SEP 14 1948

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 93—PART 12

JUNE 13, 1947, TO JULY 26, 1947

(PAGES A2831 TO A3916)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1947

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Address by Senator Martin at National Convention of Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], at the national convention of the Young Republicans, at Milwaukee, Wis., on Friday, June 6, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH SHAPES AMERICA'S TOMORROW

Chairman Becker, delegates to the Young Republican Convention, and my fellow Americans everywhere, I salute my fellow Young Republicans with special pride and satisfaction. Some years ago, while I was Republican chairman of Pennsylvania, we realized the then Young Republican organization had dwindled in numbers and weakened in influence. I helped to rebuild your great organization. Since that, I have felt myself one of you.

In passing upon legislation, as Governor and Senator, there is a yardstick that I have always applied: "Is it good for our young people—the coming generation." I have tried to think with you and to see things as you do.

I have great faith in you. Not long ago, you young men were establishing beachheads all over the world. Many of you young women served in the armed forces or did critical work on the home front. That meant you had strength, courage, and faith in America. Today you are preparing to take new beachheads, not by force of arms but by the vigor of your patriotic Americanism.

I know that you will play your part, and succeed. I am more concerned with my own generation. Will we pass on to you the tools and financial stability you need? With such help as we can give you, you must build America strong enough to withstand attack by a cancerous ideology—communism. Your job is to beat it down and go on to build a bigger, stronger America just as each generation has done before you.

The system which we call Americanism offers you individual rights and individual dignity. Under it you think as you please and speak as you please. You worship the God of your fathers as your conscience dictates. Yes; you are free to act as you please, if you respect the rights of others.

You possess also something that is granted to no other people in the world today. It is "The right to get ahead."

These are rights guaranteed by our American system. We forget how precious they are. No dictatorship or collective system dares to grant its people these things which we accept so casually.

In accepting these privileges you also accept the obligation to fight for them and pass them on untarnished.

We live today in an intensely competitive world. For sheer bitterness in the struggle for the minds and souls of men, there has never been its equal. We won the first round when we beat down the brutal cruelties of nazism.

Today we are in the second round. We are battling a force more subtle, more insidious—yes, more able to woo the minds of men—communism.

You were the spearhead that won that first round. The world looks to you young folks once again to lead the way to victory.

We shall not win this fight by pious platitudes or by name calling. We shall not win by mere political promises. We shall not win it by hand-outs to other nations.

We shall win it only by proving that we are bigger, tougher, stronger—and that our way of life is better.

This will not be easy.

Communism is a disciplined force. Its growth has been the result of cunning planning, of hard work, and of sacrifice by people who believe in their cause.

The way to win is to plan more carefully, to work harder, and to make greater sacrifices to uphold the American way. Against the godless faith of communism we must offer a greater faith in America, supported by our thousands of churches, looking toward the common God for inspiration.

In this struggle, you Young Republicans, and all our youth, must play a leading role in shaping America's tomorrow.

Be proud that our party has no subversives. We don't stand for fascism, for communism, or for any other foreign "ism." Many of the termites that bore from within to weaken our Government are holding important jobs in Washington. They were put there by the New Deal Party.

They have claims on that party, and that party owes obligation to them.

We Republicans have just one thing for them—a one-way ticket to Moscow.

We are proud of our party, you and I, but let us make it even a better party. We are not a party of obstruction and criticism. We are a party with a plan and purpose. We must move ahead steadily, building a better America.

We must beckon youth to our ranks. Youth is forward looking and liberal. It is enthusiastic in its desire for better things. Youth has a right to these dreams, but it must not succumb to false prophets who misuse the term liberalism.

Liberalism means to be free, but its meaning is warped by those who use it most. In its name, they call for more Government controls. That leads to loss of freedom and the socialistic system of a regimented slave state.

You have heard of the cuckoo bird, a creature which lays its eggs in the nests of other birds. Investigate carefully all the high-sounding new movements that invite you. For communism is a cuckoo bird that lays its eggs in liberalism's nest.

Not until we eradicate the assorted cuckoos and their ideas will we be able to take our country out of hock and give it back to our people.

At a time when our national debt stands at nearly $260,000,000,000, the present Democratic administration asks for a budget 12 times the average annual expenditure of the Federal Government following World War I.

Let me quote you something from one of the best known men of the twentieth century. I quote:

"The credit of the family depends chiefly upon whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good."

Let me end the quote there for a moment, to point out that this is what the Republican Party has been trying to do—to balance the budget, so that our Nation can live within its income and keep its credit sound.

Now to resume the quotation:

"Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors because they are a burden on production and are paid through production. If those taxes are excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, in tax-sold farms, and in hordes of hungry people, tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain."

Let me digress once more:

Is not that what the Republican Party has been warning of and seeking to forestall?

And what has happened? The administration big guns have warned us that the President wants no tax reduction and will veto our tax bill.

And now to complete the quotation. Again I quote:

"I know something of taxes. For three long years I have been going up and down this country preaching that government—Federal, State, and local—costs too much. I shall not stop that preaching."

That is the end of the quotation. These many years we Republicans have been preaching that government costs too much. We shall not stop that preaching. Because we have fought for these things, we have been condemned and ridiculed by the New Dealers on the floor of Congress and across the Nation.

The quotation was good, basic Americanism. The pity is that both the prominent

American who uttered those words, and his successor, have failed to follow them. In case you have forgotten, the man who spoke those words was Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the Presidential campaign of 1932.

Now, 15 years later, for the first time, those words are being implemented with deeds—by a Republican Congress.

Youth, unfortunately, has thought too little of the national debt and taxes. It has failed to rally to the support of those who seek to reduce this debt.

Let me warn you Young Republicans here and young Americans everywhere, not to miss the boat. You are going to have to pay most of our $260,000,000,000 debt. You face this long-term mortgage on your homes and futures.

If you are a family man, your share of the national debt is $7,500 dollars. You cannot escape it. That is why our national debt and our Federal expenses should be even more your concern than that of the Congress.

And don't miss the boat on taxes either. You have a stake in having them cut.

Your younger years are your building years. They are the years you should be making some money to put into productive enterprise for your futures. They are the years you should begin providing for the time when many of you will not be able to work so hard. You will need savings for yourselves and your families.

But see what is happening today. The present high tax rates prevent the younger people from saving. All they earn is divided into two piles. One they must spend to live; the other is taken by the tax collector. When your fathers were your age, they were able to save and invest. You should have the same opportunity.

I am well aware of the condition of the world and of this Nation's obligations in that world. But I say this with utmost confidence. With your help and support we can reduce Federal spending, let you save part of what you earn, provide new opportunities, and still make good on those obligations.

With these before you—youth must shape the America of tomorrow.

You must realize, however, as I do, that many difficult problems will be encountered. Congress has been confronted with many of these problems. Unfortunately, not many of our people are aware of the severe handicaps under which Congress has been working.

I would like to suggest that the young Republicans take on this year the task of acquainting the American public with the facts. Here they are:

We have been in session for only about 5 months. The first part of that time it was necessary for the House and the Senate to remake themselves in accordance with the Congressional Reorganization Act passed last year. That consumed considerable time. It meant that Congress was forced to commence its actual legislative work weeks behind schedule.

But with the work of reorganization done—and considering the fact that we have refused to be a rubber-stamp Congress—we have moved far more swiftly than the public realizes.

Last year's election restored the legislative branch of their government to the people. Next year we will restore the executive branch.

In a short time, this Congress has hacked away substantial sums from inflated Federal budget requests. In that time, tax reduction—the first real individual income-tax reduction in many years—has been passed by a Republican Congress. In that time, the budget has been balanced and a start has been made toward reducing the national debt.

In that time, also, I should like to point out, numerous other bills, in line with our campaign pledges, have passed. The Congress overwhelmingly passed the bill to outlaw unwarranted portal-to-portal claims—a long step toward industrial stability. It passed new labor legislation in accordance with our pledges, so as to bring about better balance between employer and employee.

It passed the law to limit the Presidential tenure to two terms, and voted large funds to aid the needy of the world and to uphold the hands of those nations which stand as a barrier against communism.

It terminated many of the wartime powers of the administration and removed many of the Government controls from business and industry—all in line with restoring free enterprise.

I want to emphasize this and wish it could be driven home to our people in all the 48 States. We did these things in this short time under the handicap of an iron curtain dropped by the bureaus and departments which have withheld vital information from the Congress, and refused to cooperate in other ways. They knew if Congress had all the facts it would be in even better position to cut away more of the deadwood.

Congress accomplished what it has despite pressure groups set up by the departments and agencies to influence Congress. You've heard about some of the work of this big, unregistered lobby which feeds directly on tax dollars while it seeks to perpetuate itself.

You may have read about confidential letters sent into the field from Washington, advising Government pay-rollers how to stir up the folks against congressional economy. You may have heard about the Federal propaganda machine stirring up the folks back home to send letters and telegrams to Congress, protesting any cut in Federal expenditures—all in the best tradition of the professional lobbyist.

You probably heard of post-office branches being closed a day or two a week in various smaller communities. The people were advised that this was being done because Congress had cut the post-office budget. And, mind you, all of this was done even before the new budget goes into effect, July 1 next.

Of course, it is nonsense to think that Congress intends to close down post offices. Nevertheless, some people have been fooled by this trick and by similar tricks. That was one of the handicaps your Congress has had to overcome.

One of the problems we have faced has been the heavy opposition of the Truman administration to income-tax reductions. Many impressive arguments have been presented by the administration, but they have concealed the real reason—politics.

Yes—politics. Let me show you how that works.

If taxes were reduced in 1947, that would not help the administration very much in the Presidential election campaign of 1948. The administration works on the principle of removing the tight shoe that pinches the corn when it will have the best political effect.

Hence the New Dealers have announced they want no tax reduction until 1948, when they would claim the credit and tell the voters that they reduced taxes, hoping to cash in at the polls.

But there is this angle to it. If the administration had had its way, the American people would have been squeezed for excessive wartime taxes for another year, for no purpose other than to make votes for the administration.

They would have forced you to wear the tight shoe another year so they could have dashed up at the eleventh hour, given you relief, and demanded their reward at the ballot box.

It has been argued by the administration that all the savings by the Republicans should be applied to reduction of the national debt. This is a strange doctrine, indeed, to come from the lips of those who for nearly 15 years have advised the American people not to be concerned about our debt because, as they said, "we owe it to ourselves."

We Republicans are cutting taxes now—because we know that we can reduce taxes and still make a substantial payment on the Federal debt. We know both are necessary and vital to our national economy.

In conclusion I would like to make some suggestions for young Republicans and older Republicans everywhere.

1. Take a greater interest in Government. Use your power to make Government function as our forefathers blueprinted it, not as foreign dictators would have it.

2. Demand the blotting out of communism and other dangerous subversive ideologies being preached in this country.

3. Fight for lower taxes and continued reduction of the public debt. The way to bring these things about is to cut the cost of Government by eliminating useless functions and useless employees.

4. Demand a plan for strong national defense based upon the American tradition of our desire to live at peace with our neighbors, but of readiness to defend ourselves against any attack.

5. Insist upon some return for the aid we are giving so freely to other nations. Many of these nations have and can spare raw materials which are vital to our national defense. I refer principally to those scarce metals and minerals which we should stock pile for our protection. Why should we not have some of these in exchange for carrying the heavy relief burden?

6. Let us conserve our own national resources so that future generations will not find themselves living in a have-not Nation.

7. Let our actions follow the road of right and not expediency. In this connection let me emphasize one point which is not given sufficient emphasis in the harsh age in which we live. I mean, the virtue of tolerance. If we are to succeed in further building our country, in making it a better place in which to live, and a model for the future, then we must preach and practice tolerance and good will.

Let us seek to live at peace with our fellow Americans, no matter what their race, their color, or their creed. United we can be an influence for good that we could never be, if divided.

Your committee did me a great honor in inviting me to speak over the air to the Young Republicans of America. I appreciate most deeply this privilege and also the opportunity to discuss with you, the representatives of the young Republican organizations of the United States, the important things that we, as Republicans young and old, have to accomplish.

It is a real pleasure, while in the great State of Wisconsin, to express my admiration for your representatives in the Senate of the United States.

ALEC WILEY, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, has won recognition as a statesman of rare distinction. As chairman of the powerful Judiciary Committee, he has performed a marvelous American job. Through his efforts legislation has been placed on the statute books for the benefit of all our people.

Your brilliant, young junior Member, Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, is a freshman Senator like myself, yet he has already, by his exceptional ability, impressed himself most favorably upon that body.

You Young Republicans have a right to be proud of your attainments in the United States. For example, you already have three Members of the United States Senate—Wisconsin's able Senator MCCARTHY, California's able Senator KNOWLAND, and Indiana's able Senator JENNER. All of them served overseas in World War II and have outstanding military records.

Again, I want to congratulate the Young Republicans of the United States. With all the emphasis at my command I urge you to move forward as a group—rededicated to youth's greatest obligation and greatest opportunity—shaping the America of tomorrow.

Flag Day Address by Senator Johnston of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Flag Day address delivered today at the Eastern High School in the city of Washington by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, General McAuliffe, distinguished guests, and young friends, it is with a feeling of deep humility and glowing pride that I share the honors of this hour with that great hero and alumnus of your school, Maj. Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe, legendary hero of Bastogne. It is peculiarly fitting and proper that you have chosen Flag Day as the appropriate occasion to do honor to such a great defender of our flag. And I say to you young people gathered here today, that if you can grasp the deep, underlying significance, the dynamic confidence in that flag and what is represents, if you can come to grips with your own conscience and your own hearts and gain for yourselves the inner-confidence, the belief in the sacredness of your Government and your flag, and the sanctity of the human soul expressed in that term of vigorous defiance of the Nazi superman, "Aw, nuts," then you, like General McAuliffe, can attain your place of eminence in the annals of American heroes who have fought and bled, and died to defend and preserve those beautiful colors and that which they symbolize.

Beleagured and beseiged, apparently condemned to destruction, General McAuliffe, like other great American heroes, knew no fear, knew no defeat. His response to the demands of surrender from the so-called Nazi supermen was a masterpiece of defiance. His classic utterance "Aw, nuts" was an eloquent expression of American confidence and determination.

In thousands of words he could not more clearly have explained the American contempt and disgust for the stupid ideology that the Nazis state was more noble and powerful than the collective strength of the American individuals. I salute General McAuliffe as a great defender in the finest American tradition, of the greatest flag that has ever fluttered in the sky.

The history of the development of the Stars and Stripes is the story of the growth of a nation, born of blood and strife and dedicated to the preservation of the dignity and integrity of the individual citizen. We people of these United States have not always been free; we suffered long under a tyrant king who ruled in absentia from foreign shores. He lost his hold on us because he failed to comprehend the intensity of the love for freedom that burned fiercely in the breasts of those courageous and adventurous souls who had braved the Atlantic to establish a new colony, apart from oppression.

These pioneers, saying "Aw, nuts" to the English tyrant, showed their contempt in the shot for freedom that was heard round the world and resulted in a war of liberation.

Tomorrow is Flag Day, proclaimed by President Truman and the Governors of our 48 States. It is the final day in a week designated for a reaffirmation of our devotion to the ideal of freedom and justice under the law and beneath the flag.

That flag symbolizes 8 years of struggle to form a more perfect union. Each star in that beautiful blue field is the manifest history of a sovereign State. That flag has been unfurled over this young giant of a nation for a century and a half. Young—as nations go—this country has climbed the peak of progress to the pinnacle of might and power and strength as the undisputed leader of today's world. Dominant in war, benevolent in peace, America stands today the guiding star of a world much in need of repair—a world that needs to learn the story of America's flag and of her history.

That flag reminds us that here is a nation dedicated to personal freedom and a respect of religious beliefs, a sanctuary for the persecuted and oppressed of all the world wherein they might have continued life and liberty and be free to pursue their own happiness.

In that flag are crystallized all the hopes and fears of a nation established in the righteous principles of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of worship.

During the years of trouble with England, all sorts of queer flags had been designed as standards for the Colonies, first by one colony and then by another, each, however, having a distinctive pattern and design all its own.

But of all the flags and symbols since the world began, there is none other so full of meaning as the flag of our country. That piece of red, white, and blue bunting, represents 5,000 years of struggle upward; it is the full-grown flower of ages of fighting for liberty; it is the century plant of human hope in bloom

General Washington, George Ross, the uncle of Betsy Ross, and Robert Morris constituted a committee of three to prepare a suitable design for the new American flag. After some study they submitted their design to Betsy Ross, a widow then, 24 years of age, living in Philadelphia, conducting the upholstery business which her husband had previously run.

Betsy Ross, an expert seamstress, then drew a draft of the flag with 13 red and white stripes and 5-pointed white stars in a field of blue, which the committee accepted. They submitted the flag to Congress, but this flag was not approved until many designs were studied and discussed by the Members of the Colonial Congress.

Finally Congress, on June 14, 1777, adopted for the Nation the flag designed by Washington, Morris, and Ross, and made by Betsy Ross. The language of the congressional resolution was as follows:

"Resolved, That the flag of the 13 United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white in a field of blue, representing a new constellation."

In 1794, with the admission of two new States into the Union—Vermont and Kentucky—two additional stars and two additional stripes were added.

The flag flying over Fort McHenry on September 13 and 14, 1814, when Francis Scott Key wrote the Star-Spangled Banner, had 15 stripes and 15 stars.

It was my privilege a week ago to visit the old historic Fort McHenry at Baltimore. As I wandered over that old battleground it seemed to me that a panorama of my country's history came before me. I could vision Francis Scott Key, confined as a prisoner on one of the boats in the English fleet, waiting patiently during the 25 hours of bombardment, wondering whether at the beginning of dawn the American flag would be flying; and I could feel the thrill that must have come to him, when, with the first appearance of dawn, he found the flag still there; then he put his whole heart and patriotic soul into the burning words of the Star-Spangled Banner, now our national anthem.

As the Nation grew in size, it became impossible to add one new stripe and also one new star for each State and still preserve the symmetry of the flag. So Congress, in 1818, passed an act providing that the flag should be composed of 13 stripes, representing the original 13 States, and that new stars should be added on the July 4 following the admission of additional States. Therefore, in the flag today the 13 stripes signify the Thirteen Original Colonies and the 48 stars signify the 48 States of the Union.

I want to call your attention, particularly on this day, to the significance of the American flag. Our flag is emblematic of the sovereignty of our Nation.

It represents the ideals, aspirations, and history of our people and engenders a feeling of patriotism and respect.

It flies perpetually over the Nation's Capitol as a sign of national perpetuity.

It flies over the schoolhouses of our Nation signifying the Nation's endorsement of education and the Nation's protection.

It flies over the capitols of all our States and over our courthouses, signifying the administration of justice.

It is the symbol of every right enjoyed by the American people.

It represents the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

It reflects the wealth and grandeur and patriotism of this great land of opportunity.

It signifies the law of the land.

It stands for peace and good will among the nations of the world.

It believes in tolerance.

It is the badge of the Nation's greatness and the emblem of its destiny.

National Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the subject of national labor legislation is one of the most serious subjects confronting the country today. Daily the press of the Nation is discussing the question. Yesterday the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference at Washington, D. C., issued a statement on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that that statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an article published in the Washington Post this morning relating to that statement; also a statement by myself on the same subject, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 5, 1947.

There being no objection, the statements and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON TAFT-HARTLEY BILL ISSUED BY THE SOCIAL ACTION DEPARTMENT OF THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Now that collective bargaining and trade unionism occupy an accepted place in American life, it is the part of political and economic statesmanship to develop an organized system of employer-labor partnership by industries and in the general economic life of the country. Otherwise collective bargaining

may degenerate into class conflict instead of being a springboard toward cooperation for the good of the entire economy.

The Taft-Hartley bill does little or nothing to encourage labor-management cooperation. On the contrary, it approaches the complicated problem of industrial relations from a narrow and excessively legalistic point of view. It runs the risk of disorganizing and disrupting industrial relations by hastily and completely recasting the whole range of Federal labor legislation just at the time when industrial stability is most desperately needed and, ironically enough, just at the time when collective bargaining shows definite signs of moving toward collective cooperation for the common good. Instead of encouraging labor and management to work together in harmony for the general economic welfare, the bill puts a number of legal restrictions on collective bargaining and particularly on the activities of trade unions—restrictions which will almost inevitably lead to industrial strife and unrest. The bill is an open invitation to management to have recourse to the courts and to the Labor Board at almost every turn and thus to sidetrack or evade the normal processes of constructive collective bargaining. It will also result in strikes of all sorts during the long period in which the administration and the legality of the bill are being clarified. It will create the sort of confusion which prevailed in American industry during the period in which the National Labor Relations Act was being tested in the courts. There is no sufficient reason to risk such wholesale confusion at the present time.

More specifically, we oppose the Taft-Hartley bill because of the following unfair and unworkable provisions:

(1) By outlawing the closed shop, the bill disregards completely the history of industrial relations in the United States during the past 50 years or more. Hundreds of thousands of American workers are now covered by closed-shop contracts, which, in the vast majority of cases, have operated and are now operating to the mutual benefit of labor and management alike. To wipe out these long-standing contracts by the stroke of a pen is to invite legitimate rebellion on the part of organized labor and consequently to encourage widespread industrial unrest and confusion. If there are occasional abuses under existing closed-shop agreements, surely these abuses can be corrected without resorting to the wholesale prohibition of the practice of the closed shop itself.

(2) The bill denies to foremen and to certain other supervisory employees the legal protection of their natural right to organize into trade-unions of their own free choosing. This denial is at once unethical and impractical. Again it is an open invitation to foremen and supervisory employees to disrupt industrial relations by fighting a last-ditch battle for the free exercise of a right which they know to be theirs and which they are determined to safeguard. Recent events indicate very clearly that these workers have no intention of tolerating such a serious infringement upon their moral and constitutional right to organize. They have every reason to expect and to demand that the exercise of this right be guaranteed and protected by law.

(3) The bill, in effect, would tend to encourage the separate States to enact antilabor legislation. It would do so by going out of its way in a most unprecedented manner to provide that in spite of the Federal law the States are free to outlaw the union shop in any of its various and long-established forms.

(4) The provision in the bill which would deny official certification to a union unless all of its officers declare under oath that they are not members of the Communist Party and that they do not favor the forceful or unconstitutional overthrow of the Government is likely to lead to serious confusion. Likewise it will prove to be very embarrassing to the great majority of sincere anti-Communists in the American labor movement. Simply by refusing to sign the required affidavit, a single Communist officer could prevent an otherwise decent and legitimate union from being legally certified for purposes of collective bargaining. This provision of the bill is calculated, therefore, to play into the hands of the Communists, who thrive on confusion and disorder. Once again the bill reveals an uncritical tendency to try to solve complicated problems of industrial relations by an oversimplified legalistic approach—an approach which, in the present instance, is rejected as worse than useless by the vast majority of those who have had practical experience in combating the influence of the Communist minority in the labor movement.

We urge the Congress to reconsider its vote and to make haste more slowly in its approach to a problem which is far too delicate and far too complicated to be legislated out of existence. If additional labor legislation is necessary, let it follow and not precede the bipartisan study of industrial relations which is provided for in title IV of the bill. This study ought not to limit itself to the details of collective bargaining as such. Rather it ought to concentrate seriously on discovering ways and means of going beyond the limits of traditional collective bargaining into an organized system of labor-management cooperation on the whole range of industrial and economic problems. Anything less than this will tend to encourage class conflict by setting off organized management and organized labor as contestants in a continuing struggle for power.

Welfare Conference Urges President To Veto Measure

The social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference voiced strong opposition last night to the Taft-Hartley labor bill as one which "will almost inevitably lead to industrial strife and unrest."

It made four specific objections, including one saying that the requirement that union officers disclaim under oath any Communist Party links would "lead to serious confusion . . . and play into the hands of the Communists."

"It will prove to be very embarrassing to the great majority of sincere anti-Communists in the American labor movement," the social action department said in an official statement.

"Simply by refusing to sign the required affidavit, a single Communist officer could prevent an otherwise decent and legitimate union from being legally certified for purposes of collective bargaining.

"This provision of the bill is calculated, therefore, to play into the hands of the Communists, who thrive on confusion and disorder."

It called this method "an over-simplified legalistic approach * * * which * * * is rejected as worse than useless by the vast majority of those who have had practical experience in combating the influence of the Communist minority in the labor movement."

The National Catholic Welfare Conference is made up of all the Catholic bishops in the United States, who meet annually and elect an administrative board of 10. These board members administer various departments, of which the social action division is one. Headed by Bishop Karl Alter of Toledo, the social action department concerns itself with industrial and economic problems, international peace, interracial matters, etc.

Besides the Communist angle, the department objected to the Taft-Hartley bill on these grounds:

1. To outlaw the closed shop (where only union members may be hired) "is to invite legitimate rebellion on the part of organized labor and consequently to encourage widespread industrial unrest and confusion." Closed-shop contracts, "in the vast majority of cases, have operated and are now operating to the mutual benefit of labor and management alike."

2. Provisions directed against unionization of foremen are an "open invitation to foremen and supervisory employees to disrupt industrial relations by fighting a last-ditch battle for the free exercise of a right which they know to be theirs."

3. The bill "would tend to encourage the separate States to enact antilabor legislation. It would do this by going out of its way in a most unprecedented manner to provide that in spite of Federal law the States are free to outlaw the union shop." The union shop permits hiring of nonunion workers, but they must join the union shortly.

The social action statement said that the bill "runs the risk of disorganizing and disrupting industrial relations by hastily and completely recasting the whole range of Federal labor legislation just at the time when collective bargaining shows definite signs of moving toward collective cooperation for the common good."

The statement asked Congress to reconsider the whole matter of labor legislation with an accent on study before legislation. Copies were sent to President Truman, chairmen of the Senate and House Labor Committees, and to the Senate-House conference committee which put into final form the measure now awaiting Presidential action.

Against

(By Senator Murray, Democrat, of Montana)

The record of labor in America is a record every citizen may be proud of. Half a century ago American workers lived lives of squalor and deprivation, working under insanitary conditions, poorly housed, with inadequate food and long hours of grinding work. These conditions were emphasized by the surrounding splendor of the well-to-do classes.

The beginning of the century witnessed an improvement in democratic processes and the development of an increasing regard for the rights of the individual.

The Democratic campaigns of 1896 and 1900 brought to the attention of the people the need for a more enlightened attitude toward the problems growing out of labor-management relations and the exploitation and oppression of the unorganized workers of the country.

Unions' growth essential

The development of the labor union movement was absolutely essential to the protection of workers. After a long and bitter struggle strong labor unions began to emerge. They have contributed immeasurably to improving wages and working conditions, and have, more than anything else, contributed to the expansion of production and general prosperity of the country.

It is my conviction that the closed and union shops have contributed materially to improve these conditions and to the stability of industrial relations in America, the purchasing power of our worker-consumers, and the normal growth of trade-unions.

Basically, they grew out of the traditional opposition to American employers to trade-unions. Unions, instead of devoting themselves to the purpose for which they were organized, were engaged in a constant struggle for existence with employers. Until the unions attained the security of closed- or union-shop agreements, they were open to all the union-busting devices available to employers.

Not new ideas; very useful

The closed shop and the union shop are not new in American industrial history; they have been written into collective-bargaining agreements for over a century.

In the development of our labor history, it has been shown that these agreements serve many useful purposes.

In many trades, such as the printing industry, the employer knows in hiring a union man that he is getting a qualified journeyman who meets union standards. The union, under closed-shop conditions, acts, in effect, as an employment agency for the industry, reducing unemployment and spreading work equitably among its members. It is able to assure uniform employment conditions so that the chiseling employer does not receive any undue advantage. It enables the union to discipline incompetent or unqualified workers.

It is notable that our most successful collective bargaining is found in those industries which have long had the closed or union shops, such as clothing, building construction, the printing trades, the pottery industry, glass manufacture, and others.

"UNDEMOCRATIC" CHARGE DENIED

It is frequently objected that the closed shop and the union shop are "undemocratic"—to my mind, a fallacious argument. A union representing a majority of employees—and everyone agrees that majority rule is part of any democratic system—must, under modern industrial conditions, make agreements covering all employees, union and nonunion alike.

The demand that all employees join the union is merely a requirement that all who share the benefits shall also share the burdens; and, most importantly, all employees share the democratic rights of participation in the activities of the union. They gain the right to vote for union officers, to attend meetings, and to have a voice in the affairs of the union that represents them.

In this view, the closed and the union shop extend, rather than limit, democratic privileges.

Under the present bills, the closed shop becomes completely illegal and the union shop is legal only if a majority of employees in the plant agree to it. Once in the union, a worker may be discharged only for nonmembership arising out of a failure to pay dues.

WHOLLY UNDESIRABLE RESULTS

Taken together, these provisions will lead to wholly undesirable results.

First, they mean that the right of employers to hire antiunion workers and thereby disrupt the union, is restored throughout all American industry. Even where these arrangements have operated most successfully and even though employers, unions and all employees are completely satisfied, the closed shop is illegal.

Second, the usefulness of the union shop is greatly reduced, for, if a worker is incompetent, or a labor spy, or steals the union funds, or is a racketeer, his employer may not discharge him if he is suspended from the union. Certainly it will not help industrial stability to require union men to continue working with someone for whom they have a justifiable contempt.

Third, the responsibility of the union is thereby greatly weakened. Left without means of disciplining the incompetent or the slothful or the merely disruptive, carefully built-up union standards may be expected to decline.

OTHER GROUPS NOT REGULATED

We have not undertaken by Federal law to regulate the membership standards of other organizations, such as lodges, medical, and bar associations, many of which enjoy in effect closed shops, and I think we should not do it for trade-unions. We have not even regulated the membership requirements of organizations set up to represent the views of industry and to organize the strength of employers in their dealings with workers, such as the Associated Industries, the National Association of Manufacturers, and others.

That there have been abuses of the closed shop and the union must be conceded. There have been examples of nepotism, of race and religious prejudices, and of other arbitrary exclusions or expulsions.

But this legislation throws out the baby with the bath; instead of correcting the abuses of the closed shop, it merely abolishes it.

Employers have been, and are, guilty of similar practices, and have refused to hire, or discharge workers for arbitrary reasons. Yet the bill leaves that more serious problem completely untouched.

OTHER ARGUMENTS REBUTTED

One usual justification for the bill is that the Railway Labor Act prohibits the closed shop and that this has worked well; yet recently A. F. Whitney, of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, pointed out to the Senate Committee on Labor the unsatisfactory results of that prohibition, which was originally adopted to outlaw the yellow-dog contract.

It is also insisted that Great Britain has not used the closed-shop agreement. Father Toner, of Seattle, Wash., an authority on the closed shop, pointed out to the Senate committee that in practice most English trade unions operate under closed shops.

This problem is too complex to warrant blanket legislation of the type now proposed by the Federal Government. It should be left where it belongs, at the plant level, to be worked out by the people on the spot—management, unions, and employees in the manner that best meets the needs of each problem.

I remain convinced that if this bill becomes law it will greatly inconvenience many employers who now benefit from such agreements. From unions and workers we may expect a storm of indignation as its weakening effect on trade-unions becomes clear.

For these reasons, I feel strongly that President Truman should veto the bill.

Statement of Principles Adopted by the Young Republican National Convention, June 7, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the statement of principles adopted by the Young Republican National Convention meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., June 7, 1947. This statement of principles was adopted by about 500 delegates representing 47 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia:

At this time, when the American way of life, with its emphasis upon individual enterprise, individual rights and freedom and political democracy, is under attack at home and abroad, the American people are turning to the Republican Party. Young veterans in particular see in the Republican Party, and in its flourishing young Republican movement, their best instrument for assuming political leadership. The Republican Party is the party of freedom. It alone has never comprised nor trafficked with any of the totalitarian factions.

To justify the support of the American people, this Young Republican National Federation offers and pledges itself to support the following statement of principles.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD

We advocate a strong, bipartisan foreign policy, which will bridge gaps between changing administrations and which should be made effective by:

1. We advocate effective opposition to the spread of communism and other totalitarian ideologies. We must have a positive, vibrant approach to the rest of the world which is designed to show our faith in the objectives and operation of our free institutions. This approach should be implemented by educational programs for the purpose of informing others of the virtues of our way of life, and by a program of economic help for other nations to the end that they may become self-supporting, such economic help to be conditioned upon free access of our press to such nations. This program would also entail the acceptance of our full share of responsibility for alleviating the food and clothing lacks of a poverty-stricken and war-torn world.

2. We should continue to play a leading role in the United Nations, work to make it more effective, and utilize and develop to the fullest possible extent its framework and machinery for peaceably settling conflicts between all nations, great and small.

3. We should maintain a strong, unified Army, Navy, and Air Force and their Reserves by securing voluntary enlistments and, to the extent that these are insufficient, by some equitable program of compulsory military training. Technological research and development must be continued on a large scale to insure the continuation of this country's technological superiority.

4. We should train and develop a competent corps of professional diplomats, with promotions dependent on merit rather than seniority, and with salaries and expense allowances sufficiently high to enable them appropriately to represent the United States without drawing upon private means.

5. To insure that complete and accurate information will be available as a basis for military and diplomatic decisions affecting our foreign policy we should maintain under civilian direction an independent, central intelligence agency with full authority to coordinate existing intelligence services in the various departments and to operate such additional facilities for the acquisition, evaluation, and analysis of intelligence from foreign countries as it may deem necessary.

THE UNITED STATES AT HOME

To keep the United States strong at home and to make her a living example of democracy at its best, the following principles should be adopted and implemented:

1. The individual's dignity and social and economic stature must be maintained and advanced, with free access to economic, social, political, educational and other opportunities, regardless of race or religion.

2. A strong, free society is dependent upon the physical and mental attainments of the people composing it. We should ensure by Federal grants in aid, if necessary, to States meeting reasonable minimum standards, while otherwise leaving control over education in the States, the fullest possible access to education. To attract better teachers, the States should develop a program of higher standards, higher pay and retirement benefits.

3. Veterans, as a whole, should by now have become reestablished in their communities, and our veterans' program should be designed to make them self-sufficient citizens. Casualties and their dependents should have the best possible care at Government expense. Maintenance allowances for veterans attending college under the GI bill should be reasonably increased, where an increase of allowance is necessary, and racketeering by a small minority of veterans under the various beneficial provisions of the bill should be eradicated. The Veterans' Administration should set its house in order

and administer more efficiently the various veterans' benefits provided by law.

4. Adequate appropriations should be made available to increase the productiveness of our country. For instance, reclamation projects and the completion of surveys for water conservation in the West should be adequately financed, particularly those projects which are self-liquidating.

5. We must restore our system of free competitive enterprise in an economy based upon free labor and free management. We favor giving free collective bargaining a genuine opportunity to function with a minimum of governmental regulation. We favor union as against closed shops, and appropriate bans against jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. Collective bargaining requires good will and desire to reach an agreement—and for this reason Communist leadership must be rooted out of unions. This is fundamentally the job of the membership and we commend those unions which, through their own democratic processes, have thrown off the Communist yoke. We must adopt and enforce rules which will prevent the monopoly of power and planned interruption of full production by Government, labor, or business.

6. We advocate the elimination of unnecessary expense by national, State and local governments; the adoption of a long-range tax plan designed to encourage the productive use of capital and the fullest initiative, and a reasonable reduction in tax rates consistent with operation under a balanced budget and the gradual retirement of the national debt.

7. Mob violence is the negation of law and order and we favor Federal legislation against it. We also favor a constitutional amendment abolishing poll taxes.

8. Present prices for farm commodities are high enough to support the full production necessary to supply the abnormal world demands made upon the American farmer, and there is no need for subsidies at this time. To help provide an expanding market and new users for farm products, we urge the continuation and expansion of Federal-research facilities. To protect American consumers, we urge the vigorous enforcement of the present program designed to prevent the spread of hoof-and-mouth disease. We urge the expansion of the rural electrification and soil-conservation programs.

9. The American housing problem can best be solved by American industry. But in the field of low-cost housing, building costs do not allow an economic rent level. Therefore, Federal aid for low-cost housing and long-term slum-clearance programs is urged so that our low-income groups may be adequately housed.

10. We urge a national program of education and publicity designed to publicly expose the real intent and practice of Communists and other un-American groups in the United States.

Respectfully submitted for the committee.

JOHN A. WELLS,
Chairman, Platform and Resolutions Committee.

Housing and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times entitled "Housing and Socialism":

HOUSING AND SOCIALISM—PAPAL ENCYCLICAL AND THE STAND OF CATHOLIC CLERGY CITED ON PROBLEM

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The late Msgr. John A. Ryan, for many years professor of moral theology at the Catholic University in Washington, was and remains recognized as one of the great pioneer sociologists and social scientists that this country has produced. Inevitably he was on the receiving end of much of the abuse from which pioneers always suffer. Time and again he was accused of radical or socialistic tendencies.

It must have been with no little glee, therefore, that he greeted the papal encyclical "Quadragesimo anno," issued in 1931 by Pope Pius XI, which endorsed everything for which Monsignor Ryan had pleaded. And one can just picture with what satisfaction the grand old man must have put his whole tongue into his cheek as he wrote shortly after the appearance of the encyclical an article for a current periodical which he entitled "The Radical (quoted by Monsignor Ryan) Aspects of the Quadragesimo anno."

Today the same confused thinking and the same technique of opposition as resulted in Monsignor Ryan's being branded a radical because he espoused such social reforms as a living wage, old-age pensions, and the like, is manifest in the campaign to discredit the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. It would be easy to multiply examples of such misleading propaganda, but a letter published recently in your columns from one Paul P. Swett, Jr., of Baltimore is an excellent case in point. "I am amazed at your willingness," writes Mr. Swett, commenting on a previous editorial in The New York Times, "to say that this bill is not socialistic."

Your correspondent then proceeds, as is customary in anti-Taft-Ellender-Wagner fulminations, to focus his whole attention on the 500,000 units provided by the bill for low-income families, completely ignoring the fact that the bill also aims to stimulate the erection of 15,000,000 other units on a straight economic basis, i. e., with no subsidy whatsoever.

Incidentally, it might well also be pointed out here that even in the case of the 500,000 units for the low-income groups, the total capital expenditure involved is repaid to the United States Treasury with interest, the only Government assistance being in the form of a rent subsidy to bring decent and safe housing within the reach of those unfortunates for whom our economic system has not yet found it possible to provide adequate means of livelihood.

If to stimulate the production by private industry of the commodity presently most needed in our Nation, homes for our people, and to give some small assistance to a very limited number (curiously enough, Mr. Swett himself stresses this limitation) of underprivileged families is socialism, well, I'm afraid I'm a Socialist. Furthermore, so are the Popes and many of the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States.

The same pontiff, in another notable document, his encyclical letter on Christian marriage, has this to say: "If, however, for this purpose" (i. e., adequate opportunity for family life) "private resources do not suffice, it is the duty of the public authority to supply for the insufficient forces of individual effort. * * * If families, particularly those in which there are many children, have not suitable dwellings * * * it is obvious great peril can arise to the public security and to the welfare and very life of civil society itself. * * * Wherefore, those who have the care of the state and of the public good cannot neglect the needs of married people and their families without bringing great harm upon the state and on the common welfare."

If that be socialistic, make the most of it.

Very Rev. Msgr. EDWARD ROBERTS MOORE.

NEW YORK, *June 5, 1947.*

One Coup Instead of Two

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to call attention to an editorial appearing in the New York Times under date of June 12, 1947, entitled "One Coup Instead of Two."

It is my feeling that the public in general will agree with the position taken by the Times and the action of Congress in support of the Truman doctrine.

The editorial follows:

ONE COUP INSTEAD OF TWO

The Communist seizure of power in Hungary is hailed in certain quarters in this country as the Soviet answer to the Truman doctrine. It is obviously intended by the Moscow government as an answer, and especially that it should be interpreted as such by the opponents of the Truman policy in the United States. But the only sense in which it is an answer is that our action in Greece forced the hand of the strategists in the Kremlin and impelled them to do a little sooner what they were quite determined to do in any case.

Anyone who has followed developments in Hungary knows that the plot to discredit and get rid of the Smallholders' Party has been hatching ever since the elections of November 1945, demonstrated that this party was supported by the great majority of the people. The Communist minority, backed from the beginning by the Russian military government, which does not hesitate now to intervene openly in the situation, immediately took over key positions, including control of the police, with the unconcealed objective of taking over the government. The first arrests of deputies of the majority party, on charges of conspiracy, took place last January, long before the Truman doctrine was thought of. Deputy Premier Rakosi, the Comintern graduate, who is the Hungarian Communist leader, boasts that he put one over on the western powers. After the last elections he was boasting that the next election would be different, as, indeed, it promises to be.

Actually, the Hungarian coup is the best justification to date of the Truman policy. It shows us exactly what was planned in Greece, and what would certainly have happened if the United States had not intervened. Greece is not occupied by the Russian Army, so the design to put the Communists in power there had to be engineered and aided from the outside. The report of Mark Ethridge, American member of the United Nations Investigating Committee and an observer of unquestioned competence and integrity, leaves no doubt that this was the case. Because it is so bald and contemptuous of the majority, the Hungarian affair is an eye opener in the new method of conquest. It is also contemptuous of the Allied Control Commission, as the State Department makes clear in a sharp protest noting that Hungary is legally under three-power control and demanding a tripartite investigation.

The Truman doctrine may have hurried the long-prepared overturn of the elected Hungarian Government. But if we had not acted in Greece, there would have been two coups instead of one; even three, perhaps, if Turkey is counted in.

Letter to Chairman of the Subcommittee on Fascism of the Committee on Un-American Propaganda Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was naturally very gratified when I learned that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL] had been designated as chairman of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Propaganda Activities with specific instructions to carry out a detailed and thorough investigation of Fascist propaganda and influences, with the same vigor that the committee has shown in ferreting out Communist and liberal tendencies.

The gentleman brings to this task not only the dignity and responsibility of a lawmaker, but also the capabilities of a newspaperman and a soldier's knowledge of what we were fighting against in the last war.

I have taken it on myself to submit to the gentleman a letter expressing my views on the scope of his investigation, and I was indeed pleased that on the very same day he received my letter he delivered his reply to me in person here on the floor.

I hope sincerely that all Members will take the time to read this exchange of correspondence, and I hope that the people of the country will be reassured by the letter of the subcommittee chairman. I hope likewise that the unfortunate misrepresentation of his words in various publications will not discourage or restrain him from carrying out a vigorous investigation.

I now insert at this point a copy of my letter to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL], in his capacity as chairman of the subcommittee investigating fascism, and following that you will find his gracious reply to me:

JUNE 9, 1947.

Hon. JOHN McDOWELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fascism, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I regret sincerely that the great press of other urgent matters has prevented my submitting to you sooner suggestions regarding the conduct of the investigation of your subcommittee of fascism in America. It is my belief that the report of your subcommittee might have been different had I been able to place this communication in your hands sooner. The evidence of Nazi-Fascist thinking is on every side, both in organized and in unorganized form. It should be investigated just as much as communism.

I supported all resolutions to create the various special committees to investigate un-American propaganda activities, and I have criticized only the failure to pay as much attention to reaction as to the alleged Communist fronts, and to the way the committee has smeared honest liberals and labor leaders without giving them an opportunity to be heard.

Aside from its lack of judicial conduct and its rash jeopardy of the good name of the Congress, the special committee under Mr. Dies' chairmanship made itself a partisan agency of repression which constituted a severe assault, bolstered by all the majesty and prestige of Congress, on fundamental freedom of thought, writing, speech, and association. As a standing committee there has not been the same reckless disregard of judicious procedure, and consequently, I have voted for all appropriations and I shall continue to do so; but I feel the committee should investigate Fascist activities, movements, and propaganda with the same vigor that it investigates alleged communism, both of which seem, to me, equally objectionable.

I certainly hold no brief for the protection of any person or any group actually engaged in revolutionary propaganda, whether it follows the international Communist line or the international Fascist line. I will agree fully and heartily that any alien found abusing the hospitality of the United States or violating its statutes should be dealt with according to law, and I likewise believe that any citizen shown to be engaged in any subversive activity of whatever character should be exposed and prosecuted under the applicable statutes.

Your committee should recognize, however, that the economic system of the United States rests on no statutory basis save the constitutional guaranties of private property rights and the regulatory statutes enacted under constitutional powers. There has been a constant tendency of your committee to confuse big-business interests and public interests, and to regard criticism of the economic status quo, however well taken, as an effort to discredit and overthrow by violence our free constitutional political system. By the same token, open efforts to defeat and nullify the suffrage and civil rights statutes guaranteed to all American citizens by the Constitution have been tacitly condoned by the committee through failure to take cognizance of the activities of individuals and organizations flagrantly engaged in such activities; worse, certain members of the committee have expressed public support of those views, encouraging those subversives doing most to undercut our freedoms.

I have said before, and others have said, what cannot be repeated too often: The political struggle in the United States is not between communism and Nazi-fascism, but between American democracy and all foreign isms.

I stand for America and for the American system of democratic government, founded on equality before the law and freedom of the individual. I am opposed to every authoritarian ideology. I believe in progress, because progress is growth.

To be opposed, even violently opposed, to fascism is no proof of Communist sympathy. No freedom-loving American, convinced of the advantages of the democratic way of life, can logically embrace any form of authoritarianism. While the term "Red fascism" is a barbarous contradiction in terms which no serious student of political philosophy will use, it has this much truth in it: That by their nature Nazi-facism and communism are authoritarian, and therefore undemocratic as we understand the meaning of the term.

Furthermore, I believe—and again this cannot be said too often—that communism and every other form of authoritarianism can best be checked by making our American democracy work, and by improving the condition of the people. We need more democracy, not less.

This is so self-evident that I am constantly amazed by those un-American individuals who believe that the way to preserve the American way of life is to suppress all criticism and to convert our free constitutional republic into a police state in which a small minority would determine all laws and administrative policies and control the dissemination of information.

The history of the American Republic is the history of constant growth and progress in the democratic processes. It is perhaps the most inspiring story in the long, slow march of man from ignorance and slavery to enlightenment and freedom.

For myself, I resent and resist with equal vigor assaults on the form and philosophy of the American way, whether from the right or from the left.

The Nazi-Fascist ideology is wholly repugnant to the ideals of the American people, and to the American way of life. Its realization would destroy the American democratic form of government.

It probably would be difficult to find in America today a single cell of the old German Bund or of the National Socialist Party; yet there is incontrovertible evidence on every hand of the existence of organized fascism in America; and no official investigation has more than touched the suface of the movement.

There follows a brief list of organizations or movements which to my knowledge have displayed sufficient similarity to the criteria I have suggested to justify careful investigation. They vary in the degree of their danger to American institutions, and they vary in the viciousness of their propaganda, in their influence, and in their resources; they have as a common factor the usurpation of the American way of life by a foreign and un-American system.

1. The Ku Klux Klan, wherever found, and under whatever name it may masquerade.

2. The Columbians of Atlanta, Ga. Although exposure by the Anti-Nazi League resulted in jail sentences for the leaders, it now appears that the followers are preparing to revive the movement with new leaders but with similar ends.

3. Democratic Nationalist Party, linked to the Columbians, modeled on the order of Hitler's Nazi Party, and reputed to be Nation-wide in its organization. One member, Maynard O. Nelsen, has been convicted in Minnesota of threatened breach of the peace as a result of his hate campaign at the University of Minnesota. Police there found evidence that Nelsen had collaborators in his widespread campaign of hate and violence.

4. The Committee for Constitutional Government, New York City. Although repeatedly under investigation by House and Senate committees in regard to political activities, its propaganda is bolder than ever, its finances greater, and its propaganda machine more extensive and better organized. It has a number of affiliates and dependent organizations, and demands the fullest possible airing of its objectives and its backers.

5. The National Economic Council, New York: This organization is perhaps the most open advocate of the corporate state in the United States, at least among "respectable" fronts. It appears to have ample financial resources, and its officers are known to have had close ties with foreign government inimical to the United States. It produces a constant stream of un-American propaganda and is not too "respectable" to employ political anti-Semitism to promote its cause.

6. The so-called America First Party, and all the connections and activities of its führer, Gerald L. K. Smith: It happens that Smith was called before your committee and given an open forum for the dissemination of his un-American hatreds. He was not even questioned on his repeated declarations that he would become dictator of this country in

the economic collapse which he predicts for the near future, nor was he questioned as to his fascistic veterans' organization, his ties with subversive, political "evangelists", the Ku Klux Klan, the Columbians, and the White Supremacy League. There is considerable reason for believing that he has close and lucrative connections with all those groups, and others. Certainly his revenues and disbursements demand congressional scrutiny; more than once congressional investigations have successfully broken up squalid financial rackets which were just within the law and therefore beyond the authority and jurisdiction of law-enforcement agencies.

7. Christian American, Inc., Houston, Tex.: This organization, again, has been investigated in relation to political activities; but never adequately. The Federal Bureau of Investigation also has made investigation; but since no public announcement of impending prosecution has been made, it is inferred that this is another organization which has successfully kept just inside the law. Your committee could render a great public service by exposing its highly developed commercialism to its victims, as well as by exposure of its un-American campaign of vilification and repression.

8. Phony veterans organizations: Before the war had ended there were some 600 veterans organizations of various complexions clamoring for recognition by the Veterans' Administration. A casual study of the list showed that their backers ranged all the way from responsible leaders imbued by the highest ideals of service to crummy little letterhead organizations designed as rackets to catch veterans' dollars, and in some cases sponsored by individuals tarred by association with the indicted seditionists still awaiting trial. While I have no current information as to which of these organizations of highly dubious intent have survived, it is a rich and rewarding field for investigation from which your subcommittee might flush some highly objectionable characters.

9. American Action, Inc., New York, Chicago, and other large cities. This group sprang into prominence in the 1944 campaign as a coalition of a number of highly reactionary groups representing great wealth and a complete lack of conscience or good taste in injecting racial and religious issues into an American political campaign. It has had 8 months in which to branch out, consolidate, and gain new adherents and new contributors. If its aims are harmless, exposure will do no harm, if they are not, exposure will do great good.

10. Steuben Society, a respectable group which sprang from the fertile mind of the German propagandist, George Sylvester Viereck, and already is taking up the pro-German line of a soft peace, kind treatment, rehabilitation of Germany's war potential, defense of the Nazi regime, and vicious attacks on the American Government.

11. Foundation for Freedom, Inc., 1628 Connecticut Avenue, Washington. This is a new organization, incorporated in the District of Columbia January 11, 1946, engaged in the publication of high-powered studies with strong anti-Semitic and antialien implications. Percy L. Greaves, former assistant publicity director of the Republican National Committee and a former congressional investigator, has lent his name to the reports. The incorporators are a law firm, Milton E. Hartley, Ernest Paland, and Winston E. Hobbs, doing business as the Corporation Trust Co., and are not, therefore, the true incorporators, but only dummies. It is noticeable that their literature is not identified by a union label. I do not suggest that this organization has no right to libel a great many good Americans; I do suggest that your committee has a duty to ascertain the names of the true backers and to discover their purpose and objectives and their financial resources. Greaves will be remembered as an individual who, through misrepresentation, gained access to the most secret parts of the foreign propaganda division of the Office of War Information during the course of the war.

I could, of course, go on for many pages with a catalog of organizations and individuals carrying on Hitler's work in America today; but the same sources of information are open to you and your staff—the newspapers, the magazines, the source books on the subject, the private organizations devoted to defense of American democracy against all dangers, and your daily congressional mail.

I shall, of course, be most happy to supply further names if you indicate a desire to have them. I shall be glad to open my files to you or to a designated responsible investigator. I shall be glad to talk to you or your agent.

I have confined myself, in accordance with the purpose of my letter, to movements representing a native Nazi-Fascist ideology; besides, the committee has, in the last 10 years, combed the list of liberal organizations, and has ruined the reputation of many admirable progressive groups by making unfounded and unsupported charges of Communist sympathy, infiltration, or sponsorship.

I have also confined myself to rather specific groups.

It is my belief, however, that careful and thorough investigation, uncolored by prejudgments, would develop positive evidence of foreign importation of Nazi-Fascist ideas, and certainly of un-American tendencies and propaganda.

The introduction of organized bigotry for the purpose of destroying our form of government, especially when organized and encouraged from abroad, has forced us to be wary of all. I do not believe that the American people will accept any statutes designed to limit the right of individuals to hold and express opinions; but I believe the people will welcome positive action from your committee forcing the preachers of hate and disunity to take public responsibility for their words and deeds, and to explain where their financial backing comes from and what their purposes are.

It is obvious that some of the hate peddlers are merely twisted psychotics who speak for themselves alone; but it is equally obvious that others are but willing pawns in a grand design, frequently with no real knowledge or understanding of the sinister conspiracy to which they have lent themselves, or so blinded by personal animosities that they do not care.

I realize, of course, as you do that many of the hate organizations are merely money rackets designed to separate gullible and fearsome old men and women from their money, to the enrichment of the promoter. These, too, should be exposed for the cheap petty rackets they are, no matter how imposing the names of the sponsors or how glittering the declarations of purposes.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I can only say that I have written in the utmost good faith, and should be most happy to learn from you your own reactions to my views.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. SABATH.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 11, 1947.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have just this moment received the report you were so good to furnish me with. I have not read it, but merely skimmed over, and when I do I shall address you further.

The purpose of this note, however, is to inform you that the newspaper accounts of my making a report on fascism to the Committee on Un-American Activities are entirely wrong, as I have made no report, and I am merely drafting the various parts of a report to be made. Where in the world they got the statement attributed to me that I had devoted 10 minutes to the study of fascism, I do not know, as it is entirely untrue. I have devoted hundreds of hours in study, research, in reading reports, examining documents, and reading also the history of the beginning of fascism in Italy and nazism in Germany. The subject is so wide and so profound that I felt I would be unable to make a report until I knew something about fascism, which thus far has not been defined, so far as I am able to discover.

Fascism is a deadly and a dangerous thing, as all of us know, and almost 30,000,000 human beings are dead because of it. It is quite possible in this country and it is the purpose of the subcommittee to determine what it is and then to determine and report to the House of Representatives if there be any movement in America that may lead us down that deadly, murderous path.

Believe me, sir, I am deeply grateful for your contribution to the subcommittee.

Respectfully,

JOHN MCDOWELL,
Member of Congress.

Hon. Emmet O'Neal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by virtue of unanimous consent heretofore granted me to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to say a few words about our distinguished friend, Ambassador Emmet O'Neal.

During Mr. O'Neal's long stay in the House, he made an outstanding record through hard work and brilliance of mind. His service to his district and State, and to the Nation, set an example to which all Members can aspire. His recent appointment as Ambassador to the Philippines offers to him another opportunity for great service to his Nation and to the fine people of the Philippine Republic.

In addition to his fine human qualities, Mr. O'Neal is a born diplomat. His many friends in the House are confident that the Philippine people in a very short while will learn to love and admire him, as do his many friends in this country. All of us predict for him a very brilliant career.

Hawaii's Population and Property Compared With That of 29 States at Time of Admission to the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a table

showing the population, racial classification and value of property, raw materials, and goods produced by the Territory of Hawaii today compared with that of 29 States at the time of their admission to the Union.

The tabulation should prove of interest with H. R. 49 to admit Hawaii to the Union, having been reported by the Public Lands Committee by a unanimous vote and now pending before the House.

The tabulation is as follows:

Territory	Date of organic act	Date admitted as State	Population at date of organic act	Racial classification and total population at date of admission as State				Value at date of admission as State [3]		
				Negroes	Whites	Indians [1] and Orientals [2]	Total	Real property [4]	Raw materials	Goods produced
Ohio	1787	1803		337	45,028		45,365			
Tennessee	1790	1796	35,691	13,893	91,709		105,602			
Mississippi	1798	1817	8,850	33,272	42,176		75,448			
Indiana	1800	1816	5,641	1,420	145,758		147,178			
Louisiana	1804	1812	76,556	42,245	34,311		76,556			
Michigan	1805	1837	4,762	707	211,560		212,267			
Missouri	1805	1821	20,845	10,569	56,017		66,586			
Illinois	1809	1818	12,282	1,374	53,837		55,211			
Alabama	1817	1819		42,450	85,451		127,901			
Arkansas	1819	1836	14,255	20,400	77,174		97,574			
Florida	1822	1845		40,242	47,203		87,445	$7,924,588	$220,611	$668,235
Wisconsin	1826	1848	30,945	635	304,756		305,391	22,458,442	5,414,931	7,293,068
Iowa	1838	1846	43,112	333	191,881		192,214	15,672,332	2,356,681	3,551,783
Oregon	1848	1859	13,294	128	52,160		52,288	6,279,602	1,452,000	3,138,000
Minnesota	1849	1858	6,077	259	169,395		169,654	25,291,771	2,060,000	3,600,000
New Mexico	1850	1912	61,547	1,628	304,594	21,078	327,300	34,682,427	4,430,134	9,320,067
Utah	1850	1896	11,383	672	272,465	3,612	276,749	68,515,498	11,440,250	17,981,648
Washington	1853	1889	11,198	1,602	340,829	11,181	353,612	177,640,259	19,917,057	41,768,022
Nebraska	1854	1867	28,841	789	122,117		122,906	38,365,999	2,902,074	5,738,512
Kansas	1854	1861		627	106,390		107,017	16,088,602	669,269	2,800,000
Colorado	1861	1876	34,277	2,435	191,126		193,561	35,604,197	8,806,762	14,260,159
Nevada	1861	1864	6,857	45	6,812		6,857			
North Dakota	1861	1889	2,977	373	182,407	8,174	190,954	166,559,896	6,611,001	10,710,855
South Dakota	1861	1889		541	328,010	19,854	348,405			
Arizona	1863	1912	9,658	2,009	171,468	30,877	204,354	84,328,045	39,283,038	64,098,510
Idaho	1863	1890		201	82,117	4,223	86,541	9,977,463	638,673	1,396,096
Montana	1864	1889	20,595	1,488	117,000	11,206	129,794	54,943,531	2,375,093	5,507,573
Wyoming	1868	1890	9,118	922	59,783	1,844	62,549	12,719,221	1,084,432	2,367,601
Oklahoma	1890	1907	61,864	137,612	1,444,531	74,825	1,656,968	719,703,439	34,152,894	53,682,405
Hawaii [5]	1900		154,001				502,122	500,493,838		112,441,163

[1] No census of Indian population by State available prior to 1890.
[2] Orientals: New Mexico, 706; Utah, 989; Arizona, 1,676.
[3] Figures for the population, assessed valuation of real property, and production, taken from the census nearest the date of admission as a State.
[4] No figures available for the assessed value of real property or value of products prior to 1850.
[5] Data on Hawaii: Population, board of health estimate for 1945; assessed value of real property for 1945—Territorial Tax Office. Hawaii's export of raw materials is insignificant. Goods produced include sugar (1945 figure), pineapple (1941 figure), coffee (1945 figure). For racial classification in Hawaii, see exhibit 21.

Sources of data on other Territories: Carter's Territorial Papers, vol. 1; Census reports; Compendium of the Enumeration of the Inhabitants and Statistics of the United States, 1840; organic acts in the Statutes at Large, U. S.; J. D. B. DeBow, Industrial Resources, etc., of the Southern and Western States; Samuel Hallett, Industrial and Financial Resources of the United States of America.

Reorganization of Executive Branch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Sensible Way To Economize," published in the News, of Buffalo, N. Y. The editorial relates to the bill, now pending in Congress, for reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENSIBLE WAY TO ECONOMIZE

The Federal bureaucracy, it seems, is a good deal like the weather: everybody complains about it but nobody does anything about it. The present Congress, however, has an excellent chance to do something, if it will recognize that the job calls for some scientific pruning.

Every few weeks some congressional committee brings out a new report denouncing the immensity of the governmental structure. The latest is the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which shows in a gigantic chart that there are some 2,369 distinguishable subunits of the bureaucracy, broken down in separate classifications including divisions, offices, branches, services, sections, bureaus, boards, corporations, commissions, administrations, councils, and whatnot. In all, some 2,285,570 civil servants were on the United States pay roll last December 31.

Congress is now chopping at this tangled underbrush, albeit ineffectively, by cutting down the departmental budgets for the 1948 fiscal year. But the meat-ax approach obviously will not bring real efficiency, economy, or simplification of structure.

A more logical way to get started with this job is proposed in a bill by Representative CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio, and Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts. They would establish a joint congressional-Presidential commission to go through the Government with a fine-tooth comb, as Senator LODGE puts it, and make its recommendations for a thoroughgoing streamlining to the Congress that meets in January 1949. The commission, which would thus have a year and a half to try to bring order out of today's bureaucratic chaos, would include four Presidential appointees (two from the administration, two from private life) and eight congressional appointees (two from each House, four from private life).

One virtue of such a bipartisan study is that it would provide a comprehensive array of factual data on which the administration taking office in 1949 could base a sound program of governmental reorganization. The proposed study will not, of course, prevent either Congress or the President from doing what it can to promote efficiency and economy in other, more immediate ways. But in the absence of a broad-gage study such as contemplated by the Lodge-Brown bill, the results of these hit-and-miss efforts to economize are sure to be disappointing.

Hon. David I. Walsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep regret at the death of David I. Walsh, who for many years was an outstanding Member of the United States Senate.

As a member of the General Court of Massachusetts, as Lieutenant-Governor, Governor, and Senator, he served with great ability and distinction. His efforts in behalf of the building of a strong American Navy will long be remembered. He possessed an intimate knowledge of the needs of New England and was a stalwart champion of its needs. He was a sturdy defender of the Constitution and the American way of life. Massachusetts has lost a fine public servant.

Civil Service Retirement: H. R. 3232

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a statement made before the Subcommittee on Retirement Legislation of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives regarding the report of the actuaries of the Civil Service Commission Retirement and Disability Fund, dated May 14, 1947:

After studying the report of the Committee on Civil Service of the Senate to accompany S. 637, amending the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, dated April 25, 1947, in which it was stated in the last six lines of the report, and I quote:

"It is estimated by the Civil Service Commission that the contributions from the employees plus the savings brought about through the economies cited above would almost totally finance the cost of S. 637, as amended. On the basis of maximum estimated expenditures and minimum estimated savings, the ultimate cost to the Government when the system reaches maturity, approximately 30 years hence, may be four or five million dollars per year; no immediate increase in appropriations is required. The Civil Service Commission endorses the amendments proposed."

I asked that this subcommittee be furnished with expert counsel, facts, and figures to justify the statement and conclusion as set forth in the report to S. 637, as amended.

Instead of getting what the subcommittee had asked for, the chairman of the full committee received a letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission under date of May 21, 1947, containing a report dated May 14, 1947, addressed to the President of the United States Civil Service Commission from New York City, signed by George B. Buck, R. R. Reagh, and Edward B. Fackler, who comprise the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Commission retirement and disability fund, accompanied by a statement, as follows:

"In accordance with the request of the Civil Service Commission, the Board of Actuaries has prepared an estimate of the cost of amending the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Act in accordance with Senate bill 637, as originally introduced and as modified under Calendar No. 144.

"Attention is called to the fact that the Board of Actuaries has not been able to make a detailed valuation of the proposed amendments (S. 637, as amended). The costs have been estimated on the basis of the last quiquennial valuation, with adjustments to reflect subsequent changes in the number and pay roll of the membership."

On page 10 of the report immediately following table 2 as therein set forth, the Board of Actuaries made this statement: "The comparative costs given above indicate that the adoption of S. 637 (Calendar No. 144) will increase the costs of the civil-service retirement and disability fund to the Government by the difference between 10.82 percent of pay roll and 6.68 percent, or 2.14 percent of pay roll, or $105,324,269 per annum on the basis of the pay roll as of June 30, 1946.

Inasmuch as the report of the Board of Actuaries admittedly figured their costs on the basis of the pay roll of personnel in civil service as of June 30, 1946, and inasmuch as their report was apparently in such contrast to the report of the subcommittee of the Senate, endorsed and substantiated by the Civil Service Commission itself, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives, which is now considering H. R. 3232, I have considered it my duty to bring the Board of Actuaries making that report, as well as members of the Civil Service Commission, before this subcommittee to explain the costs to the Government of H. R. 3232, if passed, on the basis of the present pay roll of civil-service employees as of June 1947—not the pay roll of June 1946.

The number of Federal employees on the pay roll in civil service at this time is much less than the number on the pay roll in June 1946. I am told there will be between 1,000,000 and 1,500,000 less employees on the civil-service pay roll by July 1947. It would seem clear that with a million to a million and one-half less on the pay roll in 1947, as compared with 1946, the cost of maintaining the civil-service retirement and disability fund would necessarily be much less from year to year.

I trust the actuaries and members of the Civil Service Commission, when testifying before this subcommittee, will take that into consideration.

Another matter I want to call to the attention of the members of the subcommittee at this time is that the report of the Board of Actuaries of May 14, 1947, was apparently made on the assumption that the civil-service retirement fund is maintained on an actuarially solvent basis, or what is known as an actuarially funded plan, under which private retirement funds and insurance corporations are required by law to be maintained. On that basis the reserve fund is necessarily high because as Mr. Phenix, staff actuary of the Senate Civil Service Committee, in defining "actuarial solvency" said: "Assuming a discontinuance of the fund 'actuarial solvency' means that there is enough in the fund to take care of all benefits allowed until all the beneficiaries have died, with enough left over to give benefits to those now in active service when they retire, based on service rendered to date of discontinuance of the system." But neither Congress nor the Civil Service Commission at any time has ever indicated a desire to maintain the civil-service retirement fund on an actuarial basis. In 1946, for instance, under the plan of actuarial solvency, as used by the Actuarial Board, Congress would have had to appropriate $453,578,155 to the retirement fund; but instead Congress appropriated $246,220,000 for this year. On December 31, 1946, the civil-service retirement fund had a reserve of $2,201,224,979.33, which is 10 times the total amount disbursed to Federal employees under the fund in 1946. And if the civil service retirement fund had been on an actuarially solvent basis, which is the basis on which the Board of Actuaries submitted their report to the President of the Civil Service Commission on May 14, 1947, the retirement fund would have been compelled to have a reserve of $5,000,000,000.

Furthermore, to show that Congress has never intended to maintain the civil service retirement fund on an actuarially solvent basis, I refer you to the fact that during the first 9 years of the existence of the fund (1921–28 inclusive), Congress did not appropriate a cent to the fund. I might add that in 1946 the employees themselves contributed to the fund $279,537,869.58, almost equaling the total amount of disbursements by the Government to all Federal employees under the fund for every purpose in that year, which totaled $285,190,762.28.

I sympathize sincerely with the Federal employees who have been and are now being discharged or involuntarily separated from Government service.

H. R. 3232 provides that all these employees should be refunded the total amounts they have contributed to the fund plus interest up to 10 years in the civil service.

WM. H. STEVENSON,
Chairman of Subcommittee on Retirement Legislation of Post Office and Civil Service Committee of House of Representatives.

The Graduate in Today's World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me on June 11, 1947:

Vice President Jones, members of the faculty, graduates, ladies, and gentlemen, I consider it a great distinction to be invited to deliver the commencement address before the Columbus University School of Law. However, today all honors belong to you, the graduates. This is your day. It belongs to all those who this day graduate from a world of theory and study into a world of work and reality.

The real world which faces you, as it faces us all, is a world of stress and strain, of action and reaction, of good and evil, of life and death. To know what course of action to pursue, what choices to make in such a world is not always a simple matter. Even the best educated and best informed among us cannot always know what is the right thing to do. But surely without knowledge and without information we are lost. I would remind you, therefore, that even though you may this day receive your diploma, your education has not been completed. This is an age of science, yet the men of science are the first to admit the vast areas marked "unknown" on the map of man's understanding and knowledge.

If we would progress, we must keep on learning and the training which you have received in the study of the books of the law and the study of the books of figures will help you to live in the age of the atom. America cannot depend upon the uneducated, no matter how civic minded they may be, to maintain this Nation as the greatest in the world. Yet the learned who disdain politics because of its earthiness are the cause of whatever corruption and greed exists in the political life of our country. Politics has rightly been said to be the science of government. We, who have the finest form of government in the world, must fight continuously against those subversive elements who would destroy it. If the education you have received is to serve a noble purpose, you must participate in the fight to maintain the system which made it possible.

We, in this Nation today, are confronted by the specter of educated men, who consider themselves liberal, advocating the cause of communism. True liberalism is not to be condemned; it has existed within the framework of our constitutional government since the inception of our Nation. Those founding fathers who created this country were liberals; those who followed afterward and expanded the benefits available to our citizens were liberals. It is the misguided liberal who endangers our system by advocating government by men rather than by law.

There is a place for all citizens in our political system; it is incumbent upon you to perform more than just the skeleton duties of citizenship. To vote at our gen-

eral elections is not enough; although too great a segment of our population neglects even that responsibility. You should participate in the affairs of your community, actively leading in the betterment of its people. When you leave community administration to those who have a selfish interest, you receive second-rate government. Know the people who run your community and what they plan for you and your families. Remember that educational facilities are administered locally. Your schools reflect the interest of the citizens in their local problems. Acquaint yourselves with legislative matters before your State legislature and before Congress. Make known to your local representatives, your Congressmen, and your Senators the views which you hold on matters of concern to you. They will soon become aware of your interest, and know that you are a wide-awake citizen who gives more than lip service for his beliefs. The choice is yours; a narrow area of interest confined to your work; or a wide circle of friends who respect your concern for your community, your country, and the world you are living in.

Today the representatives of the nations of the world are in convention assembled, trying to balance the books, seeking to make the figures come out right, hoping for a total in black, rather than a total in blood red. In such a world your knowledge of how to balance the books will help you give a good account of yourself.

You who have studied law know that the strength of government, the peace and prosperity of societies, the security and happiness of individuals, depends upon law. You know that our democratic civilization and the development of free societies has been possible only through the growth of law. We look to the law to protect us in our property and in our civil rights. We look to the law and the power which supports the law to keep the peace among us.

At Lake Success, N. Y., an attempt is now being made to establish in the world the reign of jurisprudence, the rule of law. The world has just fought a long and costly war to prevent domination by force. Now we must exert every effort to bring into being the laws and the administrative instruments which will dominate the world in the place of force.

I do not think I have to indulge in any long flights of rhetoric to tell you what will happen if we fail. If the last war was a mechanized war, the next will be an atomic, biologic, supersonic, hemispheric, stratospheric, Arctic and sub-Arctic war. In the next war, our schools, our churches, our courthouses, and our homes will be blasted into rubble and that love of God, of truth, and of justice which built them will be buried beneath the stones.

Everyone who has an awareness of the realities of the world of today, knows this to be a fact. We must somehow find the means to do away with war, or war will do away with us. How can this be done? The United States has consistently maintained, through its representatives in the United Nations, that the first step must be the establishment of an international system for the effective control and development of atomic energy, with full access for international inspection and with provision for swift and certain punishment of illegal activities in the atomic field.

The chief opponent, at this time, of such a plan is the Soviet Union—yet they are agreed that some system of control is necessary. Our positions are not so unrelated that we should despair of agreement. Only this afternoon at Lake Success, N. Y., Russian delegate Gromyko offered amendments to the previous Soviet position on international control of atomic energy. Mr. Gromyko stated the necessity for international control, and agreed that the control should be vested in an international authority responsible to the Security Council. This, of course, retains the power of veto, which is at variance with the stand of the American representatives. Under the new Russian plan, inspections, while by international teams, would be only periodical and subject to national control. The proposal for simultaneous control would require that the United States disarm unilaterally with other nations, thus nullifying our superiority in the atomic field. I believe this shift in policy to be indicative evidence that agreement can be attained. These differences are not insurmountable.

Agreement on international control of atomic energy can and, I believe, will be realized if there is the will to agree among all of the nations. It must be reached if we are to live in peace with the world. America must lead in the search for a better world through lasting peace.

If we do achieve agreement and an effective and enforceable system of control is established, then we can look forward to an era of health, wealth, and prosperity such as mankind has never known. Atomic energy can bring electric power to all the far and undeveloped places of the earth to help do man's work. By-products of atomic energy used in the study of plant life may eventually reveal nature's secret of photosynthesis and soil fertility and lead to the improvement and increase of the world's food supply. Radioactivated isotopes used as tracers can help us understand the nature of organic as well as inorganic matter, and may eventually point the way to cures for some of our most baffling diseases, such as certain types of cancer.

These numerous blessings of atomic energy can be ours only when we are secure against the misuse of atomic energy. In the meantime, America at least, will have as many of these blessings as safety and security will allow. Already we have an active Atomic Energy Commission functioning under the watchful eye of the Joint Committee oh Atomic Energy, of which I have the honor to be a member. Already a pilot plant for the production of atomic power is under construction at Oak Ridge. Already radioactivated material is being used as tracers in industrial processes and agricultural research. However, research and development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes will advance most rapidly when there can be free interchange of scientific information. But so long as we lack security, we must maintain secrecy. We must concentrate on keeping ahead of the world in the development of atomic energy for military purposes. In such a situation research and development for peaceful purposes naturally must be subordinate to our defensive needs. Our national safety is and must always be our first concern.

Yet, in my opinion, we are neglecting our first line of defense: intelligence, the knowledge of what others are up to. Without adequate intelligence it is impossible to act intelligently. Our British neighbors have for years maintained a system of military intelligence which has no superiors. Without it, this tight little isle, with its far-flung dominions, could not have weathered the storm of war and rebellion through the years. We, the greatest nation in the world, with our linguists, geographers, and host of citizens familiar with the peoples of the world, their habits, speech, and problems, have not progressed in our system of intelligence one iota. The Office of Strategic Services, with which I was proud to serve during World War II, performed heroically under the handicaps confronting it. It was hastily formed and mobilized to do a job which requires years of background and study.

Under these conditions the thousands of men and women recruited from all walks of life performed nobly under the stress of war. Immediately upon cessation of hostilities this organization was demobilized and its functions assumed by the Central Intelligence Group founded by Executive order. This group composed of the Secretaries of War, Navy, and State, with advisers from the military services, is inadequate to perform the task allotted to it. All intelligence information gathered by agents is submitted to the board for review and consideration of action. This necessitates delay in transmittal and in action taken upon such information.

What is needed is a separate, independent, intelligence agency with a civilian director responsible only to the President of the United States. Such an agency could procure and disseminate information without delay and without divided authority or friction.

An independent intelligence system must be our first line of defense for the atomic age.

Atomic warfare will not be conducted through exploratory raids and massing of troops preparatory to a declaration of war. The effects of the atom bomb will become known to the defending nation within minutes after a decision to wage war is reached by the aggressor.

It is vital that we know the intent of other nations and the scope of their activities in the field of potential military aggression. It is necessary that the heads of our Government are made aware of these intentions beforehand so that proper precautions can be taken either by defensive or retaliatory measures.

Every responsible person connected with the harnessing of atomic energy is agreed that there is no military defense against atomic bombs, nor is there likely to be one. The best defensive measures of the last war were only 90 percent effective which, while high, would mean certain disaster in atomic warfare. Defense through decentralization of industry and population would take years and would completely dislocate our economy and would still be only partially effective.

The sensible solution lies in effective international control resulting in the abolition of atomic weapons by international agreements. Even the peacetime use potential must be subordinated to this aim.

Agreements outlawing the use of atomic weapons as "legitimate" is not enough. There must be a system of rigid supervision through inspection to make certain that no nation is clandestinely engaged in the manufacture of these weapons while other nations in good faith are abiding by the agreement. Hand in hand with this must go a system of enforcement so that penalties may be applied to those who, with nefarious intent, are violating the covenant.

Supervision or control must take into consideration three factors: those of raw materials, personnel, and production. If sources of supply of the materials necessary to produce atom bombs are known and carefully and continuously scrutinized, there can be no clandestine use of such material. Through registration and restriction of construction, the plants necessary to process the materials may be kept under control. No project of great magnitude could be undertaken without the collaboration of many scientists well known by their contemporaries for their accomplishments and abilities. Their whereabouts and experimentations must always be known. Should a potential aggressor make the first move toward a violation, the fact would instantly become known to us through the international inspection authority or through our independent intelligence system.

It may be charged that such an independent intelligence system, as I advocate, would be a negation of the United Nations and the International Atomic Control Agency.

When the people of the United States have become so that they have voluntarily eliminated their Army and their Navy, then it will be time enough to do without our own intelligence system. Until that day arrives an effective and independent intelligence system must remain our first line of defense and is

no more antiethical to the United Nations than are national armies and navies. We must, for the protection of our national security, be certain that an alarm is sounded the moment the first step is taken toward a violation of the atomic-energy agreement. To wait until the violation actually occurs before becoming aware of it is, in the age of push-button warfare, to place our very existence in jeopardy. An independent intelligence force is our alarm system and our insurance against an atomic Pearl Harbor. Such a force in effective operation will not only guarantee America's safety, it will help to guarantee peace to the world. For we have learned from the last war that whereas weakness is a challenge to an aggressor, a strong defense can be an effective deterrent.

It is my firm conviction that if the people of the world will fight as strenuously for peace as they did in war, they will find that war is not inevitable. The development of the atomic bomb has been described as the greatest cooperative enterprise in the history of science. It required the pooled knowledge and skill of many sciences developed over many years in many lands. The achievement of a world of peace will require even greater concentration of effort and greater cooperation on the part of all peoples. With a strong and effective United Nations to settle the differences that arise among countries and with an effective and functioning world-wide atomic energy authority, men and women everywhere can look forward not only to peace but to progress and prosperity for all.

May God grant that the world of reality you are now stepping into becomes such a world in the years ahead.

You, who are the graduates of Columbus University, are truly fortunate, as the professions you have chosen are those two laudable ones of law and accountancy. The two are intertwined in our day-to-day life; friendships formed or accelerated here at the university undoubtedly will be continued or strengthened further by the constant contact which one profession makes with the other. More competent authorities than I are unable to determine where the one ends and the other begins. The understanding gained here of one another's problems should serve well in future activities.

The path ahead is precipitous, but the goal worth while, as a truly useful life as a competent and good citizen is an objective worthy of the best of men.

I now take this opportunity to offer my congratulations and best wishes to those who, through their earnest endeavors, have successfully completed their course of study here at Columbus University. May you face the future with fortitude, knowing that you possess that of which no person can deprive you—a fine education. Your teachers from elementary school through high school, and those here at the university, have done their work well. Your future rests upon you alone. Good luck!

Our Stake in German Economic Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceedingly able discussion of our stake in German economic recovery before the Economic Club, of Detroit, Mich., on May 19, by Hon. M. S. Szymczak. Mr. Szymczak has long been one of the Governors of our Federal Reserve System. He has recently returned from a distinguished tour of duty in Germany as Director of the Economics Division in our Office of Military Government for Germany. I know of no more reliable authority as a source of dependable information respecting our critical occupational responsibility in Europe. His address is well worth the careful study of the Congress.

An estimate from the Public Printer indicates that Mr. Szymczak's address will exceed by one and a half pages the two pages allowed to be printed in the Appendix without an estimate, and the cost of printing is stated to be $248.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR STAKE IN GERMAN ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Two world wars and their aftermath have made it clear that the problem of Germany is one of the keys to world peace and prosperity. For 2 years, your representatives in military government have sought a basis for the solution of this problem. They can only succeed if the American people are aware of both their achievements and their difficulties, and if in turn the military government officials in Germany understand the attitude of the public at home. To contribute to a mutual exchange of such information is the main purpose of this paper.

PRINCIPLES OF AMERICAN ECONOMIC POLICY IN GERMANY

We all know that the German economy operated in the past as one integrated unit. Each part made its contribution to, and received its support from, the rest of the country. This integration alone made possible the industrial development of Germany. None of the areas that constitute the nation was ever self-sufficient in the past or can be made self-sufficient in the future. None of the German industries draws its tools and raw materials from one single area or one single zone of occupation. Steel and coal of the British zone are vital to the metal-working industries of the American zone, but the coal mines in the British zone cannot operate without pit props from the American and Russian zones. The light industries of the American zone need optical glass from the Russian, and glue from the French zone. On the other hand, they supply the French and Russian zones with electrical equipment, antifriction bearings, and dyestuffs.

For purposes of occupation Germany west of the Oder-Neisse line has been divided into four zones: American, British, French, and Russian. Moreover, the area of prewar Germany lying east of that line has been put under Polish (or Russian) administration. The Potsdam agreement provided that the four zones should be treated as one economic unit. It has not worked out that way, however. Therefore, I shall not speak so much of global German problems such as economic unification, the levels to be established for German industry, and the reparations program. Instead I shall concentrate on discussing the economic problems of the American zone and as far as necessary of the combined American and British zones.

All of us are aware of the importance of early high-level decisions on the basic economic questions which were recently discussed at Moscow. The issues were pointed out some time ago by Secretary Marshall and we all know their substance and the urgent need for their solution.

In view of the history of German aggression and the part played therein by German industry, it may be difficult to understand that one of the major tasks of military government is the provision of assistance in rebuilding at least part of the German industrial system. Such a reconstruction, however is necessary for two reasons: To prevent Germany from remaining a source of perpetual unrest in Europe, and to aid in the recovery of our Allies.

In the crop year 1946–47, German farmers in the combined American and British zones of occupation are producing foodstuffs sufficient to provide an average diet of only about 1,000 calories daily for that part of the population that does not live on self-sufficient farms. Such a diet is less than half of the minimum standard endorsed by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization. Unless we are prepared to forego payment for the large supplies of food that must be sent to Germany for an indefinite period just to prevent wholesale starvation, we must permit Germany to redevelop its manufacturing industries which alone can produce the exports necessary to pay for food imports.

Moreover, the products of German industry are indispensable for the reconstruction of continental Europe. In 1936—the last year in which the bulk of the German economy was operated on a peacetime level—Germany was the largest exporter to, and the largest importer from, Austria, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Rumania, Switzerland, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. It was first as a supplier and second as a market for the Netherlands, Poland, and Sweden.[1] Almost the entire manufacturing industry of continental Europe was dependent upon German machinery, precision instruments, electrical appliances, optical goods, transportation equipment, and chemicals.

The fact that Germany today cannot even supply spare parts is hampering economic reconstruction in such different countries as Austria, the Netherlands, and Poland. The general shortage of coal, which is the greatest single factor in retarding European recovery, is due largely to low production in the Ruhr mines. Lack of German potash is delaying the rehabilitation of agriculture all over Europe. An increase in the output of coal and potash mines, however, depends upon the availability of mining equipment and upon larger supplies of consumer goods for miners. A German miner can earn in two days all he needs to buy his meager weekly rations and thereafter has little incentive to work. A relatively small increase in consumer goods offered to miners was an important element in raising production in the Ruhr mines by about one-fifth between the fall of 1946 and the spring of 1947. A large-scale revival of German consumer goods industries would have proportionately greater results.

Our own economy would benefit from the resumption of German industrial exports

[1] The importance of Germany for continental Europe is indicated by the following table, showing Germany's trade with some of the leading European countries:

Country	Imports from Germany	Percent of total imports	Exports to Germany	Percent of total exports
	Mil. of dol.		*Mil. of dol.*	
Netherlands	151	23.3	74	15.7
Italy	116	26.4	77	19.5
France	106	7.0	40	4.3
Sweden	99	23.9	61	15.8
Switzerland	92	24.8	51	19.4
Denmark	83	25.3	62	20.3
Belgium	82	11.5	69	10.4
Soviet Union	62	22.8	23	8.5
Czechoslovakia	55	17.5	45	14.3
Norway	41	17.6	23	13.2
Austria	40	16.9	29	16.1
Turkey	34	45.1	48	51.0
Rumania	33	39.0	30	21.1
Hungary	33	25.8	35	23.1

because the availability of German goods would help meet the foreign demand for many American goods which are still in scarce supply relative to our own domestic demand. Furthermore, some European countries can pay for imports from the United States only with the aid of dollar credits because they lack dollar resources and lack exportable commodities adapted to the American market. If they could import goods from Germany, however, they could pay for them by exporting products urgently needed in that country. In that way, they would lighten the burden which the American economy has had to bear both in respect to the reconstruction of their own economy and to the rehabilitation of Germany. For instance, before the war the Netherlands exported substantial quantities of vegetables to Germany while Germany paid for these imports in steel and machinery. If that commerce could be restored today, it would make it unnecessary for the American economy to extend credits to the Netherlands in order to enable that country to buy American machinery and it would make it also unnecessary to divert scarce American foodstuffs to Germany.

OBSTACLES

While the principle of assistance to German recovery has been generally accepted in this country, it has been very difficult to carry out the program on an adequate scale. For obvious reasons of justice and policy, the countries invaded by Germany have been given a prior claim to our aid. Our financial and material resources are limited and foodstuffs and raw materials continue to fall short of total demand. The allocation of wheat and nonferrous metals, for instance, is a task that simply cannot be fulfilled to the satisfaction of all. Similarly, coal, of which Germany is a major producer, is in generally short supply. In order to promote reconstruction in the rest of Europe, we have had to undertake substantial exports of German coal even though the revival of German manufacturing industry would have been considerably accelerated if it had been possible to retain German production for German domestic use.

It may be hoped that these scarcities will disappear within a few years, but other obstacles may take their place. Concern has frequently been expressed that the reconstruction of German industry may go too far and restore Germany's war potential. The occupying powers have tried to differentiate between industries that could be used for aggressive purposes and therefore should be restricted, and others that might be considered peaceful and therefore should be encouraged. The most innocuous industries, however, could conceivably be used for war purposes, and dangerous ones frequently are indispensable for peacetime uses. For this reason, some of the United Nations are critical of any move to improve the level of German industry even though they concede that such an improvement would benefit them from the economic point of view.

Finally, some countries see in Germany less a source of supplies or a market for exports than a dreaded competitor. At present, such fears seem premature since production the world over has not caught up with demand, and German production remains a negligible part of the total. As soon, however, as world market conditions become less favorable to the sellers, any increase in German industrial production and especially in German industrial exports, may injure the interests of some industrial group in other countries. Although such exports will in turn make possible imports into Germany and thus benefit the economies of Germany's trade partners as well as its own, the groups benefiting from access to the German market frequently will be different from those affected by German competition.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF MILITARY GOVERNMENT

Despite the conflict of objectives and the limited financial and material means at the disposal of the occupation authorities, there has been a degree of rehabilitation in Germany.

(a) Food and agriculture: The food situation continues to be the central German problem. It is far from satisfactory, but we have been able to avoid not only outright starvation but also any serious deterioration of public health. Since last fall the official ration has been maintained in the American and British zones until recently at 1,550 calories daily for the so-called normal consumer. This ration still is more than one-fourth below the minimum necessary to insure health in the long run and more than two-fifths below the German prewar standard of nutrition. Moreover, the diet is far poorer in quality than would be advisable from the point of view of nutrition, a larger proportion consisting of grain products and a smaller proportion of so-called protective foodstuffs. Even so, the ration has been maintained only by importing into the combined American and British zones foodstuffs equal to about 60 percent of their domestic production. These imports, including monthly shipments of 200,000 tons of bread grains and flour, and substantial quantities of potatoes, sugar, fish, and milk, require an expenditure of $360,000,000 in the current crop year.

The food situation is constantly being threatened by the fact that stocks of supplies are dangerously low. Food is needed in many parts of the world. For the sake of food importing countries a further rise in world market prices must be avoided as far as possible and priorities must be established by the exporting nations. Every ton of food allotted to Germany causes hardship in other parts of the world. Difficulties in ocean transportation frequently delay shipments urgently needed for maintaining stocks in Germany at the minimum level needed for the planning of equitable distribution. German farmers frequently fail to deliver their quotas. Trains must be rerouted to alleviate a crisis in some part of Germany, thus creating a shortage in another part. Losses from pilferage increase in proportion to the deterioration of food conditions. An unfortunate accumulation of such factors was the cause of the difficulties currently experienced in the Ruhr district. Delays in delivering the full rations invariably lead to unrest, diminish the efficiency of labor and the output of industrial goods, and thus add to the difficulties of rehabilitation.

In future, we expect domestic production, collection, and distribution to yield substantially larger quantities than this year. Such an improvement will depend upon the availability of fertilizer and upon a supply of industrial consumer goods which will induce farmers to raise more crops for sale. It also will depend upon the enforcement of a strict program of collection and distribution which must be efficiently performed by German officials. We can have the utmost confidence in the ability of military government under General Clay to meet this situation if they are given fair means to carry out their program.

In the long run, however, the efficiency of industrial labor cannot be maintained on a diet representing less than 2,600 calories daily for the so-called normal consumer. The American and British zones cannot expect to produce more food than sufficient for an average of 1,600 calories daily. Import requirements in the long run therefore will be the equivalent of at least 1,000 calories daily, or about two-thirds more than actual imports in the current year.

(b) Industrial production: In 1945 most manufacturing industries in the western zones of Germany were at a standstill. By November 1946, industrial production in the American zone had reached 44 percent of 1936—a year of virtually full employment in Germany.[2] With the exception of lumber, the production of all commodities is below the 1936 figure, but by 1948 prewar output is expected to be reached in a number of important industries. In the British zone, industrial production had recovered last fall to only 38 percent of 1936. The British zone includes mainly heavy industries, most of which are under severe restrictions as possible war industries, while the American zone contains mainly light industries, manufacturing consumer goods.

Unfortunately, the exceptional severity of the last winter has undone some of the progress experienced during the preceding year. Industrial production in the American zone fell in December to 39 percent, in January to 31 percent, and in February to 29 percent of 1936. In March it recovered to 35 percent, but this level still is about one-fifth below the peak of November 1946.

In spite of the low level of production there is little unemployment. Even in February 1947, unemployment in the American zone was less than 450,000 out of a labor force of more than 7,000,000. Only in the white-collar classes is the number of job openings constantly smaller than that of job seekers. This is the result of three facts. The labor force has been greatly reduced by war losses and by the Allied retention of a large number of prisoners of war in some countries. Secondly, much labor is needed for work, such as removal of rubble and plant repair, which does not show in production statistics but nevertheless is vital for resumption of economic activity. Thirdly, for physical and psychological reasons, the productivity of labor has fallen considerably, in some cases by as much as two-thirds. The gradual revival of economic activity, more food, housing facilities, and improved availability of industrial consumer goods will do much to remove the causes of low efficiency.

(c) Housing: Next to food, housing accommodations are the most pressing requirements of the German people. Despite all war losses, the population of the American and British zones has risen by around 20 percent in comparison to prewar, mainly because of the inflow of Germans expelled from the area under Polish administration and from Czechoslovakia and other eastern European countries. At the same time, urban housing suffered from terrific bomb damage during the war, especially in the industrial and commercial centers. In Bremen, for instance, 55 percent of all homes were unusable in the summer of 1945. Reconstruction has been hampered by the scarcity of building materials, which in turn is due largely to the lack of coal; approximately 12.5 tons of coal are needed for producing the material necessary to build a small apartment. Allied legislation provides for the equitable distribution of available housing among the population, but this measure can bring only small relief since the complete equalization of all housing would only provide around 80 square

[2] The rise in industrial production in the American zone is indicated by the following table, comparing production of some important commodities in the first and the last quarter of 1946:

Commodity	First quarter 1946	Last quarter 1946
Trucks (units)	400	1,434
Electric motors (thousands of horsepower)	28	131
Lumber (thousands of cubic meters)	549	1,015
Potash (metric tons)	36,849	311,098
Textile yarns, including rayon (metric tons)	5,737	10,200

feet per person in the American, and less than 70 square feet per person in the British zone.

Improvement in housing conditions is particularly needed in the Ruhr district since the inflow of additional miners from the southern area of our combined zones, required to fulfill the program of output expansion, depends upon the availability of homes. A short-range program has been and a long-range is being prepared to provide additional housing, including temporary camps and billets and permanent reconstruction. In addition to building material, beds, bedding, and furniture must be produced. While military government plays an important role in drafting the program, its execution is entrusted to the German authorities. Military government has helped in that task by reducing to a minimum the requirements for military installations.

(d) Domestic trade and transportation: Despite the interdependence of the four zones of occupation, interzonal trade has been slow to develop largely because of the lack of economic unification.[3] Since January of this year, trade between the American and British zones has been free, as the result of the economic merger of these zones, and trade between the merged zones and the rest of Germany will be increased under agreements concluded among the zonal authorities. Until and unless the over-all economic unity of Germany is achieved, however, German recovery will be hampered by obstacles to the free flow of goods within the country. Transportation has suffered particularly badly from war damage. Military government can be proud, however, of its record in repairing railroads, inland waterways, port facilities, and highways. Railroad tracks in operation represent 97 percent of the prewar total. Almost as many sunken vessels have been raised in the American zone as in all other zones together and the proportion of port channels cleared is higher than in any other zone. The American zone also has a larger proportion of operating motor vehicles than any other zone.[4] Despite this progress, transportation is even now in need of repair and maintenance is a constant problem. Allocations of materials are being made for this purpose but must be revised as required to meet new priority demands from other sides of the battered economic structure.

(e) International trade: In 1946, the foreign trade of the American zone was almost entirely confined to the importation of foodstuffs and other essential goods by the occupation forces in order to prevent disease and unrest among the population. Such imports are financed by War Department appropriations. The only other substantial import transaction was the shipment of some surplus American cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This cotton was delivered to German processors; the finished goods are being exported in an amount sufficient to pay for the cost of the imports, and the rest is available for German consumption. In the fall of 1946, similar arrangements were made by American Military Government for the importation of raw materials required for the manufacture of ceramics, optical instruments, building materials, chemicals, and toys. The interim financing for these imports is handled by the United States Commercial Corporation, a subsidiary of the RFC. Exports from the American zone in 1946 were confined mainly to lumber and hops and a few industrial goods, taken from existing inventories or produced from raw material stocks. The amounts shipped were very small, in the neighborhood of 3 percent of the estimated prewar exports of the zone's area.

Imports into the British zone were similar to those of the American zone, but exports from the British zone were considerably larger, due almost entirely to Ruhr coal. Coal exports reached a weekly volume of 260,000 tons in the summer of 1946, or about 40 percent of prewar, but this involved heavy drafts on existing stocks and inadequate allocations to the needs of the German economy. As a result, exports of coal had to be reduced by about 30 percent in the fall of 1946. Even the peak figure in the summer of 1946 was far from sufficient to meet demand in the rest of Europe, and the reduction of coal exports was a heavy blow to the importing countries.

In the first months of 1947, exports had to be curtailed still further, reaching a low of 103,000 tons per week in February. Meanwhile, however, the output of the Ruhr mines had risen and coal exports could be increased again. In April and May, the unsatisfactory food situation brought about some labor disturbances which kept coal output somewhat below the March peak.

As soon as these difficulties are overcome, a further rise in output is expected, and in that case exports will reach in summer a minimum of 265,000 tons per week, while, at the same time, allotments for the needs of the merged zones will be a minimum of 860,000 tons per week, or about 30 percent above the peak allotment in 1946. The increase in domestic allotment will mainly benefit industrial enterprises, which in this way will be enabled to raise their output and thus to contribute more efficiently to the projected expansion of foreign trade.

Apart from coal exports, foreign trade of the merged zones in 1947 will be determined by the working of the bizonal merger agreement. This agreement provides for the cooperation of the American and British occupation authorities and of the representatives of the German states in formulating an import-export program for the rehabilitation of the German economy. A major objective of this rehabilitation program is to put the merged zones of Germany back on a self-supporting basis, i. e., to develop exports to a point where they cover imports. Meanwhile, however, the occupying powers must bear the cost, not only of the basic program for the prevention of "disease and unrest," but also of the raw material and equipment imports required to "prime the pump" of German export industries. Certain funds are already in hand for this second part of the program, including the receipts from exports of 1945–46, some former German external assets transferred to the occupying powers under agreements with neutral countries. and the credits negotiated with the U. S. Commercial Company. The United Kingdom is participating in the program in two ways. It bears half of the costs of sending basic necessities to the merged American and British zones and it finances half of the funds needed for "priming the pump" of the area's industry. Whenever, in the future, additional advances should be required, the United Kingdom also will bear an equal share with the United States.

The expected increase in imports will necessitate, but also make possible, larger German exports. In order to facilitate exports, the occupation authorities have authorized foreign businessmen to correspond with prospective German trading partners. Only so-called nontransactional mail, i. e., correspondence preparing rather than concluding actual contracts, has been allowed so far, but transactional mail may be admitted in the near future. Military government also provides facilities for foreign businessmen to travel in Germany and renew trade contacts. Contracts have to be submitted for approval to the Joint Export-Import Agency of the United States-United Nations occupying powers, and all payments have to be made to the account of the Agency rather than individually to German exporters. The Agency has issued rules of procedure, stating the principles which will determine the approval or rejection of contracts, and has established branch offices in the most important trading centers of the merged zones, mainly the state capitals. Finally, the Agency is prepared to act as seller of goods if a foreign buyer is prevented by Government restrictions from entering into legal contracts with German nationals.

The necessity of setting up the bizonal export-import organization and the hardships of the winter months have delayed the beginning of the new program. Despite these handicaps, foreign trade has started to rise. In the first quarter of 1947, contracts for exports were negotiated to the amount of $22,000,000. Export deliveries, which, however, include coal, reached $34,000,000. Imports, excluding basic necessities imported by the occupation authorities, were approved to the sum of $10,000,000. These amounts still are far below the levels that must be reached in order to fulfill the bizonal program, but they represent a material improvement in comparison with preceding periods.

(f) Money and exchange: When the occupying powers entered Germany, the collapse of the currency appeared imminent. Money in circulation had increased to approximately six times the prewar level. The German people's recollection of the hyperinflation that followed the first World War added to the dangers of the situation.

Despite the oversupply of money and the scarcity of goods, the occupying powers took over the existing German system of price and wage controls and have been able to prevent any serious rise in legal prices and wages. The official cost-of-living index stood in December 1946 at approximately 120 percent of 1938. It is true that only the meager official rations can be purchased at these prices. The supply of black market goods, however, is probably smaller than the amount of goods distributed through legal channels. Furthermore, many black market transactions take the form of barter, especially for cigarettes, rather than the form of sales at high money prices.

The maintenance of the official price and wage level at virtually prewar figures has had some unforeseen consequences. At the beginning of the occupation, a military exchange rate of 10 marks per dollar was established, as compared to a prewar exchange rate of 2½ marks per dollar. This rate was introduced merely for the administrative use of the occupying authorities, especially in calculating payments in marks to the troops. Its application for general purposes, however, would have tended to upset the entire price and wage system. German domestic prices even before the war were managed in such a manner that they had lost all relation to world market prices. No uniform exchange rate, and least of all the military rate, would represent a generally applicable ratio between domestic prices as expressed in marks, and world market prices in dollars.

Thus, a difficult problem has arisen in connection with the pricing of export and import goods. The German exporter receives for his sales the legal domestic price in marks. Similarly, the German importer has to pay for

[3] In the 9-month period, April through December 1946, the American zone shipped goods valued at 475,000,000 marks (around $190,000,000 at the prewar exchange rate) into and received goods valued at 471,000,000 reichsmarks from the other zones. Trade with the British zone accounted for 63 percent, with the French zone for 28 percent, and with the Russian zone for only 9 percent of the total.

[4] The work done in this respect may be illustrated by some figures: More than 200 miles of railroad tracks, 78 bridges, and 18,000 miles of railroad telephone lines have been rebuilt; about 1,600 locomotives, 109,000 freight cars, and 8,600 passenger railroad cars have been repaired; about 800 miles of inland waterways have been cleared and 3,000 miles dredged; 978 river barges have been raised, and about 1,350 repaired; more than 900 miles of highways and 261 highway bridges have been rebuilt.

his purchases the legal domestic price in marks. On the other hand, the foreign importer of German goods pays, and the foreign exporter of goods receives, the world market price in dollars.

Therefore, the occupation authorities have decided for the time being to refrain from fixing a uniform conversion factor for the translation of mark into dollar prices, and vice versa. Instead we have issued a long list of various conversion factors, reflecting for all major commodities the actual relation between legal domestic prices in marks and world market prices in dollars. For instance, the conversion factor for carbon brushes is 30 cents, and for pharmaceuticals 80 cents per mark. This means that a certain quantity of carbon brushes that sells domestically for 100 marks has to be priced for exports at $30, but pharmaceuticals that sell domestically for 100 marks have to be priced for exports at $80. As a practical matter, this is the best that can be done until major monetary reforms are undertaken in Germany and a more normal price system is developed there. These problems have been under quadripartite (four zones) discussion for some time and it is to be hoped that an early agreement will be reached.

(g) Banking: In December 1946, military government established a new central banking organization in the American zone. Following the principle of decentralization, each German state received its own central bank, which took over the assets of the former Reichsbank as far as they were located in its area. The organization of the central banks was largely influenced by the model of the Federal Reserve System. As soon as the economic unification of Germany is implemented, the state central banks will be coordinated by a central board, which will issue currency through the medium of the state central banks. Until such time, however, the central banks have no power to issue bank notes or any other currency.

In consequence of our principle of decentralization, commercial banks in the American zone have been ordered to sever their connection with central offices in Berlin. Depositors are free, however, to dispose of their accounts both within the American and in transactions with the British and French zones, except for blocking measures applied in the process of denazification. From the beginning of occupation to the end of 1946, deposits in the American zone increased by 75 percent. Most of the rise in deposits had to be kept by the banks in cash or with other credit institutions since no other investment opportunities are available. Total assets of the banks in the American zone were 75,000,000,000 marks on June 30, 1946, of which one-third was kept in cash or bank balances, and two-fifths in Treasury bills and other government securities, the service of which has been suspended since the end of the war.

PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

All these achievements are merely the first step on the road to rehabilitation. The obstacles that still have to be overcome are, no doubt, as great as any which we have encountered so far.

First of all, the provision of the Potsdam declaration which calls for the economic unification of Germany must be carried out. Unification in itself will not solve the economic problems of Germany, but it will insure the development of the whole German economy on a more rational basis. Uncertainty as to economic unification is a handicap in many fields, notably in adjusting the so-called level-of-industry plan to changed conditions. Under that plan, which was approved by all four occupying powers 1 year ago, maximum levels were established for most German industries with a view particularly to preventing the resurgence of German war potential. Most experts agree that this plan needs substantial corrections, but the necessary amendments in each zone will largely depend upon developments in other zones and upon the question of whether the German economy is to be redeveloped as a unit or in separate self-sufficient parts.

Another problem that urgently needs attention is currency reform. The disproportion between the supply of money and of goods at prevailing prices cannot be maintained indefinitely. All experts agree that a reduction in the volume of currency will be necessary. Obviously, the execution of such a reform also depends upon the fate of unification. If common action of all four occupying powers is not forthcoming, the advantages and disadvantages of separate action in the merged American and British zones must be weighed.

Other problems arise in connection with the political aims of occupation. The decentralization of the German economy must be achieved in order to make it impossible for the country to reorganize for aggressive purposes. In this connection military government in the American zone has enacted a drastic decartelization statute, which is aimed at destroying the concentration of economic power in German industry. Property of Allied nations looted during the war has been and is being restituted. War plants have been and are being destroyed, and other plants have been and are being removed for reparations. The over-all problem of reparations, however, still remains to be solved.

The lack of unified action of the four occupying powers, moreover, creates uncertainties that are detrimental to economic progress. As long as the management of an enterprise does not know whether or not a plant will be subject to restitution, or to destruction, or to removal, under the reparations program, it cannot make definite plans for reconstruction or start an investment program which might be interrupted at any moment.

Finally, military government has to deal with the problem of reaching equilibrium in the balance of international payments of the merged American and British zones. In this connection the question of economic unification again becomes decisive. As long as unification is not achieved, interzonal trade must be treated as international rather than domestic commerce, with the resulting need for controlling interzonal payments.

The problem of equilibrium is particularly interesting to the American public. As long as the proceeds from exports do not exceed import requirements, they must be devoted entirely to paying for current imports. Only when an export surplus is reached will it be possible for our merged zones to start repaying the advances made by the occupying powers for the importation of basic necessities.

Our stake in the economic problems of Germany, however, is greater than our interest in receiving repayment of our advances. We want peace, and we know that in order to have peace we must have economic stability in Germany and in the rest of Europe.

Saving the Lives of Good Neighbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by T. J. Woofter, Director of Research, Federal Security Agency:

Seven million immigrants within the next 10 years are hoped for by South American countries recently canvassed by Phil Clark, of La Prensa Asociada. These, he states, are to be recruited "under bold immigration programs instituted by Latin American republics striving toward agricultural and industrial self-sufficiency." Immigration policies were also of major concern to the First Inter-American Demographic Congress, which recommended: "That the governments of the American countries include in their postwar planning the immigration problem, and establish the relations, qualitative as well as quantitative, between the actual population and the addition necessary to maintain and increase production in that land, without injury to the social level." Thus, methods of attracting immigrants constitute a major postwar program of a number of South American governments.

Many population experts, however, are skeptical as to the possibility of attracting immigration in a volume of 700,000 a year in the near future. In this connection, it will be remembered that the United States never received over a million immigrants a year except in a few years which were characterized by very marked industrial expansion in this country coinciding with population pressure out of Europe. The immediate future does not promise a comparable industrial expansion in Latin America, and the deficits of population in Europe which were caused by the two world wars have made most European nations seek to import labor rather than to export it. Practically all of them seek at least to hold the population they now have.

It is encouraging to see that one large segment of the world is anxious to extend a welcome to the harried, distressed, homeless people uprooted by the war. This skepticism is, therefore, not intended to discourage the efforts of our southern neighbors to attract immigrants—it is rather a warning against undue hope for large population gains from this source.

Doubt as to the ability to secure such a large volume of immigration may, however, serve to focus attention on another population resource which is nearer at hand and from which an increase of over a half million a year is potentially attainable. This is the rate of natural increase. Most Latin-American countries are still characterized by high birth rates and relatively high death rates. Although death rates in Argentina are about as low as those in the United States, crude death rates of 20 per thousand prevail in some countries, and rates of 16 and over are the rule in most of the countries.

These rates would indicate that there are approximately 1,750,000 deaths a year in Latin America. While data are not sufficiently accurate to make reliable estimates as to the number of these deaths which are postponable beyond age 65, sufficient material is at hand to warrant a fairly safe conclusion that from 500,000 to 600,000 of these deaths could be effectively postponed. Such a saving would still leave the death rates in most of the countries somewhat above present mortality levels in the United States. This would yield an attainable population increase almost as large as that envisioned by the rosy optimism of those who expect large immigration.

This conclusion is based on the following considerations:

1. From 35 to 40 percent of the deaths occur under 5 years of age. That is to say, there are approximately 600,000 child deaths. Deaths under 1 year of age per 1,000 live births run well over 100 in most South American countries and up to 200 in Chile. Even Argentina, with a relatively low general death

rate, has an infant rate of 90 as against 40 in the United States. A saving of half of these deaths would leave child mortality still considerably higher than that in the United States and would produce a population increment of 300,000 a year.

2. The conservative estimate of the potential saving of life between the ages of 5 and 65 would add another 200,000 or 250,000 increment. This would seem feasible in the light of present high rates of maternal deaths and deaths from parasitic diseases, pneumonia, typhoid, smallpox, and, in some areas, yellow fever, plague, and other tropical diseases.

3. According to the Peruvian statistical abstract of 1943, only about one-third of the deaths in that country occurred with a physician in attendance, and the ratio of physicians to population was 1 to 5,000, as against an optimum ratio of 1 to 1,000 proposed for the United States. Likewise, the ratio of hospital beds to persons was 19 beds per 10,000 people. Thus, a strenuous effort to increase health personnel and facilities would contribute greatly to the reduction in sickness and postponement of death. Not only can great improvement in health be expected by the over-all expansion of medical personnel and facilities, but much can also be secured by more adequate distribution of these facilities. As in the United States the rural areas of South America are relatively underprivileged. In Peru, the ratio of physicians to people in Lima Province is 1 to 1,000, while one department, with over a quarter of a million people, has only 3 doctors or 1 to 90,000. The distribution of hospital beds is likewise irregular, since the department of Callao has 102 beds per 10,000 inhabitants, as against only 2 in some of the rural provinces.

4. Postponement of death is also more feasible in Latin-American populations because they are relatively young in their age distribution. Past excess of births over deaths has left a high proportion of the population under age 20. In fact, the census populations show from 48 to 55 percent under age 20, as against about 38 percent in the United States (in 1930). If South Americans escape the extreme hazards of mortality in the younger ages, then longevity seems about as great as that of other countries. Bronson points out that after age 40 expectation of life is about as long in the South American countries for which life tables are available as it is in the United States.

While saving in mortality would be the most measurable result of intensified public-health measures, a reduction in sickness would go hand in hand with postponement of death, with the result that the well years of life added would constitute a priceless economic and social resource.

The reproductive potential of Latin-American populations, when mortality is curbed, is exemplified by recent Puerto Rican experience. There, from 1910 to 1944, the birth rate has remained about 40 and the death rate has declined from 25 to 14.8, with the result that the population nearly doubled (82-percent increase) in spite of some outmigration. Density has reached 550 per square mile.

While this and the other islands of the West Indies typify the almost explosive natural increase possible when mortality is reduced, they show at the same time the danger of poverty which can result from such expansion if it is not accompanied by proportionate expansion of economic opportunity.

While the land area of the Caribbean islands is more restricted than that of continental nations, the area of optimum utilization on the continent is not unlimited. Policies of population expansion in these nations should, therefore, be coordinated with policies of optimum population distribution and adjustment to agricultural and industrial opportunity. Equal attention needs to be devoted to the development of systems of education, security, and welfare which will assure a rising standard of living as well as an expansion in numbers.

It must, of course, be recognized that reduction in mortality cannot be obtained quickly or inexpensively. The necessary expansion of facilities, training of personnel, and diffusion of knowledge is a long-time process.

A considerable segment of the cultural exchange program, promoted by the State Department in cooperation with other Federal executive agencies, has a direct bearing on the improvement of health and the attainment of a better balance between population and resources in Latin America. The professional skills of the departments chiefly responsible for the promotion of the public welfare in this country are mobilized through the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation and made available to Latin America by means of exchanges of Government officials, professors, students, and scientific and cultural materials.

The description of a specific project in this field will illustrate the character of this operation and indicate some of the possibilities for cooperation by social scientists in universties. This project is the 1950 Census of the Hemsphere and the correlative efforts to improve vital statistics.

A first requisite for sound selection of necessary public health measures and planning their operation is better information as to the nature and distribution of public health problems. A first requisite for a rational adjustment of population to resources is a thorough analysis of the resource potential and the inherent population trends.

As we noted previously, the character of the information at hand is highly unsatisfactory for any determinations except those of a most general nature. Both the population figures on which rates are based and the registration of deaths and causes of deaths on which incidence is based leave much to be desired in completeness and accuracy. Some of the countries have never had a census in the modern sense of the word, and others have had none for several decades. Registration and processing of vital statistics in all but a few of the countries are rudimentary or not nation-wide in coverage.

Social scientists in the United States have a unique opportunity to collaborate with South American schools in bringing about a marked improvement both in the raw material and in analytical methods for planning population and public-health policies. On the initiative of the Inter-American Statistical Institute, all Latin-American nations have expressed a lively interest and agreed to cooperate in a comparable census of the hemisphere in 1950. It is axiomatic that the preparation for a successful census and the plans for meaningful analysis of its results will depend upon a broad and thorough program of training of the technicians who will supervise and analyze the census. It will also require a considerable degree of preparation of public opinion for a successful census in some of those countries which do not have a census tradition.

To facilitate this training program, the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, under the leadership of the Department of State, is giving major attention to training technicians for the 1950 hemisphere census. A number of statistical employees of South American governments, it is hoped, will be brought to this country for training on the job in the Bureau of the Census and other statistical bureaus of the Government in order that they may receive actual experience in census procedures and administration. Statistical advisers will also probably be sent under the Department of State auspices to assist in the organization and staffing of census units and vital statistics bureaus. This program will be developed as rapidly as appropriations from the Congress will permit.

In addition to these exchanges officially fostered by the Department of State, there are hundreds of Latin-American students in the colleges of the United States who are here either on their own resources or on private scholarships. All of these are, of course, not majoring in social science, medicine, or public health, but the majority will probably return to positions which will enable them to exert influence on public opinion. All would, therefore, profit by a closer knowledge of the plans and possibilities of the 1950 census. This means that the teachers of social science in the institutions which enroll a considerable number of Latin-American students have an opportunity to acquaint these students with this movement for improvement in the basic materials for social research and planning.

A realistic approach to the improvement, collection, and analysis of fundamental social facts will contribute greatly to the understanding of the human relationships in the hemisphere. Certainly one of the finest manifestations of good neighborliness would be the wholehearted cooperation of all the social scientists in the exchange of knowledge and skills which have a bearing on the conservation of human resources.

St. Lawrence River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Build the St. Lawrence Seaway," from the May 29 issue of the Advertiser, of Montgomery, Ala.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILD THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

If democratic America is to hold her own against totalitarian governments abroad, we must act like a unified nation and not like a miscellaneous lot of competing peddlers.

We refer to the way representatives of the railroads, of the West, the South, and many interests have succeeded in blocking the urgently needed St. Lawrence seaway.

Now such men as Secretary of State George Marshall and former President Herbert Hoover have appeared before a Senate subcommittee to testify for the seaway, which would permit passage of the larger ships right on up into the vital industrial heart of America and create a vast new store of electric power.

This is no time to complain that the seaway would hurt the railroads, or New York, or the South—it is time to meet the urgent and vital needs of the Nation. And we may be sure that if a project is needed by America, the result of its completion ultimately will be to the benefit of us all.

Good-Neighbor Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, Guatemala's experience with a farm-minded envoy from the United States might well set the pattern for a new sort of good-neighbor diplomacy. Ambassador Edwin J. Kyle, former dean of agriculture at Texas A. & M. College, is making a remarkable record with our neighbors to the south. I sincerely hope that his methods of showing others the best-known agriculture practices will be employed with all other nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Arnold Nicholson entitled "Ambassador of the Soil," which appears in the Country Gentleman magazine of June 1947:

AMBASSADOR OF THE SOIL

(By Arnold Nicholson)

When Edwin Jackson Kyle arrived in Guatemala as Ambassador from the United States, he told everyone that he wasn't much shakes as a diplomat. Thirty-three years as dean of agriculture at Texas A. & M., he intimated, had taught him practically nothing about the mysteries of protocol or when to wear striped pants.

"But," he announced, "I do know something about agriculture and education. That training is at the disposal of Guatemala. Through it I hope to serve both your country and my own, as long as I am here."

That was 2 years ago. The tall, elderly Texan's approach to his duties then seemed a bit naive to some of our specialists in foreign relations. They were used to the cautious diplomacy of career men, and the eccentricities of millionaire appointees, but this was the diplomatic corps' first experience with an "ag" colleage dean. No one was sure—not even Dean Kyle—how it was going to work out.

It has worked like a charm. I visited Guatemala recently for Country Gentleman and came away convinced that Dean Kyle's experiment as an ambassador specializing in agriculture has opened up a new and practical avenue for international friendship and cooperation between Latin America and the United States. His good neighbor path is not lavishly paved with dollars, nor has it wandered into a maze of politics at either end.

You understand why an envoy with roots in the soil has advantages denied the more conventional type of ambassador almost the moment you set foot in Guatemala. From sea-level jungle to the highest mountain slopes, agriculture is the Nation's sole resource. There are no minerals of commercial importance; no fuel other than wood. The economy of Guatemala, like that of most Latin American republics, is completely wedded to the land.

That economy and the social and political life as well head up in Guatemala City, the mile-high capital, where the heat of the tropics is tempered by the thin, cool air to almost perpetual spring. It is an orderly little city of amazing contrasts. Oxcarts mingle with motor scooters and automobiles in the narrow streets, and the white and pink and blue walls of the low buildings unexpectedly flaunt soft-drink and gasoline signs—with Spanish slogans—that you thought you'd left behind in the States. Green plazas and massive church buildings are accent points, but the dominant structure, in size, in architecture, and in all respects, is the National Palace.

The deliberations in the high-ceiled offices and open-air corridors of the Palacio Nacional are just as vital to every Guatemalteco as the happenings in our own White House or on Capitol Hill are to American farmers. But there's another spote in Guatemala City—a modest little building—where developments that influence the technical side of agriculture also begin. It's the headquarters of the Guatemala Agricultural Asscociation. Because Guatemala is small—in land area and in population the equivalent of Tennessee—the members of the association include nearly all the ranch and plantation owners who have the means to improve their operations, and thereby help the nation as a whole.

I watched Ambassador Kyle in action both at the palace and at the agricultural association headquarters. The ambassador's advice and official counsel are frequently sought, but when the dean gets an idea, like the introduction of broad-breasted turkeys or of purebred sheep to up-grade low-producing native bloodlines, he doesn't wait in the flower-filled patio of the American embassy, expecting Guatemala to come to him. He seeks the right people to interest in the job, with a rare diplomacy that he prefers to call making friends.

The turkeys, for instance, are now strutting in fields maintained by the Instituto Agropecuario Nacional, a joint research project financed by the Guatemalan Government and staffed by our own Department of Agriculture. They came from Texas Luling Foundation, of which Dean Kyle is a director. The sheep—three airplane loads of them—were delivered from the States to one of the members of the agricultural association, who bought them to stock a mountain range.

At the time of my visit the foot-and-mouth disease was relatively new in Mexico. Guatemala is Mexico's neighbor on the south, and naturally fearful that the disease may slip across the border, which zigzags through nearly 500 miles of primitive jungle and mountains. Ambassador Kyle asked the directors of the agricultural association to call a meeting, and brought them the latest reports from our American observers in Mexico. The outbreak, he explained, was going to delay shipment of two Jersey and three Brahma bulls that he had been instrumental in obtaining as gifts from American breeders to the association, and to Guatemalan Government herds. (They were later shipped.) Then the Ambassador described a brush-clearing machine recently developed by Texas ranchers. Something of the sort, he suggested, might help the Guatemalan cattlemen to clear their pastures without the legume-destroying burning that is the custom today.

When the meeting had ended one of the English-speaking directors—a grower of coffee, sugar, and citrus, and a cattle breeder as well—took me aside. "I am speaking for all of us," Señor Carlos Dorion said, "when I tell you that Dr. Kyle has done more for Guatemala than all of the Ambassadors you have sent here in the past 100 years. We said this when he had been here only a few months. We repeat it and hope that all of your people may know how we feel."

TOUR TO THE STATES

Carlos Dorion was one of a party of eight Guatemalans, including the Minister of Agriculture, a congressman, and the director of animal husbandry, whom Ambassador Kyle brought to the United States to tour farm areas in 1946. Their time was largely spent in Texas and in Iowa—the latter because of its corn.

The golden grain that means so much to the agriculture of North America originated, our scientists believe, either in Guatemala or in neighboring Yucatán. It supported the mysterious, highly developed civilization of the Mayan Empire during the years when Europe was plunged in the Dark Ages. The Mayans had no plows and cleared land with fire. When erosion and jungle grass strangled the cornfields, it is now surmised, the Mayan cities were too weak to withstand marauding tribes and perished almost overnight, leaving huge stone temples and carvings to be swallowed by the jungle. The Indians who are descendants of the Mayans—more than 2,000,000 of them in Guatemala—still mingle worship of the ancient gods and stone idols with the religion the good padres brought 300 years ago from Spain, and they still live on corn—and very little else.

The importance of corn in a country we know as a "banana republic" has to be seen to be believed. The bananas are there—eight to nine million bunches exported a year—and so are thousands of acres of the world's finest coffee trees, which produce Guatemala's most valuable export. But nimble brown fingers to pick the coffee or to cut down the bananas would not exist if it weren't for corn to make tortillas for the Indians to eat.

The Indians' milpas—little fields of grain planted, cultivated and harvested with only a hoe and machete—cover every available inch of ground in the highlands where most of these modern Mayans live. The fields run right up to the 8,500-foot elevation on the sides of Guatemala's tall volcanoes, sometimes with rocks painstakingly placed below every corn plant to keep them from sliding downhill if the slope is extra steep. Production runs from 15 to 30 bushels an acre, and every community, in fact almost every family, has its own strain of corn. There are white, yellow, purple ears; flint and dent; and every conceivable mixture of these qualities. I saw flint and dent on the same ear.

The opportunity for the plant breeder to better yields, and at the same time unearth characteristics that geneticists have never observed before, is unique. Iowa State College turned to this genetic treasure-trove recently, and established a research station under direction of Dr. I. H. Melhus in cooperation with the Guatemalan Government. Collection of strains began in 1945. Nearly 300 sorts have been yield-tested in fields at varying elevations; and of these, 25 selected for increase.

The link between Iowa and Guatemala was strengthened when Ambassador Kyle brought his touring guests to Ames in 1946. He has since been hard put to explain that Iowa hybrids can't be expected to perform in Guatemala as they do at home. But he, and Dr. Melhus, hold out the promise that the work which heads up at Antigua, and a similar program by American technicians employed by Guatemala's own Instituto Agropecuario, in time will give the nation its own adapted hybrids and better corn.

NONCOMPETING CROPS

Corn improvement is No. 1 in Ambassador Kyle's The Agricultural Economy of Guatemala, published a few months ago by the Guatemalan Ministry of Agriculture. I doubt if many ambassadors have either taken the time to prepare as thorough and thoughtful a document for local consumption, or been honored by having the government to which they are accredited sponsor its publication. The opportunity for Guatemala, he points out, lies in its varied climate and fertile, volcano-nourished soil, and the proximity of the huge United States market for noncompeting crops like coffee, bananas, rubber, and the like. But to take full advantage of this, Guatemala first must build a stronger food base at home.

"This country shouldn't have to import corn, as it did in 1946." Ambassador Kyle

remarked. We were walking through the Agropecuario experimental plots established by the Guatemalan Government at Chocola under the direction of Dr. William C. Davis, whom our Department of Agriculture has lend-leased, so to speak, together with a staff of five other Americans. Corn is one of an infinite variety of crops under test at Chocola, a 6,000-acre plantation—or finca, as the Guatemalans call all farms—which was expropriated by the government from its former German owners during the war. The seized German fincas make the Guatemalan Government the biggest farm operator in the nation today. Nearly a fourth of all the coffee grown now comes from government-owned or controlled fincas. At Chocola, 3,500 acres are interplanted with coffee and bananas—the bananas furnishing, in addition to fruit, the all-important shade for the lower-growing coffee trees.

We stood near an ancient Indian mound, in an open, grassed field. A plot of one of the 28 corn varieties that Dr. Davis' men have selected from the 366 sorts they have discovered grew in isolation in the middle of the field. Beyond the corn the field sloped down to the coffee trees, and they in turn, like an endless green sea, vanished below into the blue haze that veiled the Pacific Ocean 30 miles away. At our backs rose the great wall of 12,000-foot high volcanoes that marches straight across Guatemala from the Mexican border to El Salvador.

Ambassador Kyle turned to gesture toward the cone-shaped, happily silent volcanoes, and the rugged highlands that lay behind them. "Up there, where the Indians have their little fields," he said, "better corn may someday ease their endless labor to grow enough food. But the big opportunity for all Guatemala lies here." And he swung back to face the Pacific and the flat plain of deep, fertile volcanic soil that rose gradually from the ocean to the foothills where we stood. "Corn, cattle, sugarcane, cacao, rubber"—he ticked them off on his fingers. "There's no end to what this country can produce. The plant and animal breeders, the mechanization, the health measures to do it are ready. Soil and climate will do the rest."

The United Fruit Co., the American concern that dominates Central America's banana trade, is showing the way at Tiquisate. Most of the United banana plantations are in the humid, hot lowland on the Atlantic coast of Central America. One of the oldest is near Guatemala's Caribbean gateway of Puerto Barrios. About 10 years ago the fruit company moved over the mountains to the shores of the Pacific, at Tiquisate, and blocked out 23,000 acres of jungle for development as a banana farm.

Three-fourths of the acreage is underlaid with pipe for overhead irrigation. All of it is crisscrossed with an entirely separate system of buried pipes—6,000 miles of them—that carry Bordeaux mixture spray. A rail line travels the length of the plantation, and roads fan out from the tracks to the remotest corner. As the bananas are harvested—one bunch to a tree, with the tree cut down so a new shoot from the roots can replace it—they are loaded on rubber-tired trailers and a tractor pulls them to the rail line.

Tiquisate is one of the world's largest mechanized farms. The plantation and the model town that houses 9,000 workers and their families represents an $8,000,000 investment. The irrigation, which seems a paradox in a country that gets up to 80 inches of rain annually, has nearly doubled the size of the banana bunches. The water comes from the rivers that rise on the slopes of the volcanoes, where 200 inches of rain a year is common. It is pumped with Diesel power to revolving sprinklers atop standpipes 30 feet high. Each sprinkler showers artificial rain on 3⅓ acres. The Bordeaux controls a leaf disease called sigatoka. Each banana tree must be completely coated once a week.

Wages at Tiquisate are above the national level, but the most remarkable accomplishment is in health. Malaria is an ever-present threat almost anywhere in the tropics below the 3,000-foot altitude, yet the rate of infection at Tiquisate is far less than in many cities in our Southern States.

Tiquisate serves as a proving ground in many agricultural fields other than bananas. Although Guatemala, during the war, was able to supply a limited amount of beef to feed our forces in Central America, the local market is far from oversupplied. Better stock and better pastures are the first need. Tiquisate maintains a herd of 8,000, mostly to supply meat for the workers, and has assembled some of the finest brown Swiss and Brahman blood available to build a heat-resistant beef animal. I saw some of the first calves, and their gains compared to purebreds and native criolla cattle were outstanding.

In the crop line, the fruit company has done well with lemon and citronella grass, sources of essential oils that came from the tropics of the Orient before the war. Nursery plantings of oil palm, mahogany, and other tropic woods are maintained, and if the dread Panama disease ever should strike the bananas at Tiquisate the company would be prepared to set out replacement crops.

Although not endowed with resources to match those of the immense fruit company, individual finca owners also are setting a new, and modern, agricultural pace. Some dairies in the vicinity of Guatemala City match grade A establishments in the States. Feed is a problem. I watched a worker, at one dairy, hand harvesting alfalfa from a patch about the size of a basketball court. Each precious clipping went into a tiny hand cart, going to add a little green salad, as it were, to the diet of the cows. They were purebred Jerseys, producing about 30 pounds of milk a day. The best blood is sought. At another farm one of the famous Carnation bulls is siring the Holstein herd. Beef-producing fincas maintain Brahmas and Shorthorns it would be hard to match anywhere.

The flow of foundation stock into Guatemala from the States has accelerated in the past year or so. In part this is due to the relative proximity of the country by air and the ease of shipping animals that way. A four-motored plane needs only 6 hours to reach Guatemala City from New Orleans. It is partly due, also, to the way Ambassador Kyle not only keeps a constant stream of American experts, from Government agencies and from private life, visiting fincas, but likewise helps his Guatemalan friends to find the livestock or other items that they want from the States. Some might consider this a bit below the dignity of an ambassador. But Texas' former dean, though he may leave the details to his hard working, thoughtful agricultural attaché, Graham S. Quate, seldom can resist drawing on his experience and wide acquaintance back home when his Guatemalan friends have a problem to solve.

ENTHUSIASM IS CONTAGIOUS

This enthusiasm carries over into his relations with the Government of Guatemala and has contributed to the manner in which the budget of the Ministry of Agriculture has grown in recent years. Guatemala, under President Juan José Arevalo, now spends between three and four million of its $30,000,000 budget on agriculture. The sum is small, considering agriculture's importance, but four times its size 2 years ago. A great deal of the money is going to finance agricultural colonies, to promote cooperatives, and to aid in subdividing some of the Government-owned fincas for the use of small farmers. The administration of President Arevalo, now in office for his third year, is committed to a comprehensive farm program, including research and extension teaching. His political opponents hint that too much attention has been paid to distributing Government lands, while the President's own adherents clamor that more be parceled out.

Ambassador Kyle stays clear of the political arena, although his aid and advice are available to the Government for any of its own projects, as well as those in which the United States has a cooperative stake. Our Department of Agriculture, in addition to working with the Instituto Agropecuario, maintains a rubber research station in Guatemala. The State Department, through the Office of Inter-American Affairs, assists in operating a normal school for rural teachers and has set up and continued several health and sanitation programs. The latest project, launched by Dean Kyle, has led our Interior Department to send men from the Fish and Wildlife Service to study ways and means to increase food supplies and sport in Guatemala's lakes, forests, and sea.

AG COLLEGE IS TOPS

Guatemala is justly proud of her National School of Agriculture, revitalized by the Government 3 years ago when the school was moved to the 10,000-acre Finca Barcena, near Guatemala City, with Albert S. Muller, a Cornell graduate, who has spent most of his life in the tropics, installed as director. The plant, which includes a modern, spotless dairy barn and milkhouse, sanitary hog-houses, shops and other buildings that reflect the ingenuity and energy of Muller and his students, is worth half a million dollars or more today. Facilities exist for 150 students, who take a 5-year course. The alumni of the school, known as the Association of Agricultural Experts, recently named Ambassador Kyle their honorary president because, as they said, "of the liberal and important help which you have lent to the development of the different phases of our agriculture."

The ambassador is well aware of the advantages his background provided for him to win the friendship and respect of individual Guatemalans. "Understanding between individuals," he insists, "is the basis on which any lasting international good will must be built. Then, and only then, do the governments have a real chance of composing the differences that internal and world politics are sure to impose between them."

He hopes that he will have another year or two in Guatemala before retirement, but is even more anxious that the United States consider agricultural and engineering backgrounds in choosing future envoys to Latin America. "Men with that training," he is sure, "can't help but be, as our good neighbors put it, simpatico. Then the major problems of the country to which they are accredited are also the problems they understand."

When Ambassador Kyle retires, it will be for the second time. He stepped down from Texas A. & M. in 1944, and at that time was named Dean Emeritus. His intimate acquaintance with Latin America began 3 years earlier with a tour of Central and South America sponsored by Nelson Rockefeller. Previously he had served as unofficial adviser and friend to the Latin American students who came in increasing numbers to Texas A. & M. while he was dean.

It was the urging of Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, that resulted in his appointment as ambassador to Guatemala by President Roosevelt in January 1945. "It took me several weeks to make up my mind when the appointment was offered," he said. "After all, I was 69 that year, and that is rather late in life to start a new career. It was, however, a chance to serve my country—even if only for a few years. And that, though my ways may be unorthodox, I'm proud to do."

Address of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the proceedings of the National Board of Underwriters, May 27, 1947, including an address by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower:

President HAINES. Members of the National Board of Fire Underwriters, ladies and gentlemen, guests who have distinguished us by being with us tonight: It is my great pleasure to say that we are back on this old dinner program. Those luncheons that we had to have during the war years were all right with that little bit of dried-up chicken, but tonight we really had groceries and this seems like old times.

This is the dinner following the eighty-first annual meeting of the National Board of Fire Underwriters. My task is made very easy for me tonight by reason of the fact that our guest, who has kindly consented to speak to us, is so well known and his record of achievement so great that he needs no words of mine to elaborate upon it.

Certainly he needs no introduction to the insurance business. Sometime when you are trying to wonder whether you should take a thousand-dollar risk on a mattress factory or whether you should up your line a quarter of a million dollars or so on a fireproof building, I wish you would just ponder upon the risks that this man had to weigh in the North African campaign, in the invasion of Italy or the landings on the beaches of Normandy.

Incidentally, I understand that that landing in North Africa was known as the Torch Operation. Well, if it fooled the Nazis, it was all right. But it was not a happy choice of a name from a fire-insurance standpoint.

And think of it. He not only had to weigh those risks, but without benefit of actuarial science and without exact experience to guide him. He had to weigh and determine the premium that had to be paid to make those operations successful from an underwriting standpoint.

The man who could and did do what he did to insure that we should be allowed to continue in the way of life that suits us best, to insure that we should at least have the opportunity of peace if not for all time at least in our time, is a good enough insurance man for me. [Applause.] I hope, but do not expect, that during the term of office to which you so graciously elected me this afternoon you will always agree with me as wholeheartedly as you seem to on this point.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is my great privilege and honor to introduce to you a man who needs no introduction, and to welcome him to our midst, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff of the United States Army. [Applause.]

Gen. DWIGHT D EISENHOWER. Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, there was something rather terrifying for me in the thought of addressing an insurance association. It seemed that I could hardly go further afield in order to associate with a group of Americans with whose business I would be so little acquainted.

Yet this thought came to me: Had it not been for some eleven or twelve million fighting men in the blue and the brown during this war, there would have been a terrible insurance bill to pay in this country. In fact, there would not have been assets enough in your combined companies to pay the terrific losses. And so there must be some sort of kinship between us and our purposes in life, other than the mere fact that we are citizens of the same great and noble country. [Applause.]

Your president spoke a word just now that struck deep within me. It was the premium you had to pay, the premium you have to pay in war—and it's not measured by any actuarial science. I feel that everyone of us who has it within our power to do anything that may keep us out of war must share forever with me any responsibility I had for having to pay that premium. [Applause.] And I have addressed myself this evening to this great problem of the worst disaster that the world can face and have tried to develop my thoughts as to personal responsibility, not governmental, not somebody else's, personal responsibility in the effort to see that that great conflagration will never again strike this earth.

In our tightly knit economy, all professions and callings—no matter how widely separated they may be in purpose and techniques—all have points of contact and areas of common interest. Banker or housewife, farmer, carpenter, soldier—no one of us can live and act without effect on all the others. Since a world grown small makes all men neighbors, the philosopher's maxim, "Nothing human is foreign to me," more than ever is embedded in fact. But for our citizens, this truth demands as its corollary, "Everything American vitally concerns every American."

Even actuarial tables compiled over scores of years from hundreds of millions of individual experiences, the product of lengthy and abstruse calculations—even they directly affect the life of every man and woman in this country. During the last war they played an important though little known part in the Nation's victory effort. Their effect justifies me in seizing this particular moment to pay tribute to all of your board who were closely connected with the War Damage Corporation.

For more than 5 years they served without compensation this United States agency which issued 5,000,000 policies covering $140,000,000,000 in liability. A wise and prudent national enterprise, designed to protect the country against financial disruption and to lessen the physical cost of war, should it strike within our shores, was buttressed by your patriotic service.

No matter how much planning, how much wisdom may go into planning, whether it be an insurance program, an armed invasion of a continent, or a campaign to reduce the inroads of disease, the measure of its success always will be the spirit and mettle of the individuals engaged in its execution. No matter how much treasure may support a project or how elaborate its organization or how detailed and farsighted its operational scheme, the human element is always the central one. A business, an industry, the Nation itself prospers and is strong only insofar as its men and women are determined to make it great and work together for that end.

Particularly in matters concerning the Nation's welfare, the citizen, the community, the Government are jointly responsible: the individual American, because he is the source of all energy in a democracy; the community, because it is the most immediate agent of action; and the Government, because only through it can there be effective coordination of all the skills and knowledges, the resources and capacities that are demanded by an enterprise concerned with the welfare of 140,000,000 human beings. But the root of success is still in the contribution of the individual. National welfare—that is, general security from the four fundamental evils of human existence: Fire, famine, pestilence, and war—is the business of each citizen because it is he, ultimately, who suffers or profits. Because he has made it his business, we have attained measurable success over fire, famine, and pestilence.

We have not achieved decisive supremacy over these dangers or complete independence from fear of them. No matter how much we may boast of our accomplishments in medicine, in economic productivity, in fire prevention and control, there is evidence always about us that we are still far from full success. Epidemics cut wide swaths of death; starvation or malnutrition become so serious that the future of a people is darkened; catastrophes reduce great structures to flaming ruin. But each eruption of a natural evil spurs us to new effort for its remedy control, and future prevention. Charity, impelling us to aid our stricken fellows at home and in distant lands, is joined with studious effort to unearth the causes of disaster and with national and international planning to prevent their recurrence.

We realize that calmity is a part of human life so long as men through carelessness, stupidity, ignorance, or criminal intent breach the barriers against it. But we do not relax our effort to make its penalties less severe on the innocent. Although our tribute during the past 12 months to the god of fire cost hundreds of millions in dollars and more than 10,000 lives, we do not accept such losses as inevitable, if men are prudent and alert. Fire, famine, and pestilence, consequently, have lost much of their ancient terror as the scourages of human existence. We recognize their remaining threat as largely the penalty of our indifference or neglect.

War, however, is not a natural evil; it is man-made. Combining all the horrors of the other three its malevolence and diabolic savagery have been increased by man himself in the very years that he has learned control over the natural evils of life. As never before, the essence of war is fire, famine, and pestilence. They contribute to its outbreak; they are among its weapons; they become its consequences. The tragedy of war is multiplied by acceptance of its inevitability, although since man is its origin—his carelessness, stupidity, or criminal intent, the occasion of war—it should be subject to the same prevention and control as the evils that comprise it.

For men like myself whose professional concern is defense against war, there is obvious benefit in the study of endeavor directed toward the prevention of natural catastrophes. I do not suggest any mechanical parallel between fire prevention and war prevention, between a fire department and a war department, although effectiveness of both depends on immediacy of action with trained men and proper equipment. But there is a parallel in the development of methods and attitudes that have removed fire as a daily menace to civilized life and in what must be done if we are ever to be liberated from dread of war and its consequences.

In the former it has been and in the latter it must be a process of education and research, understanding causes and blocking their outbreak, of improving methods and devising safeguards. Above all these is the task of developing in the individual an awareness of his personal responsibility, so that the efforts of many may not be nullified by the fault of a few.

Citizen, community, and Nation joined to help defeat the menace of fire. To win security against it in the crowded city, the individual early joined his fellows in the volunteer fire departments. He entered into associations for relief from loss or injury. He sought out better devices to prevent or to extinguish. He designed legislation to curb carelessness or selfishness that might endanger property and lives. He engaged in an untiring campaign that still continues to teach the cause and prevention of fires.

To observe fire codes, individuals surrender their right to build as they choose. Communities join with other communities to learn more about prevention and control. Government cooperates through its manifold facilities. The Nation's attention by such measures as the President's conference is focused on the evil. It is a mighty effort involving all our citizens, requiring the expenditure of immense sums of money and covering every area of our social and economic life. And no one questions the value of the effort or balks at its cost. Fire, all men realize, must be controlled if the economic structure we have built is to be free from the threat of recurrent destruction.

There is here the shadowy outline, at least, of a pattern of effort against war. For too many generations too much of the world has taken it for granted that war is a normal part of human life, whose penalty can be lessened, not by rooting out the cause of war, but only by maintaining so large and powerful a war machine that defeat would be impossible—the equivalent, say, of maintaining fire departments on every street corner while building cities of tinder and of tissue.

Let no one mistake me. We need strong security forces. In the world of chaos, of disorder, doubt, and hysterical fear there is only one source to which we can look for our protection, that is, ourselves. And we must meet that practical danger of today with practical means now available. That true and that stern necessity must not ever prevent us from seeking better ways to eliminate the evil and the threat itself. [Applause.]

As I see it, we need an organized effort, embracing every phase of society, whose goal will be the development of individual, community, and national attitudes that will remove war from the category of the inevitable into its proper position as an evil subject to prevention, or at least control. Understanding by the citizen of the causes of war, acceptance by him of his responsibility to correct them so far as he can; vigilance of the community against apathy or defects that might awaken control of war; readiness of the Nation to act as a single force should war strike—these four are basic attitudes or postures whose attainment will end the weakness that provokes attack and the indifference of the individual that permits the chance of war to become the fact of war.

War is no longer the concern of the soldier alone. In its commencement, its waging, and its settlement he is only one of many. Although the outcome of battle is dependent on his action, his strength for victory is the product of the entire Nation behind him. The economist, industrialist, scientist the farmer, worker, and teacher are all necessary to the waging of war. Likewise they are all likely targets of enemy action in war. In the same way it is the business of all to contribute to the prevention of war—security against war is a function of citizenship.

From kindergarten to the Nation's highest councils war should be considered, as it is in fact, an evil whose outbreak is the result of human errors, human ignorance, human greed. Seen in its proper focus as the product of man himself, its causes known and its development predictable, we can build within this Nation a security establishment that, because it comprises all our capacity, will be a powerful curb against the eruption of war and an effective force for its extinguishment should it break loose. [Applause.]

Of necessity, it would be a very involved process. The prevention of war is a far more complicated matter than fire prevention. It must be a long-term effort—traditional attitudes toward war, developed over centuries, cannot be corrected or displaced within a generation. It may be at the start a one-sided endeavor. We cannot expect others to abandon deep-seated prejudices merely on our counsel. Discouragement is inevitable whenever humane leadership encounters a resentment and opposition that appear wholly without reason. But even such discouragement must never be permitted to develop into desertion of the cause. The difficulties are of little moment if each step toward their solution is an increase in our security against another war that, if permitted to develop unrestrained, may destroy civilization.

To teach our children so that they may be well-informed citizens of their country and their world; to train our young men that they may be able defenders of the peace; to integrate our economy so that all our resources may be mustered to meet the disaster of war—all that is nothing more or less than the duplication in another and larger sphere of the effort by which we have liberated the communities of this country from the constant menace of destruction by fire.

In the effort toward international safeguards, we shall not work alone. Nations now are seeking, at the highest level, to develop cooperation and arbitration as a barrier against war. There is no people that does not hope for their success in this attempt. I say people, not governments. I am of the earnest conviction that there is no people—and I mean the men who fight wars, the people who fight and suffer from war, that want any more of it. [Applause.] If we lead the way in showing how this international endeavor may be reinforced and supported all the way back to the individual citizen, we shall not lack for followers. Regardless of his race, politics, or creed, the common man, when given a worthy goal and guidance toward it, does not rest until it has been attained.

In a world of interdependent nations where men comprehend the causes of war and understand their mutual responsibility to control them, war may happen—but it will cease to be an institution, a characteristic of human society.

The stake in the campaign is not property and dollars, no matter how wasteful war is of these commodities. It is not merely famine and pestilence for a given proportion of the earth's population. It is rather the way of life to which we are devoted; it is civilization as we know it. Even more, it is rapidly becoming humanity's existence. The earth may become a flowering garden or a sterile desert—and we may make the difference.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

[The audience arose and applauded as General Eisenhower and his staff left the grand ballroom.]

President HAINES. I don't know how you all feel. But I feel much better for having been here tonight.

This concludes the eighty-first dinner of the National Board of Fire Underwriters.

Good night.

Mundt Bill Should Be Passed—Information and Cultural Program Necessary Part of Our Foreign Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, during this week the House of Representatives has been considering legislation—the Mundt bill—to authorize a foreign information and cultural program. The idea is that if we are going to spend billions of dollars for the relief and rehabilitation of people in foreign countries we ought to spend a small amount to get world news to them and to let them know something about the United States, the democratic institutions we support, and the policy of democracy that we hope they will follow. It is true that today in Russia and in all of the satellite nations people live behind an iron curtain. We are in direct conflict with the political philosophy that governs these people behind the iron curtain. We want to wean as many of them away from communistic doctrines as we can. The newspapers behind the iron curtain give them little news of what is happening in the rest of the world, and the news they have is always distorted to present the communist viewpoint. What the people read and what they hear is of tremendous importance in a campaign of this kind. It goes a long way toward determining whether people are going to understand communism and democracy, and whether they are going to embrace an autocratic control or a democratic system.

For some time we operated the Voice of America from Munich, Germany. It was heard by millions of people behind the "iron curtain." It was the only counterpart to the constant stream of Communist propaganda with which they are inflicted. The purpose of this legislation is to continue our operation of the Voice of America. Also in those countries to which we have access in the capital or large cities we have maintained small information offices. In these offices newspapers, magazines, and books about the United States and about our foreign policy are available. The number of people who seek information is astounding, and what they get is printed in their newspapers and talked about over their radios.

I think it would be a great mistake if this program were not approved. After all, we cannot and must not discount the value of information and news. Some people call this propaganda, but a diagnosis of what is said and done shows that we are merely trying to give the people the facts.

Further consideration of the measure has gone over until next week. The bill should be passed. Let us hope there is no further delay.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOME LOAN
BANK ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1947.

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUCHANAN: We believe you will be interested in having some current facts concerning the progress of liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, particularly

the record of its accomplishment in your State.

Out of a total of nearly 2,000,000 applications filed throughout the United States and its possessions during the period from June 13, 1933, through June 12, 1936, 1,017,821 loans were closed having a dollar value including subsequent advances, chiefly for taxes, repairs, and other necessary expenses of nearly $3,500,000,000.

Since June 12, 1936, at which time the Corporation's lending activities ceased, it has been engaged in a rapid yet orderly liquidation of its assets. As of March 31, 1946, a total of $2,695,784,648 had been liquidated, or 77.2 percent. As of March 31, 1947, 1 year later, a total of $2,896,279,856, or over 82.9 percent had been liquidated. In other words, during the 12-month period from March 31, 1946 to March 31, 1947, the Corporation liquidated a total of $200,495,208. Out of a cumulative total of 198,191 properties which the Corporation was forced to acquire, there remained on hand as of March 31, 1947, a total of but 78 properties throughout the entire country.

Out of the total number of loans made, 58,793 were closed in the State of Pennsylvania, representing an aggregate amount of $188,741,387. This amount includes subsequent advances chiefly for taxes and insurance made for the account of the borrower. In this connection you will be interested in knowing that according to the 1940 housing census 40.8 percent of all owner-occupied, nonfarm dwelling units in the State of Pennsylvania were under mortgage and 15.3 percent of these mortgages were refinanced by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

As of March 31, 1946, the total amount of outstanding loans of the Corporation in Pennsylvania together with the value of the properties acquired, had been reduced through collections and the sale of its properties to a balance of $46,686,924, a liquidation equivalent to 75.2 percent. As of March 31, 1947, 1 year later, the amount of the outstanding loans and the value of the properties acquired had been reduced to a balance of $34,881,548, a liquidation equivalent to 81.5 percent, or a liquidation of $11,805,376 during the 12-month period.

A total of 31,958 borrowers have paid their accounts in full as of March 31, 1947. This represents an increase of 5,248 over the number who had paid their accounts in full a year ago. A substantial number of borrowers in the State of Pennsylvania are making monthly payments in excess of the amount required under their contracts.

The Corporation was obliged to take over through foreclosure in the State of Pennsylvania a cumulative total of 10,724 properties. As of March 31, 1947, 10,720 properties have been sold, representing a liquidation of acquired properties in your State equivalent to 99.9 percent.

According to the present trends of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation's income and expense and the projection of these into the future, if the present loan balances are liquidated in accordance with amortization schedules, the Corporation should not only be able to cover all future expenses but also be able to wipe out its present deficit and thus make possible the return to the Federal Government of the entire original $200,000,000 capital of the Corporation advanced in 1933 by the Secretary of the Treasury.

We believe that the Corporation's record will be a source of pride to you and to the Congress which passed the original Home Owners' Loan Corporation legislation, which has proven to be one of the most advanced measures ever undertaken in any country for the encouragement and maintenance of home ownership.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FAHEY,
Commissioner.

The Genius of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Hawaii Educational Review of April 1947 entitled "The Genius of Hawaii," by Dr. Laura Thompson, coordinator of Indian education and administrative research.

Dr. Thompson spent her childhood and received her early education in Hawaii. She has achieved Nation-wide distinction in the field of scientific research as a result of her studies of the problems of Pacific people. Her comment, therefore, concerning the significance of Hawaii is of great interest in view of legislation now pending before the House to enable Hawaii to become the forty-ninth State.

The article follows:

THE GENIUS OF HAWAII

(By Dr. Laura Thompson, coordinator, Indian education and administration research)

Now that the confusing aftermath of war is somewhat abating, it is perhaps a good time to take stock. What is Hawaii's place in the postwar world? Where does she fit in the confusing cultural patterns which are emerging? What potential contribution have these islands to make toward creating a lasting peace?

Obviously a major trend of our era is the change that is taking place in the status of colonial and dependency peoples all over the world. Some groups like India, Burma, and the Philippines are moving toward, or have achieved, self-government and political independence. Others like Indonesia are gaining full citizenship rights and complete equality within the mother country. Both trends are bringing some 750,000,000 subject peoples of the world toward greater self-determination, cultural freedom, and political equality. And the whole movement away from colonialism and toward local and national autonomy is part of the great birth trauma of a peaceful and liberating world order.

Hawaii, as she advances rapidly toward statehood and full franchise status within the United States, is in the vanguard of the the world trend toward colonial freedom. Indeed, the Territory is setting a precedent in the development of mechanisms whereby a culturally diverse, geographically distant area may become an integral part of the dominant national unit. Hawaii is showing the world how political and legal unity may be achieved within a pattern of cultural diversity.

The people of these islands have worked out a way of life whereby many ethnic groups of diverse cultural heritages may live together in harmony and with equal status under the law. It is important to emphasize, however, that this life-way does not demand complete cultural conformity. It builds unity upon cultural diversity.

Indeed, an analysis of the culture of Hawaii shows us that a unified, harmonious community may be achieved among diverse ethnic components by building up conformity in certain vital areas of interpersonal and intergroup relations, and by allowing cultural freedom and variation in other areas. For example, every ethnic group in Hawaii must obey the law, send its children of school age to school, use a common language and a common medium of exchange when dealing with other groups, and conform to certain standards of public health and hygiene. On the other hand, a wide scope is allowed in family life, child-training patterns, ways of making a livelihood, social mores, club and association formation, religious beliefs and ceremonies, attitudes and values. Thus, here in these islands, has developed a unique pattern of living which allows a wide range of cultural diversity within a politically and legally unified community.

Many people in many parts of the world do not understand the creative value of cultural diversity. That which the people of Hawaii experience every day, that which gives the vital spark to island life, that which is woven into the very social fabric of Hawaii Nei, is the vital ingredient which is often missing in schemes for community, national, and international order.

For it is a truism that world peace must be built on the basis of the many culturally diverse groups which people the earth and form the human component of whatever order may eventually be achieved. Cultural diversity is one of the immutable human facts in the world, with which we must come to terms. It exists. It cannot be willed, exorcised, voted, legislated, or educated completely out of existence. It is the very stuff of which world order must be built.

But our age is cursed with a fatal simple-mindedness in regard to social and political problems. We tend to think of everything as either true or false, white or black, good or bad, smart or stupid, logical or illogical, etc. Applying this mental approach to ethnic problems, we tend to assume that in every community one culture must be the best, one race must be superior, one religion the truth, one morality the absolute. We tend to take it for granted that to be unified a community must be uniform. It is difficult for many people to grasp the fact that communities may be multicultural and at the same time unified.

This conformity mindedness is a major obstacle to the building of a peaceful world community. For it handicaps us in finding solutions to ethnic problems not only within the United States but elsewhere, and it prevents us from clearly seeing the way toward a peaceful and liberating world order. Indeed, our simple-minded approach, our drive toward conformity, gets in the way of our realizing that local government and national government and world government must be built out of cultural diversity.

The people of Hawaii, on the other hand, grow up with an understanding of a multi-patterned life-way. Island-born Japanese, Chinese, Hawaiians, Filipinos, Haoles, as well as all the other local ethnic minorities, experience from early childhood the fact that many different kinds of people, expressing different kinds of customs, attitudes, and values, can live together and create a unified community on the basis of their differences as well as their similarities. In fact, the flavor of island life, its uniqueness and vitality, lies in the existence of these differences within an over-all pattern of unity.

This, in my opinion, is the genius of Hawaii. The islanders have found a life way of unity within diversity. This is Hawaii's potential contribution to a peaceful world order. As such, it should be made explicit, strengthened, and guarded as a priceless treasure. And the way to strengthen Hawaii's genius is to recognize it, to appreciate it, to shield it against the trend, so strong in American culture particularly, toward uniformity.

In the postwar confusion and the drive toward statehood, pressures toward cultural conformity will increase in the islands. Will Hawaii be able to resist them, to strengthen her tradition, to follow her unique genius? Will she fulfill her potential leadership role in showing other communities at home and abroad a way toward harmonious cultural pluralism?

Mississippi Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herewith a copy of the Memorial Day address delivered by me at the Washington Memorial Chapel, Valley Forge, Pa., June 8, 1947, on the observance of Mississippi Memorial Day, sponsored by the Daughters of the American Revolution:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I regret exceedingly that His Excellency, Fielding L. Wright, Governor of the State of Mississippi, for unavoidable reasons, is unable to join you and address you on behalf of the citizens of that Commonwealth. But I must tell you that he, as well as 2,000,000 fellow Mississippians, is with us in mind and spirit, as we gather to give recognition to the contributions of Mississippi to the glorious history of America and our democratc way of life.

By special designation, it has become my duty, privilege, pleasure, and honor to speak for him on this auspicious occasion.

Reflections upon the suffering and sacrifices of a little band of men gathered at Valley Forge in the winter of 1778 lend further reverence to the hallowed ground upon which rests this beautiful and sacred edifice, and enhances the glory of the Father of our Country for whom this church is appropriately named.

The struggle of Washington's valiant heroes of Valley Forge did not end with the coming of spring, nor did it end with the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown—but it goes on today to manifest itself as a shining inspiration to liberty-loving peoples the world over in their ceaseless quest for freedom. It was at Valley Forge that America earned the love and respect of all of civilization; Valley Forge furnished the embryo which grew to maturity among nations and never ceased to grow until it became the richest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth. Students of history and lovers of our country, through generations yet unborn, will visit here or read of this epochal struggle which is such a significant part of American history and directed the course of many milestones of America's journey.

America is today the citadel of freedom—the bastion of democracy.

It is with pardonable but justifiable pride that I point to the innumerable contributions made by Mississippi toward achieving for America her place in the society of nations, and I wish to express on behalf of every Mississippian our gratitude for your gracious gesture of today, which I feel to be a generous acknowledgment of those contributions. If one had a yardstick with which to measure the achievements of men, he would find Mississippians among those of the greatest stature. Such men as L. Q. C. Lamar, and Sargent S. Prentiss, whose ringing oratory in the Halls of Congress has become legendary; Jefferson Davis, soldier and statesman, President of the Confederate States of America, whose memory shall live in the hearts of all Americans for time immemorial; James Z. George, statesman and scholar, and within the memory of all of us—James Kimble Vardaman, John Sharp Williams, and the late Byron Patton Harrison, have joined in the exclusive company of the immortals, and their footprints are indelibly stamped in the sands of American history. Mississippi has never failed to produce more than her share of men when our Nation has become imperiled, and thousands of her sons lie today in the soil of foreign lands—never to return—sacrificed to the cause of America and the democratic way of life. Nowhere is democracy stronger, nowhere are citizens more patriotic, nowhere is love of home and devotion to duty more in evidence among a people.

And today, as America emerges from the shadow of the last great war, names of great Mississippians emerge with her. We are proud indeed of the deserved glory brought to our people by the heroism of Admiral John S. McCain, Gen. Dan I. Sultan, and Sgt. Jake Lindsay, and thousands of unsung Mississippi men and women whose names have never graced the pages of the American press, but who fought and sacrificed with equal vigor and determination for the preservation and advancement of our unimpeachable ideals.

As America developed—so did Mississippi. Admitted to the sisterhood of States in 1817, Mississippi has made great strides. She has experienced a physical evolution from vast wildernesses to a thriving modern country, replete with the handiwork of God and man.

Mississippians are good people, believing in the divinity of God and adhering to the tenets of Christianity, humbling themselves before God, always unswerving in their zeal for the principles of righteousness. But we are also proud—proud of the heritage which is ours and the opportunities which are offered us.

May the glorious banner of the great State of Mississippi and the flags of her 47 sister States forever march onward behind the stars and bars of our great Nation toward more glory for Old Glory.

United States Information Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of June 9, 1947:

VISITOR TO MOSCOW STRESSES NEED OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION PROGRAM—AMERICANS "OVER THERE" MAY DISAGREE ON SOME THINGS BUT THEY ALL BACK PLAN, POST-GAZETTE EDITOR REPORTS

(By Andrew Bernhard)

To anyone who has been in Moscow recently, the uproar here at home over the appropriation of $31,000,000 to continue the State Department's information program abroad is incomprehensible.

Americans stationed in Moscow, for their Government or on private business, disagree on many things. But during the Conference of Foreign Ministers, I found none who objected to the information program.

Here at home one gets the idea that the radio program called the Voice of America is the whole issue involved. It isn't, though it may well be the most important as far as Russia is concerned.

CENSORSHIP IN RUSSIA

Most Americans know that no Russian can read anything his Government does not wish him to read. No foreign books, periodicals, newspapers, or magazines can be sent into Russia without permission of the Russian Government. So the impression the Russian citizen gets of the rest of the world is precisely the impression the Russian Government wants him to get.

For more than a year the Kremlin, through all avenues of communication, has carried on an unremitting, violent propaganda campaign to convince the Russian people that the western powers, headed by a predatory, greedy United States, are conspiring to attack Russia.

The United States is pictured as a Nation in the grip of bloodthirsty monopolists, who hunt down minorities like wild beasts, who exploit the resources and people of the country and who are trying to stir up war to prevent their victims from finding out what a paradise the workers of Soviet Russia live in.

TOUGH PUBLIC RELATIONS JOB

Unless we Americans wish to brush all that off and leave the masters in the Kremlin a clear field in their perversions of the truth, we are confronted with a job of public relations, and about the toughest job of public relations in history.

Through an arrangement with the Russian Government the United States sends to Russia 50,000 copies monthly of a slick-paper magazine called Amerika, printed in the Russian language.

Amerika is a combination of text and pictures presenting to the Russian reader a completely factual account of American life.

Americans in Moscow say that it is so popular with Russians that its circulation easily could be increased tenfold overnight if the Kremlin would permit it.

Considering that most Russians are aware that their government frowns on people with too great an interest in foreign affairs, that is a tribute alike to the curiosity of the Russians and to the effectiveness of Amerika.

The magazine is part of the State Department's information program which apparently would be dropped if the people who wish to be known as the watchdogs of the United States Treasury have their way and are able to kill the appropriation for the program.

VALUE IS UNDETERMINED

The Voice of America radio program is a little harder to assay as to value, just as it is always hard to determine the number of listeners for any radio program.

A firm advertising a product over the radio in the United States judges the value of its program, finally, less by its so-called rating than by its results. If sales pick up it has proof the program is doing its job.

By that judgment the Voice of America must be doing its job. It was started without the advantage of a single word of publicity in the Russian press or on the Russian radio.

Obviously, the Russians were not going to publicize a program which might expose the falsity of their propaganda drive.

Ilya Ehrenbourg, most famous living Russian writer, attacked the Voice of America program for two or three columns in the Russian press recently. That would seem to prove that the program is hitting where it hurts, that the Russians finally decided it could no longer be ignored.

I read the Voice of America program script pretty regularly while in Russia. It seemed to me that if they had a fault it lay in their dullness, their adherence to straight fact and their avoidance of the color, drama, and liveliness with which American domestic radio seeks to add appeal to its programs.

SECRET OF ITS APPEAL

But after a while I came to see that it was precisely because of this flat, unemotional, objective treatment of the news that the program developed appeal among the Russians. Their emotions, nerves, eyes, and ears are continually so harried, shouted at, and alarmed that they welcomed a program without stridency, that appealed to logic rather than prejudice.

Word got around, from one man to another, that at such and such a time and

on such and such a wave length, the Americans were telling about America. And as Russian curiosity about America is as insatiable as American curiosity about Russia, the word circulated fast.

Of course there immediately occurs to an American the question of how many short-wave sets there are in Russia. I was told that while figures were impossible to obtain, the proportion of short-wave sets is far higher there than in the United States, since the Russian radio, because of the vast distances it must cover, has developed short wave to much greater relative degree than is true in this country.

And radio sets are owned largely by professional people, engineers, scientists, managers, those best able to influence others.

AWARE OF TAXPAYERS' BURDEN

Finally, both Secretary of State Marshall and Ambassador Smith, have testified to the value of the State Department information program and to the Voice of America broadcast. Both of them are clearly aware of the American taxpayers' burden and are not men who wish to throw money out of the window.

Their testimony should carry considerably more weight than the prejudices of Congressman JOHN TABER, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

Thirty-one million dollars is a lot of money, but viewed as an advertising appropriation to build good will for us in the world it does not look so formidable.

Compared with what the Russians probably are spending it must be peanuts.

Legislation on TVA Law Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday the House, pursuant to the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, amended section 26 of the TVA charter. Under leave I include a letter of L. J. Wilhoite, president of Southern Dairies of Chattanooga and chairman of the electric power board. Mr. Wilhoite is recognized as a citizen of great ability and he has taken the lead in defending the TVA from the various assaults made against it.

His letter is as follows:

ELECTRIC POWER BOARD
OF CHATTANOOGA,
Chattanooga, Tenn., June 6, 1947.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ESTES: I was glad to learn through Mr. Ken Whitaker that we have the same point of view about the latest proposal to impede the TVA.

It is my opinion that the adoption of the proposal (TVA amendment) would constitute a repudiation of the legislative intent of the framers of the TVA Act. It was the intent of those responsible for the creation of TVA to attempt the rehabilitiation of an area that was rapidly becoming a liability to the Nation by combining under unified direction those activities that could reasonably be expected to produce results without doing violence to our democratic processes. Many of the methods authorized had already been tried out with limited success. It was believed, as it was common sense to believe, that these several measures if brought under unified direction would be more successful, and the record of TVA demonstrates that these views were sound.

The very nature of the undertaking was such as to make it necessary for the Government of the United States to assume a capital risk. For the Government to come back to the people of the TVA area within the short span of 10 years, before anything conclusive has been established as to the ultimate long-term success or failure of the effort, and ask those people to agree to give the Government a first mortgage on their economic future in exchange for the risk capital which the Government invested in the venture, violates a fundamental principle of justice that irrespective of any legalistic right the Government may have to resort to such conduct.

I hope that you will never agree to compromising the basic principles incorporated in the TVA charter, because while expediency may be necessary at times in determining conduct, it should never be resorted to if it results in injustice—and that goes for political, as well as any other kind of expediency. My grandfather always told me that it didn't make a lot of difference whether I won or lost, but that what I fought for, and how I fought, did make a lot of difference. I would rather see TVA turned back to the Indians than to compromise the principles that guided George Norris, Franklin Roosevelt, and others, in its creation.

I am absolutely convinced that if we take this fight to preserve the charter of TVA to the people of the TVA area and the Nation strictly on its merits, and let the common sense, the decency, and the fairness of the plain people of the Nation determine the issues, we will not have to compromise with the enemies of TVA and content ourselves with the crumbs that fall from their tables.

Good luck and best wishes.

Sincerely,

L. J. WILHOITE.

This is what I had to say about the legislation in the appropriation bill on TVA's charter in a radio address on Thursday:

The Tennessee Valley Authority suffered a legislative defeat this week which will be quite harmful to this great agency which has done so much for the people living in the Tennessee Valley, and which has meant so much to the Nation both in times of war and in times of peace. Before discussing the action of the House Appropriations Committee which dealt this blow to TVA, a little background will be of interest.

The great success of the TVA has been due in a considerable measure to the fact that it has some latitude in its operation—that is the directors of the TVA, situated in the Tennessee Valley, have been able to operate this great agency and make decisions about matters that come up, without having to refer everything to some bureau in Washington. The people of the Valley have an opportunity of seeing and talking with TVA directors, and the decisions are made there on the ground.

Furthermore, out of the revenues received from the operation of the electrical facilities of TVA, the directors have been able to use part of this money for the purpose of building transmission lines, putting in new generators, restoring facilities which might be damaged or destroyed, without having to first come to Congress for specific appropriations for everything done. What they do, of course, must be within the purposes outlined in the TVA Act, and the directors are held strictly accountable for the proper expenditure of this money which they take in, and in all the history of this splendid agency no one has ever contended that one penny has been misapplied, nor has there been any graft or improper conduct.

Those who conceived this great blessing to the people provided for this freedom of action in section 26 of the TVA Act. Ever since then critics and enemies of the TVA have tried to amend section 26. Their purpose is to require the TVA to turn in all the moneys it collects from the sale of power as it collects it, and to come directly to Congress for appropriations for operating, costs for expense for repairs to transmission lines, etc.

Amendments to destroy the independence of TVA have passed the Senate from time to time, but they have always been defeated in the House. Well now the House has taken action itself. Without giving TVA officials a chance to be heard in public hearing, and without giving any of the cities, municipalities or co-ops in the Valley which buy power from the TVA, or any of the interested citizens in the Valley a chance to protest and present their side of the question, the Appropriations Committee of the House has written legislation amending section 26 of the TVA Act. The sponsors of these amendments may not have in mind doing great damage to the TVA, but I fear the result will be to strait-jacket and impede its operations.

The House has required that the investment in power facilities be amortized or paid back to the Government within 40 years. Ordinarily private utilities take 75 to 100 years to amortize their investments, but the 40-year provision is not so bad standing alone, because the TVA would probably pay back all this money within 40 years anyway. But the plan of the Appropriations Committee of the House goes much further. It says that at least 40 percent of the revenues from the sale of electricity must be paid to the Treasury every year, and the Appropriations Committee can and may decide upon a larger amount each year. Heretofore the decision as to what amount was necessary in order to meet contingencies which any power facility might be confronted with was up to TVA officials. So this opens up the door to allow the Appropriations Committee to require that all the money be paid back within 20 or 25 years which, of course, would be a disastrous requirement for those who are dependent upon the TVA for electricity, as it would probably require an increase in rates.

The plan of the Appropriations Committee requires that at least one-fourth of the amount invested in power facilities be paid to the Treasury every 10 years. The trouble with this is that during one 10-year period we might have a depression or business would be bad and TVA might not earn $90,000,000, which is substantially the amount it would have to pay. If it met this contingency it would have no alternative but to curtail service and increase rates.

The provision also contains a limitation to the effect that no money can be spent on new power projects, without the express consent of Congress. Well, it is somewhat uncertain as to just what new power projects are. If that refers to new dams or new steam plants, this amendment might not be harmful, but it might conceivably be interpreted to refer to other things such as new generators or substations.

Perhaps the worst feature of the whole thing is that in adopting these amendments the Appropriations Committee also provided that it should have jurisdiction over any future legislation affecting section 26 of the TVA Act. This deprives the regularly constituted legislative committees of their jurisdiction. The Appropriations Committee does not have hearings on these matters as other committees do, so the people of the Valley have been substantially deprived of their ability to be heard in the future.

Another bad feature is, that by writing this legislation on the TVA's appropriation bill, it can be enlarged upon in the Senate

by a simple majority vote. If the legislation had not been included by the House in this bill a two-thirds vote in the Senate would be required.

Credit Where Credit Is Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to me, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Make America Strong," taken from one of the great newspapers of this country, the Youngstown Vindicator. This editorial was taken from the Vindicator issue of June 10, 1947, and I think it is very much worth while to call it to the attention of Congress for its consideration. Not only does the article point out the significance of the speech made by President Truman in his address to the Thirty-fifth Division Reunion at Kansas City, but it lays great stress upon the development of our natural resources and the situation in which the West finds itself at the present time. The editorial points out that the House cut nearly one-third from the Department of Agriculture appropriation and has reduced the Interior Department funds for reclamation, water control, and power by nearly two-thirds.

Most significant of all, the Vindicator's editorial pointed out that what the President said at Kansas City paralleled in great part the arguments which had already been presented on the floor of the House by that outstanding champion of the West, the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN, of Youngstown, Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we from the West have no greater or more sincere friend than MIKE KIRWAN whose views are not limited by the boundaries of his constituency but are as a matter of fact and record thoroughly national in their scope. MIKE KIRWAN realizes the importance of the West in the development of America's economy and I, for one, and I know I speak for all westerners, am deeply grateful to Mike for the fine work he has consistently done in our behalf. He is a credit to his city, his district, his State, and his Nation and what this country needs, in my opinion, is more men like MIKE KIRWAN who have the vision, the understanding, and the knowledge to do the right thing in the right place at the right time. I wish also to congratulate the Youngstown Vindicator for its recognition of the qualities which have made MIKE KIRWAN so outstanding in this body.

The editorial follows:

TO MAKE AMERICA STRONG

President Truman, addressing the Thirty-fifth Division reunion at Kansas City, properly stressed the need to make America strong, both militarily and in natural resources. Anyone who looks about in this troubled world will earnestly second the President's motion.

"The will for peace," Mr. Truman said, "without the strength for peace is of no avail." Hitler struck because he thought we were weak, and Japan attacked Pearl Harbor under the same illusion. "Hence we must maintain our Army and Navy and Air Force in effective readiness for any emergency. They should be organized in an efficient single military establishment and they should be supported by reserves of well-trained civilians."

Americans must look to their strength in other fields than Army-Navy unity and universal training. As Mr. Truman said, "to a greater extent than ever before our prosperity and security depend upon our natural resources." With millions of hungry men, women, and children clamoring for food, reclamation of wasteland is needed. The West is facing a serious power shortage in the next few years; its abundant water power should be harnessed. The Missouri-Mississippi rampage shows the need for flood control.

In the face of these facts the House has cut nearly a third from the Agriculture Department's appropriation, and reduced the Interior Department's funds for reclamation, water control, and power by nearly two-thirds. In asking for restoration of the money Mr. Truman paralleled Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN'S arguments on the House floor against the cuts. The President said:

"Money spent for water control, reclamation, and power projects cannot be regarded in the same light as expenses for other construction programs. Appropriations for reclamation and power projects are investments which are repaid by water and power customers. To curtail construction on projects already begun because construction costs are high is to waste vast amounts of public capital already invested by postponing the time when repayment begins."

The President and Mr. KIRWAN are right. The country will look to the Senate, which is now considering the appropriation bills, to take a further-looking view than the House majority's penny-wise, pound-foolish attempt to make an illusory record of "economy" for political purposes.

Clothing Fires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit an editorial appearing in the Standard-Examiner, of Ogden, Utah, on June 8, 1947:

CLOTHING CATCHES FIRE

Many persons, particularly women and children, are dead today because their clothing was made of material that catches fire too readily.

Congressman GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, long has fought to obtain a law that would forbid the sale of textiles that are dangerously flammable or at least provide the wearers with a warning that their garments will burst into fire when exposed to a puff of flame or a few sparks.

Nothing has come of the Congressman's efforts "because of the opposition of some groups."

Now, however, the National Retail Dry Goods Association has entered the field on CANFIELD'S side with a statement that "during the month of April the record of clothing fires that resulted in either serious injury or death ran to better than one a day."

Most of these tragedies were needless, the retail dry goods people say.

Persons who are innocently purchasing flammable fabrics should take warning. Consumers who don't like the situation should let Congressman CANFIELD know their views.

Immigration Into Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the General Assembly of Connecticut on May 28, 1947, advocating opening Palestine to unlimited and unrestricted immigration:

Whereas it has been the consistent and traditional policy of the American people evidenced by statements of our Presidents, resolutions of Congress and the State legislatures, including a resolution by our own legislature as recently as 1943, and the party platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties, to support the aspirations of the Jewish people to establish Palestine as a free and democratic commonwealth in accordance within the intent and purpose of the Balfour declaration and the mandate granted to Great Britain by the League of Nations; and

Whereas the need for the implementation of this policy has become acute and immediate as a result of the systematic persecution of the Jewish people for the last 10 years and the resulting present desperate plight of over a million homeless and despairing Jews, where only hope for survival lies in the development of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth in which they might find refuge: Therefore be it

Resolved by this assembly, That the general assembly of the State of Connecticut hereby memorializes the Chief Executive of the United States to exert the good offices of our country toward the immediate opening of Palestine to unlimited and unrestricted immigration, especially of homeless, displaced or persecuted Jews everywhere, and the immediate annulment of all laws restricting or preventing the purchase of land, its colonization or the development of the land and its natural resources in order that Palestine may as soon as possible be reconstituted by the Jewish people into a free and democratic commonwealth; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the State transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State and Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

Passed: State of Connecticut Senate, May 29, 1947.

Passed State of Connecticut House of Representatives, May 29, 1947.

Defense Housing Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

CLAIRTON, PA., *June 11, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BUCHANAN: Resolution 926, adopted by City Council of the City of Clairton, Pa., June 10, 1947, refers to the Lanham Act defense housing projects in this city.

Your kind and thoughtful consideration of the resolution will be appreciated greatly by the mayor and council.

Very truly,

D. J. PATTERSON,
City Clerk.

Resolution 926

Resolution petitioning the Federal Public Housing Authority to set aside in reserve at Clairton defense-housing projects, inter alia, for conversion to low-rent housing pending the advice and consent of Congress of the United States, and of the local communities and local government bodies

Whereas the members of the Allegheny County Housing Authority have been designated by the county commissioners as the disposition committee for the purpose of studying and recommending in the matter of the disposal by the Federal Government of the 14 Lanham Act defense-housing projects in Allegheny County; and

Whereas this disposition committee was set up at the request of the Federal Government so that the ultimate disposal (under the term of the Lanham Act), of the said defense-housing projects might be carried out with proper consideration for national and local need; and

Whereas the said disposition committee for Allegheny County has been engaged for some time in studies and will be engaged for some further time in studies and surveys, in conjunction with the many local communities, to determine and formulate a practicable, reasonable, and advantageous plan of disposal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the city of Clairton of Allegheny County, Pa., in council assembled:

1. That preliminary studies indicate that these 14 defense housing (Lanham Act) projects, erected by the Federal Government to assure Allegheny County which is metropolitan Pittsburgh, the workshop of the world and the very center of the arsenal of democracy, of an adequate supply of skilled defense workers, should as a matter of continuing national defense be continued for the use and occupancy of workers and their families at rents within their financial means to pay.

2. That Federal Public Housing Authority should be petitioned and the same is hereby petitioned to set aside and reserve these 14 defense housing (Lanham Act) projects in Allegheny County for conversion to low-rent housing projects, pending the advice and consent of the Congress of the United States and pending the advice and consent of the local communities and local government bodies.

3. That the disposition committee for Allegheny County shall continue its studies and surveys in conjunction with the local communities, local public officials, and interested persons with the objective of developing and recommending a plan of disposal which will serve national and local need.

4. That a program covering the administration of said low-rent housing projects be instituted by the Congress of the United States and the Federal Public Housing Authority so that the handling of the tax payments or payments in lieu of taxes shall be so set up as not to place any burdensome expense upon the city of Clairton, nor upon any other community in Allegheny County wherein the aforesaid defense projects are located.

Resolved this 10th day of June 1947.

JOHN J. MULLEN,
Mayor and President of Council.

Appropriation for Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership with eyes glued on 1948 rushes recklessly on in their program of cut the taxes, whatever the immediate or ultimate cost to the people.

As this cut-the-taxes program has unfolded it has become very clear just whom it is meant to benefit—the greedy, not the needy. Yes, this cut-the-taxes program will make the rich, richer, and the poor, poorer.

The cut in the appropriation for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation is a good example of what I am talking about. The Republican leadership recommended, and the Republican majority voted this cut.

Now let us see who will get the golden egg.

Every Member of this House, or anyone else who knows anything about the facts, must know that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has, as the public reports show, been liquidated by more than 82 percent. It made loans and advances to a total of about three and a half billion dollars. These have now been reduced to a little less than $600,000,000.

Instead of losing a half billion to a billion dollars, as all the bankers and loan people, as well as many Members of Congress, predicted, it will lose nothing if it is let alone. The Treasury has never been called upon to put up a cent from the time in 1933, in the midst of a national home-mortgage panic, we voted the $200,000,000 to start it going.

HOLC has paid all of its operating expenses out of its income, and if it is allowed to keep up its good work for the next couple of years, it will pay back every cent advanced and return the capital to the Treasury. It has already wiped out $337,000,000 of losses which it had to take on foreclosed property, and it turned in over $21,000,000 of net profit last year to cut down previous losses.

The report of the Committee on Appropriations itself states:

> It was originally anticipated that this Corporation would suffer considerable loss but it now appears that the actual loss eventually to be taken will be only a fraction of the amount loaned.

All the figures up to date show that there should be no loss at all if the Corporation is let alone and permitted to operate successfully as it has thus far—a fact which cannot be denied.

I challenge any Member of this House to cite any liquidation by this Government, at any time, which has made anything like the showing this Corporation has.

Back in the Hoover administration a Farm Board was created to make loans. Congress appropriated $500,000,000 for this undertaking. It was sponsored in the Senate by the late Senator McNary, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. In 1935 he reported to the Congress, with regret, that the entire $500,000,000 was lost in that operation.

Apparently the Republican leadership in the Committee on Appropriations wanted to make sure that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation does not wind up its work without imposing some loss on the taxpayers. Otherwise why did it cut the Corporation's appropriation by $723,000 to a flat $3,000,000 to run a $600,000,000 business without a word of explanation as to how it can be done?

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation had more than 450 offices and 21,000 employees at the top of its operations. It is now down to but two offices, New York and Chicago, and has but about 800 employees. Its budget was over $37,000,000 at the top. It asked for but $3,723,000 for the fiscal year 1948, a reduction of more than a million and a half from the 1946 fiscal year. Although it is already liquidated far beyond what Congress ever expected when it was organized in 1933, with only four dissenting votes in this House and none in the Senate, it is still the largest home mortgage company in existence.

On inquiry I am told it will have to close one of the two offices it now maintains and run a serious risk of its collections falling behind. The Republican leadership in the committee evidently intends to force the Corporation to sell its mortgages. It claims, and I quote, "It should be possible to make such sales by areas or States, selling en bloc all the mortgages in a given area."

This scheme was put forward several years ago by mortgage-lending institutions which at that time wanted to grab off all the mortgages which had been made good. It was shown at the time this steal would mean a loss to the Government of about $400,000,000. To put over such a plan now would soak the Treasury and the taxpayers about $67,000,000.

When the drive to force the sale of the mortgages of the Corporation was on it was shown that any deal to dump the mortgages by cities or States would not work because of the great number of small loans scattered in over 15,000 small communities. More than 10,000 such towns have but one to five loans. Nearly 7,000 of them have but one to two loans, and practically all of these are small.

The private lending institutions, which were saved from bankruptcy by the Government, do not want to buy loans of this kind. They are not profitable enough for them. All they want is what they have been after for years—to get the loans that are large enough to bring in a good income and leave the Government holding the bag with the rest. It would have to keep up an organization to collect on the smaller mortgages, but without enough coming in from such loans to pay its expenses. This would mean heavy losses.

When this House voted the cut recommended by the Committee on Appropriations for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation it voted to hog-tie it.

The people of the country and all our home owners should realize the effect of the legislative joker which gives to the financial interests their opportunity to steal the golden egg.

We Must Aid the Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article written by Dorothy Thompson appearing in the Boston Globe of June 11, 1947.

In the light of existing world conditions, and the ruthless disregard of international—atheistic—communism of the rights of peoples to make a free choice of their governments, and the peaceful maintenance of the same, this article contains a strong suggestion that cannot be ignored in connection with other strong, affirmative steps that must be taken in meeting this challenge to our civilization.

The article follows:

WE MUST AID THE REVOLUTION

(By Dorothy Thompson)

AS BRAZEN A PUTSCH AS EVER WAS PULLED OFF

How well the Hungarian conspiracy was organized is indicated by things other than the vulgar chortling of Mr. Rakosi—if that is his name, which is doubtful since Comintern agents usually operate under pseudonyms.

The government that was ousted—by as brazen a putsch as ever was pulled off—had just negotiated a credit in London, and Budapest businessmen were in correspondence with old American clients in an effort to reestablish relationships.

Now tens of thousands of Hungarians are attempting to flee into Austria, as people always flee from bolshevism, but between them and any conceivably friendly hosts is the Russian zone of Austria from which they are pushed back.

The putsch is as horrible as was Hitler's breakthrough. And it is far more dangerous, because more successful, than Hitler's prewar moves that got him only Austria and Czechoslovakia.

Czechoslovakia will now be pushed upon by Hungarian Communists, hostile Slovaks, and German Communists. The eastern bloc is moving faster than most people dreamed could happen. President Truman says it is an outrage and that he will take measures—perhaps bring the case before the United Nations. But, in Communist theory, possession is ten-tenths of the law. It is not the first cold-blooded breaking of the Yalta agreement. There was Poland.

The first thing to realize is that what is left of Europe will not be saved by our present foreign policy. Secretary Marshall says the governments of Europe must get together and plan, but admonition will not be enough. The governments themselves are, to a large extent, hamstrung by internal Communist opposition and are operated by unstable majorities. The anti-Communist parties everywhere are divided.

The situation demands a great new European party—international as communism is—of revolutionary elan, social, deeply rooted in the people, and grounded in Christian principles. This combination is the essence of the creative spirit, and decisively and exclusively backed by the United States and Great Britain.

The advantage on our side, if we act with great imagination, is that communism has failed utterly to win the European revolution. It has nothing with which to mobilize creative, new European forces. It must depend on wretched stooges, Moscow-trained, in the technique of the coup d'etat, bureaucrats, and putschists, not leaders of revolutions. Communism cannot organize Europe; it can only disintegrate and destroy it. Thus what faces western civilization is not rebirth, but destruction, and not by war, but by social disintegration.

It is very late, but it will never be earlier for us to set out to give aid and direction to the true great European revolution predicted by Victor Hugo: the revolution for civilization.

Congressmen's Voting Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide that the Legislative Reference Service shall compile and make available the voting record of Members of Congress. Under my measure, it will be possible for the editor of any newspaper or other publication published in the United States, or any group of 10 or more citizens of the United States, to apply to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and receive without charge the voting record of any Member of Congress for any period desired. It is impossible today for any voter to get such information from the Congress without authorization of the Member whose voting record is sought.

I feel that the wide dissemination of a Congressman's voting record should be made so that the people will know where he stands on each and every issue that is brought before the Congress for its consideration and disposal. It is my hope that the Congress will see fit to consider this legislation and report it favorably at the earliest opportunity.

St. Louis Communists Lead Missouri Drive for Taft-Hartley Labor Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement which I have made to the press this week. It speaks for itself. Following the statement is the Communist record of William Sentner as it appears on page 175 of House Report No. 1311, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session:

Representative WALTER C. PLOESER, Republican, of Missouri, revealed today that the advertising campaign in St. Louis, Mo., to urge President Truman to veto the Taft antilabor bill is headed by William Sentner, an avowed Communist. Mr. PLOESER emphatically declared that the labor bill is constructive labor-management legislation and denounced the veto campaign movement as full of misrepresentations and lies.

In the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Monday, June 9, a three-quarter-page advertisement appeared addressed to President Truman and demanding that he veto the Taft antilabor bill. It charged that this legislation would cripple the Wagner Labor Relations Act, break the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, shackle the labor movement, lower wage standards and working conditions, and encourage industrial strife. The advertisement was supported by about 350 Missourians, whose names were listed. At the lower left-hand corner of the ad was an address where contributions were solicited to help carry on the campaign. The address was Veto Campaign, room 603, 705 Olive, St. Louis, Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER said today: "I am reliably informed that this headquarters is being run by the United Electrical Workers of the CIO, and the man in charge of both the headquarters and the campaign is none other than the avowed Communist, William Sentner. That alone should be sufficient to tell the people the motive behind this advertisement campaign against this constructive labor-management legislation.

"The contents of the ad are full of misrepresentations and lies. The labor-management bill, which has passed the House 4 to 1, and 3 to 1 in the Senate, will prove to be a great benefit to labor; but then how can anyone expect other than lies, when this veto campaign is being run by Communist William Sentner. It is regrettable that many innocent people have signed this advertisement."

Mr. PLOESER emphasized that the labor bill would "free the Nation from paralyzing strikes and the attendant threat to public health and safety." Further, he said it would grant freedom from union-imposed restrictions on production and distribution of goods, secondary boycotts, and jurisdictional strikes. It also eliminates the burdensome cost of union-sponsored "feather-bedding" and other artificial "make-work" practices and the racketeering that has characterized the labor movement in recent years.

Mr. PLOESER said that his mail contained several letters of protest against the Post-Dispatch carrying the advertisement, one of which stated "We resent having the Post-Dispatch using its columns to solicit us surreptitiously for money which will be used by known Communists for their purposes and to pay the Post-Dispatch."

WILLIAM SENTNER

Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives, on William Sentner, as it appears in House Report 1311 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session:

According to the U. E. News, official organ of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, one William Sentner was "the featured speaker" at a huge St. Louis banquet where he propounded the objectives of the CIO Political Action Committee.

Who is this William Sentner, key figure in Sidney Hillman's political drive in the Midwest? We shall permit his record to speak for itself and in so doing to speak for the CIO Political Action Committee also.

William Sentner, vice president of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, and president of the

same union's district no. 8 in the St. Louis area, has a record as a member and official of the Communist Party since 1933. "When I joined," he declared in an interview published in Fortune magazine of November 1943, "I told everybody in town." He admitted that he still pays his party dues and solicits new party members, but devotes most of his time to union activities.

Sentner has held numerous posts in the Missouri-Arkansas District No. 21 of the Communist Party, among them being the following: secretary of the East St. Louis section committee (1934); secretary, Communist Party of St. Louis (1935); district organizer, Communist Party of Arkansas (1935); organization secretary, St. Louis (1935); member of district committee (1938); delegate to Arkansas Convention of the Communist Party (1938); and member of city committee of Communist Party of St. Louis (1939).

Records in the files of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities show that he participated in the following Communist Party meetings in St. Louis within a comparatively recent period:

January 24, 1942: Lenin Memorial Meeting, 1041 North Grand Avenue.

February 22, 1942: Farewell party for John Rossen, city secretary, Communist Party, 1041 North Grand Avenue.

August 10, 1942: Meeting in honor of Ella Reeve Bloor, Communist leader, Castle ballroom.

May 3, 1942: Meeting with Robert Minor, Communist leader, 1041 North Grand Avenue.

May 16, 1943: Meeting to celebrate release of Earl Browder, 1041 North Grand Avenue.

December 31, 1942: Communist New Year's Eve party, 1041 North Grand Avenue.

February 21, 1943, chairman of trade-union sponsoring committee: William Z. Foster, Production for Victory Rally, St. Louis Municipal Auditorium.

This 36-year-old executive of a Communist-controlled union, operating in important Midwest war plants, has been neither an electrical, a radio, or a machine worker. He studied architecture in Washington University in St. Louis and never completed his studies. As an artist he joined the John Reed Club, named after the founder of the American Communist Party, and became one of the club's national officers. He also spent some time at sea. In other words he owes his present powerful union post in a key war industry solely to the operation of the Communist Party patronage machine and not to any special qualifications in this field of industry.

Although classified as 1-A by his local draft board, he has secured deferment at the request of his union. Moreover, he was selected as a member of the War Labor Board for Region No. 7 (Missouri) on February 17, 1943, until his record caught up with him and he was forced to resign on February 10, 1944.

Sentner's earliest activities as a Communist include his acting as organizer of the Food Workers Industrial Union, affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League, a section of the Red International of Labor Unions with headquarters in Moscow. In this capacity he led a strike of St. Louis nut workers who marched militantly on the city hall. The Daily Worker reported that "the strikers, one after another, told Mayor Dickinson, of St. Louis, that it was the Food Workers Industrial Union and the Communist Party who were responsible" (June 1, 1933, p. 3).

Sentner was arrested during this period for violation of the National Recovery Act, in connection with a strike at the Lewin Metal Co., engaged in the manufacture of material designed for the War Department. The Daily Worker's account of what took place is illuminating.

"The strikers succeeded in keeping the locomotives out of the company's gates * * * Switchmen * * * refused to switch the cars * * *. The party has boldly appeared from the beginning" (Daily Worker, August 11, 1933, pp. 1 and 3.).

In accordance with the Communist Party's doctrine at the time, Sentner was concentrating on the vital parts of the American war machine. More recently, as organizer for the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, he organized the United States Cartridge Co., of St. Louis.

In 1938, Sentner, as district president of the UERMWA, was arrested on charges of criminal syndicalism in connection with the Maytag strike at Newton, Iowa, and found guilty after a jury trial. In 1939 he was sentenced to a maximum penalty of 10 years in jail and a $5,000 fine. His case was defended by the International Labor Defense, "legal arm of the Communist Party" (Equal Justice, July 1938, p. 3). The law was later declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of Iowa, and Sentner was accordingly released.

Police records of St. Louis show that he was arrested on October 14, 1933, on charges of suspicion of inciting a riot and that he was fined $25 and costs.

Sentner's record shows that he has used his post as a trade-union official to promote the current line of the Communist Party. In 1937 he was a speaker at a Communist May Day meeting in St. Louis, as national organizer of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, and rallied strikers from the Emerson Electric Co. and the Century Co. to attend (Daily Worker, May 4, 1937, p. 3).

In 1938 he was a sponsor of the St. Louis branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy, the largest Communist front of that period.

In 1940, Sentner joined with other officers of district 8 of the UERMWA to urge participation in the movement for the repeal of Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill (Daily Worker, September 25, 1940, p. 1).

In line with the Communist Party's most recent position, Sentner today pretends to be a patriot. His offer of cooperation with the war effort has elicited the commendation of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who no doubt was not aware that his correspondent was a man with a long Communist record. Sentner's union-management cooperation activities have brought forth praise from Stuart Symington, head of the Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co., of St. Louis (Fortune, November 1943). These gentlemen are certainly unaware that Sentner's patriotism is always conditioned by the line of the Communist Party.

Among the Communist organizations supported by Sentner have been the Scottsboro Defense Committee, the International Labor Defense, Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder, Harry Bridges defense, Commonwealth College, New Theater League, and National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. On February 12, 1938, he was cited on the honor roll of the Midwest Daily Record, official Communist organ of Chicago.

The Role of the United States in the United Nations—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to me, I am inserting the second part of an address I made before the National Federation of Catholic Students with the cooperation of the social-action department, NCWC, and the Catholic Association for International Peace, at New York City on Monday, June 9, 1947:

The work of the United States in the General Assembly is as important as it is in the Security Council. The United States has been in the forefront among the advocates of the regulation of armaments. This was clearly brought out on October 30 last by our representative (Senator Austin, of Vermont). He insisted that in a "system for the regulation of armaments emphasis must be placed on the creation of effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions." The draft presented by the United States on November 30 last and subsequently adopted, stressed three principal points: "First, that the Security Council should give prompt consideration to working out the practical measures, * * *, secondly, that the Council should give first consideration to the report of the Atomic Energy Commission * * * and the essential establishment of international control of atomic energy; and thirdly, that the provision of practical and effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions is essential to the regulation and reduction of armaments." This matter of regulation and reduction of armaments later became so involved with the control of atomic energy that it will be treated with the work of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The United States stand on the voting in the Security Council was made clear. The United States position may be briefly given as summarized in President Truman's report:

"The principle of the unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council is of the highest importance for the success of the United Nations. * * * The maintenance of world peace and security rests upon the unity of those nations which formed the core of the victorious coalition against the Axis.

"The United States believes that the failure of the permanent members of the Security Council to agree upon important issues before the Council frustrates the carrying out of the principle of unanimity and leaves unsettled questions. * * *

"The United States hopes that the five permanent members of the Security Council may find it desirable at sometime in the future * * * to support modification of the unanimity requirement dealing with pacific settlement of disputes."

So far the discussions held among the permanent members of the Security Council "did not produce the desired result of complete accord among the permanent members."

The United States part in the Economic and Social Council is clearly shown by our participation in every phase of Council's activities. As President Truman put it, "The active and wholehearted participation of the United States in the Economic and Social Council reflects a fundamental principle in this Government's foreign policy." The United States has been fully aware especially of three most urgent economic and social problems: The reconstruction and devastated areas, the repatriation and resettlement of refugees and displaced persons, and renewal of the free flow of trade and transportation. In addition, "The United States has initiated action for the establishment of new specialized agencies in such important fields as trade and employment, health and refugees." Under the initiative and leadership of the United States representative in the Economic and Social Council the International Refugee Organization was created. The Soviet Union delegate's proposal "that the life of the organization be limited to 1 year * * * (was) successfully resisted * * * largely

under the leadership of the United States." The first year's (1947) budget of the organization is set at $156,000,000, the United States share being about 45 percent of this sum, and the Senate has already voted for the legislation appropriating $75,000,000 for that purpose.

We have also taken the lead in the field of international trade and employment. A Preparatory Committee, set up by the Economic and Social Council for this purpose, met in London in October last and discussed a draft charter prepared by the United States Government. Having arrived at a very large measure of agreement of the text of the charter, the Committee is now holding its meetings in Geneva, where this Government is represented by a delegation headed by Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton.

The creation of the Trusteeship Council was delayed; and before the Council was set up President Truman announced, on November 6 last, that "the United States is prepared to place under trusteeship, with the United States as administering authority, the Japanese mandated islands and any Japanese islands for which it assumes responsibility as a result of the Second World War." The Trusteeship Council was set up on December 13 last, and the Security Council acceded on April 2 to the request contained in President Truman's statement of November 6, subsequently put forward formally, by voting that the United States be designated as the administering authority for these islands.

The Korean problem may also be treated under the treatment of the Trusteeship Council. At the Moscow meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in December of 1945 it was agreed that a Joint Commission of the United States and Soviet commands in Korea, with the participation of a provisional Korean democratic Government which was to be set up, should submit proposals for the joint consideration of the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and China for the working out of an agreement concerning a four-power trusteeship of Korea for a period of 5 years. The Joint Committee began its work at Seoul, Korea, on March 20 of 1946, but its meetings were adjourned sine die in May without agreement. We have been most anxious to have this matter settled, and the recent correspondence between Secretary Marshall and Foreign Minister Molotov, begun upon the initiative of the former, promises good for the Koreans as well as for the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union in the Far East.

In the instances mentioned above the United States has played a prominent part; in the Atomic Energy Commission her part has been distinguished, marked by selflessness and with due regard for the safety of humanity.

In the fall of 1945 the United States Government took the lead, along with the Canadian and British Governments, in expressing its willingness to proceed with the exchange of fundamental scientific information. The statement issued on November 15 of that year, jointly by President Truman, Prime Minister Attlee, and Prime Minister Mackenzie King, added that "we are prepared to share (the knowledge essential to the use of atomic energy) on a reciprocal basis with others of the United Nations." On the basis of this statement the Big Three foreign ministers agreed, at the Moscow Conference of December 1945, to recommend, for the consideration of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the establishment by the United Nations of a commission to consider problems arising from the discovery of atomic energy and related matters. On the basis of this recommendation the General Assembly of the United Nations, at its meeting in London on January 4, 1946, established the Atomic Energy Commission. The Commission was duly constituted and began its meetings in New York on June 14, 1946. In the meantime, the President and the Secretary of State, as well as members of the Acheson-Lilienthal group and Members of Congress, Mr. Baruch and his associates worked out the broad lines of the United States policy. The plan as evolved by June 14 was submitted to the Atomic Energy Commission on that day. This plan called for the establishment of an international Atomic Development Authority, responsible for control (including, where necessary, accounting, inspection, supervision, management, and licensing) of all activities in the field of atomic energy. It was proposed that no single state should have power to prevent the carrying out of punishments for crimes specifically defined in advance by voluntary agreement. The United States proposal gave the international control body a degree of autonomy commensurate with its responsibilities, and it also emphasized that the use of the veto should not apply in the field of atomic energy matters. It also called for effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions.

On June 19 the Soviet Union had proposed a convention calling for the immediate outlawing of the production and use of atomic weapons and the destruction of all stocks of atomic weapons. At this point it seemed difficult to reconcile the United States plan and the Soviet proposal, for the Soviet representative took the position that the United States proposals were not acceptable as a whole or in their separate parts. Toward the end of the year the Commission as a body was willing to agree with the provisions of the United States plan, and on December 17 last the Commission adopted the principles on which the United States general findings and recommendations were based. On December 30, 1946, the Commission approved a report to the Security Council. As accepted, the findings and recommendations placed in this report constitute the basic principles of the proposals that have been consistently advocated by the United States.

In summarizing his report to the Congress last February, the President stated that "In the work of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, the United States, owing to its unique position in the field, has taken the lead in providing the information essential to a reasonable understanding of the problem of control and its proposals. * * * While the Commission has still a long way to go before a treaty can be drafted to establish a fully effective international system of control, the progress made to date is heartening." That is the sum of the work the United States has done in the Atomic Energy Commission.

As was stated at the outset, in this summary count it is not possible to elaborate, or even present a mere catalog of the very numerous and important parts played by the United States in all the organizations—councils, commissions, committees—of the United Nations. It is impossible to do justice to the work of our educators and educational leaders who have given their best in the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Nor is it possible to dwell on the stout stand our representatives have taken on behalf of human freedom in the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. It should not be forgotten that the United States citizens have been, in a large measure, instrumental in keeping all the United Nations organizations as going, solvent concerns by contributing generously both to the administrative and operational budgets of these organizations. As it was stated, our share in UNRRA has run into billions (direct contribution, $2,700,000,000). Our share in the International Monetary Fund, and in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development totals about $6,000,000,000. Such large sums voted by Congress year after year should serve as eloquent testimony for our unselfish and unstinted support to the United Nations. And we have just been assessed almost 40 percent of the United Nations 1947 budget. In addition, we have made some indirect and invisible contributions to the work of the United Nations. This invisible contribution is in the form of reparations which we have allowed other United Nations to exact from former Axis countries and satellites. When Secretary Byrnes first opposed the reparation clauses in the peace treaty signed with Italy, he did it because he knew that we have to contribute toward the payment of these reparations; and he said so in so many words. But he allowed, for the sake of peace and the United Nations, our wartime allies to draw reparations from Italy.

Having worked so hard in the creation of the United Nations, having worked unswervingly and wholeheartedly in its organizations, and having played prominent—in many cases a leading—part in all of its activities, the United States regards the work of the United Nations as part of our own work. When our representative on the Atomic Energy Commission (Mr. Bernard Baruch) pleaded with his colleagues of the Commission he declared on December 2 last: "I beg you to believe that the United States seeks no advantage. I beg you to hold fast to the principle of seeking the good of all and not the advantage of one." His statement truly reflected the action of the United States Government. If recently the United States, by its newly enunciated "Truman doctrine," seems to have taken a step which appears to be a move to discredit the United Nations, it was done partly to meet an urgent emergency and partly to relieve the United Nations from such an onerous responsibility. And if our representative on the United Nations Security Council spoke on March 28 last (as did Mr. Austin) as though we have a mandate to redress human wrongs, he also meant that we are prepared, almost at any price, to stand by the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The hope of the world lies in making the United Nations work. Not for one power or one people but for all nations and all people. Mankind, through its own stupidity, has not been able to keep away from us the scourge of war and its ugly aftermaths. Mankind now, through an instrument such as the United Nations, is given a new opportunity to reason collectively, to discuss problems across a conference table, and to arrive at solutions satisfactory to most, if not all, the nations. While the results of the United Nations to date have not been entirely satisfactory, nevertheless the foundations for international understanding have been laid and the United States will help to the utmost to build a structure based on tolerance and understanding which will eventually bring, in the words of the Saviour, "Peace on earth and good will to men."

Americans Taxed for the Whole World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest in the tax bill which is now on President Truman's desk, I am

inserting herewith the following timely editorial from the pen of Mr. Robert W. Boyer, managing editor of the Altoona Tribune, Altoona, Pa., and which appeared in the June 11 issue of the Altoona Tribune.

The editorial is as follows:

AMERICANS TAXED FOR THE WHOLE WORLD

The power to tax is one of the greatest powers granted a democratic government. Taxes have been the issue upon which many a government has fallen.

Our Congressmen and legislators, our Presidents and governors sometime accept the power to tax too casually.

Two years after the great war, this country still is under the burden of the greatest tax levy in all our history. Most of our people had expected reasonable relaxation of this terrific burden with the ending of the war. Business has been waiting for the Government to let it use some of its own money as risk capital to start new industrial expansion, to widen new business horizons.

But, now we are given to understand from Washington that although the Congress passed the tax-reduction bill, Mr. Truman will veto it. The House has a sufficient margin to override the veto. The Senate does not. That means that if Mr. Truman vetoes the bill, it is dead.

It requires only a little experience for even a boy to realize that when it comes to spending money, there is absolutely no limit. That a man or a government can spend and spend and spend endlessly and forever.

That has been and is, one of the great principles and fallacies of the New Deal instituted by Franklin D. Roosevelt, and to which Mr. Truman and his closest advisers subscribe.

The President would not cut his budget of $37,500,000,000 for the coming fiscal year. He plans, so it is said, to veto this proposed reduction of taxes to bring relief to the people.

This, in our opinion, is not in the best interests of America.

Mr. Truman, we feel sure, is motivated by the New Deal fear that tax reduction must mean, of course, reduced expenditures, an abhorrent thought to the bureaucrats and internationalists in the Government who advocate Federal bureaus of some kind in every township of America and who are urging with reckless abandon that America set aside billions of dollars on a lend-lease basis to finance the world back to normalcy.

Only the people of America can halt this ruinous ideology which requires that the pressure be maintained on Americans while our national strength is drained into Europe.

Our international commitments are reaching so vast a figure and such a vast increase is planned in them that it is absolutely true that the American pepole are being taxed to support the peoples of foreign nations, even to their military.

There is no justification for this. It is a mad policy of government that is endangering the very foundations of our Nation.

It is further evidence that once the power to tax is given to a governmental body, it relinquishes that power only with the greatest reluctance.

The legislature at Harrisburg, too, should bear that in mind as it widens the power to tax for local governments.

The power to tax can ruin a city, a State, or a Nation. It must be used wisely, and with the utmost discretion.

We submit that the New Deal Government of Mr. Truman, if this tax reduction bill is vetoed, is not, and has not, used this power wisely or for the best interests of the people of America.

This issue can go far. It may not be too much to ask wherein the Government derives its authority to tax the people of America for the use of foreign governments. Look at some of the more recent gifts.

Aid to the Peron government of Argentina, a reported haven for Nazis, a totalitarian government heretofore unfriendly to the United States. This aid to include military materials.

One hundred and twenty-one United States warships to Latin-American countries.

The famous $400,000,000 for military aid to Greece and Turkey.

A contemplated expenditure of millions for military aid to Latin-American countries and to Canada during the next 10 years.

A Chinese military aid plan, now in abeyance.

These are the most notable. They do not take into account millions upon millions of dollars loaned—actually given—for direct relief and economic aid.

Truly, this has become a tax upon America for the whole world.

American Educators Provide Convincing Evidence That Educational Exchange Features of H. R. 3342 Are Vital Aids in Crusade Against Communism and for Peace—Student Teacher Exchange Provisions Cited as Paying Greatest Goodwill Dividends at Smallest Cost—State Department Record on That Score Unchallenged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union by its affirmative votes on sections 201, 202, and 203 of title II of the so-called Mundt bill, H. R. 3342, earlier this afternoon did real credit to itself and rendered the Nation a great service through authorizing the Secretary of State to provide for the interchange of students and teachers, together with books, periodicals, and other publications on a reciprocal basis with other countries on this globe. By that action we took a great stride forward in creating the climate of mutual understanding and friendship which is essential if peace is to endure and tolerance triumph.

Some pertinent questions were raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] regarding the meaning and interpretation of paragraph 1 of section 701 and while the House has now rejected the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] to strike this paragraph from the bill I want to elaborate just a bit so that the legislative record will be crystal clear as to the purport, the intent, and the interpretation included in the language of paragraph 1 of section 701. Our colloquy with the able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] high-lighted and underscored the definite and specific meaning of the language in question. The following facts from the hearings, and from the Federal Register, however, provide additional evidence as to how this language has been interpreted in the past, how it has operated under our prevailing legislation which authorizes such a program with Latin-American countries, and how it is definitely understood and agreed it will operate under H. R. 3342.

The grants of money, services, and materials referred to in paragraph one, aside from the authority provided to make certain Government publications, exhibits, et cetera, available to educational institutions, is included to detail the process by which the Secretary of State pays the tuition of foreign students which we may select for special training in educational institutions. These may be public institutions of learning such as the University of Minnesota, of Wisconsin, of California, et cetera, or they may be great private institutions of learning such as Yale or Harvard or Princeton. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that as the program has operated with the Latin-American countries the State Department scholarships are administered by the Institute of International Education in New York, a private organization which was founded from the Carnegie Corp. Such visiting students would be screened and selected by our American authorities, their enrollment at American colleges is handled by private organizations such as the institute referred to above and the payments by the State Department are the scholarship advances made in the form of tuition payments. With this understanding, it is clear paragraph 1 of section 701 conveys no important new authority to the Department of State and invests it with no great new discretionary power even in the matter of determining which educational institutions—public or private—are to be selected by the foreign student selected to prepare himself in our American ways by study on an American campus.

EDUCATORS FROM BOTH COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS STRONGLY ENDORSE STUDENT EXCHANGE AS AN AID TO PEACE

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it would have been a tragic commentary upon the desire of this Congress to promote and preserve the peace had we failed to reach agreement on a satisfactory reciprocal formula for the exchange of students, teachers, and publications with other friendly countries in the world. If the world is to use right instead of might as its directive force, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the people of the world come to know what is right. We would surely be derelict in our duty as Americans if we refused to share with others the concepts and the ways of life which long experience has convinced us are eternally right.

Yesterday in his press conference, Secretary of State Marshall, upon whose Department we must rely for the administration of peace promoting and protecting policies, made this highly significant statement:

> I am unreservedly in favor of the exchange of students, professors, and books. These methods in the long run may be far more important for the interchange of information than broadcasting.

And Mr. Speaker, in the final paragraph of his press statement yesterday, Secretary of State Marshall again

implored Congress to authorize this comprehensive program with its variety of peace tools and to include the requested encouragement for carefully selected exchanges of students and teachers as a weapon for peace. He said in conclusion:

I do not believe that a bill limited to broadcasting would give this Government the opportunities it must have to explain itself to the rest of the world.

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES ARE NOT AN UNTRIED FORMULA

Mr. Speaker, the vital force of education in creating and cementing international friendship is not a new and untried formula. It is not an untested experiment. Who can deny that the famed Rhodes scholarships have won many lasting and understanding friends for Britain? Who dare deny that the Chinese scholarships provided years ago by wise American action on the so-called Boxer indemnities have done much to bring about the warm friendship China has always demonstrated for America? For the past 7 years we have operated identically the same student exchange program with the Latin-American countries which the Mundt bill now proposes to expand to other areas of the world. Who can deny that these contacts paid priceless dividends during World War II when almost to a country the Latin-American countries threw in their lot with ours although they were not attacked and made valuable contributions to our great battle for freedom? Mr. Speaker, here is a device which has demonstrated its effectiveness for peace. Surely with atomic war threatening the world as an awesome possibility, we cannot afford to deny ourselves full use of a weapon of peace which has proved effective in the past and which costs us each year less than the price of a modern superbombing plane.

During the past few days, Mr. Speaker, schoolmen and educators from large cities and small towns, from great universities and small colleges, from secondary schools as well as from the offices of superintendents of public-school systems have been reading in the papers and hearing on the radio that a determined minority among us here in Congress is opposed to the student and teacher exchange provisions of H. R. 3342. They have read that section 201 of the Mundt bill is in peril. As a result, I have received well over 100 telegrams and many more letters urging that I do all I can to retain this important section. Perhaps some of the rest of you have also heard from schoolmen that you know and in whom you have confidence; in fact several of you have quoted prominent educators and have read messages from forward-looking and outstanding institutions of learning which are participating in this program either with Latin-American countries or through private scholarships supplied to students from other countries or programs provided by the State Department under its temporary authority which expires July 1 this year, except for the legislation, H. R. 3342, which we are now considering.

Since some of you perhaps come from areas and States or from districts or communities which have not participated in this student-teacher exchange program for international understanding and enlightenment, however, I am going to include with my remarks a small sampling of the many communications I have received on the subject. The authors of these messages are outstanding educators; they are intelligent, articulate Americans; they want to help in this battle for peace; and above all they challenge you and me to give them and the vital force of education an opportunity to demonstrate itself as a force for peace at a time when the world is close to ruin as a result of the fact that up to now no other plan, no other program, no other organization, and no other force has been able to keep peace permanent.

Surely in the face of such calamitous failure by others, it is not asking too much to give educators an opportunity to do their best in these trying times. Who among us dare risk denying the cause of peace any effective method at our command at a time when we all protest so emphatically that our most important single purpose is to preserve the peace?

HERE'S THE PROOF OF THE PUDDING

Mr. Speaker, I now refer the Members of this House to the following unsolicited communications which are a mere sampling of less than 10 percent of those coming to my desk during the past few days. Let no one shrug lightly aside the testimony of those who work with the minds and hearts of the people of this earth.

From Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio:

Communism is utterly anathema to me, and I should certainly oppose any ways in which it might become more effective in this country. To limit exchanges of students, however, is not a way of combating such ideas. Please support section 201, the Mundt bill.

HOWARD ROBINSON,
Head of Department of History,
Oberlin College.

From University of Chicago:

Hope you support section 201, the Mundt bill. Such exchanges essential in training foreign students to appreciate American democracy. Have no evidence of any communistic propaganda, being taught by any of our foreign students. That is based on close official observation during past years. Such exchange programs do not let down bars on immigration as all students, teachers, and professors are admitted on temporary visas and are controlled by United States Department of Justice and must—repeat must—leave this country upon termination of course.

WELLS F. CHAMBERLIN,
Adviser to Foreign Students,
University of Chicago.

From Service Committee Society of Friends, Philadelphia:

I believe exchange of students and teachers is most constructive step to demonstrate American good will and to increase sound world understanding. Critically important in advancing faith in democratic way of life at this time. Strongly endorse your bill, especially section 201.

BURNS CHALMERS,
Director, Student Program.

From University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa:

This university believes strongly that section 201 of Mundt bill authorizing Secretary of State to promote interchange of students and teachers between United States and other countries is essential. We are definitely opposed to efforts to eliminate these educational exchanges.

VIRGIL M. HANCHER,
President, University of Iowa.

From Northwest Missouri State Teachers College, Maryville, Mo.:

Concerned lest amendment to section 201, Mundt bill, obstruct program of exchange of teachers and students with those of other countries. Consider that program of utmost importance in postwar reconstruction and in building permanent peace. Urge you use every effort to defeat such a calamatous move.

J. W. JONES,
President, Northwest Missouri State Teachers College.

From Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.:

We have had exchange students and teachers at Fisk University for several years and it has been our experience that educational exchanges are of great importance in promoting better international understanding and facilitating extension of democratic practices to other countries. I urge you to strongly oppose any attempt to eliminate educational exchanges from H. R. 3342.

CHARLES S. JOHNSON,
President, Fisk University.

From National Jewish Welfare Board, Washington, D. C.:

Three hundred Jewish centers in United States with affiliated membership of 450,000 wholeheartedly back your bill H. R. 3342. Our form of democracy and self-defense requires orienting the rest of the world to help protect future civilization. We urge continued fight for your bill.

PHILIP SCHIFF,
Washington Representative, National Jewish Welfare Board.

From Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York City:

Strongly urge retention section 201, Mundt bill, authorizing exchange of students, teachers, and professors because of importance in encouraging exchange of knowledge and building international understanding.

HOWARD E. WILSON,
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

From former Ambassador John G. Winant and John D. Rockefeller, Jr.:

EAST NORTHFIELD, MASS.

To live together in peace the nations must know and understand the best we have to offer in democratic living. Student teacher exchange facilitates this on most intelligent level. On behalf of 200 carefully screened American students and in the interest of 150,000 devoted to youth hostel ideas we urge your continued support section 201, Mundt bill.

JOHN G. WINANT and
JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, Jr.

From president, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.:

Strongly urge passage Mundt bill particularly those sections encouraging exchange of foreign students and professors.

MILDRED MCAFEE HORTON,
President, Wellesley College.

From a great Catholic institution, Marquette University of Milwaukee.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that even the most suspicious of our colleagues, whoever he may be, who fancies he sees a Communist behind the desk of every college professor and who fears

that our Americanism is so frail and fickle that contact with students from abroad will sell their foreign ways of life to our American college youth instead of having the result that our American youth and our American concepts will in fact make a lasting and favorable impression on our visitors. Sir, I doubt that even such a frightened and frightening American would go so as far as to associate a Catholic university with atheistic communism. Consequently, I especially call to your attention this telegram just in from Marquette University:

Please stand by section 201 of Mundt bill favoring exchange of students and professors on reciprocal basis with foreign countries. They need to learn our democratic viewpoints.

GEORGE E. VANDERBEKE,
Administrator, Marquette University.

From State president, Pennsylvania State Education Association, Allentown, Pa.:

We have had two exchange teachers from British Isles this year. They have done marvelous work in creating international good will. Two of our teachers are in Britain and it is our opinion that this is one of surest ways to build strong international good will.

FRED W. HOSLER,
President PSTA.

From State of Kansas come messages of approval and support:

We have had British exchange teacher. In letters from our teacher in England am convinced that exchange teacher plan builds international understanding.

HUGH C. BRYAN,
Superintendent of Schools,
Leavenworth, Kans.

And from the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.:

Our experience with exchange students through the years is that no foreign student or teacher ever vaguely suspected of promoting communism. Our committee which observes closely the work of 50 foreign students and teachers this year strongly feels that international understanding and world peace fostered by an expanded program of international exchange. Urge you support program.

WILLIS L. TOMPKINS,
Chairman, Faculty Committee on
Foreign Students, University of Kansas.

From New Albany, Ind.:

Four thousand five hundred New Albany school children and our many service and civic clubs enthusiastically endorse our exchange teacher plan. Greatest single teaching force in world understanding we have ever had. We adults have failed miserably in world affairs. Lets give the children a chance to do better.

HARRY DAVIDSON,
Superintendent of Schools.

From Toledo, Ohio:

Understand move under way to amend H. R. 3342 to delete student teacher exchange program. Since 1941, Toledo has had three exchange teachers. Our experience leads us to believe that exchange is a fine move toward international understanding. We unalterably oppose proposed amendments to delete this program.

E. L. BOSHER,
Superintendent of Schools,
Toledo, Ohio.

From Weymouth, Mass.:

As superintendent of school system with an exchange teacher from England this year and one expected next year may I urge favorable vote on continuation of exchange program by teachers and pupils.

ELMER S. MAPEES,
Superintendent of Schools.

From Union Township, N. J.:

Union Township has had two British exchange teachers all this year. From actual experience, know that this program is of inestimable value in building international understanding and good will. Don't let section 201 be deleted from H. R. 3342.

CHARLES T. HASSARD.

From Bloomington, Ind.—urges exchange program for defeat of communism:

Exchange of teachers and students best way to build world understanding. Convinced that such a program sells American way of life and undoes bad impressions given by many American businessmen abroad, Hollywood movies, and Communist propaganda.

Foreign teachers tend to impress on American students values of our way of life too often taken for granted. Russia seems not to favor exchange program lest her young Communists learn truth. America is made of stronger stuff. Those who observe and learn first hand in Uncle Sam's own back yard prove our best friends.

LEO R. DOWLING,
Adviser, Foreign Students,
Indiana University.

And from the superintendent of schools in Bloomington comes this word:

Our experience with an exchange teacher from Britain was educational and a distinct benefit to our students, teachers, and community. Experience helped greatly to carry out the objective of international understanding.

H. E. BINFORD,
Superintendent of Schools,
Bloomington, Ind.

From Birmingham, Ala.:

English exchange teacher helped us greatly this year. Hope plan continues.

L. FRAZER BANKS.

From Rockville, Md.:

Exchange teacher from England has worked in the public schools of Montgomery County, Md., this year with very great success, and the plan for exchange teachers is so vital and helpful nothing should be done to destroy it. We strongly urge that the real service in international understanding through the exchange of teachers should be more fully understood and supported, for it has no semblance of any opportunity for foreign agitators to in any wise enter our schools.

EDWIN W. BROOME,
Superintendent, Board of Education,
Rockville, Md.

From Bloomington, Ill.:

Firmly convinced educational exchanges build international understanding.

GEORGE N. WELLS,
Superintendent, Bloomington
Public Schools, Bloomington, Ill.

From Kalamazoo, Mich.:

Kalamazoo has this year an exchange teacher from Aberdeen, Scotland. This lady has made a grand contribution in helping better understand Great Britain, and our teacher there has been enthusiastically received. Kalamazoo strongly favors such exchanges as a means of creating better relations.

LOY NORRIX,
Superintendent of Schools,
Kalamazoo, Mich.

Mr. Speaker, I have on my desk at least 100 additional similar letters and telegrams from the educators of well over half of the States of the Union. Surely the earnest, voluntary, and even enthusiastic signed testimony of these good Americans who live with this program and see it in action cannot be ignored.

It is true, of course, the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union this afternoon acted favorably on section 201, and on the other sections, including paragraph 1 of section 701 of H. R. 3342. It is, unfortunately, also true that some of the bitter and determined foes of this program of educational exchange have announced that on next Monday, or whenever we next take up H. R. 3342 for final action, they expect to offer a motion to recommit for the purpose of scuttling this portion of the bill and a few other sections to which they object. And some Members, of course, are opposed to all sections of the bill and all efforts to establish these contacts of understanding and accord with the friendly nations of the world.

The fate of H. R. 3342 and of this program of educational exchanges in which the State Department has rendered sterling service through making the contacts and facilitating these exchanges, as well as paying American teachers the requisite differentials in salaries and living expenses so they could carry the American message abroad, is in your hands. Your action on Monday or Tuesday will ring down the final answer. I once again urge you to support this program for peace. I submit that to devote less than $30,000,000 a year to the purpose of making it unnecessary to use in the blood bath of another war the more than $11,000,000,000 of defense establishment which we are annually appropriating is just simply good sense and sound action. It merits your support.

I have read into the RECORD the foregoing samples of communications reaching me primarily for the benefit of those of you who do not have within your Districts, school men or educational institutions which have participated in this program and which have learned from intimate experience of its values. I have noticed several of my colleagues reading into the RECORD, telegrams from institutions and individuals in support of H. R. 3342 and especially in support of its sections and provisions on educational exchange.

Now that the word has been carried to the country over the radio and by the press dispatches of the Associated Press, the United Press, and the International News Service that the hardest fight is being waged here in the House against these educational exchange provisions perhaps some others of you may hear from groups and institutions which have had first-hand experience with this program. If so, I hope you will share those messages with your colleagues by inserting them in the RECORD or by reading them to the membership of the House next Monday. Give us the true story of those experiences and those recommendations, be they favorable or unfavorable, but it is noteworthy that despite the caustic criticism of some and the suspicions of others the testimony and the evidence is to the effect that the State Department has done a highly

commendable service in these educational exchanges and that they, together with the other provisions of H. R. 3342, merit your support and your approval.

Mr. Speaker, the biggest single job this Congress faces is to take appropriate action to avert another war. H. R. 3342 is action of that type. H. R. 3342 provides the weapons of peace which are requested by the State Department if it is to be equipped with a complete array of what is needed in these troublesome times to produce a climate of understanding and honest information. Need I add, sir, that it is only in such a climate that permanent peace can flourish and endure.

Petrillo in a Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin of Wednesday, June 11, 1947:

PETRILLO IN A CORNER

James C. Petrillo, boss of the American Federation of Musicians, is a man of few words. But when he uses them, especially in the form of epithets, his choice leaves no doubt of his meaning. Usually he prefers action to words, and the more highhanded the action, the better it suits his purpose.

Petrillo is now on the defensive, and his opening speech to the federation's annual convention showed it. He threatened to expel Congressman KEARNS from the union, and lashed out against pending labor legislation.

That legislation would clip Petrillo's wings. It would prevent hiring stand-by musicians, and bar an employer from firing a union member for anything except nonpayment of dues. Besides that, the Lea bill, aimed directly at Petrillo, is now being tested in the Supreme Court.

The Petrillos in the labor movement are responsible for whatever restrictions may be written into law. State legislatures in number have ended the closed shop and curbed union activities. The temper of the public has been aroused to such an extent that there is widespread demand for the elimination of abuses from union practices.

Organized labor will do itself a service by getting rid of all the Petrillos.

Flag Day Address by Senator Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Flag Day address delivered by me at a Flag Day celebration in Milwaukee on June 15, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FLAG'S MEANING IN THE ATOMIC AGE

We are gathered on this beautiful spot for the purpose of "charging our souls anew" with the love of country and the love of the principles which have made her great.

We have assembled here under the inspiring auspices of the Elks, just as in Elks' lodges throughout the Nation, men, women, and children have gathered to rededicate themselves in love of flag and country.

It is a pleasure for me to be here in Milwaukee today to greet so many old and dear friends, to make new ones, to speak at first hand with the people of this great city, and to see the old, beloved sights here.

It is with a spirit of deep humility and appreciation for this privilege that I will make these brief remarks.

SILENT HOMAGE TO FLAG

This is a day more for the silent tribute of hearts than for the spoken tribute of mere words. It is a day for reconsecration by deeds rather than by mere phrases.

As we look at this lovely American banner, verses of yesteryear come to our mind:

"What shall I say to you, Old Flag?
You are so grand in every fold,
So linked with mighty deeds of old,
So steeped in blood where heroes fell,
So torn and pierced by shot and shell,
So calm, so still, so firm, so true,
My throat swells at the sight of you,
Old Glory, my flag."

HISTORY OF OLD GLORY

Every school child knows the history of Old Glory from that day in 1775 when the Continental Congress appointed a committee to consider the question of a single flag for the Thirteen Colonies. This action resulted in the recommendation of a "Grand Union Flag." We remember that John Paul Jones hoisted this flag on his masthead early in December 1775, and that the emblem flew over the headquarters of George Washington.

We remember, too, that it was on June 14, 1777, that the Congress proclaimed "that the flag of the United States be 13 stripes of alternating red and white, and that the Union be 13 stars, white, on a blue field representing a new constellation." Thus, today, 170 years later, we here on this spot, like others throughout the Nation yesterday and today, honor this immortal symbol of our liberty. Today is the final day in National Flag Week in our State, as proclaimed by Governor Rennebohm.

It is altogether fitting that we take this occasion to exmaine into the past, the present and the future of America. What mighty deeds have occurred since that day in 1777. What great sacrifices have been made for America and what inspiring challenges face us now.

Today our own State of Wisconsin alone has a larger population than the entire country had at that time.

BATTLES OUR FLAG HAS SEEN

The flag that floats from yonder mast has been altered somewhat in design, but the convictions, the ideals, and the hopes which it represented then are the same today. This is the same flag that fluttered over the ragged Continentals of George Washington when they marched to Yorktown. This is the same flag that flew at Bunker Hill, the flag that went with "Old Hickory," Andrew Jackson, to New Orleans, the flag that was pierced by shot and shell at the Alamo, that went with Custer at the Little Big Horn. It is the same flag that stormed the heights of Chapultepec, and soared with Admiral Dewey at Manila Bay. It is the same flag that the doughboys took to Chateau Thierry and the Battle of the Argonne. It is the flag that Byrd hoisted at the South Pole, that Perry hoisted at the North Pole. It is the flag that was hauled down at Bataan and Corregidor, but it is the same flag that was hoisted up again triumphantly by MacArthur and his men; the flag of victory in the battles of the Coral Sea, of Normandy, of the Ardennes, of Iwo Jima, and of Japan.

No man can pay tribute to that flag more than the brave men from Valley Forge to Corregidor who bled for it, died for it.

FLAG OF PEACE

While the flag inspired our veterans and people in time of war, it is primarily not a battle flag, but a flag of peace; and an eternal symbol of peace, of freedom, of growing souls, of pioneers, of immigrants seeking the larger life, of free schools, of religions uncontrolled by the State, of growing villages, cities, and countrysides, of singing children, of expanding industry, of free labor, of happy homes, of a land and people of unlimited horizons.

WE AND THE FLAG

Our flag is what our people made it. Our country today is what our citizens in war and peace have made it.

Our flag and our country in the future will be what we make it.

We—you and I and the next fellow, citizen and official, young and old, farmer, businessman, laboring man, teacher, housewife, are our flag.

I remember that one day many years ago one of my youngsters came home from school and told about a fine lesson her teacher had taught that day. The little one explained with a light in her eye that "Mommy and daddy, this flag is you and me and grandpa and grandma and all of us." I was thrilled by this wonderful lesson the teacher had taught my child. The teacher had wisely explained to her that the flag is not a mere piece of colored bunting. It is not meaningless cloth. It is you and I and our destiny—the destiny of this new breed of men—Americans—derived from every race, every creed, every color on earth.

When we pledge allegiance to Old Glory, we salute ourselves and our Nation. We salute all that is good in our lives and in the lives of our fellow citizens. When we sing of "The Spar-Spangled Banner," we sing of liberty and freedom, free speech, free press, free assembly, freedom of worship. We sing of the Bill of Rights and the United States Constitution.

Yes, our flag is meaningful to us as a symbol of a heritage that is very precious.

The Meaning of Our Flag in the Atomic Age—this is the subject of these brief thoughts to you today. Let us explore that meaning—the meaning of your flag and my flag.

The poet tells us:

"Your flag and my flag,
And how it flies today
In your land and my land,
And half a world away!
Rose-red and blood-red
The stripes forever gleam;
Snow-white and soul-white—
The good forefathers' dream;
Sky-blue and true-blue,
With stars to gleam aright—
The gloried guidon of the day,
A shelter through the night."

What is the particular meaning in 1947 of the red, white, and blue?

1. AMERICA'S BLESSINGS

The first meaning of our flag in the atomic age is that you and I live on soil more blessed than anywhere else on earth. By every standard of comparison, spiritual standards, and material standards, America stands unsurpassed by any other nation on earth.

The bomb which was released at Hiroshima ushered in the atomic age. It did not merely obliterate a city. It symbolized the obliteration and destruction everywhere in the civilized world except in the United States. Our land has been unmarred by the physical

scars of war. Our factories, our homes are intact. Hunger and starvation and disease do not stalk our people, as they do foreign peoples. Envy and distrust over boundaries, dating back to centuries of feuds and rivalries, do not mar our peace of mind.

This, then, is the first meaning of our flag in this atomic age—the meaning of ourselves in relation to all other peoples.

We are not haughty in our spiritual and material wealth. What we have, we wish all other peoples had. We want to help them, if at all possible, like the Good Samaritan, to help themselves to realize the blessings we alone enjoy. We want to raise a standard to which the wise and the honest will repair.

2. CLOSENESS OF NEIGHBORS

The second meaning of our flag in this atomic age is that it floats within the view of every citizen of earth, because ours is a contracted world. Man's ingenuity and invention have virtually eliminated time and space. Everything that we do on our soil is noted by every other people. The standards we live by, the achievements we make, are duly observed by them. We are the custodians of the light, spiritual and political, that the teeming millions of earth long for. We must see to it that the light never goes out.

In the atomic age, every nation is in every other nation's back yard. Jet planes, guided missiles, atomic energy—these are but the opening phases of the new era which we have entered. We must prepare our minds for discoveries and advances within the next few years bolder and more amazing than we have dreamed to date.

3. UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

The third meaning of our flag today is our awareness that, although the people of earth are living in one world geographically, we are living in two worlds spiritually and politically. America's flag stands today in contrast to another flag already flying over one-sixth of the earth. The 48 stars on the blue field with the red-and-white stripes confronts the Red flag of the hammer and sickle in every corner of the globe.

We are contesting one another not only for territorial control and economic resources control throughout the world, but for the minds of men. Two worlds face one another—the one world based upon the doctrine of statism; the other world having as its major principle the doctrine of individualism. The one upholds the right of the state above everything—the right of the state to control, to destroy, to regiment. The other upholds the right of the individual to all his freedoms, to all his natural heritage, so long as he does not harm his brother.

United States foreign policy

We are giving aid to Greece and Turkey, not as a measure of imperialism, but as a means of halting communism. Our economic aid is for the purpose of preserving liberty and for the purpose of preserving the peace.

Although the Soviet Union and the United States are in diplomatic conflict, we are still hoping to reach substantial agreement with the Russians. We are demonstrating the will, intent, and purpose for a just and lasting peace, and we have every reason to ask and expect the Russians to demonstrate likewise. History is the story of conflicting ideas. Many of these conflicts were resolved peacefully.

Russian-United States differences

The problem is not an easy one because of these factors:

(a) The differences in political ideology between the United States and Russia, to which I have already referred. Russia's political philosophy seems to operate on man's minds like a fanatic religion, whose god is worldly power, and which is worshipped and served, if need be, by cunning and violence in total disregard of the rights of other nations and individuals. Witness Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, etc.

(b) The differences in economic ideology with America seeking to promote freedom of enterprise throughout the world and Russia seeking to promote economic Marxist ideology wherein the State owns and distributes everything.

(c) The differences in spiritual values. There is a vast gulf between our way of thinking and Russia's way. We must span that gulf.

(d) Russia's historic fears, based upon the countless invasions she has suffered through the centuries; and upon the atomic bomb and bacteriological disease weapons which aggravate the fear of each nation. We must antidote that fear.

(e) Russia's new dominance in the world in which she feels the new strength of her more than 70 amalgamated peoples. She feels now, for the first time, her ability to realize her ambitions of centuries.

(f) The limited nature of vital mineral and other resources such as oil on which the modern state and modern military forces depend.

Hopeful outlook with Russia

Yet, in spite of all these differences, I have faith that we can achieve peace with Russia. We must find the way to live together, to rebuild a war-wracked earth. This does not mean that we must be innocent and blindly trusting. On the contrary, we must ever remember that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." You remember that flag which was carried during the Revolutionary War which showed a coiled snake. On that flag was the inscription "Don't tread on me." That is our message to communism and fascism today. We must prepare ourselves against any emergency with the most advanced, up-to-the-minute weapons and training as Wisconsin's Billy Mitchell would have us prepare were he physically in our midst today. And we must be united—we must get rid of the saboteurs within.

But we will have faith that peace can be secured through peaceful means, and we will work without ceasing toward that end.

We will not be discouraged at temporary set-backs. Yes, I have every faith that we can make the United Nations succeed. I pray God that reason and judgment will be born anew so that true international understanding will result.

4. MAINTAINING AMERICA UNIMPAIRED

We turn now to the fourth meaning of our flag in the atomic age. It is that we must pass Old Glory's values on, vital and unimpaired, to those who are to follow after us. We are the heirs of all the generations that preceded us. They gave to us our unmatched liberties and abundance, and we want to do the same and even better for our children and our children's children.

As the poet said:

"The glory of our present
Is to make our future free.
We love our land for what she is
And what she is to be."

Passing on our heritage will not be an easy task. In our midst today, there are influences which would subvert our American philosophy of constitutional checks and balances. These communistic, fascistic and other influences would set class against class, race against race, religion against religion. They would foment hate, envy, greed among our people. They would create strife in labor relations and in human relations.

We must antidote these influences with the searing light of publicity, with "the truth that sets men free." We must be alert to counteract un-American ideas, whether they be spread by word of mouth, by deed, or by the printed word.

We want no racketeering in our land to sully the flag—be it economic racketeering, political racketeering, or spiritual racketeering. You and I know what a racketeer is—he is a fellow who wants to play the game only his own way, with his own methods, his own tactics, regardless of the decent rules of society, regardless of his fellow man's welfare.

We want a law-abiding America, and America unlimited, an America unimpaired.

HOME, SCHOOL, CHURCH, AND INDUSTRY

We all know the flag can fly proudly over the American home—only when the family in that home live in the grand, old tradition of thrift, honesty, and decency—the kind of sober, old-fashioned American life, in which there is no place for loose living and thinking.

The flag can fly proudly over the American school only when that school effectively teaches the youth of our land their obligations as well as their rights, so that it produces graduates of vision and initative. Such graduates build for themselves and their land, know their civic responsibilities, and do not evade them. They are the kind of graduates who do not look to government to support them, but who look rather to their own efforts and their own industry to build a life.

The flag can fly proudly in the churchyards of America only when the churches effectively teach and inspire the moral character and the spiritual verities and vigor which have always made our Nation great. Such qualities can be a vast reservoir of strength in fighting off the moral breakdown, the postwar jitters and the postwar neurosis which followed the First World War.

The flag can fly proudly over American industry only when management and labor join wholeheartedly in a common cause, dedicated to the general welfare and prosperity of all of the people.

This, then, is our job. Our job is to so live our lives that the flag may fly as proudly for us in peace as it flew for us soldiers in war.

CONCLUSION

My fellow Americans, it has been a wonderful privilege to be home in Wisconsin with you today. Seeing you gives me renewed faith and confidence that America will be adequate to all the challenges up ahead.

We have today explored together some of the meanings of the flag in relation to the past, the present, and the future.

We will continue, I am sure, to carry on with a full appreciation of our responsibility before us, living gallantly, courageously, making our flag even more meaningful to those who are to follow after us. Then indeed—

"The Star Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave,
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Charity Medical Care or National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief radio address entitled "Charity Medical Care

or National Health Insurance," which I have prepared for delivery in Montana.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, I wish to talk briefly about the costs of medical care—something which is a constant source of worry to every family in America. About doctors and debts; about how we can afford to keep our children well; and about how—when sickness does strike—we can be sure of getting the care we need without going through the nightmare of asking public charity.

For many years we have fought—first to have the problem of constantly mounting medical costs recognized in Washington and then to find a solution. We have won the first part of the battle. Now even the Republican Party and its leadership admit there is a problem and that it's serious.

The fight has shifted. Today the question is not whether something should be done but "What should be done?"

There are now two different proposals before the Congress. Republican Senators TAFT, BALL, SMITH, and DONNELL have told us how they think your family should get medical care. They propose relief medicine, through public charity, under monopolistic control.

They propose to solve our national medical care problem by appropriating two hundred millions of tax money each year. This money would be turned over to the States with instructions that they use it to provide care to those people whose need is so great that they are willing to put their families on public record as applying for charity.

The amount proposed is pitifully small—enough perhaps to aid that 3 or 4 percent of our population now dependent on welfare funds. Far worse, however, is the shocking proposal that the American people accept State relief as the way to solve a problem which confronts almost every family in the land. For Senator TAFT has agreed that to get aid under his bill, people must submit to a means test—that is prove that they are poor and unable to pay medical costs.

Under this Republican proposal, a family asks for and gets charity or it gets nothing. This is what the Republican leadership in the Congress asks you to accept as the answer to your medical-care needs.

The other proposal now before the Congress is the national health insurance bill which I have had the honor of introducing along with Democratic Senators WAGNER of New York, TAYLOR of Idaho, CHAVEZ of New Mexico, PEPPER of Florida, and MCGRATH of Rhode Island.

Instead of grants of tax funds, this bill is based on the well-tried, truly American principle of insurance. In place of limited, relief care in emergencies, it provides for high quality medical care—and for preventive care to keep people healthy as well as for care when they are ill. In place of regimentation and relief investigations, the democratic national health insurance bill guarantees the patient complete freedom in choosing or changing his doctor and guarantees the doctor his freedom of choice.

Under the national health insurance bill, people would contribute to a national insurance fund. The money would be collected by the Federal Government under a plan managed locally—with representation from the doctors, of course, but principally by local citizens representing your interests.

Thus you will see, the national health insurance bill makes care available to the great mass of American citizens—makes it available to them as a right and not as charity.

The choice seems clear. On one side—State medicine, regimentation of patients, a tax-supported relief program, and limited, charity medical care. On the other side, as embodied in the national health insurance bill, comprehensive, quality medical care based on the American way of insurance. Medical care as a right of free people and not charity care for a nation of paupers. This is what the American people want. There is no question but that the people will demand national health insurance. I hope they will voice that demand so loudly and so clearly that all Washington will hear.

Your Chances of Getting Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by James H. McGraw, Jr., president of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc., which appeared in the Washington Post on Thursday, June 5, 1947.

This article, entitled "Your Chances of Getting Ahead," seems to me to go to the essence of what made the United States of America. It means to me that there will always be a penalty of leadership, but we must not put a penalty on leadership. The whole history of the world has proved that the uncommon man, or the man with ability and good leadership, is vital to the success and happiness of the common man, and whenever a government uses its power to tax for purposes other than proper expenses of government, the future of the people involved is in jeopardy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR CHANCES OF GETTING AHEAD

For 20 years we have been whittling away the foundations of our economic structure. We have been cutting away the incentives to get ahead in the world, to increase production and to improve efficiency. Unless this process is reversed soon, we risk the sort of industrial stagnation that currently afflicts Great Britain so disastrously.

How far the whittling has gone is shown by the statement at the end of this article. It shows that everyone's stake in working harder and getting ahead has been reduced sharply since 1929. In that year, anyone who was even moderately successful could look forward to reaping the rewards of his success. If he earned $5,300 annually over a period of 25 years, he could retire on a comfortable income of $3,000 per year. Or he could pile up enough capital to go into business for himself. He could fulfill the American dreams as phrased by Abraham Lincoln in his first annual message to Congress in 1861:

"The prudent, penniless beginner in the world, labors for wages awhile, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account another while, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system, which opens the way to all, gives hope to all, and consequent energy and progress, and improvement of condition to all."

Look at the situation today. To retire on an annual income from investment that will buy as much as $3,000 did in 1929, a young man needs to earn over $13,000 a year for 25 years. That's more than two and one-half times the income he would have needed in 1929. The same thing is true of acquiring a stake in a business.

WHY TRY TO SUCCEED?

While the income needed for retirement today has increased two and one-half times—or by more than 150 percent—since 1929, the average person's income has increased only 80 percent. So the average man's chances of achieving success are really slimmer now than a generation ago.

This 1929–47 trend is something new in America. The average person's chances of getting ahead improved during 1914–29. In that period the dollar income needed for retirement or a stake in business rose by 75 percent, but the average income rose by 100 percent. So more people were within striking distance of success and security in 1929 than in 1914. The story has been different since 1929.

Fewer people actually do achieve financial success today. Only 1 percent of all families now have incomes large enough to build up a retirement fund or a stake in business. In 1929 almost 6 percent of all families attained a comparable degree of success.

Higher taxes are the most important reason why it takes so much mor now to build up a competence. They account for one-half the increase in the amount needed. The other half is explained by higher living costs and lower interest rates.

It is, of course, true that few people ever get into the higher income brackets. So the process of cutting away the incentives which play such a key role in our economic system affects comparatively few people immediately. It does, however, have a powerful indirect effect on all of us.

EVERYBODY LOSES

When from one-half to four-fifths of any additional income of successful people goes to Uncle Sam, a heavy drag is obviously put on doing the work to get it. Thus, we stand to lose the benefit of full use of the Nation's best brains. By so doing we stifle industrial progress. And the loss in productive efficiency far outweighs the amount of tax revenue the Treasury gains. Carried far enough the process of stifling economic progress by slashing rewards leads straight to industrial stagnation.

The same process also multiplies the risks of embarking on new capital investment. High taxes rule out all but the most profitable new projects and restrict most expansions to boom times when profits are high. So capital invesment follows a boom and bust pattern and, by so doing, contributes much to ups and downs in production and employment.

BRITAIN'S SORRY PLIGHT

The case of Britain today provides an object lesson of how blighted incentives produce industrial stagnation. Britain's number one economic problem is to get more production. But the tax load there is so heavy it stifles the incentive to produce more.

A coal miner who works an extra shift pays about a third of his added earnings to the tax collector. And, as the London Economist comments, tax rates on business executives are so high that they kill every incentive except that to tax evasion. In short, not only is the incentive to succeed blighted, but so is the incentive to work.

A root-cause of Britain's trouble is this: The cost of an expensive program of social benefits has been piled on top of the heavy costs of paying for past wars and trying to prevent future wars. Tax rates are boosted accordingly. What her experience proves is that the attempt to provide excessive social benefits may defeat itself. It raises the tax burden on rich and poor alike and smothers the incentive to work. So the underlying basis of all economic benefits—production—is eaten away.

IT'S NOT TOO LATE

We in the United States haven't traveled as far down the stagnation road as Britain has. Taxes amount to about 26 percent of national income here as against about 45 percent there. But unless we start soon to build up incentives to do better work, instead of whittling them away as we have been doing, we will catch up with Britain fast.

Can anything be done? Decidedly yes, particularly by tax reform and reduction in the cost of living. As far as interest rates are concerned, any large increase would raise excessively the cost of carrying our war-swollen national debt, and hence raise taxes. But some increase in what are now excessively low interest rates may well be both feasible and desirable.

Action on the tax front is the first order of business. Our jerry-built tax structure is the thing that is chiefly responsible for cutting the incentives to work harder. Two things are important: (1) Government spending must be pared to the bone; (2) the tax system must be completely overhauled to remove the shackles on all-out production.

The fifty-sixth editorial in this series, published in March, outlined major steps that need to be taken in remodeling Federal taxes in order to increase incentives to individual and business enterprise. The individual income tax reduction act of 1947 is no more than a short step in the right direction. Much more must be done to clear the way for high production and rising living standards.

Lifting the blight which taxes now place on incentives would help cut the high cost of living. It would stimulate greater production and greater efficiency. But a further step is necessary. Part of the benefits of improved efficiency must be passed on to consumers in the form of lower prices.

In the past few years we have been following precisely the opposite course. In many cases wages have been increased all out of proportion to increased productivity. Result—soaring prices and a severe squeeze of the consumer, to which some greedy exploitation of war-created shortages has also contributed.

TO GIVE ABILITY A CHANCE

Our basic and most crucial problem is to get back on the track which leads to higher production and improved living standards all along the line. We got off that track in the 30's. Then, we started scrambling for larger slices of the same pie instead of trying to produce a larger pie. Now the process of getting back on the track is greatly complicated by the tremendous tax burden growing out of the war.

Yet it's not too late to turn back from the road that leads to industrial stagnation. As the statemen in the center of the page shows, we could restore the odds of getting ahead to what they were in 1929. Cutting the Federal budget to $25,000,000,000 a year and putting the tax structure in good order are the crucial first steps.

By taking these steps soon, Congress can go far to restore the incentives to hard work and efficiency which have been so largely washed away in the past 20 years. If they are not taken, the American dream of getting ahead by hard and effective work will exist only in the history books, and our children will inherit from us an economic order without opportunity, without hope, without individual liberty.

JAMES H. MCGRAW, JR.,
President McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

YOUR CHANCES OF GETTING AHEAD

To see how your chances of getting on in the world have changed during the past few decades, the McGraw-Hill Department of Economics has calculated how much it now takes to save enough to acquire a retirement income or a comparable stake in a business, as compared to what it took in 1914 and 1929.

The objective set is an income from investment equal to $3,000 a year in 1929 dollars. It is assumed that the savings required to yield this income are made over a period of 25 years. During that period it is also assumed that $4,000 per year (in 1929 dollars) is spent on living expenses.[1]

Here is how the figures work out:

Yearly income needed:

1914	$3,075
1929	5,267
1947	13,221

It now takes more than four times as large an annual income as it did in 1914 to gain a comparable stake. It takes well over twice as much as it did in 1929.

Changes in three factors—Federal income taxes, living costs, and interest rates—explain why the income needed has multiplied so. Here's how these factors line up for the 3 years.

	Federal income taxes, married man, 2 dependents		Cost of living (index numbers 1935-39)	Interest rate, high-grade corporate bonds
	$5,000 income	$10,000 income		
				Percent
1914	$10	$60	71.8	5
1929	3	40	122.5	5
1947	589	1,862	155.0	2½

Similar calculations show that if we could reduce Federal expenditures from $35,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 annually, raise interest rates by one-tenth and lower living costs by 15 percent—all realistic possibilities if we make the effort—then the income needed to build up such a retirement fund would come down to $9,500. The chances of realizing that goal would then be restored to what they were in 1929.

[1] Several other factors were omitted from the calculations because they would not have a decisive effect on the results. Thus, existence of social-security pensions and retirement funds now reduces the income needed; but if State income taxes were added, the income needed would increase.

Freezing Appropriations by the President

REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I introduced House Joint Resolution 176 on April 22, 1947, which has for its purpose preventing the Chief Executive from freezing and making impotent the appropriations as provided by the Congress of the United States.

You will remember that last year the Congress, after exhaustive hearings, passed an appropriation bill for public works which included flood control and reclamation and that the President declared a "moratorium and screening procedure for all Federal construction programs."

This was an unusual procedure. It will be remembered that—

First. The Bureau of the Budget and the President had recommended, to the Congress, all appropriations that were made for Federal construction programs.

Second. Upon this recommendation the Congress unanimously approved the funds for the recommended program.

Third. These appropriations were sent to the President for veto or approval. He approved them without the slightest opposition being registered. In fact, he signed the bills in the presence of a score of the Members of Congress, pictures were taken and pens passed out to the sponsors of the bill. The President said, "it was a forward stride."

Fourth. Congress adjourned on August 2, and on August 3, with a letter dated August 2, the President stopped this forward march and made impotent, without approval or consultation with Congress, all Federal works by a drastic limitation of their expenditures.

The President claimed he had authority to do this under the Second War Powers Act. Many Members of Congress felt it was beyond his statutory or constitutional rights.

A few days ago the Congress found it necessary to appropriate $12,000,000 for the emergency flood repairs in the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys. A million and a half acres of land are now flooded, with a tremendous loss of property. If the President had permitted the Army engineers to proceed, perhaps much, or all, of this damage could have been prevented.

If the President can nullify the acts of Congress for public works, he cou'd do the same for a part or all of the appropriations for the military, the veterans, and other important activities of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain this is entirely too much power for the President to have. That section of the Second War Powers Act, under which he claims to have this authority should be repealed. I am asking the Public Works Committee to proceed with the hearing on the resolution which will prevent the President from nullifying the appropriations as provided by Congress. If we do not do this and the authority is once conceded, then there is no limit to which a President might go. The Congress will no longer control the purse strings as provided by the Constitution and popular self-government will be at an end. The resolution follows:

Joint resolution to provide that Federal public-works projects and programs shall be carried out to the full extent authorized by law

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding any moratorium or curtailment policy heretofore put into effect at the direction of the President, it shall be the duty of all officers, departments, and agencies of the Government to proceed, to the full extent authorized by law and the limit of present appropriations, with all Federal public-works projects and programs coming under their jurisdiction.

Cyrus S. Eaton's Admonitions to Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, there are many rumors in circulation to the

effect that several leading industrialists have gone to the White House and recommended to the President that the labor bill, which is now on the President's desk, be vetoed. I do not know the correctness of those rumors, but I find in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, June 15, a statement by Cyrus S. Eaton. Mr. Eaton is one of the country's leading industrialists and financiers one who has taken a great pride in the development of industry in the United States, and he is recognized as a man entitled to speak on behalf of American industry. In an article which he has contributed to the Chicago Law Review he has much to say with reference to the proposed labor legislation. He said in the article:

We will have to make immediate and radical changes in our attitude toward labor and our methods of dealing with labor.

He further said:

We will have to begin by muzzling such organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers and by recognizing, and sincerely regretting, that there is bad feeling on both sides.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CYRUS S. EATON BIDS CAPITALISTS PLACATE LABOR—INDUSTRIALIST WARNS AGAINST LEGAL CURBS, CALLS FOR MUZZLING OF THE NAM

CHICAGO, June 14.—Cyrus S. Eaton, Cleveland industrialist and banker, said today that "to avoid extinction" capitalists will "have to make immediate and radical changes in our attitude toward labor and our methods of dealing with labor."

"We will have to begin by muzzling such organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers and by recognizing and sincerely regretting that there is bad feeling on both sides," he said.

In an article entitled "A Capitalist Looks at Labor," published in the current issue of the University of Chicago Law Review, he discussed labor legislation, saying, "Let no businessman be naive enough to believe * * * that restrictive legislation will be any more effective in bringing about industrial harmony than the Volstead Act was in discouraging drinking."

WARNS CAPITALISM

Mr. Eaton, who has broad interests in the iron-ore, steel, coal, and railroad industries, asserted that "capitalism cannot survive without the support of labor." He added:

"The casualness with which we capitalists seem willing—nay, even eager—to invite the collapse of our economic system in almost every industrial dispute for the sole purpose of thwarting labor is utterly incomprehensible. Labor not only produces the goods and consumes a large part of them; labor also has the votes. * * *

"Eventually (labor) unity is practically a foregone conclusion. The prospect of labor united should be sobering to even the most embittered and embattled capitalist.

"I also believe we may ultimately see a strong alliance between labor and the farmer, accompanied by a tremendous expansion of the manufacturing and selling cooperatives. The effecting of such a formidable combination awaits only the magic touch of some dynamic personality.

"Then, if capitalism has not already gone by the board, its continued existence will be completely at the mercy of an estranged 95 percent of the electorate."

LAUDS LEWIS FOR RESTRAINT

He credited John L. Lewis, head of the United Mine Workers, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor, with exercising wisdom and restraint during the soft-coal controversy last fall and accused the mine owners of working "under cover * * * feverishly night and day to keep a torrent of abuse turned on the miners and their leaders through every channel of publicity and to urge all three branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial—to crack down on labor."

"Throughout the entire time," he added, "John L. Lewis never uttered a syllable of complaint and never issued a statement criticizing anybody."

Mr. Eaton said the Supreme Court decision against the miners "will be productive of untold evil in the whole field of labor relations."

In an article in the same publication Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, said the American people are "expecting entirely too much of labor legislation as a panacea for industrial ills."

"I am afraid that too many, both in and out of Congress, have misled themselves into thinking that a maximum of industrial freedom in this country can be attained by putting American labor in a strait-jacket," he added.

River and Harbor Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the projects committee of the Thirty-Seventh National Rivers and Harbors Congress:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND
HARBORS CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1947.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the President, your projects committee met on May 1 to consider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 35 proposals embracing all water resource improvements with which this Congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, soil conservation, reclamation, and water conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 12 constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of $328,270,000. Two proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on 10 proposals, surveys have been authorized but the reports on such surveys have not been completed and we therefore recommend in these cass that Congress request the appropriate authority to complete reports of its investigations and surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this Congress. We find 8 proposals, which on preliminary examination appear to be desirable and needful and we accordingly recommend that engineering and economic investigations of survey scope be made in these cases with a view to developing projects for subsequent authorization. Of the proposals investigated, we find 3 are without the necessary data or sponsorship to enable the committee to reach a reasonable conclusion on their worth. However, we desire to give the applications sympathetic consideration, and, if possible, offer to the proponents the services of this Congress in reaching a solution to their problems. We have, therefore, not classified these but have suggested that the Secretary communicate with the applicants concerned and request additional data upon the receipt of which further consideration will be given to their proposals.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

Your committee has taken cognizance of the desires and views expressed by representatives of the many interests concerned with the development, use, and control of the Nation's natural resources. In this period of transition from war to normal peacetime endeavors it is propitious to summarize herein such views which reflect both individual and organized public opinion regarding the development of water and land resources of our country. As summarized by your committee they indicate:

(a) A greater and more widespread interest in the development and utilization of water resources and an unprecedented awareness by the general public of the importance of such improvements to the progressive advancement of the national welfare and security.

(b) The necessity for prosecuting an adequate Federal program of improvement of waterways and harbors, the control of flood waters, the reclamation of arid and semi-arid lands, soil conservation, and related projects in order to keep pace with the increasing needs of industry, agriculture, and business in general, and to establish a proven asset in time of national emergency.

(c) The need of sufficient annual Federal appropriations with which to construct additional projects to meet the immediate and foreseeable requirements in accordance with programs prepared by the responsible Federal agencies and authorized by the Congress of the United States.

(d) The vital necessity of adequate appropriations for proper maintenance, operation, and care of projects that have heretofore been completed.

(e) The advisability of continuing sizable survey and planning programs to consider and screen the many additional projects advocated during and since the war so that new projects which are found economically justified may be presented for consideration and approved for future appropriation.

Your committee endorses the foregoing views which have been coordinated with the resolutions committee in order that they may be embodied in the resolutions of this session of the Congress. A large backlog of sound and meritorious projects has accumulated during the past several years due to the necessity of suspending all public improvements not essential to the war effort. Many of these projects that were in the study stage prior to the war have subsequently been reported upon favorably and have now been authorized. The economics of the projects have been reexamined in the light of increased costs and the cost to benefit ratios have been found favorable. Their construction requires only the appropriation of funds.

These projects are spread over the entire 48 States, the Territories, and island possessions and have an estimated construction cost of several billions of dollars. It is obviously impracticable to prosecute such a huge program in 2 or 3 years. In fact, some of the large projects in that program will require, even with sizable annual appropria-

tions, 4 to 6 years to complete. Therefore, the large backlog of projects now authorized and those still in the study stage must be considered a long-range program to be carried out as expeditiously as the financial ability of the Government will permit.

The committee feels that those projects which are particularly important and of immediate and substantial benefit to industry, agriculture, commerce, or the welfare of the people should be carried out without undue delay. The premise is sound that public improvements in the interests of navigation, flood control, soil conservation, reclamation, and related purposes ultimately return to the people benefits more than sufficient to repay the Federal investment in these improvements. Your committee therefore recommends that our Congress and each and every Member thereof take proper steps to insure that the Congress of the United States appropriate each year adequate sums for the orderly prosecution of a balanced, long-range program of public works, which is so important to the advancement, development, and strength of this Nation.

Respectfully submitted.

SID SIMPSON,
Chairman.

APPENDIX A

(Letter R following the project number indicates revision of a previous application)

Class I. Projects endorsed

Endorsed: This means that the committee is convinced that the project is sound, needful and sufficiently advanced in status and should be promptly constructed in the public interest.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
99-R-3	Sacramento River, 30-foot ship channel	California	S. P.
360-R	Taunton River	Massachusetts	N. E.
632-R-3	New Haven Harbor and Quinnipiac River	Connecticut	N. E.
663-R	Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Fla	Florida	S. A.
705-R	Big Sandy River waterway	Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia.	O. R.
712	West Fork River Reservoir	West Virginia	O. R.
716	Appalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers	Alabama, Georgia, and Florida	S. A.
717	Buggs Island Reservoir, Roanoke River	Virginia and North Carolina	N. A.
720	Lehigh River	Pennsylvania	N. A.
729	St. Andrews Bay	Florida	S. A.
732	Lower Snake River	Washington and Idaho	N. P.
733	Bridgeport Harbor	Connecticut	N. E.
733-A	St. Josephs Bay Channel	Florida	S. A.

Class II. Projects classified as meritorious

Meritorious: This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and open for further consideration by the committee.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
722	Cape Fear River at and below Wilmington	North Carolina	S. A.
726	Channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet	do	S. A

Class III. Expeditious report on authorized survey requested

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested: This means that the committee believes the Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite the report of its investigation and survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to classification by the Congress.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
427-R	Duwamish River and Green River	Washington	N. P.
706	Allegheny River, extension of canalization from East Brady, Pa., to Olean, N. Y	Pennsylvania and New York	O. R.
707	Red River sedimentation, flood control, and river crossing	Oklahoma and Texas	S. W.
708	Muscatine, Iowa, harbor improvements	Iowa	U. M. W.
714	Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, plan for flood control and other purposes	Ohio	O. R.
718	Kincaid Creek (flood control)	Illinois	U. M. V.
719	Little River, Niagara Falls	New York	G. L.
723	Cape Fear River flood control	North Carolina	S. A.
730	Saugatuck River-Westport Harbor	Connecticut	N. E.
731	Provincetown Harbor	Massachusetts	N. E.

Class IV. Projects recommended for survey

Recommended for survey: This means that the committee believes that sufficient showing on behalf of the project has been made to warrant further examination in the form of an adequate survey by an appropriate agency of the Federal Government.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
709	Upper Monongahela River, modernization of existing navigation facilities	West Virginia	O. R.
711	Niobrara River Basin development project	Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota.	M. R. D.
713	West Fork River, drainage area survey for run-off and water flow retardation and soil erosion prevention	West Virginia	O. R.
721	Southport yacht basin, enlargement and shrimp-boat harbor	North Carolina	S. A.
724	Inland waterway, Beaufort to Cape Fear River, including waterway to Jacksonville	do	S. A.
725	Channel from inland waterway to Carolina Beach	do	S. A.
727	Neuse River, navigation and flood control	do	S. A.
728	Morehead City Harbor	do	S. A.

Pick-Sloan Plan—Or Missouri Valley Authority?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able guest editorial appearing in the Denver Post of June 3, 1947, written by Hon. Leif Erickson, of Montana. The editorial constitutes a penetrating analysis of the Pick-Sloan plan of Missouri Valley development.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PICK-SLOAN PLAN—OR MVA?—PRESENT PROGRAM DECLARED INADEQUATE

(By Leif Erickson)

Hearings on the proposed Missouri Valley Authority legislation now appear likely sometime after June 20. Sentiment for the creation of a Missouri Valley authority has grown tremendously in the valley in recent months. From Missouri to Montana, the people are learning that the so-called Pick-Sloan plan is not a plan for the development of the river, but a plan for underdevelopment of its potentialities. The main stem projects in Missouri which will inundate tens of thousands of acres of land unnecessarily and the destructive nature of the Army's proposed Osceola Dam in that State have turned that State vigorously to an MVA.

The fact that the Pick-Sloan plan will develop only about 30 percent of a reasonable minimum potential of electric power, recently revealed by the Federal Power Commission, has turned everyone sincerely

interested in industries for the West to the proposed MVA.

The total failure of the Pick-Sloan plan to consider land problems, water crop areas, erosion control and conservation, recently pointed out by the regional forester at Denver and Governor Donnell of Missouri, has high-lighted to people in agriculture and in the cities the inadequacy of present bits-and-pieces engineering.

In South Dakota, the proposed Oahe Dam, which would stand as a barrier to navigation through an area where elevators are clogged with wheat because of the boxcar shortage, has turned the people of that State to the MVA proposal.

North Dakota is in the midst of intercity strife over conflicting Army and Interior dam proposals, and alarmed at the effects which the gigantic Garrison Dam will have on her people

Colorado is disgusted with the Army's construction of the uneconomic Cherry Creek Dam near Denver, and the recent nearly 200-percent increase in cost estimates for the Interior Department's Big Thompson diversion project, which has been jumped from $45,000,000 to $128,000,000.

Here in Montana, we have learned from three splendid engineers that the Pick-Sloan plan, in terms of river engineering alone, is only about 60-percent efficient, and would waste or fail to develop 40 percent of the river's potentialities for irrigation, power, flood control, and navigation.

Hope for any revision or improvement of the planning through the interagency committee, which was set up to give an appearance of coordination, has long been abandoned.

The fact that Congressmen and Senators know of the true inadequacy of the Pick-Sloan plan, of the interagency committee, and of the inter- and even intra-agency differences is undoubtedly, in a large measure, responsible for the paralyzing reductions being made in western development appropriations at this time.

The great majority of the people of the Missouri watershed are fed up with the conflicts and the bickering, the sham and the shortcomings, and the lack of progress under the Pick-Sloan procedure. Within a majority of the Federal agencies themselves, there is a desire that a new administrative pattern be established under which there can be real unified and coordinated planning for the valley and its problems, and intelligent administration.

President and Congress: Crucial Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 14, 1947:

PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS: CRUCIAL TEST

A veto by President Truman of the labor bill would do more harm to international peace than to industrial peace. Two-thirds of the Congress may override a veto, but how could the President expect future cooperation from Congress if he sets up his judgment against the carefully considered views of more than two-thirds of the Senators and Representatives?

Congress knows far more than the President about the need for legislation and about the way the new law will meet that need. Congressmen have been holding hearings and arguing among themselves and with constituents over labor relations for many months. The President has been engrossed in a multiplicity of other problems. He won't be able personally to study the labor bill adequately. He must rely largely on advisers to analyze its merits and demerits. What advisers are as reliable as two-thirds of the Congress?

In foreign affairs the President must constantly call upon the Congress to trust him, because his source of information are so intimate and his responsibility is so great. But how could he expect the Congress to trust him if, when its Members are much better informed, he showed no trust in them and refused to follow their good judgment?

Furthermore, the Congress knows, and thinks the President should know, that our international influence and our domestic strength have been seriously weakened by abuses of organized labor power—and particularly by the reckless industrial warfare of 1946. Is our memory so short that we forget the serious conditions that created the public demand for the intervention of law? Unless labor as well as management is legally required to fulfill its obligations to the general welfare, our country will steadily deteriorate and our Government become more and more impotent to protect our interests at home and abroad. The world will wonder who pulls the strings of our Government.

It is the primary duty of the Congress to legislate. The veto power of the President was never intended, and should never be used, to impose his will upon the American people contrary to the judgment of their chosen lawmakers. The veto power is only designed as a safeguard against legislation which, because of mistake or haste or the overlooking of important considerations, would not be approved by the Congress after being advised of its errors. An example of hasty legislation which thoroughly deserved the veto it got was the Case bill. Another piece of legislation equally deserving of a veto because of its overlooking of prospective world reconstruction needs is the lopsided tax-reduction bill now on the White House desk.

But this Congress has given to the labor bill an extended and detailed consideration which cannot be duplicated by the President in 10 days or 10 weeks. This legislative judgment should weigh more heavily with the President than a million letters from persons selfishly affected, more heavily than a hundred memoranda from public officials personally concerned, more heavily than the well-intentioned but inexpert counsel of intimate advisers, certainly more heavily than the intimidation of labor leaders who, after cold-shouldering all requests for cooperation in framing wise legislation to cope with crying needs, are now filling the woods with lamentations.

When two-thirds of the Congress vote to pass a much-needed law against violent opposition, they have a right to expect cooperative approval from a President who cannot fulfill his high responsibilities except by giving cooperation in exchange for the cooperation he must obtain.

Good Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of June 16, 1947:

HOOVER PLEA FOR AID LIMITATION BACKED BY BARUCH

Bernard M. Baruch, elder statesman and United States economic guide in two World Wars, today put his weight behind bipartisan foreign-policy spokesmen in urging a new, more comprehensive approach to the problem of this country's overseas air program.

Mr. Baruch commented on the appeal of Herbert Hoover for a new appreciation of the limits of American aid to foreign countries.

"What he has advocated is sound and simple, and if it could be undertaken speedily and effectively could bring great results in peace and work for all."

ALL IN LINE

Mr. Baruch observed that the former President had entered specifically into principles he himself had advocated in the past, and that this urging complements recent statements on European recovery by Secretary of State George C. Marshall, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Republican, of Michigan, and Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia.

Other observers, however, viewed the Hoover statement as running smack against the administration's campaign to maintain present high levels of foreign trade—for both domestic- and foreign-policy reasons.

Mr. Hoover charged that the record rate of exports, although not the sole factor, was the major one in the continued rise in prices at home. This same view was expressed recently by Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, and brought a heated rejoinder from President Truman.

Mr. Hoover proposed that "our limited resources" be concentrated in areas where western civilization can be preserved. This last suggestion was a bid to abandon the Soviet Union and her satellites as areas where cooperation cannot be expected.

Mr. Hoover placed the blame on the Soviet Union for imposing billions in expenses on the United States during the last 2 years. In this, he was supported by retiring Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who, in a speech last night at Middletown, Conn., warned that financially Europe is bleeding to death and that the shock and crisis which will come next year will reverberate throughout the world.

Two years ago Mr. Baruch wrote Representative ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, in regard to overseas aid:

"We ought to examine our productive capacity and determine how to divide that production, first, to see that enough of what is produced remains in the United States to avoid disastrous inflation, and then how much to allocate for rehabilitation of Europe, China, and the Philippines.

"Unless this dividing is done wisely we will sink and the whole world will go down with us. We should direct our aid to foreign countrie by giving priority to those who need the most and who will use it to help themselves on their own feet."

Mr. Baruch is known to favor a supreme European economic council to determine what each country could contribute to European recovery, integrating this with United States aid.

Republican leaders have charged figures on European needs have been somewhat inflated because most nations seeking help know they are competing before the United States with many other countries.

When Mr. Hoover last year made his round-the-world study of food needs, requisitions totaled 28,000,000 tons. Estimates indicated the United States could supply no more than 14,000,000 tons. The Hoover study showed actual needs closer to 17,000,000 tons, and the gap was bridged in part by conservation here at home.

French failure to cooperate more fully in Europe is costing us $100,000,000 a year, according to some estimates. Another estimate is that full French-British cooperation in European relief and rehabilitation might save us $750,000,000 annually.

Too Much Politics in the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the other day in reading my home town daily newspaper, the Crookston (Minn.) Daily Times, I observed a syndicated column which I felt outlined rather adequately some of the inequities now existing in the rates charged by the Post Office Department for several classifications.

In addition, the columnist, Mr. George E. Sokolsky, severely criticized the political manipulations which tend to decrease the efficiency of the Post Office Department.

Because I feel that his article rather graphically portrays some of the conditions in the Department, I am making it a part of my remarks.

There is only one point on which I disagree with Mr. Sokolsky and that is where he states that post offices are "usually dirty, ill-kept places." I know that in the State of Minnesota these adjectives do not apply.

The article, distributed to newspapers throughout the country by the King Features Syndicate for publication on June 10, follows:

The most usual contact that most Americans have with their Government is with the post office and the postman. The post office does a huge business at a deficiency. Postmen are poorly paid in comparison even with other Government employees. Post offices are usually dirty, ill-kept places, except in those colossal, ornate, marble and granite buildings erected wastefully and beyond practical needs. Of course, there are plently of exceptions and this is not intended as a reflection on the men down the line, but on the incompetence of the politicians who operate this business enterprise.

The real trouble is that the politician appointed to run the post office is usually either chairman of the Republican or the Democratic National Committee and therefore has no time to operate the business for which the taxpayer pays him a salary. The present Postmaster General, for one reason or another, is not around too much to manage this business. Its policies are made by the permanent subordinates who, at any rate, know that a stamp is not something exclusively for philatelists.

Each year the Post Office comes to Congress to make up a deficit. Nobody investigates why the Post Office has a deficit. Nobody tries to find out why it cannot be run efficiently. The problem is to make up the deficit. The Democrats for 15 years wrangled this problem without too much trouble, because they did not care how much they spent. The Republicans, who should shake out the waste in Government, take the Post Office's word for it that there is a deficit and decide that one way to make it up is to add $8,200,000 by a new tax on the users of second-class mail. They select 250 out of 25,000 users of second-class mail to make up this amount. And they justify the discrimination by the New Deal doctrine that the more competent and successful should be penalized in the interest of the smaller units. It was generally thought that doctrine died with Harry Hopkins.

The post office asks for an appropriation of $1,500,000,000, which is more than they are spending this year and is twice as much as during the prewar years. The types of publications selected for soaking are metropolitan newspapers, farm journals, and national magazines. All other publications will be exempt from the new provisions. Small newspapers are exempt; labor, religious, fraternal, and veteran publications are exempt.

The large magazines will really carry the full load, which is what the post office plans should be the case. The 15 large, national-circulation magazines are the ones that are to be soaked. These magazines generally pay their way completely; that is, they paid $6,579,080 in postal receipts against $6,570,332 in ascertained postal costs for the fiscal year June 30, 1945.

Now, generally speaking, very few care about the other fellow being soaked, so those who are exempt will be well pleased that the load has been passed to the other fellow. If, however, these 15 discover some way of getting out from under, by rearranging their publishing or some other means, the deficit will be there again next year, and somebody now exempt will have to be soaked. So passing the buck does not solve the problems.

The way to solve this problem is to discover who says there is a deficit and why. The administration ought to hire one of the great business engineering firms of this country to study the post office as a business enterprise, with the object of reorganizing it so that it functions right.

Cutting air mail for spotlight politics and then searching around for some place to tack on the deficit is not a business operation. Nor is it a business operation to promote one kind of mail against another, air mail against ordinary mail, and then to send air mail by train without a rebate to the sender, as was done for many years. All these shenanigans represent nothing realistic. Soaking the 15 big magazines will probably bring no additional revenue, but it looks like good politics to soak the successful. Good politics for whom? For the Postmaster General or for the country?

Appointment of Magill Advisory Committee Is Republican Move To Replace Income Taxes With a Federal Sales Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, when H. R. 1 was under consideration in the House, I tried to point out the windfalls the 20 percent across the board plan would grant to upper bracket taxpayers. The rank injustice in a tax reduction program that would have given 2,166,923 taxpayers in the State of Michigan an increase in take-home pay of less than 5 percent and the 62 top taxpayers with incomes over $300,000 a 60 percent increase in take-home pay was obvious. Yet, under the backing of the Republican leadership, this fraud upon the American public was advanced as the answer to an election promise of tax relief.

From the very first day I laid eyes on H. R. 1, it smelled rotten and the aroma became more nauseating as the bill proceeded to enactment. But the awful stench that now emanates from the Republican tax program is stifling to the olfactory senses.

I should have realized from the beginning that H. R. 1 was fragrant in contrast with the shifting of the tax load to the people in the low income groups that is now in evidence. When testimony of outside witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 1 was limited to Mr. Roswell Magill, the Wall Street lawyer, and Mr. John Hanes, the New York banker and business executive, the Democrats on the committee protested that the views of these gentlemen on Federal tax matters were already known. Both of them probably are in the income brackets where the increase in take-home pay from H. R. 1 amounts to around $20 an hour in comparison with the 4 or 5 cents an hour for people with incomes of less than $5,000. So we expected them to favor H. R. 1. But I wondered at the time why both Mr. Hanes and Mr. Magill should go out of their way to present to the committee their views on a Federal sales tax.

Mr. Magill advised:

I would like to see the excise tax system strengthened.

And further:

I know it was not very many years ago when 40 percent of the revenues of the Federal Government used to be produced by excises. Now, as you [Mr. GEARHART] say, it is less than 20. My feeling would be that it should be at least 25, and the system as a whole would be more stable for good times and bad if it were more than that.

Mr. Hanes said at page 196 of the hearings on H. R. 1:

I have advocated a sales tax because I think we have to get the revenue where the revenue is, and we are going to be pressed very hard for revenue in the next few years.

So Dr. Magill and Mr. Hanes counseled the prompt enactment of H. R. 1 to stimulate managerial incentive and venture capital investment. Yet at the same time they urged that revenue requirements justify the enactment of additional Federal excise taxes, or even a sales tax.

It is to the credit of these gentlemen that they were honest. They did not attempt to hide—as did the Republican majority in the Congress—their real intention to shift the tax load of the wealthy to the poor through a sales tax. No, Mr. Speaker, all along the line the people were assured that not only could there be income-tax reduction, but debt retirement as well.

It is only recently, since H. R. 1 passed the House, that the Republican tax leaders have revealed that they secretly agreed with Mr. Magill and Mr. Hanes about enactment of a Federal sales tax. In the current hearings of the committee on the 1948 tax revision a witness on May 28 was urging the repeal of the tax on transportation of property. This tax is one of the most regressive excises and increases the cost even of the poor man's

salt. In questioning the witness, Chairman KNUTSON asserted:

We are now undertaking a revision of the tax code. It is the hope of the committee to be able to shift much of the burden that is now being carried by the income-tax group, which includes almost everyone, over to the excises at least in part, because the income tax is not a reliable source of income in times of depression or recession.

And he said:

Obviously, if we are going to extend the excise field we will have to include a great many items that are not now included. It is the thought of the committee that perhaps the revenue derived from excises should be set aside into a fund that could be called the war retirement tax fund.

Since then, Mr. Speaker, at least four or five majority committee members have dared to discuss this scheme to enact a Federal sales tax or a host of excises—which are nothing more than sales taxes.

The implementation of the plan has presented its complications, however. With H. R. 1 awaiting enactment under the theory that revenues now afford a surplus to provide tax relief for the wealthy, it was a bit embarrassing to be talking of sales taxes and new sources of revenue. So it was agreed to lie low until H. R. 1 had cleared the Congress.

Hardly had this happened, however, when appointment by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of a Special Tax Study Committee was announced.

Now, what is the significance of an advisory tax study committee, you may inquire. Where do they enter into the picture? Well, that is a mighty good question—and the answer is that they have not the slightest business in the enactment of tax legislation. That is the job of the Congress, its committees, and its employees. Of course, we want all the information we can get, in open hearings, but there is no place for individuals from industry or private law practice in the closed sessions of the Ways and Means Committee.

The appointment of Dr. Magill to head the tax advisory group is now the obvious step to obtain a mantle of academic and professional respectability with which to dress up the Republican design to reduce income taxes upon the rich and substitute a sales tax upon the poor. But it will take more sugar than Mr. J. Cheever Cowdin and all his National Association of Manufacturers can produce to sweeten the bitter pill of a sales tax for the American public to swallow.

It would have been more deceptive to have selected an advisory group whose sales-tax inclinations were not so well advertised. As the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] so conclusively demonstrated last Thursday, this tax-study committee is preponderantly in favor of excise or sales taxes as a major source of Federal revenues.

Of course, there have been Republican advocates of sales taxation for years. Andy Mellon gave us a taste of reducing income taxes which later was considered to necessitate the temporary imposition of excise taxes. But throughout my career in Congress, I have fought against excise taxes and sales taxes at every turn. I know—as Dr. Magill and his group know—that sales taxes fall heaviest on those least able to pay. As recently as February 5, 1947, I said on the floor of the House that—

The wartime excise taxes borne by the consumer should be reduced at the earliest possible date in accordance with the pledge given the American people upon my motion and insistence at the time of their enactment.

Now, the Republican scheme is not only to make these taxes permanent, but to greatly broaden the excise-tax base and enact a Federal sales tax. The financial journals of Wall Street, who are the best judges of what Neighbor Magill is thinking, are in accord that his appointment underscores the trend toward a sales tax. And to remove any possible doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this impression might be erroneous, let us remember that Dr. Magill and Mr. Hanes, in testifying before our committee in support of H. R. 1, both favored the sales tax as an alternate source of revenue.

The Wall Street Journal for June 11, 1947, states:

The emphasis in Congress is shifting from tax relief to tax law revision, meaning redistribution of the tax burden.

And further:

Republican ideas are mirrored in the naming of Roswell Magill to head a Ways and Means Committee tax study group.

Mr. Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, has been chairman of the privately financed committee on postwar tax study. He supported GOP plans for a 20 percent tax cut across the board. His tax study group recommends higher excises, and suggests the possibility of a 5 percent retail sales tax, along with other major revisions in the tax law that would immediately benefit stockholders, families with taxable incomes above the first surtax bracket, and businesses that encounter temporary financial hardships.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert the article in my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

TAX REPORT—A SPECIAL SUMMARY AND FORECAST OF FEDERAL AND STATE TAX DEVELOPMENTS

Big budgets threaten to hamper tax reduction for at least 2 years.

Despite strenuous Republican trimming, it now appears that Federal spending in the 1948 fiscal year will not be less than $34,000,000,000 and may be closer to $35,000,000,000. Enthusiastic economy advocates hope to trim two or three billion dollars from this figure in the following fiscal period. This assumes no new large demands for foreign aid—and that is a big assumption. The 1949 budget will be written in the 1948 election year, and Republican leaders already are passing the word that they will be more generous next year in appropriating funds for reclamation projects and other domestic programs.

This means tax thinking will be overshadowed by budgets well in excess of $30,000,000,000 at least until June 30, 1949. The proposed 10.5 percent to 30 percent income tax cut, now on President Truman's desk, would reduce Federal revenues by $4,000,000,000, leaving only a modest surplus to trim the public debt and hedge against the possibility of lower revenues and international emergencies. The emphasis in Congress is shifting from tax relief to tax law revision, meaning redistribution of the tax burden.

Representative GEARHART is putting the finishing touches on an omnibus tax measure. It has developed into a much more ambitious piece of legislation than Mr. GEARHART expected. It proposes a nearly universal manufacturer's excise levy of 7 to 10 percent. This would make up revenues lost by a proposed increase in personal exemptions sufficient to excuse some 30,000,000 taxpayers from income taxes, Mr. GEARHART says.

This is a more radical shift than most Republicans favor. The Democrats already are up in arms, claiming it imposes greater burdens on low income earners. The Republicans generally favor an increase in excises, but hesitate to go as far as the Gearhart measure.

Republican ideas are mirrored in the naming of Roswell Magill to head a Ways and Means Committee tax study group.

Mr. Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, has been chairman of the privately financed committee on post-war tax study. He supported GOP plans for a 20 percent income tax cut across the board. His tax study group recommends higher excises, and suggests the possibility of a 5 percent retail sales tax, along with other major revisions in the tax law that would immediately benefit stockholders, families with taxable incomes above the first surtax bracket, and businesses that encounter temporary financial hardships.

The Magill committee, however, parts company with Mr. GEARHART on personal income taxes. It recommends several sets of income tax schedules, all of which would impose a higher initial tax rate than that provided in this year's GOP tax bill. And it recommends no increase in exemptions.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to expose the Republican tax-grab bill for the rich in its true light. It is obvious now and publicly admitted on Wall Street that Federal expenditures must remain high. So the answer to their tax burdens is to send their Wall Street lawyer, the New York banker, and the representative of the National Association of Manufacturers to sit in with the Committee on Ways and Means. There they are expected to study and advise the enactment of a sales tax to permit even greater income-tax cuts for the wealthy than provided by H. R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, on this ground alone the veto of H. R. 1 is more than justified. I have tried to point out the injustice of the Republican record on H. R. 1 and the program for a sales tax, which I shall oppose as long as I am able to speak. But there is another fallacy in Dr. Magill's approach to fiscal policy other than its manifest inequity. In his statement to the press following the organization meeting of his study committee, he said:

The problem of the Ways and Means Committee, as we understand it, is to devise a revenue system which contributes to the healthy functioning of the economy. * * * Some taxes are unstable in their revenue production, giving fat yields in times of great prosperity but meager yields when business activity falls even a little below its peak point.

Now, I think it fair to assume that Dr. Magill is speaking of the flexibility of revenues from the income tax when he stresses the importance of stability of the tax structure. This emphasis upon rigidity in Government revenues is a return to the economic philosophy of Adam Smith, the English economist of the eighteenth century. The stability in revenue was one of the canons of taxation proposed by Adam Smith. Of course, excise and sales taxes yield a more constant revenue than does the income tax, but it is now generally agreed

among fiscal experts that a flexible revenue system is to be desired. This makes it possible to increase revenue in periods of prosperity, when a surplus has a desirable economic effect. Furthermore, in periods of depression it reduces the tax burden and thus helps stimulate consumer purchasing power. While it is possible to vary tax rates to achieve the same results, it is quite clear, based on past experience, that Congress cannot always take action quickly enough to accomplish the change at the correct time. For this reason, most tax economists now agree that the tax structure should be designed in such a manner that the revenues will automatically increase in good times and decrease in bad times, without requiring action on the part of the Congress.

The least Dr. Magill can do, Mr. Speaker, if he is going to assume unto himself the responsibility for advising the Committee on Ways and Means, is to read something a bit more up to date than the Wealth of Nations, published by Adam Smith in 1776. This country, and thinking on what constitutes equitable and sound tax policy, have come a long way since then. I know the American people do not want to go back to the colonial days of excises and sales taxes, whatever Chairman KNUTSON, Dr. Magill, and Mr. Hanes may have up their sleeves.

H. R. 1, when considered by itself, is a tax bill designed to provide tax relief for the rich. Regardless of revenue requirements, the President would have had to abandon his conscience to sign this perverted legislation. When combined with the sales-tax drive now setting sail under Republican command, the result is a conspiracy to reduce income taxes upon the rich and to replace them with sales taxes upon the poor. Under such circumstances, there was no alternative to vetoing H. R. 1, and unless the House wants to endorse this scheme to put over a sales tax, it should vote to sustain the Presidential veto.

The President's Veto Message of H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, when I listened to the reading of the President's veto message of the tax bill, H. R. 1, there swept across my mind the following words of Alexis de Tocqueville, which I quote as applicable to the veto message and the use to which it was proposed to be put:

When the chief magistrate enters the list (for reelection) he borrows the strength of the government for his purpose. The cares of government dwindle for him into second-rate importance, and the success of his election is his first concern. All public negotiations, as well as laws, are to him nothing more than electioneering schemes; places become the reward of services rendered, not to the nation but to its chief; and the influence of the government, if not injurious to the country, is at least no longer beneficial to the community for which it was created.

The President says:

The right kind of tax reduction at the right time is an objective to which I am deeply committed.

Evidently the right time for the President is 1948. Why is 1947 not the right time? Does the President believe that the present annual income payments can continue indefinitely at current levels, under the present oppressive rates. His own Secretary of the Treasury told our Ways and Means Committee that it takes at least 12 months before a tax bill can become effective. If the President wants to wait until a depression is upon us, before he acts, then he is adopting a "too little, too late policy." The American people want tax reduction now, not later. Canada is giving her citizens an income tax reduction effective July 1, 1947, not next year. Although it was admitted in Canada that there were substantial inflationary pressures pushing prices and cost up, nevertheless tax reduction is deemed essential in Canada to relieve the people of "painful wartime levels of income tax," and to remove "a serious impediment to a full working effort and a brake upon the drive and initiative of men and women in all trades and classes." The President also states that H. R. 1 fails to give relief where it is needed most. He complains that a family with earnings of $2,500 would receive an increase of only 1.2 percent in the take-home pay and a family with earnings of $50,000 would receive an increase of 62.3 percent. This fallacy was fully exploded when H. R. 1 was considered. Since taxes take only 3.8 percent of the take-home pay of a family with a $2,500 income, even a complete exemption would increase its take-home pay very little.

In the case of a man with a $50,000 income, taxes take approximately 48 percent of his take-home pay, so any reduction in tax increases his take-home pay much more than the man with a $2,500 income. This was also true under the Democratic act of 1945. The man with the larger income received a larger take-home pay than the man with a small income.

The President's message is politics in its crudest form.

Our Times, Our Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, at the annual dinner of the New Jersey Bar Association last Saturday evening:

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the bench and bar of New Jersey, your ladies and your guests, I want you to know that one of the reasons I am imposed upon you tonight is by the persistence of my good friend, PARNELL THOMAS; he wouldn't take "No" for an answer. I am honored, of course, that you have thought it worth while to ask me to come to you tonight and I am not displeased that such an amiable occasion as this has occurred.

But I am a bit uneasy tonight as I am going to tread on what some people say is dangerous ground. I plan to discuss a subject on which perhaps the leading expert in the House of Representatives of the Congress is one of your own. I, of course, mean CHARLES EATON, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. All of you know that down in Washington we have a bipartisan foreign policy, that politics does truly stop at the water's edge. One of the architects of that policy is CHARLEY EATON.

I should like to talk to you tonight about world peace—about what the United States must do if we are to win the peace. I do not think it will be strange to you that, in a world with so much fear of the future and with so much economic want and insecurity in the present, I should come all the way from Washington to New Jersey to talk to you, not about labor bills or tax bills or the other immediate problems before the National Legislature, but about peace.

You and I have heard all our lives, from our boyhood on, that the Americans are a peace-loving people. That is true enough; but it is also true, I believe, that this virtue is not singly and solely resident in the citizens of the United States. All the people of the world have always wanted peace, they do so today and they always will. And yet one of the discouraging facts which I have had to accept during my lifetime is that this longing for peace by the people—and, yes, almost always by the government leaders of the world—is not enough. We still have wars.

I think we have wars because this desire for peace without more, without doing something, without affirmative action, not only does not prevent war; it is often so strong that it hampers, even paralyzes, intelligent preventive action until it is too late. There are, for instance, men today who are covering the length and breadth of America saying to our earnest and hopeful people, "You want peace; very well, I shall give you peace—all you have to do is follow me, believe in me, and that will be enough."

Some of these men know exactly what they are doing. Their allegiance is not, and never has been, to the United States. They believe in, they act for, a totalitarian doctrine which is espoused by a nation other than the United States. They are willing, consciously and clearly, to further the aims of that nation whether those aims agree with or are in direct conflict with the aims and aspirations of the United States and with its affirmative program for the peace of the world.

Others of these men are mountebanks; they are opportunists greedy for selfish power, ready and willing to be careless of the company they keep as they travel the road of their own petty ambitions. These are the fellow travelers—willing to sacrifice their country for their own prestige.

And there are other men who are not at all sure just what they want. Someone has called them the fellow wanderers. These travel aimlessly up and down the highways and the bypaths of the world's stream of history. They are the crystal gazers of the postwar world. Their crystal ball says that if they want something enough, without doing anything more, they will get it—even peace. And as they travel along the road to the future, if these fellow wanderers happen to fall in with the fellow travelers and with the other gang, the men who deliberately try to direct the traffic to totalitarianism, they are not too particular about associating with them. It never occurs to them that they

make strange bedfellows for they soon discover these are the men who tell them that they are right about that crystal ball. They say if this great Nation does nothing affirmative to get peace, nothing at all except to let other nations have their way, why, praise the Lord, there will be peace.

I feel sorry for these "fellow wanderers" until I see the harm that they do the United States by telling our people that "peace, it's wonderful, and you can have it free and for the asking." I am almost inclined to bitterness when I see how they are manipulated and used by hard-eyed, hard-headed men who know exactly what they are about. This does not mean that I would do anything to prevent their meanderings. The test of a theory, to paraphrase the late Justice Holmes, is its ability to get itself accepted in the free marketplace of ideas.

What has happened in the less than 2 years since World War II ended? There have been many heartbreaks and many frustrations in these 2 years. The great hopes which sprang from the signing at San Francisco of the United Nations Charter have not been advanced very far. There are an increasing number of thoughtful men who believe that the doctrine of power politics has once again come into its own. Certainly we cannot deny the enslavement of several of the smaller states and the domination of other satellite states by the use either of brute force or of the war of nerves. That same technique of the war of nerves which once raged so long in Europe from 1933 on until the Nazis were waging aggressive war against 11 nations is again being employed. If anything, its performance and execution is smoother even than the Nazi experiments.

Lock at the map of Europe today. A totalitarian puppet shoots down the planes of a friendly nation. In Hungary a head of government is driven into exile by the threat of a treason trial; it happened so fast that the totalitarian boss could exult that the plot was executed "before the United States could rub its eyes"—and he stated the fact correctly. In Bulgaria the leader of the opposition party was thrown into prison—he was not given the choice of exile. The sin of these two men was no more than that they looked westward with hopeful eyes. Poland, once led by the liberal Paderewski, has long been silent. The whispers spread that that great nation, Czechoslovakia, the home of such real democrats as Benes and the Masaryks, is next on the list. The largest political parties in France and Italy are Communist. Their present governments also look to the west, but I wonder how hopefully?

The whole map of Europe is changing before you can rub your eyes. Europe today is more susceptible to a war of nerves than in the heyday of Hitler. We talked glibly and knowingly of total war while we waged it. But only now are we beginning to see how really totally devastating that war was. The peoples of Europe, with their economy prostrate, with their social and political problems becoming more and more acute, are slowly sinking into the hopeless corrosion of despair. Their cities were bombed and shelled into rubble. But this bombing was not haphazard, it was coldly precise and scientific—its purpose was the destruction of factories, power plants, and transportation, and ultimately of the entire economy. It is a harsh but accurate tribute to our Air Forces that this policy was so successfully executed. Years of war also ruined many acres of tillable land; disuse and scorched-earth policies took a horrible toll.

Think of Europe not as a conglomeration of separate countries. Think of it, instead, as a mass of stricken people who have spent years at war and who 2 years later are even further from recovery than at war's end. It has been aptly said that the best Communist organizers are cold, hunger, and fear. This most efficient of all Communist cells is beginning to reap its reward. The father who watches his children die of malnutrition does not worry over the niceties of a political theory; the desperate youth beset by the stresses and strains of his lot with no prospect of improvement in the foreseeable future turns to anyone who offers hope, even if that hope be totalitarian violence.

What should the United States do? What can it do? Europe asks itself these same questions. As the London Economist, a well-informed and influential weekly, phrased it last month:

"The American's hand is all trumps; but will any of them ever be played? And for what purpose?"

I think we have already begun to answer the Economist's questions with what has come to be called the Truman doctrine in Greece. That policy must be extended to all of Europe; it must be done scientifically, hard-headedly, intelligently, but it must be extended and soon.

The policy toward Greece is not as new as the debate in Washington may have made some of you believe. Nor is it based exclusively on a negative anticommunism. It is simply the present-day extension of an American foreign policy which has existed from the earliest days of the Republic. It is a policy of sympathy with, and support of, peoples in quest of self-determination and freedom, and of nations striving to maintain their independence and free institutions against external aggressors. It descends in a direct line from the Monroe Doctrine. I have been told that President Monroe struck out Greece from his original message only because he thought it was beyond our capability at that time to protect nations outside of this hemisphere. It follows the open door in China, the self-deterr 'nation of Woodrow Wilson, the agreement at Yalta.

The judgment of Nuremberg has declared such acts of aggression an international crime. It has decreed that supremacy of law must be obeyed by individuals who act for nations, as well as by those nations. Only under law can peace endure and only if small nations are free from external aggression will peace endure. If there are any here who doubt that organized outside aggression is involved in the Greek situation I suggest that they take the time to read the majority report of the United Nations Commission which has recently finished its investigation of the Greek border incidents.

What is now under way in Greece is a portent of the shape of things to come in Europe. We Americans must face up to the fact that it is only the first item in the economic reconstruction of Europe. Without a free and stable Europe there can be neither peace nor civilization in the world. The United States has the sinews of strength. In cooperation with the United Nations it is up to us to prevent the impending collapse of western Europe.

Our experience of the past 2 years has taught us that pouring money into Europe merely to relieve distress is not enough. We must do it according to a blueprint of revival for the economy of Europe.

How will this program be organized? It is too early to give exact specifications. But it is already clear that aid on a country-to-country basis is not the way to do it. The entire fabric of European economy which has been dislocated for at least the past 15 years must be considered as a whole. The Secretary of State has emphasized that the countries of Europe must themselves take the initiative in drawing up a joint program; we cannot do it unilaterally. In his words, "this is the business of Europeans."

But it is possible to speculate even now on the broad outlines of such an integrated program. Our goal is to rebuild a self-supporting European economy. The first step should be to select those projects which strike directly at the bottlenecks blocking European trade and production. It is a commonplace that the coal of the Ruhr is one key to European prosperity. Only as the war recedes have we come to realize so clearly the vital function which the German economy has played in the past and must again do so in the future in the prosperity of Europe. There is no one here tonight, particularly among those of us who have lived through the two epochs of German aggression, who is not fearful of the revival of German industry. We just cannot afford to give Germany another chance at world domination; we have come to understand how readily the German mentality grasps at any opportunity. But we likewise cannot afford to let Europe stagnate, as it will if it is not bolstered by the coal and heavy industries of Germany. We can never relinquish our watch on the Rhine but the fact simply is that no longer can we leave Germany prostrate if there is to be any chance for Europe.

Another project which has high priority is the revival of European transportation. Anyone who has traveled along the Danubian plain can understand at a glance how important to transportation that river is. The railroads which were battered almost to extinction are also suffering from an almost complete dearth of rolling stock.

Despite our large food exports and the bumper American harvests since the war there is an acute shortage of food. America will not always have bumper crops and we cannot forever ship food to Europe. The acres of that continent must as quickly as possible have their over-all production increased. For this the farmers will need fertilizer, farm machinery and seed in large quantities.

Another project might well be currency reform. The American cigarette has, ironically enough, become the symbol of stability in the black markets of Europe for the simple reason that barter is today the accustomed means of trading. The nations have lost all faith in the currency of one another. Some method must be devised to finance intra-European trade on a stable and permanent basis.

The shape of this general program will probably show a change in the nature of our exports from consumer goods to heavy durable goods. We must, since we are humanitarians, continue for a while to feed Europe, but the emphasis sooner or later has to be placed on such things as steel and fertilizer and machinery if she is ever to rise to her feet.

I know that as I have talked to you tonight there is in your mind one question, Won't this cost a great deal of money? How much? The anwer is, Yes; of course, it will. I will not be less than candid. It will cost you, the taxpayers, a great deal of money.

I think it is a good investment. If we have learned nothing else during our lifetime, we should have learned—and I think most of us have—that just wishing for peace is not enough. We must work hard for it and we must pay for it. I am a Texan who knows the value of a dollar. From the time I was a boy I had to earn my own way, and I had to do it the hard way. There were no cushions for me. I am not its slave, but I do prize that dollar.

Whatever it costs, it will be little in comparison to World War II and practically nothing compared to World War III. After Pearl Harbor we spent $300,000,000,000. Vastly more important, we spent the lives of hundreds of thousands of our boys.

Our military strategists, the same men who led us to victory in World War II, have told me time and again that, if and when World War III comes, the first target will be the United States. They assure me the lessons of the past two wars have not been lost upon the military leaders of the world. The industrial resources and the productive know-how of the United States are to be destroyed as soon as war breaks out. Next time, if we are not lucky once again, the rubble will not be

in Berlin or Warsaw or Tokyo or Rotterdam. It will be Washington and Chicago, the aircraft plants of the west coast, the heavy industries of the Middle West, and the concentration of factories along the east coast.

This is the price we may well pay for failure now.

And so in the face of such a possible alternative I cannot help feel that what we spend now is the best investment we taxpayers will ever make. There is no man who can yet tell us with any degree of accuracy how much we will have to pay. Those who have been studying this rehabilitation have suggested that it will take many, many millions annually for the next several years if there is to be any real hope of making Europe self-sustaining.

There is clearly no other nation financially able to contribute a substantial part of that amount. I am personally convinced this means we must continue to carry heavy tax burdens for many years. World realities are rapidly making large tax reductions a hope for the future instead of the reality of the present.

I hope I have not unwittingly given the impression there is a choice. Perhaps some of you think there is, that once again we can withdraw into our isolationism, that we may if we wish concern ourselves only about domestic problems and let the rest of the world go hang. I wish it were as simple as that.

Let me talk to you for a moment solely in terms of enlightened selfishness, of intelligent conservatism. World War II has left us strong, the rest of the world weak. We are today the greatest creditor nation the world has ever known. But we cannot continue to be that great creditor nation unless we can put Europe in a position to pay for our goods. Since the war our exports abroad have risen terrifically. In 1946 we exported between fifteen and sixteen billion dollars of goods and services. It is estimated that during 1947 we will export even more, marking an all-time high. Before the war our exports were around $4,000,000,000 a year.

To show how much the world trade picture has changed, I cite you some figures on the exports of 33 countries. In June 1946, 42 percent of all this world trade consisted of exports from the United States. The comparable figure for our exports in 1936–38 was only 22 percent. At the same time our imports in June 1946 were 20 percent, as compared to 17 percent in 1936–38. The slow rate of increase of our imports as compared to the huge increase in our exports can mean only eventual disaster—unless we arrange for Europe to get dollar balances to pay for these exports.

It is difficult for anyone to comprehend just what $16,000,000,000 worth of goods means. Dean Acheson, our able Under Secretary of State who unfortunately will soon retire, recently described it as 1 month's work for each man and woman in the United States, 1 month's output from every farm, factory, and mine.

Unless we can find some way for increasing our imports, $8,000,000,000 in 1946, the countries of Europe will never find the dollar balances to pay us for our exports. When these exports dwindle the high national income we enjoy today will become a memory. Factories will close, the lists of our unemployed will grow and we will soon be faced at home with an economic situation resembling depression far more than the currently fashionable word "recession."

But there is no chance for Europe to pay us off by exporting to us until her economy gives her something to export. Her dollar balances are already dangerously low.

No, I do not think we have any real alternative.

This is the only path to peace. It is not a pleasant road, it is in truth a rocky one. I am sure there is no other. The soothsayers who are abroad in our land today would have you believe otherwise. Their way is the way of the wishing-well. All you have to do is do nothing, just let the totalitarians have their own way. I have told you that I despise this way of totalitarianism.

You and I know that the eyes of the peoples of stricken Europe are looking west. There is still hope in those eyes; not as much as during the war perhaps; but it is still there. We cannot fail them if only for the simple reason that in failing them we fail ourselves.

Relief for Flood Sufferers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the speedy, emergency action of the House of Representatives yesterday in providing relief for sufferers from the current floods deserves much commendation. Especially grateful are the flood sufferers in Missouri, Iowa, and Illinois, where 24,000 persons have had to leave their homes and where 1,000,000 acres of land are inundated.

Yesterday's unanimous approval by the House of H. R. 3792, authorizing an appropriation of $15,000,000 for use of War Department engineers in repairing, restoring, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works, climaxed a race against the rising floodwaters.

Within a few minutes after the House passed the authorizing legislation, it approved, upon motion of Chairman TABER, of New York, of the Appropriations Committee, an amendment to the pending deficiency appropriation bill to provide $12,000,000 immediately. Passage of the authorizing bill and follow-up appropriation occurred within 30 minutes.

Steps have been taken for expeditious action by the Senate, so that relief for the flood sufferers and the fight against the floods may go on with increased effort.

There have been 11 levee breaks in the Sny district of Pike, Adams, and Calhoun Counties of Illinois during the last few days. Five hundred men are working on the levee, piling bags of sand against the rising water. There have been many levee breaks on the Missouri River and also on the levees in southern Illinois.

Here is the chronology of speedy action by the Republican Congress in swinging to the relief of flood sufferers:

When the northern Illinois and Michigan floods occurred last spring, I asked the Army engineers how they were prepared in funds to cope with a major flood disaster which appeared to be in the offing. They told me they had no funds available.

On April 7 I introduced a bill to authorize $15,000,000 as precautionary action, and conferred with Speaker MARTIN and Majority Leader HALLECK; also Chairman DONDERO, of Michigan, of the House Public Works Committee.

Came the floods, taking their toll in lives and ruination of crops. Protective works sagged, and there were levee breaks. Emergency forces swung into action on the flood front.

Swift hearings were held by subcommittees of the House Public Works Committee last Tuesday. The committee, on Wednesday, approved, with amendments, H. R. 3792, and yesterday the House unanimously passed the bill and inserted the funds in the passing deficiency appropriation bill.

Flood sufferers especially, and the country generally, will appreciate this evidence that their Congress can and does act swiftly in an emergency. This action is in line with the record of the Republican Congress on legislation urgently requested by the people.

New Deal Fairy Tales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of June 16, 1947:

A FAIRY TALE FORMS

Very likely there is forming a new fairy tale that eventually will be accepted as history. In the next decade or two innocent youngsters and forgetful elders will be told that in the year 1947 there was in progress at Geneva, Switzerland, an international conference. It bade fair to open up the world channels of trade and increase prosperity. But at the crucial moment, the American Congress passed a wool tariff and that knocked the whole thing into a cocked hat.

It is only a few months ago that just such a distortion was being taught and accepted; a man with a beard persuaded the United States Senate to reject the League of Nations Covenant in 1919. This made the rest of the world so mad that in a few years peoples were tearing at each others' throats. It was the fault of the United States.

This newspaper has recorded its low opinion of the wisdom of raising wool tariffs. But one holding such an opinion does not need to lose all perspective as to the importance of the event.

Of course the wool action did not wreck the International Trade Conference; it was not an encouragement certainly but it did not wreck it. In articles which have appeared recently on this page Mr. Evans has told what makes the conference ineffective. It is the unwillingness of any of the nations assembled to give up its freedom of action, to surrender in any respect its sovereignty.

That sentiment was perfectly clear before a single delegate ever reached Geneva. The thing is implicit in the type of managed economies now so popular in Europe. What is being attempted in Great Britain and on the continent probably will not work at all. Certainly no signs of effectiveness have appeared. But it must be clear that even in the blueprint stage such schemes are not practical unless the managers have absolute authority within impregnable walls, authority to force compliance with their plans and directives internally and to shut out any external influence which might interfere with those plans. The managers must have absolute authority to control the movement of goods, funds, and people across their borders. They must always be able to lower the iron curtain.

Previous to 1914, when international trade flourished, nations did have an economic check on their freedom of action. That check was found in the gold standard. At any time any nation began to cut high jinks things began to happen to it as a result. The check was automatic.

There is no one now living who can remember when the gold standard was not being denounced because it did restrain freedom of action. We heard of mankind being crucified on a cross of gold and we heard fine words that finance should be the servant of man and not his master.

Well, the gold standard is gone—broken down, we hear. And now men are trying to find something to take its place. They set up an International Monetary Fund, and before it is well under way its managers predict trouble for it. Then they go to Geneva to talk of organizing free trade, apparently neglecting the fact that freedom and organization are antithetical. What they are really trying to do is to find some rules by which trade can proceed. But they can't do that either because no one wants to be bound by any rules, which is after all a very human failing.

There are two things necessary to trade. One is the desire of people to exchange goods, and that is present and always has been. The other is to find some common medium by which the exchanges can be effected. That is not present, but perhaps it would be sooner than anyone expected if only there were removed a lot of the controls and directives which prevent people from following their instincts.

Law Is a Good Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the commencement address of my colleague, Hon. KARL STEFAN, delivered June 6, 1947, before the law class of the National University School of Law:

Chancelor Barse, Dean Wainwright, members of the board of trustees and the faculty, and the graduating class of 1947 of the School of Law of National University, humility vies with pride as I come to talk to you. No man of my time has had a greater opportunity. No man has been more eager to take advantage of what has been tendered him. We shall try to crowd into the few minutes we meet together the realistic implications of entering into a legal career in 1947.

A few short months ago, National University chose to confer upon me the honorary degree of doctor of laws even as, this year, the brilliant and efficient Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, Mr. Lewis Deschler, has been accorded a similar distinction.

I know the excellent reputation and the proud tradition of National University's School of Law. Nebraska was but 2 years a State when this school was chartered. I am aware that Presidents Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Arthur, and Cleveland were ex officio chancelors of the university; and that Supreme Court Justices, Senators, judges of other high Federal courts, able members of the staff of the Attorney General of the United States, Judge Advocates General of the United States Army—and a large number of other illustrious men in the legal life of America served either on the university's board of trustees or in the classroom.

Yes, I know that from the small beginning in 1869 under Professor Wedgewood this university has truly become a national university—of the Nation, and for the Nation.

More than a score of professions have their practitioners among the membership of the House of Representatives. Yet, regardless of what activity each Member has pursued to earn his living prior to his election to Congress, he must essentially become in spirit a lawyer. No man can make laws without finally taking on the attitudes of a lawyer. It would not be possible to decide from year to year on the appropriations for the Federal judiciary without gaining a pretty thorough working knowledge of the rules and procedures of our Federal court system. Those of us who have been connected with the Inter-Parliamentary Union have had still further indoctrination into the law. In fact, those of us who have shared this latter experience have had on-the-spot teaching in comparative jurisprudence. We, too, have had the advantage of studying with competent professors.

So it is not as a layman speaking to professionals nor as an older man speaking to younger men who will follow a different profession in a different arena, but in attitude and spirit as a fellow man of law who has arrived at something like the same goal by a more devious route that I bring you my humble message of what I have perceived in my years in our common field.

In two verses of First Timothy—the twelfth verse of chapter 4 and the twelfth verse of chapter 6—there is to be found the best advice I know of for young lawyers just entering upon their careers. The elder Paul writes to the younger Timothy, saying:

"Let no man despise thy youth; but be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity."

And:

"Fight the good fight * * * whereunto thou art also called and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses."

Law is, indeed, a good profession. It must be kept so. There lies your immediate responsibility. It is at once your duty and your responsibility to serve the American people as lawyers with unpretentious dignity and high integrity. The American people have a historic respect for lawyers. Because of this respect, the States under the Articles of Confederation sent 31 lawyers to the Constitutional Convention, which had a total membership of 55. Blackstone's Commentaries were taught by Chancelor Wythe in William and Mary College before the Declaration of Independence, and among the Wythe pupils were the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Marshall, and Presidents Thomas Jefferson and James Monroe.

Law is a good profession. The practitioner can, if he will, make it a noble profession. Throughout the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century the American lawyer occupied one of the highest positions of respect in every community in which he lived. Perhaps these lawyers did not all preside at trials, but they were familiarly and respectfully addressed as "judges." They were respected for their advice and counsel. They were honored because of their ceaseless and intelligent devotion to civic duty.

A change has been gradually taking place in the thinking of the American people. It may be this change was due to the increasing mechanization and urbanization of the United States. Perhaps this change was due to the identification of lawyers with the men in cases which they defended. The stepped-up intensity of litigation in a more complex society seems to have shifted the anger of the loser from the man who won to the man who helped the winner win. The uninformed, not knowing that, in many instances, when justice appeared to miscarry, the law—not the lawyer—was at fault, made no effort to amend the faulty statute, but instead heaped abuse on the lawyer. If they could not strike at the integrity of the lawyer as an individual, they assailed his profession.

Terms such as "shyster," "ambulance chaser," and "mouthpiece" gained currency.

How did the legal profession fight this trend? They did fight to regain what they feared they might lose—the respect of the American people. They instituted codes of ethics within the profession. They tried to see to it that interlopers who used their skill for selfish ends rather than to further the ends of justice were disbarred. They sought to protect as well as to serve the public to counter its rising misconception of their profession and their place in their Nation.

The measures employed by the legal profession in its own behalf were well taken. They were successful in combating the disorganized assaults against its integrity. Even the lax thinking of the "roaring twenties" and loose practices of the prohibition era were overcome by the efforts of lawyers to educate the American people that men of law should be respected.

But the waves of circumstance overthrew these excellent plans, and to some degree defeated temporarily the efforts to elevate the law practice to higher levels.

Totalitarian dogma became a stumbling block to human progress. This was no accident. The Japanese war lords had planned for 40 years to conquer the world. Their plots were written down in the Tanaka Memorial. Hitler schemed world conquest in his prison cell in the early twenties and arrogantly put his schemes in words in Mein Kampf. Lenin, after completing the blueprints of Karl Marx in 1919, looked across the Atlantic with greedy eyes—and where his eyes were turned his propagandists were not slow to follow.

The Third Internationale in a little more than a decade mobilized in America and established their Communist elite corps in the key cities of this country of the constitution. The new expeditionary force seized upon sectional differences and class irritations already in existence here to destroy by sundering. It gave its whole attention and force to the destruction of the basic American concept of law and order. Thus, when success was almost in the grasp of farvisioned men in the legal profession seeking to elevate the law in the estimation of their fellow Americans, an unfortunate historic development came about. Uninformed, inspired criticism of the law confronted the men of law with a far more vicious peril—a planned assault on a score of fronts.

You know the methods that have been used against law and order. They are the familiar ones that have been positively identified with totalitarianism—the "fifth column," boring from within, the Trojan horse. They embrace direct ridicule, and the planting in the press and on the radio of distrust of the men who make our laws, the men who interpret our laws, the men who practice law, and the men who enforce the law, courts included.

Since the early thirties there has been one paramount issue before us—the Constitution of the United States.

The question has not been merely "Shall we change the Constitution by amendment?" but "Shall we overthrow and abandon—or keep the Constitution?" "Shall we desert a government of laws for a government by men?"

At first, the constitutional wreckers worked underground. They took advantage of depression-bred dissatisfaction to smear the profession of the law and the men who were outstanding in the practice of the profession. They jeered at the machinery of law, calling it antiquated, a relic of the eight-

eenth century, slow, doddering, and unresponsive to the needs of the people. When the anticonstitutional faction deemed that they had sufficiently undermined our legal structure, they launched their first direct offensive. But when they were assailed, these cowardly, cunning subversionists rushed to seek haven in the very Constitution they reviled.

That offensive had as its objective the destruction of the effectiveness of the Supreme Court of the United States. At the same time, unfortunately, came the proposition to increase the number of men on the Supreme Court bench from 9 to 15. This proposal could have been, if accepted, the entering wedge by which the popular trust in the Federal judiciary could have been split asunder. But, this move met unexpected resistance. Members of Congress laid aside partisan differences and remembered only that they were Americans charged with the defense of the Constitution.

The battle was historic. I recommend to you thorough study of the intimate history of that great clash of concepts.

The results of that battle are still in evidence. The open attempt to sabotage our Government, as you know, failed. It was followed by attempted party ejections. Some of the survivors of that purge are in Congress today. I can assure you they have never forgotten the Constitution was then, and is now, the paramount American issue.

When the anticonstitutionalists failed in trying to pack the Supreme Court, and were ousted in the attendant party purge, they once more went underground. The mask had been stripped from their cunning and deliberate purpose. It was necessary for them temporarily to retire until other crises had pushed the affair of the Supreme Court far back in the public memory. The anticonstitutionalists knew that public respect for the profession of law was powerful enough to defeat their purposes. Therefore, for the time being, a direct encounter was avoided.

But that did not mean the foes of the Constitution were idle. They were merely licking their wounds and preparing for an assault on a different sector. The planned campaign in the press and over the radio against law and lawyers was resumed with redoubled fury. The second front of the anticonstitutionalists consisted in an effort to establish government by decree. Of course the more radical subversionists took full advantage of this. Between 1936 and 1940 approximately as many Executive orders were issued yearly as there were major laws passed by Congress. The excuse was advanced that legislation by the normal, constitutional, congressional method was too slow to meet emergencies, and that these Executive orders were critical stopgap measures. The trouble was that most of the stopgap measures managed to survive even the emergencies for which they were presumably invoked.

Congress has not supinely accepted this invasion of its constitutional functions. It has fought to keep its functions; and, in every battle—whether that battle has been a skirmish or a major engagement—has been supported at the polls by an aroused electorate. The American people have backed Congress. They know Congress is their special instrument of control over their Government. They know they must have a Congress for the enactment of laws as provided for in the Constitution. Without Congress, there would be only one law—the law of the strongest, the law of the jungle.

With Congress refusing to go along with manufactured trends, the anticonstitutionalists took still another route to gain their devious ends. While continuing unabated their campaign of smearing Congress through ridicule of the legislative body as a whole, and attacking individual Members, they have sought to bypass Congress by the expedient of ignoring or evading constitutional enactments of Congress. This particular type of attack has been especially used during the period beginning with Pearl Harbor and extending to the present time.

It is no mere coincidence that cartoons depicting your Representatives as blundering, venal morons have appeared almost daily in the newspapers. We on the Hill do not live in ivory towers. We must—and we do—expect plenty of criticism. We anticipate without fear or rancor fair, constructive criticism. But this bitter drive which is aimed at us by the subversionists does not consist of humor or of honest criticism. It is of a piece with the cruel propaganda with which Hitler drove members of the Reichstag to suicide, and eventually broke the German people's confidence in representative government in the early days of Nazi ascendancy.

Your Congress does not seek to still just criticism. Fair criticism is a purifying and clarifying agent. Malevolent criticism aimed at destruction of constitutional processes is the dangerous variety of criticism.

Just how has Congress been bypassed? In section 7, article I of the Constitution, there is this phrase: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." Up to the advent of the Eightieth Congress, the manner in which earmarked funds were juggled within administrative agencies has been a national disgrace. Also, the practice according to which agencies have made original requests for appropriations purporting to be sufficient for the fiscal year, only to return later in the same fiscal year with pleas for supplemental appropriations has been reprehensible. Up to the Eightieth Congress, the spirit and the letter of appropriation acts passed by Congress have been violated. And this is but one of many instances of bypassing that have come to my attention in my special field of work in the Congress.

The outstanding area in which the Congress—the Senate in particular—has been bypassed is that of our foreign relations.

Section 2, article II of the Constitution says in part:

"He [the President] shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Major international commitments were made in mid-Atlantic in the summer of 1941. Was the Senate advised or consulted? It has since been revealed that matters other than military agreements were discussed at Casa Blanca. Where can we find reference to such treaties? Quebec, Cairo, Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam—all these have been the scenes of meetings in which have been charted the future course, in war and peace, of the United States. Your future, and mine, if you please. When have two-thirds of the Senate agreed to the results of these meetings? History has written the answer to the questions I have just asked. Not once has the Senate been given the opportunity to exercise its constitutional rights in regard to treaties rising out of these secret deals under the cloak of top secrets.

The Eightieth Congress has temporarily checked the bypassing tactics of the anti-Constitutionalists. However, we are under no illusions. We have checked such tactics; but, we have not halted the movement against our Constitution. If it follows its long-established pattern, and its totalitarian adherents religiously cling to it; the movement will retire from public demonstration, gather additional forces and strike in another direction. The American people, their Congress and, in particular, young lawyers graduating this year from law schools all over the country must not relax their vigilance. Eternal vigilance is the price of your liberty.

The Bible is my Blackstone when I say in the words of the twenty-seventh verse of the third chapter of the Gospel according to St. Mark:

"No man can enter into a strong man's house and spoil his goods, except he will first bind the strong man; and then he will spoil his goods."

Members of this graduating class: Yours is not a prosaic world. Yours is a world of conflict, of challenge, of opportunity calling for courage. When you leave your classrooms, you will become a part of the conflict; the challenge will be yours. Your opportunity in this arena is as great as your courage. The gage is before you. Pick it up. You can have as powerful an influence in the affairs of this Republic today as the young lawyers of the Constitutional Convention did in 1787. You can spearhead the return of your profession to a place of respect among your fellow Americans higher that it has ever before occupied. You can lead in the defense of the Constitution itself, protecting your country against division from within, as our armed forces have protected it against attacks from without. A shattered world must be rebuilt. An arrested human progress must be resparked. A future must be molded into an edifice of righteousness and freedom. Your generation must provide the architects.

May this class never forget what President George Washington said in his farewell address: "This Government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers uniting securely with energy, and continuing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and support."

God strengthen each and every one of you to make your task one of high endeavor, great nobility and glorious achievement in the paramount human service of preserving liberty and faith in divine guidance.

We Have Got To Stop This Mad Talk of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, among many editorials and statements which have recently come to my attention, I have selected one for insertion in the RECORD which appeared in the June 15 issue of the Chicago Sun, entitled "What To Do With Russia." I consider it to be fair, straightforward, and unbiased, and on a par with the statements of Secretary of State Marshall and of that other great military genius, General Eisenhower.

The concluding paragraph of the editorial reads as follows:

We have got to stop this mad talk of war. We have got to stop pursuing policies which have meaning only in terms of war.

The whole article is one of sound advice, and I sincerely hope it will be read by the membership of the House and the people generally. The editorial follows:

WHAT TO DO WITH RUSSIA

The Tribune began its second century by asking whether it would not be a good idea

to declare war on Russia right now. "Possibly we ought to destroy the Stalin government while we can," said the venerable champion of isolation and imperialism. "It could be done within 48 hours with terrifying results. * * * Is it the thing to do? Have we the stomach for it? We have the means."

We were quite sure the Tribune would get around to this position in time. In one sense it is a useful development, for it brings into the open what some people have been saying in private and what others have been secretly thinking. Here is the doctrine of the preventive war—naked, brutal, amoral, unconscionable.

Well, let's think about the preventive war. The Tribune says the American people are unable to reflect "realistically" upon it. We hold the people in higher esteem. We think they are able to reflect and able to be "realistic." They also have a Christian conscience and a set of moral values which would make it impossible for them to wage unprovoked war.

That is what the warmongers forget. That is what others forget when they advocate an anti-Russian foreign policy which makes sense only on terms of a preventive war. The fact is that we are precluded from waging such a war so long as we make any pretense of moral conduct. Our policy, therefore, must be based on other premises.

All this has nothing to do with being pro-Russian or anti-Russian. It has nothing to do with communism or capitalism. It has nothing to do with one's approval or disapproval of the policy Russia pursues in eastern Europe. It is solely a matter of human conscience. This Nation overwhelmingly resents Soviet power politics and the attempt to fasten minority rule on satellite states. But that does not give us the moral justification for aggressive war, and without moral justification we are lost.

For those who are not impressed by moral considerations, strong reasons of expediency point in the same direction. Russia, once a firm peace settlement has been made, offers a vast market for American goods. The preventive war would destroy that market and create new relief demands, not only in Russia but probably in all Europe as well.

Let us try to think calmly about Russia. It is said that her aggressive intentions are proved by her present course in eastern Europe. But she can argue plausibly that her present course is dictated by self-defense. That does not make it right, but it makes it understandable. As Walter Lippmann has pointed out, the drive to install puppet governments probably reflects the coming withdrawal of Soviet troops, rather than any advance.

Or it is said that communism by definition seeks world control. True enough, orthodox Marxism does envision an ultimate world society ruled by associated Communist Parties. But Russia long ago subordinated that misty goal to her own national aspirations. It could not be achieved, in any case, without world revolution. And against world revolution there is only one defense—a state of political and economic welfare superior to any that communism can offer.

Our choice, then, is not between a preventive war and retirement into hemispheric isolation. The preventive war is out because we cannot justify it to the national conscience. Isolation is out because it would leave the world in chaos. We have really only one course to follow—the patient working out of a peace settlement by compromise; the steady strengthening of the United Nations; the pursuit everywhere of policies that will build up economic welfare while leaving political choices to the peoples concerned.

We have got to stop this mad talk of war. We have got to stop pursuing policies which have meaning only in terms of war.

Lynching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Richmond, Calif., one of the growing industrial centers on San Francisco Bay, has expressed itself quite positively on the matter of lynching.

I am in receipt of a letter signed by C. A. Pitchford, city clerk, Richmond, Calif., in which he officially informs me that at a regular meeting of the city council held on Monday, June 2, 1947, the following resolution was adopted and ordered transmitted to me:

Whereas the whole Nation has been shocked at the travesty of justice which took place recently in Greenville, S. C., where 28 defendants, most of whom admitted complicity in the crime, were acquitted by an all-white jury of the charge of lynching Willie Earle, a Negro being held for trial; and

Whereas the postwar period has witnessed a rising tide of lynchings throughout the South, and none of the guilty parties has been brought to justice; and

Whereas the moral leadership of the United States in world affairs is undermined by this situation prevailing in the United States; and

Whereas it is generally recognized that State laws and State courts in the South are not able to put an end to the disgrace of lynching; and the Greenville case is conclusive proof of this fact; and

Whereas for many years, legislation has been pending in Congress to provide for prosecution by the Federal Government in such cases, but this legislation has not yet been enacted due to the opposition of selfish interests which profit from fomenting race hatred; and

Whereas it is the opinion of this city council that the time has come for our country to prove to the world that we mean what we say when we speak of such things as equality, justice, and democracy: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby urge President Truman, Congressman George P. Miller, and Senators Sheridan Downey and William F. Knowland to exert the greatest possible effort to see that Federal antilynching legislation is passed by Congress at the earliest possible moment, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the above individuals and to the press.

Chicago Federation of Reform Synagogues Asks Enactment of Taft-Ellender-Wagner General Housing Bill, S. 866

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, last year the Senate passed the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill; but a small minority in the House Committee on Banking and Currency filibustered the bill to death on this side.

The Senate again has passed S. 866, a similar if somewhat weaker and less desirable measure, and again a small minority in the House Committee on Banking and Currency is holding up all action.

The country needs and demands this legislation. The real-estate industry is for it. Most builders support it. Above all, the people support it.

Housing and high prices, according to opinion polls, are the two greatest problems before the American people. It is our duty and our responsibility to do everything we can to encourage housing construction.

This bill is not a public housing measure. It is a measure designed to help the people to help themselves toward more and better homes at lower cost.

Significant indeed is a resolution in support of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill adopted by the Chicago Federation of Reform Synagogues, and transmitted to me by my friend, Rabbi Phineas Smoller. The federation is the Chicago branch of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and represents the views of 10,000 families in Cook County, and supports the bill to support family unity.

In accordance with leave granted me, I insert the text of the resolution in the RECORD at this point:

Whereas the Chicago Federation of Reform Synagogues, the local agency of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, a religious body, in the traditions of our faith and practices looks upon the home as the foundation of our society and the cornerstone of man's moral and spiritual development; and

Whereas this moral and spiritual influence is seriously impaired without proper housing; and

Whereas there is now pending a bill in the Senate to deal favorably with the housing shortage on a national level which will create a permanent housing commission to advance the cause of providing more homes for our citizens; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Chicago Federation of Reform Synagogues, the local agency of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, urge its member congregations, their rabbis and lay leaders, to support the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill (S. 866) and that public notice be made of our endorsement of this bill and that active steps be taken by our constituency to communicate this resolve to our Senators and Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That the Chicago Federation of Reform Synagogues should cooperate locally with other organizations in the effort to secure passage of this bill and implementation of its provisions.

Is "Umtee" the Answer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks I include the following article by Alexander Stewart, which appeared in the Christian Century of May 28, 1947:

IS "UMTEE" THE ANSWER?

(By Alexander Stewart)

Down at Fort Knox, Ky., the Army is conducting what it calls the "Universal Military Training Experimental Unit." In this unit are 664 young Americans who make up the most highly publicized military project since Bikini. It is a sort of "pilot plant" set up on the assumption that Congress will enact a universal military training law, as requested by the President. When I visited the unit to study it, I discovered that its officers, training cadre and men are convinced to a man that it will not be long before Congress enacts a law which will enlarge this "Umtee" program to national size. Because that may occur and because the story of this unit constitutes a very effective factor in making it possible, the Fort Knox project deserves to receive far more careful and critical attention than its public relations officers have so far given it.

My military training was received back in 1918. What I saw at Fort Knox was certainly a far cry from that. Service and ex-service men of the recent war also say that it is superior in many ways to any other military camp they have seen. In simple honesty, one must say that the glowing picture currently being painted for the public in the newspapers and movies is not much overcolored. They describe the varnished barracks, the single-tier cots with bed lamps, the reading room, the chintz curtains, and even the modernistic music room. The very smell of the Umtee barracks is different from that of any other barracks, as the commanding general reminded a group of us who interviewed him.

I

If we must have universal military training, then by all means this is the kind of camps we should have for it. Physically, the Fort Knox camp is well adapted to its purpose, as is the special service program planned for recreational and avocational activities. I was impressed with the high caliber of the officers and their supporting cadre of training assistants, as well as of the young men who are being trained. Brig. Gen. John M. Devine, who commands the unit, is one of the finest high ranking Army officers I have ever met. The two chaplains, Protestant and Catholic, have been doing exceptionally good work. The information and educational program of the unit has been carefully thought out. My visit convinced me that here is the best in military training camps.

But I am not convinced that even the best in military training camps is good for 17- and 18-year-old boys. I agree with the senior chaplain of one of our 6 Army commands, who said to me: "Nobody can tell me that there is not a vast difference between young men living together in an Army camp, no matter how fine it may be, and young men living at home where they have all the helpful influences of family, church, home town girl acquaintances and school friends. Army life is unnatural and abnormal. It removes a boy from the normal situations and contacts of life that are so important for his moral and spiritual well-being."

Before visiting the Umtee unit, I had read glowing accounts of barracks life there and wondered if they were not too good to be true. I read that there was very little swearing, practically no questionable stories and no gambling. I read that the MP's had no trouble with Umtees, that bartenders in Louisville were refusing to sell liquor to them, and that the churches in Louisville are favorably impressed with their attitude toward religion. I set out to get the facts.

I asked one of the MP's on duty at the post whether the Umtees were any better behaved than other trainees at the fort. "No better at all," he replied. "We have as much trouble with the Umtees as with the others. Some of them go to other areas of the fort to get beer or to gamble." An Umtee explained to me how he and his buddies managed to have their fun on week-end overnight passes to Louisville. "We are supposed to register at the USO or have some place to stay with approved friends," he said. "But that is easy. We register at the USO and then go where we want to and spend the night. Sometimes we take our UMT triangle off our arms and then we can get away with anything and nobody is the wiser. We resent being called the 'lace pantie brigade.'"

I asked one bartender if he knew an Umtee when he saw one. He replied: "As long as he looks old enough, I treat them all alike. I don't know one from the other." Another bartender said he had never even heard of Umtees. A third said that he thought their insignia was in the form of a triangle, but that was all he knew. If the bartenders had agreed to cooperate by not selling liquor to Umtees, these three evidently were not much impressed with the importance of the agreement.

II

The releases of the Umtee public relations office place considerable stress on the trainees' attitude toward the church. I learned that during the first 4 weeks of camp, each boy was required to attend church or to attend a lecture on morality on Sundays. The first Sunday, all but one boy elected to go to church. After the first 4 weeks the picture changed. One of the chaplains sadly admitted to me that his church attendance immediately dropped off from a high of 425 to 37. Since then, he said, it has shown some improvement, but it is still far below the attendance reached when presence was compulsory. Still the impression is abroad that church attendance is high. Where did that impression originate?

The front page of the April 5 issue of the UMT Pioneer, the weekly issued by the public relations office, carried a very impressive picture of a trainee worshiping in a church, presumably on Easter Sunday. The picture is captioned: "Indeed typical of the Experimental Unit's religious activity, 17-year-old trainee James Beasley of Fort Smith, Ark., is pictured worshiping in a church of his own choosing in the city of Louisville, Ky." It is an inspiring picture—until one learns that the man who worked on it spent 8 hours locating a church with a good window where the sun would stream in at the right time of day, finding Easter lilies 5 weeks before Easter and getting stands for them, selecting photogenic trainees, taking six of them to Louisville on a bus, picking out two girls with wholesomely pretty faces who would be in the picture but not detract from its theme—the trainee. That is how the picture was contrived. "The result has paid good dividends," said an officer who is in position to know.

III

But discount the hocus-pocus of the public relations men and get down to brass tacks. The assumption is that this Fort Knox experiment is a fair sample of what military training will be like if it is adopted on a universal scale. This assumption is false because what is being done here at the brigade level could not be even remotely approached on a national scale.

In the first place, all the present trainees were especially chosen. They are not a cross section of American youth; they are a hand-picked lot. The same is true of the officers and training cadre of noncommissioned men. Bear in mind too that this unit of 664 men has a staff of 75 officers, 3 warrant officers and 482 enlisted cadre—a total of 560 men to supervise and train 664. There are enough line officers and noncoms to staff an ordinary regiment, and almost enough public relations and special service personnel for an entire army corps. "This is an experiment under ideal conditions that could not possibly be duplicated on a national scale," one officer said, "either from the standpoint of personnel or that of cost."

Consider the question of cost—in dollars. The War Department's estimate, made in January 1947, is that "approximately 1,000,000 men would be trained each year." If these 1,000,000 boys were to be trained along the lines being followed at Fort Knox, 833,330 officers and cadre would be needed. Their salaries and perquisites, conservatively estimated, would be $3,750,000,000 a year. Selective service would have to be maintained to conscript the men. That would require $50,000,000 a year. Pay for draftees at $30 a month for 6 months would amount to another $600,000,000. Equipment and maintenance and the additional cost for the second 6 months would be $1,500,000,000 more. So the total for training alone, exclusive of all other military costs, would be over $6,000,000,000. Tell that to an economy-minded Congress!

The thinking of all the persons connected with the experiment at Fort Knox seems to center on three arguments, each of which is of doubtful validity. First, it is maintained that "UMT would shorten war." This point is brought forward in sublime indifference to the statement of Secretary of War Patterson, as reported in the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune for September 3, 1946, and the statement of General Marshall in his last biennial report, that it would take 6 months to a year to mobilize the boys who have had military training and have returned to civilian life. How would that shorten a war that will be fought, if it is fought at all, with atomic weapons and other instruments of mass destruction?

Second, it is constantly repeated that "UMT would save life." The best answer to that is an old one. The Army and Navy Journal declared in an editorial on April 24, 1920, that "one of the commonest and weakest arguments advanced in the universal-training cause is that preparedness saves the lives of men. That statement is true only to a limited extent. The men of the German Army at the outbreak of the war were prepared for warfare yet they were killed in appalling numbers. The original British Expeditionary Force was unquestionably better prepared than any army that ever left England to engage in war. Von Tirpitz said of the enlisted personnel of that force that they were all sergeants, by which he meant that they were the finest and most experienced type of soldier. Yet they, too, were killed to an extent that shocked the world."

A third argument is that "we must be strong so that the UN may be strong, since that world body is only as strong as its members." If this is true, then all the other members of the UN must also be strong. Military strength is always comparative. If we conscript millions, others will do the same and nothing will be gained but a greater certainty of war. The only realistic road to peace is through the international abolition of conscription and disarmament. That road we are closing to ourselves and to the world when we take the course forecast at Fort Knox. It is too easy to forget that the present Umtees are volunteers, but that the policy which this experiment is used to support is conscription. Conscription will not only bring the training officers up against a vastly more difficult psychological problem, but it will confront the other nations of the world with the threat of more irresponsible use of our military might.

IV

The Fort Knox experiment is obviously helping the Army to work out plans for future Umtee units, if there are any such. But its second purpose is to sell universal military training to Congress and the public. This second aim should be looked at carefully.

Congress and the Nation ought to realize that they are in danger of being sold a bill of goods which will not stand up under examination. The selling is being done by the most advanced public-relations techniques. A press release section has prepared a story on each trainee and cadre man, which has been sent to home-town newspapers in 46 States. A second story is now being prepared on each. I understand that additional personnel is being procured to furnish the War Department with feature stories. Already releases of national news value are channeled through Washington to the news services, mat services, magazines, newsreels, and radio.

But this is only a beginning. The weekly UMT Pioneer goes to the family of every trainee and cadre men, to the Army ground forces, the War Department, the various Army posts, and a large number of civilian organizations. A radio section is constantly kept busy making transcriptions for release to local radio stations throughout the United States. A photographic section with a staff of three keeps up the flow of still and motion pictures. A visitor's and speaker's office looks after guests and provides speakers and speakers' material. It has been officially stated that "it is contemplated that the War Department Bureau of Public Relations will have two speakers in each State carrying the ball for UMT." An official publication reveals that the public-relations men are especially concerned to impress women. It says: "It is recognized that women's interest groups, the largest resistance group in the country, must be approached with special technique. It may be possible to have a WAC officer, trained in public relations, as a member of this office."

The public-relations officers have also prepared for members of the President's committee on universal military training a booklet and a brochure showing the work and progress of the unit. They hope, and not without reason, that through the President's committee their work will be publicized in Congress and all over the country. I wonder if they will remember to remind the President's committee that 10,000 school superintendents and administrators recently approved a resolution which said: "We urge that the Federal Congress in developing a plan to meet the security needs of our Nation will, as a substitute for universal military training, use existing civilian institutions in promoting programs with our youth which will result in their improved physical and mental health, scientific knowledge, civic responsibility, technical skills, and the development of other attributes in them that will lend strength and stability to our Nation."

When Will Congress Act in the Alarming Air-Crash Scandal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present for the consideration of the Congress a statement prepared by Joseph Leib relative to the air-crash situation. Mr. Leib knows plenty about this matter for it was he who brought about the investigation of Army and Navy air crashes by the Senate War Investigating Committee some years ago. He was responsible also for the revamping and extension of the wartime Army and Navy Air Safety Bureaus. It was his findings and reports that caused the indictment of several airplane companies and through his efforts came the demand for better and safer aircraft for our armed forces.

On Sunday, June 15, 1947, President Truman appointed a special committee to investigate the dangerous growth of recent crashes. This committee would find it worth their effort if they would read the following story:

WHEN WILL CONGRESS ACT IN THE ALARMING AIR-CRASH SCANDAL?

(By J. H. Leib)

When is the Government going to stop using aviation as a bureaucratic guinea pig and bring about the long-needed revamping in the administration of air-safety regulations? New legislation is necessary and urgent.

Everyone in the aviation industry knows that the Civil Aeronautics Board is staffed with inexperienced, blundering, incompetent officials. Let's look over the Civil Aeronautics Board, consisting of five members:

What does Chairman James M. Landis know about aviation? Yes, he was once head of the Harvard Law School and later ran the Federal Security Exchange Commission, but he has had no training in aviation.

Iswald Ryan (vice chairman) is a nice fellow, but his qualifications are in the legal profession.

Harllee Branch: A former newspaperman and politician, but with no aviation experience.

Josh Lee: Former United States Senator who blindly supported the New Deal. Roosevelt was politically indebted to him and paid him off with an appointment to the Civil Aeronautics Board, but chances are he has never been inside of a plane.

Clarence M. Young: A former vice president of Pan American, but with no technical knowledge in aviation.

None are career men in aviation.

However, these officials make all rules and regulations in the administration of the airplane industry.

Furthermore, their subordinates are of little value to them simply because they are not the top men in the trade.

Aviation is a highly technical field as everyone knows—and persons with skill and brains are gobbled up by the industry where the bulging pay envelopes are assembled. Consequently, the Government takes the left-overs and unfortunately their advice and assistance is of little consequence.

Let me cite an example of the utter futility of the present set-up within the Civil Aeronautics Board in connection with the recent tragic air crash in Maryland and in other States.

The Safety Bureau, as it is now called, is solely responsible and directly under the Civil Aeronautics Board. All investigations and findings of air crashes are signed by the Board. The certificate of air worthiness given to each airship is made out under the authority of the Board. Minimum safety standards are also determined by this Board—and let me repeat these men have no technical knowledge of an airship.

Think of it.

The men I have listed above who make up the Civil Aeronautics Board must therefore rely on their underlings for all of their decisions, or yield to pressure from operating air-line executives or manufacturers whose basic desire is to sell their products—come what may.

Is there any wonder that the Civil Aeronautics Board is so helplessly frustrated in the face of so many startling air crashes?

In the Maryland crash of recent date Chairman Landis is personally conducting the investigation, and he has full authority to admit whatever evidence he may so desire.

In other words what Mr. Landis is doing (and he knows nothing about planes) is actually investigating himself and what a comic tragedy that is, for didn't Board Chairman Landis authorize the certificate of air worthiness that permitted this ill-fated plane to take off.

Would anyone be so foolish as to say that Chairman Landis and his Board members, in complete charge of all crash investigations, would place the blame on their own shoulders even if the facts, beyond all doubt, pointed in that direction? Of course not. Chairman Landis must invent a new scapegoat—dead pilots, passengers, and the weather can't talk back.

How can the Government get a true picture of a crash unless the investigation is conducted and headed by technical men?

If you were to build a hospital would you place a layman at the head of your surgical department? If you did you would find in a short time that you had a slaughter house on your hands and not a hospital.

President Truman and the Congress should act quickly and clean out the Civil Aeronautics Board and staff it with men who know what they are doing.

Finally, it might be well to explain the history of this amazing scandal.

Some years ago Senator McCARRAN of Nevada and Congressman LEA of California introduced identical bills calling for the establishment of an independent aviation authority to be made up of five officials. An important stipulation was that the appointees would be required to show approximately 5 years' experience in the field.

But along came Louis Brownlow and Clinton Hester so-called Government reorganization experts who had sold President Roosevelt on a bill of goods to make a guinea pig out of aviation. With the help of the White House Mr. Hester was able to induce Congressman LEA to revamp his bill to include an Administrator of Civil Aeronautics who would have policing and executive powers—and to eliminate the experience clause. This bill became law.

Hester immediately became Administrator and soon after a reorganization order came from President Roosevelt completely putting the whole works under the authority of the Secretary of Commerce, with the proviso that the Board should exercise its functions independently. The Safety Board was abolished and its functions were transferred to the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The old Safety Board had 3 aviation experts who were of high caliber in their profession. When their jobs were abolished under the reorganization order they left the Government service because they would not take lesser jobs. The aviation world soon saw the ill effects of this action—and today it is becoming even more apparent.

In addition the office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics was left directly under the Secretary of Commerce.

Bureaucracy took over and is rampant throughout the agency.

The wording of the law, giving the Civil Aeronautics Board independence from the authority of the Secretary of Commerce, has become a long-standing joke in official circles. In the name of logic, how can a bureau be independent within the same department, especially in the Government.

Well, what has developed is nothing less than a demoralization of the entire set-up, staffed with incompetent and carefree individuals in whose hands rest a great deal of the present aircraft tragedies.

Finally, it is interesting to note that President Truman's private plane (DC–6) is being equipped with the latest radar safety devices known to man, such as instruments to detect mountainous terrains, locate heart of electrical storms, and other dangerous objects, etc. Instruments are being added that will give the pilot flying height in all kinds of weather, including new radio equipment.

Certainly, the American public should be entitled to the same consideration and protection as is now being given to the President.

Why doesn't the Civil Aeronautics Board demand that all passenger planes be equipped with the same radar devices as are now being installed in the White House plane?

When will the Congress assert itself to its responsibility to the welfare and safety of the American people? Or is life so cheap to those who roost in the Washington tower of babel?

Action is needed now.

Lewis Deschler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by George E. Reedy:

Today, I'd like to depart from the ordinary course of these broadcasts, to tell you about one of the most unusual men in Washington. He is a person whose name rarely, if ever, makes the headlines. Without him, however, our Government would break down in no time.

He is Lew Deschler, the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives. Visitors to the Chamber may have noticed him. He is the tall, heavy-set man who stands just to the right of the Speaker, and is frequently seen in heated confabs with him.

The visitors usually don't know that Lew Deschler has been in those heated confabs with seven of the Speakers of the House. And it is not just the usual custom of a quick conference on legislation. For, without those confabs, it is doubtful if any bill could pass.

Lew Deschler is the official Parliamentarian of the House. That is a title, that may mean very little to the average person unfamiliar with the legislative process. But it is a job whose importance is impossible to overestimate.

The rules of the House are full of "booby" traps. There are points of order, points of privilege, precedents, and codicils that date back to the First Congress. Every one must be neatly filed in his mind and available for use at any moment.

The average legislator doesn't have time to even begin to learn all these things. He must depend upon the enclyopedic memory of Lew Deschler, and, since the time of Speaker Nicholas Longworth, his first boss, he has never failed them.

The supreme tribute was paid to him this year when the National University conferred on him the degree of doctor of laws. For years he had been the official Parliamentarian for Democratic Speakers. SAM RAYBURN relied upon him absolutely—and made no bones about it. Many thought that when the Republicans came in Lew would go out.

But one of the first edicts laid down by Republican Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN was that Lew Deschler was worth his pay and then some. MARTIN decided that in an issue so important Lew's experience was needed by either a Republican or a Democratic House.

He has never regretted that decision. Lew has stood alongside the new Speaker, and calmly laid down the rules of parliamentary law, just as he did with the Democrats before him. And in all his time, nobody has ever been able to criticize a single bill, as improperly passed.

I'm paying this tribute to him, not just because he is good, but because Lew is the symbol of the things that make the American system work. He is a demonstration that our Government is a Government of laws that are beyond petty politics.

His decisions on the way in which our basic rules of society are formulated, have never been questioned. He is the proof that our Government is something above the men that compose it—something that is logical, workable, and worth while.

The main thing, however, is that I believe that more people should know about Lew Deschler. For, as the man who supplies the grease that keeps the gears of our democracy running, he deserves the wholehearted respect of the people of our Nation.

The Transplantability of the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Transplantability of the TVA," written by Dr. C. Herman Pritchett and published in the Iowa Law Review for January 1947.

Dr. Herman Pritchett is a professor of political science at the University of Chicago. Following his academic training, he held a number of responsible positions with the Social Science Research Council, through which he had extensive opportunity to study the problems raised by the public authority type of organization. He spent a number of years with the TVA, studying its organization and operation at first hand. His book, The Tennessee Valley Authority: A Study in Public Administration, which appeared in 1943, is an authoritative statement on this subject. In his more recent article, The Transplantability of the TVA, he brings to bear on the Missouri River Basin his accumulated experience and knowledge, and has made a valuable contribution to this important problem.

I have received an estimate from the Public Printer that the cost of printing the article in the RECORD will be $195.25.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRANSPLANTABILITY OF THE TVA

(By C. Herman Pritchett)

Most people are now prepared to admit that the Tennessee Valley Authority has been a success. It is hard to dispute that since 1933 the whole face of the region in which the TVA operates has been changed for the better. The energies of its streams have been harnessed, and their destructive potentialities largely brought under control. A "Great Lakes of the South" has been created with tremendous possibilities for recreational development of the area. The immense amounts of power made available at low rates have been responsible for new industries, new patterns of rural living. Educational and demonstration activities have resulted in materially transforming an exploitative agricultural system into one which conserves and promotes both natural resources and human values.

From one point of view, indeed, the TVA may have been too successful. One might well ask, after watching the scores of bills which have been dropped into the congressional hopper since 1933 seeking the creation of similar regional authorities for almost every river valley in the United States, whether the authority device had not been oversold.[1] How many of these bills, one may wonder, have been based on a real understanding of the authority plan? To how many people is the TVA more than a slogan? It was against an unthinking overenthusiasm for transplantation of the Tennessee Valley formula to other areas that Secretary Ickes was fulminating in 1944 when he warned that problems of regional development could not be solved "merely by lighting a candle and intoning, 'TVA, TVA, TVA.'"

THE TVA IDEA

First of all, it is necessary to understand the basic elements in the authority device. David E. Lilienthal considers that there are three essentials in the TVA idea: "(1) A Federal autonomous agency, with authority to make its decisions in the region; (2) responsibility to deal with resources, as a unified whole, clearly fixed in the regional agency, not divided among several centralized Federal agencies; (3) a policy, fixed by law, that the Federal regional agency work cooperatively with and through local and State agencies."[2]

The authority thus differs in several important ways from the regular pattern of Federal departmental administration. The basis on which departments are normally established is that of major purpose or function. They are given a single major function to perform, and a wide jurisdiction in which to perform it. Thus the Forest Service is responsible for carrying out its program of forestry development and protection over the entire Nation. The jurisdiction of a Federal major-purpose organizational unit may, of course, be less than Nation-wide, as in the case of the Bureau of Reclamation which operates only in the arid western half of the country, or the Bonneville Power Administration, which carries on its power-distribution operations in the Columbia River region. But in such instances the program is still a single-purpose one, with no responsibility for or control over other governmental programs affecting the same area.

The result of the functional plan of organization is that in each geographical area such action programs as the Federal Government may determine to undertake are in the hands of separate Federal bureaus or agencies, each concentrating upon its own field of specialized interest and sharing no responsibility for the program or operations of its neighbors, with whom, in fact, its relations may be those of competition or rivalry rather than cooperation. The approach to regional problems is thus uncoordinated, piecemeal, and segmented.

It is precisely this characteristic of the Federal Government's action programs in the Missouri Valley, which have been entrusted to such bitter antagonists as the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, that has led to the demand for a Missouri Valley Authority. For the regional authority reverses the normal departmental pattern. It is a multiple-purpose agency with jurisdiction limited to a particular geographical area, within which it has broad powers to plan and operate a comprehensive and unified program of resource development. Instead of land and water and forests and minerals and transportation being split up among

[1] The recent proposals are compared in Greenleaf, What Kind of a "Valley Authority"?, infra, at p. 339. See also Clark, Proposed "Valley Authority" Legislation (1946), 40 Am. Pol. Sci. Rev., 62–70.

[2] TVA: Democracy on the March (1944), 153.

separate agencies, each jealous of its own domain, the authority can include and interrelate all these elements in its plans. Thus it avoids and ignores the lines which regular Federal agencies must draw. If there are conflicting claims, as for water use, they can be adjusted within the confines of a single agency which has a responsibility to the region as a whole, and do not become a bone of contention over which separate administrative agencies quarrel.

But it is not only the multiple-purpose omnicompetent quality of the regional authority which distinguishes it from the regular Government agency. Equally important is the fact that the control and direction of the authority are exercised within the region, in contrast to the normal Washington-dominated bureaus. It is true that regional or field offices are customarily maintained by Federal bureaus, and that these locally-situated officials may well appreciate the special problems of their regions and seek to adapt the general national policies of their bureaus to local needs. But these officials are responsible to a bureau chief in Washington, and he takes orders from his department head, so that final decisions may be made on the basis of paper knowledge and by officials motivated principally by a desire to maintain nationally uniform procedures and policies.

A centralized Federal bureau is also going to have to fight inherited routines and patterns of thought if it makes significant use of other Federal agencies and local government institutions in the various regional programs which it administers. In contrast, a regional authority set up as a corporate entity, outside the regular departmental system, has an unusual opportunity to plan a development program on the basis of regional needs. Its center of gravity lies within the area. Free from departmental jealousies, preconceptions, and administrative routine, it can develop an original approach to the satisfaction of regional needs, can bring a wide variety of functions within the control of a single operating organization, and can hope to secure the cooperation of other public agencies in its program.

Although not one of the characteristics listed above by Lilienthal as an essential value of the authority idea, the adaptability of the regional authority to the administration of self-supporting enterprise functions has been amply demonstrated by TVA experience. Free from the traditions, limitations, and timidities of normal departmental programs and methods, the TVA has been able to build up a gigantic power system, to plan and construct distribution lines, to work out policies on rates, and in general to conduct a large-scale business operation with a considerable measure of managerial freedom. It is difficult to see how a successful operation of this sort could be conducted under more constrained circumstances.[3]

Such freedom, of course, brings its responsibilities as well as its opportunities. As an autonomous financial unit, separate from any other Government agency, the authority is forced to stand on its own financial feet and make its own decisions as to rates and other financial matters with the knowledge that it is directly responsible to Congress and to the public for maintaining a satisfactory financial record. Because financial tests can be applied to a Government operation which proceeds under these circumstances—tests which are not relevant to ordinary Government-spending activities—a public authority can be released from some of the financial controls which have to be applied to regulation Government agencies.

Another aspect of the TVA's administrative freedom has been its exemption from the regular civil-service laws. Operating simply under a requirement to select its employees on the basis of merit and efficiency, the TVA has made what is in many respects the best record in effective and nonpolitical personnel administration ever achieved by a Government agency in this country.

[3] See Pritchett, The Tennessee Valley Authority: A Study in Public Administration (1943).

THE MVA PROPOSALS

The principal legislative proposals for establishing an MVA seek to follow the pattern developed in the Tennessee region in all these respects. S. 555, as introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress by Senator MURRAY, provided for a unified approach to the planning, development, and control of the water resources of the Missouri Valley. It proposed to set up a single organization, which would see the whole valley as a single problem. No longer would separate departmental agencies be identified with separate sections of the valley, nor could the problems of the different sections be handled by the dubious method of establishing spheres of influence within which each agency would proceed according to its own predilections. The MVA would have to develop and place before Congress a plan which it could defend as constituting the most effective utilization and the fairest possible division of water resources among the various uses and sections that could be devised.

A unified approach would also be achieved in carrying out the plan as developed and approved, and in making the basic decisions with respect to water management and control. The unity typified by a single boss for a single valley might well be instrumental in fostering notions of cohesiveness and cooperation among the people of the different sections of the valley. The authority would furnish an object lesson in the values of taking a wider view, and supply a core around which larger regional loyalties could form. It would dramatize the fact that it is all one river, and that the factors which seem to divide the different sections of the valley are less significant than those which unite them.

The MVA plans have sought the goal of decentralized administration by such means as the provision in S. 555 requiring the MVA to "maintain its principal office at a convenient place in the territory in which its activities are conducted," working in and with the valley. The bill did not require that the three members of the MVA board should be residents of the area, an arrangement which would probably be undesirable since there is a national interest and responsibility involved. But it did set up an advisory committee to assist the board in the discharge of its duties, this committee to include nine persons resident in the area, three each representing the interests of agriculture, commerce, and labor. The committee was to meet in the area not less than once a year, and to receive the annual report of the board. The bill summarized the regional emphasis of the authority philosophy by directing the MVA to "utilize to the fullest possible extent the advice, assistance, and cooperation of the people of the region, and their public and private organizations—local and State. * * *."

Finally, S. 555 sought to give the MVA a degree of corporate administrative freedom sufficient to permit the effective handling of its enterprise functions and business responsibilities. It was not required to turn over all its revenues to the Treasury, but only the net proceeds from its operations after the deduction of all necessary expenses and the withholding of sums for operating capital and new construction. It was given the right to determine its own system of administrative accounts, permitted to have the final word with respect to expenditures questioned by the General Accounting Office, authorized to settle claims brought against it, and exempted from regular civil-service requirements.

The MVA plan has thus been founded on the proposition that the regional authority plan which has achieved such notable success in the Tennessee Valley can operate with equal effectiveness in the Missouri Valley. If this proposition is to be denied, it must be either on the ground that there were special circumstances in the TVA experience which enabled it to succeed there which are not present in the Missouri region, or conversely that duplicating the TVA in the Missouri Valley presents problems not previously met. Conclusions as to the transplantability of the TVA must take such considerations into account.

FACTORS FACILITATING TVA SUCCESS

The nontransferable factors which helped to promote TVA success are both personal and organizational in character. The influence of Pesident Roosevelt in the formative years of the TVA was incalculably great. It was his imagination which saw in Muscle Shoals not merely an opportunity for the Federal Government to do a kind turn for the people in one small section, but rather a chance to experiment with national planning for a complete river watershed on a scale that touches and gives life to all forms of human concerns. While his contacts with the Authority were intermittent, his interest and leadership constantly influenced the direction of the TVA program, dramatized its achievements, and heartened the organization to withstand the attacks made upon it.

Likewise the two great chairmen of the TVA Board, Arthur E. Morgan and David E. Lilienthal, though they proved to be mutually incompatible, made contributions of the greatest significance to the TVA. Morgan infused the organization with an idealism, a social consciousness, a resolute resistance to political influences. Lilienthal supplied a somewhat more practical and balanced idealism, a driving energy, an inventively fertile mind, and a compelling devotion to democratic and cooperative procedures. The MVA would be fortunate to find two such talents for its board of directors.

Time, place, and circumstance played an important role in the TVA record of achievement. The emergency conditions prevailing in 1933 had prepared the way for an experiment in planning, had made Congress willing to delegate unusual measures of responsibility to administrative agencies, and had relaxed the normal controls over expenditure of funds. Depression and poverty had dissolved the suspicions and the reluctance that might have been the regional reaction to the incursion of these Yankee-Greeks bearing gifts.

The TVA, with an area four-fifths the size of England stretched out through seven States and comprehending diverse conditions of climate, agriculture, economy, and social life, was nonetheless set in a relatively compact and manageable region, especially when compared with the sprawling mass of the Missouri Valley. In the Tennessee region comparatively few other Federal resource development agencies had established themselves on a firm basis. The Department of Agriculture was of course carrying on its agricultural and forestry programs there, and the Corps of Engineers was operating Wilson Dam, maintaining its navigation program, and getting the construction of Wheeler Dam under way. But there was no irrigation or reclamation work, no extensive Federal land holdings, few Indians. Thus the TVA's problem of working out its relations with other Federal agencies was a relatively uncomplicated one.

The fact that the TVA was the only regional authority on the scene likewise facilitated its operations. There was no problem of coordination with the possibly competing activities or demands of authorities in adjacent regions. Because of the fact that the TVA was the only one of its species, the President could spare the time necessary to advise on its policy or settle its internal disputes, Congress was willing to give it unusual privileges, and the departments did not object to yield-

ing some of their responsibilities to it. It had the advantages of being an only child.

FACTORS COMPLICATING MVA STATUS

A realistic appraisal of the factors relevant to the success of an MVA must immediately recognize that the political milieu is now much less favorable than that in which the TVA got its start. The political temper is, for the time being at least, unreceptive to plans for planning or increased governmental activity. There is no support from a dynamic President. The region involved is one which has been most vociferous in devotion to the neo-Republican doctrine of States' rights, and it has been easy to present the regional authority proposal as a threat to the existing Federal-State balance of power. The governors of the States in the area have sought to demonstrate that no change in prevailing patterns of Federal resource development programs is needed. The two Federal agencies most intimately concerned with water control in the area have concluded a treaty of alliance and mutual assistance aimed at preventing the establishment of an MVA.

Congress, moreover, is at present scarcely in the mood, even in the unlikely event that it would approve an MVA bill, to write into such legislation the types of freedom in program planning and in administration that aided so materially in the accomplishments of the TVA. Congress has, indeed, already passed the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945, under the restrictive provisions of which a corporate MVA would have to operate, so that much of the speed and flexibility of TVA administration would be simply unobtainable under present legislative standards.[4]

Apart from the changed political climate there are administrative considerations which would considerably complicate the operations of an MVA. It would be set down in a tremendous geographical area where many strong single-purpose Federal agencies, well-rooted in the region and strongly supported from Washington by department chiefs and influential Congressmen, are already operating. If a truly regional approach to the problems of resource development is to be worked out, the regional authority must mold these existing departmental programs into an integrated plan of operations. For this result a choice of tactics is available. As the saying goes, the MVA can either beat 'em or join 'em.

The former policy would require the ousting of these bureaus from the region, and assumption by the MVA of sole responsibility for administering the programs they now carry on—affecting reclamation, river development, navigation, power, the public lands, grazing, and other Federal-resource interests in the region. Such a step would probably have few advocates, not only because of its obvious political inexpediency, but also because of the scrapping of the special competence developed by the existing bureaus in their respective fields, and because of the challenge which such a regional subgovernment would constitute to the prevailing pattern of national administration.

But the policy of joining the MVA and the bureaus has its own drawbacks. Under such a plan, presumably the bureaus would continue with much the same functions, but would operate under the directives of the MVA in accordance with its over-all plan for the valley. This arrangement would make MVA principally a planning organization, its operating responsibilities perhaps being limited to the field of power distribution. Acting largely through others, would its program hit the Missouri Valley with the impact that was felt in the Tennessee Valley from the TVA program? And would these old, established agencies accept without a fight planning decisions of the MVA which might conflict with their own notions of river development?

The TVA experience demonstrates that it is possible for a regional agency to cooperate with single-purpose Federal bureaus, but there can be little doubt that such a program of cooperation would be harder to arrange under the conditions prevailing in the Missouri Valley. S. 555 appeared to leave the way open for the MVA to adopt either the solitary or the cooperative policy. By that bill the President was given power to transfer to the MVA all water-control projects in the valley. But on the other hand the Authority might, "if in its judgment the interests of economy and efficiency will be secured thereby," construct or operate any of the projects called for by the basic plan "through, or in conjunction with, other departments and agencies of the United States, or in conjunction with States or subdivisions or agencies thereof * * *." Thus the Authority could, if it chose, perform its channel-improvement work through the Army engineers, and carry on irrigation activities through the existing Bureau of Reclamation set-up.

Whether to beat 'em or to join 'em is not the only administrative dilemma posed by the MVA proposal. A problem which is perhaps even more difficult concerns the degree of independence from executive controls which the MVA can be permitted to enjoy. The TVA pattern calls for a status entirely outside the departmental system, control responsibilities being vested directly in the President. This characteristic has been regarded as one of the most important factors in preserving the regional integrity of the Authority and guaranteeing that regional considerations will dominate in the decisions of the agency. This is the heart of the decentralization—the grass-roots approach—about which Lilienthal has written so persuasively. Is there any reason why an MVA should not be given similar independence?

There is a reason why this suggestion tends to give pause to persons concerned with over-all Federal organization. The independence of the TVA could be dismissed as a special case, but if a second authority is set up on the same pattern, then it begins to become a habit—a habit which has some bad features. A regional authority free from departmental control either will or will not be effectively supervised by the President. If it is not supervised, then it constitutes an area of irresponsibility operating without executive control. It might be guided by pressures and opinions in the region, perhaps channeled through the advisory committee provided for by S. 555. But the authority would have a national as well as a regional responsibility. Congress might keep the MVA under its supervision, especially in connection with its budget and its major regional plans and projects, but administrative supervision and control are not tasks which Congress is fitted to perform.

On the other hand, if the President does undertake to discharge the responsibilities that fall upon him in connection with such an independent agency, the affairs of the MVA must compete with the thousands of other duties which make the Presidency the hopelessly overworked office that it now is. In the crowded budget of his time the President must find a few odd moments to consider the problems of a three-man board located, perhaps, in Omaha—not a fortunate situation for the development of effective administrative relationships.

If it is agreed that effective control by the President is impossible under such conditions, and if it is admitted that there must be some coordination of the work of an authority organized on a regional principle with the programs of the regular Federal operating departments across whose respective fields of jurisdiction it cuts, then some thought must be given to providing for such coordination at a level lower than that of the President's office. Particularly would this need seem to be urgent if additional authorities were set up, which might very well, in the pursuance of the interests of their respective regions, develop competitive or conflicting policies which would need prompt attention from a common superior. Former Secretary of the Interior Ickes took the position that in the absence of some central departmental control over regional authorities there would be "confusion and overlapping and headlong adventures in every direction without any central guidance or policy enforced upon all." His candidate for the agency to supply this central guidance was naturally the Department of the Interior. Others saw this suggestion as merely a tactic for capturing the entire development program.

Other suggestions have been heard that the head of a department not so directly concerned with operating programs in the watershed-development field, such as the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, might be in a better position to serve as a neutral coordinator. Or possibly coordination through a single department head is too simple, and consideration should be given to a more complicated arrangement, under which various Federal agencies would assume coordinating responsibilities for one particular function in each watershed. For example, the Federal Power Commission might be given responsibility over power rates and accounting, while the authority agricultural program would be cleared with the Department of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENTAL REFORM AS AN ALTERNATIVE

The more closely this organizational problem is examined, the more it appears that there is no entirely satisfactory method of blending omnicompetent regional organizations in with single-purpose units organized on a national basis. It may well be concluded that the case for the independent regional authority rests not so much on its own inherent strength as on departmental failure to integrate developmental programs at the regional level. It is consequently of the highest importance that every encouragement be given to improving departmental achievements along this line. William Pincus has recently suggested the possibility of gathering together on a national scale the scattered functions and activities concerned with natural resources development around the nucleus of the primary tools which Congress placed in the hands of the TVA—water use and control and incidental power development—and placing them in a revamped or new Federal department. Such an organization, Pincus suggests, "might avoid the necessity for exposing this Nation to all the problems which the uncoordinated development of various regions would inevitably create in both the administrative and economic fields."[5]

Another suggestion along this same line comes from Charles McKinley, who proposes that existing Federal water and power agencies could be brought together in a reconstituted Department of the Interior, thus preserving the traditional functional pattern of national administration, but with the department so set up as to give "as large a degree of regional autonomy to its field representatives as the need for regional variation, celerity of design and construction, and efficient operation might require."[6] Even under this plan, however, he recognizes that related regional functions would still be in the charge of other departments, such as the Department of Agriculture, so that a consistent and comprehensive regional program would still need to be fused and put into

[4] See Pritchett, The Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 (1946), 40 Am. Pol. Sci. Rev., 495–509.

[5] Shall We Have More TVA's? (1945), 5 Pub. Admin. Rev., 148–152.

[6] Federal Field Integration and the Valley Authority (1946), 6 Pub. Admin. Rev., 380.

effect against the familiar jurisdictional obstacles to cooperative administrative operations. Some approximation to common regional boundaries and bureau and departmental field headquarters would also be required.

Departmental reorganizations of this more heroic sort will be correspondingly hard to engineer, so that attention must also be given to experience with various coordinative devices employed under existing departmental arrangements.[7] But until the tide for departmental reform begins to run more strongly than it has in the past, the temptation to use the short-cut to regional integration offered by the Valley Authority will remain a strong one. As one advocate of the device has said: "The Valley Authority reaches into Washington and puts a big piece of the whole Federal Government right down into each regional area." It is the most readily available and immediately promising method of breaking through the compartmentalization of Federal resource development programs and producing a unified, dynamic attack on regional problems.

There is a price to be paid, however, for its speed and its concentration. There is a real chance that regional autonomy will be achieved at the expense of national control. Regional concentration can develop into a narrow sectionalism. The administrative freedom claimed for a regional authority may extend so far as to undercut executive responsibility. Ways must be found to prevent the Valley Authority from developing the defects of its virtues, for these are the real limits on the transplantability of the TVA.

Firmness Begins To Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the distinguished columnist, Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

FIRMNESS BEGINS TO PAY

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The Truman-Marshall policy toward Russia is beginning to work. The proof is the frenzied anti-American squawks being heard from Moscow.

Alexander Werth, able correspondent of the Manchester Guardian in Russia, speaks of the "real ferociousness * * * presently reserved for the United States."

Why? Simply Washington is blocking Soviet plans—and successfully. As Mr. Werth describes it:

"The Soviet Union is expecting its influence to be felt abroad increasingly * * * above all in conceptions of the 'new democracy,' planned economy, and so on * * *.

"There is a feeling that America is trying to do Russia down wherever she can—in China, Korea, Japan, Iran, the Middle East, and Turkey."

Therefore, "all the big guns of Russian propaganda are being turned on America—radio, press, magazines, theater, cinema, and satirical journals. A paper like 'Krokodil' has in fact two main themes for its jokes or denunciations—inefficiency inside Russia and American 'democracy' and imperialism."

This is good news. Quite obviously American opposition to the unlimited spread of that minority blight the Russians miscall democracy, took Moscow by surprise.

At first they simply refused to believe it. Then they became shrilly indignant. Now they are girding up their loins for an ideological struggle which they foresee is likely to be decisive.

A preliminary to further expansion was making the present Russian camp impregnable to diplomatic offensives from the outside.

The first step was a new flock of purges inside the Soviet Union proper.

Top officials in allegedly "sovereign" Union Republics were replaced. Insidious individualism that had crept into certain collective farms was ruthlessly erased.

Discontent was partially met by scrambling. Whole European groups were scattered around Siberia. Asiatics were brought into Europe—like the "kalmuks" who allegedly replaced the exiled Poles around Lwow University.

From the new conquered territories incorporated into the Soviet Union all dangerous elements were brutally eliminated.

Dissatisfaction in the satellite countries was something else because—as Mark Ethridge stated upon his return from the Greek border—the majority of the Balkan citizens oppose the Soviet Union and look to the United States for aid and protection. But since Soviet troops must one day withdraw from these countries, Moscow intends to leave them in the hands of devoted subservient groups. This explains the Hungarian coup.

When Hungarian Communists accused Prime Minister Ferenc Nagy of participation in an antidemocratic plot, what they really meant was planning for a day when Hungary would no longer be one of Moscow's "little dogs."

At present the Russians allow the Czechoslovaks virtually complete control of their own affairs. But if the non-Communist majority in the Prague Parliament were to decide to act in opposition to Moscow, the numerous Communists within and the Russians without that country would doubtless take drastic steps to bring the rebellious Czechoslovaks to heel.

Communist threats that the Soviets will never make peace with the present Christian peoples—social democratic government of Austria—indicate another form of Soviet pressure.

Outside the satellite and occupied territories, where the Russian writ does not run, the situation is more complicated. Having had no personal contact with the Red Army and the Red police, Italians and French are more susceptible to Moscow's anti-American propaganda. Here too the new Soviet tactics are revealed by the useful Mr. Werth. He writes:

"The creation of wide 'popular fronts' in Europe against American 'imperialism' has, it is felt, a better chance than the creation of similar popular fronts had against Nazi Germany in 1934."

Maybe so. But forewarned is forearmed. Since the Soviet idea is Communist participation in governments outside Red Army control, clearly it should be American policy throughout Europe to show up the real aims of these Communist Parties—and strive for their complete elimination.

Hence the rightness of the new policy in Greece and Turkey and the need for further support of the non-Communist majorities in France and Italy.

Once the Communist tentacles have withered and dropped off and the Communist area has been stabilized, the way will be open for new, more successful negotiations with Moscow. Probably not until then.

[7] Id., at 383.

The Labor Policy of the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Labor Policy of the Eightieth Congress," written by Reverend Father Benjamin L. Masse, and published in America for June 14, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LABOR POLICY OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

(By Benjamin L. Masse)

In another month or so Congress will pack its bags and start a welcome flight from the heat of Washington.

Most of the Republicans will leave with a sense of deep satisfaction, and if a few of them have their doubts, well, every party has it mavericks and why worry about them? The regulars did the job they were elected to do, didn't they? Or tried hard, anyway, and would have done it had not a Democratic President, who missed the meaning of last November's election, chanced to occupy the White House.

That meaning was clear enough. The electorate gave the Republicans a mandate to discipline labor, to reduce taxes, to cut Government spending to the bone. They wanted all the devils of the New Deal exorcised, and no more projects to make a sturdy people dependent on their easy-going Uncle Sam. As the majority report of the House Appropriations Committee put it, explaining a heavy slash in the Department of Agriculture's budget for fiscal 1948:

"As we give thought to such a problem as soil conservation and to the saving of the surface of our land from the influences of erosion, we also have the responsibility of pursuing those policies that will prevent the erosion of that rugged individual character which was made the American farmer the greatest producer of agricultural commodities in any time or generation in the world's history."

That's the spirit, say the Republicans. That's the sort of thing the people voted for last November and that is what we have done our best to give them—rigorous pruning of Federal expenditures, stiff labor laws, a healthy cut in personal-income taxes, no new programs, like health insurance and liberalization of the Social Security Act, to pamper and demoralize a rugged people.

To these sentiments a minority of Democrats, almost all from the South (which needed the New Deal so badly and profited so handsomely from it) utter a heartfelt "Amen."

Now the present writer wouldn't know what the voters wanted last November, or exactly what sort of mandate they gave the Republicans. There are so many voters, even in a country which does not take its off-year elections too strenuously, that even the experts have trouble reading the popular mind. Some say one thing and some say another; so that everybody ought to feel sorry for Messrs. Hannegan and Reese, the respective chairmen of the Democratic and Republican national committees, who must guess right or stand to lose their attractive jobs. Not to mention President Truman, of course, and Senator TAFT, and the dozen other prominent Republicans who, it goes

without saying, with the exception of Minnesota's youthful Harold Stassen, are not candidates for the Republican nomination in 1948.

Anyhow, most of my friends and acquaintances who voted Republican last fall really are not quite sure why they did so; except, naturally, like many other people, they were tired of wartime restrictions and very, very angry over the meat famine last summer. A few of them were disgusted, too, with our appeasement of the Russian dictator and thought the Republicans, despite our bipartisan approach to foreign affairs, might do better. But then this latter consideration has nothing to do with our domestic policy, which remains the only thing setting Republicans off from Democrats (from some Democrats, that is) and vice versa.

If an amateur can risk an opinion about this involved matter, I should like to suggest that the voters last fall gave nobody a mandate to do anything really drastic to organized labor. Some of them did, of course; businessmen who have never honestly accepted unionism and who donated generously to campaign funds; many farmers, especially commercial farmers, who live in fear lest their hired hands be organized; professional people and the comfortable upper middle class who share the economic outlook of conservative industry. Many others, it is true, felt that a few union abuses—jurisdictional strikes; certain types of secondary boycott; violations of the rights of rank and file members—called for legislative remedies. And probably a majority of the voters wanted some kind of machinery that would facilitate the settlement of disputes between labor and management and lessen the possibility of "paralysis" strikes. But it is certain that the public never voted for the Hartley bill; and very dubious that it wanted anything so stiff as the Taft bill.

Look at the record of State legislation over the past few years. Is or is it not politically significant that the frankly drastic laws have emanated mostly from States that are agricultural or lie south of the Mason-Dixon line? Here, for instance, is a list of States which have outlawed the closed shop, either by statute or by constitutional change: South Dakota, Alabama, Florida, North Carolina, Nebraska, Delaware, Georgia, Iowa, Texas, Virginia, and Tennessee. Now the total vote cast by these States in the 1944 Presidential election was 6,081,733, which was roughly one-eighth of all the votes cast. If the voters of the country want such legislation, if they gave a mandate to the Republicans in 1946, why haven't heavily populated and industrialized States like Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, Illinois and Michigan hopped on the anti-labor bandwagon? And haven't the politicians heard about the effort to ban the closed shop in California, which failed so dismally?

But let us put political considerations aside and consider a question of principle: has the labor policy of the Eightieth Congress reflected a proper concern for the welfare of the Nation's working people and an understanding of their present situation?

All during the lengthy debates in the House and Senate on the Hartley and Taft bills, not even the most anti-labor Congressman dared to suggest that unions were not helpful and necessary to the material welfare of American workers. The argument was that past Congresses had stacked the cards in favor of labor, that management had now become the underdog and that, consequently, justice called for a reduction in the power of national unions and their leaders. It was asserted, too, that unions, unlike corporations, were not subject to any legal restrictions, despite the fact that they exercised enormous power and could shut down entire industries and starve whole communities. This unrestricted power, it was claimed, had begotten such excesses against employers, the public, and even rank-and-file workers that Congress was now obliged to curb it. The general purpose, then, of the Hartley-Taft bill is to right the balance between labor and management by weakening unions, the supposition being that collective bargaining has failed and led to strikes because management is presently too feeble to uphold its side of the argument.

It should be admitted that some segments of organized labor have, indeed, been guilty of abuses not now covered by any law, and that there is no immediate hope of self-reform. Examples of such abuses are the jurisdictional strike and the secondary boycott to compel and employer to violate the law. There have been abuses, also, of the rights of union members which, under present law, can be corrected only with the greatest difficulty. The Congress has the right, then, and possibly the duty, to seek a legislative remedy for these abuses. No one can quarrel with that.

But most other abuses of labor, real of fanciful, are already covered by law. There is no State in the Union, for instance, which legally permits coercion of its citizens, and violence and racketeering, or which allows mobs to block public thoroughfares and the entrances of buildings. To correct such excesses no Federal law is needed, only the effective enforcement of local laws by State officials; and it has been mildly disconcerting these past months to see men who for years took their stand against the New Deal on the ground of States' rights suddenly rise in the Eightieth Congress and demand an extension of Federal activity in the matter of organized labor. Are they more bitterly opposed, one wonders, to organized labor than they are to growing centralization of power in Washington?

It is a long step, furthermore, from necessary reforms to legislation consciously designed to weaken organized labor in its legitimate activities. Where small businesses are concerned, unions are clearly stronger than employers, although even in this case the disparity is frequently not so great as is popularly imagined. There are a number of instances of small businesses banding together to deal as a unit with a strong union, and when this happens, the difference in strength largely disappears. Even when it remains, many small businesses are helped, not hurt, by a strong union. The union solves a serious problem which they have seldom been able to solve themselves—the problem of unfair, cutthroat competition. Where such competition plagues an industry, the union brings a measure of order and stability—to the benefit of all concerned, including the general public.

Where the unions face big business the advantage still lies with the corporate giants which dominate the American economy. The reason for the duration and partial success of last year's strikes was not the strength of the unions as contrasted with the weakness of corporate management, but the growing equality between the two groups. The unions are more nearly able than was formerly the case to stand toe to toe with management and slug it out. But the heavy battalions are still on the side of big business. The United Automobile Workers certainly could not stand, either now or in the near future, another long strike at General Motors, but GM probably could. We had industrial peace this spring largely because the unions, still licking their wounds from the 1946 battles, were happy to take the best offer they could get. Their case for wage increases was exceptionally good, but they lacked the economic power to make it prevail.

In all this facile talk about the huge power of labor and the relative weakness of industry, people overlook an obvious but tremendously significant fact, namely, that all during the time when the unions were supposed to be browbeating the corporations, American industry reported the lushest earnings in its history. At no time have most corporations been in a stronger financial position than they are right now—12 years after the passage of the hated Wagner Act. If we make it easier by law for employers to resist union demands and break strikes, will the cause of social justice be promoted?

That is our objective, after all. Of course, we want industrial peace too, but peace can never be our supreme goal. The reason was given long ago by St. Augustine, who said that peace is the work of justice. Let us not confuse peace with the mere absence of strife. There was no industrial warfare in Nazi Germany; there is none in Soviet Russia. But is that the kind of industrial peace we want here?

The right way to industrial peace lies partly through collective bargaining on a plane of equality and partnership, and partly through State programs which assist workers to satisfy needs that cannot be otherwise met. By this test, the labor policy of the present Congress has been gravely deficient. The Taft bill reflects more the class-conscious outlook of anti-labor employers than it does a concern with successful collective bargaining. And in no instance has the 80th Congress approved legislation aimed at helping American workers to meet their personal and family obligations. The minimum wage remains at 40 cents an hour; the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill is moribund; nothing is being done about health insurance or necessary changes in the Social Security Act. The Labor Department has been starved for appropriations, with the result that child labor is on the increase and the National Labor Relations Board has a backlog of more than 5,000 cases. And so the dismal story goes.

Let us waive the question of political expediency. On the higher level of principle, the labor policy of the Eightieth Congress badly misses the goal. It will not foster social justice. And neither will it bring us industrial peace.

Reparations to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

REPARATIONS TO EUROPE

The above caption is borrowed from a cheery item in the current London Tribune, a weekly organ of the British Labor Party's extreme left wingers.

The Tribune breaks the glad news to its readers that President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall are planning to shovel a lot more money into Europe.

This money, the London weekly continues, will never have to be paid back, and will have to be distributed "without discrimination"—meaning to Russia and its satellites as well as to non-Communist countries.

Secretary Marshall has decided, it appears, that the United States for its own good "must pay reparations to Europe," just as if we had lost a war with Europe.

When you examine what the London Tribune is talking about, it begins to look as if we did indeed lose a war somewhere recently, though most of us still think we won one.

The subject so frankly discussed by the British leftist paper is the Truman-Marshall plan for the economic restoration of Europe, insofar as that plan has yet been revealed to the American people, who, as the Great Brain sees them, are too childish to be given bad news all in one dose.

When Mr. Truman called last March for $400,000,000 worth of loans to stop Russian communism in Greece and Turkey, it was delicately hinted that this might not be the last of such requests. That was an understatement if there ever was one.

It is now coming out gradually that Messrs. Truman and Marshall want to bribe all of western Europe not to go Red, and also want to pour more money and supplies into the Russian satellites and maybe Russia itself so as to cool off the Kremlin's present redhot hatred for us.

BIG MONEY FOR EUROPE

In return, the Truman-Marshall hope is that the western European nations at least, will get together in some sort of economic union. That would mean a knocking down of tariff barriers between these small countries, so that trade could be loosened up and recovery from the war's ravages be hastened.

This united states of Europe idea has looked good to us for a long time, it being well known that many of Europe's troubles and wars have sprung from its chronic division into a lot of little nations none of which is self-sufficient.

But it seems that the United States taxpayer is to finance the bulk of the show.

The cost will be considerable, as thus far estimated. Benjamin V. Cohen, veteran New Deal brain truster, guesses the bill will come to twenty-four billions (not millions), of which the United States would put up twelve to fifteen billions over the next 3 or 4 years. A British estimate sets the figure at twenty-five billions in 5 years, and gaily earmarks this entire sum for the United States taxpayer.

The theory underlying the plan is that, if we finance Europe back to solvency and productivity, communism will be stopped there and we'll also establish a lot of good customers for our own products.

This is a pretty theory; but will it work out that way?

DRAINING OUR OWN COUNTRY

What guaranty have we that the job will be finished in 3 or 4 years at a cost of only $25,000,000,000 or so? Can Messrs. Truman and Marshall assure us that our European beneficiaries won't just take to leaning on their shovels like so many prewar WPAers as long as Uncle Sam keeps dishing it out?

We should all realize, too, that it will not be money alone that we'll be shipping to Europe. It will be tractors, fertilizers, farm tools, railroad equipment, trucks, etc., etc., bought with the money we'll be "loaning" to Europe.

That means we shall be draining real wealth out of our own country—wealth of a kind which we could use, and of a kind that doesn't come back once you have parted with it in this fashion. How long can we stand such a drain without busting our own economy?

We should understand, too, that there will be no security for these "loans," and that many of the New Deal do-gooders and Red sympathizers who witched up UNRRA and similar activities will at least try to cut themselves in on this new peacetime lend-lease project.

All we have to say at this time on this subject is, thank heaven Congress has the last word in the matter; also, that we hope all United States taxpayers will give these "reparations to Europe" their most serious thought and their severest scrutiny.

Illinois—An Empire Within Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an advertisement appearing in one of today's papers headed "Illinois—an empire within itself."

The advertisement carries a brief résumé of outstanding facts about the great State of Illinois, and while it does not and cannot list all the advantages that it possesses, nor all the bountiful blessings of the great city of Chicago, I take pleasure in inserting it in the RECORD feeling it may be of interest to many people:

ILLINOIS—AN EMPIRE WITHIN ITSELF

Illinois, broad Prairie State on the banks of the Great Lakes, endowed by nature with fertile plains and great natural resources. The ingenuity and perseverance of her people made her a leader in manufacturing, agriculture, and allied industries, transportation, mining.

Illinois, where Abraham Lincoln spent his young manhood in the practice of law, in Springfield, leaving to assume the leadership of his country in the War Between the States, returning only to find his final resting place in Oak Ridge Cemetery.

Illinois, in the Grain Belt that feeds the Nation. Since her early days, high in agricultural output, now ranking first in production of soybeans, second in corn, third in oats, near the top in hogs and dairy products.

Illinois, an important transportation center for the United States, Chicago is the largest rail center, the busiest long-flight airport city, and the fourth busiest Great Lakes port. This State, as a whole, is third in railroad-track mileage. The Wabash, Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers are much-traveled water routes.

Illinois, with a rich yield of minerals from her soil, more than half the State is underlaid with bituminous coal. First in production of peat, new oil pools are still being discovered and developed, and her sand and gravel business is second in the Nation.

Illinois, proud of Chicago, one of the biggest industrial centers of the world, whose business district was almost completely destroyed by the great fire of 1871, reputedly started by Mrs. O'Leary's cow kicking over a lantern. Chicago has rebuilt itself to become the largest city in the interior of the continent, second in the country, and third in the world.

Illinois, third in United States manufacturing, with Chicago first in slaughtering and meat packing, and, with its adjoining cities, second in iron and steel production.

Illinois, where public education was encouraged as early as 1787, now supports a State university, in addition to five teachers colleges and normal schools, and the University of Chicago is conducting an experiment in progressive education in higher institutions of learning.

When Illinois was first glimpsed by members of the expedition of Marquette and Joliet, as they made their hazardous way in canoes up the Illinois River, one of the explorers described it by saying, "We have glimpsed nothing like this land we enter for fertility of soil; its prairies and its woods; its cattle, elk, deer, wildcats, swan, ducks, parakeets, and even beaver." The people of Illinois have made full use of all these resources; the rich plains of Illinois (it is the third most level State in the Nation) were early put under the plow, making it the leading agricultural State in the Nation by 1870. Cyrus McCormick, seeing that the best market for his new reaper lay in the agricultural Middle West, located in Chicago, a forerunner of the industrialists who were to make Chicago a manufacturing and trading center of the Mississippi Valley and, indeed, of the whole world. Chicago's site on Lake Michigan and proximity to other water routes also contributed heavily to her phenomenal development to a leading world city from her incorporation in 1833 as a village of 150 people. We citizens of Illinois appreciate this opportunity afforded us by the Hecht Co. to say that our greatest desire is that the friendly spirit displayed by the people from all the distant sections of our country, and of all races and creeds, working together here in Washington in close cooperation, may be carried to the halls of the United Nations to help further peace and democracy throughout the world.

CALVIN JOHNSON,
President, Illinois State Society.

Popular Desire and Sound Economics Back Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread concern over the fate of the tax-reduction bill passed by the Eightieth Congress, I am inserting herewith an editorial from the Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News. The sentiment expressed is representative of the thought of the district I have the honor to represent and reflects accurately, I believe, the feeling of the entire country.

The editorial, published under date of June 15, is as follows:

POPULAR DESIRE AND SOUND ECONOMICS BACK TAX CUT

This fiscal year, which closes at the end of the present month, will be the first since 1930 in which the Federal Government's income has equalled or exceeded its expenditures.

This is not due to any remarkable economy, however. The public is still paying taxes at nearly the wartime level. Congress has passed a bill which if it becomes law will help correct that situation and leave the people more of their own money to spend in their own way.

This surely seems sound and reasonable. Yet President Truman has opposed the tax cut, which ranges from 30 percent in the lowest bracket to 10.5 percent in the top bracket.

It is possible that the President will interpose a veto, and also possible that the necessary two-thirds vote required to override a veto could not be obtained in both Houses of Congress. Why should the Chief Executive be against the tax cut?

He has offered at least two reasons, both purporting to have an economic rather than a political basis. One is that by maintaining present tax rates a substantial surplus will be left in the next fiscal year to apply on reduction of the national debt.

If we also assume, as Mr. Truman most emphatically does, that his $37,500,000,000 budget cannot be cut, objection to tax cutting carries some weight. But the Republican

majority, with the aid of a number of economy-minded Democrats, aims at a substantial cut below that thirty-seven and one-half billion figure.

The Government spenders have raised a great outcry about that. Mr. Truman thus steps from the lofty pedestal of stern debt reduction and appears as an ally of the tax-eaters, who want to take 23 percent of the people's income.

The second argument Mr. Truman has advanced is that if more money is left in the pockets of the populace after the tax collector is through they will buy more goods, boost prices, promote inflation. On that score Chairman KNUTSON of the House Ways and Means Committee asks:

If there is merit in the President's contention, how does it come that he has repeatedly urged wage increases, which also give the wage earner more money to spend? Where is the difference?

Also, this should be remembered. Excessive taxation discourages risking money in new ventures which could increase taxable income. After World War I tax cuts were largely offset by this type of new yield.

The people want this tax reduction. With a greatly needed cut in Federal expenditures it should still leave money for debt reduction. The day of the Hopkins' theme, "spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect," is over.

Off the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial by C. F. Byrns which appeared in the Southwest American of June 5, 1947, published at Fort Smith, Ark. I agree with Mr. Byrns that this curtailment is a mistake and I express the hope that the funds are restored.

OFF THE RECORD
(By C. F. Byrns)

The budget cutters in Congress are interfering seriously with some important things we are trying to do with forests in Arkansas.

If the appropriation bill goes through as recommended by the House Appropriations Committee, the Federal Forest Survey in northwest Arkansas will be stopped June 30, with only 10 out of 25 counties completed, and there will be no money to publish the results of the work already done.

Arkansas people interested in forests have been trying for a long time to get a thorough survey of forest resources in the countries north of the Arkansas River. Such surveys have been made south of the river in the pine areas, but the hardwood counties of north Arkansas have been neglected. A survey was started by the United States Forest Service several months ago. It was set up to cover virtually all north Arkansas west of the Mississippi River flood plain and embraces all the valuable forest lands north of the Arkansas River. The field work has been finished in six counties, Crawford, Franklin, Johnson, Pope, Van Buren, and Cleburne. It is expected that field work will be finished by June 30, end of this fiscal year, in White, Searcy, Boone, and Stone. Then it stops, with no compilation or publication of the information, unless something happens to provide more funds for survey work than the House committee has approved.

We need that survey especially just now. The State of Arkansas has provided a State appropriation of $525,000 a year for the 2 years beginning July 1 for fire protection. The forestry division of the resources and development commission will expand its fire protection program by about 800,000 acres in the coming year, all in north Arkansas. In the following year, it is expected that every acre of forest land in the State west of the Mississippi flood plain will be under intensive fire protection. That will be an achievement of first importance to our economy, now and hereafter. We seriously need a thorough survey of the forest resources of the north Arkansas country now without fire protection, as a measure of what we now have and a yardstick by which to gage future improvement.

The Forest Service appropriation is cut in other important respects. The Forest Products laboratory at Madison, Wis., for example, has has been an outstanding center of research in the use of wood products. About 70 percent of the tree is wasted under present methods of use. It is economically sound to spend money to find out how to save as much of it as possible and turn a waste product into a valuable asset, and to find out how to make better use of the parts of the tree now being saved. Yet the committee would cut the research appropriation by a third, from $1,555,000 a year to $1,000,000.

Funds for timber sales are likewise cut by the committee. And that means more than appears on the surface. In the Ozark National Forest, for example, timber sales during 1946 totaled 11,000,000 board feet with a value of $124,000. In 1946 the cut was 16,000,000 feet, valued at $223,000. In 1947 (fiscal year ending June 30) the cut will be about 18,000,000 board feet with a value of $240,000. In the coming year, plans were set up for cutting about 20,000,000 board feet with a value of about $335,000. Under the appropriation recommended by the committee, the cut in the Ozark Forest will not be expanded, but will be reduced to about 17,000,000 board feet. The cash return to the Treasury and to the counties where the forest is located (which get 25 percent of it) will be reduced accordingly, and the lumber sorely needed on the market will not be available.

It isn't good economy to trim down activities which preserve and develop natural resources on which the income of the people is based. Yet the present budget slashers are doing that in important instances.

Purchase of War Bonds by Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Truth Revealed—F. D. R. Bought Limit in Series E War Bonds," published in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent of June 13 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUTH REVEALED—F. D. R. BOUGHT LIMIT IN SERIES E WAR BONDS

International News Service in New York, at the request of the Independent, secured from the late President Roosevelt's law partner, Basil O'Connor, information concerning war bonds and Government securities owned by Mr. Roosevelt at the time of his death.

The erroneous impression had been created that President Roosevelt had purchased only one or two $50 war bonds.

The information supplied by Mr. O'Connor follows:

The papers of the estate of Franklin D. Roosevelt on file at the Surrogate's Court, Dutchess County, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., reveal that at the time of his death the late President Roosevelt owned the following United States Government securities:

Treasury bonds and notes: $10,000 United States Treasury 2⅞ percent, due 60–55; $11,000 United States Treasury 2½ percent, due 68–63; $40,000 United States Treasury 2½ percent, due 69–64; $25,000 United States Treasury 1¾ percent, due June 15, 1948; $15,000 United States Treasury 2 percent, due June 15, 1954; $5,000 United States Treasury 2 percent, due June 15, 1954; $10,000 United States Treasury tax saving notes, series C.

Savings bonds: $5,000 Series E Defense Savings bonds dated March 1, 1942 (in inter vivos trust); $500 series E Defense Savings bonds dated May 1, 1941; $50 series E War Savings bonds dated December 1, 1942; $25 series A Savings bonds dated March 1, 1935.

President Roosevelt each year purchased the full limit of series E bonds that he could buy under the law, and these were issued in the names of his grandchildren.

Migratory Farm Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, our agricultural economy today faces many problems. These problems are all serious, but among them are two which have confronted us for decades. These have not resulted from the recent war. They are not transitory.

I refer, first, to the problem of securing sufficient labor for the farmer, and, secondly, to the problem of insuring adequate living and working conditions to the workers.

In March of this year, the Federal Interagency Committee on Migrant Labor issued its report and recommendations. This report, entitled "Migrant Labor—a Human Problem," again brings into sharp focus the problems confronting agricultural migrants. It describes in sometimes shocking, but very illuminating terms, the conditions under which migratory laborers of today live.

But it indicates, too, the difficulty which perennially confronts our farmers—the difficulty of securing sufficient seasonal farm labor to meet their demands.

Accordingly, I have today introduced a bill to insure conditions that will make possible an adequate and continuing supply of labor for the production of agricultural commodities. It is designed to safeguard the working conditions of migratory farm workers.

Mr. Speaker, our agricultural economy demands large numbers of workers, migrating from place to place, to meet the seasonal demands of the Nation's farmers. Without their labor during peak seasons, crops are lost, and the investments of food producers and processors

are sacrificed. During the thirties, the chief characteristic of the migratory labor force was its abundance. The problem of securing workers in sufficient numbers to supply labor needs did not seriously confront the farmers of that era. But as World War II approached, there was an immediate transition from an abundance of farm labor to a shortage. As former agricultural migrants turned to defense and war industries, and to the armed services, agricultural employers faced a growing lack of workers. Accordingly, in the fall of 1942, the Government embarked upon a war-manpower program to recruit seasonal workers in areas of surplus, and to direct them to areas of need.

When the supply of domestic laborers proved inadequate, foreign workers were imported. Negotiations between our Government, and the Governments of Mexico, Jamaica, Barbados, the Bahamas, British Honduras, Canada, and Newfoundland ensued, and agreements providing certain minimum guarantees for the workers in return for their labor were concluded.

But, Mr. Speaker, this emergency no longer exists. Unemployment is on the upswing; the domestic farm labor force has undergone another transition, and is today of sufficient size to meet our demands.

Unemployed farm workers—American citizens—are unemployed, while we continue to import foreign nationals for available jobs.

Why does this paradoxical situation exist? Because of inadequate working, living, and transportation conditions for farm migrant labor.

The Interagency Committee clearly recognizes this. The report tells us that—

> Recruitment of migrant workers constitutes a unique problem. Recruitment is difficult because each employer must obtain workers who are fitting employment with him in between their last jobs and the jobs to which they are moving. Recruitment plans are further complicated by considerable haphazard and unsolicited migration. Large numbers of workers move on their own initiative without adequate information on which to base their decisions as to when or where to go.

Thus what the farmer clearly needs is a program that will provide certain working and living conditions and transportation that will facilitate bringing the number of workers he needs, to the place where he needs them, when he needs them. The bill I have introduced today will do just that. It will aid the farmer in securing an adequate labor supply.

Mr. Speaker, this bill aims at improving and safeguarding the working and living conditions of today's agricultural migrants. We are all aware of those conditions. The situation described so vividly by John Steinbeck over a decade ago in his great classic, The Grapes of Wrath, has not changed markedly. For housing, the migrants and their families turn in large part to tents, makeshift shelters, broken down one-room houses, converted chicken coops, deserted farm houses, long rows of one-room cabins. Medical care, except for the limited health services provided at Government-established camps, is almost nonexistent.

Migratory workers have more illness and less medical care than any other part of our population. Children grow up handicapped by lack of education. These children, "following the crops" with their families, are often deprived of even elementary school opportunities. Employment conditions are equally disturbing. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that 74 percent of the 550,000 hired farm workers employed on 3 or more farms during 1945 worked less than 75 days.

Mr. Speaker, these are the conditions which prevail today in the lives of our own migratory agricultural workers. It is significant, however, that foreign governments, in supplying their nationals for farmers of this country during the war, would not allow their people to accept employment under such circumstances. The foreign governments agreed to supply workers only if certain conditions pertained. These little Central American Republics have shown more initiative in preventing the exploitation of their migrant labor than we have in these United States. In the agreements concluded between our Government and foreign governments, we promised to observe certain stipulations. For example, the Mexican agreement, typical of the several foreign agreements negotiated, provided (1) that Mexican workers should be paid the prevailing wage for the work for which they were transported, with a minimum of 30 cents an hour or the equivalent under a piece-rate system; (2) that they should be guaranteed employment for at least 75 percent of work days during the contract period; (3) that transportation to the work area and return to the point of origin should be paid by the United States; (4) that the Mexican workers would be provided with sanitary housing; and (5) that they would receive the same health guaranties accorded domestic agricultural workers.

Mr. Speaker, on these grounds alone did the foreign governments agree to let us import their laborers. Yet at the same time domestic agricultural labor—our own fellow citizens, men and women who bear the proud name of American—were provided only with residence in labor camps and with some medical care. And even these benefits were not carried through in full. Housing was frequently denied since foreign workers often occupied the facilities. And medical care, because of lack of funds, was available only to those housed in the camps.

Mr. Speaker, this bill asks only that those conditions, services, and privileges afforded foreign workers during the war be extended to American agricultural migrant workers and that the locally prevailing rate of wages be paid as the minimum wage for these workers.

The interagency committee has gone somewhat further and recommended "that such State and Federal legislation be enacted and such administrative action taken as is necessary to give the same protection to migrant workers as is available to other workers."

This would necessitate the extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Social Security Act, and the State workmen's compensation laws to cover migrant workers. While I do not question the virtue of such extension, I ask for no more in the bill introduced today than a bare minimum. The bill aims entirely at making a sufficient supply of labor available to the farmer, while granting to our own agricultural migrant workers the same guaranties offered foreign workers during the war.

This minimum bill which I am introducing today provides transportation, housing, health services, payments, and continuity of employment guaranties similar to those which we offered the imported migrant laborers.

Is it too much to offer the same living and working conditions which we guaranteed foreign labor to our own agricultural migrant workers?

Under the bill I have introduced today, the Secretary of Labor, is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the employers of agricultural labor. Under such agreements, the Government would render certain services to the employer, if the employer, in return, agrees to conform to certain conditions. In performing these services, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to utilize existing agencies which deal with comparable problems.

The Secretary is authorized to secure public transportation in order to assure a flow of labor to places where it is needed. He is further made responsible for the establishment of housing standards for agricultural migrant workers, and for the expansion of the present labor camps. And finally, the present tax-supported medical program is to be continued and expanded.

Mr. Speaker, the American farmer needs assistance in getting his crops harvested at the precise moment when they are ready to be harvested. I believe that most farmers want to recruit their labor on the basis of a sure, humane, and efficient system. After demonstrated coordinated Federal direction of agricultural migrant workers to the places where they are needed, we do not want to revert to the haphazard system under which crops spoiled in one place while agricultural migrant workers starved in another.

Let us help the American farmer harvest and market his potatoes, beets, corn, wheat, fruits, and produce without the tears and heartbreak that now stain so much of the clothes we wear and the food we eat.

Federal Aid for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Atlanta Journal on the question of Federal aid for schools:

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS

The question of Federal aid for public schools is becoming larger, clearer, and more insistent in the present Congress. The House Subcommittee on Education has just concluded a series of hearings at which more than 60 witnesses from all parts of the coun-

try testified, the great majority urging the enactment of legislation for this purpose. A corresponding committee in the Senate has conducted similar hearings and is preparing a favorable report.

The Senate bill proposes up to $250,000,000 a year to be apportioned among the States, on a basis of their actual needs, for the improvement of school standards and services. Sponsored by Senator TAFT, it is a bipartisan measure, and seems eventually assured of a place on the calendar. The House bill, introduced by Representative MCCOWEN, Republican, of Ohio, is much the same in its broad features, but is expected to encounter shrewd tactics of delay from so-called economy-minded Members of that body. It is improbable, however, public sentiment being what it is, that such opposition can keep the bill from reaching the floor for a full and fair debate on its merits.

Public sentiment, and sober public judgment as well, is aroused as never before to the plight of America's public schools and to the necessity of Federal aid as the only way to anything like adequate relief. The States in which the crisis is most acute are those which already are spending the largest porportion of their incomes on public education. Their present economic level and taxable values simply cannot produce the revenue needed to give them good schools. Therefore, as a matter of common justice and for the sake of the country's general welfare, the economic power of the Nation as a whole should be drawn upon to help equalize public school opportunities. America as a whole will suffer so long as the children of any State or community are denied the minimum of their educational birthright.

Congress Fights Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in 1945, shortly after Hiroshima, I wrote President Truman urging him to call a conference of medical and other experts to determine whether atomic energy could be used to combat cancer.

Today, I am glad to note a Board of Medical Review, appointed by the Atomic Energy Commission, has begun a week-long conference in the Capital on the relation of medical and biological sciences to the atomic energy program.

I supported in the last Congress legislation authorizing appropriations for cancer research. This failing, I was pleased to see our distinguished colleague, Mr. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, sponsor like legislation in the opening days of the Eightieth Congress. Last Friday, the Illinoisan followed through when he had the House Committee on Appropriations earmark $25,000,000 of the 1948 appropriation of the Atomic Energy Commission for cancer research. Our committee was unanimous.

George E. Reedy, Washington radio commentator, broadcasting over WOL Saturday, said quite properly that it was impossible to overestimate the value of the Dirksen proposal which is bound to be approved during the current week. Under leave to extend my remarks I include Mr. Reedy's broadcast:

Through the efforts of Representative EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Washington's unofficial mayor, a new field of vastly important research has been opened. It is the possibility of using atomic energy to fight the dreaded scourge of cancer.

The research will be conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission, guardian of the secret of the Nation's powerful bomb. The funds will be $25,000,000, earmarked in the appropriation bill for the coming year, at DIRKSEN'S request.

It is impossible to overestimate the importance of this project. Up to this time, most of the popular thinking on atomic energy has centered around the bomb. The more important fact that it might be the weapon against cancer has been largely overlooked.

The disease has been one of the most dreaded afflictions of mankind since recorded history began. It was first named by Hippocrates, the founder of Greek medicine, before the birth of Christ. Until recently little more than the name was known about it.

Modern medical science has made tremendous advances in the past few years in combating it. However, the techniques are still comparatively primitive. The reliable weapon to rid the earth of this disease has still to be discovered.

And yet it is a problem so compelling that millions of hours and millions of dollars have been spent in the search of a cure. Every field of knowledge within the ken of man has been explored, as far as present resources go.

On the historic day in August 1945 when a mushrooming cloud of death suddenly formed over Hiroshima, the entire world was stunned. It knew that a weapon of destruction, comparable only to the plagues of biblical times, had been discovered.

Everywhere men suddenly found themselves walking under the fear of the shadow of death. This one fact was so oppressive, so ever present, that no one even bothered to read the fine print explaining that atomic energy had other uses beside war.

That was known, however, to the men who made the bomb. And so, when Congress passed the Atomic Energy Act, a very important section was written into the bill. It authorized research into the use of fissionable and radioactive materials—for health purposes.

That section, of course, had to be implemented with money to pay the expenses of the Commission. The proposal to grant the money, to start the research now, came from DIRKSEN. It is in the Independent Offices appropriation bill, to be debated next week.

There is little doubt that Congress will approve this section. For it offers the possibility of a coordinated research into cancer. As DIRKSEN pointed out in a recent speech on the subject, the trouble with most of the research, up to now, is that it has been hit or miss.

At last, we will have a Government agency with unlimited authority and ample funds to do the job. And while there is no assurance of immediate results, there is the hope that at last we are on the road to conquering one of our most relentless enemies.

Washington State Grange Opposes Senate Bill 110

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following analysis of Senate bill 110 by John L. King, radio and research director, Washington State Grange:

AN EVALUATION OF S. 110

The following statement is submitted concerning the Reed-Bulwinkle bill (S. 110). The committee draft of S. 110 was carefully examined to determine whether it contained the same objectionable features which were present in the Bulwinkle bill, which passed the House in the last session of Congress.

The conclusion, based upon an objective study of its provisions, is that it does. The passage of this bill would not only result in a break-down in the protection of the public against the price-fixing activities of the railroads, but would establish a precedent for the newspapers, medical associations and other industries which desire to escape the application of the antitrust laws.

There are certain fundamental evils in this bill or any other bill which grants a major industry immunity from the antitrust laws. No matter how many safeguards you include for the protection of the public, the evil is still there.

In the special number of the United States Chamber of Commerce publication, Governmental Affairs (March 13, 1947), it is said:

"For two generations, railroads have arrived at proposals for changes in rates and service through various conferences. Since shortly after World War I, the procedure of rate conferences has been under a plan advocated by shippers providing systematic published notices of all rate changes and opportunity for hearings on them. After the passage of the Motor Carrier Act in 1935, motor carriers adopted similar procedures.

"Prior to this decade, the legality or propriety of such procedures was not questioned. The Interstate Commerce Commission, charged with the duty of regulating domestic carriers (other than air lines) in the public interest, knew of and encouraged them and on at least one occasion, when the railroads applied for a rate increase, the Commission in effect told them to get together and work out some needed economies."

Now let us take a look at the record. As far back as 1897, in the case of *United States* v. *Trans-Missouri Freight Association;* and again, in the following year, in the case of *United States* v. *Joint Traffic Association*, the Supreme Court of the United States held that group action by the railroads in fixing noncompetitive rates was a violation of the Sherman Act and contrary to the basic public policy of free enterprise and independent initiative.

The conference method of fixing noncompetitive rates is nothing more nor less than price fixing. If the corner grocers or the farmers or the plumbers got together and decided that a reasonable price for certain commodities or certain work would be thus and so, those companies or individuals would be subject to prosecution under the Sherman Antitrust Act.

But the railroads have said, "We are different." They would have you believe that because of the hundreds of thousands of individual rates it is impossible for the carriers to operate without such a law.

Why is this so?

Under the Interstate Commerce Act each carrier (and, in the case of joint rates, the connecting carriers) is required to fix the rates it desires to charge, such rates becoming effective when filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the act. The published charges may be protested, and when a rate in force or proposed is found to be unjust or unreasonable or unduly discriminatory or otherwise unlawful, the Interstate Commerce Commission is charged with the duty "to determine the just and reasonable rate." As expressed by the Supreme Court, the Interstate Commerce

Act, provides "a zone of reasonableness" between the maximum, above which rates may be excessively high, and the minimum, below which the charges may be too low or noncompensatory; and it is the plan of the act that within these areas rates initiated by individual carriers or joint rates initiated by connecting carriers shall be adjusted by competitive conditions. *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Louisville & Nashville Railroad* (227 U. S. 88 (1912)); *Texas & Pacific Ry. Co.* v. *United States* (289 U. S. 627, 636 (1932)); *United States* v. *Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Ry. Co.* (294 U. S. 499, 505 (1934)); *State of Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania Railroad Co. et al.* (324 U. S. 439, 65 S. Ct. 716, 727 (1945)).

As stated by the Supreme Court in the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific case and in the Georgia case, within this "zone of reasonableness" the carrier is "free to adjust its charges for itself. And as stated by the Supreme Court in the Texas & Pacific Railway case, "As the carriers are in competition for the business they may, within the zone of reasonableness, prescribed by the statute, adjust their rates so as to obtain or retain the desired traffic for their own lines," it being the "theory of the act * * * that carriers in initiating rates may adjust them to competitive conditions."

S. 110 would reverse this long-established regulatory scheme by permitting the authorization of agreements setting up private rate-making organizations which, by concerted action, could fix the rates within the area now preesrved for the interplay of competition. The relief sought by the Government in its suit against the Association of American Railroads et al., and by the State of Georgia against the Pennsylvania Railroad et al., would preserve the scheme for the play within that area of competitive factors.

It should be here stated that the Government's suit does not seek to enjoin activities of so-called rate bureaus which are not unlawful or to stop them from performing functions properly designed to accomplish efficiency in rate publication and proper cooperative exchange of information. The suits do not seek to enjoin connecting carriers from freely collaborating in the establishment of joint rates in accordance with the Interstate Commerce Act, or to prevent individual or connecting carriers from initiating rates through rate bureau facilities, so long as such rates are not fixed on a noncompetitive basis and so long as individual or connecting roads are not bound to the views, conclusions, or action of the rate bureau or other roads or groups.

Section 6 of S. 110 provides:

"The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement which establishes a procedure for the determination of any matter through joint consideration unless it finds or by condition requires that under the agreement there is or shall be accorded to each party the free and unrestrained right to act contrary to and independently of the initial determination or report, or any subsequent determination or report, arrived at through such procedure, and unless it finds or by condition requires that all carriers of the same class (as defined in paragraph (4) of this section) within the territorial and organizaitonal scope of such agreement shall be eligible to become and remain parties to the agreement upon application and payment of charges applicable to other parties of the same class. Nothing in this section and no approval of any agreement by the Commission under this section shall be so construed as in any manner to remove from the purview of the antitrust laws any restraint upon the right of independent action by means of boycott, duress, or intimidation."

This section does not overcome the objection that the bill does not, by its terms, guarantee a carrier the right of independent action. The right of a dissident carrier to take independent action in the face of the integrated structure of traffic associations, with their inherent power through collective economic pressure, is more apparent than real, in our opinion. Certainly, the activities of the associations in the past do not justify the hope which has been expressed that any individual carrier would retain the right to independent action.

Here, again, let us look at the record. Time and time again we have seen occasions when the Association of American Railroads, through its traffic committees, has impeded and prevented independent competitive action. In the first place, the system is, by its very nature, coercive from top to bottom, as must necessarily follow from the fact that each individual railroad is dependent upon other railroads for through and overhead traffic, which together constitute more than 50 percent of the total tonnage carried by any railroad. The interdependence of railroads indicated by this basic factor is increased by the highly complex financial and operating relationships between railroads and by the delicate essences of economic coercion implicit in any complex industrial relationship.

The history of the activities of the railroads shows that they have never hesitated to impose economic sanctions upon recalcitrant roads by forcing unfair divisions upon such roads and withholding overhead traffic from them.

Perhaps the most serious objection which we have to the Reed bill is that the implications of the price fixing, which would be sanctioned by Congress, extend far beyond the limits of the transportation industry. That is to say, there is a different situation in the transportation industry than that which would prevail in a more or less independent industry. The power to fix freight rates is, in effect, the power to fix prices of practically every basic industry in the country. Transportation costs are a major element in every industrial pricing system and the power to control the cost of transportation is largely the power to dictate initially the location of every industrial enterprise and subsequently the success or failure of those enterprises.

Factors, such as cost of replacement, overhead, volume, sales costs, etc., have little to do in the determination of rates. Railroads are more interested in maintaining preexisting price structures and traffic movements. This, in turn, is influenced by the number and kinds of carriers in competition with the railroads. It is only natural that the railroads desire a rigid price structure throughout the transportation field. That is why they were the leading proponents of the laws to regulate motor carriers and water carriers. The complexity of the rate structure of unregulated carriers made it impossible for the railroads to fix rigid noncompetitive rates.

Proponents of S. 110 will point out that section 4 of the bill provides that the Commission shall not approve any agreement between or among carriers of different classes unless it finds that such agreement is limited to matters relating to freight classifications or to transportation under joint rates or over through routes. * * *. This, they say, will prevent agreements among the different types of carriers. What they fail to mention is that one regulatory body is given the power to fix rates of all carriers. The implication is clear. The Commission in approving any particular agreement must consider those rates in relation to the rates submitted to it by other classes of carriers. This must of necessity be one of the basic issues in its consideration. The normal interplay of competition between different classes of carriers cannot exist as long as a single unit has the power to fix rates for all of them.

The ICC is given power to fix prices subject to certain limitations. One of the criteria set out in section 2 is that any agreement which it approves must not unduly restrain competition. However, in paragraph 9 of the bill it is stated that no agreement approved by the Commission shall be deemed a restraint of trade within the meaning of the antitrust laws. These paragraphs, considered in para materia reveal a perilous situation. In effect, Congress is saying to the Commission, "You may not approve any agreement in restraint of trade, but if you do, they shall not constitute a violation of the antitrust laws." More specifically, in paragraph 9 the Commission is given authority to approve time schedules. Under this authority it may say that X train shall leave at 12 noon and Y train will leave at 12 midnight. Competition between X and Y is not only restrained; it is completely eliminated. It is true that they may provide a more round-the-clock service, but there will be little incentive on the part of the railroads to provide new cars and those additional comforts and low-price meals to win passengers away from competitors, if schedules are fixed by the Commission and no competition exists.

If you think this is a fantastic possibility, look at the record in the Pullman case. There the railroads agreed among themselves not to put the newer types of railroad cars into operation.

The industrial basing point system and the noncompetitive freight-rate structure go hand in hand. Under the basing point system no account is taken of the relation of the particular plant from which the goods are actually shipped or the method of transportation employed. For example, just outside of the city of Laramie, Wyo., is a small town, Sinclair, which is the location of the refinery owned by the company of the same name. The refinery is located in the center of a large oil-producing field. You would expect the price of the gasoline to reflect the absence of transportation charges, but that is not the case. The price of gasoline in Sinclair was based on the rail price from Chicago, the nearest basing point.

These price-fixing schemes could not exist in a competitive system of determining transportation charges. The industrial basing point system must have a rigid freight-rate structure behind it.

The evils of the basing point system are well known. It has been employed historically to perpetuate the industrial concentration in certain areas of the country to the exclusion of new competitors in other areas. Discriminatory rate structures have been employed to suppress the rights of new industries both in the South and in the West. There are a number of examples of these discriminatory practices alleged in the complaints of *State of Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania Railroad* and *United States* v. *Association of American Railroads, et al.* An examination of the trial brief filed by the Government in the latter case is replete with illustrations of the practices to which we have referred.

Perhaps the most amusing anomaly of S. 110 is that apparently the same persons and political parties which protested vigorously in the recent election campaign against what it called tendencies toward regimentation and centralization of power in the Government at Washington are now engaging in one of the most effective and expensive lobbying campaigns to obtain the enactment of a law which, in our opinion, would set up just the sort of bureaucracy to which they recently objected. Of course, the stakes are high and they can afford to spend a good deal of money to accomplish their purpose.

As just one last thought, let us assume for a moment that the bill became a law and that Congress duly turned its supervision over to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Then, let us just suppose that an economy-minded Congress decided to reduce the appropriation of that agency. The hands of the Department of Justice would be tied, while the railroads of this country were run by the Association of American Railroads, a group whose membership does not contain a single representative of the public. It is not a pleasant thought.

JOHN L. KING,
Radio and Research Director,
Washington State Grange.

The Fight for the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following editorial taken from the Los Angeles Daily News of May 28, 1947:

THE FIGHT FOR THE WEST

If western rails are the West's arteries, then what the freight-car shortage amounts to is a kind of insidious arteriosclerosis.

That's why regular reports on the progress of this disease and efforts currently being made to cure it are in order.

Where matters stand to date is that the western congressional caucus is still holding a consultation and trying to determine what to do for the patient. Meanwhile, the patient has rallied slightly as the result of a radical transfusion of publicity. A few more freight cars have appeared recently on western lines. The arteries, however, are still restricted and the prognosis is doubtful until and unless Congress and the Interstate Commerce Commission can induce widespread changes in railroading practices.

Obviously the first change needed is for the ICC to exercise its wide powers, and to put an end to the hoarding of cars by eastern lines. Testimony of Walter R. Scott, executive vice president of the Kansas City Board of Trade, that western roads have on line 22,925 fewer boxcars than they own indicates not merely that western railroading is sick and undernourished. Also, such testimony does more than contradict the assertion of F. G. Gurley, Santa Fe president, that nobody is depriving western lines of their own freight cars.

Scott's claims suggest what the Daily News has contended all along, namely, that western industry itself remains weak and undernourished, that western economy generally is being held back from full development, because its main arteries of commerce—the railroads—are squeezed by eastern monopolistic practices and controls.

These restrictive effects have been produced in two ways. First, by the freight rate differential.

Despite the Supreme Court decision of May 12 upholding the ICC in lowering southern rates, freight tolls on the Pacific coast still are out of line with the rest of the Nation.

By the Supreme Court action, the eastern rate territory will pay more, the southern and western trunk regions less, while the Pacific West will continue to be charged rates 46 percent to 71 percent higher than all other areas.

If this represents, as the ICC claims, equalization of freight tariffs then maybe the term "equality" requires a new definition. For what the rate differential means, in concrete terms, is well described by Wendell Berge in his Economic Freedom for the West. Berge points out that the rate on work clothing, in carload lots, for 1,088 miles of eastern distance, is $18.40 per 1,000 pounds, whereas the rate for an identical 1,088 miles of western distance is $29.40 per 1,000 pounds.

Translated into producer-consumer terms, this means western industry and business suffer an enormous handicap. It means goods produced in the West and shipped outside must be sold at a higher retail price. It means, therefore, that the western producer's dollar won't produce as much as the eastern producer's dollar.

What's also evident is that under such conditions it's difficult for new western industry to burgeon. Berge calls the whole business "the slow poison of transport handicap."

The second ingredient of this poison is the freight-car shortage. Without cars on line, western roads can't serve western shippers. Western produce can't move in volume. Thus western farms are handicapped, the West's internal economy is weakened.

To get the western cars back on western lines. Scott has urged the ICC to enforce a per diem rental of $6.15 per day for off line cars. This higher, punitive charge, it is felt, will force eastern roads to return empties promptly to western owners where they can be used to move the produce of western farms and factories.

Certainly, getting freight cars for the West is the first objective. Beyond this objective, the West must fight to eliminate all its transport handicaps. By far the worst of these handicaps, from a long-range standpoint, is the rate differential.

The new bi-partisan unity of Western Congressman and Senators gives hope of forcing fundamental changes in discriminatory railroad practices. This unity also gives promise of other hopeful things such as the resumption of Federal work on western reclamation and power projects.

The fight for the West has just begun. It has been carried to Washington by southern California industrialists, for example, supporting the Kaiser Fontana application for RFC refinancing. It has been carried by Gov. Earl Warren, urging appropriations for Central Valley.

The freight car fight is a crucial part of this over-all campaign. It, too, must be won if the West is to realize its bright promise.—R. E. G. H.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, urging that the Rent Control Act be continued so as to prevent inflationary rental prices. The resolution follows:

Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to insist upon and work for the right kind of rent control legislation to prevent inflationary prices when the Rent Control Act expires June 30, 1947

Whereas the Federal Rent Control Act expires June 30, 1947, and unless the present Rent Control Act is extended this largest item in family budgets would be placed on the list of inflationary prices; and

Whereas it is vitally essential to bring the people's case before Congress to act on this important legislative matter at once: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be requested to insist upon and work for the extension of the present rent control legislation to prevent inflationary prices when the Rent Control Act expires June 30, 1947; and the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in Congress of the United States.

Air Accidents—DC–4 a Good Airplane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning George Reedy, broadcasting over WOL, Mutual network, made one of the most sensible statements I have heard on the recent air crashes, especially with reference to the DC–4's involved in these accidents. He calls for a little coolness and less hysteria, and points out the magnificent record made by this airplane. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a copy of that part of this morning's broadcast:

President Truman has taken swift steps, to meet the Nation-wide demands for action, on the recent tragic airline crashes. He has appointed a committee of "outstanding" aviation experts, to probe the situation to the bottom and find out what really is wrong.

The President's move was well balanced, and represented a rejection of many of the hysterical suggestions, with which he has been bombarded in the past 48-hours. These included a demand for the grounding of all DC–4's.

The committee will be headed by James M. Landis, chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and a man thoroughly familiar with the problems of aviation. It's membership will include Brig. Gen. Milton W. Arnold, vice president of the Air Transport Association.

The reasoning behind the President's appointment of such a group is obvious. Their report is one in which the public will have confidence. And the past experience of the members is a guarantee that their recommendations will be well reasoned.

Calm and cool reasoning is something that is badly needed at the moment. The unfortunate fact is that every air accident is the occasion for screaming headlines, while the tremendous accomplishments in air safety are always buried on the back pages.

To complicate the picture at the moment is the coincidence that the recent crashes have involved one type of airplane. The fact that the three accidents bear no apparent relation to each other has been lost in the shuffle for front-page space.

This particular plane is the DC–4—the C–54 of World War II fame, which carried Army cargoes and passengers all over the world. It enjoyed the confidence of the men that flew it and rolled up an an impressive record for getting the goods where they were needed.

Now that it has been converted to peacetime use it is rendering the same service. For months the DC–4 has been carrying passengers all over the world on routine flights that excited no more comment than would a similar trip by any other transportation.

In fact, the DC–4 is the type of aircraft in which President Truman constantly travels. It is out of the question that his official family would permit him to place his life in jeopardy, by using any form of transportation which involved abnormal risk.

The President's board is one that can be relied upon to supply the answers to the questions that the public is asking. Composed of representatives of the industry, and of the Government agencies responsible for air safety, it has the ability to get all the facts.

Should there be a basic cause for the recent crashes, those causes can be determined and corrected. And in the present

state of the public mind, there is no doubt but that those causes will be laid bare, and action taken to end them.

Most of the wild speculation at the moment is futile, and will not help the situation. To condemn aviation before the full facts are known would mean the senseless hamstringing of one of America's most important and growing industries.

Agriculture Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when the agricultural appropriation bill was before the House every Democratic Member voted against the drastic cuts in our farm program. Once again the Democratic Party has demonstrated its interest in the American farmer. That the people of Oklahoma appreciate this interest is evidenced by a full page advertisement in the McCurtain Gazette, Idabel, Okla., under date of June 7, 1947. This advertisement which was sponsored by the agriculture division of the Idabel Chamber of Commerce, reads in part as follows:

An economy-minded but short-sighted Republican Congress is threatening to cut the United States Department of Agriculture appropriations by 32 percent or more, is about to scrap the program that has done more in the last 5 years than was done in 50 previous years to restore and maintain land fertility in America. That should not be permitted to happen, and farmers and businessmen in farm States should present a united front against such short-sighted action.

Action of the GOP-controlled House Appropriations Committee has already stopped all material purchase orders by the Production and Marketing Administration which assists farmers in the purchase of materials and in payments for soil-building practices, without which farmers alone cannot hope to carry on the soil and fertility building needed to insure nutrient-laden food for 130,000,000 Americans.

The drastic slash in Agriculture Department appropriations will practically scrap the Production and Marketing Administration, the Farm Home Management Administration (formerly Farm Security), crop support prices, and crop insurance, and will badly cripple the soil conservation and school-lunch programs.

The Production and Marketing Administration does not, like the former AAA, deal out money to farmers for reducing acreage of crops, but has as its functions the encouragement of farmers in practicing soil-building and soil-conserving practices on their land, without which the farmers could not carry on such an expensive program as is needed in counties like McCurtain.

Under this program more than 120,000 feet of terraces have been built in McCurtain County since January 1 this year with PMA aid, 2,500 tons of limestone have been spread on lime-depleted land, and 290 tons of phosphate have been distributed on crop and pasture land. Other functions of PMA have included assisting farmers in the purchase of legumes and grasses to restore depleted land and improve pastures from which the meat and milk we consume comes.

Under the pending bill the tenant-purchase plan, by which numerous McCurtain County tenants have purchased and made modern, well-equipped, food-producing farm homes with the help of loans obtained from the farm home management program, will be scrapped.

The school-lunch program needs no defense. It has replaced the cold-sandwich lunch school children formerly took to school with a hot, well-balanced lunch for children at midday when they need nourishing food to sustain them through the day.

Naturally these programs cost huge sums of money, but depleted land will cost us vastly more in future years in lost health and inability to grow crops when it may be too late to restore our soil to fertility.

Representative CARL ALBERT, our Congressman, a friend of the farmer, has committed himself to fight this cut in agricultural appropriations. Let us back him up by asking the support of all our other Representatives in Congress in opposing this move to rob future generations of the land needed to sustain them.

A Chance To Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Miami Daily News of June 10, 1947, which is one of the leading newspapers of the South:

A CHANCE TO HELP

Vanquished in his battle to induce Congress to make the terminal-leave bonds redeemable immediatelly, Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS has introduced a bill which is designated to answer the claim that bond cashing would add to inflationary pressures. His bill, H. R. 3521, would make terminal-leave bonds negotiable, providing that "no person in possession of such a bond shall be considered to be a holder for valuable consideration unless he took it in consideration of the payment of an amount not less than the sum of the principal of such bond, plus the interest accrued on such bond to the last day of the month in which the bond was delivered to him."

This bill, now languishing in the House Committee on Armed Services, insures against such abuses as have occurred recently in which bonds were purchased from veterans at substantially less than face value. At the same time, the Government is protected from being called upon to make immediate expenditure for bond payments. The 5-year Government redemption clause remains unchanged. Since the bonds would necessarily be negotiated with either private persons or institutions, there would be no increase in the amount of money in public circulation.

There will be many veterans who will prefer to hold their bonds until maturity, using them as sound investments. But there are others in dire need of the money their bonds represent. These men are borrowing funds and paying high interest rates in order to meet current obligations. Representative ROGERS' proposal would assist this group.

With the House of Representatives still working on the April legislative calendar, and endeavoring to adjourn or recess on July 31, there is not too much hope that the Rogers bill will reach the floor. If it should be reported out in time for consideration, it will be a chance to help a large number of the veterans without upsetting the financial balance which the Congress is attempting to strike. The Daily News endorses this measure, and favors its prompt enactment.

Press Reports That Mundt Bill Is To Be Pigeonholed at Other End of the Capitol Are Denied—Foreign Relations Committee Has Already Appointed Subcommittee To Consider H. R. 3342—Decision To Provide a Carry-Over Appropriation for a Comprehensive United States Information Service Abroad Would Be Constructive Step but Congressional Safeguards Are Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, since some newspaper reports this morning contain accounts of decisions and programs being considered by the Republican policy committee of the other body of this Congress which erroneously convey the idea that the Upper Chamber of Congress might pigeonhole or sidetrack the Mundt bill to provide a United States Information Service abroad when it reaches that side of the Capitol, I take this opportunity of correcting those misconceptions and misinterpretations. In fact the decisions and proposals considered by the Republican policy committee at the other end of the Capitol are actually constructive steps to expedite action on H. R. 3342 and to prevent the program it proposes from being scuttled on July 1 should we fail to complete legislative consideration by both Houses of Congress before that time on this important matter.

NEWS RELEASE ON PIGEONHOLING STORY

Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of the House and the country generally might have the correct picture of what actually transpired at the other end of the Capitol over the week end, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a news release which I gave to the press and radio correspondents this noon shortly after talking with the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. Here is that statement:

After reading the AP story of this morning allegedly reporting decisions of the Republican policy committee of the Senate, I immediately called Senator VANDENBERG and asked him about the basis for this story. Senator VANDENBERG told me there was no desire or decision on the part of the Senate to pigeonhole the Mundt bill. He said that in fact he had already appointed a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to go into the Mundt bill as soon as it arrives on the Senate side and to facilitate its consideration. The members of the subcommittee are Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, and Senator HATCH, of New Mexico, Senator VANDENBERG advised MUNDT.

Senator VANDENBERG further told me that paralleling this action there had been dis-

cussions by the Republican members of the Appropriations and policy committees on the Senate side about the possibility of approving a stopgap appropriation to maintain standby operations of the Benton office until the Senate had ample opportunity to determine what fundamental changes might be desired in the program before final action is taken on this question in this session of the Eightieth Congress or the next. Senator VANDENBERG assured me personally and emphatically that there is no intention on the part of the Senate Republicans to prejudice or prejudge the action of the House on this matter.

Later this afternoon, I was asked by several reporters whether I felt that the action and considerations discussed at the other end of the Capitol would facilitate or discourage passage of H. R. 3342 when it comes up for final action later this week. As a consequence of these queries, I gave the press and radio gallery the following subsequent statement about 3 o'clock this afternoon and for purposes of completing the record at this point I am also inserting that statement as a part of these remarks:

STATEMENT BY HON. KARL MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, AUTHOR OF H. R. 3342

Asked to comment concerning the proposed action of the Senate Appropriations Committee to authorize a stopgap appropriation to continue operation of the Benton office until both Houses of Congress had finally disposed of his legislation authorizing its permanent operation and establishing standards and safeguards for its administration, Congressman MUNDT said, "I consider both the action of Senator VANDENBERG in appointing a subcommittee comprised of Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, and Senator HATCH, of New Mexico, to facilitate consideration of H. R. 3342 and the proposed effort of Senator BALL to provide a carry-over appropriation to maintain the operations of our United States Information Service abroad while Congress is deliberating its final decision on the program to be wise and helpful steps in the right direction.

Far from being maneuvers to sidetrack or pigeonhole the so-called Mundt bill when it reaches the Senate side, I consider these proposals as being constructive steps to help keep the Voice of America from dying at the very time we are trying to strengthen its tone and improve its accent through the enactment of H. R. 3342. The announcement by the Senate Republican policy and Appropriation members should help reduce opposition to this legislation in the House.

Mr. Speaker, it should again be pointed out to the Congress and the country that use of the phrase "Voice of America program" in connection with H. R. 3342 and with relationship to the prevailing program of United States information abroad refers to the entire, comprehensive and interlocking program of educational exchanges, information centers abroad, magazines such as Amerika in Russia, short-wave broadcasts, loan of United States Government specialists to render nonmilitary assistance and guidance abroad, and the other sections of H. R. 3342 and not simply to the short-wave broadcasts which form but a small portion of the prevailing and the proposed Voice of America program.

It should also be emphasized, Mr. Speaker, and in another part of the Appendix in today's RECORD it will be detailed by Mr. JUDD, of Minnesota, that were Congress simply to approve of carry-over or stop-gap appropriations alone or to continue our information program abroad by once again providing appropriations without benefit of substantive legislation we would be turning the State Department loose without restrictions and without congressional safeguards to continue virtually every aspect and phase of the program outlined in H. R. 3342 but which H. R. 3342 is designed to control, safeguard, guide, and direct by well over 20 Congressional directives not contained in the program now operating through action by the Appropriations Committee. Actually, sir, H. R. 3342 contains the provisions essential to the correction of the very ills and difficulties of which many Members of Congress have insistently complained.

Without the passage of H. R. 3342 we will once again find ourselves authorizing by appropriations only a blank check operation lacking such essentials as: loyalty checks, provisions against alien employment, machinery for deportation when required, the formula of reciprocity which requires the State Department to utilize that formula in working out exchange relations with other countries, the bi-partisan control board included in the Dirksen amendment, the provisions for utilizing private agencies wherever possible, the requirements that Congress be supplied with detailed semi-annual reports of what is being undertaken in this program and an evaluation of its results together with at least 15 other safeguards and protections which are incorporated in the basic language of H. R. 3342. In other words, by defeating or delaying passage of H. R. 3342, Congress would be but denying itself the regulatory machinery which is required to bring the Voice of America program under the control and purview of Congress.

The prudent and the practical thing for Congress to do, it appears, therefore, is to act affirmatively in support of H. R. 3342—amending it with additional safeguards if the majority of our members so desire—and thus provide the standards of administration and efficiency together with the safeguards and controls which many of us believe will be helpful in enabling us to get more for our money through this essential operation. Virtually the entire program has been operating with South American countries since 1938. Most of the program has been operating with the rest of the world through appropriations granted by the Appropriations Committee without substantive legislation and consequently without the safeguards and controls which H. R. 3342 provides. It would appear to be sensible and sound procedure, therefore, Mr. Speaker, for us to approve H. R. 3342 and thus to bring under congressional supervision and control a program so sound and so essential that with or without the passage of H. R. 3342 there seems to be general agreement that it must not be dropped or denied at this crucial juncture of world affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it may well be, as has been suggested by former President Hoover and by our distinguished leader on foreign affairs at the other end of the Capitol, who has brought new honor to Michigan by his forthright policies, that the United States has about reached the bottom of the apple barrel from the standpoint of our ability to render substantial additional foreign aid abroad. I certainly agree we must not jeopardize the solvency of America in our zeal to aid others. I favor making an inventory of what we have before making further large commitments to rehabilitate the economy or strengthen the defense of other countries.

But, Mr. Speaker, the more we are compelled to deny the requests for aid which come to us from abroad the more vitally we shall need the services of a comprehensive United States Information Service abroad to the end that our inability to extend greater help is not misinterpreted by them. We must not permit unfriendly nations to convince our friends abroad that it is mere callous indifference or selfish unconcern which compels us to deny their impassioned pleas for aid. We need our own information service abroad and our own comprehensive program for telling the true story of American purposes and problems so that those whom we must deny assistance can be made to understand the reasons for this situation. Surely we should not depend upon unfriendly voices and unfriendly information centers to explain the very legitimate and understandable reasons which require us to protect our own solvency and to deny foreign requests for aid which our financial structure will not support.

Mr. Speaker, it is fully as dangerous in times like these to demobilize our forces for peace as it would be to demobilize our armed forces charged with protecting our national security. Let us undertake to secure final action on H. R. 3342 as early this week as possible, and let us pass it with full confidence that in so doing we are equipping our State Department with the weapons it needs in order to wage successfully the all-important struggles for peace in which it and we and all the world are now engaged, and that in so doing we are placing this program under the control of Congress. Let us not be guilty of acting in such fashion that our efforts for peace will be too little and too late.

Statement by Hon. Otto E. Passman, Fifth Louisiana District, Before the Appropriations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement mad by me to the House Committee on Appropriations:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, you have been most kind in listening to me and several of my constituents from the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana, who have appeared before your committee in the interest of adequate appropriations for several flood control projects in which we are vitally interested. A few days ago Mr. Fred Hudson, of my district, spoke specifically with reference to the

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

Tensas-Concordia project and the Red River backwater area. Only recently, a very able, efficient, and respected Director of Public Works from the State of Louisiana, Mr. DeWitt L. Pyburn, who, in the brief time available, portrayed the general flood control situation in the State of Louisiana, not only with reference to the Red River backwater area, but the Morganza project, and the other necessary projects underway and planned and the great necessity of providing funds for final planning so that the efforts of the State may be coordinated with the projects to be undertaken by the Federal Government in that area.

For some years it has been very apparent that there is a definite need of a long range well-planned bank stabilization program. As it is today, reduced appropriations hamper the work of the Army Engineers to the extent that the Mississippi River is gaining every year and makes it necessary to set back more main-line levees. May I point out one example of this:

In Tensas Parish opposite Lake Bruin there is a very critical situation that it may make it necessary to set-back the main-line levee that has been raised to 1941 grade and section. This set back will be over 21 miles in length and will cost approximately $7,000,000. The reason for this long set-back is that this levee will have to be removed beyond a large lake and will take in 37 percent or more of the area of Tensas Parish. These lands that will be thrown out are the most productive and highly improved lands in the Ouachita-Mississippi River Basin. Adequate funds at this time would save this rich agricultural country and no doubt its revetment can be done much cheaper than making this new set-back.

This is a critical situation and unless it is corrected within a very short time there is the danger of a crevasse that will flood the major portion of the Ouachita-Mississippi Basin, as well as many parishes south of this point to the Gulf of Mexico.

The comprehensive Mississippi project calls for the protection of the Red River backwater area. The Army engineers have found this project economically justified and practical and work is actually under way on this leveee system. The cut-offs that have been made north of Old River have shortened the main river 170 miles, thereby increasing the velocity of the river and causing much higher stages in the Red River backwater area than was experienced in previous years. Most of the other critical sections of the valley have received assistance and their projects are well advanced. I wish to point out to you that the Red River backwater area was practically the last project to get under way and that these people have suffered increasing flood heights annually, due to the completed works upstream.

This project should be advanced on the priority list so that the people in this section can receive the protection that has been due them for many, many years. It is not unusual for as much as 95 percent of the total area in Concordia Parish to be inundated at one time, with hundreds of thousands of acres of our richest farm land covered with from 1 to 9 feet of water and the loss to the citizens of this great parish goes into hundreds of thousands of dollars. They are a patient group, but their patience is about exhausted. They are entitled to relief and protection and I urge this committee to give special consideration to the Red River backwater area levee and, if at all possible, earmark a specific sum so that the work on the Red River backwater levee can be continued.

There is another project that affects this backwater area. This is a controlled structure in Old River, which will divorce the Mississippi from the Atchafalaya. This controlled structure will enable the flood heights to be controlled between these giant rivers and will afford the maximum protection to the backwater area. Pending the completion of this giant controlled structure, it is urged that the levee system that has already been inaugurated in the backwater area be completed at the earliest possible date. This project will in the end be an integral part and make a substantial contribution to the protection, not only of a portion of the Red River backwater area, but to the protection by control of the floodwaters in the Atchafalaya diversion and this entire area.

I wish to call the committee's attention to the fact that the people in the basin between the Ouachita and the Mississippi have provided funds in the amount of $3,100,000 for major drainage works. This program is under way, contractors are at work, but it is imperative that the Tensas Boeuf River, Bayou Macon project and the Lafourche project, which are the major outlets for this drainage, be improved as provided for by Congress, in order that these drainage projects may function properly. In other words, my people are trying to do something to help themselves and I think this is an outstanding example in the entire Mississippi Valley, where such a program has been started by local groups to utilize Federal projects, thereby improving their fertile agricultural lands.

The total Federal estimate on these four streams is $10,900,000. May I urge that you include in your recommendation to the Congress that an allotment of $2,500,000 be made annually to these projects until this work is completed.

Gentlemen of the committee, I respectfully submit on behalf of the people of my district and of my State that, where we are showing a disposition to tax ourselves and provide substantial sums of money, millions of dollars, to protect ourselves insofar as we may, we are entitled to all the more consideration at the hands of the Congress when we ask for Federal aid in this protection work against conditions which are brought about incident to the entire flood control project.

In conclusion, I should like to reiterate that the flood control problems as they exist in the lower parishes of my district, more expecially Concordia Parish, are man-made, which, of course, warrants the special consideration of the members of this committee.

Rivers Belong to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. KERR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of June 12, 1947:

RIVERS BELONG TO THE PEOPLE

If the American people as a whole had been as wise as Franklin Roosevelt, Al Smith, and Robert Wagner as far back as 1910, private interests would not have been permitted to control the power of the rivers for the profit of utility companies. This trio in the New York Legislature fought Morgan and other utility companies who sought to grab up the water power of New York State. As God made the rivers their power and usefulness should have been preserved for the benefit of all the people. The North Carolina rivers should not have been permitted to be monopolized by the Duke, Carolina, and other light and power companies. All natural resources should have been preserved for the common benefit of all the people.

It was not until George Norris and Franklin Roosevelt, with wise statesmanship, teamed up to keep Muscle Shoals and the Tennessee Valley from being exploited by private interests and private profits that the people awoke to the fact that their rivers and lands and other natural resources had been obtained by private companies for their exclusive use, and the public benefited only by paying prices which were often exorbitant.

When Roosevelt's utility regulation measures were introduced in Congress, the utility companies called one bill a death sentence to their companies. Experience has proved that Roosevelt was right. The legislation insured cheaper rates to the people and the companies have prospered and enlarged. Following the TVA development, which gave more and cheaper power, like organizations by the Government created industries and prosperity on the Pacific coast. Other like developments by Uncle Sam promised benefits to other sections in the Missouri Valley and other sections. It looks like the light and power forces are resolved to get back in the saddle.

The proposals to prevent flood destruction and produce power from the Roanoke and Yadkin Rivers in North Carolina are being fought by the big power companies. They wish either to prevent use for the public benefit or get control for their profit. The hearing in Washington proved that the Roanoke project is desired by nearly all the people in Virginia and North Carolina, but power companies in these States are fighting this most important and valuable proposal. In the hearing Louis Sutton showed that utility companies learned nothing from the wonderful TVA development. He told the committee, in 1947, after TVA had demonstrated that it was the most important development for the people that the like proposal on the Roanoke River was another TVA. He was right in this particular: It will benefit all the people, too long overcharged by power and light companies. The people in all sections prospered under the Roosevelt laws, followed in some States. Before the Federal legislation for rural electrification, few people living in the country had light or power. Before Uncle Sam began to build lines to afford these modern conveniences, the power companies compelled the farmers to pay for the cost of installation. When Uncle Sam began to construct lines, belatedly the power companies started what they should have begun long before, and began to construct rural lines of their own.

If this Congress listens to the pleas of power and light companies, which wish to monopolize the rivers for their enrichment, it will turn the clock back and advertise that it is the creature of big business.

The rivers belong to all the people. They should be retained by Uncle Sam within their banks to protect farmers from floods and the waters used to produce cheaper power and light for the benefit of the people. It would be disastrous to repudiate the Roosevelt policy as to natural resources.

The rivers belong to the people and should be utilized for their benefit.

The "Heartless" Taft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY at a rally held at Kings County Democratic headquarters, 4 Court Square, Brooklyn, N. Y., on June 11, 1947:

The "Heartless" Taft bill is a piece of legislative chicanery which, by its terms, denies the working men and women of America the basic right of organization for their mutual economic benefit. It is deliberately designed to lay low organized labor and decent living standards, and to turn the economic clock of the great majority of ur citizens far back. Under its terms working people will have fewer rights than they did a generation ago.

This hastily prepared and too hastily considered bill—the conference report of 73 pages was not made available to Members of the House by the Republican majority until 3 hours before it came up for action on the floor, and debate was limited to 1 hour—this bill not only destroys the rights and protections given to labor during the past 50 years, but deliberately takes the very laws intended for the protection of the laboring man of our Nation and turns those laws around and aims them at destroying organized labor.

We all know that this vicious and punitive bill is the brain-child of the National Association of Manufacturers and big business. It is in line with every move so far made by the Republican Party during the present Congress—and they are the sponsors of this Hartley-Taft bill—to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. They must take care of their big-money campaign contributors in the National Association of Manufacturers. Last fall these big boys refused to chip in until they were assured there would be drastic labor legislation.

Last November 5 was a sad day for the American people. Last November 5 was a tragic day for American labor. Last November 5 was the day organized labor threw into the discard the sage slogan of its great leader, Samuel Gompers, when he said: "Reward your friends and punish your enemies." Now, under the terms of the present bill a labor union is not only not permitted to advocate that labor reward its friends and defeat its enemies but even to publish a Congressman's voting record in its union paper.

Last November 5 organized labor in this State endorsed the candidacy of the junior Senator from New York, Senator IVES, and repudiated one of its truest friends, the great 10-year Governor of New York, Herbert H. Lehman. What a friend Senator IVES turned out to be. Judas Iscariot argues love of labor but puts his stamp of approval on company unions, strike-breaking, Government injunctions, elimination of the closed shop, and annihilation of other forms of union security. Many in organized labor contributed to the election of Republican majorities that assured the voters last fall that labor had nothing to fear from a Republican victory at the polls; that the Republicans wanted public office only to show their warm affection for the working people. Since then they have been busy as beavers removing restrictions from business and applying them to labor. Under their plan business gets less regulation and labor gets more. There will be just as many Federal restrictions as ever but they will be transferred from business to labor.

It is interesting to note that the Republicans in the House voted 217 to 12 in favor of the conference report on the Taft-Hartley bill. And in the Senate only two of the 51 majority party Senators voted against the Taft bill. Out of 295 Republican Senators and Congressmen, only 14 voted for labor. On the basis of this showing, the Republican Party is 95 percent against labor. In contrast, not a single Democrat from New York State voted for this antilabor legislation. Your all-Democratic Brooklyn delegation in the House, of which I am proud to be a member, voted solidly against the Hartley bill in April, and against the conference report on June 4.

A blind man can see that the real aim of the National Association of Manufacturers is to smash the American standard of living, break up labor unions, and thereby force wages down and wreck the working conditions of millions of people. Never in the history of its activity has the National Association of Manufacturers spoken for improvement of the living standards of working people. It has opposed the child-labor laws, it has fought minimum wages for women and minors employed in industry, it has done its best to wreck safety and industrial insurance legislation.

The Republican Charlie McCarthys of the National Association of Manufacturers have sure cooperated with their masters. They have ignored much-needed housing legislation and legislation for our war veterans like a pay car passes a bum. But they have a pending tax-reduction bill, under which taxpayers in the Nation's low-income groups can look forward to mightly little saving, while the high and mighty are due for the cream. Under it, the top 4 percent of the taxpayers get a 37 percent slice of the cut, while the bottom 53 percent receive only 27 percent of the tax cut. A man with a wife and two children who earns $2,500 a year will save $28.50 a year in taxes, while a man with a $300,000 income will save $37,430 a year, over a thousand times the poor man's $28.50 saving.

Oh, didn't the Republican Party fool the people last November 5. They promised that with a Republican Congress and abolition of OPA, prices would come down. That promise has not been realized—prices are higher than ever. Now, when your wife travels around to the various stores—grocery stores in particular—she often hears the expression, "No, no. I can't afford that. What else have you?" It isn't unusual these days to be unable to even afford hot dogs. They get as much as 69 cents a pound for them. You pay $10.50 for a pair of shoes that formerly sold for $6.45—shoes for work, mind you, not for promenading down Fulton Street.

Look what the National Association of Manufacturers-directed Republican majority did to the school-lunch program. All but 12 Republicans voted against the Democratic motion to recommit the bill so as to insert the usual full amount for the school-lunch program.

To get back to the Republican antilabor bill. The working people of this country have never had a great deal of security. They have never been able to look forward to old age without apprehension. The Eightieth Congress has done nothing to promote their security. On the contrary, all the legislation passed to date by this Republican Congress affecting working people has been injurious or nonbeneficial to them. How can they be contented when they know this? Yet the greatest bulwark against communism is a happy and contented people. Communism thrives on discontent, and I am afraid this measure will contribute to its spread.

For 14 years the Democratic Congress protected labor. As a consequence, when our country needed labor to supply the sinews of war, production attained such a speed that we became the wonder and envy of the world.

This one-sided bill will not promote labor-management peace. On the contrary, it will stimulate tremendous industrial strife and cause discontent and unhappiness among our working people. Does anyone with an ounce of common sense think that the longshoremen along Brooklyn's waterfront are willingly going back to their pay and working conditions of 25 years ago? This bill is saturated with subterfuge and legal technicality intended to destroy and confuse collective bargaining relations. In case there's any doubt about that, one of its authors, Congressman HARTLEY, said during its consideration on June 4, and I quote his exact words from page 6383 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "I think you are going to find there is more in this bill than may meet the eye and may have been heretofore presented to you."

Yes; there is more in this bill than meets the eye. It can only bring back the mistakes of 1929, the return of bread lines and apple stands. I cannot improve on the words of a Democratic colleague, Congressman LESINSKI, just a week ago today: "Already the first signs of recession are appearing. Business leaders have begun to dig economic storm cellars. No propaganda can convince the American people that we have ever been picketed into a recession or struck into a depression. The American people know that we are speculated into panics and profiteered into depressions. They will not long be deceived by the hollow slogan that labor has become too strong."

In conclusion, I sincerely trust that for the future of America and the welfare of our Nation our great President in his wisdom will veto this outrageous piece of legislative chicanery. No law that is unfair and discriminates against the individual citizen will ever succeed in free America. You cannot by a law such as this destroy man's God-given rights.

Ukuleles and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Jefferson County Union, of Fort Atkinson, Wis., of June 11, 1947:

UKULELES AND TAXES

Probably you don't know it, but this is national Be Kind to Taxpayers Week. It's especially appropriate that this happy week should wind up with Father's Day next Sunday, especially in view of the fact that poor pappy usually winds up behind the eight ball.

Anyway, the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce thinks Be Kind to Taxpayers Week is a good idea, and for good reason, too. Mr. William J. Petersen, executive secretary of the State chamber, has written to Executive Secretary Ralph Ebbott, of the Fort Chamber, explaining why it's a good idea.

We have all been advocating reduction in Federal expenditures and economy in government. A fellow named Andy Anderson, a small businessman of Ada, Okla., now gives us a new approach to do something about it.

When Anderson learned that the Government was spending more money for its support than was being spent on food for 142,000,000 people in the United States, he got hot under the collar. He felt that it was time to do something about it, and that is exactly what he did.

He had heard about such special weeks as "be-kind-to-dogs week," so he felt it much more important to proclaim a national "be-kind-to-taxpayers week." His principal idea is to get people to spend 9 cents and 15 minutes in writing to their United States Senators and Representatives, urging their support for Federal budget cuts.

You will agree that if such a suggestion is carried out to any extent, it may do much to offset the bureaucrats' pressure campaign for continued high spending.

Probably you're somewhat puzzled by the difficulty of paring the nonessential timber from the Federal pay roll. You know a lot of people are engaged in some pretty silly tasks. Why doesn't the Government lop them off?

The difficulty is that these Federal parasites are voters, members of their families

are voters, their friends and neighbors are voters, the limited trade they serve are voters—and besides they probably do a couple of worth-while things that, in their own mind at least, justifies their existence.

Let's assume that you are 1 of 1,000 Federal employees in the fictitious Bureau of Ukulele Research. You have, let's assume, 37 relatives, none of whom want to feed you in case you lost your job, and 13 friends who don't want to loan you money under the same circumstances. If all your fellow workers are similarly situated, that's 50,000 voters who are working to keep you in office so they won't have to keep you.

Although ukulele playing is mostly a lost art, there are probably 50,000 ukulele players in the country who are interested in seeing their favorite hobby generously promoted. These 50,000 ukulele players have 50,000 wives who probably figure that it's better for the old man to spend his evenings fiddling around with a ukulele than fiddling around with that stray blond down in the next block. Furthermore, there's a neighbor on each side of each ukulele player who is probably interested in maintaining his hobby in the reasonable fear that if he gives up the comparatively quiet ukulele he may take up the saxophone.

That, unless our sixth-grade arithmetic teacher gave us a bum steer, adds up to 250,000 lively voters, all vitally interested in the preservation of the ukulele—and in preserving the jobs of the employees of the Bureau of Ukulele Research. Maybe this sounds pretty silly to you, but it isn't so silly to the squirming politician who very likely will lose 250,000 votes if he bombs the futile bureau out of existence.

The only answer to this dilemma, of course, is to follow Mr. Petersen's advice, and to exert so much pressure on the politician in the opposite direction that he will be ultimately convinced that he's going to lose more than 250,000 votes if he doesn't blast the Bureau of Ukulele Research out of existence.

The two Wisconsin Senators are ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH MCCARTHY; the Second District Congressman is GLENN DAVIS, all of whom employ competent secretaries to read and register your applause and your boos. The post office will be very happy to sell you three 3-cent stamps.

Is your pen ready?

Michigan Leads Against Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an article from the Detroit Times of June 5, 1947, relative to a law passed by my State of Michigan to compel Communists to register.

During the early part of this year I introduced a bill in the House seeking a Federal law to accomplish the very same purpose. Michigan and her very alert and aggressive Governor is leading the Nation in an attempt to preserve this country from this insidious menace of communism.

I am proud of our Governor and the Michigan Legislature.

STATE TAKES LEAD

(By Albert Kaufman)

LANSING, June 5.—Michigan lawmakers led the Nation today in the fight against communism by passing a law requiring every individual Red who follows the Moscow party line to register with the State attorney general.

The law becomes official within a fortnight after the senate concurs in several amendments and Governor Sigler signs his name to the bill, backed solidly by the Republican Party and the administration.

Only three dissenting votes were cast in the house last night as the lawmakers wrote the first bill in the country bringing Communists under State control.

HEAVY PENALTIES

Laying down heavy penalties up to $5,000 fine or 5 years in jail, or both, for those who fail to comply, the bill requires:

The Communist Party to furnish the State with a list of its membership, activities, income, and expenditures.

All Communist newspapers, radio stations, or propaganda machines, incorporated or otherwise, which come under the control of a foreign power, to register with the attorney general.

All periodicals, books, pamphlets or other printed matter distributed in Michigan by foreign agents to carry on its masthead the legend:

"Published in compliance with the law of the State of Michigan governing the operation of foreign agencies."

COMMUNISTS DEFINED

The bill defines as Communists any individual, group, club, league, society, committee, association, or political party, or combination of individuals, subsidized by a foreign government, whose object is to control or overthrow the government.

As originally drafted in the senate, the bill imposed drastic penalties upon Communist-dominated labor unions.

But the house judiciary committee struck out a provision which would have deprived such unions of bargaining rights and tied up their funds until loyal elements regained control.

Upon the effective date of the bill, the attorney general will have the right to bring in any individual suspected of communistic leanings.

If after a hearing the charge is sustained, the attorney general is empowered to bring criminal charges against the accused.

CALLAHAN IS AUTHOR

The bill was introduced by Senator Matthew F. Callahan, Detroit Republican, after his investigation of American Youth for Democracy Clubs on Michigan college campuses.

Revealing the organizations as Communist fronts, Callahan's senate committee on subversive activities, succeeded in having them ousted from State-supported schools.

Because of its startling disclosures, the committee has since been given permanent status, with an unlimited appropriation to function until the start of the 1949 legislative session.

"Passage of my bill provides the necessary teeth to carry on our fight against the Communists," Callahan said last night.

Oil and Gas Division, Department of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF., *May 20, 1947.*

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SHEPPARD: I am addressing you today in the role of private citizen to do what I conceive to be my duty—namely, make to you the following brief statement with respect to the continued existence of the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the Interior.

Throughout the war I served in Washington as Deputy Petroleum Administrator. For some months thereafter, at the request of the President, I continued here in order to organized the Oil and Gas Division of Interior—the office which is now being considered by your committee. It is this unique experience, together with my work in the oil industry over many years prior to the war, which leaves me possessed of certain knowledge that, in the public interest, causes me to communicate with you in this way.

I think there is no need to describe the nature of the Oil and Gas Division's functions. Mr. Max W. Ball, the present Director, and others I assume have supplied you with full information along these lines. What I want to do is to tell you briefly of the kind of governmental organization we had dealing with oil when I was called to Washington in May 1941—when the Nation faced the prospect of war.

There was then no Oil and Gas Division in Interior and no central office of any kind for the administration of oil affairs. There were some 28 different departments and agencies of the Federal Government concerning themselves with various phases of oil operation—independently one from the other. To anyone attempting to get an understanding of the oil position and to mobilize oil resources for war, there could scarcely have been a more discouraging prospect. To me, entering Government for the first time, it was well-nigh unbelievable that such confusion, organizational inadequacy, and ignorance of the basic facts could exist in the Government of these great United States. But it did.

It was as a body functioning without a coordinating brain. Many of the separate parts worked well enough, but, unrelated to the whole, even these made no sense in terms of the practical. Nowhere in the Federal Government could I learn either the extent of the oil requirements or of the oil resources of the Nation available to meet them.

In short, in May 1941 we were desperately unprepared. It was, with the organization then existing, a physical impossibility to function intelligently or effectively. Fortunately, we had a number of months in which to correct the condition before we were attacked. But, as one intimately familiar with our state of disorganization at that time, I dread to contemplate what would have been the result had we been attacked in May instead of December 1941.

In light of this experience in oil administration, I cannot in conscience remain silent when I see threatening a return to the same state of affairs which I have described to you. For it is just such a return to chaos which a denial of Interior's appropriation for a continuance of the Oil and Gas Division means—again only incoherent policy, unintelligent action, and ignorance with respect to basic facts can result. While I have no longer the responsibility of a Government official in this matter, I feel so strongly upon the subject that I have nevertheless come on from San Francisco to say these things to those Members of Congress who bear special responsibility in this relation. Finding the hearings closed, I communicate in this way.

Further do I want to emphasize that in respect of available oil resources we face a far more serious situation today than we did in 1941. Then, by the accident of good fortune, we had a healthy margin of reserve capacity to produce and refine crude oil—about 25 percent, or, roughly, 1,000,000 barrels

per day. Today we have no reserve capacity. At the same time, according to the military, our total requirements for oil should war be again upon us would be vastly more than in the last days of the war just ended. This time, then, we would have to face the physical fact that our present-day domestic capacity would be definitely short of meeting our needs by a large amount. I think this is a frightening prospect.

What may be the solution of the oil problem, looking to the security of the Nation in the days ahead, I do not profess to know. But this much is certain, the problem is real, it is of the greatest importance, and it must be dealt with. The Oil and Gas Division, if allowed to continue its work, will, I am sure, come forward with complete facts, properly digested, and finally with well-considered recommendations for the attention of Congress. Eliminate it and you have removed the only machinery for dealing in an organized and intelligent way with this situation.

The seriousness of the position is, I know, appreciated by the President and the Secretary of the Interior, but neither can deal singlehandedly with the problems involved. Obviously, they must have organization to carry on the necessary work. That is why the small staff of the Oil and Gas Division was recruited upon the termination of the Petroleum Administration for War. It represents a minimum with which anything worth while can be accomplished. Certainly, considering the proportions of the oil problem, the amount of the requested appropriation is of small consequence, and I would think that Congress, no less than the President and the Secretary of the Interior, would want at least this executive assistance in the discharge of its responsibility.

I reiterate—as a private citizen, but one who has had intimate contact with this problem in Government over some 5 years—it will be a tragic mistake if, in the uneasy world in which we live, the Congress should fail to appropriate the $245,000 which is required to continue the intensely important functions of the Oil and Gas Division.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH K. DAVIES.

Corporation Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the Congress is confronted with cross-currents and charges—in some instances on the part of business itself against labor, and in many instances on the part of labor leadership against business—the public becomes somewhat bewildered because there is lacking facts on which to pass judgment.

The involved question of running a business large or small is never too generally understood by the public at large. Large figures are misleading unless they are counterbalanced by equally large figures, as is usually necessary. We have been led to believe that business both large and small is making the most unprecedented profits in the world. This is no doubt substantially true but we have never been given all of the facts associated with these large profits.

Probably in the final analysis the net profits of the average business, with few exceptions particularly in monopolistic types, are lower by far than they were in what we refer to as the normal years.

I include here an editorial taken from the Minneapolis Tribune of June 12, dealing with the question of corporation profits:

CORPORATION PROFITS

The profits of business have been the subject of much abuse by both organized labor seeking higher wages and consumers seeking lower prices.

Last year's profits have been estimated by the Department of Commerce at $12,000,000,000, of which about $5,000,000,000 were paid out in dividends.

A more comprehensive study of corporation finances, however, is given in a recent study by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

This study shows that last year more than $8,000,000,000 were put into inventories, largely because of the lack of balance in the supply of raw materials and parts. With sales to civilians increasing and credit business again established, the accounts and notes receivable went up more than $7,000,000,000. Despite the tax reduction which came last year for corporations, current debt was $2,000,000,000 higher than the previous year.

These items on the books absorbed a good part of the corporation funds.

In addition, the SEC report shows the corporations invested $5,000,000,000 last year in property for reconversion, modernization and additions to plants and equipment. This figure does not include the heavy outlay for plant maintenance and repairs, most of which was put off during the war. Such replacement is coming at prices much higher than the original costs on which the depreciation reserves of the firms usually are based.

The result has been that the $7,000,000,000 which appeared to be left from the estimated $12,000,000,000 in profits last year already have been eaten up by fixed and working assets.

What is more, $700,000,000 in additional net capital were raised by these companies last year by issuing long-term bonds, and $2,500,000,000 more were raised by long-term bank loans and new stock.

The big profits which appeared on paper last year, consequently, have been whittled pretty small.

This plowing back of business earnings and financing through stock sales is what is keeping industry going. It is what is making jobs for people.

So long as those who have money to invest can see hope of making a profit by making an investment, there will be hope for the national economy.

The Late David I. Walsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to the late former Senator David I. Walsh, by Robert L. Norton, appearing in the Boston Post of June 13, 1947:

THE LATE SENATOR DAVID I. WALSH

WASHINGTON, June 12.—There are many thousands of people who feel a sense of personal grief over the passing of former United States Senator David I. Walsh.

THIRD OF CENTURY

Among them is this writer, who mourns the loss of a friendship lasting more than a third of a century. It is only in the intimate aspects of life that one comes to know a man. "Dave" Walsh was a man.

Over a long period, in this business of observing and reporting life in America, we have known quite well, many so-called great men, including Presidents and others who have figured large in the public mind in their day.

Most of these men are forgotten by the succeeding generation. They had their day. ("All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players. They have their exits and their entrances, and one man in his time plays many parts.")

STRIKING CAREER

In his full life "Dave" played many parts. He had a striking career.

When I first met the Senator, his ambition was to get a place on the Democratic State ticket as a candidate for State auditor. He was a modest young man "from the sticks," who had served one term in the legislature, handsome figure and a natural orator.

PROBES GOP SCANDAL

He was first launched into public notice when employed as attorney in an investigation of vote buying by the Republican politico-textile machine in New Bedford.

The Republican oligarchy which had controlled the State since the Civil War, except when the Democratic Party had elected Russell, Douglas, and Foss, had become decadent and rotten with surfeit of power. It was beginning to break up and a new spirit of liberalism was taking hold with the advent of the magnetic and powerful Teddy Roosevelt.

The Democratic power was centered in Boston and deriving support from discontented workers in some of the industrial centers of the State. The mention of Walsh only brought sneers from the well-entrenched Democratic machine in Boston. He was a country boy.

Up to that time the Democrats had consistently supported Yankee Democrats for high office, men like Josiah Quincy for mayor and Russell and Charles G. Hamlin for governor.

The so-called new immigrant groups of newcomers had little representation and indifferent consideration, but their aspirations and place in the government of the State and in the business life of Massachusetts had some backing.

Thus it came about that Mr. Walsh was supported in his candidacy for the governorship in days when the faint-hearted in the Democratic Party would say, conscience of intolerance and racial discrimination: "You can't elect an Irish Catholic as Governor of Massachusetts."

But Walsh was elected Governor and United States Senator, and for more than a quarter of a century became the acknowledged Democratic leader of New England and its greatest vote getter. His election demonstrated for all time that intolerance, religious and racial prejudice did not operate in Massachusetts when the Democratic Party offered a man of the high caliber and integrity of "Dave" Walsh.

IN FINE SCHOOL

Walsh was brought up in the school of men like John Boyle O'Reilly, Patrick A. Collins, and Jeffrey Roche.

Mr. Walsh became a powerful national figure in the Democratic Party. He was a

middle-of-the-road conservative in his political philosophy, a strong supporter of advanced social legislation, but likewise an advocate of free enterprise and a champion of the business interests of New England.

The late Senator did not like Franklin Roosevelt personally, nor did he follow the New Deal in all its windings, particularly when Roosevelt sought to take over the Supreme Court. He had described Mr. Truman to us as a "mediocrity and a political accident."

Mr. Walsh was not always in tune with the predominating elements in his own party. Above everything he was an independent and he belonged with men like Borah, Norris, and La Follette in the United States Senate.

SAME HELPING HAND

The Senator had an old-fashioned courtliness of manner, a gentleman of the old school. He was generous in his sympathies and literally thousands, now living, can testify that he gave them a helping hand. He was a grand and considerate companion and loved the art of graceful living. He had marked intellectual attainments and was a welcome figure in academic circles.

There were many facets to his character and career which would be of fascinating interest, since he played a conspicuous part in public affairs during one of the most critical periods in American history.

But we think, by and large, that his greatest contribution was the enlargement of the spirit of tolerance in his native State of Massachusetts and living demonstration of the fact that integrity in public office is the first duty and obligation of those who are called to represent people in the government of this country, in whatever capacity.

"Dave" Walsh was the kind of a man who helped greatly to maintain our confidence in democratic processes and representative government.

Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of June 12, 1947, entitled "Governing Guam" and one from the New York Times of June 14, 1947, entitled "The Territory of Guam."

For some days now, the Territories Subcommittee of the House Public Lands Committee has been conducting hearings on a number of bills introduced into the Congress for the purpose of establishing democracy in Guam. Among the bills introduced are several which owe their origin to the good intentions of their authors who are concerned only with establishing an American form of government in an American dependency. Certain other bills are obviously inspired by the Navy Department and are designed to preserve for the Navy as much of its governing prerogatives in Guam as can be salvaged. Among the latter there is a bill presented to the committee jointly by the Departments of Navy and Interior with the alleged blessing of the State and War Departments.

On February 28, 1947, I was present at a session of the Hawaiian Legislature when it was addressed by the Secretary of the Interior on the general subject of statehood and democracy. In that address Mr. Krug strongly endorsed statehood for Hawaii and expounded on the need for extension of democracy into the far Pacific. Included in his address were some statements referring to Guam, Samoa, and the Pacific islands. He said in part, and I quote:

The inhabited Pacific islands which are, or may become, a continuing United States responsibility need civil administration and an immediate measure of self-government. The native populations of these islands have made great progress under naval administration. But now they are ready for the next step in the American tradition, which is civil political administration, responsible to the people who are governed.

On May 28, 1947, Mr. Krug appeared before the Territories Subcommittee in company with Mr. Sullivan, the Under Secretary of the Navy, and read a joint statement on the matter of government for Guam. At that time these gentlemen presented to the committee a proposed organic act for Guam which they stated had the approval of the Secretaries of State and War. That is the organic act which the Washington Post editorial says is defective in that it make no provision for grand jury proceedings or for trial by jury. That is the organic act which the Washington Post and the New York Times say does not measure up to the United Nations trusteeship agreement nor to our own principles and past performance in the administration of dependent Territories.

I, for one, am not surprised that the Navy should submit such a bill. I am surprised, however, to find the Interior and State Departments lending it their endorsement. I am especially disturbed about Mr. Krug, who, in spite of his statements before the Hawaiian Legislature and his other public utterances on the subject, now sponsors a bill which fails to provide for immediate transfer of Guam to civil administration. In fact, the measure which he now endorses is so drafted as to allow for the continuation of naval administration for an indefinite period of years, dependent on the discretion of the President.

The Navy-Interior measure for local self-government in Guam also contains advisory language pursuant to which the Governor of Guam can continue indefinitely to be a naval officer on active duty. It also contains language pursuant to which the heads of departments of the local government can be naval officers on active duty. In supplementation to this latter provision the proposed bill specifically denies the Legislature of Guam the right to be consulted in the appointment of the heads of the departments of the local government. In this respect it contravenes the very principles of our democracy and contradicts the specific provisions of the Federal Constitution, the various State constitutions, and the organic acts for the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii.

The so-called bill of rights contained in this Navy-Interior bill as stated in the Washington Post editorial, fails to provide for jury trial and for grand-jury proceedings. To deny Guamanians these cornerstones of freedom is one thing, but to deny these rights to the many thousands of continental Americans resident on Guam is another. Jury trial should at least be optional on Guam. To deny it completed is inexcusable and in my opinion completely un-American.

The so-called bill of rights is glaringly deficient in another respect: nowhere therein is provision made guaranteeing equal protection of the laws in Guam. Why are not the residents of this American possession entitled to equal protection of the laws? I for one have difficulty in understanding why the Secretary of the Interior endorses a bill of this kind. I have heard him speak on the matter of extending democracy in the Pacific islands and I have listened to his speeches urging statehood for Hawaii. I must confess that I am completely confused by his apparent change of attitude.

The Navy-Interior sponsored bill is defective in other respects. There is no need for me to go on and bring them to attention in detail. I have no doubt that the Congress will utterly reject this compromise of the principles of democracy. I regret exceedingly that the Department of the Interior, which is responsible for the government of the non-self-governing Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands should be so weak and so unconcerned in the matter of democratic government for the people of Guam. I am also disappointed to see that the bill produced by the Navy and Interior Departments has the endorsement of our State Department. How can we expect to encourage the establishment of democracy in foreign nations when our own State Department, which has the primary responsibility in this respect, itself endorses an undemocratic form of government for one of our own possessions?

[From the Washington Post of June 12, 1947]

GOVERNING GUAM

There is room, we think, for liberalization of the proposals now before Congress to establish an organic act for the Government of Guam. For half a century, ever since we acquired it from Spain in 1899, the island has been under the rule of the United States Navy. Whatever the benevolence of that rule, it cannot be said to have discharged the pledge made by President McKinley to "insure that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of free peoples." Civil government, and an increasing measure of self-government, are essential implications of that pledge.

The proposed organic act on which the House Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Possessions has just concluded hearings would establish civil government—but at some indefinite future time. Perhaps there is justification for continued naval rule—that is, rule under a naval officer appointed by the President to the governorship—until some of the more pressing problems of rehabilitation can be overcome. But the Guamanians ought to be assured that they will have a civil governor within 2 or 3 years at the outside. And their legislature ought to have power to confirm officials appointed by him. The proposed organic act is defective as well, it seems to us, in that it makes no provision for grand jury proceedings or for trial by jury—cornerstones of freedom. The Navy appears to fear that it could not effectively administer justice if the Guamanians had

these basic rights. Is not the fear itself an admission that naval rule is necessarily arbitrary?

What is now proposed for Guam measures up neither to the United Nations trusteeship agreement nor to our own principles and past performance in the administration of dependent Territories. We do not believe that essential military security need be any more affected by the extension of civil government and the progressive development of self-government in Guam than in Puerto Rico or Hawaii. Indeed, freedom is the tie that most effectively binds our dependencies to us. And the fostering of it is the American pattern that most enhances our stature in the eyes of the world.

[From New York Times of June 14, 1947]

THE TERRITORY OF GUAM

After 50 years of denial to the people of Guam of those basic human rights which the founders of the United States held to be self-evident, it now appears that something is to be done for these islanders by Congress. The war stirred interest in this forgotten bit of land that we acquired from Spain by the Treaty of Paris in 1898. Under pressure of this public interest Congress bestirred itself to hold hearings and make an inquiry into conditions there.

The House Public Lands Committee now has before it a bill submitted by the Navy and Interior Departments which would go at least part way to repair this long neglect. It would give the Guamanians citizenship, extend to them the protection of some of our Bill of Rights, and make other reforms. But it would not put the islanders under civilian administration. Nor would it provide for trial by jury. Rights and petitions for redress of grievances would go to the President, or to Congress, but would pass through the hands of the Governor of Guam, who would be the official complained against.

Guam is not a large island. Its war-scarred inhabitants—literally scarred, many of them, through 3 years of Japanese occupation and the severe fighting that accompanied the island's recapture—number only some 20,000 people. They are industrious, clean, happy, loyal, intelligent people. While there is public interest in the matter this would seem to be a good time for Congress to go all the way and give them that democratic government and those fundamental rights that have been too long denied them.

Tribute to General Eaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, one of the great leaders of our Army Air Forces is retiring—Lt. Gen. Ira H. Eaker. He has been one of the most impressive, fair-minded, capable men ever to appear before the Appropriations Subcommittee for the War Department, a worthy associate of General Arnold and General Spaatz. Under permission heretofore granted, I place in the RECORD this tribute to General Eaker:

MISSION COMPLETED

(By Frederick H. Neely in Collier's magazine)

The day before, an Army bomber crashed on a lot in Brooklyn and its crew of four was consumed in the inevitable and immediate inferno that followed with that type of plane.

Now, here we were, strapped in the nose of a similar bomber on Washington's Bolling Field about to depart for New York. We don't think we betrayed any uneasiness, but the Army captain, who sat in the open-cockpit pilot's seat immediately behind our roofless bombardier compartment, suddenly halted the ground crew as it prepared to pull through the big wooden propellers and start the two 400-horsepower Libertys. Then he summoned the sergeant-mechanic from the rear cockpit and in a quiet but authoritative voice gave this order:

"If we have to bail out, you (meaning us in the nose) will go first the moment I give the signal. Do not jump out over the nose; you'll be chewed up by the props or hit the landing gear. Climb over us quickly—don't worry about stepping in our faces—slide along the top of the fuselage and drop off behind the wings. You (the sergeant) follow. You (the lieutenant and copilot on his right) go next. When all of you have left the ship, I'll take care of myself."

This was in 1925 and that captain was Ira C. Eaker. In a couple of days (June 15, actually) he'll hang up his Army blouse on which the three stars of a lieutenant general have blazed for nearly 4 years, close his desk in the Pentagon as Deputy Commanding General of the AAF, and drive out to Oregon with his wife, Ruth. He says he will hunt and fish and plant and harvest. His 30 years' service, 29 as an active pilot, are over. But a grateful people, by act of Congress, have ordained that he carry the permanent rank of major general.

Eaker was on the first hitch of duty in Washington in 1925 and he was hammering away at a new philosophy called air power, previously and sensationally launched by Gen. Billy Mitchell, but which no one took very seriously. (General Mitchell risked—even courted—martyrdom in his attempts to arouse a sleepy nation, and when he was scuttled after charging the Army with criminal negligence in handling the development of aviation, he retired to his estate in Virginia and followed the hounds until his death in 1936.)

Captain Eaker had nothing but his Army pay, but he cautiously risked the wrath of the high brass, then periodically refighting the Battle of Gettysburg, by continuing to preach the Mitchell gospel at every opportunity. He was an adroit supersalesman with a keen, natural gift for public relations in its original, pure definition. He knew he had a good product to sell, so he took the long, exhausting method of making friends for it and patiently demonstrating what his air service could do with the little it had then and prophesying how it could be developed into the greatest in the world.

Any writer who could command an inch of publication space received patient and honest assistance from him. He always was reachable. Soon the word got around among the Washington correspondents that this captain was a swell officer. Seemed to enjoy being called Ira rather than Captain, too. He'd give you anything, talk freely, trust you. To prove his point he'd take you up, and what a pilot.

Early in his Army life, Ira Eaker learned that one segment of the public suspects every military man of being a lobbyist for funds to pad his nest, improve his command and even of being willing to foment a real war—to win medals. He determined then and religiously followed a plan to mix with the people wherever he was stationed. He wanted their thoughts and he wanted them to have the product of the military mind, too. He participated in their civic activities and even went to school with them, first studying business law, then journalism.

Today he has a greater knowledge and understanding of the civilian attitude on war and preparedness than perhaps any other military man, and he can switch over to the civilian viewpoint quicker than he can change from uniform to mufti.

With his vision of America someday having a mighty air fleet (realized in the recent war when he alone commanded half a million American airmen in Europe), a more personally ambitious officer would not be leaving the service now, at only 51, but would hang around and await the impending retirement of his close friend, Gen. Carl Spaatz, AAF chief, with 37 years' service already chalked up. He would pull strings to head up the new and independent Air Force conceived in the Army-Navy unification plan and scheduled to be born later in the year.

But General Eaker's feelings on that point are positive and final. The new baby should be reared by the youngsters—air generals in their forties—who fought and beat the Luftwaffe and the Jap air force and who already are deep in development work on supersonic piloted planes, robots, and winged atomic weapons.

General Spaatz shares this viewpoint, too, and if the new Air Force is to come into being soon, he will stay in active service only long enough to derive the personal satisfaction of seeing his dreams, born when he sprouted wings in 1916, come true and then—go fishing. General Eaker's successor is Lt. Gen. Hoyt S. Vanderberg, 48, wartime commander of the famous Ninth Air Force, and nephew of Chairman ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The papers on June 15 doubtless will carry the story of General Eaker's retirement and they'll review his brilliant military record. It should be carefully digested by every soldier and every young man contemplating making the Army a career. Ira Eaker enlisted as a foot soldier for the other war, stayed in the service, reached three-star grade and retires a major general with 22 decorations and awards from 12 nations and many "firsts" in aviation development, five of which are permanent milestones in aviation history:

He was a pilot of the Army flight that made the first complete circuit of South America (1927) and the only airman to start and finish with the same plane. (His copilot was Muir S. Fairchild, now major general commanding the AAF Air University.) He was chief pilot of the Army Question Mark (1929), the first plane to fly continuously for more than 150 hours, by refueling in flight. (The commander of that operation was Major Spaatz.) He was the first to make a transcontinental blind flight (1936) entirely by instruments, and he did it in a single-seater fighter plane without seeing the ground except for landings for refueling. He was the first to invade Hitler's Fortress Europe (1942), leading the inaugural raid of B–17's on Rouen, France, though boss of the famous Eighth Bomber Command and then a brigadier general. He was the first to shuttle-bomb between Italy and Russia (1944), leading that flight also, though then a three-star general and commanding the Mediterranean Allied Air Forces.

General Eaker always thought first of his men during the peace years—he gets a lot of mail from them now, notably from the enlisted group—and he continued to think of them in war without compromising his plan for victory—no easy task. That is why he went out on the first all-American air assault on Hitler's Europe, and again led the first shuttle-bombing between Italy and Russia and return.

He claims he did this (by way of explaining why he risked his life when the general's job is behind the lines surveying the over-all results of his command) to obtain more direct and detailed knowledge on the problems to be met by his green youngsters than he could have received through staff reports. We just don't believe it. But we know that in personally making the kickoff and leading his team into action, he firmly established with his airmen the all-true legend that they

were not being ordered by the Old Man to do what he couldn't or wouldn't do.

Early in the life of the Eighth Bomber Command, when the supply of B–17's was pitifully low, losses were high and there was no fighter escort, General Eaker fought and won a battle with top policy makers for a limit to the number of combat missions his men should make over Germany. Once the number was completed—25 in the beginning, higher later when our losses dropped—the airmen never again were ordered into combat, and thousands of parents got their boys back because of this efficient and humanitarian Eaker policy. He gets a lot of mail from them, too.

Address of Edward F. Poss, Past Grand Worthy President of the Fraternal Order of Eagles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the address made by Edward F. Poss, past grand worthy president of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, on Saturday afternoon, June 14, 1947.

Prior to the admission of Mr. Poss as grand worthy president of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, he gave of himself in behalf of the causes of this great order: Mothers' pensions, old-age pensions, and the teaching by positive example and precept, "If I cannot speak well of a man I will never speak evil of him."

This is almost the same example and precept as taught by the father of our country, George Washington, who, in a scrapbook in his adolescent years, wrote the words, "Speak not ill of the absent for it is unjust."

The address delivered on Flag Day at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier is just what Mr. Poss and his great organization lives. Mr. Poss, a close friend of Presidents and governors, paid first attention to the man who was down and out. Every man to him was the same. He truly lived up to the words of Kipling that one "could walk with kings and not lose the common touch." It is an unusual privilege for me to include this address from a truly fraternalist who lives it:

Comrades, we appear here this afternoon in the name of one and a quarter million members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles for a twofold purpose.

First, to express our sincere appreciation for the supreme sacrifice made by you in order that liberty and peace might be enjoyed by a free people. Second, that by the preservation of this liberty and freedom such organizations as the Fraternal Order of Eagles might be privileged to spread their gospel of love of God and fellowman. It would be presumptuous on our part to attempt to add to, or detract from any of the honor that is yours. Providence has provided everlasting happiness for the unselfish sacrifice of life for one's country.

It is our duty, however, as living Americans and fraternalists, through the opportunity given by a free Democracy to save and safeguard those freedoms made possible by your sacrifice. Our pledge to you, today, is to work ceaselessly to the end that these liberties shall endure, that the right of free worship and franchise, continue. Further, we shall work to the end that a greater opportunity be given for all men to enjoy the liberties of a free Nation, that selfishness and greed be driven from our borders, that the fear of sickness, fear of insecurity of employment, yes, fear itself, shall be taken from the hearts of men, and that there may be transplanted in their stead a new consciousness of our responsibility to God and neighbor. We further pledge that we shall strive always by education, leadership, and example to promote the ideals of peace. By earnest application of love and respect for our fellowmen we will endeavor to eliminate the vices of greed and avarice and educate humanity to understand that real happiness can only come from love and understanding. With these simple pledges on our lips, and in the name of all my brother Eagles who, like you, have made the supreme sacrifice for their country, I offer you this plaque as a gesture of love and everlasting gratitude and pray God that the day will be hastened when all the nations of the world will live in peace, one with another.

The South, Its Problems and Advancement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I gave recently before the Federal Bar Association, in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOUTH, ITS PROBLEMS AND ADVANCEMENTS

You gentlemen, who spend a great portion of your time helping to unravel the legal problems in which humanity succeeds in entangling itself, appear to be taking a sort of busman's holiday in coming to listen to a discussion of the economic problems of the South. Perhaps you take a quiet satisfaction in the thought that here is a set of problems you are not called upon to solve. If so, I hope I can quickly disabuse you of that notion. It is easily demonstrable, I believe, that the problems relating to the South cannot be solved by the South alone, although we have and will make much headway, and that these problems deeply affect the lives of all the citizens of our country. No doubt you see evidence of the truth of this statement in your work.

The South is the Nation's biggest contradiction. It is rich in resources and people, but remains desperately poor when measured by per capita income. Potentially, the South leads in the welfare and wealth of its people; actually, it trails the other parts of the country. The late President Roosevelt called the South "America's No. 1 Economic Problem." All the problems have not been solved and may even become more severe as efforts are made to unriddle the economic puzzles which now exist. However, as one explores the contradictions of the South, he encounters possibilities which may make the region "America's No. 1 Economic Opportunity."

"What is the South?" Dr. Howard W. Odum, generally accepted as the preeminent authority of the region, says, "There is no longer any single entity which may be designated as 'the South.' More authentically, there is a Southeast, and a Southwest, comparable to four other major regions designated as the Northeast, the Northwest, the Middle States and the far West." In this discussion, however, I shall accept, with but one or two exceptions, the traditional 13 States of Virginia, North and South Carolina, Kentucky, Georgia, Alabama, Texas, Tennessee, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. At the last census, these 13 States contained over one-fourth of the Nation's population, or some 37,000,000 people. Within this number is more than one-half the country's total farm population. Two-thirds of the people of the South live in the country while in the rest of the Nation two-thirds of the people live in the cities. With this brief background, it is easy to understand that whatever affects the South should be of much concern to the rest of the Nation.

While we in the South recognize our problems, we are not afraid of them. We share the opinion as was stated recently by Gen. John C. Persons in a speech at the Birmingham Traffic and Transportation Club. He said, "The South has at last finished paying the price of the War Between the States. The carpetbag era is long since over. There is divided opinion as to whether we are being politically discriminated against. There is little question that there is still economic discrimination. Yet every day such barriers are being removed. And every day the South approaches more closely the status of full partnership in the affairs of the Nation."

As one reads this quote, he is reminded of the progress, the development, and the advancement of the South during the last 80 arduous years. The struggles of her brave and hospitable people, her patient wrestling with difficult problems, are a part of the achievement of our common country and constitute a noble portion of the strength and glory of the American democracy.

What are some of our present-day problems, and what are we doing about them? Let us look first at this region's agriculture. Until recent years the South had a one-crop economy, cotton. The invention of the cotton gin in 1793 was the compelling force in making cotton the foremost crop of this region. The demand abroad for this crop was in large part responsible for the institution of slavery, and though this was abolished as a result of the war between the North and South, cotton emerged stronger than ever. This despotic rule of one crop is largely responsible for the ruinous system of share tenancy and vicious credit which still exists on many of our farms, but to a lesser degree than before World War II. The one-crop system led to a progressive depletion of the soil in many areas, so that the old fields were abandoned and new lands planted farther westward. More and more fertilizer was required to maintain yield and often the small grower could not afford the required amount. Hence his yield grew less and less. Today cotton is still one of our most important crops. In fact it is the most important single farm enterprise in 10 Southern States. Thirteen million people still depend upon cotton for a livelihood and it bids fair to remain an essential part of our agricultural program. I say this because of the lessening of production and harvesting costs through mechanization and scientific farming, and the prospects through research for a more even competition with synthetic fibers. But this section no longer has all of its eggs in one basket. It is true that the boll weevil hastened crop diversification. Enterprise, Ala., has a monument to that insect on the main intersection of town, but diversification had begun before the advent of the destructive weevil.

Now the South is relying more and more upon a balanced agriculture. It is raising more of its foodstuffs, more livestock, more poultry. It has the greatest diversity of soils in the Nation. Alabama itself has 7 major types and almost 300 soil subtypes, thus the practice of diversification is made simpler. According to a southern newspaper (Richmond News Leader) the raising of cattle in the South increased 71 percent from 1930 to 1945, and hogs and pigs 65 percent. Sales of whole milk increased 128 percent, chickens 51 percent, and eggs 31 percent. New crops, such as soybeans, tung oil, and new kinds of hay, are produced, and more diversification of old crops is practiced. We in the South have discovered that steaks can be just as juicy and tender from southern cattle as from any other section of the country.

According to 1945 figures compiled by the Department of Agriculture, the five top sources of cash farm income from major agricultural products in the United States were in the order named: (1) cattle and calves, (2) milk, (3) hogs, (4) chickens and eggs, and (5) wheat. In sixth place were truck crops, and cotton and tobacco ranked seventh and eighth respectively. Corn was ninth and citrus fruits came tenth. With the exception of wheat, southern farmers are in as good a position as those of any other section for the production of any of these crops. As they continue to move toward a balanced agricultural economy, their pattern for the future will be placed upon proven sources of farm income.

Closely allied with farm diversification has been the progress in living and working conditions on southern farms. One measurement of farm modernization is central station electric service. When the REA program started 12 years ago, about one southern farm in 20 had electricity. Even now, when we have passed the half-way point nationally, the South has only a little better than one-third of its farms with power. However, remarkable progress has been made on a task which most analysts considered almost impossible. Power is coming to southern farms, and has already come to hundreds of thousands of them, on the basis of area coverage, that is, making power available for everyone in a given area, if anyone there can have it.

Most of the gain in farm power in the South can be traced directly or indirectly to the REA program. But that does not mean that electricity was provided by a magnanimous, charitable Government; quite the contrary. The power which has come to the South through the REA program has come because of the local efforts of southern people. They have banded together into cooperatives in areas where such self-help groups had never worked, never even been tried before. They created their own independent local businesses, and they ran them so efficiently that they are substantially ahead in amortizing the initial capital provided as a loan by REA. In the operation of their electric co-ops, the rural people of the South are learning and practicing economic democracy.

All over the South our people are learning how to use this new power for their own profit and comfort. The farmers are applying electricity to many chores, with a saving of time and money. And up to the present time the opportunities for putting this new power to use on the farm have scarcely been uncovered. These opportunities when developed may well lead to an even more diversified and sounder agriculture for the entire region. Just to mention one isolated case of what has already taken place, there is Forsyth County, in Georgia. This county has changed over from cotton land to poultry production since electricity came into the area. This change would have been impossible before the power lines connected these farms, because electricity has to be available to pump the enormous quantities of water necessary in a modern broiler factory and to provide light, heat, and power for a hundred other purposes in connection with this business.

Electricity is providing power for cotton gins, creameries, sweetpotato-curing houses, commercial dairies, rural machine shops, woodworking plants, and other community service establishments which are making rural communities of the South more stable and more livable.

But despite the progress of the last few years, there is still a tremendous electrification job to be done among us if all are to benefit from the use of this cheap power. In the Nation as a whole there are about two and one-half million farms still without electricity. Almost two-thirds of these are in the Southern States.

Another point that has a salient bearing on a balanced and stable agricultural economy is that of farm ownership. In June of 1937 the Congress passed the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act for the purpose of enabling more farmers to own their farms. While the recent war has had something to do with the trend toward an increase of farm ownership, it is believed that much impetus in this direction is due to the help given by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The following facts are noteworthy. These figures cover Southern States (as listed under the census classification):

Total number of farmers:	
1945	2,732,964
1940	2,856,784
1935	3,262,383
Average acreage per farm:	
1945	133.2
1940	124.7
1935	110.8
Size of families:	
1945	4.2
1940	5.5
1935	4.9
Number of full owners (not renters):	
1945	1,395,745
1940	1,222,010
1935	1,235,403
Part owners (rent part and own part):	
1945	186,016
1940	209,548
1935	224,040
Number of tenants (including share croppers):	
1945	1,139,464
1940	1,412,791
1935	1,788,754
Share croppers only:	
1945	444,342
1940	538,299
1935	711,277

Thus, while it is true that the total number of farms has declined and the size of the farms has grown larger, the number of farm owners shows a substantial increase.

The entire Nation has realized the importance of southern forestry, but the South has begun to appreciate its favorable position even more during recent years. This area has 40 percent of the Nation's forests, covering 200,000,000 acres, despite the most wasteful cutting. And two-thirds of the South's total forest area is owned by small forest owners averaging 74 acres each. More than one-half of the second-growth saw timber in the Nation is in the South, and the self-seeded, quick-growing piney woods of the coastal plains are a rich source of pulp for paper manufacture, as well as of lumber, turpentine, and rosin. The southern mountains contain the only substantial reserve of old-growth hardwood timber in the United States.

The South needs technical assistance to aid the forestry owners in adopting good management practices. Adequate steps will add approximately $15,000,000 each year to the income of small woodland owners alone. The cost of a sound forestry program will be returned many times in added growth of forest products and improved living standards. Modern conservation methods, selective cutting, and forest planning will rebuild the timber crops and save the eroded hillsides as well.

It is realized that mechanization of crop production and harvesting will require fewer laborers than the old hand methods. This is particularly true of cotton. One way of using at least part of the 5,000,000 to 8,000,000 workers, which it is predicted will be no longer needed in cotton culture, is in the farm diversification which I have discussed. Of course, many of these people will migrate to other regions of our Nation and will constitute a resettlement and reemployment problem in those areas to which they go.

Another matter which imposes a problem to the South and which is joined to its industrial development is that of economic discrimination. This handicap is being overcome, but too slowly. A recent victory of substantial weight is the decision of the Supreme Court in upholding an Interstate Commerce Commission order raising certain freight rates 10 percent in Northeastern States and lowering them 10 percent in Southern States. This decision does not yet establish complete equality, but it is a step in the right direction. Some estimate that the South will still be at a 20-percent disadvantage. There has never been any justification for charging the Birmingham, Ala., shipper 40 percent more for the same product and the same distance than the shipper in the favored Northeast.

A further argument heard from many sides, and for which there is much to be said, is that the South is an economic colony of the North. The Report to the President on Economic Conditions of the South says that "There never has been enough capital and credit in the South to meet the needs of its farmers and its industry. Its people have been living so close to poverty that the South has found it almost impossible to scrape together enough capital to develop its natural resources for the benefit of its own citizens.

"Lacking capital of its own, the South has been forced to borrow from outside financiers, who have reaped a rich harvest in the form of interest and dividends. At the same time, it has had to hand over the control of much of its business and industry to investors from wealthier sections."

It is true that outside interests hold most of the South's public utilities, railroad systems, iron and coal resources, etc. It has been necessary to encourage investment from outside sources, but as freight rates are made more equitable, there is reason to hope that our own people will dare venture into industry developed with local capital, local management, and local pride.

The South is rich in minerals and all possibilities in this field have not yet been explored. It is estimated that the South has a fifth of the soft coal in the Nation and that less than 2 percent of its coal seams have been tapped. Over 50 percent of the Nation's marble comes from the South, nearly all the phosphate and sulfur, and about two-thirds of our domestically produced oil. Bauxite and many other valuable mineral resources abound in this region.

There are great resources of water power in the South. Based on 1945 figures, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama rank third, fourth, sixth, and ninth, respectively, among all the States in developed hydroelectric power. Transportation and communication facilities are above average.

The South experienced a substantial expansion of industry during the war, but unfortunately most of it was of a type not readily convertible to peacetime uses. However, in the peacetime development of atomic energy, the region should retain its lead. Another big wartime expansion which appears

to have a continued market with, of course, some ups and downs, is the production of aluminum, also located in the Tennessee Valley. In my opinion, the Tennessee Valley area is certain to become a major concentration of heavy and light metal-working industries. It is likely that the TVA will result in a further transformation of the Scuth from a primarily agricultural region to one of proper balance between agriculture and industry. Just as the South today leads in the manufacture of textile products, so will it assume its proper place in the manufacture of other finished products. It is significant that despite a 25-percent drop in power demand on TVA during the first several months after VJ-day, a new peak of 2,035,000 kilowatts was established shortly after the beginning of the present fiscal year.

Another major concern of the Nation at present, and a particularly acute problem of the South, has to do with the education of its youth. I have pointed out earlier in this discussion that the South is far poorer than other areas of this Nation, measured by cash incomes. To make a bad situation worse, the South has far more children to educate. With ten and one-half million children of school age, or more than a third of the Nation's total—10,682,253 out of 29,805,259, ages 5–17, census of 1940—the South had only 16½ percent of total income payments in 1940, and 19½ percent in 1945.

Comparison between the rural South and urban Northeast shows an even more striking disparity. With 4,250,000 of the Nation's children, about 14 percent of the total, the rural South has 2 percent of the Nation's income. The urban Northeast with only twice as many children receives 42 percent of the Nation's income, or 10 times as much per child.

One can well imagine the inequality in educational opportunities. And yet the rural South is the seedbed of the Nation. From it is recruited the men and women to sustain the population of the cities. Estimates are that the education of children who move to the cities when they become adults costs the rural South $250,000,000 annually. The rural South loses its entire investment in these migrants while the cities get this needed manpower free.

Something then must be done to equalize the educational burdens. Some States have taken measures to do this. My own State of Alabama has adopted a minimum program whereby every child, regardless of his locale, shares equally in State funds expended for education. I believe we shall have to follow a similar practice on a Nation-wide basis. This means Federal aid to general education. Unless there is a unified national attack on this problem the result to the Nation can well be calamitous.

I have attempted to discuss briefly with you some of the problems with which we from the South are confronted and some of the progress we have made in solving them. There are others, of course, which I have not mentioned. All are issues which must be solved largely by the South, but which, in the final analysis, are national in scope and of national concern.

In closing I wish to express optimism and at the same time utter a word of caution. I say optimism because, even though the 13 States still are below the national average in annual wages, it has shown an appreciable advance in general wage levels. This is true both agriculturally and industrially. The United States Department of Labor has released figures showing that from 1940 to 1944 the average farm income in the South increased from $582 to $1,708 per year; industrial wages rose from $1,016 to $1,798. The total 1945 average income was $797, and while this is still far too low, it is better than a prewar average of $371. This increased income, if sustained, will buy more washing machines, more radios, better homes, better health, and will provide many other comforts of life. It will afford at the same time greater markets to industrial products from all parts of the United States.

On the other hand it is too early for my region to become satisfied. I realize that some of the increased income is due to higher-than-average prices for farm products and wartime industrialization. Also there are many in our population who do not share in either the farm or industrial high income groups. We still have a long, hard road to travel before we equal the national average. We do have the resources, both human and physical, for an even more advanced South. To realize this goal we must work and plan intelligently. Let us face the future with faith and foresight. In doing so we are destined for a richer and fuller life.

Decentralization of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, ever since I came to the Senate I have been keenly interested in the problem of decentralization of Government. The purpose of my interest is, of course, to bring Government closer to the people, to bring Government officials closer to the problems which they are supposed to handle, to make for efficiency and economy in Government affairs.

The fact that America is now in the atomic age has reinforced my concern with the present overcentralized congestion of Federal Government activities here in Washington. I regard this as a tremendous danger to our national security.

Recently I conducted some correspondence with the Bureau of the Budget on this subject. I ask that this correspondence be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with a statement which I recently made on the matter.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 10, 1947.

Hon. JAMES E. WEBB,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WEBB: For some time I have contemplated the grave menace of our country's security resulting from overconcentration in Washington, D. C., of all major Federal activities. It seems to me that the time is long overdue for a program for progressive decentralization from the Nation's Capital of Government agencies.

This, as I see it, would bring about advantages not only to community life in the Capital but would also bring Federal agencies closer to the people in the grass roots and would be basically a national defense measure.

It seems that the wartime decentralization from Washington has been reversed with most agency units being returned to town.

I would very much appreciate your answer to these questions:

(a) Do you regard such decentralization as I have mentioned as advisable and feasible in the near future? Of course, I do not mean a decentralization of a hundred or thousand employees, but in terms of major fractions such as one-third or one-fourth of the total number of Government employees here at present.

(b) What would you regard as the steps and the means by which Congress might promote such decentralization, e. g., what form of legislation enacted, if any, would be required?

Any comments which you might care to make on this subject would be greatly appreciated. Moreover, I would appreciate your answers to the above matter at the earliest possible date at your convenience.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1947.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter of May 10, in which you express concern over the grave menace to our country's security resulting from overcentralization of Federal activities in the metropolitan area of Washington. As pointed out in your statement printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 19, this is a matter which has been brought into sharper focus by the possible advent of atomic warfare.

You are correct in your belief that it has been the President's policy to reverse the decentralization from Washington that was undertaken in the early days of the war. The reasons for this reversal, I believe, are sound. The decentralization program undertaken in 1942 was a temporary and emergency measure. It was designed to obtain release of 3,000,000 square feet of office space as quickly as possible by removing from Washington activities or units not as essential to control and execution of the war program as the new war agencies then being created. No effort was made permanently to adjust the legal and administrative problems involved in the decentralization. Administrative efficiency and economy both dictated the decision to return many of the decentralized activities to Washington. Where there is no demonstrable advantage to return, agencies will not be brought back. For example, the War Department's Office of Dependency Benefits, first located in Newark, N. J., is now permanently located in St. Louis, Mo., at the Army's records center.

Before attempting to answer the two questions which you have raised, I should like to indicate briefly the setting in which I see these questions and which basically determines the character of my reply. In sustaining Government as an operating entity during an emergency, the question of decentralization or dispersion of governmental agencies covers but one limited segment of the problem. The questions which you raised comprehend the formulation and execution of an over-all security program designed, in the light of available information, to sustain governmental machinery under a variety of possible conditions. I share your concern about this entire problem, and have the definite feeling that we do not yet possess the detailed studies, expert opinions, and the background of consideration which would make possible an informed answer even as regards the governmental decentralization phase. Expert counsel needs to be obtained on scientific developments (particularly in respect to potential weapons of all kinds), military strategy, civilian defense measures, public health, transportation, communications, and a number of other subjects. It occurs to me that the proposed National Security Resources Board, or such similar agency as the Congress may approve, might appropriately study this problem in its totality.

You asked whether I regard decentralization as advisable and feasible in the near future. I must answer in the negative.

First, neither office space nor residential housing adequate to the needs of a major decentralization could be quickly obtained; second, the opportunity given during the war years to study the immediate results of a limited decentralization program supports the conclusion that, from a management point of view, the executive establishment would lose rather than gain from any large-scale decentralization of the administrative offices now remaining in Washington. About 90 percent of all Federal employees already are located outside the metropolitan area of Washington. The existing system of local field offices, in immediate contact with the public and directly responsible for operations conducted in conformity with uniform policy directives from Washington headquarters, represents the kind of decentralization which has proven administratively most effective. Further, from the national security standpoint alone, if a potential enemy of the United States should develop atomic weapons, I would assume that they would be directed in succession against our major cities. Thus, it would seem that decentralization and dispersion would provide only a limited degree of security and that the whole program of locating Government activities would have to be planned from the specific standpoint of maintaining some central operating authority even though physical facilities in various parts of the country might be laid waste.

Your second question related to what steps Congress might take to promote decentralization. Washington has, of course, long been established by law as the seat of the Government, and numerous statutes provide for locating activities in the seat of the Government. I assume that permanent decentralization would be regarded as a breach of the spirit or possibly the letter of these laws, and that amendment of them would have to be considered. Apart from this rather technical question, in my opinion, Congress could best promote the possibilities of such decentralization by moving to a consideration of the broader problem of whether the organizational structure of our Government should be changed to meet either changing conditions of world peace or the needs of a war waged with atomic weapons.

I hope that these comments will be of some use to you. May I state again that my answers have been phrased in general terms because of my belief that the broad problems, of which decentralization of Government agencies may be but one part, should receive serious and continued attention. If not already called to your attention, you may be interested in the views on decentralization of the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Training, which appear on page 26 of the report, A Program for National Security.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
Acting Director.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET'S VIEWS ON DECENTRALIZATION

I am grateful for the reply from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget with regard to my comments on the need for Government decentralization.

I regret, however, that I cannot agree with his conclusions.

ANTIMANAGEMENT

In the first place, I do not believe that the interests of scientific management in the Government are served by centralizing a quarter of million or so Government workers in one city, Washington, D. C., rather than sending out a substantial portion of them to the field. Surely, efficient space consolidation of Federal agencies in the field would permit moving some Federal offices there without using up more private office building space. Surely, too, in this day of high-speed transportation, officials could be assembled together in Washington for conferences, if need be, very quickly without having to maintain permanent offices here.

UNITED STATES DEFENSE

In the second place, I do not believe that the national security is served by concentration of the Federal Government in Washington. One atomic bomb could wipe out the nerve center of American defense. It is a fact, of course, as the Acting Director states, that the other major cities of America would also become targets of attack in the event of atomic war. This, however, is not an argument against decentralization, as he says, but an argument for decentralization. Even an elementary knowledge of military strategy shows that dispersion of targets is preferable to having one concentrated target inviting enemy attack.

In the third place, I do not regard decentralization from Washington as violating the letter or the spirit of any law which establishes the seat of Government in Washington. The District of Columbia could still remain the actual capital, even though it could lose 100,000 or more of its Federal employees.

There is much too much buck passing of this problem of decentralization. Surely the central planning arm of the Government, the Bureau of the Budget, should assume responsibility if only in part, instead of waiting "to let George do it," whoever George might be. Every passing month in which no action is taken along this line of decentralization renders the situation more acute.

CAPITAL'S VIRTUES

From the standpoint of the virtues of this Capital City itself, we all take pride in the beauties of the Capital here. However, those beauties could even be more enjoyed if we did not have as many as 1,000,000 people jammed like sardines into one small area, the District of Columbia and its environs. It is ridiculous to assume that the Nation's Capital must necessarily be a swarming, jammed metropolis such as it is now. There would be better living here, better governing here, and better relations with the public if many of the Federal functions were moved out of Washington to areas most closely related to those functions.

I do not intend to drop this matter of decentralization but will pursue it with every resource at my command in the interest, as I see it, of the American public. Every congressional committee, I believe, should be alert to ways and means of encouraging maximum decentralization of Federal functions within its jurisdiction. This applies particularly, I submit, to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees.

I do not underestimate the difficulties of this problem. These difficulties should, however, challenge us rather than paralyze us from taking any constructive action.

The Tax Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Tax Veto" from the New York Times of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TAX VETO

The responsibility always rests, or should rest, upon the President, in employing his veto power, to justify such action by reasoning which is so logical and so convincing as to be, to all intents and purposes, unanswerable. There are two reasons, moreover, why this generalization may be said to have applied with more than ordinary force in the case of H. R. 1, which President Truman refused to validate with his signature yesterday. In the first place, the determination of tax policy has always been regarded as peculiarly the domain of the legislative branch of the Government, not to be lightly set aside by the Executive. (This largely explains, no doubt, why yesterday's veto was only the second of its kind in the Nation's history.) In the second place, when taxes, going into the third postwar year, are still close to wartime peak levels, the burden of proof is not upon those who propose to reduce them, but upon the opponents of such a course.

Does the President's veto message justify his action when judged by these exacting requirements? In our opinion the answer is clearly in the negative. A convincing case might have been made for signing the measure with the reservation that he was doing so against his better judgment and on the understanding that if the budget surplus on which it was predicated failed to materialize Congress would be expected to provide the necessary revenues. But if an equally convincing case could be made for a veto, one will seek it in vain in yesterday's message. It is a truism in the legal profession that when a lawyer tries to prove too much it is a sign that either he is a bad lawyer or that he has a bad case. In yesterday's message the President, it seems to us, tried to prove too much. And since he has legal advisers around him of unquestionable competence, the conclusion would appear to be inescapable that he had a weak case.

The theme of Mr. Truman's veto message was that H. R. 1 represented "the wrong kind of tax reduction, at the wrong time." This is the wrong time for tax reduction, said he, for three reasons: (1) We are still in a transition period, in terms of the national finances, and the situation calls for "prudence and conservative management"; (2) the economy is already subject to inflationary pressures, and tax reduction would tend to increase them; and (3) if we are to "maintain the integrity of the national debt" we must reduce it by substantial amounts.

Mr. Truman is on sound ground when he calls for a conservative attitude toward the Nation's finances at this time. The Republican leadership, in its anxiety to make good a campaign pledge, has left itself open to the charge of patent overoptimism in a field in which overoptimism has no place; and its approach to the tax problem, as we have pointed out numerous times, has been a good deal less than orderly and consistent. Although it has been hoped that by mid-June the picture of prospective Federal income and outgo between now and June 30, 1948, would be fairly clear, developments in that respect have not fulfilled the more hopeful expectations. In recent weeks, for example, private estimates of the excess receipts over this period have ranged from as high as $10,000,000,000 to as low as $4,000,000,000. These figures, moreover, have included little or no allowance for the fact that the recent reorientation of the administration's foreign policy, with its emphasis on economic aid abroad, introduces a new element of uncertainty so far as the spending side of the budget is concerned.

But is this sufficient grounds on which to justify a veto of the proposed legislation? The best answer to that question, perhaps, is that no one has shown a greater awareness of all this than Senator GEORGE, who headed the Finance Committee when the Democrats were in control of Congress, and is recognized as the party's outstanding authority; yet Mr. GEORGE only a few days ago was reported to have urged the President against vetoing the bill.

Less convincing is the second of the President's reasons for his veto, the inflation argument. It is convincing enough as a matter of pure monetary theory. The trouble is that the administration has demonstrated in the past that its forecasts in the field of inflation and deflation and related matters have been highly undependable where they have not been highly political. It is difficult to take the inflation argument of an administration too seriously in the case of taxes, moreover, when that same administration ignores inflation of its wage policies and when one of its chief spokesmen has already gone on record against the tax reduction bill because deflation was in the offing, which, he pointed out, would mean a drop in the national income and hence in the yield of prevailing tax rates.

The third argument, that the national debt must be reduced by substantial amounts, would be impressive were it not for one fact. The authors of H. R. 1 have never said that the debt should not be reduced. On the contrary, their contention from the start has been that the fiscal outlook was such that the debt and taxes could be reduced by equal amounts. That premise may be wrong, but there can be no doubt that it is there and that it is a basic postulate among conservative Members of Congress who have supported the measure.

It is when the President sets out to show that this is not only the wrong time for tax reduction but that H. R. 1 represents the wrong kind of tax measure that he reveals the real measure of the weakness of his case. For this section descends to the plane of pure political demagogery.

One of the standard arguments advanced against an across-the-board reduction in taxes at this time is that such a reduction granted greater relief in the upper than in the lower brackets. The President not only employs this fallacious and mischievous argument but pushes it close to the reductio ad absurdum. Under the tax schedule proposed in H. R. 1, he declares, the average family with an income of $2,500 a year would receive an increase in its take-home pay of only 1.2 percent, whereas the average family with an income of $50,000 would enjoy an increase of 18.6 percent, and a $500,000-income family 62.3 percent.

Let us see what this means in terms of the actual tax figures in these three brackets. At the present time the $2,500 family is paying $95 a year in taxes, the $50,000 family $24,111, and the $500,000 family $406,600. Put another way, the Government takes 3.8 percent of the net income of the $2,500 family, leaving it 96.2 percent as take-home pay; it takes 48.2 percent of the income of the $50,000 family, leaving it 51.8 percent; and it takes 81.3 percent of the income in the case of the $500,000 family, which is permitted to take home 18.7 percent.

In other words, families in the upper brackets have been taxed at such high rates under wartime and postwar schedules that their actual income has fallen to a fraction of their nominal income. And now they find the President actually proposing to use this enormously deflated take-home pay as a statistical basis to prove that they would be treated with undue generosity under H. R. 1.

Perhaps the best way to sum up the President's veto message would be to say that he has taken the wrong course, for the wrong reasons.

German Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Our Interest in German Foreign Trade," delivered on June 13, 1947, by M. S. Szymczak, Director of the Economics Division of the Office of Military Government for Germany.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR INTEREST IN GERMAN FOREIGN TRADE

Recovery in Europe is lagging. Since VE-day, this country has provided billions of dollars of assistance to Europe. Still we find the Continent struggling with shortages of food, of fuel, of raw materials, of most of the essential ingredients for economic recovery and stability. Until Europe can export enough to pay its own way in the world, we shall find ourselves continually confronted with a hard choice: We must either provide further billions of assistance or see economic, social, and political disintegration in that vital area. We face exactly this problem in Germany; but, more importantly, our failure to handle it there on an adequate scale will seriously reduce the chances of our success in the rest of Europe. Other European countries are vitally dependent upon the renewed flow of supplies from Germany, first and foremost of coal. The reconstruction of the European economy is inseparable from the rehabilitation of Germany.

Before the war Germany, next to the United States and the United Kingdom, was the most important trading nation in the world. As late as 1937, despite efforts of the Nazi regime to make Germany independent of foreign supplies and markets, the country's foreign trade represented about 9 percent of the world's entire international commerce. Its exports reached $2,400,000,000 and its imports $2,200,000,000, equivalent at present prices to $4,000,000,000 in each direction. More than half of these exports and imports came from or went into those areas of prewar Germany that today constitute the American and British zones of occupation. About two-thirds of the imports were raw materials and semifinished goods needed for the operation of the German industrial system. Almost nine-tenths of the exports were finished industrial products. Germany provided a highly important market for many foreign countries, and its exports met essential needs in wide areas, especially in the rest of continental Europe.

In 1946, imports from other countries into the American and British zones of Germany totaled about $650,000,000. More than four-fifths of that amount represented foodstuffs needed to avert outright starvation among the German population. Only about one-tenth of the total consisted of raw materials for German industry, mainly American cotton and British wool. The importation of industrial materials thus was only a very small fraction of the quantity which the zones used to import before the war. Exports were equally small. They amounted to only some $150,000,000 and three-fourths of that sum was provided by coal exports from the Ruhr mines in the British zone. Most of the remainder was raw materials like lumber and hops. Exports of industrial goods were negligible.

As a result of this situation, the American and British occupation authorities had to finance an import surplus into their zones of occupation amounting to about $500,000,000 in 1946. Despite such a large outlay of money, the economic situation of the zones remained critical. Food imports were just sufficient to keep the ration of the average consumer around 1,550 calories per day, an amount one-fourth below the minimum standard set up by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, and two-fifths below the quantity needed for the maintenance of an efficient labor force. The scarcity of imported raw materials was an important factor restricting the revival of industrial activity. Stagnation in German industry has prevented an adequate flow of German exports to pay for imports and to contribute to the recovery of other European countries.

In December 1946, the United States and the United Kingdom agreed upon a new German foreign trade program based upon an economic merger of the American and British zones of occupation. The two occupying powers set the goal of making the combined zones self-supporting within a period of 3 years by stimulating both imports and exports, and in the meantime agreed to share equally in financing the necessary import surplus. They set up a joint export-import agency and implemented their agreement a few days ago by establishing a German economic council. This council will be composed of representatives of the legislatures of the German states located in the combined zones. It will be assisted by an executive committee representing the governments of the German states, and by a number of executive directors, heading bizonal administrative departments. Through these organizations the population of the occupied zones will be mobilized for attaining the goals set by the agency. It was hoped that France and the Soviet Union would join in the agreement and thus reestablish the economic unity of Germany, which is indispensable for the eventual rehabilitation of the German economy and to which all four powers had agreed at the Potsdam conference of 1945. Unfortunately, the other occupying powers refused to join in the merger, and the American and British authorities had to proceed on their own, leaving the door open, however, for future adherence by the other two powers.

In meeting our share of the cost of supporting Germany during this interim period, we rely upon appropriations by the Congress to cover food requirements. Raw materials and equipment for industrial rehabilitation, on the other hand, are financed through credits from United States Government agencies. The Commodity Credit Corporation shipped $30,000,000 worth of surplus cotton into the American zone to be processed by German firms. The finished materials are exported to an extent sufficient to pay for the imported cotton and the remainder is either exported in order to pay for the importation of additional raw materials or is made available to the domestic German economy. The United States Commercial Co. agreed to finance similar shipments of raw materials for the ceramics, glass, chemical, toys, and other industries. At present, a second cotton credit of $20,000,000 is being negotiated with the Export-Import Bank of Washington and American cotton exporters.

The two occupying powers also have established a joint revolving fund of foreign exchange that can be used for importing other goods needed by German industries. The fund consists of the proceeds of exports from the combined zones in 1945 and 1946, insofar as they have not been used already for import payments, and of German external assets transferred to the two occupying powers by neutral countries. This provides the Joint Export-Import Agency with a nec-

essary working balance for priming the pump of German export industries.

The actual start of the foreign-trade drive has been somewhat delayed. For many months the unprecedented hardships of last winter disrupted transportation and production in Europe. The new export-import organizations had to be set up and proper rules of procedure established. The exact specifications for the export-import program, which had to be submitted to the Agency by the German authorities, often were found unworkable. Already, however, the Agency is approving export and import contracts at an accelerating rate. Moreover, the Agency has issued regulations facilitating the renewal of contacts between German and foreign businessmen. American and other businessmen now may visit Germany in substantial numbers, and after June 15 German exporters and foreign importers will be permitted to conclude contract negotiations by mail. The Agency, however, has to approve all import and export contracts, either at its headquarters or through one of its branches, and it is designated to receive all foreign-exchange proceeds from export shipments. These precautions are necessary in order to make sure that all export proceeds are mobilized for the payment of essential imports.

Our efforts to reconstruct German foreign trade would be greatly facilitated if Germany's economic unity were restored in accordance with the Potsdam agreement. Since the four zones are interdependent to a very high degree, full merger would make possible a much more efficient economic operation. If, however, the four powers cannot agree on the terms of unification, the American and British authorities will have to press forward in their efforts to put at least their area of occupation back on its own feet. This will require a reorientation of industrial production in the two zones and an increase in industrial activity above the level set by the four occupying powers about a year ago. In this framework the foreign-trade program will make a decisive contribution to the restoration of economic stability in Germany and thus in all of Europe.

Memorial Day Statement of Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, president of the Air Force Association, for the Memorial Day service held at Union College, Barbourville, Ky., on May 30, 1947, and read in behalf of General Doolittle by Hon. T. C. Sizemore, group commander of the association for the southeastern Kentucky squadrons.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, 2 years after our second major war in 25 years, we pause as a nation to honor those who have died in the service of our country.

The military honor roll of the Second World War carries the names of 58,107 Air Force men who gave their lives or are forever missing in action. As the representative of the 87,000 Air Force Association members who also served with the Army Air Forces, I should like today to pay tribute to those men who helped America hold onto the freedom it has cherished for 170 years.

A more fitting memorial to them and to the thousands of others killed in the defense of the United States would be the positive assurance that never again would we permit this Nation to be as ill-prepared to defend its principles and its shores as it was in 1918 and again in 1941.

The Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous material, I invite the attention of the House to an editorial from the Washington Post of this date, reprinted below.

I consider the second paragraph of this editorial particularly appropriate. The problem of housing is perhaps the most important domestic issue facing us today. It is time to call a halt to bickering and buck passing in this urgent national problem. In my opinion, a complete and searching investigation offers the only foundation for a constructive program.

BALKY HOUSE

There is good reason for the rising public concern over the failure of Congress to do anything about housing. Millions of Americans are still struggling for a decent place in which to live. The shortage of housing is probably the most acute domestic problem that the war has left with us. It calls for a great national effort to plan and build the type of dwellings that the people want and need. But in place of such a national effort we are getting feverish activity on the part of a limited number of builders to reap a fortune out of overpriced houses that the people most in need of shelter cannot afford to buy. The result is certainly not a happy commentary on our democratic machinery for serving the national welfare.

Representative JAVITS seems to have concluded that the only hope of substituting an orderly and constructive program for the present floundering and confusion is to conduct a searching investigation into the problem in the next 6 months. Introducing a resolution to create a special House committee for that purpose, he expressed a belief that the vast majority of the American people are tired of labor, industry, and Government bickering about who is guilty in the case of the missing home. Perhaps this is the only means by which the House can be made to see its own responsibility in the matter.

Whatever may be said of the short-sighted policies of builders and organized building labor, the overshadowing fact is that Congress has not yet given us a national housing policy. It has not yet recognized good housing as one of the first essentials of our national health and welfare. Instead, Congress seems to be moving in the opposite direction. The rent control bill now taking final shape will take away restraints on commercial building and thus further diminish the volume of critical materials available for residential construction. At the same time the House Appropriations Committee has cut so deeply into the Federal housing subsidy fund as to disrupt even the existing arrangements which make the operation of low-rental public housing possible.

This attitude seems the more inexcusable because a well-balanced and forward-looking national housing policy is readily at hand in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which is also sponsored in the House by Representative JAVITS. It is said that Senator TAFT has promised to press the measure before the Senate and favorable action is anticipated. It is the House that is balking. Taking note of this situation, more than 30 organizations are sponsoring a Fight for Housing Day on June 25 to acquaint our legislators with the public demand. We wish them success, for we are convinced that no issue is of greater social and economic importance to the country than the proper use of our resources to provide decent homes for the people.

Tribute to Hon. Thomas Butler Pearce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a most appropriate and well-deserved tribute to the memory of the Honorable Thomas Butler Pearce, late of Columbia, S. C. The tribute was prepared under the direction of the South Carolina Research Planning and Development Board, of which Mr. Pearce was chairman, and was edited and prepared by former Senator Wilton Hall.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thomas Butler Pearce, of Columbia, S. C., who entered upon the great adventure on April 15, 1947, at the age of 59, was one of those South Carolina sons who could have said with becoming modesty that he lived—

"For the cause that lacks assistance, for the wrong that needs resistance,
For the future in the distance, and the good that I can do."

—*G. L. Banks.*

Born July 3, 1888, in Decatur, Ga., Tom Pearce removed to South Carolina as a youth of 12 and ever thereafter was a most devoted and loyal son of the State of his adoption.

Like so many successful leaders, he was initiated into business life as a newsboy, later entering his father's business and becoming an active leader in that organization before he turned the age of 20.

"Seest thou a man diligent in his business?" asked the Old Testament. "He shall stand before kings; he shall not stand before mean men." Diligent, progressive, and far-sighted in his own affairs, Mr. Pearce was endowed with both enthusiasm and vision to carry this same diligence early into a public career where he served the people of his State and Nation with unselfish distinction.

At the age of 28 he became State senator from Richland County, having been elected overwhelmingly by the people who knew him best and who were convinced that his aims were "Not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

Where lesser men would have faltered at the double responsibilities of rigorous business and public life, the latter a labor of love and devotion to his State, Mr. Pearce met

every challenge and wore boldly the mantle of a liberal in the days when that word was descriptive of the enlightened, fair-minded, and conscientious men in public life.

He believed, with the poet:

"You cannot choose your battlefield,
The gods do that for you,
But you can plant a standard
Where a standard never flew."

—*Nathalia Crane.*

By his example Mr. Pearce helped to arouse a wider interest in government among men and women in all walks of life. By his deep devotion to his duties as a citizen he left a lasting mark upon the State. He lighted in many a heart the candle of understanding, the flame of desire for a grander, cleaner, and better South Carolina, a light that will endure for generations to come.

Mr. Pearce was of the conviction, in the dark days of the early 1930's, that men of thought should be up and stirring, sowing and seedling and clearing the way to a better day and a richer life for the people of his State and Nation. He helped to carry the banner of the reenergized Democratic Party at Chicago in 1932, and ever thereafter was a devoted and active adherent to those new departures in humanitarian thinking which pointed to improvement in the educational and economic status of his beloved South Carolina and our Nation as a whole.

As a candidate for governor, he made thousands of lifelong friends from the mountains to the sea. He conducted a dignified campaign, based on lofty principles. He fought a good fight as the champion of sound government and clean politics. In defeat he was gracious, turning without pause to serve his State in other important capacities to which he was summoned on the demand of its citizens.

Always interested in the problems of hydro-electric power, Mr. Pearce, as a Senator, worked for equalization and lowering of rates to the public and it was in recognition of this interest in full development of South Carolina's resources that he was named chairman of the State's gigantic Santee-Cooper power project when that undertaking became a reality. Here, as elsewhere, he again served his State well.

During the trying years of World War II, he served on the home front as first chairman of the Preparedness for Peace Commission. This able group laid the foundation for today's rapidly expanding industrial life in South Carolina. Once again he gave generously of his talents and means to another great program. It stands as an enduring monument to his life.

Mr. Pearce was of the conviction that man has no more right to consume happiness without producing it than he does to consume wealth without producing it, and he carried that thought over into the field of government.

When the South Carolina Research, Planning, and Development Board was created, it was only natural that Mr. Pearce should have been designated as chairman. He was at his best when promoting his beloved State's resources and potentialities. Lasting progress during the war, and in the post-war era, was made under his capable command as chairman. He was its guiding genius to the very end of his life.

A progressive business leader, a faithful and conscientious public servant, a devoted father and husband, and a Christian gentleman, Thomas Butler Pearce's passing from the South Carolina scene marks the departure of a friendly, human, and altogether admirable spirit which has gone to find

"Beyond the last horizon's rim,
Beyond adventure's farthest quest,
Somewhere they rise, serene and dim,
The happy, happy Hills Of Rest."

—*A. B. Paine.*

The Case Against Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, European collectivism is aggressive in every sphere of American life, but nowhere is it more threatening than in the national campaign to fasten upon us a system of socialized medicine.

This program did not originate in the United States, but in the secret councils of world communism. It would reduce our doctors, dentists, and nurses to Federal pay rollers, responsive first to a new Federal bureaucracy.

I offer as a part of my remarks a scholarly and comprehensive article published in the South Bend Tribune June 1, by Lawrence Sullivan, noted author and journalist, who has studied the development of American bureaucracy for more than 20 years. The article is as follows:

THE CASE AGAINST SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

In a special message on May 19 President Truman recommended, for the fourth time in the space of 2 years, that Congress enact at once a comprehensive national program of compulsory health insurance. Next day the detailed bill (S. 1320) was introduced simultaneously in both the House and Senate.

The program contemplates an addition pay-roll tax amounting to 3½ percent of all wages and salaries, over and above existing social-security and unemployment taxes. These taxes would be allocated by the Treasury to a new Personal Health Services Fund in the Federal Security Agency. Thereafter all approved medical, hospital, and dental bills of "covered" citizens would be paid by the Government. At the outset, the program would cover an estimated 85 percent of the United States population, including families of all wage earners.

Participation in the plan through fixed pay-roll deductions every pay day would be compulsory. No employed person could escape the proposed health tax.

The Personal Health Services Fund would be administered under supervision of a new five-man Federal board, only two of whom need be physicians.

The bill is now before the Senate Labor Committee, of which Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, is chairman. Because of the crowded Senate calendar, no legislation is in prospect this session.

COMMUNIST ORIGINS

The campaign for socialized medicine in the United States stems directly from Kremlin communism. Louis F. Budenz, former editor of the Communist Daily Worker in New York, and one-time Communist central committee member for the United States, relates in his recent memoirs that Dmitri Manuilsky, secretary of the Communist International, first urged compulsory social insurance as a segment of the world revolution program in 1930. Addressing the sixteenth party congress in Moscow, Manuilsky said:

"In the United States, for instance, the Communists must launch a powerful movement for social insurance. They must place themselves at the head of this movement and lead it to victory."

Manuilsky added that the purpose of this campaign in the United States was to "strengthen the sections of the Comintern organization."

In another passage, Editor Budenz describes Manuilsky as a powerful figure in the Kremlin—one who "was and had always been Stalin's right hand in handling the international apparatus. He had been made secretary of the Communist International when Stalin wanted most to clear it of all his opponents. And he had led the big crusade against the United States, caricaturing it as the chief enemy of the peoples of the world * * *."

Health insurance became a major objective of the International Labor Office as early as 1927, when a model sickness insurance program was formulated at Geneva. Moscow adopted this Geneva draft as a pivotal item in the Communist world program. This was the real beginning of the international movement for socialized medicine, as now embodied in the Beveridge cradle-to-grave proposals in Britain and the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill in the United States.

The direct connection between the ILO world program and the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, again before Congress, is found in the fact that Arthur T. Altmeyer, chairman of the Social Security Board; Isadore Falk, Director of Research for the Social Security Board; Wilbur Cohen, Assistant Director of Research in SSB, and Carter Goodrich, formerly a SSB research worker under Falk, were at various times the United States delegates to the ILO conferences which framed the International Medical Code. Testimony before the Senate Labor Committee last year identified Mr. Falk as the key draftsman of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

PLAN APPLIED IN RUSSIA

Russia was the first nation to apply the ILO program for socialized medicine. How closely the Russian experience to date parallels the Wagner-Murray-Dingell program for the United States was traced out before the Senate Labor Committee last year in the statement of Dr. Carl H. Gellenthien, of Valmora, N. Mex. A careful study of the Russian administrative plan led him, the witness said, to the conclusion that the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill embodied substantially the same program for the American application of socialized medicine.

"That is precisely the plan now proposed for the United States," Dr. Gellenthien told the committee. "As in Russia today, there would be administrative zones and districts, each under the general supervision of some federally-appointed, or federally-approved, regional supervisor. Patients would be certified for this treatment or that, according to the findings and conclusions of some local administrative bureaucrat, who may or may not be a doctor. Note that under the Russian plan, as it has unfolded, the district inspections and certifications are made, not by the public health organizations, but by 'the Social Insurance Committees of the trade unions.'

"In my view we need look no further for evidence that this legislation embodies proposals which find no roots in the soil of free America. The program did not originate in America, but in Communistic Russia. It was imported in full growth and development, not by the men and women of the medical profession, who have built up in this country the finest system of medical care ever known anywhere in the world, but by a small group within the Government who seek to impose a foreign ideology on our American traditions.

"Communist medicine is not for free America."

DOCTORS OPPOSE SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

The American Medical Association reports that approximately 95 percent of all registered physicians in the United States oppose socialized medicine. But when the AMA set out a decade ago to resist the program,

the Department of Justice cracked down, in 1937–40, with an antitrust suit which, carried to the Supreme Court, forced virtual abandonment of organized resistance.

Soon thereafter, the torch of opposition was taken up by the National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service, a Nation-wide group of physicians, surgeons, dentists, and nurses, dedicated to voluntary efforts in defense of free medicine. For 8 years, this group has been the spearhead of an intensive campaign of public education to awaken America to the true implications of political medicine.

Congressman ARTHUR L. MILLER, of Nebraska, himself a physician, is one of the Nation's most militant opponents of the ILO medical program. As Congressman-Doctor MILLER once told the Labor Committee:

"This bill would introduce a new character on the scene—Uncle Sam, M. D. * * * In every country where fascism, nazism, or socialism prevails, there is socialized medicine."

About the same conclusion was expressed in the final report of the Canadian Royal Commission on Social Security, as submitted to Parliament at Ottawa in 1943.

Socialized medicine in Germany had developed a gigantic nation-wide bureaucracy which reached every family in the land. As the Canadian Royal Commission's report put it—

"During the early years of Hitler's regime, the government's medical program was looked upon by many observers as one of the greatest props of the totalitarian state."

A NEW DEAL PROGRAM

The original version of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill was sponsored by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, and Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan. The revised version now is formally sponsored also by Senators CLAUDE PEPPER, GLEN H. TAYLOR of Idaho, and J. HOWARD MCGRATH of Rhode Island.

In the House it also commands the enthusiastic support of Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, of New York.

During her crowded years as White House hostess, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt was a leader in the Washington inner circle of bureaucratic officialdom which pulled the strings on many fronts for socialized medicine. Today, she supports the movement with equal ardor in her newspaper and magazine writing.

Many officials on the Federal pay roll spend much of their time in speaking and writing for the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. Some of those who have been identified in such activities during the last 2 years are in the Social Security Board, United States Public Health Service, Children's Bureau, Office of Education, Department of Agriculture, and the Indian Service.

A recent congressional inquiry disclosed that perhaps $500,000 a year in departmental funds is spent entirely for the salaries and traveling expenses of Federal pay rollers engaged principally in advocating socialized medicine before teachers, writers, editors, women's clubs, farm cooperatives, and local discussion clubs.

One of the most incisive reports on socialized medicine submitted before the Senate hearings last year was that of William Logan Martin, of Birmingham, Ala., chairman of a special committee appointed by the American Bar Association to inquire into the legal aspects of the proposal.

"My personal conclusion, Senator," said Mr. Martin, "is that it is probably the most extensive undertaking ever made by Congress beyond the limits of the Constitution of this country. I cannot conceive that a bill which goes so far as this into the intimate details of the lives of American citizens can be justified under the Constitution of the United States."

PART OF A WORLD PLAN

Viewed in its broad international aspects, the world movement for socialized medicine is but another facet of Marxian socialism. While it is yet fashionable in some quarters of the United States to mark a distinction between communism and socialism, particularly in details of organization and procedure, the fact remains that in all points of practical application communism and socialism are but opposite sides of the same debased coin of Marxism. Both are expressions of Godless, materialistic statism. Both submerge religious inspiration and discipline, and thus snuff out the deepest motivations of individual character and achievement. Both glorify the all-powerful state as the owner of all wealth, the manager of all production, the giver of all good things.

What, for example, is the real difference between the doctrine which demands nationalization of the coal mines, the railroads, or the steamship lines in Britain, and that which demands the nationalization of all medicine and dentistry in Russia?

It has been characteristic of all such movements, in all ages, that they are masked initially as great humanitarian endeavors—steps toward the "more abundant life," as it were. But always behind the gentle mask of do-good, history at last has revealed the ugly gargoyles of power-grasping dictatorship.

And over the top layer of the all-pervasive bureaucracy there sits, finally, the head man. History once called him Caesar, then Il Duce, later der Fuehrer, presently Generalissimo or Marshall. The title is not important, but the pattern of tyrannical bureaucracy is always the same. Then liberty is dead and the long darkness of despotism is upon the land.

Never do these great humanitarian undertakings come upon a people in their final revolting form. As Edmund Burke once put it:

"Men have been sometimes led by degrees, sometimes hurried into things of which, if they could have seen the whole together, they never would have permitted the most remote approach."

That's why the beginnings of socialized medicine in the United States come as a challenge to every defender of freedom and every lover of liberty.

A NEW BUREAUCRACY

Under socialized medicine in Germany before the war there was one civilian clerical worker in the medical service for every 100 insured population. The same degree of bureaucratic expansion in the United States of America would mean another 1,200,000 payrollers added to the Government civil service lists, merely to do the record keeping for 120,000,000 insured population under socialized medicine. And this, of course, does not include the necessary professional payrollers, such as doctors, dentists, nurses, anesthetists, laboratory technicians, and dietitians. In all, our American bureaucracy in socialized medicine easily would run to 1,500,000 men and women—exclusive of the 16,000 already engaged in other phases of social security administration.

Can anyone guess how much that would cost? With such overhead in administrative costs, would the quality of the medical services be improved?

There is no case in history where socialized medicine has paid its own way, over the long pull, with the special taxes collected. In Germany, Russia, and Austria the special taxes soon were found insufficient to cover costs. Gradually, parts of the program were eased over onto the general budget. At length, in both Germany and Russia, every pretense of paying with special taxes was abandoned, and the whole operation transplanted directly to the general budget.

Such are the devices of aggressive communism—to deceive the people with promises of self-liquidating projects. Anything to get the new bureaucracy entrenched. Once established, the bureau's annual appropriations are diverted to propaganda for more power, more money, more authority over the daily lives of the people.

Hence the urgent call of American citizenship today to stand firm against every encroachment of collectivism, under whatever appealing guise of something-for-nothing. No one can afford to wait until his own ox is being gored. Marxism advances simultaneously on many fronts.

Little encroachments on many fronts ultimately will be consolidated under the unmasked head man.

That's the real meaning of what Dmitri Manuilsky told the Sixteenth Communist Congress in Moscow in 1930, when he said:

"In the United States, for instance, the Communists must launch a powerful movement for social insurance. They must place themselves at the head of this movement and lead it to victory."

William Bernard Barry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BERNARD BARRY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our late colleague, WILLIAM B. BARRY, was a great loss to the Nation, to the State of New York, and to the district which he so ably represented.

I have lost a close and dear friend.

The ties of friendship that were to grow stronger through the years had their inception during our college days at New York University where we were not only classmates but members of the same fraternity—Theta Chi. Through the years of personal friendship that were to follow, as well as a close professional and political association, I came to know BILL'S strong will and determination particularly with respect to the causes in which he believed and which he sought to advance. He possessed great courage and ability and the qualities that make for a true statesman.

In 1933 he was appointed a member of the district attorney's staff in Queens County, N. Y., and in 1934 he became a special United States attorney. From 1930 to 1935 he was a member of the Democratic executive committee of Queens County. At a special election held on November 5, 1935, he was elected to the Seventy-fourth Congress and served continuously until the time of his death. During his congressional career, he was ever conscious of the responsibility that had been placed upon him and ever seeking to protect the best interests of the people he represented.

BILL BARRY'S generous spirit, friendliness, and kindliness made him a true friend and earned for him the affectionate regard of all who were privileged to enjoy his friendship.

To the members of his family whom I have known for many years, the burden of his loss has been very great and deeply felt, for BILL was a devoted husband, father, and son. To his gracious and

capable wife and to his young son, Brian, and daughter, Jane, he has left the consolation and the heritage of a respected name and the exemplary record of a lifetime devoted to public service.

Perhaps the sentiments of his legion of friends might best be expressed in the immortal words of Earl Lytton:

Ay, there are some good things in life
That fall not away with the rest.
And, of all best things upon earth, I hold
That a faithful friend is the best.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include herewith a copy of an article published recently in the Seattle (Wash.) Daily Times written by a prominent Honolulu newspaperman, Riley H. Allen, and pertinent to the subject of Hawaiian statehood. It is as follows:

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD FOES ONLY A SHRINKING MINORITY

(By Riley H. Allen)

(Riley H. Allen, editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and well known in Seattle and the Pacific Northwest, wrote the following in response to a request from the Seattle Times that he explain the apparently conflicting reports brought home by visitors to the islands concerning the attitude of Hawaiians themselves to the question of statehood.)

HONOLULU.—Hawaii has been working for statehood for more than half a century. Even before this group of islands, 2,100 miles off the California coast, became a Territory of the United States, there was an active statehood movement under way.

Hawaii consented and indeed sought annexation to the United States, following the revolution of 1893 which overthrew the Hawaiian monarchy, on the definite belief that the status of a Territory would, in the reasonably near future, develop into that of a State. Unfortunately, conditions calling for statehood that might have been written into the Annexation Act were not made formally a part of the record of Congress and the executive departments.

But the implied promise of statehood for Hawaii certainly figured in a juncture which has been at least as important to continental United States as to Hawaii. During all these years since annexation in August 1898 the people of Hawaii have looked forward to statehood.

There was some opposition to it in the past and you can find here and there men and women who will express either opposition or skepticism. But they are in the minority—an increasingly smaller minority. By every test, from formal vote at a plebiscite to any number of informal votes and actions of individuals and organizations, the great majority of Hawaii's people want statehood and believe we are entitled to it.

Every congressional study, every Department of the Interior study, made on the subject of statehood has helped to move that goal nearer. Today it is believed that, if a plebiscite were held, the vote would be almost 5 to 1 in favor of statehood—and one witness before the most recent congressional committee which came to Hawaii to study statehood said confidently that the vote would be 10 to 1 for statehood.

The status of the issue now is this: In early 1946 a committee of the National House of Representatives came to Hawaii to investigate statehood, returned and made to the House a strongly favorable report. For various reasons, chiefly that the House in the spring and summer of 1946 had before it a great deal of pressing legislation, no action was taken by Congress. Early in 1947 the Lower House of the new Congress took up statehood and at the same time Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug and other Department of the Interior officials, with two Congressmen, came to the Pacific to make investigations of their own.

Specifically, they were interested in knowing whether statehood for Hawaii would complicate the admittedly difficult issue of the future government of Pacific islands taken from Japan. They returned to Washington with the statement, backed by no less an authority than Gen. Douglas MacArthur at Tokyo, that statehood for Hawaii, far from complicating the Pacific islands pacture, would be helpful to the United States. It would, said the general, again demonstrate that the United States carries into practice its principles of democracy of government laid down in the Constitution and voiced by its public men and others.

The House Committee on Public Lands, which under the reorganization of Congress had become the committee dealing with Pacific islands, held extensive hearings at Washington a few weeks ago. Many witnesses testified to the political, economic, educational and social development of Hawaii and to the loyalty of the Hawaiian people (without regard to race), as amply demonstrated before, during, and after World War II.

The House committee voted unanimously to report the bill out for immediate action. This means that for the first time in our existence as a territory the issue of statehood will come to the floor of Congress.

The support which Hawaiian statehood has received, on the mainland, outside of Congress, is extremely gratifying. We have a Washington statehood office. It is operated under authority of the territorial government. I have just had a letter from its executive secretary, telling me that he has clippings from editorials of representative newspapers in no less than 43 States. The very great majority—indeed the overwhelming majority—of these editorials are friendly to statehood and a large proportion of that number urge action by this Congress.

So far as I know, not one substantial element in our national population opposes statehood for the territory. We have had endorsements—resolutions favoring statehood—from more national and regional organizations than I can list, these including business, educational, patriotic, civic, and organized labor groups. Chambers of Commerce all over the country have approved statehood for the territory. There are statehood planks in both the Republican and Democratic national platforms.

No section of our Nation should be more sympathetic with statehood for Hawaii than the Pacific Northwest—the State of Washington, the city of Seattle. Washington's own record in the pioneer days of struggle toward statehood should give to every Washingtonian an intense feeling of comradeship for our fight now.

Not only that—in those early pioneer days, there were men from the then little-known Sandwich Islands who helped in the movement first to set up Territorial government for Washington and later to gain statehood. There have long been contacts and connections between the Hawaiian Islands and Puget Sound's chief cities—business, civic, and social connections.

It is fairly easy to hear, in Hawaii, some of the whispers of opposition to statehood. They often come from men in established businesses, who think and say, "Well, we are getting along pretty well under the Territory now. Why make the change?" They come sometimes from the people who have a fear—exaggerated though it may be—that "some day we may be living under a Japanese governor." They come, too, from people who resent any change and who have little confidence in local self-government.

I have heard these sidewalk and sideboard skeptics ever since I have been in the islands. I cannot help but be reminded of some of the Seattle skeptics who used to declare that the Queen City would never have a population of 300,000 people—that it was already collapsing after the Alaska boom—and that everything was wrong in government and rapidly going wrong in business.

But that isn't the prevailing spirit in Hawaii today. In fact, never before in the more than 36 years I have lived here have we had so much new business, so many new businesses, so many young men—most of them tempered in the toughening years of World War II—setting up for themselves with confidence in this Territory and future State.

Personally I have no fear for the political or economic future of Hawaii—though I freely admit we have some tough problems to meet and solve.

Government Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am inserting a copy of an editorial printed in the Daily Ardmoreite under date of June 13, 1947, which reads as follows:

DISCRETION NEEDED

Without doubt many economies should be made in the operation of Federal Government.

Many of the reduced appropriations which Congress has forced on the agencies, bureaus, and departments are wholly commendable. But the rule is not infallible. The cuts have to be made with some discretion.

Glaring instances of mistakenness are the curtailment of soil conservation activities and the closing down of innumerable Indian schools.

Both of these cuts have struck close to home here.

Carter Seminary, an Indian school of high reputation and long career of adequate and able performance of duty, faces a dark future—its doors are closed and when the doors closed educational opportunities for a large number of young Indian girls were closed.

The task of redeeming worn and eroded earth had but made a start when the chop in the funds for this work was ordered. The cessation of the activities will probably result in the loss, in a very short time, of what little gains have been made in the work.

Yes; economy is all very well in government but like the case of the individual the cuts made have to be applied with discretion. Chopping the line across the board won't always work.

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD two letters received by me, calling for the enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. In the last 2 months, nearly every veterans' post in my district, and hundreds of people, have written me demanding that this vital legislation be passed.

This Congress must act favorably, and act soon on this bill if we are to get any great amount of homes built in this country in the next few years, at prices veterans and others can afford to pay.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE, BOSTON BRANCH,
Boston, Mass., June 10, 1947.

Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to enact at this session of the Congress a National Housing Commission Act popularly known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Act

Whereas the democratic goal for a sound society is a decent home for every family; and

Whereas eight lives have been lost in the past year in our immediate community because of the substandard housing facilities available to Negroes in this area; and

Whereas it is becoming more difficult for an increasing number of our citizens to secure adequate fire-insurance protection; and

Whereas the present outlook for a solution to adequate housing nationally is jeopardized by the opposition lobby composed of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the Home and Property Owners Foundation, and the National Association of Home Builders; and

Whereas Negro Americans will suffer disproportionately in our national housing program unless the racial relations section is maintained on its present level; and

Whereas the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, S. 866, now before Congress, is of utmost importance if we are to avoid a continuing crisis in housing; and

Whereas the passage of this bill will insure a long-range housing program with Government aid to spur building of low-rent and slum-clearance projects: Therefore be it

Resolved, That 550 members of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Boston Branch, assembled, reaffirms its support of housing bill S. 866 (H. R. 2523); be it further

Resolved, H. R. 2523 is of such paramount importance to the citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that immediate action by the Congress of the United States is essential, and failure of passage prior to the adjournment of Congress will have a disastrous effect upon the lives, morals, and health of the citizens of the Commonwealth. The passage of this bill will, in large measure, insure the citizens of this Commonwealth adequate housing. The President of the United States, the congressional representatives from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to the Congress are therefore urged to request its immediate consideration and passage; be it finally

Resolved, That we urge your wholehearted support on the retention of the racial relations section of our national housing program on its present level of operation.

OAK SQUARE-BRIGHTON
POST, NO. 2022,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Brighton, Mass., June 10, 1947.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KENNEDY: This post congratulates you upon your forthright position on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. Though men in public life and private industry are aware of the thorny problem existing in present housing conditions, very few have acknowledged it or manifested a willingness to solve it, whereas you have taken the initiative and sought to find a solution to this prevailing and most unfortunate situation.

The members of Oak Square-Brighton VFW Post 2022 and its auxiliary unanimously pledge their support to you in your endeavor to put through the enactment of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, or a modification thereof.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. QUINN,
Commander.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. CROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my own statement on universal military training.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM J. CROW, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE TWENTY-THIRD DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

I am disturbed by the statements that have appeared in the newspapers to the effect that I am absolutely opposed to universal military training. That is not a correct statement of the facts. I am not opposed to military training, but I am not in favor of the bill as it has been proposed by President Truman and as approved by his self-appointed Commission to study this matter.

I am a graduate of Pennsylvania Military College and have been a member of the Reserve Officers Association since 1925, and I am still a colonel in the Ordnance Reserve. I know the value of some military training, however, I doubt the value of taking all of our boys out of schools and sending them into extensive camps all over the country for periods of 6 months or 1 year. This training will be forgotten within a short time, and if and when we have another war the same boys would have to be given their training all over again. The only ones who would be of any value to the Army would be the ones who had just finished their training, and they still would have to receive additional combat training with their weapons. If there is no war within the next 5 years the training would be of little value to millions of boys.

The total cost of operating all of the camps would be exorbitant and the results obtained would be questionable. In President Truman's address to Congress on universal military training he stated that it would not be necessary for a boy to be trained as a professional soldier, but he added that "when he finshes the training he will be proficient in the use of his arms." That, to me, makes a professional soldier. For that reason I believe that the only training required would be the basic training in the school of the soldier and during the last war the men received only 13 weeks basic training. They would receive much more training than given during the war under this plan. The same thing would happen in the next war, if we have one, that happened during the last war in regard to assignment of personnel. I had been trained as an infantry soldier since 1918 and received my training regularly with the Reserve, but when my orders came to report for duty I was detailed as an ordnance officer, which required that I attend a school at Aberdeen to learn what an ordnance officer was required to know and do. I assure you that I had to learn the hard way with the Ordnance overseas. The same thing would be done with soldiers who were proficient with their weapons—they would be used for another job rather than for the one they were trained to perform. That is the way things are done in our Armed Services.

My idea of the proper way to train our boys is to require that all of our high schools install military training in their junior and senior classes, the training being for 2 to 4 hours a week. I have been interested to find that the high schools in Washington, D. C., already have military training and I have found many high schools with the same military training installed on a volunteer basis. I recently talked with one of the boys from the Anacostia High School. He said that the system works fine and that the boys who were taking the training liked it very much. Recently, the high schools of Washington held a drill competition at the Griffith Stadium and the people of Washington had an opportunity to view the results of this training.

The advantages of this type of training would be the great savings in cost of the operation of the training and the fact that the education of the boys will not be disturbed. The boys would remain at home, and I am sure this would please a large number of mothers who hate to think of their boys as cannon fodder. The Government could furnish the equipment, uniforms, and instructors needed to carry out the program. Today, in Washington, if the school is large enough, the Army furnishes an officer, even to a colonel of Infantry to handle the training, together with personnel to aid in carrying out the program. My suggestion is that the Reserve Officer unit instructor that is available to each Army district in the United States and the Naval Reserve personnel be placed in charge of all the training in their area and that they supplement the program with Reserve officers from their district as instructors at the high schools, the officers being paid only for the days spent in training the students. We already have this supervisory personnel available to handle the program and the cost would not be so greatly increased to carry out my program in the schools. I might add that I recently visited Omaha, Nebr., and while there, I met a lieutenant colonel of the Army who was in charge of the training in the Omaha high schools. He informed me that the boys liked their training very much and were getting a lot out of the program.

In answer to the question of who will be required to take the basic training in the schools, I would say that all physically qualified boys should take the training and the only excuse for not taking it would be a valid doctor's certificate, probably made by the school doctor. Only boys whose health might be impaired should be excused.

There will be some boys quitting school before they enter high school, and I recommend that these boys be required to enter the Regular Army for 1 year so that they will have some training. The War Department could get a report from each and every school board now set up to see that all boys receive their proper training. It may be better to have a report from the county school superintendent of all the schools in his district to show that every physically fit boy is trained in

some manner. This reporting body is already available and it would not require a large group of personnel to supervise this program. One other advantage I believe would ensue from this program, and that is more of our boys would continue their schooling rather than go into the Regular Army, and we would find that we were developing better educated boys with a high-school education. There would be quite a number going into the Regular Army and that would assist the Army in keeping up its personnel without conscription during peacetime.

We have developed the following so far:

1. All boys in junior and senior year of high school would receive 2 to 4 hours of military training each week.

2. The training would be given at home with the boys eating and living in their own homes, which would be a large savings to our almost bankrupt Government. The Army, Navy, etc., would supply equipment and uniforms required.

3. The training to be given would be given under the supervision of unit instructors of the Reserve officers, using the local Reserve officers for instructors in the high schools of their district.

4. The boys who do not attend high school through their junior and senior years would be required to enter the Regular Army for 1 year's training.

5. The check on the students and reports to be given to the War Department, Navy Department, etc., would be the responsibility of the county school superintendent or of each separate school board. This would eliminate the large number of personnel that would be required to administer the universal military-training program.

To carry out the program further, I would recommend that all colleges be required to install Reserve officers training to make sure that we have many men trained to fill the necessary officer positions in the Army, Navy, etc., if an emergency should arise. The Reserve officers of the last war were a great help to the Regular Army officers in getting the men trained and manning the important positions overseas. I, personally, was in a headquarters where the Regular Army officers made up only 1 percent of the officers of the headquarters. The balance were either Reserve officers, National Guard officers, or Army of the United States officers. The same condition existed in all headquarters, except some of the higher headquarters, where the Regular Army officers generally were about 15 and 20 percent of the total number of officers.

Some colleges still have their military training for officers and all colleges should be required to set up the same ROTC training.

The Citizens Military Training Corps is being planned at the present time and I feel that some of the good boys could be given some additional summer training in this manner. My idea being that the men who make the better record in their training in the schools be selected by the instructors and recommended for this additional training with the CMTC.

I personally believe that a plan of this kind could be worked out so that the education of our boys and young men will not be interrupted and we will continue to have well educated young men coming on, and men who have had sufficient training to meet any emergency.

Some people have a great fear of the use of the atomic bomb. I do not have that same fear. During the last war, Hitler had plenty of poison gas, but did he use it? No, he was afraid to use it for he knew that we had sufficient to wipe his people off the map. The same will be true with the atomic bomb—all people will be afraid to use it, if we keep enough bombs on hand to blow them off the map and enough bombers available to hit any part of the world within a few hours. I, personally, believe that the atomic-bomb scare is being used to try to push through the larger plan of universal military training which will cost several billion dollars every year and that is only an estimate. I am quite sure that a deficit appropriation would be required to carry out the full program as set up.

I have not discussed training for girls because I believe they can be trained for use in clerical work in headquarters as we did during the last war and I do not believe military training at the present time is necessary or essential.

I hope that this clears up my position on universal military training. I am in favor of military training for our boys in a modified form of universal military training.

Accounting Practices of Shipyards Holding Government Contracts for Ship Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, in 1946 the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, of which I was a member, conducted an investigation in connection with the accounting practices of certain shipyards holding contracts for construction of vessels for the account of the Government. During the course of this testimony a representative of the Comptroller General of the United States made the general statement to the effect that many of the shipyards engaged in this work kept two sets of books and stated specifically: "The set of records which they maintained for their own account was accurate, but the set of records that they maintained for the Government's account was not so accurate." The implication of these remarks is obvious. Subsequently, the same witness, upon being questioned, testified that his general remarks applied specifically to the Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., of Chester, Pa.

At the request of the representatives of that company the Comptroller General made a detailed investigation of the books and records of Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. and ascertained that his representative's testimony as to that company was wholly inaccurate. On September 26, 1946, the Comptroller General wrote a letter to that effect addressed to our honorable colleague, SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, who was then chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. In that letter Comptroller General Warren suggested to Judge Bland that the letter should be inserted in the record of the committee's proceedings in order to correct an injustice.

Unfortunately no further proceedings of the committee have been had and it is questionable whether or not Comptroller General Warren's letter will be published as a part of those proceedings. Therefore, in order to correct the unfortunate error made in the testimony of the Comptroller General's representative before the investigating committee, and further that the splendid record of this company and its contribution to the war effort may stand unimpugned, I include with these remarks a copy of Comptroller General Warren's letter of September 26, 1946, which is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, September 26, 1946.

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on
Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At the hearing before your committee on July 17, 1946, on accounting practices in the War Shipping Administration and United States Maritime Commission, as disclosed by my audit reports for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944, Mr. Arthur P. Erb appeared and testified as a representative of the General Accounting Office. Under questioning by committee members and counsel, Mr. Erb made certain statements of which the following excerpts are representative:

"Mr. BONNER. Then the shipyard had to keep a record of what they did on the ship.

"Mr. ERB. Yes, but they were to maintain a set of records for the benefit of the Maritime Commission or War Shipping Administration for their account. In addition they maintained a set of records for their own account. The set of records which they maintained for their own account was accurate, but the set of records that they maintained for the Government's account was not so accurate.

* * * * * *

"Mr. COLES. May I carry further Mr. Bradley's question? You stated that the shipyard operator kept two sets of records. One he kept in accordance with his own private procedures, and they were accurate; the other he kept in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration, and they were inaccurate. Is that correct?

"Mr. ERB. That is right.

"Mr. WEICHEL. Would that mean two sets of books covering the same thing, which were not alike?

"Mr. ERB. Yes, sir.

* * * * * *

"Mr. COLES. To get back to the two types of books kept by contractors, let us go to construction contracts, and let us take the example of the Sun Shipyard you mentioned. In their two sets of books was there reflection of differing amounts owed by the Government to the shipyard?

"Mr. ERB. Well, for example, they would charge an item against ship construction in their private books which the Government would simply disallow on the Government books. There would be charges primarily along this line, that we could not determine the cost by contract. They could determine the cost by hull. The lumping together of their hull costs against the contract cost would not always bring out a reflective figure, and we were unable to reconcile the sets of books, on those particular items." (Hearings, pt. 1, pp. 65, 66, 67, 72.)

Mr. John G. Pew, president of the Sun Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., has protested to me that such statements of Mr. Erb imply that his company was guilty of falsifying its records. I understand that Mr. Pew has also conferred with Mr. Erb and Mr. Marvin J. Coles, general counsel for your committee, concerning the statements. At his request, I have had the matter examined into thoroughly.

While Mr. Erb insists that there was no thought in his mind of any wrong-doing on the part of the Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. or other contractors with respect to their record-keeping, he does concede that it was incorrect to say that the contractors kept two sets of books, one more accurate than the other. Mr. Erb explains that the point he was attempting to make

was that certain contractors had complete records of their costs in performing Government contracts, but that the information required and received by the Maritime Commission from the contractors in support of their claims for payments by the Government under such contracts was less complete.

However, on their face the quoted statements of Mr. Erb do imply questionable practices on the part of the contractors. Since such statements are admittedly inaccurate, I feel that the record should be corrected so that no unjust inferences will be drawn in the case of the Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., or any other contractor.

Therefore, I will appreciate it if you will cause this letter to be inserted in the record of your committee's proceedings and included with any further published report of your hearings on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

The Stratton Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, there are about 1,000,000 refugees or displaced persons now under the care of the United States and Great Britain. About four-fifths of them are Poles, White Russians, and Ukrainians, practically all of them refusing to be repatriated because of their opposition to communism and to the regimes now governing their countries. There is no room for them in the economy of the countries where they are now living, and they wouldn't want to work with their old enemies anyway, even if they could.

We are now paying out about $150,000,000 a year to support these people. When the International Refugee Organization is set up and operating under the United Nations, our share will be smaller, but it will still be more than the $75,000,000 which is our direct contribution to that organization, because our occupation forces will still be confronted by these people in our zones. General McNarney has said that their presence accounts for a noticeable proportion of the troop strength we are compelled to maintain in occupied areas.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we should stress the point that H. R. 2910 is a temporary measure, and is strictly limited in its provisions and application. It sets no precedent for further immigration. It does not attempt to change the quota system in any way. It does not make any permanent changes, in principle or otherwise, in our immigration laws. It preserves all of the screening devices we have so carefully built up over so long a period.

Mr. Speaker, complicating this problem of the displaced persons in connection with our immigration laws, and making it vitally necessary that something should be done to relieve the impossible situation that confronts us, is the Executive order issued by the President last December. In carrying out that Presidential order the State Department and the Justice Department assigned to the displaced persons 90 percent of the total quotas of the various countries from which these displaced persons come. This allows only 10 percent of present quotas for the regular visa applicants, therefore, very few regular visa applicants can come in. Since the greater part of our European emigrants today consist of parents and relatives of naturalized American citizens already here, the President's order prevents families from becoming reunited, thus working a hardship upon many American citizens. The President's order upset the regular established procedure for issuing visas, a procedure that had been in effect for over 20 years. Under that procedure all persons applying for visas were listed and the quota filled from that list, the names taken in the order of application.

The passage of the Stratton bill would do away with or replace the Executive order that now operates. If H. R. 2910 becomes law, there would be no further need of the Executive order, because 100,000 of these displaced persons would come in each year for 4 years under the terms of the bill, and in that way, the entire quota would again be available for regular visa immigrants.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on H. R. 2910 for the following reasons:

First. It will greatly reduce the cost to us of taking care of these people.

Second. It will give the unfortunate people themselves a chance to start life anew and work out their own salvation.

Third. It will bring into this country the kind of people, by and large, that we need as citizens—people having the qualities that are necessary and desirable in a democracy.

Fourth. It provides that we shall assume only our fair share of the burden and the responsibility that rests upon the Allied Nations in connection with these displaced persons.

Fifth. It provides for very careful screening, and preserves the immigration standards contained in our regular quota laws.

Sixth. It is the just, the humane, the Christian, the right thing for us to do.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Alton (Ill.) Evening Telegraph of June 1, 1947.

THE STRATTON BILL

Illinois can take pride in the knowledge that one of her Congressmen has assumed leadership in the fight to do something about the displaced persons of Europe. Republican Congressman-at-Large WILLIAM STRATTON, author of the bill to admit 400,000 of the homeless and suffering refugees of Europe, is courageously bucking a dismaying combination of apathy, provincialism, and xenophobia.

Opposition to Mr. STRATTON's bill consists mainly of the same worn-out arguments that have always been marshaled against immigration to the United States. The fear that immigrants will take jobs away from Americans was being voiced almost 100 years ago, when many Europeans fled to this country following the social upheaval that began in 1848. Yet, the immigrants of a century ago fathered some of the most distinguished families of America; their contributions to this country could not be cataloged in less than a thick volume. Those who did not achieve eminence helped in the less spectacular but useful tasks of building our railroads, spreading our frontiers, and industrializing our cities. We would, today, be a poorer Nation if the arguments now being put forward against Mr. STRATTON's bill had prevailed 100 years ago.

There are little more than a million of these people who have been left in temporary camps by the dislocations of Hitler's war. Many other nations are ready to take their share if America will lead the way. Our immigration quota act provides for the admission of 154,000 persons annually to this country, but in the past 10 years only 294,630 have come in under the quota provisions, less than one-fifth the conservative figure set by Congress.

Rather than flood the country with immigrants, Mr. STRATTON's bill would give entry to less than half the number entitled to receive it under the quota system. The bill would retain the present requirements for immigration, and would bar those who fail to meet the physical and mental health standards that have always been used.

Opposition to the bill is formidable, but it has been endorsed by virtually every major church organization in the Nation. Mr. STRATTON, himself, sums up an eloquent plea for its enactment: "Granting refuge to the displaced will be a reaffirmation of a great and noble American tradition. This country, which was founded and built by immigrants, will remain as a symbol of its early beginnings—an asylum for the oppressed."

Causes of the High Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 17 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Edson B. Smith, financial writer of the Boston Herald, on some of the factors which cause the high cost of living at the present time. I think the article can appropriately be read in connection with the conference report on the wool bill, which I understand is soon to come before the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDSON B. SMITH SAYS

The worst offenders in the price rise have been agricultural products. In considerable degree the rise in prices of farm products has been caused by Government buying. Even this spring the Government has been buying potatoes and eggs, not because the Government has any use for potatoes and eggs, but merely to keep up the price.

Every housewife in America is interested in the high price of food. The number of persons who know or care what a steam boiler or a freight car costs is relatively limited. To talk about business concerns being responsible for the high cost of living when the

Government itself deliberately holds the price of food at artificial levels is ridiculous. If the Government really wants prices to come down, why does it not stop its absurd buying program for farm products?

This farm-buying program is done under authority of a law which runs until the end of 1948. Moreover, not only does this law penalize every buyer of food but it costs the Government hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

If Congress really is serious in its desire to stop wasting the taxpayers' money, here is one place to wield the ax.

Taxes and Government Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial published in the Oakland (Calif.) Observer of June 7, 1947:

Perhaps in the spirit of a gag, one Andy Anderson of Ada, Okla., plain American citizen, proclaimed "National be kind to taxpayers week, June 8 to 14." But, as A. C. Hardison, Santa Paula agriculturalist and president of the California Taxpayers' Association, points out, it is far from a joke. In fact, Mr. Hardson declares, with ample supporting data, unless all agencies of government immediately begin reducing their demands upon the taxpayers of the country, we are all going to be sunk. However, the evidence is all the other way as to the trend in governmental expenditures. From every bureau and division, whether Federal, State, or local, the story is the same. More and still more money must be wrung from the incomes of the people to support the extravagant and inflationary basis upon which these agencies have pyramided their expenditures. President Truman has let it be known that he will probably veto the $4,000,000,000 slash in the Federal income tax. Governor Warren indicates that he will sign the record-breaking $645,000,000 State budget. Alameda County officials and employees are demanding up to 25 percent increases in salaries. The city employees of Oakland are marshaling their forces for a 25 percent increase in pay. It is the same story all down the line. As Hardison point out, taxes in California took more than $4,000,000,000 from the people of California last year, or nearly one-third of our $14,500,000,000 revenue. Government spending during the 1946-47 fiscal year is expected to take $50,000,000,000 from the people of the country, or nearly one-fifth more than the $41,000,000,000 they are expected to spend for food during the same period. "How long can the people support these peak Government expenditures and continue to maintain the free American way of life?" demands the president of the Taxpayers' Association.

"I have been reading your editorials on high taxation and soaring costs of government, but what can we do about it?" asks one worried county official. "How can we get along under our present salary schedules in the face of the high cost of living?" demands a city employee. A State assemblyman insists that the legislature has no alternative but to pass the huge, inflated State budget, because the people, themselves, voted most of the major items.

Now that brings us right down to the thesis of this editorial. Who are the real taxpayers—and who are the first and worst sufferers from the inordinate tax demands by Government? Why, the answer is as plain as the ink on the bills for the cost of living—the people at large are the first and the worst sufferers from the tax burden. Many people go to the polls and vote for this or that measure increasing the cost of government or fastening a heavy bonded indebtedness upon the body politic, imagining that only the rich, the banks, the insurance companies or Big Business, so called, will have to pay the cost thereof. But, they overlook that business passes along its taxes to the consumer in increased prices, so that in the end the general public pays the piper—hence our present exorbitant cost of living. Labor unions have a slogan: "We vote for all bond issues—they make jobs for labor." This cynical attitude is matched by the slogan of the labor leaders, who say that every advance in the cost of living must be matched by a corresponding increase in pay for labor. They are, however, no different from the jurists, who say that high-class attorneys are now earning $25,000 to $35,000 a year, whereas $15,000 used to be considered good, so our salaries must be upped to somewhere near comparable to the earnings of the leaders in private practice.

The answer is that we must become more conscious of the fact that everyone is paying taxes. There is no place for Government to obtain the funds to pay the cost of operation save from the pockets of the people. If the wage-earner became conscious of the fact that every time Government costs increase the buying power of his pay check becomes smaller, it would not be long before the pendulum would swing the other way. The budget-making period is now drawing close for local governmental agencies. The demands upon them are going to be beyond all previous records. Get behind your officials to fight off these demands.

Income Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include in the Appendix my statement concerning H. R. 1:

In vetoing H. R. 1, calling for reduction in individual income taxes, the President has over-ridden the substantial majority of the House made up of Members of both parties and has also failed to respond to the wishes of the majority of the people of this country. There is a maxim of the law that "Time is of the essence." We have seen it in operation twice within the past few days. Secretary of Agriculture Anderson said it was not the time to decontrol sugar for the housewives, but did so 4 days later. The President says it is the wrong time for tax reduction. He will change his mind next year undoubtedly. He also says that with the present huge public debt tax reduction is not in order. If we must wait until the country is out of debt, many of us will never see tax-reduction day. As stated in today's editorial of the New York Times, "Perhaps the best way to sum up the President's veto message would be to say that he has taken the wrong course, for the wrong reasons."

American Aid Extended to 59 Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of June 1, 1947:

AMERICAN AID EXTENDED TO 59 COUNTRIES—SURVEY SHOWS MORE THAN TWENTY BILLION IN TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE HAS GONE ABROAD IN 2 YEARS

(By Garnett D. Horner)

Fifty-nine countries are benefiting from United States economic and technical assistance extended since the end of fighting in World War II.

The money spent and committed in this tremendous program to help rehabilitate a war-torn world amounts to more than $20,000,000,000.

This includes nearly $12,000,000,000 in loans, direct grants and relief expenditures, lend-lease and surplus-property credits and expenditures on cultural and technical cooperation projects, plus this country's $2,700,000,000 contribution to UNRRA and $5,925,000,000 subscriptions to the World Bank and monetary fund.

So far, American economic aid to other nations has been on a "piece-meal basis," without any guiding over-all program, Secretary of State Marshall is changing this. He emphasized in a speech at Harvard University last week that future American assistance "should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative" for economic deterioration abroad.

SURVEY SUMMARIZED

General Marshall invited European countries to get together and work out a joint program of what is required to put them on their feet economically, promising United States support "so far as it may be practical." It is clear future needs will involve many more billions of dollars. General Marshall has a new policy-planning staff developing estimates of what more the United States may be able to do.

In the meantime, the State Department's Division of Historical Policy Research recently completed a country-by-country survey of the economic and technical aid supplied or authorized for other countries since mid-1945. It did not attempt any definite over-all tabulation, because of such hard-to-figure items as the value of fixed war installations turned over to other nations and the American share of UNRRA supplies in some cases.

Here is a summary of the survey's findings for each country, supplemented in some cases by material from other sources:

Albania: United States share of UNRRA supplies from June 30, 1945, to June 30, 1946, was $13,052,284. Additional $27,450,000 allotted by UNRRA in July 1946.

HIGHWAY FOR CANADA

Australia: Lend-lease shipments since VJ-day estimated at $17,500,000. Fixed war installations, costing $37,394,000, including 30 airports and 11 seaports, transferred through last June 30.

Belgium: Has received $100,000,000 Export-Import Bank loan. Lend-lease aid from VJ-day through last September 30 aggregated $68,000,000. Surplus property costing $380,000,000 transferred for $54,000,000. Two airports and 39 other fixed war installations transferred.

Canada: Alaska Highway, which cost United States $138,312,166, turned over to Canada April 1, 1946.

Czechoslovakia: Export-Import Bank credits of $22,000,000 and surplus property credit of $9,304,694. Also benefited from UNRRA.

Denmark: Export-Import Bank credit of $20,000,000, plus nearly $20,000,000 in surplus property credits.

SHIPS FOR FRANCE

Finland: Export-Import Bank credits aggregating $77,500,000, plus $15,000,000 credit for purchase of surplus property. Also benefited from UNRRA.

France: Export-Import Bank credits amounting to $1,200,000,000, plus $720,000,000 surplus property credit, and additional credit for purchase of 75 Liberty ships. Many fixed war installations transferred.

Great Britain: Loan by special act of Congress of $3,750,000,000, plus $650,000,000 credit for surplus property and lend-lease settlement. Approximately 800 fixed war installations transferred.

Greece: To get $250,000,000 economic and military assistance under special Greek-Turkish aid program, plus share in post-UNRRA $350,000,000 relief program. Export-Import Bank loan of $25,000,000, surplus property credit of $45,000,000 and another $45,000,000 credit for purchase of ships have been made available. Lend-lease aid amounted to $75,000,000 as of last June 30. Also benefited from UNRRA.

DIRECT AID FOR ITALY

Iceland: 27 fixed war installations, costing $65,000,000, including 3 airfields, transferred as of last June 30.

Italy: Received $140,000,000 in direct relief administered by Foreign Economic Administration. Export-Import Bank loans and earmarked credits aggregate $130,000,000. Surplus property credit of $10,000,000 available. Total of $258,000,000 credited to Italy for lira used by American troops in Italy under special financial agreement. To share in new $350,000,000 relief program.

Netherlands: Export-Import Bank credits aggregate $263,000,000 plus $20,000,000 surplus property credit. Lend-lease shipments from VJ-day to last June 30 amounted to $50,000,000. Eighty-four fixed war installations, valued at $44,384,624, transferred.

New Zealand: Surplus property credit of $5,500,000. Twenty-two war installations, costing $207,069 transferred.

Norway: $50,000,000 Export-Import Bank credit. More than $6,500,000 in lend-lease supplies shipped since VJ-day.

Poland: Export-Import Bank credit of $40,000,000 plus $50,000,000 surplus property credit. Benefited from UNRRA. May share in $350,000,000 relief program.

Portugal: War Department and Civil Aeronautics Administration have trained Portuguese personnel in weather-observation techniques, operation of communications equipment and other air navigational aids. Airports in Azores returned to Portuguese control.

LEND-LEASE FOR SOVIET

Spain: Air strips in Spanish West African colony of Rio de Oro, built under 1945 agreement, transferred to Spain at price of $136,697, which was 56 percent of declared cost.

Soviet Union: Approximately $250,000,000 in pipe line lend-lease supplies, to be paid for in 22 annual installments beginning in 1954. Benefited from UNRRA.

Yugoslavia: Received much help through UNRRA.

Burma: Has received approximately $11,000,000 worth of lend-lease transportation equipment.

Egypt: Airport built near Cairo during the war transferred to Egypt as part of $11,800,000 surplus property deal.

Ethiopia: $3,000,000, Export-Import Bank, and $1,000,000 surplus property credits. Benefited from UNRRA.

India: To retain more than $50,000,000 of proceeds from sale of suplus war property in India. Many war installations, including 62 airports, transferred.

Iran: $25,000,000 surplus-property credit; is negotiating for another $30,000,000. Lend-lease aid in 1946 fiscal year amounted to nearly $5,000,000. Many war installations transferred.

THE TURKISH LOAN

Iraq: Approximately $41,000 in educational aid.

Lebanon: More than $90,000 in educational aid.

Liberia: United States building $20,000,000 airport at Monrovia, and operating 5-year sanitation program involving expenditure of $200,000 a year.

Syria: More than $10,000 in educational aid.

Saudi Arabia: $10,000,000 Export-Import Bank loan, plus $2,000,000 surplus-property credit. Airbase at Dhahran transferred.

Turkey: To get $150,000,000 from $400,000,000 Greek-Turkish aid program. Has been granted previously $40,000,000 Export-Import Bank credit, plus $10,000,000 surplus-property credit and additional $5,000,000 credit for purchase of ships. Educational aid amounts to $65,000.

Yemen: $1,000,000 surplus-property credit.

China: Export-Import Bank credits total $82,793,750 so far. Lend-lease aid after VJ-day amounted to about $700,000,000. Surplus property costing originally about $900,000,000 sold to China for $210,000,000, under complicated payment formula. Big beneficiary under UNRRA. To share in new $350,000,000 relief program.

Philippine Republic: Special aid authorized by Congress amounts to $695,000,000, including $400,000,000 to pay private war damage claims.

Austria: War Department has shipped about $60,000,000 worth of civilian supplies to Austria. Export-Import Bank granted $1,000,000 loan. Surplus-property credits amount to $2,000,000. Benefited also from UNRRA.

Germany: War Department has furnished more than $400,000,000 worth of civilian supplies.

Hungary: Has used half of $30,000,000 surplus property credit; remainder suspended last week following pro-Communist government changes. Fate of $7,000,000 Export-Import Bank credit uncertain. Benefited from UNRRA.

Japan: War Department has provided $267,000,000 worth of civilian supplies.

Korea: More than $37,000,000 in civilian supplies shipped by War Department through March. Army is handling $25,000,000 surplus property credit. Benefited from UNRRA.

Argentina: $193,000 Export-Import Bank credit extended to Argentine firm for purchase of harbor barges here. United States expenditures on cultural and technical cooperation amount to about $104,000 for 1946 and 1947 fiscal years.

Bolivia: Cultural and technical projects, $245,000.

Brazil: Export-Import Bank credits of $70,000,000. Cultural and technical projects amount to $680,000. Several air bases transferred to Brazilian control.

Chile: Export-Import Bank credits, $42,000,000; cultural and technical projects, $195,000.

Colombia: $517,800 Export-Import Bank credit. Cultural and technical projects, $342,000.

Costa Rica: Approximately $1,300,000 spent for building parts of Inter-American Highway in Costa Rica. Cultural and technical projects, $240,000.

Cuba: Cultural and technical projects, $190,000.

Dominican Republic: Cultural and technical projects, $75,000.

CREDITS FOR MEXICO

Ecuador: Export-Import Bank credit of $1,000,000. Cultural and technical projects, $288,000. American-built air base at Salinas and military base in Galapagos turned over to Ecuador.

El Salvador: $167,500 spent on building parts of Inter-American Highway in El Salvador; $160,000 on cultural and technical projects.

Guatemala: Inter-American Highway expenditures, $232,700; cultural and technical projects, $425,000.

Haiti: Cultural and technical projects, $83,000.

Honduras: Inter-American Highway expenditures, $354,500; cultural and technical projects, $63,000 naval base, Puerto Castilla, turned over with American-built installations.

Mexico: Export-Import Bank credits total $87,000,000, including $50,000,000 authorized during recent visit of President Aleman, which also resulted in $50,000,000 currency stabilization agreement. More than $574,000 spent on cultural and technical projects.

OTHER OUTLAYS

Nicaragua: Inter-American Highway and Rama Road expenditures $1,250,000; cultural and technical projects, $180,000.

Panama: Inter-American Highway expenditures, $13,000; cultural and technical projects, $34,000. Ninety-eight defense sites returned to Panama.

Paraguay: Cultural and technical projects, $38,000.

Peru: Export-Import Bank loan, $450,000; cultural and technical projects, $470,000. Air base at Talara, costing $2,000,000, turned over to Peru.

Uruguay: Surplus property credit, $666,666; cultural and technical projects, $67,000.

Venezuela: Cultural and technical projects, $144,000.

The United States also is contributing to cooperative health and sanitation projects in many Latin-American countries on a long-term basis, with figures on expenditures not broken down for the 2-year period covered in this survey.

Our Seagoing Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there are many obstacles that beset the American merchant marine in world-wide competition, and I am including a timely editorial from the Washington Times-Herald which well describes part of the difficulties:

OUR SEAGOING FUTURE

Perhaps the above caption should be, "Have we a seagoing future?"

The latest of the Nation's shipping strikes began yesterday, with heads of five maritime unions ordering about 20,000 of their men to park on the ships until ordered off by the owners, so that the affair could be called a lock-out.

What started this tie-up, expected to affect about 1,100 vessels, was the expiration yesterday of three of the unions' contracts with the ship owners, plus the unions' desire for a 40-hour week as against the present 48, welfare funds, severance pay, longer vacations, and 15- to 20-percent wage increases.

SHIPS TIED UP ONCE MORE

We wouldn't attempt to predict when this second merchant marine tie-up in less than 8 months will come unscrambled. What we're wondering about is the long-range effect these things will have on the United States as a nation with a lot of freight ships carrying their fair share of the world's ocean commerce.

Our boys aren't paid pauper wages, for all the yelling their union leaders do. Here is a table of comparative monthly wages for able seamen and chief cooks on the vessels of various nations, recently issued by the National Federation of American Shipping:

	Basic		Estimated total	
	Able seaman	Chief cook	Able seaman	Chief cook
United States	$172.50	$205	$265	$310
Canada	150.00	180	170	200
United Kingdom	96.00	110	103	117
Holland	74.00	93	80	100
France	79.00	94	92	107
Greece	112.00	144	117	150
Yugoslavia	84.00	89	87	92
Denmark	85.00	98	90	103
Sweden	84.00	95	105	115

Basic pay is what a sailor makes without any trimmings. His total earnings include basic pay plus what he makes for overtime, etc.

From the above table it will be seen that foreign able seamen's estimated total earnings average only 39.8 percent of United States seamen's totals, while foreign chief cooks do only 39.7 percent as well as our cooks.

There seems to be next to no prospect that our boys will ever consent to wage reductions, so that United States shipping costs can be brought down to somewhere near the levels of British, Danish, French, etc., cost. Incidentally, our boys' wages have gone up some 120 percent since 1940.

As the other maritime nations get more ships, we shall be less and less able to compete with them for the world's seagoing freight trade on a straight-out basis.

Yet if we let our merchant marine go to ruin, we'll cripple one of our most important muscles for the next war.

So it looks as if the good old American taxpayer must expect big Government subsidies for the merchant marine from here on. There appears to be no other way to keep this essential institution afloat and at the same time keep the sailors loaded up with the more abundant life.

The Maritime Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, at 1 minute after midnight yesterday morning thousands of maritime workers went on strike. As a result, shipping in all American ports is practically at a standstill.

The issues between the seamen and the operators of the ships involve wages, hours of work, vacations, and similar matters. At this time I do not care to comment about the relative merits of the controversy, but I do feel it incumbent upon me to urge that the parties involved settle their differences promptly, or that they continue to operate the ships pending a settlement.

As a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I have learned in recent months that the American Merchant Marine, because of its high cost of operation, is dependent upon governmental aid and protection for its continued success. Our Government has spent many millions of the taxpayer's dollars during the past decade to build this American merchant marine. This aid has been of assistance not only to the owners and operators of the ships but also to the men who sail these ships. It seems unfortunate to me that both of these groups after seeking governmental aid should destroy the results of that assistance through another prolonged maritime strike, and in my opinion the result of this strike would be to nullify to a large extent the assistance furnished by the Government at such high cost.

Accordingly I feel that unless the operators and the seafarers reconcile their differences promptly they must expect to experience difficulty in their future requests for continued and increased governmental assistance.

Is the State Department, Like the Communists, Allergic to Free News Coverage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, not long ago the Communists alibied their opposition to free news coverage with the claim that American news reporting was biased and distorted. Recent actions of the State Department might indicate that they hold views not unlike the Russians in this respect.

The Kiplinger Washington Letter of June 14 reveals some information about secret seminars being held by the State Department from which all news reporters are carefully excluded.

However, the most complete exposé of this secret indoctrination was carried in the Wall Street Journal of June 9, as follows:

PIN ON A BADGE, TAKE VOW OF SILENCE—LEARN OUR FOREIGN POLICY—TO SPREAD "INFORMATION," STATE DEPARTMENT SHUTS OUT PRESS, TALKS TO CLUB, CHURCH FOLK

(By Vermont Royster)

WASHINGTON.—The State Department is unlimbering its biggest propaganda guns in support of its foreign policy.

The diplomats are holding a series of "off the record," unpublicized conferences in Washington and elsewhere about the country, with representatives of women's clubs, church groups, fraternal organizations, and independent voters' leagues. In these sessions, top officials of the State Department have set out to sell the Truman "Stop Russia" Doctrine and gather aid for other phases of the administration's foreign program.

A direct appeal is being made to these organization representatives to go home and make sure the State Department's views are known within the groups they represent.

The latest, and to date the biggest, of these conferenes was held here this week end. It was attended by approximately 250 "delegates" representing organizations with total membership estimated by a State Department official at 75,000,000.

NOT ENOUGH PUBLICITY

These delegates were told by a Department representative that the conference was called because the Department could not get out enough information on foreign policy through the usual publicity channels. Newspaper reporters were excluded from the meetings.

During the course of 3 days of meetings the delegates were told:

The United States must be prepared to give economic, as well as political, assistance where needed in the world. The Truman Doctrine is simply an extension of the Monroe Doctrine and the only logical course America's foreign policy can follow.

The public should support the State Department's effort to educate the rest of the world in the American way of life through pamphlets and radio. (Congress is still considering whether this effort deserves funds.)

The State Department has an obligation to see that the people "understand" foreign policy. The usual press and radio information channels need to be supplemented by direct contact between the policy makers and representatives of "leading organizations."

The public should be taught to understand the benefits of a "liberal" trade policy.

More people should join organizations interested in foreign policy. They and their organizations should work with the proper legislative representatives to see that the United States follows a sound foreign program.

The delegates should return home and "work through the organization to which you belong" to insure that the country does have this "sound foreign policy."

The official purpose of the conferences is to help the public participate in the formation of foreign policy. But all of the discussions were on policy matters already settled, so far as the State Department is concerned, and major emphasis was placed on getting the delegates acquainted with the official State Department views.

THE KEY POW-WOW

Apparently the key meeting was a session on "citizen participation in foreign affairs." It was at this meeting that the delegates were told of the Department's difficulties in getting their views on foreign problems understood by the public. The delegates were asked to cooperate in this effort.

Citizen participation, apparently, did not include the press. Newsmen who applied for permission to attend the discussions were turned down. One who slipped in without a guest badge was ejected.

Speakers at the sessions included Secretary of State Marshall, Dean Rusk of the Office of Special Political Affairs, Loy W. Henderson of the Department's Far Eastern Division, and William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Mr. Benton spoke on the need for an international information program. Francis H. Russell, Director of Public Affairs, presided.

SENATOR VANDENBERG DECLINES

Republican Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG was invited to address the delegates, but declined.

Visual explanations of the administration's foreign policy, including movies, were used to supplement the oral discussions. A wealth of booklets and pamphlets explaining foreign policy in simple language was distributed among the delegates.

The week-end conference was part of a general program planned by the State Department for the education of the public on

foreign problems. It is being handled by the Division of Public Affairs under Mr. Russell.

This Division has set up a series of committees, each headed by a State Department official, to deal directly with the various private organizations. One official handles women's groups, another veterans' organizations, another church societies, still another fraternal organizations, and so on.

SECRETARY MARSHALL'S EXPLANATION

Explaining the meetings, Secretary Marshall told delegates the purpose was to give out "accurate and timely information" regarding foreign affairs.

"I hope these meetings will result in subsequent programs," the Secretary said, "which will explain to a far wider audience the complexities of charting the Nation's course in world affairs."

Apparently, great effort was made to give the meetings an air of importance and the delegates a feeling of being on the inside. Admission was by special invitation only, and each delegate was issued a badge and an identification card. These were carefully checked.

Although all the speeches seemed to repeat recent public statements of Secretary Marshall and other top officials, with little new added, the delegates were warned that all discussions were off the record.

Delegates reported most of the emphasis in the conference discussions was placed on the so-called Truman doctrine and the need for the United States to use its economic resources abroad. The delegates were told that no one, not even President Truman, could say yet that the need for United States financial assistance abroad is over.

One speaker appealed for assistance in the State Department's information program. The Department, he said, needs to distribute a greater quantity of concise and simple explanations of foreign policy and the State Department's program. In addition, he said the Department would like to get together the best editorial opinion on the administration's foreign policy and see that it is widely distributed. The Department, he added, is at present handicapped by a lack of funds.

A wide range of organizations was included in the conference guest list. Here are a few: The League of Women Voters, the Southern Council on International Relations, B'nai B'rith, American Friends Service Committee, Muncie (Ind.) Community Discussion Council, National Conference of Christians and Jews, National Council of Negro Women, Southern Baptist Public Affairs Committee, Junior Leagues of America, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the Girl Scouts.

The Late Honorable Fred Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I include a resolution received from the Oyster Institute of North America paying tribute to the late Honorable Fred Bradley, chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

Whereas Almighty God has taken from his work the Honorable Fred Bradley, Congressman from Michigan, who was chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and

Whereas Congressman Bradley, throughout his long career in Congress, has loyally served the best interests of the fishing industries and the Nation; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we of the National Shellfisheries Association and the Oyster Growers and Dealers Association of North America, in convention assembled, hereby record our deep sense of loss in his untimely death, and extend our profound sympathy to his family and colleagues.

Naval Air Transport Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, while Congress is making tremendous cuts in the expenses of Government, it is important to remember that we will seriously affect the future defense of our country if we eliminate some essential functions of the Army and Navy.

The Naval Air Transport Service is one of those functions which should be maintained as an effective operation. If we could be positive that there would be no future wars, this service might be discontinued without fear. However, we have no such assurance, and all indications are to the effect that we might soon be faced with an emergency greater than the last war. The Naval Air Transport Service proved to be of unlimited value throughout World War II.

At the present time some 5,000 officers and enlisted men are carrying on a skeleton service. During the war a world-wide service was operated by some 50,000 officers and men. This small group that is retained in NATS is the essential experts and administrative personnel required to keep this organization intact. They carry on the basic operations of this service. To further reduce the personnel of this agency would seriously cripple the entire organization. To eliminate or lessen the present operating efficiency of NATS would be a serious blow to a quick mobilization in the event of war. It would be impossible to carry on a war without the Naval Transport Service. It is a necessary arm of our national defense. It is just as important for the Navy to have a transport service as it is for the Army to have its ATC.

The expeditious handling of manpower and highly critical material was a primary fact in winning World War II. NATS will be of even greater importance in the next war.

During the last war we had 3,000,000 men in the Navy. It has been estimated that 10 percent of the entire Navy personnel was in transit. In other words, we had 300,000 men who were not being used because they were being moved from one place to the other. By the use of the air-transport service this number could have been reduced to probably one-tenth of that amount. Then, too many of these men were spares, which were sorely needed at critical points. The NATS made it possible to transfer highly trained personnel from one point to another in a minimum of time.

It will be of greater importance in future wars to minimize the loss of manpower, especially technical and expert personnel, and the only way we can bring about such a saving would be through the use of a service similar to that rendered by NATS.

Not only is it important to save in manpower, but it is equally important to hasten aviation spares and parts to critical areas. In the recent war NATS made it possible to repair damaged equipment in a minimum of time. Surface transportation is often too slow for supply purposes, especially in handling highly critical replacements.

A nucleus of transport organization in time of peace will insure the continued operation of this service during time of war. We must familiarize the pilots with the routes, procedures, weather, and so forth. A trained operating organization cannot be gathered together over night. For a safe and efficient utilization of NATS for the Navy, it is essential that we keep intact the present minimum organization, which is now carrying on for NATS.

NATS will insure a continued familiarization with flight-control and space-control procedures, and hence will accomplish the desired result for future emergency with less expense of men and materials.

We cannot expect to start from zero again. We will not have a breathing spell if another war should start. Not only from the point of view of maintaining this operation for emergency's sake would it be worthwhile to want this organization at its present operating minimum, but it is important for safety's sake to keep this compact, trained group intact.

The history of NATS indicates the safety record became more desirable with the development and the training of the personnel of the organization.

During the first year of NATS, there were 25.0 passenger fatalities for 100,000,000 passenger-miles compared with 1.7 for the same number of passenger-miles for commercial air lines.

The safety record of NATS improved until 1946 it was 1.8 for NATS and 1.6 for commercial. Experience and familiarization with operations brought about this fine safety record.

I sincerely hope that the Congress and the Navy will realize the great value of NATS in the defense of our country and will maintain this organization as a strong and healthy operation.

A Well-Deserved Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, it gives me personal pleasure and large satisfaction

to include a well-deserved tribute to our colleague, Hon. RALPH A. GAMBLE, of Westchester County, appearing in the Reporter-Dispatch, published at White Plains, N. Y., under date of June 14 last.

This editorial, with its appropriate heading, gives credit where credit is due. We all know down here of the outstanding work that RALPH GAMBLE has done in helping finally to achieve the end of sugar rationing for the American home.

The editorial in full follows:

HOUSEWIFE'S FRIEND

We consider that the housewives of Westchester, along with the rest of the country, owe a substantial debt of gratitude to Representative RALPH A. GAMBLE, of Larchmont, and we suggest that in propriety they should let him know they are appreciative of what he has done for them.

Over the past year the Representative from New York's Twenty-eighth District has been studying the sugar supply and associated factors of international distribution. Last fall he came to the conclusion that sugar rationing for the American home was largely a hang-over from wartime. He made his attempt then, but failed.

Then this week he obtained other information. As a member of influence of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, he introduced a resolution on Tuesday to end sugar rationing insofar as the American family consumption at home is concerned. It went through the committee overwhelmingly and would undoubtedly have found an equally prompt and impressive reaction in the House at large, as well as in the Senate. It is doubtful if President Truman would have vetoed it.

However, the Department of Agriculture, aware that Mr. GAMBLE and his committee had incontrovertible facts on their side, decided to jump the gun and secure the credit for the administration. That was why the announcement came so unexpectedly from Secretary Anderson on Wednesday afternoon.

We doubt that any observant American will be deceived by Anderson's tactics. For our part, we give credit to Congressman GAMBLE and we believe Westchester housewives will agree with us that—pardon, please—it was very sweet of him.

Veto of the Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I have had greater difficulty in reaching a decision as to what I should do about the vote that is soon to be taken on the question of overriding or sustaining the President's veto of the tax bill than any vote I have had the responsibility of casting since I have been a Member of Congress.

As is well known to every Member of the House I opposed, as vigorously as I could, the tax bill when it was reported out of the committee and when it was before the House, for reasons then stated. When the bill went to the other body it was amended so as to not become effective until July 1, 1947, instead of January 1, 1947, as provided in the House bill. Also, other amendments, not so important, were adopted in the Senate. When the bill went to conference and the Senate amendment fixing the effective date as of July 1 was agreed to, I considered the bill was only half as bad as when it passed the House and then, as I understood, the estimate of Treasury receipts for 1948, as well as 1947, had been raised above the January 1947 estimate by two and one-half or three billion dollars for 1948, I signed the conference report and voted for its adoption in the House. Later I learned that the Treasury had not changed its estimate of revenue receipts for 1948 but still adhered to its January 1 estimate and only the staff of the joint committee had changed its 1948 estimate.

While the House has made considerable reduction in the President's budget, in the appropriation bills that have passed, few of these appropriation bills have been acted upon by the Senate and it now appears likely that a part of the cuts made by the House will be restored in the Senate. It is, therefore, impossible for anyone to tell just how much saving will be effected when the appropriation bills are all acted upon. Moreover, there is so much uncertainty at the present, not only as to the cuts that will be made in the President's budget but as to revenue receipts for 1948—with strikes in many directions darkening the economic horizon and especially the threat of a coal strike after July 1, when the Government returns the mines to the operators, with its serious economic consequences—I have decided it would be safer and wiser to defer tax reduction until we can see better what our appropriations, our foreign commitments, and our revenue receipts are likely to be. We are faced also with the possibility, if not the probability, that the Congress will undertake heavy commitments—reaching into the billions—for relief and rehabilitation purposes in Europe, as well as large expenditures in fighting communism.

I am as anxious as anyone to see the heavy load carried by Federal taxpayers lightened as soon as it can be done upon a sound basis, but above all, we should be certain that, before tax reduction, the budget would be balanced and its balance maintained and at least a reasonable or substantial payment upon the Federal debt made. At the present moment we cannot be certain that we can balance the budget for 1948, make a reasonable payment on the debt and make the tax cuts provided in the bill which has been vetoed.

So, in my humble opinion, it would be better for our committee to go ahead with its study of the entire tax problem, as it is now doing, with the objective of tax reduction as far as feasible and the revision of our present tax laws, giving careful study not only to changes or reduction in individual income taxes, but also corporation taxes, excise taxes, estate taxes, capital gains taxes and other forms or types of Federal taxes. Moreover, there is one other important change in our present tax laws that I feel should have special treatment. That is the gross inequity and injustice existing between community-property States and non-community-property States. This inequity should certainly be removed at the earliest moment possible and I have decided I will never vote for another general tax bill that does not correct this manifest injustice.

Moreover, I feel that the President knows more about our fiscal affairs and probable future financial obligations, both foreign and domestic, than is known by me and for these reasons, and others which I have not the time to mention, I have decided I will not vote to override the President's veto of the tax bill.

Plight of the Navaho Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Arizona Republic of June 1, 1947:

PLIGHT OF THE NAVAHO INDIANS

Many a Navaho family faces starvation by winter.

America's largest of Indian tribes, which in numbers has multiplied nearly nine times since it signed a peace treaty with the United States Government 79 years ago, today is reaching the end of the trail on its own reservation.

The future of thousands of its people must of economic necessity lie elsewhere.

For in the earth-colored, igloo-like hogans, in isolated reaches of that part of the 25,000 square miles which sprawl across the great plateau country of northeastern Arizona, poverty is beginning to exist today such as never before known by the Navaho.

Next week, or next month—surely by winter they say here—there will be hunger. First among the old folks. Then, it is feared, among the children.

In a nation which today is setting food production records to assure the welfare of foreign countries which yesterday were its enemies, some of its own people swiftly are approaching a crisis that for many may mean death.

What is the answer?

Neither Indian nor white man can provide it here. And both are looking anxiously toward Washington where Congress proposes a cut of $10,000,000 in requests of the Indian Office.

Education and health still are for the Navaho mountainous problems.

He carefully explained that when the tribe's delegation found sympathetic listeners among Government leaders in Washington, D. C., more than a year ago.

Then last September when J. A. Krug, Interior Secretary, became in 78 years of Navaho history the first man who rules their welfare in Washington to come to their stamping ground for an actual look at their problems, tribal leaders repeated desperate pleas for more schools and more hospitals.

Yet today those problems remain the same.

And gripping many of these first Americans who still live in ignorance and squalor is that new and more terrible fear, hunger.

Sun and wind has seared the land. The sheep are disappearing. Lucrative wartime jobs off the reservation are gone. The Navaho boys are back from the war, and no

longer do the Government allotment checks arrive. The demand is dwindling for silver and turquoise jewelry and fine rugs fashioned by these men and women with crude tools.

In seeking an education for his children, it isn't that the Navaho is asking something to which he is not entitled. On the contrary, the United States Government owes the Navaho millions of dollars in unmet treaty promises of educational facilities.

Uncle Sam prides himself on meeting treaty obligations with other nations. But over the past 75 years more than 37,000 Navaho have been deprived of school facilities, though in 1868 the Government contracted with these Indians by treaty to provide a school and teacher for every 30 children between 6 and 16 who can be induced or compelled to attend school.

Today there are twice as many Navaho boys and girls for whom no educational facilities are available as there were Navaho people in the entire tribe in 1868.

What have been the Government's accomplishments since the treaty of 1868?

By 1932 the Navaho Tribe had grown from the estimated 7,000 in 1868 to a population of 41,689. Of 11,741 children, 6 to 16, there were 5,719 in school.

Uncle Sam bestirred himself to build 50 day schools in widely separated sections of the reservation at a cost of millions. Many have been closed for lack of water, lack of teachers, lack of funds, or because they were run down.

In 1946, when the population had soared to more than 55,000 and there were some 16,500 children, 6 to 16, only 5,000 were in schools.

The Navaho claims today that 391,000 pupil-years of schools have been lost to the tribe, and at an average cost of $100 per pupil per year (a figure too low for present-day cost of education); this would amount to more than $39,000,000.

It isn't that Navaho boys and girls don't want to go to school, though there was a time when that may have been the case. Everyone on the reservation admits today the youngsters are crying for education. Schools still operating in recent years have turned away hundreds of boys and girls at the start of each school year for lack of facilities. Boarding schools are jam-packed, yet some of the Navaho families may have to get their children into such schools this fall if they are to exist through the winter.

Today 80 percent of the Navahos are illiterate. Most speak no English. There are school facilities for no more than 5,000 of the 21,000 or more school-age children.

Navaho sheep, mainstay of the reservation's economy, have been reduced in a decade from 1,000,000 to 350,000. The per capita Navaho income in 1940 was only one-tenth the national average. Wartime income provided temporary relief, but the situation now is worse than ever before.

The health situation is critical. Venereal diseases spread like a plague during the war. The Navaho tuberculosis rate is 14 times the national average. Infant mortality is more than six times the national average. Hospital and medical facilities are woefully inadequate.

The reservation cannot produce enough food for its population, and other sources of income aren't making up the difference. Direct relief has been limited to $5 per month per person—and Government funds for that purpose were depleted May 1.

Of course, the situation in which the Navaho finds himself today actually has no direct relation to the present proposed cut in Bureau funds.

But such a cut can only help to hasten the cold days next winter when many a Navaho faces starvation.

It would be unfair to blame all the Navaho troubles on sheep reduction—the program initiated by the Indian Bureau in 1934 to save the overgrazed range and improve the poor breed of sheep by slashing by two-thirds the sheep population.

But that struck the Navaho economy a blow from which it could not recover. Still, the range is so depleted that nature might have killed those sheep if man had not done so.

Yet the program, however good its intentions, obviously has failed to accomplish them.

Drought has worked against the plan. Water holes are dry. Wind whips sand into dunes where once there was browse for the sheep. So now the Navaho is left with few sheep and little good range.

Merely adding to Indian Bureau funds will not necessarily get the Navaho out of his critical situation.

Boarding schools are an economic necessity, for the Navaho must be educated. More hospitals, more doctors, and especially more field nurses must be provided if these Indians are to survive.

Yet even the money to make all of that possible likely would not assure the Navaho survival on his own reservation. James M. Stewart, reservation superintendent, says development of irrigation for farm projects and bringing in small industries would help.

But even Stewart admits that full development of reservation resources as they are known today can enable only 35,000 of the tribe's estimated 60,000 people to exist above a subsistence level. Stewart says the Navaho must be taught that their future lies off the reservation.

Taft-Hartley Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alfred Friendly, from the Washington Post of June 15 and 16, 1947:

[From the Washington Post of June 15, 1947]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT'S STAKE IN TAFT BILL IS BURIED IN A WELTER OF TECHNICALITIES

(By Alfred Friendly)

Can the Taft-Hartley bill be taken at its face value?

Will it accomplish its publicly stated aims, which are for the most part beyond challenge? Will it provide equality in bargaining between union and management? Will it stop jurisdictional strikes, paralyzing national emergencies, union coercion and irresponsibility, unfair union practices?

Or does it contain, in its 73 enormously complicated pages, provisions which will unwisely and unjustly weaken union strength? Will it hamstring the administration of the Wagner Act to the point where it becomes useless? Does it provide antilabor employers with all the ammunition they need to destroy unions?

Both types of allegations are made. The answer to the controversy, if there is an answer, will not come from broad, generalized statements, either of pious aims or frenzied name calling. It depends on a detailed analysis of some 40 or 50 major provisions in the new bill.

The objections to the bill do not center on its avowed aims, most of which are unimpeachable. They are directed, rather, to technical provisions in the measure on procedure and administration, and to complicated legal points affecting the operation of collective bargaining and the status of unions.

Below are summarized some, although by no means all, of the principal provisions which give rise to the controversy. Unfortunately, most of them are technical. But they are the heart and essence of the bill, whether for good or evil.

The arguments against the bill were culled from statements in Congress, by unions and officials of Government, and private agencies. They are presented in the left-hand column. The replies to these criticisms were obtained in part from an interview with Gerard V. Reilly, former member of the National Labor Relations Board and special counsel to the Senate Labor Committee, and in part from official statements of Senate and House conference managers. They appear in the right-hand column.

OUTLAW STRIKES AND INJUNCTIONS

1. Secondary boycotts: All forms of secondary boycotts are made illegal. These are strikes, or refusals to handle goods, by workers who seek to make an employer, not their own, recognize a union or grant some other concession. In other words, workers cannot strike against employer A to force a concession from employer B, who deals with employer A.

Under this provision, unions could no longer refuse to handle scab products or those made under sweatshop conditions. The Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, hold that it is lawful for workers to refuse to handle goods, if the purpose of their boycott is to force the maker of those goods pay better wages, bargain with their union, etc.

This provision would upset that principle. There could be no boycott, however legitimate were the primary aims of the boycotting union. The provision restores the doctrine of the famous Bedford Cut Stone and Duplex cases, which the Norris-LaGuardia Act corrected. In the Duplex case, with Holmes and Brandeis dissenting, the Supreme Court held that machinists, their union threatened by the low wages in one nonunion printing-machinery plant, were breaking the law when they refused to install that machinery after it was sold.

The provision also renders unions which conduct a boycott subject to damage suits from anyone who was injured by it. It may, indeed, make the union subject to triple damages under the Sherman Antitrust Act, contrary to the professed intent of

Under the Wagner Act, an employer has no option in the matter of recognizing and bargaining with a union, but to accept the choice of his own employees. This has resulted in the paradox of an employer, who has complied with the law, seeing his markets shut off by unions which have failed to organize his plant.

For example, suppose that employees of manufacturer A vote against union X. Members of that union, who are employed by contractor B, who handles manufacturer A's products, refuse to install them. To retain his market, manufacturer A must recognize union X, contrary to his own employees' wishes and therefore contrary to the law.

It may be noted that State labor laws exempt an employer from anti-injunction laws when, if the employer were unable to get an injunction against a boycott, he would be forced to recognize the boycotting union in violation of his employees' wishes and hence in violation of the State labor law.

the Clayton Act, which was to exempt unions from just such suits.

2. "Featherbedding": It is an unfair labor practice for unions to force, or attempt to force, an employer to pay any money, in the nature of an exaction, for services which are not performed.

The provision attempts only to stop practices such as those of the musicians' union, which exacts wages for stand-by musicians who do not work. But it is so drafted that it might prohibit unions from even asking for contract clauses providing such things as the employment of safety inspectors, rest periods, vacation time and a guaranteed minimum number of hours' pay per week, regardless of whether the time was worked.

Senator TAFT, Republican, Ohio, told the Senate that the bill has no such intent, and that the contract provisions above would not be exactions. Nevertheless, this section may well be used to hinder unions from blocking a speed-up.

For example, suppose an employer proposes to have a job done by a crew of 8 men, which customarily had been done by 10. He may claim that the extra two do not perform services. Union efforts to retain them may thus be considered as attempts to exact pay for work not performed.

In general, the effect of the provision seems to be to saddle on the workers the economic hazards of industries with intermittent type operations.

Senator TAFT's statement that the section is not intended to prevent a union from seeking legitimate contract provisions for the purposes mentioned in the opposite column is a part of the bill's legislative history. The construction he placed on the intent of the provision is binding on the NLRB and the courts. It would be absurd to place a contrary construction on it to prevent legitimate union practices.

The purpose and only effect of the provision, in the light of its legislative history, is to prevent an employer from being forced to pay money to a union—in order to keep labor peace—to compensate men whom he has refused to employ because they were in excess of his needs.

3. Cooling-off periods: It is an unfair labor practice to strike within a period of 60 days before the expiration of a collective-bargaining contract.

During this period the employer could, with relative impunity, indulge in provocative antiunion activity, for the union's hands are tied. The penalty against an employer for such provocation would be only a cease-and-desist order from the NLRB. But if the union struck, it could be enjoined, and the strikers would lose their status under the law—a much more severe punishment.

If an employer does attempt such provocation, he could not, under the "clean hands" doctrine, obtain an injunction against his workers striking. He himself, meantime, would be liable to penalties for committing an unfair labor practice.

4. Injunctions: The NLRB may seek from a Federal court an injunction against any person committing an unfair labor practice. It is required to seek an injunction when it finds workers engaged in a secondary boycott or strikes to force union recognition contrary to or in the absence of an NLRB certification. It is also required in some cases to seek an injunction against jurisdictional strikes.

It is not true in any real sense to say that the Taft-Hartley bill rejects a House-sponsored (and Senate-defeated) proposal to give private employers the right to seek injunctions against these types of strikes. For the section forces the NLRB, whether or not it feels this is the right way to settle the dispute, to apply for an injunction once a showing is made that such a strike, or a strike campaign, exists.

In seeking an injunction, the NLRB would not be acting in the traditional sense of an "impartial Government agency," for it would have no discretion in the matter.

The effect is that the private employer would be more liable to get the injunction he desires, when a branch of the Government asks for it, than if he were allowed to apply for it himself.

Because of the enormous benefit which an injunction gives employers, many will be likely to charge that every strike against them involves a secondary boycott angle. They need only show that "an object"—not necessarily the principal one—of a strike is to apply a boycott. If they can make such a showing, the NLRB is obliged to seek an injunction.

The bill does prevent a private employer from going into court and making a one-sided complaint, claiming that he is the victim of a boycott or jurisdictional dispute or other illegal strike, and thereby obtaining an injunction.

A regional officer of the NLRB must first investigate both sides of the case. He is directed to apply for an injunction only when he is convinced that a real dispute of this nature exists.

Since the employer would know from the union what demands he must grant to get his men back to work, and since the NLRB could check on the demands, there would be no mystery on what all the objectives of the strike were.

An employer could not make a phony charge, to the effect that he was confronted with an illegal strike, hold water.

5. "National emergency" strikes: If a dispute threatens to cause a strike in an entire industry, or substantial part of it, which would endanger the national health and safety, the Attorney General can obtain an injunction against it to be in force for 80 days.

Under this provision, the court might well break a strike and its orders could certainly weaken the union involved. But unlike the plant seizure provision of the Smith-Connally Act, there are no corresponding penalties or losses on the companies involved.

The effect of the provision might well be to encourage stubbornness by employers in big disputes. If they refuse to make concessions to the union, they can count on having the Government weaken the union, if not, in fact, break a threatened strike.

There were no penalties or losses to the employer under the Smith-Connally Act, because the Government operated the seized plants for the interests of its owners, and turned over the profits to them.

UNION SECURITY

6. Union-shop elections: Before workers can obtain a union-shop contract with their employer, the union shop must be favored in a secret ballot by a majority of all employees eligible to vote. (A union-shop contract requires a worker to become a union member, as a condition of holding his job, within 30 days or more after he is employed.)

The requirement that the vote must be a majority of all eligible employees makes the union shop much harder to obtain. Hitherto, in almost all types of elections and plebiscites, the principle has been that the issue shall be decided by a majority of all persons who voted, not of all who were eligible to vote.

In the best of circumstances, in all elections, a great number of eligible voters do not cast a ballot. By the new requirement, each person who abstains from voting is automatically and actually voting against the union shop.

An election under NLRB auspices, unlike a public election, is held on the premises of the plant and during working hours. Under such circumstances, 90 percent of the employees vote. Therefore this provision does not impose an undue burden on the union. (In 1946, 83 percent of eligible workers cast valid votes in NLRB elections. EDITOR'S note.)

7. Discharges in a union shop: Even though there is a union shop contract, the employer is not required to discharge a worker whom the union has ousted from membership or refused to admit, unless the grounds were that the worker did not pay his dues.

The provision weakens, if not destroys, the main purpose of a union shop, which is to give a union security of status. For if a worker is expelled from a union because of disruptive tactics, dishonesty, improper conduct, Communist Party membership, or even because he was discovered to be a company spy, he may still be retained in his job, free to continue his objectionable and trouble-making activities.

The union's power to discipline its members, and throw out those who breed trouble between it and the employer, is critically undermined.

The provision has the effect of reducing a union shop agreement to nothing more than a dues-collecting de-

It is not desirable to give a union disciplinary powers which may cost a worker his job. Though in some instances workers are expelled from unions for legitimate and proper reasons, evidence before the congressional labor committees, indicated that unions were abusing the union shop procedure. They ousted workers who belonged to insurgent factions; Communist leaders expelled the most vigorous and effective anti-Communists, etc.

A famous case is that in which a union ousted from membership a worker who refused to perjure himself by testifying in the union's behalf, in a court case. Unless there were the protection of this provision, a

vice. It would yield the union no more benefits than could be obtained from an agreement for the company to check off union dues from the wages of all employees.

worker so expelled from a union would also lose his job in a union shop plant.

8. Priority of State laws: Despite permission in the bill for the union shop, State laws which forbid this and other forms of union security shall supersede the Federal law in their jurisdictions.

Eleven States have enacted laws prohibiting the union shop. Bills to this effect are pending in the legislatures of nine more. These laws are inconsistent with the present Wagner Act, but their validity has not yet been decided in the Supreme Court.

Under the bill, these State laws would be recognized and made valid, thus diluting the effect of the permission in the Federal law by from one-fourth to one-third, and even more in the future.

It is notable that the bill provides that in all respects it shall supersede conflicting provisions in State laws. But in this one instance there is an exception: more restrictive provisions relating to the union shop in State laws shall override the Federal law.

The provision does no more than continue the legislative history of the Wagner Act. The congressional committees which reported out the original law in 1935 expressly stated that it tolerated compulsory membership agreements only to the extent that they were legal under State laws.

9. Discharge "for cause": No employer need reinstate, nor pay back wages, to a worker whom he has fired "for cause."

The NLRB has held to this policy, provided that the firing was really for cause and not for union activity. But the way in which this right has been written into the new bill suggests that the employer may be able to practice antiunion subterfuges more easily.

The bill appears to say that if the employer fires a worker for union activity, but contends that the discharge was for cause, and is able to show that the worker committed some infraction of the rules, or is able to find some other charge against him — both things easy to do—the discharged worker has no recourse.

Union sources feel that this provision nullifies the Wagner Act protection against discriminatory firings.

The provision makes no change in existing law. It simply makes it mandatory on the NLRB to continue to recognize bona fide firings for cause. It does not permit pretext discharges.

As the report of the House managers of the bill makes clear, the provision was inserted to prevent recurrences of a situation such as that in the Wyman-Gordon case. There a circuit court of appeals held that a majority of the NLRB had ignored a true defense that a worker had been discharged for cause.

10. Severance out of craft units: If a majority of any true craft in a plant votes to be represented separately in collective bargaining, the NLRB must certify its union as its bargaining agent.

For more than a decade, the NLRB has busied itself with determining, for each individual case, what union—whether craft or industrial (plant-wide)—is the proper bargaining agent. The new provision removes much of the NLRB's discretion.

Whatever the NLRB's ideas on how worker democracy and collective bargaining are best served, any craft group, by majority vote, can sever itself out of a plant-wide union and bargain for itself.

This is considered certain to upset a great number of long-standing and successful bargaining relationships in big American industries. As might be expected, because of the difference in the organizational basis of their unions, the AFL favors the provision for the most part and the CIO objects to it bitterly.

The provision restores an NLRB interpretation applied to this section some years ago during the chairmanship of J. Warren Madden. It abrogates a subsequent rule that once a determination is made regarding the proper bargaining unit for a company, that decision holds forever.

It still leaves the NLRB free to use other tests as to the appropriateness of a bargaining unit in craft versus plant-wide controversies.

11. Free speech: No expression of views, argument, or opinion may be used as evidence of an unfair labor practice if it contains no threat or promise of benefit.

The purpose of this provision is to prevent an employer's remarks, providing they are not threatening to the union, from constituting in themselves an unfair labor practice. But its effect is to bar those remarks from being used as evidence, showing motive, in connection with some other unfair labor practice charge.

Thus, if an employer declares that he objects to John Doe because of his union activities, and next day fires John Doe, the NLRB cannot use the employer's hostile remark as evidence of motive in determining whether the firing was an unfair labor practice.

This accords an employer greater protection than he would have in a court of law. There, if a man were on trial for murder, his previous expressions of hostility to the victim could be used as part of a chain of evidence to demonstrate motive for the murder.

The argument in the opposite column ignores the fact that all that is prevented from being used as evidence are "views, argument or opinion." It does not exclude other statements, directions, or instructions that an employer may issue.

The NLRB and the courts may still decide—as is proper—where opinion stops and where a reflection of intent begins. A reflection of intent would be admissible as evidence in an unfair labor practice case, it is believed.

Even in a murder case, an expression of political views or opinion, however hostile, would be inadmissible as evidence.

OBSTACLES TO UNION OPERATION

12. Communist officers: The NLRB cannot certify or handle the case of any union until there is filed with it an affidavit from every officer of the local union, and of its parent organization, certifying that he is not a Communist, Communist sympathizer, or supporter of an organization which believes in the overthrow of the Government by force or illegal means.

The effect of this provision is that a union with one or more Communist officers will be stopped from all operations until it can purge itself. Desirable as this result may be, it may have disastrous results on precisely those unions which are fighting hardest to rid themselves of Communist officers.

While they are engaged in a factional fight, trying to oust the Communist gang, the non-Communist leaders are exposed to employer attack. They cannot carry on bargaining relations which would strengthen them and therefore help accomplish the very aim sought by this provision.

The case of Walter Reuther, vigorously anti-Communist president of the CIO auto workers, is in point. Until he can get rid of Communist factions in his union—a very difficult thing to do—General Motors, which loses no love on him, can refuse to bargain with him, thus virtually destroying his power in the union.

One reason why anti-Communists have such difficulty in obtaining, by democratic methods, the ouster of Communists is that the latter rarely admit their affiliation or beliefs. If they now refuse to execute an affidavit, the rank and file would have a clean-cut issue on which to make a choice in a factional dispute.

This sort of situation is particularly applicable to the CIO auto workers.

If a Communist officer makes a false oath in his affidavit, the risk of penalty is on him alone; the union, meantime, is free to go ahead with its collective-bargaining processes.

13. Registration statements: The NLRB cannot certify a union, or handle a case for it, until the union can show that it has filed with the Secretary of Labor a very detailed set of financial and organizational statements and has furnished copies of them to each of its members.

The statements and their filing with the Labor Department are not particularly onerous requirements, since many unions already prepare such documents. But it will probably always be possible for an employer who does not wish to bargain with the union to show that some one of a union's many thousands of members has failed to receive copies of the reports. The provision would

Presumably the statements would be printed in quantity. A good-faith failure to send a copy to a member would easily and quickly be corrected. If an employer should resort to this kind of dilatory tactics, the union need only give a copy of its report to each member whom the employer produces with the claim that he did not get a copy.

permit endless delay and disruption of collective bargaining as long as any employer wanted such delay and disruption.

14. Step-by-step organization: In deciding what unit is appropriate for collective bargaining, the NLRB may not consider as the controlling factor the extent of union organization.

It has been NLRB practice to grant certification to a group, representing a reasonably recognizable and appropriate subdivision or branch office of a Nation-wide company, which was organized and ready to bargain responsibly. This permitted bargaining to begin for segments of employees where otherwise it might have been prevented, or long delayed, while awaiting the complete organization of the whole enterprise.

The new provision appears to forbid such certification of smaller units, one by one, as they become organized. This is in remarkable contrast to several other sections of the bill which encourage smaller units and discourage larger ones. Note, for example, the craft union provision, No. 10 above. Similarly, the bill encourages separate organization of professional employees and permits guards to bargain only if they are in a union distinct from that of the rank and file.

The provision does not prevent the NLRB from saying that it is not necessary to organize an entire company system, if a particular plant or office is an appropriate bargaining unit by itself.

The purpose of the language is to prevent the NLRB from falling back upon the extent of organization theory as the justifying factor when all other tests show that the unit is so fragmentary that it is clearly not appropriate.

Since 1944 the NLRB has abandoned the extent of organization doctrine as the sole test.

(The pros and cons of four other important provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill will be presented in tomorrow's Washington Post.)

[From the Washington Post of June 16, 1947]

LABOR BILL EFFECTS DEBATED FURTHER—PRO AND CON ARGUMENTS ARE PRESENTED ON UNION ELECTIONS, POLITICAL ACTIVITY

(This is the second of two articles)

What effects will the necessarily technical provisions of the Taft-Hartley labor bill have on collective bargaining and on labor-management relations.

Will they, as proponents of the legislation contend, simply implement and effectuate the avowed aims of the bill—aims which for the most part are beyond challege? Or, as critics of the bill insist, are the provisions so drafted as to make administration of the proposed law unworkable and to deny unions aid and protection?

The pros and cons of this argument, as they apply to 14 major provisions of the bill, were presented in section II of yesterday's Post. Below are similar discussions of four more sections.

The arguments against the provisions, as expressed by the bill's opponents, are presented in the left-hand column. The replies to these objections, as stated by the congressional supporters of the bill, appear in the right-hand column.

NLRB PROCEDURE

15. Preelections: The NLRB is no longer authorized to hold elections prior to a formal hearing on the representative case.

Where no substantial issue was involved, NLRB practice was to hold an election, certify a union if it won the election, and let it proceed with collective bargaining. Later, if any minor issues on representation still remained in dispute, it would hold a hearing. Usually the issues did not remain in dispute; in only about 15 percent of these cases was it necessary to hold a later hearing.

The procedure contributed significantly to facilitating an early beginning of collective bargaining. It would be forbidden by the new bill, at exactly the time when the bill adds severalfold to other NLRB burdens.

The NLRB is still permitted to hold elections without hearings if both sides agree. But where the employer has insisted on hearings and the NLRB denied them until after the elections, experience has revealed that the whole proceedings were tainted with unnecessary controversy.

In practice, the preelection plan did not expedite matters, because postelection hearings frequently revealed that substantial issues had been overlooked.

16. Employment of economists and arbitrators: The NLRB is forbidden to employ economic analysts, or to turn over to arbitrators decisions on jurisdictional disputes.

The bill requires the NLRB to determine what are "excessive" union initiation fees, and to decide all jurisdictional disputes. Both of these issues usually involve difficult economic questions, yet the NLRB is denied the technical help to be had from its own economists.

Further, in jurisdictional disputes, a decision means that one union must lose in an issue usually very vital to its existence. From the point of view of satisfactory future working relationships on other matters between that union and the NLRB, it would be much better if an arbitrator, and not the NLRB, did the deciding.

Finally, and most important, an arbitrator's decision has a degree of legal finality which no NLRB decision enjoys, particularly as the new bill amends NLRB authority. An arbitrator's award would be likely to put an end there and then, to a jurisdictional dispute. An NLRB award means only that the case will be fought out up through the courts, with the NLRB's findings and procedure subject to challenge. In effect, the case will be tried all over again.

The general purpose of the bill is to make the NLRB behave like a court. There is nothing in the bill to prevent either side from putting on economists as expert witnesses, but the board, like a court, should act on the record, not on the secret advice of its staff members.

In deciding appropriate bargaining unit cases, the NLRB has already had ample experience in what amount to jurisdictional disputes. The new provision merely makes these decisions binding on unions as well as on employers.

Finally, there is a very serious question of delegating NLRB authority to a private individual employed as an arbitrator.

17. Abolition of Review Division: To NLRB trial examiner's report may be reviewed, or an opinion drafted on the case, by anyone except board members or their personal legal assistants.

This provision abolishes the NLRB Review Division, which went over the trial examiners' cases and submitted reports to the board. The provision may mean, therefore, that each of the five board members must review all of the cases, or set up his own legal staff. Each staff must be large enough to study, separately, all of the cases.

The board is already a year behind on its docket, and now will be deprived of one of its agencies to facilitate and speed up its work. Instead it will be forced to adopt an even more time-consuming procedure.

The purpose is to place greater responsibility on board members for the performance of their judicial duties. Since they would be relieved, under the bill, from all responsibility for the supervision of field activities and investigation of complaints, the members, with the aid of their law clerks, should be able to give greater individual analysis to controversial cases.

Hitherto, instead of the divergent views of different members being reflected in each decision, the NLRB determinations have been a product of the corporate personality of the Review Division. To that extent, the congressional purpose of having the law administered by several members, rather than by one administrator, has been frustrated.

MISCELLANEOUS

18. Political activity: Both unions and corporations are forbidden to make contributions or expenditures in national election campaigns, including primaries, caucuses, and conventions.

Although purporting to be even-handed in its effect on both employers and workers, the prohibition is likely to weigh more heavily on unions, since corporation officers and owner groups are usually able to finance personal contributions out of their own incomes much more easily than union officers and members.

Further, there is a serious question affecting freedom of the press. Some 95 percent of union papers are paid for out of union funds, rather than from subscriptions paid directly and specifically for the paper by the member. Under the provision, these union papers could not make any political expression during an election campaign.

But the union officer has more opportunity to pass the hat among members than a corporation officer has among stockholders.

The real purpose of the provision is to prevent corporate and union trust funds, obtained for other purposes, from being diverted.

The breadth of the provision's application is limited, like that of the Hatch and Corrupt Practices Acts, by constitutional guaranties of free speech, press, and assembly.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over station WNBF on June 14, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, this is an eleventh-hour reminder of our date tomorrow. The place is Ross Park, Binghamton, the time 2 o'clock in the afternoon, and the occasion Townsend Day. I will have a message of great importance which I want you to hear. Don't let me down and don't forget. See you at Ross Park tomorrow at two.

A few days ago I received a telegram from a fire chief in one of our small communities asking me to request a fire apparatus used at the Binghamton Medical Depot from the War Department. This particular place is very much in need of adequate fire protection. American homes are in jeopardy without it.

Imagine my surprise to find out that there is a waiting list of over 1,700 applicants for surplus fire equipment here in the United States, but that, in spite of this demand, 700 fire engines are to be shipped immediately to the Pacific.

There may be good reason for the American Army to requisition these 700 pieces. I do not challenge them on this. But they cannot be needed over in Japan any more than we need them here in our own land. I think the War Department ought to go 50–50 at least on any supplies it may be sending out of the country. Certainly the American people deserve first consideration on this vital surplus war material.

Nobody will argue with the statement that the United States generally has the best fire protection in the world. But we have had some black eyes lately. Our record has slipped. The Atlanta and Chicago hotel fires just recently showed that something is bad. Maybe it was lack of fire-fighting equipment, maybe faulty construction, but it adds up to the same.

However, the outlying towns and communities in our section—and, I suppose, all over the Nation—are vulnerable to fire. It goes without saying, therefore, that we can't afford to let all our fire apparatus go out of the country while we are left unprotected here.

And while we're on this subject, isn't it about time we began to take some notice of just how much material, equipment, food, clothing, machinery, and everything else are going out of the country? We know the amount is tremendous, but I think we have the right to know how much.

You folks are familiar with my record on and my attitude toward this whole program of helping unfortunate peoples across the seas. I have voted consistently to succor the needy, care for the sick, to rush food and necessities to all areas devastated by war and famine. I believe in the words of the Scriptures which tell us to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and give shelter to the homeless.

No one can say the American people have let the rest of the world down. In fact, we can only hope if the day ever comes we are as unfortunate as some we are now aiding that we will receive half the consideration that is now being given to others.

The point I am making, however, is that there is a limit to everything. We can play the good Samaratin until doomsday, and while such behavior is fine, nevertheless, the time will come—yes, it may be here now—when the nations we are now helping will expect us to keep right on giving them the world.

Certainly, the great sums of money and credit we have already advanced other nations are enough to set them all up nicely. We ought to begin thinking of our own people just a little bit.

The questions we should ask ourselves might be: How much food, shelter, and clothing are necessary to take care of millions of Americans who may not be enjoying the standard of living they once did? How many jobs will we need to abolish unemployment in this country? How much more food, clothing, materials, and machinery can we spare for overseas before the well runs dry? What kind of a priority can we guarantee American citizens on the necessities of life in cases where they are desperate?

Let's find the answers to these questions. If we're going to blot out communism, we've got to eliminate the hunger, want, fear, and misery that have always produced it wherever that malignant growth appears.

America must triumph over the people's enemies. The future is bright and promising with the advent of such a victory.

Dead Lines for Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hartford Daily Courant of Monday, June 16, 1947:

DEAD LINES FOR MR. TRUMAN

If we may adapt and expand the slogan of a few months ago advertising a motion picture, we would say President Truman is back and Congress has him—that is, has him on the spot. The dead line is at hand for the President to act on the tax-reduction and labor-regulation bills. If he should approve both of them, he would share with the Republican-controlled Congress whatever blame or credit may result from the conditions the laws would produce. Incidentally, all the talk in and out of Congress about vetoes would make the speculators on the President's mind look foolish.

If either or both bills are vetoed, Mr. Truman will assign reasons for his action. What those reasons may be no one knows. But we may be certain that they will not be the major considerations. Mr. Truman will not tell Congress he has taken into account political reasons. He won't need to. Congress and the country know that both measures contain political dynamite. The little taxpayers would like that 30 percent reduction in their withholding tax. It would help out take-home pay. And we suspect they are less concerned about paying off the public debt than with keeping out of debt themselves. The tax reductions graduated in favor of the lower income brackets wiped out the early argument as to the injustice of a 20-percent across-the-board cut.

The labor bill may not be perfect in every respect, but the allegation by union leaders that Congress held no mandate for its action reveals gross ignorance of the last Congressional campaign. Even most of the timid candidates admitted something ought to be done. Senator IVES, of New York, was forthright enough to tell just what he thought ought to be written into law, and in large measure the present bill lines up with his ideas. Whether or not the vociferous labor leaders accurately represent a majority of their own members in their unrestrained and unfair attacks, a big bloc of votes, normally Democratic in recent Presidential elections, may be lost by signing the measure. And disapproval might alienate a still larger number, according to the polls of public sentiment. When Mr. Truman casts up the balance sheet, these items will be on it, and will carry more weight than the merits or defects of the legislation. All of which adds up to the fact that something can be said in support of the idea of a single term for the President. And at the moment it seems that Mr. Truman's honeymoon with the Eightieth Congress is about over. At least a veto of either bill will end it.

An Ounce of "Spizzerinktum" Is Worth a Pound of Legal Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have never advocated the policy or the practice of one's taking the law into his own hands. But some forms of New Deal regimentation have driven our people almost to the point of desperation. When people become desperate, they sometimes take the law into their own hands.

Without condoning or approving such action as a general policy, for I believe in law and order, the freedom-loving American people are inclined to say occasionally, "We have had enough."

Our veterans, with their youthful enthusiasm to see right prevail, occasionally rebel against un-American New Deal regimentation, Executive orders, bureaucratic edicts, and regulations. They want their rights and privileges protected by law. But when New Deal obnoxious bureaucratic impediments get in their way, these young fellows are inclined to push them aside and demand their rights, regardless of OPA and other such dictatorial and un-American agencies.

The following is an article appearing in a recent issue of one of the Tulsa, Okla., newspapers, which shows that one red-blooded American, an ex-GI, had his patience exhausted in dealing with OPA rent control, and more or less took the law in his own hands, in desperation. He apparently decided that an ounce of "spizzerinktum" is worth a pound of legal action.

I quote the article:

BEACHHEAD ON DARLINGTON—YOUNG MATTHEWS MOVES INTO HIS HOUSE

Denver Lee Matthews, Tulsa veteran, made a civilian beachhead Tuesday afternoon, and

today it appeared he was well on his way to holding it.

Matthews is the ex-GI who came home 2 years ago and bought a little white house with blue shutters at 1311 South Darlington Avenue, but couldn't get possession because a tenant refused to be ousted.

He went through the OPA, justice court, common pleas court, and finally to the supreme court, as the tenant appealed. Last June 1 he was running low on funds and couldn't collect rent because the matter was in litigation, so he made a gentleman's agreement with the tenants, Mr. and Mrs. Carl A. Wendt, to give them a year's lease, if they agreed to surrender the house on June 1 of this year.

The Wendts agreed, so the Matthews continued living in cramped quarters and dreaming about the day they could not only own their home, but live in it as well.

When June 1 came the Wendts did not move. They still couldn't find a house.

It looked like the young couple would have to start through the courts again, and this might take more than a year.

But before any action was instituted, the Wendts complained that the hot water heater was on the blink.

Matthews, a building engineer who knows about heaters, took it home and made the repairs.

Tuesday afternoon he took it back. With him he took some friends, who helped load the Matthews' furniture—and the hot water heater—on a truck. He gained entrance with the heater and then his buddies moved in the furniture.

The Wendts meanwhile were considerably put out, and Wendt consulted the county attorney's office.

County Attorney Elmer Adams decided today that he didn't think Wendt had much of a trespassing case against Matthews, and said he didn't contemplate filing such a charge.

At mid-morning Wendt had called a moving van.

With Mrs. Matthews settled in the spare bedroom, and the kiddies playing in the yard, Matthews was holding his beachhead, having decided that maybe an ounce of "spizzerinktum" is worth a pound of legal action.

Destruction of Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily News on the destruction of potatoes:

PRESS DID DUTY IN PICTURING DESTRUCTION OF POTATOES

We don't happen to know the editor of Business Week, but in a recent issue he worked himself into a fine dither because the newspapers have published pictures of surplus potatoes being destroyed by the Government.

To use his own words, "If we were given the job of promotion manager for the Communist Party in the United States of America, we doubt if we could possibly dream up a neater piece of business for our side than that portrayed in the center of this page."

Business Week's editor then laments that readers were left with the clear and dramatically underlined impression that while Europe cries out with hunger, we destroy fine foodstuffs in order to keep up the price.

Well, isn't that so?

REFUSED BY UNRRA

UNRRA officials have explained that while they knew last January that a surplus of 20,000,000 bushels of potatoes was available, the idea of shipping them to needy countries was impracticable.

They say potatoes must be shipped in refrigerated vessels or dehydrated; that shipping space can be better used for more nutritional foods; that the cost of preparing and shipping dehydrated potatoes would be five times the cost of sending other foods of equal caloric value.

Business Week indicts the newspapers for not telling that side of the story when the now famous potato picture was published.

Actually, they did publish these facts as soon as the Department of Agriculture, stung by public criticism, got around to explaining why the potatoes had been consigned to the dump heap.

But some other facts still remain unexplained:

1. Why did the Department of Agriculture wait so long before offering surplus potatoes to public institutions and welfare agencies?

2. What answer can the Department make to the charge by the Mobile (Ala.) Register that the same county in which these potatoes were destroyed has been ignored in its appeal for surplus potatoes to be used to feed people on its welfare rolls?

3. Could surplus potatoes have been saved for use in manufacture of flour to be sent abroad as a substitute for the exportation of relief grain?

4. Why are we importing potatoes from Canada if we had a 20,000,000-bushel surplus at the beginning of this year?

The Richmond News-Leader recently quoted the Virginia State Restaurant Association as saying that "Richmond housewives are buying Canadian-grown potatoes at double the price they would be charged for those grown in Virginia because the United States Government destroyed a considerable portion of the potato crops in this and neighboring States."

5. Why is our Government spending $80,000,000 to support the price of potatoes at the same time President Truman says prices are too high and taxes cannot be reduced?

TIME TO GET EXCITED

Contrary to the editor of Business Week, we believe the newspapers performed a distinct public service in publishing pictures of crop destruction. As a direct result, some facts, little understood, have been brought to light. Others will be unearthed as the investigation proceeds.

When potatoes must be rushed from Canada at fancy prices to meet a shortage within 30 miles of farms where the Government is destroying home-grown potatoes, the press and the public should get excited.

Basic difficulty of the whole situation is, of course, the continuance of Government price support, which was originally adopted to stimulate production of crops needed for the war effort.

Under this act, the Government must buy farmers' produce if the market falls below 90 percent of parity.

Parity is Government "gobbledygook" for the theoretically ideal condition that exists when the price the farmer gets for his produce keeps his purchasing power as high as it was in the favorable base period from 1909 to 1914.

The price-support measure served its purpose during the war, but today, as Business Week points out, it encourages excess production of the wrong things and retards the adjustment of farm production to the facts of economic life.

Although it continues in effect until December 31, 1948, the program should be abandoned at the earliest moment the Government can do so without breaking its pledge to the farmers.

But, as in practically every other phase of Government, the bureaucrats let out loud and anguished cries whenever Congress trims any of their "essential" functions.

THE PUBLIC PAYS THE BILL

Most disturbing is the people's lethargy toward saving their own money.

It is their taxes that pay for surplus potatoes and the Government inspectors who destroy them.

It is their money that pays for well-intentioned but utterly useless activities of Government that easily could be abandoned.

Yet the general public is neither clamoring for tax reduction nor economy.

We know a good many men who wouldn't leave more than a 10-cent tip for the waitress but who are hell-bent for spending billions abroad to win friends and influence people.

Henry Wallace is one of them.

When he was Vice President of these United States, Henry once gave the Wallace cook a Senate inkwell for Christmas.

These personally penurious, global-spending folk choose to ignore the fact that unless we maintain a solvent government and an expanding economy at home, the time will come when we will be unable to assist anyone.

DUTY IS: TELL FACTS

In chastising the newspapers for publishing the potato picture, the editor of Business Week suggests that "it would be hard to conjure up a more damning portrayal of hopeless confusion and frustration in our own house."

We quite agree. But our duty, as we see it, is to lay the facts on the line, whether they are palatable or not.

In what other way could some of our utterly fantastic policies be investigated and corrected?

When the newspapers start pulling their punches, God help the taxpayer.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Idaho Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, I urge those who feel that this is not the time to reduce taxes to listen while I read an item clipped from the Idaho Daily Statesman of last Wednesday, June 11. I want you to keep in mind that Idaho has a population of only approximately 500,000 people and that she ranks high as an agricultural State and also has extensive mining operations. Her potatoes are famous and are a handsome crop, but note how they size up beside her tax bill:

IDAHO TAX BILL FOUND FOURTH OF TOTAL VALUE—$102,057,853 SAID TO BE MORE THAN FOOD BILL FOR YEAR 1946

Idaho tax bill last year, amounting to $102,057,853, was a fourth the total assessed value of the State, and more than Idaho's food bill, Executive Secretary Max Yost, of the Associated Taxpayers of Idaho, said Tuesday.

Yost said the figures also amounted to three-fourths the State's realized net farm income and three times the value of Idaho's mining production.

The figures included Federal, State, and local taxes and were compiled by the Associated Taxpayers and the Idaho State Chamber of Commerce, Yost said. Federal taxes for 1946 were estimated at $63,294,880, while State and local taxes amounted to $38,762,973.

"Between 1940 and 1946 Federal taxes paid by Idahoans increased 938.29 percent," Yost said. "State taxes increased 48.38 percent during the same years, and local taxes were upped 32.87 percent."

During the years 1940 to 1946 only three classes of taxes were reduced, the figures showed. Property taxes decreased 15.73 percent; county school taxes were lowered 2.84 percent; and irrigation-district taxes dropped 29.39 percent. State increases included excise tax, 74.54 percent, to lead the list. Smaller increases, however, were shown in taxes for school and highway districts, cities, and counties. License fees increased 15.12 percent.

Yost estimated that a 100-car train of Idaho's famous potatoes, shipped each day of the year, which would be the average total crop for the State, would pay only one-third of Idaho's tax bill.

Veto of the Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, when the tax bill was before the House some 2½ months ago I voted against the measure mainly for the following reasons:

I felt and still feel that in view of our unprecedented national debt we must make every effort to at least begin payments on the same. It was necessary to incur this debt in order to prosecute the war. Under present world conditions we must continue to obligate ourselves in order to preserve a free world. I, of course, am supporting every cut in public expenditures which does not seriously impair our national security. I intend to vote for tax reductions in the proper form and at the proper time.

As pointed out in the President's veto message, the present bill does not give reductions in taxes where they are so badly needed. In my judgment, the exemptions in Federal taxes should be raised so as to exclude individuals in the lower income brackets. The families with low incomes are having extreme difficulties in keeping their heads above water. Families in the higher income brackets are groaning under tax burdens but at least are able to make ends meet.

The take-home pay of those in the higher income brackets is increased under the terms of the present bill; while the take-home pay of those in the lower income range is scarcely affected at all by this bill. In view of all the circumstances I intend to vote to sustain the President's veto, hoping that soon conditions will justify tax reductions and that the majority party now in control of Congress will present an equitable plan of tax reduction, giving greater consideration to those of lower incomes.

California's Veterans' Problems Assume National Importance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the State of California has experienced an unprecedented migration of people who have come into the State to settle there. California has welcomed this increase in population, and industry, commerce, and agriculture have expanded to provide jobs and homes and food for these people. Problems which grew out of the shortages of the war have become more critical due to the increased population, but California has met the challenge and vigorously attacked the housing and material shortages, and has accepted the additional drain on State and county hospitals, institutions, schools, and other facilities.

A large part of this increased population are veterans of the last war who have chosen to make California their home. Many of these men suffered injury or illness during their service in the armed forces, and many find it necessary to look to Veterans' Administration facilities for treatment or hospitalization. These facilities are wholly inadequate because of the influx of veterans, and additional hospital facilities are urgently needed.

The Veterans' Administration bases its budget estimates for hospital construction and administrative costs on the estimated veteran population of the various States. Its Washington headquarters insists that California's veteran population does not exceed 890,000, and bases estimates on this figure in spite of the fact that branch 12 of the Veterans' Administration, with headquarters in San Francisco, has estimated that approximately 750,000 veterans entered military service from California and that the present number of World War II veterans in California has reached approximately 1,170,000.

If the figures estimated by the San Francisco office of the Veterans' Administration are correct, then California veterans are not receiving the consideration to which they are entitled from the Veterans' Administration.

The following resolution was adopted by the Veterans' Board of the State of California, Department of Veterans' Affairs, urging that steps be taken to establish the true veteran population so that there will be a fair allocation of construction and administrative funds for Veterans' Administration facilities in California. I agree with this resolution and urge the Members of the House to take action to establish the true veteran population of California.

"Whereas California has had a tremendous influx of World War II veterans who enlisted in the military service from other States but who have come to this State to live; and

"Whereas branch 12 of the Veterans' Administration, with headquarters in San Francisco, has estimated that approximately 750,000 veterans entered military service from California, but that the present number of World War II veterans in California is approximately 1,170,000; and

"Whereas these estimates have not been accepted by officials of the Veterans' Administration in Washington, in view of a press release emanating from the Washington headquarters in which the World War II veteran population in California is estimated at 890,000: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the California Veterans' Board hereby declares its concern with the apparent lack of realization on the part of the Veterans' Administration in Washington as to the extent of the veteran migration to California, this situation being particularly serious in view of the fact that budget estimates of the Veterans' Administration for hospital construction and administrative costs are based on the estimated veteran population of the various States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the Congress of the United States be hereby requested to take the necessary steps to establish the true veteran population of California as the basis of allocating construction and administrative funds, so that California will not be discriminated against because of the influx of veterans to the State."

I, Antoinette Acalinovich, Secretary of the California Veterans' Board, Department of Veterans' Affairs of the State of California, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of the California Veterans' Board held in Redding, Calif., on May 24, 1947.

ANTOINETTE ACALINOVICH,
Secretary of the California Veterans' Board.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me by the House, I include the following address of the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, senior Sentor from New York, which was delivered by his son, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, Jr., at an antilabor bill rally held under the auspices of the Democratic County Committee of Kings County, in Brooklyn, on Wednesday evening, June 11:

My friends: Columnists, radio commentators, and political dopesters are enjoying a field day speculating over whether President Truman will sign or veto the labor bill. Much of what is written and talked about is interesting and educational but there is really no basis for speculation. The President will veto the bill.

He will veto it because he recognizes it for what it is—class legislation. He will veto it because instead of solving the real problems that do exist in the field of industrial relations it will create a great number of new and more complicated problems. He will veto it because it will create a body of law

which will interfere in a most direct way with average American citizens' economic and political freedom.

The President will veto this bill because he doesn't want to see created in this land of ours an era of lawlessness like that experienced under national prohibition. He will veto it because he is consistent. He has demonstrated this consistency in regard to labor relations in two messages on the state of the Union, and in his veto of the Case antilabor bill of last year.

He will veto it because he understands and is practiced in the principles of democracy, and like Franklin D. Roosevelt before him will not let the little fellow down. He will veto it because he wants to preserve and strengthen the power of the party that did so much to extend political democracy in America and during the last decade did so much to extend the ramparts of democracy into our industrial and economic life.

Let's not fool ourselves for even a moment. The labor relations bill passed by Congress, camouflaged as it is, is political legislation pure and simple. Its whole design, its whole purpose is one of effectively disfranchising and weakening the political power and influence of the wage and salary classes in our society.

"Labor has become too strong—it is demanding too much—it is trying to tell management how to run things. Labor has government under its control. Labor has to be taught its place. Just wait until we have them where we want them." You have heard such statements. It is that kind of thinking which was behind the bill now on the President's desk. It was out of such twisted, revengeful, and class-conscious reasoning that the Machiavellian plan was formulated by which labor could be destroyed by loving it to death.

It was a simple plan. Amend the Wagner Act—after all any act in effect 10 years needs amending—equalize it—clarify it, legally—give the individual worker his right to a job and his freedom from a union, if he wants it—make the union and its officials responsible for its acts—protect the union members from its leaders.

Young progressive-looking men who knew what was good for labor and wanted to help labor were assigned the task of selling this product. They were allowed to attack the reactionary proposals of some of their leaders and party stalwarts—in the beginning. They were even permitted to introduce moderate proposals and criticize amendments they would later accept. In the end they apologized that legislation was compromise and perfection couldn't be expected, and that if it doesn't work they would be the first to amend it.

A great effort was made all along to make it appear that the legislation was moderate. The bill as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was compared to the Hartley bill and called mild. In spite of being toughened up on the Senate floor they persisted in describing it as mild. When the conference committee finished with it Senator TAFT said it was the Senate bill with only three important concessions made to the House version of the bill. But Congressman HARTLEY told the House: "I think you are going to find there is more in this bill than may meet the eye." As a matter of fact, the bill as passed by the Senate contained 36 concessions to the House bill, by actual count, and each change made the bill worse.

Let me give you a few illustrations of what the Republicans think they can kid the public into believing are mild changes, and at the same time let me show you by a few examples what Mr. HARTLEY meant when he said the legislation contained more than may meet the eye.

The definition of "employer" was changed from "any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly" to "any person acting as an agent of an employer directly or indirectly." Not much of a change in terms of words but what it does is to make it practically impossible from here on out to pin an unfair-labor practice on an employer, because specific proof will have to be adduced showing that an employer authorized his supervisory employee to commit an unfair-labor practice. Yet this same supervisory employee is excluded from the coverage of the labor act on the premise that supervisors are part of management and act for management. This definition of the employer will also make it impossible for the Board to proceed against so-called citizens committees and vigilante groups who, according to LaFollette Civil Liberties Committee were criminally active in aiding and abetting employers in their antiunion activities.

Another simple change was made by the conference committee in the language relating to the test to be used in determining the legality of certain practices of labor unions. They merely changed the language "the purpose thereof" to "where an object thereof." The average workingman, perhaps even the average lawyer might not even notice such a minor change in language, but some very sharp and clever lawyers worked on this bill, and by this minor change these so-called friends of labor have succeeded in outlawing any strike by labor, if, incidentally, one or any object flowing from their activities is prohibited under the unfair-labor union practices section of the bill. It's the same thing as if a man was to be charged with housebreaking because he entered a burning house to save a child without being lawfully admitted.

The conference included in the bill a provision limiting the National Labor Relations Board's power to order reinstatement of a discharged employee or the payment of back pay, if an employee "was suspended of discharged for cause." This provision would greatly hinder the National Labor Relations Board in the prevention of unfair labor practices on the part of employers. The effect of it is to permit an employer to escape liability for having discharged an employee for any union activity merely if other frivolous grounds existed which would also justify the employee's discharge. Since an employer can always find some reason for justifying a discharge, this provision will make meaningless and unenforceable the chief purpose of the National Labor Relations Act—the protection afforded workers under the act against discrimination because of their union activities.

Clever and insidious as are these tricky little legalisms with which this bill is studded, the administrative restrictions and the new and revised procedures required to be followed in connection with matters before the Labor Board present perhaps grave threats to labor's rights than do the straightforward provisions clearly disestablishing labor's hard-earned rights and penalizing its slightest deviation from the law.

Any jurisdictional dispute that isn't settled within 10 days the Board itself must settle. Most jurisdictional disputes arise because of a change in technology and an equitable settlement ofttimes requires an engineering and economic analysis. The Board will be so busy trying to settle such disputes that they will have no time to spend on other cases before the Board or vice versa. In either event cases will keep piling up and the settlement of them will be prolonged beyond endurance.

The financial statements and detailed explanations required to be submitted by every union and local regarding its organization and operations will not only make it almost impossible for a great number of unions to comply, even with the best intentions, but it is highly inconceivable that a corporation lawyer who doesn't like a union wont charge noncompliance. The result again will be more hearings and more investigations—this time into all the details of a labor union operations.

Just to make sure, apparently, that the Board cannot expedite the settlement of cases pending before it, the bill before the President prevents the Board from using such proven and well adapted short cut procedures as prehearing elections and cross checks to speed noncontroversial cases and representation disputes in small units. The inevitable effect of all this and numerous new provisions in the bill will let loose an avalanche of litigation at the very time when the country's labor relations call for stability and certainty. Issues which are the proper subject of conference and adjustment between parties will give rise to protracted lawsuits before the Board and in the courts. Several years must elapse before anyone can know the complete significance of the new law, or how to govern their conduct thereunder.

Most important, perhaps, the use of the Board's processes is made so cumbersome for labor organizations that many are likely to return to the use of the old-fashioned strike weapon, rather than to ask the Board to conduct an election for investigation of an unfair labor practice.

Add up all this litigation, delay, reshuffling to the outlawing of the closed shop and the restrictions surrounding the union shop. On top of this put its encouragement to the placing by the employers of spies, agents' provocators, and general troublemakers within the union, the stimulation and encouragement given to the formation of company unions, the stringent restrictions on the right to strike, to organize, and to sell the idea and benefits of unionism and I just don't know how unions can legally function in our society.

Yet all through the discussion of the labor bill—and it was a long one and has been a continuing one—not a single Senator, and as far as I know not a single witness appearing before a committee attacked the idea of labor unionism. They are all for it, but.

Think of what this bill does to the free labor movement in America, examine the Republican platform of 1944 and the speeches of the Republican nominee for President in support of the National Labor Relations Act. Recall the pledges of some leading New York State Republicans last year on the question of labor relations and you can appreciate the duplicity of the Republican Party and its downright underhandedness and dishonesty.

In spite of the fact that some Republicans, especially some New York Republicans, are already apologizing for this bill as being a mandate of the people for some labor legislation—although you will search in vain for any promises to support legislation of the nature of the Taft-Hartley bill—the Republicans have shown their cowardness and what they already fear, no doubt, will be just retribution for their duplicity by attempting through this legislation to silence the voice of labor. Accordingly, they have included a provision which would prevent any expenditure or contribution by a labor organization for any political purpose whatsoever that had to do with the election of a Federal officeholder. Senator TAFT admitted, for instance, that this provision would prevent an editorial criticizing his vote for this bill by a union newspaper. Yet, when he was questioned by Senator MURRAY about the great corporation that controls a string of newspapers in his State and actively participates in political campaigns, Senator TAFT could only reply that if he was their attorney he would advise them to be careful.

The inclusion of this provision, it seems to me, is an eloquent commentary on what the Republican sponsors and their fellow draftsmen have so much trust in and seem

so subject to: money. They cannot, thank God, as yet, outlaw the thought and actions of freemen.

The Republicans may, if they succeed in overriding the President's veto, force labor back to the wall and cause it to suffer grave injury; but they will not destroy it unless they succeed in destroying along with it the freedom of all men. For a free labor movement is an integral a part of our cherished freedom as is freedom of speech itself.

Because the Democratic Party has always recognized this it will lead freedom-loving people back into ways which are America.

James Guilfoyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent tribute to my old and valued friend, James Guilfoyle, outstanding veteran newspaperman, which recently appeared in the Worcester Gazette, Worcester, Mass.

I have known Mr. Guilfoyle for many years. He has been an unusual figure in the public and newspaper life of Massachusetts. Of amiable personality, he is warmly regarded by all those who ever came in contact with him. His friends are legion and come from every rank and station in life.

Possessed of a brilliant, penetrating mind, his ready grasp of public questions and his accurate discernments of issues and complex situations marked him clearly and indelibly as a leading news commentator and analyst. His service to the great publication with which he was associated has been conspicuous and invaluable indeed, but the value of his contributions to the enlightenment and guidance of the general public is inestimable.

As this article indicates, Mr. Guilfoyle, because of his retirement, will sever formal connections with his newspaper. But he is still vigorous of mind and spirit, and I sincerely trust that his great talents will continue to be employed in some public field. In paying him this humble tribute, I wish to congratulate him upon his splendid career and extend my very best wishes for his future health, success, and happiness.

The article follows:

ENDS LONG CAREER AS NEWSPAPERMAN—JAMES H. GUILFOYLE RETIRES AFTER 39 YEARS OF SERVICE AS NEWS WRITER

James H. Guilfoyle, political reporter for the Evening Gazette and one of New England's best-known newspapermen, retired today after a long and varied career which began in Spencer in 1908 and has continued uninterrupted to this day. He retired on half pay.

Guilfoyle, or "Gil," as he was known by thousands throughout New England, stepped aside after a long career in which he was recognized as a top-flight political writer. He merited the recognition by a thorough knowledge of the subject, unswerving fealty to facts, a vigorous writing style, and an unbelievable capacity for work.

He was never happier than when he was poised before a typewriter with a good story on his mind.

His enthusiasm for his work was as red hot in these latter years as when he began work in 1908 for the Telegram as a county agent in Spencer.

He frequently said, and still does, that "for me there is only one way of making a living—as a newspaperman."

REAL NEWSPAPERMAN

He was a real newspaperman in every sense of the word. He could turn his hand to every type story, and frequently did. He wrote two columns in the Evening Gazette, Among the Folks and Heard at the State House, which were widely read. For a time, too, he was night editor of the Telegram.

His memory was well above average. At a convention, national or State, or a political rally, where, in the course of a night, he met hundreds of acquaintances, he was able to recall next day whatever newsworthy facts they confided in him and to quote the speakers practically word for word.

His ability to write reams of copy from a few notes was a never-ending surprise to his fellow workers.

And he had few equals and no superiors at dictating a story, say from city hall or the State house, to a rewrite man in the Gazette office. The rewrite man simply took the story, word for word, as "Gil" gave it. Sometimes he dictated for as long as two hours without interruption.

WROTE BOOK ON CURLEY

Besides providing his paper with expert and full coverage of political matters, "Gil" was a contributor to scores of magazines and wrote a book On the Trail of the Forgotten Man, a journal of a tour across the United States by James M. Curley, speaking in behalf of the candidacy of the late President Roosevelt.

He was in much demand as a speaker throughout Worcester County.

From the Spencer office of the Telegram Guilfoyle was transferred to the Fitchburg office in 1910 and he remained there 10 years. In 1920 he joined the city staff of the Telegram as a reporter, covering a variety of assignments, but most frequently politics. He was city editor of the Telegram for several years, but much preferred to write and left this position to go to Boston where he covered the State house for these papers.

In 1932 he joined the Gazette.

His love for his work made Guilfoyle's job practically a 24-hour-a-day position. He circulated wherever politicians gathered, and he knew the hideaways and nonlisted telephone numbers of the most important of them.

COVERED CONVENTIONS

His acquaintance with the high and mighty and the little guys of politics enabled him to get the story, more often than not, of what transpired at closed and secret meetings.

He was assigned to attend all political conventions, State and National, for many years. He added much to his stature by his coverage of these events and gained contacts which later proved invaluable.

He reported the famous McAdoo-Smith struggle in New York in 1924 when the Democrats compromised on John W. Davis. He was in Houston, Tex., when Smith was nominated by the Democrats in 1928; in Chicago when Hoover was nominated in 1932; and again in the same year, when Roosevelt was nominated by the Democrats. He was at Cleveland when Alf Landon was nominated in 1936. His last national convention was in Philadelphia in 1940 when Willkie was nominated.

He met the biggest politically during his stay with these papers, and he liked to recall them from time to time, in print, as they impressed him. He liked Governor Ely for his human qualities, Governor Saltonstall for his sincerity, Al Smith for his humor, Gaspar Bacon for his warmth and friendship and Willkie for his power to inspire.

POLITICIANS SOUGHT COUNSEL

The aspiring young politican invariably sought out "Gil" for counsel regarding conduct of a campaign and the oldtimer was never too busy to accommodate them regardless of the candidate's party affiliation. Officeholders of many years consulted him on policy.

After working hours were ended, if they ever ended for Guilfoyle, he could be seen on the street or in a restaurant in a huddle with somebody in public life, no doubt acquiring the inside on the latest political maneuver.

Democrats and Republicans summoned him frequently to write campaign speeches for them and many speeches which brought down the house at rallies in the city and county came from his typewriter.

HELPED MANY YOUNG MEN

But "Gil" was reluctant to reveal himself as a ghost writer.

Because of the position he occupied and the esteem in which he was held by officeholders, "Gil" was able to give a helping hand to many deserving young men and women who needed extra help to acquire a job. He went to bat for thousands, and he rarely struck out.

He was discerning at judging both the character of aspiring officeholders and causes and could spot a phony a block away.

Election night at these newspaper offices will not be the same without "Gil" in the picture, a grin on his face, cigar in his mouth, and a blase exterior concealing his inner tenseness at this dramatic moment. He loved election night.

He liked the hustle and bustle of it, the excitement, the glamour. He liked to be the first to scan the early returns and interpret them. He liked to hurry to a phone and talk with headquarters of the candidates. He liked to click out first, second, and third leads.

Nobody who has given as much time to politics and election nights in a newspaper office as "Gil" will be able to detach himself completely from a mode of life he followed to the hilt for more than three decades.

It's more than likely "Gil," even though retired, will shuffle into the office on the next election night. It's practically certain.

Politics and newspapers are in his blood.

Communists on the Federal Pay Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the present Democratic administration is paying the salaries of thousands of Communists. At the same time the services of an estimated 700,000 loyal Government employees are scheduled for termination during the next fiscal year. I think that every Member of Congress agrees that all surplus Government personnel should be eliminated from the pay roll immediately; but in making these

cuts, the last Communist should go before the first loyal American. I would like to suggest a plan whereby this might be achieved.

On March 22, the President issued an order which we were told would get rid of Communists on the Federal pay roll. But not one Communist has yet been fired, and furthermore, not one Communist ever will be fired under the President's order. Why not? Because there are so many loopholes in the order that none but the most out-spoken Communists can be touched. Therefore, we, the Congress, must act to get rid of these fifth-columnists before they become even more firmly entrenched in the Federal bureaus.

The Civil Service Commission has the names of thousands of disloyal Government employees. The Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Un-American Activities Committee also have exhaustive files on Communists occupying important positions in the executive departments. Why not start by firing them?

Southern States Industrial Council Urges Congress To Override President's Veto of Labor Bill, if President Vetoes It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter which I received a few days ago from the president of the Southern States Industrial Council.

The Southern States Industrial Council is composed of some of the leading industrialists of all of the Southern States, including those States which we frequently refer to as the solid South.

It will be noted that this group insists that, if the President should veto the Taft-Hartley labor bill, which has passed both the House and the Senate by overwhelming majorities, the veto be overridden by our vote.

The Hartley bill as it originally passed the House was voted upon by 415 out of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives. Three hundred and seven voted for its passage and one hundred and eight voted in the negative. More Democrats voted for its passage than there were Democrats who voted against its adoption. The same was true of the Republican Members of the House. This demonstrated that the measure was popularly demanded and the vote was not a partisan vote. Most of the Representatives in Congress from the solid South voted for this measure.

When the bill came back to the House from the Senate, it was known as the Taft-Hartley bill and was considered a less drastic measure. The conferees of the two Houses redrafted the measure. The report of the conferees and their redraft was overwhelmingly approved by the Members of both Houses. As finally submitted by the conferees, 320 House Members voted for its final enactment and only 79 voted in the negative. Again there were many more Democrats who voted in the affirmative than there were Democrats who voted in the negative. Again the solid South showed it was predominately in favor of the Taft-Hartley bill as finally submitted by the conferees of the two Houses of Congress.

In the first instance, the Hartley bill passed the House by a vote of almost 3 to 1. The conference report and final draft was adopted by more than 4 to 1. Hence, if the President should veto the bill, and if the Members of the House vote consistently, the President's veto will be overwhelmingly overridden by the House. The same is true in the Senate, based upon the Senate's decisive vote on the conference report.

The following is the letter above referred to, which I received from the president of the Southern States Industrial Council, dated June 9, 1947, urging that Congress override the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley bill if the President should veto it:

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SCHWABE: "The closed shop, the union shop, or any system of organizing that is not entirely free and open will never be wholeheartedly accepted by free-thinking people for the simple reason that such monstrosities stand in defiance of our American way of life."

The foregoing statement is taken from an editorial in the May issue of the Railroad Workers Journal, official organ of the Railroad Yardmasters of America. It expresses in plain language the attitude of free workingmen toward the abuses that have been premeditatedly planned and enforced under the Wagner Act—many of which will be corrected if H. R. 3020 becomes law.

I want to thank and congratulate you for your support of this measure. It is evident that the Congress is aware that citizens generally—even a large percentage of union members and sympathizers—are determined that something must be done—now—to protect the Nation against the outrageous conduct of men who have no public responsibility and no regard for the public welfare.

The bill approved by the House and Senate will do much to insure the rights of both labor and management. The act cannot be criticized as punitive, unless it be punitive to protect the rights of the many against the abuses of the few. In truth, Congress has leaned backward to escape such censure.

In making an estimate of the situation, I am at a loss to find a reason for disapproval of the proposed law. Its need is so plain, and the ills it will remedy so apparent, that the measure has received the practically unanimous endorsement of all citizens—except the leaders of organized labor. Certainly, this is no political question. It is much bigger than that, as shown by the nonpartisan vote the measure received in both Houses of Congress. And, yet, the daily press is filled with rumors, statements, and predictions of a Presidential veto.

I hope this will not occur. However, should the President take that course, it is my respectful insistence that the measure should be enacted over his veto, however reluctant you would ordinarily be to take such a step. The considerations which actuated you in your support of the bill have not changed one iota; and if there is a veto, I urge that you maintain your position and vote to enact the measure into law.

Respectfully yours,
REMMIE L. ARNOLD,
President.

Death Ends Notable Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial concerning the death of the Honorable David I. Walsh, former United States Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on Friday, June 13, 1947:

DEATH ENDS NOTABLE CAREER

In the death Wednesday of Hon. David I. Walsh, former United States Senator, Governor, and Lieutenant Governor, Massachusetts has lost one of its most distinguished citizens and sincere sorrow over his passing is widespread among the Bay State people he represented most capably and conscientiously in those high offices during the greater part of the past 35 years. His record has been outstanding and merits a prominent place in the history of the State and those who have served it best.

Nowhere in the Commonwealth is there greater and more sincere regret than in Lawrence, because ex-Senator Walsh was something in the nature of a popular idol here, having won the respect, admiration, and support of a large majority of the residents of this city early in his career and having held their high regard right to the end. From the time that he first ran for lieutenant governor far back in 1911, there was magic in his name on the ballot for Lawrence voters and invariably he rolled up huge pluralities here. Time after time his vote here not only far exceeded the totals of his opponents but topped all candidates in the other contests by wide margins, with the result that his high and prolonged popularity has been unmatched in local annals. Even when engulfed in the Republican landslide and overwhelmingly defeated for reelection by United States Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE last November, although ex-Senator Walsh's usual heavy local majority was reduced considerably, nevertheless he carried Lawrence by 4,650 votes.

For his part, the deceased was duly appreciative of the good will of Lawrence people toward him and evidenced his gratitude on every possible occasion. His affection for this city and its residents became so great that he always was happy to come here to be among his good friends and invariably accepted local invitations, even though the trip often involved personal inconvenience and sacrifice.

An extraordinary example of the inspiring bond between the former Senator and this city was provided on the occasion of the grand Fourth of July celebration here in 1942. It was such a notable event that the people of Lawrence wanted him for the orator of the day and Mr. Walsh gladly accepted the honor, even though it meant a tiring journey from Washington, D. C., and valuable time taken from his important official duties in that trying period of World War II. Somewhat late in arriving, he was placed in a car at the head of the official parade at the junction of Broadway and Essex Street and the ovation tendered to him by the dense throngs of spectators all along the main business thoroughfare was comparable to that usually tendered a conquering hero on his return from the wars. That evidenced the high spot the deceased held in the hearts of Lawrencians and it thrilled and touched the recipient, who declared afterward that

it was the finest, most heart-warming tribute ever tendered to him.

An ovation of that sort was merited not only here but in every Massachusetts community, because of the high type of service given by Mr. Walsh successively as lieutenant governor, Governor and United States Senator. His actions were motivated at all times by the best interests of the people, the State, and Nation. He was a great Democrat, but not a rubber-stamp one. The deceased went along with his party when he felt it was right, but could and did show his independence and courage by taking a counter stand on other occasions. That was frequently evidenced during the New Deal administration.

Opponents and critics often called ex-Senator Walsh an isolationist before Pearl Harbor, but the latter was following a course then that was approved by the great body of average Americans. He believed in avoiding involvement in foreign national difficulties, but also in keeping America strong and as Senate chairman of the powerful Naval Affairs Committee was an outstanding factor in creating the great United States Navy that played such a vital part in the ultimate victory in World War II. History undoubtedly will record ex-Senator Walsh's valuable contribution to the winning of the second global conflict as the premier achievement in a notable career replete with outstanding accomplishments. Death has closed a busy life and he has gone on to a heavenly reward richly earned by superlative public service to his fellow men.

"This Is Your Hour, My Country"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a poem appearing in the Rotarian magazine for December 1946 written by Arthur Wallace Peach, recognized as one of the outstanding poets of this day and generation.

I believe the poem should have a larger reading public than its publication in the Rotarian offers; so, under permission heretofore granted, I am including it as an extension of my remarks. I most heartily share the sentiments it expresses. It follows:

THIS IS YOUR HOUR, MY COUNTRY

This is your hour, my country,
To answer, not ask,
To speak, not listen,
To lead, not follow.
This is your hour of might,
The might of your arms and your faith—
Out of the ages at last a word
Mankind can hear and believe,
Pledged by white crosses that mark
The far ways of your armies,
By the brave and lost
In the lonely seas
Whose tides shall forever
Hold them in slumber.
This is your hour, my country,
That comes not again;
Fail, and a symbol fades;
Fail, and a dawn grows dark.
This is your hour of destiny,
My country!

—*Arthur Wallace Peach.*

Making Democracy Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at Emory and Henry College on June 6, 1947:

Mr. President, members of the class of 1948, I have come to talk over with you this morning the problem that weighs so heavily upon the hearts and minds of all true believers in the democratic way of life, making democracy work here in the land of its birth.

Before I enter upon a discussion of the problem, the solution of which holds, I fervently believe, the future hope of mankind, permit me first to make a few preliminary observations.

Whether some of us realize it or not, we have been ushered into a new world, and while it is a world more or less of our own making, it is, at present, a confused world, a divided world, and a world, I am afraid, we are ill-prepared to enter.

This new world in which we now find ourselves was not created overnight, nor is it a result of the war, though the war did speed up its creation. Its genesis stems back to the beginning of the technological age that culminated, during the war, in the splitting of the atom. And I am constrained to believe the reason we are ill-prepared for the new world in which we now find ourselves is that our moral development—our code of living, both individually and as a Nation—has not kept pace with our technological development.

Now, my young friends, whether we want to become a part of this new world or not, technology has made us a part, and there is nothing left for us to do but assume our rightful place in the new world order.

I know to those in this land of plenty who, are full of greed and self-interest and who lack vision, isolationism has a strong appeal. Blinded by greed and self-interest, they are unable, through their distorted vision, to see that such a short-sighted course will lead, sooner or later, to grief. Assuming that we could, by such a policy, create an American oasis in the desert of the world, do they not realize that sooner or later the ill-clad, the hungry, the starving, the distressed, the desperate, will gang up on us and break into our green pastures? And then what? Why, America, to people of today, the land of plenty may well become to the people of tomorrow a part of the world desert.

If we leave out all humanitarian considerations and consider the problem from cold, calculating logic, we cannot, even if disposed, shirk our responsibility of world leadership If we do, the time will surely come when we will find that our failure to provide leadership that will enable the peoples of the world to acquire freedom and equality and to climb to higher economic, political, and spiritual levels will result in our falling back to their level. It is no more possible for the world today to live half freemen and half slaves, half naked and hungry, and half clothed and fed, half Christian and half pagan, than it was in the days of our forefathers for Americans to live half freemen and half slaves.

Now, as I said, this new world in which we find ourselves is a divided world, and there is no use in deluding ourselves as to the seriousness of the division. Today two roads lie ahead—the democratic road and the totalitarian road—the one leading to Christianity, freedom, and equality; the other to paganism, slavery, and bondage.

Democracy, my young friends, is a Christian concept. If you forget everything else I say here this morning, do not forget, I beseech you, that the basic principle of democracy—the dignity of man—is the outgrowth of the Christian concept of the individual. Hence, in a democracy, the people are supreme and the government is only the chosen agent of the people.

Totalitarianism, on the other hand, is a pagan concept. Its basic principle—the dignity of the state—is the outgrowth of the pagan philosophy that "the king can do no wrong"; that "might makes right." Hence, in a totalitarian state, whether Fascist or Communist, you will find the state supreme and the people cringing vassals of a dictatorial, ruthless government.

The development of the state under the Christian concept has been a long, costly process, and did not reach its full flowering until the birth of this Republic. Over the centuries philosophers and publicists dreamed of, and men fought for, a government more responsive to the needs and development of man. None of these philosophers and publicists, however, fully envisioned the state based upon the Christian concept of the individual. Plato, for instance, only partially envisioned democracy when he described it as "dispensing equality to equals and unequals alike." Yes; democracy is equality, but it is more. Henry only partially envisioned democracy when, his whole being in rebellion against tyranny and usurpation, he cried out, "Give me liberty or give me death!" Yes; democracy is liberty, but it is more. Not until the immortal Jefferson, who, envisioning the true Christian concept of man's dignity, brought the thoughts of Plato and Henry together in that ever-living pronouncement "all men are created free and equal" was the true concept of democracy born.

I have defined the democratic state and the totalitarian state in order to impress upon you the division that exists in the world today. This division—we should be realists and face the facts—is an irreconcilable division. You can no more amalgamate democracy and totalitarianism, you can no more reconcile democracy and totalitarianism, you can no more compromise democracy and totalitarianism than you can amalgamate or reconcile or compromise good and evil, and our policy in meeting the conflict should not be to temporize, to reconcile, to compromise, but to stand firm for our sacred, God-given principles of Christian democracy.

Now, democracy is not automatically safeguarded. Vigilance is still the price of democratic government. And in standing for the sacred principles of democracy we should not only take every necessary means to suppress totalitarianism here in America, but we should go to the rescue of free men in every part of the world. While I know we cannot suppress totalitarianism by force, we may be driven, as a protective measure, until the United Nations become strong enough to function efficiently and effectively, to check its spread by force. To those who say that such a course leads to war, I answer, I do not know, but I do know that any other course leads to the destruction of democracy. And between war and the preservation of democracy, let it be known, once and for all, that the free men and women of America stand for democracy.

It would be bad enough to find ourselves in this new world, for which we are so ill prepared, if all nations were cooperating in bringing about the needed adjustments and corrections; but to find ourselves in a new world divided into two irreconcilable groups, makes it imperative, if we are to assume a leadership that will be respected and followed, for us to forthwith make all adjustments in our democratic machinery here at

home so it will serve the needs of our people in the new world technology has ushered us into and thus demonstrate to the world that free men are capable of self-government. And, so my young friends, I want to talk over with you this morning the problem of making democracy work here at home, believing if we can do this our democratic torch will finally illuminate the world, and thus bring about the solution of many, if not all, of the world problems.

Now, in spite of all our material progress and, I believe too we have made great spiritual progress, every one but the moral myopic knows that there is something wrong with our new world right here in America. Our democracy has gotten our of gear. It simply is not clicking as it should.

While the prying eye of science has penetrated into the secret recesses of nature and unloosed her most powerful, potent, and destructive force, atomic energy, have we developed to the point morally of knowing how to use it?

While science and invention have brought to the home many labor-saving devices, many conveniences, thus reducing the drudgery of the home work and providing more time for home building and pleasure, having discovered the way of making home life more agreeable and pleasant, can we say that we have developed morally to the point of adjusting our home life to our new environment?

The development of the machine has brought about mass production, which, in turn, makes it possible to work less and produce more, but has the moral development of our industrial-labor relations kept pace with the machine?

Foreign doctrines, philosophies, isms, and ideologies foreign to every concept of democracy and Christianity are not only being freely advocated, but are attracting the attention, yea, are being countenanced, by some of our would-be statesmen, labor leaders, teachers, and preachers. In the light of this, do you not wonder at times if our democratic and spiritual development has been all that it should have been?

Here in a land rich in natural resources, with a productive capacity far in excess of the needs of our people, we find insecurity, poverty and distress, greed and avarice, thirst for power, and a loss of the proper sense of human values rampant amongst us. It is the city slums—cesspools of disease and crime; the struggling share croppers and tenants; the neglected aged and infirm; the ill-clad, ill-fed, uneducated millions of boys and girls; the lack of proper medical care and hospitalization for the poor and downtrodden; the home life that breeds delinquency; and a complacent ministry that produces Communists and Fascists and other enemies of our Government and causes honest, though misguided, men and women to wonder if, after all, democracy is the Christian concept of government. And added to these causes is the eternal conflict between capital and labor to secure the advantage, and the autocratic city, county, and State bosses who, due to lack of interest of free men and women in elections, are ofttimes able to thwart the will of the people.

Now, let us pause and reason together for just a few minutes.

To begin, let me call your attention to the fact that in our technological development, our scientists and inventors followed basic, fundamental principles. Sticking to fundamental principles, they simply brought the machine up-to-date. Oh, I know, that many of the new machines seem to be new creations, but the more you delve into them the more you become convinced that the thing that makes them click is the same old fundamental principle. Let me give you a simple, down-to-earth illustration, that tells you better than I can explain to you, what I am trying to get over. Back in 1834 a Virginian, Cyrus McCormick by name, invented a great piece of farm machinery, the reaper, which, at the time it was first put on the market, served the purpose for which it was made. When our population was small, and our wheat production correspondingly small, it was able to harvest our wheat crop. But suppose we had to harvest our 1947 wheat crop with the 1834 model McCormick reaper. It could not be done. Now, basically, the McCormick reaper has not been changed. Sticking to the basic principle that made it click back in 1834, it has, from time to time, been modernized in order to meet present-day demands.

Now, if our scientists and inventors had sense enough to realize that the only way they could work out our technological problems was by sticking to basic and fundamental principles, are we going to admit that we do not have sense enough to realize that the only way we can work out our religious, social, economic, and governmental problems is by sticking to basic and fundamental principles? It is passing strange to me that we seem to have common sense enough to stick to fundamental and basic principles in working out our technological developments, and then think we can take short cuts and follow false gods in solving our religious, social, economic, and governmental problems.

Oh, some may sneer at the teachings of the Great Book, but, remember, we get in trouble every time we depart from the basic teachings of the Lowly Nazarene.

Oh, some may sneer at the democratic philosophy of government as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, but, remember, we get into trouble every time we depart from the basic principles of these great declarations of government.

Paul, the great teacher and philosopher, in writing to the Ephesians, among other things, admonished them to "hold fast that which is good." Sounder advice was never given. In these vexatious, troublesome days when the whole world is in confusion and we are struggling to adjust our society to the new world into which we have been thrust, it would be well for us to adopt as our motto the advice given by Paul to the Ephesians, "hold fast that which is good."

Now, let me specifically discuss some of our pressing problems that will have to be solved, and correctly solved, if democracy works here in the land of its birth.

First, I want to talk over with you the home, the church, and the school.

The home, the church, the school, the tripod upon which our Government rests, are badly in need of adjustments and repairs if they are to continue to serve in the future, as in the past, as instruments to keep democracy upon the true and straight course.

Now, I believe in the separation of the church and the state and the home. I do not want to see the church running the state any more than I want to see the state running the church, and I do not want to see either church or state policing or regulating our home life. But believing these things does not keep me from knowing that there cannot be such a thing as a lasting democratic government unless that government rests upon the solid foundations of Christianity, education, and a strong, clean home life. So long, and no longer, as our Government is anchored to this great tripod of democracy, which in turn shapes and directs our policies of state, will we be able to solve our domestic problems and be immune to all attacks marshaled against us by the totalitarians, or any other enemies of freedom, liberty, equality, enlightenment, and Christianity.

We cannot close our eyes to the fact that religion in America is not as militant as it should be, that too many of our children are receiving scant and poor educational training, and that our home life has degenerated.

The truth is our sense of true values has become distorted. Why, we spend a billion dollars more per year for tobacco than we do for public education, and our liquor bill is three times as much as we pay for public education including our State universities and colleges. Our women pay as much for cosmetics as all of us pay for religion. School teachers receive on the average less than a good ditch digger, and preachers less than the collectors of our garbage.

This distorted sense of values is now being reflected back into the American home, which, remember, is the keystone in our tripod foundation. Last year for every three marriages we had one divorce, and this year it is estimated that the ratio will be 40 percent instead of last year's 33⅓ percent. And in many of the homes that are still being held together, what is happening to the children? Why, juvenile delinquency, if not already, is fast becoming our No. 1 problem.

Now, my friends, remember this, education and religion directly affect the home, and anything that affects the home, affects democracy. In the long run our Nation will be exactly what the American home is. If the American home is strong and orderly, we will have a strong and orderly Nation; if the American home is thrifty and productive, we will have a thrifty and productive Nation; if the American home is clean and healthy and pure, we will have a clean, healthy and pure Nation; if the American home is an intelligent, educated home, we will have an intelligent and educated Nation; and if the American home is a Christian home, we will have a Christian Nation.

My young friends, unless we keep the home, the church and the school working efficiently and effectively, we cannot hope to keep democracy working efficiently and effectively.

Let us take up next for a few minutes our system of free enterprise.

The economic system devised by the founders of this Republic is known as the system of free enterprise. Now the free enterprise system does not simply mean that the enterprise is free; it also means that those who work for the enterprise are likewise free. This system didn't just happen. It is the natural outgrowth of our system of government, whose basic principles are freedom and equality, just as religious freedom, political freedom, and freedom of the press, are natural outgrowths of the system. It is inconceivable that freemen who believe in equality of opportunity could have worked out any other economic system. And yet, although our economic system in a little over a century and one-half has made this Republic the greatest, strongest country in the world, and at the same time given our people the highest standard of living ever attained by a people in the history of the world, our system is under attack, not only from without, but from within.

I admonish you to hold fast to our system of free enterprise because it is the democratic way. When you shackle the system to just that extent you shackle freedom. When you shackle the system to just that extent you shackle equality of opportunity. Now to make democracy work what we need to do is to expand freedom, not shackle it, expand equality of opportunity, not shackle it.

Now, at this point I want to briefly discuss our industrial-labor relations.

Our industrial-labor relations, so closely related to our free-enterprise system that what affects one affects the other, are, I am afraid, in a chaotic condition. Technology, initially, of course, brought about most of the confusion as it not only displaced men, but forced men to change from one type of work to another. And into the confusion stepped the Communists to sow seeds of dissension; the labor racketeers who seemingly thought that the more trouble they raised, the greater their position in the labor movement became; the laissez faire industrialists

who still consider labor as a chattel; and finally the Congress to pass legislation in an effort to stabilize industrial-labor relations, which laws, every fair-minded man will have to concede, have been poorly administered. Well, to be perfectly frank with you, due to the poor administration of the labor laws, I do not know which one of these four factors did the most harm. I do know, however, that before we succeed in bringing about peaceful industrial-labor relations, we will have to get rid of the Communists, the labor racketeers, the laissez faire industrialists, and the Congress will have to rewrite the labor laws in such a way as to give fair and equal treatment to both labor and industry and at the same time see that the public is protected. And, above all, the labor laws will have to be fairly and honestly administered.

Now, the thing that will destroy our system of free enterprise quicker than anything else is for capital and labor to continue at war to secure the advantage, thus forcing the Government to step in and put the system in a strait-jacket by stringent regulatory laws. These laissez faire capitalists who still consider labor a chattel, and these labor racketeers, who regard neither the rights of labor nor the public, will have to be weeded out if the system survives.

In working out our industrial-labor relations, if we will only stick to the true concept of democracy, freedom, and equality, we will have no trouble. Remember this: No matter which side has been guilty of excessive abuses, you cannot correct those abuses by punitive legislation. And sometimes here of late I wonder if some of our statesmen are not more interested in working out a veto than they are in working out fair and just labor laws.

Collective bargaining, under rules and regulations fair to both sides, should enable free men to sit around the table and work out their own problems. If this method is given a fair and honest trial and fails, then I see no other way than to set up an impartial tribunal to hear and determine industrial-labor disputes.

Certainly, if democracy is to function efficiently while preserving freedom and equality, we have got to work out some system whereby work stoppage, which is ruinous alike to capital, labor, and the public, will be prevented.

Let me mention another thing that has no place in a government that believes in freedom and equality.

Monopoly, in any form, by any group, is foreign to all principles of democracy, and if we make democracy work we will have to guard against all monopolies, whether industrial monopolies, public-service monopolies, agricultural monopolies, or labor monopolies. Monopolies, the creatures of greed and thirst for power, are incompatible with our system of free enterprise in a competitive market. And yet, as strange as it may sound, ofttimes the very ones who clamor the loudest for the preservation of our free competitive system of enterprise, are the ones that deal in monopolistic practices. And, in this connection, let me call your attention to another thing that disturbs all thoughtful persons. Blocs or pressure groups, closely allied to monopolies in that both groups seek to obtain the advantage, have no place in a democratic government. When you begin to operate through the bloc system the first thing you know we will block all democratic processes.

Those, my young friends, who believe in monopolies and blocs, do not believe in freedom, nor do they believe in equality. They seek to shackle freedom so the other fellow will not have an equal opportunity.

Now a few words as to our social programs that so many self-sufficient people seem to question.

In order to bring the benefits and blessings of government to all the people our social programs should be extended. Do not be deterred from standing back of our social programs on the false theory that in so doing you are promoting paternalism. While we should all stand firm against a paternalistic government, we should all stand equally as firm for a fair, just, and humane government. Now our social programs, my young friends, are good old democratic programs handed down to us by the founding fathers. They are simply modernized versions of the old democratic pioneer neighborhood spirit of all hands pitching in and helping out the neighbor in need or distress. Democracy, the government of, by and for the people, if given free expression, will ever be administered in such a way as to keep alive that spirit by promoting the welfare and happiness of all the people. Now all thoughtful people know that no particular governmental program works to the advantage of all groups. It takes many programs to bring the benefits and blessings of government to all segments of our people. Some programs will, of necessity, be of advantage to one group and at the same time work a hardship upon another group.

For instance, the tariff laws work to the advantage of the industrial group as it gives them protection against competing goods, wares, and merchandise from other countries, and to the disadvantage of the consuming group, in that it ofttimes forces them to pay higher prices. On the other hand, some of our social programs, such as old-age assistance, aid to the handicapped, housing, education, medical aid, and hospitalization, while extending benefits to the lower-income groups, impose in the way of additional taxes, hardships upon the higher income groups. But in extending the benefits of government to all the people in an effort to promote their welfare and happiness we find in the long run things level off and even up in such a way that the burdens and benefits are pretty well distributed. And this is as it should be, because the benefits and burdens of government, like the snows of heaven, should fall upon all classes alike.

My young friends, if we make democracy work, instead of curtailing our social programs, we should extend them.

Now, there is one thing a democracy cannot countenance and survive, and that thing is autocracy.

The architects of our Republic, as evidenced by the long recitation of abuses and usurpations set forth in their declaration of freedom and independence, knew from sad experience that autocracy at the top spells servitude and vassalism at the bottom. And so, in shaping and forming the fabric of our Republic, they guarded against autocratic power by dividing governmental power into three separate and distinct, though coordinate branches, the executive, the judicial, and the legislative, and placing in the hands of freemen a free ballot to be exercised in a free election. This spreading of power, in order to keep it from becoming autocratic, was no easy task. We had the privileged class then as now that fought the dissemination of power, and who used every effort and artifice to establish a government in this country in which the organized chosen few at the top could control the disorganized many at the bottom. And although some 170 years of this Republic have come and gone, the political descendants of autocracy are still with us, and in some places in control, as witness many of our State, county, and municipal governments where these autocratic leaders, while decrying the organization of farmers and workers, have organized to the nth degree, and wield an authority over the people in their respective States, counties, and municipalities more dangerous and destructive to free government than that of any labor leader that has as yet appeared upon the scene. And yet these State, county, and municipal autocrats, who are so callous of the rights of others, are frequently the loudest in their denunciation of those who have followed their despotic example to impose their will upon others, and like the Pharisees of old, are frequently heard in public places passionately thanking God that they are not like their impish prototypes. Another strange thing about these State, county, and municipal autocrats, they are usually the ones who complain most bitterly against Federal autocracy and union autocracy. Seemingly they think autocracy is all right if they are the autocrats, but a dangerous thing in the hands of others. Now remember this, no man ever has, and no man ever will, reach that state of perfection whereby he is capable of wielding autocratic power.

My young friends, when a few autocrats in any State, in any county, in any municipality, can say who can and who cannot hold judicial, legislative, and executive positions; when a few autocrats in any union can say who can and who cannot work, democracy in that State, in that county, in that municipality, in that union, has been crushed, and to that extent American democracy has been undermined.

Autocracy, the enemy of freedom, and liberty, and equality, has no place in a democracy, and should be suppressed every time it appears in our Government, local, State, or Federal, or in any of our political, labor, industrial, or social organizations. It is the one thing a free people, if they expect to retain their freedom, cannot countenance in any shape, form, or fashion.

And lastly let me briefly discuss with you democracy's ammunition.

A free, untrammeled ballot is democracy's life blood. And only by keeping the life blood pure and freely flowing through the body politic can we hope to keep our democratic institutions functioning in an orderly, democratic way. If democracy fails it will be because the people fail to use the ballot in time to cure the threatening abuses.

Most of our present governmental troubles, if not all, are either directly, or indirectly, traceable to the indifference of our people to use the greatest defense weapon to be found in democracy's armory, the ballot. This is the one weapon that everyone interested in the preservation of democracy should be trained in the use of, because it is the most potent, the most powerful, weapon known to the defenders of freedom, and liberty, and equality. And it is the one weapon the enemies of democracy fear most. And because the enemies of true democracy fear the ballot they have in every conceivable way, tried to circumscribe its use. In some places the circumscribing is attempted through the use of the taxing power, as if one dollar and a half were the proper yardstick by which to measure the qualifications of freemen to participate in the affairs of a free Government. In other places we find the circumscribing devise educational qualifications or complicated registration. Whatever the device, the object is to restrict the electorate, on the theory that the autocrats, ever on the alert, will be able to qualify those upon whom they can depend and see that they are at the polls on election day doing the bidding of their masters.

My young friends, one of the most sickening things to me in connection with the last war was the fact that many of the young men who were considered qualified to fight and die for democracy were not considered qualified, for one whimsical reason or another, to participate through the ballot in the affairs of the Government they were called upon to fight and die for.

The circumscribing of the ballot, I am afraid, has created a general apathy among our people with respect to affairs of government. No true American can look into the situation without becoming alarmed. Here in America, the greatest democracy in the world, and with the best educated and qualified electorate in the world, we find the proportion of citizens who take the trouble to

qualify themselves to vote, and then go ahead and vote, is the lowest among the real democracies. In Canada, for instance, the proportion that vote is twice as large as in America. Of our 140,000,000 population only 35,000,000, or 25 percent, participated in the general election of 1946. Of our 140,000,000 population in 1946 the Bureau of the Census reports that in round numbers 92,000,000 were 21 years of age or older. Hence, out of a potential voting strength of 92,000,000, only 35,000,000, or 38 percent, voted. Polls taken during recent years reveal some alarming facts. For instance, one poll showed that one-third of all citizens with college training did not know the number of years for which a Representative is elected. Other polls showed that in January of last year 31 percent of the voters did not know that elections would be held in November; that only 4 out of 10 voters can name both Senators from their own State; and that only one-half can give the name of the Representative in Congress from their own district. And in a poll taken in January 1945, 2 months after the election, only 68 percent of all voters could name the Vice President who, of course, is no other than our President today.

Now, the autocrats cannot be held entirely responsible for this deplorable state of affairs. Some of the blame should be placed upon our colleges and schools in not placing more emphasis upon affairs of state. While we cannot get politics mixed up with our schools, we can, and should, teach our system of government, stressing the fact that it is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and that the only way the system can be maintained is for the people to keep informed and actively participate, through the ballot, in the affairs of their Government. If democracy is a good thing, and the only way we can protect it is through the ballot, surely there is something lacking in a school system that does not train our boys and girls in the use of the only weapon by which democracy can be defended.

In a few years, my young friends, to you and the other young men and women in America will fall the task of making democracy work. I know you will gladly assume the task and acquit yourselves like true Americans.

If I may be so bold as to pass on to you a few suggestions they would be these: Stick to the basic principles of freedom and equality; ever guard the foundation stones, the home, the church, the school; preserve our system of free enterprise; put an end to monopolies; extend our social programs; get rid of autocracy wherever found; and awaken our people to the responsibilities of government so they will actively participate, through the ballot, in all affairs of state.

Do these things and democracy will work, and work in such a way that it will not only serve the needs of our people here in the land of its birth, but it will be embraced by the other peoples of the world.

Withdrawing Farm Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MONROE M. REDDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Western Carolina Tribune, Hendersonville, N. C., of Thursday, June 12, 1947:

WITHDRAWING FARM AID

It is the habit of the American people to swing to the right and left to extreme extents, one trying to correct or cripple what another has done. With Congress in its endeavor to reduce expenses and relieve people of taxes, one wonders where it will strike next in its economy program.

Noting the severe slashes made in the effort to help those in the low-income brackets of farmers who were without credit, we consulted the records of the Farmers Home Administration of Henderson County to see what this organization had done since it was established a few years ago to help many just off relief to get a better foothold in the matter of producing food for their own families and helping feed a starving world.

Since 1938, 45 farm loans have been made on a low-interest 40-years-to-pay plan. These loans for buying farms, remodeling homes, developing land, etc., totaled $170,014, and although they had 40 years to pay off, 15 have already paid out in full, $104,191 having been repaid; $12,000 has been paid before due and not a single purchaser is in arrears. That's a remarkable record toward rehabilitation. Seven loans have been made to veterans.

Four hundred and seven families since 1935 have borrowed for seeds, fertilizers, farm equipment, livestock, etc., some on a 1-year and some on a 5-year basis.

All these families have had guidance on the farm and guidance and teaching in their homes. One hundred and ninety have repaid in full, are on their feet, and find no longer need to borrow from Uncle Sam, who came to their aid when they seemingly didn't have other credit. Losses have been surprisingly few with only 15 borrowers for seeds, fartilizers, etc., having been classed as uncollectable.

President Truman recommended ninety millions for operating loans but the House has reduced this to sixty millions. He recommended twenty-five millions for farm ownership and repairs to those of low farm incomes and to the veterans, but the House eliminated this altogether. The President's recommendation of thirty million for administrative purposes was cut to eighteen millions. This has resulted in curtailment of personnel to the extent that the home supervisors in North Carolina have been given notice of the discontinuance of their services. The farm supervisors also suffered in this 46-percent reduction in personnel, counties have been consolidated, and the supervisors will become, in large measure, collecting agencies. Transylvania County will be combined with Henderson as a means of introducing retrenchment in expenses.

It seems to be false economy in times like this with underproduction of foodstuffs and prices high to curtail those agencies which work for higher production.

Export of Gasoline to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, do you realize that you here in the East and the Midwest will be rationing gasoline within the very near future?

Do you know that the very gasoline which you will not get is being loaded in 12 Russian tankers in Los Angeles harbor at this moment?

Do you realize that these same 12 tankers are the tankers which Russia obtained from us on the lend-lease program and now refuses to return to us?

Secretary of the Interior Krug has today called an emergency session of eight Cabinet members to deal with this problem.

The administration had better stop worrying about Henry Wallace, the Voice of America, and world trade and start thinking about these United States. We are repeating the same thing we did before the last war, when we shipped steel and oil to Japan. The administration should act now through an Executive order, and Congress should immediately follow through with laws to control these exports.

It is true that Russia is buying on an open market, but that is because we do not have tankers in which to ship the oil to the Gulf and the east coasts, nor do we have a proper distribution of railroad tank cars in which to ship it.

This is another result of the car shortage attributable to the bad management of railroad-car distribution, so ably exposed by the Los Angeles Daily News.

I am inserting in the RECORD the following news item by Mr. Ray Richards, correspondent for the Hearst publications in Washington:

EXPORT OF GASOLINE TO RUSSIA

(By Ray Richards)

WASHINGTON, June 16.—American oil and gasoline by the shipload was about to move to Russia today while the worst petroleum shortage in history gripped the United States.

As a final irony, 12 tankers now beginning to load more than 600,000 barrels of oil and gasoline at Los Angeles harbor for Vladivostok are American-owned lend-lease vessels which Russia has refused to return.

Lack of tankers for coastal transport is one of the main causes for the shortage.

Demand for quick action to stop the shipments to Russia came from Congressmen as Interior Secretary Krug called eight Cabinet members to an emergency session tomorrow to deal with the problem.

Krug forecast restoration of wartime export controls by declaring "the United States had better keep all the oil and gasoline it has."

Seizure of the vessels at Los Angeles was urged by Representative DEWEY SHORT, Missouri Republican, member of the House Armed Services Committee.

The committee has just reported favorably to the House a bill extending for another year the present Export Control Act, which expires July 1.

The committee's chairman, Representative WALTER G. ANDREWS, New York Republican, pointed out that even under the present act the Commerce Department has 2 weeks to restore petroleum export control, suspended by Executive order shortly after the war ended.

"If the emergency is as acute as Secretary Krug says, those west coast ships should not even start loading," ANDREWS said. "Congress is certain to continue the export-control law, if only to conserve our defense materials in these critical times."

Russia has been buying the oil and gasoline on the open California market through its trading company, AMTORG.

In the absence of American restrictions, no one in Washington knew just how much of the precious fuel Russia intends to take from the United States during the annual summer purchasing season.

But last year Russia took 2,500,000 barrels of American fuel, including 150,000 barrels of aviation gasoline.

Since then she has stepped up her efforts for a vast population and economic development in northeast Siberia, near Alaska, where the Russian Army and Black Sea fleet held their first maneuvers in history this spring.

Ships now preparing to load at San Pedro, port of Los Angeles, are the *Emba, Krasnia Armia, Tagenrog, Elbras, Maikop* and *Belgorod*.

All are of 50,000-barrel capacity except the *Tagenrog*, which carries 65,000 barrels.

Six additional tankers of at least equal capacity are reported on the way to load fuel for Siberia.

Some are former Union Oil Co. tankers. All are the property of the United States, merely lent to Russia for the late war, Maritime Commission officials said today.

Moscow has ignored several State Department requests that the ships be returned.

"We have the moral and legal right to seize them," Short said. "The emergency justifies it."

The proposal for reestablishment of petroleum export controls is to be made at tomorrow's meeting of high Government officials by Francis T. McIntyre, Chief of the Commerce Department's Export Control Section.

The White House will be represented by Presidential Adviser John R. Steelman.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the Chilton Times-Journal, a weekly newspaper published at Chilton, Wis., and edited by Mr. William J. McHale, clearly stated the issue with respect to the Taft-Hartley labor bill. Because of the convincing character of this editorial, I believe it should be brought to the attention of the people of America. The editorial follows:

THE LABOR BILL

A compromise labor bill, which received overwhelming majorities in both the Senate and House, is now before President Truman for his acceptance or rejection. And leaders in Washington who follow legislative matters closely won't be surprised if the President vetoes the measure.

To most people on the sidelines, who are not concerned with special favors for either labor or management, a veto of the measure will be regarded as unfortunate. In fact, if the bill were to be considered strictly on its merits—and not on the political repercussions that signing or vetoing it will produce—there can be little doubt that Mr. Truman would sign it. While the top labor leaders are yelling themselves hoarse calling it a slave bill, those same men know that it places them under needed restraints of law in the public interest, even as all the rest of us are under the restraints of law of various kinds.

Few bills of a controversial nature have been passed by Congress in recent years in which the Members of that body were so much in harmony after all the bitter debate. It was passed by the House by a vote of 320 to 79, and in the Senate by 54 to 17. The Republicans in the House cast 217 votes for the bill and 12 against. The Democrats cast 103 votes for it and 66 against. The opposition party, it may be seen from these figures, voted nearly 2 to 1 for it. In the Senate 37 Republicans voted for the bill and two against, while the Democrats divided 17 for and 15 against.

Adding up the figures, it will be found that in both Houses of Congress 374 Members were for the measure and 96 against it. That means that of the total Members of Congress who were recorded on this measure 79½ percent were for the bill. That was how the Congress stood after listening to weeks of bitter debate and outrageous charges and threats by the labor moguls.

Does anyone in his senses believe that 79½ percent of the Members of Congress, made up of opposing parties, would clamp down the yoke of a slave law on their fellow countrymen?

The compromise labor law takes away no legitimate right from laboring men. It does place responsibility on them, as all who exercise power should expect to bear corresponding responsibility. The restraints which the bill imposes on labor leaders are intended to keep them from excesses, in the interest of the public welfare. Labor continues to have the right to bargain collectively and to strike, except when a strike would paralyze the Nation. Certainly, such strikes cannot be permitted any more than civil war can be permitted.

The labor bill was written to curb abuses and the boys who rode high, wide, and handsome during the years of labor license have themselves to blame for it. By failure to sign this bill adopted by almost four-fifths of the elected representatives of the people, President Truman will render a disservice to his country.

Will Truman Follow the Congress or the Communists on the Labor Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, before midnight on Friday, June 20, President Truman must decide to either sign or allow the labor bill to become law or veto it. If he signs it, he will reveal the courage and determination that many thousands throughout the Nation believe he possesses. He will place himself in the same class with Ramadier, Premier of France, who successfully defied and resisted the Communist labor threat in France, when such action took more courage than it will take to defy them in this country.

If he allows it to become law without his signature, he will be taking passive action, with the hope of giving the impression that he couldn't do anything else under the circumstances, with several Nation-wide strikes facing him.

If he vetoes it, and this is the big question, he will be capitulating to the demands and threats of the Communist Party and to the warnings and appeals of autocratic and dominating labor leaders, and against the best interests of the rank and file of labor union members and the millions of wage earners in the Nation.

William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party in the United States of America, demanded that the President veto the labor bill in a recent radio broadcast in New York City. He practically said, "Veto the bill or else," and he further demanded that Truman, as head of the Democratic Party, mobilize his party to sustain his veto.

The strange anomaly of Foster's demand upon the President is the following statement from the minority report of the Education and Labor Committee, which reads as follows:

This bill is aimed at the heart of American industrial democracy. If it is permitted to hit that target, the working people of this country will not soon recover their status as free men. The Fascists and Communists learned early that a strong trade-union movement was inconsistent with their objectives and an obstacle to the achievement of those objectives. As a means of securing power, the Fascists and the Communists destroyed the labor movement in other countries, because they recognized that trade-unions were a citadel of democracy which they must batter down in order to achieve their evil purposes.

If the bill will give the Communists the weapons to destroy the labor unions, why should William Foster, the head of the Communist Party, be opposed to it?

Will the President of the United States yield to the Communists or will he assume the dignity and authority of his office and support the American wage earner and protect the general welfare of the Nation?

We shall soon know the answer.

Separation of Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, increased interest in national affairs has given impetus to expression on the part of individuals, and groups, as never before, to exert influence for and against certain legislation.

The national assembly of the Presbyterian Church, the other day, endorsed the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, known as the W-E-T bill.

Last night's Evening Star contained an article by David Lawrence criticizing a Catholic organization for attempting to meddle with labor legislation.

Such efforts on the part of religious organizations are an encroachment upon the principle established by our forefathers, and on which this Nation was founded, that of the complete separation of church and state.

Following is the article by David Lawrence, referred to:

CATHOLIC UNIT'S STAND ON LABOR BILL VIEWED AS CHURCH IN POLITICS

(By David Lawrence)

An amazing statement has just been issued by the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference—amazing because it is a partisan attack on the labor relations bill now before President Truman for approval or disapproval.

To mix the church with politics in America has long been looked upon with disfavor by laymen of all denominations. For an influential national organization of Catholics to issue a statement which, in effect, applies pressure on the President to veto the pending labor bill gives the impression that all Catholics perhaps think the same way about it or that at least one official agency of the Catholic Church in America endorses the views expressed by a Protestant group—the social research department of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America—because it appeared to be going beyond the application of moral influence to economic questions. Now a Catholic agency comes in for criticism because the principle in both cases is the same. Religious groups which involve themselves in partisan political and economic issues serve only to weaken the rightful influence of the churches on individuals.

CONFIDENCE HELD WEAKENED

When a statement is made, for instance, by a church group that taxes the credulity of observers, it necessarily tends to weaken confidence in such a church group's impartiality or objectivity. Thus the Catholic social action department says:

"The Taft-Hartley bill does little or nothing to encourage labor-management cooperation. On the contrary it approaches the complicated problem from a narrow and excessively legalistic point of view."

Who is to say that treating management and unions alike will not bring labor-management cooperation? Anyone who is familiar with the text of the proposed law knows, moreover, that it is no more legalistic than the original Wagner Act, whose phrases have been the basis of thousands of rulings and decisions already in which hair-splitting equivocal rulings have been made by the Labor Board affecting the employer.

The social action department did not protest against the enactment of the original Wagner law and certainly has not called for its repeal or revision so that employers and unions would be treated alike. The statement just issued goes further in denouncing the present bill than most critics outside the labor-union movement have gone. Indeed, it reads as if it were prepared by a labor-union leader and does not give any impression of awareness of the abuses that have led up to the passage by both Houses of Congress of a law to correct such abuses.

BARGAINING ARGUMENT IS HIT

"The bill," says the statement, "is an open invitation to management to have recourse to the courts and to the Labor Board at almost every turn and thus to sidetrack or evade the normal processes of collective bargaining."

Such a claim is wholly unrealistic because a careful reading of the bill will show that, unlike the Wagner Act, it not only puts on employers an obligation to bargain collectively but spells out the meaning of that obligation.

But in any event it is not the function of a church unit at a national headquarters, using the name "Catholic," to enter into a detailed discussion of the merits of highly technical legal provisions and to urge, in effect, on the President of the United States that the Catholic voters share or might share these views and that hence Mr. Truman might better heed the advice given or perhaps lose some of the Catholic votes.

This sort of statement by the Catholic group is an interjection into politics which thoughtful Catholic leaders may not wish to approve. A repudiation of the statement issued by the social action department would seem to be called for or at least the definition of a limited authority behind the issuance of the highly controversial pronouncement.

The province of all the churches of all denominations is to exert an influence for individual honesty and self-restraint endeavoring to make laymen responsive to spiritual interest so that they themselves will be fair and objective both in the writing of laws and in taking rightful political action.

There is not the slightest objection to the expression of views by individual clergymen on public questions when they are plainly acting as individual citizens. But for any church unit, functioning as an institution, to mix in as a pressure group on specific laws in the economic or political field is to involve America in unfortunate controversies where the influence of the churches will be weakened instead of strengthened.

Veto of Tax-Reduction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in his veto of the tax-reduction bill, President Truman took a step with but a single parallel in legislative history. The only other Chief Executive who saw fit thus to thwart the will of Congress regarding a tax measure was President Roosevelt, who in 1943 vetoed the revenue bill of 1943, giving rise to the resignation of the majority leader of the Senate and his now famous peroration of February 23, 1944, wherein he exhorted his colleagues in these words:

Let me say in conclusion that, if the Congress of the United States has any self-respect yet left, it will override the veto of the President and enact this tax bill into law, his objections to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is noteworthy that the present Chief Executive joined with his colleague, the majority leader, in overriding the President's veto by the overwhelming vote of 72 to 14.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have been interested in making some study of the history and use of the veto, which has now had its latest expression in the action of the President yesterday, attempting to frustrate the will of the Congress and the clearly expressed desires of the vast bulk of harassed and oppressed taxpayers of the Nation.

The framers of our Constitution in their convention of 1787 debated long and vigorously the question whether any power should be vested in the executive branch to overrule the legislative branch. Out of the political persecution which our forefathers had suffered in the Old World came the doctrine of the separation of powers of the three branches of government—legislative, executive, and judiciary. It was only as a gesture of appeasement and against the arguments of such stalwarts as Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, and Pierce Butler that the so-called Williamson Compromise was reluctantly accepted 5 days before the session concluded, which is now embodied in article I, section 7, of the Constitution.

The chief argument of the advocates of the veto power was that a similar executive veto exercisable by the King of England had not been used at all in 4 years. Thus they have concluded that in the future it would be used by the executive, at most, sparingly.

The best evidence of this interpretation arises from the fact that eight Presidents—John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, John Quincy Adams, Martin Van Buren, William Henry Harrison, Zachary Taylor, Millard Fillmore, and James A. Garfield—never employed either the regular or the pocket veto. Up to the final session of the Seventy-eighth Congress there had been 1,759 vetoes. Of these, President Roosevelt contributed 629, or more than 35 percent.

During the last half century, to which my study has been devoted, about 90 percent of the bills vetoed have been private bills for the relief of individuals, corporations, or localities. Many of these no doubt furnished desirable instances of a proper check on possible legislative excesses.

It has only been in the last 15 years that the veto may be said to have blossomed into full flower. Often now it only arouses passing notice when an Executive thus employs his high office to defeat the expressed will of the majority. I do not say that he should never do that. I would not remove the Presidential power of veto from our Constitution. I do, however, contend that its use as envisioned by the framers of our Constitution has deteriorated in many instances into abuse. No more pointed illustrations could be presented than the action taken by the late President Roosevelt on the Revenue Act of 1943 and now, by our present Chief Executive with relation to the tax-reduction bill which was approved so overwhelmingly in both of the legislative bodies.

The encroachment of the judiciary upon legislative functions has been the subject of much unfavorable comment. Let us hope that it will not be necessary for us to suffer the persecutions which gave rise to the origin of the doctrine of separation of powers to bring us to the realization that this doctrine is sound and in the best interests of good government. Let us say, in the words of Senator BARKLEY, still echoing through these corridors, "If the Congress of the United States has any self-respect yet left, override the veto of the President and enact this tax bill into law, his objections to the contrary notwithstanding."

Flag Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me at Clinton, Mass., on June 15, 1947:

Brothers, fellow Americans, and friends, I am highly honored today to attend these most appropriate exercises which our Clinton Lodge of the Benevolent and Protective

Order of Elks has arranged to celebrate Flag Day. Our membership and community as well as the State and Nation are still suffering poignant grief and sorrow over the loss of our great veteran patriot statesman, Brother David I. Walsh, whose great contributions to the country, whose sterling patriotism and unwavering Americanism during a lifetime of labor for the common people represented and symbolized the highest principles and noblest ideals which our sacred national anthem stands for and which Elkdom stands for. We may well dedicate ourselves today to the high purpose of seeking in our own lives and conduct to exemplify his devoted service to God and country, and to be inspired by the fine example which he set to serve our America with renewed steadfastness and zeal.

This is the one hundred and seventieth birthday of the American flag which was formally adopted by the Continental Congress June 14, 1777, at the very time when that gallant band of early American founders and patriots was fighting to establish our glorious Republic.

The Stars and Stripes, the symbol of our national strength and unity, the symbol of freedom and justice for all, is to us the most beautiful, the finest, and the noblest flag on earth. Throughout a long history of shifting vicissitudes, through gladness and sorrow, through fortune and misfortune, through bitter sacrifice and triumphant joy, through the darkness of depression and through the brightness of prosperity and happiness, in war and in peace, that flag has always inspired us and has never known lasting defeat.

It has waved over the ramparts at Valley Forge, from the hardy topmasts of John Paul Jones, John Barry, and Admiral Dewey, over the hills of Cuba and tropical islands, over the trees of the Argonne and the trenches of Belleau Woods. It has been planted in the soil of Bataan, where it now waves again in all its glory. It has roared through the skyways and over the oceans of all the world, on the fleeting wings of thousands of aircraft bearing our brave heroes to battle for freedom's cause. It has flown over our great naval fleets, over our heroic marines and gallant soldiers who gained so many glorious victories for our cause.

Yes, my friends; our flag has been planted on the stony crests at Iwo Jima to inspire our boys to new deeds of bravery, seldom equaled, and certainly never excelled, in the history of any people. Wherever that flag has gone, wherever it is flown, wherever it lifts up the spirit of the weak and the oppressed, wherever it awakens unsurpassed gallantry, our hearts and our hopes, our aspirations and our zeal for victory and enduring peace have followed it.

Red for the dauntless courage of our sons and our people, blue for their loyalty to our institutions, and white for the unsullied purity of our high purpose to keep our country free from the stains of foreign aggression and domestic corruption, Old Glory has in truth symbolized, as it has always sought to protect, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The flag has a very deep meaning to all true Americans because they know that for them it stands for and represents great political ideals in this sorry world, ideals which best recognize and secure the worth and dignity of the individual citizen. Under our flag, sanctified by the blood, the devotion and the sacrifices of so many of our country men and women of this and every other generation since it was first flung to the breeze of heaven, every person in this great land has received a far greater measure of freedom and equal opportunity under the law than has ever been enjoyed by the people of any nation. Under our flag, and in the spirit of those who died for it, just as in this great American organization, there are no distinctions of class, color or creed, and we will not tolerate such distinctions in this country of free individual citizens.

Remember, my friends, we are citizens—each possessed in his own right to all the benefits and blessings made possible by our unequaled Constitution. We are not subjects or vassals of any tyrant. We are not puppets of any totalitarian dictator who would crush the individuality of human beings under the heel of ruthless domination. We are not the slaves of alien ideologies who are herded like cattle into the indistinguishable mass of the superstate where people have no rights or property they can truly call their own, not even the right to speak their own minds, not even the meager clothes they wear on their backs. We are free Americans acknowledged to possess souls, and beings, and individualities of our own. Under our Government and our way of life, so long as we obey the law, we are free to aspire to and reach, if we can by use of our own abilities and talents, the highest goals of human achievement permitted to any other citizen of the land.

The American flag is the symbol of this freedom. The American way of life is the way of democracy and justice under law for all the people and we intend to preserve that freedom and that way of life in the name of all those who through the ages have laid down their lives, as so many of our boys so recently have done, in order that America may live to confer these matchless blessings upon our posterity and the world.

On this day of commemoration, therefore, as we solemnly repledge our allegiance to our glorious national emblem, let us rededicate ourselves to greater, more determined service, if that be possible, to the noble cause it represents. Let us reconsecrate our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor, as others have done before, to the protection and furtherance of that democracy which has sustained our people in contentment and happiness for so many years. Let this stirring occasion be a time when we publicly redeclare our firm and unflinching faith in our American institutions, our confidence in our form of government and our free economic system under sound forward-looking leaders to solve the difficult problems of the future, as America has always sought to solve its problems, with just consideration of each and every group of our people.

Let us keep in mind that in the past our Nation has met and conquered apparently insuperable obstacles and that we can and will meet and overcome them again.

The most vital thing for the American people to remember in this challenging postwar period is that we must never lose faith in ourselves and our precious institutions. Gigantic as they are and will be, the problems of the future, financial, social, economic, and political must be approached with reliance in the fundamental principles of American democracy.

We should never forget the sacrifices of the millions of our young men who have given of their youth, strength, and indomitable spirit to save the country in this desperate crisis. As long as they and their near and dear ones shall live, we must make sure that our Government in behalf of all the American people will discharge in fullest measure the great debt we owe them which truly cannot be measured in material values.

Secondly, let us do our utmost to make sure that the peace and freedom they fought and died for may be achieved through the cooperation of all nations of good faith and good will so that the curse of war may be banished from the earth.

Thirdly, let us be certain at all times that our Nation is adequately protected not only as against military aggression but also as against the inroads and penetration of those most unwelcome and undesirable ideas and forms of political and economic dictatorships that in recent years have swept over Europe and Asia. We must make democracy a living, vital force that will abundantly serve all the needs of our people regardless of section, class, color, creed, or station in life.

Fourthly, let us be determined that no subversive groups here or abroad will ever be allowed to tear down the American flag and raise in its stead the international banner of rebellion, revolution, and class warfare. Let me especially remind those of the young generation that has borne so gallantly the heaviest burdens of the war and who have to bear with equal, if a different kind of, courage the very heavy burdens of post-war America, that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Watch it carefully, guard it continuously, cherish it dearly, and preserve it at any cost. Because the lessons of history plainly show that when personal liberty is lost, when freedom is crushed, when despotism and tryranny come, that that day will mark the end of our American democracy—the end of representative, constitutional government.

Americans all—let us go forward to fulfill our great destiny of freedom and justice. With Old Glory flying as high and as proudly as ever, loyal and united in spirit and purpose, let us face the problems of the present and future with confidence and courage. Let us vow to preserve and protect our national emblem and all it stands for, "one nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all."

No Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Tax Relief," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of June 17, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO TAX RELIEF

President Truman's veto of the tax bill dashes hope of an income-tax reduction at this session of Congress. The veto could be overridden in the House, which passed the final bill 220 to 99, but the Senate never mustered a two-thirds vote in favor of the bill and can be expected to sustain the veto.

The veto comes as no surprise. It is wholly consistent with the position Mr. Truman took in his state of the Union and budget messages in January.

Now, as then, the President feels that in a time of high employment and national income, and in the face of great expenditures at home and abroad, tax revenues should be sustained at levels to meet current expenses and leave a surplus for debt retirement.

Certainly the situation has not changed for the better since January. To meet the challenge of communism, Mr. Truman has advocated expensive defense measures at home and has called for funds to implement foreign policy abroad.

Committed to debt retirement and to heavy spending in the interest of national security, Mr. Truman could not consistently approve a reduction of $3,840,000,000 in national revenue.

Failure to obtain a tax reduction at this session must rest largely with Congress

itself. It never set the Nation's fiscal house in order as a proper foundation for tax reduction. As the New Yorker magazine put it this week, Congress believes "that Uncle Sam should reduce his income and then try to live down to it."

Without showing how the President's budget could be cut even as much as $4,000,000,000 Congress plunged ahead with a tax reduction. Under the circumstances, Mr. Truman has a strong case in defense of a veto.

As for the public, disappointment in the lower income brackets need not be great. Republican Representative ENGEL, of Michigan, has charged that the bill would save most taxpayers a negligible sum each week (it has been estimated as little as 50 cents) while it gives a man who made the biggest profits during the war the biggest tax relief.

This situation led Mr. Truman to characterize the bill as "ill-apportioned." He also feels that it is risky and in violation of sound tax policy.

We can only look forward now to what the President calls "the right kind of tax reduction at the right time." The cynical may surmise that this will come during 1948, an election year.

Whenever it comes, it should be based upon what the President calls "sound and carefully related fiscal and economic policy." The sooner such a policy is evolved, the sooner we can expect tax relief.

Meanwhile, the President runs considerable political risk in a veto. If things are going well next year and he calls for a tax reduction, the public will ask why he didn't approve the one voted by a Republican Congress this year. But if the economic and foreign situations remain unsettled, Mr. Truman may be hailed as a prophet.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding tax reduction from the Washington News of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP CHOICE: CUT TAXES FOR NEXT YEAR, OR PLAY POLITICS

Republicans in Congress can give the people a tax cut, effective January 1 next—if they want to.

Or they can let the President's veto stand, do nothing but talk about it, and thereby keep alive an issue.

No doubt about it, it's a good issue—to get the votes. The Republicans tried to give a tax cut to 49,000,000 income taxpayers, effective July 1. The President vetoed it, and the House sustained the veto. To voters who read on the run, and haven't followed the nuances of what has happened, it looks as though the Republicans are on the side of the taxpayer and the Democrats against.

But the full truth may spread. It will show that the Republicans, by their blunders and politics-playing strategy, are largely responsible for this impasse. They made their first big mistake by failing to do their duty under the reorganization law, which required Congress, within 3 weeks after it convened, to fix an over-all ceiling on Government spending for the next fiscal year. The Republicans haven't yet fixed that ceiling, and they control both Houses of Congress. They are still flouting the law, still shirking their responsibility.

Their second mistake was in trying to make the tax cut retroactive to January 1 last. Their third was in delaying action 5 months and grudgingly compromising—too late—on the July 1 date. All the time there were plenty of Democrats who would have gone along, had the GOP been willing to make the tax cut effective at the start of the next calendar year. The Republicans chose instead to try to embarrass the President. To those who know the score, it would appear the Republicans themselves cannot be unembarrassed by what has happened.

It is still not too late to end tax uncertainty and assure taxpayers that their burdens next year will be lower. If congressional leaders will bring out the same tax bill, with only one change, to make the effective date January 1 next, it would attract much Democratic support and probably would be passed. Our guess is that the President would sign the bill. His principal objection to the vetoed bill—and a good one, too—was that it did not leave enough surplus for retirement of public debt. That objection would not apply to the new bill. In the unlikely event that a vote to override became necessary, plenty of Democrats would help the Republicans do the job.

Henry Wallace and the Southern Conference for Human Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very worthwhile editorial entitled "Henry and the SCHW," published in the Nashville Banner of June 13, 1947. I recommend its careful reading.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HENRY AND THE SCHW

Both Henry Wallace and the Southern Conference for Human Welfare have been best known by the company they keep. Among the company they keep is that of each other; hardly a recommendation for either. And in addition there are the wayside companionships to which each gravitates, always leftwardly, as moths to the irresistible candle flame.

So Monday evening again they are getting together, at Washington, the culmination of Wallace's barnstorming tour. It's the nearest approach to his Madison Square Garden appearances, under similar sponsorship, wherein the Reds and the pinks poured on coal to make the flame as fascinating as possible if not as hot as possible for any visiting moths. Only this time, the sponsor being the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, one anticipates that it will have something or other to do with the South.

As neither Wallace nor the SCHW enjoys any particular popularity in the South, a lack of esteem right noticeable at primary and election time; they may simply indulge in mutual commiserations and a lavish exchange of admiration. Henry may impart to them some special benediction brought from colleagues afar, or open a large keg of intellectual nails to bite.

On the other hand, he may stick to his text, and read his customary lecture about the horrible reactionaries who won't let America be loved into peace by that magnificent and pious peace-monger, Moscow.

"Dr." Clark Foreman says the SCHW is "misunderstood." The SCHW says Wallace is "misunderstood." Wallace says the Russians are "misunderstood."

Strange, isn't it, how all these "misunderstood" people get together? Can it be that "misunderstanding" is all they have in common?

Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by David Lawrence, taken from the Washington Evening Star of June 17, 1947:

TAX BILL VETO TERMED ERROR THAT MAY COST TRUMAN 1948 VICTORY

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman's veto of the tax bill may cost him the 1948 election. He mistakenly thought, no doubt, that he would gain politically by the veto.

Today the Republicans are jubilant, for they have been handed on a platter an issue that can win for them no matter who their candidate may be.

What the President said to 46,000,000 taxpayers was that they couldn't have a tax reduction because he wanted to fix the tax rates and didn't recognize the right of a majority in Congress to do so.

In all American history no tax bill passed by both Houses has ever failed to become law. Only one has been vetoed heretofore, but it was overridden by Congress. If the pending tax bill is killed because it cannot muster two-thirds in both Houses, it will bring a tremendous change in legislative practice.

The arbitrary use of the veto to defeat the will of a majority in Congress will lead to the arbitrary use of the rider attached to other necessary legislation. The majority would be well justified in attaching the tax bill to any of the current appropriation bills, if only to assert the historic right of Congress to write legislation that raises revenues and fixes tax rates.

COMMUNISTIC ARGUMENT SEEN

When Mr. Truman tells the taxpayers who were to be granted a 30-percent reduction that they can't have it because someone with a higher income is getting a 10-percent reduction, he is misjudging human nature if he thinks this will please that vast number of taxpayers in the lower brackets to whom every dollar of saving is consequential and who do not feel they should be punished because Mr. Truman wants to play the demagogue. The President is, in effect, arguing for the communistic doctrine which seeks to level all incomes irrespective of brains or thrift.

The President says that he vetoed the bill because it is "the wrong kind of tax reduction, at the wrong time." This phrase will become famous in political history as the

prize boner of the age. For it implies plainly that the wrong kind of tax reduction will be all right at the right time—presumably next year when the Presidential campaign is in the offing and when presumably Mr. Truman can strive for political credit even for the wrong kind of tax reduction.

But next year the Congress will pass the same kind of tax bill it did this year except that it will be even more unpalatable for Mr. Truman to sign, and when he signs it, he will make his message of this week look rather ridiculous.

DAMAGE MAY BE DELAYED

The damage Mr. Truman did in vetoing the tax bill will not be apparent right away. It will be apparent in the recession that could conceivably be ushered in as a consequence of his blunder, and it would be felt throughout the world.

For Mr. Truman, by his action this week, may have killed all chance of helping the world-trade situation and European rehabilitation. Export trade that has been booming may decline severely. Then there would surely be a recession. The Republicans, so many of whom don't want to vote more billions to Europe, now have been given a very strong excuse—Mr. Truman's own words. For the President said:

"With the present huge public debt, it is of first importance that every effort now be made to reduce that debt as much as possible."

This means that debt reduction is, in the President's opinion, paramount. There are plenty of Republicans who will take him at his word. They will not vote billions for Europe while a Democratic President denies tax relief to the American people.

MESSAGE CALLED BOOMERANG

Unfortunately the Truman message, while intended to play politics in order to gain support from the left wing, really will prove a boomerang with the average man, who will not understand why the $40 or $50 savings he was to get are now being denied him. To lose a 30-percent tax reduction is more serious in the lower brackets than to forego a 10-percent reduction in the higher brackets.

There is a surplus of more than a billion dollars coming on June 30 and a surplus of at least eight billions is indicated for next year—yet Mr. Truman is denying the taxpayers any relief from wartime rates.

The Republicans ought not to adjourn without passing another tax bill—this one to be effective January 1, 1948, and giving an even greater reduction in rates to individuals in the lower brackets. If Congress surrenders to the Executive its authority to fix tax rates, the legislative branch of the Government would be surrendering also the independence it has exercised for more than 160 years.

When a River's Floods Are Counted Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "When a River's Floods Are Counted Up," published in the Arkansas Gazette of June 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN A RIVER'S FLOODS ARE COUNTED UP

At the hearing on flood-control funds Representative MILLS, of Arkansas, told the House Appropriations Committee there had been 143 floods at Batesville, Newport, and Clarendon between 1921 and 1943. Only 40 floods would have come during this period if dams and other projects in the White River comprehensive program had been finished. He urges systematic work, bringing this program to completion.

The White River drainage basin is in many respects similar to what the Tennessee Valley was before the TVA was established. Eroded hills, land subject to overflow, restricted agriculture, comparatively little industry, can be seen in the upland basin of the White. There were corresponding conditions in the Tennessee River highland until the Federal Government invested hundreds of millions of dollars in regional improvement.

Representative MILLS asks that flood control funds be considered as capital investment. Greater wealth can be created by mastering the White River and its main tributaries. Many of the dams in the plan will generate electric power as well as regulate stream flow. The power should help attract industries. Agricultural yields in the fertile lower valley can be increased when the dams upstream prevent the river from raging. High production of raw materials would provide an incentive for processing within the area.

Every approved project in the comprehensive program is economically feasible. The benefits would exceed costs, as shown in preliminary studies. In time higher revenue would go into the Federal Treasury as taxes from the region. Missouri and Arkansas would be obtaining greater returns from an area that is producing far below its potential.

The core of the economic problems of the White River country is complete mastery of the stream system.

The Lincoln Reader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial from the West Union Record, West Union, W. Va., entitled "The Lincoln Reader."

The editor, Mr. Walter Stuart, calls attention to the fact that though this book is made up of quotations from 65 authors, it is so skillfully blended as to give an uninterrupted story of the life of this great American. His influence has been so great on our country that we would all do well occasionally to review the events of his time and his life.

THE LINCOLN READER

The best one-volume life of Lincoln that has ever been published is the recent book-of-the-month selection, The Lincoln Reader. It contains 179 selections from 65 authors and was compiled and edited by Paul M. Angle, of Springfield, Ill., who is generally considered the greatest living authority on Lincoln.

More has been written about Lincoln than any other man with the possible exception of Napoleon. The Lincoln Reader is really the cream of all Lincolniana. The author has taken the best of each of the works on Lincoln and has made a book that is incomparably the best one-volume edition of Lincoln that has ever been published. We really believe that the average reader will learn more about Lincoln by reading author Angle's one-volume edition than he would by reading any of the editions composed of from two to six or more large volumes.

The author quotes what he considers the very best authority on each outstanding incident in Lincoln's life, and no man living is more familiar with all the works on Lincoln than is author Angle, if all the things which have been said about him are true.

Author Angle has certainly done a fine job of selecting material for his book. One reads the book without feeling that there is any break in the continuity of the story of Lincoln's life although the volume is made up of selections from the writings of 65 authors. It carries the story of Lincoln's life right through from his birth to his death just as if the story had been written by one author instead of 65.

The Lincoln Reader is one of the finest and most interesting books we have ever read. It is a kind of book that grips the reader's interest in such a way that he does not want to lay it aside for a minute after he begins to read it. We have read several Lincoln books, but we like Paul Angle's The Lincoln Reader the best of all. One gets from it every essential fact about the life of Lincoln that one should care to know. We do not believe that the ponderous works of Albert J. Beveridge and Carl Sandburg contain any more of the important or worth-while facts of Lincoln's life than does Paul Angle's one volume of fewer than 600 pages.

More books have been written about Lincoln than have been written about any other American, and it is very likely that more books will still be written about him. The historians of a hundred years from now may have a much different perspective of Lincoln than that of the historians of today. Probably some new material about Lincoln will soon be available. Lincoln's son, the late Robert T. Lincoln, had a great many of his father's papers and documents which he would never let anyone see or examine and which, under the terms of his will, were not to be revealed to the public until so many years after his death. The time specified to elapse after Robert Lincoln's death before the papers should be available for public inspection is, we understand, about run out. Those papers may contain some new Lincoln material, but it is hardly probable that they contain much which has not already been given to the public for the life of no other American has been studied and investigated so exhaustively as has the life of Lincoln.

Well-written books on the life of Abraham Lincoln will always be eagerly read. The readers of the present generation no doubt find the story of his life as interesting as did the readers of preceding generations. And the readers of the next generation will find his story not less interesting than do the readers of today.

But we doubt whether there will ever be published another one-volume book on Lincoln that will be any better than Paul Angle's The Lincoln Reader. We do not see how any improvement could be made in the contents of the Angle book.

No doubt the most exhaustive study of the life of Lincoln is represented in Carl Sandburg's work consisting of six volumes containing something like 3,000 pages. The work that the late Senator Beveridge planned would have surpassed Sandburg's opus had he lived to complete it. He finished four large volumes, but he got only as far as the Lincoln-Douglas debates when death ended his labors.

Explaining America Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of June 17, 1947:

EXPLAINING AMERICA ABROAD

Despite Secretary Marshall's earnest appeal, the State Department's cultural and informational program is still in danger of being largely suppressed. Its troubles began when the House eliminated the entire $34,000,000 appropriation for this purpose on the ground that the activities had not been authorized. To eliminate this objection Representative MUNDT, of South Dakota, introduced an enabling bill, which with some amendments was unanimously approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee on May 21. This bill, if passed, would naturally be followed by an appropriation, though perhaps a smaller one than the State Department asked for. Its consideration has been repeatedly postponed and it has not yet passed the House. Meanwhile Senator BALL, of Minnesota, has asserted that the Senate will cut to $6,000,000 the sum of about $19,000,000 asked, mainly for the radio programs known as the Voice of America. Such a cut would keep us out of Russia, where otherwise no American voice will be heard.

If the Senate goes this far we cannot be hopeful about the rest of the cultural and informational program—the highly important interchange of students, trainees, teachers, guest instructors, professors, and leaders in fields of specialized knowledge or skill; the interchange and translation of books and periodicals; the maintenance of American libraries abroad and assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers in other countries. Hope for favorable action on the Mundt bill, in both House and Senate, and for an adequate appropriation may rest on a dawning perception that if the Marshall plan for systematizing our aid to foreign countries is to succeed we shall have to continue to explain ourselves to people in those countries. We might save a few millions by not explaining ourselves and in so doing vitiate the results of an investment of billions.

Exchange Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Exchange Students," published in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of June 13, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCHANGE STUDENTS

One result of the Second World War is the great flood of students that are now coming to the United States from foreign countries. There are more than 18,000 of them in American schools, and more are coming at the rate of 1,000 a month. Still others—some estimates run to six figures—are clamoring to get in. The United States is now the educational center of the world. These students are paying their own way but there are many more important things than money involved in this situation, which is only a prelude to a still more ambitious educational scheme that will involve extensive student exchanges between the United States and other countries.

One has only to think of the wide influence exerted by Rhodes scholars in the United States to realize that students possessing qualities of leadership can become ambassadors of good will when they return to their native country after receiving their education here. Another example is the long practice of sending outstanding Chinese students to this country. These have returned to their native land and much of China's good will toward us can be traced to them.

Since 1902 about 2,000 foreign students, 110 of them Americans, have studied at Oxford University. When the Fulbright Act becomes operative the two-way exchange of students, financed by credits acquired by the sale of surplus property, will be set in motion and will dwarf all previous programs in size. Although many of these young men will be interested only in the technological aspects of our culture, a protracted visit here is bound to affect their attitude toward us in one way or another. For example the Indian government, in preparation for its independence, is sending 2,000 scholars annually to the United States.

Nearer home, the Brazilian Government is sending young manual-training students to Connecticut to study our trade-school methods. Others will study government administration. The Fulbright Act provides for the payment of transportation, tuition, and maintenance of American students and teachers attending foreign schools. These scholarships will be administered by a ten-member board composed of representatives of cultural, educational, student, and war-veteran groups. It is an ambitious program, and may be more effective in the long run in securing permanent peace than any other means. It has been said that it is easy to hate people you do not know. That is why it is a good thing for these thousands of students, many of whom will emerge as leaders in their own countries, to know us. That is why it is good for American students to study abroad. Some of the two-way suspicion that exists between the United States and the Soviet Republic would be alleviated if a similar free flow of students exitsed between the two countries.

Flag Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address I delivered before the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Lodge 243, of Worcester, Mass., on the occasion of their annual Flag Day ceremony, June 14, 1947:

Your request to take part in this annual Flag Day service was not regarded as an invitation, but a real honor.

This June 14 marks the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of that historic day in 1777 that the flag of 13 alternate stripes of red and white with a blue field of 13 stars was, by decree of Congress, made the emblem of the new, young Republic, but with the passing of those 170 years we now find ourselves the giant Nation of the world.

Literally looked upon the flag is but a piece of cloth with certain markings or insignia upon it, but actually it represents the dreams and labors of millions of people of the different nations throughout the world and the true significance and meaning of the flag has varied from generation to generation depending upon the thinking of the people in their particular periods.

It is most appropriate that on June 14 of each year—Flag Day—we recall the history of our "Old Glory"; recalling to our minds the great struggles of our forefathers; remembering as we look at our flag, it is red because of human sacrifice; it is blue because of their true loyalty; and they wove into it the white to indicate the purity and sincerity of their motives. The stars are there because of the great heartfelt hope of a greater, holier and nobler America.

The Stars and Stripes is the crystallized ambitions and fears of our heritage; the symbol of our national gloom and glory. Those who first made it lived for it and died for it, and are among our Nation's greatest. They have gone into the silence of history, but by their example of devotion and courage in their lives they ask us to be the flag makers of today and tomorrow. Make its red a little deeper by our sacrifices; its blue a little more like the blue of heaven by our faithfulness; its whiteness a real purity by our continued Christian standards; its stars a little brighter by our devotion to their highest hopes.

Under our flag, the brave and true have served and sacrificed, fought and died. It has ever been as a pillar of smoke by day and a flame by night to the armies of freedom. It was consecrated by the labor and wisdom of Washington and his heroic soldiers; it was held aloft by Lincoln and his armies of liberation that freed the slave and preserved the Union. It fluttered under the shot and shell of the titanic First World War; and during the recent world conflagration it was borne in triumph from the fires at Normandy beaches to the blood-drenched hill at Iwo Jima.

It has now become to all the world and its people the supreme symbol of free government and a free people, and upon us today, in the course of destiny, divine providence has placed a burden of world leadership. In accepting that stern trust, we must fully realize that flag waving is folly if it becomes a substitute for practical patriotism. It is treason when it is made an excuse to cover up weakness and unpreparedness. Flag flapping, shouting, cheers, and unstable emotions do not constitute patriotism, and will not suffice in this crisis.

The challenge can be met, and our democracy can survive, only if we have a strong and competent Government alert to the interests of all of its people, and unswerving in its devotion to the principles of individual freedom. We cannot have such a Government unless we have also an alert and cooperative American people, really united and fully determined to know and accept their national and world responsibilities.

The world today is shaking in a bitter struggle between two widely different philosophies. One upholding the personal liberty and dignity of man under God, and the other the evil force of oppression and destruction of individual rights and freedom, reducing man to the stature of a slave to the state.

In the midst of this struggle of all great powers, the United States alone remains a democracy, and more than any other factor, we are the key to the destiny of tomorrow's

world. We alone may be able to avert the decline of western civilization, and a reversion to barbarism. The disintegrated and panic-stricken western world is dependent upon us for its continued existence and the survival of individual liberty, and we must not fail the test.

It is commonly observed by our leading statesmen that the disruptive force creeping across Europe today is playing a waiting game; delaying and hindering every action that would promote peaceful and friendly settlement of international problems. They are counting upon the American people becoming weary and selfish in carrying the burden of their domestic and world responsibilities. We must answer that challenge.

The common sense of America demands that we put the sentimentalism and theory of visionaries and dreamers behind us, and by serious, practical measures prepare ourselves to meet the challenge.

War is the horror of our national life. America loves peace, and we seek quarrel with no nation. For the honor of our Nation and our flag, we meet the weak with justice and consideration; the powerful with confidence and dignity; but we have learned that the country that is rich, peaceful, and unprepared is never safe from the encroachments of the evil powers that are predatory and seeking imperial domination.

Our postwar period this far has been marked by much shallowness and superficiality; of much talking and little thinking. There is today too easy an acceptance of the shadow for the substance, of the promise for the performance. There is a growing habit of evading the responsibilities and realities of our citizenship, and the obligations we owe to each other and our Nation.

We cannot fulfill our destiny with various groups of our people arrayed against each other, each concerned only with their particular selfish interest. The path to peace lies in the union of common sacrifice.

To insure peace, we must prove to the enemies of freedom and the gallant nations of the world who are watching us so carefully that we have not become careless, selfish, and disunited. We must prove that we can set our own house in order by our cooperating efforts. The clash between capital and labor can be adjusted without revengeful measures, but mutual understanding and acceptance of their respective rights and obligations; the cost of living as an American can be made reasonable by just and honest competition under our system of free enterprise; we can provide enough homes for the men and women who went across the pestilent margins of the world to save us from death and destruction at home; we can enable every American family to live in a decent home; we can give Christian example to our youth to prevent the increasing scourge of juvenile delinquency and divorce; we can afford a living wage to all our honest working people. By common service and sacrifice together we can go forward to the greatest era of our history. Together we can fulfill our world responsibility; we can achieve the greatest social welfare that any people on earth have ever known. We can do all of these things without the sacrifice of a single important liberty or right that we have.

But in this crisis confronting us we must realize that we cannot do these things without going back to the real old-fashioned patriotism and unselfish love of country that we inherited. Nor can we do them without a spiritual reawakening; without a renewed recognition and faithful adherence to the eternal truths of the Christian philosophy and practices handed down by our forefathers.

When they first unfolded to the free skies our glorious flag, they told to the earth that a new dispensation had come to men, which was the flower and fruit of the seed sown on the Mount of Calvary, when He died who came to liberate the souls of men.

To meet the test of this hour before the world; to be worthy of our heritage, we must pledge to live and work together as true friends, true neighbors, true Americans, under God and under our flag.

Letter of the Gray Corner Club, of Springfield, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, once in a while a Congressman receives a letter from a constituent or constituents which depicts so clearly and accurately the concern felt by the thoughtful members of the middle class of the American people, the backbone of our Nation, that it should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress. Such a letter is the following, which, I believe, warrants the careful consideration of my colleagues. There is no class of people outside the United States who correspond to the members of the Gray Corner Club. They are average, intelligent, industrious, and loyal citizens. They are men of small property holdings and medium-sized incomes from wages, salaries, and professional pursuits. They know the value of a hard-earned dollar. They are deeply concerned over the failure of our Federal administration to face our international and domestic problems realistically. I urge you to read this letter carefully. It will interest you and give you much food for thought. I hope it will have weight with all of us as we seek to cut down our overgrown bureaucracy to proper size.

THE GRAY CORNER CLUB,
Springfield, Mass., June 14, 1947.

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Like all members of legislative bodies, in these times of so many controversial issues, you are probably deluged with correspondence from organizations and individuals, all seeking your support either for or against specific proposals now being considered by your body. We know that it is physically impossible for you to read and answer all of your mail. It did seem to us, however, that it might be interesting to you to get the viewpoint of a group of men who have only one interest in the activities of the National Congress, and that is the preservation of the ideals which we fear are slowly but surely slipping away from us.

The Gray Corner Club is a social and civic community group, composed of about 175 ordinary citizens from many walks of life, and both political parties, including salesmen, small businessmen, employees of insurance companies, banks, factories, and others, and a few members of the medical and legal professions. We have been meeting once each week for several years, and being practical men, with an inherent love of democracy as it was preached to us during our school years, we have become disturbed, and more recently, alarmed at the complacent acceptance by the people of our great country of conditions which, in our opinion, are gradually leading us into a feeling of dependence on Government which history has proven can only mean the end of democracy.

We are writing to you, therefore, to express some of the thoughts which are in the minds of the members of our club, and which are greatly responsible for the subconscious feeling of unrest and uncertainty, and in many cases, actual fear, which has gripped the minds of so many people during the past few years. We will all agree that the unsettled foreign situation, with the possibility of another war, plus the horrible potentialities of the atomic bomb, are disturbing factors, and these, coupled with the domestic uncertainties, have created an inner anxiety which has contributed greatly to the abnormal number of untimely deaths of so many men between the ages of 45 and 55. It would be too much to expect any one man to solve all of our problems with a wave of a magic wand, but we would like you to know the impressions which we have formed, as ordinary every-day citizens. Probably these same thoughts are in the minds of many other men and women, who do not take the time to place them on paper and forward them to their Representatives.

It has always been our feeling that, in America, all governments were created to serve the people, and that the Federal Government in particular, in conformance with the expressed reasons for its creation, can only be justified insofar as it protects the rights of our citizens expressed in the Constitution of the United States, and in the performance of those functions which the States could not undertake individually, such as the raising of an Army and a Navy, the establishment of a postal system, the coining of currency, and similar functions. We now find the Federal Government engaged in about every activity performed by the States, partly as a result of the impetus given by the United States Supreme Court, in its interpretation of "interstate commerce." Since that decision, Federal agencies have multiplied to such an extent that about every pursuit in which a person is engaged is subject to control from Washington, so that we now have a situation where everyone, even States and their political subdivisions, must look to the National Government for aid or sanction, which is contrary to both the expressed clauses and the spirit of the Constitution, in view of the fact that the United States Government has only those powers which were delegated to it by the States, and is subject to their limitations. We know what has happened in Germany, Italy, and Russia by the centralization of power in a national government, and, while some of our social benefits were necessary, in many cases Federal services are a duplication of State functions, and, although helpful, only tend to build up power in a central agency, and are luxuries which we cannot afford, with potential bankruptcy staring us in the face.

It seems to us that the time is here when we must choose between ultimate totalitarianism and government by the people, and, although the step would be drastic, we see no other course but to eliminate all Federal agencies except those absolutely necessary to carry out the original duties imposed upon the Government of the United States by the Constitution. There is no in-between course. With a national debt of more than a quarter of a trillion dollars, we cannot afford any but the most vital of Federal services. The anticipated cut of from four to six billion dollars from a budget of thirty-seven billions will not even make an impression.

We are not seeking tax reductions, at least while we have such a staggering debt, but we cannot understand how the Congress so humbly acquiesced, in a way, to the proposal of the Communist Party that the income of any individual be limited to $25,000 per year. It is true that such a statute was not enacted in express language, but the present

income tax rates have accomplished pretty nearly what the Communists wanted. The theory of "ability to pay" is acceptable, provided it is not carried to a point near confiscation, but when a system makes it impossible for a man with ingenuity and ambition to become financially independent, and discourages investment in those enterprises with some risk, because of the small net return possible, while encouraging the placing of funds only in safe bonds with a small return, that system is destroying the spirit of venture which alone made America the greatest producer of industrial products in the world. None of the members of our club are affected by the high surtax rates, as we are all men of moderate income, but we cannot understand how any tax of more than 50 percent of a person's income, no matter how great, can be justified under any theory, especially when advocated by the Communist Party, as part of its general leveling-off policy. Our confiscatory tax laws are greatly responsible for the loss of the incentive which prompted the creation of so many of our great industrial plants.

We see an unhealthy situation in the loss of that old New England thrift and the loss of the hereditary distaste of public aid of any description, brought about by the feeling that the Government will take care of everyone. People in that frame of mind are ripe for socialism, the first step toward communism.

The most disturbing situation is our domestic economy. We all realize that we never cured the last depression. It was merely interrupted by the war, and great public war expenditures. There were just as many people out of legitimate employment in 1940 as in 1932, and the only reason for the present so-called prosperity is the demand for civilian goods the production of which was suspended during the four war years. When the supply reaches the point where commodities are readily obtainable, we are bound to revert to the conditions of 1940, with even a greater number of unemployed, because of the advances made in methods and speed of production, brought about by the war necessity. When this happens, and it will apparently occur within a year, from present trade and inventory indications, we will be faced with twelve or fifteen million men and women out of work, all looking to Washington for another public works program. With the loss of income tax revenue from these unemployed, and from the industries which are now being taxed on great profits, it will be impossible to meet the demands of an inflated Federal budget, and, sooner or later, the Government will be forced to extend the time for payment of bonds coming due. That will be a perfect set-up for some crusader to tell the people that, unless they want another 9 years of depression and misery, it will be necessary to regiment the assets of the Nation, and take over the industries, farms, public utilities, and other facilities, and institute a planned economy, so that all will be guaranteed a place to sleep, and plenty to eat, under Government supervision. This sounds fantastic today, but with the frame of mind of our people, it is far from impossible, especially if the credit of the Nation is lost. We will then be in the middle of communism, without even having an opportunity to express ourselves on the question of its acceptance, minus, of course, the right to control births and deaths in the name of the State.

We could survive financial chaos, and even Federal bankruptcy, but not and retain the freedom which we up here in New England cherish so dearly. We are all practical men, and the thoughts expressed herein are our own. There are no economists in our organization, to distort our minds by impractical theories. This picture is indeed gloomy, and we would like very much to have someone show us where we are wrong. It would be a great relief.

All these problems add up to one conclusion—too much government, National, State, and local. We can solve our State and local problems in our own way, but the National Government is too far removed from the local community for our voices to be heard. It has grown to such a size and complexity that it is out of our reach, but is still constantly stretching its arms out farther and farther, like an octopus, gathering in everything within its power. We see no chance of stemming this apparent lust for power, excepting by you, our elected representatives, stopping the spread of central government, and returning to constitutional government by the States, not merely to conform to the Constitution itself, but for the practical reason that any other course will most certainly lead to the loss of that liberty which Patrick Henry said he would rather die than lose.

Thomas Jefferson once made a remark which is most appropriate at this time: "That government is best which governs least." There is a lesson in that statement for all of us.

If you can spare a little time from your busy program, we would appreciate your comments on this letter.

Yours very truly,

THE GRAY CORNER CLUB,
By THOMAS T. GRAY, *President*.

The forwarding of this communication was approved by a unanimous vote of the members present and voting at our last meeting.

Plight of the Navaho Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Arizona Republic of June 9, 1947:

PLIGHT OF THE NAVAHO INDIANS

TUBA CITY, June 9.—Rising food and clothing prices and a diminishing postwar demand for fine merchandise they create are wreaking economic disaster upon Arizona's Navaho, says Ed Kerley, proprietor of a Tuba City trading post, who was born and reared in the western part of this 16,000,000-acre Indian reservation.

Hard times already have hit the reservation.

Today the Navaho are spending their "buttons." And a big storage case in Kerley's trading post contains the greatest amount of pawn his firm ever has accumulated.

The "buttons" are United States coins, generally dimes or quarters, with which the Navaho long has adorned his bright clothes. Today these "buttons," distinguishable by the small eye soldered to one side of each coin, are turning up in trading-post tills.

The pawn is the Indian's finest jewelry—belts, bracelets, earrings, chiefly family heirlooms passed down from generation to generation. It is the red man's bank account, for it always has a pawn value at the trading post.

But it generally is to be redeemed within 6 months, and at some trading posts prized articles of pawn already are being moved into dead displays, which mean the Indians haven't been able to redeem them.

In this area the wool season virtually is at end, and many a Navaho whose livelihood depends on the sheep herds cannot meet trading-post bills accumulated through the winter.

Congressional delay in passing a support bill for wool costs the red man plenty. Few could hold their clip to take advantage of possible price rises.

Trader Kerley pointed out that at this time last year the Indian received $4.25 for a small saddle blanket, about 30 by 30 inches in size. For that he could obtain 25 pounds of flour, 5 pounds of sugar, some baking powder, lard, a can of coffee, and a little candy for the kids.

The trader found a ready sale for the saddle blanket.

Today the same blanket brings the Indian only $3, and they're piling up in the trading posts. The $3 buys little more than a sack of flour and a can of coffee.

Cloth for the squaw's bright skirts, which used to sell for 20 cents per yard, now is 50 cents. Factory-made blankets the women wear over their shoulders and wrap about themselves are up from $15 to $23; were $27.50. Even common levis almost have doubled in price, from $2 to $3.75.

Many Indians ride their horses bareback, for a saddle once available for $65 now costs $175.

A year ago there still were some lucrative jobs off the reservation for the Navaho, though not as many as during war years.

A year ago the Navaho still bought some luxuries at the trading posts. Today the high-paying, off-reservation jobs are gone. Kerley says the Navaho now debate about buying some essentials.

What is the answer to the difficulties now confronting the Navaho?

Kerley frankly admits he doesn't know. He says the ranges need rain to grow more grass for lambs which now dot the sheep flocks, lambs which will be salable sheep this fall.

He insists there is a dire need for educational and hospital facilities for which the Navaho are pleading.

Many of the young Navaho who served valiantly during World War II in America's armed forces are reenlisting, says Kerley, after coming home to find they no longer can exist on the reservation.

When Kerley arrived at his reservation store and home 18 months ago, after serving with the Twenty-fourth Division, the stock of Indian "pawn" at the trading post represented $2,077 in loans. That was in midwinter when the "pawn" stock usually is heavy.

Today, at a time when most Indians have sold their wool and paid their bills, the pawn at the Kerley store represents more than $8,000 in loans. Some $1,600 in pawn is dead.

Kerley mentioned Johnnie Walker, a Navaho sheepman once considered by his tribesmen wealthy because he and his sister owned 3,000 sheep and supported all of their less fortunate relatives. Government stock reductions have slashed the flock to 750 sheep, still a large number compared to the sheep ranged by thousands of other Navaho.

Walker paid off $250 in bills at Kerley's store after selling his wool clip last year, the trader said. But this year his bills totaled $980.77, some of which resulted from illness in his family, and his wool brought him only $864.

Both Kerley and his chief trading post assistant, Maxwell Yazzie, who is a member of the Navaho Tribal Council, are critical of the Government's educational and health programs.

They say Tuba City has a boarding school which has been forced to turn down more pupils than it accepts. Yazzie declares his youngsters get to school 2 days before the opening each fall in order to be assured of enrollment. Many schools have been closed.

One at a nearby farming village has been closed since the war and the building is used for Boy Scout picnics, Kerley and Yazzie say.

They estimate as high as 75 percent of the children in their part of the reservation are unable to get into schools.

They say there are good hospital facilities at Tuba City, but they are inadequate for the area they must serve and even now there is a threat to transfer the one doctor on duty.

Navaho in the Tuba City area, declare Kerley and Yazzie, must get sick on schedule because the one doctor can't work at all hours, and not too far from the hospital because many must be sent back to their homes after being treated since there is no bed space for them.

Address of Thomas D. Russell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the RECORD a copy of an address delivered by Thomas D. Russell, president of the Russell Manufacturing Co., of Alexander City, Ala. This address was broadcast recently over radio station WRFS at Alexander City. Mr. Russell is one of the outstanding industrialists of the South, and I am quite sure his address will be interesting reading to all Members of Congress.

The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to have the opportunity of talking to you on this Sunday afternoon. Today I am opening the regular weekly program which will be put on each Sunday at this hour by the men and women who make up the Russell Manufacturing Co. During the course of these programs we hope to acquaint you with our company—its people—its products, and the things for which it stands. We will endeavor to make these programs interesting and entertaining. We sincerely hope that our friends and associates will enjoy each and every broadcast.

Today I am going to outline to you briefly the history and policy of our company. I shall not attempt to go into detailed discussion on any of the subjects which I bring up. Later in this series of broadcasts we will deal more fully with each and every phase of our business.

The Russell Manufacturing Co. was started in 1902 by the late Benjamin Russell. A half-dozen knitting machines and a one-room wooden building were the humble beginning of our company. Through hard work, foresight, and careful planning this small plant has grown steadily each year, until now our company has seven large plants, employing over 2,000 men and women. This steady growth has been made possible by the fact that it has always been the policy of this company to plow the profits which we made in good years back into the business. Thus, throughout the years, these profits have created more jobs for more people. In good times the profits are use for expansion and to provide a backlog to tide us over the bad times which always come along. However, during good times and bad times, these mills have always kept running and growing, providing a living directly or indirectly, for many thousands of people in this section.

The foremost task of these mills is to see that they continue running and growing. At the present time our company is prosperous and in robust health, as is this whole community. Much of the prosperity of this community and section is due directly to the prosperity of our mills. It is vitally important to our employees and to the citizens of Alexander City that we continue to be prosperous and healthy, for as we prosper so do you.

It is up to our management to plan for the future—to administer the mill affairs wisely and efficiently—to sell our goods advantageously. It is the duty of the men and women who operate our machinery to see that their machines run efficiently and turn out high quality materials. This task requires teamwork between management and employees, between each group of employees, and the cooperation of this entire community and section with our management and employees to keep the wheels turning. No one man—no group of men, can create an organization such as ours. The best efforts of all, working together in harmony, are necessary to safeguard our future.

That is one phase of our business—profits and production. They are very important. Yet, equally important to us is another side of our business. The human side—relations with our employees. We want our people to be happy. We take a great deal of pains and go to a lot of expense to bring about this state-of-mind throughout our mills. We firmly believe in fair play. We respect the rights and feelings of our people. We are proud of the people who run our mills. We are proud of their loyalty and cooperation. This, we shall always try to deserve. Loyalty is one commodity which cannot be bought with money. It must be earned by performance. I could talk at length of fair play, loyalty, and cooperation but such talk would be empty words unless I and my associates back up this talk by acts and deeds, and unless we earnestly and sincerely believe in these things—unless we practice them ourselves every hour of the day. Honesty, kindness, sincerity, fairness are not finery which is to be worn only on Sundays and special occasions. They are everyday working clothes to be worn at all times.

In order to sell our products in a competitive market, our mills must make efficient use of their men and women employees. At the same time we, who represent management, must see to it that working conditions are healthy and pleasant, that wages are fair and job loads are not burdensome. It is up to us to look after the health and welfare of our people. We want our employees to be happy in their work and satisfied with their jobs. These two things go hand in hand. A happy worker is a good worker and a good worker is a happy worker.

The people who work in the Russell mills are a fine group by any standard. They come to work in our mills from all over this section. They are your friends, they are your neighbors, they are your relatives, and they are your customers. In short, they are a cross-section of all the people in this city and surrounding territory. They are self-respecting, honest men and women who are proud of their skill and their job and of the company for which they work. You may be assured that their company is equally proud of them.

You read and hear a great deal about human relations, capital and labor, worker's right, big business, and a lot of other catch phrases. Here in the Russell mills we are not bothered with all this economic bunk. We have neither the time nor inclination to get involved in economic theories and propaganda. We just go along from day to day, working together and being friendly and pleasant about the whole thing. We respect each other and like each other and if there is any better way of getting along, we haven't found it yet. This may explain why we all get along so well together, why we do such good work and continue to run successfully.

Here in these mills we make a variety of products. Cotton yarns, which we spin from cotton grown by Alabama farmers; cotton cloth, which we weave from these yarns; knit cloth, which is knitted from our yarns. This knit cloth is cut and sewed into underwear and athletic wearing apparel. In our finishing and dye plants, we dye the yarns and finish and sanforize the cloth which we make. When the manufacturing process is finished, we pack our products in attractive packages and ship them to our customers all over the world.

In order to sell our goods we have to have an elaborate sales organization. This is a part of our organization that you people here in Alexander City do not see. Our salesmen are scattered far and wide, and yet they are just as much a part of our company as each of you here in Alexander City. Without our sales force functioning properly and doing a good job every day, our warehouse would soon be crowded with finished goods and we would have to close down.

Our sales start and end here with our main office in Alexander City. Sales managers decide what we are to make and sell, and the price and delivery. They contact our sales offices in New York, Chicago, Nashville, Dallas, Los Angeles, Seattle, Baltimore, and other places where we maintain salesmen. These officers get in touch with our customers and sell our manufactured products. We are on very friendly terms with our customers. We have been dealing with them for many years. They know us and know our products, and we know them. They are our friends. Over the years we have built up a name that is known and respected wherever cotton goods are sold. We are proud of our reputation for good products and for fairness and honesty in our dealings, and you too may be proud that your company is one of the leaders in the textile industry. It is important to you as well as to us. It is important to every citizen in Alexander City because it means that our goods will sell at fair prices and that in turn means that our mills will run and keep on running just as long as we continue to merit our reputation in the markets.

Our products go to the largest buying houses in the United States. Practically all the large jobbers, mail-order houses, sporting-goods dealers, converters, and dress and shirt manufacturers are included in our list of customers. Each year we manufacture and sell millions of garments and millions of yards of cloth, and believe me, that takes lots of selling.

Our company is not a one-man organization. As president, I am the one responsible for everything that goes on. Working with me are a number of men who have full authority to run their own departments, men who have knowledge, judgment, and ability to do their job and do it well. They are willing to assume full responsibility and at all times consult with me and with each other. Every policy, every new method, every important decision that is made is discussed fully and thoroughly by all parties interested. When we arrive at decisions, it is the result of the combined knowledge and wisdom of this group and rarely ever the decision of any one man. We have no individual stars. Our team is made up of experts who know and practice teamwork and who are deeply and sincerely interested in the welfare of our company and this community. In picking men, we do not want any shining lights, we want men who know how and will work with each other.

All of these factors go into the make-up of the Russell mills. They are important to me and they are important to the people who work in the mills and to the business people of Alexander City. Without the necessary qualifications which I have named, we would be just another cotton mill where a bunch of people have a job in good times and go without in bad. Just another cotton

mill which is not concerned with the welfare of the people in the town in which it operates. A mill where all vital parts function but from which human kindness is missing. We are not just another cotton mill—we are an organization devoted to the welfare of the people who work with us and to the upbuilding of Alexander City.

Briefly, ladies and gentlemen, this is the Russell Manufacturing Co., its policies, its position, and its purposes.

Terminal-Leave-Pay Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, there was recently introduced in the Florida State Legislature by Senator Leaird, of Broward County, Fla., Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 7. It was a resolution requesting the United States House of Representatives to pass legislation providing that terminal-leave-pay bonds can be negotiated and cashed. I shall not take the time of the House to read the resolution in its entirety, but suffice it to say that the Florida State Legislature unanimously requested the House of Representatives to adopt H. R. 4051 introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, DWIGHT ROGERS.

There has been much said on the floor of this House about help to veterans. He has been given priority in the matter of obtaining homes, rooms, job preference, and training, but as was so well said here the other day, priority without the financial ability or opportunity to take advantage of it, is merely a worthless, hollow, gesture. All of us agree it is a matter of rights and justice for enlisted veterans to cash their terminal-leave-pay bonds. I am certain that everyone of us, if asked the specific question, Do we favor cashing the terminal-leave pay? would respond in the affirmative and yet this Congress has not yet done anything to effectuate this desire. I read in the papers this morning that we are to adjourn on July 28, which means that less than 5 weeks remain for us to do something about this vital piece of legislation.

There is a petition now on the Speaker's desk awaiting signatures of 218 Members. Certainly those of us who sincerely believe that the veteran is entitled to his cash or to negotiate his leave bonds, should now sign that petition if he has not already done so. H. R. 4015 does not require the expenditure of any additional money on the part of the Federal Government; it does not necessitate any additional Government personnel; it merely, in a practical way, remedies a long-existing injustice by permitting the veteran who holds a terminal-leave-pay bond to use it by selling it or trading it as a negotiable instrument. Here is an opportunity for us to stop these verbal protestations of interest in the veteran and to really do something for him.

I should like to here introduce the resolution adopted by the Florida State Legislature:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

Resolution requesting the United States House of Representatives to pass legislation providing for cash payment to veterans for terminal-leave pay

Whereas there was enacted by the Congress of the United States, H. R. 4051, which bill was introduced by a former member of this legislature, DWIGHT L. ROGERS, granting and providing for terminal-leave pay for the enlisted personnel of the armed forces; and

Whereas at the time said bill was introduced by the said DWIGHT L. ROGERS, it provided for a lump-sum, cash payment for terminal-leave pay and it was so passed by the House of Representatives; however, said bill was amended in the Senate to provide for the payment of terminal-leave pay in 5-year bonds bearing interest at the rate of 2½ percent per annum; and

Whereas it was necessary on the part of the House to agree to the amendment as proposed by the Senate in order that any legislation might be passed for terminal-leave pay; and

Whereas cash payment was made to all commissioned officers for terminal-leave pay and in order to do away with this unfair and discriminatory treatment between commissioned officers and noncommissioned officers and privates, said DWIGHT L. ROGERS, Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Florida, introduced on January 3, 1947, in the Eightieth Congress, H. R. 3, providing that terminal-leave pay bonds shall be redeemable in cash upon the application of any veteran holding said bonds and that hereafter veterans can request cash payment instead of bonds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida (the house of representatives concurring), That it is the desire of this body that the veterans should be permitted to have their bonds payable in cash upon application filed by the holders of any bond and that hereafter cash payment should be made when requested; and

That the Representatives in Congress from Florida be urged to support said H. R. 3, or similar legislation which would provide for cash payment to said veterans for terminal leave pay; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the clerk of this house to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Florida and that a copy by sent to the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Post of June 17, 1947:

HIGH TAX HARRY

A famous character in American history was a gentleman known to his friends as "Light Horse Harry." He now has a successor in the title (no hero) who, we think, should be known as High Tax Harry. Of course, we mean Harry Truman, President of the United States.

For Mr. Truman has vetoed the first tax-relief bill given to 48,000,000 American taxpayers in many years. He has vetoed it on the specious grounds that the Government ought to save up a surplus now through high taxes in order to pay something on the national debt.

He has completely ignored the fact that a much more effective way of paying off the national debt would be to accumulate a surplus by reducing our daily governmental expenditures. This he is opposed to.

So we think that the name High Tax Harry is fair and truthful in describing the personal policies of our President. He believes in maintaining taxes at their present high repressive level and he believes in spending money like a drunken sailor. All this talk about reducing the national debt or making our Government's financial policies sound and conservative is specious nonsense because the very basis of sound and conservative policies is to reduce reckless spending and this the President refuses to do.

It sounds very pious, this talk about making payments on our national debt but it doesn't seem so pious in practice when one examines the President's method, which is to put 48,000,000 taxpayers through the wringer four times a year while he goes on spending money for a thousand and one unnecessary projects at a fabulous rate.

We think the Republicans who were elected on a platform calling for a reduction of taxes have a case which will carry the next Presidential election without fail, if they explain it to the people just as it is. The President spoke at Kansas City the other day and in that speech he did not advocate economy in Government. On the contrary, he advocated every costly project that his imagination could conjure up. He has gone back to the old policy once favored by the late Harry Hopkins:

"We propose to spend and spend and tax and tax and elect and elect."

Where the President's foot slipped was on the last part of the program. For the people understand this kind of business now and they are sick and tired of being endlessly taxed for expenditures they do not approve of, for wastes in Government of which they highly disapprove.

"High Tax Harry" has done it. He has sealed his own political doom for 1948.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the secretary of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York:

JUNE 18, 1947.

Mr. THOMAS JEFFERSON MILEY,
Commerce and Industry Association, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MILEY: I note that the Commerce and Industry Association has gone on record as opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project. Was there a full and complete discussion among the members of the association before this decision was reached? If not, I think it would be advisable to have such a discussion so that the members might express their views on this momentous project.

I am one of those who favors the St. Lawrence seaway. Frankly I do not think the reasons for the construction of this water seaway has been fully brought home to the rank and file of your members. The construction cost and maintenance could be fully recouped by appropriate tolls. General Marshall, former Chief of Staff, and present Secretary of State, supports this plan of self-liquidation.

I am sure your members have not been adequately told the benefits of this waterway to our national defense. The project would make possible the building and repairing of many of our oceangoing ships in the secure area of the Great Lakes. Vessels of the type of our Liberty and Victory ships could be constructed inland, at shipyards on the Great Lakes. Secondly, there would be developed a new and important line of communication into the heart of the industrial area of the United States, complementing the existent rail transportation. Nor would New York's harbor suffer. There is plenty of commerce and tonnage for all ports. Our international trade is growing and will continue to grow.

Thirdly, this project would create a tremendous source of cheap electric power, comparable to the power developed by TVA. Industry throughout the northeastern area would benefit.

Fourthly and lastly, the building of this waterway has the joint support of the Governments of Canada and the United States, primarily because it would be for the security not only of Canada and the United States, but for the security of North America.

There is, as you know, a United States-Canada permanent Joint Board of Defense, and this Board has considered the significance of the St. Lawrence seaway, and has recognized that this deep-water-navigation road from the sea to the heart of the continent would greatly increase the defense potentials of the two countries.

There are many other reasons that actuate me in espousing this cause. Because of the importance of the Commerce and Industry Association, you will agree that its members should have at first hand, complete and detailed information concerning the pros and and cons of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Please let me hear from you on this important matter.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

The Story of Appropriations by the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has already approved measures to save $4,483,916,796 in the cost of operating the Federal Government. Indications are this large total will be increased substantially before Congress adjourns.

The gratifying economy record of the Republican House of Representatives was made through wise reductions in President Truman's colossal budget estimates for spendthrift bureaucrats, repeals of appropriations, and recoveries into the Federal Treasury.

Reductions in departmental appropriations estimates accounted chiefly for one group of $3,701,326,029 in savings effected by the House. We rescinded $2,176,023,325 in appropriations on the ground they were unnecessary and at least $500,000,000 of these rescissions was set up as an expenditure in the budget and in addition, the House made savings in appropriation bills for fiscal year 1947 amounting to $282,590,767.

When we Republicans organized the present Congress last January, we tackled the job of getting our Federal house in order. Confronting us were hundreds of money-spending boards, bureaus and commissions—the spawn of 14 years of Democrat misrule.

The House Appropriations Committee, aided by some of the soundest authorities on administration of government, labored hours without end to bring a semblance of order out of the chaos that had been compounded by slip-shod fiscal policies during the war.

This is merely a progress report. Much remains to be done. The Republican Congress, as guardian of the Nation's purse-strings, is keeping close watch. I am confident that we will be able to report much more progress in cutting unnecessary cost of Government during the next session of Congress.

Every Government agency is under study by appropriate committees of Congress. Their efforts for economy and efficiency would be faciliated if the executive branch would offer enthusiastic cooperation.

That cooperation the Republican majority in Congress has not yet received from President Truman and down the line in the executive branch.

The people elected a Republican Congress because they had enough of new dealism. It will be recalled that immediately after last November's elections President Truman issued a formal statement acknowledging the verdict of the people in putting Republicans in control of Congress and pledging his cooperation with the Congress.

He has not kept that solemn pledge. He has openly protested against cutting his spend-and-spend and tax-and-tax budget one dollar. His statements have been a signal to key men in executive agencies to fight every effort to lop off their unnecessary tax-eating operations.

House Democrats, taking their cue from the White House, have fought the Republican economy drive every step of the way, obviously trying to curry favor of special interest pressure groups.

Yes, the New Deal was repudiated in the last elections, but New Dealers, from the President down, are still beating the drums of spend and spend and tax and tax at their old stand.

Some real Democrats in the House have put their country above New Deal politics and have joined in voting for economy measures. I give them their just credit. But they comprise a small minority of the minority party.

The Republican Congress, in response to the will of the people, has been cutting the cost of Government in the interest of better Government and to pass along the savings to the people in the form of relief from sky-high, wartime tax rates, and to reduce the public debt.

President Truman, in a shocking abuse of the veto power, vetoed the tax-relief bill and told the people that if they spend their own money the result would be inflationary, but if the Government takes it from them and spends it the result would not be inflationary. Nonsense.

The House, with Democratic votes, sustained the veto and thus denied the people the tax relief they were entitled to have.

An important fact to remember is that the Democratic Party denied the people the tax relief they demanded as the fruit from cutting Mr. Truman's spend-and-spend budget. Voting to override the veto were 233 Republicans and 35 Democrats; against were 134 Democrats, one American-Laborite, and only two Republicans. A two-thirds majority was necessary to override the veto.

Since that tragic action by the President and his followers I have been asked by many anxious persons whether scuttling of the tax-relief bill means the end of our Republican economy efforts. My emphatic answer is, "No." The Republican Party will not let the people down.

We shall continue to fight for elimination of unnecessary governmental expenditures. The way of the economizer is difficult when faced by an administration bent on spending every dollar in sight.

The taxpayer should realize that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and that it is impossible for the Congress to prevent reckless spending, unless it has the continuous support of the American people.

And so we come to the economy record, to date, of the Republican House of Representatives. The expenditures will be reduced much more than the actual cuts in appropriations and in getting President Truman's spendthrift budget down to size.

The House of Representatives last February set as a theoretical goal to obliterate 14 years of New Deal spending psychology, a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in expenditures for 1948, and a reduction in appropriations to be expended in 1948 of $4,500,000,000.

Herewith is the bullet-proof record of the gratifying progress made, which no New Deal chairbottomers can shatter.

Since January 3, the House of Representatives has made the following cuts in President Truman's budget estimates of appropriations and repeals of appropriations and recoveries of funds into the Treasury, and has been responsible for the submission of reduced estimates through its investigatorial and hearing activities.

These all relate either to the amounts that will be received into the Treasury or what will be paid out, and effect changes in the general balance of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1948:

TABLE I

Treasury-Post Office	$897,072,750
Labor-Federal Security	73,825,520
Interior Department	134,006,907
State, Justice, and Commerce	159,645,031
War Department, Military Affairs	435,809,077
Navy Department	377,519,200
Department of Agriculture (includes repeal of $108,000,000 for 1948 of sec. 32 funds)	340,969,342
Government corporations	28,887,470

Independent offices:	
Direct cuts	$330,540,732
Additional cuts in proposed expenditures: U. S. Maritime Commission	120,900,000
Revised estimate submitted by the Budget, resulting from investigation by the Appropriations Committee:	
Veterans' Administration:	
Printing and binding	1,500,000
Pensions and compensation	269,825,000
War Assets Administration	20,750,000
	292,075,000
Additional revenue to be recovered into the Treasury from sale and charter of vessels above the amount included in budget estimates of receipts	505,075,000
Total	3,701,326,029

In addition to that, the Appropriations Committee has made rescissions and recoveries as appear in the following table (of these rescissions, at least $500,000,000, according to my information, are included in the table of expenditures which the President sent up here for 1948):

TABLE II

First deficiency	$1,011,423,325
War, military	1,100,000,000
Independent offices: Maritime Commission rescission and transfer of receipts, construction fund	108,000,000
Federal Works Agency	$5,100,000
Veterans' Administration	50,000,000
Second deficiency, National Housing Agency	2,500,000
Total	2,277,023,325

In addition to those savings, the House of Representatives has made savings in appropriation bills for funds to use during the fiscal year 1947 totaling $282,590,767, as appear in the following table:

TABLE III

	Budget estimate	As enacted	Reduction below budget
First urgent deficiency	$179,319,100	$179,645,668	—$326,568
First deficiency	3,106,566,788	2,835,161,509	271,405,279
Second deficiency	139,528,414	117,438,858	22,089,556
Second urgent deficiency	[1] 60,278,757	[1] 70,856,257	[1] —10,577,500
H. J. Res. 154 (hoof and mouth disease)	9,000,000	9,000,000	
H. J. Res. 159 (pay)	243,255,607	243,255,607	
Total	3,737,948,666	3,455,357,899	282,590,767

[1] As passed by House, pending in Senate.

Opinion of Supreme Court in Interstate Natural Gas Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Interstate Natural Gas case, released on June 16, it is imperative that immediate action be given H. R. 2185, H. R. 2235, and H. R. 2292 in the interest, not only of the producers of gas but also the consumers of gas, in States other than those where natural gas is produced.

Evidence before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce disclosed the fear of independent gas producers and oil producers who produce gas with their oil that under the interpretation of the Natural Gas Act, which the Commission presented successfully to the circuit court of appeals in the Interstate case, they might be subject to regulation of their earnings by the Federal Power Commission. It was shown that some producers of gas are deliberately boycotting interstate-market outlets, and shutting in their wells until a market for local use is available; that some are contemplating the construction in the producing areas of plants for the complete utilization of gas in the manufacture of gasoline.

In a proposed staff report released by the Commission in March 1947 and discussing section 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act with reference to the production and gathering of gas, this fear was recognized to exist; and it was stated that a continuance of the existing disturbed situation is certain to interfere with the effective performance in the public interest of the duties of both Federal and State regulatory agencies that—

> It may be expected also that unless this issue is clarified the results will be detrimental to those who consume natural gas and to the efforts of conservation authorities to prevent its waste.

In the staff report it was suggested that the Commission might by rule determine those producers which it would subject to its jurisdiction. Commission counsel, arguing the Interstate case before the Supreme Court, sought to limit the Commission's jurisdiction over producers and gatherers to those who, because of other operations, are natural-gas companies, or who do not sell their gas under arms-length contracts.

In his appearance before the committee, Chairman Smith presented that same interpretation of the act and suggested, in part, that no action be taken by the Congress looking toward an amendment of the Natural Gas Act until it could have the benefit of the Supreme Court's interpretation. He said, in response to an inquiry from one of the members of the committee, that if the Court sustained the Commission's jurisdiction in sweeping terms, supporting what he termed "inferences" from the opinions of lower courts, amendatory legislation might be appropriate.

The Supreme Court has now acted. It has sustained the Commission's jurisdiction in most sweeping terms. It has gone even beyond the views expressed by the circuit court of appeals and has disregarded the distinction which the Commission has sought to draw between the regulation of earnings from production and gathering operations of different classes of producers.

It has now apparently held that all sales of gas committed to interstate markets are under the Commission's jurisdiction. The necessary effect of this holding will be further to limit the supplies of gas available for interstate markets.

The Commission cannot pick and choose those whom it will subject to regulation. There is no discretion vested in the Commission. Nor should there be. As the assistant attorney general of Texas pointed out in his argument of the Interstate case, the Commission is required to enforce the act against all within its jurisdiction.

Under such circumstances it is clear that producers of gas will hesitate to commit their gas to interstate markets; that they will hold their gas until intrastate markets are available.

This can result only in prejudicing the interests of consumers in States other than those of production. Most pipe lines rely in great part, and some exclusively, on gas purchased from other producers for their supplies of gas. It is obvious that a withholding of gas of such producers from interstate markets will result in many instances in shortages of supplies of gas; and that even though a pipe-line company has a substantial supply of gas from its own production, prices charged consumers will necessarily be increased because of the necessity of a shorter period of amortization.

The passage of the proposed legislation is urgently needed so as to require the recognition of gas as a commodity at the place of production and permit its free movement to interstate as well as intrastate markets.

Filipino Soldiers Are Veterans and Entitled to Veterans' Benefits, But Are Now Denied Them Under First Rescission Act of 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article entitled "Filipino Soldiers Are Veterans," by Mr. Vicente Villamin, the well-known Filipino economist, and an editorial in the Washington Post pleading for justice to Filipino veterans.

There is a school of thought in our Government holding the view that those Filipinos who fought with our forces in the Philippines under a military order of our President were "in the active service of the United States Army, but not in the United States Army" and are, therefore, not entitled to veterans' benefits provided for by law.

Mr. Villamin's article upholds the contrary view, namely, that those brave and loyal Filipinos are veterans—veterans de facto, if you please—and hence should be granted full veterans' benefits. I wish to commend him for calling the attention of Congress to this matter and I urge all Members to read his lucid and logical article.

Mr. Speaker, our action or nonaction in our treatment of the Filipinos who fought under our command with such valor and gallantry is bound to have international repercussions. We must not let the Filipinos down for the sake of simple justice and our international reputation.

Mr. Villamin brings up two economic points worth considering: First, that the Philippine government did not receive lend-lease aid from us, and, second, that the Filipino participation in the war had shortened it and thus saved not only American lives but also billions of dollars.

Mr. Villamin's article and the Washington Post editorial follow:

FILIPINO SOLDIERS ARE VETERANS

(By Vicente Villamin)

The Filipinos who fought under General MacArthur have a story to tell to the American people.

In the last war there were 116,000 foreigners who joined the American Army in the United States or elsewhere. They are considered veterans and are enjoying veterans' benefits under the law. There were 400,000 Filipinos in that Army in the Philippines, but they are not considered veterans, and, therefore, not entitled to veterans' benefits, except insurance and pensions for death or disability, which are enjoyed by only a small percentage of that number.

Thus a Filipino soldier who was lucky enough to come out of the war unscathed gets nothing except the glory of having fought under the American flag made poignant by the chagrin of being read out as a veteran by postwar legalistic interpretation of his status. He is denied the benefits of the GI bill of rights, the Mustering-Out Pay Act, the Terminal Leave Act, the Six Months' Death Gratuity Act, and other acts.

The claim of the Filipino to recognition as a veteran rests on the fact that on July 26, 1941, the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and acting under the act of Congress of March 24, 1934, ordered the Philippine Army inducted in the American Army, and it was not until June 30, 1946, that it was released from under American military authority by another order of the President.

On April 27, 1942, the Attorney General held that the Philippine Army was by the President's induction order thereby placed in the "active service in the land and naval forces of the United States." This was the law until Congress, on February 18, 1946, passed the first Rescission Act, declaring that that army was not in such active service and, therefore, not entitled to veterans' benefits, with the two exceptions noted above. Since then the War Department has recommended to Congress a bill extending to Filipinos the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, which will give them their back pay.

On the induction of the Philippine Army 4 months before Pearl Harbor, the American Government assumed its expenses, development, and direction. There was no statement at that time by the President of the United States or law of Congress that suggested even faintly that they were other than soldiers in the American Army. On the contrary, they were made to understand that they were such soldiers. They were proud of it, and they fought with more zest.

When they were ordered by the President of the United States, the Filipino soldiers who by law owed allegiance to the United States could not have refused to comply. The order was as obligatory on them as the Conscription Act was on American citizens. They were roughly in the same position as the members of the National Guard, who were ordered into the Army and became veterans on honorable release. Stated in a different way, the President's order had the force and effect of a Federal statute declaring the Filipino soldiers members of the American armed forces, and that was equivalent to enlistment en masse.

The Filipino soldiers were not mercenaries or mere hired workers in uniform to be discharged summarily without benefit of veterans' rights after their combat usefulness had ceased with the war's ending, which they helped to hasten. They had acquired rights, both inherent and derivative, while serving under the American flag even as the 116,000 foreigners in the American Army had acquired veterans' benefits in full.

The British soldiers, for example, who fought with the American forces under a unified command, are in a different category. They served under an Anglo-American agreement to coordinate military operations. They were not under an order of the President of the United States or a law of the United States Congress. Clearly, therefore, they are not veterans of the American Army.

The Philippine Army lost its organic identity when it was merged in the American forces and the Philippine Government, which under the law then in force was merely a creature of the American Congress, was in temporary legal vacuum itself. These two facts were made patent at the Japanese surrender ceremonies in Tokyo Bay, where no Filipino representative was invited to sign the surrender instrument, although representatives of New Zealand, Australia, Canada, Holland, France, China, Russia, and Great Britain did sign to punctuate their victory over the enemy.

But the Filipinos were partly reconciled to that symbolic exclusion because their friend, General MacArthur, signed for Americans and for them. They were attached to America by ribbons of service and affection—an attachment so pathetic in its sincerity. And so it is hard for them to understand that the legalists in Washington should now hold that they were not in the active service of the American forces when they ask, as they now do, for veterans' recognition.

It is a fact that recognizing the Filipinos as veterans in these postwar times would cost the American Government money. But the Filipinos had saved America much more money than the cost. Let the two following considerations be taken into account in this connection:

First, General MacArthur has stated that the participation of the Filipinos in the war had shortened it considerably and saved many American lives. If it shortened the war by 50 days, it had saved the United States some $15,000,000,000 at the rate of $300,000,000 of expenditures a day.

Second, if the Philippine Army had not been inducted in the American Army 4 months before Pearl Harbor, the Philippine Government, ever loyal to the United States, would have prepared for and waged the war as a separate entity and as such it would have received billions of dollars worth of lend-lease assistance from the United States. As it was, it received no such assistance.

The Filipinos deserve to be considered veterans of the American armed forces. Strict technicality may militate against it, but equity is in its favor and fundamental policy fortifies it.

[From the Washington Post of June 17, 1947]

FILIPINO VETERANS

Few people in this country are aware, we suspect, of the shabby treatment meted out to the 400,000 Filipino veterans who were in the American Army during the war. Some months before Pearl Harbor, while the Philippine Islands were still under United States sovereignty, the President issued an order making the Filipino army a part of the American Army. Of course, this made the Filipino soldiers who constituted that army a part of our fighting forces as much as were soldiers drafted from the States, and they remained in this status until the eve of the Philippines' independence. Last year, however, Congress passed the First Rescission Act denying to Filipino veterans most of the benefits that go automatically to other veterans who were exposed to similar risks and hardships.

We can readily understand the reasoning of Congress in denying to Filipino veterans the full benefits of the so-called GI bill of rights. Since the Philippines have became a separate nation, they may be reasonably expected to assume the continuing burden of caring for injured veterans among their own people. After all, the Filipino soldiers fought for their homeland as well as for the United States. It seems to us unwarranted discrimination, however, to cut Filipino veterans off from mustering-out pay, from the benefits of the Terminal Leave Act and from back pay under the Missing Persons Act. The War Department has specifically recommended that Filipino veterans' rights under the Missing Persons Act be restored. It is one thing to leave the long-range problem of caring for disabled veterans to the new government at Manila, and quite another thing to deny to Filipinos the current benefits which they had earned as members of the American fighting forces. We cannot help thinking that if Congress reviews the situation, with full realization that these men were members of our own Army and subject to its orders, it will see that a grave injustice has been done.

The Freedom Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Attorney General before the House of Representatives Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments concerning the Freedom Train:

I am very happy that you have seen fit to inquire about the Freedom Train. This inquiry presents a welcome opportunity to set forth on the record the motives, the objectives, and the plans for what I believe to be a highly desirable program of education in good citizenship.

At the very outset, it should be unmistakably clear that the entire project is being conducted, wholly managed, and financed entirely by the American Heritage Foundation formed by a group of public-spirited citizens who seek the development of a greater awareness of the blessings of American democracy and thus the creation of a higher standard of citizenship. These men and women were

chosen for this responsibility without any regard for their political persuasion. Each of them is moved by a patriotic concern for the welfare of our country. As a group, they represent a cross-section of leadership in many phases of industrial and civic endeavor.

These citizens have organized an educational foundation chartered in the District of Columbia known as the American Heritage Foundation. I am leaving with the committee a copy of the certificate of incorporation of the American Heritage Foundation. The governing body of this organization consists of a board of trustees. A list of the members of the board of trustees is attached to this statement and marked exhibit A. I am also submitting a statement of the objectives and program of this foundation (as presented at a conference held at the White House on May 22, 1947). Mr. Thomas D'A. Brophy, president of the foundation is present to furnish any information about the program of the foundation which the committee desires.

As the Attorney General of the United States, I have been concerned with the increase in lawlessness, the development of a tacit acceptance of American institutions, and the threatening danger of subversive activity. I am sure that these aspects of the current American scene have been of concern to you and other thinking Americans. As the chief law-enforcement officer of the Federal Government, I have an additional and special responsibility in this regard.

Because of this, early in 1946 I sought for an instrumentality that could reawaken in the mind and the heart of the American people a greater appreciation of our American heritage. If this could be accomplished, we would be able to strengthen the spiritual resources of our people and immunize the American body politic against the germs of subversive propaganda.

It was obvious that any educational program designed to meet this end would be effective to the degree that it made a dramatic impact upon the minds of the American people. In other words, something to spearhead the program was needed. This led to the idea of a special exhibit train to carry a collection of the original American documents on which our liberties are based. After canvassing the field, we found, insofar as the Federal Government was concerned, that the documents most desired are in the custody of the Library of Congress and the National Archives. In this connection, there is ample authority for these agencies to make such documents available. With respect to the National Archives, such authority is conferred by the act of June 19, 1934 (44 U. S. C. 300c), while the act of February 19, 1897 (2 U. S. C. 136), vests similar authority in the Librarian of Congress. I enlisted and secured the cooperation of these and other agencies.

The visit of such an exhibit to any community would be a significant event. There are millions of our fellow citizens who may never have an opportunity to see these priceless treasures of our heritage. The very fact of the visit will inspire appropriate coverage by the newspapers, radio, magazines, and other agencies of public information and offer them an opportunity to carry a beneficial message to the public. With this assistance, the exhibit train can become the spearhead for an effective program of education in the principles and ideals of our democracy. As the idea developed into a reality, someone labeled the exhibit the "Freedom Train," and this apt title has since been adopted. From the very beginning I felt that such a program should be handled by private citizens rather than the Government itself. It could be most effective if it became a spontaneous citizens' movement for rededication to American institutions—not just a Government project.

With this in mind, I approached some patriotic and distinguished citizens with the suggestion that they undertake to organize the program. This has been done. The project has been in the process of development and expansion for more than a year. As they enlisted the support of other persons, the group decided that the program should be handled by a patriotic nonprofit corporation to be chartered under the provisions of chapter VI of title 29 of the District of Columbia Code. On February 14, 1947, a certificate of incorporation for the American Heritage Foundation was filed pursuant to that law. Thereafter, from suggestions made by Mr. Winthrop W. Aldrich, Mr. Thomas D'A. Brophy, and myself, 34 individuals were invited to serve as the board of trustees for the American Heritage Foundation. On May 15, 1947, the trustees met in New York and elected the following officers: Mr. Aldrich as chairman of the board of trustees; William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, as vice chairman; Robert G. Sproul, president of the University of California, as vice chairman; Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, as vice chairman; Mr. Brophy as president; and Louis A. Novins as vice president and secretary. The entire management and direction of the program has since been in the hands of the officers and trustees of the foundation.

I have been delighted with the enthusiasm that the project has inspired and with the remarkable progress that has been made. I am sure you will agree that the program, as outlined in the accompanying brochure, represents a most ingenious development of the original concept and offers a stimulating program of rededication for the American public. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the devotion and zeal which the officers and trustees of the American Heritage Foundation have given to the project. They deserve the gratitude of all Americans concerned with the welfare of our country.

As stated above, the complete management and direction of the affairs of the foundation and the operation of the program has been vested in the officers and trustees of the foundation. The foundation is employing a staff of competent persons to execute the program. Members of the staff will accompany the train and will precede it for the purpose of making all necessary arrangements for the fullest participation by each community on the itinerary. Their duties and responsibilities will be those consistent with the proper development of community programs of rededication. They will endeavor to obtain the maximum educational benefit from the message of democracy carried by the Freedom Train.

Every item of expenditure for this project will be financed by the American Heritage Foundation. It should be noted in addition that a vast amount of time, space, and talent will be voluntarily contributed to the program by patriotic individuals and organizations. It is anticipated that the funds required will be raised from contributions by individuals, corporations, labor unions, and every type of civic, fraternal, veterans', and community organization. The trustees hope that the budget of the foundation will be financed by the broadest kind of public participation. The Department of Justice has no funds appropriated for this purpose and therefore will not contribute any financial assistance whatsoever to this project.

It is expected that the Freedom Train will visit approximately 300 communities in 48 States during the period of a year commencing on September 17, 1947. The list of communities has been compiled upon the principle of trying to visit at least three cities in each State together with other larger centers of population so as to reach the largest number of people. The practical limitation upon the number of communities to be visited is that the foundation has set up its budget with the objective of operating the program for only 1 year. In each community visited, this great collection of documents will be exhibited to the public without charge. Under the present plans of the foundation, the appearance of the train in a particular community will provide the basis for a community-wide program of rededication to the ideals and institutions of America. It is planned that schools and civic and patriotic groups will participate in these programs. The governor of each State and the mayor of each city on the Freedom Train itinerary will be asked to sponsor the local program within his jurisdiction. Each will be asked to appoint a citizens' committee to be responsible for all the activity within his respective area. Thus, the broadest possible sponsorship will be developed.

The documents to be carried on the Freedom Train will be selected from a list suggested by a group of experts from the National Archives, the Library of Congress, and other authoritative sources. The foundation will endeavor to exhibit an impressive collection of the significant landmarks of our American history. Each document will be a precious heirloom accepted by all of the American people as deserving of universal reverence.

The final list of the documents has not yet been approved by the trustees of the foundation, however. I am leaving with the committee a list of the documents now being considered for exhibition on the Freedom Train. The list was copied upon the basis of advice and suggestions of experts from the Library of Congress and the National Archives, Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach, the well-known specialist and dealer in such documents, Donald Culross Peattie, writer and editor, and others. The Library of Congress felt that the signed official copies of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence should not be placed on the train. They will not be, but contemporary original drafts will be included. On the other hand, various individuals have made unsolicited offers to lend documents for the exhibit, and some of them have been accepted.

Apart from securing the assistance of other Government agencies, the role of the Department of Justice is a limited one. I am assuming responsibility for the physical custody and safeguarding of the documents involved. I am being assisted in this respect by the Marine Corps which, by direction of the Secretary of the Navy, has undertaken to maintain on the train at all times a small guard of marines. In addition, they will cooperate with local fire and police officials for additional protective measures.

Extraordinary mechanical precautions are being taken for the physical protection of the documents. The three exhibit cars are being reconstructed from three cars donated by the Pennsylvania Railroad. The cars have been stripped down to the steel shells, the windows have been sealed over with welded steel plates on both inside and outside, the steel floors have been reinforced and steel ceilings have been doubled. Steel revetments will substantially strengthen the cars against stress and strain. The understructures of the cars have been completely renewed. Only fireproof or fire-resistant materials are to be used in the decoration of the cars. Thus, the cars containing the documents will in effect be traveling vaults. Special temperature and humidity controls will be installed to preserve all inks and paper. Each car will be equipped with automatic fire-fighting equipment of a carbon-dioxide type especially suitable for the protection of documents. Furthermore, the train will travel at low speeds and, usually, for short distances. The document cars will also be protected from shock by a baggage car on one end and three personnel cars on the other. The documents themselves will be exhibited behind heavy layers of special plastic and glass embedded in steel cases. The protection arrangements are subject to the approval of the experts of the Library of Con-

gress and of the National Archives, who are being constantly consulted.

The program will definitely start on September 17 from Philadelphia on the occasion of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the signing of the Constitution. I am sure you will agree that this is a most fitting time to launch such a program. This project of the American Heritage Foundation will truly attract Nation-wide interest. It invites participation by all Americans.

EXHIBIT A

THE AMERICAN HERITAGE FOUNDATION

Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the board of trustees; William Green, vice chairman; Robert G. Sproul, vice chairman; Philip Murray, vice chairman; Thomas D'A. Brophy, president; Louis A. Novins, vice president and secretary.

Board of trustees: Winthrop W. Aldrich, William D. Askren, Barney Balaban, Chester I. Barnard, Thomas D'A. Brophy, John S. Burke, C. Donald Dallas, John W. Davis, Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, William Green, Paul G. Hoffman, Eric A. Johnston, Harry T. Kendall, Robert H. Lehman, Charles Luckman, Timothy A. McInerny, Philip Murray, Reinhold Niebuhr, Louis A. Novins, Irving S. Olds, Mrs. Robert P. Patterson, Edwin W. Pauley, Samuel F. Pryor, Paul Scott, Felix T. Smith, McGregor Smith, Robert G. Sproul, Robert L. Thornton, Leroy A. Van Bomel, DeWitt Wallace, Edwin L. Weisl, Charles E. Wilson, Robert E. Wilson, and James W. Young.

Message Broadcast From the National Museum at Meeting of Washington Art Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message, broadcast from the National Museum at a meeting of the Washington Art Committee by Madam Martins, wife of the Ambassador of Brazil:

My fellow artists, ladies, and gentlemen, my message is a confession of faith in a mission of peace to which we can mostly contribute as an inspiration and as a stimulus, and of which we are an essential part—the mission of art to peace.

My message is a confession of faith in a world of freedom in which the manifold differences of race, nationalities, religions, social conditions, and opinions have full expression on the basis of free interchange. Such a world of diversified aspects, which play their adequate part without restrictions of preconceptions, privileges, or hatreds is a world of rich creative activity, not of destructive conflicts. It is our world—the world of art—for which and in which every being is good, and therefore beautiful.

First of all, contrary to common belief, art is not an appeal to delicate sentiments only; it does not request from man the best in man only; but it is an appeal to all the emotions, deep and superficial, delicate and strong, measured and unruled; it is a mobilization of all in man.

As such an absorption of everything in man—his spirit and his body, his virtues and his passions, his patience and his violence, his diligence and his intuitions—as such a universal demand upon man, it is the best program and guaranty of peace, because art is directed to creation, not to destruction; to achievement, not to domination; to expression, not to elimination; to construction and integration, not to dissociation and oppression.

The other means to peace leave some of man aside or emphasize some particular aspect of human nature.

World organization, for instance, preserves nationalism and the policy of balance of power gives relief to egotism and selfish interests.

In the second place, art is a liberation, not only for the artist, but for the admirer of art, the simple observer of artistic realizations.

To a certain extent, the contemplation of a work of art is a second creation; the sculpture, the oil painting, the song as they are touched or seen or heard impress the individual soul according to each individual nature, each individual sentiment, each individual transient mood.

Each one, educated or not to art, recreates art and by so doing grows to a higher level of human life, the level of creation. This is the Aristotelian catharsis, that superation of oneself which lifts up the visitor of an art gallery or the listener to a concert.

Now, liberation is synonimous with peace, not a stagnant peace, not a transitory peace, but a dynamic peace. It is a wrong belief, too frequently shared, to think that only war is dynamic. There is a dynamic peace, a creative peace, the peace through art.

It was by destruction of works of art, the so-called auto-da-fé, the bonfires of German-Jewish literary works as of those of a Heine, that Hitler began his nihilistic drive of conquest, domination, and destruction. Art is liberation and construction; it is by art that we must rebuild this shattered world.

What I mean is not art in the narrow sense; such narrow sense of art is a convenient example, a magnificent point of reference, a superior result of art.

What I mean is art in its universal sense, the artistic spirit, the education to art, the aesthetic contemplation, the natural inclination to regard everything in its peculiar aspect to beauty, an inclination unfortunately more congenital to orientals than to us.

After all beauty is not only in everything, but belongs to the essence of everything; beauty is transcendental.

In the third place, art is immortal, it is in a continuous process of renewal. I wish to emphasize that political regimes die, statesmen's combinations disintegrate, social theories shift from one extreme of individualism to the other extreme of totalitarianism.

Art is eternal not in its styles, not in its schools, not in its technique, not in its conceptions, nor in its subjects, but in its ideal, in its definition, in its aims, in its consequences. Art is the most solid basis of peace.

The unity of its ideal is the reason of its renewals. It guarantees peaceful transformation and adaptation to new conditions, the constant fidelity to realities, through its power of interpretation.

Political forms, social theories have limitations which point to breaks, wars, and revolutions, because to a certain extent they are rigid, lack fundamental unity, universal significance. But life changes and renders wars and revolutions necessary if governments and peoples renounce the ideal of perfection and freedom and adhere to restricted ideals and limited philosophies.

Peace through education to art is my message to you who in your jobs on your papers, in your associations, in your public or social positions, may have a decisive role in making of Washington the real center of an aesthetic peace, that is, a permanent peace, and thereby contributing to have it fulfill, as the Capital of the country, the vocation of today's America.

Fifty Million Americans Denied Tax Relief by the Veto of Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

The House had under consideration the veto message of President Truman on H. R. 1, the tax bill, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives on yesterday voted without debate on the President's veto of the tax-reduction bill. The House voted 268 to override his veto to 137 to sustain it; those in favor of this tax reduction lacked just 3 votes of overriding the veto; 233 Republicans and 35 Democrats voted to override the veto; 2 Republicans voted to sustain it. If those two Republicans had voted to override the veto, the vote would have stood 270 to 135, the necessary two-thirds.

Under the Constitution, the power of the purse—the taxing power—is vested in the Congress. The Congress is made up of the representatives of the people. The President, with his veto, made history. It is the second time that a President vetoed a tax bill. President Roosevelt, in 1943, vetoed a tax bill, and he was denounced by his majority leader in the Senate and by other Democrats, and the House and Senate both voted to override the veto.

TAX, SQUANDER, AND SPEND

The New Dealers, since 1933, have become past masters in the art of creating debts, increasing the national debt, and increasing taxes. They have never learned the art of cutting out unnecessary expenditures or in reducing debts. The statement was attributed to Harry Hopkins that the policy of the New Deal was "to tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect." Whether he made this statement or not, this is the policy that has been followed and today we find our country with the highest per capita debt and the highest per capita taxes of any of the leading countries of the world with a stable fiscal policy.

FIFTY MILLION INCOME-TAX PAYERS HIT HARD

Not many years ago, we had only a few million Federal income-tax payers. Under the New Deal, with their tax-squander-and-spend policy, we have increased this number of income-tax payers to nearly 50,000,000. It not only reached down and got practically every working man and woman and small farmer in this country, but persons of wealth and large incomes and levied a heavy tax on them so that today many persons pay 86 cents out of every dollar of their taxable incomes. The average taxpayer was willing, during the emergency of the war, to pay these heavy taxes, but the war in Europe has now been over more than 2 years and nearly 2 years in the Pacific. The President was unwilling to give tax relief to these overburdened taxpayers, both large and small, in the Nation.

The President, by the use of sophistry, in his message, would have the Nation to

believe that only a few persons would benefit substantially by this tax reduction. This tax-reduction bill gives relief as follows:

First. Thirty-percent reduction to approximately 30,000,000 in the low-income brackets. This includes all of those millions of workers, teachers, white-collar workers, and others in the low-income brackets who have on pay day a part of their wages or salaries withheld for taxes and their take-home pay thereby lessened.

Second. A 20-percent reduction to approximately 17,000,000 income-tax payers of the middle-income group.

Third. Ten and one-half percent reduction to approximately 900 persons in the higher income brackets.

Fourth. Approximately 1,500,000 people 65 years of age or over would have received an additional exemption of $500.

Those of the lower income brackets receive the highest percentage of relief and this bill gives a distinct preference to the 30,000,000 persons of the low income tax group and other persons 65 years of age or over. There is a mere handful of those who receive the reduction of only 10½ percent in the higher income brackets. Congress has shown preference here that is not shown in the State and city taxing laws. The widow, the small farmer, the owner of a small dwelling house or a small business house, pays the same rate of tax on their property as the big businessman, the big farmer, and the owner of the fine residence in the city.

The American people's income tax is not only high but they are paying tremendous sums in the way of concealed taxes on everything that they eat, wear, and consume. They are paying heavy taxes on their light, gas, oil, telephone and telegraph bills, so that today, the average common man and woman is paying out for taxes in one form or another at least 33⅓ percent of his or her wages, salaries, and other income.

The American people will refuse to continue to carry this load. Mr. Truman and his group will be driven from power in 1948 by an outraged and tax-burdened people. These 50,000,000 people can and will in no uncertain terms express their resentment. President Truman may be able, for the moment, to defeat the will of the people and the expressed will of almost two-thirds of the Congress, but, the people will have their say in November 1948.

RELIEVE OTHERS, DENY OUR OWN

The President states that because of the very heavy commitments for relief, rehabilitation, and restoration of other nations of the world that the American people must continue to carry their heavy burden of taxes. The American people have been on the giving end of this international program of war and of relief beginning with 1939. They have contributed heavily of their blood and treasure, more than $340,000,000,000, great quantities of food, clothing, and other supplies. We have stripped our country of much of its natural resources—timber, oil, and other essential commodities. We have given the blood of hundreds of thousands of our young men and women, a million or more have been injured or lost their health. We have poured into these countries approximately $18,000,000,000 since the war in wheat, corn, meat, and other foods, fuel, building materials, machinery, and many other supplies and commodities greatly needed in our own country. We have also poured into these countries money and credits.

We have shipped to foreign countries within the last year more than 12,000,000 tons of corn, wheat, and other grains, and it is claimed that we will ship approximately fourteen or fifteen million tons during the coming year, and, of course, untold quantities of food, fruits, and so forth, of every kind. These have been and will be sent to the foreign countries as gifts or on credit extended by our Government, and very little, if any, will ever be repaid. We have been stripping our own country of its supplies; we have intensified scarcity, and, of course, up goes the price of bread, meat, and other foods and other commodities. These foreign nations, with our own money, become the competitors of American consumers in American markets, and the net result is higher and higher prices for our own people. I shudder to think what will happen in this country when and if we have a real crop shortage in this country. For the last 3 or 4 years we have been unsually blessed by favorable weather.

President Hoover and many other great men of this country have, too, become alarmed. While we are furnishing the money and supplies, many of these nations are increasing their armies, engaging in wars, rebellions, and insurrections. The President and the Congress owe the American people some consideration. Of course, these heavy taxes and scarcity mean an increase in the prices of raw materials and an increase in wages and that means an increase in the cost of products consumed by the American people.

The President admits that this tax reduction means that the American taxpayers themselves will have more money to spend for things they consume. He states that this will increase inflation. The President says that we must not give the American people this break but he wants to hold the taxes high and turn the money over to him and his administration and they will spend it for waste, extravagance, relief, and the rehabilitation of foreign countries. Of course, the administration will use this money to go into American markets and buy these commodities, equipment, and so forth, and compete with the American housewives and American factory and shop workers and producers and, of course, prices will go up. Now what is the difference—to let Mr. Truman and his bureaucrats spend the money or let the American people spend the money for the things they desire and need? That illustrates the demagogery of the President in finding excuse for refusing to relieve the tax burden of the American people. It is passing strange indeed that many of the countries that we have been aiding in the war and since the war and that the President proposes to aid, have reduced the tax burden of their people. I want our country to help in any reasonable way it can but 140,000,000 people cannot continue to bear the load of 2,000,000,000 people in the world. The President should demand that these persons who have been the recipients of our bounty to quit increasing their armies, quit fighting, and go to work. The American people are working and must continue to work.

Hon. Ben Cohen, of the New Deal fame, has been going over Europe and he is reporting that we must put up $24,000,000,000 more for Europe. Henry Wallace, whom Mr. Truman tried to cram down the throats of the American people with the job of Secretary of Commerce, the RFC, and other auxiliary positions, says that we ought to put up $50,000,000,000, and our country now with the highest per capita debt and the highest per capita taxes of any country in the world.

President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall have put out a feeler that the American people with all their burdens should contribute billions more and, therefore, he says in vetoing the tax bill that he and his administration have made such large commitments for relief and rehabilitation for Europe and other countries that they cannot relieve the 50,000,000 income taxpayers of our own country.

I have been for some time voting against these wild commitments of this administration and I shall continue to do so in the future. The American people have some rights and I do not believe that Mr. Truman and his administration have the right, under the Constitution, to bankrupt our own country and to encourage the people of other countries to continue in their unwise policies.

FIFTY BILLION DEFICIT, SIX BILLION TAX REDUCTION

In 1944 and 1945 President Roosevelt and President Truman's administrations backed six billion of tax reduction largely for corporations, in cutting down excess-profit taxes and other corporate taxes, but then at that time we were having deficits of more than fifty billion and we had campaigns going on all over the country, using Hollywood stars and others, selling billions and billions of dollars worth of new bonds. Yes, President Roosevelt and Mr. Truman insisted upon tax reductions more than is provided in this bill, and not for the little income-tax payer, the laboring people, the white collar people, and others, but mostly for the corporations of the country, and insisted upon a reduction of excess-profit taxes. At that time they were not paying on the national debt. They were increasing the national debt approximately $50,000,000,000. Why did not he insist on keeping these excess-profit taxes and other corporation taxes and use the money to carry on the expense of the Government and avoid deficits of more than $50,000,000,000? But he says in his message vetoing H. R. 1 on yesterday that we should keep these high taxes for relief and rehabilitation of other countries and pay on our national debt. Of course, those tax reductions were phony. No government ought to have a tax reduction while having a deficit. Tax reductions should be made out of surplus. There should be no tax reduction while the Government has a campaign on to sell billions of new bonds as was done under President Roosevelt and President Truman in 1944 and 1945.

President Truman submitted his budget calling for expenditures of thirty-seven and one-half billion for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947. He stated the revenues of the Government would be approximately thirty-seven billion nine hundred million, leaving the small margin of four hundred million. Of course, he has enlarged his field of expenditures since he submitted that budget and if we had followed his advice, we would not have four hundred million to pay on the national debt. This budget was for the third peacetime year after the war and that is three times as much as President Roosevelt ever asked for to expend in a peacetime year. Mr. Truman and his bureaucrats have fought like tigers to prevent the cutting down of his budget of thirty-seven and one-half billion and against reduction of taxes.

The House voted to cut the President's budget six billion and the Senate voted to cut it four and one-half billion. There is little doubt but what the cuts will amount to four and one-half billion and then the budget will stand at thirty-three billion. It is now definitely estimated that the taxes and other revenues of the Government will amount to approximately forty-three billion. This will leave a surplus of approximately ten billion. This surplus cannot be less than eight billion. This tax reduction bill will take four billion of that and that will leave at least four billion to pay on the national debt.

There is no good excuse why this Nation for the third year of peacetime should spend and squander three times as much as was squandered and spent in any one peacetime year by President Roosevelt. If President Truman and his bureaucrats would cooperate with the Republicans and cut about a million of useless Federal officeholders and their expenses and cut out the waste and extravagance, the American people could have tax reduction, not only for this year but in subsequent years and also consistently reduce the national debt by a substantial sum every year. The American people cannot continue to pay this enormous sum of forty-three billion in taxes, but, the American people can never receive real relief until they change administrations and get an administration in power that believes in honesty, efficiency, and reasonable economy in government and that will give at least some consideration to the American people themselves.

Missouri Vote Scandal—Keeping the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the corrupt Kansas City political machine has played an important part in the political life of Harry S. Truman. It is unbelievable that four wards in Kansas City could influence ultimate results in elections as they have and with no credit to the President. He cannot ignore or avoid all of the implications involved.

Mr. Speaker, the United States News, in its issue of June 20, sets out in detail the rotten story of the Pendergast machine, and in particular the role of four wards in elections dating back to 1934. Here is that story:

In the 1934 primary: Harry S. Truman won Democratic senatorial nomination by 40,905 votes. Four wards in Kansas City gave him 50,477 votes over his nearest opponent, more than offsetting Truman's losses elsewhere in Missouri.

In the 1940 primary: Mr. Truman won renomination for the Senate by 7,976 votes. The same four wards gave him 9,295 votes over his nearest opponent, again offsetting his losses elsewhere in the State.

In the 1946 primary: Enos Axtell, endorsed by Mr. Truman, won the nomination for Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri by 2,361 votes. The four wards gave Axtell 10,032 votes over his nearest opponent.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include the complete article which appeared in the United States News, above referred to:

BACK OF MISSOURI VOTE SCANDAL: A STORY THAT WILL ECHO IN 1948—THREE TIMES WHEN KANSAS CITY MACHINE DELIVERED VITAL MAJORITIES—STAKES FOR HIGH OFFICIALS IN INVESTIGATION OF THE 1946 DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY

A political mystery story with all the elements of a paper-bound thriller is unfolding in four wards in Kansas City. The story is capturing the attention of the Senate. It is one of compelling interest to President Truman. Repercussions from it promise to echo all through the 1948 Presidential campaign.

The story is crammed with drama and big names. Tough characters move through it. There was a safe blowing and a theft of ballots. Indictments have been brought against 71 persons. The head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation says he was ordered to confine his inquiry to the questioning of six men. The Attorney General is being asked about these orders. There is talk of impeachment charges. A Senate committee is pressing for a full-dress investigation.

The FBI men, who formerly had been held back, now are busy in Kansas City. Under the urging of Senator HOMER FERGUSON (Republican), of Michigan, and a special Senate subcommittee, they are making a thoroughgoing investigation of the manner in which the four wards gave a Democratic congressional nomination to Enos A. Axtell, a friend of the President, in the primary of August 6, 1946. But the ballots that comprised much of the evidence have been stolen.

The implications of the study reach far beyond the defeat of Representative Roger C. Slaughter by Mr. Axtell, at the urging of the President, last August. To bring about the defeat of Mr. Slaughter, Mr. Truman called into service his old friend, Jim Pendergast, and the reconstituted elements of the old Pendergast vote-getting organization in Kansas City. Mr. Pendergast threw his resources back of the Presidential effort.

The four wards involved in the present inquiry are the old strongholds of Pendergast strength. They used to deliver the votes for the late Tom J. Pendergast, uncle of Jim, when the former was thriving as political boss of Kansas City. These were the four wards that, under Tom Pendergast's leadership, put Mr. Truman on the road to the Presidency by electing him to county offices and then by assuring his nomination and election to the Senate in 1934.

To understand the involved structure of the relationship, the story must go back to the First World War. Capt. Harry Truman served at Camp Doniphan then with a young lieutenant named Jim Pendergast. They became fast friends. After the war, this friendship with Jim Pendergast and his father, Mike Pendergast, elder brother of Tom, flourished. It was Jim Pendergast who sold to his father and uncle the idea of making Mr. Truman a county judge.

Mr. Truman served a term as judge—which, in Kansas City, is an administrative and not a judicial office—and then was beaten. After one term out of office he moved back in with the aid of the Pendergast organization and stayed there until 1934. This was during the period when the Pendergast organization was ruling Kansas City with a firm hand.

In 1934, Mr. Truman went to Tom Pendergast and told him that he wanted to run for Congress in the Fourth Missouri District, which had just been revamped so as to include rural Jackson County where Mr. Truman felt he could be reelected regularly. Mr. Pendergast said no; C. JASPER BELL, the present Member from that district, was to be the candidate.

The old story that Mr. Truman wanted to be collector of revenue and was rejected by Tom Pendergast appears to be erroneous. In May of 1934, James P. Aylward, the Democratic State chairman, and Jim Pendergast met Mr. Truman at Sedalia and asked him to run for the Senate with Tom Pendergast support. Mr. Truman said he would rather run for governor. They made it clear that he would not have Tom Pendergast's support for that spot. So he agreed to run for the Senate.

The primary brought Mr. Truman up against two men who had been or were serving as Representatives—Jacob L. Milligan and John J. Cochran. Mr. Truman came into the four tightly controlled Pendergast wards needing 9,732 votes to win the nomination. The results were:

	Cochran	Milligan	Truman
Ward 1	49	147	17,485
Ward 2	24	68	15,145
Ward 3	24	171	8,182
Ward 4	53	171	9,825
Total	160	557	50,637

The four wards gave Mr. Truman the nomination by 40,905 votes. He was elected in November in that year of wide Democratic victories.

The machine in charge of the four wards came under fire right after that victory. Maurice M. Milligan, United States district attorney and brother of the defeated candidate, said the day after the primary Federal agents had gathered evidence of ballot-box padding, of repeater voters, of judges refusing to count votes against the machine candidates. But it was several years before Mr. Milligan rounded up the evidence that he finally took to a Federal grand jury.

When Mr. Milligan cracked down in earnest, after the general election of 1936, he did not even tell Attorney General Homer L. Cummings of his plans. He simply asked Federal Judge Albert L. Reeves to call a Federal grand jury and told the local office of the FBI to move into action. Ballot boxes were impounded and put into the keeping of an armed guard.

Within a month after the election, the grand jury was busy. Mr. Milligan indicted 278 of the Pendergast political workers and

election officials. He sent 258 of them to jail. And, in 1939, he finished cracking the machine by convicting Tom Pendergast of income-tax evasion. In 1938, Mr. Truman, as Senator, fought the renomination of Mr. Milligan. He was the only Senator to vote against the confirmation.

In 1940, when Mr. Truman came up for reelection he had two major opponents for the Democratic nomination. One was Maurice Milligan; the other, Governor Lloyd C. Stark. Even in the old stronghold of the first four wards, little was left of the Pendergast organization. It had been battered down. Mr. Truman came into the first four wards of Kansas City, the fortress of the machine, needing 1,319 votes to win the nomination. The vote there was:

	Stark	Milligan	Truman
Ward 1	852	1,261	4,172
Ward 2	888	869	3,828
Ward 3	837	1,097	2,515
Ward 4	879	1,205	2,236
Total	3,456	4,432	12,751

Mr. Truman won by 7,976 votes. The four key wards, even with a battered Pendergast organization, managed to give him a margin of 9,295 votes over Governor Stark, who was his closest opponent for the nomination. But the old days of lopsided majorities in the four fortress wards seemed to be gone. Maurice Milligan had trimmed the power of the organization to the vanishing point.

MACHINE OPPONENT

Mr. Truman went back to the Senate and moved on to the Vice Presidency. When he was Vice President, the name of Maurice Milligan came up again for reappointment. Mr. Truman vigorously opposed it. He manage to get it delayed. Then Franklin D. Roosevelt died.

When Mr. Truman went into the White House, he refused to reappoint the man who had crippled the organization in the four wards. In Mr. Milligan's stead, the President named Sam M. Wear, who as a delegate to the 1944 convention had been a stanch supporter of Mr. Truman for the Vice Presidency.

In Kansas City, Jim Pendergast began putting back together the pieces of his uncle's old organization, aided by such old lieutenants as Tim Moran and Henry McKissick. The four wards began to hum again.

PRESIDENT AND FRIEND

On the walls of Jim Pendergast's law office in Kansas City are two frames. One contains a picture of President Truman inscribed: "To James M. Pendergast, friend, comrade, adviser." The other frame holds a letter on White House stationery, dated December 7, 1945. It reads:

"DEAR JIM: I am enclosing you check for $6 in payment of my Jackson Democratic Club dues. I hope the outfit is still going good. Sincerely yours, Harry." In the same frame is the uncashed personal check of the President, drawn on a Washington bank.

In 1946, the President found Representative Slaughter an obstacle to many bits of legislation he wanted. Mr. Slaughter held a key place on the House Rules Committee. The four old wards of the Pendergast stronghold lay in the middle of Mr. Slaughter's district. And Jim Pendergast had not been idle. The President called him to Washington and asked him to back Mr. Axtel. He finally agreed.

In the voting, Mr. Axtell lost Washington Township, his home town. He lost every other ward until he came to the key four, the home of the Pendergast organization. He came into these first four wards trailing Mr. Slaughter by 7,668 votes. In these four wards, the count was:

	Axtell	Slaughter	Jerome Walsh
Ward 1	5,033	825	563
Ward 2	3,264	219	194
Ward 3	2,187	704	481
Ward 4	1,620	324	585
Total	12,104	2,072	1,823

In two precincts, Mr. Slaughter did not get a single vote. In others, he got only two, three, or four. In the four wards, Mr. Axtell's majority was more than 10,000. He won the nomination by better than 2,300 votes. But he was beaten in the general election by the Republican, ALBERT L. REEVES, JR., son of the Federal judge.

A cry for an investigation arose immediately. Mr. Slaughter said he saw evidence of irregularities in the four wards. Roy A. Roberts, president of the Kansas City Star, set 34 men to collecting evidence and affidavits. The city council formally asked the Justice Department for an inquiry. A grand jury went to work.

Mr. Wear, the United States district attorney in Kansas City, sent material from the Star into Washington. Theron L. Caudle, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the criminal division, passed it along to Attorney General Tom Clark. He asked the FBI to make a study. It did. Mr. Wear talked the matter over with three Federal judges at Kansas City. They agreed there was not enough evidence to prosecute. The case was dropped. The four wards seemed to be safe.

NEW DRIVE

Then Congress came in. Senator JAMES P. KEM, a Republican, himself from Kansas City, led a drive for a congressional inquiry. Other Missourians joined in. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch added its voice. The Senate Judiciary Committee created a special subcommittee and put Senator FERGUSON, one of the Senate's most vigorous prosecutors, in charge of the inquiry.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover told the committee his orders from Mr. Clark limited the FBI inquiry to questioning six men. Mr. FERGUSON demanded to know of Mr. Clark why that was done. Mr. Clark said this was routine in preliminary inquiries. The Federal judges—Judge Reeves, Judge Albert A. Ridge, and Judge John Caskie Collet—said they had not read the FBI survey, but had seen only a summary prepared by Mr. Wear.

The judges said they had not based their advice upon full information. Moreover, they said the usual procedure was for the district attorney simply to ask a judge to call a grand jury into session without asking the advice of the judge.

FOUR WARDS UNDER FIRE

In the meantime, a Jackson County grand jury indicted 71 persons, most of them from the four key Pendergast wards. The jury reported that: ballots had been deliberately miscounted in some precincts; false returns had been made; there had been wrongful, illegal and wholesale marking of ballots; there had been vote buying and bribery; party workers who were not polling officials had participated illegally in counting votes, and there had been gross negligence, carelessness and indifference by judges and clerks.

Where miscounts were made, the jury said, they invariably were in favor of one group of candidates. There was not a single instance of an error on the other side. And it added: "It is our belief that Roger C. Slaughter in this race was deprived of the nomination by a fraudulent miscount of votes and by other types of fraud." The jury subpenaed ballots, tally sheets, poll books, and other records, and strongly urged a full investigation by the FBI.

That was on May 7. On May 28, the vault in which the grand jury had stored the evidence was blown open and the ballots were stolen, just after the grand jury had ordered a recount. Under the urging of the Senate subcommittee, the FBI began a full-scale investigation of the mystery voters in the first four wards.

In the meantime, Representative MARION T. BENNETT, a Missouri Republican, began talking about filing impeachment charges against Attorney General Clark. The national spotlight was falling upon the four Kansas City wards that hold the clues to the Pendergast strength. They helped to make a man President, and may play a big part in his reelection campaign.

Courts Martial in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, a part of the occupation job which our Army is performing in Germany is to educate the German people to govern themselves in a democratic way.

One of the cornerstones of democracy is the right to fair trial. Procedural safeguards for the accused in criminal cases form the most important parts of Magna Carta and of our own Bill of Rights. But how can our Army teach these fundamentals of democracy to the Germans when they are not observed within the Army? The example which the Army sets is probably much more effective than any preachments which are made in words.

I therefore look with great alarm at copies of three petitions to General Clay, which I received in the mail from Europe this morning. In these petitions three American soldiers state that they have been denied the right of adequate representation by counsel in court-martial cases which are currently being tried. The petitions are addressed to Lucius D. Clay, commanding general, European Command, and request the revocation of his order denying these three soldiers the right to be represented by a civilian counsel, Mr. Earl J. Carroll.

We all know that the rules of Army court martial provide that soldiers may be represented by any counsel of his choosing, military or civilian. However, while the Army is not specifically denying these defendants the rights to be represented by Mr. Carroll they have effectively prevented such representation by ordering Mr. Carroll to leave Europe. I feel that this is a shocking situation which merits the immediate attention of the Secretary of War. I ask unanimous consent to insert these three petitions in the RECORD at this point where they may be read in full by my colleagues and by responsible officials of the War Department.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST GUARDHOUSE,
HEADQUARTERS COMMAND, EUCOM,
APO 757, United States Army, May 9, 1947.

Subject: Application for redress of wrong under Articles of War 121.

To: Gen. Lucius D. Clay, commanding general, European Command, APO 742, United States Army.

1. Request is hereby made pursuant to the provisions of Articles of War 121, for redress of wrong, to wit: the improper deprivation of civil counsel selected by the undersigned and provided by him for his defense pursuant to the provisions of Articles of War 17.

2. The undersigned was inducted into military service on March 20, 1944, and served the field artillery until October 29, 1945. On October 30, 1945, the undersigned enlisted in the Regular Army for a period of 3 years. The undersigned came overseas in October 1944, served through the Ardennes, central Europe, and Rhineland campaigns with the Ninth Army. He has no previous courts martial.

3. On December 14, 1946, the undersigned was arrested and placed in confinement at the Post Guardhouse, Headquarters Command, USFET, APO 757, where he has remained in continuous confinement until present date.

4. Under date January 21, 1947, charges were preferred against the undersigned. These charges were not served until February 4, 1947. During this period, the undersigned was held helpless in the post guardhouse, while the Inspector General, Headquarters Command, USFET, built up a case against him. The undersigned had no opportunity to talk to or search for witnesses in his own behalf. The undersigned requested counsel and was advised that he was not entitled to counsel until after his charges had been referred for trial. The alleged confidential nature of an Inspector General's report was utilized as a means of securing a statement from the undersigned and other witnesses. Actually the Inspector General was used as an agency of criminal prosecution rather than as an agency of administrative investigation. Statements of witnesses were distorted. Such tactics, together with my personal observations of the prosecution of other accused by Headquarters Command, USFET, have completely destroyed all faith in the administration of justice by that command, and any hope of the undersigned for a fair and impartial trial of the charges brought against him.

5. Immediately following the service of charges, the undersigned solicited the services of Mr. Earl J. Carroll, civil attorney at law, to represent him in accordance with the provisions of Articles of War 17. Mr. Carroll has prepared the defense of the undersigned and entered an arrangement with the Staff Judge Advocates' Section, Headquarters Command, as to a suitable time for trial.

6. On May 8, 1947, the undersigned was informed by Captain Adams, the regularly appointed defense counsel, that the staff judge advocate, Headquarters Command, EUCOM, APO 757, had instructed him to inform the undersigned that General Duff, Commanding General, Headquarters Command, wanted him to know that Mr. Earl J. Carroll was not available and would not be available to act as his defense counsel, by order of Gen. Lucius D. Clay, and further that the trial of the undersigned was to be held on Monday, May 12, 1947. Captain Adams stated that the undersigned could request other defense counsel, civil or military, now present in this theater, and that such request must be by letter. He stated that such letter was to be addressed to General Clay, who would determine whether or not counsel so requested is available. He suggested that such a letter of request, if it was to be made, should be prepared immediately, and that within 20 minutes of his leaving the post guardhouse, it would be delivered to the staff judge advocate. Captain Adams stated that if the undersigned waited until he was brought before the court to request other counsel, that his request would most likely be denied, and that he would have to accept such counsel as had been appointed for him, as he was going to be compelled to go to trial without further delay. Captain Adams said, "If I defend you I won't guarantee you anything except that you won't get over the maximum punishment."

7. The undersigned has been advised by Mr. Carroll that the latter is ready, willing, and able to continue to represent the undersigned in his defense of these charges in accordance with the arrangements originally agreed upon, provided that the order issued by you, which is contained in your letter to Mr. Carroll, under date April 30, 1947, is rescinded so as to remove the obstacle to his appearance thereby created by you.

8. Under these circumstances, the undersigned is determined to reject the services of the regularly appointed military counsel on the ground that he has no confidence in either the ability or integrity to the interest of an accused; that from his personal observation he has been compelled that such services are wholly perfunctory and for the apparent purpose of giving the trial by courts martial the appearance of a controversy that does not in fact exist. It is the prevailing opinion of those who have appeared before the courts martial, conducted by Headquarters Command, that an accused does not appear before them to be tried but only to be sentenced.

9. The undersigned respectfully requests the revocation of your order which has the effect of denying him the right to be represented by Mr. Earl J. Carroll, the civil counsel selected by the undersigned and provided by him for his defense, in accordance with the provisions of A. W. 17.

PHILIP O. BOUVIER, 42107395,
T/5, 7702 Service Battalion.

POST GUARDHOUSE,
HEADQUARTERS COMMAND, EUCOM,
APO 757, UNITED STATES ARMY,
9 May 1947.

Subject: Application for redress of wrong under article of war 121.

To: Gen. Lucius D. Clay, commanding general, European Command, APO 742, United States Army.

1. Request is hereby made for redress of wrongful denial to the undersigned of his right to the services of Mr. Earl J. Carroll, civil counsel of his selection, provided by him for his defense to the charges referred for trial to general courts martial, appointed by paragraph 20, special orders No. 340, Headquarters Command, USFET, APO No. 757, United States Army, in violation of article of war 17.

2. The undersigned served as an enlisted man from 22 December 1939 to 28 October 1945, and reenlisted in the Regular Army on 29 October 1945 for a term of 3 years. The undersigned served in the Hawaiian Islands from 1940 to 1944, and served in this theater from 2 May 1946. He has had but one summary courts martial in 7½ years' service.

3. On 21 December 1946, the undersigned was arrested and placed in confinement in the post guardhouse, Headquarters Command, USFET, APO No. 757, where he has been continuously held in confinement to the present date.

4. Under date 26 December 1946, charges were preferred against the undersigned, charging violations of an unstated article of war and the ninety-sixth article of war. The specification under the first charge alleges the misapplication of an Army jeep, for which another enlisted man, Sgt. Herman Hoffman, was tried and convicted and sentenced to 6 months by a general courts martial on or about 1 May 1947. The first two specifications under the second charge, alleges alteration of bumper markings and wrongful operation of this jeep. The third specification alleges an attempt to hire civilian employees by offering 100 percent higher wages than those being paid by the Army. The fourth specification alleges wrongful discharge of a pistol.

5. On 10 February 1947, these charges were referred to trial. During the 51 days of confinement between the time of arrest and the reference of charges for trial, the undersigned was told that he was not entitled to counsel. The long lapse of time during which he was helplessly locked up enabled the prosecution to prepare a case against him without according him a corresponding opportunity to prepare his defense.

6. The undersigned engaged the services of Mr. Earl J. Carroll, civil counsel, now in this theater to defend several other accused, to represent him in defense of these charges. Arrangements were made with the Staff Judge Advocates' Section for the trial of the undersigned's case to be handled in an agreed order with other cases being defended by Mr. Carroll. Satisfactory arrangements were completed and the entire defense of the accused was turned over to Mr. Carroll.

7. On May 8, 1947, Captain Adams, of the Staff Judge Advocate's Section, Headquarters Command, EUCOM, the regularly appointed defense counsel, called on the undersigned at the post guardhouse. Captain Adams informed the undersigned, in substance and effect, as follows, "The Staff Judge Advocate has asked me to inform you that your trial will be held on Tuesday, May 13, 1947, and that General Duff, commanding general, Headquarters Command, EUCOM, has instructed the Staff Judge Advocate to inform you that Mr. Earl J. Carroll, the civil counsel who has been representing you, is not now available and will not be available to represent you at your trial, which is to be held without further delay. You can request other counsel, civil or military, by letter, which will go to General Clay, who will determine whether or not they are available. It is suggested that if you desire to request any other defense counsel, that you prepare the letter right now and within 20 minutes after I leave here, it will be in the Staff Judge Advocate's Office. Your request for such counsel is limited to someone who is already in the theater, in order to prevent any further delay in bringing your case to trial. If you wait until you go to trial to request other counsel, your request will most likely be denied, and you will be compelled to go to trial, and you will have to accept whatever counsel has been appointed to defend you. If I defend you in this case, I won't guarantee you anything except that you won't get anything over the maximum punishment."

8. Mr. Carroll has advised the undersigned that he is ready, willing, and able to continue to represent the undersigned, and to appear in the undersigned's defense, in accordance with arrangements originally made, and that the only obstacle to his so doing is the order issued by you, which order is contained in your letter to him under date, April 30, 1947, and received by him on May 5, 1947.

9. The undersigned has no confidence in the military counsel provided by Headquarters Command, EUCOM, and refuses to accept the services of such counsel.

10. The undersigned respectfully submits that his long record of military service to his country, both in war and in peace, entitles him to more equitable consideration than that which is now being accorded to him, and requests the revocation of your order which has the effect of denying him the right to be represented by Mr. Carroll, who is civil counsel of the undersigned's selection, provided by the undersigned for his defense, in accordance with the provisions of Article of War 17.

CECIL B. PITTMAN, 6997234,
T/Sgt., 3466 Ordnance.

POST GUARDHOUSE,
HEADQUARTERS COMMAND, EUCOM,
APO 757, United States Army, 9 May 1947.

Subject: Application for redress of wrong under Article of War 12.

To: Gen. Lucius D. Clay, commanding general, European Command, APO 742, United States Army.

1. In accordance with article of war 121, request is hereby made for redress of wrong, to wit: Violation of seventeenth article of war by refusal to permit the undersigned to be represented by Mr. Earl J. Carroll, civil counsel of his own selection, whose services he has provided to represent him in his pending trial by general courts martial.

2. The undersigned served as an enlisted man from 7 October 1942 to 19 October 1945, and then reenlisted 20 October 1945 for a term of three (3) years in the Regular Army. The undersigned came overseas 11 February 1944, and entered combat at Omaha Beach 16 June 1944, and participated in the Normandy, Northern France, Ardennes, Central Europe, and Rhineland campaigns with the Eighty-third Infantry Division. The only courts martial against the undersigned was a summary court fine of $5.

3. On 21 December 1945, the undersigned was arrested and placed in confinement at the post guardhouse, headquarters command, USFET, APO 757, United States Army, where he has been continuously held to date. Under date 26 December 1946, charges were preferred against the undersigned alleging violations of the articles of war 94, 96, and 83. The specification under first charge alleges misapplication of an Army jeep. Three specifications under the second charge alleges alteration of bumper markings, and improper windshield sticker in connection with the same vehicle. The fourth specification under the second charge alleges an attempt to employ a civilian by offering 100 percent increase above the prevailing wage. The specification under the third charge alleges wrongful disposal of an Army pistol.

4. On 10 February 1947, these charges were referred to trial by general courts martial, appointed by paragraph 20, special orders No. 340, headquarters command, USFET, APO 757, United States Army.

5. During the long period between the time of arrest and the reference of these charges for trial, the undersigned was deprived of all opportunity to prepare any defense whatsoever. He was informed that he was not entitled to any counsel during this time.

6. Immediately following the service of these charges, the undersigned secured the services of a civil attorney, Mr. Earl J. Carroll, present in Frankfurt to defend other courts martial cases. Arrangement was made with the staff judge advocate's section, Headquarters Command, EUCOM, to have Mr. Carroll defend the undersigned in accordance with a mutual understanding as to the order of trial of the accused represented by Mr. Carroll.

7. On May 8, 1947, Captain Adams, of the Staff Judge Advocate's Section, Headquarters Command, EUCOM, the regularly appointed defense counsel, called on the undersigned at the post guardhouse. Captain Adams informed the undersigned in substance and effect as follows: "The Staff Judge Advocate has asked me to inform you that your trial will be hold on Tuesday, May 13, 1947, and that Brigadier General Duff, commanding general, Headquarters Command, EUCOM, had instructed the Staff Judge Advocate to inform you that Mr. Earl J. Carroll, the civil counsel who has been representing you, is not now available and will not be available to represent you at your trial, which is to be held without further delay. You can request other counsel, civil or military, by letter, which will go to General Clay, who will determine whether or not they are available. It is suggested that if you desire to request any other counsel, that you prepare the letter right now, and within 20 minutes after I leave here, it will be in the Staff Judge Advocate's office. Your request for such counsel is limited to someone who is already in the theater, in order to prevent any further delay in bringing your case to trial. If you wait until you go to trial to request other counsel, your request will most likely be denied and you will be compelled to go to trial, and you will have to accept whatever counsel has been appointed to defend you. If I defend you in this case, I won't guarantee you anything except that you won't get anything over the maximum punishment."

8. Mr. Carroll has informed the undersigned that he is ready, willing, and able to continue to represent the undersigned and to appear in the undersigned's defense in accordance with arrangements originally made, and that the only obstacle to his so doing is the order issued by you, which order is contained in your letter to him under date April 30, 1947, and received by him on May 5, 1947.

9. The undersigned has no confidence in the military counsel provided by Headquarters Command, EUCOM, and refuses to accept the services of such counsel.

10. The undersigned respectfully submits that his long record of satisfactory military service entitles him to more equitable consideration than that which is now being accorded him, and requests the revocation of your order which has the effect of denying the undersigned the right to be represented by Mr. Carroll, who is the civil counsel of the undersigned's selection, provided by the undersigned for his defense, in accordance with the provisions of Article of War 17.

WARREN G. COLLINS, 35561519,
S/Sgt. 3466 Ordnance.

Speech of Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech of Henry A. Wallace, editor of the New Republic, at the Water Gate, sponsored by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Monday, June 16, 1947:

During the past 60 days I have traveled in five foreign countries and in the East, West, North, and South of the United States. I have talked with the people.

Everywhere I have found a belief that both Russia and the United States are pursuing aggressive courses which will lead to war.

Everywhere I have declared that neither war nor depression is inevitable.

Everywhere I have denounced the dangerous practice of arming reactionary governments.

Everywhere I have found that the people demand peace.

Tonight, I have come back to Washington where I spent 14 years of my life working for the greatest government on earth in the greatest capital city in the world.

I came here in 1933 to join a team which saved our capitalistic democracy from its own folly.

I worked with men and women of great integrity—many thousands of them—who were wholly devoted to their country and its democratic principles.

Many of you—happily—are still in the Government, doing good work. I hope that you will not be purged because of your presence here tonight.

The man who put the team together and made it work, has gone—though he lives in the hearts of the common people the world over.

Harry Hopkins has gone.

Harold Ickes, Henry Morgenthau and Frances Perkins have left.

You will excuse me if I feel a certain nostalgia for the troublesome, but exciting days a decade ago, when the energies of men and women in Washington were being poured into the constructive jobs of solving human problems and meeting human needs.

The job in Washington today should be no less exciting and satisfying than it was a decade ago.

The atmosphere here should be one of hope and confidence; not frustration and fear.

This postwar world can be excitingly peaceful or we can continue to pursue the road toward war.

We must change our course. We can't ignore the cries of people everywhere for peace and prosperity.

We must find and travel the road to peace.

Everywhere in the United States we hear that it is Russia that stands in the way of peace. And so it is.

But I doubt that it is entirely the Russia of reality which is the great obstacle to peace. It is—in large measure—the Russia which is painted for us—day in and day out—by men of blind prejudice or genuine malice.

Outside of our own borders one hears that not only Russia, but the United States, as well, stands in the way of peace.

I have been asked many times why I do not denounce the Soviet Union. There is widespread belief, perpetuated by unfriendly segments of the press, that I have not been critical of Russia.

That is not true.

I have been critical. But I have always tried to be constructively critical.

I could stand on this platform and declaim at great length about Soviet actions of which I thoroughly disapprove. But by so doing I should do nothing to advance the cause of peace.

I am primarily concerned with influencing the policies I can help to change.

I am primarily concerned with making our own American practices conform to American principles.

I share with millions of my fellow Americans a conscience. I can get as indignant as any man at the suppression of civil liberties anywhere in the world.

But I admit to a certain shame when I hear some of our official statements of protest about election methods in eastern Europe; and look at the same time at certain election methods in South Carolina and Kansas City—and the absence of any elections at all here in Washington.

This discrepancy disturbs me.

I can't insist on the perfection of democracy abroad and ignore undemocratic systems at home.

I believe that the preservation of our democratic system here in the United States depends on the living practice and demonstration of democracy.

I oppose terror or intimidation anywhere in the world. But my conscience and common sense tell me that I must use my strongest language against such methods in my own country.

I can hope in this democracy—if we save it—to help change policies which breed fear. I can hope to see the day when all Americans can hold their heads high and speak with pride their differing views.

Here in the United States, it should not take courage to exercise the right of free speech.

If it were true—which it is not—that our official indignation with Russia is over her suppression of civil liberties in her zone of influence; then, our greatest hope of changing that situation would be to find the ways to minimize her insecurity and remove her fears of encirclement and attack.

I don't believe there is more than a handful of Americans who want us to attack and attempt to obliterate the Soviet Union. But the Russians—as they study our press and listen to the statements of high officials—naturally think they have reasons for fear.

We must remember that many of the things we dislike about the Communist leadership of Russia today flow directly from the way in which Britain, France, and the United States armed the reactionaries of Poland and other peoples for the purpose of destroying the Russian revolution.

If we persist today in a policy of threats and encirclement, we shall increase international suspicion and distrust.

We are paving the way to war.

We must either exhibit our faith in democracy—in the give-and-take of differing ideas—or we shall breed a psychopathic hysteria which will drain our resources and lead us into a war in which there can be no victory.

The world cannot afford its present annual expenditure of $26,000,000,000 for armies and navies.

The world cannot afford 19,000,000 soldiers and sailors.

We need the dollar-power and the manpower to meet human needs and eliminate the causes of wars.

The European leaders with whom I spoke during my trip abroad could not understand our preoccupation with communism. They could not understand the world's greatest power trembling in fear of an idea, or the ideas leading * * * exponent-devastated Russia.

Many of these leaders are veterans of the resistance movements in their countries.

They will not be bribed nor intimidated.

They will not accept any policy which has the seeds of war.

They have gone through hell; and they are looking—with you and me—for a road to peace.

They will not join the United States in a war against Russia; nor Russia in a war against the United States, unless by pursuing the Truman doctrine we drive them—against their wishes—into the Communist camp.

The failure of force to suppress ideas is nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in the recent history of Italy, where Mussolini stood—not long ago—as the mighty suppressor of communism. Today, in Italy, there is a Communist Party of 2,000,000 members.

We must not be fooled by the cries of communism which fil' the air today.

Most of those who raise the cries do not fear communism; they fear democracy.

Communism, as an idea, is a threat to capitalism; but it will be a real threat only so long as we delay in ridding our capitalist economy of depressions. Twenty-five thousand-dollar loyalty investigations will never stop communism; full stomachs and security can do that job.

We must overcome this Red phobia which the reactionaries would carefully nurture in all of us.

We must concentrate on the solution of our major domestic problems.

We must take positive actions to make peace with Russia, as a fundamental to world peace.

An agreement with Russia must take precedence over the peace treaties with Germany and Austria so ardently sought by Herbert Hoover and ARTHUR VANDENBERG.

The Russians require peace.

The Russians must have peace.

The evidence is plentiful.

There is, first of all, the indisputable fact that Russia today—and for many years to come—will not be in a position to wage war.

The devastation of her most productive manufacturing and agricultural areas by the Nazis—as they invaded and retreated from the Soviet Union—is almost incalculable.

The Russians must have peace.

And I am convinced that Russians genuinely desire peace.

In three important interviews this year—with Alexander Werth, the British newspaperman, with Elliot Roosevelt, and with Harold Stassen, Stalin clearly indicated that he believes such cooperation is possible and necessary.

Many editorial writers and commentators insist on quoting the statements of Stalin 25 years ago that peace is not possible in a world part socialist and part capitalist.

I can see no legitimate reason for believing Stalin's statements a quarter of a century ago and doubting his statements of the past 6 months.

Stalin can change his mind in 25 years. Most of us have. Twenty-five years ago I was Republican.

I do not question that there are men in Russia who act as foolishly as ignorant men in the United States—men who insist that war is inevitable.

But the fact that Russia needs peace and that her principal spokesmen are genuinely seeking peace should provide a practical step toward peace.

Our hopes for a strong United Nations rest on our ability to make peace with the Soviet Union. It should be easier to reach agreement with a valiant ally than with the dictator in Argentina.

As a first step, I would suggest that the President and Secretary Marshall issue an invitation to Stalin and Molotov to meet with them in Berlin for the avowed and announced purpose of drawing up an agreement which will cover all the points at issue between the United States and the Soviet Union.

We must settle basic differences with the Russians, as completely as possible; or we shall continue to increase the friction which develops in every attempt to settle secondary problems.

We cannot reach agreement on Germany until Russia and the United States have reached agreement on their individual objectives.

We need markets—and as the world becomes increasingly short of dollars—we shall have more and more difficulty in our attempts to do business abroad.

We can act now to develop trade relations with the Soviet Union and keep our plants in continuous operation, or we can continue to pursue a policy of arming Russia's political enemies and reap the results in depression.

We can invest our wealth constructively in long-term loans at low interest rates, or we can waste our wealth in the unproductive, dangerous business of manufacturing and distributing munitions.

We can assure our businessmen reasonable profits, our farmers good prices, and our workers good wages, by planning for peace.

The world needs machinery and plows and motors, not guns and tanks and bombers.

Our first duty to ourselves is to protect our international markets by reaching an agreement with Russia.

Russia today does not need world markets. She does not have sufficient goods for international trade.

But Russia does need assistance in economic rehabilitation. We have the means to help.

We must be practical. The time has come to substitute a "get practical" policy for the Dulles-Vandenberg "get tough" policy.

There is nothing in the Russian Socialist economy which prevents us from developing good trade relations.

Eventually we must be prepared to accept repayment of initial investments with the purchases of materials the Soviet Union will be able to furnish.

Covering one-sixth of the world's surface, she has immense undeveloped resources which will eventually be useful to American industry.

Our own resources are not inexhaustible.

The time will come when we shall be glad that we have established long-term friendly relations with a powerful nation rich in natural resources.

We shall need Russia as a market and as a source of raw materials. Today we have bargaining power. Tomorrow—given depression—we may not have such power.

In 1931 and 1932 Russia purchased about 70 percent of our machine-tool production and 55 percent of our tractor production. At the depth of the depression Russian orders saved some American business firms.

And Russia, more than any other country, has generally adopted American production methods and machinery. Industry after industry has been built and modernized along American lines.

Russia is a ready-made market.

If Truman and Marshall will discuss frankly with Stalin and Molotov the respective economic needs of the two nations, agreement can be reached.

If we fail to act now, the time will come when we have bought our way, through munitions, into a full scale depression.

At that time we shall be confronted with two alternatives:

If no agreement is reached, when depression hits, we can either let Russia save us with large purchases of goods at depression prices or we can manufacture a war as an escape from the doldrums of depression and to ward off any moves toward socialism here which might be undertaken in a time of crisis.

We abhor both depression and war. We can avoid both.

If we remember that there is nothing criminal in the idea of socialism, we can do business—in peace—with a socialist Europe. But if we set out to lick socialist ideas with bribes and the force of arms, rather than through a practical demonstration of democratic capitalism, we shall prove the contention of the Communists that a capitalist economy can't be free of depressions.

If we pursue the policy of fighting ideas with force we shall drive the peoples of Europe and Asia to completely socialist economies and we shall drive them into military alliance with Russia.

If Truman and Marshall will arrange trade relations with Russia to indicate to the peoples of Europe that we are sincerely working to eliminate the causes of friction we can have peace and prosperity, and Europeans will enjoy greater freedom than they have ever known.

American-Russian agreement is the fundamental for a strong United Nations capable of preserving the peace.

An agreement with Russia must involve an understanding on the problems of the Near East.

American engineers and technicians are the best equipped in the world to develop the oil resources of that area, but we must give evidence—not only to Russia, but to all of non-Russian Europe—that we will abide by article IV of the Atlantic Charter which pledges equal access to the raw materials of the world.

If we persist in unilateral exploitation of these resources we shall increase our

friction with many nations outside the Soviet sphere of influence and shall, indeed, increase that Soviet influence.

Russia wants to perfect her own Socialist economy within her borders.

She has confidence that a successful experiment in Russia will win the peoples of the world to socialism.

She is challenging us.

We must meet the challenge by an active demonstration of the potential superiority of our democratic capitalism.

We are having difficulty in reaching agreement on the control of atomic weapons. We have remained adamant in our insistence that our plan be adopted. The Russians have remained adamant in their position.

We must have such control and understanding, but we need a first step as evidence of our good faith and Russia's good faith in looking toward eventual disarmament.

As evidence of our good faith and as a test of Russia's good faith, I suggest that the United States propose a complete ban on international traffic in weapons of war. This is only a first step, but first steps are important.

By this time I know that there are thousands in this politically conscious Capital City who are saying: "Wallace is crazy. He doesn't realize that the Senate would never approve a settlement which had in it a large loan to Russia and a prohibition against arming foreign powers. Moreover, the House would not furnish the money."

Undoubtedly you are right about the present House and Senate. But remember that there is an election coming up in 1948.

Truman's only possible chance for election is to make the Democratic Party the party of peace.

If Truman and Marshall make a sincere effort to get a settlement with the Russians of outstanding issues—an agreement which would guarantee the success of the United Nations and serve as a guarantee against real depression; and, if they carry their fight for approval into the elections of 1948, we shall get a Congress dedicated to peace.

If the issue is clearly drawn the people will vote right and we shall have in 1949 a peace Congress, not a war Congress.

If both parties insist on pursuing the present suicidal course toward war and depression, there will be a new party, even if it has no chance of election success in 1948.

It will be important—if the Democratic Party succumbs to Wall Street domination—to have a new party to let the people of the world know that those who believe in peace and understanding still have some means of expression.

It will be important as evidence that this is still a democracy.

It would provide the evidence that the United States has not gone completely imperialistic and psychopathic.

And like third parties in other periods of American history it would have a long-term influence on American life.

I have profund affection for the Democratic Party of Franklin Roosevelt.

It was a genuinely liberal party. It was the true friend of the worker, the farmer, and the small businessman.

Under Roosevelt, ordinary people the world over, and especially in Latin-America, loved the United States for its democracy instead of fearing it for its dollar diplomacy backed up by armed might.

Today the Administration has departed from the course Roosevelt charted. The local leadership and the rank-and-file of the Democratic Party throughout the Nation, must act now to reverse this trend.

I still have faith that the Democratic Party can come back again to the new freedom of Woodrow Wilson and the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt; and that both its foreign and domestic policies can command the affectionate respect of the common man everywhere in the world.

If the Democrats are to win in 1948, we must demonstrate that they have applied American principles in working out a pattern for international understanding; and that we have energetically worked for a dynamic program implementing the employment act of 1946, which established an advisory council to plan ways and means of avoiding depressions.

We must appeal to the people for support in carrying out the recommendations of the President's Economic Advisory Council.

If we fail to get action from the present Congress, we must make this an issue for getting a new Congress in 1948.

The Economic Advisory Council has made recommendations to the Congress, and a congressional committee, headed by Senator TAFT was established to consider the recommendations and do something about them. Last winter the Council reported that prices were dangerously high. Today they are even higher. The committee headed by Senator TAFT has done nothing to meet the problem.

The announcement of good programs for stabilizing our economy and warding off depression is not sufficient.

Genuine leadership requires fighting for these programs with every power at the President's command.

The President did not lack vigor in rushing to Congress at the time of the railroad strike a year ago, when he berated leading labor leaders and called for dangerous repressive legislation; nor did he lack vigor in rushing to Congress with an emergency message on the need of shipping arms to Turkey.

We must have the same vigor on behalf of positive programs that we have seen in the presentation of these negative programs.

The President can and must demonstrate that he recognizes the national housing crisis as at least equal in importance to the munitions requirements of reactionary governments abroad.

He can and must appeal to the Congress and the people for the health legislation which will extend the useful lives of millions of Americans.

He can and must carry a vigorous fight for the improvement of our educational system through Federal aid to the States.

In meeting a dozen major domestic problems he need not manufacture emergencies—they are here, now.

I would suggest, also, that the administration and the Democratic Party take leadership—now—today—in a campaign to nationaliz our munitions industries.

The people should own and control our armaments plants.

There should be no profit in the patriotic duty of defending our country.

Leadership on this issue will bring a response from the people; it will increase faith in the legitimacy of national expenditures for weapons of defense.

If the new Congress elected in 1948 is again composed chiefly of Republicans and crypto-Republicans masquerading as Democrats we may be certain that it will continue to grind labor under its heel, sabotage the farm programs, strangle reclamation and power programs, and refuse to take action to prevent depression.

It will refuse to appropriate any large sums of money except for fighting Russia.

It will kill the capitalistic democracy some of us are fighting so hard to save.

I have said that if the Democratic Party does not return to liberal principles, it will not return to power.

Merely blaming Republicans for national crises will not win for us Democrats.

I have mentioned the possibility of a third party. Let me add a few words on that subject:

I am convinced by a careful study of the American political scene that a truly liberal party—whether it be the Democratic Party or a new party—can elect a useful number of Congressmen in 1948.

Such a liberal bloc in the Congress will help halt the present reactionary trend.

I would prefer to see a genuine two-party system.

I would rather congratulate the administration on a reversal of present trends and on assuming some dynamic, positive, liberal leadership. The trend of the past year has been the other way.

In the 9 months which have passed since President Truman reversed his approval of my foreign-policy speech at Madison Square Garden, we have taken many dangerous steps down the road toward war and depression.

But though these steps have been accelerated in recent weeks, the decisions are not irrevocable.

We can yet regain the respect of the peoples of the world.

We shall not regain such respect by strengthening the Peron dictatorship in Argentina.

We shall not regain such respect by using our limited shipping facilities for guns in place of plows.

We shall not gain such respect by failing to recognize that we have just lost a war in China at a cost of $2,000,000,000 and yet continuing a policy of arming reactionaries.

We shall not regain respect by training our 18-year-olds in the art of war and in other ways expanding our already fantastic military superiority over the rest of the world.

To gain respect we must vigorously push a domestic program to avoid depressions.

To gain respect we must attempt to reach agreement with the Soviet Government and substitute strict adherence to our basic principles for dangerous economic and political opportunism.

To gain respect we must practice at home the principles we preach abroad.

Let's stop fooling ourselves.

We can gain no respect—except in the most reactionary circles—by our failure to abolish the poll tax and extend and protect our fundamental doctrine of equal opportunity.

The case against us which is preached by leftists throughout the world may be exaggerated, but it has a substantial basis in fact. When confessed murderers are acquitted in South Carolina, the world does not rush to embrace American democracy.

The correct antidote is remedial action:

We can abolish the poll tax and other hindrances to free franchise.

We can establish a Federal fair employment practices commission—with power.

We can put the power of the Federal Government behind those law-enforcement officers who want to thwart those who take the law into their own lands.

We can end the right of Congressmen—without majority approval—to use their cloaks of immunity from libel to smear any American who suggests we practice democratic and Christian principles.

We can and must give evidence of our devotion to basic American principles and to the principles of the United Nations.

Democracy is only practical when it is not infringed. We shall perfect our democracy or we shall come to know—at first-hand—the lash of dictatorship.

Peace requires thinking on a grand scale. It demands leadership. We have all the resources and the know-how and the manpower to create abundance for the common man everywhere. We have the knowledge and spirit to create such a world. We must imbue our present leaders with that spirit or we must replace them.

The application of common sense and a little courage will make peace inevitable.

Louisiana Deserves Its Rightful Place as a Great Industrial and Agricultural State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana is one of the great industrial States in the Union. Henry Kaiser, the industrialist, realized the great commercial possibilities when he took over the aluminum plant at Baton Rouge, and is now building a wharf at Baton Rouge costing approximately $1,000,000,000, which will permit ocean-going vessels to go through to the Baton Rouge aluminum plant to unload bauxite. I had the pleasure of working with Henry Kaiser in completing negotiations with the War Assets Administration for the aluminum plant and aiding in the opening of this great industrial giant.

On May 29, 1947, Henry J. Kaiser, president of the Permanente Metals Corp., Oakland, Calif., wrote me as follows:

I have just been informed that the Baton Rouge alumina plant is now actually producing the entire alumina requirements for our aluminum plants in the Northwest.

When I received this message, it immediately recalled to me your great determination and untiring efforts to develop peacetime utilization of the war plants in Louisiana.

I know you will share our sense of constructive accomplishment in the successful reconversion of the Baton Rouge plant and its contribution to employment and productive capacity of both your State and the Nation.

I should like to add that the people of Louisiana whom we have come to know—many as employees and others from business contacts arising from our operation of the Baton Rouge plant—have been most warm and helpful to our establishing this new business

In addition, about a year ago, through the joint efforts of myself and the New Orleans Association of Commerce, an air route was established to the Latin-American countries.

As a Congressman from Louisiana, with its great industrial potentialities, I am, indeed, proud of my record of support of every sound piece of legislation, and I repeat for emphasis, every sound measure, which would assure a happier and more prosperous livelihood for our farmers, our laborers, our oilmen, our veterans, our lumbermen, our trappers, and for our fishermen. Louisiana ranks third in the Nation as a producer of natural gas and petroleum and is internationally known for its agricultural products. Our fishing industry is a most important commercial enterprise and we produce more fur pelts than any other State. The coastal waters of Louisiana afford endless sources of shells and salt deposits and the chemical industry is now taking its place among the important industries of the State. Power is cheap. Labor supply is adequate and all types of transportation are available. The ideal climate of Lousiana is most desirable. Its strategic location makes it accessible to a tremendous market, both foreign and domestic.

FIGHTING FOR THE EQUALIZATION OF FREIGHT RATES FOR THE SOUTH

The Supreme Court decision upholding the Interstate Commerce Commission directive lowering southern and western freight rates was, indeed, a victory for the South. But it does not eliminate all the estimated 39 percent discrimination under which the South has labored for the past century.

The ICC order raises the official Northeastern territory rates 10 percent and lowers southern and western rates by the same amount. Although full equalization in national transportation is not yet a reality, a great deal of credit should be given to President Truman, who lives in one of the States unjustly discriminated against. We of the South must continue our efforts until all unjust discriminations in freight rates are completely eliminated.

SECURED INTERNATIONAL AIR ROUTES

Ever since I came to Congress I have worked hard to promote aviation for Louisiana. Recently I urged the Civil Aeronautics Board to permit air line extensions from New Orleans to Caribbean countries and from New Orleans to Central American countries. My cooperation and efforts were successful as shown by Civil Aeronautics Board release of May 26, 1946, authorizing the following extensions:

Chicago and Southern Airlines, Inc., for extension of service from New Orleans to Havana, Cuba; Port-au-Prince, Haiti; Dominican Republic; San Juan, Puerto Rico; Kingston, Jamaica; and Curacao, Venezuela.

Eastern Airlines for extension of service from New Orleans and Mexico City to terminal point San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Pan American Airways, Inc., for extension of service from coterminal points of New Orleans, La., and Houston, Tex., to Merida, Mexico, and terminal point Guatemala City.

At this point I desire to present a letter from the New Orleans Association of Commerce:

NEW ORLEANS
ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
New Orleans, La., May 23, 1946.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRISON: Thank you very much for your telegram informing us of the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board granting air routes from New Orleans to Mexico City, Habana, San Juan, and Caracas—service which our organization had been advocating for several years.

This decision will assure New Orleans of its ability to maintain its preeminent position as the gateway to Latin America and the principal North American center for Latin-American business.

We recall with pleasure your active cooperation and support in our desire to have this decision finally announced and we wish to express to you our sincere appreciation of your assistance in the matter.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,
GEO. E. SCHNEIDER,
General Manager.

FARMERS DEMAND HIGHWAYS

Good highways are the backbone of every State. To get products to market, farmers are urging better farm-to-market roads.

During the war the Federal Government contributed approximately $13,000,000 in Louisiana for the construction of 430 miles of new roads to carry the war implements from our factories to our ports, and the State highway department contributed $3,000,000 toward the cost.

But our highway system felt the pangs of war. Military maneuvers sent fleets of wheeled and tracked vehicles pounding over our back country roads, breaking down the bridges and damaging some roads. To correct this damage, the Congress authorized $2,000,000 for the repair of hundreds of miles of highways in Louisiana. In this connection it is worthy to note that outside of the war period, dating back for approximately 8 years, very little has been done to improve or repair the highway system of Louisiana by the State department of highways.

Surely, there is an urgent need for extensive Federal and State highway and farm-road maintenance in Louisiana. There is also an urgent need for new roads both paved and black-topped. Already motor-vehicle registrations for 1947 are within 2 percent of the 1941 peak. Motor-fuel consumption, a reliable gage of travel, is 19 percent greater than in 1941. This year we will have more cars on the road than ever, and they will travel more miles than ever before. There seems to be no limit to travel so long as we can provide road space for cars and trucks.

FORESTRY ROADS A MUST

Sixteen million acres—more than half the total land area of Louisiana—is forest land. The forests of Louisiana support industries which normally employ more labor than any other industrial group except crop farming. One-third of all workers employed in manufacturing receive their income directly from industries based on forest products.

The annual value of the forest crop in Louisiana is approximately $50,000,000. That does not include the value added by remanufacture into numerous products. Louisiana is among the leading States in the production of hardwood lumber. Seven pulp mills place us first among the States of the lower South in pulp output, and fourth in the Nation. The new pulp mill at Springhill, La., is the largest in the South.

Good roads are not only important to agriculture, tourist business, and business generally in Louisiana, but they are important in forestry. They reduce the cost of truck logging and facilitate transportation of forest products; and aid fire protection and forest management.

All told, the forest resources of Louisiana are of tremendous importance to the State and if they are properly and wisely managed they will continue to play a major part in Louisiana development and prosperity.

I shall, therefore, devote all the time and energy required to make certain that Louisiana's matching funds are made available so that urgently needed repairs can be made at the earliest possible date and will advocate construction of

thousands of miles of new highways to serve our people and our industries.

AGRICULTURE IS LOUISIANA'S BREAD BASKET

Louisiana is one of the greatest agricultural States of the Union. The varieties of soils to be found within the State and our favorable climatic conditions make possible the growing of almost every kind of fruit and vegetable known to man.

Cotton is our most valuable crop. Our annual income from production of cotton averages $50,000,000.

We are the largest producer of sugarcane, producing 75 percent of the product grown in the continental United States. Louisiana ranks first among all States in production of rice. In 1946 Louisiana produced more than 22,000,000 bushels of this important food. We are first in the production of sweetpotatoes and also one of the large producers of Irish potatoes. Soybeans, Spanish moss, and tung-oil trees are also important agricultural products in Louisiana.

Other fruits and vegetables produced in abundance include strawberries, oranges, peppers, snap beans, and cabbage. We market more than 2,500 carloads of strawberries per year normally. Our oranges are the finest produced anywhere. Our vegetables go to more than 20 States.

The value of our dairy and beef products has more than doubled in the last 10 years. For example, in 1935 our dairy products were valued at $14,000,000 while in 1944 income from dairy products exceeded $28,000,000. In 1935 our cash income from sales of cattle and calves was $7,500,000 while for the year of 1944 it was almost $17,000,000.

Corn, oats, hay, alfalfa, lespedeza, and other feed crops are produced in large quantities.

WILDLIFE RESOURCES OF LOUISIANA

The forests and waters of Louisiana have enormous resources of fish, oysters, and fur-bearing animals that enrich the State for commercial uses. The pursuit of hunting and fishing for recreation in Louisiana is unexcelled.

Louisiana leads the Nation in the production of the small fur-bearing animals, whose pelts are sold in the fur markets of the world. In 1944, trappers took 8,869,000 pelts in this State to supply the demand. Most of these were muskrat—the most universally popular and most widely used fur in the United States. Other furs taken in Louisiana include mink, opossum, otter, and skunk.

One of the most valuable fishery products of the country—the shrimp—has its center of production in Louisiana. Fishermen of this State take more than a hundred million pounds of shrimp annually. This is about two-thirds of the total United States catch. Shrimp fishing, unlike many industries, is not centralized in a few large ports, but is carried on from many small coastal towns. One of these—Morgan City—has within the past ten years seen the development of a new fishery based on the large and especially valuable "jumbo-size" shrimp. These are taken in deeper offshore waters where large populations were discovered about 1938, and we are the only source of this size shrimp.

Louisiana is also rich in waterfowl. The State lies at the southern end of the vast system of migratory routes known as the Mississippi flyway. It is the wintering ground for large numbers of blue geese, snow geese, mallards, pintails and other species.

The Federal Government maintains more than 200,000 acres of wildlife refuges in the coastal marshes of Louisiana to provide necessary winter food for these birds. In 1946, the State of Louisiana issued 163,000 licenses to hunters, and 35,000 to fishermen. These sportsmen took advantage of the abundant fish and game and in pursuing their recreation brought financial benefit to many small and scattered communities.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, Louisiana deserves and is entitled to its rightful place as a great industrial and agricultural State in this land of the free and home of the brave.

FLOOD-CONTROL AND NAVIGATION PROGRAM SHOULD BE CONTINUED

Louisiana, at the foot of the Mississippi River, receives the run-off waters from 41 percent of the United States including all or part of 31 States. Being so situated, the economy and welfare of the State is largely dependent upon artificial works to protect its property and people from the floodwaters of this second largest river system in the world.

In 1717, Bienville founded the city of New Orleans at its present site because it was the only portion of southern Louisiana which he found above floodwaters at that time. Within less than a year the settlement started the construction of levee protection, the first levee on the Mississippi River. Since that time, gigantic levees have grown on the Misssissippi, Red, and Ouachita Rivers, and lesser streams. The northwest part of the State is dotted with reservoirs; emergency spillways have been constructed; floodways and auxiliary channels have been built to care for floodwaters in excess of the carrying capacity of natural streams. Channel dredging is performed annually in the interest of flood control as well as navigation. The structures that have been completed or authorized in the interest of flood protection for the State of Louisiana aggregate $500,000,000 in estimated cost.

The future prosperity of the State, its industrial economy as well as its agriculture, are largely dependent upon the completion and maintenance of authorized improvements.

The most important project affecting the State of Louisiana is the one for the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River which is being constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers. Work accomplished on the project for the protection of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River has demonstrated its effectiveness by an unbroken record for a period of 18 years.

Louisiana has been greatly benefited by the flood-control works constructed and operated by the Corps of Engineers. Continued cooperation of the State and Federal Governments in the construction and operation of flood control and navigation facilities is essential for the safety of our people and development and profitable operation of our industries.

PETROLEUM AND CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES

Few industries either directly or more vitally affect every American family than the petroleum industry. Aside from food and shelter no other factor enters so intimately into the life of the people as well as into their industries as do the products of this industry.

One of the reasons why our chemical production is expanding is because we have in abundance many needed basic materials such as petroleum, natural gas, sulphur, salt, and so forth.

During the last 5 years, Louisiana's chemical industry has been expanding by leaps and bounds. The annual value of our products has increased more than $100,000,000 and prospects for future expansion of this industry indicate that the annual value of our chemical production will double within a short period of time.

Synthetic rubber, ammonia, sulfuric acid, salt cake, and paper pulp, are among the products being manufactured in quantities at our Louisiana factories. Naturally, I am sincerely proud of Louisiana achievements and shall continue my efforts to cooperate with one and all and thereby do everything possible to help and aid the great State of Louisiana.

Congress Versus Presidential Encroachment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Sun is very well written and clearly demonstrates the attempt of the administration to play politics with tax reduction.

It should be called to mind that the present tax law was written by a Democratic Congress, and if the rates of tax on those in the low-income brackets are disproportionate, it is the result of Democratic legislation.

A Democratic Congress passed the present tax law and fixed the present tax rates. Any reduction in taxes is just that much less that the taxpayers are required to pay under the present Democratic tax law.

The editorial above referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS VERSUS PRESIDENTIAL ENCROACHMENT

President Truman's message accompanying his veto of the tax-reduction bill is one of the strangest, most confusing, and most disingeneous of all the messages ever sent from the White House to the Capitol. If it is not as provocative as the one which Congress slapped down in 1944, this is simply because Mr. Truman knows better than Franklin D. Roosevelt ever did how sensitive the boys on Capitol Hill are about such things. Essentially, however, the two are equally mischievous. What both have said in effect is that, for reasons of political expediency, the control of the public purse, which tradition and the Constitution have placed in the hands of Congress, must now be transferred to the hands of the Executive.

On February 22, 1944, Franklin D. Roosevelt vetoed a revenue bill in a bitterly sarcastic message in which he termed the measure as "not a tax bill but a tax-relief bill providing not relief for the needy but for the greedy." His good friend, "Dear ALBEN BARKLEY," was so angry that he resigned as majority leader of the Senate, declaring that if Congress had any self-respect left it would pass the bill over the President's veto. By smashing majorities in each, both Houses did vote to override.

Observe, now, with what greater urbanity President Truman makes almost the same point made by his predecessor:

"H. R. 1 reduces taxes in the high-income brackets to a grossly disproportionate extent as compared to the reduction in the low-income brackets. A good tax-reduction bill would give a greater proportion of relief to the low-income group."

What an extraordinary statement. The bill just vetoed would reduce taxes by approximately 30 percent for persons in the low-income group and by only a fraction more than 10 percent for persons in the highest income group. If a reduction of 30 percent isn't greater than a reduction of 10 percent, the President should, without delay, issue a new textbook on simple arithmetic.

The real issue of partisan politics appears in the second sentence of the veto message. "The right kind of tax reduction," says Mr. Truman, "at the right time is an objective to which I am deeply committed." When will that right time roll around, Mr. President? What will be the right kind? If the White House doesn't know the answers, we do. The "right time," from a Democratic point of view, will be next summer, some 3 months before the Presidential election. The "right kind" will be a tax bill sired by Democratic partisanship out of the remnant of the New Deal.

The basic and inescapable truth is, of course, that the intrenched spenders of Federal bureaucracy are still managing the formulas of finance of which President Truman is residuary legatee. Reduction of taxes means drawing, somewhere, some kind of line against the extravagance which has brought the national debt and Federal spending to heights which threaten the fiscal integrity of the United States for a hundred years to come. Yet the President can say: "There is no justification now for tax reduction." Mr. Truman should go back home and take a refresher course with some of the practical professors of economics so numerous in the region around the confluence of the Missouri River and the Kaw.

The failure of Congress to override this veto can only be interpreted as acquiescence in an encroachment upon its constitutional power of the purse.

OPA Fades Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following recent editorial from the Medford (Mass.) Mercury, which is one of the best statements I have seen relating to the passing of OPA:

OPA FADES OUT

The much "cussed and discussed" Office of Price Administration finally passed out of the picture on Saturday, May 31. So ended quietly a Government bureau which has caused more controversy than any other in the modern history of Washington at least.

Grumblingly tolerated during the war, criticism of the bureaucracy and its unscientific and often stubborn positions became increasingly louder until at the close of the campaign of 1946 the scarcity of meat and other commonly used household articles due to OPA price control became the dominant political issue. So violent was the political reaction to the OPA because of scarcity of meat that President Truman decontrolled meat a few days before the election. In November and December, before the Republican Congress could have a whack at decontrol, President Truman practically completed the job. Near the end the only friends of the OPA were the CIO-PAC and the lunatic left-wing fringe.

During its final days all the OPA had left was control of sugar and rents. The duties of controlling these have been turned over to other departments. In the fall control over sugar will be lifted unless the Department of Agriculture decides to do it sooner.

The story of the OPA is the history of a bureau which thought itself bigger than the laws of nature and economy, and then learned to its sorrow that it wasn't quite that large.

But at any rate the OPA has passed out of the picture, taking with it the fond hopes of all left-wingers who wanted to regiment American life into the European way. And as Shakespeare wrote of one of his characters in Macbeth, "Nothing in his life became him like the leaving it."

And Now, Mr. Truman, We Come to the $64,000,000,000 Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, should the President of the United States veto a bill that contains his own recommendations?

We will give you until midnight Friday, June 20, to answer, Mr. Truman. No coaching from the audience, please.

Here are a few tips which may help you with the answer.

Remember, Mr. Truman, in your message to Congress recently you stated that there was no justification for jurisdictional or secondary boycott strikes, and you recommended that such strikes should be outlawed. The labor bill contains your recommendations. No coaching please.

Remember, Mr. Truman, you also recommended in a recent message to Congress that there be a nonpartisan board set up to make a long-term study of the causes of labor-management difficulties. Well, this bill contains your recommendation on that also. Please, no coaching.

Remember, Mr. Truman, you vigorously recommended that Communists should be cleaned out of Government positions. Well, this bill will clean Communists out of labor unions, which I am sure you will agree with.

Here is an additional tip. An editorial from the June 14 Washington Post, which contains some excellent and carefully thought out suggestions on the Taft-Hartley bill and its relation to the power of the veto possessed by the President.

This may prove helpful in your answer to the $64,000,000,000 question. I suggest you read it carefully:

PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS: CRUCIAL TEST

A veto by President Truman of the labor bill would do more harm to international peace than to industrial peace. Two-thirds of the Congress may override a veto, but how could the President expect future cooperation from Congress if he sets up his judgment against the carefully considered views of more than two-thirds of the Senators and Representatives?

Congress knows far more than the President about the need for legislation and about the way the new law will meet that need. Congressmen have been holding hearings and arguing among themselves and with constituents over labor relations for many months. The President has been engrossed in a multiplicity of other problems. He won't be able personally to study the labor bill adequately. He must rely largely on advisers to analyze its merits and demerits. What advisers are as reliable as two-thirds of the Congress?

In foreign affairs the President must constantly call upon the Congress to trust him, because his sources of information are so intimate and his responsibility is so great. But how could he expect the Congress to trust him if, when its Members are much better informed, he showed no trust in them, and refused to follow their good judgment?

Furthermore, the Congress knows, and thinks the President should know, that our international influence and our domestic strength have been seriously weakened by abuses of organized labor power—and particularly by the reckless industrial warfare of 1946. Is our memory so short that we forget the serious conditions that created the public demand for the intervention of law? Unless labor as well as management is legally required to fulfill its obligations to the general welfare, our country will steadily deteriorate and our Government become more and more impotent to protect our interests at home and abroad. The world will wonder who pulls the strings of our Government.

It is the primary duty of the Congress to legislate. The veto power of the President was never intended, and should never be used to impose his will upon the American people contrary to the judgment of their chosen lawmakers. The veto power is only designed as a safeguard against legislation which, because of mistake or haste or the overlooking of important considerations, would not be approved by the Congress after being advised of its errors. An example of hasty legislation which thoroughly deserved the veto it got was the Case bill. Another piece of legislation equally deserving of a veto because of its overlooking of prospective world reconstruction needs is the lopsided tax reduction bill now on the White House desk.

But this Congress has given to the labor bill an extended and detailed consideration which cannot be duplicated by the President in 10 days or 10 weeks. This legislative judgment should weigh more heavily with the President than 1,000,000 letters from persons selfishly affected, more heavily than 100 memoranda from public officials personally concerned, more heavily than the well-intentioned but inexpert counsel of "intimate advisers," certainly more heavily than the intimidation of labor leaders who, after cold-shouldering all requests for cooperation

in framing wise legislation to cope with crying needs, are now filling the woods with lamentations.

When two-thirds of the Congress vote to pass a much-needed law against violent opposition, they have a right to expect cooperative approval from a President who cannot fulfill his high responsibilities except by giving cooperation in exchange for the cooperation he must obtain.

The American Taxpayer Is No Moron

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's action in vetoing the Individual Income Tax Reduction Act of 1947 reveals a carefully planned attempt to delay tax reforms until the Presidential campaign of 1948. It is an echo from the immediate past when WPA and relief funds were used for political purposes. In other words, here is a practical application of the age-old saying "history repeats itself."

It will be interesting to watch the speed of the present administration during the next 6 months in deciding that tax reduction is a worthy objective. Conversion to this viewpoint will be accomplished with both eyes on the 1948 ballot boxes of the Nation. In fact, President Truman left the door open by his reference to tax revision, which makes it more difficult for him to justify his veto of the tax bill.

There is no denial of the fact that the American people are sick and tired of exorbitant taxes. They are demanding reduction in the expenses of their Government, realizing that it is impossible to continue the waste of public funds without bankrupting the Nation and stifling the economic growth and development of the individual and the country by levying a multitude of taxes on every phase of American life.

There are approximately 46,000,000 citizens of the United States who are income-taxpayers. Twenty-five million of this group are in the low income brackets, while an additional 6,000,000 have slightly higher incomes not in excess of $1,400 annually. The third group embraces some 15,000,000 earning in excess of $1,400 annually, but not over $302,396. There are approximately 922 taxpayers whose taxable income, after deductions and exemptions, exceeds $302,396.

The average American citizen is conscious to a marked degree of the effect of the withholding tax on his regular pay check. It is an insult to the intelligence of the American workingman to conclude that he is unschooled in the fact that the present high cost of government is robbing his pay envelope and depriving him of providing his family with many of the necessities of life.

While we do not know the identity of the President's economic advisers, it is evident that they are not "rubbing elbows" with the average American citizen who works for a living. Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, who are in close contact with their constituents, approved the tax bill in response to overwhelming sentiment for tax reductions. Surely those Members of the Senate and House of Representatives who provided the fine majorities in both branches of Congress in approving this bill cannot be charged with faulty reasoning in following the wishes of the people from home who elected them.

The tax bill as vetoed by President Truman afforded tax relief on a graduated scale of benefits that are in adherence with the American standards of justice and fair play.

It is intellectually dishonest to establish a smoke screen and thus attempt to delude American taxpayers by piously referring to inflationary tendencies and the need for reducing the national debt. Such hypocrisy on the part of the present administration is fully revealed when we recall that we were told by the late leader of the Democracy Party to forget the national debt and not worry about it as it was merely an obligation we owed to ourselves.

The average American workman is not the only one to be sacrificed in the efforts of President Truman to bewilder and befuddle American taxpayers while he views the 1948 Presidential election with anxiety and alarm. The elderly citizens of this great Nation, who upon attaining age 65 were granted an additional exemption of $500 for income-tax purposes, are affected by the President's veto of the tax bill since it contained such a provision. To these splendid citizens, in the twilight of life, the future becomes increasingly bleak and fraught with continued despair.

While President Truman was filling his fountain pen, preparatory to vetoing the tax bill, the American people were listening to fervent pleas that we continue to pour millions of dollars into foreign countries without any guaranty that we would ever recover one dollar of these vast sums of money, taken from the pockets of the American taxpayers.

Republican Members of Congress, in their drive for economy in Government, are being crucified by the present administration in the frenzied efforts being made to mislead the rank and file of American citizens, as to the true story regarding tax reduction. But the American workingman is no moron and that fact will be brought home to New Deal disciples when they profess the faith in tax reduction and schedule their conversion when the polls begin to open in 1948. Their sincerity would be more genuine if they had recognized the burden of the American taxpayer and hit the saw-dust trail now by approving the tax bill as a worthy measure of relief to the 46,000,000 income taxpayers of America.

In fact, when the 46,000,000 people pay a quarterly income tax in September and December, they will know they are paying 20 or 30 percent more because President Truman vetoed the tax bill. It will be a Truman assessment on the American people.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the labor legislation now awaiting the President's approval or veto has called forth much editorial comment throughout the Nation. One of the most interesting discussions of this bill which I have read is by a distinguished Georgia editor, Ralph McGill, which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution under date of June 16, 1947. I insert this editorial here as a part of my remarks:

FROM NO OLYMPIAN HEIGHT
(By Ralph McGill)

Kenneth Douty, Georgia State director of the Textile Workers of America (CIO), is one of my acquaintances I most respect. I would be less than honest if I did not say I sincerely like him.

He is a waspish man, of superior intelligence. I think perhaps he has a heart of gold, but at times it seems to me he has copper-plated it. He dwells in the monastery of CIO with all the devout zeal of a Trappist monk. When he chooses he can be sharper than the serpent's tongue and woe betide the ill-informed and awkward of speech who verbally jousts with him.

In a note to me he said, in effect:

"Over here (CIO headquarters) the opinion is you haven't read the bill (Taft-Hartley). I maintain this may be true, but the greater problem is that it would be difficult for a newspaper editor to have the experience to evaluate the effect of a clever and complex bill. And that you refuse to take it in its historical context in the social and economic life of the country. I think you do yourself a real disservice by okaying a bill (as 'generally fair') that is a part of a stream of reaction that may engulf us all."

It is a fair letter, as I would expect. Therefore, I wish to discuss it.

ENVY

I long have envied those persons who have all the answers. I frequently sigh for the good old days when one could go to the Oracle of Delphi and get the real McCoy. I know columnists who dwell on Olympian heights, looking down on the poor mortals below, who hand down opinions as if they were bolts from Jove himself.

I frankly admit to a wrestling match over many issues. There are times when I regret opinions previously reached.

GENERALLY FAIR

I have read the labor bill. I doubt, incidentally, that his own members have. But Kenneth Douty is correct in saying that I lacked the background to detect certain "sleepers" in the bill. Obviously, the amendment which makes it possible to refuse "reporting pay" was maliciously slipped into the provision of the bill which strikes at the admitted evil of feather-bedding. The experts of the CIO and AFL have found several other provisions which make possible abuse of the rights of labor.

Nevertheless, I believe the bill to be generally fair and I believe that it should be signed.

Labor is in the poor strategic position it occupies because it so avidy used the provisions of the Wagner bill which enabled it to carry on admitted abuses.

Also, it is regrettably true, that not only did no responsible labor leader raise his voice

against the abuses in labor's ranks, and worse, there came from labor no recommendation for remedial legislation.

POWER

I have been going about the rural sections of the State. Farmers are not against high wages. They know high wages mean good prices for farm goods.

But farmers are genuinely, and deeply, concerned by the enormous power possessed by labor. It is no greater power than the farmer possesses if he should choose to use it as he has not. But it disturbs him that John L. Lewis or the Railway Brotherhood can, and will, strike and paralyze the whole Nation for the benefit of only a few thousand persons among the Nation's millions.

The farmer is not antilabor. That surprised me some. But the farmer is antilabor boss, and he is rabidly against the use of strikes which tie up the Nation.

The farmer is a good 100 percent for some protective labor legislation. He hasn't read this bill, but he has read about it and listened to radio discussions and he is for it.

THE BILL

This bill contains none of the measures to which labor orignially objected. It is not as harsh as the one Congress really wanted to pass. It is not as severe as the Case bill. It is, save for a few sleepers, which public opinion may prevent from being turned into abuses, a middle-of-the-road bill.

It does not enslave labor. It does not, as far as I can see, relieve the employer of any major measures required by the Wagner Act. It certainly is nowhere close to the proposal to draft strikers into the Army in cases of great emergency.

Labor cannot say there was no need for legislation when, with the Wagner Act in full operation, there were 113,000,000 man-days of work lost in 1946 by strikes. It is not true that matters were working out satisfactorily. Strikes were not being reduced.

Certainly, the overwhelming support given it in Congress reflects not simply reaction, but public opinion.

Some of this legislation goes against my instincts and emotions; but I believe it important to keep in mind we are a nation and that organized labor is but a part of it. I believe the national welfare required a start be made. The next Congress is but a few months away. It can begin the task of amending where necessary.

The historical fact is we progress by trial and error. The Wagner Act will remain.

Taft-Hartley Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to discredit Members of Congress who voted for the Taft-Hartley labor bill, an anonymous circular from an unknown source styling itself, "Committee for the Preservation of Southern Traditions," has been issued and widely circulated, charging that the bill contains a provision that would put into effect the so-called FEPC bill.

This statement is utterly untrue and obviously put out as a red herring by some unknown opponent of the labor bill.

The basis for the circular is formed by quoting a part of a sentence from section 8 (a) of the bill and failing to quote the entire language of the sentence. Section 8 (a), subsection (3) makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer by "discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization." The bill then provides an exception to that rule by permitting the formation of a union shop by agreement between the employer and a majority of the employees. By this method, an employer and a union may agree that all employees shall be required to became and remain members of the union after a period of 30 days as a condition of employment. This means that if, for any reason, an employee did not become a member or did not maintain his membership, the union could demand his discharge.

If the language of the bill stopped there, all employees under such an arrangement would be at the mercy of the union, and if the union refused to accept an employee or dismissed an employee from the union for any or no reason, the employer would be compelled to discharge him, regardless of the merits of the controversy.

A further proviso was therefore written into the bill which was quoted in the circular referred to, the effect of which is to say that the employer shall not be compelled to discharge an employee in a union shop where he is willing to join the union and is refused membership or is expelled. The provision is eminently fair, and no fair-minded person could object to it in this bill or in any other bill.

It should be clearly understood that the language of the bill does not compel the employer to hire or discharge any person, whatever his race or religion may be.

It does not compel the union to accept any person into membership if the union does not wish to do so.

It merely provides that the union cannot compel the employer to discharge an employee unless he refuses to join the union or maintain his membership in the union.

It does not compel the union to admit anyone to membership or to exclude anyone from membership.

It simply provides that the union may not exclude an employee from membership and then demand his discharge from his job.

Nothing could be fairer to all parties concerned. Without this provision the bill would have been highly discriminatory and indefensible.

As far as I am concerned, I have always advocated labor legislation that would give to employer and employee and union as much freedom and as little compulsion as possible.

This provision gives to the employer the freedom to agree or refuse to agree to a union shop the freedom to hire or fire as he sees fit employees who are excluded by a union from membership.

It gives the employee the freedom to work without fear of arbitrary exclusion by the union and discharge by the employer.

It gives the union the freedom to select its own membership and exclude those employees that it prefers not to extend its membership to.

I cannot conceive of any provision that could be more expressive of the rights of all free American citizens, regardless of race or religion.

I have made some effort to ascertain the identity of the organization styling itself Committee for the Preservation of Southern Traditions.

I find that the circular was mailed out by an individual who is a member of the electrical workers union and claims to be associated with other union members whose objective is to induce Congress to sustain a possible veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill.

This individual has so far declined to reveal the identity of any of his alleged associates in the so-called Committee for the Preservation of Southern Traditions.

The President's Tax Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's veto of the tax reduction bill, H. R. 1, indicates that the New Deal continues to follow the Harry Hopkins formula of tax and tax, spend and spend, and I may say that his veto message was replete with demagoguery and sophistry, unworthy of a President of a great Republic.

Canada and the United Kingdom have already had a tax reduction and the Canadian people are to get a second cut in taxes on July 1 that will give those in the lower brackets as much as 29 percent tax reduction.

Mr. Truman does not want tax reduction because that would give him less money to spend, and he is the greatest spending President in our history, as witness his $37,500,000,000 budget for the fiscal year 1948, which is four times greater than the highest Roosevelt peacetime budget.

I am sure the corporations of America feel grateful to Mr. Truman for having given them a $6,000,000,000 tax reduction in 1945, notwithstanding that we were facing a $50,000,000,000 deficit at the time. Now when a Republican Congress proposes to give tax relief to 49,000,000 individual taxpayers, at a cost much lower than the corporate tax reduction cost us, he would have us believe that such reduction would be inflationary. I might say parenthetically that we now have a substantial surplus in the Treasury and we are, therefore, in better shape to give relief. I also contend that tax reductions do not increase prices, as do the wage increases the President has forced the country to accept.

It looks like we will have to wait for a Republican President to take over in January 1949 before there can be tax relief for the harassed individual.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the President's action, which is universally condemned, I desire to insert a very fine

article on the subject by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Star last evening.

The article follows:

TAX BILL VETO TERMED ERROR THAT MAY COST TRUMAN 1948 VICTORY

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman's veto of the tax bill may cost him the 1948 election. He mistakenly thought, no doubt, that he would gain politically by the veto.

Today the Republicans are jubilant, for they have been handed on a platter an issue that can win for them no matter who their candidate may be.

What the President said to 46,000,000 taxpayers was that they couldn't have a tax reduction because he wanted to fix the tax rates and didn't recognize the right of a majority in Congress to do so.

In all American history no tax bill passed by both Houses has ever failed to become law. Only one has been vetoed heretofore, but it was overridden by Congress. If the pending tax bill is killed because it cannot muster two-thirds in both Houses, it will bring a tremendous change in legislative practice.

The arbitrary use of the veto to defeat the will of a majority in Congress will lead to the arbitrary use of the rider attached to other necessary legislation. The majority would be well justified in attaching the tax bill to any of the current appropriation bills, if only to assert the historic right of Congress to write legislation that raises revenue and fixes tax rates.

COMMUNISTIC ARGUMENT SEEN

When Mr. Truman tells the taxpayers who were to be granted a 30-percent reduction that they can't have it because someone with a higher income is getting a 10 percent reduction, he is misjudging human nature if he thinks this will please that vast number of taxpayers in the lower brackets to whom every dollar of saving is consequential and who do not feel they should be punished because Mr. Truman wants to play the demagog. The President is, in effect, arguing for the communistic doctrine which seeks to level all incomes irrespective of brains or thrift.

The President says that he vetoed the bill because it is "the wrong kind of tax reduction, at the wrong time." This phrase will become famous in political history as the prize boner of the age. For it implies plainly that the wrong kind of tax reduction will be all right at the right time—presumably next year when the Presidential campaign is in the offing and when presumably Mr. Truman can strive for political credit even for the "wrong kind of tax reduction."

But next year the Congress will pass the same kind of tax bill it did this year except that will be even more unpalatable for Mr. Truman to sign, and when he signs it, he will make his message of this week look rather ridiculous.

DAMAGE MAY BE DELAYED

The damage Mr. Truman did in vetoing the tax bill will not be apparent right away. It will be apparent in the "recession" that could conceivably be ushered in as a consequence of his blunder, and it would be felt throughout the world.

For Mr. Truman, by his action this week, may have killed all chance of helping the world trade situation and European rehabilitation. Export trade that has been booming may decline severely. Then there would surely be a recession. The Republicans, so many of whom don't want to vote more billions to Europe, now have been given a very strong excuse—Mr. Truman's own words. For the President said:

"With the present huge public debt, it is of first importance that every effort now be made to reduce that debt as much as possible."

This means that debt reduction is, in the President's opinion, paramount. There are plenty of Republicans who will take him at his word. They will not vote billions for Europe while a Democratic President denies tax relief to the American people.

MESSAGE CALLED BOOMERANG

Unfortunately, the Truman message, while intended to play politics in order to gain support from the left wing, really will prove a boomerang with the average man, who will not understand why the $40 or $50 savings he was to get are now being denied him. To lose a 30-percent tax reduction is more serious in the lower brackets than to forego a 10-percent reduction in the higher brackets.

There is a surplus of more than $1,000,000,000 coming on June 30 and a surplus of at least $8,000,000,000 is indicated for next year—yet Mr. Truman is denying the taxpayers any relief from wartime rates.

The Republicans ought not to adjourn without passing another tax bill—this one to be effective January 1, 1948, and giving an even greater reduction in rates to individuals in the lower brackets. If Congress surrenders to the Executive its authority to fix tax rates, the legislative branch of the Government would be surrendering also the independence it has exercised for more than 160 years.

I also wish to insert an editorial from yesterday morning's Times and a front-page editorial from the New York Sun for Monday morning:

[From the New York Times of June 17, 1947]

THE TAX VETO

The responsibility always rests, or should rest, upon the President, in employing his veto power, to justify such action by reasoning which is so logical and so convincing as to be, to all intents and purposes, unanswerable. There are two reasons, moreover, why this generalization may be said to have applied with more than ordinary force in the case of H. R. 1, which President Truman refused to validate with his signature yesterday. In the first place, the determination of tax policy has always been regarded as peculiarly the domain of the legislative branch of the Government, not to be lightly set aside by the Executive. (This largely explains, no doubt, why yesterday's veto was only the second of its kind in the Nation's history.) In the second place, when taxes, going into the third postwar year, are still close to wartime peak levels, the burden of proof is not upon those who propose to reduce them, but upon the opponents of such a course.

Does the President's veto message justify his action when judged by these exacting requirements? In our opinion, the answer is clearly in the negative. A convincing case might have been made for signing the measure with the reservation that he was doing so against his better judgment and on the understanding that if the budget surplus on which it was predicated failed to materialize Congress would be expected to provide the necessary revenues. But if an equally convincing case could be made for a veto, one will seek it in vain in yesterday's message. It is a truism in the legal profession that when a lawyer tries to prove too much it is a sign that either he is a bad lawyer or that he has a bad case. In yesterday's message the President, it seems to us, tried to prove too much. And since he has legal advisers around him of unquestionable competence, the conclusion would appear to be inescapable that he had a weak case.

The theme of Mr. Truman's veto message was that "H. R. 1" represented "the wrong kind of tax reduction, at the wrong time." This is the wrong time for tax reduction, said he, for three reasons: (1) We are still in a transition period, in terms of the national finances, and the situation calls for "prudence and conservative management"; (2) the economy is already subject to inflationary pressures, and tax reduction would tend to increase them; and (3) if we are to "maintain the integrity of the national debt" we must reduce it by substantial amounts.

Mr. Truman is on sound ground when he calls for a conservative attitude toward the nation's finances at this time. The Republican leadership, in its anxiety to make good a campaign pledge, has left itself open to the charge of patent over-optimism in a field in which over-optimism has no place; and its approach to the tax problem, as we have pointed out numerous times has been a good deal less than orderly and consistent. Although it has been hoped that by mid-June the picture of prospective federal income and outgo between now and June 30, 1948, would be fairly clear, developments in that respect have not fulfilled the more hopeful expectations. In recent weeks, for example, private estimates of the excess receipts over this period have ranged from as high as $10,000,000,000 to as low as $4,000,000,000. These figures, moreover, have included little or no allowance for the fact that the recent reorientation of the Administration's foreign policy, with its emphasis on economic aid abroad, introduces a new element of uncertainty so far as the spending side of the budget is concerned.

But is this sufficient ground on which to justify a veto of the proposed legislation? The best answer to that question, perhaps, is that no one has shown a greater awareness of all this than Senator GEORGE, who headed the Finance Committee when the Democrats were in control of Congress, and is recognized as the party's outstanding authority; yet Mr. GEORGE only a few days ago was reported to have urged the President against vetoing the bill.

Less convincing is the second of the President's reasons for his veto, the inflation argument. It is convincing enough as a matter of pure monetary theory. The trouble is that the administration has demonstrated in the past that its forecasts in the field of inflation and deflation and related matters have been highly undependable where they have not been highly political. It is difficult to take the inflation argument of an administration too seriously in the case of taxes, moreover, when that same administration ignores inflation in its wage policies and when one of its chief spokesmen has already gone on record against the tax-reduction bill because deflation was in the offing, which, he pointed out, would mean a drop in the national income and hence in the yield of prevailing tax rates.

The third argument, that the national debt must be reduced by substantial amounts, would be impressive were it not for one fact. The authors of H. R. 1 have never said that the debt should not be reduced. On the contrary, their contention from the start has been that the fiscal outlook was such that the debt and taxes could be reduced by equal amounts. That premise may be wrong, but there can be no doubt that it is there and that it is a basic postulate among conservative Members of Congress who have supported the measure.

It is when the President sets out to show that this is not only the wrong time for tax reduction, but that H. R. 1 represents the wrong kind of tax measure that he reveals the real measure of the weakness of his case. For this section descends to the plane of pure political demagoguery.

One of the standard arguments advanced against an across-the-board reduction in taxes at this time is that such a reduction granted greater relief in the upper than in the lower brackets. The President not only employs this fallacious and mischievous argument, but pushes it close to the reductio ad absurdum. Under the tax schedule proposed in H. R. 1, he declares, the average family with an income of $2,500 a year would receive an increase in its take-home pay of only 1.2 percent, whereas the average family

with an income of $50,000 would enjoy an increase of 18.6 percent and a $500,000-income family, 62.3 percent.

Let us see what this means in terms of the actual tax figures in these three brackets. At the present time the $2,500 family is paying $95 a year in taxes; the $50,000 family, $24,111; and the $500,000 family, $406,600. Put another way, the Government takes 3.8 percent of the net income of the $2,500 family, leaving it 96.2 percent as take-home pay; it takes 48.2 percent of the income of the $50,000 family, leaving it 51.8 percent; and it takes 81.3 percent of the income in the case of the $500,000 family, which is permitted to take home 18.7 percent.

In other words, families in the upper brackets have been taxed at such high rates under wartime and postwar schedules that their actual income has fallen to a fraction of their nominal income. And now they find the President actually proposing to use this enormously deflated take-home pay as a statistical basis to prove that they would be treated with undue generosity under H. R. 1.

Perhaps the best way to sum up the President's veto message would be to say that he has taken the wrong course, for the wrong reasons.

[From the New York Sun of June 16, 1947]

MR. TRUMAN THROWS A BOOMERANG

Yes, when President Truman vetoed the tax-reduction bill, he threw a boomerang which was a beaut!

Although the President is left-handed, experts tell us tnat a southpaw can throw a bomerang with great effect. This particular one will gather force as it goes and, in November of 1948, will come back with numbing effect to the place from which it started.

By this veto the President has made his choice between petty partisan politics on one hand and, on the other, the butcher's bill and the grocery bill of every worker for wages or salary in the United States. He plumped for partisan advantage.

The difference does not involve peanut money.

It affects the take-home pay of not fewer than 48,000,000 American citizens.

As estimated in discussion before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, the bill passed by Congress would mean an aggregate saving of $2,000,000,000 to taxpayers in 1947 and $4,000,000,000 in 1948.

That would buy a lot of pork chops, Mr. Average Citizens!

Put another way, the bill would mean on the average that, for the rest of 1947, each taxpayer could take home to his wife at least one of the $10 now claimed from him by the Federal Treasury; that for the first half of 1948 he could take home 2 of the 10 smackers which then will be claimed from him.

All this notwithstanding the probability that by the end of the present month the surplus in the Treasury will be anywhere from $1,250,000,000 on up.

Partisan Democratic strategy has decided that it would be bad politics to allow credit for any such reduction to accrue to a Republican Congress; that it would be good politics to wait until next year when it might accrue to the advantage of the next Democratic candidate for the Presidency.

Apparently Mr. Truman's advisers have persuaded him into acceptance of the old hokum that the public memory is short; that the people will be so happy over lower taxes next year that they will forget all about excess taxes unnecessarily abstracted from their pocketbooks this year.

The bill he has just vetoed is far more moderate than the one originally presented in the House of Representatives. In general, it provides for a reduction of 30 percent on taxable income up to $1,000; of 20 percent on that between $1,000 and $136,720; of 10.5 percent on all higher income. Since all reductions would be effective only from July 1 of this year, actual immediate reductions would be one-half those. Full percentages would be effective on incomes for 1948. Any taxpayer who can add and subtract needs only a pencil and the back of an envelop to figure out for himself what it may cost him personally for the President of the United States to play party politics in anticipation of the Presidential plebiscite in 1948.

Whether Congress will get mad at Mr. Truman for thus interfering with its control of the public purse—as a previous Congress got mad at Franklin D. Roosevelt for vetoing a revenue bill in 1944—remains to be seen. Party loyalty may keep enough Democrats in line to prevent any such recurrence. But whether it does or not, the Republicans in Congress and in the Nation at large have every reason to expect practical results. A lot of taxpayers will be going to the polls in 1948 determined to put an end forever to what is left of the Hopkins formula about taxing, spending, and electing.

The President accompanies his veto measure with a lot of choice rhetoric of which there is a specific name in his native Missouri.

Out there they call it "soft sawder."

Price Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Tom McGovern which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, published in Lynn, Mass., on Sunday, June 15, 1947, which merits the attention of each and every Member of Congress. It must be apparent to all of us that the necessities of life and especially foodstuffs continue to increase in price daily so that it is becoming humanly impossible for the poorer class of people to obtain the meat and foodstuffs vitally necessary to sustain life. Prices have now risen to such an extent that only through the action of Congress by investigation of this problem and by legislation to be passed will this constant increasing of prices be terminated. I sincerely hope that some one of our select committees of the House will institute an immediate investigation of this situation which is of primary importance to the entire population of our whole United States. Some action must be taken and that action should be commenced immediately.

The article follows:

STILL WAITING

I'm almost ashamed to confess that I believe Russia has it on the United States in one little department—not that I want to leave here and go there to live.

I have reference to the liberties extended to those who openly endanger the Nation's economy for their own selfish pecuniary advancements. I don't think they could get away with it anywhere but here in the United States. It's just a reminder that democracy is too good for some people.

It was just about a year ago that price controls were dropped by the President. To the President's credit, he knew it wasn't the time for the abandoning of ceilings but he found himself squeezed by powerful monopolistic groups and forced to bend.

The most of us will recall that meat was so scarce in June of last year that you were almost afraid to be locked in a room with your cat. We were assured, however, that once controls were out of the way, the old law of supply and demand would take over and everything would be just lovely.

There would be mild boosts in prices, the public was informed, but that was only to get things rolling; later on prices would fall off until there was plenty for everybody at nominal costs.

Nowadays when you walk into a meat store, you feel like screaming. It's so bad that some of the markets advertise items like boiled ham at so much per half pound. Apparently they're ashamed to put down the actual price per pound. At last reports, boiled ham had reached the $1.30 per pound mark—wonderful.

Why, I keep asking myself, should such things be allowed to exist? Who is bigger, the Governement or the meat packers? In the light of existent prices, the answer is obvious.

I happened to be examining the ceiling prices of a year ago, and they're interesting, to say the least. Bacon (curse the pigs) was then 41 cents per pound—today it is 75 cents, and that is at the supermarkets where it sells for 2 or 3 cents cheaper than in the neighborhood marts.

Top of the round steak was 42 cents per pound, today it is 89 cents. Hamburger has risen from 27 cents per pound to 45. Porterhouse steak from 51 to 79 cents per pound. Rump steak from 52 cents to 99 cents per pound. Tenderloin which was something like 59 cents, now sells for $1.25—and I suppose there are a lot of people buying it.

Aitchbones of beef which formerly retailed at 29 cents per pound are now 49; chuck roast with the bone in has risen from 29 to 49; chuck roast boneless has soared from 38 to 65 cents per pound; pig's liver (damn the porkers) has jumped from 22 to 39 cents—even the poor cat is taking it on the chin, every penny of his allowance is going for food.

Brisket corned beef has jumped from 35 to 55 cents per pound; pork chops of hallowed memory from 37 cents to 79 cents per pound, and roast pork from 31 to 59.

Somebody is cleaning up it is obvious, but at the expense of the poor American workingman whose children are deprived of various little pleasures and advantages a modest week's pay might bring to them, were not about every penny going for food each week.

Those who expect that things are going to remedy themselves, I believe, are in for a long hard struggle. Relief will come only when the Government gets hard-boiled and steps into the picture with some two-fisted directives.

After the debacle of the last year, I think those Congressmen who opposed price controls should now be convinced that you can't do without them, that there are certain businessmen who can't be trusted, who place their own personal bank accounts on an altitude miles higher than the American way of life and the well-being of the American Government.

It shouldn't be difficult to get to the bottom of these fantastic prices. It's not the stores, not the shippers, only those who are slaughtering or raising the cattle. Why is their business any better than all others that they should be looking for such outrageous profits.

I know that I speak for about everybody when I express the hope that something will be done before the greed of certain interests gets the country in a position from which it will take years to recover.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch Deplores Possibility Congress May Not Authorize Program of United States Information Abroad in This Critical Period in Our Battle for Peace—Favors Prompt Passage of Mundt Bill—Secretary Marshall Takes New Action To Assure Information Program Is Administered by Able, Patriotic Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the unfinished business now before the House is the final disposition of H. R. 3342, the legislation unanimously reported by the House Foreign Affairs Committee to establish and regulate the operation of a United States Information Service abroad adequately equipped to enable America to wage its struggle for peace and world security. It is expected this legislation will be scheduled for final action this week, and it is highly important to the future stability of the world that this House reach a wise and rational decision on this legislation. To demobilize our forces for peace and to cripple our defense against the alarming aggressions of communism would be a reckless gamble to take in an era when the future is filled with frightening and frightful possibilities.

Mr. Speaker, in its good wisdom the House has now added eight additional safeguarding amendments to H. R. 3342 in addition to the more than 20 congressional controls and safeguards written into the legislation by our Committee on Foreign Affairs. The question is now reduced in its simplest terms to the decision as to whether we are to withdraw from the world, surrender its remaining areas of freedom to communism, and deprive ourselves of effective weapons with which to defeat and deny the poisonous propaganda being circulated against us by unfriendly nations or whether we are to face up to the responsibilities of peace the way we measured up to the challenges of war and equip ourselves with every available means of getting the true story of American principles and purposes across to every region of the world which we can penetrate with the bright light of truth.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the question reduces itself down to this: Are we to rely upon the light of the Red star of Moscow or the beacon from the Statute of Liberty to enlighten the world as to the causes which the United States espouses and the principles and purposes which motivate our actions at home and abroad? A vote against H. R. 3342 or a vote to recommit it to committee, which would be equivalent to killing it without decent burial, is a vote to place our confidence in the voice of Russia rather than developing and equipping a Voice of America to carry our own message in our way where we know it is imperative that it be heard.

In this connection it is tremendously important we do not limit General Marshall in his hunt for peace to a single shell or a single weapon. In other words, we must guard against establishing or continuing a so-called Voice of America program which emits but an occasional squeak. General Marshall has insisted over and over again that simply broadcasting to others by short-wave radio is a waste of public funds and is a futile program unless augmented and supplemented by the other portions of the program envisaged by H. R. 3342, which tie into the radio broadcasts and round out an effective attempt to tell the world about America. General Marshall has reiterated over and over again that he needs the educational exchange features of this proposal, that he needs the information centers abroad, the right to assign Government specialists to aid the faltering governments of friendly powers, the authority to publish and circulate abroad magazines and periodicals portraying the true American concept and purpose. To me, sir, it is incredable that this Congress should deny our forces for peace the equipment it tells us is its minimum requirements if we are to preserve the peace and promote conditions essential to our national security and peace of mind.

Mr. Speaker, I think the great St. Louis Post-Dispatch, of St. Louis, Mo., puts the challenge before us clearly and cogently in the following editorial:

SHOUT LOUD, AMERICA

Is it conceivable that Congress proposes to stand by and allow time to silence the Voice of America 3 weeks hence? Unless approval is forthcoming, our overseas information program is scheduled to end July 1. The House shoved aside consideration of an approval measure after three attempts at passage ran headlong into stormy debate.

Absence of an American voice moving into the homes of millions in other parts of the world would constitute a major loss, a catastrophe of great proportions. For today the value of propaganda is greater than ever. Two civilizations are competing for the rest of the world. While the Soviets present data colored by Communist monitors, we must counter with a true and straightforward exposition of the facts.

Secretary Marshall considers the program essential to our foreign relations. He told a Senate committee:

"As I have said before, one effective way to promote peace is to dispel misunderstanding, fear, and ignorance. Foreign people should know the nature and objectives of our policy. They should have a true understanding of American life. We should broadcast the truth to the world through all the media of communications."

This is no occasion to hamstring an imperative program. The best way to implant democracy in the countries where it is tottering is to make known the mechanics of democracy. It is our democratic responsibility to make known the facts of the way we live, favorable and unfavorable, so the peoples of other lands may get to know and to cherish the advantages of free government.

Rather than silence the Voice of America, better raise it high and loud.

SECRETARY MARSHALL HAS STARTED THE "HOUSE-CLEANING JOB"

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about "cleaning house down at the State Department" before we approve of a program such as encompassed in H. R. 3342. In a way, that is like locking the fire engine in the station while the city burns because we are not satisfied that the fire chief has had a recent bath but in all events there is no longer any reason to delay giving the State Department the tools it needs to build a permanent temple of peace because, sir, the evidence is crystal clear that the "house cleaning job" is under way.

H. R. 3342 itself takes care of that problem and I am among those who have long insisted that the character of the people in our State Department and their loyalty to America must be as pure as Caesar's wife. We have provided for a complete loyalty check by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, we have provided a bipartisan control board to regulate and develop our information program, we have provided against the employment of aliens. Now comes the good news that Secretary of State Marshall is acting on his own initiative to remove every shadow of suspicion from the personel of his department and of the division handling the American information program abroad by requesting the FBI to check his Department first. In addition, Assistant Secretary of State Benton has asked Secretary of State Marshall to have the FBI screen and scrutinize his employees first of all among those of the entire Department. So that the record will be clear on this point, I refer you to the following Associated Press story carrying the date line of June 14—just a few days ago:

RADIO VOICE STAFF FACES FBI CHECK—MARSHALL ASKS PRIORITY IN LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, June 14.—Assistant Secretary of State William Benton said today that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, now engaged in investigating the loyalty of Government employees, has been asked to check first on personnel of the "Voice of America," the short-wave broadcasting in foreign languages done by the State Department.

Mr. Benton told about the request to the FBI in testifying before a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee.

"Secretary (George C.) Marshall, at my suggestion, has written to the Attorney General asking the FBI to give highest priority in its loyalty investigations to the State Department, and in this case to OIC," he said. He referred to the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, which handles the broadcasts.

Mr. Benton appeared before the subcommittee to ask $34,000,000 for OIC's operation in the 12 months beginning July 1. The House refused to vote the funds on the ground that Congress never had authorized the program, but legislation now is pending in the House to sanction it.

He said passage of this legislation would make it possible "to bring in more top people who up to now would not have been warranted in giving up their jobs for the risky venture which we have been pioneering."

Mr. Speaker, a Republican public relations expert sent me yesterday some suggested programs which he believes might well be included in the radio scripts, the films, the news releases, and the demonstration areas operated under the authority of H. R. 3342. Many of them closely resemble plans I have heard discussed in connection with the operation of this program. I think they reveal some of the possibilities and potentialities of a United States Information Service abroad as well as some of the reasons why some such type of program is so

imperatively needed now. If they do nothing else they reveal from an experienced traveler some of the slander and libel being directed against America abroad. How best to offset these attacks and how best to defend ourselves must be worked out by experts and will be one of the first major studies of the advisory control board provided for in H. R. 3342 by the Dirksen amendment.

Unless we are willing to sit back and say nothing, do nothing, and be nothing in this turbulent world of unpredictable events, however, we should approve H. R. 3342 and move forward with an intelligent and effective program of information abroad directed to the important goals of national security and international peace.

SUGGESTIONS FOR PROJECTS TO BE INCLUDED IN VOICE OF AMERICA BROADCASTS TO EUROPE

The Soviet Union is conducting an intensive and vicious anti-American propaganda both at home and abroad. This propaganda attacks not only the actions of the American Government, but tries to discredit, in the eyes of the Russian people and the world in general the entire American social, economic, and political way of life.

It is, in my opinion, utterly inadequate to counteract such a propaganda by simply presenting a picture of conditions and events in the United States without regard to the Soviet charges and conditions in the Soviet Union itself.

I believe that in reviewing conditions and events in the United States they should, at least in part, be so selected and presented as to refute or discredit Soviet propaganda and, whenever possible, directly or indirectly, reflect on the Soviet system.

In order to achieve this, I believe, that a certain part of the daily broadcasts should be built along the following lines:

I. Refutation of the usual Soviet contention that workers in America are mercilessly exploited.

This could be achieved by a series of talks about, by, or with workers (preferably Russian-speaking ones) of various trades and industries. Union officials or representatives could also be called upon to speak (many of them are of Russian descent and speak Russian).

Facts which should be brought to light are illustrated by the following average and actual case:

"Paul B., Manhattan, N. Y.; a Russian immigrant. Came to the United States in 1923 at the age of 22. Learned the trade of house painter. Average earnings for the last 10 years, $2,800 per year. Works 5 days a week, 7 hours a day, getting $14 per day, with time and a half for overtime, or $20 for a 9-hour day. Supports wife and mother-in-law. Occupies a nice 6-room apartment, consisting of living room, dining room, three bedrooms, kitchen, and bathroom, with all modern improvements—electric light, gas, heat, electric refrigerator, etc. Has $2,800 in the bank. Entertains friends regularly. Goes to the movies regularly. Wife always well dressed. In summer drives out of town on week ends. Last winter took a 4-month vacation going with his wife to Florida in his own car, 2,800 miles. Recently went into business as contractor in partnership with another Russian immigrant who owns an apartment house in New York."

Some other points which should be brought home are:

(a) The fact that hundreds of thousands of American workers own houses and automobiles.

(b) That the United States, with only 6 percent of the world's population, is producing 47 percent of the radios, 49 percent of the telephones, and 72 percent of the automobiles.

(c) That the average factory worker in the United States is able to buy 7.5 pounds of bread with the proceeds of 1 hour's work, whereas comparable prewar figures in other countries were: Great Britain, 5.2 pounds; Germany, 2.5 pounds; and the U. S. S. R., 1.9 pounds. That the average worker in the building trades—painter, carpenter, plumber, bricklayer—can buy a good-quality, 100-percent woolen overcoat or suit with the proceeds of 2 or 3 working days, and a pair of good shoes with the proceeds of half a day's work.

(d) The worker's right to strike, change his employer, etc.

(e) The fact that any worker (or other person in the United States of America) is free to move or travel without any permit, and can go abroad by freely obtaining a passport from the Department of State. That thousands of American workers and farmers have visited their native countries.

II. Refutation of the usual Soviet propaganda line to the effect that scientists, artists, inventors, etc., are mercilessly exploited by capitalists and have no chance of success (such propaganda can be found even in children's textbooks).

This can be achieved by broadcasting to Russian listeners biographies of Russian-born scientists, etc., who have achieved fame in the United States. Such broadcasts would be especially interesting because, generally speaking, everyone likes to hear success stories and especially stories which tell of the success of one's own countrymen in a foreign country.

As far as Russian scientists, etc., are concerned, biographies of the following could be used:

Radio and television: David Sarnoff, Dr. Vladimir Zworykin (head of the RCA research laboratory), Prof. Leo Terëmin (theremivox).

Aviation: Igor Sikorsky, Major Seversky.

Science: Prof. E. P. Timoshenko (Stanford University and Westinghouse), Prof. Basil Boldyreff (former assistant of Prof. Pavlov), Prof. Alexis Romanoff (embryology), Prof. Pitirim Sorokin (sociology, Harvard University), Prof. Alexander Petrunkevich (biology, Yale University), Andrew Avinov (director of Carnegie Museum in Pittsburgh), and others.

Music: Serge Rachmaninoff (deceased), Serge Koussevitsky, Fabian Sevitsky, Arcady Dubensky, Yasha Heifetz, Misha Elman, Gregory Piatigorsky, the Don Cossack Chorus, etc.

Ballet: Michael Fokin (deceased), Balanchin, Mordkin, Leonidov, the Ballet Russe, etc.

Painters: Dobuzhinsky, Savely Sorin, Constantin Alajalov, Boris Artzybashev, Eugene Dunkel, and others.

Sculpture: Deryuzhinsky, Arkhipenko.

Moving pictures: Mamulian, Gregory Ratoff, Akim Tamiroff, Maria Ouspenskaia, etc.

III. Refutation of the Soviet contention that there is no freedom of the press in the United States. (See booklet published by Pravda, The American Press, also Simonov's play, The American Question, etc.)

In refuting charges against the American press, the question of free speech and free assembly could be brought up. Town meetings and forums of the air, etc., could be described.

IV. Refutation of the Soviet contention that there is no freedom of elections in the United States. (See booklet published by Pravda, Political Parties in the United States of America, etc.)

V. Rebuttal of the Soviet contention that the American system is doomed through the inevitability of depressions which make millions of people idle.

The fact that no one ever died of hunger in the United States may be mentioned (in contrast with two major famines in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics when millions of people died of starvation, 1921–1936) also that the United States has learned how to cope with depressions (public works, etc.).

N. C. STEPANOFF,
Formerly With the National Republican Committee on Public Information.

The Roosevelt That Jim Farley Knew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 14, 1947:

THE ROOSEVELT THAT JIM FARLEY KNEW

James A. Farley's memoirs, the first instalment of which appears in the current Collier's, throws an intensely bright spotlight upon the Roosevelt era, and some of its darkest corners.

Revealed by it is the monstrous cynicism; the lust for power that could abide no interference; the gross ingratitude that was the reward for loyalty; the queer code of ethics that laughed off broken promises but made mingling with one's social inferiors a disgrace; the hypocritical attempt to pose as the champion of the masses while seeking only the aggrandizement of one man and his clique: all these the distinguishing traits of the New Deal philosophy and the man who directed its practice, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Roosevelt was a politician. Farley was a politician too, one of the best-equipped and most successful. No one alive today is better qualified to judge the late President from the political standpoint. The result is a dissection of Roosevelt's political career that brings him down to his rightful size, not the demigod of the New Deal survivors but a cold, calculating politician who could cast off his most loyal friends and followers as one would discard a worn-out garment.

With Franklin Roosevelt the ancient dictum that the king can do no wrong was still valid. Undeviating adherence to his every whim, right or wrong, was demanded of his followers.

Jim Farley, who, more than any other man, was responsible for getting Roosevelt into the White House, was ushered out of the presence and left unforgiven because he put the welfare of the Democratic Party above the personal allegiance the President considered his due.

Accompanying this leader complex in the Roosevelt character was the persistence of class consciousness.

Farley was Roosevelt's friend and most loyal of supporters, besides holding important offices as Postmaster General, chairman of the Democratic National Committee and chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee.

Yet, amazingly, he was never invited to spend the night in the White House; never asked to join intimate White House gatherings. Mrs. Roosevelt explained it all in a statement Farley quotes: "Franklin finds it so hard to relax with people who aren't his social equals."

As a politician avid for votes he could shake the hands of all comers; as a member of the Hyde Park caste he held to the theory of a master race.

Roosevelt's ungrateful treatment of Jim Farley, terminating in their historic break, had many political repercussions. But it was strictly in character. The split was gradual,

but inevitable, because of the difference in the characters of the two men.

Farley believed in keeping his word, and he believed others meant to keep theirs.

Roosevelt's declaration that he would not seek a third term, and his reversal of that position later, shocked Farley. So did the President's blunt demand that they violate their joint pledges against taking sides in the Senate leadership contest between Senators BARKLEY and Harrison, and seek Mayor Kelly's intervention to gain the winning vote for BARKLEY.

When Farley refused to break his word Roosevelt coldly told him that "I'll get Harry Hopkins to do it"—which he did.

Roosevelt's vindictiveness was shown when he sought to purge Members of Congress who opposed his Supreme Court-packing plan. When Farley refused to go along with him on the purge he made Farley a victim of his vindictiveness, too.

This country suffered much from the foul play, double-crossing, overspending, and overtaxing tactics of the Roosevelt era. But a hang-over from that era remains. The remnants of the New Deal gang, in high office in Washington, in Henry Wallace and the assortment of freaks who surround him, in radical labor leaders who were nourished by Roosevelt, in the pro-Red fringe who preach communism in Roosevelt's name, are with us still. They are hungrier than ever for power, for the chance to afflict us again with the hypocrisy, the extravagance, the dictatorial rule that Roosevelt thrust upon our people.

Cold revealing facts about the Roosevelt New Deal and how it operated, as revealed in Jim Farley's story, help bring home the urgent warning: Don't let it happen again.

Rebild American National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I received a visit from one of Chicago's prominent advertising executives, George P. Jensen, whom I have been very proud to know as a friend for many years. He was on his way to Denmark, where he is scheduled to speak at Rebild American National Park in that country on the 4th of July. The history of Rebild American National Park, and its very unique relationship with our Nation, is such that I cannot refrain from making a brief statement with respect thereto. In doing so, I shall use some of the information given to me by Mr. Jensen, and facts which were obtained from the Rebild National Park Board and other sources.

On July 4, 1909, Danish-American Day was celebrated at the national exposition in Aarhus, and the attendance was the greatest in the history of the exposition. The event gave the late Dr. Max Henius, an eminent citizen and chemist of Chicago, Ill., the idea of creating an American national park in Denmark. Here, he thought, Danish-born Americans, and other Americans, might meet annually and celebrate the American Independence Day.

There was but a short step from thought to action with Dr. Max Henius. With his usual initiative and energy he aroused interests among other Danish-born Americans in the project of an American National Park. Certain parts of the beautiful heather hills in Rebild were bought. On the grounds thus acquired a great festival was held in the summer of 1912, and the land was formally presented to the Danish Government as a gift from Americans of Danish origin.

This was done by means of a formation of a corporation not for profit in the State of Illinois. Danish-American citizens of Chicago were among those who raised the original funds and successfully completed the project.

Since 1912, with the exception of a few years when world events made trans-Atlantic traffic difficult or impossible, every Fourth of July has been celebrated in Rebild National Park, as it was called. These celebrations, with speeches and songs, have strengthened the ties between Danes in the United States and their mother country, and between Denmark and the United States. Year by year, more and more acres have been added to Rebild National Park and it is now visited annually by thousands of tourists from America, Denmark, and other countries.

There is probably no other place in the world where Danish-born American citizens are so deeply stirred by pride and patriotism in and for their adopted country as in Rebild American National Park in Denmark on American Independence Day.

The park, consisting of 278 acres of heather land—an almost extinct topographical condition in Denmark, as the prairie is in the United States—was purchased 35 years ago by Danish-born American citizens and presented to the Dutch Government, with the provision that in it on the Fourth of July each year, when possible, the independence of the United States should be observed with appropriate ceremony as a mark of understanding of freedom that the Danish and the American peoples have in common.

The park has a natural bowl, formed by surrounding hills on which the 48 State flags of the United States are grouped, and over a speakers' platform on the floor of the bowl the American and the Danish flags fly side by side. Seated on the slopes of the hills may be 40,000 Danes, and a number of American visitors, who rise to the strains of the Star-Spangled Banner.

The colorful sight of the great silk flags, the large audience rising to sing the American national anthem, and the stirring music by a large orchestra, is a heart-moving event that no American can ever forget.

Usually members of the Danish royal family are present, as are members of the Danish Parliament, and noted persons in Denmark and from the United States make the addresses, which sometimes are broadcast to America.

The park board of directors have control of the park and of the celebration, half of the members residing in the United States, the others in Denmark. Dr. Max Henius, the founder of the movement, was board president for many years. Subsequently, Mr. George P. Jensen was elected to the office. The president now is Mr. Holger Bladt of Aalborg, and the vice president is Mr. Jean Hersholt, well-known Danish-American. In 1930 Mr. Jensen was leader of a group of 250 who were received by President Hoover on their way to Denmark, and Mr. Jensen was given a special message from the President to the King of Denmark and to the Danish people. He has been invited as ex-president of the board to make the address this coming Fourth of July. Let us trust that it will be even more successful this year than it has been in the past, and that it will assist in continuing the fine relationship which exists between Denmark and our Nation. It is to be hoped that similar arrangements can be made with other nations of Europe. It will certainly help to bring the peace which we all so deeply desire and for which we constantly pray.

World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by one of my constituents, Mr. W. C. Carter, of Delaware, Ohio.

I fully realize many will disagree with Mr. Carter's statements, but I take the position his article merits consideration. Mr. Carter has spent much time and study on this subject and I feel that all should be given the opportunity to read his comments.

The article follows:

WORLD WAR III

(By W. C. Carter)

We are not yet finished with the bloodiest, costliest, and most destructive war of all history, and instead of promised international peace and cooperation we have the atomic bomb, Russian communism, and general dissension—the ominous signs of World War III. In fact, this war has already been declared in no uncertain terms and the opposing forces are busy jockeying for strategic positions. World War II was presumably fought against aggression and dictatorship, but while putting down one dictator, our "superminds" in Washington have been misusing American resources and prestige to build up another dictator even more ruthless, unscrupulous, and unpredictable. This growing threat is personified in "Bloody Joe" Stalin and his miscalled communism which is really an absolute and cruel despotism for the benefit of the few, imposed upon the common people against their will, and enforced through intimidation, imprisonment, forced labor, and even mass assassination.

Communism is presumed to be "rule by the proletariat"—the common people—but they have very little to say about their own welfare or government, and their sorry plight is concealed behind the iron curtain of censorship and closed borders. A small group of internationally minded racketeers misrule Russia and through traitorous stooges in all countries their poisonous doctrines are being spread throughout the world.

Their established policy is confiscation and aggression against weak minorities, the promotion of world-wide trouble and discord in every possible way, and the hope that revolution will bring about the adoption of their oppressive system.

The strong position of Russia today is largely due to the moral and material support of the United States of America, but we are now the avowed target of Soviet attack as the main obstacle in the path of their planned world conquest. While seeking favors from us, they brazenly repeat that there can be no compromise between their so-called communism and our free enterprise system, yet for many years our State Department policy has been one of appeasement through recognition, concessions, gifts, and loans. This dangerous un-American liberalism was evidently followed for political reasons—the votes of reds, pinks, and radicals. Now—while tolerating Communist activities at home—our Washington politicians propose to spend hundreds of millions of the taxpayers' dollars to fight communism abroad.

The military development of the atomic bomb and its unjustified use 16 days after Japan was ready to surrender, was the greatest strategic blunder in all history because it introduced a new and incomparable horror into warfare. Regrettably, that tragic mistake cannot be corrected, and if Stalin had the atomic bomb, he would not hesitate to use it on the United States of America today. The present Russian regime has consistently shown open contempt for pledges, promises, treaties, or cooperation for peace, and a callous indifference for the rights of minorities. This cynical, moralless regime does not represent the interests or the wishes of the people it presumes to govern, and it maintains its absolute power only through brute force. Russia is today ready for an internal revolution, and a well directed, timely push would send its tyrannical government crashing like a house of cards.

The wrangling United Nations—like the old League of Nations—has so far shown its incompetence and impotence to promote international peace and cooperation. Instead of squandering our wealth and resources in a vain attempt to check a universal and threatening evil from abroad, we should attack that evil at its source. Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves in the United States of America, and the United States of America could render no greater service for lasting world peace and justice than to free the slaves of Europe and Asia by sending an atomic bomb, to be delivered from on high and dropped in the center of the Kremlin.

Why should we not be realistic and recognize the ominous signs of war? Strong measures are justified if your way of life and government is to survive, and if World War III is to be prevented. A proven military maxim and sound strategy is, "When in doubt the best defense is attack."

Peacetime Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolution regarding peacetime military training adopted at the annual meeting of 140 Congregational Christian Churches in southern California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Nevada at Riverside, Calif., on May 13 and 14, 1947:

RESOLUTION REGARDING PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING

Appreciating the gravity and complexity of the international problems threatening the peace of the world and confronting the leaders of our Government, and recognizing the necessity of implementing for the present our diplomatic efforts in maintaining the peace with strength commensurate with our security, we do, nevertheless, hereby express our belief that peacetime conscription, under whatever name, would tend to make our youth believe in the war method rather than in spiritual forces as the ultimate court of decision in international crises; that conscription would tend to produce another armaments race among the nations which in turn would lead to fear and antagonism among nations; that conscription now bears little if any relation to adequate national defense in atomic warfare; and that conscription tends to minimize the vital factor of world-wide international organization, law, and law enforcement as the only real preventive of war; therefore, be it resolved, that this conference urge the members and pastors of its constituent churches to bring the pressure of the Christian conscience to bear upon Congress against conscription or compulsory peacetime military training; and that we ask our conference office to transmit our opposition to the present plans for a conscription measure to our Congregational Senators and Congressmen in Washington without delay.

The Tax Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks, I desire to include an article which appeared in the Washington Post this morning in regard to the proposed tax study by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Marquis Childs, the writer of the article, is recognized as one of the foremost columnists of the country, whose keen perception and impartial analysis of trends and events has won for him the confidence and admiration of the American reading public. The article follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)
LOPSIDED TAX STUDY

The political clamor following on President Truman's veto of the Republican tax bill is likely to obscure one of the most telling points he made. In the last paragraph of his veto message he called for a program of tax adjustments and tax reduction "geared to the financial and economic needs of this country."

That kind of program is long overdue. The late President Roosevelt talked about it often, but he never got around to it.

Evidence is growing that some Republicans have a tax program they intend to try to put over next year. It is also evident that they want to try to shift as much of the tax burden as possible from income tax to the excise or sales tax. In other words, they would shift to the kind of tax that penalizes the low-income groups.

A tax program must originate with the House Ways and Means Committee. The other day Chairman HAROLD KNUTSON of that committee named a group of outsiders to help draft a tax plan for 1948. He named them without consulting the full committee and there were prompt cries of dictatorship.

The key men of that committee long have lobbied to reduce income taxes in the higher brackets. In some instances they have openly advocated a Federal sales tax.

The chairman and prime mover of the special "tax study committee" is Roswell Magill, member of one of New York's largest corporations law firms and a professor of law at Columbia University. One of the most influential members is John W. Hanes, who represents large corporate interests in New York, including the Hearst properties. Hanes was one of the two private citizens permitted by the Republican majority to testify before the Ways and Means Committee on the tax bill just vetoed.

Another member is Cheever Cowdin, motion-picture executive who has frequently been a spokesman for the National Association of Manufacturers on taxes and finance. Still another member is Carson S. Duncan, economist of the Association of American Railroads.

KNUTSON'S efforts to make this appear a bipartisan committee is plain foolish. While there is some window-dressing—members who theoretically represent farm and labor—the key men will speak from the special point of view of great wealth.

An editorial in the New York Journal of Commerce made clear what the Wall Street community thought of the Magill group. The editorial had the headline: "Magill Appointment Underscores Trend Toward Sales Tax." Magill, said the editorial, will play a key role in formulating a new tax program.

Representative AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, one of the Democrats who challenged KNUTSON'S right to name these outsiders and give them special powers, pointed out a deadly parallel. It is a parallel which should make the Republican leadership stop, look and listen.

In 1930 Herbert Hoover was in the White House; Republicans controlled both Senate and House. While the stock market crash of 1929 had jarred confidence, the philosophy of high and unending prosperity was still in the ascendant.

In that fateful year the Republicans in the House invited businessmen to come in and write a tariff law. They brought into the committee room high priests of high protection—such men as Joseph Grundy, of Pennsylvania—and they told them to write their own ticket.

The result was the Smoot-Hawley high-tariff law. Mr. Hoover himself protested. A thousand experts in economics and political science signed an earnest plea to prevent adoption of the law. They knew that it would hasten the tide of depression all over the world.

A tax program that transfers even part of the burden to the low-income groups will take dollars out of the pocket of the average consumer that he otherwise would spend for the products of our factories and farms. It means we shall be less able to buy those products. It means depression.

There should be changes in our antiquated tax structure. The Committee for Economic Development pointed the other day to the need to give small businesses a chance to invest a larger share of their earnings. These and other changes are long overdue. But if they come as merely part of a plan to switch the load to the small wage earner, then we shall be asking for boom and bust in the good old pattern of 1929, and after.

H. R. 3: Terminal-Leave-Pay Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at Miami, Fla., April 17, 1947, at the Twenty-ninth Annual Convention of the American Legion, duly assembled:

The following resolution was offered by Legionnaire Dan Kelly, of Fernandina, a member of the Theodore H. Hernandez Post 54:

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the American Legion, Department of Florida, in convention assembled at Miami, Fla., this 17th day of April, that H. R. No. 3, commonly known as the Rogers bill, providing for cash payment of terminal leave pay, is pending in the Congress of the United States, and

"Whereas it is extremely important to the thousands of veterans in Florida that they receive their terminal leave pay in cash: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Twenty-ninth Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of Florida, go on record as strongly urging the Congress of the United States to immediately pass H. R. No. 3 for the benefit not only of the veterans of Florida, but of the entire United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the congressional delegation of the State of Florida and a copy be furnished the local press."

I, Reid Mann, department adjutant of the American Legion, Department of Florida, do certify that the above and foregoing resolution was duly adopted at Miami, Fla., April 17, 1947, at the Twenty-ninth Annual Convention of the American Legion, duly assembled.

Attest:

REID MANN,
Department Adjutant.

Tax-Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of June 17, 1947:

A PROPER VETO

The reasoning behind the President's veto of the income-tax-reduction bill should appeal to the common sense of the American people.

The prospect of continuing high taxes is not, of course, a pleasant one. The man or woman who likes to pay taxes has not yet been born, and it must be admitted that the Republican promise of tax reduction appealed to an instinct that is deeply rooted in human nature.

Nevertheless, the better arguments are on the President's side.

We are in the midst of an era of exceptional prosperity, and it is in such a period that debt must be reduced if it is ever to be done. The Senate was aiming at a reduction in the national debt of $2,600,000,000 in the 1948 fiscal year. That, however, is only 1 percent of the total debt. At this rate, and on the highly improbable assumption that an equivalent reduction could be made annually, it still would take 100 years to pay off the debt.

This is enough to demonstrate the desirability of reducing the debt as much as possible in the years when we are able to afford it. Every man who has wrestled with his own budget problems knows that debts must be paid when the money to pay them is available. For if they are not paid then, they never will be paid.

Another effective argument against tax reduction at this time lies in the uncertainties of the international situation. As Mr. Truman said, we are still in the midst of a transition period, and we continue to be confronted with relief and rehabilitation demands. The exact cost of these is unknown, but it certainly will be heavy.

In the face of these considerations, it seems to the Star that it would be sheer folly to reduce Government income at this time. The President is to be commended for his veto of the tax bill. It may prove politically harmful to him, but in the long run it will best serve the interests of this country.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. ELSAESSER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. ELSAESSER. Mr. Speaker, the new proposals for the construction of a St. Lawrence seaway and power project will not remove any of the objections which I believe are self-evident.

Self-liquidation, by payment of tolls, cannot make the water navigable for more than 6 or 7 months of the year. Neither will it provide the docking facilities sufficient to serve the larger ocean-going vessels. Thirteen major ports on the Great Lakes would be bypassed by this shipping and huge investments would become worthless or partially worthless.

The city of Buffalo, which is a thriving grain center, would be compelled to expand its facilities at a cost of at least $50,000,000 in order to continue receiving, storing, and processing grains. The same is true of every other city in which grain is one of the major industries.

The toll charges, proposed by the Vandenberg resolution, will never liquidate the cost of constructing such a seaway. Self-liquidation is a loose term used to confuse the opposition to this project. The power development, which has found favor among many of the friends of this proposal, will be costly and the expense of producing power would be excessive and much greater than the cost of power developed by modern and efficient steam plants.

The fact that this proposed seaway would be of great importance in national defense is not justified when submitted to careful scrutiny. Certainly the seaway would be useless unless Canada and our country were allies in a war. Ninety percent of the seaway is and must be Canadian dominated. If the United States became engaged in a war and Canada remained a neutral nation, it would be a breach of Canada's neutrality to assist this country, a nation at war, by operation of a seaway that is jointly owned.

The proponents of this seaway project further advance the fact that shipbuilding is an important factor in a national-defense program. Ships would be built on the Lakes instead of being built along the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The Lake ports are promised new industries. However, the proponents overlook the winter season in the Great Lakes area. Large vessels require open water for navigation. For at least 5 months of each year these ships would be frozen to the drydocks and would make excellent targets in warfare.

My objections to the investment of billions of dollars for this seaway are based on facts, which the self-liquidation theory cannot change. At its very best it would be a part-time seaway. The tolls collected during this period would be consumed by the year-round supervision and maintenance costs. In my opinion it would never liquidate itself. It would cause havoc among existing facilities, rearranging and resettling the Lakes area. It is not a defense necessity and the power that would be generated and sold by the operating agency would be produced at a terrific expense if honest bookkeeping is to be employed.

Can We Keep the Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial, Can We Keep the Peace? which appeared in the Laurinburg Exchange, Laurinburg, N. C., on June 5, 1947:

CAN WE KEEP THE PEACE?

There is a great deal of apprehension and fear in the minds and hearts of the American people today. Now that we have won a second world war, and stand to lose the peace.

Americans are frustrated and scared because of the strangeness of the new world to which they are not accustomed. They are homesick for the good old days, the yesteryears when this country could safely mind its own business and not worry too much about that of others. At heart most of us are isolationists and would prefer to live our lives apart from the swirling currents of world affairs.

But two wars have taught us a lesson, and good sense tells us that we can't live apart any more, or be indifferent to what is going on in other parts of the world. And since this is the most powerful, the richest, and least damaged of all the major powers by the war, the role of world leadership is thrust upon us.

Will our leaders muff the ball? Can we furnish a leadership sufficiently good and strong and wise to formulate a policy of world peace? There are many who feel that if things are managed rightly there need not be another war. But it is so easy to make

a mistake, so easy to miss the bus, to muff the ball. The United States and the American people are standing in the need of competent leadership today as never before.

Will a strong military power save us? The President's Commission recommends it. Our military leaders say it is indispensable. Yet, many distrust it. We know that our weakness as a military power was largely responsible for World War II. If weakness failed us once, can military strength save us next time? Maybe so, but deep in our hearts we know there is a spiritual reserve that is stronger than armaments, greater than statesmen, and more to be trusted than powers and municipalities.

In the present unhappy period we seem to be groping for just the right formula of power and spirit to make a go of it. Not by the sword, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord!

A Message From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech which I gave over WJR, the Goodwill Station, Detroit, Mich., on Saturday, May 31, 1947:

Ladies and gentlemen, through the courtesy of WJR, the Good Will Station, it is my privilege to address the citizens of my home State of Michigan at this period known as Your Congress program.

I am very glad to report to you that, notwithstanding certain comments and articles that you have heard or read, the Eightieth Congress now in session is ahead of previous Congresses in its legislative program. It is true that at the beginning of this session there was some criticism at the slowness with which the Congress seemed to be functioning. However, many of our citizens did not know that, under the new Reorganization Act passed last year, the first thing that Congress had to do before it could start its legislative business was to comply with the provisions of that Reorganization Act. That was the immediate major problem confronting Congress when it convened on January 3 last, and was accordingly done.

I was formerly a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, upon which I served for many years. Under the Reorganization Act, the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee were merged into the Armed Services Committee, consisting of 33 members. It is my privilege to be a member of this committee and to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Pay and Administration.

The Armed Services Committee is now one of the most important committees in Congress, as it deals not only with the Army and the Navy but with the Air Corps, with the Coast Guard, with the Marine Corps, and with all other agencies of our armed forces.

Let me just give you a brief outline of what the Armed Services Committee has done thus far in the eightieth session of Congress. Among the more important bills is the Army-Navy nurses bill, which was reported by our committee and passed by Congress—which, for the first time, gives nurses a permanent status as commissioned officers in the Regular Army and Navy with substantially the same provisions for promotions, pay, and retirement as other officers. In addition, this act established an Army-Navy Nurse Reserve Corps with permanent status.

We also have reported a bill to the House to establish a Medical Service Corps of the Army and Navy with almost identical provisions for each. When this bill becomes a law, as I am sure it will, it will group into one corps for each branch of service those categories of persons whose work or profession is allied with medicine.

Our committee also reported a bill which provided $30,000,000 for the construction of two experimental submarines. This was done in order that our Nation might keep abreast of the developments in submarine construction, particularly that learned from examining captured German submarines.

The Armed Services Committee is now in process of reviewing the Army-Navy forms of military justice in order to eliminate existing inequities and to bring the system of military justice into line with our present-day concept of justice.

It will also be the Armed Services Committee that conducts the hearings and passes on the legislation pertaining to universal military training. While hearings have not yet been started, you may be assured that when this matter is brought before the committee, it will be considered with the view of determining what is for the best interests of our Nation.

You may recall that last year the House passed the terminal-leave bill which provided for cash payments of terminal leave to our veterans. The Senate amended our bill providing that payment should be made in 5-year nonnegotiable bonds. We have bills before our committee now providing for an amendment to the existing law so that these payments can be made to our veterans in cash.

As chairman of the subcommittee to which this bill is referred, I wish to state that in the immediate near future my committee will conduct hearings on this bill. It is my judgment, when our bill is reported favorably, that the Congress will approve it so that those veterans now holding terminal-leave bonds may convert them into cash, should they so desire, although I would state that the Secretary of the Treasury is opposed to the passage of this bill at the present time.

Our committee has already reported to the House favorably 43 bills, and many others are yet to be reported.

The Congress is concerned over the attitude which Russia has maintained toward this country and toward the United Nations organization. At no time has Russia manifested a spirit of cooperation. Let me illustrate what I mean.

Our State Department has repeatedly made demands upon Russia for a settlement of her $11,000,000,000 lend-lease account. These notices have been ignored by the Soviet Union, although other nations to whom lend-lease was extended have been cooperative with the United States in arranging settlements therefor. Seventy percent of this country's $51,000,000,000 lend-lease operations has been settled.

In view of the aid which has been given to Russia by the United States, it is rather difficult to understand the philosophy underlying Stalin's treatment of our country in his neglect to either adjust or settle her lend-lease obligations, and his refusal to return to the United States more than 100 ships which were turned over to Russia during the preceding administration.

Few of us seriously believe that Russia wants, or could fight, another war; but the United States and Russia are the two great powers of the postwar world. It is impossible for us to undersell Russia's position, her resources, her manpower, and above all, her determination to take a leading position in world affairs.

It is absurd to feel that we can bargain on equal terms with Russia unless we can match her, resources for resources, determination for determination, machine for machine, trained men for trained men.

One of the major questions confronting the Congress and the American people today is to determine the attitude of the United States with reference to European countries that are asking for financial and economic support, in order to safeguard those countries and to prevent the sweep of communism and radicalism which is gradually destroying them.

World War II, which was the greatest of all wars, has brought in its wake the greatest political, social, and economic upheaval of recorded history.

The great British Empire which for many years boasted that the sun never set on her Dominions is gradually disintegrating, and already Great Britain has announced that she will no longer be able to continue her commitments to some of her possessions and to other European countries needing aid.

Korea, which is controlled temporarily as a war measure by the United States and Russia, is slowly being flooded with communistic principles. France is thoroughly depleted financially. The smaller countries of western Europe are exhausted and practically prostrated. If Germany is to be maintained as a Republic, it is apparent that much money must be furnished her by nations interested in restoring to Germany a responsible government.

The President, in addressing a joint session of Congress recently, spoke of the urgent need of Greece in securing money and equipment to maintain the responsibility of her government.

Turkey, from the reports of American experts abroad, is in dire need of financial assistance in order to preserve her integrity as a nation. Other countries, devastated by war, are asking for relief.

This is not a very hopeful picture of foreign countries and their economic conditions. We all know that the United States has a debt today in excess of $250,000,000,000. Tax experts state that the average citizen is paying in taxes—National, State, and local—35 percent of his income.

Congress is doing its best to curtail expenses to the limit. How much further we may be able to go in furnishing relief to other countries overseas, and at the same time maintain our own economic solidarity is a serious problem.

It is well that Congress and the American people at large have begun to realize the menace of the growth of communism in the United States. I remember the time on the floor of the House when those who were antagonistic to communism were called "Red baiters," and the Communists and those who sympathized with them attacked the proponents of the Dies committee, later known as the Un-American Activities Committee, predicating their attack upon the constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

Of course, when our forefathers wrote the Constitution and guaranteed freedom of speech, they did not mean that an individual under the Constitution could call any other individual vile or indecent names; neither did they mean that any group seeking refuge under the Constitution could attack insidiously and destructively our Government structure. This is not freedom of speech.

Official Washington, during the last few months, has been hearing the voices of the great rank and file of the American people in their protests against communistic activities, since which time it is highly noticeable in congressional circles that it is much easier than formerly to remove avowed Communists from the public pay roll.

The Supreme Court recently stated in no uncertain terms that the head of a department has the right to remove Communists from his department.

Then, President Truman recently issued a statement to the effect that Government agencies and bureaus should remove those

known to be Communists. This is a wholesome sign.

The great majority of the American people believe in the Constitution and in constitutional government and have no use for those people who, seeking the protection of our Constitution, endeavor to subvert or destroy it.

The FBI has done an outstanding job in this matter. The FBI knows no politics—is neither Republican nor Democrat—and under the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover has brought to public attention the menace of encroaching communism in this country.

This Congress is going to do everything possible to remove from the Federal Government any known Communist who, at the taxpayers' expense, is endeavoring to destroy American institutions.

Any person has the right to criticize his Government but so long as he remains a citizen of his Government, he is duty bound to support the principles of the Constitution to which he has given direct allegiance by oath if he is naturalized, or indirect allegiance if he is born in this country.

Communism is antagonistic to the American way of life; it is antagonistic to American institutions, to our religion, and to our school systems. The quicker that menace is removed from America, the better for all of us.

In conclusion, let me state that in the time allotted to me, I have been able to discuss only a few of the problems pending in Congress and affecting the American people. One thing is definite, however, and that is the people of the United States do not want a potential World War III. They are, therefore, greatly interested in the United Nations organization and in the endeavor of that organization to remove the causes of war insofar as possible.

One of the best means to prevent war is to be adequately prepared in time of peace. For that reason, it has been stated by Congress that the postwar Army will consist of approximately 1,000,000 men, the Navy approximately 425,000 men, and the Marine Corps 80,000 men.

We want our Army, Navy, and Air Forces maintained at the highest degree of efficiency in order that this country may be adequately protected at all times. If we are a strong Nation, we will be better able to be of assistance in the counsel of the United Nations organization. For that reason it is not inconsistent that we maintain efficient armed forces and yet, at the same time, express our approval of the United Nations organization. The two work hand in hand rather than being opposed to each other.

Let me also state that the Eightieth Congress now in session realizes the economic conditions of our own country; are definite in their desire to reduce the budget, to make substantial payments on the national debt; to reduce, insofar as possible, our income tax; to eliminate needless agencies and bureaus; and to remove from the public pay roll thousands of employees not necessary in the various bureaus and agencies of the Government.

I appreciate the courtesy of this station in giving me this opportunity of presenting to you a few of the many important problems confronting the Congress and the American people. I thank you.

Ambassador Emmet O'Neal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, the President did honor to both the United States and the Philippine Republic when he named as Ambassador to the Philippines that outstanding American, the Honorable Emmet O'Neal, of Kentucky. It was a foregone conclusion that the Senate would confirm his appointment, because there is nothing that can be brought against him.

Those of us who have served in the House of Representatives with Emmet O'Neal fully appreciate his great ability, his loyal Americanism, and his unwavering support of democratic institutions. In all my experience I have never known a man who tried harder to put himself in the other fellow's shoes and to understand his problems. He is full of kindness for all mankind. There is nothing of the bigot about him. To know him is to respect him.

Such a man will certainly make an ideal Ambassador to the great new Republic in the Pacific. The people of the Philippines will always find his ears receptive to their problems and in him an able champion of their legitimate aspirations.

Bunker Hill Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the Bunker Hill address delivered yesterday by the Honorable Joseph E. Casey, former Member of the United States House of Representatives from Massachusetts, who served his Nation and State well for 8 years. As always his address presents a thoughtful and timely message.

The address follows:

It is altogether fitting—and, indeed, I think necessary—that here in the shadow of Bunker Hill we commemorate that epochal battle that meant so much to the future history of the United States. While this noble shaft that rises as a monument to Bunker Hill is a constant and visible commemoration of that battle, it is our inspiring duty to actively celebrate this day. We are, of course, not the first nor shall we be the last to do it gladly. From a standpoint of numbers involved, the Battle of Bunker Hill does not belong in the category of important war engagements. There were only some 1,500 Americans opposing a force of approximately 3,000 British troops. What is it that makes it so important? In order to find the answer I think that we must go back in our minds to the days that preceded it.

On April 19, 1775, there had been skirmishes at Concord and Lexington between the American Colonials and British Regulars. The Battle of Concord and Lexington has been described as "the shot heard round the world," meaning that it gave heart throughout the world to the forces that were fighting for freedom and liberty.

After the Battle of Concord and Lexington there was a lull in hostilities. The commander of the British troops sent hasty messages to England asking for more troops and supplies. Before Bunker Hill these fresh troops had arrived.

On June 15, 1775, at Philadelphia, George Washington took command of the Continental Army. The day after, June 16, 172 years ago today, a band of some 1,500 Americans, with some few engineers, marched up the hill and proceeded to build redoubts and speedily entrenched themselves. The British lost no time moving against the hill because they saw its strategic importance.

On the next day the British troops, marching as though on parade up the steepest part of the hill, were routed by the calm and efficient fire of the American defenders. "Don't fire until you see the whites of their eyes" was the command and with the coolness of veterans these amateurs waited until they could see the whites of their opponents' eyes and then blazed forth with such devastating fire of musketry that the British fell back in disorganization. Their forces were rallied a second time and they marched up the hill in the same closed-rank fashion and a second time they were met with the same deadly fire and once more they fell back. The third time they were successful because by this time the American forces were out of powder. This was the first battle of the Continental Army against the British Army.

Before this battle it was a widely prevalent idea that the untrained Americans would stand no chance against the fresh and well-disciplined forces of Great Britain. Had American forces not defended the hill in such an efficient and courageous manner, it would have meant to many minds in the Colonies that resistance against the great power of England would be foolhardy. Their firm and determined stand gave heart to Washington, the newly elected Commander in Chief; gave heart to all of the colonists and proved that there was at least an even chance of success in the struggle against the mother country.

Without Bunker Hill there might never have been the United States of America. That, then, is the importance of this event which we celebrate. I might go on and continue to praise the courage and bravery of the heroes of Bunker Hill, but having said what I have said I prefer to leave it without further addition.

Bravery and courage belong to no particular race. No race has a monopoly of these qualities. Indeed, the British Regulars showed a high degree of bravery and courage when they rallied for a second and third time in the face of devastating fire to finally gain possession of the hill.

The courage of the Russians at Stalingrad and Leningrad in defense of their home land has never been surpassed.

The courage of all the races in the world involved in World War II has been proved beyond reasonable doubt. It is not, therefore, a lesson in physical courage and bravery that is gleaned from the Battle of Bunker Hill. It is something above and beyond that. It is the story of how free men met the issues that preceded Bunker Hill and determined them upon a high moral plane.

When we read about the heroes of these early days we are apt to fall into the error of thinking of them as being immortals. We assume that they were infallible and that there never was any question in their minds about the course which they would pursue. Such was not the case. These heroes whom we celebrate tonight were human beings. They did not know what the future held in store for them. They were filled with doubts and fears. There was a strong division of opinion as to whether or not they should resist the mother country. There were ties of common ancestry, ties of a common tongue. Understandably, there was a large minority of Tories. The question was debated pro and con throughout the Thirteen Colonies. The majority decided to throw off the yoke of oppression and to sacrifice life, property, and all that they held dear, in order to achieve liberty and freedom. They were motivated by a high sense of moral values and an appreciation that man is a creature of God, made to his image and likeness, and that he is endowed from outside himself, from his Creator, with the power to determine right and wrong.

The majority of them made the decision, but it was not their belief in the wisdom of the majority that convinced them they were right. They did not believe in the divine right of kings, and they did not believe in the divine right of the majority either. They looked beyond themselves to find the answer to their problem, and their answer came straight from God.

The greatest lesson that comes down to us from these early patriots is not to be found in the exhibition of physical courage. It is rather to be found in the high inspiration that motivated them, in the intelligent manner in which they met the issues of their day, and their determination to fight for the right as they saw it. We have great need for those qualities today.

True, we are not engaged in a shooting war, but we have grave problems to solve and great difficulties to surmount.

In 1775 the Thirteen Colonies were merely "a segment of the British Empire." These small colonies have grown so that today they have become the United States of America, the strongest and, I hope, the wisest Nation on the face of God's green earth. We need divine inspiration. We need to be motivated by a sense of high moral values. We need intelligence to appraise our problems which are world-wide in scope. We need resoluteness to determine our course of action and we need courage and bravery to pursue that course of action when once it has been determined.

We are the only real democracy left. In this democracy, the people rule, the people govern, the people elect, the people determine the issues. In this Government, therefore, more than under any other form of government, it is absolutely necessary that the people be well informed, that they may be able to make the momentous decisions that have to be made. If we are frank with ourselves, we must admit that we have shown a lamentable ignorance about affairs beyond our shores. Most of us thought that when we won the war the people of other lands, having the hand of oppression removed from them, would automatically turn to Jeffersonian democracy. We know now that such is not the case. Democracy and free enterprise are good for America, but may not be the best form of government for countries that have been devastated, for countries whose economies have been ruined, whose people are impoverished and hungry, and where the fires of even hope itself, are almost extinguished. These are the ills that communism thrives upon.

Communism offers them a plan, something to do, something to eat, and many of them in their bewilderment and hopelessness have grasped at this plan and have accepted communism.

Russia does not march great military forces into a country which it wishes to conquer. Where want and suffering prevails, it offers a positive plan, a plan that whispers "the state will take care of you; the state will give you work; the state will give you food; the state will give you shelter and it will distribute the wealth even amongst you."

The state is all. It is from within yourselves that good must come. There is no higher law. There are no higher moral values.

Eastern Europe has succumbed to the blandishments of this ideology. The only opposition came from the church, came from religion, but the church's plea that man does not live by bread alone, the church's offer of spiritual help, was not sufficient. The hunger was there. The mess of pottage was there. Mankind's birthright was sold.

The culmination of all this was the political coup in Hungary. It practically completed Russian domination of eastern Europe. The shadow of the Bear now falls menacingly over western Europe. The issue becomes increasingly clear. Shall we continue to stand by until nation after nation falls under the domination of communistic Russia?

There are extremists on both sides. Some who answer "Yes;" let us confine ourselves to our own problems and pay no attention to what goes on beyond our territorial limits." There are some who ansfer "No; let us begin a shooting war now."

In the middle, I hope, are the sound and clear-thinking people of this democracy who wish to take neither of these courses. The first course of isolationism we reject as having been tried twice and found wanting. It is for those who have learned nothing from the lessons of the past.

Those who are in favor of war with Russia now argue that we have the atomic bomb, within 5 or 10 years Russia may have it, but while we have the advantage we ought to start shooting. We reject this violent doctrine because instinctively we abhor war and violence with all its attendant suffering and anguish. Force is to be used only as a last resort. We cannot make a people change their ideas or change their atheism by dropping bombs upon them.

The course that we must follow seems to me to be pretty plainly marked. We must first of all recognize the fact that we are already engaged in an economic war. President Truman and the Congress recognized this fact, as evidenced by our loans to Greece and Turkey.

Eastern Europe, already lost, is beyond our power to aid. We can, however, help in western Europe. The people of most of those countries hate communism. Countries such as Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Netherlands, Belgium, France, Italy, are all opposed to communism. They have fairly stable governments. They are our allies. We can and must help their economies.

Their first need is for economic freedom. When economic freedom has been established, there will be individual freedom. These countries must be productive to be free. They need the tools of industry. They need dollars to buy machinery to get back into production. We should loan dollars to them to the utmost of our capacity. It must not, however, be done with a profligate hand. We must bear in mind on the one hand that the basis for future loans or grants rests upon a sound economy at home. If we have not a sound economy at home, if management and labor can't settle down to a long period of constant production, our ability to aid will be seriously hampered. Management and labor and the citizens of our country can find inspiration in the conduct of the founders of Massachusetts whose memory we celebrate here tonight. They met the issues of their day not only with courage but also with intelligence. They were motivated by a high sense of moral values. These qualities are needed by our citizenry of today just as they were in 1775. If we turn our back upon suffering mankind, we virtually push them down the road to communism.

Already our leaders are acting with wisdom and foresight. Secretary of State Marshall is talking about a plan to integrate European economy, a plan to make all of Europe a common economic entity. This is a splendid start in the right direction. The trade barriers that separate all of the various European countries are unsound. Europe should be an economic unit unhampered by any tariff barriers. There is more sense to their barriers than there would be if the United States had tariff restrictions and trade barriers between States. Such barriers would prevent free movement of goods. It does the same thing in Europe. We should all give support to General Marshall's idea of treating the whole of Europe as one economic unit.

We must help Europe help itself. When this is done, we must help them build up their productive facilities. This is the best method for combating communism. When coal is being mined in Europe with our machinery, when food is being raised in great quantities with our machinery, when machines begin to whir again in the factories of Europe, it will bring the spark of life to the peoples of Europe. It will arouse ambition. It will create within them an urge for self-expression. It will create an economic condition that will enable them to make a free choice. If they have a free choice, they will never choose communism. I firmly believe that it will be the cheapest money we have ever spent. Such a course may well lead the world into its greatest era of prosperity.

The men whom we honor here tonight have given us an example that we would do well to follow. If we let them, they can continue to be a living influence in the endless struggle of mankind for freedom. Let us make the fight without bitterness but with all the enthusiasm we possess for a better, saner, and a more peaceful world.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "In Opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947," made by Vernon P. Spencer, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee this afternoon.

I have submitted the statement to the Public Printer, and he estimates that the cost of printing it will be $230.75.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Honorable chairman and members of the committee, I am Vernon P. Spencer, of Inglewood, Calif. I have been associated with savings and loan institutions for the past 17 years and am presently serving both as director and counsel for federally and State chartered savings and loan associations. As such director and counsel, I have been in close contact with the home-construction industry in southern California, and am responsible for the development of plans and techniques whereby upward of $5,000,000 of low-cost housing facilities have been constructed by private industry in Los Angeles County, Calif., our association having made loans in excess of $5,000,000 for this purpose. The techniques developed by our association have now become standard practice in Los Angeles County and have done much to encourage the fulfillment of housing needs in that area at costs within the means of the low-income groups.

I appear before this committee today by express authorization of the California Savings and Loan League.

Before presenting the resolution of the California Savings and Loan League, I desire to make the following observation: That the California Savings and Loan League regrets that its opposition to reorganization plan No. 3 of 1947 must be directed to the plan in its entirety by reason of the fact that the Congress has no power to amend the recommendations of the Chief Executive, as expressed in the plan, that power being denied to the Congress by the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1945. Therefore, in view of what appears to the California Savings and Loan League to be serious deficiencies in certain aspects of the plan, the league on June 10 adopted the following

resolution at its recent convention at Santa Barbara, Calif.:

"Whereas the Committee on Expenditures of the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency have before them the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3; and

"Whereas said reorganization plan abolishes the statutory five-man Board of the Federal home-loan bank and substitutes therefor a three-man board, the Chairman of which is given arbitrary power over the Federal Home Loan Bank System and of any agency under the Board, including the Federal savings and loan associations; and

"Whereas the functioning of the FHLB system through one-man administration under Executive Order No. 9070 has proven unsatisfactory and dictatorial; and

"Whereas said reorganization plan makes provisions which appear contrary to the express directives of the Reorganization Act of 1945; and

"Whereas the ambiguities in the plan indicate that its scope must be determined by litigation; and

"Whereas the California Savings and Loan League believes that the Federal Home Loan Bank System can only be effectively managed in the public interest if its policies are established by a representative board reflecting the diverse problems throughout the Nation, such as the five-man Board provided by the Federal Home Loan Bank Act; and

"Whereas the plan perpetuates the emergency wartime control and direction by the National Housing Administrator of the thrift and home-financing business: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the California Savings and Loan League in convention assembled does hereby make known its opposition to the approval of said Reorganization Plan No. 3; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress and the United States Senators from the States of California and Arizona and to each member of the committee of the Congress now considering said reorganization plan."

I was privileged to sit in with the committee of the California Savings and Loan League having Reorganization Plan No. 3 under consideration. Therefore, I am in a position to state that the resolution finally adopted by the committee was not the result of a moving clique, but was the deliberate and considered judgment of the members of the committee after a 2-day study of the plan.

One of the fatal defects, it appears to me, in the reorganization plan, as submitted by the Chief Executive, is that the plan fails to distinguish between two entirely different functions of the Federal Government with reference to the housing problem.

That this in fact is a fatal defect, we are certain will be made clear by the considerations to which I respectfully invite the attention of the committee. One of the principal bulwarks of our democracy lies in the traditional ownership of homes by our citizens. The policy of our Government has always found expression in legislation fostering the private ownership of homes by its citizens. That has been the American concept as distinguished from the concepts advanced and fostered by other nations. Therein lies our strength and in the further extension of that concept the future of our Nation is secure. Any policy which tends toward a lessening of the dignity attaching to the benefits flowing therefrom threatens the very fiber of our Nation and the foundation upon which our Government rests.

Implementing this concept, the Congress as far back as 1932 established the Home Owners Loan Corporation to provide a means for the refinancing of mortgage-ridden residential and farm properties, the private ownership of which was threatened by the economic disasters incident to the depression of those days. As an integral part of that legislation and for the purpose of encouraging and fostering thrift to enable our citizens to acquire their own homes, the Congress authorized the organization throughout the Nation of Savings and Loan Associations, provided that they be Federally chartered, granted them benefits in local ownership and management and exempted them from Federal and State income taxation.

To enable such federally chartered savings and loan associations to carry forward their primary purpose of providing adequate home financing, the Congress in 1932 established the Federal Home Loan Bank System and created a Federal Home Loan Bank Board whose primary purpose was to bring into being credit reservoirs upon which such locally managed Federal savings and loan associations could rely for funds to achieve the objectives which Congress set up. This System, the Federal Home Loan Bank System, was established in the following manner: The United States was divided into 12 districts. A Federal home-loan bank was established in each such district and pursuant to the enabling act of the Congress the Federal home-loan bank in each district was granted corporate autonomy, its affairs being subject to management by a board of 12 directors, 4 of whom, representing the public interest, were designated by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the supervising agency of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, and 8 of whom were elected by the stockholder members of the district bank. As in other bodies corporate, the management of each district bank was vested in its board of directors which had authority to select officers, employ and fix the compensation of its personnel, and otherwise to conduct the affairs of such bank within the territorial limits of each district in accordance with the needs and local conditions prevailing in such district. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board was charged with the duty to supervise the management of such district banks and was authorized to suspend or remove the officers thereof for cause in the manner provided by statute.

The System admirably served the needs of the Nation and realized the fondest hopes of those who were instrumental in providing this means of assisting the encouragement of thrift and home ownership. The System flourished in the accomplishment of the objectives which Congress had set up and grew in strength. Through it untold thousands of American citizens were enabled to achieve the dignity and stability and independence which is inherent in private-home ownership.

In 1942, with the advent of the war and pursuant to the alleged authority of title I of the First War Powers Act, the President of the United States, for the avowed purpose of furthering the war effort, subordinated the Federal Home Loan Bank System to the authority of the National Housing Administration, and by Executive Order No. 9070 directed, amongst other things, that the functions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board be performed by one member thereof, to wit, its Chairman. This change, however, was stated to be a temporary expedient which would terminate upon the expiration of title I of the First War Powers Act, at which time the independence of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and its constituent agencies was to be reestablished.

Now that we are on the eve of the expiration of title I of the First War Powers Act, and despite the admitted absence of any exigency justifying the further deferral of the restoration of the independence of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and its constituent agencies, the Congress is confronted with the President's proposal to abolish the statutory independent Federal Home Loan Bank Board and permanently substitute in its place a device which will perpetuate the autocratic and totalitarian philosophy of government represented by the administration we have experienced under the authority of Executive Order No. 9070. That experience has not been happy nor has it contributed to the realization of the objectives for the accomplishment of which the Federal Home Loan Bank System was established. (See Tenth Intermediate Report of the Select Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies of the House of Representatives, 79th Cong.) If that were the only aspect upon which criticism of Reorganization Plan No. 3 could be predicated, in our humble opinion, it would be more than sufficient to condemn it, but, unfortunately, that is not even the case. In addition to centralizing extreme authoritarian power in the hands of one individual, contrary to every precept of sound democratic government, the plan proposed envisages the subordination of the Federal Home Loan Bank System to the over-all planning philosophy of a superior administrator.

The plan proposes that the Federal Home Loan Bank System, which is designed to encourage private home ownership, be placed on the same level as publicly owned and administered housing and that an Administrator be superimposed upon both for the avowed purpose of coordinating the functions at such level. Logically the coordination of functions would necessarily imply that such functions be reasonably related to the accomplishment of the same objectives, but in the proposal before this committee the objectives of the Federal Home Loan Bank System are unalterably opposed to the objectives of public and communal housing authority. The two are irreconcilable. The one is an expression of the dignity of the individual tradition in American democracy and typified in the private ownership of homes. Whereas the other, by encouraging dependence upon the Federal Government for housing facilities, of necessity is destructive of both the incentive for private home ownership and the individual's responsibility as a citizen.

Any policy, whether of the Federal Government or of Federal officials, inherently capable of tending toward public ownership and communal management of housing facilities, is a serious step taken in contradiction to the natural tendencies of our people, who, ever since the founding of this country, have been encouraged to plant their feet firmly on the soil of our land. Such a step should not be undertaken by the Congress without serious consideration of the consequences which will inevitably follow. Any assumption that such diverse objectives as private home ownership and Government-owned housing can be harmoniously coordinated is obviously fallacious. We trust, however, that the members of this committee will be alerted to the danger inherently implicit in the proposed grant of authority to any Administrator to sublimate the traditional and proven philosophy of private home ownership to the doubtful benefits of Government ownership and communal management of housing facilities.

Attention is respectfully invited to the fact that Reorganization Plan No. 3 as submitted contains no standards whatever for the guidance of, nor any limitations upon the authority of the proposed Administrator, with respect to the extent to which either system may be fostered as against the other. The only safeguard which has been advanced has been a disclaimer by Mr. Foley of any allegiance to the ideology which favors Government ownership and communal management of housing facilities as a national policy.

Ever since the effective date of Executive Order No. 9070, which consolidated the functions, duties, and powers of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the members of said Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the powers and duties of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Savings

and Loan Insurance Corporation with other agencies into a consolidated agency designated as National Housing Agency, and transferred the Board's powers, functions, and duties to the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration and the Federal Savings and Loan Association to the National Housing Agency in a Commissioner acting under the direction and supervision of the National Housing Administrator. The savings and loan industry in California, and I believe throughout the Nation, has been working for the restoration and control of the Federal Home Loan Bank System by a board constituted, as originally provided for in the Federal Home Loan Bank Act.

This desire is natural and understandable in light of the fact that as originally established each district Federal home-loan bank was an independent autonomous and self-governing corporate entity subject only to the general supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Each local district bank was managed by a directorate representative of the saving and loan industry in each district. True, in the beginning a substantial part of the capital of each of the several Federal home-loan banks was provided by the Federal Government. It was nevertheless contemplated and it is now a fact that the investment of the Federal Government in the capital of each district Federal home-loan bank did diminish from year to year and that ultimately all of the capital of the several Federal home-loan banks would be provided by the constituent members thereof and thus assured each bank keeping autonomous except for such supervision as might be necessary in the public interest. While the proposal now under consideration purports to provide for a Board to administer the Federal Home Loan Bank System it is the opinion of the California Savings and Loan League that the proposed Board does not restore to the savings and loan industry an independent Federal Home Loan Bank System managed and controlled by an independent Board of Directors having the power and duties originally conferred upon the directors of banks of the Federal Home Loan Bank System or an independent Federal Home Loan Bank Board with powers and duties as defined by section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act.

It is to be noted that under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act the following provisions were made with reference to the government of the Federal Home Loan Bank, to wit:

"FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

"SEC. 17. For the purposes of this act there shall be a board, to be known as the 'Federal Home Loan Bank Board,' which shall consist of five citizens of the United States appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three members of the Board shall be members of the same political party. Each member shall devote his entire time to the business of the Board. Before entering upon his duties each of the members shall take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office. The President of the United States shall designate one of the mmebers of the Board to serve for a term of 2 years, one for 3 years, one for 4 years, one for 5 years, and one for 6 years from the date of the enactment hereof, and thereafter the term of each member shall be 6 years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed. Whenever a vacancy shall occur among the members the persons appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term of the member whose place he is selected to fill. Each of the members of the Board shall receive a salary at the rate of $10,000 per annum: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year 1933 the salary shall be $9,000 per annum. The President shall designate one of the members as Chairman of the Board. The Chairman shall be the chief executive officer of the Board and in his absence or disability the duties of his office shall be performed by some one of the other members to be designated as Acting Chairman by the Chairman in such order as he may determine. The Board shall supervise the Federal home loan banks created by this act, shall perform the other duties specifically prescribed by this act, and shall have power to adopt, amend, and require the observance of such rules, regulations, and orders as shall be necessary from time to time for carrying out the purposes of the provisions of this act. The Board shall have power to suspend or remove any director, officer, employee, or agent of any Federal home loan bank, the cause of such suspension or removal to be communicated in writing forthwith to such director, officer, employee, or agent and to such Federal home loan bank."

It is to be noted that under the original provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act the Chairman of the Board had no powers which were greater than those given to any member of the Board, and that all action with reference to the operation, supervision, and functioning of the Federal Home Loan Bank System was the result of action by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. But all of that was changed by Executive Order No. 9070, for by that order the offices of all members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, other than the Chairman, were vacated for the duration of title I of the First War Powers Act and the Chairman of the Board was invested with the authority, powers, and functions which had theretofore reposed in the 5-man bipartisan Board. The Chaiman was then designated as a Commissioner and headed up what came to be known as the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration. (See secs. 3 and 8 of Executive Order No. 9070.) The Federal Home Loan Bank Administration itself was one of the three main constituent units of the National Housing Agency which the Executive order referred to created.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board proposed is nothing more than a phantom board in which all real authority of significance is vested in the single individual designated as Chairman. This, for all practical purposes, permanently imposes upon the Federal Home Loan Bank System and its constituent agencies the very limitations which were originally said to have been justified only by the exigencies of the war. That conclusion is apparent in the following provisions quoted from the reorganization plan.

Section 2 of said reorganization plan, subsection A, provides as follows:

"The Home Loan Bank Board shall consist of three members, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Subsection B of said section 2 provides: "The President shall designate one of the members of the Home Loan Bank Board as Chairman of the Board. The Chairman shall (1) be the chief executive officer of the Board, (2) appoint and direct the personnel necessary for the performance of the functions of the Board or of the Chairman or of any agency under the Board, and (3) designate the order in which the other members of the Board shall, during the absence or disability of the Chairman be Acting Chairman, and perform the duties of the Chairman."

Subsection C of said section 2 provides: "Except as otherwise provided in subsection B of this section, there are transferred to the Home Loan Bank Board the functions (1) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, (2) of the Board of Directors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, (3) of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, (4) of any member or members of any of said Boards, and (5) with respect to the dissolution of the United States Housing Corporation."

From the foregoing quotations from Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947, it is clear that for all practical purposes, and to a large extent as a matter of law, if this be law, the absolute control and administration of the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the agencies under it would be vested in the Chairman of the Board. This is totalitarian power. No such power was vested in the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as originally constituted by the Congress. Although it may be argued that as a matter of practice the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as originally constituted exercised the proposed powers granted to him under the reorganization plan, such power if exercised by the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board was exercised either by and through the sufferance of his fellow members of the Board, or as the result of expressed Board authorization. Under the proposal now before the committee, the exercise of the functions proposed to be granted to the Chairman and which may have heretofore been exercised by him under the circumstances just mentioned, are powers vested in him by law thus placing the Chairman of the proposed Board of the Federal Home Loan Bank System in a position superior to that of his fellow members, thereby making it possible for the Chairman in the exercise of the administrative power so granted to negative any policy established by the Board. In other words, the proposed Board does not have the power to enforce its policies.

Under the provisions of section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Board of the Federal Home Loan Bank was given certain powers with reference to "suspending or removing any director, officer, employee, or agent of any Federal home-loan bank, the cause of such suspension or removal to be communicated in writing forthwith to such director, officer, employee, or agent, and to such Federal home-loan bank."

The powers proposed to be given to the Chairman of the proposed Board of the Federal Home Loan Bank under Reorganization Plan No. 3 with reference to the personnel of any Federal home-loan bank are vested exclusively in the Chairman of the Board without any requirement whatsoever that the chairman give notice as to the cause of such suspension or removal. Moreover, the powers proposed to be given to the Chairman of the Board go beyond the Federal home-loan banks for, as heretofore noted, subsection B of section 2 of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 grants to the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board the power to appoint and direct the personnel necessary for the performance of functions "of any agency under the Board." This language, in our opinion, is sufficiently broad to give to the Chairman of the proposed Federal Home Loan Bank Board the power to remove without cause any director, officer, agent, or administrative personnel, of any Federal savings and loan association for such associations are, in my opinion, agencies under the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and are a necessary and important constituent element of the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

The attention of this committee is respectfully invited to the fact that the Federal Home Loan Bank System was one which the Congress created and surrounded with certain safeguards to the end that the banks which comprised the System should have a great deal of autonomy. The management of all the banks of the Federal Home Loan Bank System under the law is vested in a Board of 12 directors, 8 of whom are chosen by stockholders, and 4 of whom are appointed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board under section 2-B (2) of the reorganization plan before the committee. It is proposed that the Chairman and not the Federal Home Loan Bank Board shall appoint such directors.

This provision of the plan is flatly in contravention of the original act of Congress and would permanently strip the Federal Home Loan Bank Board of its real authority. In effect, the proposal establishes a phantom board of a potential autocrat with unlimited authority.

It appears to us that the proposal now before this committee is in direct conflict with the Reorganization Act of 1945. The Reorganization Act of 1945 provides, in part, as follows:

"Section 5 (A). No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

"* * * (5) authorize any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or (6) impose in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative functions possessed by an independent agency any greater limits upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization; except that the prohibition shall not prevent the abolition of any such functions."

Under the proposed reorganization, there is vested in the Chairman of the proposed Federal Home Loan Bank Board the exercise of functions which are not vested in him by express authorization of law and the functions possessed by the independent Federal Home Loan Bank Board, whose powers are now in a state of suspension by virtue of Executive Order No. 9070, are materially and substantially curtailed; moreover, that limitations are imposed upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion in the carrying out of authorized functions imposed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Act upon the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. In other words, the Executive has invaded the legislative prerogatives of the Congress by nullifying the policies of the Congress as expressed in the Federal Home Loan Bank Act by attempting to vest substantial and arbitrary power in the Chairman of the Board as distinct from the Board itself instead of leaving the Board to freely exercise the independent judgment and discretion with which it was originally vested. Incidentally, the Congress has no way of preventing the exercise of this legislative power by the Executive except by disapproving the plan and concurring in the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution No. 51.

It is to be noted that in the hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives of this Congress, on whose Concurrent Resolution No. 51, Mr. Frederick J. Lawton, Acting Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, appeared as a proponent of the proposed reorganization. A study of his testimony convinces one that the only substantial benefit which Mr. Lawton can find in the proposed reorganization plan was the possibility that the public and private housing interests, as represented by and in the proposed three constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency was the possibility of the development of plans for low-cost material, the use of housing, the testing programs, and things of that sort, and yet Mr. Lawton did not direct attention to any element in Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 which makes such a study possible, or if made, superior to the studies which have been and are now being made by established agencies of the Federal Government. It should also be noted that Mr. Lawton acknowledged that the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 would create an additional superagency, (see p. 12 of the hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments) and at the same time an examination of Mr. Lawton's testimony discloses that he was not at all sure that the consolidation of housing functions pursuant to the proposed Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 would in any wise reduce the aggregate number of the personnel of the Federal Government charged with the responsibility for housing, or the over-all cost of administering any housing policy established by the Congress. There is nothing in the Reorganization Act of 1945 that authorizes the creation of a new agency, rather Congress specifically intended by enacting it to authorize the Congress to reduce the number of agencies rather than create superagencies, and to effect economies averaging 25 percent of the budget for the year 1945.

I listened with interest to the presentation which Mr. Foley made to this committee yesterday and I cannot refrain from expressing concern with the philosophy of government which is implicit in the thesis he presented. His premise tended strongly toward a state of affairs which would encourage and foster dependence by the people upon the Federal Government for the solution of our housing problems, whereas in fact the real answer to the problem lies with the people themselves at the local community and not the national level. Mr. Foley recognized that the housing problem has not been solved, chiefly because of production costs, nor did he demonstrate during the course of his remarks that the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3 would in any wise result in a lowering of production costs or the establishment of more efficient means of housing construction. Mr. Foley stated he believed this could be accomplished through new methods, techniques, and materials, greater efficiency and reduction of waste but there is nothing whatever in Reorganization Plan No. 3 which refers to new methods, techniques, and materials for the building of housing.

His statement, "I am convinced that these costs can and must be definitely reduced as measured in relation to the ability of middle and low income family groups to pay for housing," clearly implies a conviction on his part that such ends can only be attained by a planned economy.

Mr. Foley, in common with other proponents of the reorganization plan who are directly identified with the National Housing Administration, fails to recognize the distinction between powers exercised by the Chairman of the proposed Board as a matter of law on the one hand, and by sufferance or direct authority of the Board, on the other hand. Mr. Foley states, "While section 2-B of the plan provides that the Chairman of the Board shall 'appoint and direct the personnel necessary for the performance of the functions of the Board' this is entirely consistent with his functions (under the plan as under the Home Loan Bank Act) as chief executive officer of the Board." In making this statement Mr. Foley was less than candid with the committee for, as heretofore pointed out, section 17 of the Home Loan Bank Act does not give the Chairman of the Board any powers different from or greater than these imposed upon any other member of the Board.

In conclusion it may be said that the proposed Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 is not substantially differennt from the proposals of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1946 and that the proposed Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 is inconsistent with the action taken by the Seventy-ninth Congress which determined in effect:

"(1) Congress and the Federal Government should encourage private home ownership and discourage Government ownership because private home ownership is the foundation of our democracy (2) private home ownership is strongly favored and will not be encouraged or protected by an agency whose policy favors Federal building and Federal control of homes; therefore (3) while there should be a permanent consolidation and grouping of all related housing agencies and the functions thereof, such agencies as the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Housing Administration which respectively make mortgage loans to, and insure mortgage loans for private builders and private home owners, should not be placed under administrative control of an agency whose primary function is to build houses with Federal funds or manage Federally owned housing projects."

Moreover, agencies now allied with and in effect governed by Federal Home Loan Bank Board should not be placed under administrative control of an agency which might be tempted to place administrative emphasis upon public housing and the expenditure of Federal funds therefor.

It seems extremely likely that if the Congress does not disapprove proposed Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 that the validity of said plan will be questioned in the courts, in which event the proper functioning of the said Home Loan Bank System as a credit reservoir for savings and loan institutions would be seriously impaired for so long as the matter of the validity of the plan was being contested it would be impossible for the Federal Home Loan Bank System to offer for sale the debentures authorized by the Federal Home Loan Bank Act for the purpose of making available adequate financing for private home owners. It appears to me that Congress should be most concerned with the increasing tendency of Government to concentrate its administrative functions in the hands of individuals free from legislative restraint and control with powers capable of being exercised in an arbitrary and autocratic fashion.

The Federal Home Loan Bank System as originally conceived was designed to encourage thrift and savings for the primary purpose of enabling the average American to own his own home, to plant his feet more firmly in the soil of American tradition, and to make of him a sounder and more substantial citizen taking pride in his resourcefulness and ability to live in the American way without the assistance of Government crutches, and to attain a stature either exceeding in dignity that which he could ever enjoy as the supplicant for housing accomodations at some publicly managed facility.

We hope this committee will take such action as, in its judgment, may be calculated to permit the Federal Home Loan Bank System to again serve the Nation as it has in the past. That end will necessarily require disapproval of the plan of reorganization before the committee and the restoration of the Federal Home Loan Bank System to the status established by the Federal Home Loan Bank Act.

Chickens Coming Home To Roost in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, chickens are coming home to roost. Mohammed Ali Jinnah, president of the Moslem League, by his dogged insistence and misdirected enthusiasm has secured Pakistan. He now issues a manifesto insisting upon the right of the Indian princes to declare themselves independent sovereign nations. One can imagine the confusion worse confounded with Pakis-

tan, Hindustan, and over 580 small and large princely sovereignties. One would have to have a hundred different visas to travel across India.

Nehru stated that the recognition of the independence of any princely state by an foreign power would be regarded as an unfriendly act by the Congress Party.

This conflicting approach to the question of the independence of the princely states points to a bitter break between Hindustan and Pakistan. Jinnah, doubtlessly, is determined to have as many of the princely states as possible join Pakistan in opposition to Hindustan. Hyderabad and Travancore, two of the largest princely states, have already declared their independence and have demanded that they become the inheritors of Great Britain's paramountcy.

India by culture, tradition, language, geography should be a single nation. The very idea of Pakistan and now the refinement of Pakistan into hundreds of princely states shows how wrong it was from the very beginning. As I said before, Pakistan is an engraved invitation to His Majesty's government to remain in India. India should remain one nation. Its salvation and its progress depend upon the unity of India. Pakistan is a menacing and overshadowing cloud.

It is hoped that unity of India will be obtained by peaceful ways and that eventually Jinnah will be won over to the principle of unity, wiping out forever the cross purposes that have wracked India.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times of June 11, 1947, written by one of the best known and outstanding editors in our Pacific Northwest, Mr. Claude E. Ingalls, of Corvallis, Oreg.:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

With the report of President Truman's special commission for the investigation and study of universal military training, comes the first ray of hope for those right thinking citizens who know the necessity of military preparedness. If our lawmakers will now seriously consider the commission's recommendations, which for the most part seem very sound, we may feel that it is no longer a dirty trick to bring new children into the world. If, on the other hand they insist on listening to crackpots, commies, and fellow travelers, and putting their political careers before the welfare of their country, we may as well cash in our chips and wait for the chain gang.

The old adage of Hegel's "We learn from history that we learn nothing from history" has never been more pathetically demonstrated than in a case history of the United States Army versus the United States Congress.

Because we failed to supply George Washington with an adequate regular army and sufficient funds and supplies, we fumbled around in our war for independence and won it only by default when the British were required to withdraw their troops to face the Napoleonic menace. Washington later wrote, "Had we formed a permanent army in the beginning—we should not have been the greatest part of the war inferior to the enemy, indebted for our safety to their inactivity, enduring frequently the mortification of seeing opportunities to ruin them pass unimproved for want of a force, which the country was completely able to afford—."

Regardless of the pleading of our first soldier and President, a short time after the conclusion of the war, our Regular Army consisted of exactly 80 men. Even after our Constitution was adopted we could boast of only 590 men. For the next decade the Indians killed thousands of settlers and militia troops along our frontier and it wasn't until Anthony Wayne raised and trained an army for over a year before leading them into battle that this scourge was eliminated.

One of the most shameful stories in American history is the War of 1812. The Navy, well trained, officered, and manned, fought bravely and creditably; our untrained army was poorly led and was a dismal and disgraceful failure. The figures show that we called out over a half-million men and could not drive a maximum of not more than 16,000 from our shores in over 2 years. We spent nearly $200,000,000 when 2 percent of that sum, with a small, well-trained force would have been sufficient. The greatest tragedy was the loss of 6,000 lives, when that figure need not have been over 200. That the war was again successfully concluded in our favor was the responsibility of Napoleon who had so wearied the British in Europe. We did learn one great lesson from this war. We kept our army up to strength for 3 months before reducing it to 10,000 men; 5 years later we pruned it down to 6,000.

By 1834 we again received our reward for false economy and shortsightedness when we found we had only 4,000 men trying to guard a 10,000-mile frontier and seacoast. Indians were killing off settlers and militia faster than men could be sent against them. Finally Congress authorized a 10,000-man Army and the Indians were put down.

In 1842 the Army was down to 8,613 men. At this time Cengress thundered at no prospect of war and the waste of money and just 4 years later we were embroiled in war with Mexico. Gen. Zachary Taylor had less than 3,000 troops against a possible 50,000 Mexicans, yet he was supposed to advance his force into Mexico as well as defend our own borders. We had to hold up the war until we trained an adequate Army to bring the Mexicans to terms.

Even after this lesson the Americans refused to learn. At the conclusion of the war the Army was reduced to a size similar to its strength at the end of the War of 1812. In the meantime we had gained close to a million square miles of territory and increased our population by 12,000,000. This paltry Army was supposed to protect our frontiers against hundreds of thousands of warring Indians. Thousands more settlers lost their lives, but it was too expensive to provide an adequate Army.

This condition existed up to the time of the War Between the States. Experts, foreign and domestic agree that if we had had a finely trained force in the East in 1860, of not more than 25,000, the war could not have lasted over 3 months with the maximum of a thousand casualties. As it was the North threw away 360,000 lives and the Confederate losses would bring the toll to a half-million. Today, we still have people preaching against preparedness.

One morning in 1898 our people woke up to find the battleship *Maine* had gone down and we were at war with Spain. When we looked around for our Army we found that it was 25,000 strong—the size it had been 22 years before—and scattered in small posts on the border and Alaska. There were no plans for expansion, no staffs, no maps, and equipment, food, and guns were lacking. We still had our Revolutionary War precept, "an able-bodied man is a soldier." The Navy finally won that war for us, while the Army vainly struggled to train a reasonable army. The gallant sacrifices of a few of the 200,000 men called out were not in vain, but 13 times as many men died in camp as were killed by the enemy. We did not even have the facilities to train the men in camp.

A short time after the Spanish-American War we cut our Army down to 25,000 men and then sat around watching Europeans slaughter each other and Germans sink our ships. Had it not been for Pancho Villa's depredations against our border we would have been even less prepared for World War I than we were. When we finally got into the war we found we needed immediately 200,000 trained offieers to train the new officers and men. We had 10,000. In equipment we were worse off—a few obsolete airplanes, artillery ammunition for 2 days' battle, no automatic rifles, and comparatively few machine guns and rifles. The most horrible part of the whole thing is that we never would have had to go to war at all had we been ready and able to fight—no one would have provoked us into the bloody mess.

At the end of the First World War Americans permitted their Congress and actually encouraged it to forget national defense in deference to their pocketbooks. They still believed that an adequate Regular Army was an invitation to war. In the past when armies were the playthings of kings perhaps this belief was true; today, no. No idea could be more distressingly pitiful. The tragedy of the last war is still too much with us to forget that had we been prepared, no Jap plane would ever have flown over Pearl Harbor and there would have been no death march from Bataan.

We heartily commend the report of the Presidential committee, and urge that Congress adopt the policies outlined therein.

Address of Hon. James P. McGranery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a powerful and timely radio speech delivered by the Honorable James P. McGranery, judge of the United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania, at the second annual corporate communion breakfast of the Pennsylvania Railroad Holy Name Society on Father's Day, June 15, 1947, at Broadwood Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa.

As most of my colleagues know Judge McGranery served with ability, distinction, and courage for a number of years in this body, and was a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

The speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellencies, Right Reverend Monsignori, Reverend Fathers, distinguished guests and members of the Pennsylvania Railroad Holy Name Society, "Justice and chairty must meet again, and good will be the cement between men and between nations."

These words echo through the years and reecho on this day set aside to honor fatherhood—in this assembly of men solemnly dedicated to daily honoring of the holy name of our Divine Father.

You are the working partners of the Pennsylvania Railroad system, one of the greatest railroad systems in the world. It is the artery through which flows the life-giving blood of the East to all parts of our vast country. It is the builder and developer of our community living and of our community relations.

Always the greatest contribution to the growth and development of your railroad—and to America—has been made by men like you—whose loyalty is a trinity of devotion; to home, to country, to God.

Your beloved president, Mr. Clement, is one of America's great leaders. He commands the respect and regard of the Nation, but we who have had the happy privilege of knowing him more intimately, give to him also our affection.

History of men is the history of communications, and the forward march of civilization has followed the lines of communications. Therefore, at a glance one can see the vital part that you—and I mean each of you—play in America's future. No wonder I am indeed proud and happy and grateful to be here at these exercises, to take part in your public manifestation of divine faith.

For the brotherhood of man is but an empty phrase if it does not bring the further thought of the fatherhood of God.

America was founded on a religious idea and this idea was proudly proclaimed by its founders, who declared that men were created free and equal, that they were endowed with reason and that they were morally responsible.

These early Americans thus expressed their faith and revealed their hope—their vision of the distant day when all men would walk the earth in freedom and equality.

Washington, Jefferson, and their contemporaries made a pact with destiny, as they foresaw America's role as the role of the peacemaker. She was to be the exemplar of democracy, and to be militant only in its defense.

To others could be left the short-lived triumph of transient conquest and of passing empire. The final end of a Napoleon, they knew, would always be as ignominious as the last collapse of a Hitler.

In those early years our statesmen had a sense of history, as our national life has since revealed. Lincoln solemnly phrased this when he said:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history; the fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth." He forever emphasized his certainty that nations, like men, shall be judged by the moral consequences of their actions.

Ever since the beginning of our country, we have passed through national crises and world crises without forsaking these ideals.

World War II began, for us, with a sneak attack upon our Territorial integrity. It found us better prepared spiritually than materially. It aroused our ire and our fervor as it challenged the philosophy which is the wellspring of our national life.

It was at once a Global War, and a universal struggle striking at truths, fundamental to human existence.

Our Republic proved its military strength, as it may again, with the infinite sacrifice of millions of our heroic youth.

Pearl Harbor immediately enflamed the spark of patriotic fervor in the breast of every American, but we know well that months and years of intense, coordinated effort were required to build the military planes and ships and armaments; yes, even the manpower organization demanded for total war. We shall never know the price exacted during those months and years in needless loss of the lives of America's young manhood.

Needless, I say, because we had the lessons of our own history to dictate the necessity for military preparedness.

Yet the record discloses all too clearly that we failed to heed the lessons of World War I. Yet, we had been told then, as now, that if we are to know the future we must study the past.

Instead, following the First World War, there was held a series of disarmament conferences.

The great nations of the world participated in these and entered into solemn agreements to disarm. What happened?

We of America, in good faith, cut our appropriations for the Army and the Navy; and we actually scrapped our naval ships.

Some of the other great powers took their agreements home, tucked them away in their archives, and quietly—secretly—continued their armament-building programs.

Conduct such as this should, by now, have taught the American people a costly lesson in history.

I earnestly pray that the Congress of the United States will not be blinded by short-sighted economy and require us to take the lead again in disarming.

If our Nation is to hold fast to its moral position in a havoc-stricken, war-torn world, we cannot strip our defenses. Soviet Russia dictates that we share the secret of the atom bomb while she draws tighter her iron curtain in ominous secrecy.

The bold gangster methods which the world witnessed in the rape of Hungary and in the continuing Balkan annexations are part of the same world-disruptive plan under which she insidiously continues to promote strife, confusion, and discord within the borders of our own country.

Communism conquers only where there is already chaos. Russia uses treachery and deceit to accomplish her goal of tyranny and oppression. It has been too clear that those who have been betrayed into communism were deceived because communism uses the language of liberty and follows with the methods of totalitarianism.

These unwilling captives have awakened abruptly to discover the loss of every freedom—even and especially the freedom to find their way to God. Their children have been kidnapped early by the collective state and doomed to a perpetual delinquency of spirit from which there is no escape.

The political slavery of atheistic communism has already overtaken too many of our brothers across the sea.

A world half-slave and half-free can never come to know the tranquillity of order which is the only peace and guarantee of continued peace.

Oppression, despair, and ruin inevitably result from a defiance of the moral law—from loss of the grace of God among men.

Our own country through the years has freed groups of our fellow Americans from racial and economic bondage.

We have fought to carry out the words of the founding fathers to their fullness. We have battled for a family wage under conditions befitting the dignity of human nature. We have loosed the shackles of the economically enslaved and at the same time protected the property rights of capital to a fair share of the profits.

We have tried—and we must continue to try—to strengthen the family spiritually as well as economically.

For the true strength of a country is in its citizens. We must defeat the Communist objective which is to destroy our form of government through their European-rehearsed method, and to erode public confidence in the workings of democracy.

Our Government continues to be a practical medium for expressing the popular will.

No one who cannot speak the common thought, who does not move by the common impulse is the man to speak for America, or for any of her set purposes.

Only he is fit to speak who knows the thoughts of the great body of citizens.

Repeatedly we have been singularly blessed in having such a man at our helm in time of critical need. Today when there is a cleavage of ideas abroad, and the menace of the atheistic collective state reaching westward with the greedy hands of empire-hungry men, we have a truly American President who, within this week, has expressed the American ideal and the American mind, when he said:

"At this crucial point in history, we of the United States are deeply conscious of our responsibilities to the world.

* * * * *

"We seek a peaceful world, a prosperous world, a free world, a world of good neighbors—living on terms of equality and mutual respect.

* * * * *

"We intend to uphold those who respect the dignity of the individual, who guarantee him equal treatment under law, and who allow him the widest possible liberty to work out his own destiny and achieve success to the limit of his capacity."

His words might have been uttered by Washington or Lincoln. They are of our time and of all time for they are based on the eternal conscience of mankind.

President Truman voiced the charity and good will which form the cement of men or of nations when he further declared:

"We know that in this trying period, between a war that is over and a peace that is not yet secure, the destitute and the oppressed of the earth look chiefly to us for sustenance and support until they can face life with self-confidence and self-reliance."

And I say to you today that the reality of the world situation and the principles of justice alike demand that America share a portion of her harvest with those still freedom-loving men who were victims of World War II.

It is dangerous to be the only well-fed people in the world.

It is dangerous not only because America could soon find the world regimented against her, and herself the shining target to be annihilated.

It is doubly dangerous because it would mean the surrender of her long-cherished principles of justice, charity, and good will, and it would mark the crumbling decay of our national fiber.

If America isolates herself completely from the oppressed abroad, she will betray her historic role, she will betray herself, and betray her God.

In sharing her bread with freedom-loving men who are standing uncertain at the brink of starvation, America will revive in them the very breath of spiritual liberty.

For it is not enough to restore these war-shattered people physically. To do just this alone would merely set the stage for a more devastating and perhaps conclusive global conflict.

Human values are the clue to human solidarity. And the peace, to be a lasting peace, should be founded on the nature of man. Blueprints of the future must be traced with lines of justice and charity. Then only will come peace to men of good will.

America shall strengthen herself at home in the democratic way by standing guard with the Bill of Rights, true sentinel of liberty. Her people's prosperity, natural fruit of economic justice, will protect her institutions from the termites of Communist Russia.

America, dynamic in her democracy, can then and only then, continue to be a vision of hope to oppressed people everywhere. She will have the true answer to people who want security joined with freedom.

The twentieth century is America's century if we make it the century when justice and charity meet again and good will is the cement between men and between nations.

Republican Paper Admits Republican Errors Brought About Veto of Republican "Soak the Poor" Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, here is an editorial from one of the outstanding Republican newspapers of the country, the Washington Daily News, owned by Republican Roy Howard's vast news empire, admitting that Republican errors brought about the courageous veto by the President of the Republican soak-the-poor tax bill.

I am inserting here just a few paragraphs from this remarkably frank editorial:

GOP CHOICE: CUT TAXES FOR NEXT YEAR, OR PLAY POLITICS

To voters who read on the run and haven't followed the nuances of what has happened, it looks as though the Republicans are on the side of the taxpayer, and the Democrats against.

But the full truth may spread. It will show that the Republicans, by their blunders and politics-playing strategy, are largely responsible for this impasse. They made their first big mistake by failing to do their duty under the reorganization law, which required Congress, within 3 weeks after it convened, to fix an over-all ceiling on Government spending for the next fiscal year. The Republicans haven't yet fixed that ceiling, and they control both Houses of Congress. They are still flouting the law, still shirking their responsibility.

Their second mistake was in trying to make the tax cut retroactive to January 1 last. Their third was in delaying action 5 months and grudgingly compromising—too late—on the July 1 date. All the time there were plenty of Democrats who would have gone along, had the GOP been wiling to make the tax cut effective at the start of the next calendar year. The Republicans chose instead to try to embarrass the President. To those who know the score, it would appear the Republicans themselves cannot be unembarrassed by what has happened.

But, Mr. Speaker, this editorial does not tell the basic and underlying error made by the Republicans.

That error was that they sent to the President a tax bill which favored the few over the many.

It soaked the poor and pampered the rich.

It takes real courage to veto a bill reducing taxes; but the President knew that he was right and he knew that the people would back him up.

The Republican tax bill relieved those best able to pay of tremendous burdens, while it gave very little relief to the little man struggling with Republican high prices and faced now with Republican high rents.

With one hand they granted the $2,500 a year family tax relief amounting to not more than $50 a year, and with the other hand they passed a so-called rent-control bill which will add from $100 to $200 to the same little man's rent bill this coming year.

The Republican tax bill made no provision for retiring our staggering public debt at a time when the country is at its highest prosperity of all time and can best afford to pay on the national debt.

Rent Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release which I prepared on the rent-control bill, on which we so recently voted.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The legislation just reported by the conference committee should be disapproved by the two Houses, and in any event merits a Presidential veto.

Congress and the country should be under no illusions about the proposition. For all practical purposes, this measure kills the veterans' housing program. For all practical purposes, it ends effective rent control for 16,000,000 families in the United States who have relied on its protection.

In the face of the most desperate housing shortage in American history, especially for veterans and their families, this bill wipes out the few remaining controls that were deemed necessary by the Housing Expediter for the limited period of the 1947 construction season. It opens the floodgates of construction for commercial purposes, for which $2,000,000,000 in permits are pending at the present time. It makes possible construction of luxury apartments and mansions instead of homes of modest size within the veterans' means to buy or rent. It strikes down the guaranteed market program to stimulate prefabricated housing and new-type materials, thus destroying a growing nucleus of mass production that would turn out housing in volume for the volume needs of the American people. It eliminates further expenditure for access roads to enable small lumbermen, as well as the giant interests, to bring desperately needed timber out of the Government-owned lands.

This Congress has given no better illustration of selfish interests running riot than in the callous provisions of this measure.

The rent control provisions are equally farcical. The bill practically assures landlords a 15-percent increase across the board, notwithstanding the liberalized procedure for adjustments and the thousands on thousands of adjustments for individual hardships made in recent months. The local board idea is sound on an advisory basis, but this measure really creates local boards nominated by the Governors of the States, as an added administrative layer, thus confusing the picture and slowing up the procedure of administration, adjustment of individual hardship and decontrol where the facts justify such action. The bill in effect repeals Federal control over evictions. It repeals rent control over so-called residential hotels and new construction, thus creating two types of housing, controlled and uncontrolled, with certainty of discrimination against the veterans who would move into uncontrolled accommodations and against the owners of controlled accommodations. It would end rent control next winter with the certainty of widespread hardship evictions or cruel increases of rent.

I submit that Congress and the President should not take lying down the repeal of the Veterans' Housing Program, with its promise of hundreds of thousands of homes this year if controls are continued, in order to continue for a few months more an empty shell mislabeled rent control. By vetoing the measure, the President would insure that the controls under the Patman Act would remain effective until their expiration date December 31, 1947.

Congress has set another trap for the President similar to that of a year ago when it sent to the White House a deceptive and confusing bill purporting to extend price control. That OPA bill was a time bomb which did not explode until the Congressmen who planted it had adjourned and taken cover outside of Washington. By vetoing the measure, the President will place responsibility for destroying rent control where it belongs, squarely on the Republican Congress.

It will then be up to the public to compel the Congress to create real and effective rent control.

The bill reported by the conference committee is called the Rent Control Act of 1947. A better name would be the rent decontrol and dehousing bill of 1947.

Information and Educational Exchange Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and also an editorial from the Washington Post of June 18, 1947:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 14, 1947.

The Honorable DONALD L. JACKSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: I am writing to urge you to support in every way possible H. R. 3342, the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1947. During 1945–46 I was head of the United States Information Service in Copenhagen. I know that our work in making available to the Danish public an accurate and a fair picture of American life and policy was highly successful and much appreciated by the Danish press and public.

Our USIS supplemented the routine work of the legation, with which we always worked as a team. Our press service, library, films documentary and educational, musical recordings, advisory service to students and mature scholars planning to visit the United States, went out to a public that no private news or other agency was equipped to handle. Secretary Marshall and his Department will be able to work more efficiently if the Voice of America is heard in the world,

and if the present Information and Educational agency is properly supported and maintained. It will enable us to implement our leadership in world affairs.

Yours very sincerely,

WALDEMAR WESTERGAARD.

[From the Washington Post of June 18, 1947]

SOTTO VOCE

The fate that seems to be in store for the State Department foreign information program is nothing short of disastrous. By a series of pettifogging delays the unrepentant isolationists in the House have prevented the Mundt bill from reaching the floor. This is the bill that would continue after July 1 the short-wave broadcasts, the American libraries abroad and the other informational and educational services which seek to present a true picture of this country. The strategy of the House die hards is to kill the program entirely by talking it to death. The disturbing part is that now the Senate Republican leadership, which should know better, apparently has thrown in the towel. Influential GOP Senators are reported to have consented to a compromise which would narrow the information activities to a constricted broadcasting program with an appropriation of only $6,000,000 instead of the $31,000,000 originally asked.

Important as are the overseas broadcasts in themselves, their consideration should not exclude other significant aspects of the foreign information program. If the present congressional tack continues, for example, it will force the closing of our libraries abroad. In many capitals these libraries constitute virtually the only source of accurate factual information about the United States. The libraries are fountains of Americana. They contain reference books, periodicals, copies of official publications. They are becoming increasingly popular. Another essential which congressional parsimony would eliminate is the distribution of the texts of important American speeches and policy statements—texts which otherwise would not be available in many areas of the world. These activities in making the truth known about America add up to a composite package of the most effective advertising we could have.

The issue now becomes a matter of principle. Either we present the facts, along the line established by the Mundt bill, or we leave it to the Kremlin to explain our motives. No American who knows the diet of falsehood dished out by Pravda can want that. But we may rest assured that if we do not continue to tell our story, no one else will do it for us.

The Tax Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's veto of the tax-reduction bill—H. R. 1—has aroused a storm of indignant protests from coast to coast. These protests come from editorial writers, commentators, businessmen, and just plain folks. One woman in upstate New York wrote me that a $30 reduction in her tax may appear as chicken feed to Mr. Truman, but it would have meant two tons of coal to her. All agree that the President was playing cheap politics, as witness the following editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press for June 17:

TRUMAN'S VETO

President Truman vetoed the tax reduction because he was thinking more about the votes to be cast next year for President than he was about the votes that were cast last November for Congress. The veto is a direct repudiation of the result of the fall election, which was fought on a Republican promise to reduce taxes. It is also a repudiation of Truman's own pledge at the time to cooperate with Congress to carry out the wishes of the people.

The technical right of the President to veto this or any other legislation is of course indisputable. But the moral right of a President to obstruct the legislative process in a matter of tax policy after his own party and administration had been set down by the voters is another matter.

Reasons for vetoing any tax reduction or tax increase can always be found, since this is a matter of policy and a complicated one. But Congress, and particularly the House, has far more right to decide those matters of policy than the President when, as in this case, it comes fresh from a mandate of the people. This is all the more the case when the man who is President was never elected to that office but owes his power to the accident of Vice Presidential succession.

In overruling Congress, President Truman has undertaken to overrule the American people. He perhaps expects to correct this situation next year when he can carry out the wishes of the people with some part of the credit coming to himself. This maneuver will cost 49,000,000 taxpayers $4,000,000,000.

Congress should see that the rights and interests of the people are served in this modest measure of tax relief by repassing the bill over his veto. It is significant that the House seems to have the votes to do this; the Senate not. All the House membership was elected last November, but only one-third of the Senate.

There is ample justification for overriding the veto. The most conclusive one is the simple fact that 2 years after the war, taxpayers are entitled to some measurable relief from the peak of onerous wartime taxation. The rights of the taxpayer to this consideration, strangely, were not even mentioned as a major factor in the veto message.

The message rested heavily on the inflationary effect of putting more money in private pockets. President Truman had no such compunction when he signed the repeal of the excess-profits tax, which put $6,000,000,000 into private corporation pockets at a time when the Government was running on a $9,000,000,000 deficit. Now he vetoes a $4,000,000,000 tax cut for private individuals at a time when the Government is running on a six to eight billion dollar surplus.

Of this surplus, some three billions at the least will result from economies in his budget legislated by Congress; in other words, three billions which he had intended the Government to spend. If it would not be inflationary for the Government to spend this sum, it is not inflationary for private citizens; certainly not more so. The inflationary factor in this tax cut thus is a matter of $1,000,000,000, which is too small to be judged as a factor at all, a mere matter of half of 1 percent or so of the entire national product at this time.

Assuming that the veto stands, Congress should not let its concern for the taxpayer stop there. A smaller tax cut would be better than none. To refuse to try again on the theory that Truman might get off the spot would also be playing politics with taxpayers' money. Congress should put up another tax cut, this time conforming to the amount it is saving on the Presidential spending budget; and if that is also vetoed, then override the veto, even though Truman would thereby have less to answer for.

The rights of taxpayers, caught between the onslaughts of ferocious tax rates on their incomes and the equally ferocious costs of living, come ahead of all party politics.

Preparations for National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very outstanding address delivered by Mr. Cord Meyer, Jr., at a luncheon-forum sponsored by United World Federalists and American Federation of Scientists, in Washington, D. C., today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I hardly need to remind you here, who are close to events in the National Capital, of the crisis in foreign relations which our Government now faces. It is impossible to exaggerate the fatal significance of the decisions that America cannot avoid making in the immediate future. Whether our fate is to be peace or an atomic-biological war is the issue. I do not overstate the case when I say that the lives of more than one-third of humanity and the survival of what we have chosen to call civilization are at stake. Let me describe briefly the three basic alternatives before us.

The first alternative is to attempt to insure our national security by remaining the strongest military power in the world. Although there is no effective defense against an atomic attack once it is launched, we can try to prevent a would-be aggressor from ever beginning such an attack by the obvious size and efficiency of our preparations for a counteroffensive. By building up our capacity to retaliate even though our cities lie in ruins and half our people are killed, we can hope to instill such fear into other governments that they will never dare to risk war with us. This is the policy of peace through intimidation into which our Government is rapidly drifting.

If we adopt this alternative, other nations have no choice but to do likewise. When superior military power is the sole guaranty of national security, each government is forced to compete for that superiority. Every increase in our armed strength will provoke a corresponding increase in the power of others. A mounting competition for arms, allies, strategic bases, and raw materials is the inevitable result. Our only possible competitor in this struggle is the Soviet Union, which alone has the potential strength to challenge our lead. Quite apart from ideological considerations, the United States and the Soviet Union are doomed to be the two central contestants because in the search for national security each is the only real threat to the other.

Before we are finally and irrevocably committed to this meaningless struggle, there is still time to consider the consequences. We cannot insure our ability to strike back after the holocaust of a modern assault merely by

building more atomic bombs, biological weapons, bombers, and rockets than our possible opponent. That nation which is able to protect from atomic bombing vital sections of its industry and population by subterranean dispersal will enjoy a decisive advantage in any future war. If we seek protection in our ability to retaliate, we have no time whatever to lose in building secret and self-sufficient underground production centers. Our present concentration of men and machines in a few congested cities makes us the most vulnerable target in the world. There is also need for a large professional standing army equipped with the most effective modern weapons, widely dispersed, and kept in instant readiness to launch the counter-offensive. As far as possible, our urban population must be protected by underground shelters. The concentration of the entire directing personnel of the Government in Washington can no longer be tolerated.

This is the minimum price of modern preparedness. It can only be paid by profound changes in our political and economic system. The necessary dispersion of industry can only be accomplished by autocratic planning and Government edict. Labor will have to be conscripted to work in the underground factories. As the stock piles of weapons grow, our living standards will decline. Anti-sabotage and anti-espionage precautions will restrict and finally eliminate our civil liberties. In foreign policy, the search for allies will lead us into backing any regime, no matter how corrupt and tyrannical, so long as it opposes Russia. In attempting to defend the independence of our country, by military power in this new age, we will have to give up all that has made it worth defending in the past. When the last measure of preparedness has been completed and the state has become one vast military machine poised for instantaneous retaliation, we will be a driven and degraded people, and life for the individual will be a drawn-out agony of oppression and suspense.

Will these sacrifices accomplish their purpose? Can war be prevented by fear of our armed power? I do not believe so. As the nations accumulate the weapons with which they can annihilate each other's cities, suspicions will grow monstrous. Already as the struggle for power increases between the United States and Russia, each government protests that its own preparations are purely defensive but each suspects that the other plots aggression. Now that the only defense is a counter-offensive, there is no longer any way of distinguishing between defensive and aggressive preparations, until the last moment when the attack is launched. Sooner or later, fear will provoke war and one nation or the other will strike first in order to deny the advantage of the initiative to its opponent. Peace cannot be built on mutual terror. In the war that will inevitably result from competing programs of preparedness industrial society will be totally destroyed.

The second alternative is the preventive war. The difficulties and dangers of a prolonged competition for military supremacy with Russia have led some to the conclusion that we should attack now while we have the atomic bomb and they don't. Life magazine has recently condensed for mass consumption James Burnham's vision of an American Empire established and maintained by nuclear fission. There are demands in the Senate for an immediate showdown with Russia. Because the body of opinion that believes in the preventive war is growing with remarkable speed, the argument is worth refuting. Morally, preventive war is a nice name for aggression. The unsubstantiable suspicion that our victim planned to attack at some future date could not mitigate our guilt. Preventive war is the act for which we hung the Nazi leaders at Nuremburg. Practically, the preventive war is not as easy as it has been made to appear by its supporters. It would not end with the atomization of Moscow and Leningrad. The Red Army would march into Western Europe, the Middle East and China. They would have many allies, as our attack would alienate even our own friends. The resulting land campaign would be long and incredibly costly. England and Europe would be ruined beyond repair. If the Russians do not yet have atomic bombs, it is quite probable that they are already armed with the means of biological warfare. Should we attack them, they would be justified in striking back with incurable epidemics that might eliminate whole sections of our population. Eventually, we might be able to win a shadow victory. We would then be forced to establish an iron tyranny over the entire earth in order to prevent the defeated from constructing modern weapons for revenge. Nor can the spread of communism be stopped by killing large numbers of those who believe in it. Past attempts to crush militant faiths by the sword have been singularly unsuccessful.

Who would fight this preventive war for those who seek to provoke it? I believe that there are many who fought bravely and well in the last war to defend their country who would prefer jail to the role of aggressors. Preventive war is a nightmare that we must reject.

There is a third alternative: It is the policy of attempting to find with the Soviet Union and the other nations a cooperative solution of the security problem. Good-will gestures of unilateral disarmament are futile and dangerous. But we must offer to join with others in transforming an impotent United Nations into a reliable system of international security, while preserving our national armed strength until general agreement to the new system is obtained. Once it is recognized that no amount of sacrifice for armaments can delay war for long or protect the country when war comes, it is clear that we have a right and a duty to demand that the first objective of the United States Government be the establishment of an effective international organization for our protection.

What has the United States Government done to date in order to strengthen the United Nations and to halt the suicidal arms race that has already begun? It has proposed the Baruch plan, and many think that in doing so we have fulfilled our obligation as the first country to develop and use atomic weapons. The feeling is general that we have done all within our power to assure peace. Now, it is argued, the other nations, and particularly Russia, must accept the Baruch plan or, by refusing it, convict themselves of intent to commit aggression. Whether this view is accurate can only be shown by a critical analysis of the Baruch plan itself.

As you know, the plan calls for an abolition of atomic weapons. Inspection and an international monopoly on the potentially dangerous peacetime uses of atomic energy are to insure that bombs cannot be secretly constructed by any government. Only by expropriating the plants of the international authority would a nation be able to manufacture bombs, and this seizure would be immediately evident to the world. All other nations acting through the Security Council are then to join forces against the violator, which would not retain its veto to prevent collective action. In other words, if and when the Baruch plan is put into effect, the danger of sudden and surprise attack with atom bombs will be eliminated, since no nation will have them. Any attempt to make bombs is to be discovered by an international intelligence service, and all governments can then seize the atomic plants in their respective territories and join in the race to make the first bombs for the resulting atomic war. All weapons except atomic explosives are to remain uncontrolled and each nation is to retain its army, navy, and air force. How practical is this plan and what chance is there of its general acceptance?

It has been claimed that by eliminating the veto the Baruch plan would insure effective enforcement action against a government violating the atomic agreement. I cannot agree. Here in new guise is the old fallacy that separate armed nations can find security by formally undertaking to use their respective armies jointly against any one of their number that commits aggression. It is an attempt to revive the impractical principles of the League of Nations and to graft them on to a veto-ridden United Nations. A mere change of voting rules in the Security Council can have no effect on the actions of the United States and Russia. If either chose to defy the international inspectors and seize the plants of the authority, the result would be World War III, with the two giants and their satellites ranged against each other. No majority vote in the Security Council could disguise that reality or provide protection. It is even unlikely that such a vote could ever be taken. The seizure of atomic plants would be such a clear indication of aggressive designs that it would only be attempted in coordination with a general assault launched with rockets, blockbusters, bacteria, and mechanized armies. The victims of the attack would be more interested in defending themselves than in voting. Changes in the structure of the United Nations more fundamental than a juggling of voting rules in the Security Council are necessary, if the swift, certain, and sure system of punishment which Mr. Baruch called for is to be achieved.

Under the Baruch plan, veto or no veto, war would result from interference with the inspection system. The plan recognizes this fact by calling for a strategic balance of atomic plants among the nations. The number of plants and the amount of nuclear fuel within the borders of each nation will be an essential factor in its national security. If one nation seizes its plants to produce bombs, the others will be forced to seize theirs, and the side that has the largest atomic industry will have a considerable advantage in the resulting war. Agreement to a scheme determining the allocation of atomic industry is a prerequisite to the acceptance of the plan and such agreement is extremely unlikely.

For instance, if the Soviet Government believed that the United States and the British Commonwealth would be allied against it in the event of another war, it could hardly agree to an equal division of atomic facilities among the three. Nor can I imagine either the United States or Britain consenting to a balance which would give the Russians as large an atomic industry as they owned together. Similarly, the number of atomic plants the United States might allow France for peaceful use would depend entirely upon the direction of French foreign policy. A victory at the polls for the French Communists would swing France into the Russian orbit. The United States would then be compelled to demand a revision of the balance or accept military inferiority when and if aggression occurred.

Agreement to a distribution scheme is further complicated by the impossibility of equalizing the factors that condition the speed with which the various nations can convert to bomb production. The high level of industrialization, the technological skill, and the special experience of the United States with atomic energy combine to place this country for a long time at a distinct advantage in any sudden attempt to construct bombs. The Soviet Union might well hesitate to agree to a plan which upon the first violation would commit it to an atomic armament race which it would have little hope of winning against the technological superiority of the United States. Russia may

prefer to continue unrestricted and secret competition for atomic weapons in the belief that an inferior supply of bombs is more protection than no bombs at all, if a potential enemy can construct them with greater speed than its own industrial efficiency permits. Even if accepted, the Baruch plan would only replace competition for bombs by an intense rivalry between the nations for the personnel and methods with which to produce bombs in the shortest possible time. Peace based on a balance of power has proved to be a brief truce between wars. Peace based on a nice balance of atomic power is not likely to be any more stable or enduring, whether that power exists as bombs ready for use or as plants capable of conversion within 3 months to bomb manufacture.

Another serious obstacle to the acceptance of the plan is the fact that under its provisions the nations are to remain free to compete for every weapon except bombs. With proper concern for American security, the Senate would be justified in refusing to destroy our atomic weapons except in conjunction with the demobilization of the Red army and in return for material proof that Russia was not preparing for other types of specialized warfare. The Senate leaders have repeatedly demanded "a foolproof system of security" in return for any surrender of atomic secrets. The Baruch plan is far from foolproof. Each nation would retain as many millions of soldiers, as many mechanized divisions and biological weapons as it wished. Against a large nation armed with these forces, an attempt to punish a violation of the atomic agreement would result in a long and indecisive conflict. By agreeing to the Baruch plan, the United States would be giving up its one decisive weapon in return for the privilege of competing for other weapons where it has no advantage.

I hope this analysis of the plan will indictate why many of us in UWF believe that a more comprehensive and effective scheme is necessary, if there is to be any chance of acceptance by either the Russians or the United States Senate. The fatal defect of Mr. Baruch's proposal is the false assumption that atomic bombs can be probibited while aggression in all its other forms remains possible. Security is undivisible and cannot be realized by attempting to ban one particular type of weapon. The first and only step toward the prevention of atomic warfare is the creation of an international organization powerful enough to prevent all war between nations. By specific amendments, the United Nations must be strengthened to the point where national preparation for war is not only unnecessary but impossible. The indispensable changes are briefly these.

First, the United Nations must be given the power to administer world laws binding the individual citizens of each country as their first duty. The constitutional authority must be strictly limited to those matters found essential to the preservation of peace. For example, the United Nations must be able to prohibit by binding enactment the manufacture or ownership by any national government of the means of organized warfare. It must be able to prohibit the use of force in the settlement of international disputes and it must be able to control and regulate the dangerous aspects of atomic development.

Secondly, the United Nations must have the power to arrest and try in world courts those who violate the basic security law. We need a procedure through which a Nuremburg trial can be held according to an established law before rather than after war has begun.

Thirdly, the United Nations must have the power to conduct an international system of inspection with free access into every country. It would be the task of the inspectors to discover any illegal attempt to produce the prohibited armament.

Fourthly, the United Nations must have not only the right to prohibit internation war but the police power to enforce its authority. A world police force must be recruited from the individuals of each nation. It must be responsible only to the United Nations, armed with a monopoly on modern weapons, and strategically distributed. Until national governments are willing to give a world organization preponderant military power to keep the peace, they will be condemned to compete for arms among themselves.

These significant additions to the authority of the United Nations will necessitate certain changes in its internal structure. Particularly, the Security Council will cease to be legislator, prosecutor, judge, and jury. It will become an executive cabinet operating to administer the laws every nation has accepted as essential to the common security.

This would be world government, if you want to use the word. But it would be government only in a very limited area. Each nation would remain free to conduct its domestic affairs and foreign trade without restriction. The nations in agreeing to these amendments would be giving up only the right and means of annihilating each other.

There is but one way in which these changes can be made realities. As the nation which first developed, employed and continues to manufacture atomic weapons, the United States has the responsibility for taking the initiative in proposing the formation of a strong United Nations. Our unilateral action in Greece and Turkey has been explained on the ground that the United Nations is not yet capable of assuming such a burden. But the United Nations cannot strengthen itself. It is a league of sovereign states and will remain impotent unless its members agree to give it the strength it needs. Through every available instrument of public information, the American people must be reached with the knowledge that they must choose between a suicidal war or a strong United Nations. An insistent and informed public demand must be brought to bear on the Government here in Washington.

But what of Russia? There are many who claim that the Soviet Regime would reject any radical amendment of the United Nations and that the offer is not worth making. I am not so pessimistic. They have as much to lose as we do in a mutually devastating war. Faced with a choice between a desperate arms race ending in war and an effective system of security protecting them and us alike, the Kremlin leaders may well choose security. At least, until the Russians are given a fair opportunity to make the choice, we cannot tell whether the purpose of their present policy is aggression or defense. An American offer to erect an enforceable world law would be the only real test of Russian intentions. If they turned that down, we would be justified in assuming the worst. But let me repeat that I believe there is a good chance that they would accept.

I recognize that the changes necessary in traditional institutions are great and the time short. A shooting war may not be imminent but we are rapidly approaching a critical point when in preparation for conflict policies will have been adopted that make war inescapable. Soon preparedness and propaganda will have swept both governments past all chance of turning back. While there is still time and room for hope, let us present to the people of this country the real choice, the destruction of civilized society or some measure of world government. When they understand that choice, I have confidence in their decision. Men are sufficiently rational to acquiesce in their own survival.

The Taft-Hartley Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have just received a statement from 13 leading practitioners and professors of administrative law, which points out serious defects and dangers involved in the Taft-Hartley bill. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We write to you as students and practitioners of administrative law and procedure; and without reference to the economic and social effects of the substantive provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill (H. R. 3020). We have, however, carefully examined the provisions having to do with the procedures for administration, and have come to the conclusion that these violate nearly every tenet of sound administrative law and procedure developed and established during the long history of administrative agencies in this country. These defects are, in our opinion, so serious that for this reason alone, and without reference to the inherent merits or demerits of the substantive provisions of the bill, we urge you to disapprove it.

1. The first aspect in which the bill flouts and threatens the whole administrative process is in respect of its provisions with respect to judicial review of the Board's findings. (Amendments to sec. 10 (b), (c), (e), and (f) of the act.) It is a well-settled principle of administrative law that the findings of administrative agencies are to be accepted by the courts if they have substantial support in the evidence and a rational basis in law. This rule has heretofore been applied in the case of the National Labor Relations Board (see *Consolidated Edison Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board*, 305 U. S. 197; *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Hearst Publications, Inc.*, 322 U. S. 111; *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Nevada Consolidated Copper Corp.*, 316 U. S. 105; *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Packard Motor Car Co.*, decided March 10, 1947, U. S. Supreme Court, October 1946 term), as well as in the case of other similar agencies such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission, to name only a few (final report of Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, S. Doc. 8, 77th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 89–91. See also sec. 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946, and comments of Attorney General Clark with respect to its effect. S. Doc. 248, 79th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 229–230).

Unless this principle is accepted, there is little, if any, excuse for the administrative process, which rests upon the fundamental concept that proper solution of certain difficult social and economic questions requires the attention of specialists who may become and remain continuously informed about them. It was because the courts and legislatures could not give these problems the specialized and detailed supervision which was required that administrative agencies were established to do so.

The Taft-Hartley bill deliberately and unequivocally rejects this essential principle. In explaining the effect of the amendments to section 10 of the act, as agreed upon by the conferees, the conference report (House Rept. No. 510, 80th Cong., 1st sess.) states (p. 56):

"As previously stated in the discussion of amendments to section 10 (b) and section 10 (c), by reason of the new language concerning the rules of evidence and the preponderance of the evidence, presumed expertness on the part of the Board in its field can no longer be a factor in the Board's decisions."

The report criticizes the courts for giving "deference" on occasion "to specialized knowledge that is supposed to inhere in administrative agencies" (pp. 55-56), and specifically adverts to the Hearst, Packard, and Nevada Consolidated decisions of the Supreme Court as intended to be overruled. We cannot emphasize too strongly that this basic approach to the bill to the proper relations between administrative agencies and the courts threatens to destroy the values of expertness and specialization which were sought in the establishment of administrative agencies.

2. A second respect in which the bill overrules sound administrative practices is in respect of dispersion of responsibility for administration. This is accomplished by the creation of an independent office of the general counsel, to be appointed by the President for a fixed term, and to be completely independent of the Board with respect to issuance and prosecution of complaints (sec. 3 (d)).

An essential advantage of regulation by the administrative process over regulation by the judicial process is insurance of a single, coordinated policy and responsibility for regulation in the field. For this reason, Congress has heretofore consistently merged and centralized all functions of the administrative process in the agency heads, and has refused to require a complete separation, for example, of the investigative from the judicial functions. Congress made its considered and informed decision in this connection, following more than a decade of intensive study, in the recently enacted Administrative Procedure Act of 1946. In that act Congress established a uniform system of "internal" separation applicable to all agencies, including the Board.

The Taft-Hartley bill reverses this. A new office of General Counsel is established, who is to have (conference report, p. 37) "the final authority to act in the name of, but independently of any direction, control, or review by, the Board in respect of the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints of unfair labor practices, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board. * * * By this provision responsibility for what takes place in the Board's regional offices is centralized in one individual, who is ultimately responsible to the President and Congress."

Under this provision, responsibility for regulation of labor relations is divided between the Board and the general counsel. The advantages of coordinated and uniform policy are ignored. Here again, the approach of the Taft-Hartley bill threatens the essence of the administrative process.

3. A third respect in which the Taft-Hartley bill violates a fundamental tenet of administrative law is with respect to its provision in section 10 (b) that the administrative proceedings shall, so far as practicable, "be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States under the rules of civil procedure. * * *" The universal, firmly-established rule of administrative law, embodied in the Administrative Procedure Act (sec. 7 (c)), is that the technical rules of evidence applicable in courts of law need not be followed, but that, as a matter of policy, irrelevant, immaterial, and unduly repetitious evidence shall be excluded.

An important characteristic of the administrative process is its speed, informality, and freedom from technicalities. This quality comes into play most significantly in connection with hearings and settlements. The safeguards established in the rules of evidence to avoid erroneous decisions and improper influences upon juries are not needed in the case of administrative agencies. Morover, liberality in admitting evidence cannot in itself cause any prejudice, because where inadequate evidence so admitted is made the basis of an administrative finding, a clear remedy is available to correct the error in the reviewing courts. The administrative agency is thus free to receive all relevant evidence bearing upon the issues.

The Taft-Hartley bill, by incorporating into administrative law unnecessary and technical concepts prevailing in courts, threatens to dissipate these important advantages which the administrative process is able to employ in discharging its functions in the field sought to be regulated.

4. Still another respect in which the bill imposes serious impediments on the administrative process is in connection with the so-called "free speech" provision, contained in section 8 (c). All administrative agencies, like all courts and other governmental bodies, are precluded under the first amendment to the Constitution from infringing the right to freedom of speech and expression. Under the guise of further protecting this right against infringement by the Board, however, the Taft-Hartley bill forbids that agency from even receiving in evidence any statements or expressions of views or opinions if they do not on their face contain a threat of force or reprisal or promise of benefit.

This is a shocking shackle to place upon administrative agencies in their search for the truth in factually-disputed cases coming before them. All courts, including even the criminal courts in cases involving capital offenses, are permitted to receive and consider relevant statements of a defendant bearing upon motive or intention. For example, if a defendant in a criminal case has made statements which show bias or purpose, such statements may be received in evidence for the probative force they may have in connection with those issues. Under the bill, however, for the first time, an administrative agency is forbidden from using such clear evidence of intention. Here again, the bill turns the clock back on well-established and valuable principles of law as they are applied in the administrative field.

The foregoing objectionable features of the Taft-Hartley bill do not exhaust the ways in which it turns back the clock on the administrative process. But we do not believe it necessary or desirable to catalog every one of the respects in which this bill makes a departure from fundamental principles upon which the structure of the administrative process rests. The inroads described are serious enough in themselves, we think, to warrant our conviction that if they are accepted or permitted to go unchallenged, the development of sound governmental techniques and procedures will be retarded and perhaps wholly defeated in very substantial respects.

For this reason, if for no other, Mr. President, we do not believe this bill deserves to become law. We, therefore, respectfully urge that you disapprove it.

Respectfully,

William Hammatt Davis, of Davis, Hoxie & Faithful, New York City; Ralph F. Fuchs, Professor of Law, University of Indiana Law School, Bloomington, Ind.; Willard Hurst, Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin Law School, Madison, Wis.; Robert E. Mathews, Professor of Law, Ohio State University Law School, Columbus, Ohio; Louis L. Jaffe, Professor of Law, University of Buffalo Law School, Buffalo, N. Y.; Eugene V. Rostow, Professor of Law, Yale University Law School, New Haven, Conn.; Leon Andrew Ransom, Former Acting Dean, Law School, Howard University, Washington, D. C.; Mitchell Franklin, Professor of Law, Tulane University Law School, New Orleans, La.; William G. Rice, Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin Law School, Madison, Wis.; Nathan P. Feinsinger, Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin Law School, Madison, Wis.; J. H. Beuscher, Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin Law School, Madison, Wis.; Harry A. Shulman, Professor of Law, Yale University Law School, New Haven, Conn.; Douglas B. Maggs, Professor of Law, Duke University Law School, Durham, N. C.

Since this letter was dispatched to the President, Walter Gellhorn, professor of law, Columbia University Law School, has indicated his agreement with the points made herein.

Dispute Over Air Safety Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "CAA, Air Lines, Armed Forces Squabble Over Air Safety Equipment," by Albert Douglas, published in the June 19, 1947, issue of the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAA, AIR LINES, ARMED FORCES SQUABBLE OVER AIR-SAFETY EQUIPMENT—CAN'T AGREE ON WHICH ADVANCED RADIO AND RADAR SYSTEMS TO USE; HIGH COSTS A HURDLE

(By Albert Douglas)

WASHINGTON.—The men responsible for air safety agree present navigation instruments aren't good enough—but they're at loggerheads over what to do next.

The Civil Aeronautics Authority, the airline managements, and the Army and Navy Air Forces are in a three-way tug of war. Recent plane crashes have high-lighted shortcomings of existing equipment—and the discord over a solution. One high congressional figure comments the two most recent tragedies might have been averted by using one or another of the complex radio and radar instruments under dispute, and many air experts have to agree with him.

The principal radio aid currently serving planes is a Nation-wide network of beams shot out from transmitters on the ground. Receiving sets aloft enable the pilot to follow the path.

TROUBLE ON THE BEAM

When he's on the beam, however, he still may have trouble. The beam is subject to

static; it can be interfered with by other range stations, and can actually be bent by mountains. Aviators complain that if they flew some beams according to rule, they'd go into hillsides. What's more, the beam can't tell the pilot or airport control tower the plane's distance from the landing field or the ground beneath it. More and faster planes are complicating the problem.

Vastly improved instruments have been invented, built, and tested. But what suits one group does not fit the precise ideas of the others. And there's the huge hurdle of who is to foot the bill.

Today's $25,000 to $50,000 outlay for instruments in each transport craft might be boosted to more than $100,000 per plane. The CAA complains it can't get from Congress the millions of dollars needed for ground installations. Nobody has an answer to how costs shall be divided between taxpayer and air line.

Here are directions the three groups are tugging:

Army and Navy agree their flights should be controlled through ground radar, known as GCA, which means ground-control approach. An operator on the ground can observe the plane despite fog and give the pilot landing directions. Ground radar also permits the operator to observe other planes and keep all informed of each other's whereabouts. The Army would supplement this with ILS—instrument-landing system—sending local radio beams from port to plane, giving it a path for gliding into the field. The Navy is now constructing its supplement A—radar airway—across the Nation with beacon signals connecting plane and ground.

The military services also want airborne radar such as was used during the war, but the air lines complain most such present equipment for use aloft is too heavy and too expensive.

Two lines, TWA and American, plan to install much lighter and less costly, but more near-sighted, radar instruments on their planes.

The air lines' pet idea is a mechanical-block system, comparable to the block-signal system used by railroads. This would divide each heavily traveled air route into segments, or blocks, with only one plane permitted in any one block at a time.

These blocks, 20 miles long and 500 feet high, would be marked by very high-frequency (VHF) radio "doors." Lights in the pilot's cockpit would tell him when he passed through a "door," and whether it was safe to enter the next block.

The air lines are working, too, on a powerful lightweight airborne radar designed especially for use with the block system. This radar, like that of TWA and American, is lighter and less expensive than the similar military radar. The combination of the two instruments would tell the pilot where he is and what's ahead of him in flight, say the air-line experts. The dual system is being tested now.

CAA TURNS THUMBS DOWN

The CAA likes neither the air lines' nor the military's systems.

"None of the systems offered to us has proved itself to date," says Charles Stanton, Deputy Administrator. The CAA, Government agency responsible for air traffic control and air safety, is pushing the construction and use of its own static-free VOR ranges coupled with DME, or distance-measuring equipment.

VOR stands for very high frequency omnidirectional ranges. This beam fans out in all directions from the ground point where it is installed. A pilot "working" a VOR range using special airborne radio equipment learns in what direction he is relative to the range. DME is another airborne radar instrument which measures the distance to a VOR transmitter. Coupled, the two instruments tell the pilot where he is. Both these airborne instruments are costly.

To date the CAA has built 10 VOR ranges and hopes to build 500 of them by the end of 1948 if Congress provides the money. Prototype DME equipment will be available by January, according to the CAA.

The CAA also is developing other instruments to be used in conjunction with VOR and DME, such as the navigational computer which automatically keeps the pilot informed at all times of his position with reference to the ground.

The CAA favors the ILS landing system, but disagrees with the military as to which radio frequency should be used by the ILS.

The air lines' complaint against the CAA proposed system is that it would cost too much. The military complain that their own radar navigation systems were proven during the war, and if "properly refined" would provide for safe flight control as well as be a warning system, through the use of ground surveillance radar, against possible enemy air attack.

The private pilot, unwanted stepchild in the argument, complains he cannot afford to buy the costly radio equipment necessary to use in any proposed control system offered to date.

The Potato Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, although it is true, as is stated in the editorial which I shall include as a part of my remarks, that there may be before the country and the Congress more pressing and serious problems than the potato situation, the action of the Department of Agriculture in destroying huge quantities of this vegetable when poor people need them in this country and entire nations are starving overseas, has aroused so much resentment among our people that I must speak out against this inexcusable waste and inefficiency.

I am hopeful that House Resolution 166, which has already been passed authorizing and directing the Committee on Agriculture to undertake a thorough investigation of the potato surplus, will lead to the enactment of remedial measures which will prevent a repetition of such a shocking performance.

I commend to the careful consideration of my colleagues the remarks appearing in the Appendix of June 2 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD made by my neighbor, the able gentleman from the Thirty-sixth New York District, Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, who speaks on this subject from his own personal business experience as well as from the depths of his common sense, which has been vouchsafed to him in such great abundance.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials from the Rochester Times-Union and from the Washington Evening Star:

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union]

POTATOES AS EXHIBIT A

The House Agriculture Committee has been looking into the results of Agriculture Department activities in taking over the potato surplus last fall. It has found some odd things, according to a Gannett News Service dispatch from Washington.

For example, in Richmond, Va., where one of the Government's potato-destruction incidents occurred, restaurant owners were later forced to buy Canadian potatoes for $4.50 a hundred pounds. We must assume families fared no better on their potato purchases last winter.

The Times-Union, months ago, cited complaints from housewives that they found it hard to get really first-grade potatoes. The set-up on potato-price support encouraged the farmers to sell practically all their top-grade potatoes to the Government. It was simpler and cheaper to do this than to dicker with commission men later on.

The Government did not place these potatoes on the market. That would have defeated the idea behind the price-support law. The amount public institutions could take was limited. Potatoes are too bulky and spoil too easily in a ship's hold unless refrigerated to ship them to the starving Europeans, as many persons proposed. So the potatoes were left to rot.

Now Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Republican, of Minnesota, chairman of the committee, says that unless the potato program is better administered there is danger of an acute domestic scarcity next winter and spring.

Very likely. That's the way Government controls work. They foster scarcity. But the House Agriculture Committee does not grasp that basic fact. It lays the trouble to personal bungling by officials and has a brand-new price-support program in view.

What reason is there to suppose the new plan will work any better than the old? For hundreds of years the efforts of governments to establish fair prices for commodities have ended in failure. They still do.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

TOO MANY POTATOES

There are more important problems in the world today than the issue of our surplus potatoes and what to do about them. Yet the potato problem is one concerning which the average man can form an opinion, and the opinion to which he is being driven is one that is not apt to fill him with confidence in the ability of those on the higher planning levels to solve the weightier dilemmas.

The latest development is the announcement that the Department of Agriculture, as an alternative to destroying surplus potatoes, now is willing to sell them to industrial users for 1 cent a bushel. It seems that this can be done without nullifying the price-support program for potatoes. "Price support" is a fancy name for the subsidy being paid potato growers. But these same surplus potatoes which are virtually to be given to industrial users, who presumably could afford to pay a reasonable price, cannot be given to the poor and hungry. For to do this, it is claimed, would upset the price-support program.

Maybe this makes sense. But last year the Government bought up 1,750,000,000 pounds of choice Maine potatoes, and in the end almost half of them were dumped. One method of dumping is to pour kerosene over them, so they are fit for nothing. At any minute now the Government will be called upon to buy up 200 carloads of South Carolina potatoes, and the chances are that they, too, will be dumped. And there will be more of the same before the season is over.

With hunger and famine sweeping the world, this may be good, sound, sensible planning. But a good many people are going to be hard to convince.

Analysis of Key Points of the Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Louis Stark entitled "An Analysis of Key Points of the Labor Bill," which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, June 15, 1947. Mr. Stark is one of the ablest labor reporters in the country, and I believe his analysis of the bill should be studied by those who are interested in arriving at an accurate conclusion as to the merits of the legislation now pending on the President's desk.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF KEY POINTS OF THE LABOR BILL—SOME OF THE CLAUSES ARE SUBJECT TO WIDELY VARYING INTERPRETATIONS

(By Louis Stark)

WASHINGTON, June 14.—The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, now on President Truman's desk, is one of the most important pieces of social legislation of the last 15 years.

By writing a substitute for an extension of the National Labor Relations (Wagner) Act of 1935, Congress has definitely cast its lot with those who have been insisting that in recent years labor's rights and privileges have so far outstripped those of industry that the imbalance must be righted.

Seldom has a measure been so attacked and defended. Labor has denounced it as a slave bill which would turn back the clock and deprive employees of many hard-won rights. Employers generally and others who hold with them say that it will strengthen the collective-bargaining procress because it recognizes the responsibility of both parties to carry out agreements and for the first time compels unions to bargain collectively. Hitherto only employers have been compelled to bargain.

Most important to the public, according to the bill's proponents, are the sections which would discourage national paralysis strikes and deal with the vexing problems of jurisdictional disputes and secondary boycotts.

Some labor relations students believe that under this bill, as under the Wagner Act or any bill dealing with labor relations, disputes will arise. There follows a summary of the bill and the points which may lead to controversy.

WHAT THE BILL PROVIDES

The principal provisions of the new act are these:

(1) The closed shop (making union membership a condition of employment) is forbidden and the union shop (requiring workers to join after they are hired) is greatly restricted.

(2) The National Labor Relations Board's administrative and judicial functions are separated.

(3) To equalize the Wagner Act, which limits unfair labor practices to those committed by employers, a new section is added banning unfair labor practices by employees.

(4) The right to strike is restricted in some respects but is not banned.

(5) Employers' free speech rights are broadened.

(6) Injunctions and damage suits against unions are made easier.

(7) Industry-wide bargaining is limited.

(8) The individual employee's rights are to be protected against his union.

(9) Political expenditures and contributions by unions to caucuses, conventions as well as to elections are prohibited.

UNION SECURITY

The closed shop, under which 30 percent of organized employees are operating, came into existence largely because of employer discrimination against union membership prior to the Wagner Act. The act sought to and succeeded in removing, to a great extent, such discrimination.

The congressional conferees frankly were out to change what they felt to be the abuse by union leaders of their prerogatives in closed or union shops. They did this by outlawing the closed shop and placing severe restrictions around the union shop. However, many employers have come to favor the closed or union shop because, in their experience, it has made for union responsibility.

The union shop is allowed to continue under certain conditions. The main one provides that a majority of those eligible must vote for it, not a majority of those voting as required in ordinary elections.

A union can call for dismissal of members from their jobs only for failure to pay dues. So long as a member makes such payments he is not subject to union discipline, though he may have engaged in actions which would otherwise result in loss of membership.

Labor-management relations may become strained in such cases since union members will not relinquish the right to work or not work with nonunion members. British unions do not have closed shops, but refusal to work with nonunion members is an effective weapon to gain the same end. There is also the possibility of continuing a banned union security provision (by the employers who prefer it) on a sort of "bootleg" basis. Oral closed-shop agreements are already being made in States which ban this type of union security.

THE NEW NLRB

"The NLRB is investigator, prosecutor, judge, and jury."

This charge has been leveled at the Board frequently to support the argument that its administrative and judicial functions should be separated.

The new NLRB will be turned into a judicial body, a labor court. It is divested of its administrative functions by an arrangement which sets up a statutory general counsel. This official, now made all but independent of the Board, will have complete supervision of the field staff in the regional offices and final authority in regard to attorneys, with certain exceptions, and also over investigation of charges and issuances of complaints. The general counsel takes over many of the Board's functions. He will settle approximately 85 percent of the cases in the field "on behalf of the Board."

The general counsel's office was set up by Congress in its eagerness to divorce the NLRB's administrative and judicial powers. His salary is to be $12,000 a year, equal to that of the Board members.

The general counsel, named by the President subject to senatorial confirmation, can refuse requests by unions or employers for issuance of complaints against each other. There is no appeal from his decision. So much depends upon the general counsel that it may be said that his personality will be dominant in the future course of the Nation's labor relations.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

The new act forbids coercion of employees to join unions.

Considerable controversy and litigation may arise over the exact meaning of coercion, which is not defined.

If picket-line brawls constitute coercion these questions may arise: (1) Does State laws cover such contingencies, and (2) if not, will these disputes encumber the Federal courts with many police-court types of cases?

It is made an unfair labor practice for a union to require members in a union shop to pay "excessive" fees. How will the NLRB decide what is excessive? It may be impelled to go into the internal affairs of a union in a manner that would be deemed by the union as interference in the legitimate conduct of its business.

Secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes are also made unfair labor practices by unions. While the act's sponsors do not feel this provision should prohibit boycotts against sweatshop conditions, labor spokesmen have raised this question. It will be for the courts to decide.

Aiming to end "featherbedding," the act holds it an unfair labor practice for a union to require an employer to pay money "in the nature of an exaction" for services not rendered. This issue will involve disputes over such things as whether a machine should be manned by three men or five, whether radio stations using records may be compelled to use or pay live musicians, whether a textile worker can run half a dozen machines or more.

RIGHT TO STRIKE

The act provides a 60-day cooling-off period at the end of each contract. Employees would summarily lose their rights under the act if they violated this regulation. On the other hand, if an employer were guilty of an unfair labor practice, only a "cease and desist" order would be issued; he would not lose his rights under the act.

The strikers would also lose their voting rights in an election since the act bars "economic strikers" from the suffrage. Since under another provision an employer may now request an election under much more liberal terms than hitherto, the loss of employee rights may involve sharp controversy and lead to sympathy strikes.

In emergency cases where a strike or threatened strike affects substantially an entire industry and also "national health or safety," there is a delay of about 75 days, with the final step a report by the President to Congress for appropriate action.

Labor relations experts, analyzing the complicated provisions to delay strikes affecting health and safety, point out that these disputes are shunted from the President to a board of inquiry to the Attorney General to the NLRB, and finally left in the lap of Congress when the strike threat still remains.

FREE SPEECH

The NLRB has ruled that an employer's statement to his employees must be considered in the light of his subsequent actions in charges of unfair labor practices. It is now provided that no expression of his views can be "evidence" of an unfair labor practice under any of the provisions of the act.

This is interpreted to mean that the Board cannot receive testimony of a statement of an employer made on one day, though the employer is charged with firing a worker illegally the next day.

The controversy over this question of free speech is likely to be one of the early cases to go up to the Supreme Court.

This section was defended by the Senate proponents as necessary to employers' free speech but experts studying it now point out it will cut both ways, namely, that union officers and members will also be permitted to speak freely without having their works quoted to support a charge of unfair labor practice.

INJUNCTIONS AND SUITS

The Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act of 1932 is softened in the new bill to make injunctions easier in some cases.

Seeking to stop certain flagrant abuses of secondary boycotts and disputes over jurisdiction, the new act permits employers and employees to ask the NLRB to petition for injunctions in all unfair labor-practice cases.

It is significant that the Board may apply for the injunction as soon as a complaint is issued by it and before a trial is had. In secondary boycott cases and jurisdictional disputes, however, it is made mandatory upon the Board to ask for a restraining order even before a complaint is issued.

Under the act there may be considerable competition by employers and employees for injunctions. Despite the union's reluctance hitherto to resort to such proceedings, they may feel driven to this action.

INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING

Although a House ban on industry-wide bargaining as such was killed in the Senate, one section of the act dealing with emergencies limits such bargaining.

It requires the NLRB to supervise elections by employes of each individual employer on the basis of the latter's last offer.

Intended to apply to such national emergency disputes as the current coal wage controversy, this section means that each coal operator would poll his own employees. This opens the way for a multiplicity of "final offers" which might, in some cases, be acceptable and in some not. In any event, this provision is likely to lead to a dimunition or break-up of industry-wide bargaining through a national miners' union. Wages again may be thrown into a competitive struggle.

The unions have raised the question as to why this section—if it is to be fair to both sides—does not require the vote of the management negotiators on the union's last offer. As sometimes happens, they feel that these negotiators might agree with the union but would be overruled by top management. As it now stands the unions feel the rule is one-sided since it permits employees to disagree with union leaders but not management conferees to disagree with their chiefs.

INDIVIDUAL GRIEVANCES

The protection of the right to work has long been a goal sought by employers to cover the case of individuals who refuse to join unions and wish to bargain separately. The act now states that employees shall have the right "to refrain from * * * concerted activities."

Since it is made an unfair labor practice to interfere with this right, the unions believe it opens the way for employees to make individual agreements with employers not to join unions. Thus the so-called yellow-dog contract would be revived.

Whether this assumption is correct would be matter of litigation.

A section of the new bill allows individual employees or groups to adjust grievances without the union bargaining agent's intervention so long as (1) the individual arrangement is not inconsistent with the union contract, and (2) the official union bargaining agent is allowed to be present at such adjustment.

Whether the union agent might be allowed to appear at the preliminary discussions is not disclosed, and this may lead to charges of favored treatment to nonunion employees, in an attempt to undermine the union. Labor feels that this provision is a long step backward and would compel it to renew its early struggles for union status.

POLITICAL EXPENDITURES

Ever since the formation of the CIO's Political Action Committee the part played by unions in political campaigns has been under attack.

The act prohibits, under severe penalties, contributions by labor unions and corporations in connection with Federal elections and also extends this ban to expenditures in primaries, caucuses, and in conventions as well as in elections.

It was brought out during the Senate debate that this section prohibits any kind of activity by a union in favor of a candidate for Federal office if the union spends any money in this work.

Republican Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, agreed with Democratic Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, that if Labor, a publication of the railway labor organizations, were to put out a special edition in support of a Democratic Presidential candidate it would be banned as a political expenditure if it were supported by union funds contributed by union members as dues.

The section, said Senator TAFT, would also forbid a union to issue a pamphlet advising its members about the labor record of a candidate. This argument over freedom of the press may move from Congress to the courts.

Only the passage of time will tell whether the new measure would interfere with collective bargaining and diminish purchasing power, as asserted by labor, or, as contended by its proponents, help bargaining power while compelling unions to conduct their affairs democratically and responsibly.

The Proposed Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial regarding the proposed Missouri Valley Authority, which appeared last week in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A FIELD HEARING ON MVA

Senator MURRAY brings home some unpleasant but palpable facts to his colleagues in pointing to the failure of Congress to do anything really adequate for the prevention of Missouri River floods which are damaging large areas of croplands. He points to the way to make up for this inaction—an investigation and hearing in the field by the Senate Public Works Committee.

It is not only proper but pressing for the Public Works Committee to give consideration to Senator MURRAY'S MVA bill and to come into the Missouri Valley and ascertain the wishes of its people respecting development of this region. Two Senate subcommittees went through the motions of hearings on MVA year before last, but Senator OVERTON, arch-foe of MVA and mouthpiece for the Army engineers, subverted them to his own prejudices. A genuine hearing of the issues is yet to be made and, as the Denver Post says, MVA must eventually be considered by Congress on the merits.

Senators and Representatives frequently complain that loud but unrepresentative lobbies try to mislead them, and that it is difficult to know what the people want. Senator MURRAY is offering the Congressmen a golden opportunity in the instance of MVA.

Trinity River Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM PICKETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 12, 1947, the initial step in construction by the War Department on the comprehensive improvement program of the Trinity River and its watershed was taken by the breaking of ground for the Benbrook Dam and Reservoir. The initiation of the program is the result of long years of planning and working by many citizens who have envisioned the great benefits to be derived by the completed program. Foremost among the sponsors of the program is one to whom major credit is due for the success thus far achieved, our able and distinguished colleague, Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD. Another who has been among the leaders in the improvement is the Honorable D. A. Nunn, of Crockett, Tex., an able attorney and distinguished citizen, who has been tireless in the exercise of his influence and energy to achieve the goal we all are striving for. Under Judge Nunn's sponsorship, a resolution paying tribute to Judge MANSFIELD was adopted during the ceremonies on last Thursday. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas citizens from every part of the Trinity River watershed, as well as distinguished guests from all over the State of Texas and from other regions of the Nation, have gathered on this occasion to celebrate the initiation of War Department construction on the comprehensive program for the improvement of the Trinity River and its watershed; and

Whereas the men who have done most to make this project possible are accorded particular honor; and

Whereas no man has made a greater contribution to the development of water resources than has Judge MANSFIELD: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the citizens of Texas here assembled, along with our distinguished out-of-State guests in the field of water and soil conservation and utilization, take special notice of the profoundly regretted absence of Judge MANSFIELD; and be it further

Resolved, That we inform Judge MANSFIELD of our delight in the recent reports of his improvement in health with the hope that this great friend of conservation soon may be able to be with us again in person as he has been with us always in spirit.

For all those associated in the Benbrook Dam ceremony.

JOHN M. FOUTS, *General Manager.*

NOTE.—Passed by acclamation on proposal by D. A. Nunn, of Crockett, Tex.

Confederate Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to

include an article from the Nashville Banner of June 4, 1947, written by Charles Moss.

My home town is Franklin, Tenn., scene of the bloodiest battle of the Civil War. An old southern mansion still stands just outside the town where, at one time, the bodies of five Confederate generals lay, who were killed in that engagement. Nearby is a cemetery where 1,500 Confederate soldiers are buried, also killed in that engagement.

The article follows:

CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL—SECTIONALISM WILL LIVE SO LONG AS—

(By Charles Moss)

A June wind dipped into the bend of the Harpeth River that holds the towers and white pillars of Franklin, the battlefield of Franklin and the cemetery where 1,500 young Confederates lie buried.

It was a Sunday afternoon, one of those early summer afternoons when the wind seems to blow the sunlight along in incandescent white shadows. And it was the day of the Confederate memorial. Cars were gathering beyond the iron fence. Inside, young girls in white dresses carried baskets of flowers, dropping blossoms on each grave. Earlier, gallant little Confederate flags had been placed before each headstone.

All this was the work of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

The services were about to begin. The quadrangle of chairs in the corner of the cemetery was filling. Men leaned against a honeysuckle-covered fence. Men and women sat on the grass. The girls were coming back with empty baskets.

Mrs. W. P. Mullens, president of the UDC chapter, arose and read from a paper that had been written in longhand. She talked of honor and of being worthy sons and daughters of those who were buried there. She said things that have been said before, things that a sophisticate would call trite and meaningless. But to us they sounded beautiful and good. People do not gather much these days to talk of honor and of being worthy of those who have gone before.

"We will have the honor," she said, "of hearing from a leader of the First World War." Gen. Lytle Brown walked out into the bluegrass and faced the people. He looked like a soldier. He spoke up so his voice could be heard against the wind that billowed his dark coat.

These are not his words, but this is what he said: "These men lying here fought for what they thought was right. They were not fighting against the Constitution. They were fighting for State's rights in which they had been brought up to believe."

There was a pause. The Confederate flags, 1,500 of them, stood taut like companies of soldiers. They fluttered and hummed.

The speaker continued: "We will always have sectionalism, as long as the Federal Government interferes too much with our local affairs. We will have sectionalism as long as one part of the country smears the other by broadcast and press."

He spoke of efforts at national unity, world unity, and the curse of totalitarianism.

"If this country is ever defeated at war," he said, "I hope it is not from unworthy ambition and greed. I pray that it will be on some great Armageddon where we will be fighting for the glory of God."

Mrs. Mullens stood. "We will now hear from a veteran of the Second World War," she said. Her son, Will Reese Mullens, who in 1943 had left college to join the Naval Reserve, came forward. He had fought in the South Pacific on a submarine as a first lieutenant.

He too talked of honor and of worthiness, saying that the gray-clad men, who fought on these same fields where we stand were fighting for the right to live their own lives, determine their own destinies and conduct their affairs as they saw fit.

"Let it not be said," he continued, "by these warriors that look down on us today, that we failed to uphold the torch of the struggle to maintain the dignity of the individual. We are faced today by forces that personify the very opposite of all these things in which our forefathers believed. There is no doubt of the necessity of maintaining this struggle. It may not be our lot to wage this ideological conflict to a successful conclusion, but of the necessity of waging the conflict there is no doubt. They have passed to us a torch of courage, of dignity, and unswerving loyalty. They have passed it to us with the admonition to hold it high. Let us take the torch and heed the admonition with the words: 'Your example was not in vain.'"

There was another prayer and short commands brought an American Legion firing squad to position. The volleys rang out across the green valley. Then a young veteran standing beside a cedar tree, far back in the cemetery, sounded taps. The wind tore at the notes and carried them out over the rolling wheat field.

For a moment the people were still. Someone moved. Another started for the iron gate. The crowd started away. Automobile engines caught. A horn blew. A plane whipped by overhead.

Soon the cemetery was deserted except for the Confederate flags, 1,500 of them, that lived in the wind. The white flowers stirred against the initialed headstones of young colonels and captains and lieutenants and privates who had worn the gray.

At that moment they also seemed alive. And we were not too sure that sectionalism had died. At least we knew that the pride of a section still lived.

What It Means To Be an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on May 21, 1947, I had the privilege of addressing the people of Hazleton, Pa., and vicinity at the I Am an American Day ceremonies sponsored by veterans' organizations of that patriotic section of Pennsylvania. In connection with I Am an American Day there, a contest was conducted in the schools for the best essays on what it means to be an American.

First prize went to Allan Holman, of the Hazleton Senior High School, who summed up America in relation to its freedoms. Second prize was won by John S. Marinko, of St. Gabriel's High School, who contrasted American democracy with other systems of government. Third prize went to Mary Veronica North of the D. A. Harman Junior High School, a ninth-grade student, who was much impressed with America in terms of its opportunities.

These are all such fine essays that I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD for the purpose of bringing home to all of us in Congress the fact that when we sometimes begin to lose faith in our country or in the things it stands for, we need only recall the fine faith of our youngsters.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Allan Holman, of Hazleton Senior High School)

The question is frequently asked, "What does it mean to be an American?" The first thought to come to my mind when asked this question is freedom. Freedom is defined by Webster as, "possession of the rights or privileges of a citizen." In a sense the word "freedom" may be divided into four categories: freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from fear, and freedom from want.

The first of the four, freedom of speech, is characterized by the words of one of the great statesmen of our country, who helped elevate the United States to its present status as the leading power of the world. Without this freedom, through which their opinions and views were expressed, I, as a citizen of the United States, would not have the opportunities for advancement and success or the pleasures I enjoy in everyday life. Freedom of speech, which gives me the authority to express my opinions as I see fit, is the first reason for my thankfulness to America. This is America to me!

Freedom of worship is the next large factor to be considered. A tangible grasp cannot be secured on life unless a person worships God sincerely and faithfully, whether he be white or colored, Christian or Jew. Freedom of religion is the rudimentary factor in the success of every American. Without it a true democracy could not survive. This privilege, to worship God freely, I cherish with my life. This is America to me!

The third condition which characterizes the American way of life is freedom from fear. The framers of the Constitution, upon which this country is governed, endowed us with this unalienable right, making my life, liberty, and happiness secure. Because of this freedom, I may have confidence in myself and my country, thereby taxing my talents to their highest level in order to keep this country and my community a superior place to live in. This is America to me!

Freedom from want is the fourth and final in this series of indispensable freedoms. Insuring my prosperity and social level, this privilege gives me the right to make a living in any legitimate way, retaining a part of my income. Although the Government has access to a percentage of my earnings, I have the privilege, through the foresight of those who created this freedom, to accumulate my acquired wealth and invest it in any lawful manner. This is America to me!

The four freedoms I have enumerated are without a doubt the basis of any democratic system of government. These four democratic principles are all equally important. The views I have related under each category may be honestly placed under the heading, America, because there could not be a United States of America, as I know it, without any one of the "four freedoms." Liberty is worth to me more than all the wealth in the world, and I will do everything within my power to live up to the expectations this country has for me as a citizen. This is America to me!

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By John S. Marinka, of St. Gabriel's High School)

The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to the attainment of our American principles. Our way of life was established by men whose insatiable desire for freedom, drove them to seek progress and prosperity across the seas. Those who came here brought with them the

best of racial, national, and religious culture. As a result we have our own "Sweet land of liberty."

Our way of life and system of government is democracy. It considers first the dignity of the individual and human nature. In the democratic view, man has intrinsic value, and this value takes primacy in human relationships. In communistic countries, democracy has the meaning dictatorship of the proletariat, while freedom means elimination or imprisonment of all who differ from the rigid decisions of dictatorship. Communism is a threat against job, home, security, and freedom of every working individual. It is a threat against our American way of life.

In America there are no dual nationalities nor diversion of people according to religion. All men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of their conscience. Be they Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, they all say, "In God we trust."

Respect for law, orderly processes of government, and ethical behavior may well be cataloged distinctly American. Through the learning and practice of sound Christian principles, true peace and prosperity prevail in industry and business. Under the basic principles and design of the Constitution we live, and by actions prove our allegiance to God and country.

There are weaknesses in our ways, for America after all, is of this earth. Racial, religious, and social distinctions are found in schools, clubs, unions, and the like. Minorities still suffer, but it is relatively easy martyrdom. There are social disorders, increase in divorce, less family life, and a dangerously low birth rate. It's about time we resurrected the standards of discipline that gave this country its rugged, stalwart honesty of purpose, determination, and achievement.

In former days, obedience to the laws of God signified obedience to the established laws of our democracy and today we sadly need a revival of this basic spirit. Conditions are far from ideal. Headliners would do well to come down from their high horses and lead the hero-worshipping youngsters on to a moral victory. Americans can make America as clean, high-minded, and progressive as they desire it.

Yet, opportunities offered by the United States cannot be found elsewhere in the world, due to her system of protective law and popular government, her standards of living and national wealth, her guaranteed freedoms and God-given resources, free schools, labor, speech, press, and ballot with sovereignty in the people.

Such is our heritage and American way of life and such it must and shall continue to be. This is what it means to be an American. With all gratitude and thankfulness to God, we can proudly say, "It's great to be an American."

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Mary Veronica North, of D. A. Harman Junior High School)

Oh, say, can you see, by the dawn's early light,
What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming—

As the bold chords of the Star-Spangled Banner reach your ear, do you ever wonder why they send a chill up your spine or why the whole world seems to turn almost solemn with respect and reverence as Old Glory passes in review? Why does your pride swell within you as you boastfully proclaim to the world that you are an American? Just what does it mean to be an American?

Many of us do not fully realize what it really means to be an American because this privilege was, as the saying goes, handed to us on a silver platter as our birthright.

On the other hand the American who has become one through naturalization, who has known oppression, suffering, and hardship, knows full well the advantages which our great country showers upon us.

Were you to ask one of them what it means to be an American, the reply would probably be "freedom." Although it is doubtful whether he could enumerate our many freedoms for you, we all know what he means.

The equality of the richest and the poorest, the brightest and the dullest, the right to worship as one sees fit, the right of security, of freedom from want and fear—these are all the gems of democracy.

Our public schools are a striking example of the principle upon which our country is based. Here the opportunity of an education is offered to everyone regardless of sex, race, creed, or financial standing.

Since July 4, 1776, when a group of brave men signed the Declaration of Independence, the cornerstone upon which a great Nation was built, Americans have suffered by tears, sweat, and blood to maintain the government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The words of Sir Walter Scott express beautifully the point which I have sought to express:

"Breathes there a man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself has said,
'This is my own, my native land'."

Pier Congestion in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID M. POTTS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave given to me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an item with respect to the tremendous pier congestion in New York City. This article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, June 15, 1947. There is no doubt that New York City is utilizing all of its pier facilities and if shipping which should go through the port of New York is to be put through the port of New York, expansion is necessary. No better natural deep-water area remains than that along the East River in the vicinity of Hunts Point in the Bronx. This is the section which has been many times referred to as the Bronx seaport. This is the area which Captain Dollar considered to be the best in and about New York City.

The people of Bronx County want their seaport, and I think it behooves the officials of New York City to get behind the Bronx Chamber of Commerce and the Bronx Board of Trade in their efforts in this connection.

SHIP COMPANIES ORGANIZE TO END PIER CONGESTION—WILL ASK MOTOR CARRIERS TO FORM BUREAU TO DEVISE SOLUTION FOR PROBLEMS

Organization of the steamship industry's share of a joint steamship-motor carrier project to relieve congestion at the city's piers is expected to be completed at a meeting Tuesday afternoon at the Maritime Exchange, 80 Broad Street.

The meeting will be devoted to choosing a negotiating committee of six steamship officials to represent the industry in talks with a similar committee of motor truck company officers. The outcome of the talks will be the organization of a central bureau to study the causes of pier congestion and attempt to work out methods of alleviating them.

The bureau will probably be given powers to enforce its recommendations. These powers are expected to be similar to those of the Association of American Railroads which can impose embargoes against ships that are tying up more than five lighters.

Since organizing on June 5, 30 steamship companies have pledged financial support to the undertaking and more are expected to join. The bureau will receive the assistance of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York and will probably have temporary offices at the Maritime Exchange. Most of the principal motor carrier companies have agreed to support the project in an effort to relieve a situation that has been immobilizing as many as 5,000 trucks on some days through waiting in long lines outside the piers.

The steamship companies have named the following officers to represent them in the project: Philip E. McIntyre, of United States Lines, as chairman; T. C. Hopkins, Funch, Edye & Co., secretary, and Morrison Pretz, Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., treasurer. The executive committee is composed of Capt. T. J. Sartor, American South African Line; A. F. Kearney, American Export Lines; L. B. Pate, Seas Shipping Co.; J. B. Young, Barber Steamship Lines; F. A. Warner, Isthmian Lines; D. J. Nerney, International Freighting Corp.; John Gammie, State Marine Corp.; J. J. Walsh, Furness Withy, and J. E. Light, A. H. Bull & Co.

Foreign Information Bill Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but believe that you Republicans are willfully delaying action and even are filibustering in order to bring about the defeat of the bill. You fail to realize that business and all men of good will and intentions believe that there is a great need for this legislation, and I am inclined to feel that your opposition to the bill, though unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, will, instead of helping you, come to plague you.

I take it for granted that very few of us in this House have time to listen to the foreign short-wave broadcasts or to pay much attention to the barrage of words showered upon us from abroad; but we do know that every country, even those friendly to us, is, due to jealousy, trying to persuade and influence our people by their propaganda to their point of view, and to justify their actions.

OTHER COUNTRIES PROPAGANDIZE

You and I know that these millions of words are, for the most part, the product of official government propaganda agencies, no matter how carefully disguised they may be.

On the other hand, almost as many words are filed every day from foreign correspondents here in the United States. Some are seasoned observers or native Americans who do give a fair picture of American life. Others are

unfortunately fanatic propagandists who distort and deliberately misunderstand and misrepresent everything they hear and see. Our great news services have been doing the job that our Government should have been doing. It is unfair to expect them to carry on an official propaganda campaign to meet the war of ideas. These great news services are, after all, private enterprises which must make money to stay in business. They cannot afford to disappoint their customers nor to write and forward material which they cannot sell. The people owe our American news services a deep debt of gratitude, but that does not mean that in this critical time we should expect them to continue to do the job which the Government ought to do.

Ideas are weapons.

Are we going to let our businessmen, our diplomatic, or official representatives, go into the world-wide struggle of ideologies unarmed?

We are sending military aid to China, to Greece, to Turkey, to our good and some not so good South American neighbors; we are arranging to maintain our air bases in the far-flung corners of the globe; we are going to keep the South Pacific Islands we tore from the grasp of the treacherous Japs.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD HAVE FACILITIES

Why then should we balk at providing our Government with the means of justifying these actions, and of assuring the people of other lands that our purposes are laudable, and intended to aid and assist in bringing about a just and lasting peace, and to promote in every way friendly relationships, political and commercial?

Even if this program should cost $30,000,000 it will be an exceedingly well-paying investment in public relations, as it will greatly aid in bringing about better understanding and an earlier peace.

I feel personally that it will help to offset the many rash statements on the floor as well as of the publicists and radio commentators who are working overtime to leave the false impression the world over, that, due to our overwhelming power and might and size, we are girding for war, which is the farthest from the thoughts of 90 percent of the American people.

UNFRIENDLY WRITERS MISREPRESENT OUR AIMS

We believe that we are right; but when our warlike and aggressive acts are reported to the frightened, hungry, war-weary people of the world by unfriendly writers, without any explanation of why we are doing these things, I fear we are making enemies.

I want to go back to October 28 of last year when Philip D. Reed, chairman of the General Electric Co. and chairman of the United States Associates of the International Chamber of Commerce, explained to the members of the New York Financial Writers Association how a program like this could reduce the hazards of war and thus reduce national defense costs.

INSURANCE AGAINST WAR

The Republican Party is committed to reducing the budget regardless of whom it hurts. Even so, the United States is spending almost half of its income in insurance against war; that is, for the armed services and for development of atomic energy, and in pensions and disability compensation for which the cost is growing by leaps and bounds.

Would it not be foolhardy and short-sighted to balk now at the expenditure of just a few million dollars for a program which might enable us to reduce our payments for past and future wars by eliminating the need for new and more terrible physical weapons?

EXCERPTS FROM REED SPEECH

I shall insert at this point, Mr. Speaker, some of the more trenchant paragraphs from Mr. Reed's speech.

Mr. Reed said in part:

Let me say at the outside that I believe America must maintain a strong, modern military machine. We must not only be formidable—and, if possible, the most formidable—in land, sea, and air forces but we must be known in the capitals of the world to be in this commanding position.

The dreadful thing about this insurance is that it costs so much. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, the American people will pay more than 10 percent of the total national income and roughly 50 percent of the Federal Government's total tax receipts for the support and development of our Army, Navy, and Air Force. This is the premium we are paying on our insurance policy against war. If you and I were using half our income to pay our fire, automobile, and accident insurance premiums, we would be giving a great deal of thought and putting a great deal of heat on our Government to adopt measures which would reduce fire, automobile, and accident hazards and thereby make possible a substantial reduction in the cost of that insurance. This, precisely, is what we must do to reduce the cost of our war insurance. For only as the risk or hazard of international warfare is reduced will it be possible to cut the terrific premium on our war insurance policy to more reasonable levels.

Briefly stated, the three major tools or instruments for reducing the hazards of war are: trade, travel, and the facts. Let me enlarge a little on each of these items.

TRADE

The arguments for expanding world trade both in the interest of high employment and better living standards here at home and in foreign countries are well known to you. * * * I am profoundly convinced that a far larger volume of foreign trade—and this means imports as well as exports—would be good for America, good for America as a whole, not simply for those who would profit directly from increased exports or imports.

Today national trading areas are separated from each other by a complex and staggering number of obstacles and barriers to the natural, easy flow of goods and services. They include tariffs, monetary restrictions, exchange controls, import and export licenses and quotas, and endless formalities and red tape encumbering or prohibiting the movement of materials and products across national boundaries. Many, if not most, of them have come into being during the past 25 years. And they stand today as a veritable fortification against exchange. * * *

TRAVEL

If there is any more potent instrument for building international understanding and reducing the risk of war than travel, I have failed to discover it. And on this subject I can give direct testimony based on my experience in London during the 2½ war years I spent there.

THE FACTS

This brings me, gentlemen, to the third item in our triumvirate for reducing the cost of insurance against another war. Intelligence, information, communications—call it what you will—the essential objective is to provide means of currently and continuously exchanging the facts with other countries of the world. Trade and travel are themselves important means of exchanging intelligence or information with our neighbors abroad.

What I am concerned with under this heading, however, are the other well-known media for communicating information about our country to every corner of the earth to the end that a true picture of America, her way of life, the interests and activities of her people, her current events, her accomplishments, and her failures, shall be faithfully depicted and understood everywhere.

It is important that this running story be well and fully told. The very fact that we are today the greatest economic power on earth and thereby have, whether we like it or not, a responsibility for leadership, requires that our aims, our policies, and our objectives be made known to other nations. Anyone in a position of great power will be feared, suspected, and perhaps ganged-up on if he fails to demonstrate his good intentions or to win the confidence and respect of the community.

The urgency and importance of getting this job organized and under way is emphasized by the fact that other powerful governments, notably Russia and her satellite countries, are continuously putting out false and misleading statements about us, our activities, and our objectives. These statements are designed to arouse fear and resentment toward us and to attract other countries into the Russian orbit.

The job of telling adequately and truthfully the story of America to the rest of the world is not a simple one. It is a mixed task in which both Government and private agencies must play important roles.

I also wish to insert an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of June 18, as follows:

SOTTO VOCE

The fate that seems to be in store for the State Department foreign-information program is nothing short of disastrous. By a series of pettifogging delays the unrepentant isolationists in the House have prevented the Mundt bill from reaching the floor. This is the bill that would continue after July 1 the short-wave broadcasts, the American libraries abroad, and the other informational and educational services which seek to present a true picture of this country. The strategy of the House diehards is to kill the program entirely by talking it to death. The disturbing part is that now the Senate Republican leadership, which should know better, apparently has thrown in the towel. Influential GOP Senators are reported to have consented to a compromise which would narrow the information activities to a constricted broadcasting program with an appropriation of only $6,000,000 instead of the thirty-four million originally asked.

Important as are the overseas broadcasts in themselves, their consideration should not exclude other significant aspects of the foreign-information program. If the present congressional tack continues, for example, it will force the closing of our libraries abroad. In many capitals these libraries constitute virtually the only source of accurate factual information about the United States. The libraries are fountains of Americana. They contain reference books, periodicals, copies of official publications. They

are becoming increasingly popular. Another essential which congressional parsimony would eliminate is the distribution of the texts of important American speeches and policy statements, texts which otherwise would not be available in many areas of the world. These activities in making the truth known about America add up to a composite package of the most effective advertising we could have.

The issue now becomes a matter of principle. Either we present the facts, along the line established by the Mundt bill, or we leave it to the Kremlin to explain our motives. No American who knows the diet of falsehood dished out by Pravda can want that. But we may rest assured that if we do not continue to tell our story, no one else will do it for us.

The Voice of the Vatican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post:

THE VOICE OF THE VATICAN
(By Walter Lippmann)

Twice within the past week the newspaper of the Vatican, L'Osservatore Romano, has discussed the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. The full texts of these two editorials are not yet available over here. But excerpts are available and there are news reports from Rome which state that the editorials were written by the chief editor, Count Guiseppe della Torre, at the suggestion of Pope Pius, and that "in Vatican circles" the arguments were said "to reflect the Pope's anxiety over the increasing tenseness between Washington and Moscow."

The significance of these editorials lies in the fact that despite the traditionally strong anti-Communist stand of the Vatican, they take a position of complete impartiality and realism in the Russian-American conflict, admonish both Moscow and Washington to be more objective, to avoid an ideological struggle which could lead only to war, and to seek practical compromises.

The warning and the advice from the Vatican came at a time when Mr. Bevin and M. Bidault have been meeting in Paris in response to Secretary Marshall's speech at Harvard. Their first concern has been with an aspect of the question which the Vatican's newspaper is discussing. The immediate question for them is whether they can cooperate with us and not break irreparably with Russia. It is most important that all who make and administer our foreign policy, and that all who discuss it, should see clearly this dilemma of the Europeans—which is the occasion for the Vatican's warning and is a principal subject matter in the Bevin-Bidault conversations.

All the leading countries of Europe, including many within the Russian orbit, are deeply opposed to the expansion and the domination of Russia. But none of them is prepared to accept American leadership in an anti-Communist coalition. And they have come to believe that this is the intent of the so-called Truman doctrine, and of its progenitor, Mr. Churchill's Fulton speech.

During the past year reaction and resistance have been growing in Europe to any policy which would make Europe the stakes of Soviet-American competition, and the Continent the battlefield of an ideological and an international war.

We have been, I believe, curiously blind to this phenomenon, and have failed to appreciate its historical importance. The fact is that Europe is rising again, and is determined and is destined to align itself neither with Russia as she is now nor with America, as we have in this past year appeared to be. This is not, as so many of us imagine, the opinion exclusively of the left and of the fellow travelers. The idea that the European states, including Britain, should mediate between Russia and America and prevent a war, was put forward for the British Commonwealth and Empire by Prime Minister Smuts last June, by General de Gaulle in France last July, in effect by Mr. Churchill in his more recent speeches about the United States of Europe, and now by the Vatican newspaper. When President Truman was in Ottawa recently, he seems to have been talked to on this subject by the Canadians.

It goes without saying that on the continent almost any leader of a labor party, a Socialist Party, or a popular Catholic Party, and of an ordinary liberal party, dreads and resists being placed in the position where in order to retain the good will of this country he must be uncompromising and irreconcilable with the Soviets. For the Europeans do not wish to be ground between the upper and the nether millstones.

The question now is whether the Marshall proposals are a revision of the Truman doctrine. To answer that question sincerely would greatly improve the likelihood of their success abroad. Yet it must be admitted that a sincere answer may cause some embarrassment within the administration here at home.

The fact is that the Truman doctrine was a hasty and ill-considered improvisation, designed to meet an emergency for which the State Department was not prepared, and propounded in a form which, whatever its effects elsewhere, was deemed most likely to win quick support in Congress. The Marshall plan is a considered attempt to supersede the crudities and the unworkable elements of the Truman doctrine—and to place this country behind a constructive settlement rather than at the head of an ideological crusade.

The sooner we admit this, the more frankly we say it, the sooner and the more surely we shall regain what we have been losing—the confidence of the great masses of the people who are too civilized and too proud to be the satellites of Russia or the clients of the United States.

Neither the exhibition of our military power nor the spending of money can restore that popular confidence. We shall have also to prove to mankind that our influence and power are the instruments of statesmanship, which seeks peace, and the rehabilitation of this shattered world, and the settlement of the secular issues that divide it.

The Mundt Bill Versus Previous "Voice" Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on H. R. 3342, the Mundt bill, establishing the Office of Information and Educational Exchange, it became apparant that many Members believed the Committee on Foreign Affairs was recommending a bill which gave the Department of State broader grants of power in this field than it has had heretofore. The reverse is the truth.

As evidence, I include with my remarks the portion of Public Law 490, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1947, which provides for the program for this year substantially as it has been carried on in Latin America since 1939. It will be seen at once that many of the provisions of H. R. 3342 are the same as those heretofore prepared and approved by the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress. H. R. 3342 makes no additional or broader grants of power, except that it authorizes the program in the Eastern as well as the Western Hemisphere. On the contrary, the bill places many important limitations and restrictions on the scope and nature of the program to be carried on in all countries hereafter, and it contains for the first time strict safeguards as to reciprocity, loyalty of personnel, use of private agencies, deportations, termination by Congress if it desires, and so forth.

The overwhelming testimony of those Americans who have observed the previous program first hand is that even with admitted mistakes and some bad personnel, the net result has been very beneficial to the United States in many countries. H. R. 3342 authorizes a more carefully defined and a much more strictly controlled program. After careful study, I am convinced it will have correspondingly increased effectiveness and value.

The text referred to follows:

COOPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet the obligations of the United States under the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations between the United States and the other American Republics, signed at Buenos Aires, December 23, 1936, and to carry out the purposes of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American Republics," approved August 9, 1939, and to supplement appropriations available for carrying out other provisions of law authorizing related activities, including the establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries, on land acquired by gift or lease for the duration of the experiments and demonstrations, and construction of necessary buildings thereon; such expenses to include personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $150,000 for printing and binding; stenographic reporting, translating and other services by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5); not to exceed $15,000 for entertainment; not to exceed $5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with the furtherance of the purposes hereof; and, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, tuition, compensation, allowances and enrollment, laboratory, insurance, and other fees incident to training, including traveling expenses in the United States and abroad in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended, of educational, professional, and artistic leaders, and professors, students, internes, and persons possessing special scientific or other technical qualifications, who are citizens of the United States

or the other American Republics: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State is authorized under such regulations as he may adopt, to pay the actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens of the other American Republics while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, and to make advances of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes; traveling expenses of members of advisory committees in accordance with section 2 of said act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 249a); purchase (not to exceed six passenger automobiles), hire, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled and animal-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; purchase of books and periodicals; rental of halls and boats; and purchase, rental and repair of microfilming equipment and supplies, and colored photographic enlargements, $5,375,000; and the Secretary of State, or such official as he may designate is hereby authorized, in his discretion, and, subject to the approval of the President, to transfer from this appropriation to other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government for expenditure in the United States and in the other American Republics any part of this amount for direct expenditures by such department or independent establishment for the purposes of this appropriation and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, or independent establishment to which amounts are transferred: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $100,000 of this appropriation shall be available until June 30, 1948: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available to make contracts with, and grants of money or property to, nonprofit institutions in the United States and the other American Republics, including the distribution of materials and other services in the fields of education and travel, arts and sciences, publications, the radio, the press, and the cinema.

Agricultural Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama:

Whereas the huge reduction in the 1947 agricultural-conservation program funds from $301,720,000 to $165,614,290, and the reduction in other agricultural appropriations, recommended by the House Appropriations Committee in Washington, has halted practically all Production and Marketing Administration (AAA) activities in Alabama. Preliminary estimates recently made by PMA show that funds already obligated will equal or exceed the $165,614,290 allowable by the Appropriations Committee recommendation; and

Whereas much progress has been made in conservation during the past 9 years with the aid of AAA; practically one-half of Alabama farmers are now planting winter cover crops; terracing and other soil-conservation work is being carried on with great benefit to Alabama and the Nation; and

Whereas there are now about 65,000 farmers in Alabama cooperating with and being directly benefited by this program; and indirect benefits are being derived by all the people of Alabama; and

Whereas the conservation needs of Alabama are far in excess of what are now being met; we believe it is the responsibility of society to see that our soil resources are maintained and improved for future generations; and

Whereas the proposed reduction in agricultural appropriations threatens to wreck the school-lunch program in Alabama unless the State greatly increases its funds of matching Federal money; and funds will be denied for farm tenant loans to thousands of Alabama veterans, and small farmers under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Purchase Act; and

Whereas we believe the farmers will be forced to exploit and drain the soil fertility if the agricultural-conservation program is curtailed; much heretofore accomplished will be lost: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State Senate of Alabama (the House of Representatives concurring):

1. That the Congress of the United States be most respectfully urged to continue and not to reduce the appropriations for the United States Department of Agriculture to carry on the agricultural-conservation program and other programs being put on by the Agriculture Department.

2. That the United States Senators, Hon. LISTER HILL and Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN, and our Representatives in Congress, be asked to support the agricultural-conservation program and to vote for and to lend their support for the continuance of the annual appropriation of $301,720,000, and other agricultural appropriations vital to the people of Alabama.

3. That the secretary of state of Alabama be directed to transmit duly certified copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, chairmen of the United States Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, the United States Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington, and to each Member of our congressional delegation.

Approved June 13, 1947.

The Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House today, I include in the RECORD the two following editorials published in the Brooklyn Eagle, the first on June 17, 1947, following President Truman's veto of the so-called tax-reduction bill; and the second on June 18, 1947, following the action of the House in sustaining that veto:

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of June 17, 1947]

PRESIDENT'S VETO OF TAX BILL WISE IN FACE OF HUGE DEBT

The reasons which President Truman offers for his disapproval of a bill to reduce individual income-tax payments cannot effectively be refuted. They have their origin in the requirements of a sound national economy and are designed to promote an orderly return to normal conditions which will make possible tax reductions without danger to economic stability.

Politically, the effects of President Truman's veto of the tax-reduction bill may be harmful. The relief which it provided would have been experienced by millions of Americans who have borne a great load of taxation through the war years and who have hoped that peace would bring an easing of the burden. They will be disappointed. Those who are fair-minded, however, can hardly question the logic of the President's reasoning.

At present the United States is carrying a war debt which must be reduced if it is not to bring danger of economic disaster in later years. It must be slashed drastically as quickly as possible, not whittled away by barely perceptible degrees as the years go by. The most advantageous time to reduce the debt is when business is good, money is plentiful, and wages are high. Nothing can be accomplished toward this purpose once the trend has turned and a recession becomes either a fear or an actuality.

At the risk of inviting the political disfavor of both business interests and workers who would like the pressure of high taxation eased, President Truman has followed a course of practical realism. If the national debt is to be reduced, the time for such action is when unemployment is at a minimum and the national income is close to record levels.

The arguments for the tax-reduction bill have never been very impressive. It has been maintained that tax relief would stimulate business. But business does not require stimulation. While it is true that the purchasing power of certain elements of the population has been impaired, the remedy lies, as the President insists, in "wise policies and improved practices of business and labor," not in governmental intervention.

Eventually, and not in the distant future, there will be a proper and a safe time for tax reductions. This will be when inflationary pressures have been eased, when commitments abroad which involve an investment in world peace are less exacting, when the national debt is lower, and when the whole future can be envisioned in clearer perspective.

When this transition is complete, or further advanced, there must be a downward revision in taxes. But it must be, as the President insists, on an equitable basis. The bill vetoed by the President is both untimely and unfair. Its obvious weaknesses, emphasized so impressively by the President, would seem to preclude the possibility of the passage over his rejection.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of June 18, 1947]

VETO SUSTAINER A TRUMAN VICTORY

When Congress voted to give tax cuts precedence over debt reduction it followed a course which would have brought a great deal of satisfaction to many Americans and would have strengthened the party politically in anticipation of 1948. About 48,000,000 Americans would have benefited to the extent of more than $4,000,000,000 if the Republican tax reduction bill had become law. Failure of the House to override President Truman's veto ends insofar as this year is concerned all hope of lower taxes.

This failure, although only by the narrow margin of two votes, revealed a surprising weakness in the forces supporting the bill. While there was a disposition to concede that the bill could not be passed in the Senate over its rejection by the President, no such difficulty was expected in the House, where its supporters were believed to present a solid front.

President Truman is accordingly in a position to claim a substantial victory over his opponents in Congress. It is one which is all the more creditable to him because it can hardly bring anything in the nature of political benefit. The voters will be reminded next fall that it was a Democratic President, not a Republican Congress, who stood in the way of tax relief.

Among those who are concerned for the stability of the Nation's economic structure, however, rather than personal financial advantage, there will be willingness to concede

that the President has acted wisely and that the House has shown creditable restraint in sustaining him.

President Truman has stated repeatedly that he felt sound finance called for the avoidance of tax cuts until fiscal, budget, and debt uncertainties are cleared away. When profits are at an all-time high and the national debt was never higher taxes should be maintained and the debt reduced. And when tax benefits are granted they should go principally to the lower income classes, whose purchasing power is impaired by high prices.

Strange Doings in State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, it appears from the news items in the press during the past week that the administration now is really going into high gear with European spending. It is evident that the State Department has made its decision and now is beginning the process of selling the American people on the idea that it is our duty to take over and support the whole of Europe for the next decade.

The following is an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of June 19, which gives you an idea of what is going on:

STRANGE DOINGS IN STATE

Secretary and ex-Gen. George C. Marshall's State Department has recently developed a most peculiar looking method of merchandising the Truman-Marshall plan for restoring Europe or as much of Europe as Russia doesn't grab first.

Whether Mr. Marshall himself dreamed up this scheme, or whether he is even aware of it in its entirety, we don't know. Anyway, here is how it works:

State Department invitations are sent out at intervals to various people to come to Washington and sit in on meetings described as off the record and extremely important. These people are lady and gentlemen leaders of various church, patriotic and lodge groups in their communities.

Naturally they are flattered, and naturally they fall over their feet to get to Washington on time. At the meetings, under State Department auspices, they listen to hush-hush talks by key Government men, from Marshall down.

The gist of these talks is that it is vitally important for the guests to go home and spread among their fellow citizens the Truman-Marshall gospel that the world or a large part of it has to be saved from Joe Stalin at no matter what cost to the United States taxpayer.

No real news, we understand, is dealt out at these sessions. But the mysterious-urgency atmosphere is as thick as Mahatma Henry Wallace's hide; and to make it all the more impressive, reporters are barred, and the guests are warned not to talk to the press afterward.

Just what in the hell does this mean, anyway?

Here is a scheme which will affect every American for years to come, perhaps even to the point of involving us all in a war with Russia. Yet the State Department is bypassing the press as regards stating the administration's arguments for the Truman-Marshall plans.

Why? What is Truman, or Marshall, or somebody, afraid of? Or if fear or something isn't behind this strange procedure, what is behind it?

The whole business reminds us of pre-Pearl Harbor times, when Roosevelt was shouting peace with his mouth while trying to provoke a German attack on us with his right hand and a Jap attack with his left. Like Harry Hopkins, he felt that the American people were "too damn dumb to understand" what was good for them.

Most Americans, we think, are still doing their best to hold Secretary of State Marshall in high esteem. The Secretary will not help them to do that by playing along with the kid-the-people great brainers who still infest the Truman administration.

Mr. Speaker, I admonish my colleagues to be alert on this subject and inform the people throughout the Nation in regard to this new insane proposal on the part of the administration.

Hoover's Plan for Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Washington Post recently. It is most interesting and enlightening. The mad rush for the rebuilding of Germany has many Americans deeply disturbed. The article follows:

HOOVER'S PLAN FOR GERMANY

After reading Mr. Herbert Hoover's letter to Chairman TABER of the House Appropriations Committee, published May 27, regarding the treatment of Germany, I am convinced that if Mr. Hoover's recommendations were carried out, the structure of peace would be built upon quicksand.

The sum and substance of Mr. Hoover's latest proposals is that the Allies must ignore the lessons learned from our failure to protect peace after World War I and to discard the economic controls agreed upon at the meetings of the Big Three. The Allies will be repeating the mistakes made in 1919, if Mr. Hoover's views are made official policy.

The Allies paid bitterly during World War II for not having learned the nature of such economic controls and for not having imposed them upon Germany. It is apparent that Mr. Hoover would repeat the very same blunders again when he states "It is urgent that we at once revise the reparations and industrial demilitarization policies imposed * * * by various Allied agreements."

Mr. Hoover conveniently forgets the fact that the whole aggregate of economic and industrial power, left intact after World War I, enabled the Germans to experiment and plan for the future production of weapons of war. When Mr. Hoover now calls for the elimination of the disarmament program, he not only approves the present failure of military disarmament (in the British zone, for instance, only 7 percent of the tank, gun, and other military factors have been eliminated thus far) but in fact, is in favor of a policy to leave the tremendous German war potential intact.

Significantly, Mr. Hoover also ignores the entire problem of atomic research which would imply that Germany should be permitted to engage in such work.

The implementation of Mr. Hoover's recommendations would make Germany the greatest industrial power in Europe. When Mr. Hoover advocates the scrapping of the reparations program to which our country is committed, he is striking an irreparable blow at the economic rehabilitation of Germany's victims. Thus, Mr. Hoover completely ignores the plight of the occupied countries which were deliberately bled white, in order to perpetuate Germany's economic domination of Europe.

Mr. Hoover, in discussing reparations, omits pertinent facts which the American people should know. He failed to tell Representative TABER and the public that, out of 1,557 plants which have been earmarked for reparations, only 6 have been actually delivered to the victims of German aggression. Nor does he reveal the sabotage of reparations deliveries by the Germans and the failure of the Allies to prevent it. Although Mr. Hoover knows the serious conditions of French industry, due to war devastation and the shortage of coal, he complains that "we are supplying France with Ruhr coal which could be used in the manufacture of exports from Germany with which to pay for food."

The American people should know the real facts which Mr. Hoover has chosen to bypass:

1. Besides the fact that France is not getting reparations from the Ruhr, she must pay in dollars or in gold for the small quantity of coal she gets from Germany. These dollars are being used by the AMG to pay for food imported to Germany—contrary to Mr. Hoover's implications.

2. France has received only 160,000 tons of coal per month from Germany for the first quarter of 1947, although she must import 10 times as much to balance her economy.

3. At present, Germany retains 79 percent of the coal produced in the Ruhr and only 21 percent is sold to all her neighbors, against dollar payment.

4. The present German consumption of coal per capita, per year, is greater than in France.

5. German coal which is a major factor in European industry is being deliberately withheld in order to use it as a political and economic weapon against Germany's neighbors.

Though Mr. Hoover was supposed to survey the German situation from the point of view of our security requirements, he has presented a distorted picture. Because we listened to Herbert Hoover after World War I, we paid in blood, sweat, and tears. Must we pay that price again?

C. MONTEITH GILPIN,
Secretary, Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc.
NEW YORK.

Explaining America Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

EXPLAINING AMERICA ABROAD

Despite Secretary Marshall's earnest appeal, the State Department's cultural and informational program is still in danger of being largely suppressed. Its troubles began when the House eliminated the entire $34,000,000 appropriation for this purpose on the ground that the activities had not been authorized. To eliminate this objection Rep-

resentative MUNDT, of South Dakota, introduced an enabling bill, which with some amendments was unanimously approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee on May 21. This bill, if passed, would naturally be followed by an appropriation, though perhaps a smaller one than the State Department asked for. Its consideration has been repeatedly postponed and it has not yet passed the House. Meanwhile Senator BALL, of Minnesota, has asserted that the Senate will cut to $6,000,000 the sum of about $19,000,000 asked, mainly for the radio programs known as the Voice of America. Such a cut would keep us out of Russia, where otherwise no American voice will be heard.

If the Senate goes this far, we cannot be hopeful about the rest of the cultural and informational program—the highly important interchange of "sudents, trainees, teachers, guest instructors, professors, and leaders in fields of specialized knowledge or skill"; the interchange and translation of books and periodicals; the maintenance of American libraries abroad and assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers in other countries. Hope for favorable action on the Mundt bill in both House and Senate, and for an adequate appropriation may rest on a dawning perception that, if the Marshall plan for systematizing our aid to foreign countries is to succeed, we shall have to continue to explain ourselves to people in those countries. We might save a few millions by not explaining ourselves and in so doing vitiate the results of an investment of billions.

NAM's Free Enterprise—Not American, Not Christian, Not Too Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, NAM's Free Enterprise—Not American, Not Christian, Not Too Free, written by Rev. Benjamin L. Masse. This thoughtful, scholarly, and penetrating article appeared in the Catholic magazine America for May 31, 1947.

The National Association of Manufacturers has appeared prominently in the public press, claiming credit for having exerted such influence on the citizens of this Nation and their elected representatives in the Congress as to result in the untimely killing off of price control last year and forcing the passage of the labor bill now on the President's desk. Such an institution of big business pressure, spending over $3,000,000 a year on propaganda of this kind, does so, according to its own widely advertised statements, in the interest of the "American system of free enterprise."

Now, I for one believe strongly in a system of free competitive business enterprise, as does Father Masse, the author of the article appearing in "America." But when he examines the two weighty volumes describing NAM's conception of the American individual enterprise system, he finds that NAM indulges in a dangerous line of propaganda, petty prejudice and careless scholarship, in defending an antisocial, anti-Christian philosophy of economics, identified by NAM with American capitalism.

I commend the entire article to the Members of the Senate as important in determining the weight to be given NAM's lobbying and propaganda activities in the interest of our system of free competitive enterprise.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NAM'S FREE ENTERPRISE

(By Benjamin L. Masse)

For a long time the writer has wondered what exactly the National Association of Manufacturers means by the popular phrase, "American system of free enterprise." He has had his suspicions, but only recently, with the appearance of an elaborate book, have these suspicions been confirmed.

Six years ago the NAM created an Economic Principles Commission, composed of 7 industrialists and 8 economists, and ordered it to make a study of the American economic system. The fruits of that study have now been published in two weighty but attractive volumes. (The American Individual Enterprise System, 2 vols., McGraw-Hill, $10.) Although NAM Board Chairman Ira Mosher explains in a foreword that the views expressed by the authors are not necessarily those of the NAM, it is safe to assume fairly general agreement. Otherwise the book would scarcely have been published under NAM auspices. We can regard it, then, as a representative account of the NAM outlook on the American economy.

As seen by the authors, the "American Individual Enterprise System" is first and foremost American. "We could not have our present system of production and distribution without our present system of government," they affirm, "nor our present system of government without our present system of business." The system was not imported from abroad; it is uniquely our own; it marks a new departure in economics.

No formal definition of the "American Individual Enterprise System," we are told, can do justice to all its qualities. It regards the individual as supreme; sharply limits the economic function of the state; recognizes competition as "both the guardian of efficiency and the guarantor of progress"; protects private property and the right of the individual, within certain limitations, to exchange his goods and services as he sees fit; consecrates "hope of reward" and "fear of loss" as energizing principles constantly urging the individual to his maximum capacity; deprecates and discourages governmental paternalism.

In more technical terms the authors describe the system as "closely identified with the economic doctrine of laissez faire." With approval they quote the following summary of that doctrine by Edwin G. Nourse:

"1. As to government, let its activities in the field of business be limited to the very minimum necessary for the maintenance of property rights and peaceful life.

"2. As to business, let the system of private capitalism grow naturally under free enterprise, and the law of supply and demand will operate automatically to establish the right prices. Commodity and service prices will reflect the lower costs resulting from progress in technique and organization. As for wages, they will reflect the productivity of each worker. Economic activity will be guided by such prices into the most productive channels and thus promote to the fullest possible extent the national prosperity. These principles were conceived as embodying universal truth capable of achieving 'the wealth of nations' and the welfare of the masses."

The NAM writers add that laissez faire does not mean unrestricted freedom. It does not prohibit the Government from passing "safety and health legislation," or from enacting laws to protect the public against fraud. It simply means "that there should be no legislative interference with the competitive price system; that special privileges should be prevented, and reliance should be put upon competition."

This idea the authors develop more fully further on. Adverting to the fact that economic activities are undertaken for the most part for "selfish gain," and that individuals are motivated not by considerations of the general welfare but by what will benefit them most, they concede the necessity for some regulation. But under the American system this regulation is provided mostly by competition. Distinguishing two types of regulation, by government and by competition, the authors write:

"Of these two types of regulation, competition is by all odds the more important. In fact, it is safe to say that competition is the real 'regulator' of our economy, and so-called Government regulation is, or at least should be, nothing more than an effort to strengthen and make more effective the regulation of competition. In other words, freedom of competition truly is one of the basic principles of the individual enterprise system."

Although some errors have been made, "such has been the philosophy," we are told, "under which as a Nation we have grown great." This is the system which "has given amazing results, more amazing results than any other system or economic philosophy yet devised by man."

Such, then, in broad outline is the system to the explanation and defense of which these volumes are dedicated. To the reader who is acquainted with elementary economics, who has followed the controversies of the past 15 years and read the publications of the NAM and the works of such economists as Willford I. King, Rufus S. Tucker, and Ludwig von Mises, it is scarcely necessary to catalog and describe the contents of this work. It is a mélange of elementary economics (clearly written but not superior to a dozen textbooks in current use), of applications of laissez-faire principles to wages, prices, profits, etc., of economic controversy (some of which are competent, scholarly, and respectable), of apologies for big business. It includes also some dubious assumptions, bad scholarship, propaganda, and special pleading.

I am aware that this résumé may sound somewhat ill-tempered and ungracious. Frankly, it is. When the most powerful business organization in the country, at a time of world crisis, lavishly subsidizes a second-rate piece of work, a piece of work which reflect the narrow viewpoint of the most reactionary economists in the country and the prejudices of our least enlightened industrialists, a piece of work which defends economic principles that are in conflict with the Christian conscience and have been repudiated by responsible religious authority, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, I cannot find the patience either to take it seriously or to treat it urbanely. At a time when the institution of private property, the democratic system of government, the freedom and dignity of the individual are under savage attack from the most ruthless and dangerous enemy in the history of Christian civilization, I find it impossible to deal gently with a book, coming from supposedly friendly sources, which betrays the good cause. And that is exactly what the American individual enterprise system succeeds in doing.

So that the reader may understand my reaction, I shall offer a few exhibits.

Let us consider in the first place the bald assertion that our economic system is something entirely original with us and unique in

all the world. The fact is, of course, that laissez-faire economics, like a lot of other things, was imported lock, stock, and barrel from Great Britain. The great bible of the capitalistic system, The Wealth of Nations, was published in 1776, the year of the American Declaration of Independence, and was written by Adam Smith, a professor at the University of Glasgow. His theories, and those of his British successors—David Ricardo, James Mill, and Nassau Senior—were discussed in American academic circles as early as the first quarter of the nineteenth century, if not before. For more than a half century after the United States was established as a Nation, our economic literature was almost entirely a discussion and application of the writing of British economists.

This constant British influence on American economic thought, which continues to this day, was intensified during the two decades between 1870 and 1890, when Herbert Spencer became the darling of big business, the inspiration of university presidents, and even the mentor of the Supreme Court. In an opinion dissenting from the Court's ruling in *Lochner* v. *New York*, a decision which held unconstitutional a State law fixing a maximum 10-hour day for bakers, Justice Holmes adverted to Spencer's influence on the Court. Wrote the judge:

"This case is decided upon an economic theory which a large part of the country does not entertain. * * * The liberty of the citizen to do as he likes so long as he does not interfere with the liberty of others to do the same, which has been a shibboleth for some well-known writers, is interfered with by school laws, by the post office, by every State or municipal institution which takes his money for purposes thought desirable, whether he likes it or not. The fourteenth amendment does not enact Mr. Herbert Spencer's Social Statics."

If the NAM should undertake a study of the influence of Herbert Spencer on the thinking of American industrialists, it would find in his Social Statics and Man versus the State, wherein Darwinian evolution was made to support laissez-faire economics, the seedbed of much business oratory. In this superficial English writer it might even discover one of the prime sources of its own propaganda for the American way.

For another example of the curious "scholarship" which occurs in The American Individual Enterprise System I cite the treatment accorded the quotation from Edwin G. Nourse printed above. The quotation occurs in the text in such a way that the reader naturally gets the impression that Dr. Nourse, who is Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, concurs in the theory which the authors are expounding. To make matters worse, there is no reference to the source from which the excerpt is taken. Now the fact is that the quoted passage occurs on page 34 of Dr. Nourse's Price Making in a Democracy, in the midst of a chapter in which the writer is criticizing American businessmen, including some NAM bigwigs, for their careless and unrealistic use of such slogans as "Free enterprise," "Capitalistic system," "American way," etc. Far from approving the theory of laissez-faire economics as advanced in the NAM book, Dr. Nourse, in the passage cited, is merely defining it in order to show how inadequately it accords with the economic realities of our day. The whole chapter from which it is taken is an effective criticism of the chapter in this book which it is used to confirm. Such writing is at best careless and slipshod; at worst it is dishonest.

A third example of deficiency in scholarship is the prejudiced treatment of organized labor. All forms of union security are condemned as un-American hindrances to the operation of the individual enterprise system. The condemnation is dogmatic and universal. There is, apparently, not a single intelligent argument on the other side, as though competent moralists and economists had not often defended union security.

The wage policies of organized labor, especially those of the American Federation of Labor, are given similar summary treatment. The A. F. of L., the authors argue triumphantly, has been contradictory and inconsistent. It demanded a living wage in 1907, but in 1922, because living costs were declining, abandoned this position and insisted that wages be geared to the increasing productivity of the worker. Should the circumstances be reversed, they charge, and productivity decline while living costs rise, labor economists would in all probability return to the now abandoned advocacy of a living wage. In other words, the wage policies of organized labor are based on nothing more scientific than a kind of irresponsible expediency.

Although this cavalier treatment is exasperating to any fair-minded reader, it is not without its amusing side. The very evidence which the NAM writers cite and from which they argue, shows that the A. F. of L. did not abandon its insistence on a living wage when it emphasized productivity in 1922. Here is the exact text of the A. F. of L. statement:

"A wage based solely upon cost of living or subsistence or a saving wage bears no direct relation to production or service rendered. However, a wage based upon productivity or service must accept as an initial standard a wage based upon human needs and aspirations * * * without reference to the other considerations that enter into a wage which compensates for productivity or service."

It will be immediately obvious that the A. F. of L., far from denying its stand in 1907 on the living wage, is here reemphasizing it and relating it to the wage based on other factors, of which productivity is one. It is merely stating that a wage rate tied to productivity and service must not disregard the fundamental criterion of a just wage, namely, the needs and aspirations of the worker. That is, it must not disregard the criterion of the living wage.

It is scarcely necessary to observe that it is a fundamental rule of controversy to know your opponent's position. Otherwise, as in the present case, your argument may be ineffective and foolish.

Incidentally, I also found it amusing that in a two-volume work which contains a good deal of economic history, there is no mention of such important terms as "labor spy," "yellow-dog contract," "strikebreaker," "industrial munitions," etc.

But one could overlook the propaganda, the petty prejudices, the careless scholarship, and enjoy the undeniably good things which the authors have set before the reader were it not for two facts: (1) the book defends an antisocial, anti-Christian philosophy of economics and identifies this philosophy with American capitalism; (2) it gives the utterly false impression that we must either embrace laissez-faire capitalism or resign ourselves to endure communism or fascism. These contentions are so vicious and dangerous that a reviewer feels justified in not dallying to pluck the occasional good fruit from an otherwise rotten tree.

I laid these tomes down with a prayer of gratitude. I thanked God that the Committee for Economic Development exists among us, and the American Management Association and the National Planning Association; and that many, many industrialists, inside the NAM as well as outside, do not agree with the small group of men who, apparently, still dominate that organization and profess to speak in its name.

And someone, I think, ought to warn Stalin, in the event that this work should come to his attention and lead to exaggerated hope and optimism, that the NAM no more speaks for American business than does Henry Wallace for the common man.

Address of Hon. Mary T. Norton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech recently made by the Honorable MARY T. NORTON, of New Jersey, to the Ninth Congress of the International Council of Nurses at Atlantic City:

Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, delegates and representatives to the International Congress of Nurses, and friends, it is a privilege and very great pleasure to join you today in this Ninth Congress of the International Council of Nurses, particularly as this meeting follows the World War. My good friend, Miss Murdock, who, as you probably know, is director of the School of Nursing of the Jersey City Medical Center, has told me a great deal of the remarkable work that has been, and is being, done by the ICN. It is a record of which you should feel justly proud and one closely conforming to the tradition of Florence Nightingale and many others whose professional lives are not to the same extent a matter of record, but whose great services have been recorded in the hearts of their patients, and so, Madam Chairman, I salute you, the officers of the ICN, the international representatives and delegates present, and the membership of your very important and great council.

It is good to know that women everywhere in the world can be depended upon to answer the call for service. And I believe it can be recorded that you have made a great contribution to bring peace and solidarity to the world.

There are many things I would like to discuss with you, but time will not permit more than a bare outline. Other speakers will no doubt tell you how happy you should be that you are members of a profession ranking second in importance over all others and thirtieth in all occupations. I congratulate you on this achievement, but may I also suggest that you have a very great responsibility because of these facts. We who are part of this changing world have witnessed a tragic upheaval in our way of life. We have had to adjust our standards—to think in terms of world solidarity—of good-neighbor policy. It is good for us, and we have gained much by the contacts we have made. You women here today from many countries are proving how right this is. You have come to us with your much older world civilization and also much more tragic experience to broaden our world and our thinking. We are grateful to you, and we welcome you to the State of New Jersey and to the United States of America, and we hope and pray that some day there will be a United States of Europe and of the world.

I was born at a time when women were given little consideration by the policy makers of our Nation. We had no power other than the power women have always wielded as women—based on their beauty, personality, and sometimes brains. We were supposed to adorn—more or less—to go to a finishing school, if we were rich; to marry, be a good wife and mother, a good cook, a good housekeeper, and many other things the mothers and grandmothers were noted for in that and preceding generations. And, may I say, most women in those days, doing the things they were expected to do, found contentment, much peace of mind and happiness. Well, we have come a long way since

that day. We have gained much in experience, have taken a proper place in the affairs of our home, our city, and our country.

We have been accepted in business, in the professions, in politics, and even on the assembly lines. We have proved, that given the opportunity, we can compete with the men of our Nation, and, in some instances, even do a better job. And so, we now have some power—not too much, to be sure, but some. And we are gaining but our improvement is not nearly what it should be for we, too, have had tragic experiences during two World Wars, which should have added much to our thinking and which should have strengthened our will and given us a clearer vision of things to come. Unfortunately, much that has happened seems to have been forgotten by the many, and remembered only by those who played a part—often a tragic par'—in the events of those years.

You women have had the opportunity of playing a very important part in the development of all women and of yourselves. Because of your profession you come closer to the hearts of people—men and women. And you can be a distinct influence in their consciousness. I have said many times, and I repeat now, that one of the things we should all develop is the art and habit of thinking, of using the brains that God gave us and not accept, as we so often do, the opinions and comments of people, who may be completely one-sided in their thinking. As nurses are truly the vanguard of health, you must also take your place as one of the great influences on the future social structure of our great country. Your profession takes you into the far-flung corners of the world. You know that we are all part of one great world. The world of yesterday, when oceans divided us, is no more. North, south, east, and west are now merely parts of one great world, and the responsibility of knowing its movements, trends, and policies has become an individual responsibility to each and every one of us. And I think particularly it is a responsibility to the nursing profession. There is no group of workers who should have better balanced judgment. Therefore, you should prove of great value to the peacemakers and policy-shapers of the world. And, I would suggest that whenever the opportunity is presented, you do not hesitate to take your well-earned place in the consideration of world affairs. Get away from being just nurses. You are citizens of the world, and, as such, you must give all you have of heart and mind to help shape the policies of the world of today and tomorrow.

What we are all greatly in need of today is faith in God, in our world, and in ourselves. If we cultivate this state of mind, we can accomplish almost anything we set ourselves to do. In this life we are now living, with its broader usefulness, its great need of right-thinking women, lies our great opportunity. We must ask ourselves how we shall meet the challenge to our citizenship, to being part of this great world we have given so much to build. Let us evaluate just what our contribution has been in terms not only of money, but in that much greater contribution—the lives which have been sacrificed, broken health, broken homes—all this, and much more—to build a world in which this and future generations can live together in harmony, in serving God, in serving our country, and in courageously accepting whatever part we are called upon to take.

I like to think of the nurses of today, particularly the young women, as a great force in the world. Most of you have had the advantage of higher education. You have been trained in a broad field. Many of you have distinguished yourselves on the battlefields of the world, all of which should equip you for the important part you will have to play in the battle for democratic freedom. In this battle, it is necessary to have a firm foreign policy and, if we are to live in harmony, we must learn to give and take. I do not mean that we must give up any of our ideals but I do mean that we must learn how to successfully arbitrate international disputes. None of us is always right. The hope of the world is based upon economic cooperation. If we are realists, we cannot get away from that fact. The necessities of peace are no less important and serious than were those of war. We must find a way to live together. This does not mean we need to love a people or a country with whom we cannot agree. It does mean that we must hold fast to the things we believe in, the things of the spirit, and the things which were responsible for making the United States the greatest country in the world.

We should make democracy a living thing, talk democracy, live it every day, forget politics, forget our advantage over other countries, avoid criticism, and remember we are the one nation in all the world that has come out of the war inferno unscathed. And because we have been given much, much will be expected of us. Perhaps this thought was brought home to me during my visit to Europe in 1945. I saw, as no doubt many of you have seen, tragedy and starvation such as I could not have believed possible, and I saw heroism and courage that almost broke my spirit. Never again could I think of the brave people I met without a tear in my eye and a prayer on my lips.

And so I say to you, let us base our international good will on mutual understanding and loyalty to the ideals of our great country. I have lived and taken part in two World Wars. I know that I shall never see another. I hope and pray that you never will. If my long public life gives me the privilege of suggesting to, or advising with you, I would say never permit yourselves to be discouraged. Remember that your sons and husbands fought for freedom of individual conscience, freedom of religion, freedom from want. We can never let them down. You, yourselves, were part of that fighting force. You did a great job and now you are engaged in another big job, to see to it that we shall establish a just and lasting peace in the world, that war shall be outlawed, and that democracy will become a living, vital force around which all the peoples of the world may live in harmony and understanding. We have laid the cornerstone of peace and solidarity through the United Nations organization. How well we shall build the structure depends, to a very great extent, on our individual effort. How much we want peace and how much we shall put into it to make it a vital force. There is no other way.

An Example of International Probity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that the hard-pressed people of Finland, despite the ravages of war and the oppression by Russia, have made another payment of $164,852.24 on their $8,400,000 debt of World War I.

This payment constitutes more than an expression of common honesty or of good business; it denotes the heroic courage of the Finnish people and serves the world as an example of honor and the integrity of a nation's word. Repudiation is unknown to the Finn, while it is rife on all sides and among nations far better situated from the standpoint of finance and liquid resources.

Seems to me that such exemplary courage and honesty should more than be acknowledged by the American people; it should be rewarded by the prompt remission of the entire undiminished principal.

In these days of readjustment, when we aim to stabilize the European economy, let us not forget the valiant and honest Finnish people. The plan evolved by Gen. George Marshall will be deficient if it does not provide amply for struggling countries like Finland. But entirely aside from the Marshall plan, in view of the billions already spent and about to be expended in Europe, it would be a splendid and a worth-while gesture to remit the outstanding indebtedness to Finland. It would be a reward for honesty, integrity, and courage.

Polish Relief Program Bogged Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, after checking with the Parcel Post Overseas Shipments Division of the Post Office Department, I have received the following report on parcel-post packages sent to Poland and to Germany. I have had them broken down on a monthly basis. The report shows that parcel-post shipments to Germany are four and five times as great as the shipments to Poland.

The Polish shipments for May and June 1947 are particularly disturbing, and it is difficult to understand why they have dropped so low in the last 2 months. This report clearly calls for the most energetic, concentrated, and united effort of all individuals, clubs, and organizations. The Polish people need our assistance desperately. We must help them.

Of the fall sowings, 23 percent of their rye, 44 percent of their wheat, and 62 percent of their vegetable oil seeds were destroyed, and a total or over 1,000,000 hectares of fall planting was killed by the severe winter. The spring crop is suffering because of the terrible drought. There has been no rain during April, May, and June thus far. President Truman stressed the urgency of immediate relief in his message to Congress.

The War Department spent over $1,000,000,000 in Germany in 1946. With the help of Mr. Hoover and others, another billion dollars will be dumped into Germany this year. Besides this, the report shows that Germany is receiving through private parcel-post packages more relief than Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Greece, and all of the victims of Nazi aggression combined.

Certainly the American friends of these people who have suffered so much will not let them down.

For Poland

1945:	*Pounds*
October (when program commenced)	31,700
November	467,841
December	340,160

	Pounds
1946:	
January	584,063
February	111,308
March	1,072,656
April	1,393,675
May	2,617,182
June	1,339,888
July	2,091,137
August	2,239,444
September	2,548,544
October	4,161,880
November	3,749,919
December	3,174,096
1947:	
January	3,747,389
February	2,574,335
March	1,797,737
April	4,353,829
May	1,529,283
Up to June 18, 1947	794,910
For Germany	
1946: December	15,000,000
1947:	
January	8,800,000
February	10,300,000
March	14,800,000
April	15,600,000
May	10,500,000

The Atom Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which I delivered on June 17 at Tulane University before a forum sponsored by Tulane and Loyola Universities:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am indeed glad to be here tonight on the campus of my alma mater, and to participate in this discussion sponsored jointly by Tulane and Loyola Universities. I am flattered that you should ask me here to talk about some of the social and political implications of atomic energy. After all is said and done, it is the central problem facing all of humankind today; so grim are its potentialities in the field of international relations. I fervently wish that I could tell you that great progress is being made and that man's political institutions were at last abreast his scientific ingenuity. But such is not the case.

The other speakers here tonight have been part and parcel of the great scientific team which made possible this new force for good and for evil in our world. They know so much better than you and I can know the awful implications as well as the promises of a better day for mankind, as a result of their discoveries and inventions. And certainly it would serve no point for me to attempt to enter any discussion within the complex technical realm of their unique knowledge. As an American citizen, however, I, as you, have attempted to learn as much as possible about the subject from the standpoint of its effect upon the world in which we live.

There have been available to those of us who are laymen the printed copies of the exhaustive hearings conducted last year before the McMahon committee in the Senate of the United States; the reports filed by the Army on the results of the bombings in Japan; the Navy documents on Operations Crossroad; the Acheson-Lilienthal report, and the Baruch recommendations or the American plan submitted to the United Nations for the international control of atomic energy.

I believe that every study, whether made by the military, by impartial and conscientious laymen, or by scientists, has come to the conclusion that there must be effective international control of atomic energy, if we are to prevent world catastrophe on a scale heretofore undreamed of.

I need not here engage in any flight of rhetoric to describe what may happen if we fail. That great elder statesman, Bernard Baruch, has said that already we are in a struggle between the quick and the dead. The picture of the next war has been painted by far greater artists than I. Suffice it to say that in the next war our country, with 50,000,000 people living in crowded cities, with our complex and interdependent industrial machinery, with our highly centralized Government, will be the principal target, and this time our institutions, our great plants, our schools, our churches, our centers of learning will be turned into heaps of rubble and the love of truth, of freedom, and justice which has built them will be buried in the rubble. Millions of us may die, and millions of our children may die, and all that has made life full of hope and meaning for us may disappear. The race of men that will emerge from all of this will be men of yet more unstable natures; they will be poorer men; they will be more frightened, more superstitutious and weaker and they may be men living without the hope of justice and happiness. They may have lost all the instincts of freedom.

With the knowledge at hand, it seems incomprehensible that statesmen would not sit around the conference tables and within a reasonable period of time perfect the machinery required to effectively prevent an atomic war. How impatient the scientists of all nations must be. Again and again they must say to themselves, "Are the leaders of the world deranged? Certainly they must know how critical the danger is. The mere existence of this weapon should insure the end of war."

In the final analysis, it is perfectly obvious that there is no real security against the bomb except the elimination of war, and the most certain way to eliminate war would be the setting up within the United Nations of a world government of limited sovereignty, based on law, possessed of overwhelming force and supported by the confidence of the peoples of the earth. We cannot achieve this by international control of atomic energy alone, but it would be the beginning of world government.

One of the most enlightened books on the subject of war and peace was written some years ago by Mr. Emery Reves. He calls his book the Anatomy of Peace. In it he shows the intimate relationship between unbridled nationalism and war. He traces the growth of the concept of sovereignty from the family to the clan, to the city, to the state, to present-day nations. He points out how practical it is for various political subdivisions to exercise limited sovereignty.

(For instance, here in Louisiana we have drainage districts, school districts, fire districts, ward, parish, municipal, and State political subdivisions, as well as the Federal Government exercising limited and well-defined sovereignty over us.) He shows the growth of the American constitutional system, and the development of our Federal Government on a program of limited powers. It is his conclusion that only by the delegation of sovereignty in the fields of armaments and war making to a world organization dedicated to the preservation of peace by force if necessary can world peace be guaranteed. It is a sound, logical, and unassailable thesis. The difficulty about all of this, however, is that we are faced with very practical realities. That despite the existence of the bomb; that despite the universal understanding of the necessity for international control we have made little progress, and alternatives to the ideal of international control now must be considered. But before considering these alternatives, it may be well to very briefly review our thinking immediately after the bomb was dropped and the difficulties now blocking international control.

Two years ago, when the American people were suddenly confronted with the atomic bomb, and we came to realize that in dealing with atomic energy we were dealing with the basic power of the universe—in the words of the President, "the force from which the sun draws its power," the reaction swept the country that we must, for reasons of national safety maintain the secret of this great force; that we must establish security patrols heretofore unknown in our country. But again the men who had made possible this awful force came forward and soon convinced most Americans that there was no basic secret, and that the only advantage that our Nation had was the fact that it had perfected the industrial know-how. As a result of one of the most enlightening debates ever conducted in our Nation in the press, over the radio, in public forums, in hearings before Senate and House committees, the people decided in favor of international control of atomic energy. This decision resulted in the plan which was presented to the United Nations by our country, and the other countries which had a part in the perfecting of the bomb.

It would be time-consuming for me to discuss those proposals, because they are known to all of us. In the opinion of statesmen, laymen, scientists, these proposals are most generous for we would completely forsake whatever monopoly we may enjoy. They involve fundamentally the relinquishment of national control of the sources of and development of atomic energy.

Our proposals were accepted by all the United Nations except the Russians and their satellite, Poland, who has refused because they will not (1) relinquish the veto power, and (2) permit international inspection.

Effective international control with a veto power retained nationally is utterly silly and unthinkable. Likewise to contemplate control without free and uncensored inspection is equally foolish.

It therefore appears at this time that the one sure way of controlling future wars and the atomic bomb is hopelessly mired in the diplomatic double-talk of the Kremlin.

And that, my friends, brings us to a discussion of alternatives, most of which are unpleasant, and all of which will involve continued sacrifice on the part of the American people if the institutions of freedom are to survive and if an atomic war is to be prevented. But none of them can give a guarantee against that catastrophe. Within the realm of alternatives, many people have seriously discussed what has been termed a "preventive war." Their argument goes about as follows:

We now have the industrial know-how. We are some years ahead of Russia. Russia has conclusively demonstrated that she has no desire to cooperate with the rest of the world, and while we are able and have the preponderance of force, we should immediately attack Russia, leveling her cities, destroying the Communist regime, and establishing a democratic administration in order to insure Russian participation in a cooperative world movement for peace.

This argument has much logic, but it too is entirely unrealistic. Our Nation would never sanction such a war, and we would be torn by internal dissension; in addition to this, whatever claim to moral leadership we might have we would lose by fighting such a so-called "preventive war," which by any other word would be labeled "aggressive."

Therefore, it is the considered opinion of the vast majority of the people today that a so-called "preventive war" just won't work and won't happen. What next then as alternatives?

President Truman, in his address before the Canadian Parliament last week restated the ideals and objectives of the United States when he declared that we are seeking "a peaceful world, a prosperous world, a free world, a world of good neighbors. We intend to support those who are determined to govern themselves in their own way and who honor the right of others to do likewise. We intend to aid those who respect the dignity of the individual, who guarantee him equal treatment under law, and who allow him the widest possible latitude to work out his own destiny and achieve success to the limit of his capacity. We intend to cooperate activity and loyally with all who honestly seek, as we do, to build a better world in which mankind can live in peace and prosperity."

This is a reaffirmation of the historic American tradition. The difficulty about it is that in the past we have spoken in these words, but we have not maintained the power to back them up. The result has been that Hitler did not take us seriously and by a combination of intrigue, propaganda, political warfare and fifth columns, subjugated the smaller nations of Europe. Today we see a repetition in Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Finland—in all of the countries of eastern Europe. Documents produced in the Nuremberg trials proved conclusively that Hitler's timetable was scheduled upon the weaknesses of the western democracies. Had these weaknesses not existed history may have been quite different.

Therefore, it seems to me that until such time as Russia decides to enter the society of free nations there is only one alternative that we can follow in order to prevent World War III.

The first part of this alternative is the so-called Truman doctrine, supplemented with a program for Europe. It is doubtful that Russia has the slightest concept today of a shooting war, but it is, and has been, conducting a political war—principally throughout the continent of Europe. Therefore, we must evolve a positive program for Europe, such a program taking into account the conditions under which communism thrives and spreads—hunger, disease, insecurity, unstable economic systems, reactionary and undemocratic governments, and excessive and senseless nationalism.

We must have a program for Europe—all of Europe. Not a program for Greece, or for Turkey, or for Italy, or for France, but a program for the whole of Europe, so that Europe can become economically self-sustaining, and can become economically strong so that in itself it will be a bulwark against the spread of communism by solving its social and economic problems.

That is why at the behest of many of our constituents Senator FULBRIGHT, Senator THOMAS, and I have been pressing for the enactment of a resolution endorsing the formation of a United States of Europe, and that is why the Kremlin has been opposing that plan. In all of the Russian propaganda spread throughout the world the central theme is that an economic collapse in the United States is inevitable. The piece-meal feeding of millions upon millions of American dollars to a failing economic and nationalistic structure in Europe could very well hasten such an economic collapse within our own country.

We have been encouraged in the past several days by the endorsement of the necessity of a positive European policy by Secretary of State Marshall, first in his splendid address of several days ago at Harvard, and a few days later in his letter to Senator VANDENBERG, endorsing in principle our resolution. The idea has appealed to statesmen for generations, but it now is a virtual necessity for the preservation of Europe and the United States. The essential thing is that a constructive, positive way has been pointed, and the Truman doctrine, supplemented by a Western European Confederation, now begins to take form. It appeals to the common sense as well as the idealism of the American people, and the way is left open for Russian participation, if Russia can forget her suspicions long enough to examine our proposals.

The second part of our alternative involves the maintenance of American power. It is sad to contemplate that with so much needed in the fields of education, of public health, of housing, of public works, flood control, and the public welfare generally, that our Nation and the other democracies of the world must continue to burden themselves with a tremendous load of debt and taxes to maintain an army, navy and air force second to none and the most modern and expensive facilities for scientific research in the field of military power. Yet more men are under arms today throughout the world than at any previous peacetime period, and if we desire to prevent the calamity of an atomic war, we must maintain our power. There is no point in kidding ourselves about this matter. There is only one possible nation on the face of the globe today that could involve us in war—Russia. And here too history is important. The documents leading up to the Stalin-Hitler pact have been carefully studied by the British and American experts. They reveal that despite all of the years of friction between Hitler and Stalin, Stalin above all, wanted peace in order to develop his economy. They show that he made numerous concessions in order to avoid war, and when the German attack finally came, many Russian divisions acting on orders did not respond in the hope that even then war could be averted. As I pointed out previously, the Hitler documents show that World War II developed principally because of the lack of an intelligent social and economic program to prevent the rise of nazism and fascism in Europe, and secondly by the lack of power on the part of democracies to stop its spread once it was under way. So that today, as long as the world is divided as it appears to be, the American Nation must remain superbly strong economically and militarily. The isolationists of 1947 would bring us into World War III more rapidly than they brought us into World War II. The appeasers today are every bit as dangerous as the appeasers at Munich. The "business as usual" and "back to normalcy" boys who would abandon our power in order to promote selfish gains are the heralds of the atomic war.

Many of you have no doubt read the Compton committee report on the necessity of universal training. That committee is made up of citizens of highly divergent political beliefs. It includes some of the best known educators of America. The committee reached the unanimous conclusion that the only way we can lend authority to our position in international affairs and to inspire confidence in the determination of the United Nations to enforce peace, is to maintain our armed strength at a level of efficiency and power that will defy challenge by any would-be aggressor. The committee has come to a clear, unanimous, and forthright conviction about the course which our country should follow in respect to universal training. Our Nation has been warned that unless its recommendations are adopted, in spite of the costs involved, that the United States may soon risk calamitous defeat at the hands of an aggressor power which in a few years will possess the know-how of the atom bomb, and other instruments of destruction now unknown to the public. The report should shake Americans out of their complacency.

All over the Nation we are seeing a revival of the thinking which prevailed prior to World War II that our Nation could not be attacked successfully, and the consequent weakening of our armed forces. This thinking made possible the Second World War, and it will make possible a third world war. There is a fundamental difference this time, however. Before the First World War, and the Second World War, we had the time to prepare, and, in addition, man had not invented the atom bomb and the other fantastic weapons of destruction.

The alternative which I have put forward is certainly not new or novel and it is grim. It carries all the implications of being prepared for instant atomic warfare: underground installation, decentralization of our cities, great delegation of powers to small groups, frightful costs. But have any of you in light of the developments of the past 2 years, in light of Russia's aggressive and expansionist attitude a better or a safer solution? God knows the democratic world yearns for it.

In conclusion, in order to avoid the horrors of an atomic war, it is my belief that we must continue to press for international control of the sources and the production of atomic energy, and we must continue to insist on a program similar to the one now pending before the United Nations. This is the real hope of humanity, and if adopted it would permit mankind to reduce its armaments, and to devote its wealth to the manifold problems of the human race. It would also permit the rapid development of the peacetime uses of atomic energy, bringing wealth and happiness to millions upon millions of people everywhere. Unfortunately, however, before such a plan is adopted, there must be a change of attitude on the part of the rulers of the Kremlin, and there must be a change in the present Russian policy of aggression and expansion. Until that change comes, the alternative seems to be the development of a positive program in Europe, which will remove the soil in which communism thrives, and will make possible the reconstruction and reconstitution of a great and strong democratic society on that continent. At the same time, the strengh and power of our own democracy as a world leader must be maintained, despite the cost and the sacrifices which such a program inevitably means.

Synthetic Scandal in Occupational Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the occupational currency question has been bandied about and has reached the level of near scandal. Much of the yapping is, of course, cheap, but nefarious, political claptrap intended for partisan political gain and emanates from political sources. Gleaned from the pages of the Detroit News is a brief, but comprehensive, fact-packed editorial bearing on the subject which should dispel the smoke and clear the atmosphere, even though it might not drive to cover the mouthy partisan.

AMERICAN GREED WAS THE CAUSE

The Senate demand for an inquiry into the reports that the United States has redeemed

millions of dollars worth of German occupation money printed by the Russians is our latest national sensation.

As the incident is reported, it makes our Army authority look like a pack of chumps, witlessly taken in by the conniving Russians. The stories have been somewhat artfully slanted that way.

But this view simply ignores the real circumstances.

When the war ended it was necessary to void the currency system of Hitler's Reich and to substitute a system which would be based upon the economic plan and purposes of the Allied armies. At that time we still believed that all would work together toward a reunified Germany.

Consequently the occupation currency was intended for use by all armies. It became legal tender with the Russian Army as with our own. Whether the Russians borrowed plates from us to print money, as is reported, is only incidental to the fact that they had the same right to pay their troops in occupational currency as had we.

But the system broke down not because of Russian plotting but because of American greed. Had not our own people gone into the German black market with all four feet, there could have been no hurt to our finances.

They sold the Russian wrist watches, alarm clocks, picture frames, and every kind of junk at many times its real value. In many cases American families shipped their sons cigarettes, foodstuffs, and other goods just so they could deal in this market and swindle Russians out of hard earned war pay.

Where is the money today? Do the Russians have it? Not at all. All that they have to show for the squandered millions is a certain number of new possessions, largely manufactured in this country, which aren't worth 5 cents on the dollar.

The money is in American banks, put there by dishonest American hands, after Russian occupation money had been converted into American dollars. True, the Army might have stopped this larceny by a stiffer discipline. But we should at least recall that at that time the whole Nation was riding hard in exactly the opposite direction.

McGregor Objects to Petroleum Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I note in the newspapers of today that President Truman is greatly disturbed over the Nation's critical petroleum supply shortage and I also note that Secretary of Interior J. A. Krug declares it may be necessary to again ration gasoline and fuel oil.

I would like to call your attention to an Associated Press release issued from San Pedro, Calif., and I quote:

RED SHIPS LOAD UNITED STATES OIL—HEAVIEST MOVEMENT OF PETROLEUM SUPPLIES TO RUSSIA REPORTED

SAN PEDRO, CALIF., June 15.—The heaviest movement of petroleum supplies to Russia reported by Los Angeles harbor officials was well under way today as the 50,000-barrel Soviet tanker, *Elbras*, loaded oil and gasoline.

Two other 50,000-barrel oilers, the *Emba* and the *Krasnia Armia*, arrived yesterday and were scheduled for early loading. A fourth vessel, the *Taganrog*, of 65,000-barrel capacity, is due Thursday, the Marine Exchange said.

Russian tankers have been loading petroleum products here on regular voyages during and since the war. The purchase is being made through the Amtorg Trading Co., Soviet agency with offices at Long Beach and San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, I insist that the exporting of our petroleum products to Russia be stopped immediately. Is it not about time we gave the American people some consideration?

I am wondering if this policy of exporting critical materials is not a cleverly arranged plan to maintain shortages in the United States which certainly makes our living costs remain at a high level. I firmly believe if we would stop these exports we would have sufficient amounts of everything to meet our needs in this country, which would mean our living costs would be reduced. Again I say, let us give the American people more consideration.

FEPC Resuscitators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a timely editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune. Unfortunately, this editorial pretty well sums up the reasons for the new FEPC drive. All thinking people must realize that this type of legislation will bring about the worst form of regimentation that the country has ever seen, and yet we find Republican Members of both branches of the Congress bent upon agitating this question, notwithstanding the fact that they went before the country last fall on a program of doing away with so-called New Deal regimentation.

The editorial is submitted herewith with the suggestion that these gentlemen stop, look, and listen before pressing such proposals:

FEPC RESUSCITATORS

Back of Congress' new FEPC drive is a curious mixture of idealism and politics with the idealism on the scanty side. The pressure for a vote-fishing expedition among minority groups is what is getting the bill a hearing before the Senate Labor and Welfare Subcommittee.

Members of Congress from politically close States are being told they must find a way to revive the FEPC—just any kind of a fair practices law that can be used for political propaganda in next year's campaign. That, we suppose, is back of all the compromises various supporters of the measure propose in order to get its passage. To reduce the opposition they are willing to make it apply only to employers of more than 50 workers, and one of the GOP bigwigs is thinking of asking an amendment that would leave all enforcement to the States. Give them a law, a new bureau—and it is no matter of great moment if the law is useless and harmful and the bureau expensive.

The drive has placed the Republican-dominated Congress on an uncomfortable seat. Most of the 100 or more groups behind the FEPC movement do not like the present Congress. They have denounced its economy-mindedness and generally they don't like its labor bill. But they are quite ready to have the GOP majority believe it can extend its sweep in 1948 by creating a permanent "witch hunting" bureau or "thought police."

Congress has not been impressed with the progress the FEPC boosters have made with the States. In New York, where the minorities constitute a majority, there is a State FEPC. But it is a caricature on the law rather than law, since enforcement is left to a bureau which can choose among those whom it wishes to antagonize or please. Similar statutes were pressed through the New Jersey and Connecticut Legislatures, but nowhere else do the "antidiscriminationists" seem to have had any success.

Congress doesn't expect to go anywhere with the bill of New York's Senator IVES at this session. But apparently the National Council for a Permanent FEPC is willing to wait until next January when it thinks political juggling in anticipation of the Presidential campaign may get for the measure enough Republican support to put it over. They might be too optimistic, for it is evident that some Members of Congress, even in close States, have not been impressed by the home support for a Federal bureau with the obvious mischief-making potentialities of a permanent FEPC.

Taft-Hartley Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following analysis of the Taft-Hartley antilabor bill which now awaits action by President Truman, made by the Honorable Irwin Steingut, Democratic minority leader of the Assembly of the State of New York, and discussed by him at a "Heartless"-Taft labor bill meeting of the Democratic organization of Kings County in Brooklyn, N. Y., on June 11, 1947:

TAFT-HARTLEY BILL

Section 2 (2) changes the definition of an employer from "anyone acting in the interest of an employer" to "acting as an agent of an employer." This means that an employer will be responsible for the acts of his foreman or supervisor only when he authorizes their anti-labor activities. This will give employers a defense whenever charged with antiunion activities.

Mr. Justice Douglas pointed out in *International Association of Machinist's* v. *NLRB* (311 U. S. 73):

"The employer however, may have held to have assisted the formation of a union even though the acts of the so-called agents were not expressly authorized or might not be attributable to him on a strict application of the rules of respondeat superior. We are dealing here * * * with a clear legislative policy to free the collective bargaining process from all taint of the employers' compulsion, domination or influence."

By section 4 (d), the appointment of a general counsel nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate who would be in charge of all legal work and administrative, as well. Counsel would determine which cases shall be investigated, tried and enforced and he would be responsible only for clear malfeasance in office, by reason of the method of his appointment. Much of the general

counsel's work will not be reviewable on appeal to the Board or other courts. No real power is vested in the Board which is increased from three to five members. Coordination in policy is essential in order that rules and regulations, prosecutions and decisions maintain some consistency and this would require complete cohesion of effort by all of the parties charged with the enforcement of the NLRA.

Section 8 (b) (2). A union may not demand the discharge of, and under section 8 (a) (3) an employer may not discharge an employee for nonmembership in a union unless such nonmembership arises from failure to pay dues.

In this connection if a union member leads a wildcat strike, is a Communist or is a labor spy or steals union funds, he may not be discharged upon demand of the union.

There is a provision in the new law which states that any views expressed shall not constitute or be evidence of unfair labor practice unless it contains evidence of a threat or promise of a benefit. One can readily see the difficulty in presenting and being successful in such presentation of an unfair labor practice charge when the proof to be submitted is so difficult to meet the act.

The Board is now precluded from holding prehearing elections and conducting cross-checks of pay rolls against union cards. These two methods were extremely useful in matters which presented no substantial issues. This will now require a hearing in practically every case where representation heretofore was easily determinable. The bill will require the union to file voluminous and extensive records with the Secretary of Labor and the failure to comply with this section of the bill will deny to the union the right to obtain the benefits under the act. The report must show:

1. The name and address of the union.

2. Names, titles, compensation and allowances of its three principal officers and the compensation of those officers in excess of $5,000.

3. How were these officers elected, appointed or otherwise selected?

4. The initiation fee or fees for new members.

5. The regular dues in order to retain members in good standing.

6. A detailed statement of bylaws and constitution showing the procedure followed with respect to:

(a) Qualification for or restriction on membership

(b) Election of officers and stewards.

(c) Calling of regular and special meetings.

(d) Levying assessments.

(e) Imposition of fines.

(f) Authorization for bargaining demands.

(g) Ratification of contract terms.

(h) Authorization for strikes.

(i) Authorization for disbursement of union funds.

(j) Audit of union financial transactions.

(k) Participation in insurance or other benefit plans.

(l) Expulsion of members and grounds therefor.

The union must also show that it has filed with the Secretary of Labor:

(a) A report of its receipts and the source of its receipts;

(b) Its total assets and liabilities at the end of its last fiscal year; and

(c) The disbursements made during the year including the purposes for which it was made and that the union has furnished to all its members copies of the financial report required to be filed with the Secretary of Labor.

Industry and management is not required to file any such information with the Secretary of Labor or any other department or official in order to come before the NLRB, even though industry and management has been found to have committed an unfair labor-practice act or other violation of the act.

No union may receive the benefit of protection under the act unless the heads of the union file an affidavit with the Board that within the preceding 12-month period none of the officers of the labor organization nor the officers of any national or international labor organization is not a member of the Communist Party nor that he is not participating in the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. An affidavit which is false, the affiant may be punishable under the provisions of section 35A of the Criminal Code.

Unions will now be charged for the first time with unfair labor practices, such as union coercion of employees in their choice of a bargaining agent; union attempts to discriminate against employees for dual union activity; union refusal to bargain with an employer, participation by the union in jurisdictional strikes or secondary boycotts; and labor violations of a collective-bargaining agreement. There will be one election annually for a collective-bargaining representative. Every agreement would include an automatic 60-day cooling-off period. Unions would not be permitted to terminate or modify a contract without following the giving of a notice, conference, and cooling-off requirements. The closed shop is banned. The union shop and other forms of union security will be regulated more closely by the secret ballot conducted under the supervision of the NLRB. This means that on only those things which have been adopted by a union at a secret ballot, as aforesaid, the employer will be bound to negotiate with the union, and it removes the bargaining for concessions that heretofore existed in the negotiation of a contract. Individual employees would have the right to present their grievances to their employer and the employer would have the right to adjust such grievances without the act of intervention of the union. The employer would not be required to bargain with foremen supervisors. In situations affecting national industries and creating national paralysis the Federal Government would have an opportunity, through the Attorney General, to obtain an injunction without regard to the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Hague Tribute by Moore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to extend my remarks by including a news item appearing on the front page of the Jersey Journal in its edition of Wednesday, June 18, containing the address delivered at the ceremonies which took place in Jersey City on Tuesday evening, June 17, incident to the resignation of Hon. Frank Hague as mayor of that city.

The address was delivered by Hon. A. Harry Moore, the only three-time Governor of the State of New Jersey and former United States Senator. Mr. Moore began his elective public service as a member of the first City Commission of Jersey City in 1913. One of his colleagues in that first Commission was the beloved and extraordinarily popular Frank Hague. Mr. Moore has maintained his close friendship with Mayor Hague ever since that time and no one is better able to interpret the character and motives which have marked Mayor Hague's long and distinguished career.

The sentiments expressed so eloquently and with such feeling by the former Governor are those of Mayor Hague's legion of friends and followers.

In addition to the speeches referred to in the newspaper article, an address was delivered by Hon. MARY T. NORTON.

The news item follows:

HAGUE TRIBUTE BY MOORE

In the speeches delivered last night in the Dickinson High School at the demonstration in honor of Frank Hague on his retirement as mayor, an outstanding address was that of former Gov. A. Harry Moore, who, while differing at times with Frank Hague, was also proud to be associated with the mayor in many of the conspicuous accomplishments marking the Hague career of 34 years in the city commission.

Detracting in no way from the superb eulogies uttered by Congressman EDWARD J. HART, former United States Senator John Milton, and former Chief Justice Thomas J. Brogan, the Moore eulogy of Hague is printed in full because of its contents and its review of a record to which Moore for 34 years contributed in a notable way as commissioner, Governor and United States Senator.

Here is the speech of the three-times Governor, A. Harry Moore:

"In June 1913 I sat with Frank Hague as a member of the first commission in Jersey city elected under the commission government act. With hands upraised, Frank Hague, as did the rest of us at that time, took the oath of office and before God and the people of our city promised to serve Jersey City to the best of our ability.

"We were young and had dreamed and had visions of what we could do for our city.

"Time marches on. Thirty-four years have passed.

"Tonight, with emotions that are akin to sadness, I stand with him again as he relinquishes the reins of office to younger hands. While I am sorry to see him go, yet I am sure that tonight he, too, is filled with mingled emotions as memory rolls back the screen of time and he recounts the highlights of his public career. And tonight he may at least lift up his head, look into the eyes of friends and foes and say, 'I have kept the faith. I have been true to my oath, and I defy anyone to point to an act of mine that was detrimental to the best interests of the city which I love and have served.'

"I did not always agree with Mayor Hague, but as a young commissioner I was dazed at his ability and daring and captivated by his fearless efforts to give Jersey City a government of which it might well be proud.

"As a commissioner of public safety, he fell heir to a police department shot through with politics and antiquated in its methods. He was confronted with a fire department, many of whose members considered it their first duty to attend all the political picnics and dances. Oftentimes, the alarm having been sounded, a fire company would arrive at the fire with only a driver and one or two firemen.

"With his customary vigor and forthrightness, he reorganized these departments until there finally emerged a police and fire department unsurpassed for ability and equipment by any police and fire department in the world.

"Low dance halls, houses of ill fame, honky tonk joints and places where crime is bred, were never allowed to carry on their unholy practices in this city.

"During prohibition, when highjacking, thuggery, and bootlegging were rampant

throughout the Nation, never were these activities permitted to sully the good name of our city.

"Is it any wonder that he was acclaimed by the people and reelected to office?

"Well has our local paper said: 'There was never a case of protection money paid by any businessman or industrialist, even during the days when racketeers in other cities flouted the authorities by exacting tribute under threat of destroying life and property.'

"Labor found in him a fair and friendly advocate, and industry found encouragement and equity in its dealings with him.

"All over the United States mayors come and go, but what mayor of any city throughout the Nation has caused such a wave of excitement and interest in his retiring as occurred when 2 weeks ago the mayor announced his decision? The announcement drove the United Nations deliberations, the labor bill, and the tax bill from off the front page, while editors and commentators in amazed excitement proclaimed that Mayor Hague had retired. Surely, there must be something interesting about such a man.

"He has confounded and bewildered his critics by his ability to be elected and reelected to the office of mayor.

"He has been investigated time and again by experts, by politicians, by prosecutors breathing brimstone and fire, but when the shouting and the fighting died, Mayor Hague stood out calm and straight as the champion of his people who trusted and honored him.

"His critics overlooked the fact that he is a great humanitarian.

"Frank Hague never forgot the fact that he was born in the second ward and that he sprang from the ranks of the common people.

"He could have forsaken his heritage and joined forces with the rich and powerful interests but he chose rather to walk with the crowd.

"The poor and needy found in him a strong and able defender and friend. He never failed them.

"Out of his personal knowledge, he realized that there were many good but needy families who could not properly care for their sick; who could not afford to pay for nurses and the necessary needs of serious illness.

"So he dreamed his dream of a great medical institution where the poorest of the poor might get the very best in medical and surgical treatment.

"He built the medical center with more than 3,000 beds and every modern hospital accessory. There it stands second to none in the country.

"And, mark you, he did not choose as its head a political henchman, but he took a man who for more than 20 years was medical director of the Allied Hospitals of New York.

"Of course, he has made mistakes. We have all made mistakes, and like every successful man, he has felt the sting of slander and enmity.

"But he has never turned his back to the foe. He has always carried the fight to his adversaries and no matter how powerful they were, they found that Frank Hague could punch just a little harder and was just a little smarter than they were.

"When the legislature, bowing under the lash of their master's whip, sought by legislation to deprive Jersey City of millions of dollars of railroad tax money, he sprang to the defense of his city, defeated the administration in the State courts, even in the highest court of the United States, and won for his city many millions of dollars which belonged to it by right.

"Was this the act of a mercenary?

"Was this the act of one who sought emoluments from the mighty?

"A humanitarian yes, who looking over his city was intrigued by the sight of crippled children vainly trying to keep pace with more fortunate children.

"Thus the first public school for crippled children came into being and here hundreds of poor little crippled kids with their limbs clamped in braces, dragging their pain-racked bodies along, have found education, manual training, medical, and surgical attention, and were given a new horizon of life.

"In these days when colleges are crowded and entrance difficult, he realized the disappointment of those who sought a college education but could not get it. So, there came into being a city college where any ambitious boy or girl might gain their heart's desire without money and without price.

"No, it was the act of a humanitarian, a man of courage, a man of the people.

"A man who knew no master's lash but fought singly and mightily for the protection of the people.

"His fights were difficult, and perhaps he did not always come out unmarked, but he could well say with Henley:

"'In the full clutch of circumstance,
I have not winced nor cried aloud,
Under the bludgeonings of chance,
My head is bloody, but unbowed.'

"And he might well add:

"'I am the master of my fate
I am the captain of my soul.'

"Mayor Hague made enemies, but he was always loyal to his friends and he and I have been friends for 40 years or more. I have no better friend.

"I would not be true to myself if I did not credit him as leader of our party with making it possible for me to be three times a candidate for Governor of New Jersey and United States Senator.

"An old philosopher has said:

"'Let him not boast, who puts his armor on,
But he who takes it off, the victory won.'

"Here tonight, amid the acclaim of his friends and fellow citizens, the warrior takes his official armor off.

"And as he looks back over the road he has come, the victories he has won, the service he has rendered his people, his soul is satisfied.

"So as he passes from official life, fair-minded man must join with us in saying, 'Here is a man, a great man, a great humanitarian.'"

A Gruesome Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, from the noise coming from the administration's cheering section, it would appear that Secretary Marshall has won a great diplomatic victory and is measuring up to the administration's expectations. He evidently has decided to continue the State Department's policy that all wounds and all troubles can be healed with American dollars. The fact that we have expended approximately $15,000,000,000 in Europe and Asia since the war, with disastrous results, bothers him not a bit.

The latest diplomatic victory the administration is crowing about is that the Secretary of State has actually succeeded in talking Europe into accepting some $20,000,000,000, in addition to present commitments, from the American taxpayer during the next 3 or 4 years, and, as in the past, the steam and propaganda for this insane financial undertaking seems to stem from our own State Department.

The following news item—a guesome story—indicates that all Europe is in favor of grabbing United States gold, provided we agree to further concessions:

SEEK UNITED STATES GOLD HOARD TO BACK MARSHALL PLAN—EUROPE MAY INSIST ON FREE TRADE

(By Henry Wales)

PARIS, June 15.—Europe will eliminate customs barriers and prohibitive tariffs and adopt an identical money standard if the United States will abandon its protective systems against cheap foreign labor and toss the gold reserve buried at Fort Knox into a common jackpot. (The total gold holdings in the United States as of June 11 were more than $21,000,000,000.)

The Tribune learned today that is the essence of a preliminary agreement thus far reached by advance conversations among the British, French, Dutch, Belgians, and Luxemburgers in response to Secretary of State Marshall's offer to let American taxpayers pay for the Old World's reconstruction and modernization estimated by some observers to cost $24,000,000,000.

BEVIN LOSES NO TIME

British Foreign Secretary Bevin is losing no time to make Britain the spokesman for Europe and persuade the continental nations to support the British viewpoint on the terms to be imposed on the United States for acceptance of the latter's aid.

Downing Street also believes that Sweden and Switzerland and even Spain should participate as they form an integral part of Europe and must be included if the Continent expects a quick revival. London does not consider that Eire should share in the deal but should look to Britain for help.

Seeking elbow room from British domination in the scheme and placating the powerful local Communist Party, the French Government seeks to draw the Kremlin into the conversations, but thus far Russian Foreign Minister Molotov has declined to respond to the invitation.

REJECTS RESTRICTIONS

The leftist newspaper Franc-Tireur today remarked that Washington is forced to resuscitate Europe to provide a market for American surplus manufactured goods, as otherwise a depression would swamp the United States.

"Let America level her customs barriers, and abandon tariffs and accept other payment than dollars," the editorial said.

Franc-Tireur also rejected any restrictions on various nations subsidizing various industries even though they are condemned in advance to lose money, as it would impinge on sovereignty. Furthermore, it added, every state is entitled to decide what industries it requires for national defense and security.

PROPOSES UN SUPERVISION

The editorial further proposed that the whole scheme be shifted out of the hands of the United States and European governments and placed within the jurisdiction of the United Nations, with Uncle Sam delivering the key to his bullion vaults and letting the international politicians decide how to divide the precious metal.

Communist Leader Maurice Thorez's mouthpiece, l'Humanite, warned Marshall that the stipulation of any conditions or strings on American bounty will split Europe into the east and west.

"We must be extremely careful about accepting Marshall's proposals or it will cut Europe in two and deliver a helpless France

to the subtle intrigues of American imperialism," l'Humanite warned.

OTHERS MORE RESERVED

"If there are any conditions attached to Marshall's offer, then American control on European economy compromises the political independence of every government accepting it," the editorial said. "It is absurd to believe that the Soviets would permit intervention of American capitalism in their economy."

Rightist and centrist newspapers took a more reserved view and while insisting that France can accept no foreign dictation, they urged acceptance and grabbing of the gold offered before American public opinion turns cold on the bickering and haggling over terms and forces Washington to withdraw the offer.

My Trip to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jack Hamilton, 9 years old, fourth grade, Central School:

[From the B. and W. Boilermaker of May 1947]

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON

(By Jack Hamilton, 9 years old, fourth grade, Central School)

Early Thursday morning, May 8, I joined a happy group of Barberton patrol boys at the B. & O. Railway Station. In spite of the snow and cold we got on the train with faces all aglow to start our "never-to-be-forgotten trip" to our Nation's Capital. It was a most enjoyable train ride.

Then at breakfast time we were served sandwiches and milk. At lunch time we went into the dining car to eat, and that is quite an experience. As we went on our way we came to Sand Patch, W. Va., which is 2,250 feet above sea level. The people around Sand Patch get snowed in when there are heavy snows, and planes have sometimes dropped down food to the people. There is one family who have a dog, and when the engineer of the train blows the whistle the dog comes to the train. The conductor throws out some newspapers he has tied together, then the dog catches them and runs home. We have arrived in Washington, and there is great excitement among us, and we can see the Capitol with its great dome high up against the sky. The fine Union Railway Station is the largest station in the world without roof supports.

We walked to the Plaza Hotel, and after we ate dinner we went out walking. We saw the Senate Building, the Capitol, and the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress contains the largest collection of books and maps in the world.

We looked at the Union Station from across the street, then went back to the hotel.

After a good night's sleep we got up at 6 a. m. Friday morning. We ate a very good breakfast, then our sight-seeing bus came for us. Our first stop was the United States Mint, where we saw them making 5-, 10-, 20-, and 50-dollar bills. We even saw a 200-dollar bill.

From there we went to the FBI Building. There we saw articles taken from saboteurs. There was a cane and inside a sword was hidden. The FBI showed us chemicals that are used to find hidden words in letters. We saw guns belonging to criminals. The story of John Dillinger's capture was told to us. We were taken down to the shooting gallery in the basement where the FBI men practice shooting at paper dummies. From there we went to the Washington Monument.

The elevator carried us nearly to the top, a height of 555 feet. We stepped out on a platform and through little windows we had a bird's-eye view of the city. Most of us walked down instead of riding in the elevator. There were 898 steps and I was one who walked down. Boy, did I have sore legs after that! From there we went to the White House. We went up a broad stairway and went into the East Room where all the formal receptions are held. There was a beautiful gold piano there. Then we looked into the Blue Room, Red Room, and Green Room.

We got on our bus again and rode by the foreign Embassies. Then to the House of Representatives and to Mr. HUBER'S office. Mr. HUBER took us through the tunnel to the Capitol. Each one of us sat on the Speaker's chair in the House Chamber. At night when the Representatives are in session, two lights burn on the dome of the Capitol. Mr. HUBER took us to the basement of the Capitol to see the tomb where George Washington was going to be buried. But they found in his will that he wanted to be buried at Mount Vernon and that is where he is buried. We came upstairs and as we looked up into the great dome of the Capitol we saw a beautiful painting.

Before the artist finished the painting he fell to his death and another artist had to finish it. In this room if you whisper your voice carries across the room. On our tour through the Capitol with Mr. HUBER we saw beautiful paintings and marble figures. As we came out of the Capitol Building we saw two marble figures, one of Christopher Columbus and an Indian girl. The other represents a pioneer fighting with a savage.

We came down the broad flight of stairs and walked back to the hotel for lunch. After lunch our bus took us to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and we were in time to see the changing of guards. In front of the tomb there was a bed of beautiful tulips. From there we went to Alexandria to see the little church where George Washington worshipped. On our way to Mount Vernon we passed the airfield and saw President Truman's private plane called Sacred Cow. When we arrived at Mount Vernon we found it was being redecorated. So we couldn't see so much, but we did visit the kitchen. From Mount Vernon we went to the Lincoln Memorial. There are 57 steps, one for each year of his life. There is a lovely marble figure of Abraham Lincoln.

We returned to the hotel, and after eating supper we went to the theater at the base of Washington Monument. After the theater we went back to the hotel and then to bed. On Saturday was the big parade. There were 15 States represented, 15,000 boys, and 29 divisions. It was a wonderful parade, and we were all very proud of ourselves. We all wore hats, belts, and tee shirts the same. The parade was over by lunch time. After eating we went to the Zoo.

We saw all kinds of wild animals and two gorillas. Also the cutest little prairie dogs.

Then we went to the Philadelphia-Washington ball game. It was an exciting game, with Washington winning.

Washington is a beautiful city with lovely lawns and trees in nearly all the streets. The grounds around the buildings are beautiful. We checked out of the hotel at 8 p. m. and boarded the train for Barberton, arriving home at 8 a. m. Sunday morning.

We all had such a good time, and I want to take this opportunity to thank the American Automobile Association Club and the Central Labor Union for making this trip for us possible. And thanking Officer Seryak, Mr. Cordray, and Dr. Benner for taking such good care of us, and for all thoughtful things they did for us. The Barberton Patrol Boys have been very lucky to have Officer Seryak over us.

Aid for Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered in Greek Parliament on the message of President Harry Truman, concerning the help to Greece, by George Bacopoulos, deputy for Athens:

[Translated from the Journal of Proceedings of May 5, 1947]

G. BACOPOULOS. Gentlemen, it is clear from the contents of the communications made by the President of the Council, or at least such is the impression given therefrom, that their main point is the one referring to the decision of the people of the United States and their great President, Mr. Truman, to save Greece from the total economic collapse that is now imminent; an event which would have decided the fate of the Greek state and the Greek society; to save Greece from the threat of communism and slavism lurking at its back. And this impression is justified, because this is, indeed, the principal subject of the communications. In the course of the debate on these communications, however, this subject was confined to a secondary place. It is reasonable that the debate should principally devolve around the question of public order and the security of the state. It was proper that the debate should cover this burning question, and previous speakers have reported events of great importance, especially those described for the first time, with such convincing force and national feeling, by Mr. Eliades, the honorable and so hardly tried Florina member. This, however, does not justify the transfer of the principal subject of the Government's statements to a secondary degree and its being placed on a plane almost equal to nonexistence.

As though it had itself been subjected to an attack by the parastatal organizations, which were so triumphantly led to this House by the distinguished diplomat and experienced politician from Argolis and Corinthia. And as if frightened by this attack it drew away from sight to avoid the danger. It dived down into the swamp, shall we say, of untimely and purposeless debate on parastatal organizations in order to avoid moral injury.

It would appear that there is still an insufficient apprehension of the moral and material omnipotence of the decision of the people of the United States to put an end to the activities of small or big agitators, the enemies of democratic principles and international justice. All talk about parastatal organizations, which in fact do not even exist, at this time and after this important decision, is mere pettishness. Assistance has last year been granted to us by Great Britain, and we are grateful for it, but no decision was taken to put an end to the unsettled conditions and the gradual undermining of Greece, owing to bad neighbours, because the assistance granted was not accompanied by a will to this effect. All sorts of parastatal organizations, EAM, Communist, NOF, SNOF, etc., and everything that goes against the decision of the great American commonwealth to impose justice and peace on earth, will be swept away like

toys by the irresistable current of the creative capacity of the American spirit.

Let us only pray that this spirit will also extend its directive capacity and interest in Greece to all aspects of society and even of the State, and let us ignore the malignant and calculated calumnies that this decision should serve imperialistic aims of the great American democracy. What a blasphemy! But this blasphemy is being uttered by those who in their fight for supremacy have made it a principle to distort even the simplest truth. The great decision of the American commonwealth, to assist and save Greece, derives from the tradition first created on that historic day of July 4, 1776, and the cause is that small nations are facing the danger of losing their freedom.

In 1776 the heroes of the American Revolution and founders of the present great Commonwealth wrote in that historic document by which they declared the independence of the United States, that all men have equal rights, among which are the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. It is from this declaration that the tradition starts, which led to the present great decision. And it is not the first time that Americans take up the defense of the freedom of small peoples. In the course of time this tradition took solid roots in the history of the United States.

In 1822 President Monroe declared that the United States would not be indifferent in case the independence of any people of the Western Hemisphere were to be threatened by any European power. This took place at the time of the Greek revolution during which many Americans came here and assistance of all sorts was sent to support the Greeks in their fight for liberty; an assistance granted with the knowledge of the American Government but without its pursuing any imperialistic aim whatever.

In 1863 Abraham Lincoln, the greatest of Presidents, manifested again, with his famous Proclamation of Emancipation, the belief of American spirit in liberty and the right of all to be free.

Inspired by this belief, Americans fought in 1889 against Spain for the liberation of Cuba. They defeated Spain and occupied the island. They kept it just as long as was necessary to reconstitute it economically and to organize it as an independent state, and then departed. During the period of their occupation they had not omitted to organize a sanitary service which freed the island from the scourge of yellow fever.

True to the same tradition, Americans have sent their armies to Europe in both World Wars to fight for the freedom of peoples and international justice. And we all know the share of their contribution to the victory over the evil spirits of humanity as personified in the Italian Duce, the German führer, and Boris of Bulgaria, in their attempt to subjugate other nations. In all these cases there is not the slightest sign of an intention to follow an imperialistic policy on the part of the American Commonwealth, but only sacrifices in the interest of the freedom of others. But even if the assistance granted to us and the interest shown by the people of the United States in our country, does have the sense of an imperialistic policy, we accept it with pleasure, because it is incomparably preferable to find ourselves under the political influence of such a people than to come under the yoke of criminal communism and barbaric Slavism [applause]: under the influence of a people whose political leaders are competing as to who will be the first to serve international justice in the case of their beloved Greece. Just a few hours ago the news was given over the radio that one of the leaders of the Republican Party, Senator from the State of Ohio, leader of the Senate majority, son of the late President William Taft, and one of the candidates for the office of President, Mr. ROBERT TAFT, declared that he will insist on a speedy assistance to Greece and will oppose the amendment of the House of Representatives as regards a reduction in the amount and any other amendment attaching any strings to the assistance given.

Besides the said tradition, substantial reasons and immediate causes have called for this decision of the American Commonwealth. And these reasons have been created by those who, with actually imperialistic intentions of domination over other nations, have endangered fundamental principles for which a second world war, such a destructive one, had to be fought.

One is tempted to think that a malignant fate was jealous of the good luck that was coming to the peoples of the world, victors and vanquished, after the victory of right over injustice, of real civilization against camouflaged barbarism.

The same malignant fate which for centuries keeps appearing at important turns of humanity, at critical moments, to hinder the progress of the peoples toward mutual understanding put forth again on the international scene the malevolent spirit of the times, to protract the drama of war and unsettlement. It presented communism, this satanic organ of Slavism, by which it is threatening the independence and freedom of many peoples, for whom the Americans have fought and sustained large sacrifices.

The danger was immediate and great. We Greeks were running the greatest danger of all. In fact, from what has recently come to light, the conspiracy against our country was of a much larger scale than what we imagined. The Slavs had dangerously armed and organized much of the riffraff in Greece.

The whole world and we ourselves were wondering whether there was any hope of a "Deus ex machina" appearing to save the liberal-minded nations from the gloom of slavery and despair. And there the sunrise from the west. The message of President Truman appeared in the gloomy international horizon as an enlivening sun. Its historic contents are well known. It will constitute a most important milestone in human history. On one side it will be a breakwater against the waves of the communistic plague, which was threatening to flood over the whole of humanity, and on the other hand it will constitute the starting point for favorable evolutions. It has been an honor for us that this milestone was placed in Greece. The Fates have again set Greece as one of the advance sentinels of civilization.

It is up to us to prove ourselves worthy of this honor. It depends on us to take advantage of the good fortune sent us by God through President Truman at the most critical moment.

The Government, which includes men of high ideals and capable of fully grasping the significance of this event, should turn its undivided attention to it and prepare the premises for its realization, adapting them to American mentality which hates bureaucracy, procrastination, useless red tape, and slowness. All of us here must rally around the Government, or any other nationalist government, to contribute all we can so that the great aim of social and economic reconstruction of our country may be attained. And when our fatherland is reconstructed, thanks to the assistance of our great friends and to our own efforts, and when economic despondency and misery, into which we have sunk, on account of the war, is followed by prosperity and a moral order of things, then even the slightest vestige of the multiple organizations and rebellions will have also disappeared in the same manner as mosquitoes disappear after a morass has been drained.

Then, we may be sure that Greece will prosper. Greece will prosper, as she deserves to.

Then, grateful to God and Truman, to Truman and the people of the United States, to the people of the United States and anyone who would have cooperated for the good of Greece, we will build on the highest summit of our Macedonian mountains a replica, an immense replica of the Statue of Liberty, adorning the port of New York, with the torch in her hand to show the light to the peoples beyond our frontiers and to show to them what liberty and social justice are. With the other hand she will be crowning the statue of Truman, who will in this case symbolize the idealistic greatness of the American spirit. [Long applause.]

The Crime of Apathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE CRIME OF APATHY

The Farm Journal, like thousands of other special interests, admits it has a pet appropriation request, but unlike thousands, it is sending no wires. It is not high pressuring Congress.

This is a refreshing note to drop into the veritable battle raging over the economy cuts a Republican Congress is attempting to make in Federal expenditures.

Yes, the Farm Journal would like to see more money spent—on new crops research. But not now. It puts the "general welfare" first.

Congress is receiving big bundles of letters and telegrams imploring it not to cut favored items.

Strangely, all the petitioners are for economy but at somebody else's expense. As for their pet scheme—ah, but that's different. There are exceptions you know.

The Farm Journal's comments exemplify a constructive attitude. It might well have beaten the drums for appropriating the full amounts sought by the Agriculture Department since it works the formers' side of the street.

But this magazine and other leaders in its school of thought represent America before they represent any group therein.

"More important than any single appropriation or any single activity of the Department," it says editorially, "are these: That the Government * * * and the American dollar keep their strength; that the mammoth debt be reduced; that taxes be lowered so that men have incentive to produce.

"These things can't be accomplished unless Federal expenses are sharply lowered. Expenses can't be lowered except by cutting appropriations, and cutting them hard.

"Before any citizen sends his wire to protect some favored activity, let him ask whether the reduction of expenses and taxes will not serve him and his country better."

The Farm Journal observes that agriculture did pretty well for a great many years while the Department's funds were only a fifth as much.

And won't little pigs make pork and crops be harvested whether the Department has two billions or two millions to spend?

If people must wire their Congressmen, let them for once back their economy efforts.

They might write in an encouraging tone similar to messages from a group of Fort Wayne businessmen.

"Yours is a difficult and unpopular task," they said in a letter to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees. "Please know that you have our wholehearted support."

A sufficient number of messages like these from representative citizens, one may be very sure, would flatten the special grabbers in nothing flat. As it is, public apathy becomes an accessory in the crime of continued Government extravagance.

Southern Conference for Human Welfare a Stooge for Communism—Editorial From Memphis Commercial Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Tuesday morning, June 17, 1947, entitled "Stooge for Communism," referring to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare which the Committee on Un-American Activities has found to be a Communist-front organization.

If we had more editors with the courage and conviction of Mr. Frank R. Ahlgren, the distinguished editor of the Commercial Appeal, we would have less trouble in driving the curse of communism from American soil.

The editorial referred to reads as follows:

STOOGE FOR COMMUNISM

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare has been branded officially as a manipulated stooge for international communism.

It is, says the House Committee on Un-American Activities, "perhaps the most deviously camouflaged Communist-front organization in the United States."

That is something every American should recognize, and particularly those living in the South against whose best interests the SCHW has long labored insidiously and damagingly.

The published findings and conclusions of the House committee are contained in a document which should be read by every southern law-enforcement officer and ought to be thoroughly known and understood in every southern home.

The only welfare in which the SCHW is genuinely interested is that of communism.

It has successfully duped some splendid southerners and genuine liberals, the majority of whom, be it said to their credit, quit the group when they discovered its real purposes.

Based on an investigation the House committee conducted into activities of the SCHW, the report sets forth that the organization "seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South."

"Careful examination of its official publication (Southern Patriot) and its activities, however, will disclose that the conference actually is being used in devious ways to further basic Soviet and Communist policy.

"Decisive and key posts are in most instances controlled by persons whose record is faithful to the line of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union."

That is an undeniable fact to which the Commercial Appeal has repeatedly directed attention during the SCHW's almost decade of existence.

Exploitation of the Negro for purely selfish reasons and chiefly for the purpose of creating the type of dissension which is a prerequisite to violent revolution is fundamental with the American Communist Party and with international communism.

Activities of the SCHW in matters pertaining to Negroes too closely follow parallel basic Communist policies to be something of mere coincidence, and on that score the report says this:

"In allying themselves with the Communists and in permitting the Communists to control policy and strategic positions, the non-Communists in the Southern Conference for Human Welfare are wittingly or unwittingly promoting the following fundamental principles of the Communist Party in dealing with the Negro question:

"1. The Communists are not interested in the long-range welfare of the Negro. They are interested rather in using the issue as an explosive and revolutionary tinder in destroying American democracy.

"2. They have placed themselves on record as favoring an independent Negro Soviet Republic in the southern Black Belt, which, in essence, is a call to civil war in which the Negro population would be the unhappy victims and in which all their social gains in recent years would be sacrificed."

There's no regard for human or southern welfare in any such objective as that.

The report names names—does not neglect to point out that Clark Howell Foreman, president of SCHW, "has been most successful in confusing the people as to the Communist-front character" of his group.

Besides setting forth a conclusion as to the Communist camouflage, the committee finds that—

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare "shows unswerving loyalty to the basic principles of Soviet foreign policy."

That it "has consistently refused to take sharp issue with the activities of either the Communist Party, U. S. A., or the Soviet Union."

That it "has maintained in decisive posts persons who have the confidence of the Communist press,"

That it "has displayed consistent anti-American bias and pro-Soviet bias, despite professions, in generalities, of love for America."

Such an indictment is sufficient to condemn it in the minds of all earnest Americans.

The House committee has done the South a great service in debunking this organization which has so misused the cloak of humanitarianism to hide its machiavellian scheming.

When an enemy's ugly countenance is fully seen and recognized it can be more readily, effectively repelled.

There is no room in the South for the evil things of which the SCHW is the evil agent-provocateur.

Propaganda Activities of Government Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the consideration and information of my colleagues a broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on Thursday, June 12, 1947.

The broadcast will give the Members of the House first-hand information regarding the propaganda activities of Government personnel, particularly in the Agriculture Department, and their campaign to influence the action of Congress and maintain the enormous wartime pay roll of the administration.

The letter contained herein, in addition to being an illegal act on the part of the sender, is misleading to the extreme.

The broadcast follows:

If you're interested in knowing why it's so difficult for Congress to accomplish any reductions in appropriations and in Government spending, I have here before me tonight an original document which should be of interest to you. I found this afternoon that it was of such interest to the Senate Appropriations Committee that they demanded that I turn it over to them after this broadcast tonight, as evidence for the Government in Federal prosecution by the Department of Justice. (Seems like the Department of Justice is getting a lot of business here tonight.)

The Agriculture Department appropriation bill which has been passed by the House of Representatives, and is now before the Senate Appropriations Committee provided certain reductions under President Truman's budget requests, in appropriations for soil conservation and for price-support activities.

This is a letter, mailed under Government frank, free Department of Agriculture mail, with the usual penalty for private use and so forth, and it is mimeographed with the letterhead, United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Agricultural Conservation Program, Elkhorn, Nebr., June 9, 1947. And it is signed by George C. Bull, chairman for Douglas County.

The letter reads as follows:

"Farm Owners and Operators:

"The House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, has taken action which cut the $300,000,000 committed by the Seventy-ninth Congress to $165,000,000, thus reducing the amount farmers should receive for approved conservation practices.

"They also voted to no longer allocate to the Department of Agriculture $148,000,000 of the money derived from excise taxes, heretofore used in supporting the prices of farm products.

"If this action is sustained by the Senate, when they vote on this measure in the near future, it will mean that you as well as all other farmers owning or operating land in this county cannot be paid the full amount of money appearing on your copy of the notice of approved practices, which was recently mailed to those of you who signed up before May 1, 1947. Amounts paid on practices already carried out may have to be refunded in part, possibly to the extent of 50 percent or more. The payments retained or the amounts of payments to be made depend entirely on the final action of Congress in voting funds.

"The price-support program will, of course, be curtailed if money for that purpose is not made available. The plan is to offer a so-called simplified loan program which, if the farmers fall for it, will in effect again place us at the mercy of the grain trade.

"As your elected AAA representatives, we believe it to be our duty to keep you informed of actions that affect not only the immediate status of agriculture, but that may eventually result in economic disaster for agriculture and the Nation in the years ahead.

"If price stabilization is denied farmers and no provision is made to protect the land against the damages caused by the elements, history will repeat itself and economic disaster can be the only result.

"GEORGE C. BULL,
"Chairman, Douglas County ACA."

That is the form letter sent out by official Government free mail, under Department of Agriculture letterhead, to farmers in Nebraska. Whether it has been sent out elsewhere the Senate appropriations will find out.

Now, section 18 of the United States Code, paragraph 201, provides that no money appropriated by any act of Congress shall be used directly or indirectly for any communication, letter, printed or written matter, or any other device, intended to influence, directly or indirectly, any action of Congress for or against any legislation or appropriation. And that any violations shall be punishable by dismissal from Government service of those individuals responsible, and a fine of $500 and 1 year in jail.

I called this case to the attention of Chairman STYLES BRIDGES, of the Senate Appropriation Committee, today; he ordered that I turn the letter over to the committee as evidence immediately after this broadcast, and stated that it was a flagrant example of a thoroughly immoral practice that has been operated on a wide-scale basis by virtually all departments and agencies of the Government, to resist reductions in appropriations. He said it is an excellent sample of the manner in which Government bureaus and departments use taxpayers' money to propagandize the public to support continuation of their jobs and their spending.

He said that as soon as he has this document his committee will issue subpenas for those responsible, to appear before the committee with an explanation, and that the committee will then turn the matter over to the Department of Justice, with instructions that all violations of the Federal statutes be prosecuted.

Charles Lewis Gerlach

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHARLES LEWIS GERLACH, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow and a sense of personal loss that I learned of the death of our colleague from Allentown, Pa., the Honorable CHARLES L. GERLACH.

Mr. GERLACH ably represented the Eighth Pennsylvania Congressional District in Congress since first entering the House of Representatives with the Seventy-sixth Congress.

He served with honor and distinction on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. His devotion to duty, both in the House and on the committee throughout the years of World War II, demanded its toll and contributed to his untimely death.

The Members of the Republican congressional delegation from Pennsylvania, together with the entire Congress will miss Charlie. He was a wise counselor in our delegation conferences. An outstanding Republican, he was not given to compromising principle for expediency and once knowing himself to be right, his determination for the right would not waver.

I sympathize with Mrs. Gerlach and others close to Charlie, who mourn him. May our Heavenly Father make their burdens light.

Address of Maj. Gen. L. C. Sheppard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a copy of an address delivered by Maj. Gen. L. C. Sheppard, assistant to the Commandant, United States Marine Corps, to the thirteenth annual encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Mississippi, in Jackson, Miss., on Monday, June 16, 1947:

It is my pleasure on behalf of the United States Marine Corps to extend greetings to the Department of Mississippi, Veterans of Foreign Wars on the occasion of its annual encampment. Our commandant was most distressed at not being able to keep this engagement himself, as originally planned. Unfortunately, he was required to appear before a congressional committee this morning. General Vandegrift has asked me to express his regrets to you and to extend his best wishes for a happy reunion.

It is, indeed, a pleasure for me to visit this historic Mississippi town and to experience the hospitality of the deep South. I always enjoy attending veterans' gatherings and reminiscing with old comrades in arms.

In the first year of the war, when I was in command of the Ninth Marines, I had in my regiment a lieutenant from Jackson, Miss., by the name of Lewis H. Wilson. During training this young officer showed great promise of becoming an outstanding leader. I was later pleased to have my opinion justified when he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism above and beyond the call of duty during operations on Guam. Wilson is now a major in our corps, and the city of Jackson has every reason to be proud of its distinguished son.

It is apparent from the newspapers that the veteran is beginning to assume a rightful share of influence in national affairs.

From considerable experience with speeches at gatherings of this nature I have found that it is customary to tell a story at this point. Again from experience, I can tell you that a great many of those stories are rather ancient. However, I am going to tell one that is more than 300 years old, but which I believe will be in keeping with the subject of my remarks.

In the year 1630 the British Parliament received a petition about a tax matter which began: "We, the people of England." Naturally, the members of Parliament were keenly interested immediately. However, they noticed that the petition was signed with only nine names. An investigation was made and they discovered that all of the signers were tailors, who lived on Tooley Street, near London Bridge.

Today, 300 years later, this practice is still in vogue. I have noticed in the Letters to the Editor columns of most newspapers that it is a habit of many writers who are veterans to begin by saying, "We veterans of World War II."

Now I think it is quite apparent that no government can determine its policies merely on the advice of "nine tailors from Tooley Street" or from a few veterans. There are nearly 15,000,000 veterans from World War II alone. The veterans are not a majority in our Nation of 140,000,000 people. However, we must consider that the families of veterans are as much concerned as the veterans themselves by what is, or is not, done to aid the veteran. By including the families it has been estimated that this group will include anywhere from one-third to one-half of all our citizens.

Of course, it is obvious that the opinions of individuals are important. That is a basic tenet of democracy. The majority is not always right, but it is fact-proved by history that the majority is very seldom entirely wrong.

It is another tenet of democracy that public opinion is stronger than the Congress or a legislature. Public opinion is strong, but it is many-headed and has a tendency to sleep. Without freedom of expression and our jealously guarded freedom of the press, public opinion might well remain dormant. Statesmen here tonight can tell you, I am sure, that it is a difficult and thankless task to attempt to carry out the will of the people when that will has not been expressed.

That is why we have leaders, such as our Governors, Senators, and Congressmen. We need more leaders. We need leaders on all levels, not only on the top ones. It is as important to have good government here in the city of Jackson. and in Hinds County, as in Washington.

An English writer speaking of America once said, "The republican form of government is the highest form of government: But because of this it requires the highest type of human nature—a type nowhere at present existing."

We cannot agree with that statement in full. We have developed leaders, and we will develop more. Our governmental system is in itself a school for the education of citizens and the development of men to hold high office.

I know something of the veteran. I know what he can do in combat. He requires the minimum of leadership because of his initiative and common sense. He is himself a leader. There were many times when a situation was saved by junior officers, noncommissioned officers, or privates who leaped into the gap when their commanders fell and took charge. This initiative and willingness to assume the responsibilities of command is even more important than raw courage. It is more than physical courage; it is moral courage, and that is a quality which good citizens must have. Our veterans have it, and they will make good citizens.

There is no need to fear the future. Many of us can remember an earlier postwar generation. That was a generation which passed through the jazz age and the turbulent twenties, and all kinds of other horrible things. Then came the depression, and we found that those who make a profession of viewing with alarm were sure that our youth was soft, flabby, weak, spineless, and totally unfit. They did us a favor, because our enemies believed those words and counted on an easy victory against the so-called luxury-loving American youth.

They must have begun to have their doubts at Wake and Bataan, but by the time Tarawa, Iwo Jima, and the campaigns in Europe were over they knew for sure that they had guessed wrong. The generation that had been so scorned had written its name in the pages of history.

That generation is not going to stop now and rest on its laurels. That is not the American tradition, and it is not the tradition of this new generation. We were not content to dig in on the beaches of Iwo Jima and Normandy. We attacked. We must not be content to hold the peace which has been partially established. We must win the peace.

The veteran is bound to be in the forefront of the campaign for a lasting peace.

I am here to express my confidence in the future of the United States, which will soon be largely in the hands of the veterans who have preserved it. I do not have to tell this organization why it is important to maintain our defenses.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars stand for preparedness. The Nation learned a lesson after the last war when we scrapped our weapons without finding a way to keep the peace when marauding nations were on the prowl across the world. The vast numbers of veterans of this war who have rallied to the standard of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is proof that the veteran is vitally concerned with the maintenance of peace. He is not going to tear down our defenses until he knows that a proved, workable method of insuring peace has been found.

It is a primary duty of the veteran to be defense minded. He has successfully completed many and arduous duties already, but all that has been done can be lost by default. It was almost lost not long ago, but it was saved, and this time it will be preserved. Two world wars have been two wars too many. I do not need to tell you how horrible war can be. I cannot tell you how horrible it will be in the future, if we should allow one to begin. And if war begins, we have found that we cannot remain aloof.

This whole Nation has become a primary target. The city of Jackson is as much an objective as a warship or an airfield. We must face facts.

Even an ostrich with its head embedded in a bucket of concrete has to recognize the fact that the possibilities of war have not yet been eliminated from the world. This does not mean that we must have war, but it does mean that refusal to face the facts would be criminal folly.

We want peace. We are working for peace. God willing, we shall have peace. The cost of victory has been defined as "blood, sweat, toil, and tears." Can we offer less for the security of our ideals and the safety of our children?

Another duty of the veteran is to be politically minded. By that I do not mean that every veteran should seek political office. Those who are qualified should be willing to enter the public service, even though that service may mean that they will not be as well off financially as others.

There is no doubt that our veterans are qualified for the high duties of citizenship in a great and free republic. They are qualified by birth, by heritage, and by sacrifice. As I have said, they have learned to meet responsibility squarely from the reserves of moral fortitude which they have demonstrated so effectively to the world.

It is also the duty of the veteran to be civic-minded. The path which leads out of our present difficulties begins right in our own backyards. We can make a beginning toward a better life by our efforts in the communities in which we live. The veteran is going to be interested and active in every facet of the life around him. That is obvious from his training during service overseas. The men who have been doers will not be content with a place as bystanders.

The talent, drive, and initiative of the veteran is making itself felt throughout American life today. In everyday life the veteran is not a member of a special class of citizen. The extra drive comes from the fact that he must catch up for lost time. His war service has retarded him in the economic race, but he has come out of the war with a matured and consolidated viewpoint. He will catch up.

The complete absorption of the veteran into national life is not the problem that it has been painted. Some would have us believe that absorbing the veterans is a project comparable with the depression or a scourge of 7-year locusts. This is obviously absurd. Our veterans served in many a foreign land, but they are not immigrants suddenly thrust upon the Nation. They were born here, they have lived here almost all of their lives, and there is a place for every one of them.

The absorption of 15,000,000 matured, ambitious young men is not a problem. It is a privilege. These men will be a leavening influence in our national life. They will quicken the pulse of the Nation's business, both as producers and as consumers.

I have spoken of the duties of the veteran to the Nation. No matter what sacrifices he has made he cannot escape the vital, and sacred, duties of citizenship. At the same time the Nation cannot escape its duty to the veteran. Laws have been set up; benefits have been provided. These are all well and good. The job will not be completed, however, until every veteran has been given an equal chance with other citizens. It is a job which must be followed through, and I am sure that it is one which the Veterans of Foreign Wars will follow through for as long as is necessary.

In the words of Theodore Roosevelt, who fought in one of the battles that gave this organization its start, "A man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterward."

I suppose housing is a relative matter. On Guadalcanal I was fortunate to inherit a house of sorts from the previous occupants of Henderson Field. One night some of the previous owners came back with a battleship and served eviction papers in the form of a 14-inch shell. I was out at the time and my sentiments were not so much regret at the loss of this shack as relief that I had not been at home.

In civilian life today, when a man has a wife and children to care for, a house is vitally important. I am glad to see that the Veterans of Foreign Wars are actively supporting measures to obtain housing for veterans. Housing is only one of the many problems which assail us today.

The problems of prices and food, of getting a new car, and of finding the right job are vital. They are tremendously important and they always have been. We do know that they can be solved, because they have been solved before. The problem of a permanent peace has most obviously never been solved before.

Lack of houses, food, clothing—all these can be compared with the buzzing of mosquitoes when you are trying to find a soft spot in a fox hole. Mosquitoes can give a man malaria, just as these problems can make our Nation sick. But war is like a bullet or a shell. It can completely destroy this Nation and everything for which we stand.

The New England sage, Ralph Waldo Emerson, often quoted an observation made in the days of the forming of the United States:

"A monarchy is a ship, which sails well, but will sometimes strike on a rock and go to the bottom; while a republic is a raft, which would never sink, but then your feet are always in water."

The history of the United States, which was a new experiment in government, has proved that a democracy can work if all its citizens work together. There have always been those who said it couldn't be done. There always will be.

I had the high honor of serving during the war with some young American men and women who wore the uniform of the United States Marine Corps. They proved to me that "impossible" is a highly overrated word.

I saw young marines whom nothing could stop. The jungle couldn't stop them on Guadalcanal, a reef couldn't stop them on Tarawa, and a hail of steel couldn't stop them on Iwo Jima. A few civilian problems are not going to stop them now.

The United States will lead the way to world recovery and the establishment of a workable peace. These are the problems which count. The man who knows why they count—the veteran—will insure that they are solved.

With 15,000,000 veterans we can establish a firm beachhead on a new and better world. We can and we will.

Taft-Hartley Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the National Clergymen's Committee on the Taft-Hartley bill:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 17.—A statement signed by 642 prominent religious leaders in all parts of the country urging a veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill will be presented to President Truman today. Representing the National Clergymen's Committee on the Taft-Hartley bill, a four-man delegation bearing the petition will arrive at the northwest gate to the White House at 2:15 p. m. The delegation will include the Reverend John Duffy of New York City, Rabbi Ira Sud of Arlington, Va., Father Charles Owen Rice of Pittsburgh and the Reverend Sheldon Rahn, secretary of the committee.

Among those supporting the delegation are Bishop William Scarlett, of Missouri; Father William Kelly, of Brooklyn; Dr. David De Sola Pool, of New York City; Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein, of New York City; Dr. Liston Pope, of New Haven, Conn.; Father Wilfrid Parsons, of Washington; Rabbi Bernard Segal, of New York City; Rev. Donald Harrington of New York City; Rabbi Julius Mark, of Nashville; Bishop Charles K. Gilbert, of New York City; Rev. Ernest Fremont Tittle, of Chicago; Bishop Edward L. Parsons, of California; Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of New Haven; Rev. William Lloyd Imes, of Dundee, N. Y.; Father Richard B. Lavelle, of Brooklyn; Dr. Howard Thurman, of California; Father Joseph F. Buckley, of Brooklyn; Rabbi Manuel Laderman, of Denver; Father M. Sidney Rushfort, of Brooklyn; Father Philip Dobson, of Jersey City; Dean Walter Muelder, of Boston; Father Joseph Hammond, of Brooklyn; Rev. Edwin McNeil Proteat, of Rochester, N. Y.; and Bishop Walter Mitchell, of California.

Catholic members of the committee pointed out today that strong opposition to the Taft-Hartley bill has been voiced by such leaders as Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio; Bishop Bernard J. Sheil of Chicago; and many priests in local communities throughout the country. The National Catholic Welfare Conference, representing America's Catholic Bishops, in opposing the bill, has said it "will almost inevitably lead to industrial strife and unrest."

The formal statement of Protestant and Jewish leaders follows:

"We appeal to you to veto the Taft-Hartley labor bill because it would violate human freedoms essential to the ethics of both democracy and religion. Basically it substitutes Government regimentation for sound collective bargaining and wise attention to the fundamental economic and psychological causes of industrial strife. It is a measure calculated to destroy the real strength of a free labor movement by undermining basic principles of collective bargaining, making the Government of the United States a ready instrument of employer resistance to legitimate needs of workers, and subjecting unions to a process of decimation and frustration under Government control.

"The closed shop and the union shop developed historically as a defensive union measure against determined employer resistance to independent unions. Many industries such as clothing have combined closed shops with some of the best and most constructive industrial relations in America.

But, in addition, just as every town resident must share the costs of community services by paying taxes, so every worker in the industrial community bears an obligation to share the costs of collective bargaining through the agency designated by a majority of the employees. Just as some towns have occasionally enforced tax-collections under tyrannical administrations, so a few industries have had closed shops under tyrannical and dishonest union controls. But the remedy lies, not in abolition of compulsory union dues or town taxes but rather in the enlightened concern of free community and union members. This legislation would destroy constructive industrial relations already achieved.

"We look to you for a vigorous veto message."

David I. Walsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials eulogistic of the late Senator David I. Walsh, the first from the Boston Herald of June 12 and the second from the Boston Globe of the same date. I am sure the editorials will be read with great interest by all the many friends in the Senate of the late Senator Walsh.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston, Herald of June 12, 1947]

DAVID I. WALSH

Even though defeated for reelection to the United States Senate last November, David I. Walsh remained an imposing and influential figure on the Massachusetts political scene. But death intervened before he could rise again, as it seemed he must.

To young people Senator Walsh no doubt seemed a rather stodgy conservative, who regarded with fear and concern the New Deal with which he was embarrassingly affiliated by party ties. While he liked Franklin Roosevelt personally, he undoubtedly had little more respect for the late President's political policies than did most the Republicans. Mr. Walsh, moreover, was a Democratic mugwump who strayed from President Wilson's leadership on the League of Nations in 1919, and who openly opposed Mr. Roosevelt's interventionist strategy in 1940–41. A New Englander who had been brought up in a mill town, he was a protectionist to the end, no matter what Secretary Hull and other Democratic liberals might say.

But the David Walsh who become Governor of Massachusetts at 41 in 1913 was a different man. He was "the people's candidate," a man who had worked his way up from near poverty, the shining, knight in armor who represented thousands of Irish, Italian, and other immigrants, and children of immigrants, who were just beginning to make themselves felt in State affairs.

Then in 1919 he went to the Senate, the first Democrat to be elected to that august body from Massachusetts since before the Civil War. Possibly Washington made him homesick for the safe, familiar ways of his home State. Possibly some of the real radicals from the West shocked and frightened him. But aside from a rather conventional loyalty to organized labor he thereafter became so conservative that it made it extremely difficult for a Republican rival to pick a fight with him.

The explanation seems to be that this earnest, ambitious individual had gradually absorbed most of the traits of his Yankee environment. In his isolationism, he no doubt went further than many of his Yankee contemporaries would have, including even the grandson of the famous Henry Cabot Lodge. But, after all, this change from radical to conservative was a natural development from youth to old age. The important thing, and the thing for which all Massachusetts will honor his memory, was that David Walsh was always a loyal, honest, and thoughtful agent of the people of the State, as he understood their wants and needs.

[From the Boston Globe of June 12, 1947]

DAVID I. WALSH

Massachusetts will remember David I. Walsh as a Democratic Party pioneer. When he was elected lieutenant governor in 1913, he was the first successful candidate to wear his party's label in that office in almost 90 years. But that was only a beginning. After he had served two 1-year terms as Governor of the Commonwealth, he was the first of his party to break the long Republican monopoly upon the United States Senatorships from this State. Elected in 1918, he was the first Massachusetts Democrat whom the Senate had seated since Robert Rantoul went to Washington, for a brief term, in 1851. And Rantoul's victory had been won before the Republican Party was born.

The promise that the youthful Senator Walsh had thus shown in his early campaigns was fulfilled by his later career. His Senate service, from 1918 to his retirement in 1946, totaled 26 years. Only two Massachusetts Senators have served a greater length of time—George F. Hoar, whose terms add up to a few months more than Mr. Walsh's, and the elder Henry Cabot Lodge, who was a Member for 31 years. But it must be recalled that Mr. Walsh's political life spanned a period of political tumult. Two of the major changes of that time—the strong Republican tide that ran in favor of Calvin Coolidge in his Presidential campaign of 1924 and the equally definite Republican turn of 1946—resulted in defeats. On the five other occasions when he sought election, in 1918, 1926, 1928, 1934 and 1940, Mr. Walsh was successful; and each time he won, his plurality was larger than it had been at the previous election.

His grip upon the voting public was amazing, and all the more striking because he acquired it by no familiar set of political rules. He was not, for example, a rabble-rouser and never dealt in the large promises that are likely to attract a following as large as his came to be. His philosophy of public service was, instead, a philosophy of dignity. He believed in a dignified appearance, dignified debate and dignified action. He scrupulously observed the code in his own case and he was jealous of any threatened infringement upon it by others.

That philosophy, entirely his own, was doubly useful to him. On the one hand, it kept him from engaging in petty altercations within the party—disputes whose effects might have been felt at the next election. On the other hand, since the philosophy sprang from a small-town upbringing and an understanding of what small-town people expect of their representatives in office, it struck a responsive chord in the hearts of those whose backgrounds in other communities resembled Mr. Walsh's in Clinton. Analysis of the vote in any of the Senator's successful campaigns shows how he benefited, in Boston and the larger cities, from freedom from factional quarrels and, in the smaller cities and the towns, from shared experience and, consequently, a shared point of view.

As a Senator, Mr. Walsh grew conservative with the years and for that reason he was an independent during the New Deal Congresses. His major committee post was as chairman of Naval Affairs in the years preceding and during World War II. He worked willingly and earnestly for the Democratic party nationally and helped to write most of the platforms drafted at national conventions during his political lifetime.

His contributions to these larger affairs were many, but Massachusetts always has thought of him and long will remember him as an honorable, hard working, and faithful public servant who worthily upheld the traditions of the Commonwealth.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Plight of the Navajos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Arizona Republic of June 10, 1947:

PLIGHT OF THE NAVAJOS

GANADO, June 10—RICHARD F. HARLESS, Arizona's junior Congressman, flying from Washington to view first-hand the crisis today confronting the huge Navajo nation, was told here that the end of Federal wardships would be the first step in a long-range program for salvation of these red men.

Confirming reports that some of the Indians in isolated areas on the sprawling Navajo Reservation face starvation this winter unless relief comes quickly, Dr. C. G. Salsbury, noted medical missionary, told Congressman HARLESS:

"Today, not tomorrow, is the time for adequate, concerted, cooperative action to meet and solve the Navajo health and education problems."

Superintendent of the world-famed $1,000,000 Ganado Mission Hospital and School operated here by the Presbyterian Church, Dr. Salsbury believes granting to the red man of the right to vote and assumption by the State of responsibility for education and health regulation is the only real solution to the critical Navajo situation.

Congressman HARLESS agreed there already is talk in Washington of the Federal Government "getting out of the Indian business" and delegating its wards to the States in which they reside, with Federal subsidy payments to those States for a specified number of years.

The threat of hunger isn't the only Navajo problem, Dr. Salsbury declares.

"It is apparent to every experienced worker in the Navajo country that only a handful of the school-age children are in school because schools are not available. It also is apparent that only a very nominal effort is being made to control the flow of venereal disease and tuberculosis and other diseases which are running unchecked through the reservation like a river of death.

"It also is plain that no serious attempt is being made to enforce liquor laws or to eliminate the use of peyote, a drug menace which is growing at an alarming rate.

"What is needed most is constructive use of the discouraging facts now in our hands, and that effective measures be put into operation at the earliest possible time."

Dr. Salsbury declares two closely related problems—education and wardship—must be considered in any long-range measures for relief of the Navajo.

"It is virtually impossible to carry on any effective educational campaign along health or other lines among largely illiterate people so widely scattered as are the Navajo. Only about 20 percent of these Indians speak English with any degree of ease, and those who don't speak English have no written language. This makes it all but impossible to spread information by use of literature."

Declaring that the Federal Government has "toyed with Indian education" for more than three-quarters of a century, Dr. Salsbury cited the thousands of Navajo boys and girls now unable to gain an education for lack of school facilities, and the overcrowded conditions in ill-equipped Government boarding and day schools still in operation.

Of Federal wardship, the medical missionary declares, "The Navajo is a sharp, keen individual, skilled in the arts by which he has had to make a living. There is no valid argument against his being granted the full rights of citizenship."

He pointed out that Elma R. Smith, a member of the Navajo Tribe who was graduated from the University of Arizona in 1941 with a bachelor's degree, last week received her master's degree—yet cannot vote.

"The first step in a long-range program for education of the Navajo and carrying out of an effective health program," the doctor told HARLESS, "would envision the end of Federal wardship over the Indians, the granting of the franchise, and assumption by the State of responsibility for the education and health regulation of the Navajo.

"This," he said, "would mean elimination of the Indian Bureau. It would mean the Federal Government would need to make substantial grants in aid to the State until the backlog of ignorance and disease could be overcome and the Indian become an asset rather than a liability."

Believing that the classroom is a strategic point from which to carry on health education for the children and, through them, their parents, Dr. Salsbury says, "If prompt, adequate action could be taken, in less than 15 years every child of school age could have at least an elementary education and the problem of health and education would, to a very large extent, be solved."

In advocating taking the Federal Government out of the business of caring for Indians, Dr. Salisbury declares the big reservation headquarters agency at Window Rock should be converted into a Navajo high school or sanitarium.

In conferring upon the Red Man the right to vote, he does not believe more than 2,000 could at present qualify because of the tribe's high rate of illiteracy, but emphasizes the right to vote would be another incentive to seek an education.

Would Navajo who could qualify as voters be controlled by traders, missionaries, or governing officials? Emphatically not, says Salsbury. The Navajo are rugged individualists who make up their own minds.

The medical missionary says Government day schools now are acknowledged failures. Busses can't transport the children to and from their isolated homes over the spider web of unimproved reservation roads which become quagmires when rains fill the washes and gulleys with rushing water.

Boarding schools, he says, are the only answer.

"To meet the immediate medical need a number of small but well-equipped hospitals should be built. Probably these should not be more than 50 to 60 beds, and strategically located so as to render the greatest service in the neediest sections.

"Every trading post and day school should be a clinic center where regular visits are made by a visiting doctor. Mobile clinic cars with facilities for simple X-ray examinations, minor surgery, and simple laboratory procedures would be of great service in some areas. Such units, staffed by a doctor and nurse, could spend several days at regular intervals in remote areas.

"Existing laws controlling use on the reservation of liquor by whites and Indians should be vigorously enforced.

"The need for action is urgent," says Dr. Salsbury. "The Navajo is ready to be helped. The day when the medicine man was a constant and effective stumbling block to medical progress is gone. Often he is our most enthusiastic and influential ally. And, with a little diplomatic public relations on the part of the doctor, he can become our most valuable ally.

"If approached and appealed to in a friendly manner, the Navajo themselves will cooperate wholly and wholeheartedly in correcting wrongs of so many years standing."

Reason for Voting To Override Presidential Veto on Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I voted to override the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill because I believe certain conditions relating to stoppage of work have grown up in recent years that have been highly detrimental to the public welfare and need correction.

There is nothing more important in this postwar period in meeting its numerous and varied problems than full production. Any stoppage in work is a detriment to full production and consequently a serious handicap in our economic recovery.

I believe in trade-unionism. Throughout my entire service in the House for more than 20 years I have supported legislation that would promote the right of workers to organize and thereby make effective the principle of collective bargaining, in which I firmly believe.

I represent a congressional district which has a population of approximately 350,000 people. There are naturally many different viewpoints. It is my duty as a Representative to do that which, in my opinion, will best promote the welfare of all the people, regardless of class.

Unfortunately, the last year or more there have been stoppages of work that affected all the people and required stoppages of work in industries other than those in which the labor-management disputes existed. As an illustration, the coal strike and certain utilities strikes, including the telephone strike. The strikes I have mentioned affected not only the workers in the particular industries where the strikes existed, but thousands of other people who were innocent, including union workers in other industries whose work was stopped by lack of fuel, power, light, and transportation.

Furthermore, it is my opinion that jurisdictional strikes are absolutely indefensible—likewise secondary boycotts. The President seems to be of the same opinion. The bill which he vetoed sought to correct these matters.

There are many other features of the bill with which I am in accord, particularly those that would give the individual union member a larger part in fixing the policies of the union of which he is a member and that would protect his or her right in respect to the amount of initiation fees, dues, and contributions, and other financial obligations placed upon the individual member of the union. On the other hand, there are some features that I would have liked to have seen eliminated, especially those which some think might curtail freedom of expression. While I do not agree with the interpretation that has been placed upon these provisions by those who oppose them, yet I would have liked to have seen language used that would have left no doubt. However, the sponsors have given assurance that there is no intention to curtail freedom of expression. The proper administration of the act, in my opinion, can remove any danger in this respect. After considering the bill as a whole, I was of the opinion that more good for more people would come from its enactment than harm.

I would not have voted for any bill that would destroy unionism or collective bargaining. This bill does neither. It merely seeks to correct conditions that have proven detrimental to our public welfare, and I am certain that, if administered with wisdom and equality, it will prove helpful and not harmful in working out the economic problems with which we are now confronted.

Whether or not the bill will improve existing conditions depends in large measure upon the kind of administration that is given to it. I hope, notwithstanding the misgivings expressed by the President in his veto message, that there will be an administration that will prove fair and equitable with respect to all interested parties—labor and management, and the public in general.

Celler Offers Bill To Abolish Office of Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have this day offered a bill to abolish the office of Vice President of the United States. The office of Vice President makes possible the seating of a person as President of the United States one who in actual practice has never been subjected to proper public scrutiny for the high office of President. We must admit frankly that the person most often nominated for the

office of Vice President is chosen, not for innate ability to carry on as chief of state should the need arise, not for his probity or perceptions, not for his past performances in public office, not for his experience, but for the circumstances surrounding him that will best promote the election of the nominee for President.

As Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of the Institute for Advanced Study, at Princeton, points out in his article on the Presidential succession in a recent issue of the Atlantic Monthly, the office of Vice President has no duties; his position as President of the Senate is analogous to those of the Speaker of the House and has nothing to do with duties as Vice President. The Vice President does not sit in judgment on the Senate, has no vote except in cases of a tie, which happens once in ten decades. Actually, the office of Vice President is used as bait in many instances, either to placate a petulant State, to offer a favorite son the nomination for bargaining purposes, and so forth. This is a practice well known. The result, however, is of serious concern to all. The death of a President promotes a man to the highest office who, in most instances, was not considered a first choice. We are then asked to take what I put politely as second best.

Six times in our history we have been called upon to accept Vice Presidents in lieu of the man elected for such office. The deaths of Presidents Taylor, Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, Harding, and Franklin D. Roosevelt brought into the Presidency Vice Presidents Fillmore, Johnson, Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, Coolidge, and Truman, respectively. I am not discussing the capabilities of the successors. I am emphasizing the danger that exists in permitting men not specifically chosen for high office to walk into high office automatically. The nominee for Vice President is not searchlighted by public interest; his convictions or vigor are never election issues. Throttlebottom was good healthy satire and essentially correct in emphasizing the inanities of the office of Vice President.

Mr. Wilmerding has cut through to the heart of the matter. In the simplicity of his recommendation lies its virtue. Abolish the office of Vice President and provide by law for a new election in the event of the President's death, resignation or removal, the election to take place at the next congressional election. Congress could then designate the Secretary of State to be a caretaker of the office until such election is held.

Since the abolition of the office of Vice President requires a constitutional amendment, I have made provision by way of constitutional amendment. On the other hand, provision for midterm elections of a new President can be regulated by statute, and to that end I shall within a short while introduce this measure by way of a simple bill.

My chief concern with the problem is to eliminate the danger because of the complexity of government today, because of our role in world affairs, never contemplated by the founding fathers, and because of the need for an elastic and active democracy of a man being elevated to the highest office in the land who had never been chosen by the people explicitly for that post and whose fitness for that post had not been sufficiently explored. We want and need a President by choice and not by accident.

A copy of the resolution follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That an amendment is hereby proposed to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States. Said amendment shall be as follows:

Article —

SECTION 1. After noon on the 20th day of January 1953, the office of the Vice President shall cease and the Senate shall choose their own President and other officers.

Commander Griffith on Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, of Gary, Ind., in the accompanying editorial, makes some highly constructive suggestions in regard to our deplorable immigration regulations and the need for common sense in dealing with the same. He sets out some common-sense advice to the leader of the American Legion in going off half-cocked on a highly involved problem without making a thorough study of the facts.

The editorial follows:

COMMANDER GRIFFITH ON IMMIGRATION

Some very serious charges against this country's immigration officials and its defense and security forces have been made by National Commander Paul Griffith, of the American Legion. He told the DAR convention in Washington that a flood of illegal immigrants is making the United States "the laughingstock of the world."

We do not know how true his charges are. He did not document or prove them. He simply fired a broadside and left the burden of proof to others.

Thousands of foreigners enter this country illegally ever day, said Griffith—10 illegal immigrants for every legal one. He called immigration "a racket of specific racial, religious, or economic groups." Furthermore, he charged, this country still harbors a large number of atomic spies whose names are known.

These are pretty specific accusations. They suggest that Mr. Griffith has made a long, careful study of the situation, aided by a staff of assistants who have checked these facts.

But we doubt Griffith's wisdom in saving all this up to spring as a surprise on the Daughters of the American Revolution. It might be better if an organization as publicly dedicated to patriotism as the American Legion had turned its information over to the proper authorities or, failing to get cooperation from them, had proceeded through official channels.

(Immigration Commissioner Ugo Carusi said, "Griffith's figures and ours are at tremendous variance, but we would be glad to receive any information he has on the subject," and would "want to do something about it." This suggests Griffith hasn't checked with Carusi.)

Nor do we think that Mr. Griffith's proposed solution is the wisest possible. If his charges are true, the Legion commander does not call for strengthening of the immigration department, or greater vigilance by the armed forces or the FBI. Instead, he would close down all immigration for 1 year, thus shutting off the legal one while permitting the illegal 10 to continue their infiltration.

Also, we doubt Griffith's wisdom in making immigration a strictly foreigner-versus-veteran issue, which he does when he said, "Every foreigner in the United States is a veteran's immediate rival for a job, for an apartment, for a house, for a suit of clothes, for a hard-to-get automobile."

We believe that statement is open to question. We believe that condemning a foreigner simply for being foreign is neither very just nor very American. After all, the nonveteran citizen is the veteran's immediate rival, too.

If Mr. Griffith has proof of an immigration racket, or of flagrant immigration violations, or of lax authority, let him present it to the proper authorities. But let's not try to panic some 14,000,000 veterans with the bogey of 100,000 or even a half million foreigners. The ancestors of a majority of those veterans were foreigners once themselves.

Aid to Foreign Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. KERR
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that if this Nation is to speedily regain our world business, we must do our utmost to increase our foreign import trade, and the outstanding justification for this Nation's spending billions to provide relief and purchasing power to foreign nations is that it will enable them to regain their business activities and normal business with us.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 14, 1947, written by Mr. Jay G. Hayden, which is a statement of facts, unquestionably correct, and discloses the business situation of the world and its importance to this Nation:

AID TO FOREIGN NATIONS HELD MATTER OF UNITED STATES ECONOMIC NECESSITY

(By Jay G. Hayden)

While largely increased financial help to foreign nations so far has been argued for mainly on the ground of resisting the spread of communism, it is even more a matter of sheer economic necessity for the United States itself.

This is so because the United States was left by the war so exclusively the source of supply of both food and manufactured goods that the whole world is rapidly going bankrupt to buy from us.

A compilation in the June bulletin of the National City Bank of New York arrives at

the astounding conclusion that our exports now are running ahead of imports by $12,000,000,000 a year. This means that foreign nations are dissipating their buying power, beyond exports, at a rate of a billion dollars a month.

LATIN-AMERICAN BUYING

The disparity by no means is confined to the war-stricken countries of Europe. Latin America, which immediately before the war sold to the United States on the average $58,000,000 more goods a year than they bought from us, currently is buying from us at an annual rate of $1,608,000,000 over and above the goods sent in exchange.

Our prewar trade balance as against Canada averaged $109,000,000 a year—a differential which was more than offset by Canada's sale of foodstuffs to Europe in excess of her purchases from that continent.

But now Canada is buying from us at a rate of $920,000,000 a year in excess of her sales to the United States, while her European customers can no more pay her than they can pay us.

Before the war Brazil, because of her huge export of coffee, always had a substantial balance of trade as against the United States. But Brazil now is buying from us at more than 10 times the prewar level, and the same is true of Mexico, Argentina, and other South American countries. Cuba, Colombia, and El Salvador are the only American countries with an export edge over the United States.

FAR EAST PURCHASES SOAR

In times past the Far East (especially China and India) had a favorable balance as against the United States but now the overall far eastern purchases from us are running $710,000,000 a year in excess of our compensatory imports.

As for Great Britain and continental Europe, excepting Russia, the excess of our exports over imports right now is at the rate of $4,529,000,000 a year.

And even Russia is buying from us $147,000,000 worth of goods in excess of our purchases from her.

The National City Bank bulletin mentions wool, silk, furs, textiles, liquors, leather goods, diamonds, and ferro-alloys among commodities which we presently are importing even at a lower rate than in 1946.

That condition, of course, is due solely to the fact the exporting countries simply haven't got goods to offer.

Silk, before Pearl Harbor, accounted for 90 percent of Japanese export to the United States, but silkworms were eaten and mulberry trees used for firewood during the war and, in consequence, Japan now has little silk to sell. The British, still with a skimpy food ration, can't spare breadstuffs for whisky manufacture.

WAY TO ALLEVIATE SITUATION

The simplest and most economical way to alleviate this situation is to stimulate American buying of foreign goods. Certainly we should not double an already sky-high tariff on wool, as the House has proposed, and we might well remove the tariff entirely from furs, liquors, diamonds, and other high-priced luxury goods—specially useful in bolstering foreign exchange.

Certainly no outside nation is in position at present to ship enough of that sort of goods to the United States market as seriously to interfere with home production.

And even with the utmost that can be done to increasing imports, American taxpayers inevitably will be called upon for uncounted additional billions to provide purchasing power to foreigners until they can regain their economic feet and make things for themselves.

St. Lawrence Waterway Would Be Detriment to This Great Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in opposition to the St. Lawrence River waterway:

Gentlemen of the committee, if the St. Lawrence River waterway becomes a reality it will not only jeopardize but destroy a large part of the economic future of our great Nation. Our waterways, our ports, and our transportation would all suffer, and many sections of our Nation would pass into economic obscurity. The Mississippi Valley is the market basket of the United States. With the building of the St. Lawrence River waterway it would be a national—if not international—discrimination against this country, every vestige of our economic advantage would be surrendered to foreign flags and our potential economic competitors.

If the St. Lawrence River waterway is built, it will turn the Mississippi River traffic in reverse gear. This traffic now naturally goes down the river touching the docks of many American cities, finally offering itself to the marts of the world at the port of Louisiana's greatest city, New Orleans. The Mississippi River is an American river, serves the American Nation, which constitutes one of the greatest waterways in the world to make possible easy and natural handling—by Americans—of the fruits and vast bulk of products of American farmers and industries. It brings lifeblood to the port of New Orleans, which, without the river's traffic, would tend to shrivel as an important city. The river, as it is being used, in its natural way, guarantees to America a great trade with our neighboring countries of South America. In these respects, the Mississippi Valley traffic as now charted is an absolutely essential economic instrumentality for the prosperity of all America.

On the other hand, the St. Lawrence waterway would divert this great stream of American commerce into channels immediately foreign; would allow flags of foreign countries to enter into the heart of our great country—there to dictate to us—the terms and conditions of their service and business; would allow unfavorable competition with our own industry and commerce; and, finally, by shunting the business northward and away from normal and natural trends, would weld still another shackle upon the great Southland—already discriminated against by too many adverse economic influences.

We cannot allow the Southern States of this country to be sacrificed to an unfair and unnatural competition with foreign economies that pay nothing toward our well-being, but instead seek to sap the substance from our own American economy.

It is freely predicted that if this St. Lawrence waterway is completed the Southern States of this great Nation would be gutted economically to a point that without hope we shall be abandoned forever as a perpetual sacrifice to a foolish foreign economic policy that would never be a benefit to our great country.

I have discussed this matter in my State with dairymen, cotton farmers, vegetable and sugarcane growers, rice planters, oil producers, various civic clubs and organizations representing the principal industrial activities of the great State of Louisiana, and I find them practically unanimous in their opposition to the St. Lawrence River waterway. If this problem is settled from strictly an American viewpoint, I feel reasonably sure that by far the vast majority of the people of this great Nation will be opposed to this St. Lawrence River waterway.

Must the Old Folks of America Move to Foreign Countries To Share in Old-Age Security and Disability Benefits From Uncle Sam's Treasury?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I pose a question, Must the old folks of America move to foreign countries to share in old-age security and disability benefits from Uncle Sam's Treasury? I am prompted to do so by reason of the fact that the American Congress has refused to give any consideration to the elderly citizens of America who are in dire need of a minimum of the essentials of life to maintain them in decency and health. Notwithstanding this refusal, since the war ended, the United States has sent overseas to foreign nations—some of whom did not join with us in the recent war—over $21,000,000,000 for relief and assistance.

In this conection, Mr. Speaker, I particularly call attention to H. R. 16, which I introduced on the opening day of the Eightieth Congress, which has for its purpose the providing of security against old age and disability. This bill has been pending before the Ways and Means Committee since its introduction. In response to a request by the committee, I appeared before it on May 16 and made a statement in support of the bill, urging that it be reported to the House so that action thereon might be taken at this session of the Congress. The request has not been granted.

I made the following statement to the committee which sets forth the names of our colleagues who are sponsoring the legislation, and also some of the reasons why the legislation should be enacted and particularly why it should receive consideration by the House before we adjourn:

STATEMENT OF HOMER D. ANGELL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, IN SUPPORT OF HIS BILL, H. R. 16, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 16, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you and urge the consideration of H. R. 16, introduced by me on January 3, 1947.

This is a bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal retirement insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to

widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

The following Members of the House are sponsors of this bill:

HOMER D. ANGELL, Third District, Oregon.
EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, Thirty-seventh District, New York.
HOMER A. RAMEY, Ninth District, Ohio.
J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Seventeenth District, Ohio.
CLAIR ENGLE, Second District, California.
WALTER E. BREHM, Eleventh District, Ohio.
GEORGE H. BENDER, Representative at Large, Ohio.
ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, Tenth District, California.
WILLIAM S. HILL, Second District, Colorado.
FRANK A. BARRETT, Representative at Large, Wyoming.
JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Second District, Minnesota.
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Nineteenth District, Ohio.
GEORGE W. GILLIE, Fourth District, Indiana.
MARION T. BENNETT, Sixth District, Missouri.
WILLIAM LEMKE, Representative at Large, North Dakota.
GEORGE P. MILLER, Sixth District, California.
GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, Fifteenth District, California.
RICHARD J. WELCH, Fifth District, California.
FRANCK R. HAVENNER, Fourth District, California.
JOHN PHILLIPS, Twenty-second District, California.
HAROLD C. HAGEN, Ninth District, Minnesota.
NOBLE J. JOHNSON, Sixth District, Indiana.
CHET HOLIFIELD, Nineteenth District, California.
EMORY H. PRICE, Second District, Florida.
J. HARDIN PETERSON, First District, Florida.
GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Fourth District, Florida.
BERTRAND W. GEARHART, Ninth District, California.
HENDERSON H. CARSON, Sixteenth District, Ohio.
TOBY MORRIS, Sixth District, Oklahoma.
RAY J. MADDEN, First District, Indiana.
ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Third District, Florida.
JOE HENDRICKS, Fifth District, Florida.
CHARLES R. CLASON, Second District, Massachusetts.
RAYMOND H. BURKE, Third District, Ohio.
WALTER B. HUBER, Fourteenth District, Ohio.
CHESTER H. GROSS, Twenty-first District, Pennsylvania.
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Twenty-second District, Pennsylvania.
THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Sixth District, Washington.
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Tenth District, Wisconsin.
EARL WILSON, Ninth District, Indiana.
DWIGHT L. ROGERS, Sixth District, Florida.
W. M. (DON) WHEELER, Eighth District, Georgia.
CECIL R. KING, Seventeenth District, California.
JOHN A. CARROLL, First District, Colorado.
BARTEL J. JONKMAN, Fifth District, Michigan.
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR., Third District, Maryland.
JAMES H. MORRISON, Sixth District, Louisiana.
JOHN R. MURDOCK, Representative at Large, Arizona.
PAUL W. SHAFER, Third District, Michigan.
GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, First District, Michigan.
P. W. GRIFFITHS, Fifteenth District, Ohio.
AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Twenty-seventh District, Pennsylvania.
WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, Third District, Wisconsin.
JACK Z. ANDERSON, Eighth District, California.
EDWARD A. MITCHELL, Eighth District, Indiana.
WALTER K. GRANGER, First District, Utah.
ROSS RIZLEY, Eighth District, Oklahoma.
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Eighth District, Minnesota.
REID F. MURRAY, Seventh District, Wisconsin.
EDWARD O. MCCOWEN, Sixth District, Ohio.
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Twentieth District, Ohio.
MERLIN HULL, Ninth District, Wisconsin.
GERALD W. LANDIS, Seventh District, Indiana.
NORRIS POULSON, Thirteenth District, California.
MARGARET C. SMITH, Second District, Maine.

On February 28 I called a meeting of the sponsors of this legislation and other Members who are interested in old-age security. At this meeting the merits of the bill were discussed and a program outlined for its consideration. Attention was called to the great interest throughout the Nation for the enactment of old-age-security legislation. A recent poll taken disclosed that this program was approved by 39,432 of those polled with only 1,912 in the negative.

At this meeting I called attention to the great contribution that has been made by Dr. Francis E. Townsend, founder of the Townsend program, to the advancement of social security for old people in America and in recognition of his service I proposed the following resolution, which was adopted unanimously:

"Inasmuch as there was no such thing as a Federal old-age pension law 14 years ago when Dr. Francis E. Townsend startled the Nation with the first draft of his Townsend plan; and inasmuch as since that date, with the friends and workers for the Townsend plan constantly keeping their objectives before the Congress, the first Social Security Act was enacted and amendments in two other Congresses have liberalized its provisions, it seems fitting that this group of congressional friends of the Townsend plan here and now go on record as complimenting the 80-year-old father of old-age pensions in America, Dr. Townsend, for his activity and integrity and continuing fight in the cause of America's senior citizens."

Mr. Chairman, the basic principles underlying the Townsend national recovery program in the main have been approved by the Social Security Board. On July 16, 1946, the functions of the Social Security Board and its Chairman were transferred to the Federal Security Administrator, under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2, and on the same date the Social Security Administration was set up as a branch of the Federal Security Agency. In a final report the Board, which was the policy-making body, made a number of far-reaching recommendations which, if adopted, would put into force in our social-security program many of the provisions of the Townsend national recovery program. During the war many social-security programs were put into operation as emergency measures to alleviate distress and provide social security for the families of America. We find, however, that in the postwar period, although we are at peace with high levels of employment and earnings, many of our people are in distress, particularly those in the old-age groups. It has come to be realized by all forward-looking citizens that disability and old-age, as well as unemployment, are hazards in our modern society against which provision must be made. The Social Security Board in its final report, to which I have referred, made the following recommendations:

"A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF SOCIAL SECURITY

"The Social Security Board recommends the establishment of a comprehensive basic national system of contributory social insurance, covering all major risks to economic independence and all workers and their dependents threatened by such risks. The program would include insurance against wage loss in periods of disability and against costs of medical care, for which no general provision now exists in the United States, as well as old-age and survivors insurance and unemployment insurance, with benefits related to past earnings and with provision for additional benefits for dependents. It would be designed to close existing gaps in the coverage of both persons and risks, to remove present inequities in the protection of workers and the financial burdens of employers, and to provide a consistent relationship among insurance provisions for the various risks and between provisions of the basic system and of supplementary special systems for particular groups. As compared with separate programs to meet particular risks, such a system would reduce administrative cost and reporting burdens and simplify arrangements as they affect workers, employers, and public agencies.

"OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

"The Social Security Board recommends:

"Coverage of all gainful workers, including agricultural and domestic employees, public employees, and employees of nonprofit organizations, railroad employees, and self-employed persons, including farmers and small businessmen.

"Legislation to prevent servicemen from losing the protection of the old-age and survivors insurance system because of service in the armed forces.

"Reduction of the qualifying age for all women beneficiaries from 65 to 60 years.

"Changes in the average monthly wage and benefit formula to increase benefit amounts, particularly for low-paid workers.

"Increase from $3,000 to $3,600 a year in the maximum amount of earnings which are subject to contribution and counted in computation of benefits.

"Increase in the amount of earnings a beneficiary may receive in covered employment without suspension of benefits.

"Greater uniformity in defining, for purposes of the insurance system, family relations and conditions of dependency that qualify members of a worker's family for benefits.

"Benefits during periods of extended or permanent disability, like those for old-age retirement.

"Provision for insuring uniformity in coverage decisions relating to liability for contributions and eligibility for benefits, which are based on identical language in the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code but are made by two separate Federal agencies—the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Board.

"Adoption of a long-range plan for financing old-age and survivors insurance which looks toward an eventual tripartite division of costs among employers, employees, and the Government.

"PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

"Deletion of the Federal matching maximums for individual payments of aid to dependent children, and deletion or increase of such maximums for old-age assistance and aid to the blind.

"Abolition of State residence and citizenship requirements as a condition of eligibility for assistance under State plans approved under the Social Security Act.

"Elimination, as a condition of Federal grants, of State requirements for transferring title or control of property by an applicant or recipient to the State or locality.

This action would not preclude any agency from claiming from the estate of a deceased recipient recovery of assistance formerly paid.

* * * * *

"The Board in discussing social security in a democracy said:

"'In the opinion of the Board, no time should be lost in taking every feasible step to extend the present protection of the social-security program to all households in the United States, and to wipe out limitations and inequities that can no longer be justified by logic or necessity. For a people, as for an individual, it is prudent to provide in good times against adversities that almost surely will arise sooner or later.'"

An examination of this comprehensive report of the Social Security Board and the recommendations made by it discloses that the advanced steps in social security recommended are in keeping with much of the program of the Townsend old-age security plan. At the beginning of 1946 nearly half of all civilian jobs were excluded from coverage under social security, and two in five of all persons employed were neither fully nor currently insured. At best the social security law we now have is a haphazard program which, in effect, is largely financed by the public generally, but the benefits of which are shared in by only a few selected groups. It encourages inflation by collecting a huge fund currently used for deficit spending. These difficulties would be overcome by the adoption of H. R. 16, which would cover all citizens falling within its provision and the obligations and benefits of the program would likewise be shared by all. It would be all-inclusive in its provisions and therefore would obviate the necessity of continuing many social-security laws now in existence and would for the first time set up in our country an old-age security program which would insure all of our elderly citizens 60 years of age or over against the hazards of old age. It would build up no reservoir for deficit spending, but the moneys collected would go back into the channels of trade each month, providing local markets for American production and buying power for aged citizens.

Mr. Chairman, the whole problem of social security, and particularly for our elderly citizens, is one of deep concern to the citizens of the United States, and the Congress has been dilatory in giving it consideration and making adequate provision for our old people. It has been reported on reliable authority that it costs a $5,000 a year income family $12,750 to rear a child to 18 years of age. This forcibly brings to our attention the heavy investment the old people of America have made in rearing their families and providing the Nation with its citizens. The families of yesterday made possible the men and women of today who are in positions of authority protecting the liberties of America. Unfortunately many of these old people, some ten or twelve million of them in fact, having expended their funds in rearing their families and providing for themselves, now are in need and want. The average assistance given to them approximates $25 a month.

The Census Bureau has just released a report showing that the median income for American families living under one roof rose by $169 during 1945 to a total of $2,378. This means that half of the 40,075,000 family units of America receive an annual income of $2,378 or less. Certainly families with children to support, under the high cost of living of today, cannot provide the funds for taking care of fathers and mothers of the heads of these families, who are in need.

The Congress has just passed a bill opening the Public Treasury to send $400,000,000 overseas, much of which, according to plan, is to be used for developing the resources, economy, and for relief of the peoples of foreign lands, some of whom did not join with us in the recent war. The United States since the war's end has made available for world aid $21,058,422,818, as follows:

Contributions:	
UN	$29,289,349
UNRRA	2,700,000,000
World Bank	3,175,000,000
World Fund	2,750,000,000
Lend-lease	2,163,000,000
Other advances:	
Surplus property	1,148,000,000
Loans to Great Britain, Philippines	4,390,000,000
War Department grants	1,771,926,293
Export-Import Bank	2,931,209,176
Total	21,058,422,818

Would it not be good judgment while considering this expenditure for the Congress to grant some relief to the old folks here in America as well? There are in excess of 10,000,000 American citizens over the age of 60 years, many of them in want and distress, yet the Congress has denied their appeals down through the years for some relief. Many of them receive a stipend of old-age assistance of less than $10 per month and the average is a little more than $25 a month, while living costs are mounting skyward.

Mr. Chairman, the sponsors of H. R. 16 and the companion bill H. R. 2476, introduced by Representative J. HARDIN PETERSON, have asked me and the other members of the committee in charge of the legislation, to urge that the Committee on Ways and Means provide for a hearing upon this bill so that an opportunity will be given to present evidence of the merits of the legislation and the necessity of its enactment, and also an opportunity for its opponents, if any there be, to be heard.

In the event that the committee finds it impossible by reason of the demands upon its time to grant a hearing before the full committee, we request that a subcommittee be appointed to hold these hearings; and if the committee in its judgment finds it is unable to hold any such hearings at this session of the Congress, we most respectfully request that the record of the hearings made in the Seventy-ninth Congress be considered by the committee and H. R. 16 be reported to the House so that an opportunity may be had by the Members of the House to vote on this important legislation. I, personally, request that such action be taken by your committee.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and our colleagues sponsoring this legislation, I most respectfully urge that the leadership of the House make it possible for the House to have an opportunity to discuss the merits of this and other legislation which will provide a program of social security for the elderly citizens of America at this session. As set forth in the foregoing statement, we have sent these billions of American money overseas since the end of the war for relief and aid to the people of foreign lands. There seems to be no valid reason why the Congress should longer delay in providing old-age security for our own people if American tax dollars are available for such generous aid to foreign countries. As I said in my opening statement, will it be necessary for the elderly citizens of America to move to these foreign lands in order to share in social-security protection from the American Treasury which is necessary to keep their bodies and souls together in their declining years? Let us not adjourn this Congress without passing legislation for old-age security. Let us put it on the "must" agenda for this session.

Address of Mr. Eric Johnston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the address of Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association, which was presented before the banquet of the national convention of the Young Republicans on June 7, 1947, at the Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. Johnston was introduced by Hon. Ralph E. Becker, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation. Mr. Becker's introduction follows:

It has, perhaps, been unfortunate for American businessmen that their strong point has been, and is, actions—not the putting of inactivations and thoughts into words. Only a few, by reason of their positions as spokesmen for business, develop from their actions a reasoned philosophy. We have the exception with us tonight.

Our guest speaker tonight grew up in the West. He sold papers (like a Horatio Alger hero) in grade school. In high school he was a part-time reporter for the Spokane Spokesman-Review. While in college, he worked on the Seattle docks.

He served in that famous body of fighting men, the United States Marines, during World War I. And, going into business after his discharge, his ability and personality brought almost immediate success.

After heading various businessmen's organizations, he was elected to head the United States Chamber of Commerce. And following a most successful tenure of office, he became president of the Motion Picture Association of America.

It is a pleasure and a privilege to introduce to you one of the leading apostles of the American way—Mr. Eric Johnston.

The address of Mr. Johnston follows:

Every time I go abroad, I find out once again that Europeans look on our American political system with increasing wonderment. The functionings of our two-party system utterly confuse them. They are perplexed because they try to interpret our political methods in terms of their own situation and their own backgrounds. And there just isn't any comparison.

All over Europe there's a sharp, distinct, and definitely defined cleavage between an economic right and an economic left. That cleavage is based on the issue of government ownership of industry. If you're against it, you belong to the economic and political right; if you're for it, you belong to the economic and political left.

This issue simply doesn't exist in America. Americans who believe in Government ownership; in State ownership—or in socialism of any kind—hardly constitute a good-sized platoon of people compared to the great mass of us Americans who believe in America's going system of free, competitive capitalism based on private ownership.

In contrast, capitalism in Europe has either been obliterated from the map or is being shoved toward oblivion by socialism.

In Britain, Socialists are aggressively pushing forward their program of nationalization

of industries. Even the Conservative Party now states it will accept some measure of nationalization.

On the Continent, the grip of socialism is even tighter.

Communists, Socialists, and other parties of the left dominate the scene. All favor government ownership of industry in varying degrees. The parties which still favor private ownership are weak and growing weaker.

Over here, the American kind of capitalism and the American political system are stronger than ever.

The real, underlying reason why the Old World doesn't comprehend our political system is because it never experienced the kind of capitalism we have in America. Old World capitalism was related to American capitalism in name only. We didn't import our kind of capitalism from Europe. It grew right here on this side of the Atlantic. It is as native to America as Indian corn or the Mississippi River.

But Old World capitalism gave the capitalistic system a bad name everywhere. It wasn't a people's capitalism. It had a preponderance of plutocrats on one hand and a preponderance of paupers on the other. It was a capitalism of class distinctions; of special privileges for a ruling class; of colonial exploitation; a capitalism of private monopolies, cartels, state grants, and charters. Its creed was to divide up markets, restrict production, guarantee profits, keep wages down and prices up.

Our American-born capitalism is a long way from perfection, but it holds the loyalty of Americans because it is a partnership capitalism—a more truly participating capitalism than any which ever existed.

From what I've said you might think I almost agree with our European friends who can't see how we can have two great competing political parties in this country when both of them are stanch advocates of capitalism. I hope there always will be two strong, competing parties.

In a free society, the spirit of competition is as inevitable as it is necessary and valuable to the society. The competition of ideas; the competition of personalities for posts of leadership, constitute a bulwark of a free society. It is the antithesis of the total state system where no competition with the views of the central ruling group is tolerated. The two-party system, based on competition, is part of the bedrock on which our society rests.

Our own party was born in an hour of national crisis. It was born in the restless, insurgent West. It was a party of the people; a party of middle-class people, of workers, of farmers. It stood for freedom, for liberty. It held that human rights come ahead of property rights. It believed the worker was more important than his tools and the man more important than the machine.

It was this attitude—it was this principle—which swept the Republican Party to its first victories. When it has abandoned or neglected this attitude and this principle, our party has gone down to defeat.

Demagogs delight to toss around the phrase "human rights above property rights" as if the two were always and inevitably in conflict. They attempt an emotional appeal, not based on facts.

I espouse the doctrine of human rights above property rights too, but as an appeal to reason. I say that human rights and property rights can be and should be in harmony. But when these rights conflict, the decision should always be in favor of man over property.

The right to hold property is also a human right—and the human rights here in America could not long continue unless they were bolstered by the rights of property.

The Republican Party's first platform reflected the attitude that human rights must be supported by property rights—that the right to hold property contributed to human rights. The first platform called for an orderly and early disposal of the public lands of the West. It advocated a homestead act, with the land to go free to settlers who would work it and produce on it and make their homes on it. "Vote yourself a farm" was the popular Republican slogan of 1860.

Our party wanted to build the new and untamed West, conscious that the destiny of America lay in developing the giant of wealth which slept beneath the western prairies, timberlands, and mountain ranges. Toward this end, it also called for construction of a transcontinental railroad—with Government help to build it.

Its whole concept was to build, develop, spread the benefits of capitalism; give men a chance to take a chance. That was its attitude then, that must be its attitude today if it expects victory next year or any other year.

There are issues before us today by which we can determine the party's attitude on basic humanitarian needs.

There is the question of housing. The need is desperate. What is to be the Republican attitude on housing? Shall it support a Government program to finance homes for lower-income families at prices they can afford to pay?

I think it must. I think it is obvious that this crying need can be met only in this way, and I think it is equally obvious that such a program, wisely administered, would stimulate private construction. I think that good citizenship depends in large measure on good citizens; that decent homes make decent people; that delinquency develops in shacks and slums. By fathering the proper kind of housing act in 1947, the Republican Party, which sponsored the Homestead Act in 1860, can demonstrate again that it believes in decent homes for men and their families as part of their human rights.

Once again, too, the West looks to the Republican Party. The natural resources of the West, poured out so bountifully for so many years, today must have replenishment. Erosion has robbed us of some of our richest soil. Recurring droughts have done their tragic work. We can't afford to take chances on reduced farm production in an hour like this when we are feeding a large proportion of the world's peoples.

So now is the time to rebuild as we built; to plan out carefully new projects for reclamation, for irrigation, for soil conservation, and for power development.

These are jobs for government. Private business can't dam great rivers. Government must do it, but let me say this: Once government has done its share in power development, for example, then let government get out of the development as quickly as it can. The distribution of power is a job for private business under our system and not a job for government.

We want our Government to stimulate business, to encourage business to help make more and more business, but we do not want the Government doing business which private individuals are willing and competent to do.

I am proud that the Republican Party has remained faithful to the ideal of freedom which imbued it at its birth. I am proud of its stand against the poll tax. I am proud of its support for fair employment legislation. I am proud that it has consistently stood for civil liberties.

It is one of our great national embarrassments today that we preach about civil liberties and then fail to practice them in full measure here at home. We talk about democracy abroad and crudely ditch it now and then here in America. We can't have two classes of citizens in America.

Hand in hand with civil liberties and human rights, it seems to me, is the chance for the individual to advance himself materially as well as politically and spiritually. This is a land of initiative; a land which attracted persons from the Old World because it offered men a chance to be somebody; to make something of themselves; to provide for their families; to rise above the fixed, arbitrary class standards which prevailed over there.

Today, initiative in America is being substantially thwarted by the Federal tax structure. It is freezing opportunity for too many younger people. We need a tax system today which will encourage new men and new dollars to go into new businesses.

I am not as interested in cutting taxes as I am in adjusting them to a point where they cease to do mischief to our economy. One of the strengths of our capitalism is the number of small businesses. We need more and more of them. Our tax structure should be overhauled so that it will encourage, and not discourage, young men in young business enterprises.

The things I have talked about—a program of decent housing for our low-income groups; redevelopment of the inland empire of the West; a genuine application of our civil liberties; and a tax program to stimulate new business—are only a few of the measures we need here at home to keep our social and economic system robust, vigorous, and vibrant.

I am not trying to write platform planks for the Republican Party. I am only suggesting a few things I believe would contribute substantially to the material, moral, and spiritual progress of all our people.

In the Old World, living standards have steadily deteriorated since the war. Production is still 20 to 50 percent below prewar levels, in marked contrast to an American production almost double the prewar level.

Europe is prostrate. It is haunted by the four horses of hunger, cold, nakedness, and pestilence. It lives with daily doubts, suspicion, and the threat of another war. We can't be indifferent to the plight of Europe even if we wished. Our purse strings and our heartstrings are both involved in the fate of the world. A rich man can't long retain his riches in a community of paupers. What is true of a rich man in a community is true of a rich nation in a world community of poor neighbors. And America's innate sense of decency and justice rebels against the spectacle of want and hunger anywhere.

What can we do about it?

To answer that question intelligently, our people must first have a clear understanding of what the problem is. The American objective is clear-cut and simple. I believe it demands constant restatement to keep it always before the world. America wants these three things:

First, we want a peaceful world of free people and free nations.

Second, we want an effective United Nations organization, its members cooperating with one another for the common good.

And, third, we want world economic reconstruction, recovery, and stability.

Every move America has made in the last 2 years has been to promote our three broad objectives. We want no new territory. We seek no conquests. The spirit of aggression simply does not exist in America.

Never before in history has a victorious nation been so magnanimous in trying to lift up the vanquished and in helping nations ravaged by war to rebuild from devastation and ruins.

The task would have been immensely easier if we had been joined in it by Soviet Russia. Russia, second only to us today in power, has chosen the course of noncooperation in the United Nations. Her refusal to join various agencies of the United Nations raises the question whether Russia really wants world order.

Her consistent attempts at pressure and coercion upon small and weaker neighbors have created an unwholesome atmosphere for world economic recovery. It is idle to talk about economic rehabilitation while aggression still stalks world boundary lines.

Meanwhile we have already poured out billions of our dollars for the relief of the world. But the international crisis has deepened. The world is in far worse shape than we thought.

As I see it, there are two great dangers we must guard against today: One is economic and social collapse in Europe. The other is any possible break or rupture in our bipartisan foreign economic and political policy.

The crisis in Europe exhibits alarming symptoms. The loan to Britain is running out. France and Italy are near bankruptcy. China is desperate. Other nations need help.

Up to now we have been operating in a piecemeal fashion, making unrelated appropriations for this purpose and for that purpose in the world. But what we've done is only a start—a palliative.

The world needs food at once, but, more important for the long period of years ahead, it needs seed and machinery to plant and harvest its own crops. It needs clothing, but, again, more importantly, it needs raw materials and machines to make its own clothing. Europe can't borrow out of trouble. It must work it out.

If we are going to meet the giant problems ahead of us, we must have two things: First, an inventory of the world's needs, and, second, a survey of our own resources. Add them together, and we can get a bill of particulars covering a correlated program of relief and reconstruction. It can't be an exact blueprint, for world conditions constantly change, but it can, and must, indicate the general pattern of our efforts and purposes.

Only with such a bill of particulars can the American people make up their minds what they want to do. There seems to be a tendency in some places to keep the facts of the situation from the people on the notion that the facts of the burdens ahead of us are likely to be unpleasant. That's a mistake. The American people are not children. They can be trusted. They don't run from responsibility when they know what needs to be undertaken. But they do ask for facts—all the facts—and they're entitled to them.

This bill of particulars is needed now, before the American people are asked to contribute yet unestimated billions for world recovery. Any world program on which we embark inevitably will affect our taxation program; our national budget; our employment; our own food supply; our wage levels, and our price levels. All these things must be examined and pulled together into a related whole.

Congress is preparing to recess next month. When it reconvenes, it should have before it a coordinated study of the needs abroad and the resources at home. Then, and only then, can the American people decide what course to follow. To me this is only common sense. To me this is the proper and orderly procedure. To me this should be the aim of government in Democratic America. To me this is sound national policy.

This bill of particulars should be drawn under bipartisan sponsorship. The most effective way to do it, I think, is to create a joint council to make the study and draft plans for the consideration of the people. This council should be composed of officers of the executive departments and of members of appropriate congressional committees, such as those dealing with foreign affairs, appropriations and taxations. It could be set up on the initiative either of the President or of Congress. Obviously, the council would have a competent technical staff and would call in responsible representatives of American labor, agriculture, and industry.

In this way, we would get the bill of particulars. In this way, too, we would maintain our bipartisan foreign policy. It is not in the spirit of bipartisanship to place halfway measures before Congress and ask for rubber-stamp approval. Bipartisanship should start with the formulation of policy and carry right on through.

In our relations with foreign nations, the most important thing of all is to have a dependable policy—a policy backed by the American people and one on which the world can rely. Vacillation is no policy at all. It is weakness. It is undependable.

We know the tragedy of the phrase "too little and too late." We don't want to do too little in furtherance of our policy of world reconstruction, and we don't want what we do to be done too late. Such a course invites disaster. So does any course today which denies the American people the answer to these two questions: "How much?" and "How soon?"

The American people want to know how much a program of world reconstruction will cost to accomplish—or how much it might cost them not to do anything at all—and let the world wag as it will.

They want to know to what extent it is to their own self-interest to carry out a program of that kind. They are the judges.

If we do wrong on what we do today in this world crisis, it will be principally you young men and women who will suffer. You will pay for the mistakes in money or in blood, or both.

From now on, this is your country—until it becomes your children's country. I urge you, as the heirs to leadership in the Republican Party, to exert every influence at your command to insure that our part in world affairs will be kept as a people's policy; I urge you to demand a bill of particulars—to ask "How much?" and "How soon?"

Ours is a party which built altars to the spirit of freedom for all men. Ours is a party which believes in equality; in justice; in civil liberties. Ours is a party born in an hour of crisis—and this is an hour of crisis. Ours is a party born among the people, and today's decisions must be made by the people. This is our Republican creed.

A Proper Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of June 19, 1947:

A PROPER VETO

The reasoning behind the President's veto of the income tax reduction bill should appeal to the common sense of the American people.

The prospect of continuing high taxes is not, of course, a pleasant one. The man or woman who likes to pay taxes has not yet been born, and it must be admitted that the Republican promise of tax reduction appealed to an instinct that is deeply rooted in human nature.

Nevertheless, the better arguments are on the President's side.

We are in the midst of an era of exceptional prosperity, and it is in such a period that debt must be reduced if it is ever to be done. The Senate was aiming at a reduction in the national debt of $2,600,000,000 in the 1948 fiscal year. That, however, is only 1 percent of the total debt. At this rate, and on the highly improbable assumption that an equivalent reduction could be made annually, it still would take 100 years to pay off the debt.

This is enough to demonstrate the desirability of reducing the debt as much as possible in the years when we are able to afford it. Every man who has wrestled with his own budget problems knows that debts must be paid when the money to pay them is available. For if they are not paid then, they never will be paid.

Another effective argument against tax reduction at this time lies in the uncertainties of the international situation. As Mr. Truman said, we are still in the midst of a transition period, and we continue to be confronted with relief and rehabilitation demands. The exact cost of these is unknown, but it certainly will be heavy.

In the face of these considerations, it seems to the Star that it would be sheer folly to reduce Government income at this time. The President is to be commended for his veto of the tax bill. It may prove politically harmful to him, but in the long run it will best serve the interests of this country.

Spotlight on Bonneville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to request granted, I include as a portion of my remarks the following editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal, dated June 31, 1947:

SPOTLIGHT ON BONNEVILLE

What are gentlemen in the Congress thinking about when they slash the appropriation for the Bonneville Power Administration? Why do they wish to emasculate the Nation's greatest power source? Why do they forget that Bonneville helped win the war with power for shipyards and aluminum plants? Why do they ignore the indispensable place of power in the peacetime progress of the Pacific Northwest? Why do they wish to reduce the contribution of the Pacific Northwest to the economic fortunes of America?

Bonneville Power Administration is a half billion dollar utility. It includes Bonneville and Grand Coulee power plants, a partially completed electric transmission grid and facilities for service to public agencies, industries, and private utilities. It will include McNary Dam at Umatilla Rapids on the Columbia and other power derived incident to flood control, navigation, and irrigation works.

Nobody in the Congress or anywhere else has the right to play ducks and drakes with an enterprise in which so much Federal capital has been invested and which is so vitally related to every other Pacific Northwest activity.

It isn't enough for the small but noisy Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma to condemn Bonneville because it represents public ownership. The power sites on the Columbia and its tributaries belong to the Government.

The Government is but playing the part of a prudent and responsible steward in developing them at the rate of demand not only for power but for flood control, navigation, irrigation, industry, and agriculture. But the fact shown by the 1946 Bonneville report is that private enterprise is a large beneficiary because of BPA. While public agencies have first call on 50 percent of Bonneville power, the present distribution shows 12 percent to public agencies, almost 45 percent to directly served industrial users and a little more than 22 percent to private electric utilities. Moreover, the private utilities can buy Bonneville power for less than they can generate it for themselves and very properly give their customers the benefit of the saving.

Nor is it enough to say, as does the bill introduced in the House by Representative DONDERO, of Michigan, that all sales should be at the bus bar without transmission.

High-transmission lines are an integral part of the power plant. Interconnecting lines not only unify supply of electric current and spread its availability over wider area, but largely dispense with the need for steam standby plants.

While a part of the attack on Bonneville results from the enmity of private electric utilities, especially in the East, local utilities (example the Portland General Electric) have joined in the plea for development of more power to prevent a demonstrable shortage.

It is wholly sane that Bonneville Administration, its methods and personnel be overhauled. Revisions of organization will doubtless have to be made in any event. But the vital relationship of Bonneville Power Administration to the region should not be disturbed.

Should not be disturbed, we repeat, because of an argument that transcends, yet strengthens, all previously stated—the millions of people, whether served by public or private agencies who are entitled to the power, to opportunity and to a widening future.

Clatter in the Congress by men willfully heedless should not drown out words Franklin D. Roosevelt once uttered. He said:

"More power to you!"

Who Is Following What Party Line and Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party, demanded that Truman veto the labor bill, in a speech over the Mutual radio network.

At that time Foster said:

The workers and other progressives should demand that President Truman, besides vetoing the Taft-Hartley bill, should also as Democratic party leader mobilize the Democrats in Congress to sustain his veto.

On June 20 Truman vetoed the labor bill, but he was decisively overridden by a vote of 331 to 83; 106 Democrats voted to override Truman, 71 to sustain. Foster's demand fell flat in the House. Truman's leadership was a complete failure.

Is it not reasonable to ask who is following what party line and why?

Hoover Warns of Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of June 19, 1947:

HOOVER WARNS OF LIMIT

While British and French foreign secretaries meet to discuss the plan set forth by our Secretary of State Marshall for the rehabilitation of Europe, former President Hoover has issued a warning that there is a limit to how far we can go in extending aid to some billion people in foreign countries. Especially after President Truman finds it impossible to cut our taxes to the extent of about $4,000,000,000 2 years after the end of the war, our people might well wonder how we can afford to spend three or four times that amount in building up the rest of the world.

Hoover agrees that we must help the foreign countries that have been devastated by the war. He says that there is greater danger of political and economic chaos in the world than at any time since the war ended. "There is more hunger and want today than there was during the war, but," he adds, "the greatest danger to all civilization is for us to impair our economy by drains which cripple our productivity. Unless this one remaining Gibraltar of economic strength is maintained, chaos will be inevitable all over the world."

He further points out that we have been helping with too lavish a hand and with too little cooperation by the rest of the world, especially by Russia. He says there is no question but that we have been sending out food and other supplies in such enormous volume as to increase prices for necessaries here at home to the present inflationary level. Not only have we been thus putting an undue strain upon our domestic food supplies, but, he also says, that other exports have placed a strain upon our own railroad, factory, and housing construction. As a result, he says, "Prices have risen so high in the construction industry that we now have considerable unemployment in these trades, while at the same time our country is crying for homes and building."

He specifically declares that, "the obstruction of the Soviet Government to peace has during the past 2 years imposed billions in expenditure upon us through support of occupation armies and relief to starvation which would not otherwise have been required."

How long are we going to stand for this dog in the manger policy by Russia? Are we going to continue sending out more billions until, as Hoover says, we may find our own country on the verge of bankruptcy?

At the conference this week between the French Foreign Minister Bidault and the British Secretary Bevin, it was reported the main concern was to insure that their acceptance of Secretary Marshall's plan for further assistance to Europe should not widen the split between Russia and the western democracies.

Apparently Secretary Marshall's plan for spending more of our billions in restoring Europe may not be put through until Russia O. K.'s it. Already the Communist parties in France are tearing the plan to pieces and, while Russia had not officially replied to the British and French on the proposal to discuss the matter, there was an unpromising article in Pravda, the official Russian news organ.

It would seem that the time has come when our State Department must break with Russia on this matter. It must insist that Britain and France go along with us and make peace with Germany and arrange a scheme for rehabilitation. Then tell Russia to take it or leave it.

Veto of the Tax Reduction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials on the tax bill, one from the Durham Morning Herald and one from the Greensboro Daily News.

[From the Durham Morning Herald]

THE PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF THE TAX REDUCTION BILL

It may be that President Truman's veto of the tax bill was "cold-blooded politics," as Representative KNUTSON terms it, but to this newspaper it appears that the bill, and not the President, deserves this description. In his veto, President Truman revealed a devotion to principle above politics, for tax reduction is good for votes. No matter what you say about it, you can't make it unpopular with the people.

The President has contended all along that the financial condition of the Nation would not permit tax reduction at this time. Even if the time were right, he would not have signed this particular bill. To him it was the wrong bill at the wrong time, and even if it had been the right time it still would have been the wrong bill.

As he pointed out in his veto statement, the Republican bill would give the average family with an income of $2,500 a year a tax saving of less than $30 a year, while the man with the income of $50,000 a year would have a saving of nearly $5,000.

On top of this, the President has the very firm conviction that the Nation has commitments which make tax reduction at this time impossible. He feels also, that the money saved by American taxpayers would merely serve to increase the inflationary pressures which in turn actually would take more money from the pockets of the average man.

Now that the deed has been done, the Republicans cannot get by with placing the blame for failure to reduce taxes on the President alone. They have bungled the thing from the start. All of us want tax relief and we want to be convinced that such relief is practical and desirable. But the Republicans by their insistence upon tax reduction regardless of other consideration destroyed much of the confidence of the people in any plan that they might have advanced.

[From the Greensboro Daily News]

THE PRESIDENT IS RIGHT

Wholly aside from politics, of which both Democrats and Republicans are playing their respective parts in the tax-reduction battle, soundness and sense undergird President Truman's veto of bill No. 1 of the GOP-controlled Congress.

Everyone would like to have an easement of his tax burden But stronger qualities

than personal likes are required to further the national welfare, strengthen and preserve the national economy, and enable us to meet the obligations and responsibilities inherent in world leadership and an international security synonymous with peace and not merely sustainment but projection of our way of living.

While the President devoted considerable portion of his veto message to what he regarded as defects, deficiencies, and inequities in the Republican-sponsored bill, the Chief Executive was on firmest ground in his denunciation of the timing of the proposed reduction. We do not know just how we stand financially as a nation now. From the very outset the tax-reliefers have placed the cart before the horse in that they did not first reduce expenditures to determine what our actual spending would be during the next fiscal year, next set aside a given amount for debt reduction, and then meet the tax-reduction issue on the basis of this sound approach and intelligent determination of primary figures. What the GOP, with some Democratic assistance it is true, did was to pass a tax-reduction bill and attack expenditures with a hatchet afterward. At no time has there been definite decision as to what would and should go into debt reduction. Yet, it is this $275,000,000,000 indebtedness which is hanging over our economy and our future and which must be met, if at all, during times of easy money, high income, and inflation such as we are now having.

Those who are charting our fiscal course must likewise remember that while the war is over peace has not been established in the world, that our armed forces must be maintained at a reasonable level during the occupation and otherwise transitional period, and that, even since tax legislation was cleared by Congress, the European crisis has broken squarely upon us with the Greco-Turkish commitment already voted and a gigantic program apparently shaping up for attempted unification of Europe as an antidote to chaos and political confusion.

Patently, the present is no time for tax reduction. And, when that reduction does come it should be arrived at through an orderliness and intelligence which were not manifested in preparation and passage of the bill to which the President applied a veto and the House promptly gave the coup de grâce.

Showing of Immoral Pictures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Associated Press article from Durham, N. C.:

THEATER MANAGER FINED FOR MOVIE—DURHAM POLICE TO RETURN FILMS BRANDED AS IMMORAL AT THEATER SHOWING

DURHAM, June 18.—A plea of nolo contendere, submitted by a defense counsel in the case of Francis Mahoney, manager of a local theater, charged with showing of alleged immoral pictures, was accepted by Assistant Judge W. C. Purcell today.

A fine of $50 and the costs of the case were assessed against the defendant, bringing to a close the controversial matter in which Judge R. Hunt Parker had ruled at Hillsboro Monday Durham police should not be required to relinquish the confiscated films until trial of the charges against Mahoney.

The theater management had sought return of the films on grounds of financial loss. The defense had denied from the beginning charges that the films were immoral, claiming that they were shown for educational purposes. The films were Birth of a Baby and Main Street Girl. Under agreement which was a part of today's judgment the confiscated films are to be returned to the theater management with the provision that they are not to be shown here by the theater.

Veto of Tax-Reduction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Clifford B. Ward:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

President Truman vetoed the tax bill because of party politics. You can't have a winning political machine unless you have millions and millions to spend to keep the machine properly lubricated. When the chips were down and he had to decide whether to be a President of the United States, representative of all the people, or the head of the Democratic Party, eager for another 4 years of power beginning in 1948, he ran true to his political upbringing in Missouri and went along with the boys in the back room.

This country, as Herbert Hoover and every other intelligent person knows, is on the way to fiscal chaos. It is nothing less than obscene that any party chieftain now should put party welfare ahead of our national welfare, but President Truman has done it. The hypocrisy of his pleas to business to keep prices down is shown by his determination to keep the price of Government up at its highest level. If a government, getting more money to spend than ever before in its history, can't reduce prices, then capital can't reduce the price of its hire and neither can labor.

Mr. Truman, insulting logic to justify his political partisanship, says that reducing taxes would add to the inflationary spiral, ignoring completely the fact that it is government in this country which is responsible for inflation. The greatest setback for inflation would be reduction of Government expense and retirement of the national debt.

Mr. Truman gives the impression that taxes must continue to be at high levels so that the debt may be reduced. He is guilty of dishonesty when he says this because there is no disposition on the part of himself or his administration to apply the excess of current income over current expenses to payment of debt. That excess will be dissipated in political expenditures both at home and abroad.

The veto of the tax-reduction bill was expected, yet there were some who were hoping against hope that Mr. Truman would think in broad national terms rather than in narrow party terms. These persons he sadly disappointed. If Mr. Truman now vetoes the labor bill, he will have completed the disillusionment of millions of Americans and written off as a waste of time, the present session of Congress.

As Mr. Hoover in a communication made public Monday states, this country must soon run off a balance sheet and when it does it will probably discover that it is no longer a creditor Nation but a debtor Nation. We cannot afford, despite our motives, to ruin this country financially and thus extend the chaos of Europe to this country. Despite the fact that we have poured billions into the rat holes of Europe, there is not a country in the world today that would give the United States a thousand-dollar bill unless collateral in excess of $1,000 was provided. We haven't a friend among the nations of the world, except possibly England and there it's a wish rather than a fact that we are indulging.

Mr. Truman in vetoing the tax reduction bill has played politically into the hands of professional Republican Party leaders, because his veto is political capital for his opposition, but despite the fact that I am a Republican, interested in a Republican victory, I would rather have seen the President do what is right than to see him do something against the national welfare even if it does advantage Republicans.

Mr. Truman has only succeeded in convincing the American people that they can't expect much at Washington until they make the Republican control of the House effective both in the Senate and in the White House.

Admission of Veterans to the Bar of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to facilitate the admission to the bar in the District of Columbia of former members of the armed forces.

It provides that the written examination shall be waived in the case of any veteran who has served honorably for a 2-year period, or whose service was terminated in less than 2 years because of having suffered a service-connected disability.

My interest in this matter was aroused by a petition which was presented to me by the legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, signed by about 50 Washington veterans who consumed several years of their lives in the service of their country, some returning with varying degrees of disability. During the time when they would normally have prepared for and taken the bar examinations, they were busily engaged on the beaches of Normandy or Iwo Jima. It seems to me we owe them the consideration of attempting to place them, so far as the time element is concerned, as nearly as possible in a comparabale position with those whose studies were not interrupted by World War II.

As a member of the legal profession, I am also acutely aware of the desirability that the standards of the profession be in no way lowered. For that reason, this measure provides that anyone seeking its benefits must meet all of the educational tests and the high character requirements which are now prescribed.

My own State of New York, where the admission of attorneys to practice is

governed by rules promulgated by the court of appeals, and where we take pride in endeavoring to maintain a high standard, has adopted similar amendments to its rules following both World War I and World War II. I have been in correspondence with Hon. Edmund H. Lewis, one of the eminent judges of that high court, who advises that in the action which they took, and which, incidentaly, goes even farther in liberalizing the requirements than the bill which I have introduced, they enjoyed the benefit of collaboration and careful study of the problem by a special Committee of the American and New York State Bar Associations, and by the Joint Conference on Legal Education, of which Hon. John W. Davis is president. This special committee consisted of Mr. Warnick J. Kernan, a leading lawyer of Utica, N. Y., and Daniel J. Kenefick of Buffalo, former Supreme Court Justice, and the deans of Albany, Columbia, Cornell, New York University, and St. Johns Law Schools.

A public hearing was held, which was widely attended. After study of the record and after giving due weight to various reports and recommendations which were filed, the court adopted the new rules. Judge Lewis then says:

The rules as promulgated represent the court's best judgment as to appropriate regulations governing admission to the practice of law in this State, with proper regard not only for our duty to deal fairly with the veteran whose legal education was interrupted by active service and with disabled veterans whose war-incurred disability will constitute a definite handicap in their professional ambitions, but also to preserve for the bar those high standards for which the profession in this State has long been noted. Those high professional standards are essential not alone to the well-being of our profession but also to the vast business and private interests of our citizens.

I think it is fair to say that there have been relatively few protestations, most of which have involved requests for relaxation of requirements for admission without proper regard for our duty to maintain the standards which our profession and the public have the right to demand.

It is my considered judgment that the enactment of the legislation which I have offered will in no way tend to affect adversely the maintenance of a high standard of the bar in the District, but will give great aid and correct an existing injustice to those young men who have served our country and deserve this tangible token of our gratitude.

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Jewish Daily Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the fiftieth anniversary in the life of any newspaper is an important event and one of public interest, particularly to the subscribers and readers of such a newspaper.

On June 1, 1947, the Jewish Daily Forward celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of its establishment.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address given on that occasion in the Boston Opera House and carried over Station WNAC by Alexander Kahn, general manager of this splendid newspaper:

We feel grateful for this outpouring of friendship.

We welcome you, and with you, we hope to be of service to our people, to our country, and all humanity, for many years to come.

Two weeks ago the New York celebration took place in Madison Square Garden. The place was filled to the roof. The previous evening, the Communists had a meeting in the same place, and it was half empty.

Madison Square Garden can be used for many purposes; for ice-skating, for prize fighting, for a circus—a circus that exhibits queer animals from foreign countries, who love their homelands, and hate to come here. It is also used for a circus to exhibit peculiar American creatures, which hate their own country, but stay here, and give their loyalties to a foreign land, and an all-powerful foreign potentate. All the circuses are now over and closed.

That day Madison Square Garden was filled with people—real people, who came from various parts of the world, who appreciate the freedom of this country, and love its democratic spirit. Our people have abandoned Russia, Poland, and Rumania, because of the tyranny, oppression, and dictatorship that existed there, and, unfortunately, still exists. When we swore off all allegience to the potentates of those countries, and swore loyalty to the United States, we meant it. We are happy to be a part of this great democracy, the United States of America.

We know that many abuses still exist here, and during our entire existence, we have labored to remove them. But as long as freedom exists, and democracy is in action, our peaceful progress is assured. It is only under tyrannies and dictatorsships that hope for progress and liberty is in vain.

This fiftieth anniversary of the Forward is being celebrated in every large city in the United States, from Boston to Los Angeles. The greatest part of the Jewish people in the United States is participating in the celebration, and rejoicing in our success.

The history of the Forward is a record of struggle and triumph.

The Forward has been the high school and college of the Jewish masses. When our people first came to this country, the Forward taught them to speak and read English, American customs, laws, and American history.

We organized them into trade unions, to protect them from exploitation, to improve their standard of living, and we taught them to aspire to a world free from exploitation, tyranny, and oppression.

We organized the greatest fraternal order among Jews, a unique benevolent and cultural organization—the Workmen's Circle.

We translated the world's classic literature into Yiddish, and the greatest Yiddish literature which was translated into European languages, was first published in the Forward.

The Forward was the first in the Jewish community to fight against the sweatshops, against slums, against corrupt politicians, and against domination of trade unions by demagogues and cheap politicians.

We started the movement among the Jewish masses for the New Deal. It was in this same Madison Square Garden that our great editor, Ab. Cahan, was nearly hissed off the platform, when he endorsed our then great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The reactionaries on the Right, and the Communists on the left, supported Roosevelt whenever it suited their purposes, and called him a war monger, when Hitler and Stalin joined hands.

The Forward was the only Jewish newspaper that supported Roosevelt consistently, throughout his entire administration.

Our 50 years have all been years of struggle. We are for a better world, and for freedom, democracy, and peace. We believe we can attain it with the democratic process. But that means eternal vigilance and struggle.

We must, by all means, defend our liberties, and fight dictatorship, if we are to make progress.

During the last 30 years, therefore, the Forward has been consistently fighting the Communist menace. The Forward fought them when it was alone, with small means, against unlimited resources poured into this country through secret channels.

Due to the influence of the Forward, the Communists are an insignificant element in the Jewish community. The noise they create is made by paid agents and brass bands, at so many dollars per day. But the people are not with them.

Fortunately, our country, and the world, are now fully aware of the menace of totalitarianism, and the fight has been taken over by more powerful hands than ours.

These 50 years cover some of the greatest progress and triumphs of Jewish existence. But they also record the greatest calamities that have befallen our people. The Forward was on guard at all times to help our people in their misfortunes in Europe and settling them in Palestine, and wherever else havens could be found for them.

In all these 50 years, the Forward was true to its principles, and served our community with talent, ability, sincerity, and honesty, and the Jewish communty has recognized this.

In spite of the millions of dollars that have been spent to destroy us, the Forward, today, is the largest and most influential Jewish newspaper.

We thank you for your support, for your loyalty, and for your good sense.

With your help, we shall continue to labor for peace, progress, civilization, and a free, democratic world.

Management Speaks to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Management Speaks to Labor" by Alexander Printz, president of the Printz-Biederman Co., of Cleveland, and chairman of the National Coat and Suit Industry Recovery Board, at the June 20th session of the twenty-sixth convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union at the Public Auditorium in Cleveland:

It is, indeed, an honor to be invited to address this great convention. I look upon the invitation as tendered to me not as an individual employer, nor even as chairman

of the National Coat and Suit Industry Recovery Board, but as symbolizing the admirable progress that has been made over the years in harmonious management-labor relationship in the industries with which your organization is identified.

As a Clevelander, who has been in the garment manufacturing business here for more than half a century, it is a source of particular pride to me that this city should be the scene of your triennial meeting. I want to join with other of my fellow citizens and the industry members of this city in bidding you welcome and in expressing the confidence that you will find Cleveland so satisfactory a meeting place that you will come here soon again.

I had the privilege of speaking at your convention in Atlantic City more than 10 years ago and again at your noteworthy gathering in Boston in 1944.

Each time you have asked me to speak, I have accepted your courteous invitation, not because I felt that I could make any significant contribution to your deliberations but because it seemed to me that it was fitting and proper that a representative of management should, when afforded the opportunity, report to labor on matters of common concern.

The fact that there is a community of purpose between management and labor in the wholesome functioning of an industry was cogently expressed a number of years ago, at a time of grave depression, by the late Morris Hillquit, the able counsel to your union and a truly distinguished figure of his time. He declared that labor was interested in the creation of proceeds by industry; that, without such proceeds, there would be nothing with which to give adequate remuneration to labor.

AN INSIGHT INTO MANAGEMENT'S ROLE

It would, I sincerely believe, aid in the consistent improvement in worker-employer relationship for management to accord to labor an insight into management's role in the operation of an industry. Such an insight is made possible in the coat and suit industry through the National Coat and Suit Industry Recovery Board, which serves as a medium of common consideration of industry affairs by management and labor. The meetings of the Executive Committee of the Board, which comprises representatives of your union and the employers' associations in the various coat and suit manufacturing centers throughout the Nation, has been aptly described by your president, David Dubinsky, as the "Parliament of the Industry."

This is an attitude free of the isolationism that precipitates controversies and that causes the waste inherent in suspicion and in conflict. It is a form of relationship in which neither side surrenders its individuality nor dilutes its partisanship but which recognizes the sound precept that labor and management are not traditional enemies or ingrained adversaries.

It requires courage for union leadership to take part in such a program as that represented by the Recovery Board. It is not as dramatic or colorful as are more belligerent forms of union activity; it does not have the popular appeal for fist-brandishing or saber-rattling. It is a broad-visioned pattern for peaceful progress worthy of the widest possible emulation.

CONSTRUCTIVE INTERCHANGE OF VIEWS

In those industries in which the worker-employer concord has not reached a point at which a program such as that of the Recovery Board can be introduced and developed, a beneficial purpose would, in my opinion, be served through joint conventions of representatives of labor and management. This would constitute a forum for the interchange of views and ideas, not under the stress of contract negotiation, but in the spirit of mutual enlightenment.

Not to presume upon your kindness in inviting me here today, I do, however, wish to dwell for a moment upon the true character of management's role as the marketing agent of the grist of the skill and effort of an industry's workers. An outline of management's duties in the apparel industry quickly discloses it to be a many-sided, arduous job that merits the respect, not of labor alone, but of the public as well.

It is management's task to utilize to the utmost its knowledge and ingenuity, not merely in intraindustry competition but in the broader intercommodity rivalry.

Management in the apparel industry does not rest upon laurels of the past; it recognizes the fact that each season poses a separate challenge. Fabric and other resource markets must be exhaustively studied and conclusions concerning them must be supported by substantial investment. Management must direct extensive styling activities, hazarding a sizable part of its capital in the preparation of its lines. Management must engage in intensive merchandising and distribution procedure and must underwrite and coordinate a great many other functions that make for lasting good will and for product improvement.

STABILIZED LABOR CONDITIONS ESSENTIAL

To enable management to center its attention upon the capable performance of its manifold duties, orderly and stabilized labor conditions are not merely desirable; they are unquestionably essential.

It is, indeed, my opinion that the weakening of constructive unionism would be as injurious to conscientious employers as it would be to labor itself. In an industry such as ours, made up of numerous comparatively small firms, a responsible labor organization is necessary to prevent an unreasonable and unfair minority of employers from undermining those who depend for survival upon the merit of their product and their service.

Advancement toward an equitable management-labor relationship in industry in general cannot be achieved through depriving conscientious labor groups of their effectiveness. It is true that jurisdictional disputes, secondary boycotts, and similar actions have evoked justified criticism but it would be everlastingly regrettable if, in attempting to curb these, the very life of wholesome unionism were to be endangered.

The fact that there has been some unsavory union leadership does not justify any generalizations that ignore the role of organized labor in our Nation's march of progress.

LEADERSHIP OF HIGH INTEGRITY

You of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union are to be congratulated upon the leadership of your organization—men of high integrity and proven ability. They give aggressive representation to your great organization and although we, as employers, disagree with them on many occasions, they have our sincere and enduring respect.

In closing, let me voice my belief that there is an awareness among reasonable and capable employers that strong unions, led by men of vision and probity, are indispensable to industrial orderliness and stability.

Speaking out of my own experience, I withstood the unionizing of my firm for a quarter of a century—from 1910 to 1935. Now, after 12 years of conducting a union plant, I feel that, despite the occasional problems and differences that are inevitable in any relationship, I would not want to revert to a nonunion status and I would view with regret any developments that would place unionzation in our industry as a whole upon a demoralizing defensive.

The task of making way for a better tomorrow in our Nation is, properly, a joint endeavor of us all. It is the common goal of worker and employer—of management and labor. Drastic curbs upon either labor or management will not attain this eagerly desired objective.

Mutual confidence and good will, as exemplified by your extending to me the privileges of this platform, are the basic essentials for lasting betterment for ourselves and for the generations to come.

Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, your vote today to override the President's veto of the vicious Taft-Hartley bill, after having heard his thorough analysis of its faults in his message, which should have convinced any fair-minded American that this repressive bill, far from encouraging industrial peace, will destroy it, is now a matter of public record. Nothing now can erase this blot.

I am sure that the American people will hold the Republican Party, and the Republican Members of the House, responsible for this, in the same way but in greater degree than they have the unfair and discriminatory tax bill.

If you have any doubt of the sentiment of the American people, read the results of the Gallup poll as published this morning in the Washington Post. Ponder it well. The American people have not been fooled by your political appeals even to their pocketbooks. No more will they be fooled by the discredited appeals to their emotions on the labor bill. Remember this: There are more people working for a living than there are people clipping coupons for a living.

Following is the text of the poll results as published in the Post:

TAX-BILL VETO IN LINE WITH PUBLIC SENTIMENT

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., June 19.—President Truman's tax-bill veto was closely in line with majority public sentiment throughout the country as expressed in public-opinion surveys dating as far back as last year's election campaign.

The majority of voters have felt that if it came to a choice between cutting taxes and cutting some of the public debt, the latter should take preference.

Obviously, nobody enjoys paying high taxes. And nearly two voters out of every five feel that taxes should be reduced regardless of what happens to the public debt. But most of the rest express greater fear of the huge mountain of public debt than of the heavy burden of taxation which they have to carry.

This issue was put to the public as early as last October, before the Republicans captured control of Congress in the 1946 election. At that time, before any concerted drive had been launched in Congress to cut taxes, the weight of sentiment was more in favor of debt reduction than tax reduction.

Then came a long blast of publicity about tax cutting, with Republican leaders advocating substantial cuts. While it might have

been expected that this would increase public sentiment for tax reduction, actually the movement of public opinion was in the opposite direction. As the discussion continued there was a drop in the number of voters favoring tax reduction in preference to debt reduction.

In October, just before the 1946 congressional elections, the country's attitude was as follows:

Should the Congress elected in November reduce income taxes in 1947, or should this wait until some of the national debt has been paid off?

The vote:

	Percent
Reduce taxes	41
Wait	49
No opinion	10

In May of this year the issue was again put to the voters in a question which named the specific surplus involved.

The United States today has a billion dollar surplus in its running expenses. Should this money be used to reduce income taxes, or should it be used to reduce the national debt?

As reported May 30 the vote was:

	Percent
Cut taxes	38
Reduce debt	53
No opinion	9

The typical American has raised few objections to high taxes when he felt the need was clear.

When war broke out in Europe in 1939 and our own outlays for defense began to mount, polls found the Nation's voters saying they were willing to pay more in taxes. In fact, the public was ahead of the Government, in the sense that its own ideas about what it should be taxed were stiffer than what the Government proposed. The majority of Americans recognized that they would have to carry a heavier burden and were more than willing to do their share.

At the same time, there was no sentiment among the general public for soaking the rich. When asked what income tax a man earning $20,000 or $50,000 annually be required to pay, the public named a rate much lower than the Government was already requiring people with such incomes to pay in taxes.

New evidence that the general public is not out to soak the rich is contained in a survey just completed. This shows that the majority of voters believe the amount of income tax for persons with large incomes should be limited to 50 percent. In short, no one in the United States should be required to pay more than half of his income to the Federal Government, in the opinion of the majority.

The present tax rates go up to more than 80 percent.

A Surprise in Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following appeared in the Tulsa Daily World, of Tulsa, Okla., June 13, 1947, as an editorial in that newspaper:

A SURPRISE IN SUGAR

Suddenly there comes a Department of Agriculture order for the discontinuance of sugar rationing. Regardless of the mixed motives and the unclear factors, the release is welcomed by the public and the retailers. Aside from the pleasing release of this big item from a long control, the action is welcomed because it marks practically the end of the rationing system begun about 5 years ago. Vast harassment has been caused. That rationing was necessary was unquestioned, but there were many disagreeable features which seemed unnecessary and unfair. Abolition of the whole system will not make all of us forget the weariness, but it will add to general content.

Obviously the order for stopping of rationing for households, hotels, and restaurants was hurried up by the knowledge that Congress was about to pass a law requiring an end to the system. Ostensibly, the order took note of 350,000 tons of sugar above the amount anticipated a few months ago. Other unexpected supplies are said to have developed. This leads the mind backward. How long has the Department known of the increased supply, or did that supply just show up day before yesterday? This leads to the unpleasant reflection that the Government or somebody has been holding out information and somebody must have been manipulating sugar itself. How did the Department make up its mind so suddenly? Did the big manipulators who have been cooking up messes ever since rationing started get scared and decide they better be good?

Probably the swift move of the Department will take some of the steam out of the congressional investigations and exposures. Undoubtedly there would have been, in the course of the debate on the termination bill, revelations and exposures. The controversy could easily have developed leads which would lead to the finding of crookedness. The manipulators may have fooled the Government along with the public and at last have sensed the danger of keeping up artificial and burdensome conditions too long.

We are just about in sight of release from all food controls. Whether there will be some price gouging on the strength of the releases we do not know. Hereafter, however, the fight will be directly between the householders and the dealers. Government is mostly out of it, and that is a great gain. While necessary at times, price control, particularly in foods, tends to trouble.

The public will know how to deal with extortioners now that the Government gets its hand out of the matter. Supply and demand should now come into proper operation.

No Premium on Stealing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the National Tribune, the Stars and Stripes, of June 19, 1947:

NO PREMIUM ON STEALING

Three weeks ago the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported favorably a bill that proposes to increase the subsistence allowances now provided to married veterans of World War II who are pursuing studies under the GI bill of rights, but, before the measure was sent to the House floor, there was included a proviso that no veteran can receive its benefits if he is a member of an organization which advocates the overthrow of this Government by force or violence or who belongs to any group listed by the FBI as one in sympathy with the general aims of the Communist Party.

It is a little surprising that so far there has been very little public expression about the amendment. It is a new departure in veterans' legislation, and, if accepted by the Congress, may be applied to other veterans' benefits. Doubtless, it has been accepted as a desirable restriction by most thinking ex-servicemen, who will not place themselves on record for fear of some sort of reprisal. We go for it in a big way, largely for the reason that it can affect only a few disloyal persons who deserve no consideration, but we are amazed that there has been so little comment from left-wing commentators who usually find in such matters ammunition for their poison pens.

Editors of the Washington Post, which is not universally considered as a particularly conservative sheet, term the committee action "a vicious move" because "it does violence to the principle of freedom of thought," promotes martyrdom, furthers Communist ends, and "casts dishonor on all military service," and Tom Stokes, of the Washington Daily News, says it is contrary to American tradition for the reason it denies to student veterans "the privileges and delights and frivolities of a college education." Of course, it does nothing of the kind. As a matter of fact, those who would pay anything to anybody who is attempting to aid and assist enemies of our form of government to overthrow it, who would give them greater rein by adding to their means of doing it, whether they be war veterans or not, would be subsidizing disloyalty with the taxpayer's money, and would be opposing this Nation's adopted policy of putting an end to the appeasement of Communists.

Honorable service, according to the Post, was honorable service regardless of the political affiliation of the men who performed it. With that we do not disagree. It is nevertheless a well-known fact that far too many men in the American uniform during the war just concluded did not render honorable service even though they were awarded honorable discharges or were released under conditions other than dishonorable. Many of them, officers and men, were given soft jobs through political influence, or took on noncombatant duties to escape the rigors of real service. All are eligible to GI rights under existing law, yet it is also known that some caused untold embarrassment to the big brass under the guise of freedom of speech. In addition, there were those in uniform who were placed there for the specific purpose of sabotaging the war effort, and some got away with it. We hold no brief for that breed of cat, and, if they can be identified belatedly through their present chosen company, they should be spotted and labelled as the traitors to their country that they are. They get no sympathy from honest veterans; they deserve none.

Stokes falls back on memories of "bull sessions" in college dormitories as sacred to the institution of learning, to the freedom of mind, spirit, and inquiry. He says they are places where men gather at night to talk about everything under the sun "and advance the craziest or silliest or most revolutionary notions, or talk seriously or frivolously" about many things. Well, we can easily recall such sessions when they were more frivolous than serious, but in far too many instances they have in recent years been profaned. Such meetings as are sponsored by Communists and their fellow travelers are a deadly serious proposition and are purposed to tear down the very institutions that house them. They may be a joke to Stokes, and he may attach his own yardstick when measuring their danger, but we cannot concede that the Government is

obliged to educate rascals when it has hope of being repaid only by a stab in the back if or when the opportunity is afforded.

People are only obstinate when they disbelieve what organized Communists openly admit. There is nothing spontaneous about some of these youth movements in our schools and colleges. They are Communist-inspired and Communist-directed, and they are too frequently tolerated and encouraged by professors who have lied their way into their college chairs. Fortunately, there is only a very small minority of GI's in the whole mess, but our people certainly should not be called upon by legislative failures to encourage the ungrateful few who have not the intelligence to take advantage properly of the rights accorded to them.

Too many of our people are today disgracing their citizenship in the name of liberalism. There was never a time in all history when the rights of free peoples were more seriously threatened. Attacks upon their morals are being made flagrantly through the press, the motion picture, and by mail, and the accent is placed on our youth. The most American of all American institutions are the schools of our land, and the minds of school-age persons are the most susceptible to false propaganda. As the Red influence was deliberately sifted into the armed forces, so it is being filtered into our schools and colleges. It is not funny. It is a disgrace, and those who condone it can do so only through ignorance or through design.

Real Americans want no part of it. Those who make up the great bulk of organized veterans will oppose it with all of the will they possess. They, therefore, favor any measure that will help to guarantee a maintenance of the freedoms for which they fought and for which their pals gave their lives. Many of them are already finding the going tough and they know it will get tougher as time goes on. They learned the hard way that there is no such thing as partial allegiance, that one cannot be partly loyal to this country and in part true to a foreign power. They know the fallacy of any attempt to subscribe to conflicting sets of principles, and they appreciate that hyphenated Americanism has no place in this land of ours. They do not choose to encourage the placing of a premium on stealing.

Education for Democracy in a New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in the quiet, scenic, and majestic foothills of the Ozarks stands the College of the Ozarks, steeped in tradition and with a heritage heralded throughout the educational circles of our country, a college noble and proud. Noble for its greatness; and proud of its accomplishments.

Many great and illustrious sons have adorned the halls of this institution to go forward in mighty conflict and take their places in the cause of peace, proclaiming truth and liberty. Included in this fine and successful group of citizens is one of our colleagues from Arkansas, the Honorable W. F. NORRELL. Over a period of years the College of the Ozarks has recognized the success and accomplishments of its esteemed sons and other outstanding citizens. For the success he attained in 1945, for the contribution made to his country and humanity, for the tradition he upheld throughout the years, he was awarded in a fitting ceremony at commencement an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

On May 25, 1947, the fifty-sixth commencement was held at the College of the Ozarks. Our colleague, Mr. NORRELL, was invited to deliver the commencement address to a fine and outstanding class. At this memorial occasion, a former colleague, the Honorable David D. Terry, who served in this House for many years and held the admiration and respect of all of the Members, was too awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws for his notable accomplishments and outstanding service to his State and Nation.

Education and democracy have grown and progresed together throughout the history of the United States, accentuating the basic philosophy that has made our country great. I believe many will be interested in the graduating address of Mr. NORRELL on this occasion on the subject of education for democracy in a new world. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his thought-provoking, sustaining, and inspirational address:

President Hurie, members of the graduating class, members of the faculty, ladies, and gentlemen, I am happy to have the privilege, pleasure, and honor of returning to this great institution, sacred in my memory, not alone for the purpose of delivering the address on the occasion of the graduation of these splendid young men and women, but to visit this campus once again, look inside classrooms, meet schoolmates, faculty members, and old acquaintances, and to recall very pleasant memories of bygone days.

Someone has said that reminiscing is a sign of old age. Well, if it is, I must be very, very old indeed.

I recall happy days spent here—days when I increased in wisdom and stature and, I hope, to some extent, in favor with God and man. I am grateful for the honors bestowed upon me by this institution—the first college which lived to be chartered in Arkansas, and also for the honor award given me in 1945 by the almuni association.

I have chosen to speak to you on the general theme of Education for Democracy in a New World. This subject may seem to you to be abstract and visionary on first thought. However, upon reflection, I think you will agree that it has vital implications for the maintenance of international peace and the welfare of all nations.

In these hills of the Ozarks every one of you has had the experience of attaining a broader vision by climbing from the depth of a small valley to the top of one of the surrounding mountains. Those of you who served overseas during World War II, and others of you who have traveled far, have likewise had the experience of attaining a broader mental vision from the acquired knowledge of other lands and other nations. Furthermore, in your studies at this college and in other ways you have gained a basic understanding of the international situation and how it may vitally affect the life of every one of us.

A NEW WORLD; A NEW CRISIS

With the advent of the atomic bomb a new world was born. It is a new world of physical power. More importantly, it is a new world of ideas. Man's conception of his place in the universe is basically changed. He is conscious of far greater power. It remains to be seen to what extent he will use this power for good, and to what extent for evil.

The House Appropriations Committee, of which I am now and was a member during the war, supplied the money for the atomic project. When the committee was first approached on the subject, the members were opposed to the idea of making an atomic bomb. They felt that the world would be better off without it. However, General Marshall, who had at first presented the proposal to the committee, reappeared and emphasized that the nation which first obtained atomic bombs would win the war. The committee finally granted the money. Some of the members later witnessed the test of the bomb in New Mexico. When the bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, the world quickly learned what had been done.

Early last year the Army and the Navy decided to see what atomic bombs could do to ships. As a Democratic member of the House committee, I was designated to witness the test at Bikini. We all know what happened there. This Nation shuddered when we first heard the news of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. For months thereafter newspapers and magazines predicted the destruction of civilization by this awful force. A few pointed out that if diverted to constructive use, this great power might be a boon to mankind.

The possibility of utter devastation from the misuse of atomic energy still hangs over the earth like a great cloud; yet, throughout history of civilization, man has many times faced what appeared to be an agent of complete destruction.

Imagine primitive man seeing the lightening start great forest fires, which seemingly would devour all living things. Surely he must have thought at first that if man ever learned to make fire and use it as a weapon he could destroy the earth.

As centuries passed, and men learned to use stone axes, iron spears, and bows and arrows in warfare, many must have been the predictions that warring with such weapons would destroy the human race.

The consternation upon the spread of news of the invention of gunpowder was comparable to that upon the advent of the atomic bomb. When gas was first used in World War I, it was widely believed to be an agent of destruction of all mankind. Yet defenses against gas were invented, as defenses against all earlier weapons had been.

So may defenses be found against the atomic bomb. We do not know; but we have reason to believe that men will not disappear from the earth because of the use of atomic energy. There is a new world crisis, but it has been preceded by other comparable ones. In some respects, they have been essentially different.

NOT A CRISIS OF FEAR

The new world crisis is not primarily one of fear. As has been pointed out, man has faced the fear of utter devastation many times before. But fear has never adequately motivated him to build a better world—a world in which all could live as free men.

Now, as never before, man faces an opportunity to build such a world, but we cannot rely only upon fear of atomic bombs to cause him to do this. Fear may motivate him to build defenses against these bombs. It may also influence him to use other and more commendable methods, such as the furtherance of world-wide education for international respect and understanding, for the maintenance of international peace. Unless this is done on an unprecedented scale, fear will produce greater distrust among the nations and cause them to arm themselves more powerfully than ever before to wage war with one another.

In many foreign lands I have had opportunity to observe the suspicion and distrust of one nation toward another. Some time before Japan actually surrendered, we had information that she was willing to do so.

The question arose as to how much money appropriated to the War Department for the prosecution of the war could be returned to the United States Treasury for peacetime uses. In order to help find an answer to this question, I was one of several Members of the House Committee designated to accompany Maj. Gen. George Richards, Chief Budget Officer for the War Department, and a number of other high-ranking Army officers, on a tour of investigation to practically every major country of the world, Australia, China, India, Iran, Egypt, Italy, Greece, Germany, France, and England. I was impressed with the evidences of distrust and suspicion among the nations—even those allied in the war. By world-wide education for democratic living, we can combat this distrust and create conditions conducive to world peace. About this I shall have more to say.

A MORAL CRISIS

It is tragic that men today generally see in the use of atomic energy only a greater danger to their physical existence. The present crisis is a moral crisis. With the aid of atomic energy, men at last have the power to build a world of freemen. Will they do it?

In his great work, the Dawn of Conscience, James H. Breasted has recounted the expansion of the feeling of obligation for our fellowmen. He tells how man at first felt obligation toward his family, and later, in succession, toward his tribe, community, state, and country. But not all have developed a concern over the welfare of their countrymen. Few have developed an interest in the welfare of the people of the world. Until recently those who felt such concern could do comparatively little about it. The world was too poor, and communication and travel too difficult.

A CRISIS OF OPPORTUNITY

For the first time in history, men are able, if they wish to use existing means, to think, work, and act on a world-wide basis. We all know of the wonders of the radio, and of modern air travel which makes any point on earth only about 40 hours distant from any other point. Such rapidity of communication and transportation as we have today was never forseen by most of those who lived a decade ago.

The nations of the world are faced with a crisis of opportunity to work together for the welfare of all peoples. It is a crisis of opportunity to dispel ignorance and fear, and to create feelings of good will among the nations.

THE POWER OF EDUCATION

I have pointed out to you that we are living in a world of new physical power, and of new basic ideas; that the present period is a period of crisis, and that this is a crisis not of fear but of moral responsibility—a crisis of opportunity to build a world of freemen. Let us now consider the role of education in meeting this crisis.

In a famous statement of the 1920's, H. G. Wells predicted that the fortunes of the world were dependent upon the outcome of the race between catastrophe and education—the right kind of education. By 1939, it was clear that catastrophe had won the race. It cost the world 6 years of bitter warfare, 60,000,000 casualties and $3,000,000,000,000 to give itself another chance—a chance to start the race all over again.

The great power of education—good and bad—has been dramatically demonstrated in recent years, both by democratic and totalitarian nations. It is evident that now, more than ever before, democratic government and a democratic way of life are possible only to a people well educated under democratic principles.

Our government and the governments of the world to a great extent are now recognizing that fact. In an address at San Francisco, in 1945, the President of the United States said, "We must set up an effective agency for consistent and thorough interchange of thought and ideas, for there lies the road to a better and more tolerant understanding among nations and among peoples." Pursuing this thought the Secretary of State wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives early in 1946: "In a world where nations may arm themselves with weapons against which there is no physical defense, basic security lies in the creation of mutual trust and confidence among the peoples of the world."

Education is the most effective instrument by which such mutual trust and confidence can be created. It is more powerful than the atomic bomb in this respect. Thus education constitutes a primary basis of peace.

One man has said: "We shall never achieve an international relationship, marked by understanding, peace, justice, and good will unless we make full use of the instrument of organized education to that end." Another has said: "When victory is won, we should see to it that the evil which has brought about the world catastrophe is attacked at the source—in the schools." Still another has said: "Education has a role of the first importance to play in building the foundation of a just and lasting peace."

I think it can be said that every great change in human society from tribal government to nationalism, from chattel slavery to modern capitalism, has been accompanied by equally profound changes in the structure, scope, and purpose of organized education. This idea to use education for mutual understanding and peace is not new. It has been developing ever since there were nations and organized school systems. If it can be demonstrated that a desired extension of knowledge is apt to show us how to make war less likely and peace more probable, then international cooperation to discover that knowledge must be our business. I would permit one reservation: Our purpose is not intended to promote peace at any price. There could be a peace of slavery—a peace where human rights are ignored—the peace of death. There could be a security in the submission to injustice—a security in stagnation—the security of a cage. These are not the peace and security to be established.

It is generally agreed that wide difference in economic and social conditions among the nations are major causes of war; these variations are largely accompanied by differences in educational standards. For example, the Scandinavian countries, in spite of relatively poor natural resources, are distinguished by their high standard of education and by their superior economic and social development. On the other hand, many areas in Africa and South America, with the richest of natural resources, have very low standards of education and inferior standards of living.

Throughout the world, literate and educated nations tend to have a higher standard of living, illiterate and ignorant nations tend to be poverty stricken. By working together for mutual understanding and for higher standards of democratic education everywhere, the nations can further their democratic, economic, and social progress and reduce the probability of war. The United Nations has taken decisive action toward the attainment of these goals through the creation of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY

If world peace is to be maintained, nations must be taught the love of God and of their fellow men. They must learn to understand and respect each other. All peoples must obtain sufficient knowledge to utilize modern inventions and develop the natural resources of their countries, so as to minimize the economic differences which produce wars. As long as there are dictatorships, there will be wars; and as long as there are nations inadequately educated in the principles of democracy, there will be dictatorships. There must be world-wide education in democracy, for the maintenance of peace and for the welfare and progress of all peoples.

UNITED STATES ACTION ABROAD

The United States is engaged in a number of activities for the promotion of peace and progress through education. Many of these activities involve cooperation with other countries. The United States is serving as the chief architect for the structure of peacetime living which the people of our country and the people of some of the other countries are working together to build—largely using the material of education.

Our country has played a leading role in the establishment of the United Nations educational, scientific, and cultural organization. While serving as Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes defined the task of this organization in the following terms: "Its task is to lay the foundations of future world peace in the minds and hearts of men. A major duty of modern statesmanship is to establish conditions of mutual understanding among the peoples of the world. This can only be achieved if the peoples of the world themselves turn their thoughts toward this goal."

Assistant Secretary of State William Benton (then chairman of the United States delegation to the General Conference) said: "I know of no task more challenging, more difficult, or more hopeful than the task of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to advance the cause of peace through understanding among peoples. It is both a symbol and an instrument of our determination to construct the defenses of people in the minds and hearts of men."

Our Departments of State, War, and Navy, and other interested agencies, have cooperated in formulating and carrying out a comprehensive program for the reeducation of the defeated Germans and Japanese in the ways of democracy. The United States is actively participating in several phases of education for democracy abroad. However, in its international information program we are doing far less to teach other nations the principles of democracy than the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is doing to teach them communism. Concerning this point, I should like to tell you a very brief story.

A small boy was riding a mule which balked near a country doctor's office. After overhearing for some time the sounds of the boy's futile efforts to make the mule go, the doctor came out and offered a remedy. He rubbed some very powerful, hot liniment on the mule and shortly thereafter the mule suddenly rose and went galloping across the field. The boy looked at the mule in amazement, and then said, "Doctor, did that liniment cost much?" "No," replied the doctor, "only a nickle." "Well," said the boy, "you better rub about a dime's worth on me, 'cause I've got to catch that mule."

The international information program of the United States needs a double dose of stimulation in our efforts to educate the world for democracy, or to catch up with the efforts of the Soviet Union to indoctrinate the world for communism. Upon this race may depend whether or not the world will remain at peace. Dictatorships lead to wars, and the Government of Russia today is a dictatorship.

UNITED STATES ACTION AT HOME

To many people coming from foreign lands to this country, the opportunity for democratic education has been a beacon in the darkness. Such opportunity did not exist in the lands of their birth; so they determined that their children should be given better advantages. Our educational system has been the guardian of America's ideal of equal

opportunity. There is common agreement that the educational attainment of the peoples is important to the welfare and progress of the country as a whole; that a fairly high minimum level of education is of fundamental importance for all citizens in a modern democracy is no longer a subject for debate. Yet in the school year 1944–45, the latest year for which such data are available, the United States spent only $2,600,000,000 for the operation of its public elementary and secondary schools—somewhat less than $2,700,000,000 which the people of this country spent for tobacco in the calendar year 1944. In the same year our people spent $7,100,000,000 for alcoholic beverages—an amount approaching three times the expenditure for the public schools.

During the school year 1944–45 the total amount spent in the United States for all types and levels of education, public and private, was about $3,500,000,000—only a little over 2 percent of the national income for 1945. During the calendar year 1945 it is claimed that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics spent over 8 percent of its national income on education.

While the data on expenditures for education in the Soviet Union is questionable, it appears that they are spending considerable sums in support of the distribution of Communist propaganda throughout the world.

Higher education in this country is faced with unprecedented problems. With tremendously increased enrollments following the war, the colleges and universities are still hard pressed to find adequate classroom space and teaching equipment, enough qualified instructors, and sufficient housing for the students.

Numerous proposals are now before the Congress for additional Federal aid to the States for education. Some of the proposals are for universal military training, with emphasis on the military. Others are simply for universal training. Some time ago the President appointed a Commission on Universal Training, which has been making extensive studies and is expected soon to render a report on this question. What action the Congress will take on these national issues remains to be seen. Action by the Congress, either to institute a universal training program or to provide for annual appropriations to the States for education, will establish an important national policy.

When the entire long record of Federal activities in education is considered, it is evident that throughout the years the Federal Government has been increasingly concerned with the satisfactory education of the Nation. This trend may be expected to continue. Let us hope that our Federal, State, and local Governments, and the governments of other nations, will cooperate in the furtherance of education for democracy in the new world of atomic power. Therein lies the road to mutual understanding and respect among peoples, and to the maintenance of peace and increased prosperity of all nations.

Soil Erosion by Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Your Country's Soil Is Being Stolen," appearing in the Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia on June 15, 1947. This dramatically worded editorial shows an awareness of the problems involved in the Mississippi flood, in areas far removed from the scene of the disaster. Appearing in a Philadelphia newspaper, more than a thousand miles from the Mississippi-Missouri River area where these raging floods are causing such havoc and destruction, the editorial shows the widespread interest of the American people in this problem. These floods are recognized as having national and not merely local effects on our economy. They require the earnest, concerted, and intelligent action of the Congress of the United States. I remind the Senate that there is now before a committee of this body a joint resolution introduced by me on June 12, urging appropriate action to meet the present flood emergency in the Mississippi-Missouri region.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR COUNTRY'S SOIL IS BEING STOLEN

Year in and year out, the United States is openly robbed of millions of dollars' worth of its natural resources.

The robber is the Mississippi River, aided and abetted by its tributaries.

These tributaries grab soil that belongs to the people—soil the possession of which is connected with the country's future properity—and deliver it to the master thief. The master thief carries it down to the Gulf of Mexico and dumps it.

The people cry "stop thief!" They have been shouting for more than a hundred years that the pillage must stop. They have created committees and commissions of investigation, and hired men skilled at dealing with that kind of criminal, and have got practically nowhere.

Ol' Man River, he jes' keeps rollin' along, stealing from his banks, stealing from all the surrounding country, and unloading the loot according to his centuries-old plan.

Every year, in flood season, he extends his operations. Every few years he goes on a special rampage, as he has done this June, and then the anguished cries of the victims rise to high heaven.

Now, this is 1947. Since first we began to talk about the ravages of the Mississippi and the Missouri and their pillaging of a vast productive area the engineers of this country have grappled successfully with many major problems.

They have dug the Panama Canal. They have impounded the waters of many great rivers with seemingly impossible dams. They have built a sea-going railroad and bridged San Francisco Bay. If they had the backing, they could not only stop the Mississippi floods, but save the soil that is being wasted and the lives that are annually destroyed and the thousands of houses carried away and valuable livestock drowned by the unregulated flow of the waters of this robber gang of rivers.

Of course, the Mississippi is a thousand miles from here, and we have river thieves at work right in our own State. But we have a long-range stake in the prosperity of the great plains area and in the protection of the property taken away by the Mississippi, for it's part of our national heritage.

And of course we want economical government. It is not regarded as an extravagance to take out burglary insurance and to capture and confine professional thieves.

This country might, with prudence, invest in the control of raging flood waters any sum the interest on which would not exceed the money losses it suffers by inaction.

Truman Blocks Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., entitled "Truman Blocks Tax Relief":

President Truman has interposed his veto between millions of Americans and a substantial measure of relief from the staggering tax burden. He has raised a number of objections to the tax-cutting legislation approved by the Republican-controlled Congress, but none of his criticism will prevent him from having to bear the full responsibility for denying the taxpayers a $4,000,000,000 cut in their income-tax bill.

Mr. Truman makes the claim in his veto message that the tax-reduction measure is inflationary—a position which may surprise many persons who have gained the impression that the President was in favor of the reduction of prices which they are required to pay.

There is likely to be a widespread inability to understand why savings which would result from reduction of taxes would be more dangerous to the national economy than the savings which would accrue from other price reductions which the Chief Executive has been urging upon business.

Inasmuch as it now costs Americans billions of dollars more to pay the costs of government than it does to provide themselves with food, President Truman will seem to many to be inconsistent in appealing to business to reduce the prices which it charges for goods and in refusing to reduce the price which the Federal Government charges the people for its services on the grounds that reductions in the latter field would be inflationary.

Mr. Truman also maintains that income-tax reduction is not now necessary to permit business expansion—a contention that is likely to make little impression upon those in the lower-income brackets who have been thinking of tax relief in terms of more money with which to buy the necessities of life.

Despite the fact that the bill which he has vetoed properly would provide the greatest percentage of reduction in the lowest income brackets, the President complains that tax savings to the average family with an income of $2,500 would be less than $30. Because he apparently does not believe this to be enough, he has decreed that they shall get no reduction at all.

It is very possible that the bill in question is not perfect but to millions of Americans upon whom the payment of taxes at the present rates is a hardship it undoubtedly would be preferable to no relief.

Mr. Truman claims that the legislation is unsafe from the standpoint of Government finances despite the lack of proof that, if rigid economy is practiced by Government, enough would not be left for tax relief after balancing the budget and making substantial payments on the public debt.

The President's refusal to cut income taxes because of an apparent conviction that the Nation's economy still can stand up under high taxes would seem to place him in the position of others who contend they have a right to charge for what they sell all that the traffic will bear.

Regardless of all the objections which Mr. Truman has raised to cutting taxes now rather than at a time less distant from the

1948 Presidential election, the President cannot alter the fact that he has stood between the people and a lightening of the tax burden.

By passing the tax-cutting bill and sending it to the White House, the Republicans in Congress completed the redemption of one of their major pledges in last fall's campaign. Mr. Truman will have to bear the full responsibility for preventing the American people from obtaining the benefits of that redemption.

Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on Tuesday, June 17. In addition, I want to say that I have been receiving letters from many people indicating keen disappointment that the President saw fit to veto H. R. 1, which would have provided reductions in personal income taxes. It is notable that the majority of these letters come from people in the lower-income tax brackets. They had counted upon the relief that it would have afforded.

The editorial follows:

DEMAGOGIC VETO

If we were not firmly convinced that President Truman hopes to sponsor and take credit for tax reductions in time for his 1948 campaign, we would consider that his veto of the Republican bill showed at least the political courage of his expressed convictions.

But the arrant demagogy with which he denounced the tax bill as favoring the rich makes it impossible to credit him with sincerity. His fight for every last cent of his extravagant budget exposes the false pretenses of his professed concern for sound economy.

His charge that the wealthy would be unduly spared by a 10.5-percent reduction on large incomes, as compared with 30 percent on small incomes, is pure vote bait, pitched to appeal to the envy and malice on which the New Deal thrived. The income tax is already steeply graduated. The 10-to-30-percent spread in the vetoed bill would have saved money for all, but it would have magnified the difference in the rates paid by the lowest and the highest incomes.

Under the present law, a married man with two dependents earning $2,500 a year pays $95 in tax. A similar individual earning 4 times as much does not pay 4 times the tax; he pays $1,862, nearly 20 times as much.

The income tax has become a means of bringing the incomes of all citizens closer to that dead level so beloved of the Roosevelt regime and its heirs. It could be argued that if this country had ever dreamed that the income tax would be turned into this socialistic instrument it never would have been accepted back in 1913.

We agree with the President that a substantial start toward the reduction of the $257,000,000,000 debt is more important than tax reduction. Contrary to his opinion, however, we believe that a determined drive to shoo the hordes of useless bureaucrats away from their entrenched positions at the public trough would enable us to have both.

Mr. Truman's talk about deferring tax cuts "until the structure of prices is on a more stable basis" is unadulterated twaddle. Relief from the heavy burden of wartime tax rates would do as much as anything else to shake out the notion that all costs are on a permanently higher plateau.

It appears unlikely that votes can be mustered in the Senate to override the veto, although the House may be able to do so. The Republicans will be false to their pledges and derelict to their duty if they allow this veto to prevent a relentless hunt for every dispensable item in the administration budget.

If the Treasury surplus can be boosted to $6,000,000,000 or more, and protected from Mr. Truman's spenders, a debt reduction of that amount would be gratifying salve for the taxpayers' welts.

Blow at Religious Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, the decision rendered by the Supreme Court recently, permitting the use of public funds to pay for the transportation of pupils to sectarian schools, is a subtle but nonetheless dangerous decision to the cause of religious freedom, upon which this great Nation was founded. In this connection I wish to include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Blow at Religious Liberty":

BLOW AT RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Separation of church and State is a bulwark of religious liberty. To remove a stone from that bulwark is to weaken the fortress of religious liberty. In our opinion the Supreme Court, by its decision permitting the use of public funds to pay for the transportation of pupils to sectarian schools, has torn down a whole section of that bulwark.

The majority opinion protests, "We would not approve the slightest breach." It holds that the adherents of any church should not be deprived of the benefits of a general law under which the State of New Jersey reimburses the parents of pupils who have to use busses to get to school. This appears plausible until one realizes that where the public pays for transportation to public schools, parents are deprived of no benefits unless they insist on sending their children to private schools. It is their own act which cuts them off from free school facilities.

That fact makes it plain that pay for busses to facilitate attendance at parochial schools gives special aid to such schools. This is underscored by the fact that other private schools get no aid. This entering wedge of support could be pushed very far, as the dissenting opinions of Mr. Justice Rutledge and Mr. Justice Jackson point out. Will the next step be to reimburse parents for the tuition they must pay to sectarian schools? Since taxes pay the tuition in public schools, could they not plead for such aid on the same ground?

Indeed, there is a Nation-wide campaign to get public aid, and this Supreme Court decision fits right into it.

It seems to us that the Court has opened a very wide door. Where will it draw the line? It might be well for friends of religious liberty to carry a new case to the Court, to permit it to call a quick halt to this breaking down of the separation between church and state, or even to reverse itself. Meanwhile a movement is already under way to establish an explicit safeguard by means of a constitutional amendment which cannot be overturned by any court.

In the beginning we said the separation between state and church is a bulwark of religious liberty. This is so because where there is no separation either the state dominates or the church dominates the combined power.

In one case the state uses the church for political purposes. This tends to a condition in which vital religion is either corrupted or suppressed, and where the church dominates it uses political power for its own ends. This tends to a condition where other churches are banned or hampered, clericalism completely controls education, and a pampered church decays. In either condition real religious liberty is lost. History is full of the evil results. Spain and Russia, Italy and Argentina, have furnished modern examples.

Statistics of Veterans in Kentucky Schools and Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. HOWES MEADE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tables:

TABLE 1.—*Sex, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total	Male	Female
All schools:			
Total	4,868	4,812	56
Not married	3,173	3,133	40
Married	1,695	1,679	16
Without children	988	976	12
With children	707	703	4
University of Kentucky:			
Total	2,858	2,810	48
Not married	1,974	1,939	35
Married	884	871	13
Without children	525	515	10
With children	359	356	3
University of Louisville:			
Total	588	586	2
Not married	320	318	2
Married	268	268	----
Without children	147	147	----
With children	121	121	----
Berea College:			
Total	94	94	----
Not married	36	36	----
Married	58	58	----
Without children	33	33	----
With children	25	25	----
Kentucky State College:			
Total	68	68	----
Not married	58	58	----
Married	10	10	----
Without children	6	6	----
With children	4	4	----
All other colleges and schools:			
Total	1,261	1,254	7
Not married	786	782	4
Married	475	472	3
Without children	277	275	2
With children	198	197	1

TABLE 1a.—*Age, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Age																			
	Total reporting	18 years	19 years	20 years	21 years	22 years	23 years	24 years	25 years	26 years	27 years	28 years	29 years	30 years	31 years	32 years	33 years	34 years	35 years or more	Median age
All schools: Total	4,805	1	127	472	695	691	677	540	471	326	254	171	135	66	61	30	23	13	52	23.6
Not married	3,128	1	117	439	589	510	469	352	251	138	113	44	40	20	18	9	6	3	9	22.8
Married	1,677	------	10	33	106	181	208	188	220	188	141	127	95	46	43	21	17	10	43	25.5
Without children	974	------	8	26	84	128	142	120	133	95	59	62	45	15	18	10	7	3	19	24.8
With children	703	------	2	7	22	53	66	68	87	93	82	65	50	31	25	11	10	7	24	26.5
University of Kentucky: Total	2,807	------	98	305	407	399	385	328	274	192	148	91	63	35	31	12	12	5	22	23.5
Not married	1,936	------	92	285	360	314	282	216	156	82	71	22	22	14	11	3	3	1	2	22.7
Married	871	------	6	20	47	85	103	112	118	110	77	69	41	21	20	9	9	4	20	25.5
Without children	515	------	5	18	39	63	72	69	75	53	35	32	18	8	7	5	3	2	11	24.9
With children	356	------	1	2	8	22	31	43	43	57	42	37	23	13	13	4	6	2	9	26.5
University of Louisville: Total	585	------	5	51	73	78	99	53	58	48	33	24	28	12	13	2	1	1	6	23.9
Not married	318	------	4	47	60	44	62	31	24	17	7	9	9	1	3	------	------	------	------	23.1
Married	267	------	1	4	13	34	37	22	34	31	26	15	19	11	10	2	1	1	6	25.7
Without children	146	------	1	3	12	23	22	16	21	18	10	5	8	2	2	1	1	------	1	24.8
With children	121	------	------	1	1	11	15	6	13	13	16	10	11	9	8	1	------	1	5	27.0
Berea College: Total	94	------	------	3	11	8	16	12	14	11	6	5	3	3	------	------	------	------	2	(1)
Not married	36	------	------	3	7	2	8	6	6	2	1	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	1	(1)
Married	58	------	------	------	4	6	8	6	8	9	5	5	3	3	------	------	------	------	1	(1)
Without children	33	------	------	------	2	4	6	5	5	4	1	2	1	3	------	------	------	------	------	(1)
With children	25	------	------	------	2	2	2	1	3	5	4	3	2	------	------	------	------	------	1	(1)
Kentucky State College: Total	68	------	------	3	8	15	14	6	6	3	3	3	2	------	1	1	1	1	1	(1)
Not married	58	------	------	3	8	14	14	6	6	1	2	3	------	------	------	------	1	------	------	(1)
Married	10	------	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	2	1	------	2	------	1	1	------	1	1	(1)
Without children	6	------	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	1	1	------	------	------	1	1	------	1	------	(1)
With children	4	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	1	------	------	2	------	------	------	------	------	1	(1)
All other colleges and schools: Total	1,251	1	24	110	196	191	163	141	119	72	64	48	39	16	16	15	9	6	21	23.6
Not married	780	1	21	101	154	136	103	93	59	36	32	10	9	5	4	6	2	2	6	22.8
Married	471	------	3	9	42	55	60	48	60	36	32	38	30	11	12	9	7	4	15	25.3
Without children	274	------	2	5	31	37	42	30	32	19	12	23	18	2	8	3	3	------	7	24.7
With children	197	------	1	4	11	18	18	18	28	17	20	15	12	9	4	6	4	4	8	26.0

[1] Median not computed where the base is less than 100.

TABLE 1b.—*Married veterans with children, by number of children, for a group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School	Total reporting	1 child	2 children	3 children	4 children	5 or more children	School	Total reporting	1 child	2 children	3 children	4 children	5 or more children
All schools	703	541	133	20	5	4	Berea College	25	20	4	1	------	------
							Kentucky State College	4	3	------	1	------	------
University of Kentucky	356	284	64	7	------	1	All other colleges and schools	197	132	46	11	5	3
University of Louisville	121	102	19	------	------	------							

TABLE 1c.—*Presence of dependents other than wife and children for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Presence of dependents other than wife and children			School, marital status, and presence of children	Presence of dependents other than wife and children			School, marital status, and presence of children	Presence of dependents other than wife and children		
	Total reporting	Yes	No		Total reporting	Yes	No		Total reporting	Yes	No
All schools: Total	4,136	435	3,701	University of Louisville: Total	529	43	486	Kentucky State College: Total	58	36	22
Not married	2,535	344	2,191	Not married	270	35	235	Not married	49	31	18
Married	1,601	91	1,510	Married	259	8	251	Married	9	5	4
Without children	928	54	874	Without children	143	6	137	Without children	6	3	3
With children	673	37	636	With children	116	2	114	With children	3	2	1
University of Kentucky: Total	2,426	207	2,219	Berea College: Total	85	10	75	All other colleges and schools: Total	1,038	139	899
Not married	1,582	165	1,417	Not married	30	8	22	Not married	604	105	499
Married	844	42	802	Married	55	2	53	Married	434	34	400
Without children	495	25	470	Without children	30	2	28	Without children	254	18	236
With children	349	17	332	With children	25	------	25	With children	180	16	164

TABLE 2.—*Scholastic status, present school attendance, and length of time out of school, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Was student when entered armed forces				Was not student when entered armed forces							
						Length of time out of school						
	Total reporting	Attending same school now	Not attending same school now	Not reporting	Total reported	Under 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	3 to 4 years	4 to 5 years	5 or more years	Not reported
All schools: Total	2,524	1,068	1,446	10	2,265	802	430	281	181	115	316	140
Not married	1,663	698	1,007	8	1,408	615	266	159	114	59	110	85
Married	811	370	439	2	857	187	164	122	67	56	206	55
Without children	488	219	267	2	486	131	96	65	34	25	104	31
With children	323	151	172		371	56	68	57	33	31	102	24
University of Kentucky: Total	1,535	652	878	5	1,264	491	254	164	90	57	135	73
Not married	1,085	450	631	4	846	387	158	103	61	32	52	53
Married	450	202	247	1	418	104	96	61	29	25	83	20
Without children	275	121	153	1	239	73	48	32	17	8	47	14
With children	175	81	94		179	31	48	29	12	17	36	6
University of Louisville: Total	336	170	163	3	249	76	46	26	27	23	39	12
Not married	187	93	91	3	131	49	31	9	11	12	11	8
Married	149	77	72		118	27	15	17	16	11	28	4
Without children	83	39	44		64	15	10	8	7	9	13	2
With children	66	38	28		54	12	5	9	9	2	15	2
Berea College: Total	76	59	17		18	3	4	6	1	1	1	2
Not married	33	26	7		3		1	2				
Married	43	33	10		15	3	3	4	1	1	1	2
Without children	26	22	4		7	2	2	1		1		1
With children	17	11	6		8	1	1	3	1		1	1
Kentucky State College: Total	25	13	12		42	15	8	2	2	1	6	8
Not married	24	12	12		33	14	6	1	2	1	3	6
Married	1	1			9	1	2	1			3	2
Without children					6	1	2	1				2
With children	1	1			3						3	
All other colleges and schools: Total	552	174	376	2	692	217	118	83	61	33	135	45
Not married	384	117	266	1	395	165	70	44	40	14	44	18
Married	168	57	110	1	297	52	48	39	21	19	91	27
Without children	104	37	66	1	170	40	34	23	10	7	44	12
With children	64	20	44		127	12	14	16	11	12	47	15

TABLE 3.—*Scholastic average, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Reporting scholastic average														
	Before entering service								At present						
	Total	A	A— (B+)	B	B— (C+)	C	C— (D+)	D or F	Total	A	A— (B+)	B	B— (C+)	C	C— (D+)	D or F
All schools: Total	3,963	147	398	1,267	867	1,139	102	43	4,238	157	559	1,399	1,073	970	59	21
Not married	2,591	108	261	836	552	755	54	25	2,772	85	318	861	712	732	47	17
Married	1,372	39	137	431	315	384	48	18	1,466	72	241	538	361	238	12	4
Without children	809	27	73	256	190	223	31	9	865	35	141	309	228	146	4	2
With children	563	12	64	175	125	161	17	9	601	37	100	229	133	92	8	2
University of Kentucky: Total	2,328	89	261	724	532	646	57	19	2,521	89	320	744	685	625	43	15
Not married	1,588	65	180	505	353	445	30	10	1,720	47	189	477	470	491	34	12
Married	740	24	81	219	179	201	27	9	801	42	131	267	215	134	9	3
Without children	435	15	47	131	107	112	17	6	470	19	79	159	133	75	4	1
With children	305	9	34	88	72	89	10	3	331	23	52	108	82	59	5	2
University of Louisville: Total	517	16	51	145	115	153	25	12	532	16	60	168	173	107	6	2
Not married	281	12	22	78	60	85	16	8	294	7	35	83	97	66	4	2
Married	236	4	29	67	55	68	9	4	238	9	25	85	76	41	2	
Without children	134	3	14	36	29	45	5	2	136	4	15	43	49	25		
With children	102	1	15	31	26	23	4	2	102	5	10	42	27	16	2	
Berea College: Total	89	3	6	33	17	26	4		90	1	13	39	21	14	2	
Not married	34	1	4	11	5	13			36		7	14	8	5	2	
Married	55	2	2	22	12	13	4		54	1	6	25	13	9		
Without children	32	2	1	12	7	6	4		31	1	4	12	8	6		
With children	23		1	10	5	7			23		2	13	5	3		

TABLE 3.—*Scholastic average, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*—Continued

School, marital status, and presence of children	Reporting scholastic average															
	Before entering service								At present							
	Total	A	A— (B+)	B	B— (C+)	C	C— (D+)	D or F	Total	A	A— (B+)	B	B— (C+)	C	C— (D+)	D or F
Kentucky State College: Total	53	4	3	23	6	16	----	1	60	2	2	20	10	26	----	----
Not married	45	4	3	21	5	11	----	1	51	1	2	18	8	22	----	----
Married	8	----	----	2	1	5	----	----	9	1	----	2	2	4	----	----
Without children	5	----	----	1	1	3	----	----	5	----	----	2	1	2	----	----
With children	3	----	----	1	----	2	----	----	4	1	----	----	1	2	----	----
All other colleges and schools: Total	976	35	77	342	197	298	16	11	1,035	49	164	428	184	198	8	4
Not married	643	26	52	221	129	201	8	6	671	30	85	269	129	148	7	3
Married	333	9	25	121	68	97	8	5	364	19	79	159	55	50	1	1
Without children	203	7	11	76	46	57	5	1	223	11	43	93	37	38	----	1
With children	130	2	14	45	22	40	3	4	141	8	36	66	18	12	1	----

TABLE 4.—*Plans for continuation of education, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Plans for continuation of education								
	After discharge, no GI bill of rights			Now, no Government aid			Future, after exhaustion of Government aid		
	Total reporting	Yes	No	Total reporting	Yes	No	Total reporting	Yes	No
All schools: Total	4,687	2,588	2,099	4,720	2,249	2,471	4,621	2,584	2,037
Not married	3,058	1,858	1,200	3,082	1,671	1,411	3,008	1,826	1,182
Married	1,629	730	899	1,638	578	1,060	1,613	758	855
Without children	943	480	463	949	382	567	943	461	482
With children	686	250	436	689	196	493	670	297	373
University of Kentucky: Total	2,734	1,692	1,042	2,764	1,488	1,276	2,704	1,541	1,163
Not married	1,885	1,258	627	1,909	1,128	781	1,864	1,160	704
Married	849	434	415	855	360	495	840	381	459
Without children	498	286	212	503	234	269	501	241	260
With children	351	148	203	352	126	226	339	140	199
University of Louisville: Total	569	334	235	568	308	260	557	360	197
Not married	310	210	100	309	205	104	303	211	92
Married	259	124	135	259	103	156	254	149	105
Without children	141	78	63	141	65	76	137	84	53
With children	118	46	72	118	38	80	117	65	52
Berea College: Total	89	54	35	89	38	51	92	54	38
Not married	34	23	11	35	23	12	35	19	16
Married	55	31	24	54	15	39	57	35	22
Without children	31	22	9	31	12	19	32	21	11
With children	24	9	15	23	3	20	25	14	11
Kentucky State College: Total	68	30	38	68	20	48	63	39	24
Not married	58	27	31	58	19	39	53	35	18
Married	10	3	7	10	1	9	10	4	6
Without children	6	2	4	6	1	5	6	2	4
With children	4	1	3	4	----	4	4	2	2
All other colleges and schools: Total	1,227	478	749	1,231	395	836	1,205	590	615
Not married	771	340	431	771	296	475	753	401	352
Married	456	138	318	460	99	361	452	189	263
Without children	267	92	175	268	70	198	267	113	154
With children	189	46	143	192	29	163	185	76	109

TABLE 5.—*Subsistence, and amount of additional monthly expenditures, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	Living entirely on subsistence	Not living entirely on subsistence											
			Total	Additional monthly expenditures										
				Under $10	$10 to $14	$15 to $19	$20 to $24	$25 to $29	$30 to $34	$35 to $44	$45 to $59	$60 to $74	$75 and over	Not reported
All schools: Total	4,794	460	4,334	9	98	185	394	591	502	796	623	347	572	217
Not married	3,121	342	2,779	8	84	172	341	515	388	556	331	118	115	151
Married	1,673	118	1,555	1	14	13	53	76	114	240	292	229	457	66
Without children	974	65	909	1	11	9	35	53	76	139	166	131	248	40
With children	699	53	646		3	4	18	23	38	101	126	98	209	26
University of Kentucky: Total	2,800	172	2,623	2	52	95	212	346	317	524	416	216	335	113
Not married	1,932	140	1,792	2	48	91	192	314	256	392	244	94	78	81
Married	868	32	836		4	4	20	32	61	132	172	122	257	32
Without children	513	17	496		3	3	13	20	39	83	99	77	137	22
With children	355	15	340		1	1	7	12	22	49	73	45	120	10
University of Louisville: Total	585	44	541	4	9	19	37	48	40	65	73	59	150	37
Not married	317	36	281	3	8	18	35	41	30	44	40	13	25	24
Married	268	8	260	1	1	1	2	7	10	21	33	46	125	13
Without children	147	6	141	1	1		2	5	8	9	16	22	69	8
With children	121	2	119			1		2	2	12	17	24	56	5
Berea College: Total	94	19	75	1	9	8	14	11	6	8	7	4	2	5
Not married	36	16	20	1	6	5	4	1		1				2
Married	58	3	55		3	3	10	10	6	7	7	4	2	3
Without children	33	2	31		2	2	8	7	4	6	2			
With children	25	1	24		1	1	2	3	2	1	5	4	2	3
Kentucky State College: Total	68	38	30	1	2	6	2	4	2	3	3	2	3	2
Not married	58	35	23	1	1	5	2	4	2	2	1	2	1	2
Married	10	3	7		1	1				1	2		2	
Without children	6	2	4		1					1	2			
With children	4	1	3			1							2	
All other colleges and schools: Total	1,247	187	1,060	1	26	57	129	182	137	196	124	66	82	60
Not married	778	115	663	1	21	53	108	155	100	117	46	9	11	42
Married	469	72	397		5	4	21	27	37	79	78	57	71	18
Without children	275	38	237		4	4	12	21	25	40	47	32	42	10
With children	194	34	160		1		9	6	12	39	31	25	29	8

TABLE 5a.—*Subsistence, and source of additional monthly expenditures, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	Living entirely on subsistence	Not living entirely on subsistence							
			Total	Source of additional funds						
				Part-time work	Home (family)	Cashing war bonds	Other savings	Loans	Scholarships	All other	Not reported
All schools: Total	4,794	460	4,334	1,260	1,198	675	1,032	57	8	57	47
Not married	3,121	342	2,779	657	849	462	730	34	7	22	18
Married	1,673	118	1,555	603	349	213	302	23	1	35	29
Without children	974	65	909	305	253	121	174	7	1	27	21
With children	699	53	646	298	96	92	128	16		8	8
University of Kentucky: Total	2,800	172	2,628	789	695	398	662	24	7	26	27
Not married	1,932	140	1,792	435	521	295	496	16	6	12	11
Married	868	32	836	354	174	103	166	8	1	14	16
Without children	513	17	496	182	126	61	100	3	1	11	12
With children	355	15	340	172	48	42	66	5		3	4
University of Louisville: Total	585	44	541	226	148	55	93	2		10	7
Not married	317	36	281	110	85	29	53			2	2
Married	268	8	260	116	63	26	40	2		8	5
Without children	147	6	141	49	47	13	20			8	4
With children	121	2	119	67	16	13	20	2			1
Berea College: Total	94	19	75	47	5	7	15				1
Not married	36	16	20	17		2	1				
Married	58	3	55	30	5	5	14				1
Without children	33	2	31	21	4		6				
With children	25	1	24	9	1	5	8				1

TABLE 5a.—*Subsistence, and source of additional monthly expenditures, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*—Continued

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	Living entirely on subsistence	Not living entirely on subsistence								
			Total	Source of additional funds							
				Part-time work	Home (family)	Cashing war bonds	Other savings	Loans	Scholarships	All other	Not reported
Kentucky State College:											
Total	68	38	30	6	7	9	7	1			
Not married	58	35	23	3	5	7	7	1			
Married	10	3	7	3	2	2					
Without children	6	2	4	2	1	1					
With children	4	1	3	1	1	1					
All other colleges and schools:											
Total	1,247	187	1,060	192	343	206	255	30	1	21	12
Not married	778	115	663	92	238	129	173	17	1	8	5
Married	469	72	397	100	105	77	82	13		13	7
Without children	275	38	237	51	75	46	48	4		8	5
With children	194	34	160	49	30	31	34	9		5	2

TABLE 6.—*Hours per month and availability of part-time work, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Hours of part-time work											
	Total reporting	Less than 10 hours	10 to 14 hours	15 to 19 hours	20 to 24 hours	25 to 29 hours	30 to 34 hours	35 to 39 hours	40 to 49 hours	50 to 59 hours	60 to 79 hours	80 hours or over
All schools:												
Total	1,194	20	42	29	98	28	102	34	172	77	215	377
Not married	632	13	22	17	61	14	57	25	84	51	106	182
Married	562	7	20	12	37	14	45	9	88	26	109	195
Without children	287	6	14	7	19	10	23	4	52	11	57	84
With children	275	1	6	5	18	4	22	5	36	15	52	111
University of Kentucky:												
Total	736	10	17	11	52	18	58	23	90	48	147	262
Not married	406	6	11	8	30	10	37	18	47	33	76	130
Married	330	4	6	3	22	8	21	5	43	15	71	132
Without children	169	4	5	2	13	5	12	1	27	7	34	59
With children	161		1	1	9	3	9	4	16	8	37	73
University of Louisville:												
Total	205	6	8	7	21	6	16	4	24	10	37	66
Not married	99	5	5	5	13	4	8	3	9	5	14	28
Married	106	1	3	2	8	2	8	1	15	5	23	38
Without children	46		1	2	2	[illegible]	4	1	5	1	14	14
With children	60	1	2		6		4		10	4	9	24
Berea College:												
Total	63		3	3	1		2	2	34	11	4	3
Not married	33		1		1				19	8	3	1
Married	30		2	3			2	2	15	3	1	2
Without children	20		1	1			1	2	12	1	1	1
With children	10		1	2			1		3	2		1
Kentucky State College:												
Total	6		2		1	1					2	
Not married	3		2		1							
Married	3					1					2	
Without children	2					1					1	
With children	1										1	
All other colleges and schools:												
Total	184	4	12	8	23	3	26	5	24	8	25	46
Not married	91	2	3	4	16		12	4	9	5	13	23
Married	93	2	9	4	7	3	14	1	15	3	12	23
Without children	50	2	7	2	4	2	6		8	2	7	10
With children	43		2	2	3	1	8	1	7	1	5	13

TABLE 6.—*Hours per month and availability of part-time work, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*—Continued

School, marital status, and presence of children	Availability of part-time work					
	Total reporting	Yes	No			
			Total	Would work if available	Would not work if available	Not reported
All schools: Total	3,529	1,492	2,037	1,675	302	60
Not married	2,237	866	1,371	1,126	204	41
Married	1,292	626	666	549	98	19
Without children	740	337	403	327	68	8
With children	552	289	263	222	30	11
University of Kentucky: Total	2,009	933	1,076	837	200	39
Not married	1,357	576	781	611	142	28
Married	652	357	295	226	58	11
Without children	380	199	181	133	42	6
With children	272	158	114	93	16	5
University of Louisville: Total	442	241	201	153	39	9
Not married	236	122	114	90	19	5
Married	206	119	87	63	20	4
Without children	109	56	53	41	12	----
With children	97	63	34	22	8	4
Berea College: Total	83	79	4	4	----	----
Not married	30	30	----	----	----	----
Married	53	49	4	4	----	----
Without children	29	27	2	2	----	----
With children	24	22	2	2	----	----
Kentucky State College: Total	46	10	36	35	----	1
Not married	37	6	31	31	----	----
Married	9	4	5	4	----	1
Without children	6	3	3	3	----	----
With children	3	1	2	1	----	1
All other colleges and schools: Total	149	229	720	646	63	11
Not married	577	132	445	394	43	8
Married	372	97	275	252	20	3
Without children	216	52	164	148	14	2
With children	156	45	111	104	6	1

TABLE 7.—*Intention to continue in school, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Continuation in school if no increase in subsistence		
	Total reporting	Yes	No
All schools: Total	4,543	3,141	1,402
Not married	2,996	2,146	850
Married	1,547	995	552
Without children	902	627	275
With children	645	368	277
University of Kentucky: Total	2,653	1,991	662
Not married	1,852	1,398	454
Married	801	593	208
Without children	473	377	96
With children	328	216	112
University of Louisville: Total	542	432	110
Not married	300	258	42
Married	242	174	68
Without children	134	101	33
With children	108	73	35
Berea College: Total	91	66	25
Not married	36	30	6
Married	55	36	19
Without children	32	24	8
With children	23	12	11
Kentucky State College: Total	68	21	47
Not married	58	20	38
Married	10	1	9
Without children	6	1	5
With children	4	----	4
All other colleges and schools: Total	1,189	631	558
Not married	750	440	310
Married	439	191	248
Without children	257	124	133
With children	182	67	115

TABLE 8.—*Expenditures per month (total, rent, food, insurance), by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

TOTAL EXPENDITURES PER MONTH

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	Under $65	$65 to $69	$70 to $74	$75 to $79	$80 to $84	$85 to $89	$90 to $94	$95 to $99	$100 to $104	$105 to $109	$110 to $114	$115 to $119	$120 to $124	$125 to $129	$130 to $134	$135 to $139	$140 to $144	$145 to $149	$150 to $154	$155 to $159	$160 to $164	$165 or over
All schools: Total	4,767	358	135	200	282	348	386	400	346	327	234	199	179	166	151	136	127	134	104	120	52	62	321
Not married	3,100	339	134	197	275	337	366	357	302	266	156	108	74	45	39	25	12	15	6	10	8	5	24
Married	1,667	19	1	3	7	11	20	43	44	61	78	91	105	121	112	111	115	119	98	110	44	57	297
Without children	969	13	1	2	4	8	12	26	32	39	56	51	68	72	68	61	64	65	55	65	26	31	150
With children	698	6	----	1	3	3	8	17	12	22	22	40	37	49	44	50	51	54	43	45	18	26	147
University of Kentucky: Total	2,780	136	55	77	143	191	254	274	253	235	152	127	105	92	100	79	71	77	60	65	29	32	173
Not married	1,915	128	54	76	140	184	244	256	235	204	118	82	56	36	31	19	7	10	4	5	5	----	18
Married	865	8	1	1	3	7	10	18	18	31	34	45	49	56	69	60	64	67	56	60	24	29	155
Without children	513	6	1	----	1	6	7	10	14	19	24	23	29	34	41	32	36	39	36	36	14	17	88
With children	352	2	----	1	2	1	3	8	4	12	10	22	20	22	28	28	28	28	20	24	10	12	67
University of Louisville: Total	583	74	19	22	24	35	30	23	17	28	31	24	21	20	12	21	17	22	18	17	9	14	85
Not married	315	71	19	22	23	32	30	20	11	21	22	14	7	4	4	2	3	3	1	1	----	2	3
Married	268	3	----	----	1	3	----	3	6	7	9	10	14	16	8	19	14	19	17	16	9	12	82
Without children	147	3	----	----	1	1	----	2	5	4	5	7	10	10	4	12	8	10	8	10	9	3	35
With children	121	----	----	----	----	2	----	1	1	3	4	3	4	6	4	7	6	9	9	6	0	9	47
Berea College: Total	94	23	5	2	5	2	3	5	4	7	7	5	7	4	3	2	3	1	2	1	----	1	2
Not married	36	21	5	2	5	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----
Married	58	2	----	----	----	1	3	5	4	7	7	5	7	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	----	1	2
Without children	33	1	----	----	----	1	----	3	3	5	6	5	4	2	2	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
With children	25	1	----	----	----	----	3	2	1	2	1	----	3	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	----	1	1

TABLE 8.—*Expenditures per month (total, rent, food, insurance), by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*—Continued

TOTAL EXPENDITURES PER MONTH—continued

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	Under $65	$65 to $69	$70 to $74	$75 to $79	$80 to $84	$85 to $89	$90 to $94	$95 to $99	$100 to $104	$105 to $109	$110 to $114	$115 to $119	$120 to $124	$125 to $129	$130 to $134	$135 to $139	$140 to $144	$145 to $149	$150 to $154	$155 to $159	$160 to $164	$165 or over
Kentucky State College: Total	68	2	14	17	9	6	10	3	1	1	1	1	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1	-----	-----	1
Not married	58	2	14	16	8	6	9	2	-----	-----	-----	-----	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Married	10	-----	-----	1	1	-----	1	1	1	1	1	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1	-----	-----	1
Without children	6	-----	-----	1	-----	-----	1	1	1	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1	-----	-----	-----
With children	4	-----	-----	-----	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1
All other colleges and schools: Total	1,242	123	42	82	101	114	89	95	71	56	43	42	45	50	36	34	36	34	24	36	14	15	60
Not married	776	117	42	81	99	114	83	79	56	41	16	12	10	4	4	4	1	2	1	4	3	-----	3
Married	466	6	-----	1	2	-----	6	16	15	15	27	30	35	46	32	30	35	32	23	32	11	15	57
Without children	270	3	-----	1	2	-----	4	10	9	10	21	16	25	26	21	17	20	16	11	18	3	11	26
With children	196	3	-----	-----	-----	-----	2	6	6	5	6	14	10	20	11	13	15	16	12	14	8	4	31

RENT EXPENDITURES PER MONTH

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	None	$1 to $4	$5 to $9	$10 to $14	$15 to $19	$20 to $24	$25 to $29	$30 to $34	$35 to $39	$40 to $49	$50 and over
All schools: Total	4,429	1	92	265	771	895	767	396	326	204	396	316
Not married	2,832	-----	89	251	722	816	588	151	100	32	66	17
Married	1,597	1	3	14	49	79	179	245	226	172	330	299
Without children	938	-----	1	9	27	43	119	112	135	106	207	179
With children	659	1	2	5	22	36	60	133	91	66	123	120
University of Kentucky: Total	2,595	1	1	12	517	611	536	250	175	115	225	152
Not married	1,754	-----	1	11	493	593	455	95	53	17	29	7
Married	841	1	-----	1	24	18	81	155	122	98	196	145
Without children	498	-----	-----	1	13	8	56	68	76	62	124	90
With children	343	1	-----	-----	11	10	25	87	46	36	72	55
University of Louisville: Total	526	-----	4	2	31	75	90	35	49	20	92	128
Not married	271	-----	3	1	30	69	75	25	28	5	26	9
Married	255	-----	1	1	1	6	15	10	21	15	66	119
Without children	144	-----	-----	1	-----	3	7	5	11	6	41	70
With children	111	-----	1	-----	1	3	8	5	10	9	25	49
Berea College: Total	93	-----	23	8	4	17	18	13	6	1	1	2
Not married	35	-----	22	8	3	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1
Married	58	-----	1	-----	1	16	18	13	6	1	1	1
Without children	33	-----	1	-----	1	9	11	8	1	1	1	-----
With children	25	-----	-----	-----	-----	7	7	5	5	-----	-----	1
Kentucky State College: Total	66	-----	15	33	11	1	4	1	1	-----	-----	-----
Not married	56	-----	14	32	9	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Married	10	-----	1	1	2	-----	4	1	1	-----	-----	-----
Without children	6	-----	-----	-----	2	-----	3	-----	1	-----	-----	-----
With children	4	-----	1	1	-----	-----	1	1	-----	-----	-----	-----
All other colleges and schools: Total	1,149	-----	49	210	208	191	119	97	95	68	78	34
Not married	716	-----	49	199	187	152	58	31	19	10	11	-----
Married	433	-----	-----	11	21	39	61	66	76	58	67	34
Without children	257	-----	-----	7	11	23	42	31	46	37	41	19
With children	176	-----	-----	4	10	16	19	35	30	21	26	15

FOOD EXPENDITURES PER MONTH

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	None	$1 to $19	$20 to $24	$25 to $29	$30 to $34	$35 to $44	$45 to $54	$55 to $59	$60 to $64	$65 to $74	$75 to $89	$90 and over
All schools: Total	4,629	-----	191	169	152	263	758	1,437	230	733	310	271	115
Not married	2,983	-----	177	162	145	226	584	1,040	135	379	77	49	9
Married	1,646	-----	14	7	7	37	174	397	95	354	233	222	106
Without children	960	-----	7	3	4	32	134	250	57	216	104	108	45
With children	686	-----	7	4	3	5	40	147	38	138	129	114	61
University of Kentucky: Total	2,709	-----	59	64	31	98	363	989	158	514	193	169	71
Not married	1,855	-----	52	59	28	81	288	798	116	324	66	37	6
Married	854	-----	7	5	3	17	75	191	42	190	127	132	65
Without children	508	-----	4	2	1	15	53	123	28	117	59	72	34
With children	346	-----	3	3	2	2	22	68	14	73	68	60	31
University of Louisville: Total	542	-----	60	36	16	46	73	126	16	68	46	37	18
Not married	281	-----	56	34	16	35	39	55	7	27	7	5	-----
Married	261	-----	4	2	-----	11	34	71	9	41	39	32	18
Without children	143	-----	2	1	-----	10	27	45	2	23	14	13	6
With children	118	-----	2	1	-----	1	7	26	7	18	25	19	12

TABLE 8.—*Expenditures per month (total, rent, food, insurance), by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*—Continued

FOOD EXPENDITURES PER MONTH—continued

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	None	$1 to $19	$20 to $24	$25 to $29	$30 to $34	$35 to $44	$45 to $54	$55 to $59	$60 to $64	$65 to $74	$75 to $89	$90 and over
Berea College:													
Total	93		9	7	5	3	15	22	6	13	7	6	
Not married	36		9	7	4	3	8	3		2			
Married	57				1		7	19	6	11	7	6	
Without children	33				1		5	13	5	7	2		
With children	24						2	6	1	4	5	6	
Kentucky State College:													
Total	68			2	38	9	11	5		2	1		
Not married	58			2	37	8	11						
Married	10				1	1		5		2	1		
Without children	6				1			3		2			
With children	4					1		2			1		
All other colleges and schools:													
Total	1,217		63	60	62	107	296	295	50	136	63	59	26
Not married	753		60	60	60	99	238	184	12	26	4	7	3
Married	464		3		2	8	58	111	38	110	59	52	23
Without children	270		1		1	7	49	66	22	67	29	23	5
With children	194		2		1	1	9	45	16	43	30	29	18

INSURANCE EXPENDITURES PER MONTH

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	None	$1	$2	$3	$4	$5	$6	$7	$8	$9	$10 and over
All schools:												
Total	3,578		94	201	373	183	194	1,208	193	171	119	842
Not married	2,166		77	129	286	109	105	904	117	85	53	301
Married	1,412		17	72	87	74	89	304	76	86	66	541
Without children	820		9	54	56	46	53	193	41	54	43	271
With children	592		8	18	31	28	36	111	35	32	23	270
University of Kentucky:												
Total	2,079		41	105	198	93	98	786	113	95	62	488
Not married	1,327		33	74	153	62	57	601	71	45	31	200
Married	752		8	31	45	31	41	185	42	50	31	288
Without children	444		3	25	29	19	27	121	20	32	21	147
With children	308		5	6	16	12	14	64	22	18	10	141
University of Louisville:												
Total	516		12	26	36	27	32	158	29	28	18	150
Not married	266		11	13	29	14	14	113	17	13	5	37
Married	250		1	13	7	13	18	45	12	15	13	113
Without children	134		1	9	3	7	13	26	7	11	7	50
With children	116			4	4	6	5	19	5	4	6	63
Berea College:												
Total	71		1	4	12	4	6	21	3	3	5	12
Not married	21		1		3	1		9	2	2	1	2
Married	50			4	9	3	6	12	1	1	4	10
Without children	28			4	6	2	1	5	1		2	7
With children	22				3	1	5	7		1	2	3
Kentucky State College:												
Total	59		3	7	15	4	4	11	1	4	2	8
Not married	49		3	4	13	4	4	10		4	2	5
Married	10			3	2			1	1			3
Without children	6			2	1			1	1			1
With children	4			1	1							2
All other colleges and schools:												
Total	853		37	59	112	55	54	232	47	41	32	184
Not married	503		29	38	88	28	30	171	27	21	14	57
Married	350		8	21	24	27	24	61	20	20	18	127
Without children	208		5	14	17	18	12	40	12	11	13	66
With children	142		3	7	7	9	12	21	8	9	5	61

TABLE 9.—*Condition and type of housing and persons sharing room, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Condition of housing			Type of housing											Persons sharing room						
	Total reporting	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Total reporting	Parents	Relatives; pay no rent	Relatives; pay rent	Dormitory	Fraternity	Rented room	Temporary housing facility	Apartment	Trailer	All other	Total reporting	No person	1 person	2 persons	3 persons	4 persons	5 or more persons
All schools:																					
Total	4,711	3,697	1,014	4,677	634	85	346	639	244	1,743	750	123	20	93	3,666	914	1,781	616	278	38	39
Not married	3,072	2,642	430	3,109	563	31	160	610	236	1,269	223	1	1	15	2,741	712	1,283	446	232	30	38
Married	1,689	1,055	584	1,568	71	54	186	29	8	474	527	122	19	78	925	202	498	170	46	8	1
Without children	950	605	345	929	40	28	108	17	5	363	257	80	10	21	611	130	446	26	8	1	
With children	689	450	239	639	31	26	78	12	3	111	270	42	9	57	314	72	52	144	38	7	1

TABLE 9.—*Condition and type of housing and persons sharing room, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*—Continued

School, marital status, and presence of children	Condition of housing			Type of housing										Persons sharing room						
	Total reporting	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Total reporting	Parents	Relatives; pay no rent	Relatives; pay rent	Dormitory	Fraternity	Rented room	Temporary housing facility	Apartment	Trailer	All other	Total reporting	No person	1 person	2 persons	3 persons	4 persons	5 or more persons
University of Kentucky: Total	2,755	2,206	549	2,746	308	56	175	239	230	1,155	456	61	19	47	2,225	609	1,031	372	154	30	29
Not married	1,905	1,652	253	1,924	276	29	94	232	224	872	182	1	1	13	1,730	511	750	280	135	25	29
Married	850	554	296	822	32	27	81	7	6	283	274	60	18	34	495	98	281	92	19	5	-----
Without children	500	320	180	490	15	15	46	4	5	218	129	42	9	7	332	62	253	13	4	-----	-----
With children	350	234	116	332	17	12	35	3	1	65	145	18	9	27	163	36	28	79	15	5	-----
University of Louisville: Total	575	421	154	565	189	8	93	43	12	125	45	31	1	18	361	136	166	46	12	1	-----
Not married	310	270	40	315	170	-----	33	40	10	59	3	-----	-----	-----	235	111	101	17	5	1	-----
Married	265	151	114	250	19	8	60	3	2	66	42	31	1	18	126	25	65	29	7	-----	-----
Without children	146	83	63	140	12	4	36	2	-----	49	14	18	1	4	79	18	60	1	-----	-----	-----
With children	119	68	51	110	7	4	24	1	2	17	28	13	-----	14	47	7	5	28	7	-----	-----
Berea College: Total	91	84	7	94	2	-----	3	34	-----	5	49	-----	-----	1	73	11	46	15	1	-----	-----
Not married	35	34	1	36	2	-----	-----	33	-----	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	35	-----	29	6	-----	-----	-----
Married	56	50	6	58	-----	-----	3	1	-----	4	49	-----	-----	1	38	11	17	9	1	-----	-----
Without children	32	28	4	33	-----	-----	2	1	-----	2	28	-----	-----	-----	21	6	15	-----	-----	-----	-----
With children	24	22	2	25	-----	-----	1	-----	-----	2	21	-----	-----	1	17	5	2	9	1	-----	-----
Kentucky State College: Total	68	36	32	67	3	2	1	32	-----	12	16	1	-----	-----	64	1	7	23	31	1	1
Not married	58	31	27	57	3	-----	1	29	-----	8	16	-----	-----	-----	57	1	5	21	29	1	-----
Married	10	5	5	10	-----	2	-----	3	-----	4	-----	1	-----	-----	7	-----	2	2	2	-----	1
Without children	6	2	4	6	-----	2	-----	1	-----	3	-----	-----	-----	-----	4	-----	2	1	1	-----	-----
With children	4	3	1	4	-----	-----	-----	2	-----	1	-----	1	-----	-----	3	-----	-----	1	1	-----	1
All other colleges and schools: Total	1,222	950	272	1,205	132	19	74	291	2	446	184	30	-----	27	943	157	531	160	80	6	9
Not married	764	655	109	777	112	2	32	276	2	329	22	-----	-----	2	684	89	398	122	63	3	9
Married	458	295	163	428	20	17	42	15	-----	117	162	30	-----	25	259	68	133	38	17	3	-----
Without children	266	172	94	260	13	7	24	9	-----	91	86	20	-----	10	175	44	116	11	3	1	-----
With children	192	123	69	168	7	10	18	6	-----	26	76	10	-----	15	84	24	17	27	14	2	-----

TABLE 10.—*Amount of GI insurance carried or reason for not carrying, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

PERSONS CARRYING GI INSURANCE

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	Amount carried										
		$1,000	$2,000	$3,000	$4,000	$5,000	$6,000	$7,000	$8,000	$9,000	$10,000	Not reported
All schools: Total	2,600	63	125	88	23	524	8	6	3	1	1,708	51
Not married	1,680	43	77	67	11	350	4	2	2	-----	1,090	34
Married	920	20	48	21	12	174	4	4	1	1	618	17
Without children	539	10	26	13	7	107	2	1	1	-----	361	11
With children	381	10	22	8	5	67	2	3	-----	1	257	6
University of Kentucky: Total	1,609	33	73	43	16	297	6	4	2	1	1,113	21
Not married	1,086	26	46	33	7	215	2	2	1	-----	738	16
Married	523	7	27	10	9	82	4	2	1	1	375	5
Without children	313	4	14	6	6	54	2	1	1	-----	222	3
With children	210	3	13	4	3	28	2	1	-----	1	153	2
University of Louisville: Total	393	9	12	19	3	62	1	1	1	-----	276	9
Not married	210	5	7	12	1	34	1	-----	1	-----	144	5
Married	183	4	5	7	2	28	-----	1	-----	-----	132	4
Without children	95	2	3	3	-----	18	-----	-----	-----	-----	67	2
With children	88	2	2	4	2	10	-----	1	-----	-----	65	2
Berea College: Total	59	1	5	3	1	16	-----	-----	-----	-----	32	1
Not married	21	1	1	1	-----	3	-----	-----	-----	-----	14	1
Married	38	-----	4	2	1	13	-----	-----	-----	-----	18	-----
Without children	23	-----	3	2	1	8	-----	-----	-----	-----	9	-----
With children	15	-----	1	-----	-----	5	-----	-----	-----	-----	9	-----
Kentucky State College: Total	28	-----	4	-----	-----	7	-----	-----	-----	-----	14	3
Not married	26	-----	3	-----	-----	6	-----	-----	-----	-----	14	3
Married	2	-----	1	-----	-----	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Without children	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
With children	1	-----	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
All other colleges and schools: Total	511	20	31	23	3	142	1	1	-----	-----	273	17
Not married	337	11	20	21	3	92	1	-----	-----	-----	180	9
Married	174	9	11	2	-----	50	-----	1	-----	-----	93	8
Without children	107	4	6	2	-----	26	-----	-----	-----	-----	63	6
With children	67	5	5	-----	-----	24	-----	1	-----	-----	30	2

TABLE 10.—*Amount of GI insurance carried or reason for not carrying, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*—Continued

PERSONS NOT CARRYING GI INSURANCE

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	Aware of reinstatement without exam			Reason for failure to reinstate insurance			
		Yes	No	Not reported	Did not want insurance	Financially unable to carry insurance	Not aware insurance could be reinstated	Not reported
All schools:								
Total	2,198	2,004	179	15	203	1,742	76	177
Not married	1,445	1,313	124	8	153	1,126	54	112
Married	763	691	55	7	50	616	22	65
Without children	433	395	32	6	36	344	14	39
With children	320	296	23	1	14	272	8	26
University of Kentucky:								
Total	1,193	1,070	116	7	128	910	53	102
Not married	849	763	82	4	101	640	35	73
Married	344	307	34	3	27	270	18	29
Without children	200	178	20	2	21	149	13	17
With children	144	129	14	1	6	121	5	12
University of Louisville:								
Total	189	178	10	1	14	150	5	20
Not married	105	97	8		9	83	5	8
Married	84	81	2	1	5	67		12
Without children	51	49	1	1	4	38		9
With children	33	32	1		1	29		3
Berea College:								
Total	35	35			4	30	1	
Not married	15	15			3	11	1	
Married	20	20			1	19		
Without children	10	10				10		
With children	10	10			1	9		
Kentucky State College:								
Total	40	36	4		4	34		2
Not married	32	28	4		2	29		1
Married	8	8			2	5		1
Without children	5	5			2	3		
With children	3	3				2		1
All other colleges and schools:								
Total	741	685	49	7	53	618	17	53
Not married	444	410	30	4	38	363	13	30
Married	297	275	19	3	15	255	4	23
Without children	167	153	11	3	9	144	1	13
With children	130	122	8		6	111	3	10

TABLE 11.—*Receipt of disability compensation, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	Receiving disability compensation	Not receiving disability compensation
All schools:			
Total	4,501	476	4,025
Not married	2,921	249	2,672
Married	1,580	227	1,353
Without children	911	119	792
With children	669	108	561
University of Kentucky:			
Total	2,565	243	2,322
Not married	1,773	140	1,633
Married	792	103	689
Without children	461	57	404
With children	331	46	285
University of Louisville:			
Total	576	41	535
Not married	309	19	290
Married	267	22	245
Without children	147	10	137
With children	120	12	108
Berea College:			
Total	90	13	77
Not married	34	6	28
Married	56	7	49
Without children	31	3	28
With children	25	4	21
Kentucky State College:			
Total	60	3	57
Not married	51	3	48
Married	9		9
Without children	6		6
With children	3		3
All other colleges and schools:			
Total	1,210	176	1,034
Not married	754	81	673
Married	456	95	361
Without children	266	49	217
With children	190	46	144

TABLE 12.—*Attitude toward veteran bonus and deduction of benefits from a bonus, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	Favor veteran bonus				Do not favor veteran bonus
		Total	Benefits should be deducted from bonus	Benefits should not be deducted from bonus	Not reported	
All schools:						
Total	4,411	3,201	573	2,547	81	1,210
Not married	2,867	2,126	350	1,715	61	741
Married	1,544	1,075	223	832	20	469
Without children	895	628	121	497	10	267
With children	649	447	102	335	10	202
University of Kentucky:						
Total	2,498	1,705	339	1,322	44	793
Not married	1,728	1,211	235	946	30	517
Married	770	494	104	376	14	276
Without children	448	287	59	222	6	161
With children	322	207	45	154	8	115
University of Louisville:						
Total	561	359	88	267	4	202
Not married	301	194	38	156	3	107
Married	260	165	50	114	1	95
Without children	143	95	25	69	1	48
With children	117	70	25	45	----	47
Berea College:						
Total	87	62	11	51	----	25
Not married	34	28	3	25	----	6
Married	53	34	8	26	----	19
Without children	31	19	3	16	----	12
With children	22	15	5	10	----	7
Kentucky State College:						
Total	67	64	3	61	----	3
Not married	57	55	3	52	----	2
Married	10	9	----	9	----	1
Without children	6	6	----	6	----	----
With children	4	3	----	3	----	1
All other colleges and schools:						
Total	1,198	1,011	132	846	33	187
Not married	747	638	71	539	28	109
Married	451	373	61	307	5	78
Without children	267	221	34	184	3	46
With children	184	152	27	123	2	32

TABLE 13.—*Opinion of Veterans' Administration handling of the GI bill of rights, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	Opinion of VA handling of GI bill				
		Excellent	Good	Very good	Poor	Terrible
All schools:						
Total	4,439	1,020	2,145	994	249	31
Not married	2,892	654	1,435	632	153	18
Married	1,547	366	710	362	96	13
Without children	895	223	408	201	56	7
With children	652	143	302	161	40	6
University of Kentucky:						
Total	2,528	579	1,276	541	120	12
Not married	1,752	382	906	367	88	9
Married	776	197	370	174	32	3
Without children	452	120	209	102	19	2
With children	324	77	161	72	13	1
University of Louisville:						
Total	563	133	278	122	27	3
Not married	304	77	151	62	13	1
Married	259	56	127	60	14	2
Without children	143	35	72	28	7	1
With children	116	21	55	32	7	1
Berea College:						
Total	90	8	50	25	7	----
Not married	35	4	22	8	1	----
Married	55	4	28	17	6	----
Without children	31	2	16	12	1	----
With children	24	2	12	5	5	----
Kentucky State College:						
Total	62	19	26	12	2	3
Not married	52	17	22	9	1	3
Married	10	2	4	3	1	----
Without children	6	1	2	3	----	----
Wit children	4	1	2	----	1	----
All other colleges and schools:						
Total	1,196	281	515	294	93	13
Not married	749	174	334	186	50	5
Married	447	107	181	108	43	8
Without children	263	65	109	56	29	4
With children	184	42	72	52	14	4

TABLE 14.—*Intention to complete course and attitude toward aid until course is completed, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	Will complete course and receive degree			Will not complete course
		Total	GI bill should provide aid	GI bill should not provide aid	Not reported	
All schools:						
Total	4,493	4,332	3,370	693	269	161
Not married	2,933	2,830	2,214	461	155	103
Married	1,560	1,502	1,156	232	114	58
Without children	907	876	677	136	63	31
With children	653	626	479	96	51	27
University of Kentucky:						
Total	2,571	2,510	1,887	463	160	61
Not married	1,780	1,736	1,314	329	93	44
Married	791	774	573	134	67	17
Without children	460	456	336	79	41	4
With children	331	318	237	55	26	13
University of Louisville:						
Total	575	566	427	95	44	9
Not married	311	306	225	53	28	5
Married	264	260	202	42	16	4
Without children	147	146	115	25	6	1
With children	117	114	87	17	10	3
Berea College:						
Total	89	88	65	16	7	1
Not married	34	33	26	7	----	1
Married	55	55	39	9	7	----
Without children	31	31	20	5	6	----
With children	24	24	19	4	1	----
Kentucky State College:						
Total	67	67	66	1	----	----
Not married	57	57	56	1	----	----
Married	10	10	10	----	----	----
Without children	6	6	6	----	----	----
With children	4	4	4	----	----	----
All other colleges and schools:						
Total	1,191	1,101	925	118	58	90
Not married	751	698	593	71	34	53
Married	440	403	332	47	24	37
Without children	263	237	200	27	10	26
With children	177	166	132	20	14	11

TABLE 15.—*Intention to attend professional or graduate school and type of school or posteducation employment, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	Will go to professional or graduate school												Will not go to professional or graduate school			
		Total	Law	Medicine	Dentistry	Engineering	Teaching	CPA	Business administration	Politics	Agriculture	All other	Not reported	Total	Will have a job waiting	Will not have a job waiting	Not reported
All schools: Total	3,944	2,640	348	283	143	636	436	198	233	17	42	176	128	1,304	288	722	294
Not married	2,613	1,707	235	172	90	417	244	127	178	12	28	119	85	906	200	504	202
Married	1,331	933	113	111	53	219	192	71	55	5	14	57	43	398	88	218	92
Without children	775	542	59	67	29	146	87	50	33	3	8	35	25	233	56	129	48
With children	556	391	54	44	24	73	105	21	22	2	6	22	18	165	32	89	44
University of Kentucky: Total	2,282	1,445	221	180	44	430	164	67	110	12	27	109	81	837	199	423	215
Not married	1,590	958	158	108	32	283	87	43	85	10	21	80	51	632	151	329	152
Married	692	487	63	72	12	147	77	24	25	2	6	29	30	205	48	94	63
Without children	405	286	34	41	9	100	28	18	12	2	4	21	17	119	31	57	31
With children	287	201	29	31	3	47	49	6	13	----	2	8	13	86	17	37	32
University of Louisville: Total	464	385	77	47	63	113	18	14	20	----	----	22	11	79	10	45	24
Not married	273	224	46	24	31	74	12	4	15	----	----	9	9	49	6	26	17
Married	191	161	31	23	32	39	6	10	5	----	----	13	2	30	4	19	7
Without children	109	88	16	14	15	23	3	5	4	----	----	7	1	21	3	13	5
With children	82	73	15	9	17	16	3	5	1	----	----	6	1	9	1	6	2
Berea College: Total	87	76	2	2	1	12	28	1	12	1	6	7	4	11	1	5	5
Not married	32	29	1	----	----	2	10	1	7	----	2	3	3	3	----	1	2
Married	55	47	1	2	1	10	18	----	5	1	4	4	1	8	1	4	3
Without children	31	29	----	2	1	6	9	----	5	----	3	2	1	2	----	1	1
With children	24	18	1	----	----	4	9	----	----	1	1	2	----	6	1	3	2
Kentucky State College: Total	65	41	4	4	1	8	11	----	11	----	----	1	1	24	2	18	4
Not married	55	35	4	3	1	8	8	----	9	----	----	1	1	20	1	16	3
Married	10	6	----	1	----	----	3	----	2	----	----	----	----	4	1	2	1
Without children	6	4	----	----	----	----	2	----	2	----	----	----	----	2	----	1	1
With children	4	2	----	1	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	2	1	1	----
All other colleges and schools: Total	1,046	693	44	50	34	73	215	116	80	4	9	37	31	353	76	231	46
Not married	663	461	26	37	26	50	127	79	62	2	5	26	21	202	42	132	28
Married	383	232	18	13	8	23	88	37	18	2	4	11	10	151	34	99	18
Without children	224	135	9	10	4	17	45	27	10	1	1	5	6	89	22	57	10
With children	159	97	9	3	4	6	43	10	8	1	3	6	4	62	12	42	8

TABLE 16.—*Posteducation plans, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Posteducation plans						
	Total reporting	Will have employment waiting	Do not know type of employment desired	Expect to find employment desired	Do not know now where to find job	Expect an easy time finding job	Expect a hard time finding job
All schools: Total	4,280	848	552	928	870	666	416
Not married	2,811	514	448	564	560	445	280
Married	1,469	334	104	364	310	221	136
Without children	835	164	66	194	190	141	80
With children	634	170	38	170	120	80	56
University of Kentucky: Total	2,443	510	341	542	455	379	216
Not married	1,707	329	282	356	324	268	148
Married	736	181	59	186	131	111	68
Without children	419	89	34	108	81	69	38
With children	317	92	25	78	50	42	30
University of Louisville: Total	518	143	62	106	84	76	47
Not married	291	68	50	49	45	47	32
Married	227	75	12	57	39	29	15
Without children	120	31	7	31	22	21	8
With children	107	44	5	26	17	8	7
Berea College: Total	86	11	14	23	22	13	3
Not married	33	4	9	4	8	7	1
Married	53	7	5	19	14	6	2
Without children	30	3	4	8	8	5	2
With children	23	4	1	11	6	1	----

TABLE 16.—*Posteducation plans, by school, marital status, and presence of children for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*—Continued

School, marital status, and presence of children	Post education plans						
	Total reporting	Will have employment waiting	Do not know type of employment desired	Expect to find employment desired	Do not know now where to find job	Expect an easy time finding job	Expect a hard time finding job
Kentucky State College:							
Total	62	3	5	13	19	11	11
Not married	53	1	5	10	18	9	10
Married	9	2		3	1	2	1
Without children	5	1			1	2	1
With children	4	1		3			
All other colleges and schools:							
Total	1,171	181	130	244	290	187	139
Not married	727	112	102	145	165	114	89
Married	444	69	28	99	125	73	50
Without children	261	40	21	47	78	44	31
With children	183	29	7	52	47	29	19

TABLE 17.—*Intention to enter teaching profession, by school, marital status, and presence of children, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

School, marital status, and presence of children	Total reporting	Intend to enter teaching profession	Do not intend to enter teaching profession			
			Total	Would become teacher if salaries raised	Would not become teacher if salaries raised	Not reported
All schools:						
Total	4,223	626	3,597	883	2,184	530
Not married	2,764	355	2,409	584	1,489	336
Married	1,459	271	1,188	299	695	194
Without children	855	130	725	192	430	103
With children	604	141	463	107	265	91
University of Kentucky:						
Total	2,410	239	2,171	475	1,365	331
Not married	1,671	129	1,542	328	983	231
Married	739	110	629	147	382	100
Without children	431	42	389	89	243	57
With children	308	68	240	58	139	43
University of Louisville:						
Total	526	40	486	96	310	80
Not married	288	22	266	55	168	43
Married	238	18	220	41	142	37
Without children	133	11	122	29	76	17
With children	105	7	98	12	66	20
Berea College:						
Total	85	39	46	16	24	6
Not married	32	11	21	5	12	4
Married	53	28	25	11	12	2
Without children	28	12	16	7	9	
With children	25	16	9	4	3	2
Kentucky State College:						
Total	65	16	49	25	20	4
Not married	56	13	43	22	17	4
Married	9	3	6	3	3	
Without children	5	2	3	2	1	
With children	4	1	3	1	2	
All other colleges and schools:						
Total	1,137	292	845	271	465	109
Not married	717	180	537	174	309	54
Married	420	112	308	97	156	55
Without children	258	63	195	65	101	29
With children	162	49	113	32	55	26

TABLE 18.—*Status of wives of married veterans with and without children, by school, for a selected group of veterans in Kentucky schools and colleges (males only)*

Item	University of Kentucky	University of Louisville	Berea College	Kentucky State College	All other places
MARRIED, WITHOUT CHILDREN					
Wife at school:					
Total	515	147	33	6	275
Yes	370	93	28	1	188
Student	65	9	11		35
Not a student	305	84	17	1	153
Not reported					
No	81	47	1	5	75
Not reported	64	7	4		12
Wife working:					
Total	515	147	33	6	275
Yes	258	99	16	3	110
Less than $10		1	4		
$10 to $19	1		1		2
$20 to $29	5	2			2
$30 to $39	3	1	1		1
$40 to $49	4	2		1	3
$50 to $59	4		2		5
$60 to $69	12	2			2
$70 to $79	9	1			2
$80 to $89	18	6	1		6
$90 or more	189	83	6		54
Not reported	13	1	1	2	33
MARRIED, WITHOUT CHILDREN—con.					
Wife working—Continued					
No	191	41	13	3	150
Would work if available	98	18	7	2	98
Would not work if available	70	20	4		41
Not reported	23	3	2	1	11
Not reported	66	7	4		15
MARRIED, WITH CHILDREN					
Family at school:					
Total	356	121	25	4	197
Yes	247	97	20	1	163
Wife student	9	1	1		4
Wife not a student	238	96	19	1	157
Not reported					2
No	31	3		3	8
Not reported	78	21	5		26
Wife working:					
Total	356	121	25	4	197
Yes	31	15	3		25
No	243	85	18	4	144
Not reported	82	21	4		28

United States Frigate "Constellation"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

SOCIETY FOR THE PRESERVATION
OF MARYLAND ANTIQUITIES,
Baltimore, Md., June 19, 1947.

The Honorable G. H. FALLON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FALLON: We have had several communications with you on behalf of the Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities with reference to the return of the frigate *Constellation* to Baltimore. Enclosed you will find copy of the resolution that has been drafted representing the views of this society in support of the resolution you have introduced in the House of Representatives. I trust the form of the resolution will meet with your approval and will be helpful in furthering your objective. Copies of the resolution are being sent to the President, Secretary of the Navy, and all the Senators and Representatives from the State of Maryland.

If there should be anything else we can do in this connection, kindly let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT GARRETT,
President.

RESOLUTION OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE PRESERVATION OF MARYLAND ANTIQUITIES

On April 9, 1947, a resolution was offered, and adopted by unanimous vote, to petition the Congress to return the U. S. frigate *Constellation* to her home port of Baltimore.

The *Constellation* was one of the six frigates authorized by the Congress in the administration of President John Adams, her sister ships being the *Constitution*, the *Chesapeake*, the *President*, the *Congress*, and the *United States*. She was built at the shipyards of Samuel and Joseph Sterett on Harris' Creek, in the Baltimore Harbor, and launched on September 7, 1797. She was equipped and manned in Baltimore before putting to sea.

Of the 13 commissioned and warrant officers assigned to her, 6 were Marylanders. Among them was John Rodgers, then a second lieutenant. During the quasi war with France, Rodgers was present on the *Constellation* during her victorious engagement with the French frigate *L'Insurgente*. He later became her executive officer. John Rodgers, who had a distinguished naval career which culminated in his command of the fleet with the rank of commodore, shares with Stephen Decatur the honor of being one of Maryland's two greatest naval heroes.

Though the *Constellation* was relatively inactive during the War of 1812, she is a sister ship of the frigates which made history during that conflict and were so largely responsible for establishing the traditions of the United States Navy that have been passed down through the years. No other scene in that war is more sacred than Fort McHenry, in Baltimore Harbor, whose gallant defense was the inspiration of our national anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner.

Fort McHenry is now excellently maintained as a shrine by the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior. Convenient to the National Capital, it is visited annually by thousands of tourists from all parts of the country. It would, indeed, be appropriate if the *Constellation* were returned to Baltimore and berthed near the Fort as a magnificent addition to its present exhibits.

For the past 50 years the *Constellation* has been attached to the United States naval training station at Newport, R. I. It is quite understandable that Rhode Islanders have come to look upon the frigate as their personal property, to dispute Baltimore's prior claim and to fight the ship's removal. On the other hand, Rhode Islanders, who are familiar with and rightly proud of their great contribution to the Nation in the persons of Oliver Hazard Perry and Matthew Calbraith Perry, would be the first to recognize that the *Constellation* has no part in their ancient naval tradition. That tradition stands on its own merit. It needs no artificial stimulation.

Would it not be a generous gesture if the Representatives of Rhode Island in the Congress were to surrender their claim to the *Constellation*, recognizing her association with Baltimore and also with John Rodgers, whose son, incidentally, married a daughter of Matthew Calbraith Perry? Certainly it would be most gratifying to Baltimoreans who would see to it that Rhode Islander's sacrifice was publicly memorialized on some part of the ship.

The Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities heartily endorses the bill of Representative FALLON, of Maryland, authorizing the return of the *Constellation* to its home in Baltimore and begs that the Congress give the proposal full and complete consideration.

A Political Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Omaha World-Herald, one of the outstanding newspapers of the Nation, which was founded by former Democratic Senator Gilbert M. Hitchcock, has carried an editorial analyzing the President's veto of the tax bill. I wish to extend my remarks by including that editorial:

A POLITICAL VETO

The essence of President Truman's objections to the tax-reduction bill is contained in two short passages of his veto message.

In the first he said:

"The time for tax reduction will come when general inflationary pressures have ceased and the structure of prices is on a more stable basis than now prevails. How long it will take for this point to be reached is impossible to predict. Clearly, it has not been reached as yet."

In other words: Not now. Wait a while.

In other words: Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States, is going along with the often stated, openly acknowledged strategy of the Democratic Party. He is blocking Republican tax reduction in 1947, and giving every indication short of an actual promise that he will propose and support Democratic tax reduction in the campaign year of 1948.

The second significant passage is this:

"In addition to the fact that this is not the time for tax reduction there is a fundamental objection to this particular bill. An adjustment of the tax system should provide fair and equitable relief for individuals from the present tax burden, but the reductions proposed in H. R. 1 are neither fair nor equitable. H. R. 1 reduces taxes in the high-income brackets to a grossly disproportionate extent as compared to the reduction in the low-income brackets. A good tax-reduction bill would give a greater proportion of relief to the low-income group."

A fast reading of that paragraph might give the impression that H. R. 1 provides greater reductions, percentagewise, for the rich than the poor. But that is not the case.

H. R. 1 provides a reduction of 19¼ percent in 1947 for those whose total tax is not over $200. It provides a reduction of only 10 percent for those in the highest brackets.

Thus the bill which the President vetoed actually followed his formula. It offered "a greater proportion of relief to the low-income group," although possibly it did not go as far in that direction as Candidate Truman would advocate.

When income taxes were raised spectacularly during the war the stiffest percentage increases were levied against the upper brackets. The rate went as high as 91 percent. "Soak the rich" said the administration then in power.

Now Harry Truman echoes: Soak the rich.

He apparently takes the view that when taxes go up the increases should be levied mainly against the upper brackets, but when they go down the benefits should go almost exclusively to the lower brackets.

That is a share-the-wealth program, a sort of American state-socialism program, bearing the respectable seal of the Democratic Party and Harry S. Truman of the Pendergast school, Kansas City, Mo.

The truth is that soaking the rich doesn't really hurt the rich but it takes the pep out of the American enterprise system. It prevents the rise of future Henry Fords and Walter Chryslers. It tends to freeze economic power in the hands of old corporations and old families, and to repress unmoneyed youngsters with ability and drive and bounce—the kids who should have a chance to use their talents for America.

There is little need to discuss such truths. They are well known to all informed Americans—including President Truman and his advisers.

But—1948 is election year.

So don't let the opposition claim credit for doing the sensible thing, the thing that 40,000,000 Americans want. Postpone it for a year, and then put it over with a whoop and a holler and a loud Bronx cheer for the idle rich.

That quite evidently was the White House reasoning.

The veto was a political action and the message was a political document from beginning to end.

The Truman Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, before Dean Acheson resigned his position as Under Secretary of State, he said that the new Truman foreign policy, if carried out, involved the following:

(a) Relief to needy nations totaling several billion dollars and additional loans totaling an unknown number of billions of dollars—all at the expense of the American taxpayer.

(b) Congress must extend the President's war powers over the same, transportation, and exportation of a list of

commodities; extend the power to assign priorities to producing firms upon a restricted list of items; and continue the present export controls over all exported goods.

Dean Acheson knows what he is talking about. Do we want to pay the price—in dollars, in goods, in continued controls, restrictions, and scarcities, in continued high prices, in furnishing American boys to police the four corners of the world?

OUR FUTURE TAX LOAD

Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam has extended aid to 59 different countries since the fighting ended. A total of $20,000,000,000 has been handed out in loans, grants, relief, lend-lease, surplus property credits, and cultural cooperation projects, all to come out of the American taxpayers' pockets. General Marshall, our Secretary of State, now says that it will require at least $6,000,000,000 more per year for the next 3 years to put European countries back upon their feet, economically and politically. This is a staggering load to place upon the American taxpayers' back. It requires some explaining by those responsible for doing it.

In the break-down of the $20,000,000,000 handed out since VJ-day, we learn that France has received $2,000,000,000, plus credit on the purchase of 75 Liberty ships; Great Britain, $4,400,000,000, plus 800 fixed war installations we built there; Italy, $530,000,000, plus her share in the $350,000,000 new European Relief Fund. We begin to realize now what the rehabilitation of Europe is going to cost us before we are through, because these three countries are again seeking more aid.

When we consider the $50,000,000,000 lend-lease hand-out we made during the war—$11,000,000,000 of which went to Russia—the $20,000,000,000 handout since VJ-day, and the $20,000,000,000 that General Marshall estimates we must yet hand out to rehabilitate Europe, one can easily see that our American tax burden will be a heavy one during the next 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "Taxing Americans to Support Europe," from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Wednesday, June 18, 1947:

TAXING AMERICANS TO SUPPORT EUROPE

Herbert Hoover, whose expertness in postwar relief and reconstruction has been recognized by President Truman just as it was a quarter of a century ago by President Wilson, is alarmed over the draining of America to rehabilitate Europe. In a letter written to STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the former President asserted that America is exporting beyond its means. He said that exports exceeded imports by $14,100,000,000 in the last two fiscal years.

There are further commitments which will run the import deficit in the present calendar year to a much higher figure. In largest part the exports are being provided as gifts and as loans which will never be paid.

"The greatest danger to all civilization lies in the possibility that the United States will impair its economy by drains which cripple our own productivity," Mr. Hoover warned. He added that "unless this one remaining Gibraltar of economic strength is maintained, chaos will be inevitable."

The country will have to consider along with this dark picture a proposal of Secretary of State Marshall that the United States make new loans or gifts to European countries to an aggregate of eighteen to twenty-four billions in the next 3 or 4 years.

While the war was still being fought, a program brought to the United States by John Maynard Keynes was approved by American experts and President Roosevelt, and later was authorized by Congress. This was the Bretton Woods proposal which provided for the creation of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Many thoughtful economists opposed the creation of these organizations because of the drain they would place upon the American economy and because of the debilitating effect the easy-money institutions would have upon the countries which were aided. Nevertheless, the Bretton Woods plan was approved and the American Government subscribed $6,000,000,000 for two institutions to restore world currencies and to finance the reconstruction and development of war-torn countries.

Bretton Woods had scarcely been approved by Congress when the British sent a delegation here to obtain huge additional funds. The delegation, headed by Keynes, said that England would handle her own internal reconstruction and development without any outside help. However, extra dollars were needed until the British export industries were put back on their feet so that they could earn enough foreign exchange to pay for imports. A great deal was said about the re-equipping of the industries, whose machinery was old and obsolete.

Upon these representations the United State assented to the second plan for postwar aid. A credit of three and three-quarters billion dollars was authorized to be drawn as Britain desired. At the same time the lend-lease debt of $20,000,000,000 was canceled, and the debt still owing as a result of the other war was ignored, indicating that we were willing to forget it.

As Congress had to approve the big loan, a campaign was conducted to convince the American people that the credit would help this country. It was asserted that British revival would help all the countries of the world. The Truman administration positively stated that the British credit would not be a precedent for other loans.

The loan was to meet Britain's requirements until 1951, by which time repayment was to start. That was only a year ago, and already the British have used half their money. At this rate, it will be entirely gone early next year. Has the British economy been rehabilitated? Read what Winston Churchill said about this in a speech in Britain on April 18: "Everyone is conscious of the approaching crisis in our financial and economic affairs. The Socialist government is living upon the American dole and squandering with profligate rapidity this loan which can only be justified as a means of reequipping our industries."

The British even in the highest circles refer to the loan as dole money obtained from the American Treasury, and in turn provided by taxes levied upon the American people!

The $3,750,000,000 will last another half year, but the British are looking ahead. Stafford Cripps, one of the top men in the British Government, in a speech in Bristol on March 29, first stated publicly that more money would be sought abroad. A month later there was a story describing a new method the British had suggested to give them dollar aid "to tide them over the reconversion period." The plan was for America to make loans to France and other European countries so that they could pay in dollars for whatever purchases they made in Britain.

Within the last week Secretary of State Marshall and his associates have been giving out bit by bit the terms of the new deal. Britain has a commission to get the countries of Europe to make their demands upon us in one package. The proposed relief budget for Europe which America is to meet is estimated by State Department officials at $6,000,000,000 annually for 3 or 4 years. It is described as Europe's help yourself plan—which really means help yourself to the American Treasury.

The latest eighteen-to-twenty-four-billion-dollar program is to be managed in our interest by the British. Foreign Minister Bevin is enthusiastic about it. If Congress were so foolish as to approve it, there would be no end. The existing commitments are beyond our means. It it is time to tell the world to go to work. Only ruin is in it for ourselves if we try to carry them on the dole any longer.

Our Republic Form of Government or Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, recently I was furnished by the author with a copy of an address delivered by Mr. Edward F. Hutton, of New York, before the Long Island Association on June 10, 1947.

In this address the author has stressed the fact that either communism or our republic form of government is going to be strong. Not two of us. Only one will survive.

He urges that we make our Declaration of Independence not a declaration of dependence, based upon the doctrines of communism. The author outlines the duty and responsibility that rests upon each of us as citizens of this great country, and insists that we should resell the Constitution and the Bill of Rights to the American people and the oncoming generations in order that communism and other foreign ideologies may not be substituted for our American traditions and institutions.

I call especial attention to the quotations used by Mr. Hutton from numerous New Deal advocates who have held positions of responsibility and policy-determining rank in the Federal Government. These quotations, with their implications, are enough to make us shudder for fear of what may and can happen here, unless we restore and preserve Americanism for America and for the world.

I am pleased to quote the address to which I have referred:

The time has come, I think, for all of us to consider the obligation of the press of America to the American people. The time has come also for us to consider the tremendous power of our press; power to save the Declaration of Independence and prevent it becoming a declaration of dependence. The press as a whole, stretched across the country, should assume this obligation and do it right now, and in no uncertain terms.

The press is in business for profit. You gentlemen are attending to your affairs on the same basis. Without a profit, the press is out of business and you are out of business. When you go out of business, labor loses jobs. If our press goes out of business,

our country as we know it will end. That is a simple truth.

The only way we can hope to remain in business is by making every effort we can to keep our press free and to suggest, and even demand, of the press, a new realization of its responsibilities to the American people. Joseph Pulitzer said: "Our Republic and its press will rise or fall together." That is a fact. As long as we have a free press, we have a free country. That too is a fact. When once we have a government press, you can rest assured we will have a police state. That is axiomatic.

It is the obligation of our free press to put this question on the record. What would communism do for all Americans, men, women, and children? What would it do to anyone with the God-given ambition to get somewhere and be somebody? The kind of people that are common only in America.

Our free press should answer questions like these right on the front pages: Will communism give us more liberty—freedom—than our Constitution and Bill of Rights now gives us? Or will it smash them? Will it give us the right to earn more and achieve our own security? Or will it take away everything we have? Will it give us greater freedom of religion, or is the church to be abolished? Will we have the right to trial by jury or will it abolish justice? Will we have the right to strike, the right to work where we want to work? It may be that this type of reading is not what we would like to have. But it had better be, if you want a free press and the press wants its freedom.

Progress is a change of attitude. The people want the truth as to where we are heading. Not so much of sensational reporting about commonplace and sordid things. Either comunism, or our republic form of government, is going to be strong. Not two of us. Only one will survive.

To talk about the Constitution and Bill of Rights sounds as dry as dust. It cannot compete with a juicy divorce proceeding or any other kind of sensational news. If I could write an editorial which would make Daniel Webster look like a pool player, 5 percent of the people would read it in their press. I know I could write an editorial attacking the local constable on the grounds that he stole a kiss from the housemaid, dramatize it, and 95 percent of the people would read it. The responsible American citizen has withdrawn from politics and apparently is indifferent to public questions. They have surrendered their rights to think and act to those who refuse to think and act. Government, they say, is for the politicians. The constitutional Bill of Rights should convey to him, as it should to the press, just this: It is our bread and butter document. It makes America the strongest nation on earth. This document is the foundation of freedom upon which rests the good will and assets of all private and free enterprise and liberty. If it is ever superseded by the communistic doctrine, it would mean a treadmill of the state for we, the people; your right to conduct your affairs would be at an end, the good will and assets, all your possessions, would be at an end. Your key to your home, under communism, would belong to the state.

The press to be free should inform the people. The press creates public opinion. One's judgment is no better than one's information. It is important and a "must" program to have the press print the news of those sniping at our Constitution, to erode our Bill of Rights, to make our Declaration of Independence, one of dependence based upon the doctrines of communism. Unless the press talks about this, in terms of what can happen by those planning to make it happen, our press will never have the chance to print it as news after it does happen.

Who are they who have been sniping at our republic form of government?

Tugwell, Governor of Puerto Rico: "Business will logically be required to disappear."

Berle, Assistant Secretary of State: "The Government will gradually come to own most of the production plants in the United States."

Porter, of War Labor Board: "All owners of stocks, bonds, mortgages, land, buildings, or equipment shall be required to surrender them in return for commonwealth bonds."

Durr, Federal Trade Commission: "The Government will provide the market and say what and how much is to be produced."

Aimlee, Assistant Attorney General: "Congress shall have power to enact laws to provide for the ownership, operation, and management of business, manufacturing, commerce, industry, and banking."

Blanchard, of State Department: "Having once captured the Government and shelved the Supreme Court, we Socialists would nationalize as many large industries as we could chew. We would do it peacefully, if possible, and otherwise, if necessary."

Sifton, Department of the Interior: "The whole capitalistic shell game can sink and be damned. Tell them we've got a war on—a war to establish a workers' government."

Olds, Federal Power Commission: "Ownership will become more and more divorced from any active part in the business of society. The owners will cease to be necessary."

Trippett of OPA: "Take control of industry and Government, abolish the present capitalistic system and build a workers' republic."

Wallace, ex-Vice President: "The Government can't take its heavy hand off of business after the war. Furthermore, no Silas Marner will be allowed to close his plant for banking reasons and let his workers starve."

Mrs. Evelyn Burns, chief author of the National Resources Planning Board Report on Postwar America which report the President urged on Congress: "Society will have to devise methods that would refuse individuals the right to make what use they wish of their own labor and property."

Hansen, of the same Board: "Congress will surrender to the administration the power to tax and to direct when and how the money will be spent."

What has happened to Hungary can happen to the United States of America. Those men in appointed key positions in government are attempting to make it happen. That is a fact, not a theory.

To endorse this, Senator BYRD has stated in 1942: "The people must realize this dictatorship is not a thing born of war. It was conceived 10 years ago, when the New Dealers came into office and stealthily tiptoed toward the abandonment of government by the people; under these war powers, they have the authority to do what they have always dreamed of, to take complete control of the fortunes and the conduct of every citizen."

Unless the press exposes those who have been attempting to destroy our form of life for other isms, if they fail to do so, they, the press, are in danger of their freedom. Little Hungary is now a land of Russia. Freedom of the press in that country no longer exists. It is now a government press. Our press should be on guard. It can happen here. But not, if the people are told how and why it can happen. The press should be feeding the people this type of news. Permit them to know the directions of world events and the dangers to their liberty right here in the United States of America. It is our Republic form of government or communism. I repeat: one of us is going to be strong, not two of us. One will survive. The first line of defense of our liberty and the front line of attack in defense of our liberty is the press of America. In no uncertain terms, the press should resume the responsibilities that were vested in it at the birth of liberty, the voice of we, the people.

When groups or individuals assault our system, the press should flank it with the truth. Once a week or more, run an editorial on your front page in defense of liberty, and in language we the people can understand. Show the trends, point out the dangers, state both sides, expose those who exercise free speech under the Bill of Rights to discredit the American system. Would it be news if their bills were paid by a foreign paymaster? Would it be news that if the foreign idea to take over is accomplished, you would not be a newspaper and we the people would be in a closed shop, the Communistic closed shop? Then, what becomes of liberty and freedom? If that is a fact, tell us, would that be news? So much for the press.

The bar association also has a responsibility. Every man and woman practicing law took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution "so help me God." If there has been any public protest respecting the whittling away of the rights of the people by the bar association, I have not heard of it. The lawyers and the bar association have put aside their oath of office for legal expediencies. If America loses its freedom, then the gentlemen of the bar association will not be practicing law. If you want to continue your legal activities, your obligation is to protect your right under the constitutional Bill of Rights to continue to practice law.

The businessmen of our country have the same responsibility. They are spending in national and local advertising over $2,000,000,000 reaching the consuming public to promote acceptance of their products. They fight like a pack of wildcats to protect their competitive positions while neglecting the very product which gives them the right to advertise and remain in business. That produet is the Constitution and Bill of Rights, and that is the one product that must be resold to the American people.

The existence of freedom can be held and secured by an aroused and informed public opinion. This can be accomplished only by the awakening as to the consequenees of their loss of liberty. Abraham Lincoln summed it all up when he stated: "Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fail. Without it, nothing can succeed." Consequently, he who molds public sentiment goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces decisions. He makes statutes and decisions possible, or impossible, to be executed.

This is a big undertaking at this present moment. Seeking courage, fortitude, and self-sacrifice from the businessmen, from the bar association, from the life-insurance companies who advertise security and longevity to sell their products, and also the press is not an easy road to contentment. Those who are willing to carry the toreh for freedom are far and few between. It is the obligation of us of this generation to keep open the road for the young—our children and posterity—which road today has been darkened by philosophies foreign to liberty. Our press, American business, bar association, and life-insurance companies should be telling the people how and why this country grew from three-cornered pants into the No. 1 world power—because we had a Constitution and Bill of Rights. This gave us liberty, freedom, and enterprise. This developed the romance of American business, high wages, and mass production. Mass production created high wages and less hours of work. But high wages and less work did not create mass production.

What has the Bill of Rights done for you gentlemen here tonight? Without our Bill of Rights, I couldn't be talking to you and you couldn't be listening. We are what we are, whether it be doctor, lawyer, businessman, scientist, because our Bill of Rights permitted us to choose to climb the rungs of the ladder to success. Without that document, we would not have had such rights. Communism does not give the right to success, to ambition or the right to exercise our affairs within the framework of law and

order. If we want to change this atmosphere, we must have a stomach for a fight and a combative instinct. Otherwise, the picture of America as we know it and see it is over.

To most people, our Constitution is an abstract document. Maybe it has ceased to be a human document, born of blood and tears. Unless the press, American business, and the bar association, do a good selling job on these two foundation stones of the American people, then our Republic will be out of business.

If only the press will resell the fact that our system is far from obsolete, decrepit and in need of replacement by a glorious communistic state. If they would recite the fact that we are not a downtrodden, frustrated, exploited people, not yet, but we could be. Those who are frustrated and downtrodden need our dollars because their system has failed to produce that which our system has produced. That is the great prize the Communist Party want to grab. Recite these truths and state them often; shout them out loud. The press, which stretches across our free land, can carry such messages. Otherwise, the future looks dark.

The Communists here have the right of free speech—so have the press—and we, the people, businessmen, life insurance activities, Bar Association, should exercise that God-given gift and do more shouting than those who would take from us our rights to conduct our affairs, own our own homes and live within the Constitution. Save our country? It can only be done by those, I repeat, who have a stomach for a fight and a combative instinct. It means just this: Americanism or communism. That is the issue facing us.

These United States are confronted by the biggest problems history has revealed within its recorded past. If we discover a lasting solution, it will come from ordered thinking backed by courage by those who, I repeat, have a stomach for fight.

Expediency is a vicious taskmaker. What we pile up ahead always turns into a mortgage, falling due at the most inopportune time. The world has a cancer. That is the first thing to consider. It serves no purpose to direct our thinking to how nice it would be if the world did not have a cancer. It has; that is a fact, not a theory. We ask for a remedy, not just to help the pain but to prevent recurrence. No palliative will suffice. It must be a cure or it will develop into a fatality later. The cancer centers wherever our mortal enemy, communism, spreads its talons.

One of us, communism or our republic form of government, is going to be strong. Not two of us. One will survive. If ever a people were charged by Almighty God with the preservation of freedom on earth, that people is this generation.

We cannot buy with American dollars the cure for communism. America did not buy with its dollars our freedom. If we could buy peace, it would be cheap. And we could forget the price; but money will not suffice, no matter how much there is. A dissipation of our national wealth will serve only the purpose of removing the one remaining strong hand in the world. That is the first thing; we should put it first. If the last few years have failed to convince us of the need of our fullest possible strength, then it would appear that nothing will ever convince us. That is unthinkable. We stand as a people consecrated to liberty. We oppose communism. Let us not by incipent appeasement debilitate the very power we have to keep freedom.

"A task without vision is drudgery,
A vision without task is a dream,
A task with vision is victory."

Will the press, the bar association, the businessmen, the churches, accept this challenge to save our country with vision and make it your task?

Spendthrift Hunt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the current issue of Newsweek:

SPENDTHRIFT HUNT

The following story—heretofore untold—was prepared by Newsweek's Washington bureau on the basis of reports made by special investigators to the House Appropriations Committee and cites some of their examples of governmental waste:

"The yelping and griping had been heard for years: Management methods in the Federal bureaucracy were slipshod. No private enterprise could survive with such stupid and inefficient administration. What the Government needed was the know-how of competitive business.

"Representative JOHN TABER, of New York, heeded such beefs when he became chairman of the House Appropriations Committee last January. He set out to give private experts a crack at the Federal budget instead of relying solely on governmental investigators from the FBI and General Accounting Office to probe governmental expenditures.

"Quietly, TABER recruited a private staff of nearly 30 from chambers of commerce, financial institutions, accounting firms, and pricate industry. He borrowed them temporarily, paying most of them only $15 a day.

"BULLETS FOR BUREAUCRATS

"What this staff dug up was not publicized. It was used, instead, as ammunition for TABER and other congressional economizers to fire at Government agency heads who were trying to justify their proposed budgets. By last week it had enabled the Taber committee, at a cost of only $25,000, to squeeze hundreds of millions of dollars out of the Federal budget. Typical wasteful practices which the private experts exposed:

"Veterans' Administration field offices doing similar work had wide variance in staffing policies—ranging from 1.16 to 14.6 employees for every 1,000 veterans.

"VA hospitals varied from 1 employee per 6.8 patients to 1 employee for each patient.

"The VA sought $557,920 to purchase 303,217,500 letterheads—enough to permit each employee to write 1,348 letters. It also asked $7,900,200 to buy 3,674,511,600 blank forms—an average of 25 for every American man, woman, and child.

"The VA's 3-year $1,000,000,000 hospital-construction program, which will be used almost entirely for treating non-service-connected cases, has a construction cost per bed as high as $23,600, compared with $10,000 in private hospitals.

"The Department of Agriculture has five unintegrated, duplicating agencies dealing with soil conservation.

"The Maritime Commission was discovered to have $505,075,000 which, because of inept bookkeeping, it didn't know it had. The Commission operates from receipts as well as appropriations through a revolving-fund arrangement. It had failed to list income from the sale and charter of vessels.

"The Maritime Commission also asked $2,400,000 for reconverting four cargo vessels, when by its own estimates the sum should have been $1,050,000. Again, it asked $10,000,000 for a job which it figured would cost $5,000,000.

"The Federal Public Housing Authority's records were so poorly kept that a well-known accounting firm refused to audit them. The agency built up cash reserves of between $40,000,000 and $50,000,000 in local housing authorities to use as a cushion in case Congress cut off subsidies.

"A Commerce Department office, ordered to cut its staff, reduced itself to nine $9,000-a-year men and one file clerk. Throughout the Government, the trend is to keep on the highly paid workers and fire the others. Such disproportionate staff cuts play havoc with efficiency.

"Department heads are paid according to the size of their staffs. They are therefore reluctant to purge superfluous workers lest their own pay be cut.

"The General Accounting Office is 3 to 5 years behind in its work. By the time it discovers an irregularity, the people responsible often no longer work in the department concerned and sometimes the office itself doesn't exist any more.

"Army and Navy make no joint use of such similar facilities as ports of embarkation and ocean-going ships. The Army has its ships overhauled yearly by private contractors, even though navy yards could do the work.

"The Navy requested funds for new autos and station wagons at a time when it had large numbers of all type of vehicles on hand as a carry-over from the war.

"For every 150 jobs created in the Government, 3 more must be added for new timekeepers, records clerks, etc. One investigator's comment: 'It's like throwing a pebble in a pool. Each ripple makes another.' "

The Deportation of the Slovak Population in Sudeten by the Czechs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following appeal of the Slovak Action Committee to the civilized world concerning the deportation of the Slovak population in Sudeten by the Czechs:

APPEAL OF THE SLOVAK ACTION COMMITTEE TO THE CIVILIZED WORLD CONCERNING THE DEPORTATION OF THE SLOVAK POPULATION IN SUDETEN BY THE CZECHS

Since the occupation of Slovakia by the forces of the Red army, and the imposition of antidemocratic rule upon Slovakia by the Czechs and the Communists, there has been no interruption in the series of crimes committed against the Slovak Nation. And now, after the political oppression, the introduction of terrorism and violence, the extermination of a great number of the Slovak intelligentsia, the establishment of concentration camps, the reinforcement of Communist rule in the anti-Communist Slovakia and after the destruction of the Slovak economy, the Czech-Communist Government had stretched its hands to the very root of the Slovak national existence and to the fundamental freedoms of the Slovak population.

These are the facts shocking the mind of the Slovaks, at home and abroad, and shaking the very foundation of humanity. Till the end of November 1946, 200,000 Slovak peasants and workers were violently trans-

ferred to the uninhabited ex-German Sudeten countries in order to populate them, as the daily Cas (December 18, 1946) reported and the Prague Ministry of Foreign Affairs admitted in a statement on November 27, 1946. Counting women and children, the number reached 300,000 inhabitants. This number is increasing daily and must reach 500,000, including those Slovaks who return from Rumania and Hungary, allegedly to their fatherland, in reality to be violently settled in Sudeten-German homes.

In order to keep the territory of the former Czechoslovakia, where once lived 15,000,000 inhabitants, for his 7,000,000 Czech nation, Mr. Benes violently expelled 3,000,000 Sudeten Germans and is now deporting there Slovaks and the Hungarian minority from Slovakia. In this way, Mr. Benes intends to realize their Czechization, to make them his accomplices in the Sudeten-German tragedy, and thus impose upon the so-called Czechoslovakia the uniform Czech character.

This violent transfer of Slovaks has doubtlessly the ruthless characteristics of deportation:

(a) It is carried out through written orders, forcing the deportees to move and indicating the locality of resettlement;

(b) Peasants and workers are constrained to move together with their families in order to remain definitively in Bohemia;

(c) Freemen are compelled against their will to abandon their native homes, and that in spite of a great shortage of labor in Slovakia;

(d) Nobody is allowed to oppose the deportation under pain of confinement to a labor camp;

(e) No consideration is taken of pregnant wives whose husbands are deported;

(f) Resettlement is going on regardless of arctic cold during the winter;

(g) Lastly, this measure is authorized only by a presidential decree (Nr. 88/1945), being the decision of a single man; thus, it has no legal basis; but even if a law were promulgated, the measure would not be justified by it, since no positive law is able to render an antinatural action into a just one. Besides, the Czechs have no right to deal with the Slovak population, because no nation has the right to dispose of the members of another nation. And the Slovaks, even if akin to, are a different nation from the Czechs.

As far as the inhuman methods of the deportation are concerned, they have been described by the French correspondent, L. Hubert-Rodier, in Le Monde for February 1, 1947.

In order to hide the criminal aspect of the deportation the Czechs are asserting that the Slovaks have to stay in Bohemia only for the period of the 2-year plan. This affirmation is easily denied by these facts: (a) The deportation is intended to be definitive, as the Czechs also banish the families of the deportees; (b) Mr. Lettrich, President of the Slovak National Council, admitted the definitive character of the deportation. He said: "The Czechs require us to replace the Germans who have left the Sudeten edge countries" (daily Cas, October 23, 1946); (c) in Slovakia there is also a great shortage of labor and a greater need of reconstruction as Slovakia suffered greater war damages than Bohemia.

Carrying out the deportation the Czechs told many falsehoods.

The Slovak population was said to go to Bohemia only in order to get acquainted with the industrial machinery which would be transferred to Slovakia from Sudeten. Now, after having deported the Slovak labor, the Czechs assert that no transfer of industry equipment is possible as in Slovakia there is not sufficient labor to man it.

The Slovaks from Hungary and from Rumania were enticed to move by the promise that they were returning to the Slovak fatherland of their ancestors, but the trains transporting them did not halt in Slovakia and brought them to Bohemia. The Czechs know too well that no Slovak would have consented, if he had known that he was to be settled in Bohemia instead of in Slovakia. In fact, that is the reason why today no Slovak from Hungary desires to be repatriated.

The wages of the Slovak deported workers are those of slaves. The daily Cas (January 8, 1947) is quoting the Czech newspaper Obzory concerning the wages: "The Czechs are employed in the offices and therefore we are hunting for agricultural labor in Slovakia. Thousand crowns (viz, monthly wage) suffices for the nourishment of a single person, but under the condition that one live in a barrel (sic!), go barefooted and naked and that one smoke potato leaves."

The deportation of Slovaks has the character of crime both against humanity and nationality.

The Nazi violent recruitment of labor in occupied territories was condemned in the Nuremberg trial as a crime against humanity. In fact, the mass deportation of labor is unnatural and inhuman, because it violates the personal freedom of the workers, it separates them from their native homes and natural milieu, it deprives them of its benefits and exposes them to the incognita of the foreign milieu. The deportation of the Slovak labor is yet more unpardonable as it is a consequence of the brutal deportation of the Sudeten-Germans in Germany and of the fact that the Czech population declines hard work in fields, mines, and factories.

Besides this crime against humanity, the Czechs also acted criminally against the Slovak nationality. The Slovak nation as well as other nations has the right to exist and its members have right to Slovak nationality. By deporting 500,000 Slovaks from their fatherland the Czechs violate the Slovak right of nationality. The Czechs, directly or indirectly, force them to become Czechs. In fact, during 20 years of the former Czechoslovakia the Czechs endeavored by all means to Czechize the Slovaks.

The Czechs brutally violated the right of the Slovak nation to exist for by the deportation of 500,000 of its members they seriously menaced its very existence. The Slovak nation counts only 3,000,000. Since 1850, the Slovak nation not only did not increase, but fearfully diminished in consequence of the denationalizing and exploiting policy of Hungarians and Czechs.

The national, political, and economic consequence of this deportation constitutes a catastrophe for the Slovak Nation. From the national viewpoint the Slovak Nation will be terribly weakened, politically it will lose its physiognomy, and economically, the chance of reconstruction and development, as 300,000 workers is the maximum of the Slovak labor market. In fact, rehabilitation and economic planning are impossible for Slovakia, according to Mr. Frastacky, vice president of the commissars body, speaking before Prague Parliament as reported on December 18, 1946, by the daily Cas.

And these are precisely the aims of the Czech Communist Government and of Mr. Benes: by this raw encroachment in the biological substance of the nation itself they want to disperse the Slovak Nation and break its resistance to Czechoslovakia and international Red totalitarianism, of whom the Slovaks are mortal enemies, as the general elections on May 26, 1946, clearly showed.

The Communists approved the deportation as Czech industry is working for Soviet war plans.

Writing on the exploitation of Slovak labor in Bohemia and Moravia the daily Cas has emphasized recently: "The Slovak poor labor are unable to rid themselves of this modern slavery" (January 8, 1947). In fact, without international intervention it is impossible for them to break free.

The Slovak Action Committee, being the representative of the Slovak Nation, calls the attention of the civilized world to the brutal deportation of Slovaks by the Czech Communist Government of Prague, to the inhuman treatment of the Slovak Nation's members and to the unnatural oppression and unjust occupation of Slovakia by the Czech Communist forces.

We appeal to civilized men and to responsible statesmen to defend democracy and humanity against their violators, the Communists, and the Czechs. Do not believe the lying propaganda of Mr. Benes. Mr. Benes is the most mendacious helper of international communism and a vanguard of the Red totalitarian menace in Europe. With communistic help Mr. Benes oppresses the Slovaks because they resist communism and the Czech imperialist policy.

Help us to overthrow the regime of terror and oppression. Help us to restore the sovereignty of the Slovak Republic. Help us to give the Slovak Nation its national independence and the Slovak population its human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The injustice committed in one part of the world concerns the whole of it. Without justice being restored in the world, there can be no lasting peace for the nations.

SLOVAK ACTION COMMITTEE,
Prof. Dr. FERDINAND DURCANSKY,
President.
Dr. STEFAN POLAKOVIC,
Secretary General.
BRIDGEPORT, CONN., *February 1947.*

The Clark Hill Project, South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hold in my hand copies of statements by two eminent and distinguished South Carolinians with relation to the appropriation for the Clark Hill project in my State. The first is a statement by Gov. J. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, before the Civil Functions Appropriation Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. The second is a statement by Hon. Butler B. Hare, a former Representative from South Carolina, before the same subcommittee.

I ask that both these statements be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF J. STROM THURMOND, GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA, BEFORE THE CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Chairman ENGLE and members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, the construction of the Clark Hill project by the Federal Government is of vital importance to the States of South Carolina and Georgia, and we greatly appreciate the courtesy extended us of a hearing in this matter.

It is our firm conviction that the Federal Government should continue with the construction of the Clark Hill project and for two reasons should not accept the offer of the Savannah River Electric Co. to build it.

1. THERE IS NO ASSURANCE THE POWER COMPANY WILL CONSTRUCT THE PROJECT

We doubt the good faith of the power company in its request to build this project. The past history of this company, or its affiliates, indicates that it would not. A license was granted to this company in 1928, and it held this license until 1932 and did not build the dam. It surrendered the license. The company changed its mind.

About 1929 or 1930 the company, the Georgia Power Co., started the Furman Shoals project on Oconee River, near Milledgeville, and after spending several million dollars upon it over a period of 17 years, the company decided to build steam plants instead of hydroelectric plants, and the Furman Shoals project has never been completed. With regard to continuing with that project, the company changed its mind.

In 1935 the Georgia Power Co. promised to cooperate with the people of the Savannah River Valley in the construction of the Clark Hill project by the Federal Government. It expressed no desire to build it and offered to assist Georgia and South Carolina in furthering the project. In July or August 1946 the company again changed its mind.

At the Federal Power Commission hearing in Atlanta, Ga., during October 1946, when the power company attempted to obtain another license to build this project, Mr. Arkwright, former president of the power company, stated conditions had changed, that money rates were low, coal high, and it was their desire now to build the project. But, what will occur if money rates go up, coal down, or a depression occurs? We are fearful that the company will again change its mind. If a license should be granted to the power company to construct the project, about 1 year would be required to design plans and specifications. I say this time would be required because a private concern, Charles T. Main & Co., of Boston, which designed the plans for the Government, required about this time to design the present plans. The power company would require a similar length of time or approximately that, in our judgment, especially since it says it will furnish its own plans, and especially since under the company's proposal the powerhouse would be placed on the Georgia side instead of the Carolina side, necessitating considerable change from the present Government plans.

On the other hand, the past history of the Federal Government in projects of this nature leads us to believe that it will complete the project. We do not know of any Government project of this nature that has been abandoned by the Government. We know of many such projects that have been constructed by the Government and carried to speedy conclusion.

On the Tennessee River there are approximately 50 dams known as the TVA project. They were all carried to completion. On the Colorado River there is the Boulder Dam, which was carried to completion. On the Columbia River there are the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams, which were carried to completion. On the White River in Arkansas there is the Norfork Dam, which was carried to completion. And there is now being constructed a project on the Allatoona River, which we are informed is going forth without delay.

There is further assurance that this project will be completed by the Federal Government. The Government has shown a steady and continuous interest in this project. Pursuant to the resolution of 1927, the Clark Hill project was included among the navigable streams of the Nation as worthy of development. In 1936 Congress acted favorably in the Flood Control Act by embracing therein a proviso authorizing this project again to be investigated. In 1938 an appropriation was included to begin work on this project, but the Comptroller of the United States ruled that the project has not been authorized, therefore the appropriation could not be used, and it was not used, but it showed the interest of Congress in the project of 1938.

In 1944 the Flood Control Act actually authorized the construction of the project. In 1945 the first Deficiency Appropriation Act included an appropriation of $1,000,000 to begin construction of the project. In 1946 there was appropriated an additional $4,500,000 to continue construction of the project. This makes a total of $5,500,000 actually appropriated for construction, and of this amount about $4,500,000 has been spent or committed.

2. FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Public development of this project has been recommended by every public agency that has investigated it. In 1935 the Army engineers submitted a report to Congress and recommended it, known as Report 308. In 1936 a special board appointed by President Roosevelt investigated this project and submitted a favorable report to him. In 1939 the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission concurred in the reports of the Rivers and Harbors Board and the Chief of Engineers, both of which reports recommended the construction of this project. In May 1944 the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission recommended it to the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army. In June 1944 the Secretary of War recommended it to Congress in House Document 657 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Not a single public agency that has investigated this project, so far as we are informed, has recommended private construction. On the other hand, the numerous boards and agencies that I enumerated have all recommended that this project be developed by the Federal Government.

If the Federal Government develops this project the natural resources of the Savannah River Basin will be more fully utilized and the potential values of the entire Savannah River Valley will be developed to the maximum, whereas, we are very much concerned if it is developed by the power company.

The proposed development is a multiple-purpose project. It has three primary benefits: Power, navigation, and flood control. We think it is better for the Federal Government to develop this project from the standpoint of the primary benefits. A more complete job will be done and the benefits will inure more to the people than if it is developed by the power company.

This project also has numerous secondary benefits:

Malaria control: This would be handled by the United States Public Health Service and will give adequate malaria control and not be a mere stab at the matter.

Reforestation: This will be handled by another branch of the Government, and will be a great asset to the Nation in the development of this comprehensive project.

Soil conservation: This means a great deal to the country and to the people of the Savannah River Basin; and with the great arm of the Federal Government behind soil conservation, we feel that adequate steps will be taken along this line.

Wildlife conservation: It is felt that under Federal construction, wildlife will be conserved to a much greater extent and more pains will be taken to preserve it than under private development.

Recreation: This is one of the most important benefits of the project, although classified as a secondary benefit. Under the proposal about 16,000 acres of land in the Savannah River Basin would be used for recreational purposes. If the power company should develop this project, as I understand it, the land would be available for recreational purposes, but someone else would have to do most, if not all, of the recreational work on the project in order for the people to reap the biggest benefits from the standpoint of recreation. If the Federal Government develops the project the plans call for beautiful parks, roads, and trails. Water is to be provided. Facilities will be available for fishing, boating, swimming, and picnicking. This means not only more enjoyment but increased health to our citizens. All of these things mean a great deal to our people of the Savannah River Basin. We feel that the working people, the farmers, textile workers, barbers, mechanics, people on the street, the people we frequently refer to as the common man, will have an opportunity to enjoy the benefits of this basin from a recreational standpoint. Recreation is now given more attention throughout the country than ever before. We who have dealt with courts and crime know the importance of proper recreational facilities in preventing crime in this country. We, the people who reside in the Savannah River Basin, do not want these benefits I just enumerated only passively concurred in. We want them aggressively accomplished. We do not feel that any private company will aggressively accomplish them to the extent that the Federal Government will.

We also feel that since there are 10 other dams to be constructed in this Savannah River Basin, the Keystone Dam should not be allotted to any private company to develop, as it might then be probable that the Federal Government would not see fit to develop the other dams. Or, if it did see fit to develop the other dams, we are very fearful that the proper coordination in regard to all these benefits that I have just enumerated would not be had, and that best results for the people would not be accomplished. There can be no doubt that the power company would not develop the other 10 dams.

The Constitution and laws of the United States provide that the waters of navigable streams belong to the people. We want the greatest benefits from these waters, and under the proposed plan of the Federal Government for construction, and under that plan alone, do we feel these benefits will be derived.

The power company is in the business to make money. It was organized for that purpose. Monetary considerations govern its actions. The profit motive will undoubtedly determine the course it will pursue in every major decision. If the Federal Government develops this project, there are many considerations, other than making money or deriving a profit, that are of great advantage to the people of the Savannah River Basin, and we feel these benefits deserve the utmost consideration.

If the Federal Government develops this project, the first consideration will be the public good. If the power company develops this project, we feel their first consideration will be the company's good. A great majority of the people of South Carolina, one of the States vitally interested in this project, favors public development. If we are to receive lower power rates for REA cooperatives and for other purposes, our best hope, in fact, practically our only hope, lies in the development of this project by the Federal Government.

I would like to briefly consider the objections that have been raised to Federal construction by those who favor the power company developing this project:

1. The first point raised by them is that the counties and political subdivisions might suffer a loss of taxes. If the project is developed by the Federal Government, the cheap rates to be afforded the people will far more than offset the small loss in taxes by the political subdivisions concerned. In addition, the manner in which the power company gets the money with which to pay its taxes is from the people, and, after all, it

comes out of the people, and the company has to make a profit from the users of current in order to pay the taxes. Besides, we are not too certain there will be a loss in revenue to the political subdivisions, because the Federal Real Estate Board is now working upon a plan, which we understand it will recommend, to make payments to political subdivisions in the respective States for land taken over by the Federal Government, in lieu of taxes that would have been paid upon that land.

2. The second point raised by opponents to Federal construction is that this project will increase the public debt. This is a self-liquidating project and it will amortize itself over a period of years, as many other projects are now doing, and for this reason the finances of the country will not be jeopardized one iota by the building of the Clark Hill project. I am informed that the expected revenue from the sale of power will far more than offset the payments that will be required to liquidate the cost of the project over a period of years.

3. The third point raised by opponents to Federal construction is that roads will be destroyed. Plans for this have already been worked out by the Federal Government. Also, I understand other plans are in contemplation of being worked out for the county roads, so there should be no loss to any political subdivision on account of the roads that would be destroyed by the construction of this project. Whether the power company builds the project, or the Federal Government, the roads will have to be relocated, and we believe the Federal Government will be more reasonable with the people and reconstruct better roads than would the power company.

4. The fourth objection that has been raised to Federal construction is that the Government is entering business. On this point we wish to say, we do not object to the Federal Government entering business where the health, welfare, or security of the people is involved. In this particular project, there is no question but that the health and the welfare of the people are involved.

5. The fifth point that has been raised by opponents to Federal construction is that the project is socialistic. It might be said for the record that from 1935 until 1946, 11 years—11 long years—the power company didn't think the project was socialistic so far as we have been able to find out. But after the power company decided it desired to build this project, it used the argument to the people that it was socialism, or bordering on socialism, for the Government to build it. My information is that it has not stated the Allatoona project is socialistic. My further information is that the power to be derived at Allatoona is nothing to be compared with this project. The company feels it could not make a profit on the Allatoona project and doesn't care to build it and doesn't call it socialistic, but does call the Clark Hill project socialistic because it wants this dam site and this area to build the dam, to make a profit for the company.

The people of South Carolina had this issue presented to them this past summer in the Governor's race. My opponent in the second primary stated that he favored building the project by either method, whichever plan would build the quickest. On account of the multipurpose nature of the project, I took the straight-out position that I favored its construction by the Federal Government, and that the benefits which should accrue to the people of South Carolina could only result if the project were developed by the Federal Government in its comprehensive plan for the development of the entire Savannah River Basin.

The South Carolina Legislature at its recent 1947 session unanimously adopted in both bodies a concurrent resolution which was signed by me, endorsing the Federal construction of the Clark Hill project. This resolution had over 100 authors in the body of its origin and signified the strong feeling of the people of South Carolina that the Federal Government should build the project.

The Honorable Monson Morris, president of South Carolina Electric Cooperative, states that 99 percent of the 70,000 members of his organization desired the Government to build the project.

The Honorable Butler B. Hare, former Congressman for the Third District of South Carolina, conducted a straw-vote poll on the question of the Federal Government continuing with the construction of the project, and about 90 percent of the responses were to the effect that it should.

Let me say that all of us appreciate the necessity for economy in governmental expenditures at this time. Certainly nonessential activities and personnel must be eliminated. However, there are some functions and activities of government which are so essential to the future prosperity and happiness of our people that it would be almost criminal to neglect or eliminate them, and one of these is the continued development of our rivers and watersheds. Every dollar spent in making these streams navigable, in controlling floods, in developing power, in the reforestation of the watersheds, and in providing recreational facilities for the people, is an investment in the future. It is protection for generations yet unborn. In the end every dollar invested will yield handsome dividends, not only in dollars but in better living for our people.

STATEMENT OF BUTLER B. HARE, FORMER REPRESENTATIVE FROM SOUTH CAROLINA, BEFORE CIVIL FUNCTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, IN BEHALF OF APPROPRIATION FOR CLARK HILL PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, I come before your committee with a great deal of pleasure and confidence. It is a pleasure because of my pleasant 7 years of association with you and your committee, and I come with confidence because I have learned from these associations that you do not make snap-judgment decisions but base your conclusions upon facts and logic.

I flatter myself in thinking that due to our past associations I may have left with you the impression that in presenting justifications supporting any matter I would rely solely upon information and established facts. It shall be my purpose, therefore, to justify on this basis further appropriations for the development of Clark Hill project on the Savannah River near Clark Hill, S. C.

For the benefit of the newer members I shall briefly review the history of the project before you for consideration. The Savannah River is the boundary line between the States of Georgia and South Carolina, a distance of approximately 300 miles. This is reported to be the longest river flowing into the Atlantic between Maine and Florida. The early settlers of this area found a wide expanse of forests which, for many years, served to control the floods and promote navigation by temporarily withholding floodwaters and feeding them into the main stream over a longer period of time. But after the forests were removed to accommodate a rapidly increasing population and to promote agriculture, the excess waters found their way to the main stream more quickly and more rapidly, resulting in more frequent and disastrous floods along the river for a distance of upward of 200 miles between Augusta and Savannah, Ga. Augusta, one of the oldest and largest cities on the Savannah, was settled a little more than 200 years ago and grew quite rapidly because of its location near the head of navigation. There were quite a number of other trading posts established on both sides of the river, such as Petersburg, Purysburg, Hamburg, Silver Bluff, and a number of smaller towns and villages. Quite a large quantity of export and import trading was carried on through these posts, the early exports being principally cotton, lumber, and clay, the imports being mostly brick and tobacco. However, after the forests were removed and the floods became larger and more numerous, all of these towns and villages were virtually destroyed and abandoned and today you can hardly find a trace of them except the city of Augusta.

The proposal before you has, to my personal knowledge, been of interest to the people in that area for the past 20 years; they have endeavored to interest the Federal Government in assisting navigation facilities by providing a more uniform and regular flow on the river and at the same time obviate frequent and excessive floods. The records will show that the United States Government has manifested its interest in the problem for upward of 50 years and has undertaken from time to time to assist in providing better facilities for both transportation and flood control, particularly the city of Augusta in protecting itself from frequent floods, the city having spent upward of $2,000,000 in the past quarter of a century for this purpose alone. An appropriation of over $600,000 was carried for this purpose in your appropriation bill of 1941. Augusta is now fairly well protected, but little or nothing has been done to prevent the overflow of lands between Augusta and Savannah amounting to upward of 200,000 acres.

In 1927 the river and harbor bill provided that the Board of Engineers should make a thorough survey of the Savannah River with the idea of determining whether there would be justification for additional Federal aid in providing facilities for increased navigation and flood control. A great deal of work was required in this survey and the engineers did not report for a period of 7 years, or until 1934, when a rather full and complete report was submitted. It was recommended that a dam be constructed by the Government across the Savannah River about 21 miles above the city of Augusta at a point near Clark Hill post office, South Carolina. It was recommended further that since the dam was to be constructed at an estimated cost of upward of $20,000,000, a power development should be added in order that it may be a liquidating project and the Government be reimbursed for expenses incurred.

In 1935, upon the request of Members of Congress from South Carolina and Georgia, the Chamber of Commerce of Augusta, Ga., the engineers and other representatives of the Savannah River Electric Co., and the Georgia Power Co., the President of the United States called upon the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission to designate one or more representatives from each of these agencies to make a further study and report on the advisability of proceeding with the construction of the project recommended. The following year this committee or board submitted its report, showing that the site near Clark Hill was exceptionally well suited for the creation of a reservoir to impound waters for flood-control purposes; it reported further that the site was equally well suited for storing waters to be used when needed for navigation purposes. To use the exact language, the report read:

"This reservoir is located well down the main stream of the river so that a large volume of water for filling purposes each year is definitely assured. The reservoir could be operated in such a manner as to reduce the stage of major floods at points below the dam, without detriment to either navigation or power, and thus increase the margin of safety at Augusta against possible inundation."

This report not only showed that the construction of the dam would prove to be an insurance against floods for a distance of over 200 miles, and insure a year-round 7-foot channel for navigation, but it found that:

"The Clark's Hill site is one of the best undeveloped power sites on any of the streams entering the Atlantic Ocean from the South Atlantic States."

The following year this report was submitted to the National Resources Committee and to the Federal Power Commission for a further study and report on the necessity and industrial possibilities in the Savannah River Valley and adjacent territory. These two agencies submitted their report in due time and stated that there would be ample and suitable markets for all the electric power to be generated at this plant when completed. The proposal was then considered by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives. It was my privilege to attend the hearing and I did not hear of any objection to the proposal from any source whatsoever. The recommendations for this project were approved, reported by the committee and included in the Rivers and Harbors bill and later in the Flood Control bill, both of which were approved by the House of Representatives and the Senate and the latter became a law on December 22, 1944. That is now over 2 years ago. The appropriations for use on the project have been approved by your committee and the Congress. Several contracts have been let and work on the project is now well under way. Entering highways have been constructed and railroad transportation facilities for delivering materials and equipment to the dam site completed. Two contracts for the construction of the approach, one at each end of the dam, have been let and contractors have now been at work for several months. Other contracts for performing specific parts of the construction have been let and others are now being processed.

The Army engineers did not act hastily in preparing its report and making its recommendations. Their study and surveys covered a period of 7 years. The Federal Power Commission did not act hastily. The Rivers and Harbors Committee and the Flood Control Committee did not act hastily in preparing and submitting their report to Congress. The Congress did not act hastily in passing the act authorizing the development of the project. The time consumed by these several agencies of Government covered the period from 1927 to 1944 and at no time was there any pronounced opposition recorded. Then 2 years elapsed before Congress made the first appropriation of $1,000,000 and the second appropriation of $4,500,000 was made in May 1946 and up to that time nothing but cooperation had come from the power companies or otherwise at any time.

SAVANNAH RIVER ELECTRIC CO. OBJECTS

Although the Savannah River Electric Co., owned by the Commonwealth & Southern Power Co. of New York, was one of the outstanding sponsors of this project for a period of 10 years or longer, it is now asking your committee to disregard the action of the Congress and disallow the appropriation recommended by the Budget Bureau to continue the work now in progress; it is also proposing repeal of the act authorizing the development of this project in order that the Federal Power Commission may have the right to consider and approve its application for a license to develop and operate the project itself, saying it is willing to reimburse the Government for all expenditures made to date and develop the project according to Government specifications and operate same under Government directions.

Mr. Chairman, this is an unprecedented procedure. The project involved has been under consideration by one or more agencies of the Government for upward of 20 years. A greater portion of this time the proposal apparently had the hearty support and cooperation of this power company, and to come now and ask a committee of the Congress to ignore its responsibility and wholly disregard the action of the Congress is so unusual and so far reaching in its objective I am sure, if you plan to give the matter any consideration whatever, you will want to go into it with some detail and at length.

Flood control and navigation on the Savannah River was a live issue when I was first elected to Congress in 1924. It has been my honor to represent two congressional districts in the meantime. The two districts together included every county in South Carolina that touches the Savannah River. Therefore, I have been vitally interested and watched the development with a great deal of concern. I shall endeavor to give the committee my sincere reaction to the more recent developments. To do this it will be necessary to review the relationship of the Savannah River Electric Co. to the Savannah River development program for the last 10 or 15 years, and in doing so I shall begin with the written records and not rely upon hearsay evidence.

POWER COMPANY SECURES LICENSE, 1928

In 1928 the Savannah River Electric Co. secured from the Federal Power Commission a license to develop what is now known as the Clark Hill project. The company later decided not to develop the project and voluntarily returned the license to the Federal Power Commission in 1932, simply saying it would not develop the plant. The company says now it did not construct the plant because of the stringent money market and its inability to secure the necessary funds, saying it may become interested later if conditions change. Apparently these reasons were not submitted in writing and there is now a wide difference of opinion as to why the license was voluntarily returned. According to written statements, the president of the Savannah River Electric Co. said in 1935, "The power company which I represent will never build another hydroelectric dam," giving as the reason for this decision, "too much Government red tape, Government supervision, and Government direction exercised over such plants." These statements were made to a group of representative citizens of Augusta, Ga., who called on Mr. Arkwright, then president of the company, in 1935 to inquire as to the future intentions of the company to develop the project at Clark Hill.

In view of later developments, it would appear that this latter reason or excuse is the one which governed their action. If they had really wanted to develop this project, they would have filed an application in 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, or 1944, when there was an increasing demand from day to day for electric power, but they did not. In fact, if they had had an intention in the back part of their heads to develop this project, they certainly could have obtained the license in either one of the years mentioned and the Government would have furnished whatever financial assistance that might have been necessary, for it did finance quite a number of power plants in order to secure electric power for use in making aluminum and other materials for manufacturing necessary and highly essential war implements.

The failure of this company to take advantage of this unprecedented opportunity proves that they were telling the truth in 1935 when they declared they had no intention of ever constructing this project, and I am convinced they have no intention of doing so now, even if you should fail to make this appropriation and the Congress should deauthorize the project and the Federal Government should give them a license to proceed with the development. This company knows that the water in this river belongs to the public and knows it is the responsibility of the Government to protect, preserve, and promote the interest of the public, and it knows further that as long as our present system of Government stands and undertakes to discharge its full responsibilities there will be some Government red tape, Government supervision, and Government direction in any kind of water-power development in streams like the Savannah River. Therefore, if the reason assigned for surrendering the license in 1932 was an honest reason, that reason still exists and will continue to exist until there is some change in our system or form of government and I have every reason to believe that the power people will never develop this project. If you were to give them a license today they could change their minds tomorrow and, in light of the past, they would change them, and the people who have been clamoring for this service for 25 years or longer would be absolutely helpless. This committee nor any agency of the Government could in that event require or compel this company to complete the job or even reimburse the Government for money already spent. But they say: "We have made you a bona fide offer in writing and filed it with one or more agencies of the Government, and we have agreed and offered to construct, maintain, and operate the project under the specifications, supervision, control, and direction of the Federal Government." Certainly, but we remember they made what they called a bona fide offer in writing in 1943 and filed it with one or more agencies of the Government, in which they said, in effect:

"We have no intention now or hereafter to develop the Clark Hill dam site. It is a project that should be developed by the Government and if the Government will build it we will cooperate in every way possible in the construction and the operation of the plant when completed."

The offer was accepted in good faith by every agency of the Government to which it was submitted. The Congress of the United States consummated the contract by formally enacting a law providing for the development of this project. Appropriations have been made, contracts have been let, work is well under way, but the Savannah River Electric Co. has "changed its mind" and is now undertaking by every possible means, fair or foul, to defeat or delay the project.

It is true there was a money stringency in 1932, and I think it is true that money is more plentiful now than at that time, but the power company, insofar as I have been able to ascertain, has not submitted evidence to show that because there is a greater supply of money it is easier to get. I do not know that the company has submitted evidence showing any increased financial ability in the meantime, but the record shows at the hearing in Atlanta October 28, 1946, they stated definitely that no action had been taken and no plans made showing whether the money would be available for them if the license should be granted. They may make the statement that they are "willing, able, and ready," but they made that once before and changed their minds.

FLOOD CONTROL

It has been urged that the flood-control provision in this development is only incidental to the power project, saying the Army engineers did not emphasize the flood-control feature in their report from the standpoint of cost. This observation is partially correct, but it should be remembered that the engineers, in determining damages or losses from floods, take into consideration only such things as farm crops, loss of livestock, buildings, persons, etc., for the year previous to the survey or covering a period of only recent years. Naturally the loss or damage from recent floods would be light for the reason that

since the floods have become large and numerous very little property is left in the flooded areas to be destroyed. The heavy losses in dollars and cents from these floods occurred a number of years ago, as we have previously mentioned. The engineers do not include the losses sustained when a town, city, or village was destroyed by a flood 60 or 75 years ago and they do not include any future benefits that might accrue from flood control. That is, they do not attempt to estimate or consider any income that would follow the development of upward of 200,000 acres of fertile lands that would be reclaimed for farming purposes, livestock, industry, and other purposes in case floods on the Savannah are controlled, nor do they take into consideration losses sustained 50 years ago or longer when the floods practically destroyed towns, villages, and farm homes in this area, all of which would probably be restored under an efficient flood-control program.

TAXES

The power companies have propagandized the people in three or four of the counties that would be affected when this project is completed by saying the lands acquired by the Federal Government will not be subject to taxation, whereas if the project is completed by the power company the taxes of the company and its property will be enlarged. They emphasize that if the Government completes the project the taxes of the people will increase, but if the power company constructs it the taxes will decrease—quite plausible, if correct. The construction of additional plants by the company on the property naturally will increase taxes to some extent, but under existing policy, as I am informed, the value of the land covered with water will not be in excess of the assessed value at the present time and, consequently, there would be but little difference in the taxes paid to the counties by the company, as compared with the present taxes, even if the company should construct the plant. Only one county in South Carolina would be seriously affected. That is the county of McCormick, where the Savannah River Electric Co. returns approximately 15,000 acres for taxation and pays approximately $1,300 in taxes per annum. The chances are if the Government constructs the project the county will be reimbursed for any losses it may sustain on account of lands being taken from the assessment books. In this event, the county would lose nothing, but since the Government has already arranged to construct this project and is now at work and, under the prospects of completing it, business activities are springing up in practically every locality within 50 or 75 miles of the project, and it is the taxes from these activities that will increase the revenues of the counties affected. I am advised that one industry alone established in McCormick County primarily because of the prospect of obtaining sufficient power from the Government, will pay into the county treasury annually between two and three times as much as that now paid by the Savannah River Electric Co.

POWER COMPANY ONE OF FIRST TO URGE DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECT BY GOVERNMENT—THEN CHANGES MIND AGAIN

A public hearing in the interest of this development was held in Augusta, Ga., October 2, 1935, where Mr. Arkwright, president of the Savannah River Electric Co., testified at length, and in his opening statement said:

"I didn't come here for the purpose of hurting this enterprise. I came here with the view of helping wherever possible. I do not want to volunteer anything except with the approval of the committee in charge of it. We did not initiate the petition for the development of Clark Hill. We are not in objection or antagonistic toward it. We wish to cooperate with it to the full extent of our ability. I would like to say that we are here for the purpose of its support. Probably it might seem unusual to you that the electric power company in the immediate territory to be affected by the development of a hydroelectric plant by the Federal Government should not be in opposition or an antagonist but should come to support it. For my own part, I know of no other instance where that is so."

While discussing how the electric power would be disposed of following the construction of the plant, Mr. Arkwright said:

"I assume that some of the load would be allocated to South Carolina and perhaps some to Savannah, but whatever remains, or if you cannot get it absorbed in South Carolina or Savannah, I believe the Georgia Power Co. could in time absorb it all. Not all at once. There was a load-building time allowed at Boulder Dam and it would be reasonable to allow a load-bulding period here. Now that means that until that was absorbed, if you wished us to absorb it, it would be turning over to the support of the development all the future growth in the electric market in the main part of Georgia for at least 10 years."

Proceeding further, and in concluding his statement, Mr. Arkwright suggested:

"Now, as I get this situation, the people want improvement for navigation, which would be of inestimable benefit to shippers of this section. They want additional protection from floods, which would be extremely beneficial. They want prevention of soil erosion; nothing could be more desirable. They want adequacy of electric supply. They want reasonable rates, which is perfectly proper. If the Government wants the work done now, and the people care to get it done now, this company is willing to aid by cooperation and the use of the power. I do not demand that we distribute it. I merely say we have the facilities and the market and are willing to do it if you wish. * * * And I state again that our company information, records, men, and engineers are at your service. Any information we have will be available to you. If you examine our records, which I hope you will, and if you find that the best way to bring this about and to assure the economics of the project is by the distribution of the power through existing agencies, you will find us most cooperative in forwarding the project. But, regardless of what plan you may finally recommend, we stand ready to cooperate to the fullest extent in making available to you any information we may have which you may think pertinent to your investigation.

The statements quoted were made about 3 years after the power company had voluntarily surrendered its license and had stated it had abandoned the idea of developing this project and never intended to build or construct another hydroelectric plant.

The printed hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee, October 27, 1943, carry the following quotation from a communication addressed to the Board of Engineers by Mr. Arkwright, president of the Savannah River Electric Co.:

"I would also like to mention in this connection that the Savannah River Electric Co., an affiliate of the Georgia Power Co. in the Commonwealth & Southern Corp.'s southeastern power system, owns about 40,000 acres of land, including the dam site, in the proposed Clark Hill Reservoir. In event the Clark Hill development is authorized by Congress the Savannah River Electric Co. and the Georgia Power Co. will cooperate in the construction of the development by transferring this land with the dam site to the proper authority at a fair price based on actual cost to the Savannah River Electric Co. and by purchasing at the switchboard at a fair price, all electrical energy which can be generated (or such portion of the energy which can be generated and allotted to the Georgia Co.) for distribution throughout the State of Georgia over its extensive transmission and distribution system, as rapidly as such energy may be absorbed by normal growth of load on this system, or used to replace steam generated energy. I have made this offer before and wish to renew it at this time, as assurance of our desire to cooperate in any development of the Savannah River area which may be recommended by your Board and authorized by Congress."

COMPANY AIMS TO DEFEAT PROJECT

All these commitments confirm the statement that the power company had no intention of developing this project. The situation is further confirmed by an admittted fact that the power companies have, in the meantime, had plenty of money to construct or now have under construction at least three or possibly four additional steam-power plants to assist in taking care of the increased demands for electric power. If the power companies had any intention to develop this project there never could have been a more appropriate time to do so than some 3, 4, or 5 years ago. Their offer to construct the project now, in my judgment, is only a smoke screen. They really do not want the development. They certainly do not want it until after there is sufficient demand for electric power to absorb the maximum production of their steam plants now under construction and scheduled to be completed and in operation by the middle of 1948. The purpose now is only to delay or defeat the project.

PROJECT DOES NOT COMPETE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

If the company is offering to complete this project in order to secure additional power, there is no reason why it could not develop one of the several sites above Clark Hill on the Savannah River where the lands have already been purchased by this company or one of its affiliates, but the power people, by their actions, are saying, "this is not the primary reason," and they are propagandizing the public otherwise. For example, they are claiming and magnifying the idea that this is primarily a power project where the Government is entering into business in competition with private enterprise. I note from press reports that a considerable number of people from Georgia and a few from South Carolina have written the Federal Power Commission and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Congress, urging that the project be abandoned by the Government and a license to complete the project be given the Savannah River Electric Co. This power company knows full well the Government has no intention to go into business and compete with private enterprise. In the hearings before the Federal Power Commission in Atlanta, Ga., October 28, 1946, less than 1 year ago its then president admitted that the staff of the power company had been quite active in contacting people and getting them to write such letters, despite the fact he knew that the Government has no intention of going into business in competition with private enterprise. In fact, he so declared when he stated on page 120 of the hearings referred to, as follows:

"The Government is not interested in making and selling electricity. The Government is interested in navigation and flood control. They make and sell electric power as an incident to their control of the river for navigation purposes."

This coincides exactly with the conclusion reached by the Army engineers after they had devoted 5 or 6 years to a study of plans for promoting navigation and assuring flood control on the Savannah River. They concluded the only effective plan would be to construct a dam of such magnitude that it would impound the waters in such volume they would prevent floods and when loosed in an orderly

way facilitate navigation. The estimated cost of the dam alone at that time was approximately $22,000,000. This is quite a sum of money and, in order that there could be some way for the Government to reimburse itself for these expenditures, the added power facility was recommended. Mr. Arkwright is definitely correct when he says the Government is not interested in making and selling electricity. It is interested in navigation and flood control, and the making and selling of electric power is only incidental, which not only refutes the charge that the project is designed to put the Government in business in competition with private enterprise, but it also refutes another argument these same power people, promoters and friends of the project for 11 years, are now putting into the mouths of other people and having them to write Members of Congress, saying they are opposed to the project on the grounds that it is a socialistic program.

NOT SOCIALISTIC

The power company does not object to the dam being constructed for the purpose of promoting navigation and facilitating flood control. In fact, they insist and urge there is sufficent justification for such a project. They do not feel that a dam for flood control and navigation is socialistic, but when you add the power feature to be used by the Government to reimburse itself for expenditures to promote navigation and facilitate flood control, they then insist it becomes socialistic. If they want to be unselfish and sincere in their political philosophy, they may find that the Government expenditures for flood control and navigation alone may come nearer being socialistic than the proposal with the power feature added. In the former, the expenditures would be a gratuity paid out of the Government Treasury, from which the Government would get no immediate return, whereas under the proposed plan the people who are to be primarily benefited from the expenditures for flood control and navigation will be the ones to use the power and will, therefore, reimburse the Government when they buy and pay for the electric power furnished. However, this question seems to have been settled by the Congress when the project was authorized, unless it was definitely settled years ago when authorizing other similar projects. My only reason for referring to it now is to show how easily these people change their minds, and to show the power company has again changed its mind by going out of its way within the past 6 or 8 months in an effort to delay or defeat this project by propagandizing the public to make an effort to have the Government think the people of South Carolina and Georgia are really opposed to this project.

RESERVATIONS

The late Mr. Arkwright, president of the Savannah River Electric Co., at the hearing in Atlanta October 28, last year, stated that when he returned the license to the Federal Power Commission in 1932 he made some reservation by saying his company may want to get a new license and resume their program some time in the future, and that by reason of this reservation the Government was put on notice and that he, therefore, has some right, legal or equitable, that should be recognized and is now calling on your committee to help him enforce such right.

I am not prepared to say Mr. Arkwright did not indicate in some way that he may at some time in the future want to renew his request for a license. Such a suggestion may have been reasonable, but there is no evidence that such suggestion was in writing, and if it had been it would have had no binding effect on the Government; for 3 years later, in 1935, Mr. Arkwright appeared before a representative of the Federal Power Commission, the United States Board of Engineers, and the National Resources Commission in the city of Augusta and says he told them: "We would be glad to let them go on the property for the purpose of surveys and development," saying further he told them that he "offered to sell and convey the land at a reasonable price, not in excess of the cost." He then and there urged these men to recommend the construction of this plant by the Government, and he knew the power feature was incorporated in the plan.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the Savannah River Electric Co. or any of its officers made any reservations in 1932, their actions from 1935 to 1945 and subsequent thereto show conclusively they never intended to file a request for another license and their tactics in this procedure are not calculated to inspire any confidence whatsoever in the representations or justifications submitted to this committee for consideration.

THE PEOPLE FAVOR GOVERNMENT COMPLETING PROJECT

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that you and members of your committee, as well as other Members of the Congress, have been flooded with a number of letters from people declaring that while they believe the project should be developed, they are opposed to the work being done by the Federal Government and insist that a license should be given to the Savannah River Electric Co., saying that a majority of the people in the two States are opposed to the present program. If you have received such information, I want to say emphatically that such statements are erroneous. When I saw press accounts of such activity and found it was inspired by the power company, I suggested that the Clark Hill Authority of South Carolina make an effort to ascertain the true sentiment of the people. We did not travel from county to county to contact and argue with people and prevail upon them to write a letter in support of the project, as the power people had done. We simply addressed a questionnaire containing one question, which was as follows:

"What percentage of the adult population in your county would prefer having the United States Government complete the flood-control, the navigation, and power project now under construction on the Savannah River near Clarks Hill, S. C., rather than rely upon the promise of a corporation or private individuals to complete it? (Give your answer, name, occupation, post office, county, and State.)"

Many of the questionnaires were addressed to "Boxholder," because we were anxious to secure the unbiased and unprejudiced opinion of the people generally. Between 1,200 and 1,500 questionnaires were mailed, about 45 percent of which were returned, and the tabulated results show that 90 percent of the adult population are reported as being in favor of the Government completing this project rather than having it done by someone else. I tabulated these returns personally, and in the tabulations I found 33 percent of those reporting were farmers, 12 percent merchants, and 1 or more of the remaining 55 percent gave their occupation as follows: Banker, sawmill operator, dairyman, funeral director, lawyer, bookkeeper, automobile dealer, mayor, druggist, farm laborer, engineer, State employee, city clerk, county agent, cotton ginner, fertilizer dealer, school superintendent, cotton-mill superintendent, housewife, college professor, constable, land surveyor, county superintendent of education, magistrate, seed dealer, county supervisor, pharmacist, chief of police, cattle and livestock dealer, pulpwood dealer, clerk of court, radio operator, minister, teacher, vocational instructor, livestock dealer, physician, oil mill operator, editor, RFD carrier, machinist, Soil Conservation Service, linotype operator, furniture dealer, dealer in farm machinery, county treasurer, State board of health, State labor department, junk dealer, clerical worker, contractor, filling station operator, carpenter, textile operator, miller, skilled laborer, member of State legislature, highway commissioner, gas and oil distributor, horticulturist, boarding-house keeper, civil engineer, restaurant manager, secretary, loan association, county auditor, implement dealer, lumberman, electrician.

I note further from the newspapers that some of the letters sent to Members of Congress urging them to reverse their previous action in making appropriations for this project have been publicized to a considerable extent. I do not know whether the letters were publicized because they appeared to be so ridiculous, or whether they were publicized for the purpose of promoting the propaganda of the power people to influence the public and Members of the Congress to change their minds and prejudice them toward this project and other similar developments. I am referring to one of the press reports because it is alleged to have come from a representative citizen of South Carolina not far from my home and he is reported to have been very persistent in having the Congress reverse its action and give the Savannah River Electric Co. a license to construct and operate this project, saying that if this were done and as soon as the Savannah River Electric Co. could begin operating at normal capacity it would contribute in the way of revenues to the States of Georgia and South Carolina, including the Federal Government, at least $900,000,000 annually. Of course, this is ridiculous. If it were true and the revenues could be divided annually in equal parts between the Federal Government, the State of Georgia, and the State of South Carolina, South Carolina would then be able to repeal all of her revenue acts, double her expenditures for education, old-age assistance, including expenditures for every other activity in the State and still have a surplus of $100,000,000 annually.

SUMMARY

1. The Savannah River Electric Co. was given a license in 1928 by the United States Government to construct a dam across the Savannah River near Clarks Hill, S. C., and after holding it for 4 years, voluntarily returned it to the Federal Power Commission in 1932. Then after a lapse of 15 years, which was 2 years after the Congress had provided that the project should be developed by the Army engineers, and after appropriating $5,500,000 for this purpose, and after work on the project has been in progress for approximately 1 year, the company now comes and urges that no further appropriations be made for this purpose and that it be given a new license, notwithstanding that for the past 11 years the company has insisted that the work be done by the Federal Government.

2. The excuse the power company gives for not developing the project when it had a license was because of the stringent money market. No evidence has been given, further than a mere statement, that this was the real reason, but there is a transcribed record showing where and when the president of the company stated the license was returned because they did not want to be bothered with so much Government red tape and Government supervision. It is true there was a stringent money market in 1932, but if that had been the real reason, the company has submitted no reason why the application for a new license was not renewed in 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, or 1944, when the money market was in excellent condition and the demand for electric power was greater than any 5-year period in our history. The reason the company gives about the stringent money market does not appeal to reason, but the one about Government red tape and Government supervision is still here and will remain as long as our present system of government remains, and if it were sufficient reason for

not developing the project when the company had a license, it will still be sufficient reason for changing its mind again and delaying the matter for another 15 years, or indefinitely if possible, for this appears to be its only purpose.

3. The power company insists that the license was returned with reservations consented to by the Federal Power Commission, but no record has been offered in evidence to this effect, and if true, there should certainly be a written record of some kind in the office of both the company and the Federal Power Commission. In the absence of such a record, the logical assumption is that the president of the company was definitely correct in 1935 when he said his company never intended to construct another hydroelectric plant, and this company now has no legal or equitable right whatsoever superior to that of any other company or any person for a license to develop this project.

4. The company complains about the Government depriving it of the right to develop its own properties; in fact, it has no properties at Clark Hill except land and forests, and it is water in the Savannah River in which the Government is interested in protecting and controlling. The power company has no interest in this water; it does not own a gallon, not even a drop of water in the Savannah River. These waters belong to the public, and it is a responsibility of the Government to conserve and control same for the benefit of the public. It is true this company owns about 40,000 acres of land adjoining the Clark Hill site, which, according to reports, were obtained about 1928 and 1929, at ridiculously low prices by promising the owners that the company would use the land and water in developing a gigantic power plant, and at the same time control the floods and promote navigation on the Savannah, justifying the promises by saying the company had already secured a license from the Government to develop the project.

5. The power company is endeavoring to lead you and the public to believe this is primarily a power project, but it knows this is not true, for its president, testifying under oath before the Federal Power Commission less than a year ago, denies and refutes the idea when he said, "The Government is not interested in making and selling electricity. The Government is interested in navigation and flood control. They make and sell electric power as an incident to their control of the river for navigation purposes."

6. This company is trying to convince you and the public that the people of Georgia and South Carolina are now opposed to having the Government complete the project. You did not hear of the people objecting in 1935 when the power company pledged its undying support to the proposal, saying the project should be developed and operated by the Government until the revenues were sufficient to reimburse the Government for expenditures, then to be turned over to some municipality, county, State, or power company. These people, or their representatives, did not object to you and other Members of Congress when the matter was before your Rivers and Harbors Committee, your Flood Control Committee, or your own committee when you recommended appropriations for this project on two separate occasions. No; you did not hear of any opposition from the people of these two States for a period of 10 years, or until last August when this power company played the Judas Iscariot act, by renouncing its allegiance to the program and began to propagandize the Congress and the public against further development of the project, saying that a majority of the people are now in favor of taking their chances with the power company rather than the Government. To illustrate the justification for this statement, the company refers to a hearing in Atlanta last October, where 67 witnesses appeared in favor of the company's proposal, and only 7 appeared as being against it. The company does not tell you that its president was one of the 67 witnesses and that he testified that a number of his staff had been contacting people in person and telling them their county or counties would become bankrupt if the Government completed the project, but if the power company could build it, their taxes would be decreased.

To find out to what extent the people had fallen for this propaganda, the Clark Hill Authority of South Carolina sent a questionnaire to 1,200 or 1,500 people in the counties in South Carolina touching the Savannah River, requesting them to state in their opinion what percent of the adult population in the county preferred having the Government complete the project rather than leave it to someone else. The tabulated results show that 90 percent favor the Government completing the project. Many of these inquiries were not addressed to any particular class of people but to box holders and to show how representative of the people from which reports came, we have herein listed the names of the occupations shown from the replies received, where the tabulations show 72 occupations, which would indicate we have a good cross section of the entire population.

Mr. Chairman, when the President of the Savannah River Electric Co., stated orally and in writing in 1935 and subsequently thereto that if the United States Government would agree to construct, maintain, and operate the Clark Hill project the company would convey approximately 40,000 acres of land to the Government at a price not exceeding the cost, turn over its files and records to the Government to be used in any way it may see fit, furnish any information it may have that might prove to be of service, and cooperate in every possible way in the development and operation of the project, it was an offer with no reservations attached, for his concluding words were: "Regardless of what plan you may finally recommend, we stand ready to cooperate to the fullest extent," and when Congress passed the flood control bill in December, 1944, providing for the development and operation of this project it accepted that offer, and both parties then became honor-bound to the fulfillment of the agreement. I shall let the Congress be the judge as to what constitutes honor. Our Government has always been very jealous of its honor, and I am glad to bear witness that the Congress, irrespective of political parties, has ever guarded with jealous care its honor and integrity. "That nation is worthless that will not venture all for its honor."

When the State of South Carolina, through its legislature in 1933, authorized and directed the governor and secretary of state to issue to the United States a grant of such lands, flowage rights or easements, that may be required in the development of the navigation project or projects on the Savannah River, it was a conditional offer to the United States Government and when Congress on December 22, 1944, passed the flood-control bill, the offer, in effect, was accepted by the United States Government and both are now honor-bound to carry out their agreement. When South Carolina, through its legislature in the early part of 1947, unanimously adopted a resolution favoring and urging the completion of the project by the United States Government, it reaffirmed the action of the State legislature of 1933 and declared, in effect, that the State is still willing, ready, and able to discharge its part of the agreement. I understand that similar action was taken by the State Legislature of Georgia, and to turn turtle now, after the action of the Congress in providing for the authorization without any objections on the part of anyone, coupled with the persistent support and cooperation of the Savannah River Electric Co., for 10 years, and with the construction of the project well underway, it would be a breach of good faith with the State of South Carolina, the State of Georgia, with the people of the United States, and it would create much criticism, raise a justified suspicion, and tend to destroy the confidence of the people in the integrity of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the development of this project has been one of the dreams of my political life, and, in view of the preceding actions of the Congress, I would regret to learn that the interest of the people I represented for 16 years has been subjected to an unprecedented action of the Congress simply to promote the unwarranted selfish interest of a small group of individuals after having broken their faith with the Congress. The establishment of such a precedent would be extremely dangerous. I shall look with confidence for your decision in the matter.

The Central Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, submitted to the Senate Committee on Public Lands May 3, 1947:

The introduction of S. 912 faces us with just one more stage in a concerted, clever, and unusually well-camouflaged drive to wreck American national land policy.

That land policy was established over the past 150 years, and it has required a lot of hard political fighting to win and to hold. Its principle, simple and clear, is this: To favor the actual farmer who works the land as means of livelihood for his family.

The actual farmers won the Preemption Action of 1841 to protect the squatter on the land against the speculator, who sought by legal cleverness to wring material gain for himself out of the squatter's toil.

The second great victory was the Homestead Act which Abraham Lincoln signed in 1862. Its principle was the same—to settle the land with families who would live on it.

The third victory for the actual settler was the National Reclamation Act of 1902, passed with unanimous support from every western delegation in Congress and bearing the signature of the great Republican President Theodore Roosevelt. It was hailed on the floor of Congress as lineal extension of the Homestead principle, into the arid West.

We now face this issue: Are we to see the great edifice of national land policy torn down stone by stone? The first breach was made in the reclamation law. It was made in 1938 on the Colorado-Big Thompson project. The breach was widened a little on the Humboldt-Nevada project in 1940. Now, in S. 912, the effort is to drive wide the shoulders and create an irreparable breach, to write "finis" to a principle that Americans of past generations laboriously established and held in the confidence that it would endure. If we should allow S. 912 to pass, the death knell of the family farm on western American soil will be sounded and the day of the corporation farm will have arrived. As the agriculture relations secretary of the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, the Rever-

end Shirley E. Greene has just warned, "This broadening of the proposed legislation confirms the fear * * * that the Central Valley bill (S. 66, H. R. 655, 656) was but an entering wedge on the part of those who would sacrifice the family-type farm to their own selfish interest and greed."

The National Farmers Union regrets to have to say that the initial breach was made on a project in Colorado, where our organization has strength, headquarters, and a long history. We regret to find in S. 912 that the repeal of 1938 on the Colorado-Big Thompson is now being made use of as a sort of "precedent" to undermine the family farm on the vast lands of the Central Valley in California, on the spreading, watered lands of the Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas, and back again in our own State on the lands of the San Luis Valley. By reason of our position in Colorado we feel a special responsibility for exposing at this time the falsity of position of those who seek to use the 1938 repeal in this fashion to carry destruction elsewhere.

When, in 1938, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the United States Senate presented the bill to repeal the 160-acre water limitation on the Colorado-Big Thompson project, someone wrote into its report this trumped-up two-point argument: (1) The intent of the original reclamation law was to develop undeveloped public lands, presumably not to develop private lands, or partially developed lands with insufficient water supply. (2) Provision of supplemental water to developed land is something different from what was contemplated as the central purpose of the original law, and therefore subject properly to exemption from it.

What this misleading Senate report said is this:

"The Federal reclamation laws, as originally adopted, were for the purpose of supplying unused water to undeveloped public lands. In order to make provision for as large a number of settlers under projects as would be economically feasible, and to prevent individuals from acquiring more than a fair share of the land to be reclaimed, the Congress limited the amount of land which could be owned by one individual and supplied with water from the reclamation project to 160 acres. This provision was entirely appropriate to conditions to which it was intended to be applied." (Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, 75th Cong., 3d sess., S. Rept. No. 1921.)

That was the first point. Its initial sentence, which has been used over and over again to mislead is, as a complete and adequate statement of the original purpose of the law, erroneous on its face. If, as implied, the intention was not to water private lands, but only public lands, then why was the 160-acre water limitation on private lands included at all in the original statute? That limitation, which now is at issue on private lands in Colorado, Texas, and California, has no other reason for being, except that the purpose of the Federal reclamation laws as originally adopted was not confined to the limited purpose declared by the Senate in its report of 1938 and used as a basis for its recommendation to the Senate for repeal. Besides, the limitation was on water, not on land, and the intention was that no one should get more than his fair share of the water to be developed by public appropriation. The evil that men do lives after them, but we don't want the evil of that distortion of historical fact to spread false justification for repeal to California, to Texas, and then back home again to roost in the San Luis Valley of Colorado.

The second point in the argument of the 1938 Senate report is as follows:

"The situation under the Colorado-Big Thompson project, the only one involved in the present bill, is quite different from that of the earlier reclamation projects. The Colorado Big Thompson project does not bring under cultivation new land. It is intended to furnish a supplemental supply of water to an already highly developed area of agricultural lands. These lands are now in private ownership and irrigated by numerous existing irrigation ditches. Due to various factors, such as more intensive cultivation, drought, and increased consumption of water by other systems, the water supply for this large area, amounting to 615,000 acres, is inadequate in many seasons to insure the maturing of crops. This project will supply the necessary additional water to make certain the harvests which are now uncertain."

The simple truth is that all irrigation provided under Federal reclamation is supplemental, and always has been. It supplements rainfall, underground waters, or both. The fact that water is supplemental furnishes no valid basis for exemption from the beneficent purpose of the law, which is to create many homes on the land. Supplemental water is not a test whether a good law should apply, and it was not so regarded by the framers of Federal reclamation in 1902.

These alleged views—rather than the true views—of those who originated reclamation, have been spread so assiduously, that it is time to remind ourselves what the true intentions were. It is not the lawyers, including evidently those of the great landholding corporations of the Central Valley of California and of the excess land-holding interests of the San Luis Valley and the valley gravity project in Texas, who spread false law. They have no doubts that the reclamation law applies to their private lands. It is rather the propagandists who try to make it appear to the man in the street that the bureaucrats are putting over sometning which the grand men of the last generation had never planned or wanted. The truth is just the opposite.

Let's look at the record of those grand men. Representative Mondell, of Wyoming, made this clean-cut declaration while the reclamation bill was under debate in the House:

"Under nearly every project undertaken by the Government there will undoubtedly be some lands in private ownership and it would be manifestly unjust and inequitable not to provide water for these lands, providing their owners are willing to comply with the conditions of the act; and in order that no such lands may be held in large quantities or by nonresident owners, it is provided that no water right for more than 160 acres shall be sold to any landowner, who must also be a resident or occupant of his land. This provision was drawn with a view to breaking up any large land holding which might exist in the vicinity of Government works and to insure occupancy by the owner of the land reclaimed."

Congressman MARTIN of South Dakota was equally explicit. Referring to the water-limitation clause of the bill under consideration he told the Congress: "The policy of the Government is to build up communities of many settlers with small holdings, and not to encourage the prosecution of agriculture by large corporations." With prophetic insight that belies those who declare that changes have been so great that the standards of the framers no longer fit the times, Congressman MARTIN added: "In this day of colossal enterprises private capital could reclaim arid lands at a great profit, provided the land and water could be owned by private capital on a large scale." That condition is exactly what this 160-acre limitation on water provided against.

Authoritative studies of this subject have been made and they have been published. There is no excuse for ignoring the results of their examination of law and history, or for permitting the continued spread of false information to compound the mistake of the Colorado repeal of 1938.

A study of "Acreage limitation and excess land provisions" included in the report of Central Valley Project Studies, Problem 19, makes careful examination of the declarations of those who framed and passed the national reclamation law of 1902. After quoting a series of clear-cut declarations, it concludes:

"These statements, and others of like character that could be cited, indicate quite clearly that the sponsors of reclamation arrived at conscious decisions (1) in favor of acreage limitation, (2) in favor of supplemental as well as primary irrigation, (3) in favor of the irrigation of private as well as public lands, and (4) in favor of steps necessary to force the breaking up of large private holdings. Provisions in the Reclamation Act of 1902, respective to these points, were not there by accident or through insufficient consideration; they represented deliberate decisions based upon thorough discussion."

This was in keeping with the statement by Congressman Mondell, of Wyoming, who told the House deliberating on the bill that, "No law ever presented to any legislative body has been so carefully drawn with a view of preventing the possibility of speculative ownership in lands * * *."

The framers of the law were familiar with the facts of western land monopoly. The deliberations of the National Irrigation Congress and of other western associations are full of explicity and repeated discussions of how to deal with it.

The statement by Senator Francis G. Newlands, coauthor of the original act, before the Sacramento Valley Development Association in 1905 is definitive:

"Now, what national machinery have you? You have the machinery of the National Reclamation Act, intended, as your Governor has remarked, to meet the demands of the home seekers of the country. Guarded in every way against monopoly and speculation, intended to secure to every man of industry an area of land sufficient, according to the soil and the climate or productiveness, for the support of a family, and sufficient for that alone [applause], it is also intended to break up existing land monopoly. How is that accomplished? We realized in the framing of that act that it would not be fair to apply it only to the public domain, for within reach of every governmental project lie lands in private ownership, thirsting for water to be supplied by national aid, and we felt that it was as much the duty of the National Government to supply agricultural communities that were thus imperiled as to create new agricultural communities.

"And so we provided that water rights could be secured for lands in private ownership within reach of Government projects, to be guarded against monopoly by preventing any proprietor from securing water rights for more than 160 acres, the amount of land fixed in the bill. * * *

"Here let me say that in my own opinion California has no greater curse than these large landed estates. [Applause.] To the Spanish or Mexican land grants was added the concentration of large areas of land secured from the Federal Government, part of the national domain, obtained either under lax laws or by evasion or maladministration of the laws. I have no word of censure to apply to the men who own these grants, or who now own these large areas of land. I only condemn the policy which made land monopoly possible on this coast and throughout the arid region." [Applause.]

That statement of the purposes of the law made by its chief author, was received by the association to develop the Sacramento Valley with evidences of the greatest satisfaction.

A recent student of this subject, after analyzing the past, points out an extreme danger

of the future. Ralph B. Wetheimer, in his Legislative and Administrative History of Acreage Limitation and Control of Speculation on Federal Reclamation Projects, published as part of Central Valley Project Studies, problem 19, states:

"There is no difference in principle between a supplemental and a primary supply insofar as the wisdom of applying acreage limitations and antispeculation provisions is concerned. Pressure to relax the restrictions in such cases may be viewed as a flank attack upon the whole policy, for in the future many million acres which the Bureau of Reclamation expects to irrigate will receive supplemental supplies."

We oppose misuse of "supplemental water" as a phony doctrine for concealing destruction of the American family farm. The National Farmers Union wants to preserve the family farm on those millions of acres which will receive publicly supplied water in the future.

The Colorado-Big Thompson repeal is to be distinguished not only by the clever distortions which enabled it to produce a phony basis for exemption from a sound law. It bears other marks which ought to raise questions in the minds of serious men. The national reclamation law was the result of long, careful, and public deliberation over a decade of time. The destruction of the protections provided by that law on the Colorado-Big Thompson project, on the contrary, was the result of rapid work. If its preparations were careful, and presumably they were, they were not preparations in public.

The same distorted statement of purpose of the reclamation law upon which the Senate committee relied was recited by the Acting Secretary of the Interior (not the Secretary) who gave formal assent for the Department of the Interior. He made it appear, also, that there was no practical need to maintain the law, since its purpose of breaking up land monopoly would be achieved on this particular project by natural processes of land subdivision. If he was correct that the Colorado-Big Thompson project was a special case, certainly he made this repeal unusable as general precedent. The general doctrine of natural subdivision is false, and has been rejected specifically by a dozen Congresses giving approval to limitation by law.

There were no public hearings on the Big Thompson repeal.

There was no debate on the floor of Congress.

The second exemption was obtained on Humboldt project in Nevada in 1940. Since the primary ground for exemption on that particular project was that 160 acres was too little to permit successful family farms, the Humboldt exemption affords no precedent whatever for general exemption. Another Acting Secretary of Interior, the one to give assent to repeal on the Nevada project, was very careful to declare just this. He said that he did not mean to indicate that, in all cases where a project is furnishing merely a supplemental water supply, the excess-lands provisions of existing laws ought not to be applied and enforced. The solution in similar cases, he indicated, might be found, after study, to lie not in exemption, but in flexible acreage determination by the Secretary of the Interior of the size of a farm unit appropriate to each project. Naturally that size might be either larger or smaller than 160 acres. Thus the record of the Humboldt exemption itself recognizes that repeal affords no general remedy.

A third attempt to repeal the 160-acre water limitation was made on the California Central Valley project in 1944. The Big Thompson and Nevada exemptions were used as precedents, but the effort nevertheless failed—as it should have.

Your committee will hear fully about Central Valley from well-informed interests which oppose repeal, and the National Farmers Union does not intend to cover the same ground. There are aspects of the drive for repeal there, however, which need to be set down in this chronicle of the attempt that broke out in Colorado in 1938 to destroy the family farm in the West.

On the California repealer, as on the Colorado and Nevada bills before it, there had been no public hearings when it reached the House floor, practically without warning.

The repealer was in form of a rider, introduced as a committee amendment after the committee hearings on the rivers and harbors bill to which it was attached were completed. The maneuver succeeded. It was slipped through on March 22, 1944, in a few minutes.

On the contrary, after hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, the rider was killed by the committee, and the Senate refused to allow the bill to pass. Senate opposition was so determined that the entire rivers and harbors bill was dragged down with it.

One other aspect of the tactics in the House deserves mention. The Chairman of the House Committee of the Whole overruled a point of order that the repeal amendment was out of order, a rider that "modifies the fundamental reclamation laws." The man who was in the chair to give that ruling was not the Speaker of the House; it was none other than the California member who helped put the Colorado-Big Thompson repeal through the House in 1938.

It is too late to use surprise as a tactic in California Central Valley any more. But it is not too late to try it in the San Luis Valley of Colorado and the Valley Gravity project in Texas. S. 912 attempts exactly this.

According to a Washington dispatch dated March 18, 1947, Senator DOWNEY, of California, was quoted indirectly as saying that "discussions of the Colorado and Texas project exemptions would be 'simpler' than those on the California one * * * because there was little controversy on them." If there is "little controversy" the reason is that people have not been informed of what they face. The National Farmers Union knows that, contrary to the Senator's impressions, there is plenty of controversy on the Colorado and Texas projects, and on any others where repeal may be proposed. It is the people of the Nation, not just those of a locality, who lose by repeal, and it is the people of the Nation who are entitled to be fully and completely informed when it is proposed to tear down the land laws they have so laboriously built up over the generations.

The sad truth is that within Texas the tactic of surprise and concealment may be as successful now as it evidently was in California until 1944 when the Elliott rider went through the House. What looks like a conspiracy of silence has blanketed Texas so that even Texans who otherwise are well informed do not know that the water limitation applies as a protection to the Valley Gravity project. Witness the following omission of any reference to the law from the pen of a Texan writing in the New Republic on April 7, 1947:

"So the Federal Government is preparing to spend $70,000,000 on a huge gravity irrigation system, and a still larger amount on a series of storage dams in the Rio Grande River. All this will not only guarantee the Valley's water supply, but will make possible a 50-percent increase in the irrigated area of the Valley. And already Valley promoters are beginning to eye people up in Illinois and Ohio and Nebraska, getting ready for the next land boom."

At least, the author has warned the people up in Illinois and Ohio and Nebraska that it is they who are going to pay the costs of permitting repeal to pass; they are going to pay it in the speculative prices the 160-acre water limitation is intended to protect them from. But the thing significant to an understanding of the tactics of the repealers is the fact that the Texan author, writing in a national magazine engaged in fighting against repeal in California and elsewhere, could honestly not know that the protections of the reclamation law apply to a Bureau of Reclamation project in his State, and not know what those protections are.

If there is no controversy in Texas over repeal, it must be because the people there who will be damaged by it have been victims of the same tactic of silence that enveloped the people of California until they were shocked into action by the passage of the 1944 Elliott rider through the House.

The story of how the 160-acre water limitation has been put to sleep in people's minds in one part of the country after another needs to be ferreted out and told, so that the people's interests can never be so stealthily threatened again.

In the light of this studied silence, of which Texas furnished but the latest example, the National Farmers Union demands that Congress postpone any action whatever on the Colorado and Texas projects until the Bureau of Reclamation shall have made and distributed widely the results of studies of the water limitation on those projects, studies which shall be as thorough and detailed as those which the Bureau has had made in California's Central Valley.

Two more aspects of this battle to save the family farm, to defeat monopoly of land and water, and to prevent speculation in the benefits from public appropriations, require description here.

First, is the sleight-of-hand used to confuse the people and so to prevent them from seeing or acting in their own interest. We face that tactic in the Missouri Valley, but the clearest statement we have seen of its movements is one that described what was going to happen in California's Central Valley before most of it happened. Telling of the entry of the National Farmers Union into the battle against repeal, the magazine Business Week laid out in detail in its issue of May 13, 1947 the tactics which the repealers would employ. The blue-print prescribed four tactics: (1) Direct repeal; (2) use of the Army; (3) use of the State of California; (4) use of deep-well pumps at the expense of the small farmers and the public. Here is the text of the Business Week description:

"If the big landowners in the Valley lose out in this particular fight [for direct repeal], they have several other proposals to accomplish their end. One of them is a House bill which would authorize the Army to add irrigation and power development to its present navigation and flood-control powers. The legislation also would call for construction of a series of irrigation and power projects throughout the country, especially in Central Valley. This would circumvent the 160-acre rule, since the Army is not bound by that restriction.

"Another proposal, said to have originated among the big landowners of Fresno County, is for the State of California to take over the Central Valley project, paying the entire bill. This, too, would sidestep the 160-acre limitation. Still other landowners are sinking wells around their holdings in order to be prepared to pump irrigation water from the raised water table, thus getting a free ride on the Central Valley project."

This blueprint has been and is being followed in detail. Although printed in a national journal in 1944, these very tactics still serve to confuse Congress and to defeat the people.

The National Farmers Union submits this statement of the tactics of the repealers in the hope that their complete and utter defeat will be easier when their tactics are thoroughly exposed and understood.

In this great fight to defeat land monopoly once more, the issues should always be kept clear, not confused. Every project where repeal or modification is proposed should first be studied thoroughly. There should be no conspiracies of silence, no alliances of big landholders with hidden interests, no sleight-of-hand or surprise tactics, no pitting of agency against agency to divide and destroy, no use of projects to log-roll, no threats by private beneficiaries of public reclamation that unless the heart is torn out of the law for their own special benefit, they themselves will wreck its enforcement, defy the Congress and the people of the United States, and pull down the pillars of America's historic land policy.

When we face tampering with our national land laws the issues ought to be kept perfectly simple and clear.

Flood Control at Moravia, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me by the House, I include herein the following statement made by the senior Senator from New York, Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER, with regard to an appropriation for a flood-control project at Moravia, N. Y., as well as a newspaper article from the Syracuse Herald Journal of May 22, 1947, describing the flood which inundated Moravia, N. Y., last month.

Senator WAGNER'S statement reads as follows:

While the authorization of a flood-control project in Moravia, N. Y., became law on December 22, 1944, as yet no appropriation has been made. The project would only cost $262,000 and the State has already appropriated its participating share. The engineers are ready to begin work. All that is necessary is the Federal appropriation. This matter has been called to the attention of the Corps of Engineers and the House Appropriations Committee, but as yet no appropriation has been made for it.

On May 22 I received the following telegram describing one of the worst floods in Moravia's history:

"Moravia stricken by one of the worst floods in its history. Railroad tracks are covered for several feet and the water has reached Main Street. All highways closed to traffic. Fire and police department evacuating people from western part of village to higher ground. Lehigh Valley station and adjacent properties flooded to several feet. Property and business losses mounting to thousands of dollars. Appropriation for flood-control program of United States Army engineers desperately needed. Your help deeply appreciated.

"F. HELEN MACLEAN,
"Chairman, Cayuga County Flood Control Committee."

It is a good example of the "pound-foolish, penny-wise" philosophy that seems to underlie the thinking of the majority in this Congress. The damage the flood inflicted is estimated at $250,000, or approximately what the project would have cost to construct. I hope the House Committee on Appropriations will promptly approve the appropriation requested for this purpose.

[From the Syracuse Herald Journal of May 22, 1947]

CLOUDBURST INUNDATES MORAVIA—SYRACUSE HIT—STORM CELLARS FLOODED BY DELUGE

A heavy overnight downpour flooded Syracuse with one of its heaviest May rains and caused thousands of dollars of damage in a cloudburst at Moravia.

Airline schedules were disrupted and street intersections were flooded in Syracuse by the heavy rain.

At Moravia the rain which lasted 7 hours drove Moravia residents from their homes at 1 a. m. today, inundated streets and cut off highway communications. The damage was estimated today at approximately $250,000.

Police and firemen worked all night at Moravia with volunteers carrying persons in inundated sections of the village to homes or higher ground. Ambulances, trucks, and cars were commandered as water poured from cellars and in some instances was 5 feet over street levels. The torrent ran through the Lehigh Valley station and swept into business places.

Residents described it as a veritable nightmare. As firemen and police roused residents in the lower parts of the village and waters rose in almost an instant to various depths.

The floodwaters were receding this morning although 1 foot remained on route 38 from Auburn.

The fire department had pumpers at work pumping water from Moravia cellars all the morning.

The western part of Moravia was not affected. At 1 a. m. there was no water in cellars in the eastern part but within an hour water was pouring from cellar windows and rose to floor levels as Mill Creek and Dry Creek, converging in the village, overflowed.

Water rose so rapidly that railroad tracks were covered. West Cayuga and Aurora Streets were inundated to a depth of 5 and 6 feet. Pouring through the Lehigh station at the foot of Central Street, the flood caused heavy damage to Whaat Bros. grain tanks, to Hewitt Bros., and to the G. L. F. plant.

Police and firemen stood in water above their hip boots. Dry Creek overflowed into South Main Street, covering it with water and Mill Creek became a lake in East Main Street.

All through the morning volunteers, firemen, and police carried the elderly, the sick, and others from their homes.

Volunteers worked to save cars from garages where water had risen to the car seats. Dr. Paul M. Parker called for help to get out his car and firemen extricated Wallace Rodees' and Mayor Glen Eaton's cars. Neighbors joined in helping where help was needed.

Thousands of dollars of damage was done to oil burners and other equipment in cellars of many homes. No estimate of the loss could be given today.

All roads into Moravia were cut off excepting the Gulf Road. Tons of earth were washed down onto the Dresserville Road, which was also reported washed out near the Jencks farm.

Sheriff Willard R. Wilcox has all roads posted at Auburn and all traffic is detoured from Moravia highways.

This is the second serious flood this spring. The first was the Saturday preceding Easter. Efforts were under way today to clear highways.

The heavy downpour that lashed Syracuse during the night added almost an inch and a half of rain to the May total. The heaviest part of the month's rain has fallen this week, the weather man said. There has been precipitation every day but five in May.

The storm that began about 8:50 p. m. Wednesday disrupted air-line schedules, causing cancellation of some flights in and out of Syracuse Municipal Airport.

Throughout the city, catch basins were clogged by the thick streams of water and many intersections were flooded. More than a foot of water was reported at Hiawatha and State fair boulevards. At many other points cars drove through water up over their running boards.

The rain was accompanied by a sharp drop in temperatures after the warm mugginess of Wednesday afternoon. The coolness is due to extend throughout today, although the sunshine was bright. By Friday things will be warmer, the Weather Bureau predicted, with a threat of colder weather and perhaps more rain not before Friday night.

Wake Up, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of Friday, June 20, 1947:

SAYS RUSSIA HAS 20–1 EDGE

MIAMI, June 19.—Lt. Gen. J. Lawton Collins said today that Russian soldiers outnumber those of the United States Army 20 to 1.

In addition, he declared, the Russians have over 10,000 airplanes, and we cannot man 4,000 aircraft today.

General Collins said that in case of trouble in Europe the United States forces there are so small that they could easily be overrun.

He estimated that Russia is capable of putting 200 divisions in the field, have them in the field right now, compared with 10 divisions in the whole United States Army. He said "Russia's satellites in Europe could provide another 100 divisions.

"I simply cite these as examples of the fact that we are terribly weak today," the War Department information chief said in a speech before a convention of the Reserve Officers' Association.

Proposed Amendment of Clayton Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, June 21 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, within the last few days Mr. Ed Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Small Business, and editor of Forward America, delivered a radio address over Stations WSAI, Cincinnati, Ohio; WHIO, Dayton, Ohio; WJJD, Chicago, Ill.; and KSMO, San Mateo, Calif., on the pending bill to amend the Clayton antitrust law to prevent the continued growth of monopolistic mergers. Companion bills have been introduced in both Houses. The House measure, presented by Representative KEFAUVER, has been favorably

reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary by Representative GWYNNE, of Iowa. The companion bill, which I introduced in the Senate, is pending before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wimmer's radio talk be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For the past several weeks, ladies and gentlemen, I have been doing some talking about one of the most controversial and hard-fought legislative acts ever to receive the consideration of the United States Congress. This act, known as the O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill, which is a bill to amend sections 7 and 11 of the Clayton Act, would, if passed by the House and Senate, have more far-reaching and beneficial effects upon the lives of the American people than any other legislation now up for consideration by this Congress. I realize that such a statement covers a lot of ground, considering the revolutionary aspects of proposed labor laws, aid to foreign nations, atomic power controls, universal military training, etc., but what good would it do us to solve any of these problems if we do not solve the problem of saving our democratic way of life?

Let us look at a few of the facts.

In 1914, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled in Congress and approved legislation known as the Clayton Act, which was an act supplementing existing antitrust laws, and designed to halt the merging of competing corporations. The intent of Congress at that time was to discourage monopoly by stopping corporations from getting control of other corporations, especially their competitors. In those early years of monopolistic trends in our country, the biggest corporations were buying up the stocks of their competitors, both large and small, and liberal-minded men of that day realized that if the trend in this direction was not halted, there would be a danger that a few gigantic corporations would get complete control over the economic and political life of the Nation. The result of this kind of thinking was the passage of the Clayton Act, and section 7 of this act specifically declared that no corporation engaged in commerce could acquire, directly or indirectly, the stock or other share capital of any other corporation, where the effect of such acquisition might lessen competition or restrain trade, or tend to create a monopoly.

The Federal Trade Commission, created about that time, was given jurisdiction over provisions in the Clayton Act, and it was provided by Congress that the Federal Trade Commission pass judgment on all important mergers to determine if such mergers substantially lessened competition. The Commission was given the power, also, in this legislation to order the divesture of stocks whenever it was shown that any merger had lessened competition.

LOOPHOLE FOR MONOPOLY

Within a few years after the passage of the Clayton Act, however, the lawyers of the bigger corporations discovered a loophole which permitted the corporations to bypass the purposes of the legislation by acquiring the assets instead of the stocks of another corporation, and, following this discovery, there was born an era of monopolistic mergers that has resulted in conditions which threaten the freedom of every man, woman, and child in this country, as well as the hopes of freedom-loving people in all parts of the world. I say this because monopolistic trends in this Nation have now reached such proportions that if they are not stopped we shall pass into some kind of corporate fascism for a period of time, after which will probably come early changes delivering us straight into the arms of socialism or communism.

This thought was brought out by the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1941, when it reported to the President and to Congress that it was quite conceivable that even though we obtained a military victory over the aggressors, we would find ourselves, in the end, under the domination of an economic authority equally destructive of democracy as were our military enemies.

Emphasizing this fact 5 years later, the Senate Small Business Committee reported, in 1946, among other things, that the 45 largest transportation companies were now in control of 92 percent of all the transportation facilities in the United States, the country's 20 largest banks held 27 percent of the total loans and investments of all banks, 17 of the largest life-insurance companies accounted for over 81 percent of all the assets of all life-insurance companies, 200 nonfinancial corporations now owned 55 percent of all the assets of all the nonfinancial corporations in the United States.

DEVASTATING CONCENTRATION

I could give you figures piled upon figures to show the economic devastation that has taken place in this country because we have allowed this concentration to take place. One big chain grocery system has gotten control of 14 percent of the retail food business, 20 percent of the retail coffee business, and has grown equally powerful in other directions. I could also show how many opportunities have been killed, how many communities have been robbed of their independence and self-determination by another chain that has brought ruin to independent factories, mills, and innumerable other business all over America. I could prove to you that such concentration as this caused the 1929 crash, the depression that followed, the closing of 15,000 banks, and many other disastrous things, but I want to spend the balance of my time discussing this O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill which is now resting in congressional committee.

Something must be done to prevent any further merging of competing corporations. Even the topmost spokesmen in big industry, men such as John J. McGraw, Alfred P. Sloan, Owen D. Young, and many others, who have actually helped to put these mergers together, admit this, and in some cases are advocating it, but every attempt to accomplish this end over a period of some 25 years, has gone down to defeat.

A few weeks ago I gave extensive testimony before the House Judiciary Committee in support of the O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill, which the committee unanimously reported out. In my testimony I told the members of the committee that in my opinion we had now reached a stage in our economic life where any more delay in stopping monopoly on all fronts, would place us in the position in which the MacArthur Commission, which is attempting to break up the Japanese monopolies, now finds itself.

You may know that some five families in Japan had gotten control over the entire economic resources of the Japanese people prior to the outbreak of war, and since the end of the war, the United States Government, operating through MacArthur and his staff, has attempted to untangle these Japanese financial and industrial empires, but without apparent success. The reason for this is that the Japanese combines had grown to a point where the sole responsibility for the conduct of social, economic, and political affairs was in the hands of a small group of giants who had ground out all important individual enterprise on every hand. The result was that in Japan there was no middle class—no responsible citizenry to take over or to operate the enterprises which our Government is trying to redistribute.

We are fast approaching this situation in the United States, and a serious recession or a depression, if you wish, would nullify our chance to unwind similar gigantic combines, because if depression should befall us to any great extent, there would be no market for the stocks of the decentralized companies, the only alternative probably being socialization of the banks and major industries, which would be the beginning of the end of our entire free enterprise system.

RESTORE INDEPENDENT ENTERPRISE

Mr. Henry Luce, publisher of Life, Time, and Fortune magazines, brought this out very clearly several years ago when he stated in Fortune magazine, and I quote: "Business can now unwind at a profit, just as it wound up at a profit, and if neither business nor government make a move in this direction, if bigness is to remain the standard concept of the economy, then the American businessman, the American politician, and in short, all American citizens, must prepare themselves for a different order of things, in which the powers of the government are not limited, in which the right to risk and profit is not clear, and in which the making, the selling, and even the buying of the products of the biggest show on earth are all mysteriously directed from abroad."

In my opinion, the O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill—H. R. 3736—will plug the loopholes in the Clayton Act, at least to some degree, and will slow down at least the enterprise-killing and freedom-killing merger business long enough for Congress to study and to pass legislation along the lines of the Public Utility Holding Company Act, so that all unlawful mergers effected since 1914 can, as Mr. Luce says, "be unwound."

If we Americans are to carry a State and Federal tax burden of some $40,000,000,000 annually for many years to come, keep 60,000,000 or more people employed, care for our aged, meet our foreign obligations, care for our veterans, clear our slums, and do the many other things which we talk about doing, then we will have to maintain a national income of not less than $170,000,000,000, and we will never be able to do this unless we restore independent operation of our farms, businesses, and professions, wherever practical and possible.

Restoration of independent enterprise would give millions of our youth a chance to become important in their communities, give hope to our aged, guarantee economic opportunity to hundreds of thousands of returned war veterans, keep the professions free, protect and expand legitimate big business, make more millionaires and fewer billionaires, stop the trend to monopoly in the field of labor, and give local control over local affairs to local citizens.

This, and much more, is at stake in the passage of H. R. 3736 and similar legislation. Senator O'MAHONEY says it is H. R. 3736 or socialization of all big industry. Congressman KEFAUVER says it is H. R. 3736 or the loss of all our freedoms. Scores of prominent leaders in all walks of life have agreed with both Senator O'MAHONEY and Congressman KEFAUVER in their views.

The National Federation of Small Business conducted a Nation-wide referendum on this legislation, and 96 percent of the members voting approved H. R. 3736. Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the federation, urges that we do not forget the "roaring twenties" when business tycoons ran wild with their mergers, and had to be bailed out by the Government, thus being saved from communism. Mr. Harder now poses the question: "Where would we get the money to bail them out again?"

Think it over, friends, and, believe me, thinking time is running out on us.

Until next week, thank you for being with us, and, may I again repeat, good luck and good thinking to all of you.

Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, on Veto of Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH H. BALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, June 21 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator of Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on the veto of the pending measure. The address was delivered last night at 10:45 over the Mutual and Columbia networks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President's message vetoing the labor bill is a complete misrepresentation, both of the general character of the bill and of most of its detailed provisions. Remember that this bill was considered in detail by both Houses of Congress for 5 months. Every provision was worked over and debated, first in the committees, several times on the floor of the Senate, and then in conference. Now the President attempts, in 10 days, including the 3 or 4 days spent in Canada, to put his judgment of the meaning and effect of a hundred detailed provisions over that of a great majority of those who have carefully drafted and analyzed these provisions. It is not surprising, therefore, that the President's veto message shows that he knows practically nothing about the bill.

The President ignores the opinion and studied conclusion of the Democrats in the House of Representatives who voted 106 to 71 this afternoon to override his veto. On the contrary, the President has apparently adopted in large part the prejudiced arguments of the union labor leaders, who from the beginning have opposed any legislation whatever and refused to cooperate with Congress or make any constructive suggestions. The President's message follows in many details the analysis of the bill prepared by Lee Pressman, general counsel of the CIO, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 3 by Congressman MARCANTONIO, and another memorandum inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 6 by Senator MURRAY. President Truman wholly ignores the detailed answers to these arguments and misrepresentations which I presented on the floor of the United States Senate.

Following the lead of labor union leaders, the President does not find a single good provision in the entire bill. He ignores every abuse by labor unions which fill the record of evidence before the committees. While he gives lip service to the idea of labor reform by saying that he heartily condemns abuses on the part of unions and employers, he nowhere recognizes the existence of any specific abuse. He wants a commission to study a matter carefully studied for months by committees of Congress with the best expert advice. This is the standard device of those who wish to delay and defeat action. He assumes that every power given to the labor union leaders is for the benefit of the members of labor unions—and utterly ignores the fact that these members and their wives and families are the real sufferers from unjustified strikes and arbitrary closed-shop agreements. No workman is deprived of any fundamental right as the President stated this evening. Only the arbitrary power of the labor bosses are curbed.

If there is one subject upon which every unprejudiced person is agreed, it is that unions must be made responsible for their acts, that collective bargaining cannot continue to be an important factor in our labor relations unless both parties are bound by their contracts. The President criticizes every provision designed to make unions responsible. He criticizes the requirement that they file financial and other reports with the Department of Labor. Corporations have long been required to file reports, both with State and local authorities. Why not unions?

He attacks the provisions that unions may be sued for breach of collective-bargaining agreements—on the ground that they should not be bothered with having to defend lawsuits regardless of what they do. He says they might be harassed by an employer. Everybody else in the United States is subject to harassment by lawsuits. Why not unions? In any event, the purpose of this provision is to induce them to live up to their contracts, and if they do, few suits will ever be filed.

Perhaps the most extraordinary provision of the message is the President's attack on the section permitting an injunction against a Nation-wide strike affecting the national health and safety. It was through such a procedure that he secured an injuction against John L. Lewis last fall. Last year when faced by a Nation-wide strike, it was the President himself who recommended Government seizure and the drafting of all the strikers into the United States Army. Because Congress now gives him a carefully drafted authority to delay such a strike, to attempt mediation and finally to conduct a strike vote when other remedies have been exhausted, he says the procedure will do more harm than good. He prefers to let the Smith-Connally Act expire on June 30 without any protection whatever for the people against Nation-wide strikes.

The only new thing in the message is the claim that this bill provides for too much Government intervention in our economic life and imposes Government control over free collective bargaining. The bill in no way interferes with the rights of the parties to agree on wages, hours, and working conditions, and in no way limits the right to strike if they fail to agree, except in the case of a Nation-wide strike for a period of 80 days until an election can be held. There might be something in the argument if the Government had not already intervened in all collective bargaining on the side of labor. Every collective-bargaining contract has been subject to the terms of the Wagner Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Clayton Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the intervention of Government conciliators. All this bill does is to say that when the Government does intervene, it shall be as an impartial public servant, and not in every case as an advocate of the labor union. The administration of the Wagner Act by the National Labor Relations Board, and the court decisions regarding it, made it so one-sided as to produce a general public demand that the law operate both ways. That is the purpose of the new bill.

The only new limitations or collective bargaining relate to the closed and union shops and the welfare funds. Closed and union shops have developed to such an extent as to make it almost impossible for men to get a job unless they join the union, and impossible to hold a job if they offend the labor-union leaders. Our regulation of welfare funds requires only that every employee have a legal and enforceable right in the funds, so that it is not in the arbitrary discretion of the labor-union leaders to give or not to give. These huge funds should, of course, be subject to Government regulations just the way insurance companies are subject to Government regulations to be certain they remain sound and unimpaired.

I can, in a brief time, deal with only a few of the direct misrepresentations of the details of the bill.

The President says that a union will be liable if any of its members engaged in an unauthorized wildcat strike. This is simply not so.

The President says the bill would force unions to strike if they wish to have a jurisdictional d'spute settled by the National Labor Relations Board. This is not so. All the union has to do is to file a petition under the representation section. How could this provision increase strikes when it is not effective at all until there is already a jurisdictional strike or secondary boycott in effect? Here are two union abuses which every witness recognized as abuses. Yet the President criticizes the provisions making them illegal and subjecting them to correction by the National Labor Relations Board or the courts. The President talks against them, but he doesn't want anything to be done about them.

In various places the President asserts that the bill requires election after election, and the number of them has been multiplied. He completely ignores the fact that the bill limits elections by specifically permitting only one a year, both with reference to representation and union shop. The only elections we added to those required by existing law are those to find out whether the men really want a union shop. The President objects to an employer having the right to ask for an election when someone claims to be a representative of his men. Surely, an employer ought to have the right to find out whether the union leader really has organized his men, or hasn't.

The President says that the provisions regarding the arbitration of grievance disputes are transferred to the courts, to be determined by lawsuits. He repeated this statement on the radio. It is not so. Arbitration provisions are entirely legal and remain effective under our law. As long as either party abides by the arbitration decisions he, of course, is not subject to suit.

The President says an employer can discharge a man on the pretext of a slight infraction, even though his real motive is to discriminate against the employee for union activity. This is not so. The Board decides under the new law, as under the former law, whether the man was really discharged for union activity or for good cause.

The President says the law would expose unions to suits for acts of violence, wildcat strikes, and other actions, none of which were authorized or ratified by them. This is not so. We have simply provided that unions are subject to the same general laws or agency as any other corporation or citizen in determining their liability for the acts of the agents.

The President attacks the provision giving freedom of speech to employers. The need for such a provision was the one thing admitted even by labor union leaders. The Bill simply provides that views, argument, or opinion shall not be evidence of an unfair labor practice unless they contain in themselves a threat of coercion or a promise of benefit. Without these provisions there would be no freedom of speech on the part of employers any more than there has been for the last 10 years.

The President criticizes the provision that State laws prohibiting union shops are to remain in effect. He does not tell you that this is the provision of the Wagner Act, which has never undertaken to authorize closed-shop agreements if the State law prohibits them.

It is astonishing to find the President objecting to the section which attempts to prevent Communists from being officers of labor unions. We have merely required that every officer of a labor union seeking certification must file an affidavit that he is not a member of the Communist Party and does not favor the forceable overthrow of the Government. This is the same affidavit required to be filed by Federal employees.

This does not hold up the certification of a union. But any Communist who makes a false affidavit can be sent to jail. The President says "the mere refusal by a single individual to sign the required affidavit would prevent an entire national labor union from being certified for purposes of collective bargaining." Why should an individual officer refused to sign if he is not a Communist, and why shouldn't every labor union make Communists ineligible for election as officers? The President's statement simply echoes the argument made by Lee Pressman in his June 3 memorandum, ignoring the fact that a union could take immediate steps to remove itself of any Communist officials.

There is hardly a sentence in the President's message which is not open to direct challenge, and there are many others besides those I have cited which misrepresent the meaning of the new bill. The committees of Congress who wrote this bill had no anti-union prejudice. They have tried to restore equality in collective bargaining, and correct only those abuses against employers, union members and third parties which were clearly shown to exist by bona fide evidence. The campaign carried on against the bill by the labor unions has been a complete tissue of falsification, to support the contention of the last 10 years that unions are above criticism and above the law, that there must be no legislation on the pain of political execution. It is discouraging to find the President of the United States yielding to their pressure, adopting their arguments and blocking the effort of the great majority of the people's representatives including a large majority of the Democratic Party to secure a reasonable reform.

Nazi Revival in Many Lands Seen—A Survey Lists German Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Mallory Browne, which appeared in the New York Times of June 15, 1947:

NAZI REVIVAL IN MANY LANDS SEEN—A SURVEY LISTS GERMAN OFFICIALS

(By Mallory Browne)

LONDON, June 14.—Detailed charges that nazism and fascism, "supported by considerable means and by steadily growing influences," are "openly starting to rise again," not only in Germany and Italy but in many countries, are made in a report published today by the International Committee for the Study of European Questions.

In a document that has been submitted to all the Allied governments the committee lists by name a number of Nazis still holding key posts in both the United States and British zones of Germany.

It accuses the Swiss, Swedish, South African, and Argentine Governments of laxity in dealing with Nazi assets and organizations in their own countries.

It alleges that underground groups of the Fascist Party exist in nearly the whole of Italy, actively engaged in organizing the escape of former Axis collaborators and that "this network has the support of a number of convents directly depending on Rome."

The International Committee for the Study of European Questions includes a number of prominent Europeans. Among its British members are Lord Vansittart, Lord Brabazon, and Viscount Elibank, as well as two labor MP's, Capt. Raymond Blackburn and Seymour Cocks. Edouard Herriot, former French Premier, heads the list of French members.

Today's report is to be followed in a few weeks by a document on communism. The committee declares that a "world-wide struggle between communism and anticommunism is taking place today" and that in face of this dangerous development "the United Nations appears powerless."

Recalling the round-up of Nazis in Germany that followed its most recent previous report, the committee repeats its charges that Nazis hold key jobs in the allied zones.

"In spite of official denials," the report says, "Nationalist elements are still holding key positions in very many of the official departments dealing with the economic situation." In the United States zone it gives the following as "only a few examples among many others":

In the Ministry of Agriculture of Bavaria Hans Muller, formerly a member of the Nazi Party and of the famous Freikorps, is in charge of the central office; Dyonis Schmidt, former member of the Nazi Party, is in charge of the establishment office; Herr Schaefer, former ministerial councilor, is in charge of the price-control office; Hans Fischer, former member of the Nazi Party and legal adviser of the Nazi Labor Front, is in charge of the leather-control office; Helmut Bauer, former member of the Nazi Party, is in charge of the department of mineral oils.

RUHR IS HELD HOTBED

The same state of affairs exists in the British zone and "on a wide scale in the coal and metallurgical administration of the Ruhr," the report continues, and it names the following as occupying influential posts on the North German Coal Control:

Herr Dehnen, member of the Nazi Party and the SS; Herr Klip, former member of the Nazi Party in charge of the secretariat; Dr. Wiedemann, former Nazi, in charge of the economy and the technique of heating; Herr Schaeffer, former Nazi, in charge of the dispatching of coal; Herr Nedelmanh, former Nazi and SS member, in charge of transport.

The report includes a letter from a German in the American zone alleging that he was arrested with eighty-seven companions in 1940 and that all except himself were murdered. He says that the "judge who gave the order to arrest us and to have us taken to prison where all my comrades were executed has now, with, apparently, the approval of the American military authorities, become head of the Department of Justice of our state of Wuerttemberg-Baden."

The report charges that "large numbers of dangerous Nazi agents retain their freedom of action in Switzerland and still retain property and important assets."

In Sweden, the report says, Nazi organizations have resumed their activities and sent Nazi propaganda material to other countries. Regarding Argentina, the report says that in spite of the efforts of the United States, the political line there remains unchanged. It claims that the four chief agents of Nazi Germany, Ludwig Freude, Ricardo Staudt, Fritz Mandl and Heinrich Doerge, who acted as advisers to the government of Buenos Aires during the war, are still its advisers today.

Speaking of the reorganization in secret of the Fascist party in Italy, the report says that the most important centers are in Milan. It complains that on April 28, the anniversary of the death of Benito Mussolini, high masses were celebrated in memory of Mussolini in many important towns.

ARGENTINE EXODUS BELITTLED

LONDON, June 14.—The report of the International Committee for the Study of European Questions said:

"There are today in Argentina 90,000 Germans who took part in Nazi activities during the war. Sixty thousand of them were members of the German Workers' Front, and 20,000 belonged to Nazi sporting and cultural associations. These personalities remain closely united today.

"Two Nazi benevolent societies and a German religious center have become active elements of the Nazi reorganization in the Argentine. They are the German Beneficent Society and the German Woman's Beneficent Society. They meet at reunions of the German Evangelical Church, which has congregations in all parts of Argentina, and which, through northern provinces, is spreading its influence in Brazil."

The report added that the 60 German concerns the Perón Government recently agreed to liquidate "scarcely represented one-sixth of the German firms.

"At the same time the Argentine Minister of Foreign Affairs announced that 13 Axis agents had been deported he confessed that 34 others had escaped. This is the third time in a year that at least 50 percent of the Nazi agents due for expulsion have escaped."

The committee's report said that in south Africa four leading Nazi organizations "have tens of thousands of members and continually carry out military exercises in uniform." The groups were listed as the Ossevabrangwag, which was said to be striving to set up a National Socialist State in South Africa; the Broderbond, which has a secret army, and two auxiliary societies known as the Gray Shirts and Black Shirts.

Norway Plans for Tourists This Summer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1945 I traveled extensively in Norway. At that time I felt that it would be several years before Norway would be in a position to again act as host to the many thousands of tourists who come to see that beautiful land of fjords, mountains, and valleys.

I did not take into account, however, the fact that the Norwegian people have the capacity for setting an objective and accomplishing their aims in the shortest possible time. I have just received information to the effect that the efforts of the Norwegians have been so successful that they plan to entertain an eighth of a million travelers this summer. No doubt more Americans and others will visit Norway next year.

You will be interested in the following article which appeared in the Foreign Commerce Weekly on May 10, entitled "Norway Plans to Welcome 125,000 Foreign Travelers This Summer":

Two years after the liberation, Norway is hard at work rebuilding housing and travel facilities which made this peaceful and hospitable corner of Europe favorite among American vacationers," says the Royal Norwegian Information Service. War damage to hotels since the invasion in 1940 has meant the loss of nearly 2,000 accomodations, but state and private initiative are replacing these losses with excellent buildings and equipment. It is estimated that a total of 16 new hotels with places for 1,100 guests will be completed during 1947 and that by the following year tourist housing should reach

1939 levels. Recovery has been swift and the quality of service high. Food is no longer a problem, and the visitor will find both variety and quantity in keeping with the best national tradition, say the Norwegians.

The only severe restrictions on travel will be found in northern Norway where the Nazis leveled a 60,000-square-mile area. With reconstruction in those areas largely dependent on coastal transport, Norway's greatly reduced coastal fleet is hard pressed to keep abreast of local traffic, and coastal transport from Trondheim northward will not be sufficient to meet prewar tourist demands. A host of coastal vessels are now under construction, however, and the familiar North Cape and fjord excursions are expected to be resumed next year. In the meantime fjord transport is being maintained on a reduced schedule, and in certain of the southern and central fjord districts improved service is planned for the summer months. Northern Norway, however, is not yet prepared to welcome visitors.

More than 1,000 miles of new highways have been built in Norway since 1940, and careful maintenance and improvement of roads through some of the country's most scenic areas are calculated to please the visiting motorist. The new road to northern Norway has opened a vast new scenic wonderland which should be available to the visitor "before too long." At present, a shortage of accommodations along this route plus the heavy reconstruction traffic advise against a motor trip to northern Norway this year. Though gasoline is still rationed, the visiting motorist is assured a sufficient supply.

The National Travel Association of Norway, in looking beyond the reconstruction years, has planned a broad expansion program centering about a 5-year rebuilding plan. At the present time plans for more than 100 new hotels have been forwarded for approval, and special attention is being paid to the needs of the middle-class traveler. A special organization has been set up to improve the taste and quality of the many carved, woven, and painted handicraft items which visitors have found appealing. Henceforth, all items of this type which have met the group's rigid standards will be stamped with a special mark of approval.

Rail service, hard hit by the occupation, has been bolstered by the addition of several new streamlined trains on the Oslo-Bergen, Oslo-Trondheim, and the Oslo-Gothenberg lines. It is interesting to note that the completion of these Norway-built carriers—ordered before the war—was successfully delayed until after the German capitulation in 1945.

During the summer months of 1947 (May-August) 125,000 foreign travelers are expected to visit Norway, filling available visitor's accommodations. Though this figure is still 35,000 below 1939, Norwegians believe, says the Information Service, that the gracious and courteous host should offer only his best. "Second-best is never worthy of the guest."

Why Processed Foods Should Be Used in Foreign Relief Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an article by Mr. Allen Walker, of the National Canners Association, Washington, D. C., as follows:

FOREIGN RELIEF PROGRAM—TRI-STATE PACKERS ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE MEETING, JUNE 5, 1947

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS BROUGHT OUT DURING DISCUSSIONS AT MEETING OF FOREIGN PROGRAM COMMITTEE OF TRI-STATE PACKERS ASSOCIATION, AT THE LORD BALTIMORE HOTEL, BALTIMORE, THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1947

Allen Walker, director of International Trade Service of NCA, was present by request to furnish information regarding the status of the Government's food relief program.

When called upon for a statement as to the Government's projected program, Mr. Walker summarized reports which already had appeared in NCA's Information Letter and International Trade Letter, filling in details in answer to specific questions.

When asked what was NCA's policy on the subject, Mr. Walker referred to the record of the May directors' meeting of NCA and the Information Letter's extensive report thereon. He made it clear that he was there as the result of the request made of Mr. Campbell by Mr. Skinner for his (Walker's) attendance, and was ready to furnish whatever data was within his province to supply embracing foreign-relief program information. He thought these limitations should be understood.

As the result of discussions which followed, the following points were evolved for citation to members of the Tri-State Packers Association and to other trade organizations who were seeking to collaborate in the projected program.

All present agreed with Mr. Mairs' statement that the committee should seek to furnish some kind of specific response to the request made by Col. Stanley Andrews, of USDA, in charge of the Informational Supply program, when their (Tri-State's) previous delegation waited upon him in Washington. That request, as they all knew, was for a specific plan whereby processed foods could be included in the foreign food relief undertaking, so that USDA, when the growers' accumulated problems for 1947 "descended upon the neck of the Department," would possess justifiable ammunition for presentation to the proper Washington sources as a means of getting the United States Government's active endorsement of the proposals to be submitted.

In the meantime, it was agreed, all interested parties should join forces to descend upon Congress in a body to make the legislators cognizant of all the factors involved.

The following were the high spots of the discussion:

1. Obviously futility of past and present relief diet in European famine areas demonstrated by acknowledged fact that, in spite of our costly food-relief program over past two years, people are still undernourished and physically unfit to do the laborious field work essential to preparing to feed themselves.

2. That while desperate measures may have been necessary for a time to furnish available food (grain cereals) which might "keep 'em alive longest at least cost," such bare subsistence diet must be regarded as meeting emergencies, but as a protracted program admittedly is mere expediency and calculated to put no end to the tax on American citizens nor limit the constant drain on American resources.

3. That it is not even common sense to keep on draining the American economy of commodities (food grains) which are not now in short supply, and whose continued purchase at high prices only aggravates the present price inflation, while neglecting the procurement of many farm commodities now in surplus, and whose steady price decline is a matter of daily record. That such policy is calculated to react on the approaching packing season and precipitate a severe depression for most fruit and vegetable growers in the United States.

4. That there is no sense in the contention of some United States Government departments that "they can only respond to the demands of recipient European governments as to their primary needs (allegedly grain cereals)," because it has been proven,

(a) That such foods as flour, raw meats, wheat, etc., which have to be cooked with fuel which the European housewives have to buy by the pound (when they can get it) are no more economical than certain ready-to-eat processed foods, plus the fact that when not balanced by other foods they are totally inadequate to nourish the recipients.

(b) That a combination diet, embracing a broader list of commodities (including processed foods) would be far more nutritious and health-assuring; would relieve the monotony of the present civilian diet and stimulate their morale. That numerous processed foods, at current prices, when balanced with grain staples in a combination diet, comply with the formulae of established procurement agencies; namely, maximum nutritional and caloric values at minimum cost.

(c) That it is not beyond the realm of probability that communistic-dominated governments in central Europe do not want to see the diet of their starving people improved along lines calculated to restore their physical strength and enable them to get in shape to feed themselves since they, the Communists, believe that continued lack of proper food is the surest breeder of discontent and economic chaos, upon which all communistic propaganda thrives.

5. That if it be true, as proclaimed by the State Department, that the projected $350,000,000 foreign-relief program is inadequate to do more than purchase a proportion of the grain cereals demanded by the European governments—short-sighted as these demands may be. If it be true that it will take $5,000,000,000 a year for five more years to insure Europe's economic recovery, without which our entire war indebtedness—exceeding $250,000,000,000—will have been wasted, not to speak of the American blood spilled in the process. Then why not begin appropriating right now a part of the $5,000,000,000 which we shall need for the projected 1948 program instead of risking total European economic collapse in the interim and the consequent dragging of the rest of the world down into the abyss?

6. That such additional moneys, if voted now, would enable the United States Government to broaden the diet of the needy peoples abroad; would serve to restore their physical strength to the point of getting them in shape to feed themselves; would put Europe back on its economic feet and establish future markets for United States goods in the quickest possible time.

7. That otherwise, according to the authorities best able to weigh the facts, there will be no definitive termination to the job of feeding the hungry peoples overseas; we shall have wasted our gigantic war efforts entirely; we shall witness no early European recovery and we shall risk world-wide economic disaster.

8. That all Government, industrial, agricultural, and labor economists agree upon one fundamental; namely, that only maximum United States economic productivity will sustain maximum economic employment and maximum national income; that maximum productivity means expanded markets to take care of it; that foreign markets are largely closed to us now because of the shortage of dollar purchasing power; that the United States Government's subsidization of foreign food relief offers no substitute for the loss of these essential food export markets so long as they continue to be supplied with an unwisely limited group of commodities which neither serve a constructive, comprehensive purpose nor take off the domestic market the very items that are in

long supply and available at the lowest market price since prewar days.

ALLEN WALKER.

NOTE.—It seems to me not inappropriate to sound one note of caution here by reminding all concerned that all trade groups in the canning industry and individual canners who are pressing the Government on this subject, while perfectly justified in pleading for the inclusion of processed foods in the relief program on stated grounds so long as Congress has already appropriated the money; also, that they are further justified in asking for the precipitation of any future program ($25,000,000,000) provided the Government is intent upon effectuating such a program anyway. But it should be remembered that practically all American industry (including canning) has constantly urged the Government not to favor subsidies of any kind; and not to favor any particular branch of the economy by voting special appropriations in response to group pressure.

A. W.

The Veto of the Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the veto message of President Truman disapproving the labor bill is an invitation to revolution. Its incitement to law resistance is a dangerous departure from the theory and practice intended by those who framed the Federal Constitution. President Truman in his veto message of the labor bill appeals to the passions and prejudices of men instead of to their reason. Is such a diatribe likely to lead to law observance or is it an open encouragement to resistance and violence on the part of those who do not wish to be restrained by the law of the land?

I am inserting under leave to extend an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star under date of June 21, 1947:

A POLITICAL VETO

Thre is nothing in the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill which counteracts the impression that his disapproval rests primarily on political considerations.

On Tuesday Mr. Truman said that he had not yet read the bill as finally passed and that his mind was still open. Two days later he had made up his mind against the bill and was drafting a 6,000-word veto message which consisted for the most part of sweeping and unsupported generalities. Congress spent months working on this measure. But the President found in it not a single provision worthy of commendation. He simply denounced it from beginning to end.

It is not feasible here to review either the bill or the veto message point by point. But there is one point which serves to illustrate the character of the bulk of Mr. Truman's statement.

He denounced as being ineffective and discriminatory the section aimed at major strikes which imperil the national health and safety. It is true that this section does not prohibit and would not necessarily prevent such strikes. In its essentials, however, it provides for a board of inquiry to investigate and report publicly on the facts of the dispute; it empowers the Attorney General to obtain an injunction which would postpone such a strike for a maximum of 80 days, and it authorizes a secret vote by the workers as to whether they wish to accept the employer's last offer of terms.

If this verdict were in the negative, the strike could be called. The President condemns this as ineffective, although the only effective alternative would be compulsory arbitration, which he also opposes.

In this connection, it is interesting to turn back to a "fact-finding" proposal which the President himself made some 2 years ago, and which he discussed in January of 1946 in a radio address.

With respect to strikes vitally affecting the national public interest, the President asked authority for a Government commission to step in, ascertain all the facts and report them to the people. Meanwhile, he wanted Congress to impose by law a 30-day "cooling-off" period in which the workers could not strike. And he was confident that the force of public opinion, once the public knew the facts, could assert itself in "a practical way."

Now there is no important difference between that proposal, desired by the President 2 years ago, and the provision in the Taft-Hartley bill, for which he has not a single good word to say. Yet in 1946 he chided the legislators for not giving him what he wanted. "I had hoped," he said, "that the Congress either would follow my recommendations or 'would at least propose a solution of its own.' It has done neither."

The quotes within the above quotation have been supplied for emphasis. But the President was even more emphatic later on in that speech when, referring to his labor plan and other legislative proposals, he declared: "If the measures which I have recommended to accomplish these ends do not meet the approval of the Congress, it is my fervent wish—and I am sure that it is the wish of my fellow citizens—that the Congress formulate measures of its own to carry out the desired objectives. That is definitely the responsibility of the Congress. What the American people want is action."

When Congress acted, however, what did the President do? When the legislators passed the Case labor bill, shortly before last year's elections, he vetoed it. Now that the Taft-Hartley bill has been passed, and with a Presidential political campaign beginning to take form, he vetoes that. And this in the face of the fact that the people, through their Representatives in the House, have expressed repeatedly for 9 years their desire for new labor legislation—only to be thwarted time and again by an administration-controlled Senate Labor Committee or a Presidential veto.

The strength of this sentiment for a change is shown by the crushing House vote to override this latest veto—331 to 83. On this issue the President could not even muster a majority of his own party, the Democratic vote being 106 to override and only 71 to sustain the veto.

These are facts and figures which argue persuasively that the President is catering to pressure groups and ignoring the wishes of the people of the country. The people want a new deal in labor legislation. There is real need for a revision of the labor laws. The Senate should see to it that the change is made by joining with the House in overriding this political veto.

Navy Department Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, through inadvertence, the following opening remarks I made during the general debate on the Navy appropriation bill a few days ago were omitted:

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the committee spent some 6 or 7 weeks hearing witnesses and generally considering this bill. No time was lost on partisanship. As a matter of fact, your committee takes great pride in the harmony that prevails in the committee. The gentleman from Vermont, my distinguished friend [Mr. PLUMLEY], is an outstanding chairman. He certainly has done a remarkable job and we are all most grateful to him. And, I would like to pay my respects to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], and certainly not the least, even though he is the newest member on the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]. The gentleman from Kansas did wheel-horse work, and I venture to say that if you watch his progress throughout his career here, it will be outstanding.

To correct that omission, so that my views may be of record, request is made to insert those comments at the proper place in the permanent RECORD.

Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an article entitled "Where Are the Veterans' Hospitals?" which appears in the July 1947 issue of the American Legion magazine. This article points up the need for making use of the surplus Army and Navy hospitals. A subcommittee of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has examined the Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa. I am inclined to believe that the recommendation of this committee would be favorable. If other similar hospitals were examined I believe that we would find that they could be used to relieve the congestion which exists due to inadequate facilities to take care of the wounded of World War II and those veterans of World War I who also require medical attention. I urge all Members of the House of Representatives to read this article:

WHERE ARE THE VETERANS' HOSPITALS?

(By Charles Hurd and Robert B. Pitkin)

Unless you are a veteran who has applied for hospital care you may not know that your country is woefully short of veterans' hospitals. There are thousands and thousands of former service men and women who may be entitled by law to medical care, to whom the promise of the law is not much more than a scrap of parchment offering paper hospitals.

Compared to the need there are so few veterans' hospitals in operation today that some of the manpower of the Veterans' Administration is being devoted, not to admitting eligible veteran patients to hospitals, but to selecting between them so as to determine which shall get in and which shall not.

The taxpayers are paying scores of paper workers to decide which eligible veterans will not be let into these hospitals.

In communities all over the land doctors daily examine veterans and receive modest fees from the VA to help determine medically the need for hospitalization.

Out in a few cities of the land there are a few foundations and holes in the ground where veterans' hospitals authorized in 1944 may some day stand.

In Iowa and California and a few more States there are some surplus Army and Navy hospitals standing empty and boarded up.

All the above is part of a picture of our Veterans' Administration hospital program, so hopelessly behind today that it will be more years than anyone can accurately figure before a veteran can be admitted to a veterans' hospital simply because he needs hospitalization and is eligible under the law. By that unknown date many of today's eligibles will be well—or dead.

The story of the hospital program for veterans is a discouraging story of 5 years wasted that should have been 15 years well spent. Only in the past few months has the program begun to function as it should have years ago. Now, too late to turn back the lost years, Surg. Gen. Paul R. Hawley, of the Veterans' Administration, with the assistance of the Army Corps of Engineers and the American Institute of Architects, is trying to make up some of the time that is gone forever. In that job he and his subordinates are working closely with the rehabilitation division of the American Legion—but they are running a race the best part of which was lost before it began.

The story is this:

Long before World War II the Legion asked that new hospital construction for veterans be started. In May 1940 the President approved a 10-year construction program which had as its goal 100,000 beds by 1948.

The Legion estimated, on the basis of the old ratio of 1 bed per 40 veterans that over 250,000 beds would be needed by 1948. The Administration shortly thereafter published its estimate of eventually needing 300,000 beds for eligible veterans by 1975.

Congress acted in 1943 and 1944 when it authorized money for 74 new veterans' hospitals. It also passed a law in 1943 giving World War II veterans the privilege of hospitalization for nonservice-connected disabilities if unable to pay for same, on the fair theory that a man who offered his life for his country should never languish in illness in peacetime for reasons of private want.

That action in 1943 caught the VA flat-footed. General Hines, the then VA Administrator, had apparently assumed that, as in the case of World War I veterans, World War II veterans would wait 5 years after the war for the right of hospitalization where the disability was not service-connected.

As you will see, act of Congress or no act of Congress, that's about how it's working out anyway.

But the real joker was in waiting until 1944 to authorize an enlarged hospital-construction program. In spite of fine paper priorities, the prosecution of the war came first. It had to. Men and materials were not available for other purposes. If war comes again next year or a hundred years from now, the present mess will repeat itself—unless the public, and through it the Congress, comes to realize that planning for veterans' care is part of any peacetime national-defense program.

By March of this year, 3 years after Congress allocated funds for the construction of 74 new hospitals, 68 sites had been chosen, specific planning was under way for about 59, contracts had been awarded for only eight and actual construction had started on only two or three of these. None of them is completed today.

Almost 2 years after war's end the Veterans' Administration is struggling along with (a) the hospitals built for World War I veterans and still largely occupied by them, and (b) such military hospitals as could be converted to VA use.

Several fine Army hospitals are standing empty, boarded up. They were offered to the VA but could not be used because the Army built them too far from any population center to staff them with doctors and nurses. These hospitals were fine for an Army, which could draft or commission medical staffs and order them whither it would. But they are in some instances not adequate for an administration which must use civilian doctors. Medical men say it is like drilling a well in a rock to build a big hospital where there are no doctors.

One of the locked-up Army hospitals is at Clinton, Iowa, in an area where veterans recently went begging for care because the Chicago VA hospitals were packed to the rafters and couldn't take them. The VA had to turn down use of the Clinton hospital because the nearest community with a medical center is Iowa City, too far from Clinton for Iowa City doctors to commute, or leave their practices.

The VA is planning a new hospital at Iowa City, and at Clinton the big Army hospital stands empty and unused, a shining ghost of the recent war. Meanwhile the VA has arranged that urgent cases in the Clinton area may go to other VA hospitals more distant than Chicago, for care.

And what is the story of the 74 hospitals authorized in 1944? Why are none finished and few being built today?

Construction is a matter of plans and materials and workmen and time—1944 was too late. There is no better comparison between authorization and having hospitals than the official record of the new 400-bed veterans' hospital at Providence, R. I., one of the first started under the postwar program.

Providence was approved September 12, 1944. The site was selected April 19, 1945. Architects' plans were completed June 13, 1946. The bid for construction was let September 10, 1946, and ground was broken the same month. The hospital is scheduled for completion in April 1948. That's 3 years and 7 months after authorization and 3 years after VE-day, when prospective patients began coming home in large numbers. Any delays caused by strikes, material shortages, or other causes will postpone the opening date, which is, after all, just a paper date.

Will there be further delays? Maybe. Workmen are scarce, particularly where commercial construction at bonus rates competes with hospital building, and that is virtually everywhere. Costs multiply and original plans need upward revision. The new NP hospital south of Peekskill, N. Y., on which ground was recently broken, will cost nearly three times as much as originally planned in 1944. Over eight million dollars then, twenty-two-million-odd now.

One contractor in Wisconsin undertook a major alteration job, bidding on the assumption he could put 100 bricklayers to work on a veterans' hospital. After he started, not more than eight bricklayers reported on any one day. His penalties for delay in the contract exceeded the amount of profit he could make.

Instances like that make contractors unwilling to bid on veterans' hospitals in the new program. The uncertainty of their ability to complete the job causes them to shy away. Contracts are being rewritten to remove penalties for delays beyond the control of the contractor—but the whole building situation adds to the dreamy quality of our present paper dates for completion of our 74 new hospitals. Today's estimate is that most of the new beds will be ready in 3 to 5 years (that's 5 to 7 years after VJ-day). But even that estimate is more ambitious than realistic the way things are going. It is doubtful if more than half the 300,000 hospital beds General Hines foresaw in 1943 as eventually necessary will be ready in 1950 or 1951. There's not much you can do about that fact now except write a row of exclamation points after it. It is certainly up to the VA and the Congress to make sure no further ground is lost.

What do all these figures, dates, estimates and shortages mean in terms of people?

Nobody knows how many men and women are going totally without the care they need.

Or how many are being crowded into State hospitals by States which don't care to wait any longer for promised Federal facilities.

Or how many are being held in Army and Navy hospitals without discharge, awaiting available Veterans' Administration hospitalization.

Or how many are going to the free clinics and wards of municipal and private hospitals.

There will never be a census of them all, and the VA is far too busy with an avalanche of more urgent paper work to attempt a count.

However, in a single day recently 13,000 men and women—all veterans to whom promises have been made in the law—visited the single regional office of the VA in New York City. They all came with problems troubling them, with questions to ask, or desperately needing help—and many were seeking hospitalization for disabilities or ailments. They didn't all get it—not even those who were clearly qualified, clearly in need.

Today it is utterly impossible for the VA to make so much as a gesture toward accommodating the non-service-connected veteran patients, patients who need hospitalization and are unable to pay for it.

Instead, when this year began, the VA was straining under a policy which stated first and foremost that no service-connected case would be turned away at the hospital doors. The intentions were very laudable.

It was a paper policy, and was not actually being realized, but was being pushed as far as facilities, and the abilities of the present VA staff, could push it.

The VA admitted, in January, that in spite of this policy there were a few instances of service-connected patients not hospitalized. In fact, Surgeon General Hawley cracked down hard in February in one or two instances where VA hospitals had, apparently knowingly, turned away service-connected patients.

But the VA's few instances were not accurate national figures. Out in the field the few loomed much larger. Some Legion department medical advisors said that within their own States there were more nonhospitalized cases of certain clear-cut service-connected ailments than the VA statistics admitted for those particular ailments in the entire Nation. One Legion doctor was sure this held for service-connected tuberculosis in his State. From another State the top Legion medical advisor reported that State hospitals were taking tubercular patients straight out of the Army. The State was unwilling, in the absence of VA facilities, to let tubercular patients go home to infect their families, he said. And the State did this despite overcrowding and understaffing in its own hospitals. However, in most of the States even these crowded facilities are not available. They do not have sufficient beds or staffs to take care of their urgent civilian problems.

It was further reported that crowded and understaffed conditions in VA hospitals had been causing tubercular patients to leave before they were entirely well. In one such instance a disgruntled tubercular veteran left the hospital and moved in with his sister and her children. Subsequently one of the children developed tubercular meningitis and died.

The VA was happily able to report in February that recently improved conditions were rapidly cutting down the number of such voluntary withdrawals from tubercular convalescence. This may be ascribed to recent legislation advocated by the American Legion.

At further variance with the small VA figures for nonhospitalized-service-connected

patients was the experience of Legion rehabilitation officials in Washington, who took a sampling of applicants for VA hospitalization from one area in North Carolina on which no action had yet been taken. The sampling revealed a high percentage of prima facie service-connected cases not hospitalized. These are cases which by their very nature are service-connected, about which there can be no argument. They vary from such things as gunshot wounds received in service to, in the case of Pacific and other tropical veterans, malaria. There was no reason to assume the sampling was not representative of the Nation.

The VA does not conceal its records. The discrepancy between its figures and the evidence of the private doctors exists because the VA figures are incomplete. The doctors meet patients who feel it is useless to apply for veterans' aids, or who started to apply but quit because of the red tape. They meet more who still have their applications pending, and many more whom the VA has turned down as not service-connected—without convincing the doctors. None of these patients are in the VA tabulation of a small number of service-connected cases not hospitalized last January.

The VA will move heaven and earth to give immediate care to a veteran once it is established to the VA's satisfaction that his complaint is service-connected.

Its reviewing boards toil mightily to get through the blizzard of applications, and steps are taken occasionally to cut some of the red tape vets must go through.

When all is said and done, the present clear-cut service-connected cases are more than enough to jam the beds presently available, and they are not all asking for hospitalization. Meanwhile the Legion doctors believe that a fat percentage of the men and women who will be turned away this year because they are adjudged not to be service-connected cases will eventually prove to suffer, in truth, from afflictions rising out of military service. Yet for them it wouldn't make much difference today if they won their argument.

Veterans in either the service-connected or nonservice-connected category are entitled to hospitalization when in need of it. The distinction between them as applied most generally to veterans today is an administrative one, made in an effort to parcel out inadequate facilities to the most deserving of an army of men and women, all of whom are eligible, but as to whom a priority specified by law must be observed. Lack of facilities is at the heart of the trouble.

It would be great sport to pin the entire blame for the situation on the Veterans' Administration, for it is charged with all the responsibility and looks like a handsome target. The events that led up to the present mess spell delay and delay and more delay. The VA has certainly made its mistakes, it ravels and snarls its own red tape. But it has also been caught in a web of shortages of material and labor, has met its share of bureaucratic bungling from the outside, and has been required to do too much with too little time.

Did you raise your eyebrows on learning that of 74 hospitals authorized in 1944 none is finished? From the point of need, this is shocking. But very little is to be accomplished by making the VA the entire scapegoat, or the veterans organizations, or the Congress, or the prewar administrations.

When all the cards are face up on the table, gentle reader, the villain of the piece is nobody but us, meaning We, the People. You can recount all the mistakes, all the pitfalls, all the blunders, all the political gambits and inept officials, and while they make a pretty list, they do not explain the shocking shortage of veterans' hospitals.

It was too late, in 1944, to plan for the care of veterans of the recent war. Then our manpower and materials were needed for the prosecution of the war, and no matter what priorities were written on paper, no matter who ran the VA or how, those 74 hospitals would not materialize in a hurry.

The time to plan veterans' hospitals is when we are at peace, as part of the national defense program that always recognizes the possibility of war.

It might have been political suicide for any Congressman to urge construction of 74 veterans hospitals in 1938. Amid cries of warmonger, a frightened, shocked public would have voted him out of office. We who make up that public are responsible for today's shortages of veterans' hospitals.

The Truman Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Cleveland News of June 18, entitled "The Truman Tax":

THE TRUMAN TAX

Party whips cracked in the House of Representatives to bring enough Democrats back into line to uphold President Truman's tax-reduction veto.

The Democrats evidently figured they couldn't afford to leave their next year's Presidential candidate all alone out on that limb, whether they enjoyed his company or not.

Mr. Truman was intent on being the first American President to forbid a majority of Congress to cut taxes; it seems an odd way to win friends and influence voters. Of course, it's easier to milk the taxpayer than to enforce economy in government—so long as the taxpayer can be fooled. Looks as if Mr. Truman elected to take one more chance at it.

We don't think the taxpayer is going to be fooled. Millions of workers are denied the raise in take-home pay a July 1 reduction would have put in their envelopes. They'll remember who is responsible.

Just to keep memory fresh we have an idea for a weekly reminder. We suggest all those millions of workers keep track of the difference between the withholding tax as might have been and what they actually pay. The difference to be known as the Truman tax.

He's the man who levied it. He sure ought to have credit for it.

Foreign Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the following editorial by Mr. John S. Knight, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on Saturday, June 21, 1947; it well represents the growing feeling of the people of the United States:

FIT CHARITY TO RESOURCES LEST WE FALL WITH EUROPE

When an individual contributes to the support of the needy, whether they be less fortunate relatives or a deserving charity, his gift normally bears some relation to the state of his own finances.

The balance sheet of his assets and liabilities determines what portion of his income he feels can be used for helping others without jeopardizing the security of his own family.

Thus, a sense of prudence and self-preservation guides his thinking because he realizes that mismanagement of his financial affairs will in time not only reduce his own standard of living but directly affect his ability to assist the indigent.

A comparison can be made in the relationship between nations. The sole difference is that the United States is the only country with the money and the resources to help rehabilitate the war-stricken areas. Therefore the hungry and impoverished peoples of the earth look to the United States for salvation.

If we agree that they should be helped, and I hold strongly to that view, the question remains: To what degree can we afford to help them?

For a nation, like an individual, ultimately finds that its capacity to pay can be exhausted. If we ever permit ourselves to fall into that dilemma, the United States will wind up in the hands of a communistic receiver.

BILLIONS GET US NOTHING

The record of our generosity to date shows that billions have been poured into China without achieving economic stability in that unhappy country; money and credits extended to Russia's satellites have been used for further expansion of Soviet power, and one-half of the British loan of three and three-quarter billions has already been exhausted.

At the time Congress supported the Truman doctrine by appropriating $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey, the Daily News opposed the loan on the theory that it was unrealistic to believe that we can stop communism with dollars.

The soundness of that view was demonstrated recently when Russia took over Hungary without firing a shot, and, as one Soviet leader said, "before the United States could rub its eyes."

We predicted, also, that if the Truman doctrine were carried out to its logical conclusion wherever communism was on the march, the cost to the United States within the next few years would run from seventeen to twenty billions of dollars.

The accuracy of that prediction is now supported in the recommendation of Secretary of State Marshall that a new program calling for gifts or loans of $5,000,000,000 a year is necessary for world rehabilitation.

The Secretary tells us that "in many countries, confidence in the local currency has been severely shaken." What he did not tell us is that, with the exception of England, these countries have made little effort to live within their means; that they have tried to escape their financial obligations by printing money; that, because of their political and ideological vagaries, it is doubtful whether they will ever mend their ways.

It is true that Secretary Marshall is striving for a joint program, but here again, what course shall we pursue if Russia decides it is not to her advantage to participate? Do we go it alone—and foot the entire bill?

MOTIVES DISTORTED

How is Europe reacting to our latest venture in world paternalism?

In France, the newspaper Franc-Tireur explains that the motivating force behind the Marshall plan is fear of a business depression.

This newspaper reasons that overproduction of goods is forcing us to look to world markets.

The Communists in France, according to George Weller of the Chicago Daily News foreign service, have decided not to shoot Santa Claus so long as thousands of superfluous functionaries can be carried on the pay roll. The Communists in Italy have decided that they want plenty of any money that is being handed out.

In England, where our funds are being poured into a hopelessly inefficient economy, Graham Hutton of the British information service says frankly, "Everyone knows Britain is living on the American and Canadian dollar loans, and that those dollars are fast running out, like sand out of the hourglass."

Mr. Hutton urges the British to face the truth that they cannot afford what they would like to buy, that the Nation must get to work with the utmost efficiency, and that precious human beings must not be wasted in the confusion of hopeless red tape caused by tying up more of Britain's working population in government offices than in any other nation in the world.

From his vantage point in Paris, George Weller writes that "no Communist and indeed few Europeans of any political flavor can understand why the United States, plagued by strikes and housing and tax troubles, is willing to throw any further moneys into Europe without asking anything in return."

A rapidly growing number of Americans are today beginning to ask themselves the very same question.

ESSENTIAL PRECAUTIONS

Four steps suggest themselves as essential if the American people are to support further aid to Europe:

1. We should first follow Herbert Hoover's recommendation that all governmental agencies having anything to do with foreign relief, international finance, and exports be coordinated. This step would eliminate much of the present interdepartmental conflict and confusion.

2. Our capacity to extend aid must be carefully surveyed so that we do not bankrupt ourselves while endeavoring to aid others.

3. We should create a bipartisan committee to plan and supervise the administration of an overseas economic program. In other words, we should have something to say about the way our money is spent.

This suggestion stems from the British experience, where 52 percent of the American loan has been exhausted without any of us having the faintest idea where the money has gone. In fact, no break-down is available from the British.

In other words, simply pouring out American funds to pump oxygen into dying economic systems is neither good charity nor good business on our part.

4. If we are actually frank enough to admit that the ultimate purpose of the Truman and Marshall doctrines is to stop Russia's expansion, why can't we see the folly of being economically interventionist and militarily isolationist?

As an example, we have spent between three and four billion dollars in China for economic relief and political prestige, but the coastal bases, fixed garrisons and airports remain in Soviet hands.

The same experiment, conceded to be a colossal failure in China, is about to be repeated in Greece and Turkey.

Why can't we see, as George Weller says so succinctly, that creditable as both the Truman and Marshall plans may be, the hard core of military reality is missing? Both plans are soft at the center because they make America responsible for Europe but ignore the very security they aim to achieve.

BEWARE OF BLANK CHECK

I believe that Mr. Truman, who says this is not the time to reduce taxes, will find his new $24,000,000,000-aid-to-Europe program meeting tremendous opposition in Congress. Certainly the people who pay the bills are entitled to know just how, where, and why the money is to be spent before they place their approval on a single cent of such a staggering appropriation of funds.

Our hearts go out to the less fortunate peoples of other lands but experiences of the immediate past give little hope that these additional gifts will be used effectively for their own best interests.

We should never agree to let the Government sign our names to another blank check without knowing all the facts and having our eyes wide open.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Shipment of Oil and Gasoline to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, while we are considering many important problems in the Congress, many of which will immediately concern the people generally, I desire to present for the consideration of the House the problem which we now face respecting our gasoline and oil. It has just been discovered that those in charge of our agencies of Government have become quite generous in shipping our meager supply of oil and gasoline to Russia. This is probably being done under the so-called good-neighbor policy, of which we have heard much during the 14 years last past.

This present program reminds us of the days before we were attacked by Japan—when we were sending gasoline, oil, iron, steel, and steel scrap to our recent enemy, Japan, under the same so-called good-neighbor policy. We recall that the shipments so made to Japan so depleted our own stock pile of those commodities that when Japan attacked us, and the war was in progress, our Government called upon our people, and our children, to collect steel, iron, tin, aluminum, and other essential materials in order that we might successfully prosecute the war. Of course, after Japan attacked us, she used that gasoline and oil to prosecute the war against us, and she used that same iron and steel to mold into bullets and shells which they shot back at us. Doubtless, many of our boys were shot and killed in the late war by that same material which we supplied to them under the so-called good-neighbor policy.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Procurement Division has just reported that Russia has on hand, today, a reserve supply and stock of oil and gasoline, ready for immediate use, of 150,000,000 barrels, and she has and is producing oil and gasoline in large quantities. Yet, in our own country, we have but a limited supply, and we rank fourth among the nations of the world in our supply; we have on hand, and ready for use, but 50,000,000 barrels of that highly essential commodity. Therefore, Russia has three times the supply of these commodities that we have—yet, our Government, by and through the agencies set up and now in operation, controlled by the President, continue to ship both oil and gasoline to Russia at the rate of approximately 1,000,000 barrels each month. Russia is requesting these shipments, and her requests are largely in excess of those made during the recent war—and our agencies of Government continue to ship her that which she requests regardless of our shortage in this country.

May I further advise the people that the heads of our Military Establishment have advised, and they have warned us, that our supply of gasoline and oil is only sufficient for normal peacetime military operations. In fact, they state that many of the normal operations have been materially reduced, or discontinued in part, because of this very limited supply of these commodities in our country. These statements verify the fact that a shortage exists, and they state that shortage will continue, and these commodities will remain critical, until we are able to secure oil and gasoline from Persia.

Mr. Speaker, many of the Government officials here who have been and are now participating in this policy of shipping oil and gasoline to Russia, in the face of our very short supply, warn us that within the next 30 days it may become necessary to again ration oil and gasoline in the United States. At the very time that warning was given, those same Government officials were approving, or had approved, a shipment of 50,000 barrels of oil, from Los Angeles, Calif., in a Russian tanker—to Russia; they had also approved other shipments, because two other Russian tankers were in process of loading, each to carry a like amount of gasoline and oil to Russia, and 10 other Russian tankers are now awaiting to be loaded, with a like or similar amount of these scarce commodities. Of course, this policy is depleting our supply, and sending to Russia, which nation has plenty of gasoline and oil, that supply which we need so badly. My own concern is this: Why send large quantities of oil and gasoline to Russia? She has plenty of these commodities. And why reduce our own supply to the point where rationing may be necessary in the future? These questions can be answered only by those in control—those who are now engaged in carrying out the so-called good-neighbor policy. Let them answer these questions to the satisfaction of the people, if they can.

Mr. Speaker, many of us are wondering if this is a part of the planned-scarcity program, which has been followed for a long period of time. If it is—then it is time for those in charge to awaken and change that policy. The precedent of the action of Japan prior to World War II should be ample warning to them. It is my hope that these high-powered and so-called experts now handling these commodities, and many other commodities, will not continue to give away our essential commodities, thereby impoverishing our own people, and making

it necessary to go back to the day of rationing all because they have failed to estimate the situation.

A Realistic Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article written by me entitled "A Realistic Foreign Policy." This appeared in the Manchester Evening Leader, Thursday, June 19, 1947, and in the New Hampshire Morning Union, Friday, June 20, 1947. Both papers are published in Manchester, N. H. The article follows:

A REALISTIC FOREIGN POLICY

THE UNITED STATES—THE LEADING WORLD POWER

The world today is exceedingly small because of the revolution in communication and transportation. There are no longer any far-away places on this earth. The interests of the United States are global. Isolationism is dead. The war through which we have just passed and the peace we are trying to establish are parts of the same globe-encircling upheaval gripping the troubled nations of this planet.

This Republic cannot stand apart from the onrushing stream of world affairs. Just as we have taken the leading role in two great wars during the past three decades, so we must take our position as the foremost leader in the current struggle to win the peace. For this purpose destiny has brought this nation into existence. We must rise to the present occasion, assume responsibility for leadership, and be determined that we will not fail in establishing a permanent peace. If we fail in this undertaking, we fail not only ourselves but the entire human race.

THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

On April 10, 1947, I said on the floor of the House of Representatives that the heart of the present debate on the foreign policy of the United States, frankly speaking, is to be found in the relations between the United States and Soviet Russia. The current critical world situation has resulted from an unwillingness on the part of Communist-controlled Russia to live up to agreements solemnly made plus a desire on the part of Moscow to take advantage of the postwar world dislocation for the express purpose of achieving a world dominated by communism. The world crisis will be resolved when the United States comes to grips with the realities of the situation and makes a determined stand against Soviet aggression and the advance of communism.

RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY

There are two basic principles in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. The first is expansion by the acquisition of territory and the second is to spread communism whenever and wherever possible. The recent action in Hungary is the latest example of the determination of Russia to spread her totalitarian communistic regime. We have protested against the action in Hungary and Bulgaria. Secretary Marshall is becoming more outspoken in the face of the advance of communism. Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, speaking at Wesleyan University in Middletown, Conn., on Sunday, June 15, 1947, used strong language in reference to the Soviet Union. Said Acheson, "Unhappily the whole force of recovery and the international pursuit of happiness has suffered deeply by the failure to attain or maintain great power unity. This has come about by the Soviet Union's pursuit of policies diametrically opposed to the very premises of international accord and recovery."

I further stated on the floor of the House on April 10 that in my opinion Mr. Stalin and his associates will not stop their program of aggressive expansion and of spreading communism until the United States takes a firm stand. I believe that this is the time for a show-down. This is the time to make the position of the United States absolutely clear.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

The Congress by a heavy vote passed and the President signed a bill to extend $400,000,000 in aid to Greece and Turkey. Thus the Truman doctrine, which I hope will become the American doctrine, has been approved by the Congress. This action is significant because it indicates that we intend to take a firm stand in international affairs. It marks the stiffening of the foreign policy of the United States. It is the first show of realism by our Government since the end of the Second World War.

A REALISTIC FOREIGN POLICY

The great debate on the foreign policy of the United States has just begun. There is considerable talk in Washington about the possibility of a special session of Congress to be called sometime in the fall for the purpose of considering matters of foreign policy exclusively. Secretary of State Marshall has already formed a board of planners within the Department of State to make recommendations in foreign affairs. Congress in the future will be required to render many decisions on international questions. I believe that we should formulate immediately a firm, realistic and resolute foreign policy.

On May 23, in speaking to the Women's Republican Club of New Hampshire in Concord, I suggested that a platform on foreign policy should include the following planks—

PLATFORM ON FOREIGN POLICY

First. The United States should dedicate itself to maintain its position of leadership for world peace. This opportunity has been given to us by destiny. The Republic has come into being for the express purpose of laying the foundations for a permanent and a lasting peace. Every American heart should be dedicated to the achievement of this objective.

Second. Congress should make a thorough study of international relations and investigate the Department of State and the foreign service. Such procedure would give the representatives of the people a greater voice in the determination of policy. In November 1945 I introduced a bill for the purpose of conducting such a study and investigation. The Secretary of State evidently feels that a committee on policy formation is essential since he has created one within the Department itself.

Third. The United States must continue leadership in the UN. The defects of this organization, chief of which is the veto, must be removed.

Fourth. We must exert pressure to bring about the honoring of solemn agreements, such as Yalta, Potsdam, the Atlantic Charter, and the Charter of the United Nations. Only recently we sent sharp notes to Bulgaria and Hungary. The President has taken a firm stand against what is happening in the Balkans. This pressure must be continued until the march of aggression and totalitarianism is halted. In connection with this I believe that recognition should be withdrawn from all of the Soviet-dominated governments.

Fifth. Diplomatic appeasement of the Soviet Union in which we have been indulging since the end of the war must cease. Diplomatic appeasement failed in the 1930's. It will fail in the 1940's.

Sixth. Economic assistance to rehabilitate the economies of countries resisting the spread of communism must be extended by the United States. Secretary Marshall speaking at Harvard stated that the purpose of our foreign policy "should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist."

No man knows what it is going to cost to stabilize the world. Recent estimates have run as high as $24,000,000,000. I have often stated that if it requires twenty-five billions to stabilize the economies of the world and to win the peace it will be far cheaper than fighting another war. It will be money invested for the security of our country.

In connection with extending aid, we should follow an important principle, namely, the principle of helping the nations who receive assistance to help themselves. As soon as they are self-supporting and we have successfully halted the sinister spread of communism, our aid can cease.

Seventh. This country should inform the world that we intend to stop aggression directed at certain strategic positions such as the approaches to the Atlantic, the Dardanelles, the islands of the Pacific, Iceland, Gibraltar, the Persian Gulf area, etc. Our interests circle the globe and when there is encroachment on strategic areas, the integrity of which is necessary to our security, we must be ready to offer immediate, continued and unrelenting resistance.

Eighth. Most important of all planks in a realistic program on foreign policy is the maintenance of adequate preparedness on the sea, on the land and in the air. Atomic supremacy and air supremacy by the United States must be achieved at all costs. All the money necessary to keep us the strongest Nation in the world should be appropriated. Only by so doing will we win the peace. A strong United States is the greatest guarantee for a decent society in the future.

THE AMERICAN DOCTRINE

The Truman doctrine must be implemented in every way possible. It must become the American doctrine. I believe the 8 planks on foreign policy which I have outlined should be adopted at once by both parties as a platform on foreign policy. A weak foreign policy, an unrealistic foreign policy, a foreign policy of appeasement will lead to war and to death. A strong policy, a resolute foreign policy, a firm foreign policy will lead to a peaceful world, a world in which nations can live without fear of aggression, slavery, and ultimate annihilation.

The Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, supplementing my remarks on the floor today with respect to the Maritime Commission, I am including below a letter dated June 9, 1947, from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission to me, and my reply thereto, dated June 17, 1947; and a letter dated June 20, 1947, from the Comptroller General to me.

These letters set forth the pertinent facts with respect to the effort of the

Maritime Commission to avoid reducing their pay roll to the amount authorized by the appropriation act by making transfers between their accounts which the Comptroller General has held to be illegal.

The letters follow:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, June 9, 1947.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TABER: This letter is in reply to an inquiry made orally by Mr. Harvey, clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, to Mr. Kirsch, budget officer of the Commission, concerning the ability of the Maritime Commission to absorb the cut of $90,000 made by the Congress from the Commission's request for an increase of $1,890,000 in the administrative limitation of the construction fund to provide for increased costs brought about as a result of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946. Mr. Harvey also inquired how the Commission was able to absorb the apparent deficit of $331,522 referred to in my statement before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies on April 14, 1947.

Shortly before I appeared before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies, the Commission had requested the Bureau of the Budget to support a request for increase in the administrative limitation in the amount of $331,522. This request had been denied by the Bureau of the Budget only a few days before I testified, and at that time specific plans had not been developed to prevent this apparent deficiency. Immediately thereafter, however, a program designed further to reduce expenditures and to bring the administrative accounting records up to date was instituted. The provisions of this program are as follows:

1. At the time the request was contemplated for an increase in the administrative limitation to cover an apparent deficit of $331,522, pay rolls had not been reviewed to a point where the Commission was able to determine that certain charges had been erroneously made against the administrative limitation. The review of pay rolls has been expedited, and it has been determined that charges, aggregating more than $200,000, resulting from salaries to personnel engaged in the checking of materials on ships going into or coming out of lay-up, were erroneously allocated to the administrative limitation; whereas they should have been charged to the limitation for reserve fleet operations. It has further been determined that another $100,000 has been charged in error to the administrative limitation, about $90,000 of which should have been made against warehouse operations and $10,000 against the funds for the maintenance of inactive shipyards. Steps are being taken to have these expenditures correctly charged.

2. The posting of all credits to the administrative limitation account is being expedited. Often credits to various accounts are not made until after the close of the fiscal year, but in view of a possible shortage of funds we are currently posting all credits so as to have the administrative limitation account properly reflect the amount of cash available. These credits consist of reimbursements from other agencies, canceled pay checks, and adjustments of employee accounts. For example, so far this fiscal year credits amounting to approximately $70,000 have been made as a result of canceled checks. A substantial portion of these credits would not ordinarily be reflected in our books until after the close of the fiscal year.

3. All promotions, other than those required by law, which would cause increased expenses to the administrative limitation have been forbidden.

4. All new appointments or transfers of employees paid from other limitations or funds to positions paid from the administrative limitation have been forbidden.

5. All overtime except in cases of unusual emergency has been forbidden.

6. All advance of sick leave has been forbidden.

7. All advance of annual leave has been forbidden.

8. The rate of separations has been increased. The following table compares the actual number of employees on duty as of various dates as compared with the number estimated to be on duty as shown in an exhibit presented to the Subcommittee on Deficiences on April 14, 1947:

U. S. Maritime Commission administrative limitation—Construction fund

Date	Number of employees on active duty	Number of employees estimated on Apr. 14, 1947, to be on duty
Apr. 4, 1947	3,048	3,050
Apr. 18, 1947	2,982	3,000
May 2, 1947	2,961	3,000
May 16, 1947	2,926	2,950
May 30, 1947	2,894	2,950

The total of 2,894 employees on duty May 30, 1947, compares with a total of 6,081 on duty July 12, 1946. This represents a reduction of 51 percent.

As a result of this program, the Commission is in a position to stay within the approved limitation.

If you have any further questions regarding this matter, the Commission will be glad to supply the answers.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, June 17, 1947.

Admiral W. W. SMITH,
Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMIRAL SMITH: Due to conflict of schedules, it has not been possible for us to hold the hearing on the proposed adjustments to avoid the deficiency which was in prospect in your administrative expense limitation at the time you appeared before the deficiency subcommittee on April 14, 1947, and due to the shortness of time I am writing this letter in reply to your letter of June 9 in lieu of a hearing.

On April 14 you advised the committee that if your request for $1,890,000 was granted, you would still be confronted with a further deficiency of $331,522 which it would be necessary to absorb in the remaining months of the year in order to stay within your limitation. The Congress imposed a reduction of $90,000 in the deficiency request, leaving a gross deficiency of $421,522 to be absorbed.

You stated on April 14 (p. 126 of the hearings on the second deficiency bill), in response to a question by Congressman SHEPPARD as to how you expected to absorb this deficiency:

"We have several solutions under consideration. The most drastic one, of course, would be staggered furlough of everyone in the staff, possibly a week's compulsory leave without pay.

"Then we are making a study also of which employees' salaries are properly chargeable to War Shipping Administration funds. We know that there are some, but we would not make that shift without the approval of the Comptroller General."

I have before me a copy of the letter of the Comptroller General, dated April 29, 1947, replying to your letter of April 14, 1947, in which he refused to permit the adjustment in accounts to which you apparently alluded in the hearings. When requested by this office to report just what adjustments were made to absorb the deficiency you sent your letter of June 9 and I am forced to say that it is not responsive to our request. The numbered paragraphs in your letter set forth a number of broad general statements as to methods to be used by your Commission in absorbing this deficiency. For example, you point out that there are:

"Charges aggregating more than $200,000 resulting from salaries to personnel engaged in the checking of materials on ships going into or coming out of lay-up, were erroneously allocated to the administrative limitation; whereas they should have been charged to the limitation for reserve fleet operations."

In view of the fact that the Comptroller General had rejected your first proposal to make an adjustment to meet the deficiency one naturally assumes that the second proposition is not as meritorious as the first or you would have offered it to the Comptroller General in the first place. You failed in your lettter to give details of this adjustment in accounts and dealt with it in only broad general terms and to that extent your report is not responsive to our inquiry. I am informed by the General Accounting Office that your request for this adjustment, submitted on a series of Forms 1097, proposes to charge personnel which have all the year been charged to the administrative expense limitation to other limitations, where funds are plentiful, from July 1, 1946. It is pertinent to inquire why your accounting system and budget management processes are of such a nature that you did not discover this until May. Had you informed your deficiency subcommittee, on April 14, that adjustments of this nature were possible in all likelihood the deficiency granted would have been less than the $1,800,000 that was approved.

Your letter refers to the posting of credits to the limitation account. The statement with respect thereto can be looked upon only as an admission that your accounting practices are slipshod.

You state in the last sentence of your letter:

"As a result of this program the Commission is in a position to stay within the approved limitation."

The fact remains, however, that in order to stay within the approved limitation you must get the approval of the Comptroller General of the various adjustments to which you refer. I have conferred with representatives of the General Accounting Office whose responsibility it is to develop the information necessary to a decision by the Comptroller General on your Form 1097 dated June 6, 1947, proposing to make adjustment between limitations in the amount of $233,133.14, which, if granted, will serve to absorb a little better than half of the known deficiency. The General Accounting Office tells me that it will require considerable research into the basic records before they can make a decision on this request and it is now just 13 days until the end of the fiscal year. If the decision were rendered adversely today, you would be in a very difficult situation and each hour that goes by before a final decision by the Comptroller General will make it that much worse. I have requested the Comptroller General, and am supplying him with a copy of this letter, to make an exhaustive examination in order to be sure that your proposed adjustments are absolutely legal. Inasmuch as you do not present this request until the last month of the fiscal year and then only after you have discovered that you cannot stay within the limitation and have already made one attempt to get approval by the Comptroller General of an adjustment which would have cleared your accounts, no other course of action is in accord with sound business practice.

While it may be be said that the penal provisions of the Antideficiency Act are not applicable to this situation, since this is a limitation and not a separate appropriation,

your moral responsibilities are exactly the same as if it were a separate appropriation.

You have no doubt observed the statements on pages 26 and 27 of the report on the independent offices appropriation bill, 1948, about your budget presentation. The handling of this limitation in the fiscal year 1947 is exactly like the situation therein referred to. The only conclusion which I can draw is that if you were keeping your accounts in a proper manner this situation could not have occurred.

As Chairman of the Commission, the responsibility is yours not only to see that your expenditures for administrative expenses for fiscal year 1947 are within the limitations set by the law—and I do not see how you can avoid taking such steps as are necessary to insure that fact immediately rather than to await a problematical decision on adjustments in accounts which may not be available for some weeks to come due to the great amount of detailed work necessary on the part of the auditors—but also to take immediate steps to put your accounting and budget offices in shape to administer your affairs in the future so that you will not only know what your expenditures are currently but be able to present to the Congress your budgetary requirements in a clear, concise, and accurate manner.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN TABER, *Chairman.*

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 20, 1947.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of June 17, 1947, enclosing a copy of your letter of the same date to the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, relative to an adjustment requested by the Commission of the General Accounting Office on standard Form 1097 dated June 6, 1947, involving a credit of $233,133.14 to the limitation for personal services and a charge of a like amount against the limitation for reserve fleet expense under the construction fund of the Commission.

As explained to you more fully when I visited your office today, accompanied by Messrs. E. L. Fisher, F. H. Weitzel, and E. W. Bell of this office, the General Accounting Office can find no legal basis for the proposed adjustment, and hence must disapprove it. The Chairman of the Maritime Commission has been so advised.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

United States Antitrustizing Japan's Zaibatsu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

UNITED STATES ANTITRUSTIZING JAPAN'S ZAIBATSU

(Article 19)

The liquidation of the Zaibatsu is one of the most sensational developments in the financial world since the midget sat on J. P. Morgan's lap.

The Zaibatsu are the 10 wealthiest families in Japan who controlled most of its banking and industry through gigantic holding companies and interlocking directorates and whose activities contributed to the financing of the war and the production of war supplies. These are the Aikawa, Asano, Furukawa, Iwasaki, Mitsui, Makajima, Nomura, Okura, Sumitomo, and Yasuda families.

To dispose of their holdings the occupation authorities have established an antitrust and cartel section, which operates like the antitrust division of the Department of Justice, except that it doesn't have to go through the routine of getting court orders for what it does. This section issues its own orders.

Its purpose is to break up large corporate enterprises and to abolish monopolistic trade practices. It operates through the holding company liquidation commission, an agency of the Japanese government established at the suggestion of the occupation authorities to liquidate and distribute the Zaibatsu holdings.

The first official act of the holding company liquidation commission was to designate the Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Sumitomo, Yasuda and Fuji industrial holding companies for dissolution and to take physical possession of securities having a book value of 1,500,000,000 yen.

It has since designated for dissolution 40 additional holding companies and 20 of the larger Zaibatsu subsidiaries which operated in a dual capacity as both industrial and trading enterprises and holding companies.

Through these holding companies the liquidation commission controls 3,500 operating corporations. The securities of about 3,000 of these corporations are scheduled for liquidation, under a recently enacted Japanese law prohibiting stock ownership by the restricted companies and their subsidiaries and affiliates.

These securities eventually will be sold to Japanese individuals, with employees of the various companies having priority purchase rights. The ultimate aim is to develop an investing public and to establish widespread ownership of securities, as in the United States, rather than having them concentrated in a few hands.

Technically this is not confiscation. The original owners of the securities, the Zaibatsu families, will be compensated from the proceeds of the liquidation. They are to be given 10-year nonnegotiable bonds. This won't make them wealthy, however. About 85 percent of what they get will go to the government under the capital levy tax.

Actual sales of securities to the public will not begin until they have been appraised and fair prices established for them. In many cases this will involve reorganization of the companies involved, especially those which have sustained a total loss of their assets in Manchuria, Korea, China, and other places where Japanese exploitation ceased with the end of the war.

Moreover, it appears that currency stabilization which would establish some kind of value for the yen outside of Japan would be highly desirable to make the investments attractive.

Sales of the securities will be conducted by a securities coordinating liquidation committee, composed of representatives or various agencies of the Japanese Government.

WIDE DISTRIBUTION IS SOUGHT

Its purpose will be to coordinate sales so as to prevent the market from being flooded and to secure as wide a distribution as possible. A central registration bureau will be established so that ownership of the stocks can be supervised and regulated.

Meanwhile the income of all the Zaibatsu enterprises has been impounded. The members of these families are dependent for their living expenses on allowances granted to them by the liquidation holding company. These allowances will be deducted from their eventual compensation.

Some observers of the occupation were impatient in the early days because the heads of the Zaibatsu were not lopped off the day after General MacArthur landed in Japan. But when we get through with them, according to the program that has been worked out by SCAP, they won't have much left but their heads.

San Francisco's Cable Cars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, with all of San Francisco's natural and man-made marvels to boast of, features in abundance, of which it is rightfully very proud, its cable cars—the "ugly ducklings" of municipal transportation—are, strange to relate, the objects nearest and dearest to the hearts of the people of that famed metropolis.

As the cable cars constitute modern San Francisco's living link to its glorious yesteryears, I am sure that which Mr. Edwin Eaton, president of the Fresno Guarantee Building-Loan Association, wrote of them in his monthly letter should find its place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—the ever-expanding repository of present-day happenings to which the historians of the present and the future will turn in their search for material as time moves on. His is, indeed, a stirring description of a day that is rapidly fading.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eaton's letter, to which I have just referred, is the following:

THE PRESIDENT'S MONTHLY LETTER

San Francisco's picturesque cable cars have been the subject of much recent controversy in the hilly city by the Golden Gate. Mayor Lapham and others in responsibility claim that the cars have outlived their usefulness, are a menace to life and limb, and are a positive liability to the city. They say the cars themselves are old and decrepit. The tracks are worn and bumpy and cannot be replaced. Experienced gripmen are old, and young men to replace them are not attracted to the hard physical requirements of the job. The cables break and cause interruption of service. The cable lines now operate at an increasing loss. Hazards to passengers and to traffic impose a great financial liability on the city.

On the other hand, sentimentally the cars play a big role in the hearts of San Franciscans and visitors. It is claimed that the cable cars are such a distinctive feature of San Francisco that they attract more than enough tourist trade to counteract their operating loss. The question is to be put to the voters as to whether or not the taxpayers shall foot the bill for the sake of the sentimental value.

Without attempting to take sides in the controversy, let me be reminiscent for a moment about San Francisco's cable cars as I knew them in boyhood days. While I, myself, was born in Fresno, my mother was born in San Francisco, which no doubt accounts for my early familiarity with "the

city," as we habitually referred to it. Father always took his vacation in July and we usually spent that month each year at a different California resort. Upon Father's return to Fresno on the 1st of August, Mother and the children would go to San Francisco to spend August and a week or more of September until Fresno schools opened. Thus it was that I spent a month or more each summer in San Francisco from babyhood to college days.

Most often we lived on or near Sutter Street and so used the Sutter Street cable car more than any other. Unlike the cable cars now operating in San Francisco, the Sutter Street cars were in two separable parts—a closed section with parallel seats facing each other and an open dummy with seats facing outward on each side and two seats facing forward and two rearward. The reason for the separate units was that the Sutter Street cable franchise went only as far as Sansome Street, where Sutter enters Market Street. From there to the Ferry Building horses pulled the enclosed section of the cable car the few remaining blocks to the ferry and back. The detached dummy would wait at Sansome Street for the first horse car to arrive from the ferry. As soon as the horses were detached, the dummy would be hooked on and started on its trip up Sutter Street, pulled by the underground cable. A grip in the dummy provided the means of connecting and disconnecting with the continuously moving cable. There was a song whose chorus started "Oh, the gripman gripped the grip upon the grip car."

Most picturesque of all San Francisco's cable cars were the Market Street cars whose eastern terminus was a turn table at the Ferry Building. Five different streets angling into Market Street contributed their brilliant hued cars to the colorful parade to the ferry. Alike in all other respects, these cars were painted different colors to designate the routes they traveled before entering Market Street. The Hayes Street cars were green, the McAllister Street cars were yellow, the Haight Street were maroon, the Valencia Street blue and the Castro Street cars cream. Standing at the ferry turn table, it was easy for a passenger wishing any of these 5 lines, to determine by the color when his car was arriving. Unfortunately the earthquake and fire of 1906 put an end to these picturesque cars. The Market Street lines were all electrified when service was restored.

San Francisco will never seem quite the same without cable cars. However, we sentimentalists who don't foot the bill had better step side and let San Francisco's taxpayers decide whether or not they wish to underwrite the loss necessary to continue this picturesque but uneconomical means of transportation.

Cordially yours,

EDWIN M. EATON,
President, Fresno Guarantee Building-Loan Association.

Let Us Pick a Chief of Police Qualified To Be Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police Department in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three editorials that appeared in the local newspapers regarding the appointment of a new chief of police for the Nation's Capital.

These expressions of editorial opinion do not speak well in behalf of the candidacy of Inspector Barrett and it is obvious that these newspapers view the possible appointment of the present chief of detectives as head of the Police Department with skepticism and apprehension:

The clippings follow:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 21, 1947]

MR. YOUNG'S RESPONSIBILITY

The active career of an able and loyal public servant came to a virtual close yesterday when Maj. Harvey Callahan, Washington's chief of police, asked to be retired on grounds of physical disability.

The people of Washington owe Major Callahan an important debt of gratitude. It is to be hoped that Major Callahan, relieved of the strain of fighting to return to his job, will find his way back to health.

His request for retirement brings to public attention again the matter of his successor.

Ever since Major Callahan first became seriously ill it has been understood that Inspector Robert Barrett, chief of detectives, has been the personal candidate of Commissioner J. Russell Young.

A few weeks ago, the News expressed at some length a considered opinion, with reasons, that Inspector Barrett is not suited to be chief of police in the Nation's Capital.

Today, when the appointment of Major Callahan's successor is imminent, we repeat this opinion with equal emphasis and with equal hope that Commissioner Young will reconsider. The News believes that, in fairness to the people of Washington and in respect of his trust as Police Commissioner, he cannot do otherwise.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of June 22, 1947]

A NEW CHIEF OF POLICE

The man chosen to be superintendent of the Metropolitan Police Department of Washington should have a record on the force that is above reproach.

Inspector Robert J. Barrett, whose selection for this job seems to have been taken for granted in some quarters, has many qualities that make a good policeman. But he does not have that sort of record.

He has fought his way up from the ranks in spite of black marks on his record that would have barred other men from promotion. He is fearless and determined. He has a reputation of being a hard driver and of getting the maximum of work from his men. But some of the attributes that have brought him advancement, as an individual, might easily work to the disadvantage of the Department in a position that demands administrative ability, tact, and the power to command loyalty from his men and the confidence and respect of the community.

Inspector Barrett's appointment as chief of police would carry the implication that no other men in the Department were as well or better qualified for the job. That in itself would be an undeserved reflection on the caliber of the top-ranking officers in the police force.

[From the Washington Star of June 21, 1947]

POLICE CHIEF QUALIFICATIONS

It is regrettable that the failing health of Maj. Harvey G. Callahan will compel his retirement as superintendent of police. The Metropolitan Police Department will lose an able, faithful leader of the type who inspires efficiency in the ranks and confidence on the part of the community.

A number of possible nominees for this important law-enforcement post are mentioned in the speculation over Major Callahan's successor. Several outsiders are said to be among the candidates. Heading the list of police candidates is Detective Chief Robert J. Barrett, whose "paradoxical" record of commendations and of board and court trials was related in the Star yesterday.

The Star has no particular candidate to propose, but it has a suggestion or two to offer the Commissioners as to the type of officer who should be selected to head Washington's police force. First of all, the Star believes that the appointee should be chosen from within the ranks of the department. This is a highly specialized job that should not be permitted to become the property of patronage seekers. Politics and law enforcement do not mix successfully. Moreover, the task of policing the National Capital presents problems of jurisdiction and administration not found outside the seat of government. Familiarity with these peculiar problems is highly essential.

It is the Star's firm conviction, furthermore, that in choosing a man from within the the department the Commissioners should be guided not by their personal likes or dislikes, but solely by a determination to give the city the best police administration possible. To assure that kind of police service the department must continue to have leaders of the Callahan type whose records, training, temperament, and reputation are above reproach. There are such men in the department and one of them should be chosen. The vital thing is to give the Police Department a leader who will command the wholehearted respect and trust of his men and of the citizens he serves. Any doubt on this score should be resolved in favor of the public interest.

HOLC—Benevolent Mortgage Holder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "HOLC—Benevolent Mortgage Holder," which appeared in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., on June 22, 1947:

HOLC—BENEVOLENT MORTGAGE HOLDER—FORECLOSURES ARE AT THE LOWEST MARK IN HISTORY—MANY THOUSANDS HAVE BEEN SAVED FROM EVICTION

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Home foreclosures today are at their lowest point in history. Yet only 13 years ago the Nation was in the depths of its worst mortgage loan panic, homes were being foreclosed at the rate of more than a thousand a day, and many home-financing institutions were facing ruin.

Largest single item of debt in the United States—aside from national, State and municipal indebtedness—was $19,242,000,000 in mortgages on city homes. And of that sum, the staggering amount of more than $4,000,000,000 was in default.

RESCUED HOME BUYERS

More than 800,000 families then in default on loans today owe retention of their homes directly to the operations of the Home Owners' Loan Corp., which recently reported it expects to clean up its vast home salvage job without a penny of cost to Uncle Sam.

This agency—which still is the world's largest mortgage holder—refinanced 1,017,821 homes in tens of thousands of communities in virtually every county in the Nation between 1933 and 1936.

At one point, it came to the rescue of defaulting home buyers at the rate of 3,000 a day. Throughout the country, it refinanced one out of every five of all owner-occupied city homes on which there was a mortgage. In one State, one of every two such homes was refinanced.

To carry out its huge rescue mission, HOLC invested $3,492,000,000, employed as many as 21,000 persons at one time, had 460 branch offices and spent as much $37,500,000 a year for administrative expenses.

COLLECTS BY MAIL

Today it still has 387,000 debtors in 16,000 cities and towns, yet its 460 branch offices have shrunk to 2—1 in Chicago and the other in New York—employees are down to fewer than 800, virtually all its collections are by mail, and the agency says it can squeeze by with only $3,723,000 for administrative expenses next year, all of which would be met from its own income.

John H. Fahey, Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, has directed the home-salvage job almost from the beginning. He was a member of the Corporation's original board, became chairman a few months after HOLC started operations, and since February, 1942, has played a many-sided role as the over-all administrative head of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and HOLC.

A former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Fahey started his career as a newspaper reporter, later becoming New England superintendent of the Associated Press, publisher of the Boston Traveler, New York Post, and other newspapers, and president of a shipbuilding firm.

During his years in the newspaper business, he was chairman of a national committee which revised the bylaws of the Associated Press, and served for a time as an AP vice president.

MOSTLY SQUARE SHOOTERS

To Mr. Fahey, courtly, keen-eyed, and firm-voiced at 74, HOLC operations prove at least one important thing:

"The great mass of our people are square shooters; and if you give them a decent chance, they will pay what they owe."

But back in 1933, as the depression deepened, more and more families found it impossible to continue to pay high interest rates then being charged (from 6 to 9 percent on first mortgages, mostly of short term, and as high as 14 percent on second mortgages).

Even when interest charges were met, many lending institutions refused to renew mortgages owing to their critical need of cash.

As a result, foreclosures skyrocketed. Total foreclosures for 1933—blackest year for home buyers—was 252,000. Millions of other homes were threatened. The Nation was traveling swiftly along the road to catastrophe.

Then Congress acted. In June 1933 it set up HOLC to help bail out lending institutions and save homes facing foreclosure. The Corporation was provided with a capital of $200,000,000 and authorized to issue up to $4,750,000,000 in bonds backed by Government guarantee.

Whatever the cost an alarmed Congress was ready to foot the bill. And at that time it was freely predicted Uncle Sam would be out of pocket by from a half billion to a billion dollars before the adventure ended.

SAVED MANY BANKS

In exchange for delinquent mortgages, HOLC pumped $2,750,000,000 into banks, savings and loan associations and insurance, finance, and mortgage companies. With the need for cash thus relieved, many of those institutions were saved from collapse. And most of them soon were able to ease off on foreclosures and grant better terms to other delinquent debtors.

Besides cash for lending institutions, HOLC paid out a total of $487,000,000 in borrowers' delinquent taxes to communities, spent $203,000,000 to repair and recondition 500,000 homes of borrowers, paid $18,000,000 in delinquent fire insurance.

In place of the home buyers' original short-term mortgages, HOLC gave new liberal terms—15-year mortgages at 5 percent interest (later reduced to 4½ percent) and as high as 80 percent of the appraised value of the property. It thus helped make standard the present "direct-reduction" mortgage, which is paid like rent.

But the job of saving homes wasn't easy. Recovery lagged and distress continued. In spite of a charter to be lenient with its new debtors, HOLC was obliged to foreclose on 198,000 homes whose owners could not, or would not pay. And as late as 1939, Congress extended the repayment period of about 255,000 other mortgages—then seriously in default—up to an additional 10 years.

ONLY FEW IN ARREARS

In the beginning, many home owners seemed to have the impression HOLC was a "relief" organization and that the loans needed no repayment. But in the last 7 or 8 years, accounts in arrears have steadily decreased. At present, 98 percent of remaining borrowers are current in their payments or less than 3 months in arrears.

By the end of 1946, the number of accounts had been reduced by 62 percent, and 82 percent of its $3,500,000,000 investment had been liquidated. More than two-fifths of those still owing money on their homes have mortgage balances of less than $1,000. Seventy percent have balances of less than $2,000.

Of the 198,000 homes foreclosed—chiefly between 1937 and 1940—all but 76 had been sold by April 30 this year. Still owed on the remaining 387,000 HOLC mortgages is a total of $636,000,000, of which $416,000,000 is on the original loans and $220,000,000 on the foreclosed houses which have been sold.

OPTIMISTIC ON LOSSES

HOLC at present figures its "book losses" on the entire operation at $58,319,000, but expects that by the time all mortgages are paid off this deficit will be more than wiped out.

Practically all book losses suffered by HOLC came as a result of sales of foreclosed houses. Such losses at one point amounted to about $337,724,000 on the capitalized value of the properties. The capitalized value, HOLC explains, includes the loan balances, unpaid interest, taxes, and the costs of foreclosing and reconditioning.

Had the agency held its properties, virtually all its book loss would have been avoided owing to present higher values, and a tidy profit could have been obtained. But as an emergency agency, the corporation's policy was to sell any houses it acquired as quickly as local markets could absorb them at fair prices, and without dumping or taking unjustifiable losses, officials explained. As it was, more than 80 percent of all foreclosed properties were sold before Pearl Harbor.

During the war, HOLC urged borrowers to pay off loans ahead of time while earnings were high. As a result, in 4 years nearly $200,000,000 in advance payments were made.

INVESTED IN SECURITIES

Besides making mortgage loans, HOLC invested $223,856,000 in securities of savings and loan associations after it was established. Of this total, all but $15,191,000 had been repaid by the end of 1946. From these investments the corporation received $44,255,000 in dividends.

In addition, HOLC invested $100,000,000 in capital stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, a Government agency created in 1934 to insure investors' accounts in savings and loan associations. On this investment, HOLC received $3,035,000 in dividends up to 1935. For the period since then, dividends of $34,500,000 have been allowed to accumulate in a special reserve fund of FSLIC.

At present $627,000,000 in unmatured HOLC bonds are outstanding (all held by the Treasury Department), on which HOLC pays only 1 percent interest. During 1946, bonds were retired at the rate of about $21,600,000 a month.

Rogers Fights On for Equality—Terminal Leave Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from Tiff, the Sunshine Special, of June 19, 1947, one of the leading local newspapers in Palm Beach County, Fla.:

ROGERS FIGHTS ON FOR EQUALITY

Tiff takes this occasion to commend Congressman DWIGHT L. ROGERS from our district, who still continues his fight for equality among all who served Uncle Sam in World War II. Although Congress has not backed him in his program to make veterans' terminal leave pay bonds negotiable, he wars on. If the enlisted men and women are madder'n wet hornets over the discrimination made against them by holding up the negotiability of their bonds for 5 years, while officers were permitted to cash in immediately, they have just cause for their ire.

Even though unsuccessful to date, Congressman ROGERS is making a determined battle for fairness. He has introduced another measure, H. R. 3521, in which he has tried to overcome every obstacle thrown at the measure. Again he proposes these bonds be made negotiable. If our Congress desires to go what is presumed the American-way in this vitally important matter that affects so many persons, it will follow Congressman ROGERS' lead. It would be wise for those in Congress to consider deeply how they perform on the bill. There are upwards of many millions who have their eyes on them. And, even if they are not particularly interested in the power of the polls, in sense of fair play, they should see that all get an even break.

Message to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item of June 9, 1947:

MESSAGE TO MOSCOW

Acceptance by both Great Britain and France of the principle of Secretary Mar-

shall's proposal for an economic federation of Europe presents some very significant aspects. For one thing, it marks the genesis of continental rather than national thinking in the quest for a solution of Europe's postwar difficulties. For another, it is virtually an admission that, in view of the harsh realities of the situation, Europe can't survive in the modern world as a patchwork of small, unrelated bits of territory, each bleeding its already anemic resources to maintain a costly but ineffective military establishment, and each shut off from the others physically by guarded boundaries, politically by petty nationalist jealousies, and economically by trade and tariff barriers.

Secretary Marshall's suggested economic federation will not suffice to unify Europe into a functioning continental entity. There have been no instances in the past where such a federation has been maintained successfully except as part of a political federation.

With the best will in the world, the London Economic Conference accomplished nothing tangible. The ITO at Geneva is today in a state of confusion over such matters as the demand for a wool subsidy of $130,000,000 a year in the United States. Our reciprocal trade pacts with other nations are constantly being subjected to the strains and stresses of the economic moment.

Under unforeseen dislocations, the urge of expediency is as potent a disruptive force in the matter of economic agreements as it is in the matter of disarmament pledges, none of which have ever proved workable. Was it not under a disarmament pledge that Japan prepared for Pearl Harbor? Was it not under cover of the Ribbentrop 10-year mutual assistance pact between Germany and Russia that the Nazis launched their effort to conquer the Soviet Union in June of 1941, just 22 months after the solemn 10-year agreement had been signed?

But the Marshall plan for an economic federation at least opens the way for the political federation of a United States of Europe which alone can make economic federation a functioning reality. To that degree, it is a notable step forward and is all to the good.

Even more heartening is the enthusiasm with which the plan has been accepted in principle by France and Britain. This is heavily underscored by their invitations to Russia, yesterday, to discuss the proposal. Possibly taking its tone from the stiffening attitude of the United States toward Soviet aggressivism, this invitation virtually gave the Kremlin until Monday to accept. As plainly as such matters could be stated in the inevitable double-talk of diplomacy, the word to Moscow was: "You can join us and the United States in this program if you wish. If not, we are going to effect it without you."

No word has yet come from Foreign Minister Molotov which would indicate how this was received by Russia's policy makers, the 14-man Politburo. But there seems to be no doubt about the growing impatience of the western democracies of Europe with the backing and filling that has marked Russia's policy on questions of global cooperation.

Federal Aid for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PARKE M. BANTA
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WAYNE COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Greenville, Mo., June 10, 1947.

Representative PARKE BANTA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BANTA: I wish to express my opposition to Federal aid for schools in any form whatsoever. Some school people are so anxious for any extra money that they are trying to kid themselves into believing that we can have Federal aid without Federal control, but, of course, any serious reflection, and even a superficial knowledge of history and of the ways of dictators, will confirm the belief of the more cautious that there can be no Federal aid without Federal control. It will make no difference how the law may be worded. Once the camel has got his nose in it is well known what always happens.

I hope no such legislation will be enacted by the Congress because of the danger of indoctrination and regimentation of the minds of the youth of our land.

Moreover there is no necessity for Federal aid for schools. The States can take care of it. And if the people of the several States cannot take care of their schools, how could they take care of this proposed added Federal expense and at the same time retire the colossal Federal debt and take care of the already excessive Federal expenses? Too many people seem to have the mistaken idea that Federal aid costs nobody anything. But this proposition of Federal aid for schools is not a matter of expediency, it is a matter of selling or refusing to sell our children's guaranty to the right of freedom of thought.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours truly,

CHARLES M. RANDALL,
County Superintendent of Schools.

Truman Versus Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of June 21, 1947:

TRUMAN VERSUS TRUMAN

The long and labored "explanation" of President Truman, telling why he vetoed the labor bill, isn't worth reading.

It's an extremely boresome piece of special pleading.

He had his mind set on vetoing the bill, and simply hid in a mountain of words the fact that he didn't want to explain why he was against it.

He could have put his case very briefly, thus:

"I need labor votes to be reelected; the labor bosses control labor votes; they are against this bill because it would liberate union workers from their grip; if I veto the bill, maybe they'll 'deliver' for me. Therefore, I'll veto it."

He didn't say that. Of course not!

Nevertheless, the best answer to the Truman labor bill veto message of 1947 are the words of the same President Truman, delivered on the radio almost exactly a year ago, heard by millions, reprinted at length in virtually every daily newspaper in the country, and fully meriting repetition today.

Truman's words of 1946 make a joke—though a very pathetic one—of the Truman veto message of 1947.

What is the purpose of new labor laws? Why are existing ones inadequate? Just what is the target of the proposed restrictions?

A year ago (May 25, 1946) President Truman defined the need for new labor regulations in the most graphic terms:

"What we are dealing with is not labor as a whole.

"We are dealing with a handful of men who have it within their power to cripple the entire economy of the Nation."

That put the matter in a nutshell. The purpose of the labor laws was to clip the wings of unruly and overbearing labor leaders.

Why was this necessary? Again the President described in most eloquent language the sort of labor crisis for which his veto once again lays down the White House welcome mat:

"For the past 2 days the Nation has been in the grip of a railroad strike which threatens to paralyze all our industrial, agricultural, commercial, and social life. * * *

"The disaster will spare no one. It will bear equally upon businessmen, workers, farmers, and upon every citizen of the United States."

What he had to say of the railroad strike was true of the whole series of Nation-wide and broad local strikes of that period—the type of strikes which the labor bill proposed to prevent. There was the steel and the motor strikes, the truck strike in New York City, the power strike in Pittsburgh, the longshoremen's strike in all American ports, and so many others it would be impossible to list them.

The President's veto of the Case bill last year, and his veto of the labor bill this, leaves conditions precisely where they were. Whenever labor leaders wish, these widespread and disastrous strikes can be resumed. The American people are again defenseless.

President Truman last year fully recognized the need for new labor laws. He definitely called upon Congress for both an emergency and a long-range program of labor-law changes. While he made suggestions for the short-term program, he made few if any for the permanent plan.

By every token of good faith, he promised to sign whatever labor plan Congress thought best met the emergency he described.

Yet twice he has protected that handful of labor bosses from regulation and restriction by Congress after himself pointing out the urgent need for such laws.

What he said, after identifying the persons responsible for the strike disasters as a handful of labor leaders, was as follows:

"I believe that the time has come to adopt a comprehensive labor policy which will tend to reduce the number of stoppages of work, and other acts which injure labor, capital, and the whole population."

In his veto message, President Truman insists he still thinks there should be changes in the labor laws, but says he is vetoing the present bill on the ground that it goes too far.

The recommendations which the President made for controlling labor, upon the occasion of the railroad strike a year ago, make this labored opinion of his today thoroughly ridiculous. He himself went infinitely further.

The law he slaughtered would have restricted labor activities in various minor fashions. It would have left labor itself free, with labor leadership forced into a more responsive position with regard to workers and the public.

Is this "punitive?" And how does it compare with what the President himself asked, a year ago?

"I request the Congress immediately to authorize the President to draft into the armed forces of the United States all workers who are on strike against their Government."

He also asked injunctive and mandatory powers against union leaders who incited strikes under certain conditions; power to deprive strikers in these conditions of their seniority rights; and power to prosecute criminally those who violated his proposed act.

Today, in a time of world crisis and national uncertainty, the President shows himself unwilling to accept any labor plan which he personally doesn't think is perfect—and to take all the time in the world to get it reenacted along the specifications he personally has in mind.

His veto means, of course, that there is almost certain to be no labor legislation whatsoever at this session of Congress—and very likely none until a new President comes into office.

This is a complete refusal to cooperate with Congress, or to permit Congress and the American people to have any ideas on the subject of labor laws which he does not personally accept.

Once again his words of a year ago are the most complete censure and indictment of his attitude in the veto.

Then his position was—and not the very direct promise or cooperation—as follows:

"The time for action has arrived. In that action you, the Congress of the United States, and I, the President of the United States, must work together—and we must work fast."

And for what purpose must they cooperate? Again he put it in words which make a sham and political fraud of his rambling explanations in his veto message:

"The action which I shall ask you to take—passage of temporary and permanent labor-law changes—are necessary for the preservation of our Government.

"That action also is necessary to save the great and mighty masses of working men and women from the dangerous effects of the ill-advised and misguided acts of some of their own leaders."

In the light of President Truman's remarks of 1946, what do you think of President Truman's remarks in 1947?

The Mundt Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to state that I am in favor of the Mundt bill, H. R. 3342. An interesting and emphatic endorsement of one of its provisions came to me in a letter from the assistant director, agricultural extension, department of agriculture, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn., which I herewith include in my extension of remarks:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
University Farm, St. Paul, June 16, 1947.

Hon. EDWARD J. DEVITT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Today I sent you a wire in which I urged that you support that phase of the Mundt bill covered in paragraph 201, which authorized exchange of students, teachers, and professors. We have had a number of these students here at University Farm, studying various phases of agriculture. They have been a hard-working, serious-minded group. Those we have had have been here particularly to study United States farming methods and extension work with farmers. Part of their stay has been in farm homes, and without exception the farm families have been impressed with the character and attitude of the students, and have thanked us for having made the contact possible for them. Several of the students have been particularly interested in the democratic process by which we set up issues and then resolve them finally by voting.

Last summer I spent 5 months in Central and South America. The trip was financed out of the State Department funds, but the request for my services and the itinerary were made out by the Department of Agriculture. The nature of my work on the trip was to consult with USDA workers in the countries visited and with representatives of the foreign governments relative to the establishment of extension work in agriculture in those countries. On the trip I came in contact with a number of young people who had been in the United States studying in various fields of agriculture, including soil conservation, irrigation, and general education and extension. With one exception I am certain that they got much knowledge, and particularly that they received a new vision of possibilities by their trips to the United States. The one exception I felt had probably obtained his appointment through political connections. In any case, I did not feel that he was using information gained, and that he had just had a pleasant trip to the United States. The young man who had studied soil conservation was leading a movement for conserving the soil in Costa Rica. An agricultural engineer who had studied irrigation in western United States was carrying the torch for improvements in irrigation, but more especially for improved educational opportunities and democracy for the people of Peru.

As for myself, the opportunity to visit Central and South America gave me a far better understanding of the difficulties which face these countries in developing truly representative government and really democratic regimes. My feeling most of the way was that I was in a different world rather than merely in different countries. The general poverty and the lack of educational and economic opportunity was very depressing. My feeling was that this situation could be changed, but it would have to be changed not through the benevolence of the United States but through the work and leadership of the people of the different countries. The contribution which the United States might make would be to give bright young men an opportunity to see democracy functioning in the United States and then return to their own countries to work toward a similar situation for their own people.

I feel that the program of exchange of persons being carried on by the State Department has been doing that very thing, and for that reason I came back feeling that I would be willing to see some of my income-tax money used for this work. I would add that I observed some other United States activities in these countries that I would not be willing to spend anything for, and that I felt that not only had money been wasted but that because of bad handling we had actually lost friendship and respect through the activity.

Should there be any opportunity for me to discuss this with you at a time when you are in St. Paul, I would be very pleased to do so.

Sincerely yours,

SKULI RUTFORD,
Assistant Director, Agricultural Extension.

Income-Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FADJO CRAVENS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. F. Byrns from the Fort Smith Times-Record of June 18, 1947:

WELL, WE'D HAVE LIKED A TAX CUT—THE WISHES OF MICE AND MEN, ETC.

(By C. F. Byrns)

Personally, all of us are a bit disappointed that there will be no Federal income-tax reduction this year. But thinking beyond our own personal problems to the Nation's welfare, I believe most of us agree that the President's veto of the tax bill was sound and the House was justified in sustaining his action.

A cut of 20 percent in my own income tax would be most welcome. I can think of so many things I should like to do with that amount of money. But it often happens that the interest of the individual clashes with the interest of the group. This is that kind of a situation.

The Nation has a debt which will be hard to chin under the best of conditions. It is something in excess of $260,000,000,000 at this moment. If we are going to make any dent in it, now is the time to do it, while the national income is high.

It is said, of course, that politics dictated the President's veto. It may be said with equal justice that politics dictated the action of the Republican majority. All national affairs are necessarily influenced by politics. Our Government operates by the consent, if not the will, of the people. Interpreting and guiding that will is the essence of politics.

The Republicans, now in command of Congress, and the Democrats, now in command of the executive branch, are both looking at the 1948 elections. The Republicans naturally want credit for cutting taxes, since it would mean more votes from those who are influenced chiefly by the size of the immediate tax bill. The Democrats would like to cut taxes, too, but the President would like to initiate the effort rather than following the lead of the Republicans. Both recognize, I think, that there must be a reduction in the national debt now if ever there is to be one.

Looking at the matter selfishly as a citizen of the Southwest, my personal disappointment because there will be no tax cut this year is off-set by improved chances for Federal appropriations which we need in this area for public works. We have a lot of things going on in the Southwest which require Federal money. We have six flood-control dams under construction upstream from Fort Smith in the Arkansas basin. We have one on the Arkansas basin below us now almost complete, one at the narrows on the Little Missouri River, one at Bull Shoals on the White. Preliminary work is about to start on Blakely Mountain Dam on the Ouachita, and a considerable number of local flood protection jobs, some of which will require more appropriations to complete. We have congressional approval of the comprehensive plan on the Arkansas basin, which includes additional flood control, navigation, power, recreation, and other uses of the waters which will be most beneficial to this entire area. Our chances for carrying on all the present work and getting a start on the large program

ahead will be improved by failure of the tax-reduction bill.

Appropriations for agriculture, for forestry, for water studies by the geological survey, are all being cut. The chance of restoring all or part of the cuts which affect us down here will be better since it is definitely known there will be no tax cut this year.

We can't have everything. The welfare of the Nation probably will be served with no tax cut this year.

How To Have Peace With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal of June 18, 1947:

HOW TO HAVE PEACE WITH RUSSIA

The way to have peace with Soviet Russia, a former American Ambassador to the Red Fascist government warns the people of the United States, is to keep the Communist rulers of Russia convinced that they could not hope to conduct a successful war against America.

The rulers of Russia are presently convinced of this fact, says Mr. William C. Bullitt, for otherwise they would not hesitate to make war upon us without warning or excuse, and in all probability would have long since done so.

Speaking at the commencement program of Georgetown University, Mr. Bullitt said that the only reason we have peace with Russia now is that we have the only thing she respects—the power to defeat her.

Hence, if we desire and hope to keep peace with Russia, he urges, the only reliable method of achieving that purpose is to keep the Soviet Union constantly confronted by superior force.

"Stalin and his associates deliberately and consciously have chosen to declare themselves the enemies of all peoples that live in freedom," says Mr. Bullitt, against the background of his personal observation and study in Russia, with the advantage he then enjoyed of diplomatic access to the secrets and the truth about Russia.

"Day and night the war potential of the Soviet Union is being raised by a 5-year plan that emphasizes, not the production of consumer goods but the production of machines useful in war.

"At the moment they do not dare to make war against us or our friends, because they know that, for the moment, the United States is far stronger than the Soviet Union and all its satellites.

"But if ever they believe they are the stronger, they will attack."

Since the only things Russia respects are the things she fears, it is essential to our peace and security that we remain invincible in our exclusive possession of the factors of military superiority which she clearly recognizes as a power to frustrate and defeat her program of world conquest.

The factors of our present military superiority over Russia, says Mr. Bullitt, may be briefly named, the atomic bomb being one and our potentially vast air force being another.

These we must surely maintain in superior force, he earnestly advises.

To rely upon any other method of seeking amity with Russia, as he observes, would be to put our trust in the Russian record and policy of "total immorality in international relations," and to pit our honest hopes for peace against the evil intrigues of a government criminally capable of "using any and every means for the achievement of world conquest, including its pledged word given and broken, and war."

Of course, as long as the threat and menace of Red Fascist Russia thus hangs over the civilized world, "there can be no real peace on earth, but at best only an uneasy armistice of the sort we live under today," acknowledges Mr. Bullitt.

But that is infinitely better than its only alternative, which is, as Russia would have it, the sort of peace which would ensue when "all the peoples of the world have been conquered for communism," with the "total extinction of our Christian civilization" as its price.

Flood Control in the Des Moines River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the recent floods of the Des Moines River have during this month twice devastated the city of Ottumwa, Iowa, caused the loss of a number of lives, wrecked business houses and homes, and destroyed thousands of acres of growing crops on nearby farm land. All of this could have been prevented had there been proper flood protection on the Des Moines River. A survey was made a number of years ago and the Chief of Engineers recommended the construction of a dam at Red Rock on the Des Moines River and one at Madrid, Iowa. The citizens of Ottumwa are asking for an appropriation for the purpose of immediately starting work on the building of flood-protection dams, and under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I desire to include therein a resolution adopted by the City Council of Ottumwa showing the amount of flood damage that was done and urging that a substantial appropriation be made to complete the plans and start construction of the dams:

Whereas the Des Moines River Valley was subjected to severe flooding conditions during the period from June 6 to June 9, 1947, and a reoccurrence of such flooding conditions from June 14 to June 16, 1947, during which time the Des Moines River on two occasions reached a stage at Ottumwa, Iowa, in excess of 20 feet, which gage reading was higher than the record flood of 1903; and

Whereas as a direct result of said flooded condition the services from the municipal waterworks and the Iowa Southern Utilities electrical power plant were interrupted, leaving the city without lights or adequate public water supply, business properties were seriously injured and stocks of goods and merchandise wholly destroyed, transcontinental railroads washed out, and Federal highways in all directions from the city of Ottumwa, Iowa, closed to traffic, United States mails interrupted, and telephone and telegraph service greatly impaired; and

Whereas approximately 8,000 residents of the city of Ottumwa were made homeless and their homes and furniture seriously damaged and injured, and four known lives were lost; and

Whereas streets, sewers, sidewalks, and other public works of the city of Ottumwa were seriously damaged or wholly destroyed and terrific expense was incurred in protecting the citizenry of Ottumwa and their property; and

Whereas such injury and damage by flooding conditions could have been eliminated by adequate flood-protection dams in the Des Moines River watershed, thereby protecting not only the people of Ottumwa, Iowa, but all persons in the Des Moines Valley watershed and people in the lower reaches of the Mississippi River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of Ottumwa, Iowa, That the Congress of the United States of America be urgently requested and petitioned to make substantial appropriations forthwith for the completion of plans for flood control in the Des Moines River Valley watershed for the immediate construction of dams for flood-control purposes only, in the vicinity of Red Rock, Iowa, and Madrid, Iowa, to the end that adequate flood-control facilities will be planned for and constructed by the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senators GEORGE E. WILSON and BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER and Representatives KARL M. LECOMPTE, THOMAS E. MARTIN, and PAUL CUNNINGHAM, together with appropriate data showing flood damage which the city of Ottumwa and nearby communities have sustained by reason of flooded conditions heretofore mentioned.

Passed and adopted this 23d day of June A. D. 1947.

CITY OF OTTUMWA, IOWA,
HERMAN J. SCHAEFER,
Mayor.

Attest:

FRANK GIBBONS,
City Clerk.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD today a letter from Hon. John B. Atkinson, city manager of the city of Cambridge, Mass., which describes eloquently the difficulties that Cambridge is meeting in attempting to house its many veterans.

This letter emphasizes the pressing need for the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
June 20, 1947.

Congressman JOHN F. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In common with the thousands of veterans who are badly in need of homes, I read, with an unpleasant feeling, in the newspapers it is quite possible the Congress may adjourn without taking any action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

Cambridge is but a small part, I realize, of your constituency, but the need for veterans' homes here is far greater than the city can even hope to provide.

During the past 5 years we have managed to reduce our debt from $11,000,000 to under $3,000,000, but we are now prepared to go into debt to the tune of over $3,000,000 in order to provide homes for our veterans.

Up to this time it was not possible to erect multiple-dwelling units, but with the passage of a bill by the Massachusetts Legislature, cities and towns are authorized to spend up to 2 percent of their valuation for housing, and we are willing to take this city, which within another 3 or 4 years would be completely debt free, and double our present debt in order to get housing for our veterans; yet with all this effort, we cannot hope, with the present cost of housing, to provide housing for more than 300 to 325 veterans' families, where we have a known shortage of housing for over 2,000 families.

We are completely dependent upon you as our Congressman to act for the city in this and we feel no selfish interests, which, as far as we can see, are completely motivated by the Committee on Banking and Currency, should be induced to stop the passage of this bill. The shortage of homes was undoubtedly produced by the war, and the fact that a great many of our young soldiers married perhaps a great deal earlier than they ordinarily would, plus the fact it has brought to Cambridge a large number of people outside the State who came here to work in the various war-production plants and decided to stay here. In addition to this, the fact that Harvard and MIT have practically doubled in size without producing more than 900 additional units to take care of almost 9,000 students, leaves a condition here in Cambridge that is a very unhealthy one from the local viewpoint.

I believe that you as a Congressman could more quickly gain the highest regard of our citizens if you could do something to push this along. I read with interest the day-to-day reports in the Congressional journal and all I can see is that a number of selfish persons are doing everything possible to prevent the passage of this bill, and it is apparently in their hands.

The situation here is really desperate, and I do hope that you will not consider this as the usual run of letters that come to you from constituents, but one in which I speak for the entire population of 115,000 citizens. If the city of Cambridge is willing to double its debt for this purpose, I do not feel it is too much to ask the Federal Government to carry on where it left off at the beginning of the war and provide housing for a situation which is critical.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. ATKINSON,
City Manager.

GOP Promises Kept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of June 20, 1947:

GOP PROMISES KEPT

The Republican promises made in the congressional campaigns last year now have been largely carried out.

The GOP candidates promised to pass a tax-reduction bill. They did so—a bill which would have cut the taxes of the average American 20 percent, and those of lesser-paid citizens by 30 percent.

They promised to pass laws which would prevent any recurrence of the labor violence which marked the first year of postwar conditions under President Truman. The labor bill has been passed.

They promised to outlaw the portal-to-portal suits. This has been done, and the President, with a lot of sour comments on the subject, signed the measure.

They promised to slash heavily the spending programs of the Federal Government. The bulk of this has been accomplished. Under existing appropriation measures, savings have been effected which, added to surplus in sight, would easily have covered the tax cuts vetoed by the President—and left a balance to apply to the national debt.

The Republicans promised to unregiment the American people by doing away with the war-controls, to which the executive branch was clinging tenaciously. The worst of these have been wiped out—some by congressional action, others by the President himself before Congress could act.

Congress is part of a team, so far as the Government is concerned. It can do only so much. It can't run the whole show, disregarding the President, any more than the President himself can function as he wishes without heeding Congress.

When Congress passed these bills, with many other lesser ones which might be included, and laid them on the President's desk, then it had done its full part.

The Republicans have kept their faith with the American people. The laws it promised last year were enacted.

The fact that key bills were ruthlessly vetoed, for political motives, is not a matter over which the Republicans had any control, and for which they cannot be blamed.

At no time during the long discussion of these matters did President Truman offer any help or guidance to Congress. On the contrary, he muddied the water with a series of conflicting and misleading reports on financial matters, and encouraged his staff to unruly and high-handed resistance to congressional inquiries.

The Republican record of performance, its adherence to its campaign promises, is the silver lining to a situation otherwise dark.

The present crisis is bad. Once again our Government has been stymied. It has been brought closer than ever to a break-down. Presidential encroachment on Congress' authority has penetrated to its deepest extent.

Inflation has been restimulated by the President's tax veto. A nation already tax poor is being denied relief almost imperatively needed for proper recovery. The foreign situation grows steadily worse; we are blundering toward, if not actually into, a new World War III. The American people are rapidly losing the power of directing their own affairs. No one has cause for glee except the Communists.

But it is something to know that there is still one political party which believes in keeping its promises.

If there is a majority of citizens in this Nation who want to preserve the American system, who cling to constitutional freedom and fear the consequences of our present drift toward communism, then they now can know where to turn.

They now have proof that there is available to them a political party willing to stick by its word—willing to run the Nation on the basis of what's best for the whole country, not what policies will reap temporary vote support.

The Republican performance is in bright contrast with that of the New Deal. The Democratic record at Washington is one of false promises, of broken faith, of waste and extravagance, of trying to hide colossal blunders under still more colossal propaganda.

Fourteen years ago the New Deal started out with a President who had campaigned on a pledge to stop the deficits and cut Federal spending 25 percent. He had also got very indignant when his opponent had accused him of planning to inflate our currency by going off the gold standard.

Those three promises went out the window with his inauguration. So have all other promises which the New Deal has made from time to time—down to and including the promise of President Truman to permit Congress to exercise the lawmaking functions granted it by the Constitution.

The Republican Party can go into the crucial coming elections of next year with a clean record and a clear conscience.

On the first major assignment in the National Government given it by the American voters since 1932, it has come through with flying colors.

It kept the faith.

United States of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 11, 1947:

SECRETARY MARSHALL SPEAKS UP

Secretary Marshall's letter to Senator VANDENBERG indorsing the principle of a United States of Europe is a distinct gain for a historic plan. Secretary Marshall favors the Fulbright-Thomas resolution with only the proviso that America is not attempting to impose anything on Europe.

America has no desire to impose anything, but it does have a definite and legitimate interest in promoting conditions under which the part of Europe still free, or potentially free, can further democracy. Therefore it becomes America not merely to go on record for a strong United States of Europe, but to give the plan strong political and economic support.

Passive encouragement is not enough for countries in which the Communists are the largest or one of the largest political parties. The anti-Communist coalitions need the articulate, substantial assistance of America and Britain.

A United States of Europe is the only plan which offers the democratic forces of Europe a program to offset the revolutionary drive of communism. European federation, with Germany divided into several states, is the only basis which will permit German industry to be revived without Germany becoming a threat to European and world peace. European union is the only plan which offers the Continent a large free-trade area, with the standard of living its people have a right to expect in an age of mass production.

But time is of the essence. It is an asset which Russia uses to the utmost. Although Secretary Marshall's pronouncement yesterday is encouraging, it comes nearly 3 months after the Fulbright-Thomas resolution was introduced.

Even now Senator VANDENBERG has no idea when he will report the resolution out of his Foreign Relations Committee. There is a great deal of important business ahead of it, he says.

Perhaps so, but we doubt if anything is more important than moving forward with a plan which offers the best hope of any plan yet proposed for blocking communism's advance and rehabilitating western Europe. Procrastination is the ally of the forces we are opposing.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Arthur Bevan, Chief, Flood Control Survey, United States Forest Service, to Allegheny River Improvement Association Fiftieth Anniversary Convention, June 21, 1947:

We all remember the floods of March 1936 in the Northeast. Following these memorable floods which caused enormous losses, Congress passed the Omnibus Flood Control Act of 1936. Although Congress had previously recognized the flood problem in the Mississippi Delta region, it had given comparatively little attention to the situation elsewhere. Deeply concerned now with the Nation-wide extent of the losses and their magnitude, the Congress authorized a comprehensive national attack on the problem. In this it called upon both the engineers of the War Department and the technicians of the Department of Agriculture.

The act authorized and directed the Secretary of Agriculture to make preliminary examinations and surveys for run-off, waterflow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention. Department of Agriculture activities under this legislation began in 1937. They continued until June 1942, when work ceased because of the war, and were resumed in July 1946. Preliminary examinations were made on a number of watersheds in the northeastern region, including the Allegheny River. Several surveys were started and three were completed. Those in this region not finished are now in process of completion for submission to Congress. The Secretary has, among others, authorized a survey by the Department of Agriculture of the Allegheny River. However, funds have so far not been made available to carry out this survey.

The Department has assigned this flood-control work to the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service. Primary responsibility for the reports has been assigned according to the predominate land use in a watershed. The Forest Service has primary responsibility for the survey on the Allegheny watershed. However, both agencies participate in the work and collaborate on the findings.

The purpose of the Department of Agriculture is to develop a comprehensive program for flood control on a watershed. It is based primarily on a land-use-management program, and must consider all phases of land use and its effect on run-off and water conservation. Damages result from floodwater and sedimentation, and affect the entire economy of the watershed. It is, therefore, necessary to consider all types of land use and to evaluate flood and sediment damages on such widely separated uses as agricultural land, urban and industrial areas, transportation systems, including railroads and highways, power and water utilities, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

The soil in any watershed is a great reservoir, but like any reservoir it has its capacity, and when filled spill occurs; also, if the condition of the soil is such that water is unable to enter the ground at the rate it is falling, it must go somewhere and surface run-off occurs. Differing from man-made reservoirs, however, the condition, depth, and type of soil all govern the rate at which water will enter and be trapped in this reservoir. Vegetative cover is the control gate which determines the rate and amount of water entering the soil reservoir, and so cover conditions are of primary importance in these surveys. Forests under good management produce one of our best soil conditions, and maintain the land in a condition to receive maximum rainfall and release this water slowly to the streams and rivers, as pent-up water is released from a flood-control reservoir. The forest floor is protected by the crowns of trees at different heights and the mass of shrubs and ground plants below. The ground surface itself is a mat of dead leaves, twigs, and other plant remains.

Beneath this loose litter is a layer of partly decayed vegetation, and below that a mass of more or less completely rotted or organic matter. Underneath these organic layers is mineral soil, also occurring in layers. The top portion is considerably enriched with organic material and shot through with growing and decayed plant roots and the minute channels of innumerable earthworms, mites, insect larvae, bacteria, and fungi working constantly throughout the soil. All this biological activity keeps the soil porous and gives it a crumbly structure ideal for holding, storing, and filtering large amounts of water. Good forest soils, which absorb water quickly, can hold 50 percent or more of their total volume. The depth of the soil thus becomes a determining factor.

But do not be fooled. We may look across a valley and see what looks like a good forest cover, but close inspection will show that it is far from good. It may be pastured, and while the cover looks fine from a distance, actually the soil has been impacted by the cattle, the underbrush destroyed, and the humus, so valuable for flood control, largely destroyed. Such forest soils have lost their ability to absorb rainfall rapidly and the storage capacity is reduced, just as it is in a reservoir which is filling with silt. The stand may be young and the soil has not had a chance to recover from clear cutting or excessive cutting. Skid roads downhill have not healed and act as channels for quick concentration of run-off. Again the area may have been burned in the past, destroying the humus, and it may be years before the damage is repaired. All these things will have a serious effect on the rate of run-off and erosion. Have you ever walked in the forest and felt that the ground is soft and spongy? Such a forest is in good condition from a flood-control point of view. It is possible to walk into the woods blindfolded and make a good estimate of its condition, just from the way the ground feels underfoot.

We must not forget, however, that in addition to the forest lands there are agricultural lands. Land fitted for agriculture should be used for that purpose. These lands should be farmed under the best soil and water conservation practices. Such practices make a definite contribution to flood control and in addition pay cash dividends to the farmer in better crops and pastures, as well as maintaining the fertility of the soil for the general welfare of the watershed and the economy of the Nation. Good pasture, besides feeding more stock, will retain much more water than poor pasture. Strip cropping, contour plowing, diversion ditches, contour furrows, and all the other conservation practices recommended by the Soil Conservation Service make a substantial contribution to flood control. There is ample data to show that good land-use management will pay dividends through reductions in run-off.

In a land-management program for flood control, maximum benefits accrue from improvement of the soil both as to its capacity to retain moisture and the rate at which water can enter the ground.

There are many benefits from good watershed management in addition to those obtained for flood control. For example, we all like to fish and hunt. The condition of the land determines the very occurrence of fish and wildlife. The farm, the forest, the stream has its characteristic form of living creatures. The available food, cover, water, and many other environmental factors help to determine the kind and number of fish and wild animals. What man does to the land is the determining factor as to how good our hunting and fishing will be. We expect to produce fish and wildlife as a result of good watershed management. When land is used intensively in accord with its natural capacity, the pattern of the land takes a new shape, and to this pattern wildlife readily adapts itself.

Strip cropping, a recommended procedure in checking run-off and reducing soil erosion, will result in twice the number of ground-nesting birds to be found in a similar area planted solidly to meadow. In wooded areas we recommend fire protection, elimination of grazing, and selective cutting. Ungrazed woods are about twice as productive of wildlife as grazed woods. Reduction of sediment through flood-control practices on the land will provide better fishing. We could go on and enumerate the many other benefits which would accrue from good land use and water management, such as clean water for domestic and industrial use, more water during periods of low flow, recreation, etc.; but my time is running out.

How much of the land in the Allegheny watershed is in good condition? We only have to look around to see the land abuse that has taken place since early settlement. The damage which has been done in the past century and a half cannot be repaired overnight. That it can be repaired we know.

Many of you are familiar with the flood problem at Bradford, Pa., your nearby neighbors. Here is a problem to challenge flood-control technicians. The city has encroached on the flood plain of Tuna Creek until the river channel is only a large flume through the city. The watershed above Bradford has been terribly abused. Access roads to oil wells have been bulldozed straight uphill without any planning. Power lines, water mains, gas mains, excessive clearing of the land for drilling, all have and are being done without any consideration of run-off and water management. This watershed is still deteriorating and of Bradford the best that can be said is "the worst is yet to come." We are very doubtful that the situation can be completely solved. Much, however, can be done and the hazard materially reduced. Channel improvements and flood walls installed by the engineers will help. A land-use and watershed-management program would also help very materially. We are pretty certain that both will be necessary to a reasonably satisfactory solution to the problem. This is not a large area, but it contains most of the elements contributing to floods in the Allegheny watershed and is well worth an inspection by interested persons.

In the process of our flood-control surveys we are required to estimate the cost of any proposed program and evaluate the benefits which will accrue. The cost-benefit ratio must be better than a dollar of benefits for each dollar of costs. A plan of improvement proposed by the Department of Agriculture takes into account all possible flood-control practices necessary to accomplish maximum reductions in flood damage. Small reservoirs, dikes, channel improvements, and similar engineering structures are considered. However, as a comprehensive program, it must be integrated with the program of the United States Corps of Engineers and those of any other agencies which contribute to the control of floods.

As I have said before, the damage which has been done to the lands in our watersheds cannot be repaired immediately. It must be realized that maximum benefits from a land-use and watershed-management program are fully realized only after a long period of time. As usual, we have to pay the bill for our misdeeds. There will be substantial benefits, however, along the way. I

want to emphasize our belief that the best approach to flood control is a comprehensive, integrated program, including engineering structures and land-use practices, which will produce the most flood control for the least expenditure of funds.

As was so aptly expressed in the Secretary of Agriculture's report for 1943: "In order to achieve the greatest possible benefit in the shortest possible time, it is essential that the upstream and downstream phases of flood control be properly timed and coordinated, through the development of one over-all plan for each of the major flood-contributing watersheds."

Explosion at Wilmington, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, the explosion yesterday in the harbor at Wilmington, Calif., of the tanker *Markay* with 2,940,000 gallons of gasoline and other oils aboard further points up the absolute necessity of immediate action to stop all future shipments of gasoline, oil, and other potential war materials to Russia. The President, by Executive order, has the power to stop these exports but failed to do it even though it has been called to his attention by Members of Congress.

The explosion of the tanker *Markay* caused loss of life and damage estimated at more than $10,000,000. Mr. A. B. Kurz, vice president of the Keystone Shipping Co. of Philadelphia, informed me over the telephone this morning that the tanker *Markay* was headed for Portland, Oreg. I received no information that the gas and oil on the tanker *Markay* was for shipment to Russia, but the fact remains that many tankers have been loading on the west coast with our oil for the Russians. Worse than that, of the tankers, 12 are American tankers which were turned over to the Russians on lend-lease and the Maritime Commission has been trying to get them back without success.

When we consider that the Treasury Procurement Division reports that Russia today has a reserve of oil and gas ready for use of 150,000,000 barrels and that the United States ranks fourth among the nations of the world in oil reserves ready for use, having only 50,000,000 barrels—meaning that Russia has three times more than the United States—I think we should pause and consider whether we should continue shipping oil and gas to Russia at the rate of a million barrels per month.

Incidentally, Russia is requesting from us today more oil and gas than she requested during the war.

I have received many letters and wires from my California friends who cannot understand why the Government has warned that it probably will be necessary to again have gas rationing in parts of the United States this fall while we are still shipping approximately 1,000,000 barrels of gasoline a month to Russia.

I have assured my constituents that I intend to get to the bottom of this matter and do all I can to immediately stop shipments of gasoline and other potential war material to Russia.

The Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown from the New York Journal and American:

THE POLITICAL PARADE
(By George Rothwell Brown)

GENEVA, June 18.—Twenty-eight years ago even such experienced scholars and statesmen as Lloyd George and Clemenceau failed to understand that any commitments made by Wilson at Versailles would have to be ratified by the United States Senate.

There was still a vast unfamiliarity with the American system of Government on the part of foreign politicians as the International Trade Conferences began in Geneva.

It is now beginning to be realized that Congress still has great powers in determining tariff policies and that this Congress is controlled by a party in opposition to the Truman administration.

Australia thought, for example, when her delegates arrived here, that the executive branch of our Government was solely responsible for its commitments here in tariff concessions and in the broader field of a permanent international trade organization. This is strange, for in the case of Australia herself, every action taken by her representatives in Geneva must be confirmed by her Parliament.

Two incidents have created great disquietude among the foreign politicians and economists here, and in Paris and London it is perceived with dismay and doubt that the American Secretary of State has presented a stupenduous scheme for the grant of economic aid to Europe as a purely Executive action and that he did not, or the President did not, submit this "Plan Marshall" to Congress as a report on the state of the Union as the Executive is required to do by the Constitution.

In short, the Congress was by-passed on a matter involving astronomical appropriations and political commitments in Europe of a very grave character at the very moment when the Congress, in its action on the wool-import bill, was rejecting a major administration policy and, in effect, nullifying the purport of the President's Ottawa speech.

Here are implications that have naturally enough caused jitters and gooseflesh in Europe.

At this jittery moment Senator VANDENBERG, the Republican leader who has done most to underwrite the Truman foreign policy for his party, proposes a survey of American economic resources to determine the amount of American aid that the United States is capable rationally of extending.

This is realism with which European statesmen, in their dealings with Washington under the Roosevelt New Deal, have long been unfamiliar.

The condition in the "Plan Marshall" that before America can help Europe, Europe must first help herself, is in itself disquieting to responsible European politicians and, indeed, it seems utterly unrealistic and fantastic to imagine that the various countries of Europe, outside of serene and happy Switzerland and the Scandinavian nations, can create a harmonious "United States of Europe" when they cannot even create harmony of political factionalism within their own boundaries.

With Foreign Secretary Bevin in Paris for consultations upon the Marshall Plan, only the first step has been taken on a long road upon which Congress might at any moment flash a red light.

Geneva is suddenly becoming exceedingly Congress conscious, and it is high time it did.

Truman's Veto of Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when President Truman vetoed the tax bill last week he abused that right under the constitutional process as it is generally understood. Only twice in the history of our country has a President vetoed a tax bill which was designed to reduce taxes—Franklin Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. It will be recorded that both were prompted by political considerations.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include an editorial by Mr. Mason Dobson, editor of the Beloit (Wis.) Evening News, which points out the responsibility of the President when he vetoed the tax bill. I commend it to the House Members:

President Truman took upon himself a great responsibility when he vetoed the tax reduction bill passed by both the House of Representatives and the Senate. He will take upon himself another great responsibility if he vetoes the labor bill adopted by both Houses of Congress.

It is the essence of representative government that the acts of the chosen representatives of the people should not be negated by the will of a single executive except under the most extraordinary circumstances. Yet Mr. Truman has undertaken to deny the expressed will of the people's representatives in the case of the tax reduction, and he probably will attempt to do so again in the case of the labor bill.

The extent to which Mr. Truman sets himself against the expressed wishes of the people's representatives is measured by the vote of the tax bill. In the House the vote was 220 to 99 in favor of the reduction. In the Senate it was 48 to 28.

This is a total vote in the Congress of 268 to 127—a preponderance of more than two to one—in favor of the bill which the President of the United States has just vetoed.

Surely a President of the United States needs to be supremely cocksure of himself to veto a measure having such a preponderance of support.

Perhaps the President is armed with this sort of cocksureness. But the 268 Representatives and Senators were quite as confident they were voting the will of their constituents in the best interests of the country.

At any rate, they were fulfilling their function as legislators in a democracy—and it is a serious matter to defeat their will by the executive act of a single executive functionary.

Basically, every veto is a denial of the right of an elected majority to express itself.

It ought to be resorted to only in the gravest crises, and then only with due regard to the violence which is done to the principle of representative government in a democracy.

You may search Mr. Turman's veto message in vain for any recognition of this.

The tax-reduction bill may have been good or it may have been bad. Like most bills, it probably was part good and part bad. Most things are.

But it was arrived at democratically by the elected representatives of all Americans and it is entitled to respect on that score. It should have the respect of the President above almost all others.

To deserve the summary dismissal which Mr. Truman gave it, the bill must be shown to be impossibly evil and dangerous. It is doubtful if it can be proved that bad.

That is why Mr. Truman has shouldered a heavy responsibility.

He has set up the principle that he personally, and not the Congress, knows best. He has negated the two-to-one majority act of the people's representatives.

Address of Hon. Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, at Monroe County Convention of the American Legion, Rochester, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, on June 21, at the Monroe County convention of the American Legion held at Rochester, N. Y. I commend Mr. KEATING on this fine speech, and call to the attention of the Members of the House the very sound reasoning presented by him for the enactment of H. R. 246, to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and for the passage of legislation making it possible for veterans to convert immediately their terminal-leave bonds into cash.

County Commander Felerski, my comrades of the American Legion, I am very happy to be here today and grateful to you for the privilege you have accorded me to say a few words to you. Unless it is utterly impossible because of the requirements of my job—a more confining one, by the way, than I had ever imagined—there are two places where I never deny myself the opportunity of speaking in these critical, and I am afraid I shall have to say perilous, times. One is before veterans' organizations such as yours and the other is in the house of God. For that reason I am particularly honored to share this platform with a fearless man of God who for years has foreseen some of the things which are now taking place in this country under our very eyes and who has dared to speak out against them, always forcefully, always convincingly, always effectively. I refer, of course, to our good friend and past national chaplain of the American Legion, Father George Kettel.

I thought it might be more interesting than anything else to tell you a little about some of the legislation affecting veterans with which I have been most intimately concerned in Washington.

I am exceedingly proud to be a member of the American Legion and for that reason was particularly happy when I was selected by the national headquarters of your organization to be the sponsor of a bill prepared with the aid of the legislative representatives of the Legion to amend the Nationality Act of 1940. The purpose of this bill is to accord appropriate recognition to our brothers of foreign birth who served in the military or naval forces of our country in World War II, and to facilitate their efforts to become American citizens. It waives certain requirements of the naturalization law, such as declaration of intention, period of residence within the country, educational tests and fees for filing naturalization papers.

No one, I believe, will seriously challenge the contention that the men, few in number, who chose to identify themselves with the ideals and principles for which this Nation struggled, are entitled to special consideration in their efforts to become United States citizens.

Proper safeguards are provided in the bill in that affidavits of two credible citizens attesting to personal acquaintance with and the good moral character of the applicant and his attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States are required, together with convincing proof from military or naval forces of his honorable service. No dishonorably discharged soldier can qualify.

This is, in my opinion, a well-merited gesture of appreciation to our brothers of foreign origin who joined with us to crush the forces of tyranny and oppression.

I have been assured of an early hearing on this bill and believe it is likely to become law.

Another measure which I have introduced is designed to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans who were discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of that act. When the original act was passed it provided that an enlisted man must make application for his mustering-out pay within a 2-year period, or be forever barred. I was told of at least two instances here in this district, and of course there are probably thousands throughout the country, of enlisted men who at the time of their discharge were never fully informed about the pay which they had coming. They never learned of their rights until after 2 years had elapsed, and it was too late to take advantage of them.

This bill would extend the time to receive this pay, which Congress has already said they are entitled to get, for a 5-year instead of a 2-year period, or until February 1949. I am happy to say that just this week I have been advised by the clerk of the Committee on Armed Services that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Treasury will interpose no objection to the passage of this legislation.

Another bill which I think was the first one I offered has as its purpose the provision of a Gold Star lapel button to the wife and parent of one who gave his life in the service of his country in World War II. This bill has encountered a little difficulty and for that reason I want to tell you about it in the hope that those of you who feel that it merits support will communicate with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services regarding it. It should be referred to as H. R. 1544.

The objection which has been raised by certain Government departments is that there are presently two other awards which sufficiently meet the situation. One is the Purple Heart and the other the service lapel button, which is available for purchase by the family of one who served in the armed forces. Of course the Purple Heart, as you know, is only awarded to the family of one who was killed by enemy action. It does not apply to those, oftentimes equally courageous, who may have succumbed to disease in the fever-infested jungles of Burma or New Guinea or who crashed to their death from the skies.

The service button, designed back in 1942, is the one familiar to so many of you, which is not awarded by the Government at all, but can be purchased in any store by anyone and the use of which has been, I am sure you will all agree, badly abused.

To those who sacrificed husband, son, or father on the altar of freedom a grateful Nation can never repay in dollars and cents the debt it owes. We can, however, and shall remain through the years, ever mindful of that obligation. To most of those who gave so much a continuing recognition of our indebtedness means more than any monetary considerations. If confirmation of this statement be necessary, ask any Gold Star Mother, no matter what her riches, to name the most precious item in her jewel box.

My bill directs the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy by joint action to design this Gold Star lapel button to be awarded to the widow and each parent of one who gave his all.

I have told you in some detail about it in the hope that many of you may join with the Gold Star Mothers' organizations and other patriotic bodies throughout the country who have exhibited such an intense interest in this legislation in urging a favorable report upon the chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee.

There are two other pieces of legislation affecting veterans in which I have been particularly interested, although not the author of either. One relates to a raise in the ceiling in the apprentice and on-the-job training program. After many young veterans had incurred obligations, both family and financial, in reliance upon a promise by the Government to pay a fixed amount to them over and above what they were able to earn while in training, the last Congress, in the closing days of the session, hurriedly passed a bill placing a total limit on the amount a veteran could earn from all sources of $175 a month for a single man and $200 for a married man.

This was a devastating blow to these young men, particularly the married veterans who were trying to raise a family and had incurred heavy obligations of various kinds. Probably most people would agree that some ceiling is proper and that if a man's earnings during this training period are sufficient, there is no compelling reason why the Government should supplement them. My feeling, however, was that these veterans were misled by the Government which they loyally served and which should be their grateful protector and that a bill which was offered in this session to increase the over-all amount which they could earn from all sources deserved my wholehearted support. I shall continue the fight.

Finally, there are some $2,300,000,000 in Government obligations outstanding due to enlisted men in the form of terminal leave pay bonds. Many of you may remember a public statement which I made upon my return from overseas duty, at a time when public office was furthest from my thoughts, when I said that in my opinion it was absolutely inexcusable that officers should receive terminal-leave pay when enlisted men, who bore the brunt of the fighting and who, in most instances, needed the money more, were deprived of it.

The Congress rectified that situation in part in due time, but provided that the terminal-leave pay for enlisted men, rather than being paid in cash, as was the case with officers, should be given to them in the form of bonds payable 5 years from date. Now that is certainly a long step toward removing the earlier discriminatory provisions, but

many of these men need that money now, when they are trying to get started in business, or are just getting married, or are going through the readjustment period. I quite agree that it is a fine investment for those who feel able to retain their bonds; I urge upon all of them who can do so to hang on, but here we have over $2,000,000,000,000 in Government obligations, every dollar of which that is paid off reduces the national debt by that amount. In remarks which I made in the debate on the tax-reduction bill, for which I voted, I made clear my position that debt reduction should accompany tax reduction, my opinion being then as it still is, that the reduction in Government expenditures which is being effected and the financial condition of this country permits a balancing of the budget, a substantial payment on the national debt, and a reduction in the tax loads, and an increase in the take-home pay. Certainly there can be no doubt now that a Presidential veto has eliminated the possibility for this year of this increase in the take-home pay, that we can and should make a real dent in the size of our national debt.

I advocate that the first Government obligations which we retire under this policy be those owing to our fighting men who now stand in need of this assistance.

The opponents of such a measure make the same argument as those who contended that we should not reduce taxes and thus make available more spending money. They say that the release of these funds into the hands of the veterans or the taxpayers will lead to inflation. That is the threadbare argument of the Government spenders. They want to retain the money so that they can spend it rather than, by reduction in governmental expenditures, make it possible either for the wage earner and the taxpayer to have proportionately more to spend or for the GI who may be in critical need of financial assistance now, not 5 years from now, and who as a terminal leave bondholder is a creditor of Uncle Sam, to receive payment of all or part of the obligation he holds, thus helping him and at the same time reducing the national debt. As a matter of sound fiscal policy, therefore, as well as a principle of basic fairness to those young men who, when their country called, never faltered in their answer, I shall continue my fight to see that appropriate legislation is enacted to permit those who need the funds to convert their bonds into cash.

One of the most rewarding features in my job as your Representative in Washington has been the opportunity, so frequently presented, to assist my comrades, their widows, parents or family, in helping, so far as I could, to unravel some of the red tape surrounding their problems with the Federal Government. In this work I have at all times enjoyed the most complete cooperation from the American Legion both here in Rochester and at national headquarters in Washington. Your fine organization is performing a magnificent service for the veterans and their families.

In my remarks today the limitations of time have necessarily precluded a discussion of legislation other than that affecting veterans. Occasions may arise, and undoubtedly will, when your Representative may feel that the best interests of the country and the welfare of all its citizens may conflict with the official position of our organization. In such cases, if those interests cannot be reconciled, the decision must be—and you, I know, would not have it otherwise—that the ultimate good of the greatest number must prevail. That is the way democracy works; that is the way those very principles are upheld for which you and I fought and to sustain which so many of our brothers gave their lives. I am happy and proud, however, to give testimony here and now, and in so doing to pay the highest tribute to the American Legion, when I say that I recognize, as do the Members of Congress generally, the invaluable assistance which you have rendered to us in helping us to solve some of the complex and baffling problems which today confront the Government of the greatest country on earth. I can assure you it is thoroughly appreciated. You men who fought in wartime to save the country you love are continuing your fight in peacetime to keep her strong. My comrades, I salute you.

The Truman Policy and Planned Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Henry Hazlitt, in the current issue of Newsweek, states that we are about to subsidize planned chaos in Europe. He says that it is time for this Government to get out of the foreign-lending business, and I agree with him. In the past few years we have set up international agencies which were created for that very purpose. And notwithstanding President Truman and his policy-makers are about to embark on a bigger and better lending and spending program. It does not make sense.

As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the article by Mr. Hazlitt:

SUBSIDIZING PLANNED CHAOS
(By Henry Hazlitt)

It is unfortunate that Secretary Marshall, in his speech at Harvard, could come so close to diagnosing the real economic disease of Europe and then miss it. He pointed out that "in many countries, confidence in the local currency has been severely shaken." But he did not tell us why. It is because the Governments of these countries have insisted on living beyond their fiscal means; because they have financed the difference by printing more money; and because the ideology and vested political interests within these countries give little assurance that this process can be brought to a halt.

But there is an obstacle to European recovery even more serious. The money, though fallen in value, would still facilitate production and exchange if commodity prices and foreign rates were free to move in response to actual supply and demand. But precisely this is prevented by Government controls which make it a crime for anyone to buy or sell goods in accordance with the shrunken value of the currency. The European farmer refuses to plant wheat, or feeds it wastefully to livestock, not, as Secretary Marshall says, because "he cannot find the goods for sale which he desires to purchase," but because the distortions of price fixing either make it more profitable for him to sell wheat in the form of poultry, hogs, or beef, or make it unprofitable for him to raise wheat at all. And the principal reason why he cannot get goods in the cities is because price fixing in turn discourages and prevents production and sale in the cities.

Secretary Marshall's speech at Harvard represents an advance in American policy in at least one important respect. It indicates that further financial aid will not be forthcoming from this country except under conditions. But it is extremely vague regarding what these conditions ought to be. There must, said Mr. Marshall, be "some" agreement among the countries of Europe as to the requirements of the situation. Everything depends, however, on precisely what this agreement is. It is not important whether or not some European nations agree to a "joint" program. What is important is whether the programs they adopt, jointly or individually, are really such as to promote economic recovery.

Secretary Marshall's reluctance to suggest a definite program is understandable. He does not wish to put the American Government in the position of "dictating" to Europe or "interfering in its internal affairs." But this is the inescapable dilemma of Government lending. For unless the American Government does impose conditions, its future loans, like its past loans, will merely subsidize and prolong the socialistic and restrictive policies that are strangling production and making recovery in Europe impossible.

We now seem ready to make loans to practically any government that says it is anti-Communist, even though the policies it follows mean that the loan will soon be used up, that it will be back for more, that private enterprise in that country is tied hand and foot, and that the borrowing government, in short, though it is "fighting the Communists" is meanwhile pursuing the very economic course that leads toward communism.

All this suggests that, instead of framing still more grandiose foreign lending schemes, our Government ought to get out of the foreign lending business as soon as possible. The best immediate policy is to leave all further foreign loans either to private hands or to the International Bank, which is compelled to take credit worthiness into account because of the fact that it must sell its debentures to private investors. If the International Bank sends an expert economic mission to each country that applies for a loan, if it frankly tells each borrowing country that investors will not be interested unless that country makes certain specified economic reforms, then a loan may really achieve its purpose. Under such conditions, in fact (as experience with the League of Nations loans proved after the First World War), it is not the load itself that is important in assuring recovery, but the reforms made in order to get the loan.

Farmers Talk to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the United Farmers of Madison County, Ill., to insert in the RECORD a communication addressed to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

I realize that the farmer is much misrepresented. He is supposed to be rolling in wealth; he is supposed to be responsible for the high cost of living. The contrary is the fact. With very few exceptions the farmer is just getting cost of production, a price he always should have gotten.

A few months ago I had occasion to check on the price of meat. I discovered that the farmer on that day was getting, on an average, 21 cents a pound for his live hogs, while bacon was selling for 80 cents a pound. Out of that 21 cents the farmer paid for the raising and feeding

of the mother pig, that raised the pigs that produced the bacon. He raised the grain to feed these pigs and cared for them.

Then he hauled them to market, paid the transportation charges, and a commission. All out of his 21 cents. It took him over 12 months to produce this bacon. Yet he got 21 cents a pound, while those who handled the bacon took the other 59 cents. Remember that 80 percent of the live hog is now sold for edible meat, and every ounce of the other 20 percent is sold for other purposes. There is no waste.

Many similar instances could be cited. I am, therefore, happy to include in the extension of my remarks the article of the United Farmers of Madison County, Ill. I am confident the final solution is cost of production.

UNITED FARMERS OF MADISON COUNTY, ILL.,
Highland, Ill., May 19, 1947.

To the Honorable Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, House of Representatives:

I want to thank the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations for the courtesy granted this writer on his recent visit to Washington in behalf of the United Farmers of America, Inc.

As stated to the committee in Washington, the United Farmers of America are seeking no financial assistance of their Federal Government. The men who make up this organization are confirmed in their belief that all Government should emanate from the consent of those governed.

They are ever conscious of the fact that a Government can spend no money or can have no reserve except from the taxes paid by those who themselves organize the form of Government under which they wish to live.

The United Farmers of America maintain that it is the duty of a people to support the Government which they themselves establish; and contrawise that it is not the function of the Government established by our Constitution to endeavor to support its peoples and that the taxes collected from the American farmers are the monies earned in the sweat and toil of labor and privation.

It is because of these reasons and for reasons hereinafter to be enumerated that the United Farmers of America are asking your committee and the Congress of the United States * * * to desist from making any further appropriation to refuel or to support a bureaucratic administration which never should have been fostered under an economy of free enterprise and certainly should not be refueled in this coming year by the appropriation of $944,241,318 of tax money to be syphoned out of the Federal Treasury and poured down the rat holes of extravagance and waste through the maladministration of the United States Department of Agriculture.

The United Farmers of America is not a political organization nor does it advance as its spokesmen or proponents those who seek either personal advantage or special privileges for its membership.

The United Farmers of America is exactly what its name connotes: They are first, last, and always Americans. They are all farmers.

They are men who, believing in rugged individualism, throw the harness on their mules and go down the furrow with a song on their lips—a song of liberty, a song of freedom—to earn their own bread in the sweat of their toil

The United Farmers of America are united solely in behalf of the industry of agriculture.

They are sprung from the loins of forebears who established this Nation—forebears who came to these shores armed only with their brain, their brawn, and their Bibles.

They are men whose forebears wrought fertile fields out of virgin forests, builded their barns and their homesteads out of native timbers and husbanded with equal care their families and their cattle.

The United Farmers of America are not unmindful of the economic struggle following in the holocaust of World War II. They are fully cognizant of the great national debt that was incurred by their Government in the prosecution of that war.

The United Farmers of America are not unmindful that the interest and a part payment on the principal on that national debt must be met annually and that, in the meantime, their Government must be supported in its every necessitous function.

The United Farmers of America take this opportunity to point out to this, the Nation's Eightieth Congress, that in the last decade and a half those charged with the administration of Federal affairs have gone far afield in effectuating laws, rules, and regulations which have proven wholly destructive of the American way of life and particularly so with respect to the treatment accorded agriculture.

The farmers of American believe that the economy of scarcity was wholly violative of the laws of nature and of nature's God.

Among other great precepts, the Master taught: "That we should feed the hungry—that we should clothe the naked—that we should minister to the sick."

These teach an economy of abundance.

Directly in contradiction of those precepts of divine origin laid down in the Scriptures, the heavy hands of a transitory administration in a time of economic scarcity and depression and while millions stood in bread lines, shivering with cold, made laws and proclaimed:

1. That the American farmer must plow up his wheat and his other grain crops.

2. That the American farmer must plow up his cotton and curtail the production of his crop of wool.

3. That the Federal Government, through its Secretary of Agriculture, should drown millions of our pigs as well as sows with pigs.

4. That administrative officials should shoot 5,000,000 head of our cattle.

5. That those administrative officials should throw the carcasses of hundreds of thousands of our sheep and our goats to rot as carrion in the canyons of our great west country.

These things—all of them—were done under the guise that an economy of scarcity would effectuate a rise in price for the products of our farms.

These things—all of them—were done without heed of the morrow.

Under that same fallacious economy the same administrative government regimented our farmers.

They measured our acres; they restricted our production; they told us when and where we could cultivate our lands and to what crops; they told us how to package them; they told us where and when we could offer them for sale and in what manner we could sell them; in some instances they even fixed the hours of sale.

American agriculture languished under that system. With crops and production restricted, shortages occurred, and a flood of imported products of foreign growth was brought into our country to furnish the American people with necessary fats, food, and fibers—after the destruction of our own production and the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in the capital structure of our farmers.

Hams were shipped into America from Poland.

Corn and oats from the Argentine and Danubian countries.

Barley and barley malt from Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

Dried eggs, yolks and albumens, and frozen eggs from China and Japan.

Cattle—train after train—rushed across the borders from Mexico to the south and from Canada to the north into the markets of Houston, Dallas, St. Paul, Omaha, and Chicago.

Oats (hulled and unhulled), rolled oats, wheat, eggs, butter, cheese, pork products, rutabagas, maple sugar, and a host of other products came across the Canadian border.

Hundreds of millions of pounds of corned beef, canned roast beef, beef bouillon in cubes were rushed into American markets from the Argentine, from Uruguay, from Paraguay, from Brazil.

Fifteen hundred million (one and a half billion) pounds of coconut oil, palm oil, cottonseed and peanut oil, sunflower seed and corn oil, babasu and rape seed, perilla and whale oil, coming in by the boatload, drowned out the historic market for our American hog lard—historically used in all times by our people and upon which use of hog lard we had built the brawn and brain of these United States.

Gone was the historic home markets of the American farmers.

Prices were slaughtered by the influx of imports. There was unemployment on every side. Federal bonds were sold, placing secondary mortgages upon our farms and our firesides, and out of the proceeds of the moneys derived from the notes issued by the Government, American agriculture was lulled into the beggarly role of accepting hand-outs from the Federal Treasury in the guise of benefit payments to our farmers—with a complement of relief payments to the unemployed industrial workers in our cities.

Now the piper must be paid.

Interest, as well as principal, on all outstanding obligations must be met by the workers.

The tax gatherers are at work.

The farmers must repay, with interest, the money handed out to them by their Government.

The industrial workers, likewise, must meet the debt incurred to pay their relief checks and in addition thereto, must pay all accruals of interest on the same.

All of the above was done under the counterfeit guise of the good-neighbor policy and a "new deal" for farmers—a la Henry Agard Wallace.

In truth, it was a "new deal" all right. But:

It was a new deal for the farmers of foreign countries.

It was a dirty deal for the farmers of these United States.

The United Farmers of America never have sought and they do not want now any help from the Government which they themselves instituted and for which they are willing to pay their pro rata part to maintain.

They long since discovered that the dollars they send to Washington, D. C., are a whole lot smaller when they are returned!

They do not want any subsidy or handouts for the products that they produce.

They want no acreage benefit payments.

They will care for their own soils, and they require no so-called soil-conservation benefit payments, collected from themselves—and after extensive deductions have been made to support an unwarranted agricultural bureaucracy returned but in part—and bestowed as a gift from those in Government who exploit them to their personal and private benefit and gain.

The United Farmers of America do want an American price for their crops of fats, foods, and fibers on a parity with the cost of the products of other American industries and American services which they buy with the money they receive.

The United Farmers of America are entitled to such a parity of price and we petition this, the Eightieth Congress of the

United States, to fix the price at parity levels—not as of 1909 and 1914, but as of today, and to see that the American people henceforth pay, at law, an American price for that portion of the crop consumed in the United States.

It is only fair, just, decent, and equitable that the Congress fix the prices on the nonperishable crops of American production.

Is not the value of gold fixed by law?

Are not the freight rates fixed by law?

Does not the sovereign Government fix the rate of taxes—yes; and prescribe a legal rate of interest on borrowed money?

Are not the rates of electric power—the telephone and telegraph charges; water rates—household, industrial, and, as used in agriculture for irrigation—established by law?

Minimum wages for labor, the legal hours in a workday and the workweek are now part of the organic law of the land.

Passenger fares, bus fares, and a thousand and one other services, including that of the service obtained through the use of postage stamps, are things which farmers, by sovereign law, are compelled to pay for out of the products of their soil and their toil.

Because of these things we, the United Farmers of America petition the Congress of the United States to:

1. Reduce the expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and other departments by cutting out useless bureaucrats and waste.
2. Retain the support prices now established by law up to and including 1949.
3. Retain the Steagall amendment.
4. Proceed immediately upon the enactment of the Lemke bill to provide cost of production, including labor charges. as per the Pace amendment.
5. Reduce all expenditures by the Federal Government in its every unnecessary activity.
6. Reduce all Federal taxes by eliminating useless and inefficient personnel.
7. Reduce all excise taxes on necessities.
8. Bring the Federal budget into balance.
9. Reduce the national debt. Remove the Government from out of business, and put more economy and business practices to work in the Government.

By these tokens alone can we restore individual initiative, purchasing power to our farmers, and economic prosperity to our people.

Again thanking you for your every courtesy.

Yours respectfully,

RAY IBERG,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Tax Savings Through Estate Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been called to a highly informative and most interesting article dealing with the timely subject of tax savings through estate planning. It first appeared in a recent issue of the Texas Bankers Record, a highly regarded publication of wide circulation in the State of Texas where it has created much favorable comment in banking and legal circles.

The article is validated by the high authority of its joint authorship, coming, as it does, from the competent professional pens of the Honorable George Ray and the Honorable Oliver Hammonds, each of them a former special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. The public service having ended with the commencement of World War II in which they both served with distinction, they are now engaged as partners in the practice of the law in Dallas, Tex.

Because of the timely importance of this splendid article, its high value to those of the legal profession who specialize in problems having to do with taxation as well as to those whose property interests may be involved, I offer it for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the article to which I have just referred is the following:

TAX SAVINGS THROUGH ESTATE PLANNING

(By George E. Ray and Oliver W. Hammonds)

The importance of adequate planning with respect to estates and the savings in taxes to be achieved thereby are becoming more evident each year, and particularly so with the sharp increase in Federal estate and income-tax rates. Among the principal tax advantages to be derived from adequate planning of an estate arises with respect to the Federal income tax. The reason for this lies in the fact that it permits the splitting up of property among many taxpayers, thereby taking advantage of the lower-rate brackets. A simple example will illustrate this. Let us assume that a grandfather, with a wife, a son, a daughter-in-law, and four grandsons, all living, has $500,000 over and above other property which will adequately take care of his needs. The $500,000, let us further assume, yields an income of $25,000 per year. On this income, aside from his other income, he pays each year an income tax of at least $9,000. If he were to transfer the property to his four grandsons, either outright or in trust, they would together pay a total of approximately $5,000 each year in income taxes, thus effecting an immediate saving of about $4,000 a year.

In addition to the income-tax saving, there would also be a substantial saving in estate tax on the transaction. On the transfer of the $500,000 to the grandsons or to trust for their benefit, the grandfather would pay a gift tax, after $30,000 exemption, of $99,000, whereas the Federal estate tax on $500,000, less $60,000 exemption and 5-percent administration expenses, would have been $110,000 had he kept the property until his death, plus $10,000 State inheritance tax, leaving out of consideration his other property. By making the transfer during his life he would thus save $21,000 in estate and inheritance taxes. The grandfather in our case has a choice as to whether he will make outright gifts to his grandsons or whether he will transfer the property to trusts for their benefit. If he does the latter, the trusts will enable him to place restrictions on the use of the money and, since his grandsons are minors, he may decide to have the property handled during their minority by a trustee of his own choosing. Of course, the grandfather should not, in either case, overlook the tax-saving possibilities inherent in making separate, tax-exempt, annual gifts of $3,000 each to his four grandsons, and to his wife, son, and daughter-in-law.

Proper estate planning also can enable the owner of property to effect an additional saving in estate tax through the setting up of successive ownership in various members of a family without payment of estate or gift tax upon the successive transfers from life beneficiaries. For example, if the $500,000 of property above referred to were transferred to a trust, with successive life interests in the grandmother and son, before distribution to the grandsons, the gift tax would be, as noted above, $99,000. If the property had not been transferred to the trust, however, estate and inheritance taxes would have had to be paid on it by the grandfather, the grandmother, and the son, in succession, not to mention the daughter-in-law, assuming that at least 5 years intervened between the successive deaths. The property would have been reduced by $120,000, when it went to the grandmother; her $380,000 would have borne a tax at her death of $82,000, leaving only $298,000 for the son; his estate in turn would have paid an estate tax of $58,000, reducing to $240,000 the property going to the grandsons, or less than one-half of the grandfather's original $500,000.

If, on the other hand, the grandfather had set up a trust and paid gift tax on the $500,000, there would have been $401,000 left for his grandsons. Of course, the grandfather's ability to pay the gift tax out of his other property without unduly impairing the funds he needs to live on should be duly considered. A further estate-tax benefit to him would result from the reduction of his taxable estate by the amount of the gift tax paid.

The efforts of taxpayers to retain control over their property through the flexible-trust device and yet rid themselves of the tax burdens on the trust income and property, coupled with the need for greater revenues, have accelerated the production of changes in the Federal tax laws which restrict the use of trust for tax-saving purposes. In planning the disposition of estates, all of these restrictions must be kept in mind.

The nature and scope of most of these restrictions can be examined by surveying briefly the pertinent provisions of the Federal estate-tax law, section by section. A similar survey should be made of the pertinent provisions of the income and gift taxes as well, both State and Federal, if the overall tax planning for an estate is to be comprehensive and sound.

The pertinent provisions of the Federal estate-tax law are found in section 811 of the Internal Revenue Code. The tax is imposed on the decedent's net estate, computed by deducting from his gross estate the exemptions and the various deductions for expenses, losses, indebtedness, and taxes. This article will be confined to a consideration of what interests are includible in the gross estate.

(a) Interest of the decedent at the time of his death.—Section 811, with disarming simplicity, first provides that the decedent's gross estate is to be determined by including the value at the time of his death of all property, real or personal, tangible or intangible, wherever situated, except real property situated outside of the United States, "(a) to the extent of the interest of the decedent at the time of his death." The subsections which follow attempt to define in specific terms what property interests are intended to be reached and included thereby in the gross estate. For purposes of brevity, only those of importance in connection with the use of trusts will be referred to herein.

(b) Transfers in contemplation of or intended to take effect at or after death.—Subsection (c) applies to transfers "by trust or otherwise, in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after his death."

The "contemplation of death" portion of this provision, together with the rebuttable presumption that gifts made within 2 years of death were made in contemplation of death, creates no special problems as to trusts except to the extent that a transfer made to a trust may be held to have been made in contemplation of death, like any other kind of transfer. Thus, if the grandfather in our case died within 2 years of the time the trust was created, or if he was elderly or in ill health, an effort would certainly be made by the Treasury to include the trust property in his gross estate for estate-tax purposes.

The balance of subsection (c) is of particular interest with respect to the retention

by a grant or "strings" upon property transferred in trust during his lifetime. Under subsection (c) the trust property must be included in the grantor's estate if (1) the transfer was intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after his death, or (2) if the grantor, either alone or in conjunction with "any person," regardless of whether that person has an adverse interest or not, retained an interest in the possession or enjoyment of the property, or the right to income from the property, or if he retained the right to designate the persons who are to possess or enjoy the property or the right to the income from it.

The application of this last provisions has been the subject of much litigation in the courts, culminating in the now famous opinion of the Supreme Court in *Helvering* v. *Hallock*. In that case the Supreme Court held that where a grantor had transferred his property to a trust, with the income to go to his wife for her life and upon her death the trust to terminate and the principal and accumulated income to be paid to him, the trust fund must be included in his taxable estate. Later cases and the current Treasury regulations have interpreted the Hallock case as requiring the inclusion of the entire trust property in the grantor's estate if (1) possession or enjoyment of the transferred interest can be obtained only by beneficiaries who must survive the decedent, and (2) if the decedent or his estate possesses any right or interest in the property, "whether arising by the express terms of the instrument of transfer or otherwise."

The Hallock case requires great care in drafting trusts so that the Treasury cannot claim that the decedent grantor retained a taxable reversionary interest, or "string" on the trust property. In our case, for example, if the grandfather provided that in the event that the grandmother, the son, and the grandsons all died before he did the trust property should come back to him, the trust property would be included in his gross estate, under the Hallock case. Or, if the grandfather retained any interest in the trust property, or the income from it, or even the mere right to decide who should enjoy the trust property or who should get the income from it, the trust property would be included in his estate.

(c) Revocable transfers: Subsection (d) of section 811 relates to another type of "string" which will result in tax. It provides for inclusion in the grantor's estate of property transferred by him during his lifetime in trust if he alone, or in conjunction with any other person, may alter, amend, revoke, or terminate the trust. For example, if the grandfather in our case provided that he and the trustee, acting together, could amend or revoke the trust, the trust property would be included in the grandfather's estate. If, however, the trustee alone had that power, then the trust would not be included in the grandfather's estate.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that subsections (c) and (d) of section 811 speak of the grantor, "either alone or in conjunction with any person," whereas the corresponding sections of the income-tax law, sections 166 and 167, speak of "any person not having a substantial adverse interest."

This variance in language, as well as a number of other similar variances between the income and estate tax provisions, make the following possible in our case: (1) The grandfather can rid himself of the income tax on the trust property by reserving a power to revoke in conjunction with his son, when the son has a life interest, since the son is then a person having a substantial adverse interest, and yet the property will be included in the grandfather's taxable estate when he dies, because he has a power to revoke in conjunction with any person.

But this is only one of many situations where there is inconsistency or duplication in Federal taxes. For example: (2) if the grandfather places the power solely in the hands of another person who has no substantial adverse interest, as in the case of a disinterested trustee, the X bank, the property will not be included in the grandfather's taxable estate at his death, but he will nevertheless, during his lifetime, remain subject to income tax on the trust income. And (3) in case the grandfather's transfer to the trust is made in contemplation of death, both the estate and gift taxes will apply. Although there is provision, in computing the estate tax, for a credit of the gift tax previously paid, the credit is limited to the same percentage of the estate tax as the gift property bears to the entire gross estate. The credit may therefore prove in some cases to be more illusory than real, especially where the value of the property has declined substantially between the date of gift and the date of death.

(d) Property of other persons: Subsection (e) of section 811 requires the inclusion in the decedent's estate of interests held by the decedent with any other person as joint tenants or tenants by the entirety, or by the decedent and surviving spouse as community property. Although section 1000 (d) of the gift tax provides that gifts of community property shall be considered gifts of the husband, unless shown to have been derived from the wife's earnings or from her separate property, use of the trust would be of real help even in a community property State, since the gift tax would be imposed only once, while the estate tax would apply twice.

(e) Powers of appointment: Subsection (f) of section 811 provides for the inclusion in the decedent's estate of property with respect to which he held a power of appointment. This subsection was drastically revised in the 1942 Revenue Act and is of considerable importance with respect to the estate tax on trust property.

Just as the trust is a flexible device for transferring property and yet retaining control over it, so the power of appointment adds additional flexibility to the trust. To illustrate this provision, let us assume that in the case presented above the grandfather, as the trust grantor, instead of setting up four separate trusts in equal amounts for the four grandsons, were to provide that the trust property in each case would go as the son had appointed by will. This clause would enable the son to determine which of the grandsons needs the property. For example, it would enable the son, at the time he drafts his will, or a codicil thereto, to take into account facts such as the following: One grandson has no children and is married to a girl who is a spendthrift; another has two children and has been crippled for life; the third has married into a great deal of money, and the fourth is making a steady income of over $50,000 a year in his business. Obviously, the crippled grandson with the two children would really need the money. The others either would not need it or would not put it to such effective use.

The estate-tax problem with respect to the power of appointment held by the son would arise at the time of his death. Since, however, the son's power to appoint was limited to an appointment within a class consisting only of the four grandsons, the son's estate would escape estate tax under the statute. The reason for this lies in the fact that such a power falls within one of the two exempt classes of power specified by subsection (f) inclusion in which does not result in tax to the decedent's estate.

An additional hurdle in the statute lies in the provision that if a power to appoint is exercised by creating another power to appoint, the second power is not exempt from tax, even though it would otherwise qualify under paragraphs (A) and (B) above.

In fairness to trustees and others holding powers not previously subject to estate tax, it was provided in the 1942 Revenue Act that they could release otherwise taxable powers created prior to October 1, 1942, without payment of gift tax, if the release took place prior to the end of 1942. The period for such releases was extended several times, however, since in many cases it took years for people holding taxable powers to learn of their peril, let alone do something about amending the trusts or releasing the taxable powers. The time for release will now expire on July 1, 1947, except in certain instances not material here.

Despite the restrictions placed on powers of appointment by the 1942 Revenue Act, this flexible device, as in the case of the son's power in our case, remains a very useful technique in the planning of estates involving trusts, although, of course, great care must be used in drafting the trust instrument.

(f) Life insurance: The last of the subsections of section 811 of interest with respect to the use of trusts in tax planning for estates is subsection (g), dealing with the proceeds of life insurance. The trust is a very useful instrument for handling the proceeds of life insurance. For example, in our case the $2,000,000, might be composed in large part of life-insurance policies. A trust provides much greater flexibility than the usual optional settlements. Subsection (g) of section 811 requires the inclusion in the decedent's gross estate of the proceeds of insurance on the decedent's life: (1) to the extent received by the executor and (2) to the extent received by all other beneficiaries if, after 1942, (A) the premiums were paid by the decedent, directly or indirectly, or (B) the decedent possessed at death any of the "incidents of ownership."

Among the more frequent uses of the trust device in connection with life insurance is found in the business insurance trust agreement. While these agreements can vary greatly as to details, their usual form is as follows:

Two partners or business associates, each owning a half interest in a business, agree not to sell their interests except to each other; on the death of either, the decedent's interest is to be sold to the survivor at a price fixed in the agreement. Each partner insures the life of the other in an amount sufficient to provide the cash needed for the purchase of the other partner's interest on his death. The trustee serves as a stakeholder to make certain that the agreement is carried out. The plan avoids forced liquidation in case of death and provides money for carrying out the purchase. If the agreement is carried out at arms length, it may serve to establish a value for estate-tax purposes.

It seems evident, even from this very brief survey of the provisions of the Federal estate tax, as applied to our illustrative case, that the trust is still an important and useful instrument in planning any estate involving possible Federal estate tax. The importance of the trust is no less in the case of the income tax and gift tax phases of estate planning. Obviously all three taxes, and the needs of the decedent himself, during his lifetime, as well as those of his family, must be taken into account. Good planning, from a tax standpoint, involves balancing the taxable gifts during life with the taxable estate, so as to produce the lowest possible over-all rates as to both taxes, bearing in mind that the gift-tax rates are three-fourths those of the estate tax and that gift taxes paid are a credit against the estate tax, when both taxes apply to the same property.

The trust, together with the power of appointment, affords a very flexible means of balancing the various tax factors, reducing over-all rates, and yet affording protection to the beneficiaries. The trust is by no means a competitor or substitute for savings bank

accounts or life insurance. Those two methods of accumulating property should properly be used to supplement the trust. Their particular virtue, from a tax standpoint, lies in their providing sufficient cash with which to pay the estate tax, and the debts, expenses, and specific legacies of the estate. The other assets of the estate, such as stock in a family-owned corporation or real estate, which might otherwise have to be sold at a sacrifice, may thus be left intact.

One more caution should be added. Merely setting up a carefully planned trust is not enough. The trust must be watched, year by year, to see that it is still as useful and effective as it was when drafted. No one can guarantee that economic conditions or statutory provisions will remain static. The 1942 act amendments with respect to powers of appointment emphasized very pointedly the fact that Congress may at any time pass legislation upsetting trusts which were well drafted years before. Nevertheless, it appears clear that a well-drafted trust, carefully and intelligently serviced, can for some time to come, pay real dividends in tax savings to anyone aware of the tax problems involved in planning an estate.

Housing Show-Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Peter Edson appearing in the Washington Daily News, June 14, 1947:

HOUSING SHOW-DOWN

(By Peter Edson)

Anyone taking a dim view of the housing situation can today confidently expect that it may be a lot worse before it gets any better.

On half a dozen fronts in Congress and the executive agencies events are shaping up for an eventual show-down on Government housing policy. What it will lead to no private industry nor Government housing official can say with any certainty. But these developments seem likely:

Heavy cuts in appropriations for existing housing agencies.

Curtailment or abolition of many more housing controls.

A late summer and fall in which private-enterprise real estate and building interests will have everything their own way. If they are able to build more houses and bring down prices, as their trade associations have claimed they could, further expansion of Government participation in housing activities may be ended.

If private industry doesn't deliver, chances for passage of a Government long-range aid to housing bill, such as is incorporated in the Taft-Wagner-Ellender proposal, would seem to be much improved. There is little chance that the T.-W.-E. bill can get past the House in the present session of Congress.

Either way this situation develops, it is going to take the better part of a year to work out. In the light of recent developments in Congress, there appears to be no other solution than to scrap many present programs and start again from scratch.

If Congress and the real-estate and building lobbies had permitted the veterans' emergency housing program to operate, the story today might be different.

If Congress had approved President Truman's housing agency reorganization plan last year the story might be different.

If Congress should approve the President's new Reorganization Plan No. 3, sent to the Capitol on May 27, something still might be salvaged from the ruins. This plan would group the 13 existing Government housing agencies under a new Housing and Home Finance Agency, with a new director to boss the works.

On top of all this negative action, the House Appropriations Committee's special report blasting the Federal Public Housing Authority as "a complete failure" puts all Government housing programs under suspicion. The report is one of the most vicious criticisms ever made by a congressional committee against an executive agency. It charges waste, mismanagement, embezzlement, favoritism to labor unions and all manner of shady practices.

The new housing bill introduced by Congressman JESSE P. WOLCOTT, of Michigan, has already curbed much of the Expediter's powers. The bill has been passed by both Senate and House. The President will practically be forced to sign the measure. Failure to do so would allow all housing and rent controls to expire June 30.

The present mess in which Government housing agencies find themselves represents a complete victory for the housing industry. Real estate, materials, and builders' organizations wanted all Government housing programs killed so as to restore the business to uncontrolled free enterprise. That's what they will soon have. But if they don't deliver more and cheaper housing within the next year, the situation may well be dynamite for the Republicans in 1948 elections. Their only hope lies in Senator TAFT's being able to put over the T.-W.-E. bill or something like it, taking full credit for himself.

Honest Labor Unshackled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 17, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a voice more forceful than that of President Truman has been heard this day. A sovereign people through the Congress of the United States has spoken with firm finality to those who would defy law and order.

The will of a people determined to be free and remain free through the processes of law will not be mastered by organized tyranny on the part of any group. The chains fastened upon the honest laboring men by self-serving racketeers have been removed by the labor bill which has now become the law of the land.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article by Frank Kent which appeared in the Evening Star of June 23, 1947:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—POLITICS, RATHER THAN TERMS OF BILLS, BLAMED FOR TRUMAN'S TWO VETOES

(By Frank R. Kent)

There are two notable things about those two veto messages of Mr. Truman—one on tax reduction, the other on the labor bill. In both, the case he makes for himself is weak and unconvincing. Poor on the tax bill, it is worse on labor. In neither does he tell the full truth as to his reasons.

The evidence is overwhelming that on both measures, but particularly on the labor bill, politics swayed Mr. Truman far more than any consideration of the merits or demerits of the measures. This statement does him no injustice. To ignore the fact is to be completely unrealistic. There is no way to alibi him out of it. Nor is it easy to exaggerate the disillusionment of vast numbers of citizens in all sections who believed in his basic courage and ability to disregard political threats in the general interests.

The disappointing truth is that he just did not stand up. It is true that on the tax bill there were some sound arguments for disapproval. But their soundness for Mr. Truman was diminished by two facts. One was in 1945 he had done exactly what he assailed the Republicans for trying in 1947. In the former year, Mr. Truman, with his own party in control of Congress, exempted some millions of individuals from all income taxes and completely wiped out the excess-profit tax on corporations.

PERMITS POLITICS CHARGE

The latter not only deprived the Treasury of enormous revenue which could have been used for debt reduction but enabled many corporations to make abnormal profits, thus providing an excuse for the wave of crippling strikes with which the country was afflicted in 1946.

In addition, Mr. Truman's tax reasoning was weakened by his implied promise himself to initiate tax reduction next year—which is election year. Clearly, this opened the door for a charge of politics hard to refute. But where the President went wholly political was in his use of the argument, so loudly mouthed by all the left-wing radicals, that it was designed to afford greater relief to rich taxpayers in the higher brackets than to poor ones in the lower.

This was sheer political demagoguery and involved a distortion of facts and figures to present any plausibility at all. Its lack of foundation was so apparent that its adoption by the President was dismaying to many of his friends.

LOST POLITICAL STRENGTH

However, it was in his labor bill veto and speech that politics was unashamed and undisguised. And what makes it more difficult to forgive is that politically it was so utterly unintelligent. In no other way could Mr. Truman have lost more political strength and gained less. Certainly, he has deeply offended many thousands of Democrats who have been voting Republican nationally for 12 years and wanted to support him in 1948. And he temporarily pleased only the labor and radical elements, whose leaders were pretty emphatically repudiated in the 1946 elections.

Clearly, the dishonest, violent, highly organized, highly financed campaign put on by the CIO, the AFL, the Communists, the professional liberal groups and the "bleeding-heart" journalists scared Mr. Truman. Combine this with the frightening antics of Henry Wallace and the short-sighted advice of Presidential counselors of the Hannegan-Sullivan-Schwellenbach type, who believe the one Democratic hope is in continued submission to the CIO bosses, and it is easy to understand how completely the merits of the bill were obscured.

Almost literally he crumpled under the pressure. This was as clearly shown by the strained indictment of the message as by the somewhat hysterical radio address in which he sought to justify himself. Both, as Senator TAFT declared, might have been written for him by the CIO general counsel, Lee Pressman.

FAILED TO BE CONVINCING

He had to resort to the arguments of the labor propagandists and press agents. He had to twist the words as well as the purpose of the bill. He had to misrepresent its character. He had to resort to ingenious and fallacious points to make the veto seem respectable—and he did not succeed.

He was disingenuous and uncandid. He ignored the fact that he himself had made a far more "drastic" and "punitive" request for labor legislation last year—and been turned down. And he failed to utter a single word in disapproval of the gross abuse of union power by which the comfort, health, and general welfare of the public had been menaced in the past year.

It is as impossible convincingly to defend Mr. Truman from the charge of politics in this matter as it is to regard his arguments as sound. He has not reflected the sentiment of the American people. He has not reflected the sentiment of his own party, a majority of which in both branches of Congress supported the bill.

Probably his veto will be overridden. Certainly, it should be. But should it be sustained, it must be plain to the American people that their only hope for legislation that will protect them from the labor bullies whose unrestricted power is a constant threat to the economic life of the Nation is through the election of a Republican President. It is discouraging, indeed, to realize that after the labor politicians have lost their grip on Congress and it has regained its independence, they are still dominant in the White House.

David I. Walsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I think it eminently fitting that the following lines by a lifelong friend in tribute to our late colleague, Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts, be added to those in the RECORD. The author, William H. McMasters, is a prominent publicist and newspaperman, and I understand was intimately connected with the political campaigns of the Senator in his early years.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVID I. WALSH

I am presuming on a half-century of friendship for David I. Walsh, late Governor and Senator from my State, to offer a personal tribute to his memory. Ever since I first met him, in his law-school days, until his passing, I always saw in his public service a dignity and courage that is far too often lacking in many elevated to high office. He early developed an organized mind and broadened it through many years of devoted effort for the people of our Commonwealth. Never did he fear that he would be misunderstood. He had an abiding faith in the ultimate record to vindicate his judgment. Some distant day, should an inquiring student of history scan these lines, it well might be that he translate from them a rough composite of the sincere regard that thousands of other friends held for this distinguished son of Massachusetts. All who came to know him found him a gracious and cultured gentleman whose main ambition was to be a faithful representative of those who entrusted their civic affairs to his keeping. Swift flows the current. Men come and go. But their true worth lives forever in the enduring conscience of time.

WILLIAM H. MCMASTERS.

BELMONT, MASS.

Excerpt From a Speech by Hon. Owen Brewster, of Maine, on American Help to Other Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on June 14, 1947, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] delivered an outstanding address at Flag Day exercise in Philadelphia. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How to help others without destroying ourselves is the challenging problem before Americans today.

Undermining our own economy by excessive grants will endanger the whole structure of our civilization.

All Americans must be grateful that there is now general recognition in all quarters that our grants abroad must begin to take into account not only the needs of others, but the needs of our own country in maintaining a strong and productive America.

Otherwise we shall be consuming the seed corn.

America today is the hope of the world, but this is a result of the sweat and toil and tears which in the last hundred years have made America the productive marvel of all the earth.

Glorified soup kitchens are not the answer to the world's economic ills, however, anxious America may be to help those who are in want.

Pouring out of our substance and our surplus to help others is the American way, but it must not be followed to the point of imperiling the industrial machine which has made it possible for America twice now to make the indispensable industrial contribution to the saving of our civilization and our way of life—and the machine to which the whole world looks now for salvation.

"For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"

America must make sure that America continues to expand its production, as we expend more and more in helping to save the world.

Let America continue to set an example of ordered progress for the inspiration of mankind.

"And I, if I be lifted up, shall draw all men unto me."

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made on June 11 of this year when I appeared before the House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittee considering flood control and rivers and harbors items in the Army civil functions appropriation bill for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This matter of flood control and rivers and harbors appropriations for the next fiscal year is so important to my State that instead of waiting for the bill to come to the Senate after passage by the House, I am making this somewhat unorthodox appearance here to urge that this subcommittee report out a bill providing adequate funds for these vital programs.

It was my pleasure during my three terms in the House to have had the present members of this subcommittee as my colleagues here on the House side. In those days, and in the subsequent years since I have moved over to the Senate, I have always had the utmost respect for the work of this subcommittee.

You earned that respect during the war years by the magnificent manner in which you put your entire energy to the task of obtaining sufficient funds for the prosecution to a victorious finish of that most bloody war of all time. I remember, too, how those of you who were members of this subcommittee in those years were not satisfied merely to sit comfortably in Washington and listen to the generals and the War Department officials tell you what they needed but went yourselves to all the battlefronts to see personally the conditions under which our Army was operating.

And in the risk you personally took in underwriting the cost of the atomic bomb, getting the rest of Congress to provide the money without us knowing what it was for while you men shared in that awesome secret, you earned not only additional respect but the gratitude of the entire Nation.

And so, although my good friend, the late Representative J. Buell Snyder, was removed by his death more than a year ago as chairman of this subcommittee, and although the control of Congress has since passed from Democratic to Republican hands, I see no reason to fear that this subcommittee, which has demonstrated such greatness and statesmanship in the past, and which is largely composed now of the same men who carried out its obligations in previous years, would now proceed to repudiate the things for which it has stood with such forthright courage in previous years.

I am referring specifically to the great program for control of our rivers and streams under the flood-control program launched by the National Government only 11 years ago and which you are now considering in this appropriation bill for the Army's civil functions.

I don't have to tell you how important, how vital, that program is to the Nation and to Pennsylvania, particularly, for you already know that. Suffice it to say that I can think of no program of the Federal Government which was instituted in the past 14 years or so which has been more popular in my State than this program.

Thanks to the work of this subcommittee in previous years, there are now large areas of Pennsylvania once subject to periodic devastation by floods where there is now a new sense of security.

The floods now rampaging down the Mississippi and tributaries would undoubtedly be much worse today had it not been for this flood-control program of previous years.

The war, of course, interrupted the normal expansion of this program into additional areas of Pennsylvania and of other States and today we stand on the brink of a very

important decision in regard to the program. We must decide whether to allow that program again to continue to expand the way it would have expanded had the war not intervened, or whether we are to begin, temporarily, at least, and out of a policy of false economy, to shrink down that program so that only a few projects here and there which are already under construction can be continued at a snail's pace while no new projects would be undertaken.

The same alternative exists in connection with traditional rivers and harbors activities.

I can understand the President's reluctance to make large-scale expenditures in the coming fiscal year for work of this sort which might be considered deferrable because of his desire to try to save every dollar of Federal funds he thinks can safely be saved at this time. But when I look at the over-all budget recommendations for flood control and rivers and harbors work, I can not help but think that if the rest of the President's budget is as bone-bare as this part, then the $37,500,000,000 total budget which he has recommended for the 1948 fiscal year and which is under such strong attack, far from being fat or bloated as some charge, is instead woefully small. I know for a fact it is too small, it is an undernourished budget, insofar as waterways expenditures are concerned, and I think you gentlemen, in all fairness, agree with me.

As you know, the Corps of Engineers of the War Department is under wraps and unable to tell even Members of Congress, with the exception of members of this subcommittee who may request the information, how much money they think they actually need in the next fiscal year, and are restricted, instead, merely to defending the recommendations made by the Budget Bureau. Those recommendations as to particular projects have not been made public—again under restrictions imposed on the engineers—and so I cannot discuss official estimates because I do not have them, except in occasional cases where "leaks" have sprung in this information. Since your hearings are closed hearings with the information produced in them not available until after the bill is reported out, I do not know what data you have on the projects in Pennsylvania.

But, from information which is available, I think I can discuss some of the Pennsylvania projects in their proper perspective.

I would like, first, to make this observation in regard to the budget. The House Appropriations Committee has taken the position on nearly every appropriation bill to come before it during this Congress that the President and the Budget Bureau are all wrong—way off—on their figures. Invariably, the result of this attitude has been deep slashes in budget figures. The committee appears convinced that the budget figures are wrong, as I said, but always the conviction runs to a conclusion that the figures are too high.

I notice that the one appropriation bill which has already come out via this subcommittee, however, the military budget for the Army, was cut less percentagewise than any other. That indicates how careful this subcommittee is trying to be, and I congratulate you for your care and your energy and your patriotism.

The observation I wished to make is that if the committee is so convinced the Budget Bureau figures are crazily out of line with reality, could the committee not be persuaded that the Budget Bureau can err on the side of too much economy in some instances, particularly in regard to this bill?

Now, as to specific flood-control projects in Pennsylvania, some of which I know have been discussed for you already by Members of the House in whose districts they are located or whose districts are affected by them:

CONEMAUGH RIVER RESERVOIR

This mammoth dam is a well-known project to you gentlemen who remember when it was started and who have discussed it at great length in previous years. Yesterday you heard from Members of Congress and from many individuals and representatives of organizations and municipalities in the western Pennsylvania area about the strategic importance of this reservoir in protecting not only Pittsburgh and environs but the entire Ohio River Valley. This is one project on which there has been an informational leak, and so we all know that the Budget Bureau har recommended $3,200,000 for it, whereas the engineers actually need $5,200,000 to keep work progressing at normal pace. I join with those witnesses you have already heard in urging that the budget figure be disregarded and that the full appropriation be provided.

My office has been deluged with mail on this project from hundreds and hundreds of Pitttsburgh businessmen, industrialists, civic leaders, and so on, pointing to the necessity for adequate flood protection for this part of Pennsylvania which is the heart of America's productive machine. You gentlemen, I know, have also received great volumes of mail in support of the full $5,300,000 figure. I urge that you grant it.

EAST BRANCH, CLARION RIVER RESERVOIR

The figures available to me show that this project will require $6,781,400 to complete by 1950, the scheduled goal. So far, only $588,600 has been provided, of which there will be practically nothing left for new work at the end of this fiscal year ending this month. I do not know what the budget recommendations are on this project, but I urge as vigorously as I can that you allow this project to continue and give it the necessary funds so that the citizens of this area of Pennsylvania in Elk County and vicinity can look forward with some degree of optimism to an early completion of the work. Funds are also needed for planning work on the Johnsonburg-Ridgeway-St. Mary's diking work necessary to supplement the reservoir project.

The $500,000 voted last year for the reservoir on the East Branch of the Clarion River was designed mainly to get the work under way in preliminary fashion. This has been done promptly and expeditiously, from the information available to me. I suggest, in view of the urgent need for protection for this area, that the committee make available at least $1,500,000, regardless of the budget aspects. I believe the engineers could use much more than that, but in view of the over-all situation, I know it would be useless to ask for more. I repeat: Since the House committee has not regarded the budget as sacred, and has cut it cruelly in many items, the budget should not then be sacred when the figures it asked are demonstrably too low. This subcommittee so far is the only agency which has had the opportunity to know and to study those figures, and hence I ask that you study them carefully from that standpoint.

PUNXSUTAWNEY FLOOD WALLS

The work on these dikes is approaching the halfway mark. The dikes originally were to be completed in 1948. So far the Congress has provided $1,192,000, of which only a few hundred thousand dollars will be available into the fiscal year beginning July 1. Needed to complete the work is $1,463,000. I strongly believe the engineers could complete much of the work in the next fiscal year if the funds are made available. I ask that you provide these funds.

WILLIAMSPORT FLOOD WALLS

Perhaps the members of the subcommittee recall the disastrous floods in Williamsport just recently, when the citizens of that oft-flooded community watched the floodwaters swirl around their unfinished and therefore still useless dikes and bring great financial loss to the business and industrial life of the community and great suffering to the people.

When I opposed in the Senate early this year the arbitrary proposals for $6,000,000,000 or even $4,500,000,000 cuts in the President's budget, I did so because I was unable to find out from the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget what such reductions would mean to just such programs as these flood walls in Punxsutawney and Williamsport and Sunbury, and the Conemaugh and Clarion River Reservoirs and similar projects in my State.

I know for a fact that the $188,356,100 recommended in the budget for flood-control appropriations in the coming fiscal year is far too small to maintain efficient speed of operation on these projects and that is why I make the point that the budget should be disregarded. On this project, the Williamsport dikes, I do not know what the budget recommends, but I know this:

About twice as much money is needed to complete the work as has already been provided. The $3,408,700 appropriated and made available so far will largely be used up at the end of this month, leaving $6,987,400 yet needed.

In view of the recent terrible floods there and the persistent danger of new floods, the committee should provide for next year at least $3,000,000 or so and preferably in the neighborhood of $4,000,000 to allow full speed ahead. I urge that you do so.

SUNBURY FLOOD WALLS

A little less than $3,000,000 is still needed to complete this work. About half of that amount has been provided up to now, thus permitting about one-third of the work to be done. This project was started just about the time of the freeze order on new work and began slowly because of the uncertainty of having necessary money. Now that it is under way, however, I think it can be completed expeditiously if Congress does provide the funds. This is a very important project to an area which has frequently suffered bad floods. I suggest the committee provide at least $1,500,000 to guarantee completion of two-thirds of the work by July 1948 so that the project itself can be completed sometime during the 1949 fiscal year, perhaps before the spring floods of 1949.

OTHER PROJECTS

There are many other projects in Pennsylvania not now in the going stage which I believe should gradually be undertaken. These include the Bear Creek Reservoir for Allentown and Bethlehem, for which I believe planning funds and some construction funds should be made available; the Turtle Creek Reservoir; and the Allegheny Reservoir. I should like to see some funds made available also for the Latrobe project. As I say, I do not know the budget recommendations on these.

There are, incidentally, several reservoirs on the Susquehanna River in lower New York State, chiefly the Almond and East Sidney Reservoirs, which I hope the committee will expedite so that these dams in turn can help to hold back some of the terrific floods which have developed on the Susquehanna in Pennsylvania.

PLANNING FUNDS

It is my belief the engineers have not been receiving sufficient planning and survey funds to enable them to do what is perhaps the primary responsibility of their corps in times such as now when we are trying to hold off on Government spending as much as possible because of the possible inflationary pressure of such expenditures. Planning work is our insurance that if and when a time should come when it will be important to our economy to provide public works as means of maintaining employment that the plans will be ready for immediate use.

You gentlemen perhaps have heard of a series of recent flood in the Bradford area of Pennsylvania. A survey was under way there to determine the need for flood-control work. After the hearings were completed, a new flood struck the area, causing great damage and hardship and lending added weight to

the importance of control programs. The new flood meant some resurveying of the area in the light of the latest flood.

The cost of the Bradford survey was roughly estimated at about $10,000. Yet, so short on funds were the engineers that for a time, I understand, there was some doubt they would have the $10,000 to complete the work. I am happy to be informed that the work is progressing and that a report should be forthcoming from the district engineer in the near future. But this experience demonstrated to me the importance of having sufficient funds available to the engineers so that they can meet emergency situations when they develop.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

The port of Philadelphia, one of our most important in the Nation, requires for efficient operation sufficient channel clearance to accommodate newer type cargo ships and tankers now in use and this means continuous channel maintenance work and additional new work on the Schuylkill and Delaware rivers. I do not have available to me the budget bureau estimates on this work. The committee does. I know that this committee will examine the facts carefully. I urge that you provide sufficient funds, regardless of budget ceilings, for the Delaware and Schuylkill, and also, of course, for the Ohio River, a vitally important navigational stream from the standpoint of western Pennsylvania industry, and that pledges made by the Congress for deepening and widening of the Schuylkill River channel in Philaelphia be kept. This last one is a new project and hence probably not provided for. I urge that you set it up anyway, however, because it is urgent.

A total of about $2,000,000 was authorized for this work between the mouth of the Schuylkill where it enters the Delaware and the Passyunk Avenue Bridge and from the Passyunk Avenue Bridge to the University Bridge. The lower part of the work contemplates deepening the channel to 33 feet—a must for many industries along the river. The rest of the project is for restoring the old channel above the Passyunk Bridge.

Since the engineers are not permitted to tell me, I do not know how much of that $2,000,000 they could effectively use in the forthcoming fiscal year. The committee is in a position to know. I urge that you use that information to provide at least a minimum amount now to get the work under way. The Budget ruling against new work of this sort is not binding on the Congress and I urge you to ignore it.

In connection with the Schuylkill River work in Philadelphia itself, I might say I had intended asking for an initial appropriation for the long-range Federal-State program for the dredging of accumulated coal wastes from the Schuylkill above the Fairmount Dam. The Federal portion of this work rests on recognition of the importance of the upriver dredging in lowering subsequent Federal maintenance costs at the mouth of the Schuylkill and in the Delaware.

However, there now appears to be great doubt that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania can comply with its required preliminary obligations on this program by the end of the 1949 calendar year or perhaps even in 1950. In any event, it will certainly not be in a position, I understand now, to comply in the coming fiscal year. There is, therefore, no occasion for asking for any of the $13,000,000 for this project at this time.

The point I want to make in connection with it is, however, that unless the Congress provides enough money now for necessary continuing maintenance and other projects now under way, and begins to provide this year for the start of some long-delayed projects which were never begun because of the war or intervening economy orders, that in subsequent years we will have built up such a backlog of very urgent projects that the amounts necessary then will be staggering. We are not saving money by long delays on waterways expenditures; we are, actually, wasting money, because floods get worse, and lose the Government large amounts in income taxes. Likewise, injuries to industry as a result of inadequate waterways maintenance and improvement tend to restrict business activity with possible serious repercussions on our economy.

Hence, I urge that you do your very best, within reason, to provide adequate funds next year for waterways—flood control and rivers and harbors work—and not put off this work until it piles up into an overwhelming backlog.

America's New Role in World Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] at the commencement exercises at Carroll College, at Waukesha, Wis., on June 9, 1947.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The event celebrated here today is full of meaning. This commencement program is representative of an experience and a tradition which all who are present here share with those who participate in similar observances all over this land. As the very word indicates, commencement must always have a forward look, although it recognizes past accomplishment. Today's commencements in our schools and colleges and universities have an unusual quality because of the urgent challenge of the times. Seldom, I think, have Americans stood at the threshold of an era more significant in the history of our country since that earlier time when young men and women heard the challenge and the opportunity of the great western frontier as the Nation developed across the continent.

When I speak of the larger significance of this commencement day, I do not forget that to you who are members of the graduating class, this event marks the culmination of years of earnest effort and brings with it the hope of useful achievement in the years to come. I know that for your parents and your friends, also, this is a most happy occasion.

For the college, this day marks the conclusion of another successful year, and one which has added interest because you have been going forward under a new president whose scholarship and whose vision are being translated into a dynamic leadership. Having known the large part which the educational institutions of my own State of Minnesota and throughout the country have taken in American life and in the growth and development of the United States, I feel especially honored and privileged to be able to share this day with you at the invitation of my distinguished oldtime friend, President Russell.

You young men and women of the class of 1947 are being graduated at a time when the need for disciplined minds and sound characters is pressing and immediate. The happiness of people everywhere will depend to a large extent upon the caliber of the thinking we do in this country in the next decade. There is unrest and lack of purpose in our country and in the world. There are complex and difficult problems to be met. We are seeking to rebuild a world that has been sadly torn and shattered by war. Our great problem is whether we shall be able to build a world that is better than the world of yesterday and of today.

We are indeed a part of a new age. It is a new age partly because of the achievements of our own scientists under the stress of war. We must provide scientists in peacetime with the same impetus and opportunity they had during war's emergency. At the same time we must broaden our horizons so that these scientific advances and discoveries, and our use of them, will serve continuously to improve the lot of humanity.

You graduates can, and you will, have a large part in shaping the future. If there were no challenges to be met, if all were simple and easy and well-planned, and if we knew just where we were going and just how we would get there—then I would have to say that you would be commencing your careers at a less significant time. It is partly because our Nation is troubled and humanity seems uncertain of the future that your opportunities are as great as they are today. Above all else your generation will have the privilege of helping to shape a pattern of life which will hold out hope to mankind.

I spoke of the challenge of today in contrast with that of the time when the frontiers of our own country beckoned the adventurous pioneers, the kind of young men and young women of whom this great State of Wisconsin had so many notable examples. That generation opened up a great land area to cultivation. Hardships were overcome or endured because people were free and were building for freedom for their children as they literally transplanted a civilization into the wilderness.

You may think that your grandparents lived in an era of greater opportunity than yours. That is perfectly natural. All of us have shared that feeling at one time or another. Yet each generation has had its opportunity. The generations which followed the early settlers saw the great development of power dams and reclamation projects which have contributed so much to our industrial and agricultural development. Congress even now is undertaking to continue and expand these projects.

Although today the United States has no territorial West to be developed and peopled, there are still many frontiers with challenges and opportunities as great as those which faced other generations of Americans. Every field of human endeavor offers opportunities for men and women who possess trained ability, courageous spirit, and human understanding.

For you of this generation there is a tremendous opportunity in the field of conservation of our forests and our soils, which, in turn, will make it possible for future generations to enjoy the fruitfulness of the land which you and I have enjoyed. America's amazing growth was made to a large extent at the expense of her natural resources and these reserves must be rebuilt. We must never forget that next to mankind itself, our greatest resource is the good earth.

Conservation of our human resources does naturally take precedence. You men and women of the graduating class of this college are trained in the field of education. Many of you are going to devote your lives to teaching. I can think of no frontier that is more important than this one, because in a very real sense it embraces all the rest. What we make of this new age in which we live will depend in a large measure upon the sense of awareness, the positive and creative spirit, and the skill and resourcefulness of our educational agencies. We look to education for leadership, for a keener understanding of the American philosophy of

government and democracy, for the answer to many human needs.

The work of the scientist, whose part in the new age I have already mentioned, helps to join all these resources together, the natural, physical, and human resources. There is, indeed, an almost limitless field for the human spirit and human genius in the research laboratory which will provide an outlet for the modern pioneer.

There are many frontiers today. Your imagination as educated men and women will enable you immediately to see and to understand what the possibilities are in the forward progress of mankind.

These new advances into unexplored areas are fundamentally frontiers of human needs and aspirations. They are to be found in the problems that arise out of political, social, and economic life, out of the countless hazards which changing conditions have brought to bear upon all relationships of life, and out of those challenges to faith, and courage, and ambition which beset us on every side. Today's pioneer seeks to preserve human values and to find the key to right human relationships. He would make the new forces of science and the mechanical appliances of our civilization the means to a fuller and richer experience for all, rather than ends in themselves or instruments of destruction. He knows that ability, and skill, and knowledge, important as they are, are not enough. The new order will demand a social conscience, a passion for justice, a sound approach to human relationships, and above all, a will to achieve them.

Yes; we are at the dawn of a new age—the atomic age. There are many questions still far from solution which offer a challenge to young Americans in the frontiers of today. The answer to these questions must be found if humanity is to progress. The challenges must be met if modern man is to be at home in the new world.

1. Can we live happily and securely in this new age that is opening before us?

Yes; we can if we develop a new sense of moral leadership that will help to solve the problems of peace with as much ingenuity and common sense as we did those of war.

2. Can that common ground of cooperation between various segments of our economic life be found which alone will preserve the free-enterprise system?

It would be a great tragedy in the present period of American life if we were to find ourselves unable to establish a common ground of understanding upon which we might reasonably unite in solving our difficulties. We certainly cannot, and we will not, admit that our complex economic, social, and governmental problems are beyond solution. Therefore, we must restore confidence and understanding. We must find a common plane of ideals and aspirations.

We must begin by understanding America. We need to ask ourselves why people from every country of the world have found a home in the United States and have shared in making this country great. Yes; the culture and the characteristics of the strong races of men have been woven into the fabric of our own American way of life.

We must also explore America's complex needs and problems as we seek to better our common life, for this is, indeed, a challenging frontier which demands the best that all of us have to give. You who have had the advantage of high educational training have a special obligation to proclaim the American philosophy. You are better able to evaluate it in contrast with other philosophies which destroy the individual initiative of man and subject him to the will of a totalitarian system.

3. Can a will to peace be nurtured and strengthened that will assure justice and make effective the machinery to end war among the nations of the world?

In many respects, the frontier of greatest promise and the frontier which we have barely explored is that of world peace and the relations among nations. Here is the great challenge of our day, for nothing else will matter in this new atomic age if we are unable to find the formula for a lasting peace. It is here that we especially need vision, courage, and a determined optimism. It is here that we need the will to achieve peace. Another world war would be so destructive and so devastating that it is unthinkable. It must not happen.

The United Nations organization offers the best hope of the peoples of the world for peace today. We know that it has weaknesses and imperfections, but that is to be expected of any newly conceived thought or plan. But do not become discouraged. The United Nations is a vital step in the right direction. It is plain folly to become indifferent to it before it has had a chance. How to improve it, how to make it work, offer the challenge.

The United Nations will not succeed unless the people of the world, and most of all the people of the United States, want it to succeed and work to make it succeed. That is why world peace, and what we do about it as individual citizens, stands as one of the most challenging and most promising frontiers today. It is not a fully explored frontier because we have not found the complete answer in perfecting the judicial, the legislative, and the operating aspects of this new agency of international cooperation for peace. Yet I venture to say that its very imperfections and the struggle to make it work are exactly the reasons why educated men and women, such as you who are graduating here today, should wish to devote their talents and their interests to building a sounder structure and an even more responsive international agency.

This leads directly into a consideration of where the United States is to stand and what we as Americans are to do in creating the new world order which we hope will emerge.

Three decades ago we entered World War I for purposes which seemed compelling in our own interests as a Nation and with ideals that brought us the moral leadership of the world. The League of Nations, quite like the United Nations organization, was intended to provide the vehicle and the atmosphere for the peaceful solution of the problems and differences among the nations of the world. We did not build the brave new order which we talked about so glibly. We did not create a permanent peace. A more devastating war followed as ruthless dictators, feeding upon deluded and unhappy peoples, sought to engulf the entire world in an alien philosophy in which there was no place for the democratic spirit. The terrible costs of that war are too recent to need recounting here.

The tragic truth is that after World War I we failed to build the kind of a world we thought we were fighting for. We Americans became indifferent to the obligations we had assumed. We became more interested in the gadgets and the comforts of living, and in that new automobile that had the horsepower to enable it to take this hill or that hill in high gear, than we were in the crying needs of mankind. We refused to become members of the League of Nations and shunned its councils while 55 other nations, with more or less sincerity of purpose, sought unsuccessfully to make the deliberations at Geneva effective in assuring justice and peace. I do not think we can escape a measure of responsibility for that failure. We turned to isolationism as a national policy, until the futility of isolation in the modern world was completely demonstrated and we were drawn into World War II. Again precious American youth were strewn on battlefields all over the globe and our treasure was poured out to gain victory in a conflict which should not have been. Again we gave all this so that men and women might at last enjoy the freedoms to which we are pledged. Americans sacrificed, fought, and died to gain not only security for themselves, but to create a world in which youth could grow to manhood and womanhood without the destructive element of war. We assumed obligations which even at this moment are pressing us to decide whether we are prepared to enter into the responsibilities which our victory made inevitable.

I do not wish to oversimplify the comparison between our present situation and the conditions that prevailed after the First World War, but recalling our own part in the failure of the peace at that time, I think we need to ask ourselves this question: Are we going to make the same mistake a second time? Or are we now sufficiently matured as a nation, and have we learned well enough that we cannot ignore the lessons of history, to accept the responsibilities which America's new role in world leadership involves? Upon the answer to those questions will depend the very future, not of ourselves alone but of all nations.

It is not often given to any nation twice in a quarter-century to have such a responsibility and such an opportunity thrust upon it. We did not obtain this opportunity by conquest. We do not have it because of any imperialistic motives on the part of our Government. We are not certain that we desire such leadership. But we have it, and we can neither ignore it nor lay it aside if Christianity is to go forward. Our great opportunity will be to develop that leadership for the benefit of all mankind. If we are able to do so, in keeping with the ideals which have made America great, we will have justified as no other nation in all history the peculiar destiny which has been ours, for in no other country have the sons and daughters of so many different races, so many diversified nations, so many rich cultures, been drawn together in a whole, as in our own. Americans should be fitted as no other people to understand the problems and the aspirations of all their neighbors in the world today. And we have the power and the strength, as well as the understanding, to assume that responsibility of leadership.

The history of the world has many examples wherein civilization has been held together by a single strong power. That power was maintained for centuries by the Roman Empire; in more modern times we have had the British Empire to provide the stabilizing force in the world. Today there are two especially strong nations, each with a different ideology, to one or the other of which the world will look for leadership. The United States is one of these nations. The other is Soviet Russia.

I do not believe there is any escaping the responsibilities of the United States in providing the stabilizing force that will hold civilization together as nations recover from the wounds of war. In assuming that obligation, we may find it more difficult to vote necessary appropriations. We may question why we tax our treasury for this purpose when there are crying needs of our own for flood control, reclamation, conservation of the fertility of our soils, and the great human needs in relief, welfare, and education. To many these may seem more worthy than relief and aid for stricken people of other lands. All of these questions we have constantly before us and we must measure them, but we must not forget that we did not have our country laid waste by the ravages of war. We have a great abundance of food, and if we are going to assume the leadership of the world we are going to have to share that food with the hungry and starving in other countries. We are going to have to show our good intentions and our good will in order that the world will look up to and follow the American philosophy of democracy and freedom.

As Americans we enter upon this leadership with no thought of imperialism. America seeks no military conquests. We do not desire merely to control or foist our way upon other nations. Our immediate pur-

pose is, and it must continue to be, to aid in the rehabilitation of the people of war-devastated nations, and to help these nations become self-supporting and self-respecting members of the family of nations. Our ultimate purpose is to use our influence to sustain justice and strengthen democratic forces, and to point the way for all peoples "to live together and to work together, in one world, at peace."

Eventually, we hope to find in the United Nations itself the stabilizing force that will assure peace and justice in the world, that will safeguard the rights of all nations large and small, but until that time comes the United States must accept the responsibilities which go with its new role in world leadership.

Only a strong America, enjoying economic and social health, can undertake this great task. Only an America that is well informed and united in spirit can do it. Only an America that commands the respect and good will of the world can do it. Setting a good example of the effectiveness of democracy in solving the Nation's problems, of allegiance to the common interest, and of friendly good will toward other nations will do much to make us worthy of the leadership of the world and will be necessary in making that leadership acceptable and effective as we embark on this adventure in a new chapter in the history of the world.

There is a call for another generation of American pioneers—and the American youth of today are equal to it, equipped and trained as are you graduates of this college—to explore and develop these new frontiers of better human relationships, a more enduring world peace, and the leadership of America in creating a happier world order. You will find the hazards as dangerous, the challenges as inspiring, and the needs as great as those which confronted the pioneers of our country in the days of the territorial frontier. And just as the American pioneers laid enduring foundations for a mighty Nation, so the pioneers of today, building in the heart of our civilization, will lay the foundations of a great new age. It will be a better age if we, as Americans, have the vision, the skill, the courage, and the faith to make it so.

Facts, Fiction, and Fancy As They Apply to H. R. 3342, the So-Called Mundt Bill To Establish a United States Information Service Abroad—A Specific Analysis Detailing Just What the Legislation Does and Does Not Do—Before the Final Roll Call on This Measure Members Will Want To Know Exactly What They Are Supporting or Denying by Their Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, partially because the legislative process by which H. R. 3342 has been considered has taken so long and has not run in consecutive sessions of Congress, some Members of the House still have sincere misconceptions about what actually is contained in this measure as it is presently written and as it will come before us for the final roll call vote. In response to requests received from some of these conscientious Members who have maintained open minds on the subject and who are desirous of voting with wisdom and prudence on this highly significant proposal to help preserve and promote the peace, I have prepared the following detailed analysis of the facts about this measure as contrasted with some of the fiction and fancy which has been said and written about it by well-meaning but ill-informed observers.

I hope this factual analysis will answer some of the groundless and irrelevant charges made against H. R. 3342 and that it will allay some of the fears and suspicions which have arisen in some minds because of arguments made on this floor in connection with eventualities and circumstances which have no pertinence to the legislation as it will come before you for a final vote.

Every responsible official of the Government charged with protecting our security and preserving the peace has spoken out in favor of this legislation in its present form, without further deletions or reductions. Secretary of State George Marshall, Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State William Benton, our American Ambassador to Russia Bedell Smith, Chief of Staff Gen. Dwight Eisenhower all appeared before our House Foreign Affairs Committee to plead for the passage of H. R. 3342 with all of its major peace-serving provisions intact. They argued as strongly for the maintenance and development of information centers abroad as they did for the publication of news and information tracts telling the truth about America in regions which now hear only the slanderous falsehoods circulated by the spokesmen of unfriendly nations. They pleaded as emphatically for the educational exchange features of H. R. 3342—exchange of students, teachers, books, periodicals, newspapers, skilled personnel—as they did for a continuation of short-wave broadcasting. They urged us with all the eloquence and sincerity at their command not to deny them any of the essential tools they need in their efforts to help build a temple of peace in which humanity can be secure and in which the dove of peace can find a permanent haven.

Mr. Speaker, Members will find the complete text of H. R. 3342 starting on page 7517 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday, June 20. This reprint of H. R. 3342 in its present form brought down to date with all of the safeguarding amendments and restrictions added by our floor deliberations. H. R. 3342 now contains just those provisions included in the language on the pages above referred to in Friday's RECORD. Thus Members with open minds seeking to inform themselves on the bill's exact contents can in 10 minutes reading and study find the complete and current text of H. R. 3342 by examining Friday's RECORD on pages 7517 to 7520. All arguments, assertions, and allegations dealing with eventualities, projects, and propositions not included in the legislation as it is reproduced in final form in Friday's RECORD have no bearing and no relevancy on the decisions we must make on this legislation by our final roll-call votes.

At the conclusion of these remarks, Mr. Speaker, in the further interests of clarity and consistency I am also identifying each amendment added by our floor deliberations, together with the name of the author of each amendment. Most of these amendments were presented to our subcommittee for study and approval before they were adopted; all of them were adopted with the acceptance and support of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which is eager to make this peace-promoting and peace-preserving measure as effective and foolproof as possible. There were 14 such amendments approved during our floor deliberations; all of them are constructive; they have made H. R. 3342 acceptable to many Members of the House who at first were hesitant about voting in favor of the legislation. A complete analysis and discussion of these amendments and how they tighten up the legislation and remove from it activities and authorities about which complaints were made, Mr. Speaker, will be found at the end of these remarks.

Now, in the interests of clarity, permit me to discuss some of the fiction and fancy which has been attached to this legislation, and let me answer these statements by citing the facts from the printed text of the legislation itself.

FICTION

The student and teacher exchange features of H. R. 3342 would "let down the bars against immigration" and bring aliens into this country for permanent residence.

FACT

Students and teachers entering the United States under H. R. 3342 come in under special visitors' visas which do not permit the holders to qualify in any way and by any method for permanent residence. Visitors in this classification are permitted to remain here only until the completion of their study under section 4 (e) of the Immigration Act of 1924. This type of visa limits the off-campus activities of its holders; it requires enrollment in a full course of daytime classes; it provides he must depart from the country immediately upon the completion of his scholastic work, and during his entire stay in the country he is subject to the supervision of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to insure full compliance with immigration laws and requirements. Every foreign student and teacher is required to report to the Immigration Service every 90 days while he is in the United States.

The State Department records disclose that in not one single instance has a foreign student or teacher succeeded in remaining illegally in the United States after completion of his studies or teaching services.

FICTION

By utilizing educational exchanges to promote a better comprehension abroad of our American concepts, ideals, purposes, and pattern of living "we would simply be opening our schools to Communists and agitators."

FACT

Quite the opposite is true. Section 201 of H. R. 3342 specifically provides that this interchange program shall be

on a reciprocal basis limited to those countries willing to accept American visitors on the same basis that we accept foreign students and teachers. Thus Russia and other Communist countries must admit our nationals behind their "iron curtain" or their visitors and observers will be denied visitors' visas to America under the terms of this act. Section 201 also provides specifically that "any person from another country while in the United States (who) is engaged in activities of a political nature or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States—shall be taken into custody and promptly deported."

Thus it is clear that H. R. 3342 sets up a working formula of realistic reciprocity together with instructions for the deportation of any person abusing the privileges extended to visitors in the United States. Neither of these two safeguards are now in operation despite the fact that nearly 17,000 foreign students and teachers are now in the United States, including over 3,000 visitors from Russia who are here despite Russia's refusal to extend reciprocal privileges to Americans seeking to visit the U. S. S. R. These two highly significant safeguards will become operative only if section 201 of H. R. 3342 is approved, and this new formula for the exchange of students, teachers, and official observers is enacted into law by Congress.

It should also be pointed out that before visitors' visas are granted incoming students, teachers, or specialists of any type the candidates for entrance are screened and investigated in their own countries by our American embassies prior to the awarding of scholarships, teaching assignments, or travel permits. H. R. 3342 is an effective weapon for rejecting and repelling Communists rather than a device by which Communists can extend their influence.

FICTION

H. R. 3342 would "flood our schools with foreign students at a time when they are overcrowded with GI and other students" and it "would provide up to $10 per day to pay the expenses of foreign students through giving them more generous treatment than accorded our American veteran students."

FACT

Both of these allegations are completely groundless and without fact. H. R. 3342 would provide scholarships for perhaps 500 foreign students carefully selected by our own representatives abroad because of their ability to return to their native lands after an educational tour in America and contribute to the development of more democratic and more pro-American governmental conditions at home. We now offer such scholarships to about 350 Latin-American students; H. R. 3342 would extend these scholarships to perhaps 500 additional students.

The total number of foreign students in the United States is now approximately 17,000. Of these only 350 have come in with State Department encouragement. The total number of foreign students in the United States of America is not likely to be increased by passage of H. R. 3342 but the type of visiting students will be improved by providing better criteria for approving their admittance. Now, foreign students coming to America are largely sons and daughters of rich foreign families who come here for cultural courses and a study of the arts and sciences. The State Department scholarship students will be selected because of their interest in economics, government, and national problems which will enable them to return home to make worth while and constructive improvements in their own countries.

An indication of how important such carefully selected students can be in bettering American relations with other countries can be found in the following facts: In 1944, a young man from Ecuador came here for training in agriculture; today after study in Washington, D. C., and in the University of Minnesota he has been promoted to be Secretary of Agriculture for Ecuador.

In 1943 an agricultural technician came up from Costa Rica to study in the United States. Today he is Secretary of Agriculture in Costa Rica.

The top three agricultural scientists of Argentina, specializing in forestry, in grain, and in fruit raising were all trained in the United States under such a program as is now envisaged by H. R. 3342 and which has been operating for some time with Latin-American Republics.

The head of the Agricultural and Industrial Bank of Colombia, South America, equivalent to our Farm Credit Administration, was trained in the United States.

On page 157 of our hearings, you will find a list of the 221 Latin-American students who are now being trained in United States Government agencies. In 15 percent of these cases the other Government pays all the expenses; in another 60 percent the other government pays part of the expenses of these trainees; State Department scholarships take care of the rest.

When I was abroad in 1945, I found the head of the Reclamation Service in Iran to be a man trained and tested in American Reclamation Service activities. In Bagdad, Iraq, a number of the prominent officials of that Government were American-trained. It is difficult to overestimate the importance to America and to peaceful understanding which attaches itself to the educational exchange features of H. R. 3342. We badly need the services of such American-trained and American-admiring young Government officials today in Greece and in Turkey; their services would be invaluable in helping to stabilize war-weary China. They can render indispensable service to prosperity and to peace in every country in the world which will work with the United States on a strict basis of reciprocity in conducting the educational and training exchange features of H. R. 3342.

IS SUCH A PROGRAM UNFAIR TO THE GI?

Probably the best answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, is that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the AMVETS have all endorsed this training and educational program.

However, here are the specific reasons why such a peace-preserving program is not unfair to the American GI student. In the first place, the total number of foreign students in this country has never been greater than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total enrollment. The number which could come under State Department scholarships as provided for in H. R. 3342 would actually be less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of our total college and university enrollment.

Furthermore, under the State Department scholarship and assistance program only postgraduate students are brought into this country and these are absorbed in the departments of colleges and universities where the postgraduate courses are not now overcrowded.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, visiting students and teachers do not get $10 per day as has been asserted. The $10 per diem refers only to visiting dignitaries such as cabinet officers, military leaders, and prime ministers for whom the State Department is authorized to spend up to $10 per day in providing them American hospitality and housing. The average for the educational exchange people is actually only $700 per year which is substantially less than 50 percent of the assistance provided for American veteran students under the GI bill of rights.

FICTION

It has been said either on or off the floor of Congress that H. R. 3342 would enable the State Department to finance American tours by foreign visitors, that it would provide them with regal entertainment, that it would permit us to finance the visits of important foreign specialists to American conventions, and that it would enable the United States to set up reception centers for foreign students and visitors to help them orient themselves to American ways and customs.

FACT

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believes that some of the activities proposed above would be mighty good investments in good will and human understanding for the United States. I happen to know some of the Belgian editors who were given such a 2 weeks' tour of the United States 2 years ago under the war powers of the Executive. I talked with these editors personally. They went back to Brussels and Ghent and Liege and to other Belgium cities singing the praises of America. Ever since they have been writing editorials praising our free way of life, our private-enterprise productivity, our sense of fair play, and the might and spirit of the America they had been shown on a 2-week tour taking them from coast to coast.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I think the few dollars we could invest in trips like the one taken by Belgian journalists are among the most productive investments this country could ever make in the areas of peace, human understanding, good will, and enduring friendships. I feel the same way about inviting a few foreign specialists to attend American conventions in the fields of medicine, den-

tistry, engineering, journalism, education, and so forth. I also feel that reception centers which help foreign visitors learn to know what to expect in the United States, where to go and what to see and how to interpret American life would be pennies spent to secure dividends which dollars could not purchase.

However, so that the record will be clear and so that the facts will refute the fiction spread about H. R. 3342 let it be clearly understood that none of the foregoing activities or projects are now included in the legislation. All of them have been deleted and removed by amendments which our committee has approved. We wanted our colleagues to support the major essentials of this legislation without having to accept minor activities and projects against which they were disposed. So we have removed all these projects from the text of H. R. 3342. In the form that H. R. 3342 now comes before you for a vote the legislation is limited to its fundamental essentials so no member need vote against it because he is out of sympathy with some of the collateral activities above described but which have now been deleted from the legislation.

FICTION

It has been charged the employees in the United States information service abroad are paid or would be paid salaries out of harmony with other Government salaries.

FACT

The records show that the salaries in this division of State Department activity come within the same salary classification act as Congress has prescribed for all Foreign Service personnel. The figures which have been quoted to show fantastic salaries are simply those provided by act of Congress to compensate State Department personnel abroad for the awesome inflationary conditions under which they must live. Their base pay is no different from other personnel and their promotions in grade are only such as are authorized by the Foreign Service Act which Congress approved overwhelmingly last year.

FICTION

Some have said they approve of such a program as it is set up under H. R. 3342 but that they have no confidence in the State Department personnel—especially that serving in the division headed by Assistant Secretary of State Benton, who is in charge of the temporary program being carried on in the office of the OIC.

FACT

H. R. 3342 does not continue the office of OIC in any way, shape, or form. It sets up a new office under the Secretary of State to be known as the Office of Information and Educational Exchange. Neither Assistant Secretary of State Benton nor any of his associates or employees are continued in authority by the passage of H. R. 3342. Secretary of State George Marshall whose wisdom in selecting such men as General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, General Mark Clark, and General George Patton when he served his country as Chief of Staff in time of war has not been questioned by anybody, will have to determine to whom he is going to entrust the operations of the Office of Information and Educational Exchange. Secretary of State Marshall will be held responsible for the conduct of the office by the Congress and the country.

Only such of the personnel that is presently employed as is affirmatively and newly appointed to positions in the new Office of Information and Educational Exchange will continue to function and the Secretary of State is free to pass over all present employees in his search for competent officials should that be his decision. It would seem logical that an administrator who chose his associates so wisely and effectively in time of war could be depended upon to utilize similar good judgment and prudence in selecting his coworkers in time of peace.

To make doubly certain that the questions which have been raised about personnel be not permitted to induce Members of Congress to demobilize our peace forces and disarm our peace department, however, our Foreign Affairs Committee wrote into H. R. 3342 two highly significant and completely effective safeguards. Section 901 provides for a loyalty check on all personnel—whether presently employed by the Government or not—which requires that the Federal Bureau of Investigation must affirmatively certify as to loyalty and security all people employed by the State Department to serve in the Office of Information and Educational Exchange. All citizens and all Congressmen may, therefore, be positively certain that no Communists, no disloyal Americans, and no un-American influences will be certified by the FBI for employment in this important new office.

As an additional safeguard our committee wrote into section 701, paragraph 7, the requirement that the employment of aliens within the United States in the Office of Information and Educational Exchange shall be limited to services related to "the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available."

Mr. Speaker, no Member of Congress can in good conscience vote against H. R. 3342 on the basis of personnel, because we have provided for a more careful and complete check and investigation of the personnel to be employed in this new office than was utilized in selecting the personnel during the war which worked on the now famed Manhattan project, by which we developed our first great atomic bombs.

FICTION

It is all right to retain short-wave broadcasting to other countries but the other features of the Voice of America program are not needed, they are not important, and they are not considered by the State Department and by General Eisenhower as important and basic to our struggles for peace and our plan for security.

FACT

Gen. George Marshall, our Secretary of State, has repeatedly said that the short-wave broadcasts alone are not enough. Both he and General Eisenhower testified to that effect and their statements are found in the printed hearings on H. R. 3342.

In addition, on June 12, Secretary of State Marshall at his regular press conference again cautioned Congress not to cripple our efforts for peace by reducing the so-called Voice of America program to one of mere short-wave broadcasting. Here are the exact words of Mr. Marshall on that occasion. He said:

I am unreservedly in favor of the exchange of students, professors, and books. These methods, in the long run, may be far more important for the interchange of information than broadcasting. * * * I do not believe that a bill limited to broadcasting would give this Government the opportunities it must have to explain itself to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, to the end that there could be no last lingering doubt in the mind of any Member of Congress about the tools he requires to build a temple of peace, Secretary of State Marshall sent a special letter up to Congress on June 19 which appears in full on page 7515 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday, June 20. In that letter, Mr. Marshall made this highly pertinent point, among others. He said:

I want to make my position plain.

I consider American security to rest not only on our economic and political and military strength, but also on the strength of American ideas—on how well they are presented abroad—and on how clearly we are understood abroad.

There is no question that some other nations are using ideas as weapons and distorting facts to fit their ideas. We do not propose to follow suit. But I am convinced that we must present ourselves clearly, candidly, and affirmatively if we are to achieve the kind of peace we believe in. I know from personal experience that we are grossly misunderstood or misrepresented in many parts of the world.

I gave your committee my view that the facts about the United States must be spread in various ways. In some countries we must rely largely on radio. In others, we use also the press or motion pictures or exchanges of students and books or the assignment of government advisers. All are important and must be used if we are to be successful. To remove any one of these activities from the bill would be a form of demobilization. Peace cannot be served by any rationing of American facts or by limiting the methods for making them known.

I have informed committees of both Houses of Congress that authority for this type of program is necessary if the State Department is to fulfill its responsibilities to the President and the Nation. Without legislative authorization it has become almost impossible to recruit additional highly trained personnel to work on this program, either at home or abroad.

I am asking for the tools which are necessary to meet present circumstances in world affairs.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

FICTION

A program such as that proposed by H. R. 3342 has merit but now is not the time to adopt it. Let us first of all settle world conditions. Besides the members of the other body have indicated they will not approve H. R. 3342 and will not appropriate the necessary money to maintain the program.

FACT

Winning the peace like winning the war requires specific action along definite

lines at mandatory times. We need the machinery to win the peace now at the time when the peace needs to be won. To postpone the use of these peace-serving proposals for a year or two or several years is to face the immediate future divested of some of the very most important tools which we are told are essential to winning the peace.

As to the members at the other end of the capital and what the other body will do it is significant to point out that at the time H. R. 3342 was reported out of our Committee it was generally stated that the Voice of America program was dead for this year. It was predicted it would receive no authority and receive no money. It was all over but the funeral and the burial. Now, however we have been advised by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body that a subcommittee has already been appointed to facilitate consideration of H. R. 3342. Furthermore, news reports bring us information that instead of denying this program any money with which to operate the gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol first suggested giving it a $6,000,000 interim appropriation while this legislation is being finally considered and this morning the news reports are that they are considering making $12,000,000 available for the program.

It is highly important that since money is to be made available for the program that the safeguards and regulations contained in this legislation be also put into action and that the whole program of United States information abroad be brought into the focus and under the control of Congress as is provided for by H. R. 3342. Simply to appropriate a sum of money and to permit the program to continue without permanence, without guidance, without the loyalty checks, and without the controls and directives included in this legislation would be for Congress to fail to face up to its responsibilities on this important problem. In all events, we of the House can only be guided by our own responsibilities and what takes place in the other body will have to be determined by future decisions.

Mr. Speaker, let me now call attention to the constructive and safeguarding amendments which have been adopted during the floor consideration of H. R. 3342. Several Members have stated that the addition of these corrective and constructive amendments has induced them to support H. R. 3342 with confidence and enthusiasm whereas at first they were hesitant to vote in favor of this peace-serving measure. For the convenience of those who have not found it possible to be on the floor during all of the debate on H. R. 3342, I am therefore summarizing at this point all of the important amendments added during our floor deliberations.

AMENDMENTS ADDED DURING FLOOR DELIBERATIONS

AMENDMENT NO. 1

By Mr. FULTON, of Pennsylvania: Adds to section 2 as an additional objective of H. R. 3342 "The dissemination abroad of public information about the United Nations, its organization and functions, and the participation of the United States as a member thereof." This amendment broadens the range of objectives of the legislation and permits our information service to refute the slander of those who would picture us as by-passing or ignoring the United Nations.

AMENDMENT NO. 2

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: It tightens up the reciprocal formula included in section 201 of H. R. 3342 by removing some of the discretionary authority of the State Department in this field and providing that all interchanges must be conducted on a basis of reciprocity in the clear-cut, commanding language in which the text of the legislation now appears on pages 7517–7520 of the RECORD for Friday, June 20, 1947.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

By Mr. HOFFMAN, of Michigan: This amendment provides that any visitor engaging in political activity or whose behavior is not consistent with the security of the United States must be promptly deported. It strikes out all right for appeal or delay as provided by the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended. This amendment should set at rest any remote fears held by anyone that the foreign visitors coming to America under the terms of this act might engage in Communist propaganda or other un-American activities.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3, moreover, set a pattern for State Department administrative procedure which may well be applied to all foreigners coming over with visitor's visas as well as to the very small fraction of such visitors who will be authorized to visit America under the terms of H. R. 3342.

AMENDMENT NO. 4

By Mr. KEEFE, of Wisconsin: This amendment strikes from the bill the authority to provide for the development and demonstration of better methods for teaching the English language abroad. Mr. KEEFE pointed out that the Office of Education now has facilities and authority for handling this service so it was stricken from H. R. 3342.

AMENDMENT NO. 5

By Mr. BRADLEY, of California: This amendment extends the prohibition against aiding foreign countries in any capacity relating to the organization, training, operation, development or combat equipment of its armed forces to all personnel associated with the functions of H. R. 3342.

AMENDMENT NO. 6

By Mr. BRADLEY, of California: This amendment prohibits any American Government employee from taking an oath of allegiance to another government while serving with that government in an advisory or administrative capacity. A search of the records reveals that no such oath of allegiance to a foreign power has ever been taken by such American personnel but Mr. BRADLEY's amendment was adopted as an additional safeguard.

AMENDMENT NO. 7

By Mr. FELLOWS, of Maine: This amendment struck out of section 403 all exceptions to the prohibition against any services rendered by Americans working under authority of this act which bar them from engaging in the construction or supervision of public works in foreign countries. At Mr. FELLOWS' suggestion the exception that such Americans might assist in investigative, instructive, or demonstration activities on public works projects even though barred from engaging in actual construction or supervision was eliminated. The present language appears in the text of the bill as printed in the RECORD on June 20.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. BROWN of Ohio: This amendment requires that all press releases, radio scripts, and so forth issued under authority of H. R. 3342 shall in the English language be made available to press associations, newspapermen, radio systems and stations in the United States and to Members of the Congress upon request within 15 days after release of the information abroad. Thus this amendment guarantees that private press and radio associations as well as 435 Members of Congress will be constantly on guard with complete information at their disposal to make certain the State Department programs are effectively and properly prepared and planned.

AMENDMENT NO. 9

By Mr. DIRKSEN, of Illinois: This amendment provides for an advisory commission to formulate and supervise the policies and programs carried out by the State Department in implementing our American information program abroad.

The Dirksen amendment sets up an 11-member advisory-control board not more than six of whom shall be of any one political party and all of whom must be approved by the United States Senate. This bipartisan board comprised of outstanding Americans who are prominent in walks of life reflecting a cross section of American activity brings to focus upon this significant peace-promoting program the best brains of America to assist the State Department in the development and administration of a program of information abroad which will serve to the maximum degree the best interests of peace and security.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

By Mr. KEEFE, of Wisconsin: This amendment strikes from the legislation the provisions which would have authorized the Secretary of State to provide official entertainment and to establish and maintain in the United States reception centers for foreign students and visitors in connection with the program set up in H. R. 3342.

AMENDMENT NO. 11

By Mr. KEEFE, of Wisconsin: This amendment strikes from the legislation the authority to provide planned travel itineraries within the United States for foreign visiors and to pay their expenses at meetings or conventions in this country.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 12 AND 13

By Mr. KEEFE, of Wisconsin: These amendments assure the fact that repayments by others for services rendered by this act shall be covered directly into the Treasury of the United States and not used as a revolving fund and that the State Department shall not be per-

mitted to receive gifts from private sources to finance or expand the purposes implemented by H. R. 3342.

AMENDMENT NO. 14

By Mr. HORAN, of Washington: This amendment emphasizes the stress placed by our committee on the use of private facilities and services in the administration of this program by stipulating that the Secretary of State shall encourage participation in the program by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field.

Mr. Speaker, each of the foregoing amendments now appears in the corrected text of H. R. 3342 in the form that it comes before us for final consideration and in the form in which it is printed on the pages referred to in the RECORD for June 20. Every Member can thus inform himself fully and accurately on what is and what is not contained in the present version of H. R. 3342. Every one of the foregoing amendments was approved by the committee handling this legislation and most of them were submitted to the committee and secured our approval before they were introduced. While two or three of them limit the scope of the legislation more than many of us would desire, none of them cripple the essential and basic features and functions of the program envisaged by H. R. 3342. Thus we have adopted 14 amendments in our desire to reduce this legislation to its basic essentials and to provide every conceivable safeguard for its effective operation. About an equally large number of amendments were rejected and our committee is grateful for the support of the House in that no amendment which we opposed was adopted.

H. R. 3342 is now stripped down to the basic minimums listed by Secretary of State Marshall and General Eisenhower as essential to their work in promoting the peace and protecting our security in these uncertain and chaotic times. It merits the support of Members of Congress. We have appropriated many billions of dollars to arm and equip our Military Establishment. That is as it should be. In good conscience, however, I believe that it consistently follows that we should not deny the few millions and the limited authorities which are required to equip our peace establishment in an era of history when no problem has more paramount importance than the prodigious one of holding at bay the hounds of war and making this a just and lasting peace. I solicit your support on that basis for H. R. 3342.

Public Power in the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Attack on Public Power Is Threat to Northwest," published in the Seattle Star of June 13, 1947. The editorial refers to the so-called Dondero bill, House bill 3036, which in effect provides that all public power shall be sold at the bus bar. There are many of us in the Northwest who believe this would be not only a threat to public power but a a complete destruction of our public power and reclamation program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ATTACK ON PUBLIC POWER IS THREAT TO NORTHWEST

A new attack on public power is pending in Congress. It is a measure introduced by Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, and identified as H. R. 3036. It provides that when Army engineers build future hydroelectric projects they shall control the sale of power and shall sell the power at the bus bar.

The bill provides specifically that it shall not apply to power sales from the Bonneville project. There is, however, a strong likelihood that if the bill should be enacted as introduced, it would apply to McNary Dam, now under construction; Foster Creek Dam, authorized but not yet provided with appropriations; and any other Columbia River developments other than Grand Coulee and Bonneville.

Such an arrangement would be manifest absurdity. The McNary and Foster Creek sites already are linked with the Bonneville grid plan. To require purchasers to build their own transmission lines to the bus bars, on these projects, instead of taking power from the Bonneville lines, would be the height of the ridiculous.

Probably the bill will be amended to eliminate anything like this. But it is nonetheless a vicious measure.

As Representative WALT HORAN, Republican, from Washington's Fifth District, said in a recent appearance before the House Committee on Public Works, in protesting against this measure:

"Bus-bar sales mean sales to a single company on the company's terms."

In the case of Grand Coulee and Bonneville the battle over sales at the bus bar was fought out long ago. The decision, clearly the proper one, was that to prevent monopolization of federal power, the Bonneville Administration should build its own transmission lines.

In recent months the only dispute between private power companies and the public-utility districts has been over whether this transmission system should be restricted to "backbone tranmission" or should include "feeder lines," the latter to serve the PUD's and Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives which could ill afford to provide substations and other connections between the "backbone" transmission lines and their own distribution systems.

Representative DONDERO's proposal to return to bus-bar sales is a proposal to turn the hands of the clock back—away back.

There are other reasons why the Dondero plan is unsound. The Corps of Army Engineers is not set up as a marketing agency. It is designed as an engineering and construction agency and so far as we can learn has absolutely no ambitions to go into the merchandising business.

Would a man who planned a butcher shop hire the architect who planned the building or the contractor who erected it to run the retail business? Giving the Army engineers the job of selling power would be scarcely less incongruous.

The Dondero bill probably can be stopped if Members of Congress from the Pacific Northwest are sufficiently interested, and the activities of Representative HORAN and the concern being expressed by public-power groups in this territory is an indication that this interest will be aroused.

But the fact that the Pacific Northwest must remember is that the enemies of public-power development never rest in their fight.

No sooner had Initiative 166 been swamped by the people in last November's election than an even dozen bills, threatening public power, appeared in the State legislature.

The opening of the Eightieth Congress saw enemies of public power cutting Bonneville and Columbia Basin appropriations to the bone in the House of Representatives, with the deepest slashes being made where the greatest injury would be visited upon the PUD's and REA cooperatives.

The Rockwell bill, planned to amend reclamation laws to make power projects more difficult to undertake and more costly, apparently has been beaten, but while it was being buried Senator ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma popped up with his own anti-public-power bill in the Senate and now Representative DONDERO has this new measure in the House.

The enemies of public power never rest. If power development is to continue in this region, the friends of public power must be equally vigilant.

Congress and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the June 2, 1947, issue of the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette, entitled "Congressional Failure," and another editorial entitled "Housing—This Session of Congress?" published in the June 13, 1947, issue of the South Boston Gazette. Both editorials relate to the urgent need for action by Congress on the housing problem.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette of June 2, 1947]

CONGRESSIONAL FAILURE

There does not seem the slightest likelihood Congress will do anything substantial at this session toward solving the serious housing problem.

This bleak prospect, we think, identifies a most serious congressional failure.

As Senator LODGE said, thousands of people in his own State lack adequate housing. Right here in Haverhill we know how serious is the lack of housing units. Haverhill's situation can be multiplied again and again in the State and in the country. Hundreds of thousands, millions, of Americans need housing.

Their need is serious enough to constitute a national emergency quite as serious as some emergencies that have inspired vigorous congressional action.

The huge cost of Government attack on the housing problem, the interference with private enterprise, the statement that time will solve it—these are the arguments we hear when governmental action is urged.

Well, time will solve the problem, as time will solve all problems. Time will solve the problem of personal illness, for instance, sometimes with death. Wise folks don't wait for time if there is anything they can do to hasten the result they desire; they do something.

Private enterprise undoubtedly will be interfered with by Government attack on housing, but private enterprise always is interfered with when Government attacks an emergency. War bothers it, and so does depression, but it manages to survive.

Of course, Government attack on the housing problem would be costly, but as LODGE said, it is not necessarily extravagance.

In a democratic country, LODGE rightly said, we simply cannot afford to have unhappy people, who, through no fault of their own, are existing under conditions which are below the American standard of living, which so many of them a little while ago were fighting to protect against foreign enemies.

It is unfortunate there are not in Congress more men who think and speak in agreement with the Bay State Senator.

[From the South Boston (Mass.) Gazette of June 13, 1947]

HOUSING—THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS?

The present session of Congress will adjourn soon. So far, there has been no legislation passed to help solve the country's most serious domestic crisis—the housing shortage. While divorces and juvenile delinquency are on the increase, and while hundreds of thousands of our best citizens are living in cellars, attics, garages, and other makeshift shelters, Congress continues to ignore their plight.

What can be the cause of all this inaction on the part of our national legislators? Is it one of ignorance of the need? If that is true, let them talk to any priest, minister, or rabbi, any social worker or veteran and they will soon get the startling figures. Here in Massachusetts we need more than 57,000 low-cost homes or apartments. And that is just the beginning.

Can it be that our elected representatives don't care about veterans who sacrificed so much—who lost so much time and so many opportunities. The average veteran seldom brings this up. All he wants is a fair deal. And a fair deal in housing will make for a better United States, and a better America, that now has to face the rest of the world with every single bit of strength it can muster.

Senator LODGE in a recent public statement said that Congress should not adjourn "without taking effective action toward solving the housing problem." We agree with the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Spending by Government Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, Herman A. Lowe, a columnist on the Philadelphia Inquirer, has written an article which I commend to the reading of the Senate, dealing with the plan of some of the bureaus to purchase 1948 supplies out of funds from the last appropriations. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY

DEMOCRATS SAVING UP—1948 FUND GROWING—BUYING IN ADVANCE—IT'S YOUR TAX MONEY—FIGURES CONCEALED

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—The Democrats are hard at work down here building a special campaign fund for 1948. They are working to a fare-thee-well a source that only the "ins" get their hands on—your tax money.

You have not heard much about this yet, but you undoubtedly will during the coming months. In part it involves buying as much as possible of next year's necessary supplies and equipment with this year's funds. This will leave plenty of loose change in the department kitties next year for such things as adding personnel where it will help get votes.

The figures are being carefully concealed from inquiring newspapermen and inquiring Members of Congress, but it is estimated that in the last few weeks a couple of billion dollars have been obligated on purchases to be delivered for the next fiscal year.

These are things which should be paid for from fiscal 1948 (July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948) appropriations. They are being bought instead out of 1947 funds. Hence, hundreds of millions of dollars of 1948 money, which Congress believes is necessary for certain specific purposes, will be free and unencumbered.

You don't have to be able to add more than 2 and 2 to realize the election-year possibilities of all that loose change, which the Democrats know about down to the last penny but which the Republicans have not been able to draw a bead upon so far. And, of course, no one accuses the Democratic high command of backwardness in the field of political higher mathematics.

Here is money which will serve to keep people on the pay roll although Congress thinks they are being dropped to save funds. It will also serve to put deserving Democrats on the pay roll where they can do the most good. This is not limited to Washington. It is even more important out in the field where a political worker can do the party a lot of good hustling among the taxpayers and citizens.

This is not a new trick. What makes it particularly important is that there is more of this political black-market money around than ever before. Remember, the highest prewar budget was about $9,000,000,000. Expenditures for fiscal 1947 (the fiscal year ending June 30) will be above $40,000,000,000, and will be almost the same for fiscal 1948, despite the best efforts of Congress to melt out some of the lard.

The fact is Congress has not been particularly successful in penetrating the iron curtain concealing substantial administration expenses. The cuttable items are there, but the legislators have not been able to put their hands on them. Which means that plenty is being piled up on the shelf to help out in next year's election.

Under the ideal set-up, when a department comes to the end of each fiscal year, it should release all its unexpended balances to the Treasury and start anew with its next appropriation. But even in nonelection years, no department is willing to let nature take its course. It might prove to Congress that the department was receiving too much money, and should get a smaller appropriation.

So the departments scurry around to spend as much as possible of what is left over, in order to prove that they need every penny. For instance, the Labor Department has recently equipped a lot of its offices with new rugs and carpets, using up money. And sometimes purchases, which would normally be paid for over 4 or 5 years, will be paid for in a single lump sum to evaporate large balances.

This year, particularly, there is huge ordering of equipment for the next fiscal year. This alone nails down hundreds of millions of dollars which would otherwise revert to the Treasury. To say nothing of putting fiscal 1948 money where it will be able to strike a blow toward the November election.

The Senate Expenditures Committee has walked around this thing for some time without acting. But Pennsylvania's Senator EDWARD MARTIN has been urging party leaders to hold a congressional investigation. If and when it ever gets started, there will be some tall explaining to be done in the executive departments.

Importance and Attractiveness of the Teaching Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article which I wrote for the magazine Forward, and which appears in its issue of June 21, 1947. The purpose of this article was to invite the attention of our young people to the importance and attractiveness of the teaching profession, which so many folks seem to want to belittle these days. The magazine Forward is published by the Publications Division of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO YOU DON'T WANT TO BE A TEACHER

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

"What? The teaching profession? I should say not. I'm not sure what I wish to be, but that is one job I don't want."

This kind of talk is heard frequently around the corridors of many of our high schools, according to many reports, now that graduation is getting near.

Because my three daughters went into the educational field and found much satisfaction in it, I suppose I took for granted that many young women entered that profession. While talking to one of my friend's daughters a few days ago, I said to her, "What are you going to teach?" With a withering look, she said to me, "Teach! My eye! I wouldn't teach. I'm taking a business course. I want to get married sometime. I sure don't want to be an old-maid school teacher."

That young lady was attractive, had personality and ability. In all probability she would make an excellent teacher. I wondered why she thought that teachers never married. Of course, many of our fine young women want to get married. That's the normal, happy way of life. If entering the teaching profession means automatic spinsterhood, it is easy to see why enthusiastic, vital, attractive young women, whose ultimate goal is family life, don't take to it.

But my good judgment tells me this is false reasoning. I have known many fine women in the teaching field—my wife, my daughters, my sisters, et cetera—and many of them have married. I'm certain if you teensters were to ask your own mother or the mothers of your friends, you would find that many of them had been teachers. Statistics bear out the statement that the marriage rate for women teachers is as favorable as for women in comparable professions.

Another eager, clear-eyed, ambitious young lady told me, "There is no money in it; you get practically nothing for teaching."

I've been reading many articles on the underpaid teacher, but it has seemed to me that an effort also is being made to increase teachers' salaries. I decided to find out. This is the letter I wrote to that young lady the following day:

"You may wonder why I am taking the liberty of sending you this letter. I'm concerned, Joan, about my country's welfare. Its future rests on the youngsters in our schools. No matter how much money the reports say we spend on education—way more than any other country—it isn't the amount of money spent that makes us good; it is the caliber of the teacher. And, seemingly, many teachers have left the profession, many are teaching who shouldn't be, but, worse yet, many of our talented younger people like yourself are not preparing to be teachers. You mentioned the money angle; of course, that is important. One should make enough to live nicely, but I think I know you and your bringing up well enough to know you'd never be satisfied with the kind of job that paid a large salary but was empty from the standpoint of growth, appreciations, and real service.

"The National Education Association makes this statement: 'If history repeats itself, there will be another year or two of a fairly rapid trend in the average salary of teachers, then a less rapid increase for another 9 or 10 years.' They imply that in the near future salaries will have reached a level high enough to offer a significant inducement to promising young people to consider it as a remunerative career as well as worth while from many other angles. You know, of course, that teachers have many vacations. Practically, something else you should consider are the provisions for retirement pension and sick leave.

"Joan, your generation appears to some oldsters as materialistic, selfish, and ruthless. Certainly you and I know that in many cases those are but defense mechanisms and that you and your contemporaries are searching for opportunities to express your talents, hopes, and aspirations. Have you had some poor teachers? You know, then, the harm they can do. You don't want your young brothers and sisters to continue having them. Talk it over with your friends; you can change it, you know, by entering the profession and becoming good teachers.

"Somewhere I have read, 'The duty of a teacher is to ring the rising bell in the dormitory of the soul.' Certainly, Joan, anyone who brings this idea to her job will never find it a humdrum existence.

"Joan, I hope you become a teacher. We make all kinds of laws down here, and there are times when we feel important to the Nation, but there wouldn't be much use for our work down here if our children didn't grow into good citizens. That job rests primarily with the teachers of the country. Quite a challenge, isn't it, young lady?"

How about it, you teensters? If you wish for great wealth, do not enter the teaching field, but in the near future there seems to be the promise of a reasonable salary along with a more human attitude toward the profession. Whatever profession you enter, success is dependent for the most part on good, hard work. Doctor, Congressman, or what have you—no profession, when you are in it, is all glamour. Enthusiasm, attractive personality, and ability are traits that should promote achievement in whatever you do. Along with them, if you have the yen to serve, the teaching profession needs you. How about it? Think it over.

Harry F. Sinclair and the Anglo-American Oil Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, on Friday, June 20, there appeared in the New York Post, an article by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior. This article, it seems to me, provides some very illuminating facts regarding the efforts that are being made to defeat the Anglo-American Oil Treaty which is now pending before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN TO MAN

(By Harold L. Ickes)

If Harry F. Sinclair succeeds in wrecking the pending Anglo-American oil treaty he will have consummated his most ambitious plot against the public interest since Teapot Dome. This treaty, if ratified, will make more sure American access to middle eastern oil. At the time of the Teapot Dome scandal, Mr. Sinclair tried to get his hands on some valuable oil deposits that belonged to the Navy of his country. With hands dripping with crude oil, he got caught at it.

This time he has again been working like a mole, and the only chance of his being convicted is in the court of public opinion. It is generally known throughout the oil industry that Mr. Sinclair has taken advantage of the delay in bringing this treaty to a hearing to build up opposition to it in the State of Texas. So far as is known, Mr. Sinclair is the only one who has been interested to invest a large amount of money in a plot which, if it succeeds, will not benefit even Mr. Sinclair financially, although it will seriously hurt his own country in its international relationships.

It will also disadvantage rival oil companies that have legitimately acquired interests in foreign oil. This country is going to need foreign oil in increasing quantities because even today we are not producing enough oil in the United States to supply the needs of our own people.

Just why Mr. Sinclair is working against the public interest this time, I do not know. Nor is he likely to take the public into his confidence. He is known in the oil industry as a contumacious person who is instinctively opposed to any policy that his competitors approve. He just naturally opposes anything that does not produce a business advantage or money profit to Mr. Harry F. Sinclair.

I would avoid cynicism, especially when such an altruistic citizen as Harry F. Sinclair is involved. However, I cannot but be puzzled when I consider his principal argument against the treaty—the simulated fear that its adoption will mean a flood of foreign oil in our domestic markets—because it is generally believed that Mr. Sinclair imports more oil now into the United States than any of his competitors. So he must have a different reason for opposing the treaty.

Mr. Sinclair first went to work after the agreement was signed in London on September 24, 1945. He has been as busy as a beaver ever since, but not in the open. Mr. Sinclair is too modest to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to say that he is against this treaty. Least of all would he say why. While he could advance the sham arguments that others have made against the treaty with as straight a face as they, he prefers to employ lawyers to speak for him. During the hearings that were recessed some 10 days ago to be resumed next week, a lawyer from Texas, by the name of Spencer, represented him, although the committee may not know who the client is. Others on the Sinclair pay roll have thronged the hearing room, but they were not proud enough of their Sinclair connections to disclose it.

Mr. Spencer, with a straight face, insists that the treaty is a cartel—or, at any rate, might be—well, at least it could lead to a cartel—or something like that. Moreover, believe it or not, according to Mr. Spencer, the treaty would compel the Government to impose its arbitrary will upon the oil industry besides liquidating the States into so many corporate corpses that would clutter up the greensward.

The technique employed by the Sinclairites in Texas has been of the same nature as that used in starting a run on a bank. To the State officials of Texas the Sinclair retainers whisper, "Pss-st! This treaty will cut the revenue of the State in two. Our whole State government will collapse." Teachers and educational associations are warned, "Pss-st! This treaty will force Congress to cut the Texas oil production to the bone. We will have no revenue for the schools." The small oil producers are greeted with, "Pss-st! This treaty will throw open the American market to a flood of cheap foreign oil. You will be ruined overnight."

The Sinclair forces pretend to be fighting for the interest of the common man. And, of course, hasn't Sinclair himself, who is paying the bill, which must already have reached a sizable figure, shown himself to be the champion of the common man, long before Henry A. Wallace discovered him? Certainly, at the time of the Teapot Dome affair he was enthusiastically, if quietly, trying to get possession of Government oil that would be sold to the common man at a profit. And even more certainly today his lawyers, his lobbyists, and his publicity men, as they crowd the hearing room of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, are working for the common man at Mr. Sinclair's expense.

Statement by Hon. Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, Before Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am about to appear before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1948, to testify particularly with respect to some items as they affect the West. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD

the statement I shall make to the subcommittee, and also an editorial entitled "Congress Mutilates Program To Preserve Nation's Soil," published in the Seattle Star of June 5, 1947.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I have requested this opportunity to appear before you because of my sincere concern over the effect of House reductions in certain items included in the Department of Agriculture budget.

I realize that this committee has had full benefit of the testimony accumulated during House hearings, and that in addition you have heard many witnesses on many segments of this program.

At the risk of repeating some information you already have, I wish to express to your committee my own views on research, soil conservation, crop insurance, access roads in the national forests, and rural electrification.

RESEARCH AND CONSERVATION—GENERAL COMMENT

Funds appropriated by the Congress for research and activities aimed at conserving our natural resources classify as investments in the true sense of the word. We can increase goods for consumption by increasing our production per acre of field crops or national forests, but also we can increase such goods by discovering new uses and methods for utilization of these crops.

I am sure this committee would agree with me that had the Federal Government not invested, over the years, considerable sums of money in research aimed at more extensive utilization of the products of our forests, the drain upon that great natural resource would have been even more devastating than it is today. All of us remember the day when a substantial portion of the great Douglas fir trees in the States of Oregon and Washington were left to rot on the ground; when the lumber companies of the Nation skimmed the cream and left in our forests millions of board feet of timber as waste, a fire hazard, and a breeding place for injurious insects.

A few days ago representatives of the Department of Agriculture described to the committee the significant advances that have been made in the utilization of sawmill waste. They described the operations of a plant at Springfield, Oreg., which, if I recall the figures correctly, anticipates making some 6,000,000 gallons of alcohol this year out of material which otherwise would be completely wasted. This one process and this single plant are concrete evidence that funds appropriated by the Congress for research represent an investment in the wealth of the Nation. Likewise, funds appropriated for programs formulated to protect and conserve our soil and our forests are funds invested in the future of the Nation.

Research cannot be turned on and off like a bathroom faucet. Neither can advance guaranties be given that a particular piece of research will yield the desired result. In general, however, research is the handmaiden of progress, but continuity in staff and experimentation is imperative, and this is dependent upon stable and adequate appropriations. Well planned and executed research yields greater per dollar return than perhaps any other single part of an appropriation. I know your committee recognizes these facts and will demonstrate that recognition in the treatment accorded research items in this budget.

Most private utilities are now thought of as perpetual operations. The directors of such a private enterprise are extremely zealous in ploughing back into the business each year a sufficient amount of capital to keep the plant in top-notch operating condition. In my judgment wise congressional policy will make provision for a similar ploughback into our agricultural plant in the form of appropriations for greater utilization and conservation of our natural resources.

There is one other general observation I wish to make. The House Agriculture Committee has been holding hearings for weeks on what the chairman of the committee calls a long-range agricultural program. I think this is a very wise and important step on the part of this legislative committee. When the hearings first began I instructed a member of my staff to follow the hearings as closely as possible and to report to me periodically on developments. Obviously, I do not know how long the hearings will continue or specifically the kind of comprehensive program that will come out of those hearings. I am fully convinced, however, that any comprehensive and long-range agricultural program will of necessity contain, among other things, provisions for conservation and use of our croplands.

In view of the fact that this comprehensive study of agricultural problems is now under way, and in view of what I have just mentioned, it appears to me extremely unwise for the Congress through its appropriations powers to drastically curtail or to terminate entirely some of those very programs which the legislative committee will call upon us to reestablish when its deliberations take the form of concrete legislative proposals.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

For research, the Soil Conservation Service presented a budget calling for appropriation of $1,423,000. The House cut this to $673,000, a reduction of over 50 percent. For operations, the Service requested $43,437,000. This the House cut to $38,000,000, a reduction of about 12 percent.

At various points in the hearings before your committee, Mr. Chairman, two questions have been raised in regard to the Soil Conservation Service: First, are the farmers themselves in favor of this program? And, second, can this work be better carried out by the Agriculture Extension Service?

On the first question I should like to let the farmers of my State speak for themselves. I have received during the year a number of reports sent to me voluntarily by conservation districts in the State of Washington. Incidentally, most of them were sent to me long before hearings on this bill began in the House and do not represent an attempt on the part of the Department of Agriculture or anyone else to propagandize Members of Congress.

Let me quote briefly from the 1946 annual report of the Pine Creek soil conservation district at Oaksdale, Wash.:

"The Pine Creek soil-conservation district is located in the northeastern part of Whitman County in the State of Washington. The district covers an area of 188,000 acres. Approximately 90 percent of the area can be farmed in a wheat, pea, and sweetclover rotation. The district was voted into existence in 1941. * * * The Soil Conservation Service provided the district with two conservationists, a soil scientist, an engineer, and two conservation aides. Two and a half tons of grass seed and 2,000 trees were given to the district by the Soil Conservation Service. The personnel and material were distributed over the entire area, working with approximately 400 farmers in the district.

"In March we had our rally day. Our 1946 rally day varied considerably from the previous ones. Instead of speakers we had a panel discussion with the farmers of the district. In the afternoon we made a tour from Oaksdale to Thornton to Rosalia and back to Oaksdale. The lessons learned on that tour stuck.

"During the middle of June we arranged another tour, but this time we checked different methods of farming. The areas that had conservation practices stood out clearly and made us resolve to speed the work of conserving our soil and emphasized the problems for us."

Let me quote a few paragraphs from the 1946 report of the Lewis County soil-conservation district. On page 1 the farmers' committee states:

"The district is very grateful to the Soil Conservation Service for technical help to farmers in our district. The farmers appreciate the on-the-farm help with their land-use problems. * * * Detailed conservation surveys classifying the soil according to its capabilities have been made for 58,742 acres this year, totaling 119,367 acres to date."

Here are a few statements taken from the Montesano-Elma-Oakville district report. These statements relate specifically to soil-conservation practices. On page 4 the committee states:

"Our recent charted analysis shows that the seeding of improved hay and pasture mixture is one of the major practices needed in the district. In this respect it is gratifying to note that quite a number of farmers are buying equipment for improved soil preparation and seeding."

Then, concerning fertilizing hay and pasture, the committee states:

"We have in this district areas of first bench where lime should be used as a basis for the farmers' fertilizer program. Lime should also be the basis for any fertilizer program attempted on hill soils."

And then here is a typical localized item:

"Several farmers, like Andy Seifert, W. D. Olson, and Sam DeYoung, have found that fertilizer and seedings made by September 20 are, perhaps, the most important items in getting a fall seeding through the winter successfully.

I have just one more quote I would like to read to the committee, taken from the annual report of the Underwood soil conservation district:

"We have made over 260 farm plans since the district was organized and now have 198 plans in active operation. * * *

"We wish to take this opportunity to thank the Soil Conservation Service for its loan of technicians and equipment to our district. We appreciate the efforts of the Soil Conservation Service to keep a full staff on duty, and we hope, now that the war is over, the large turn-over in personnel will be eliminated."

The striking thing to me, gentlemen, is the fact that the farmers of these areas are sufficiently impressed with the necessity for soil conservation and with the service they are receiving from this division of the Department of Agriculture that they are willing to take time from their own farming operations to serve as committeemen and to assume the responsibility of getting this kind of program started and of contributing the stimulation that is required to keep it going. To me the excerpts which I have just read demonstrate conclusively that the answer to the first question I mentioned, namely, Are the farmers in favor of this program? must definitely be answered in the affirmative.

A second question has been brought up before your committee, Should the soil-conservation work be carried on by the Extension Service or by Extension Service methods? In my judgment it certainly is appropriate for this committee to indicate its views in this regard, but I think this is a problem which the Department itself or a legislative committee should decide.

My own experience indicates that both are necessary. Extension methods are essentially educational in nature, backed, of course, by a huge assemblage of factual information. I think it was one of our great

educational philosophers, John Dewey, of Columbia University, who said that the best way to learn is to learn by doing. My own view, therefore, is that a combination of extension methods and actual operations on the farmer's land will provide the greatest promise of success.

Safeguarding our productive land through sound conservation practices is a continuous program. The destruction of thousands of acres each year through erosion continues even while the Congress of the United States is making up its mind. I think we must view soil conservation as a permanent part of our agricultural program. There will always be a need for soil-conservation services, because even though the discovery of sound conservation practices may sometime be completed, the application of those practices to the individual acres of our farm lands requires technical knowledge and skill.

I wrote to the Department of Agriculture, asking what effect the House reduction in this appropriation would have upon soil conservation in the State of Washington. The Department answered my inquiry in a factual way, giving me the benefit of their best estimates.

The 1948 budget would have provided for the State of Washington about $32,054 for soil-conservation research. Under the program of the House less than $9,500 would be available. For soil-conservation operations, about $906,000 would have been expended in the State. As a result of the House action this would be reduced to about $810,000, or an over-all reduction in the State of Washington alone of approximately $120,000. Similar reductions, of course, would apply to the other 47 States of the Union.

The effect of the House action cannot be truly appreciated by simply saying that the funds expended in the State of Washington will be approximately $120,000 less. That $120,000 must be translated into terms of acres of soil eroded away because of failure on the part of the Congress of the United States to keep the program going.

CONSERVATION AND USE PAYMENTS

I want to speak now on a related program, conservation and use payments. The Department requested $301,720,000 with which to carry on this portion of the agricultural adjustment program. Of this sum, $267,620,000 is disbursed to farmers in the form of cash payments and advances, for soil-conservation materials. The House cut this figure to $150,000,000. The Department requested approximately $34,000,000 for administrative expenses at National, State, and local levels. This the House cut to $13,050,000. Two major problems confront your committee in this regard. The first one has to do with the commitment made last year by the Congress to finance a $300,000,000 program for the crop year 1947. The second has to do with the essential value of the program itself.

I realize that it is impossible for one Congress to bind its successor, but there is a moral obligation to the three and a half million farmers of this Nation to make good on the assurances which were given them in good faith by the Department of Agriculture. Last fall the Department announced a $300,000,000 program for the 1947 crop year. The Department made that announcement on the strength of certain language contained in the 1947 appropriation bill itself, and upon the discussion between Congressman Tarver and his associates on the floor of the House last year, when this item was under discussion.

I know that all members of your committee are familiar with these facts. To me it is almost inconceivable that the Eightieth Congress would refuse to honor the moral obligation to those farmers who have included approved conservation practices in their 1947 program. Some of the three and a half million farmers who are participating have already completed their practices. A majority, if not all of them, are in the process of carrying them out. I frankly don't see how we can renege at this stage in the crop year.

As to the merits of the program itself, I wish every member of the committee and of the Congress could read pages 1235–1276 of the House hearings, where Under Secretary Dodd and members of the House committee discussed this program at considerable length. Last year over half the Nation's farmers, operating almost 70 percent of our crop land, participated in the program, and indications are that more will participate this year. What I have said earlier in regard to the need for investing Federal funds in conservation of our natural resources is especially applicable to this program. Each year we harvest crops from some 350,000,000 acres of land. Some studies indicate that we are taking fertility out of the soil as much as 20 percent faster than we did 25 years ago. The present generation of owners and operators cannot be expected to make all of the sacrifice to keep our soil resources intact for future generations. Here the public interest is involved, and in the interest of the public welfare the Government is justified in giving assistance.

I want to emphasize just a few of the statements Under Secretary Dodd made to the House committee, because to me they reveal in a dramatic way what has been accomplished through conservation and use payments. Mr. Dodd pointed out that prior to the beginning of this program there were less than 3,000,000 tons of lime used in this country on the farms. Today farmers are using over 23,000,000 tons and would use in excess of 25,000,000 tons, if we had it available. In 1936 the total tonnage of phosphates used was 203,000 tons. In 1945 it was 2,401,000 tons. In 1936, 43,000 tons of potash were used; in 1945, 119,000 tons. Mulching materials in 1936 were used on 19,000 acres; in 1945, on 121,000 acres. In 1936 there were 1,900,000 linear feet of spreader terraces. By 1941 this had grown to 6,289,000 linear feet.

These figures contain not only a statistical demonstration of the fact that the program is working on the farms but, likewise, these figures demonstrate the tremendous collateral benefits to the fertilizer companies of the United States emanating from the program. If I were a lime manufacturer, I would write a sincere note of thanks to the Department of Agriculture, because in the process of teaching farmers sound conservation practices they have increased the farm market for lime by over 800 percent.

One other portion of this program deserves special consideration by this committee. Through the years the Department of Agriculture has built a tremendous farmer organization to formulate and administer the program. The Department has offices in over 3,000 counties. There are more than 9,000 elected county committeemen and over 97,000 community committeemen. The House committee in its report states:

"Well-considered expressions of opinion were placed before the committee to the effect that soil-conservation payments could be deleted entirely from the bill, but the committee believe that it should be tapered off, beginning in the present crop year, and completely eliminated for the crop year 1948."

If the advice of the House committee is followed, the county and community organization of which I have just spoken will disintegrate, and, in my judgment, the momentum which sound conservation practices have attained among the farmers of the Nation will come to a halt. I feel certain your committee will not permit that to happen.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak very briefly about the action of the House in relation to the budget request of the Crop Insurance Corporation. For administrative expenses the corporation requested $9,330,000. The House cut this to $1,000,000. You will recall that for the year 1944 the activities of the corporation were suspended—the corporation was in liquidation. The administrative expenses for that year were $1,715,000. For the crop year 1943 the corporation, according to data shown on page 1641 of the House hearings, had in force 290,000 wheat contracts and 131,524 cotton contracts, or a total in these two major crops of 421,524. In 1946 the corporation had in force 305,000 wheat and 114,000 cotton contracts, or a total of 419,000. Secretary Anderson stated before your committee, on the opening day of these hearings, that for the 1947 crop year the corporation has in force some 540,000 contracts on wheat alone.

I mention these figures to indicate that even if your committee decides to force the Crop Insurance Corporation into liquidation, the appropriation approved by the House is grossly inadequate. With far fewer contracts in force in 1943 liquidation expenses of the corporation in 1944 were $715,000 more than the House has allowed. I understand that the Government's potential liability on 1947 wheat contracts alone is over $500,000,000. Certainly $1,000,000 will not finance sufficient personnel to protect the Government against unwarranted claims and losses on this vast coverage. Truly there is no economy in such an unbusinesslike procedure. To achieve a paper saving of eight and a third million dollars the House jeopardizes a half billion-dollar liability.

Now just a few words about the merits of crop insurance, and I am particularly concerned about wheat, because the eastern section of the State of Washington is one of the richest parts of the breadbasket of the Nation. The farmer faces multiple hazards in growing and marketing a crop. Many vital factors are beyond his control—he cannot control the weather; he cannot control the market price. Crop insurance provides a means whereby he can trade a sum certain in the form of premiums for a partial guarantee against disaster.

I readily admit that the history of crop insurance has not been a happy one. In the period 1939 to 1943 the Federal Government paid to wheat farmers almost $33,000,000 more in indemnities than it collected in premiums. Hedging operations netted a profit during the period of roughly $7,000,000, thereby reducing the net loss to about $26,000,000. In the years 1945 and 1946, however, as a result of the experience gained in the earlier years, insurance operations in wheat show a net gain of $7,065,000, Nation-wide.

In the State of Washington, even during the years 1939–43, the wheat insurance program was financially sound. During that period 16,588 farms were insured. Premiums collected totaled $811,119, against indemnities paid of $410,989. In 1945 and 1946, 1,666 contracts were written. $323,833 were collected in premiums; $167,509 were paid out in losses, for a net gain of $156,324.

A number of wheat farmers from my State have written to me urging the continuation of this program. They express a view in which I concur, namely, that after investing over $26,000,000 in wheat crop insurance during the 1939–43 period, why abandon the program now, when the experience during that period has enabled the corporation to operate in the years 1945 and 1946 at a $7,000,000 profit. They argue that the $26,000,000 loss must be charged off to experience—that it represents an investment in know how—that the know how purchased with that investment is paying dividends at the present time in the form of an actuarially sound wheat crop-insurance program.

May I read just one of the letters I have received. It is quite short. The others I would like to have placed in the record.

DOUGLAS, WASH., *May 29, 1947.*
The Honorable W. G. MAGNUSON,
Senator from Washington,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been reading in the papers that crop insurance is to be limited to 50 counties. I am strongly in favor of crop insurance for Douglas County and hope we can keep it. My brother and I have carried it since it was available.

I believe that after a few lean years most farmers will realize its importance, and it will take a few lean years to do it.

It's basic for us. Why carry insurance on your house, or your life, if you can't pay for it if your income fails? It doesn't make sense.

Crop insurance is one of the strong factors in the well-being of our Nation as well as the farmers. No one benefits from an impoverished rural population.

Very truly yours,

CARL H. VIEBROCK.

I know the Agriculture Committee of the House, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, is considering this problem from a legislative standpoint. I sincerely hope your committee will restore the funds requested by the Crop Insurance Corporation. I understand they have urged restoration of at least $5,000,000. Let's not throw away the experience we have gained, unless the appropriate legislative committees and the Congress decide that such a course should be followed.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

Your committee has already heard representatives of the Forest Service describe the importance of access roads to the proper management of, and sale of timber from, our national forests. Some of you were on the floor when Senator CORDON'S amendment to the rent-control bill was discussed—an amendment to make available an additional $10,000,000 in fiscal 1948 for access roads. In supporting Senator CORDON'S amendment I pointed out that funds expended by the Federal Government for access roads are returned with interest in the form of a higher price for national-forest stumpage—in addition that competitive bidding is insured, and the Government through the Forest Service is able to locate main-stem roads in the national forests on a planned basis.

The natural tendency of the private operator is to cut timber as he comes to it—moving from the perimeter toward the center of the body of timber he is working on. Such practice is not always the best method of harvesting timber, but for the private operator it is usually the most practical method. Access roads properly located permit the Federal Government to manage the harvesting of timber on that basis which will bring the greatest yield to the greatest number of operators. Access roads are one means of providing the small logger, the small millowner, an opportunity to remain in business.

Last year the Forest Service had available to it $18,900,000 for access roads. The budget this year called for $12,500,000. The House cut this request $2,500,000, leaving $10,000,000 available for fiscal 1948. In my judgment the $12,500,000 requested by the Service was too low to begin with. I say this because the Forest Service estimates that an appropriation of $15,000,000 yearly for the next 5 years would permit it to construct the additional access roads required to place our national forests on a sustained yield basis. On a sustained yield basis we would increase our yearly harvest of timber from about 4,000-000,000 feet to 6,000,000,000 feet. At $5 per thousand board feet this additional yield would increase our revenues from timber sales by $10,000,000 per year. In about 10 years the entire $75,000,000 investment in this 5-year program would be returned to the Federal Treasury—taking into account the 25 percent paid to the States from timber sales. Furthermore, at the end of the 10-year period, we would still have the roads, free and clear, for use in the sustained yield program.

I doubt there is a businessman in the Nation who would refuse to make such an investment under the same circumstances. Here by launching a 5-year program costing $75,000,000 the Federal Government will get its money back in 10 years on the additional yield alone, and still own the roads in perpetuity.

I sincerely urge your committee to add at least $5,000,000 to the House figure, thereby restoring not only the $2,500,000 cut, but adding another $2,500,000 to it. To do so is sound economy.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Chairman, there are many additional items in the Department of Agriculture budget on which I should like to speak, but time will not permit. I do, however, wish to comment on REA. This is a program which literally has brought light into the lives of 1,700,000 farmers of America. Like our great western hydroelectric projects to which REA is closely related, funds loaned to these farmer cooperatives have proven sound investments. The record of repayment of REA loans is exceptionally good. By the end of fiscal 1947 over $1,000,000,000 will have been allocated to borrowers, and about three-quarters of a billion dollars will have been advanced. On December 31, 1946, $126,000,000 in principal and interest had been repaid and payments overdue more than 30 days amount to less than $900,000.

In spite of the fact that REA loans are sound investments, the House cut the REA budget for salaries and expenses from $5,000,000 to $4,000,000—a reduction of over 28 percent—and, in addition, reduced its lending capacity from $250,000,000 to $225,000,000.

In the House hearings there was considerable discussion between the committee chairman and REA representatives as to the administrative costs of the program. The chairman chose to use the number of miles of line energized and the number of consumers connected in 1946, compared to 1940, as a yardstick for measuring REA efficiency and need for personnel. I do not wish to quarrel at length with this premise. I do wish to point out, however, that these measuring rods taken alone are not conclusive. These criteria must be judged in the light of conditions which preceded the year 1940 as compared to 1946—how much preparatory work was done in 1938 and 1939 which contributed to the lines energized in 1940—how availability of materials in 1940 compares with the same factor in 1946—and what is the supervision and processing load now compared to 1940. On the latter score it is significant that the number of borrowers has increased from 630 in 1940 to 1,150 by fiscal 1948. In this period the miles of line have increased 225 percent and the number of consumers 345 percent. These figures are indicative of the increased work load in REA. I am certain your committee will take them into consideration in determining the validity of the House reasoning upon which the 28½-percent cut in salaries and expenses was predicated. REA is a billion dollar business. Without adequate personnel it cannot discharge its obligation to borrowers, and to the taxpayers of the Nation, over whose funds it holds trust.

As to the borrowing capacity of REA—cut by the House from $250,000,000 to $225,000,-000—at the end of fiscal 1947 the department will have a backlog of applications totaling about $270,000,000. Assuming that as much as 15 percent of these applications were rejected, with a $225,000,000 limitation, REA will not have sufficient funds to finance applications already in hand, to say nothing about those which will come to it during fiscal 1948.

In the State of Washington, on January 31, 1947, we had 21 REA systems energized with 6,883 miles of line, serving 16,867 customers. About 85 percent of the farms are electrified. Washington State farmers have made far greater progress in this direction than those in many other States. North Dakota, for example, has only 10 percent of its farms electrified and South Dakota only 13 percent. However, at the time REA appeared before the House committee, applications on hand, under survey, or to be placed under survey by June 30, from the State of Washington totaled $5,380,000 and involved 2,921 miles of line to serve 4,843 rural customers. Since the funds are repayable with interest, I fail to see the economy in denying a portion of these farm families the benefits of electricity as a result of failure on the part of the House to provide REA at least $250,000,000 of lending capacity.

In closing, I want to emphasize again that funds appropriated for research, conservation of natural resources, and rural electrification, are investments in the prosperity of the Nation—investments which coming generations, were they able to speak for themselves, would demand of us as a set-aside out of our income to protect the basic natural resources which they will inherit.

ST. JOHN, WASH., *May 26, 1947.*
The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I understand that the Federal crop insurance on wheat has been changed so only 50 counties in the wheat States will be allowed to carry the Federal crop insurance.

I also understand there are a number of 173,000 bushels of wheat, which I do not feel we want to be deprived of if we cannot continue to have the benefit of this insurance. Furthermore, we have been striving for the 10-percent reduction in premium rate after 5 years' continuous average without a loss.

I also understand there are a number of policyholders in Whitman County who have had continuous coverage for 5 years and would also have to forfeit that benefit.

I do not think Whitman County would be in favor of discontinuing the Federal wheat insurance.

I also think the continuance of this insurance will be of great benefit to our war veterans in helping them to get started in farming after being in the service for several years.

Yours very truly,

ED SCHUSTER.

LACROSSE, WASH., *May 26, 1947.*
The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: As a farmer of Whitman County, Wash., I am much concerned of what we read in the newspapers and news letters. There seems to be some question of continuing the Federal crop insurance program on the old basis or possibly reducing it to 50 counties over the Nation.

I'm much opposed to such a drastic change. We, the policyholders of Whitman County, have accumulated 173,000 bushels of wheat through premiums earned. We feel this is our wheat. We have this reserve, if ever needed to pay off indemnities. It would be a great disappointment to all of us, and we would lose confidence in all Government programs.

We also were promised a 10-percent reduction on rates if, after 5 years, no losses. Do we have to give this up? It also gives the best security to our people who want to start out in life to establish a home. Thinking of the war veterans who fought so bravely, I urge you to help us to hold our programs and oppose a new bill. I hope we can keep our Federal crop-insurance program We are depending on you.

I'm also much concerned of all what we have read of reductions on appropriations on the agriculture program. I maintain that we

must have a sound farm program and need assistance of the Government to help us carry on. I hope you will be able to help the people in your State to carry on with the soil building and soil conserving program.

Sincerely,

KARL SCHRENK.

WARDEN, WASH., *May 26, 1947.*

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A few days ago I noticed an article in one of the daily newspapers concerning changes that Congress contemplates making in our present Federal crop-insurance program.

As a wheat grower and leader of farmers in this county, I am expressing myself in that capacity. It is my opinion, and I am sure that the wheat growers in this county who are now participating in the crop-insurance program will back me up when I state that such changes as are in the process of being made will be a very serious mistake. With this in mind I am going to make an effort to notify or contact every farmer who is now participating in the crop-insurance program in hopes that they will also express themselves in regards to placing the crop-insurance program back into the experimental stage.

It is the opinion of the majority of wheat farmers in this county that the crop-insurance program is the best phase of the present farm program. It gives farmers and especially younger men and returning veterans some assurance of being able to meet their obligations in case of a crop failure. It takes a good deal of courage and financial backing to produce a crop of wheat for making a living and to help feed the business people of this world.

It is true that our present program is not perfect. However, I feel assured that such minor changes as are necessary can be worked out as time goes on.

The program in our county and State has certainly not cost the Federal Government very much. In addition to this, this county has built up a nice reserve in premium collections to cover any future losses, when and if they occur. In other words, we feel we have an equity in this program, and I assure you that we do not want Congress to take this away from us.

I know that the wheat crop insurance program is certainly beyond the experimental stage. It has provided a very definite amount of security to the farmers of this county, especially to the younger farmers and returning veterans, who have had difficulty in obtaining financial backing to cover the cost of their operations. If the crop-insurance program is going in the red, it is certainly no fault of those counties who have properly administered the program and by doing so have built up a good reserve. I feel that such a drastic change as Congress intends to make will certainly reflect on my ability in administering this program.

It seems to me that if there was a check made on losses, you would find they occurred mostly in States and counties on farms that are operated by men who derive only a small portion of their income from growing wheat, and not by the major producing States and counties.

I sincerely hope that you will give this matter favorable consideration when it is brought before you.

Very truly yours,

ALBERT WIDMER.

PASCO, WASH., *May 27, 1947.*

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to our attention, through newspaper releases, that Congress is considering limiting Federal crop insurance on wheat to 50 counties.

We feel this is a mistake as the Federal crop-insurance program has proven to be sound and operating without deficit. However, if this is to be done, we feel that our county, Franklin County, Wash., should be one of those selected.

The Federal crop-insurance program in Franklin County has proven to be popular with the farmers and has been in force every year that it was available to us. Our county has always operated well in the black, and we have the highest percent of participation in the State. The 6 years in which the program has been in operation we have had to pay only 22 claims and have an accumulated reserve of 103,633 bushels.

In our opinion, Congress would do well to give this program the merit that it deserves.

Sincerely yours,

R. C. WATSON,
Chairman, Franklin County Agriculture Conservation Committee.

ARCHIE PRIOR & CO.,
Yakima, Wash., May 28, 1947.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to advise you that we are interested in seeing the present United States Department of Agriculture crop-insurance program continued in its present form.

We feel that this insurance program is to a considerable degree self-supporting and not a drain on the Treasury.

We also feel that this program contributes to the stability of our agricultural economy.

Yours very truly,

ARCHIE PRIOR & CO.,
By DONALD G. PRIOR.

KENNEWICK, WASH., *May 29, 1947.*

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Benton County farmers alarmed over proposed drastic reduction in ACA funds and virtual elimination of crop-insurance program. If the farmer is forced to bear the brunt of economy drives by uninformed eastern legislators, we urgently request the selection of this county as the one to continue crop insurance, for which we have a very definite need.

BENTON COUNTY ACA COMMITTEE,
A. J. THOMPSON.
ROLLA LANNING.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Star of June 5, 1947]

CONGRESS MUTILATES PROGRAM TO PRESERVE NATION'S SOIL

In his master's address yesterday to the fifty-eighth annual convention of the Washington State Grange, Henry P. Carstensen called soil conservation the No. 1 national problem.

This statement may seem overdrawn to some people. The American people have become used to hearing many things described as No. 1 problems—living costs, strikes, relations with Russia, automobile accidents, the sad state of the movies, or radio programs, or what not.

We shall not qarrel with Master Carstensen in his designation of the No. 1 problem. For food is fundamental to life. Food growth requires soil. And the soil of this country is wasting away at an alarming rate. The rivers wash tons of topsoil into the seas daily, especially from lands bared by overgrazing. The winds whisk other tons into the air, especially from lands impoverished by overcropping. Each year this Nation comes nearer the point at which it will be unable to raise the food it needs for its present population of 140,000,000.

Under these circumstances the action of the House Appropriations Committee, in slashing drastically the funds allowed for soil conservation programs, is indefensible.

Only within relatively recent years has the importance of soil conservation been generally understood. The dust bowl and the resultant emigration of Okies and Arkies helped dramatize the problem. But the dust bowl episode was only one act in an American drama of waste that has been building up toward a tragic climax ever since white men first saw this country, with natural resources that seemed inexhaustible.

Fortunately the dust bowl did set people to thinking. They began to listen to the scientists and farm leaders who had seen this tragedy mounting. The result was adoption by Congress of an administration program under which technical experts were provided to advise farmers who would set up soil conservation measures, with financial compensation promised those land owners who cooperated in carrying out these locally adopted programs.

It is these programs that are now threatened with wreckage. The House Appropriations Committee has cut soil conservation appropriation requests 52 percent.

The committee contends that a cut of only 12½ percent has been voted in the appropriation for the technical experts who aid the farmers. As indicated in the recent House debate, however, this 12½ percent cut is figured on the basis of the number of soil conservation districts in existence a year ago. This number was 1,838. New districts have since been created and are still being created at the rate of 20 a month. The effect of the cut is therefore to reduce present operations approximately 22 percent—actually to set operations back to a figure of pre-war years, since war conditions inevitably prevented reasonable extension of the program.

What is more serious is the fact that the committee has undertaken to end altogether a program under which $300,000,000 was set up a year ago as the amount which would be available to pay farmers entering into these soil conservation projects. The figure is halved for 1947 and eliminated altogether for 1948.

While it is legally true that no Congress can bind its successor in the matter of appropriations, the $300,000,000 item was adopted by the Seventy-ninth Congress with the clear understanding that farmers were to be notified what aid they could expect if they undertook their local programs. Now the compensation for the 1947 programs, already undertaken, is to be cut in half and the whole plan dropped for next year.

Let no one think that soil conservation is something that should interest dwellers in the dust bowl or the Atlantic Coast States or the deep South alone.

Mr. Carstensen noted, in his master's address.

"Farmers of this State have a right to be particularly concerned, in view of the fact that a high ranking Government soil-conservation official reported recently that in erosion damage our Palouse area was second only to an area in northern New York."

The problem is particularly important here, Mr. Carstensen noted, with Columbia Basin lands about to be brought under cultivation, adding:

"Unless the people of the Pacific Northwest take steps to protect those lands they will lose the millions of dollars that have been spent on this project."

Certainly it is timely for city people to be joining with farm people in recognizing the seriousness of the soil depletion problem. The city man has to eat, too.

And it strikes us that the city people might well join with the farm people in protesting the penny pinching that threatens to wreck one of the most worth-while programs being carried out under Government auspices. It is essentially a farmers' program, democratically operated by elected farmer-district supervisors, with technical help from the

Government to make it effective. But it is not for the benefit of the farmer alone. It is for the benefit of all of us.

Speech by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida, in Support of the President's Veto of Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio speech broadcast by me at 10:30 p. m. on June 22, 1947, over the Mutual network, in support of the President's veto of the labor bill.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tomorrow afternoon at 3 o'clock the Senate of the United States will decide the most momentous domestic issue of our times. If two-thirds of the Senate vote to override the President's veto, the American people shall have lost its greatest battle against forces of reaction and monopoly. For this legislation affects not only labor unions but the vast majority of the American people. Those who vote for the bill cheapen the labor of the Nation when actual workers' wages are already falling. They contribute to a depression when our prosperity is already slipping away. They weaken America when today the strength of America is the hope of the world.

Mark Hanna, a Republican Senator from Ohio, is credited with being the first to work out a firm deal between big business and politics in the United States. Tomorrow Mark Hanna would be proud of his successor, Senator ROBERT TAFT, of Ohio, if the veto of President Truman should be overridden and this antilabor bill should become a law. For through it Senator TAFT, also a Republican Senator from Ohio and also speaking for big business, would have fastened upon the American working people the servitude of big business as complete as that which Hanna achieved in his day.

The lines of battle between those who believe in the people and those who are against the people are sharply drawn. This is a struggle which can only be decided by the people themselves.

As early as September 1945, President Truman recommended to the Congress a 21-point program of constructive legislation designed to ease the transition from total war to a peace of plenty and progress for the American people. That program would have prevented the suicidal rise of prices, increased production of needed peacetime goods, built over 3,000,000 new homes and protected the American people against inflation and depression.

The Republican Party and a minority of Democrats wrecked that program of constructive legislation.

When the war ended and war production stopped, the take-home pay of the workers was cut. Senator TAFT and the Republican leadership sharing his views succeeded in ending all controls that protected the people from war shortages and profiteering. Caught between lower wages and higher living costs, the workers of the country demanded increased rates of pay. Big business arrogantly replied it was none of the workers' business, it was none of the Government's business, what they were able to pay.

The truth was that the corporate leadership of America were determined to break the power of labor organizations in America.

From the working people they determined to strip the protection of labor laws and labor unions. From the consuming public they determined to remove the protecting shield of price control and the fair distribution of the limited goods we had. From the Government they would remove controls over monopoly powers.

Over the veto of President Truman—which was as stinging a rebuke as his veto on the tax bill and this antilabor bill—Senator TAFT and the Republican leadership destroyed price control. Just last week in the Senate they destroyed effective rent control, under the false banners of "freedom for private enterprise—down with bureaucracy." What they really meant was freedom for the piercing sword of profiteering; down with the shield of Government protection.

Meanwhile the National Association of Manufacturers and the Republican leadership turned every weapon in modern political warfare toward battering down the defenses of the working people built under the leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. They have pretended to be concerned only with curbing the leaders of labor, while they have been reaching out to encircle and destroy the working people themselves.

I should be less than frank if I did not warn you that if we lose this battle for the workers, not only the American worker but the American consumer as well as the American small businessman and the American farmer, will stand helpless under the crushing power of the big-business magnates and monopolists of America to fix wages, prices, and rents to satisfy their lusts for profit and power.

The Republican high command in this same week gave railroads immunity from the antitrust laws, another blow at the shippers and, hence, the consumers of this Nation. They tried to force through an inequitable tax law which would raise the income of the poor man 1 percent, but of the rich man 34 percent. President Truman courageously vetoed that bill—and his veto was sustained. They denied school lunches for the children of America. They denied veterans a chance for easy credit to buy farms. They cut the funds for electricity for the farmers of this Nation. They shut the doors to many GI's seeking training or loans by additional restrictions.

That is the Republican record. No health bill for the sick, no funds for teachers and students, not a dime for increasing old-age pensions. And at a time when two out of five families in America have savings of less than $40 and a weekly income of $40, we find that, as the New York Times reports this very morning, the profits of 228 corporations in the first 3 months of this year were 300 percent higher than their profits in the same 3 months of 1946—and 1946 was their most prosperous year in history. Can the American housewife buy three times more today than in 1946?

About one section of the labor bill Senator TAFT was strangely silent in his reply to the President. That section would deny the fundamental freedom of press and freedom of speech to the working people of this country, to their families and to all citizens. They could not use a penny of their common funds to publish the record of a Congressman. While the National Association of Manufacturers could freely advertise their views on legislation and political candidates, no union could spend a penny to defend their interests against their political oppressors.

While corporation executives can donate millions to the Republican Party, unions can not spend a dime for political contributions. While States and counties elect officers by a majority of those voting, unions can obtain union security only by a majority of all workers. While corporation executives can meet to agree on prices and maintain profits, union members in one plant cannot meet with union members in another to discuss or maintain standards of working condition. Employers are encouraged to hire strikebreakers—and usher in again an era of violence in labor relations.

It is a rank deception of the people if Senator TAFT or Senator IVES or any other supporter of this bill denies that it was intended to outlaw union security or make it almost impossible of accomplishment; to make it difficult, if not impossible, for labor leaders to speak for the union or for labor organizations effectively to represent the workers; to make it difficult, if not impossible, for workers to organize into a union and to retain their union, once they get it organized.

It is deception if anyone denies that under this bill it is difficult, if not impossible, for workers to work together in a whole region or in the whole Nation to maintain wage standards and living levels which are decent for the American family; it is deception if advocates of this bill deny that it is legally impossible for the working people of this country to have any real voice through their organizations in the free exercise of their rights as citizens to protect everything they hold dear.

No wonder the President has said that this bill is the most serious economic and social legislation of the past decade and that its effects, if enacted, will be felt for decades to come.

In this fight the Democratic Party is making its record.

I speak earnestly as a Democrat to those Democrats who are listening.

The President sent a stirring veto message to the Congress and appealed directly to the people by radio. Both were in the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He invited Democratic Senators for a private conference and impressed upon them the depth of his conviction against this bill and the meaning of this bill to the country and to the party.

While it is clear that a majority of the Democratic Senators will sustain the President's veto, yet the people know we have 44 Democratic votes in the United States Senate. That is more than the one-third needed, so that the people know that we Democratic Senators have it in our power to sustain our President's veto. If enough Democratic Senators do not sustain the veto, we shall be held accountable by the working people of this country and by those who see the un-American character of this bill.

The Republicans are making their record, too. This bill was thrust through the House of Representatives and through the Senate by the Republican high command. According to present prospects, at most only 5 out of 51 Republicans have indicated any possible support of the President's veto. If the Republican Party, by that overwhelming majority, combines with a minority of Democrats to thwart the President's veto and fasten this vicious legislation upon the backs of America's working men and women, there will be no escape for the Republicans from the wrath of those who have to bear the weight and sweat of a nation's toil.

President Truman has reminded the Congress and the country of what we fundamentally stand for in America, not only of our traditions but of our aspirations and our dreams. He has pointed to more democracy, not less; better living, not poorer, for American people—a stronger America in goods and in democratic faith to help a shattered and distraught world. We are shaping tomorrow in the Senate the kind of America—yes; the kind of world—we shall have for decades to come. Now, as to the minutemen upon the commons of Lexington and Concord, the moving stage of history has given to the people another glorious challenge to fight for their homes and for their freedom.

The Mississippi River Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief United Press dispatch appearing in the Washington Post for June 18, describing the major Mississippi River flood, now hitting a 150-mile stretch of the central Mississippi Valley. There it is pointed out that the Iowa State Department of Agriculture predicts that most of the bottom land in the southern half of the State will produce no corn this year, with an estimated loss of millions of dollars. This new flood, now cresting along the Mississippi, is prevented only by already weakened levees from sweeping across 400,000 acres of the Nation's richest farm land.

These startling facts prompt me to also insert in the RECORD two ably written editorials describing this continuing problem of damaging floods, and pointing out the necessity of once and for all preventing such devastation through the enactment of a unified river-basin resources development plan, as suggested in the Missouri Valley Authority bill S. 1156. One editorial, appearing in the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily for June 16, is entitled "At Expense of the Many." The other, printed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for June 11, is entitled "MVA Lesson of the Floods." I commend these thoughtfully written editorials to the Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 18, 1947]

MAJOR MISSISSIPPI RIVER FLOOD EXPECTED

KEOKUK, IOWA, June 17.—Heavy rains poured torrents of water down Iowa streams today and Army engineers warned that a major flood would hit a 150-mile stretch of the central Mississippi Valley within 24 hours.

Hundreds of farmers in lowland areas had fled taking with them furniture, chickens, and livestock. The number of homeless, which reached 20,000 in Iowa, Missouri, Illinois, and Nebraska a few days ago and then dropped off, was building up rapidly as floodwaters rose.

Great areas of farm land were under water from recent floods. Whole villages were flooded. And rising floodwaters were spreading over new areas.

CORN CROP BLASTED

The Iowa Department of Agriculture predicted that most of the flooded bottomland in the southern half of this tall-corn State would produce no corn—the Nation's basic crop—this year. Crop losses in Iowa alone the department said, will run into the millions of dollars.

Heavy rains in northern Iowa brought one flash flood and predictions of others. A flood hit Waverly, Iowa, on the Cedar River, and inundated the entire southern section of town (population 5,000).

Col. W. N. Leaf, of the Army engineers at Rock Island, Ill., said the danger area on the Mississippi extended from Wapello, Iowa, to Clarksville, Mo. Surrounding the area nearly 400,000 acres of the Nation's richest farm land, protected from the river only by levees already weakened by last week's floods.

The Sny Levee, south of Quincy, Ill., was endangered by the pounding Mississippi. The Red Cross at St. Louis said the levee might give way at any time. The agency was preparing evacuation of the 600 residents of Hull, Ill. If the levee breaks, the agency said, it will have to care for 1,500 to 3,000 persons in the area.

Above Keokuk, the Des Moines River had spilled over its banks for 12 miles between Alexandria, Mo., and St. Francisville, Mo. The water spilled toward Wayland, 8 miles from the river, where evacuees from Alexandria still were waiting for last week's floodwaters to recede from their homes.

[From the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily of June 16, 1947]

AT EXPENSE OF THE MANY

Through the efforts of the late George W. Norris, of Nebraska, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt the problem of flood control was solved in the Tennessee Valley. No longer does the Tennessee River run wild and add its former excess of water into the Mississippi when floods run rampant and cause so much misery and property damage throughout the Mississippi watershed.

We now know how to prevent these disastrous floods. Right here in York we are experiencing the benefits of flood control and escaping the damage which so frequently was our lot before the problem was tackled intelligently. Here, however—fortunately for us, no doubt—there was no power problem involved.

Mississippi and Missouri River floods can be prevented. There is no longer any doubt about that. And as a byproduct of such prevention cheap power can be produced which will prove of great benefit to the regions in which it will be available for use.

Why, then, have we failed to repeat the success of the Tennessee Valley project throughout the other parts of the Nation and done away with floods and the damage they cause?

There is seemingly only one reason. Private utility owners block more flood-control projects, because they fear for future profits. No cheap electricity for the people if they can help it. No real flood control, because a necessary incident would be the production of large amounts of electricity at small cost. What would so greatly help the people, the private power outfit consider against their personal interests and their influence is so great in Congress that the people suffer that they may have their pound of flesh.

We have spent billions of dollars in erecting levees to hold back flood waters on the Mississippi when the sensible thing to do was to prevent the waters from reaching the Mississippi by building storage dams in the upper parts of the tributaries as was done so effectively in the Tennessee Valley.

But flood control we cannot have generally because a very few of us must be permitted to continue to profit at the expense of the many.

Sometime, of course, unless we destroy ourselves in the meantime by one or the other of those instruments of mass destruction we have conjured up, there will be authorities like the Tennessee Valley Authority at many places throughout the Nation. Great damage from floods will have been done away with, electric power will be cheap and plentiful, and no one will have suffered. Not even the greedy private power crowd, for they will have been bought out at generous prices, as was done in the Tennessee Valley.

It is not that the private power crowd does not expect to be amply paid for their assets in case of the establishment of valley authorities, it is future big returns they object to being denied.

This present flood should be more than enough to bring about at least a Missouri Valley Authority. It will be if the people of the Mississippi watershed exercise anything like intelligent self-interest. Even a Congress so wedded to reaction as the present one would not dare ignore these people if they really set out to protect their interests.

The alternative is to order the Army Engineers to throw away a lot more money building levees and main river dams that cannot and will not prevent floods which are obviously uncontrollable once they reach the main rivers.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 11, 1947]

MVA LESSON OF THE FLOODS

The floods which are ravaging the upper Mississippi Valley and north central Missouri areas along the Missouri River are testimony to the bankruptcy of old ideas about river control.

For these old ideas, this year and every year's flood victims are indebted to pork-barrel-minded politicians in Congress and to the Army engineers. It is these same elements that are trying to patch up the old ideas and keep the pork barrel going by means of the fake MVA, the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee.

The levee system, which is failing in the present flood just as it fails in every flood, is a monument to the pork-barrel politicos and to the Army engineers, who have been their complacent beneficiary.

For the first 25 years of their flood-control work the engineers relied almost entirely on levees, built by State levee districts or private associations, sometimes with Army financial aid. As they proved inadequate, they were built higher and higher. In consequence, the narrowed channel silted, and floods became worse than when they had the deeper channel to run in.

The pork-barrel brigade in Congress, and the Army, continued going around in this vicious circle until 1927, when an unusually disastrous flood in the Mississippi made it apparent to everybody, themselves included, that something better than the levee system alone would have to be found.

The something better was first provided in the engineering works of the TVA on the Tennessee River system. TVA didn't wait to control floods after they had happened. It started before they occurred and worked to prevent them. It didn't use just one or two of the means of flood prevention; it used all of them in the book.

Some of them, like erosion control and forestation, were carried out for their own sakes, too, but always with the purpose of contributing to flood control. As much potential floodwater as possible was soaked into the land. Soil was kept from eroding into the streams and raising flood heights. Large reservoirs were built on the rivers tributary to the Tennessee, to catch and hold back potential floodwaters from the main stream.

The Army engineers, after the big failure of 1927, began thinking in terms of reservoirs, cut-offs, and spillways to keep the volume of water within the limits that could be dealt with by the levees. The Pick plan, which the Army devised for the Missouri Valley, makes use of reservoirs for flood control. So does the Reclamation Bureau's Sloan plan, which has been merged with the Pick plan.

But in their eagerness to imitate TVA and thereby avert—they hope—an MVA, the Army engineers have not been able to adopt the whole method. They are not authorized by Congress to go into erosion control and forestation for flood-control purposes, and, furthermore, their professional prejudices are against attaching very much importance to such activities, except, perhaps, as a political come-on. The Pick-Sloan plan contains ample blank spaces for other agencies to fill in with programs in these fields if they like.

The Interagency Committee includes the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service, through the Department of Agriculture, one of five committee members. But these activities are the stepchildren of the Pick-Sloan plan. The Army Engineers and the Reclamation Bureau are not bending every effort to make erosion control and forestation major parts of the program, as important as flood control and irrigation, and in fact parts of the same problem. They are not bending every effort to see that these essential parts of the program are adequately financed.

No; they are bending their efforts for their own parts of the program and their own appropriations. As long as partisans of fractional phases of the development are allowed to direct the whole development, that is the way it will be: incomplete and lopsided.

As the people of the upper Mississippi and Missouri Valleys see their farm lands, homes, and communities wracked again by floods that could be prevented, they can take hope if they have learned the lesson of these catastrophes. That lesson is that no more makeshifts are wanted, no more pork barrels, no more part-way measures.

No flood-control scheme is good enough unless it is complete. To be that good, it will have to be modeled on TVA—not in part merely, as the Army proposes, but in full. It will have to be administered by an agency big enough to use all the means in the book and to give them all their proper emphasis.

There is no such agency short of the proposed MVA.

St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Dream That May Come True," published in the Winnipeg Tribune of June 19, 1947. The editorial relates to the development of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DREAM THAT MAY COME TRUE

Arguments in favor of the joint United States-Dominion St. Lawrence seaway project are piling up and indications are that much of the opposition to it is being overcome. During his recent visit to Ottawa President Truman had a few significant words to say about it. Discussing cooperation between the United States and Canada he singled out the St. Lawrence route as one of the assets in common still to be developed to the maximum and declared the scheme to be economically sound and strategically important. In view of this it can be fairly assumed that the President intends to urge Congress to ratify the seaway agreement of 1941.

Less than a month ago George C. Marshall, United States Secretary of State, told a United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the seaway would aid immeasurably in United States-Canadian defense of the North American Continent. He held that completion of the project would make possible construction and repair of 80 percent of the world's oceangoing vessels on the Great Lakes and added that the route, for one-third of its length, would be safe from submarines.

It is only reasonable to believe that the advocacy by President Truman and Secretary Marshall will stimulate proponents of the scheme to greater activity in trying to bring about ratification of the agreement. So far as Canada is concerned, the lakes-to-sea route would have been completed years ago had Washington given consent. The Welland Canal was built, the Toronto Harbor deepened, and other links in the chain provided on Canadian waters in full expectation that the over-all project would some day be carried out.

While arguments are still being waged about the navigation benefits of the scheme, it is generally agreed that the deepening of the waterway to permit oceangoing ships to come up to Port Arthur and Fort William would lop off some of the costs of carrying grain overseas by the reduction of transfer and storage charges.

Apart from the navigation feature, however, there would be developed large blocks of hydro power that could not fail to benefit Ontario, Quebec and eastern United States industries. The chief disagreement now seems to be regarding the cost of the undertaking. In 1941 it was estimated at around $500,000,000. It is realized that with present labor costs and the high price of materials this figure is altogether too low. Many engineers now say the cost would be in the neighborhood of $1,000,000,000.

Opposition from United States ocean port authorities, railways and others has heretofore been strong enough to block action by Washington. Recently the New York Times said that most of their arguments had been answered repeatedly. It branded as untrue the statement that St. Lawrence waterpower would be dearer than power produced from coal; on the contrary it would be cheaper by perhaps 50 percent.

The latest proposal made in the United States that in order to meet costs of the navigation end of the project tolls should be collected from ships using the seaway has been agreed to "in principle" by Canada. This announcement was made by Hon. Louis St. Laurent, Minister of External Affairs, in Parliament last April.

Stressing of the "strategic importance" of the scheme by President Truman and its advocacy by Secretary Marshall as an aid to North American defense may do more to sway Congress than any economic arguments. All indications seem to point to the 50-year dream becoming an actuality comparatively soon.

Address of Hon. Benjamin V. Cohen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Benjamin V. Cohen, counselor of the Department of State, speaking before the national convention of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce on June 12, made an eloquent appeal that the United States must not flinch before the tasks of peace, just as we were not daunted by the heavy tasks of war.

The urgency of his words makes them worthy of the study and thought of every Member who believes in peace through the United Nations. I am proud to commend them to your attention:

We are now engaged in a struggle for peace. But we are only beginning to appreciate the efforts and sacrifices that will be required. Peace in a free world requires more than good intentions. Peace no less than war requires courageous action.

We alone did not win the war. But the war could not have been won if we had not organized ourselves and our resources to win it—if we had not used our brains, our talents, our skills, our treasure, and all our strength to win it.

We alone cannot win the peace. But if we are going to do our part to win it, we must devote ourselves to the organization of peace as fully as we devoted ourselves to winning the war. Winning the peace may be in many ways more difficult than winning the war. But it is the task of our generation to win it.

We cannot afford defeatism about the peace any more than we could afford defeatism about the war. It took the Allies nearly 6 years to win the war after it had started in Europe in 1939. During the first 3 years it looked very much as if our side was losing. It took us in the United States a long time to realize how real was the danger that our side might lose the war, and how great our efforts would have to be if our enemies were to be defeated.

We are now only beginning to realize how difficult is the task of organizing peace under law and how great and continuing our efforts must be to achieve it. That is no reason for us to despair of success and to abandon our efforts. That is the reason for us to quicken and redouble our efforts.

In his last message on the State of the Union, President Roosevelt warned us:

"Perfectionism, no less than isolationism or imperialism or power politics, may obstruct the paths to international peace. Let us not forget that the retreat to isolationism a quarter of a century ago was started not by a direct attack against international cooperation but against the alleged imperfections of the peace.

"In our disillusionment after the last war we preferred international anarchy to international cooperation with nations which did not see and think exactly as we did. We gave up the hope of gradually achieving a better peace because we had not the courage to fulfill our responsibilities in an admittedly imperfect world.

"We must not let that happen again, or we shall follow the same tragic road again—the road to a third world war.

"We can fulfill our responsibilities for maintaining the security of our own country only by exercising our power and our influence to achieve the principles in which we believe and for which we have fought."

We cannot fulfill those responsibilities by withdrawing from the world in protest. Nor can we fulfill those responsibilities by yielding up our own freedom or expecting other people to yield up their freedom for our peace. Peace without freedom is not peace, but tyranny.

How then can we most effectively exercise our power and influence to fulfill our responsibilities to ourselves and to the world and strengthen the cause of peace in this imperfect world?

There are no simple, easy answers to this question. I will only suggest two avenues of approach which should be helpful.

In the first place, we can and must make it clear that we ourselves intend to live by the Charter of the United Nations and that we will exercise all our power and influence to see that other nations, large and small, live by the Charter.

In the second place, we can and must exert ourselves to help those countries whose economies have been shattered by the war to become again economically self-supporting. For only if the war-wrecked countries of the world are restored to health will their peo-

ple feel that they have a stake in a peaceful world of law that is worth defending.

The Charter of the United Nations expresses the common hope of the peoples of this world for enduring peace based on law, because the Charter is cherished by the peoples of the world, it cannot be completely ignored by any government that may find itself in power in any country. That is an impelling reason why we must hold to the Charter, defend it, live by it, and build upon it.

The principles of the Charter are not, however, self-enforcing. There is no self-operating mechanism which can be devised to give the world peace under law. There is no voting machine which can reflect with unerring accuracy world opinion or which can yield an incontestably right answer to every perplexing world problem.

The Charter of the United Nations, like the Constitution of the United States, was constructed, as it had to be constructed, on the basis of compromise. Its future depends not upon its lettered provisions, but upon the moral and material support which the nations of the world give to it and the extent to which they live by it.

President Truman has pledged that the United States will support the United Nations with all the resources we possess. If we keep that pledge and if other law-abiding nations likewise support the United Nations, the Charter will live and grow.

As our Constitution provides the basic law of our land, so the Charter of the United Nations provides the basic law of nations. The law the Charter provides may be incomplete, but it does strike without equivocation at the use of force in any manner contrary to its purposes.

Unfortunately much of the discussion of the unanimity rule and the veto has blurred and obscured this basic and all-important fact.

Under the Charter, all members of the United Nations, large states as well as small states, pledge themselves to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Charter.

Under the Charter, all members of the United Nations, large states as well as small states, pledge themselves to settle their international disputes by peaceful means, in such manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered.

As our representative to the United Nations, Senator AUSTIN, has said, "These sweeping and binding commitments are not limited by the power of veto in the Security Council. The veto does not legalize any violations of these commitments. They are the law." As President Truman has said, "Every member of the United Nations is legally and morally bound by the Charter to keep the peace."

The General Assembly has also affirmed the principles of international law recognized by the statute of the Nuremberg tribunal and the judgment of that tribunal which make the planning or waging of a war of aggression a crime against humanity for which individuals as well as nations are responsible.

It is true that unless the permanent members of the Security Council are agreed that there has been a violation of the Charter no state is bound to act simply because a certain number of states believe that there has been a violation. But in case of clear aggression no state has the moral right to stand mute. In case of clear aggression, all law-abiding states have the right to and are under a moral duty to defend the Charter.

Magna Carta had no elaborate machinery to ensure its enforcement. The Constitution of the United States had no clauses dealing with what should happen in the event that States attempted to secede. The principles of the Magna Carta survived and the Constitution survived, because the people were determined that they should live. We must make it clear that we are determined that the law of the United Nations shall prevail and that we are prepared to use our power and our resources, veto or no veto, to defend the basic law of the Charter.

I think it is clear that respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter includes respect for present power relationships. As former Secretary of State Byrnes has said:

"The present power relationships of the great states preclude the domination of the world by any one of them. Those power relationships cannot be substantially altered by the unilateral action of any one great state without profoundly disturbing the whole structure of the United Nations.

"The great states are given special responsibility under the Charter because they have the military strength to maintain peace if they have the will to maintain peace. Their strength in relation to one another is such that no one of them can safely break the peace if the others stand united in defense of the Charter."

If we want peace in the world, and we cannot have peace in the world without some law in the world, we must realize and make others realize that delicate and sensitive power relationships cannot be undermined by unilateral action through force, coercion, or more subtle forms of pressure and penetration.

That does not mean that we oppose, and that the Charter of the United Nations forbids, all change in the external relations of states.

We believe in progress and in freedom. We are not defenders of privilege or of the dead hand of reaction.

The Charter of the United Nations permits and encourages free and friendly negotiations between states and provides means, particularly in article 14, for the concrete expression of world opinion on the need for peaceful change.

There will be need for peaceful change. The world does not stand still. But no nation or group of nations has the right to impose by force or threat of force its political or economic system or way of life upon other nations. No state has a right to wage a war of nerves against another state or seek through devious devices of infiltration and penetration to control or undermine its government and to destroy the freedom and dignity and basic rights of its people.

War inevitably brings changes in power relationships among the great states. Doubt and uncertainty as to the consequences of these changes generally creates uneasiness and fear among the victors as well as the vanquished. That is why it is vitally important that there should be no further unilateral action to disturb established power relations by force or coercion.

Uneasiness and fear in the world can only be increased if the world is divided among a few great states, each dominating satellite states. A contest for satellites is not a struggle for peace. It is a struggle for power. And it can only lead toward war. We do not want to force the smaller states, or the less powerful of the great states, to choose their guardian state or to have their guardian states chosen for them. Friendship among states like friendship among individuals should not exclude friendships with others. We want to live in a world where power is diffused and freedom under the law of nations is the right of every state.

The aim of the policy of the United States is not to engage in a struggle for power over other States and other peoples, but to help States and peoples to regain and rebuild their political independence and economic health. It is for that purpose, and not for the purpose of bringing them within the orbit of our power, that we are extending help to Greece and Turkey. We could not leave them economically weak and defenseless against a continuing war of nerves. Had we not placed ourselves in the postion to continue and supplement the assistance that the British Government had been furnishing these countries, there was grave danger that the war of nerves being conducted against these countries would have been intensified in the false belief that we would not act in defense of the rights of these countries under the Charter of the United Nations.

We are engaged, not in a struggle for power, but a struggle for the supremacy of law. We must not slacken in our efforts to maintain the law of the Charter. For only under law can peace endure.

While we must remain strong and ready to defend the law of the Charter, we must not ourselves fall victim to the belief in the inevitability of conflict. There is and has been room in this world for different ways of life. War is inevitably only if people fail to tolerate and respect ways of life that they cannot share.

None of us is wise enough to predict the future, but we should be slow to judge the future by the conditions that now prevail in this terribly sick world. In the immediate aftermath of war there is a tendency to think too much in terms of military power and too little in terms of economic need.

That brings me to my second point. It is not enough for us to take our stand for law and peace. We must do our part to make the peoples whose social and economic life has been shattered by the war, feel that they too have a worth-while stake in law and peace.

Peace is not merely a truce between wars. If we want peace, we must deal with the causes of unrest in the world and not merely their symptoms. It is economic distress, hunger, sickness, and hopelessness that breed political unrest and make men the prey of warring ideologies and rival tyrannies. People want freedom and law, but they must have food, shelter, and clothes. We have often said glibly that the last war was the most devastating war in all history. But we are only beginning to realize how completely it has shattered the economies of Europe and how difficult it has made the resumption of normal living.

Europe is not the only part of the world that is in need, but time compels me to confine my remarks to Europe whose economic recovery is vitally important to the economic health, peace, and security of the whole world.

If we want a free Europe—and it is hard to see how we can have a peaceful world without a free Europe—we must urgently consider what can be done to put Europe back on her feet economically, what can be done to help Europe to become again self-supporting.

We must, I think, face the fact our programs for economic aid to Europe, large as they have been, are going to be clearly insufficient to enable Europe to get back on her feet.

Our previous programs underestimated the ravages done to the European economy, the time which would be taken to restore its effective functioning, the substantial rise in the costs of American exports and other factors.

In 1946 we exported to the rest of the world about $15,000,000,000 of goods and services. This is more than twice as great in value as the goods and services we are importing from the rest of the world. In 1946, $6,000,000,000 of these exports were financed directly or indirectly by loans and grants-in-aid by the United States Government. Existing authorizations cannot possibly enable the flow of needed exports to continue at the extraordinary rate of the first quarter of this year, a level of more than $19,000,000,000 a year. Some leveling-off of this extraordinary rate of exports is inevitable. But

unless substantial additional financing is forthcoming the decline could assume proportions which would aggravate misery abroad and increase the possibility of recession at home.

Those who have been studying Europe's rudimentary rehabilitation needs tell us that Europe, including Great Britain, may require as much as five or six billion dollars a year for another 3 or 4 years to meet those needs.

Unless Europe can secure adequate assistance, it may be difficult for some European countries to avoid political unrest and political instability and the danger of dictatorships. People long tired, cold, hungry, and impoverished are not wont to examine critically the credentials of those promising them food, shelter, and clothes. And dictators, knowing that they intend to hold power if they can get it, will play the right side or the left side, and sometimes both sides, to get and keep power.

Our interest is in a free Europe. The way to keep Europe free is to restore the war's shattered foundations of the closely interrelated and interdependent European economies and to give the European peoples renewed confidence in themselves, hope in their future, and a genuine stake in peace and law.

At the close of the war many of the liberated countries of Europe were not concerned with the revival of the German economy. And while the liberated countries do not now want German economic revival to have priority over their own revival, they have come to learn that the extremely low level of productivity of the German economy is hampering and not helping the revival of Europe. Europe needs German products and German markets. In fact, coal from the Ruhr is one of the keys to European recovery.

As the liberated countries are learning that they have an interest in the peaceful economic revival of Germany, so we must learn that we have a definite economic as well as political interest in the economic revival of Europe as a whole. Europe's economic recovery is as important to the economic health of a peaceful world as Germany's economic recovery is to the economic health of Europe.

To cut Europe adrift and to compel her in her misery to shift for herself during the next few years would be a body blow to security, political stability, and economic progress the world over. The loss of European markets would not only cause serious and painful readjustments in our own country but would have repercussions all over the world.

Economic help to revive war-shattered Europe will be costly. But the withholding of economic help would also be costly—not only in economic consequences but in social and political consequences.

The more important problem in many ways is not whether Europe should be helped but how Europe should be helped. After the First World War we thought we were pursuing a policy of fairly prompt retrenchment on European aid and the gradual retirement of the war debts. It turned out, however, that we aided Europe substantially and not altogether wisely.

The problem of Europe's rehabilitation is much more serious now and we should try to think it through more clearly. After the First World War we were more concerned with questions of money repayment and money interest than we were with the question of the effectiveness of our aid in producing sound and healthy economic conditions throughout the world.

If we are to assist in intelligent programs of economic aid for Europe, our first and primary objective should be to assist programs that will rebuild a self-supporting European economy. Until the European economy does become self-supporting it is difficult to see how Europe can make substantial payment of capital or interest except as she borrows from or puts off payment to Peter in order to pay to Paul. And we must not forget that unless we wish to subsidize heavily our future foreign trade, we can over the long term be repaid only in goods and services which we are willing to accept and in investments which we are willing to hold in foreign countries. If we wish to preserve over the long term our economic position in the world, we must build up and replenish the resources base upon which the continuance of our productivity and prosperity depends.

Inasmuch as the economies of the individual European states are closely interrelated, priority in economic aid should be given to programs which will serve to revive the European economy as a whole. Particular consideration should be given to projects which will serve to remove economic bottlenecks which obstruct the efforts of European states to increase their trade and production. For example, whatever we can do to help increase coal production and facilitate its transport would have a stimulating effect upon the economy of nearly every European country.

Even with our large food exports to Europe there is an acute shortage of food through Europe. A project to increase overall European food production by the supply of fertilizer, seed, and farm machinery could have its effects throughout Europe.

Trade between European countries has been hampered and has become largely a matter of barter because they have no confidence in one another's currency. Possibly a project could be devised to finance trade between European countries which would have a stimulating effect upon trade and production throughout Europe.

We should consider our help to Europe and other countries not merely in terms of dollars but in terms of production and goods for which the dollars are to be used. We must not permit our economy to be inflated or distorted to the point that our own economic health is impaired. We cannot hope to be able effectively to help create economic stability in a free world unless we can keep our own economic house in order. Our productivity and resourcefulness, which won the war, will be equally necessary to win the peace.

The task of helping to rebuild a war-wrecked world is a heavy task. But it is a challenging task. We were not daunted by the heavy tasks of war. If we want peace, we must not flinch before the tasks of peace. If we want a free, peaceful, law-abiding world, we must see that the peoples of this world have a stake in the peace and have the vitality, strength, and will to maintain peace and freedom under law.

Citations by B'nai B'rith to Secretary of State George C. Marshall, Associate Justice Robert H. Jackson, and Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, that great national patriotic organization, B'nai B'rith, which has made such outstanding contributions to our country in war and peace, held its triennial convention May 11–14 in Washington, D. C. The theme of that inspirational convention was freedom and democracy. Citations were awarded to three great Americans for their contribution to humanitarianism and justice, Secretary of State George C. Marshall, Associate Justice Robert H. Jackson, and Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the responses of Secretary Marshall, Associate Justice Jackson, and Secretary Patterson to the award of citations, as well as the address of the Attorney General, Tom C. Clark.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESPONSE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL. Mr. Goldman, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am naturally greatly honored by this award, by this distinction, and by the generous expressions with which it was presented to me. I shall naturally treasure it.

During the war years I had some contact with your organization and was familiar with your work, in particular in hospitals and with the transports with which you lent great assistance. More recently, in my present position, I became involved in the effort to salvage the tragedy of Europe, and I became more imminently aware of the tragic situation of so many of your people in Germany and in Austria.

I have met and listened to many of your leaders here in the United States, in Berlin, and even in Moscow. I can but assure you of my profound sympathy for that tragic situation in Europe, and I can assure you of both my deep personal and my deep official interest in reaching a prompt solution.

Thank you very much for this honor. [Whereupon the assembly arose and applauded unanimously.]

RESPONSE BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE JACKSON

Hon. ROBERT H. JACKSON (Associate Justice, U. S. Supreme Court). Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chairman, I am of course deeply touched at the tribute and the award. It is quite natural that the Jewish organizations and the Jewish people should have taken a great interest in what was done at Nuremberg. The Jewish people stood a good deal of the pain of the Nazi regime, but it was non-Jewish people who must bear the shame of the Nazi regime, and it was the non-Jewish people who needed to square themselves with civilization for the wrongs which had been inflicted, among others, predominantly upon the Jewish people.

I find great difficulty in talking about it, because one is either inadequate or sensational. We have become so numb in this country, so accustomed to these recitals, that we cannot grasp the enormity of the program of crime that was carried out in Europe. We believe it could only occur in some dark age; indeed it has only occurred in a dark age, because when the story is written, ours is one of the darkest ages of all history. Never has the world seen a program of enslavement that reached so many people; never has it seen a program of extermination, that exterminated so many people. Of all the history of the world, ours in that respect is the darkest age of all times, and it is not a pleasant thought.

When I face an audience like this, I cannot help but think of the comparison: more people than are in this room were exterminated at single gasps in the gas chambers in the Nazi concentration camp at Oswitz—More than 2,000 at a time. Look about you and see how many souls that really is, and you can see how impossible it is for us to grasp the program. More than 4,000,000 people—more than a city like Cleveland, almost of the city of New York, wiped out by

this process, and we in this country find it in our hearts sometimes to complain about the absence of steak or the amount of taxes or some other detail. I confess I have little patience with it.

The trials at Nuremberg represented some effort to square this era with history; to write into the record something that would make clear that the history that records these atrocities must also record that the mass of mankind did not approve of them. We have tried to set up principles by which the second half of this century may redeem its first half, by opening up a better way—but it is a long way to go.

I deeply appreciate the interest that you have taken in this effort, and the expression of appreciation which you have voiced.

Let us hope that the four nations which united in condemning aggressive warfare will unite in carrying through the principles they declared. Let us hope that the rights of minorities which we sought to protect, the right to live, the right to follow their own creed, the right to have their own thoughts and express their own views, that those rights may win broader protection. Those are the things that Nuremberg tried to write into the record to offset as far as possible the record which darkens our time.

[Whereupon the assembly arose and applauded unanimously.]

RESPONSE BY THE SECRETARY OF WAR

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON (Secretary of War). Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, and friends of B'nai B'rith. I am profoundly moved by the distinguished honor you have given me tonight. To have received it from an order of the traditions of service and the ideals of service that B'nai B'rith stands for is, indeed, a great source of satisfaction to me.

I like to think of it, however, as a tribute by you to the men and women of the United States Army. [Applause.] Having fought a war on the tremendous scale of World War II, and having with our allies forced the surrender of the German Nazis, the United States Army in Europe found 6,000,000 enslaved persons, dragged from their places of origin, to work for the so-called master race in Germany. They aided, succored, and sent back the greater part of those persons, but they took care of 600,000 remaining and they have extended that succor, aid, and assistance to them now for 2 years, giving them the necessaries of life, and enabling them at least to live a decent existence.

Of course, that is only a stopgap. It is a program of improvisation. The real solution must come in resettlement, with hope for those people in another land. [Applause.]

I go along wholeheartedly with what Mr. Harrison has said. [Vigorous applause.] The International Refugee Organization is a step in the right direction, but it is by no means the whole distance. It is for the United States of America to show its faith by its own program; to take its share of displaced persons to our own shores. It is a blunder and a mistake and a fallacy to believe that those people will be a burden on us. They will not be. Their mere survival through the years of misery, degradation, and hardship, their mere survival proves their stamina. They will bring talents, skills, and energies that will be an asset to this Nation, and that will make them paying passengers, not deadheads. [Applause.]

Until that day comes the Army will do its assigned duty, and so, as I said in the first place, I prefer to think of it as a tribute from you to the men and women of the United States Army. [The assembly arose and applauded and cheered.]

ADDRESS OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Hon. TOM C. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chief Justice, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, members of the Cabinet, and friends of B'nai B'rith, it is an honor and a privilege to gather with you here tonight to honor the memory of our friend, Henry Monsky, and to recognize the accomplishments of three patriotic, courageous, God-fearing Americans, Marshall, Jackson, and Patterson [applause and cheering]—three names that shall long be close to the heart of every American. But tonight on behalf of peoples all over this earth who believe in a living, dynamic democracy, I wish to say to Secretary of State Marshall, and to Associate Justice Jackson, and to Secretary of War Patterson: God bless you and keep you.

My friends, it is in a mood of sadness, coupled with deep respect, that I come here tonight to greet the triennial convention of the supreme lodge of B'nai B'rith. I, too, miss Henry Monsky. I miss his smile, his warm handclasp, his kindly, brotherly greeting. Tonight his heart would be filled with deep satisfaction at this distinguished gathering that honors him.

Henry Monsky's untimely passing is not only a great loss to his people, but also to the entire Nation. It is a personal loss to me, for I knew him well, worked with him often, and loved and admired him for that work. His accomplishments for humanity were many. He recognized no racial barriers. He loved mankind. Tonight I think of him as being here with us, for in the words of James Whitcomb Riley, "I cannot say and I will not say that he is dead—no; he is just away."

He leaves behind him in the flesh the oldest and the largest Jewish organization in the entire world's history.

Nobody knows what freedom is so well as those who do not have it. No Americans are better equipped to cherish and guard their heritage than those who have once known what it is to endure oppression, to live in the shadow of persecution and under the handicap of unequal opportunity.

American Jewry is versed in the meaning of these injustices, these inhumanities to man. You, the Jews of America, are members of a free society, citizens of a democratic country. But your forebears lived in the house of bondage.

Yes, you know, you understand well. And that is why your forebears, 104 years ago, founded the B'nai B'rith. They founded it "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights." Those fundamental precepts of democracy live today incorporated into the Charter of the United Nations.

Yes, like Henry Monsky, Henry Jones, and his 11 associates back on October 13, 1843, when they founded your order, built it on a solid foundation of faith and service, and as their adopted country, America, expanded to the limits of its geographical frontiers, so has your organization extended its services until you delegates here tonight represent more than 300,000 men, women, and young people throughout this earth.

I need not recount to you its active leaders and workers, the superb record of your order as a cross-section of Americans of Jewish faith in every patriotic national endeavor since your inception. You are familiar, too, with the organization's participation in every field of activity in the recent war. That record, to which President Truman, the War and Navy Departments, the American Red Cross, and other Government and civilian agencies have paid merited tribute, needs no embellishment from me. It is written in the pages of history, as are the names of the more than 500 members of your organization who gave their lives in World War II for our peace and our security.

Under our democratic form of government we have grown from 13 colonies, with their sparse population scattered along the Atlantic seaboard, into the world's greatest nation. We owe this to no one faith, to no one color, to no one race. The quest for freedom, for the inalienable right to enjoy the civil and human rights of man, has brought immigrants of every creed from every part of the globe to these shores of ours. They and their children were the pioneers who forged our Nation; they and their children are the citizens who brought us safely through two world conflicts in our own generation. Every faith has played an important part in our history. There is not a single one which has not made a vital contribution to the building of America. It is gratifying to you, I am sure, to know that none exceeded the people of your own faith, and that none has striven more diligently for the principles of unity and humanity without which there would have been no United States of America.

The history of the Jewish people in America goes back to our very founding.

One of the most important figures of the War of Independence was Haym Salomon, who came to New York from Poland in 1772. Who will forget Haym Salomon? Some historians estimate that Salomon poured a tremendous sum into the Revolution, and he died impoverished in 1785 at the early age of 45. His reward, like many, delayed over 150 years, came on December 15, 1941, with the unveiling of a monument in Chicago as a joint memorial to George Washington, Robert Morris, and Haym Salomon, the funds having been contributed by Americans of all religions and of all ancestries.

In every period of our history, whether in peace or war, prosperity or adversity, members of your faith have played a leading part. When our future as a united people hung by a thread in Civil War days, they served with distinction on both sides of the Mason and Dixon line. One of the greatest men on the side of the South was Judah P. Benjamin—United States Senator—while on the North was Mayer Lehman. It was he who arranged for the shipment of food to the suffering through the blockade of the South.

It is hardly necessary to recall the familiar names of those who, since the turn of the twentieth century, have labored so unceasingly and so well in the cause of Americanism and the brotherhood of man.

It is no secret that for 20 years or more we have been the target of an adroit, a subtle, but a wholly vicious campaign designed to lull us into a false sense of our own security—to blind us to the dangers from totalitarian forces bent upon conquest of the world and subjugation of all its peoples.

It was Goebbels who said, "No other country has so many social and racial tensions as America. We shall be able to play on many strings there." We fooled Goebbels and we fooled all of his kind.

The military threat from without we met squarely and turned back. But, it is true internal dangers of this nature are still with us; it seems they never cease.

One fact cannot be hurdled by any clear-thinking American today: For a strong Nation, a safe Nation, loyalty to our Government is of the very essence. When asked the question, How many subversives can the United States Government afford to harbor? our prompt answer is, Not a single one. It is my purpose to make this a living reality.

This can—and it will—be done. We shall eliminate the abuses of freedom, but in so doing we shall not destroy freedom itself. There will be no whitewash. There will be no witch hunts. There will be an America safe from the fifth column and equally safe from the gestapo. That is the only kind of America that true Americans want.

No law is better or worse than the personnel administering it. And because we are men and women and not robots or stones, we rightly try to humanize our law rather than legalize the human soul.

And so all of the argument, legal or otherwise, in the world cannot prevail against ideals. It was an ideal, the flaming zeal to

make democracy a living fact, which carried our ancestors safely through the trying times of the War for Independence. But there is another type, the insidious infiltration of propaganda by the Communist Party, by bigoted Fascist-minded groups like the Ku Klux Klan and the Columbians, and by other nefarious organizations which would destroy our unity and with it our way of life. I am very proud of your organization; it is in the forefront fighting against that type of thing, as so forcefully stated in a recent issue of the National Jewish Monthly:

"We are opposed to communism in the United States. We are opposed to it because it would substitute for our present social freedoms the dictatorship that would mean the end of free speech, free press, free religious assemblage. There is nothing wrong with democracy that more democracy won't cure."

Oh, how true—let me repeat, "There is nothing wrong with democracy that more democracy won't cure."

America today is proof positive that democracy works. It works for peoples of different races, religions, and natonality backgrounds. Here all classes live together in harmony under the laws of God and the government of their fellow man. In this connection, I voice the hope that President Truman's plea for us to accept a fair share of those homeless victims of world cataclysm be promptly heeded. As the descendants of immigrants we cannot now lock the doors of our beloved land to a fair share of those worthy souls that now ask legal entry.

Our country today is the only hope of the world. For democracy to live and work, its peoples must have hope. They must have that same hope that fired the enthusiasm of our ancestors, the hope of peace, the hope of a tomorrow, that hope that kindles, thrusts out fear and destroys want.

The recent plea of President Truman for aid to stricken countries has done much to rekindle that hope throughout the world. By admitting our fair share of immigrants who have a background not inimicable to our ideals, we strengthen the hope of democracy throughout the world.

All of us—hand in hand—will march on—side by side, contributing each in his own way, not only to the advancement of our own country but to the advancement of the world. In so doing we have the hope of eliminating want and fear and bringing about a permanent peace among all peoples everywhere on the face of the earth—for God intended it so to be.

It Did Happen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a column by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and other papers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT DID HAPPEN

[By Thomas L. Stokes]

It can happen here. In our own Capital, seat of a proud democracy and of the most powerful nation today.

Freedom of speech and assembly challenged. The right to testify in one's own behalf denied. The right of petition denied. Espionage on American citizens gathered at a public meeting. And all at the command of responsible Members of our Congress.

All this did happen in a chain of events preliminary to the public appearance here of Henry A. Wallace—a chain of events rather frightening because it showed how insidious the fever of persecution can become—how minds fired by emotion and prejudice and fear can rationalize one step after another.

It all started a few days ago when Representative PARNELL THOMAS, Republican, New Jersey, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, announced the committee would have "spotters" at the open-air, public meeting that Henry Wallace would address here.

This preliminary maneuver became clear when the committee subsequently issued a report for publication the day before the meeting charging that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which sponsored the Wallace meeting, was a Communist-front organization. This obviously was designed to warn Government employees. Under President Truman's recent Executive order, Government employees who are members of such organizations, or even sympathetic with them, can be fired.

This paved the way for another move, which was the attempt of the American Anti-Communist Association, headed by a Member of Congress, Representative O'KONSKI, Republican, Wisconsin, to get an injunction to prevent the meeting. It failed.

But that was not all that happened in the House. Representative HOLIFIELD, Democrat, California, read a telegram from Clark Foreman, a native of Atlanta Ga., president of the Southern Conference. Mr. Foreman attacked the Un-American Activities Committee as being itself "un-American," said its report contained "lies and half-truths," and protested that the conference had been given no opportunity to testify on its own behalf.

This criticism of the committee was too much for Representative RANKIN. He moved to expunge the telegram from the RECORD. Only seven members stood up to vote against his motion, all on the Democratic side, with 146 for it.

It was left to a woman, Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS (Democrat, California), one of the seven, to rise and voice a protest. She said she would be present at the Wallace meeting. She reminded the House that "the American way is to listen, to read, and to try to think for yourself."

"God help America," she concluded fervently, "if ever freedom of speech and freedom of assembly are threatened."

In an abject and unexplainable fear of communism, which is not complimentary to our strength as a Nation, some people would strangle the only force which can combat it, which is a strong democracy, and strangle it in all its manifestations, spiritual and material.

Somebody's got things all mixed up here.

New Labor Act

REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the Taft-Hartley law protects the fundamental rights of labor. It is directed toward safeguarding the public interest in connection with labor disputes, setting forth more explicitly the rights, duties, and responsibilities of both workers and employers and eliminating certain abuses that have crept into the labor movement. It preserves every basic right of labor. It guarantees labor's right to join a union, the right to organize and the right to strike. It guarantees the rank and file of labor the right to take a greater part in their problems. The secret ballot preserves for them the right to decide for themselves secretly without coercion by radical labor leaders or management. It guarantees labor the right to bargain with management on a local, region, or industry-wide basis. It guarantees them the voluntary check-off and the right to bargain collectively on wages, hours, safety measures, and better working conditions.

Do you think we need labor legislation? I do. Let us take a look at the record.

First. How would you like to return from the Navy and start in the wholesale produce business and have a union prevent you from using your own truck with union labor because they wanted the teamsters' union to do the hauling?

Second. How would you like to own a dairy with 150 cows and have your milk declared "hot milk" and dumped in Main Street because your 5 men who milked the cows would not join the union?

Third. How would you like to pay a stand-by band a high price in order for a high-school band to be permitted to play on the radio?

Fourth. How would you like to be a union stone fabricator in Indiana and be deprived of work because the building trades in New York or Chicago refused to use stone fabricated by union men in Indiana?

Fifth. How would you like to be forced to hire an orchestra of 15 members when 12 members were sufficient to do the job?

Sixth. How would you like it if you were in a business for 50 years and the union gave you 15 minutes to get off the streets because your office girl would not join the teamsters' union?

Seventh. Do you think labor leaders should draw their salaries while their union is out on strike?

Eighth. If the right to strike and collective bargaining mean anything, do you not think unions should abide by their contracts?

Ninth. Would you like to ask a union's permission to enter your business at certain hours of the day or night?

Tenth. How would you like the building of your home delayed for weeks because of jurisdictional strikes?

The law is far better than either the country or labor unions have had any reason to expect. It will not destroy labor unions. The present National Labor Relations Board may have trouble in administering the law. However, many difficulties can be avoided by decent and common-sense administration. A committee of 14 Members of Congress will be selected to watch over the new law so that Congress will be in position

to act intelligently on any needed revisions.

The radical labor leaders are crying the loudest. Well let us take a look at the new law and see what they are crying about.

The toughest section of the law is the mandatory injunction against secondary boycotts. Now let me give you an example of a secondary boycott. The building trades in New York will not put up a building in New York made of Indiana limestone if the stone is not fabricated in New York. However, if this building stone had been fabricated in Indiana by union labor the building costs would have been reduced about $100,000. The CIO refused to install electrical goods made by the AFL and vice versa. Now can you see any reason why Congress should not put a stop to this nonsense?

Another section of the law to which these labor leaders object is the penalty for jurisdictional strikes. These strikes grow out of disputes between two or more representatives of employees. These strikes should be outlawed because innocent employers should not be penalized because unions force a strike to settle difficulties between unions. The mill or factory should continue operating during jurisdictional strikes. Under the new law unions are given 10 days to settle these disputes. The penalties for these strikes are: First, discretionary injunction by the regional office of the Board; second, suit for damages; third, workers discharged for this cause are not entitled to reinstatement. All of the labor leaders I have contacted admit that jurisdictional strikes are wrong.

We have received many complaints from radical labor leaders on the section dealing with subversive union officers. Under this section unions are denied the protection of the act unless officers have filed affidavits that they are not Communists or subversive individuals. Officers can be fined if they falsify their affidavit. All Federal employees are required to file the same affidavit. So, I see no reason why labor leaders should object to such a plan.

The chief reason why Congress outlawed the closed shop was that it prevented many workers from obtaining a job. On many occasions many skilled men were barred from closed-shop unions. Closed-shop unions and other labor organizations may organize union shops if more than 50 percent of them vote for it and their employer agrees to it. Workers are allowed to strike for a union shop.

Peaceful picketing is allowed but no picket or group of pickets is allowed to stop workers going to and from their place of work. The penalties are: First, cease and desist order by Board; second, discretionary injunction by Board; third, workers discharged for stopping workers are not entitled to reinstatement.

Strikes which imperil national health and safety—if the President finds a strike affects the public health and safety he can have the Attorney General issue a temporary injunction which will extend over a period of 60 days for mediation and 15 days for the rank and file of labor to vote on the employer's last offer. Another 5 days is allowed to report the results back to the President and Congress. The time limit on the injunction is 80 days. This plan is like the one used in the Railway Labor Act.

The act's provisions relating to welfare funds, which are paid for by the employer exclusively or by the employer and employees jointly, is to be managed under written rules and under joint administration. This is a prolabor measure. The rank and file of labor should welcome protection of their funds which provide for sickness and death benefits.

This act will outlaw strikes against the Government. Federal employees who strike are barred from Government service for 3 years.

This act will guarantee free speech to employers in their dealings with workers, provided their statements about unions are not coercive nor threatening.

This act permits supervisors to join unions but they receive no protection from the act.

Vote on the employer's last offer—if the Mediation and Conciliation Division of the Government is called in on a dispute, the Director of this Division may submit the final offer of the employer to a vote of the rank and file of workers.

This act would ban unions from charging excessive dues or initiation fees.

The Corrupt Practices Act is to be strengthened by extending its provisions to cover all types of expenditures by corporations and unions designed to influence the outcome of elections. To invoke the assumed danger of an invasion of the right of free speech and freedom of the press is to draw a red herring across the trail.

Both management and labor has the right to sue for a breach of contract.

The National Labor Relations Board is not abolished but increased to five members.

The functions of the Board are separated. General counsel appointed by the President exercises the prosecuting functions and the Board acts as the judicial body.

The act says you cannot compel an employer to pay its members for services not performed. Financial reports must be filed with the Secretary of Labor and distributed to each member of the union.

This act shall not be applicable with respect to any matter which is subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time.

As a member of the House Labor Committee for the past 9 years and as one of the conferees on this bill, I have worked hard and long on this problem. It has been seriously considered from every angle. The general public is vitally interested and there was a genuine demand for constructive legislation with the view of creating a system whereby disputes between labor and management might be peacefully settled, without violating the fundamental rights of either, and without causing long periods of strikes and unemployment or great loss to industry.

I believe this bill goes a long way to bring this about. While this bill may not be perfect, it is not a vicious antilabor bill, as many radical labor leaders have tried to make the rank and file of labor believe. I suggest that every man who labors get a copy of the bill, study it, and learn just what the provisions of the bill are. They will find it is not as represented by these radical labor leaders or as represented by President Truman. A few days before he sent his veto message to Congress he said at Princeton University that he had not read the bill. I think he told the truth about that and anyone who will read the bill and then read the veto message must come to the conclusion that the President, or whoever wrote the veto message for him, did not know what was in the bill, or there was an attempt to misrepresent the facts.

I am convinced that if Government, labor, and management will make a good, faithful effort to comply with the provisions of the act, that it will provide the system for industrial peace and prosperity.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 13, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, June 7, 1947:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Hearings before the House Subcommittee on Education have now come to a close and the subcommittee is considering its report. Some 60 witnesses appeared before it to argue the pros and cons of Federal help to the Nation's schools. Previously a Senate Education Subcommittee had voted to report a similar bill favorably, and is now ironing out the final details of the measure.

Some leaders of the House contend that this is not the time to add new expenditures to the Federal budget. But the House itself ought to have an opportunity to consider this question and to debate the bill openly and on its merits. To keep it "frozen" would be poor strategy; too many people are concerned with the plight of the American public schools. It is neither advisable nor desirable to kill so important a measure in this manner.

Twenty-seven organizations have banded together to see that the House gets an opportunity to vote on the bill. The reason they are centering on the House is that little difficulty is expected to arise in the Senate, where Senator TAFT is sponsoring a Federal aid measure. It is to be hoped that the House, too, will assure a vote.

Answer to Commander Griffith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week in extending my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I included an editorial written by H. B. Snyder, editor of

the Gary Post-Tribune, of Gary, Ind., wherein he criticized National Commander Paul H. Griffith, of the American Legion, for making unfactual statements in addresses concerning the immigration and admission of refugees and displaced persons to the United States.

I am hereby presenting the testimony of Ugo Carusi, Commissoner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which was made before the Subcommittee on Immigration of the House Judiciary Committee on June 20, 1947. This factual testimony reveals that Mr. Snyder's editorial was justified in that Mr. Griffith's figures of 1,540,000 illegal entries of persons to this country is about 800 percent too high.

This testimony should be read by every Member of Congress in order to clear up the propaganda being carried on against the admission of a reasonable number of helpless or displaced war victims to the United States. It follows:

SUMMARY OF THE STATEMENT OF UGO CARUSI, COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION, MADE BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 20, 1947

Much has been said and written of late on the subject of immigration. Unfortunately some of the writings and utterances are false and misleading. A recent example is the address delivered by Paul H. Griffith, national commander of the American Legion, to the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C., on May 22, last. Because of the prominence of Commander Griffith's position, these assertions of misinformation and gross exaggeration were given wide circulation in the press. Failure to challenge the commander's statements, and to meet them with facts, may give them undeserved weight in the public appraisal of the immigration picture.

Attorney General Clark properly insists that the people of this country should know exactly what is going on in the field of immigration, and I am happy, at his direction, and through your courtesy for this opportunity, to set forth in this memorandum a statement of official fact which he and I are confident will lead to a better understanding and appreciation of our immigration problem, and what the Department of Justice and its Immigration and Naturalization Service are doing in the administration and enforcement of our immigration laws.

Inasmuch as Mr. Griffith in his recent address had something to say on each of the important aspects of immigration, I have chosen in this memorandum to take up each point as he has raised it.

LEGAL IMMIGRANTS

Mr. Griffith says: "Legal immigrants are entering this country at a rate of 154,000 a year."

The largest number of immigrants to come to this country in any one of the last 10 years was 108,721, in 1946. The annual average in the last decade is 55,157, of whom the quota immigrants comprise 29,463, and the nonquota immigrants (mainly immigrants from Western Hemisphere countries and spouses and minor children of American citizens) number 25,694. The actual number of quota immigrants in the fiscal year 1946 is extremely close to the annual average for the past decade, it being 29,095. The nonquota immigrants in 1946 showed a decided increase over prior years, due primarily to the 45,496 war brides and their alien children who entered during that year and boosted the nonquota figure to 79,626. So far the figures for the present fiscal year indicate that the number will be slightly higher.

Mr. Griffith's assertion that 154,000 immigrants are entering legally each year may be explained by the fact that the immigration quotas fixed under law total 153,929 each year. He may have assumed, without verification, that every one of those quota numbers connotes an actual immigrant, when, in fact, in the last 10 years 80 percent of the quota has not been used.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS

Mr. Griffith says: "But for every legal immigrant for whom Richard opens the door to America there are at least 10 illegal immigrants—black-market immigrants, if you please They belong to the 'Sneak Into America' 1947 World Club."

Based on his statement that 154,000 are entering legally each year, his figure for illegal immigrants must be 1,540,000 per annum. Continuing on that basis, he adds: "Every day thousands of foreigners run our borders or skip our laws in illegal entries into the United States."

The largest number of illegal entries is over the Mexican border. Almost to a single man or woman or child, those illegal entrants are Mexican laborers or members of their families. No evidence has come to the Immigration and Naturalization Service that that border or the Canadian border is being used by persons from other countries seeking to enter the United States surreptitiously, in other than rare, isolated instances. The vigilance and cooperation of the Mexican and Canadian Governments have had much to do with this result. On the Canadian border most of the illegal entrants are Canadians coming into the country to work, shop, or visit without strictly following the legal requirements. The experience of the Immigration and Naturalization Service has shown that persons who seek to "slip by" the immigration bars at our seaports are limited to less than 2,000 a year. In the past year about 1,400 of them were stowaways. All but a handful had been apprehended by the master of the vessel and turned over to the immigration officers at the pier. A few who succeeded in getting ashore have been apprehended and subjected to deportation proceedings.

In his reference to illegal border crossers, Mr. Griffith says: "Outlanders from the four corners of the earth run our borders daily along the Canadian and Mexican boundaries and over the Caribbean waters, making a mockery of our meager patrols."

It has already been pointed out that the illegal crossers are almost exclusively Mexicans and Canadians. As for the mockery which they are making of our meager patrols, it is sufficient to say that in the first 10 months of the fiscal year 1947 the Border Patrol and other officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service have brought about the apprehension and expulsion of 171,703 deportable aliens, of whom 15,313 were deported and 156,390 were made to depart at their own expense in lieu of deportation. Of this number more than 90 percent were Mexicans; the next largest number were Canadians. In 1946 the number was 116,320. It may be of interest to know that this large number of expulsions has brought about a labor shortage in the States bordering Mexico; this is convincing proof that the expulsions are now exceeding the entries. Indeed, in order to meet the labor shortage, agreements have been reached between the United States and Mexico by which Mexican agricultural labor is now being recruited and imported in compliance with our immigration laws. The largest estimate of illegal entries which can be made from the number of apprehensions (including the large number of Mexicans) clearly shows that Mr. Griffith's figure of 1,540,000 is about 800 percent too high.

SEAMEN

Mr. Griffith says: "Seamen, many of them that only in name, are jumping ships in American ports."

In the past 10 years there have been 7,665,342 arrivals of alien seamen at United States seaports. Of this number, 45,100, about two-thirds of 1 percent, deserted. The records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service show that most of them have either been apprehended, deported, or reshipped foreign. Desertions in the fiscal year 1944 were 5,811, in 1945 they totaled 5,577, in 1946 they totaled 4,365. In the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1947 the number is 1,860. This shows a definite downward trend of desertions. Our most recent figures tally closely with those of the prewar years. In speaking of desertions by seamen we must not overlook the fact that this is a technical term and does not, in many instances, indicate that the seaman has left the vessel with the intention of abandoning his calling or remaining in the United States. If a seaman arrives at the pier just too late to sail with his vessel, he is counted as a deserter, although he departs on her next sailing, or, indeed, on a sooner sailing of another of his employer's vessels.

VISITORS AND TRANSIENTS

Mr. Griffith says: "Foreigners arriving 'in transit' on the way to other lands make it a permanent 'sit' in the good old U. S. A.," and "Aliens dropping in on 'visitors' visas' manage to get 'lost' in our wide-open spaces."

The three largest groups of legal nonimmigrants are the visitors for pleasure, who have averaged 40,642 for each of the past 10 years; visitors for business, 29,525; and aliens in transit through the United States to other countries, 33,060. Other nonimmigrants are resident aliens who are returning from trips aboad; foreign government officials, their families and servants; students; and treaty traders. The complete nonimmigrant figures for the fiscal year 1946 are:

Government officials, etc	17,031
Temporary visitors for business	74,913
Temporary visitors for pleasure	59,913
In transit	31,124
Treaty traders	378
Returning residents	13,306
Students	5,855
Members of international organizations (United Nations delegates and families)	658
Other classes	291
Total	203,469

As of April 30, 1947, there were in the United States in legal status 78,543 visitors and 11,391 transits. During that month more visitors and transits departed than entered; 53,090 visitors had entered and 55,357 had departed; 14,348 transits had entered and 13,336 had departed. These figures are cited in connection with the assertion that visitors lose themselves here and transits just sit. Of course, many visitors and transits do seek to extend their stays here and some attempt to remain permanently. The experience of the Service has been, however, that most of them seek to accomplish it by legal means; that is, by asking for extensions or change of status. Inasmuch as such applications are granted only in cases of real merit and where the application is obviously made in good faith, the number of denials of applications runs between 80 and 90 percent.

A check-in and check-out system is maintained by the Service in order that illegal overstays may be detected and appropriate action taken. Our field officers are alerted to act promptly to bring about the departure of those who seek imprcperly to extend their stays. The law does not require nor does limited personnel permit the checking of every person who leaves this country, par-

ticularly persons who leave by train or automobile. Consequently, while we have accurate statistics on the number who enter the country legally, the recorded number of departures is always less than the actual departures. However, in order to be safe, we proceed upon the assumption that a person whose departure is not of record is still in the United States. On that basis, our records as of April 30, 1947, showed that 85,471 visitors and transits were possibly in the country in illegal status. In the past 2 months, we have assigned additional personnel to the task of checking these records. As a result, the number is dwindling fast. Already, a large number have been found to have departed, confirming our judgment that the majority of them had departed at the expiration of the time for which admitted. We hope to complete this survey in the next few months.

STUDENTS

Mr. Griffith says: "Overseas students come here to study and make it life jobs."

In the past 10 years the yearly average of student visitors has been 2,302. The number to come in the fiscal year 1946 was 5,855. Periodic checks are being made by the Immigration Service to determine whether the student is continuing his studies at the university in which he was enrolled. Some instances have been found where students have left the school to go to work or have taken up unauthorized employment while going to school. In those instances the status of student is declared breached and appropriate action taken.

We are watching the student cases very closely, and requiring reports from the school officials as the activities of each alien admitted as such.

GENERAL COMMENT

I have tried in the foregoing to give specific information as honestly as I can on those observations of Mr. Griffith which he would term factual. It has not been my purpose—nor do I feel it appropriate—to comment upon his general views or characterizations. I do add this thought, however: To the extent that he infers that the officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service are acting dishonestly, carelessly, and without regard to the public good and their oaths of office, with the result that there is—in his words—"skulduggery * * * under our existing laws," and that "Immigration in 1947 has run amuck." Mr. Griffith unfairly condemns a large group of loyal and efficient public servants, a very large number of whom are members of the great organization which he presently heads.

Oil for Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last week when it first came to the attention of the House that petroleum products were being exported to Russia I made inquiry covering the matter of American tankers and I was informed by the Maritime Commission that they knew of none being used for transporting of petroleum from the United States to Russia.

However, I find that on June 14, 1947, the tanker *Belgorod*, claimed to be owned by the U. S. S. R., 4,374 tons, cleared for Vladivostok with 49,131 barrels of fuel oil and 15,999 barrels of bunker fuel, with the consignee being Sanzneflexport, Moscow, Russia, and the information is that this ship was built by the Cal Shipping Corp., Los Angeles, Calif., in 1943, and was formerly the *Paul Dunbar*, and the oil is being provided by a well-known petroleum company in Los Angeles.

Further, I find that on June 14, 1947, the tanker *Elbruz* claimed to be owned by the U. S. S. R., 6,301 tons, cleared for Vladivostok with 35,000 barrels of fuel oil and 14,000 barrels bunker fuel, with the consignee being Sanzneflexport, Moscow, Russia, and the information is that this ship was built by the Swan Island Yards, Portland, Oreg., and was formerly the *Muir Woods*, and the oil is being provided by a well-known petroleum company in Los Angeles.

Further, I find that on June 17, 1947, the tanker *Emba* claimed to be owned by the U. S. S. R., 6,301 tons cleared for Vladivostok with 123,835 barrels of 71-octane gasoline and 12,500 barrels bunker fuel, with the consignee being Sanzneflexport, Moscow, Russia, and the information is that this ship was built by the Swan Island Shipyards, Portland, Oreg., and was formerly the *Shawnee Trail*, and the oil is being provided by a well-known petroleum company in Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that 71-octane gasoline is a much better quality than that supplied to American automobile owners, and I cannot understand why our Government and petroleum companies of this country are shipping to foreign nations better grades of gasoline than are supplied to American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I have further examined into the matter of these ships being built in the United States in connection with their present use of transporting oil and gasoline to Russia. It has been claimed that there is a shortage of gasoline in the United States, and it must be imported, yet it is being sent to Russia in ships that were formerly part of the United States tanker fleet.

Since February 1947 I have requested the return of American-owned ships now in the hands of Russia consisting of dry cargo, tankers, and other vessels, but up to this time they have been neither returned nor payment made to the United States for their purchase.

In addition to the three tanker loads of gasoline and oil that have been shipped from Los Angeles to Moscow in the last 10 days, I find three other tankers in the Los Angeles area awaiting cargo and repairs. These tankers were built by this Government as late as 1943, by the Cal Shipping Corp. of Los Angeles at San Pedro, Calif., by the Swan Island Shipyards, in Portland, Oreg., and the Sun Shipbuilding Co. at Chester, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, today discloses that these very same 6 tankers loaded and to be loaded with gasoline and oil for Russia are part of the Americant merchant fleet turned over to Russia without payment during the war, being 36 Liberty dry-cargo vessels, 3 Liberty tankers, 4 T–2-type tankers, 2 tugs, 47 older dry-cargo vessels, 1 older tanker, and 1 older tug, and still being used by the Russians to carry on their philosophy of government.

Within the last 2 weeks the Department of the Interior says that there is insufficient petroleum in this country that it must be imported, and today we find the Department of Commerce making arrangements to export oil and gasoline, with the State Department and Maritime Commission, using American-owned ships to carry gasoline and oil to Russia.

Mr. Speaker, by what kind of reasoning is this Government giving away hundreds of millions of dollars supposedly to preserve the American way of life and at the same time our Government-owned tankers are carrying gasoline and petroleum products to foster and expand the Russian philosophy of government?

Food Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am moved to address this body today on a subject well known to a majority of my colleagues. I would hesitate to estimate the number of speeches that have been made, and the reams of newspaper copy that have been printed, on this subject. Scores of indignant Americans have demanded action by the United States Government or through the United Nations to halt the vicious practices I am about to summarize. Despite the interest aroused, however, the Yugoslavian Government continues to violate in terrifying manner the principle of religious freedom—that freedom so highly valued among all of the Allies in the recent war and chief among the ideals represented in the "four freedoms."

It is not my intention to present these abuses in great detail, Mr. Speaker; but I feel it is important that my colleagues have placed before them, in sharp highlights, the essential practices of the Yugoslavian Government which are destroying the Christian religion within that country. In summarizing these practices, I should like the Members of this body to bear in mind that while the Catholic Church, as the oldest and largest religious institution in Yugoslavia, has borne the brunt of the government's program, I speak as a Congregationalist concerned simply with antireligious persecution wherever it may exist.

Mr. Speaker, the following facts were obtained from a cross section of the American press and were compiled in a number of petitions to the President of the United States. These practices stem directly from governmental action in Yugoslavia and have been substantiated by travelers, refugees and on-the-spot reporters.

First. In Croatia alone, 369 Roman Catholic priests have been killed; 400,000 lay people killed and thousands have been imprisoned because of their religious beliefs. Unspeakable outrages have been committed against the bodies of those executed and Christian cemeteries in general have been desecrated.

Second. Churches, religious, and wayside shrines all over the country have been destroyed, desecrated, and profaned.

Third. Religious books and objects of piety have been burned in homes and churches.

Fourth. Practically all Roman Catholic church property has been destroyed or confiscated. All religious endowments have been seized by the Government.

Fifth. In the State schools, atheism is openly taught and religion is scoffed at. Children are forced to recite anti-religious songs and lessons.

Sixth. All citizens are obliged to attend "spontaneous demonstrations" on Sunday mornings; forcing most people to miss church or suffer consequences. Priests are advised by their superiors not to preach, but to advise; on a non-political basis.

Seventh. All government propaganda agencies are conducting an unceasing campaign against the church of Christ.

Eighth. A reign of terror is being conducted against those who actively practice or preach Christianity. Men and women are taken forcibly from their homes in the night and seldom return.

Ninth. Roman Catholic young people have been barred from all institutions of higher education. Christian youth are constantly terrorized by youth groups sponsored by the Government.

Tenth. The best known example of these practices is typified in the imprisonment and trial of Archbishop Stepinac. This Christian leader, who had conducted an unceasing campaign against nazism and fascism, was given a hearing no civilized system of jurisprudence could call a trial and condemned to 16 years of hard labor. Confiscation of his property by the Yugoslav Government followed, as well as his citizenship rights for a period of 5 years following his release from prison.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of this body to weigh these facts in their respective minds; remembering that Yugoslavia is but a reduced reflection of the Soviet Union; remembering that oppression of religious freedom was one of the initial steps in the creation of Hitler's Germany; and finally remembering that the people of America cannot safely look to their liberties when such practices are so openly practiced abroad.

GOP Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Carleton Kent, from the Chicago Times of June 7, 1947:

GOP TAX BILL

(By Carleton Kent)

WASHINGTON.—If the Republicans in Congress had written a better income-tax reduction bill, they would have been in a better position to argue that it was President Truman's duty to sign it.

There is at least one good argument for a tax cut at this time. Perhaps it is superior to the President's contention that in good times like these there should be no tax cut at all—that any Government surpluses should be paid on the Federal debt.

Many economists believe the inflationary peak of prices has now been reached, and that on the other side is a deflationary slope down which the Nation may slide into a pile up—a recession, which might even become a depression.

One good way to avoid a deepening deflation, they think, is to pump more spending money into the national economy by tax reduction—by giving to the mass of low-income consumers tax savings with which they can buy goods that otherwise would pile up on the Nation's shelves, close factories, cause unemployment, and play general hell.

A tax expert of 30 years' service in the Treasury Department puts it this way: "At such a time a billion-dollar tax reduction is worth several times that much in public works projects."

But most of these economists feel that the only equitable way to distribute the tax rebate, as well as the only way of getting most of the savings into the hands of the low-income groups that would spend it best for the national economy, is by raising the personal income tax exemption from $500 to $700.

This the Republican authors of the new tax bill have not done. Instead they gave people with a net income of $1,500 a 30 percent cut. From $1,500 to $137,000 a year, the reduction is 20 percent, 15 percent up to $302,000 a year, and 10.5 percent for all over that.

They helped the poor man a little bit; and the rich man a lot more.

More than 46,000,000 people, or 93 percent of those paying income taxes, earn $5,000 or less a year. Yet the other 7 percent of the taxpayers get something like 36 percent of the benefits from the Republican reductions.

It was noticeable that the House delegates, in conference committee, yielded on 15 of the 16 amendments proposed by the Senate conferees, but stood pat on the one giving those with incomes of $79,000 to $137,000 a year a 20-percent tax cut, instead of the 15 percent which the Senate thought was enough.

The Republican argument for giving the high-income man a disproportionate share of the tax relief is that it is necessary to encourage "risk capital" to invest in enterprises that will raise production, bring down prices, and keep employment and pay rolls high.

The Democratic rejoiner never successfully refuted, is something like this: "That's all very well, but what's the matter with giving some real encouragement while you're at it to the workingman who's trying to raise a family on $2,500 at prices which you boys sent sky-high when you 'did in' the OPA?"

Terminal-Leave Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Members of Congress we have only 5 weeks left in this session and to date nothing concrete has as yet been done to live up to the many promises made to the veterans. The terminal-leave-pay bill has not yet passed and even though after the President vetoed the tax bill, the majority leadership decided to have hearings on terminal-leave pay, because now there will be sufficient money in the Treasury, still there is little time left for consideration and the veterans back home need the help now. We have met for 23 weeks and no concrete step has been taken toward the housing problem which plagues and harasses the veteran. Those veterans who attempted to go to school under the GI bill found that their subsistence was not sufficient to continue their courses and many of them have been forced to drop out. This problem has been brought to the attention of Congress time and again and yet nothing has as of today been done about it. Those veterans who are needing hospital facilities and medical attention, instead of getting what it was reported to them they would get, are now seeing this Congress cut the appropriation for their medical assistance and help. It appears we are making the same mistake that has heretofore been made at the end of previous wars. We are forgetting the obligation that we owe to those men who gave so much in order that others might continue to enjoy the fruits of their sacrifices. I have in my district a very talented gentleman by the name of Francis J. Brady who has written an eloquent and moving poem entitled "Let's Not Forget." Under my extension of remarks, I submit this poem for consideration:

LET'S NOT FORGET

When the boys come marching homeward
What will they have to look toward,
Will they get the same old glad hand
And then be forgotten by the land
They fought so bravely to uphold,
Will the country turn them down cold,
The same as the boys of eighteen
When they have their lives to redeem.

Let them know our welcome is real
And not give them the same old deal,
Will this country forget again
The debt owed these boys in the main;
Will we forget what they went through
Let's not forget, but still be true,
They were the cream of our young men
Let's keep the faith we had in them.

These boys were the cream of the land
As we prepared to make a stand
Against a foe of savage mind,
Beastly cruel and insanely blind,
Against great odds they made their stand
For you and I and our great land,
Let's not forget, lest we regret,
We owe these boys an honest debt.

Give them a chance to start anew
And don't forget what they went through,
They left behind a broken thread
To take up arms of war instead,
They'll need our help to start again,
Some will come back, others were slain
On fields of battle where they remain,
Did these boys give their lives in vain?

Let's not forget, lest we regret,
Let's pay these boys our honest debt
So they can take up once again
Where they left off, though not in vain,
The threat of life they can redeem
And not like the boys of eighteen
Be pushed aside and forgotten
By a once grateful nation.

—*Francis J. Brady.*

New Labor Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 24, 1947:

NEW LABOR ACT

Now that the Taft-Hartley bill is the law of the land the great obligation of the Government is to put it into operation with as little friction as possible. The overriding of the President's veto in both the House and Senate, by substantially more than the two-thirds vote required in each instance, leaves no doubt that the bill reflects in general policy the will of the people. We think it should be accepted in that spirit.

The clash between President Truman and the Republican majorities in the Senate and House has undoubtedly dragged the issue into politics. Yet the bill can scarcely be said to be a partisan measure. In the House 60 percent of the Democrats voting were for it even when it carried the mark of a Presidential veto. In the Senate 20 Democrats voted to override the veto and 22 to sustain it. Such liberal and fair-minded men as Senators HATCH, FULBRIGHT, and HOLLAND were among those who cast the winning votes on the Democratic side. It is a pity that, in spite of this opposition from his own party and in the face of certain defeat, the President did not have better judgment than to imply that enactment of the measure will "adversely affect our national unity." As for Senator MORSE'S comment that organized labor "is going to dig in along a united front to prevent the application of this bill," we think that is a gross insult to labor. It implies that labor does not believe in democratic government and is not willing to abide by the will of the majority in matters of broad public policy.

The administration's last-ditch attitude in fighting the bill puts it under an especially heavy obligation to take a thoughtful view now that the measure has become law. For purposes of argument the President had put the most unreasonable and extreme interpretation on many provisions. Now it becomes necessary to administer the act with fairness and temperate regard for the policy that Congress is seeking to effectuate. It will not be a pleasant task for the administration or for the National Labor Relations Board. But it is an obligation that must be faced with sincerity, good temper, and diligence if the strength of our democratic system is to be maintained in this critical period.

Congress, too, has acquired a heavy obligation. It has written this act into the books without removing all of its defects. Modification of some of the more harsh and doubtful provisions will undoubtedly be needed. Congress can unquestionably ease the problem of making the new law effective by studying its operation. To this task it ought to assign its most skilled and experienced members. We think that the appointment of Senator IVES to head the joint committee "to study and report on basic problems affecting friendly labor relations and productivity" would go a long way toward assuring labor that legitimate grievances against the new act will be carefully weighed and that corrections found to be warranted will be promptly recommended. The very nature of the task calls for a man of Senator IVES' background and temperament. It is especially important to name a chairman with whom organized labor will freely cooperate. For the committee's first task will be to smooth out the friction points of the present legislation and to adjust its operation in the light of experience.

Food Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, in the acute food shortages which are being experienced all over the world, surely there is enough ingenuity and common sense in our Government departments to handle the surpluses such as the thousands of tons of potatoes recently destroyed. While the rest of the world is starving, I find it hard to explain the situation set forth in the following letter which I should like to enter in the RECORD:

TURLOCK COOPERATIVE GROWERS,
Modesto, Calif., June 19, 1947.

Congressman NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives Post Office,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is to call your attention to the difficulty we are having in trying to move a rather large block of dried peaches from last year's crop.

We have tried all avenues of outlet and find it impossible to move these peaches at any price. For your information, we are offering them packed f. o. b. car or dock California as follows:

	Cents per pound
Ungraded	13
Standard	11
Choice	12
Extra choice	13½
Fancy	14¼
Extra fancy	15

It may interest you to know that if the peaches were sold on this basis, the grower would not get back enough money to pay for the cost of harvesting and drying the fruit. The prices, therefore, are on a salvage basis.

We also wish to direct your attention to the fact that unless these distressed stocks are moved, they will have a very definite adverse effect upon the 1947 crop, which will be harvested in about a month and a half.

Your assistance is earnestly requested in attempting to move some of this fruit on the foreign relief program, or any other channel which may be used in this connection. We were very much disappointed when told that the Foreign Relief Procurement Agency had decided that this fruit did not contain sufficient nutriment to justify channeling it into the foreign relief market. We sincerely hope that a change of attitude may be had in this respect, since we all know that dried fruit does have a very stimulating effect, not only from the standpoint of vitamins but also as a part of any diet.

Any assistance you may offer in this connection will be greatly appreciated by the writer and this organization.

Thanking you for your indulgence, we are,
Very truly yours,

L. E. NEEL,
General Manager.

United States Employment Service—Views of Idaho State Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to state that I favor approval of the President's reorganization Plan No. 2. I believe that a more effective Employment Service will be provided the American workers and industry by retaining the United States Employment Service permanently in the Department of Labor, rather than in the Federal Security Agency, which is primarily concerned with welfare functions.

In that connection there has been some misunderstanding as to the attitude of the Idaho State Employment Service on the pending legislation.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that statements by Col. S. D. Hays, director of the Idaho State Employment Service, and Mr. A. J. Tillman, assistant director of the Idaho State Employment Service and presently acting director, be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The undersigned, at present recalled to active military service for purposes of observation, treatment, and appearance before the Army retiring board at Fort Lewis, Wash., and in civil life holding the position (now on leave without pay) of State director of the Idaho State Employment Service, a division of the State Industrial Accident Board, states as follows:

1. That as director of the State employment service, I do not subscribe to the opinions expressed by Mr. H. F. Garrett, the executive director of the Unemployment Compensation Division of the Industrial Accident Board, nor to his statements of purported facts.

2. That prior to 1941 the two divisions were integrated and the undersigned was the executive director of both divisions.

3. That it has always been the opinion of the undersigned that the Employment Service to be an efficient service should never be integrated in either operation or administration with any other division or agency, as the administration should be devoted solely to the operation of an efficient and complete employment service. Any integration lessens efficiency.

4. That the statement with regard to interference or undue assistance from a Federal level in the organization and operation of the Employment Service in Idaho is not true and without basis and is a distortion of the facts.

5. The statement that the Regional Director of the United States Employment Service went over Mr. Garrett's head and approached the Governor of Idaho to establish the employment service is a distortion of facts. Mr. Garrett heads only the unemployment compensation division with no authority or jurisdiction over the employment service so it was not a matter of going over his head. I understand the Regional Director of the United States Employment Service did go to the then

Governor of Idaho, I believe sometime in September 1946, and discussed with him the return of the Employment Service to the State, that the Governor stated to him that whatever the undersigned, then the State Director of the United States Employment Service in Idaho, proposed as the proper organization was acceptable with him as Governor of Idaho. Further, on the following day the undersigned with the said Regional Director of the United States Employment Service met with the State Industrial Accident Board and discussed the method of return and organization. That, at that time integration was mentioned and that the Regional Director said it might be possible to make some, but that the Board following the recommendation of the undersigned decided that they would return the employment service as a separate division pending the possible results of legislation, which it was expected would place the service in a new department of labor in the State or otherwise determine what was to be done. True, Mr. Garrett, as head of one of the divisions of the said accident board, and a subordinate of that board, was not consulted, it was not deemed as a concern of his. He was considered, however, in the return of personnel as it directly affected his personnel operations as it did all agencies operating under the State merit system.

6. That during the recent session of the legislature, when the State veterans organizations and others were driving to get the employment service established as a separate entity by law, which the members of the legislature thought they had accomplished and would have accomplished except by a "fluke" in the engrossing committee of said legislature, the regional director and the Washington office kept hands off at all times.

7. That to the knowledge of the undersigned as witnessed by the acceptance by the legislature members of laws (which they thought they had passed) which they voted upon and their votes thereon, there is no desire of the people of Idaho to integrate or consolidate the two divisions of the Industrial Accident Board. The undersigned is without knowledge as to the Governor's attitude, however, during the legislative session he was agreeable to an amendment to the laws of Idaho permitting and establishing the employment service as a separate organization, hence it is not the belief of the undersigned that the Governor when apprised of the facts would condone Mr. Garrett's statement as his position.

8. That as director of the State employment service with previous experience in directing the two services in an integrated form, gave careful consideration to various integration of administrative sections of the two divisions: That there is no justification in the form of economy of funds, personnel or space for the consolidating of the two services not considering the effect such integration or consolidation might have upon the efficiency of operations in local offices.

9. That the statements with regard to referral of workers and the classification of registrants are misleading and not confined to complete facts. That to the best of our knowledge the complaints registered to the committee by Mr. Garrett are confined to the actions of new employment service personnel who were untrained, and that he should be requested to support his broad statements by documentary facts. If Mr. Garrett did receive complaints from farmers about inability to secure farm labor, he withheld these complaints from the employment service for political purposes and for such purposes as is here disclosed.

10. That the costs of operation of the Unemployment Compensation Division of Idaho, particularly with regard to the taking of benefit claims is purely created by Mr. Garrett and was made excessive by his lack of cooperation and with the withdrawal of the claims taking function from the local United States Employment Service offices in Idaho, July 1, 1946, and was done solely for purposes to force integration.

11. That the regional head of the Bureau of Employment Security of the Social Security Administration expressed to the undersigned that he did not favor the separate establishment of claims offices.

12. That it is the belief and opinion of the undersigned that either from a Federal level or State level the consolidation, joining though any integration of the two services herein mentioned, would only work to the disadvantage of the Employment Service, which should be strengthened rather than weakened, as it is the constant attacks of power-desiring persons and agencies (Federal and State) attempting to obtain control over the Employment Service which takes from said Service a portion of its effectiveness of operation. That in Idaho there is more justification from an operating standpoint to make the Employment Service a part of the Department of Agriculture, for it has more functions in placement, contacts, etc., with farmers (not covered by the unemployment-compensation law) than with the unemployment-compensation-covered workers or employers. To subjugate or even "tie in with" the Unemployment Compensation Division in Idaho of this Service does not further the best interests of the majority of workers or employers in the State. A check-up of Idaho's placement record will show that over one-half of all placements during any year have been agriculture and that only a percentage of other placements have been in covered industry.

This statement is made by the undersigned, at present a patient in Madigan General Hospital, Fort Lewis, Wash., this 10th day of June 1947.

SAMUEL D. HAYS,
Colonel, FA, O170950.

Witness of signature:

JAMES R. HYDUK,
Captain, Ordnance Department, O907655.
JOHN BUNYAN,
Chief Warrant Officer, U. S. A., W2103924.

The undersigned, assistant State director of the Idaho State Employment Service since February 1946, State director for 5 years previously during the absence of Col. S. D. Hays on military duty and from December 1933 to March 1941 serving in other capacities in the employment service, having read the statement of H. F. Garrett, states as follows:

1. That, in my official capacities and with full knowledge of the activities of the Employment Service in Idaho both as Federal and State entities, I do not concur in the opinions expressed by Mr. Garrett.

2. That it has always been the opinion of the undersigned that the free public employment service must be maintained as a separate service devoted to the principles of an efficient organization serving all of the people and not certain segments. In order to accomplish this purpose it must not be integrated with or subordinated to any other division or agency.

3. That the reason Idaho is not now integrated is because of the desires of the people of this State as expressed through the State legislature, veterans' organizations, labor unions, individual employers, farmers, and others. It is not a separate service as a result of Federal interference or insistence at any time. It is a separate service because Mr. Garrett and the interstate conference have so far been unable to override the wishes of the people of this State. It would be a separate service by State law had the bill as passed by the legislature been properly engrossed and signed.

4. That the then Governor of Idaho approved of a separate employment service because of his knowledge of its functions and activities and not because of pressure from the regional director of the United States Employment Service.

5. That there is no more reason to insist upon a combined statistical department or business-management department because we are dealing in the same field than to combine these functions with any other State department. It is only because of the desires of certain individuals to increase the scope of their own power and authority. It is not because of economic waste which has been stated but not proven. In fact, the only separations affected from previous integration (except for the war emergency transfer of the employment service to the Federal Government) have been made by Mr. Garrett, who stated that separation would increase efficiency and lower costs. These actions were: Separation of the joint statistical department in May 1944 and taking claims-taking functions away from the Employment Service June 30, 1946.

6. That the statements concerning referral of, or failure to refer, certain benefit claimants because of classification are misleading or are contrary to the unemployment-compensation law itself regarding suitable employment. The statement that the Employment Service makes the determination of suitability is also misleading, as all determinations of eligibility for unemployment insurance are made solely by the Unemployment Compensation Division. It is the Employment Service's responsibility to properly register, classify, select, and refer workers on the basis of qualifications, and not because an applicant is or is not a benefit claimant. It would seem that the Unemployment Compensation Division should, if properly performing their duties, inform the Employment Service of these complaints. We have had numerous complaints about the unemployment compensation and have referred them in writing to Mr. Garrett. Does it seem reasonable that the Employment Service would fail to or refuse to refer an applicant to a farm or any other job, if qualified, and in the face of employers' and farmers' demands for workers, when the primary function of the Employment Service is to place workers? All functions of the Employment Service are geared to that ultimate good which is literally its bread and butter.

A. J. TILLMAN,
Assistant State Director.

Witness of signature:
DOROTHY I. ANDERSON.
W. J. ADAMS.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig of June 15, 1947:

WHAT TO DO ABOUT OL' MAN RIVER IS POST-FLOOD PROBLEM

For the second time in 3 years, the upper Mississippi Valley has experienced a disastrous flood. Several levees have been broken, flooding thousands of acres of rich farming land. Cities have been inundated. Lives have been lost, and the damage to property will run into many millions. Other properties have been saved at tremendous cost in time, effort, and money. Crops may be

grown this year in the drainage districts where the levees were held, if dikes withstand the coming flood.

The entire upper valley must face the problem of what to do about the Mississippi. It isn't enough to say that the recent all-time record river stage is unprecedented. Three years ago, the river stage was only a foot lower and the damage was almost as heavy. It is true that we are now in a heavy-rainfall cycle, that the long average has not produced rainfall of such heavy proportions along the upper river. But we have had floods each spring for many years, and twice in 3 years they have attained disaster proportions. We must accept the fact that similar conditions will occur two or three times in each decade.

WHAT CAUSES FLOODS?

Why are present-day floods worse than those of a generation or more ago? There were periods of heavy rainfall a half-century ago, and the lands now protected by levees were flooded. In those days, the river bottoms near Quincy were several miles wide. The water stretched from the Illinois bluffs to Taylor, Mo. A part of the cause of the present high stages must be charged to the restrictions placed on the river.

When the early drainage districts were set up, there was little perceptible change in flood stages. But when area after area was drained and leveed and the flood basin was narrowed to little more than a mile in many places, the flood water, unable to spread out, was forced to go to higher stages.

Still, floods in the 20's failed to rival the one last week in severity. The big flood of 1929, worst on record to that time, reached a peak of 21.4 feet, almost two and one-half feet under the recent one. Yet more rain fell over a wider area in that spring than was responsible for this flood. In the 75 years prior to 1929, the river exceeded a stage of 20 feet only once, when it reached 20.3 feet in 1903. Average yearly high stages for that period ran little over 15 feet.

After the construction of the levees, there was a marked increase in the flood stages. Then, in the late thirties the system of navigation dams was constructed in the upper river. Since that time, the average flood stages have been higher, and this area has had two record-breakers.

The claim that the dams are in part responsible for higher water is denied by Army engineers in charge of the upper river. Perhaps the run-off has not been retarded, although the dams, even when the roller gates are open, offer a considerable obstacle to the free flow of water. But the dams maintain an average normal stage of approximately 11 feet in Quincy. Many springs in the past opened with a river stage of 4 or 5 feet. When the heavy rains come now they find the river only a few feet below flood stage.

The steady deposit of silt along the banks of the river also has played a part in causing floods. At one time the river bottoms and the hills bounding them were covered with trees. As these were cut and the land put under cultivation, soil erosion increased until, today, millions of tons of top soil go down the creeks into the Mississippi each spring. There it builds up back of wing dams, along the shores, further narrowing the stream.

POSSIBLE REMEDIES

Several remedies for the flood condition have been proposed. Each would, perhaps, help to relieve an almost unbearable situation. A system of huge run-off reservoirs has been suggested. Col. W. N. Leaf, chief of the Rock Island district, who directed the battle on the flood here last week, explained the plan which has the support of his office.

Most of the water that causes floods in this stretch of the river comes from Iowa streams. Little rain that falls in northwestern Illinois goes directly into the Mississippi, but virtually all the State of Iowa and southern Minnesota drain into the big river, principally through the Des Moines near Keokuk.

The proposal is to build big lakes along the Iowa streams, reservoirs of sufficient size to handle great quantities of flood waters. In rainy season, much of the excess water would be diverted to these reservoirs where it would be held until the flood crisis had passed. Then it would be released gradually at times when it would cause no damage.

The weak points in the reservoir plan are that it would require huge areas, totaling a fair percentage of the total of the land in this area from which the river is barred by levees and that the reservoirs would in a few years fill with silt. But the plan offers many advantages and is, perhaps, the best offered in the way of mechanical control.

A measure of relief could be obtained by setting back levees, thus giving the river more room. To be effective, all drainage districts would have to adopt the plan. The setback would have to be at least one-half mile, thereby doubling the flood width of the river. The difficulty in this plan lies in the heavy cost of buying land to be abandoned and the great tax burden necessary to rebuild all river levees. The program is being followed in the Coal creek district west of Beardstown, where the levee was virtually destroyed in the great Illinois river flood of 1943.

A great deal could be done in halting the run-off of silt from the hills. This lost top soil comes from the entire watershed. Some of it travels through creeks for 100 miles or more and comes to rest along the banks of the Mississippi. There it builds up mud banks and lessens the water capacity of the river. This erosion is costly to the owners of upland and drainage district land, but it can be checked only if farmers are willing to put sub-marginal land in grass and timber.

TIME FOR ACTION

The time for action is now. Many thousands of acres of the most fertile land in America are in danger of being put out of production in the next few years unless a solution is found. The productive capacity of these areas is fabulous and the investment in land, drainage equipment and buildings is tremendous. It is evident that some permanent plan of relief is needed. Excess rainfall must have means of reaching the Gulf. That avenue is the Mississippi River that must carry most of the run-off of all the land between the two mountain ranges.

The reservoir plan is for the present. The matter of levee set-backs might well be considered for future action. Too much cannot be said for control of erosion as a long-range plan of soil conservation and flood control. Congressional plans for appropriating fifteen millions and the Illinois Legislature's program for two millions in aid will help to alleviate current distress. But more than temporary aid is needed. The great floods are no longer extraordinary events. They will come again and some better way for handling them must be devised.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Vermont Royster, from the Wall Street Journal of June 9, 1947:

PIN ON A BADGE, TAKE VOW OF SILENCE—LEARN OUR FOREIGN POLICY—TO SPREAD "INFORMATION," STATE DEPARTMENT SHUTS OUT PRESS, TALKS TO CLUB, CHURCH FOLK

(By Vermont Royster)

WASHINGTON.—The State Department is unlimbering its biggest propaganda guns in support of its foreign policy.

The diplomats are holding a series of "off the record," unpublicized conferences in Washington and elsewhere about the country, with representatives of women's clubs, church groups, fraternal organizations, and independent voters' leagues. In these sessions, top officials of the State Department have set out to sell the Truman "Stop Russia" Doctrine and gather aid for other phases of the administration's foreign program.

A direct appeal is being made to these organization representatives to go home and make sure the State Department's views are known within the groups they represent.

The latest, and to date the biggest, of these conferences was held here this week end. It was attended by approximately 250 delegates representing organizations with total membership estimated by a State Department official at 75,000,000.

NOT ENOUGH PUBLICITY

These delegates were told by a department representative that the conference was called because the Department could not get out enough information on foreign policy through the usual publicity channels. Newspaper reporters were excluded from the meetings.

During the course of 3 days of meetings the delegates were told:

The United States must be prepared to give economic, as well as political, assistance where needed in the world. The Truman doctrine is simply an extension of the Monroe Doctrine and the only logical course America's foreign policy can follow.

The public should support the State Department's effort to educate the rest of the world in the American way of life through pamphlets and radio. (Congress is still considering whether this effort deserves funds.)

The State Department has an obligation to see that the people understand foreign policy. The usual press and radio information channels need to be supplemented by direct contact between the policy-makers and representatives of leading organizations.

The public should be taught to understand the benefits of a liberal trade policy.

More people should join organizations interested in foreign policy. They and their organizations should work with the proper legislative representatives to see that the United States follows a sound foreign program.

The delegates should return home and "work through the organization to which you belong" to insure that the country does have this sound foreign policy.

The official purpose of the conferences is to help the public participate in the formation of foreign policy. But all of the discussions were on policy matters already settled, so far as the State Department is concerned, and major emphasis was placed on getting the delegates acquainted with the official State Department views.

THE KEY POW-WOW

Apparently the key meeting was a session on citizen participation in foreign affairs. It was at this meeting that the delegates were told of the Department's difficulties in getting their views on foreign problems understood by the public. The delegates were asked to cooperate in this effort.

Citizen participation, apparently, did not include the press. Newsmen who applied for

permission to attend the discussions were turned down. One who slipped in without a guest badge was ejected.

Speakers at the sessions included Secretary of State Marshall; Dean Rusk, of the Office of Special Political Affairs; Loy W. Henderson, of the Department's Far Eastern Division; and William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Mr. Benton spoke on the need for an international information program. Francis H. Russell, Director of Public Affairs, presided.

SENATOR VANDENBERG DECLINES

Republican Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG was invited to address the delegates, but declined.

Visual explanations of the administration's foreign policy, including movies, were used to supplement the oral discussions. A wealth of booklets and pamphlets explaining foreign policy in simple language was distributed among the delegates.

The week-end conference was part of a general program planned by the State Department for the education of the public on foreign problems. It is being handled by the Division of Public Affairs under Mr. Russell.

This Division has set up a series of committees, each headed by a State Department official, to deal directly with the various private organizations. One official handles women's groups, another veterans' organizations, another church societies, still another fraternal organizations, and so on.

SECRETARY MARSHALL'S EXPLANATION

Explaining the meetings, Secretary Marshall told delegates the purpose was to give out accurate and timely information regarding foreign affairs.

"I hope these meetings will result in subsequent programs," the Secretary said, "which will explain to a far wider audience the complexities of charting the Nation's course in world affairs."

Apparently, great effort was made to give the meetings an air of importance and the delegates a feeling of being on the inside. Admission was by special invitation only, and each delegate was issued a badge and an identification card. These were carefully checked.

Although all the speeches seemed to repeat recent public statements of Secretary Marshall and other top officials, with little new added, the delegates were warned that all discussions were off the record.

Delegates reported most of the emphasis in the conference discussions was placed on the so-called Truman doctrine and the need for the United States to use its economic resources abroad. The delegates were told that no one, not even President Truman, could say yet that the need for United States financial assistance abroad is over.

One speaker appealed for assistance in the State Department's information program. The Department, he said, needs to distribute a greater quantity of concise and simple explanations of foreign policy and the State Department's program. In addition, he said, the Department would like to get together the best editorial opinion on the administration's foreign policy and see that it is widely distributed. The Department, he added, is at present handicapped by a lack of funds.

A wide range of organizations was included in the conference guest list. Here are a few: The League of Women Voters, the Southern Council on International Relations, B'nai B'rith, American Friends Service Committee, Muncie (Ind.) Community Discussion Council, National Conference of Christians and Jews, National Council of Negro Women, Southern Baptist Public Affairs Committee, Junior Leagues of America, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the Girl Scouts.

Unnecessary Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a condensation of an article on Unnecessary Operations from the July issue of the Woman's Home Companion. The article was written by Albert Deutsch, who is also a writer on health and welfare for the newspaper PM, of New York. I am also pleased to announce that reprints of this condensation are available from the Woman's Home Companion, 250 Park Avenue, New York City 17, N. Y.

There being no objection, the condensation of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNNECESSARY OPERATIONS

(American medicine, including surgery, is undoubtedly the finest in the world. But do surgeons often operate needlessly? This straightforward answer may shock readers, but it will be no news to most doctors. It is a condensation of an article by Albert Deutsch appearing in the July Companion.)

Medical men have long known the shocking fact that many of the 9,000,000 surgical operations performed annually in America are unnecessary. Among doctors it is an open secret that in many an operating room the cloak of surgery covers mayhem and even manslaughter.

Every year thousands of anatomical parts from tonsils to stomachs are cut away or taken out because of faulty diagnosis, overzealous surgeons, incompetent or mercenary doctors, fee-splitting conspiracies, or an inexcusable surrender to the morbid wish of some patients to be cut open.

"The public must be told," a noted surgeon told me. "We cannot erase this sin of surgery in the profession without the support and pressure of an alerted laity."

There are too many unqualified doctors literally getting away with murder in the operating room. There are too many operations motivated by an interest in the patient's pocketbook.

Does this sound fantastic? Ten years ago the American Foundation made a survey of the state of American medicine. Here are some excerpts:

A member of the American Surgical Association said: "It is probably true that at least half of the surgical operations of the country are done by physicians without special qualifications." Today that would be an understatement. Now about 40,000 practicing physicians perform surgical operations, although fewer than 15,000 are certified.

An Ohio surgeon, ex-president of a medical society, said: "In this country we have the largest postoperative mortality in ordinary operations of any civilized country."

A certified gynecologist in a well-known medical school said: "In the smaller communities the chiefs of the various (hospital) services lack training. But they operate—often with disastrous results."

The present-day testimony of medical experts reveals that the situation remains basically disgraceful.

The appendix, of course, has been the classic object of unnecessary operations. Although many lives have been saved by the prompt removal of a diseased appendix, many a life has been endangered by needless excisions. Vain and neurotic patients, sloppy diagnosticians, and mercenary surgeons have combined to make appendectomy the biggest surgical racket of all time.

Commenting at last year's meeting of the American Medical Association, a midwestern pediatrist warned: "I am amazed at the discrepancy between the number of abdominal scars I see daily and the few cases of genuine acute appendicitis."

A professor of obstetrics and gynecology at a large university recently made a study of 246 womb operations performed during a 4-month period in 10 midwestern hospitals. He found that fully one-third of the excised wombs were not diseased at all.

A noted urologist recently warned: "In the surgical treatment of diseases of the kidney, the fetish for nephrectomy (excisions of the kidney) comes near to being the surgical 'original sin'."

Many unnecessary operations are also performed on neurotics who get a morbid satisfaction in being cut up. A New York surgeon of unquestioned reliability told me this:

A general practitioner asked him to operate on a patient for cancer of the breast. The surgeon reported an operation was unnecessary. "The patient insists she has a breast cancer," the general practitioner responded. "If you don't operate, some other surgeon will." Later the surgeon learned that the woman had found a complacent colleague who removed one of her breasts.

Adenoids, tonsils, thyroids, intestines, and teeth are also the object of surgical vagaries.

Widespread ignorance of the emotional and mental sources of ill health has also led to unnecessary operations.

A well-known western psychiatrist recently studied a hundred psychoneurotic patients, finding that 72 had been wrongly diagnosed as suffering from organic diseases. Reporting to the American Medical Association, he revealed that the 72 had undergone a total of a hundred and seventy-two operations, at least half of which were unnecessary.

A clinic specialist in internal medicine adds: "No internist with psychiatric interest can help feeling distressed as day after day he sees the unfortunate results of surgeons who expected to make a diagnosis after opening the abdomen."

A prominent surgeon calls attention to one of the most vicious sources of unnecessary operations—the fee-splitting racket. It is the practice of dividing a patient's fee among two or more doctors without the patient's knowledge. To be sure, the practice is confined to a small minority. But it is not so insignificant that it can be ignored.

Here's how the racket operates. A woman visits her doctor who, unknown to her, is a fee-splitter. With a keener eye on her purse than on her complaint, he suggests an operation, recommending a surgeon with whom he has an understanding. She is subsequently relieved of some normal organ. The fee is split between the profit-sharing medics.

The American College of Surgeons and other reputable medical societies have repeatedly condemned fee splitting and, on occasion, taken steps toward repressing it, but with little result.

What steps can be taken by and for the patient, to safeguard him against these menaces?

1. Surgery should be licensed by each State. Every doctor should have a surgical license, based on examination of his special training, skills, and ethics, before he is permitted to perform a major operation.

A doctor may be competent to do a minor operation but unable to cope with an emergency. Recently a prominent surgeon of my acquaintance was suddenly interrupted by a nurse in the midst of an operation. Quickly she whispered that the patient in the next room was near death from a hemorrhage which the operating surgeon was unable to stop. Luckily it was safe for my friend to

leave his case halfway, push aside his scared colleague and tie together the bleeding veins of the patient, thus saving his life. What happened to his bungling colleague? He is still doing major operations.

In larger cities there is a growing trend—which isn't moving fast enough—to insist on definite standards before a doctor is permitted to perform major operations. In one city, for example, no doctor is allowed to perform a major operation unless he has had at least 3 years of special training in surgery, beyond his internship, or is a Fellow of the American College of Surgeons or a diplomate of the American Board of Surgery.

2. If your surgeon is a certified diplomate of the American Board of Surgery or of some allied medical specialty board or is a member of the American College of Surgeons, you have a guaranty that he has the minimum training and experience deemed necessary for good surgery and that he is considered ethical by his colleagues.

3. Be sure to choose a reputable hospital. The American College of Surgeons annually lists the hospitals it approves for surgery.

4. Decisions involving major operations should, except in acute emergencies, be made by more than one doctor, in consultation with colleagues representing other specialties.

5. A well-conducted modern hospital has a pathological department which analyzes every anatomical part removed from a patient's body by surgery. These reports are vitally important in detecting incompetent surgeons and needless operations.

In one case, reports showed that 28 of 35 appendices removed by a hospital's chief surgeon were normal. He was dropped from the staff.

6. Every hospital should be compelled to organize regular staff conferences to pass on every surgical operation. It is very difficult, under such circumstances, for a surgeon to make many mistakes and remain undetected.

7. Some leading surgeons propose that no major operation be permitted without the signed approval of two or three acknowledged experts.

8. One surgeon at a famous eastern hospital makes the radical recommendation that no surgeon be permitted to engage in private practice. Financial considerations, he argues, should never enter into decisions involving operations. The best safeguard, he says, is for every practicing surgeon to be a full-time staff member of a reputable hospital on a salary basis.

9. Finally, the vicious practice of fee splitting that debases medicine and encourages excessive surgery should be forcibly repressed. States should make it a criminal offense with loss of medical license upon conviction. Medical societies should take far more active measures to eliminate the practice in their own ranks.

The South as I Know It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, 1947, the Southern States Industrial Council, composed of large and small industrial organizations from the 16 Southern States, assembled in Washington, D. C., and invited the United States Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives, and other governmental officials to be their guests at a dinner. The principal address of the evening was delivered by Mr. T. Russ Hill, presently residing in the city of Detroit, but a native of Kentucky. He spoke on the subject The South as I Know It. Mr. Hill's address was most timely and illuminating.

Following Mr. Hill's address, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, United States Senator from the State of Virginia, addressed the meeting. Senator BYRD's address was an outstanding appeal to the American people, and especially to the people of the South, to stand by, and militantly support, the principles upon which our Government was founded, the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

It is my pleasure to quote the addresses of Mr. Hill and Senator BYRD on that occasion, as follows:

THE SOUTH AS I KNOW IT
(By T. Russ Hill)

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Southern States Industrial Council, ladies and gentlemen: There is something about a gathering of Southerners that makes everyone glad they came. This is true whether the gathering is in the South, noted for its warm brand of hospitality, or in any other section of the land. Probably in Southerners this feeling is greatly above the reactions which others experience, but others get similar responses. This characteristic of the South increases the pride of her sons in their nativity no matter where they roam. They shout when they hear "Dixie" and experience a degree of nostalgia when they hear Stephen Foster melodies or spirituals. This tie holds. Southerners are warmly proud of the scenes of their birth.

That is not always true. A young man came home from school recently pretty much fed-up. He expressed his dislike of school to his mother, basing his opposition primarily upon the fact that his teacher was always asking foolish questions. "Today, for instance," said he, "she asked everyone in the class where they were born."

"Well," replied his mother, "you certainly had no trouble with that question. You told her 'The Woman's Hospital,' didn't you?"

"Ah, no. I didn't want all of those kids to think I was a sissy, so I said Yankee Stadium." You will never find a Southerner who isn't eager to give you the place of his birth. That is one of the things that the South means to me, and it is important.

You know it isn't easy to boil down into a speech, the length of which you would endure, what the South means to me. In fact it would be very easy to reach filibustering proportions in covering even her major elements of importance. There is a chance, a good chance, of being accused of omitting important elements and violating some others.

A short time ago a friend in Detroit was relating her experiences in a medical center in which she was interested. It seems health and some other important matters were being discussed with a colored lady who had had little or no experience with medicine or its exponents. After being questioned in every conceivable manner to get to a starting point, the lady finally desperately asked, "Weren't you every X-rayed?"

"Lawdy, no!" replied the distracted sister, "but I has been ultraviolated." I shall depend upon the tolerance, which I have always found in the South, to forget all omissions, trangressions, and violations.

THE SOUTH'S RISE

It would be relatively easy to spend all of the allotted time reciting statistics to prove how well the South has done on her own since she was left absolutely destitute some eighty-odd years ago. Not only was she destitute, she was oppressed. Her accomplishments in that short period of time are a glorious chapter in the Nation's history. When the attitude of today's prostrate nations of Europe are considered, the story of the South's rise takes on new luster. The European nations are dazedly begging crumbs from others' tables. The South in her darkest hour never begged or winced. She has come far under her own power. The spirit that made that possible, cannot be put on a statistical chart. She has done well and will do better, and she has the brains and courage with which to do it on her own. Many who are so busily engaged in trying to pass laws to regulate the South into salvation should drink deeply from her reservoirs of Americanism and courage and gain strength thereby to bolster the Nation against a lot of sophisticated nonsense that threatens its verities and, therefore, its existence. Nonsense resulting from statistics fever. Statistics, after a certain point are often confusing.

In fact, too many have the effect that a handsome young man had on an attractive young sales lady in a Detroit department store. Rushing up to her counter hurriedly, he asked, "Do you keep stationery?"

"Up to a certain point," gasped the young thing, flustered by the handsome chap, "then I go all to pieces." Statistics often have the same effect.

Besides, statistics aren't easily understood and can be answered according to the mood. They also smack of lecturing, like the uncle who was taking two nephews to task on their extravagance. "All you boys of today think about is money," said the irritated uncle after a long discourse on the values of life. Then he made the mistake of continuing with: "Do you know what I was getting when I married your aunt?"

And one nephew popped back, "No; and I bet you didn't either."

Charles Gilbert also left the gate wide open anyway when he assigned such a general subject as the one on the program. He took a lot for granted. It is a difficult subject to fit, and it is doubtful if I have the proper implements with which to do the job. Speaking of implements, a businessman went to Chicago recently to address a Rotary dinner. When he got to his place on the podium, he suddenly discovered that he had left his teeth at the hotel. Turning to the man seated next to him, he disclosed his dilemma. "I cannot speak without them. I'll only whistle." His friend, jumping to the rescue, shot his hand into his coat pocket, pulled out a set of teeth with a "Try these." The speaker slid them in, tried them with a snap, and then dolefully remarked, "They are too big. If I managed to keep them in, they would hinder my speaking as badly as no teeth at all." The "serving" boy was not stopped. His other hand dove into the other coat pocket and brought out another set of teeth. "Try these," said the fixer. The speaker did and found them just right. After finishing an unusually forceful speech, he sat down and immediately turned to his benefactor with gratitude. "It certainly was fortunate," he remarked, "that they happened to seat me next to a dentist." "Dentist," shot back the helper, "why, I'm an undertaker." Perhaps the liberties with the subject will not prove so shocking.

The beauty, charm, hospitality, gentleness and valor of the South are known throughout the world. Its share-croppers, gunpowder tempers and illiteracy ratings are almost as well known. The South means this and more to almost every one, but there are other characteristics of the South which are more important to the Nation at this disturbing moment. Because of what these elements represent, they mean more to national security than anything else that belongs to the South that is known to me.

This is increasingly true in the light of current conditions.

Since the war the Nation has experienced a discord beyond a normal expectancy for such a period. The people have turned from fighting their enemies to quarreling among themselves and with their friends. The heroism of sacrifice which characterized the war effort has been choked out by the grasping of greed. The workers who were fused by fear are engaged in conflicts of hate. There are ample evidences of the abuse of power by labor and by management, while power politics has reached a new high or a new low according to the point of view. Wages and prices have played an exaggerated game of leap frog, spiralling into a war of nerves under the threat of economic revolution.

WHAT'S THE USE

These and other eruptions of the period have jangled the people into a sense of insecurity, and filled them with forebodings for their futures. In many important quarters a "what's the use" attitude prevails. This uneasiness is fanned by the evident agreement of the leading economists that we are in a boom spiral which will turn into a depression by middle or late summer. Buyers' strikes, heavy inventories, industry's pricing responsibilities, large profits, labor demands, budgets and taxation are two-inch, front-page headline news frightening in their implications and, therefore, devastating in the reaction upon the morale of the people. So much so that constructive action is hampered. In such an atmosphere it is difficult to estimate and correct the basic causes of surface eruptions. The proper emphasis is not given to hidden elements of security, bulwarks against the avalanche of ruin which some forecasters hear roaring down upon the people carrying varying degrees of injury for all.

It seems very popular to give credence to forecasts of gloom. The American people just love a good cry. Many attend every funeral they hear about for that purpose. If the minister doesn't wring the hearts of the mourners, they consider the service a flop. Such eat up tear-jerker scenes in movies. They encourage the kind of news that makes the front page of the papers, particularly the calamity stuff. Such reactions by the public does not make the forecasters' prophesies correct. The present crop could be wrong, too.

Just as the practical joker in the country was when he came upon a young lady in swimming in a secluded creek, tied her clothing in knots, and sat down on the bank to await developments. Of course, the shocked young lady was staying submerged to the chin and the water was cold. She remonstrated in every way with the interloper, even appeal to what he did not possess—chivalry—to no avail. In desperation she began to search the bottom of the creek for some sort of covering under which to emerge. Her foot finally struck an object which proved to be a tub. She pulled it up and holding it in front of her strode up the bank hurling epithets that were just within the border of a lady's vocabulary. Receiving no response except a grin on the face of her tormentor, she finally screamed, "You beast! I know just what you are thinking."

To which the grinning tormenter replied, "You do? Well, I know what you are thinking, too. You think there is a bottom in that tub."

The bottom is not going out of America's tub. Nevertheless, to many, present conditions must only be considered as paralleling those of 1920. On this premise there must be a 1921, if not a 1929, somewhere in the future. It is inconceivable to others that the country could allow its spirits to again ebb to the level of this belief. The Nation pulled up stakes and ran for the caves in 1929 when just such roars as are now being heard echoed through the land. Courage instead of ghost hunting would have reversed the trend then as it will in 1947–48. Even completely discounting the favorable condition of Government bonds, private debt, savings accounts, and money in circulation in the Nation today, not to mention the world's needs now as compared to the late teens—forgetting all these plus factors would not justify a damaging recession in our economy. Only a recession of spirit can permit it to happen. Certainly a strengthening of spirit, a difficult process because of the contrary selling being done, will prevent it.

SYSTEM ON DEFENSE

There is no clearer example of this defeatist attitude than the fact that it is found necessary to defend the American system at home and abroad. The fact this Nation pulled the world through two wars in 30 years, financially and industrially, is evidently overlooked. Being the only solvent world power today, and in the process of underwriting and actively manning the rehabilitation of that world, is not considered as basic evidence for our system—rather an invitation for much of the world to take a shot at democracy. Until late years people have continuously come to this country to get away from their systems of government and to get a chance to carve out their own destinies. They are now coming to tell us how good those same systems are and to ask us to adopt them. Some among us, who sponsor the cause of those foreign systems, are good sounding boards for their doctrines here as well as abroad. Such go lecturing to those people on the fallacies of America and her leaders. Naturally, many abroad are susceptible to such preachments. Being stripped to the bone, it is something of a consolation to find that a land they regarded as so fortunate could be in such danger of going to pieces. Thus they draw away from us if not actually lining up against us. The right answer is not in that direction.

Like the case of the youngster who asked his father one evening—"Dad, how much is a billion dollars?" Dad replied without looking up from his paper—"A hell of a lot of money." After school next day the boy came in crying. "What is the matter son?" inquired his father. "It wasn't the right answer," sobbed the boy.

If her people get the facts, America will be too shrewd, too sensible to come up with the wrong answer on collectivism under any name. Such systems are moon-bayings as far as material worth or spiritual benefit to man is concerned. They cannot match ours in a single department. There is nothing new in or to them. Their leading exponent can not even put her stolen machine tools into successful operation because of the poor management that always characterizes such governments. For the same reason poverty and some hunger stalk her lands in spite of lend-lease equipment and materials forwarded to offset such conditions. America has no need for such a system. She has one that has taken her on the fastest run of accomplishment in the world's history. It may need a new bearing here and there or some other slight overhauling but it is still the best government ever conceived by man. Recent history strengthens that fact.

BENEATH THE SURFACE

When the people stop listening to the rattles, mechanical and vocal, and get to their causes, the jitters of the day will give way to hard thinking and constructive action. Laws and policies of expediency will be superseded by those based upon facts. Modern man is not as brilliant as he pretends. His spontaneous and crisis judgment is, therefore, not good nor conducive to the continued smooth performance of the democracy to which he belongs: America needs to revalue her tap roots and then take the offensive. She is entitled on her record to do so. A defensive role does not befit her or belong to her. Neither is such an attitude good for one world no matter what the boundaries. Reducing America to the political status of other world powers would mean the end of hope for all mankind everywhere. She cannot continue to back up under appeasement's press or because of false conceptions of free speech. To do so will hasten the destruction of those things she seeks to save. There will then be no consolation in measuring the extent of the losses or in nursing regrets.

Recently a bum in front of the Detroit Statler approached an emerging guest in deep humility and asked—"Mister, would you give me a penny? I haven't eaten in 5 days." The size of the request startled the guest so that he asked—"If you haven't eaten in 5 days, what good would a penny do you?" The suppliant replied with increased humbleness—"Mister, I just want to weigh and see how much I've lost." There is no compensation to the patriot in weighing the amount of the loss if it is his democratic way of life. The logical course is that of corrective measures, and, therefore, loss preventives. America's mission is to raise other systems to our level if she can, but to stand her ground if she cannot.

UNDERLYING CAUSES

To be sure, there are many underlying economic causes for the distorted condition in the Nation. The chief ones lie deeper than wages, prices, production, or controls. Because such are not obvious they are often overlooked, particularly by the average citizens, which are most of us. The correction is not too difficult. The will to correct is something else. Both can only be superficially discussed here.

One of these underlying causes, it seems to me, is taxation. The basic question cannot be whether to have more or less taxation. The purpose for which the tax is levied and what the money will accomplish for the Nation when spent for that purpose is the important thing. Taxation of any successful individual or business to provide for the unsuccessful is a basic plank in the platform of the advocates of an alteration of our way of life that is natural, because that practice will destroy it. It is a two-edged knife of annihilation because it destroys ambition in one and encourages indigence in the other. The answer is all indigence, all wards of the State, which by the process has been deprived of its milk for succor. That is what Alexander Dumas was warning against when he wrote long ago, "If we are to submit absolutely to the level of equality, we had better choose the level of nobility. I like equality that elevates, and not that which lowers mankind." Taxing the automobile business at the beginning of the century to keep the buggy and wagon plants going would have been today's theories in operation then, stopping the progress and development of the Nation. When taxation is for the essential functions of government only, without the extras, democracy will be relieved of its spasms.

Another is money manipulation; selling bonds, printing money, taxing it, and spending it. Such processes push the money supply ahead of the merchandise it can buy. We have reached that stage here. With a money supply now of $163,200,000,000, highest in our history by almost $100,000,000,000, it is past time to stop the printing presses and start paying the debt. That illustrious son of the South, the late O. Max Gardner, cried out against this practice. "Three words," said he, "taxes, borrowing, and spending stand as silent monuments to mark the fall and decline of character, credit, and governmental stability in every hamlet, city, and State throughout the length and breadth of this Nation."

A third is monopoly of labor which forces laborers out of their jobs at the whim of an industry-wide union czar. Why do the workers strike when the call goes out from head-

quarters? Because they know they cannot work again if they do not. Why cannot apprentices get started in many trades? Because competition in labor is not welcomed by the oldsters. These conditions stifle progress and therefore destroy jobs. It is the steel band of an organized minority, forged in the furnace of greed for power and tempered in the laws written primarily in the same spirit. The freeing of labor and the holding of its despoilers, within and without, to strict accountability is the third of the fundamental economic adjustments required to relieve the Nation of its present nausea. The closed shop, and the same thing by another name, the union shop (crucifiers of human liberties) and the right of promiscuous striking must be weighed in that light and not the light of who loves or hates labor or industry.

Laws alone will not suffice. Our Congress has been much concerned about a labor law. Tough and wild are the two types mentioned. No labor law alone can solve this problem any more than prohibition and controls solved those problems. England has laws forbidding strikes against the Government, laws against secondary strikes and boycotts, against wildcat strikes and mass picketing, against political contribution by unions, and laws requiring financial reports by unions. What did these do for England? Her laws walked around industry-wide bargaining and closed and union shops just as we are doing. Their inclusion might have produced a different result. However, the will of the people, not law, is the final remedy. There is no one here who does not know what that will is in labor matters as well as the other two needed basic corrections. Probably the people have not expressed that will strongly enough to secure proper conduct. They will and action will come, but probably not until the plums of 1948 have been gathered and that could be a bit late. The people are long suffering, but they finally erupt and with emphasis—a behavior which recalls a story Eddie Guest told me of a Detroiter who married three times. After losing his first wife he married again. As he entered his house with the second wife, he explained a lady's hat hanging on the hall tree by saying: "Dear, that red hat was a favorite of my first wife. As a matter of sentiment I'd like to let it hang there, if you do not mind." It didn't worry the current spouse and she gladly consented. After losing the second wife and marrying the third, he found it necessary to explain two hats to her. This he did stating that the red one was his first wife's favorite and the brown one was a favorite of the second wife. That out of sentiment he would like them to continue to hang on the hall tree if it were all right with her. She did not even hesitate. "Perfectly all right," said she. "I do not care anything about those little, old hats and they do not worry me at all. But there is one thing I want to tell you right now. The next one that goes up there is going to be your gray fedora."

SPIRIT

In this battle to increase the spirit of the people, look to the South. She has the requisites, still undiluted, for citizenship of force and character. That is what the South means to me, and I am grateful to the omnipotent that she stands at this particular time just as she is—solid. Whether she is an economic disgrace or an economic opportunity is unimportant in the battle before us. Her zeal for the elementary tenets of the democratic way of life is much more important. The contributions of southern leaders during the past 15 stressful years to the continuance of our way of life will not be completely evaluated in our day. The South's ratings in some classifications may be low, but not in the particular requirements of democratic citizenship.

Her irresponsibles may resort to lynchings, a form of savagery which may be lower or higher than the political death beating in New York of a worker at the polls or an ambush slaying in Peoria of a president of a railroad. It is popular in some so-called more enlightened centers to point the finger of scorn at the South. One day even these centers may see the sunrise of a revitalized democracy. The glow will be from the South. There, possibly to a greater extent than in any section of our land, are the ingredients of the lost cord in the fabric of our democracy. It is the lack of that cord which is largely contributing to the break-down of the spirit of our people. That failing spirit is spawning the "what's the use" attitude.

Three of the vital cords in our democratic fabric are strong and easily recognized. There is the crimson cord of glory, spun on our battlefields, against which there can be no indictment. The crosses of victory on the breasts of many lands and many men attest that. The silver cord of culture, outlined in the establishment of colleges and libraries, research and extension courses, lectures and radio, art, music, and drama is an equally vivid monument. The golden cord of industry, the wonder of the world, needs no statistical support or eulogistic treatment. It is enough to state that it paid for the first two. But the platinum cord of character, particularly in human relations, is not so clearly defined. It is almost invisible. Its weakness endangers the entire fabric of democracy. The South, as I know her, embodies the elements for restoring that invisible cord. The three cardinal elements necessary to produce that cord are basic with her people.

SOUTHERN CHARACTERISTICS

The Southern people almost universally practice a belief in God, the cornerstone of democracy, and the chief element in the weaving of the lost cord of our way of life. Freedom of speech cannot be found where freedom of worship does not exist. In fact, no freedom exists without this belief on the part of the people. All America needs to hear and heed what my friend, Fred Zeder, of Chrysler, told a group of scientists in this city recently—that the Master Mechanic is needed. The vast majority of the people of the South believe that, and take it seriously. When the same percentage of the rest of the Nation believe that and defend it without flinching against the blitzkrieg of ism atheism from any quarter, within or without, the lost cord of character will begin to take shape and peace will begin to settle over our land and then the world. Long ago a historian wrote that God could not see the South lose with Stonewall Jackson praying for it so He had to take Jackson. The South still prays to the same God who never let Jackson lose a battle and who cradled him in peace in the thick of the battlefield. A peace that enabled him to mutter with his last breath, "Let us cross over the river and rest under the shade of the trees." That is characteristic of the South as I know it. The fires of worship burn on her millions of altars—enough to start the furnaces for tempering the metal of character throughout the Nation.

The southern people blindly love the flag, another required element for the reclamation of the lost cord of the American way. In the South is the only county in the Nation from which not a man was drafted in the First World War—every eligible male volunteered. Travel the South and question people in all stations and activities. You will not find one native who supports or believes in any other form of government. He may be in rags, but the flag still covers him. He may know nothing of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the budget, or one world, but he does know the stars and stripes of the flag and will fight for it at the drop of a hat. He belongs to the "what's right with America" group and refuses to listen to the "what's wrong with America" destructionists.

The South puts heavy emphasis upon the home, basic in the character of a nation. She is often assailed for living in the past, for being reactionary, for clinging too long to the odor of jasmine, lavender, and old lace. However, no face lifting has been able to pull her away from this cornerstone of society, the home. That far overshadows the ridicule often thrown at hoop skirts or Prince Albert cutaways, especially in this day of 30-percent divorce rates and spiralling juvenile delinquencies. The latter are eating away at the Nation's platinum cord. Nevertheless nothing very serious will happen to this Nation internally as long as man's castle is his home and so regarded. The South is the bulwark of this philosophy.

SOUTHERN SHRINES

Visit the Hermitage near Nashville, Tenn. Drive down its avenue of stately cedars, walk through the house and into the garden where lies the body of Old Hickory. As you gaze on his tomb and that of his beloved wife, and notice the simple slab nearby marking the grave of his faithful servant, your thoughts are not on the battle of New Orleans, his duels with adversaries, the bank fight, and his stand against secession. A voice seems to come out of the hush of the garden, saying: "This, American, is my home, sacred above all else to me, and you stand here a freeman because of my belief and that of thousands of others who believed as I."

Journey to Monticello and walk in the gardens designed by the great exponent of democracy. His Declaration of Independence, Bill of Rights, charter for University of Virginia, of the fact that he declined a portfolio to a foreign court in order that he might go home to a failing wife, are not uppermost in your thoughts. You do seem to hear a voice rising out of the sacred stillness, saying: "This, American, was my home. You stand here a freeman because I and countless others fought for it. You will stay free as long as you are willing to do the same."

Or visit Mount Vernon. Roam through its gardens and buildings and over its rolling lawns. Pause before the tomb of George and Martha Washington. Valley Forge, the Continental Army, the Farewell Address, the early struggles of Washington to form a Nation—all these will fade before a voice that seems to come from the tomb saying: "This, American, is my home and you stand here free today because men of my day fought to preserve it and their homes."

From the pages of history these and countless other southerners step to portray the South as I know it far better than I could ever do. Their challenge is still the South's challenge today. It rings from the plains of Texas to the heart of Maryland. From the depths of hearts stimulated by justifiable pride in their accomplishments and humbled by divine solicitude, they cry: "Leave us our freedom that we may continue to carve out our own destinies; that we may make even greater contributions to the continuance of this greatest Nation on earth."

INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR BYRD

The council is highly complimented tonight by the presence of a large number of Senators and Congressmen from the South. We have and do deeply appreciate the interest you gentlemen have manifested in the position the council has taken on legislative matters, and the courteous reception we have always received at your hands. I feel that the evening would not be complete if we did not have a short response from one of your number.

There is among you a man whom we all love. He has served our country faithfully and efficiently for many years. His fame is Nation-wide—not alone as a statesman but as a hard-headed businessman who has worked day in and day out to eliminate the waste and extravagance that has followed centralization of power in Washington. He

has been selected for these, and for the additional reason that he is my Senator and my friend. I am honored to present the senior Senator of Virginia, the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD.

RESPONSE BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

I am very happy tonight to have the privilege to say a word of welcome to the members of the Southern States Industrial Council. I am proud of the fact that your president, Remmie Arnold, comes from Virginia, and I have known your general counsel, Tyre Taylor, for a long time, and your secretary, Mr. Gilbert. I am especially proud to welcome such a fine group of southerners, with whose fine work I am familiar. Barring some economic catastrophe, the South, I think, stands on the threshold of a great industrial development.

I am always glad, too, to see businessmen come to Washington. What we need here are more businessmen and fewer bureaucrats.

I cannot say that the American businessmen deserve the credit alone, but this cannot be denied: That the system of free business enterprise in America, directed by the American businessmen, has given to us a greater progress, higher living standards, and a greater development in a shorter time than any country has ever experienced in the history of the world.

It was not long ago that it was made to appear somewhat discreditable when a businessman succeeded by his own efforts and without the aid of the Government. We were called economic royalists, copperheads, and other names that tended to hold businessmen up to public contempt. But times have changed, and American businessmen are in better repute after an example of efficiency during the World War in the production of war materials unparalleled in all the world's history.

As our problems multiply in foreign fields, it is well to remember that the greatest single obligation we owe to ourselves and to the world is to keep America strong at home—to preserve our fiscal solvency, our productive capacity, and safeguard our ability to finance our obligations without crushing taxation. Upon our financial security depends our capacity to protect our defense if another war should come. An American internal collapse would be the best weapon for the advocates of expansion of world communism. The financial strength of America is the chief bulwark in the world today against autocracy and totalitarianism. Weaken the financial security of America at home and you have made the whole world defenseless to the assaults of communism.

I may mention at this point that since the end of hostilities, the United States has made outright gifts, exclusive of lend-lease, to Russia and her satellite countries of $1,500,000,000, and other appropriations are now pending, bearing Presidential approval, for further gifts to these same Soviet-dominated countries. On the reverse side, we are about to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars to fight communism. This effort to ride two horses going in opposite directions—to nourish communism with our right hand and attempt to crush communism with our left—is, to me, so fantastic that I will never vote for a single dollar of American money to go to strengthen any communistic country. The chief result of this contradictory and ineffective policy will be to dissipate our resources and destroy our strength.

We hear a lot these days about the high cost of commodities. What about the high cost of government? Just to mention one item of cost: Two years after the war we still have 2,232,143 Federal employees as compared to less than 1,000,000 the year before the war. This charge on the taxpayers is $7,500,000,000 annually—nearly twice the cost of all Federal Government when I came to the Senate 14 years ago. Today all governments—National, State, and local—are collecting more than $50,000,000,000 in taxes—about three times the collections the year before the war—from the American people, and this is nearly one-third of our total national income. So taxes, next to labor, are the main cost of doing business.

Lower prices with only reasonable profits, would be best for all of us. The businessman today, however, is faced with a condition never before experienced to an equal extent. His chief costs are for labor and taxes, and these items are, in the main, so rigid and inflexible as to place it beyond the power of a businessman to accomplish reduction so as to lower the cost and the selling price of his products. Excepting in instances of unreasonable profits, when we are told that prices must come down, we have the right to ask of our Government what is being done to reduce the high cost of government, and is the Government encouraging or discouraging new increases in the cost of labor.

We have a bipartisan program to unite all Americans behind our foreign policies. It would certainly seem wise to have a bipartisan support at home for economy in government, so as to enable and strengthen us to adequately perform our obligations abroad and keep ourselves strong at home.

Since, and before the November election, the Republicans have talked a lot about economy and simplification of the Federal Government. The two go hand in hand. Now we will see what the Republicans will do about it, as they control by working majorities both the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House, where appropriation bills are, in effect, actually written.

In this difficult task of establishing economy in a government notoriously wasteful for 14 years, I pledge, as a Democrat, to continue my years of effort for economy and efficiency with all like-minded colleagues, whether they be Republicans or Democrats. The sooner we forget partisanship politics in our effort to restore government to efficient and economical operations, the better we serve the vital interests of America.

In recent years the average citizen has been influenced to hold the belief that a grant from Uncle Sam is a gift. Many think of the Government as a third party, when, in fact, we ourselves are the Government. Its wealth is the collective wealth of all our citizens. If our democracy is to survive, the people must support the Government and not the Government the people.

At Washington a public man is often judged as a liberal in proportion as to how liberal he is with other people's money.

It is a basic and indisputable fact that no democracy has or can survive if its fiscal solvency is impaired. However, the modern self-professed liberals do not hesitate to imperil the very institutions of our Government by attempting to continue to expand their schemes of experimentation.

The people at home want to clear the confusion here at Washington. They want less legislation, fewer directives, less regulations, and less governmental interference with business. One example illustrates my statement: The vital question of housing. There are actually nine agencies attempting to regulate the housing program. In the Federal Government there are 1,100 main boards, bureaus, agencies, and departments, and hundreds of these have powers conflicting with each other. The almost unbelievable stupidity with which many of these Government agencies have been administered has seriously menaced our prosperity.

Many people are asking: "Why not try freedom?" It is time for us to realize that it is only economic freedom combined with hard and steady work that will overcome wartime dislocation and start our country on the road to financial stability. Work and public economy are our best, and I think our only protection to safeguard our progress and go forward to a new and greater destiny.

We have built up great labor-union trusts controlling the necessities of our life—coal, railroads, steel, shipping, etc.—in short, our national economy. Our Government broke up monopolies in business years ago, but in doing so labor unions were exempted. What is a greater monopoly than the United Mine Workers? It mines all the coal; it has the closed shop, and one man controls it. Without coal our Nation cannot function. Never has a more powerful trust existed.

I do not pretend to know all the answers to the problems as to what must be done to control these labor leaders who have such power, but I do know that full production is essential to our economic prosperity and that continued and unwarranted strikes must be curbed.

It may well be that we can only preserve our security at home by breaking up great national monopolistic unions so that no one union can destroy our economy. The exemption given labor unions in the Sherman and Clayton antitrust laws should be cancelled. In this democracy we cannot give special privileges to any group of our citizenship.

The same applies to the Wagner Labor Act. It gives special privileges to labor, and these should be promptly removed. Some seem to think that the Wagner Labor Act is sacrosanct, but I think the time has come to strike directly at the Wagner Labor Act by specific amendments, preserving always the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively. Mutuality of responsibility by law must exist in labor contracts. A union, like an employer, must be liable for civil damages in the event of nonperformance of contracts or damage to property. Jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts must be outlawed. Essential industries must be kept in continuous operation. The Corrupt Practices Act should be applied in politics against labor unions as well as business corporations. The labor unions should be required to incorporate, to hold honest elections, and to account for their funds. The closed shop should be barred. It is undemocratic in a democratic country. Abolition of the closed shop and industry-wide bargaining would effectively break up labor's monopolistic control of the essentials of life, and this may well be the best and simplest way to destroy the power of these great labor leaders who have dealt so cruelly with the American people and have done such a disservice to the laboring man himself. The House labor bill passed by an overwhelming majority is, in my judgment, the best labor reform measure yet enacted by either branch of Congress. I shall do my utmost to see that the labor measure passed by the Senate conforms as nearly as possible with the House bill.

We made good progress in the Senate today when, in the vital question of sending the bill back to committee, the Senate voted in the negative by 59 to 35. This is a good omen that the amendments pending to strengthen the Senate Labor Committee bill, of which I am a copatron, will be adopted by about the same majorities. Short of a Presidential veto, which I hope will not occur, we have the brightest hope in the past 10 years to enact strong but just labor legislation which will restore the balance of equality, under the law, between labor and industry.

The Wool Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorials:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of June 13, 1947]

WOOL AND WAR

The wool-grab bill, by which this country would revive its suicidal high tariff policies of the twenties, is almost certain to be passed by Congress. This bill would not only retain the present duties on wool, but would require the President either to raise them or to impose quotas whenever imports were found to be reducing the amount of domestic fiber produced.

The immediate effect of the bill will be to sabotage the efforts of our State Department officials who are now negotiating reciprocal agreements with representatives of 18 nations at Geneva. It is questionable whether these nations can now place much credence in our pious words about freeing world trade when our legislative actions prove us hellbent for economic isolationism.

The wool tariff hits most of all the British Empire, that family of nations which should provide our closest allies. For example, almost 90 percent of Australia's exports to this country—and a large part of New Zealand's—are accounted for by wool. If we are to close our markets to these Dominions, we shall not only invite a resumption of the Empire preferential system, but will set an example in those discriminatory trade practices which are the sure harbingers of war.

Unless all our postwar foreign policy is to go by the board, President Truman must veto—and Congress must sustain his veto of—the wool tariff bill.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of June 16, 1947]

LET THE COSUMER SPEAK

Most of the opposition voiced against the wool bill which Congress is about to pass is based on the fact that it conflicts with efforts of the State Department to broaden international trade as a basis for American leadership in world affairs.

This argument should be sufficient to kill the bill, but the tariff-minded Republican majority is not impressed. It is bent on opening the way for a 50-percent increase in the tariff on wool. It also wants to impose wool quotas for the further protection of our poor little western lamb against the predacious sheep of Australia, New Zealand, Africa and Afghanistan.

But what about the poor little consumer? According to a carefully researched article in the January issue of Fortune, the tariff on wool added $136,000,000 to America's clothing bill in 1946, or about $10,000,000 more than the value of all the wool produced in the United States that year.

If the tariff is upped 50 percent, the cost to the consumer will rise to more than $200,000,000. The tariff itself won't cost the consumer that much, but when the cost is compounded in the mark-up of the various processors, that is the resulting burden on the consumer.

What it amounts to is this: Every man, woman and child in America has been contributing $1 a year to the support of the American wool grower. If the new bill is not vetoed, the consumer will contribute from here out $1.50 a year. Yet America produces only a third of the wool it requires, and that is not of the best quality.

If Congress is not impressed by the pleas and protests that the new wool bill will sabotage our foreign policy, the consumer should speak up and see if he can impress Congress that he doesn't want his pocket picked for the benefit of a handful of wool growers. Maybe the high-tariff boosters will be impressed by that. Votes are involved there, too.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of June 17, 1947]

BREAK IN THE DIKE

Some persons will see in the congressional enactment of the new wool bill a return to economic isolationism. Such an assessment misses the mark. The superprotection provided for American wool stems, in our opinion, from a combination of purely domestic circumstances. It has been fostered by representatives of the western wool-producing States in part as retaliation against Republican cuts in reclamation projects. Their colleagues then passed the buck to the President as a way out of a predicament which is always felt on the favor-bartering Hill. The trouble is that this action is buck-passing with economic peace and treaty observance.

The dilemma in the wool industry could have been resolved for at least the present by acceptance of the Senate bill providing for domestic subsidies. Instead, the conferees left the President with the ugly alternatives of raising the import fees or lowering the import quotas to support the price of domestic wool. It is bad enough that such ill-conceived action makes a mockery of all our high-sounding talk on new trade agreements at Geneva. What is worse is that the amended program, if upheld, will provide a flagrant violation of reciprocal trade agreements we have already signed with the wool-exporting nations.

As Mr. Stimson phrased it, it will "amount to a repudiation of the whole structure of American economic policy developed * * * during the 15 years since Cordell Hull began his great work for trade agreements" and would be "a shocking indication that the policy of the United States can at any time be shackled by the sort of economic short-sightedness for which all the world has paid so dearly in recent years." If this blow is sustained in contravention of our pledged word, what nation can then afford to trust us? An emphatic veto should be forthcoming.

[From the New York (N. Y.) Times of June 20, 1947]

A BILL TO HINDER TRADE

By a Senate vote of 48 to 38 yesterday afternoon Congress completed action on a measure which might truthfully be called "An act to hinder world trade." This was, of course, the wool bill, a hybrid produced by grafting on an administration price-support plan a provision for quotas or import fees to keep foreign wool from competing with domestic wool. The drive behind this amendment originated with the American wool producers but was not confined to them. Other producers, foreseeing future need for protection in their own fields, joined in. The wool bill, as it stands, is a device to keep up the domestic price of wool and consequently of woolen goods and clothing. By the same token, it is a bill to encourage the use of synthetic fabrics, against which no protective system will avail.

But it is more than that. It is a declaration by 151 Representatives, out of 216 voting, and by 48 Senators, out of 86 voting, that when it comes to a pinch they do not believe in making concessions to encourage international trade. It is a notice to Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa that they had better stick to cartel arrangements within the British Empire preference system. It is an admonition to the nations which we encouraged to send representatives to the Geneva Trade Conference that Congress differs with the administration's policy, as expressed by Under Secretary Clayton, of eliminating discriminations against trade and reducing barriers against trade." Supporters of the bill have argued that the President need not fix import quotas or impose import fees if he does not care to. It is certainly the intent of Congress that he shall do so if the interests of a small minority of domestic wool growers seem to require it. The interests of the larger public and the integrity of our foreign policy were disregarded.

This is clearly a case in which a Presidential veto would be justified.

It Takes Hard Work, Effort, and Patience To Accomplish Deeds for Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1947

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, it has been with extreme pleasure and pride that I have had the good fortune of representing the Sixth Congressional District of Louisiana for several terms as Congressman in the Nation's Capital here in Washington. I have had numerous requests from various individuals and organizations for a résumé of some of my activities. In compliance with these requests, I will do my best to outline and relate a few of the things I have worked diligently to help and serve the constituents of my district and their needs.

CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE PEOPLE

Every letter addressed to my office has been answered promptly and every request for service to be rendered or help extended has always been complied with as fully and quickly as possible. Such data and service have been furnished on request to individuals, to civic and patriotic groups, or other organized committees, as well as to city, parish, or State government departments or agencies.

ASSISTANCE TO BUSINESS

Active cooperation has been extended to literally hundreds of private commercial businesses and enterprises and chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and other similar governmental units.

HELPING VETERANS

Many thousands of GI's and veterans have been assisted promptly not only throughout the State and Nation but throughout the far corners of the world—wherever Louisiana boys are stationed. In addition, the numerous requests for help from their parents, relatives, and friends receive the same courteous and efficient consideration. Active and frequent cooperation has also been rendered the veterans' posts and veterans' service centers.

These requests involve action with regard to family allotments, furloughs in case of family sickness and death, location of missing GI's, action on delayed applications for separation from service, transportation of wives of our servicemen, loans to veterans for home building and business, back pay and travel reimbursement, cars for our amputees, disability pensions, estates of deceased veterans. Also action has been taken on application for reemployment rights, housing priorities, GI educational benefits, invalid pension cases, and many other types of assistance.

To further help the veterans I introduced various veteran legislation, including H. R. 482, which provides for terminal leave to be paid in cash in lieu of bonds and those bonds already issued for terminal leave be redeemable at any time. Other bills of interest to veterans, introduced by me since the beginning of the Eightieth Congress in January, are H. R. 2528, for removing maximums placed on income of veterans receiving subsistence allowance for schooling and employment; and H. R. 500, which provides for a bonus for the members who served in the armed forces during World War II. Altogether I have introduced many bills at the request of veterans and veterans' organizations in the Eightieth Congress.

FUTURE FOR LOUISIANA

I have stressed and I have worked actively to bring about industrial and agricultural development to Louisiana. I have tried for a number of years to cooperate with all organizations to bring new industry to Louisiana. Much of my time has been spent in trying to aid the farmers and help them with their many problems.

AIRPLANE INVESTIGATION

In the midst of the last war I became astonished at the sudden and alarming number of Army and Navy air crashes. I made a thorough investigation of the facts and found that a number of aircraft companies were producing defective and faulty ships for our armed forces. I took the floor of Congress on many occasions and demanded that the Government take immediate action to save the lives of our boys—and action came quickly. On May 18, 1943, the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch carried a front-page banner headline crediting your Congressman with bringing these shameful facts to the attention of the Nation. Months later, the Senate War Investigating Committee released its startling report upholding my charges. Needless to say, my work in this connection in all probability, saved thousands of American lives and millions of dollars of taxpayers' money.

VETERANS' HOSPITALIZATION

On February 8, 1945, the Stars and Stripes, a veterans' newspaper, published in Washington, D. C., carried a front-page editorial in which your Congressman was congratulated for his forceful efforts in the fight to eliminate veterans from being required to take a pauper's oath in order to get into a veterans' hospital, and for my work in bringing about a thorough investigation and clean-up of the veterans' hospitals throughout the Nation and for my assistance to veterans generally.

HELP TO FARMERS

On April 6, 1946, the New York Packer, which is the largest produce newspaper in America, published the following story on the front page:

STRAWBERRY PRICE CONTROL EXEMPTION—CREDIT MORRISON

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 5.—Score a bull's-eye for JIMMY MORRISON, Congressman from the famed Louisiana strawberry area, who has just successfully convinced Government officials that exemption of price control over strawberries deserves a trial. This is good news, which equals the excellence of the Louisiana strawberry, as far as producers from that and other late-producing States are concerned.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Your Congressman introduced one of the very first pieces of legislation that provided funds for school lunches in behalf of needy and deserving children of the State of Louisiana and made a number of speeches on the House floor, urging the immediate passage of this worthy measure. This matter was soon after approved.

AID TO TEACHERS

In this Eigthieth Congress I introduced H. R. 2525, a bill for Federal aid to education providing for a better and improved educational program, increasing present teachers' pay and to establish additional schools so that a greater percentage of our children will be able to receive a decent and proper and better education.

BENEFITS FOR THE AGED

On April 9, 1947, I introduced H. R. 2979 which provides that the Social Security Board pay $65 to those needy citizens who have reached the age of 55 years or over and are physically handicapped or unable to work any longer or who have already worked for 20 years or more.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION

I have introduced numerous other bills which affect the welfare, happiness and future of nearly every person in the State. I shall discuss these measures more fully at a later date.

AT YOUR SERVICE

I know you will understand that the foregoing is not intended to, nor can it be a complete report of my numerous activities in behalf of my constituents, but I trust it will serve to give you some of the information which will add further to your own knowledge of what your Congressman has done for you. If you have any questions or if you seek further information on any matter, will you please communicate with me.

The following represent a few of the thousands of letters I have received in appreciation of my efforts and are, of course, self-explanatory:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Baton Rouge, La., May 23, 1946.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRISON: I have your letter of May 15, 1946, advising that my testimony has been included in the official record of the hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I sincerely appreciate your prompt and efficient cooperation in our efforts to secure Federal legislation which will be beneficial to the needy people of our State.

If at any time I can be of service to you, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
W. S. TERRY, Jr.,
Commissioner of Public Welfare.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *May 22, 1946.*

DEAR MR. MORRISON: I wish to inform you that I have received my check from the commission.

Your efforts and interest in this matter are greatly appreciated by both myself and my family.

All people you meet admire the interest you show in the folks back home. They are always assured of an early reply and feel that your office is well taken care of. So, to our next Governor, thanks a lot.

C. R. MASSEY.

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
Baton Rouge, January 29, 1945.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIMMY: Yours of the 25th to hand and note what you say in reference to farm labor.

I can assure you we appreciate your splendid efforts in assisting in this most important matter.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,
HARRY D. WILSON,
Commissioner.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
SECRETARY OF STATE,
Baton Rouge.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIMMY: Thanks very much for your telegram advising me that the House had passed the insurance legislation in which I was interested.

Your cooperation and support in this matter are deeply appreciated.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
WADE O. MARTIN, Jr.,
Secretary of State and
Insurance Commissioner.

ZACHARY, LA.

Congressman JIMMY MORRISON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for giving us your assistance in extending the mail route that I requested. I feel that I am also expressing the appreciation of the other 26 signers of said petition. It will be such a benefit to our community.

Thank you again for giving it your immediate attention.

Yours truly,
MRS. GERALD PHARES.

SLIDELL, LA., *February 9, 1946.*

Hon. JIMMY MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts in my behalf in securing my annuity. I am indeed indebted to you for quick action, as I received my first check last week.

I feel that without your help this matter may have continued indefinitely.

Again assuring you of my sincere appreciation, I am,

Yours very truly,
WILLIAM M. PAINTEN.

BATON ROUGE, LA.

Mr. JIMMY H. MORRISON.

DEAR SIR: I will again write you to thank you for your service that you rendered me, and I highly appreciate what you have done for me. At any time that I can do something for you in return I will be more than glad to do so. Thanks again.

Yours truly,
E. J. VICKNAIR.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts in helping us get the mail delivered to our homes on Route 1, Gonzales, La. The extension of this

route is of great benefit to all of us, and we are all grateful to you for helping us.

I understand the mail will be delivered to our homes beginning the 16th of this month. I will return home in a few weeks and will enjoy with all the others the convenience of having our mail delivered home instead of a mile away.

Respectfully,

MRS. F. K. MORRIS.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AND AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Baton Rouge, La., August 19, 1946.

Miss FLORENCE H. COOLEY,
Secretary to Congressman James H. Morrison, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS COOLEY: In the absence of President Hatcher, I wish to thank you for your letter of August 13 and your telegram of August 16 with regard to the triple-A priority for this institution. I passed the information contained in both messages on to the comptroller, who gave the matter his prompt attention.

Assuring you that we appreciate everything your office has done for us concerning this problem, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRED C. FREY,
Dean of the University
(For and in the absence of the President).

BATON ROUGE GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Baton Rouge, La., August 22, 1946.

MR. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: I greatly appreciate your work, on behalf of the hospital, in securing the prompt attention to our application for priorities.

We appreciate your assistance in this matter several times before, and I assure you that you are making a definite contribution to the public health of the community.

Yours very truly,

BATON ROUGE GENERAL HOSPITAL,
W. E. B. LOCKRIDGE,
Administrator.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AND AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Baton Rouge, February 21, 1946.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON, *Member of Congress,*
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: In the absence of President Hatcher, who is recuperating from a severe case of influenza, I wish to thank you for the faithful cooperation you have given us on our housing problem. Please be assured that we appreciate all of the courtesies you have extended us.

Sincerely yours,

FRED C. FREY,
Dean of the University
(For and in the absence of the President).

WASHINGTON PARISH CANNING CO.,
Franklinton, August 9, 1946.

Representative JIMMIE H. MORRISON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have your telegram advising us that the Department of Agriculture has granted us an additional 150,000 cases of cans for sweetpotatoes, and we certainly appreciate your efforts in helping us get this quota.

Yours very truly,

WASHINGTON PARISH CANNING CO.,
LOUIS JOHNSON.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baton Rouge.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 22 to which you attached a copy of a letter received from the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, dated March 21. This letter advises of the approval by the Commission's Interdepartmental Committee on Essential Activities of the publication of textbooks approved by State educational authorities.

The action of this committee of the War Manpower Commission should relieve the problem of getting a reasonably adequate supply of instructional materials. This is more necessary now than ever, due to the personnel problems which are being experienced by parish and city school boards.

We know that you have been very busy, and we hesitated to call upon you for the time required to press this to the successful conclusion which has been reached. The importance of a successful solution to the problem, however, dictated the action which was taken. We want you to know that we sincerely appreciate the splendid work which you performed in this instance, and we express again our thanks for this aid.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. M. BOYET,
Supervisor, Materials of Instruction.

LOUISIANA BAPTIST FOUNDATION,
Shreveport, La., April 17, 1945.

The Honorable JAMES H. MORRISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: We greatly appreciate your prompt assistance in securing early ruling from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The Commissioner passed on our request on the 10th of April and we had been warned that it took 6 to 8 weeks to secure a ruling. Without your assistance we would have been handicapped in our work.

We greatly appreciate your courtesy and your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. B. LOCKRIDGE,
Treasurer.

EAST BATON ROUGE
PARISH SCHOOL BOARD,
Baton Rouge, La., February 23, 1946.

Hon. JIMMIE H. MORRISON,
United States Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: Your telegram in which you advised that you voted for and supported the school-lunch program has been received. We appreciate your interest and support in all problems pertaining to public education.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am

Yours sincerely,

CLARK L. BARROW,
Superintendent.

BOLOGNA BROS.,
Baton Rouge, La., May 22, 1946.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Congressman, Sixth Louisiana District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRISON: I greatly appreciate your assistance in quickly obtaining my passport for trip to Italy. Passport was issued 2 weeks after I wrote you.

Thank you, and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JOE BOLOGNA.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY,
Baton Rouge, April 5, 1946.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MORRISON: I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your kind expressions contained in your letter of April 2.

We in this department are watching with keen interest the negotiations of the Kaiser interests in acquiring the now idle aluminum plant here at Baton Rouge and want to assure you that we want to render any services that we can to you or the Kaiser interests in expediting this matter in order to open this plant, thereby helping the reconversion program as well as our State's further economy.

Again thanking you, and with sincere good wishes, I remain

Respectfully,

W. HARRY JOHNSON,
Executive Director.

LOUISIANA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION,
Baton Rouge, La., March 4, 1946.

Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIMMY: I appreciate your letter of February 28 advising the House approval of H. R. 3370. I am grateful, too, for your wiring me of this action on the day the bill was acted upon.

Let me know at any time of any service I can be to you for the many courtesies you have extended to me personally and to the office of the Louisiana Teachers Association.

With kind personal regards, I am

Yours cordially,

H. W. WRIGHT,
Executive Secretary.

RADIO SERVICE,
Plaquemine, La.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: On behalf of the entire population of Plaquemine, La., and Turnerville, I personally wish to thank you on the great favor you have rendered us, by securing through your untiring effort, the renewal of the practice of crossing the Plaquemine locks, by pedestrians.

We have been notified by the local engineers on the locks that we are permitted to use same as a means of crossing Bayou Plaquemine and this past Sunday it looked like old times to see all of the pedestrians going to and returning from church use this means of crossing Bayou Plaquemine.

I personally would like to have more of your friends here sign this letter with me, but as I do not have time to pass it around for their signatures, I know that I speak for all when I say "Thanks again, all of us appreciate your untiring effort on this matter."

After seeing that so much has been done in such a little time by you, I feel that even more now than before you are working in Congress for the good of all the people of the State that you represent, and here's wishing you continued success in all that you undertake to do for the people of the good State of Louisiana.

Sincerely,

C. C. NEUBIG, Sr.

STANLEY MARTIN POST, No. 69,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Lafayette, La., February 15, 1946.

Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON,
Sixth Congressional District,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I thank you for your efforts directed toward aiding the veterans of Southwestern in obtaining housing facilities so that they can attend college.

Your work will receive due recognition at the February meeting of Stanley Martin Post, No. 69 of the American Legion.

Trusting that you will continue the fight, I am

Sincerely,

R. L. BROWNE,
Commander.

JOINT EMERGENCY COMMITTEE,
FOR THE SOUTHERN PINE INDUSTRY,
New Orleans, La., March 8, 1946.

Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRISON: This committee, representing the entire southern pine industry, desires to express to you its appreciation for the interest you have shown in the problems of the southern pine industry and, particularly, for your efforts with Government agencies to bring about relief to our industry through amended Directive 94, issued February 13.

Our industry, which produces one of the key materials for the reconversion's construction program, is anxious to do its full part in this great responsibility. Its ability to render maximum service to the Nation depends, to a large extent, upon the realism with which our problems are handled by agencies of the Government.

We, therefore, hope you will continue to show the high degree of interest you have manifested in the seriousness of our problems and that our industry may continue to have the benefit of your careful thought and attention.

Yours very truly,
JOINT EMERGENCY COMMITTEE FOR THE SOUTHERN PINE INDUSTRY,
C. C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman.*
H. C. BERCKES, *Secretary.*

SOUTHWESTERN LOUISIANA INSTITUTE,
Lafayette, La., April 1, 1946.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: This is to acknowledge your letter of March 29, to which was attached one from Commissioner Philip M. Klutznick relative to veterans emergency housing for Southwestern.

We deeply appreciate your splendid cooperation.

Sincerely,
JOEL L. FLETCHER,
President.

WASHINGTON PARISH CANNING CO.,
Franklinton, La.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRISON: I wish to express our appreciation for your efforts in securing approval from the War Food Administration in issuing to the Washington Parish Canning Co. an additional 25,000 cases of No. 2½ cans to be used in the completion of the sweetpotato-canning program for Washington Parish, La.

If this allotment had not been granted the Washington Parish Canning Co., over one-half of the sweetpotato crop would nave been a loss to the farmers of this vicinity. You have not only favored the Washington Parish Canning Co. by your efforts, but also Washington Parish and its entire agricultural interests.

Yours very truly,
NICK A. SKRMETTA,
Manager.

HUB CITY MOTORS,
Lafayette, La.

JIMMIE MORRISON,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: As you will soon depart for a much needed rest and vacation, having very closely followed your work and efforts during this session of Congress, I want to congratulate and thank you for your untiring efforts and self-sacrifices under the most trying conditions. We, as well as the Nation, owe you a debt of gratitude for your splendid efforts and accomplishments.

With very best wishes for your continued health and success in the hope that we will have the pleasure of seeing you in person on your return to our good State.

Very truly yours,
HUB CITY MOTORS,
BROWN A. FORTIER,
Managing Partner.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *May 12, 1947.*

DEAR JIMMY: I want to thank you for what you've done; you have been a great help to me. I appreciate it from the bottom of my heart, and I know Dad will too when I tell him in my letter today what you have done. It will be a surprise to him.

Thanking you sincerely.
Mrs. CARL H. MILLER, Jr.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
Pensacola, Fla., June 17, 1947.

Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept my sincere appreciation for your great help in my securing housing. I received a permanent house shortly after your second letter, moved in, and like it fine. I assure you that I won't forget your kindness in the future, neither will my extra large family of four brothers and two sisters, all married.

Wishing you continued success and again thanking you for your help, I am

Very truly yours,
BILLY DAY, Sr.

FORT LEWIS, WASH., *June 3, 1947.*

DEAR SIR: Upon reading the latest edition of the Army Times, I found that you have introduced a bill into the House providing that reenlistment leave taken before enactment of Armed Forces Leave Act will not be charged to leave credits. I wish to thank you, sir, for introducing such a bill. It is about time that someone started to give us Regular Army soldiers a break and it looks like you will be the man to start the ball rolling. Nearly everyone in the Regular Army lost $300 to $400 when the War Department canceled out our reenlistment bonus and counted it against our regular leave time. This was a serious blow to us as we had been promised at the time of our reenlistment that the reenlistment furlough would not count against our regular leave. Needless to say we were all pretty disgusted when they did so. Your bill is exactly what we have been waiting for and I assure you that we are a thousand percent behind you. I, and my thousands of comrades in the Army, wish to thank you, sir, for what you are trying to do for us.

Sincerely yours,
Staff Sgt. MILTON L. ASHBY, 19022619,
Annex 1, Madigan General Hospital,
Fort Lewis, Tacoma, Wash.

NATCHITOCHES, LA., *May 20, 1947.*

Mr. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: I want you to know that I appreciate your effort and support of bill H. R. 1625, and that your support will not be forgotten.

Thanks a million and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,
AUSTIN E. BROWN,
C-280725.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *May 8, 1947.*

Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Sorry to have been so long in letting you know that I have received two of my checks for on-the-job training since you looked into the matter for me. I wish to express my thanks for your very prompt attention.

Yours very truly,
HARRY F. PRICE.

RESERVE, LA., *May 8, 1947.*

Mr. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: It is with overwhelming gratitude that I write you this letter of thanks for all the assistance you have given me. Your kindness will be remembered by me and my family always. Thanks a million for everything, Mr. MORRISON. Any assistance I can render you at any time will be done with pleasure.

With kindest personal regards and appreciation unending, I remain,

Gratefully yours,
PAUL J. CAMALLO.

DELTA TANK MANUFACTURING CO., INC.,
Baton Rouge, La., April 24, 1947.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I appreciate your cooperation and efforts with the War Assets Administration in getting them to release that blast furnace to Sheffield Steel Corp.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for your handling the numerous requests that have been made. If at any time any of us can be of assistance to you do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,
HAL S. PHILLIPS,
President.

ARLINGTON, VA., *April 23, 1947.*

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: At long last I have received from the Veterans' Administration in Washington my certificate of eligibility which will facilitate my own end. From here on I will carry the ball. Thanks a lot for your kind cooperation.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON C. GAUTREAU.

AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF LOUISIANA,
New Orleans, La., April 21, 1947.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Sixth District Representative,
State of Louisiana,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Many thanks for your letter of April 17, together with copy of telegram sent to the Coca-Cola Co. in reference to assistance to the United States Marine Hospital at Carville, La.

I am just in receipt of a letter from Dr. Johansen, senior surgeon, temporarily in charge, that your assistance has been of a great benefit and apparently things are now coming through for that hospital.

Again let me assure you of the deep appreciation of these patients and also of the Legionnaires.

Yours truly,
VICTOR H. KENNEDY,
Department Vice Commander.

RICHARDSON & RICHARDSON,
Bogalusa, La., April 14, 1947.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIMMY: Thank you for sending us copies of correspondence with W. L. Schillings, 101 Huron Avenue, Bogalusa, La. We deeply appreciate the services rendered by you, and in order to be fair in these matters we always try to call your good services to the attention of our clients.

Wishing you every success, we are

Very truly yours,
RICHARDSON & RICHARDSON,
By JIM W. RICHARDSON.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *April 10.*
Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building:

Thanks for your message about transfer of property to School for Spastics. Greatly appreciate your help in this matter.

SPENCER PHILLIPS,
Superintendent,
Louisiana State School for Deaf.

LE BLANC'S AZALEA AND CAMELLIA FARM,
Lafayette, La., April 8, 1947.
Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIMMY: I want to thank you kindly for the letter you sent me from the Department of Agriculture. The information it contains is exactly what we were seeking.

Many thanks and with the kindest personal regards, I am.

Yours very truly,
LE BLANC'S AZALEA AND CAMELLIA FARM,
DUDLEY J. LE BLANC.

AMERICAN SUGAR CANE LEAGUE OF THE U. S. A., INC.,
New Orleans, La., April 3, 1947.
The Honorable JAMES MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRISON: We desire to express our appreciation for your support of the bill to decontrol the price ceiling and rationing of sugar on October 31, 1947.

All elements of the Louisiana sugar industry will thereby be given the opportunity to harvest and market their 1947 crop under free enterprise.

We are convinced that October 31 is the appropriate date for decontrol and that it will permit a gradual change from war controls with the least violent market fluctuations.

Thanking you, and with kind regards,

Sincerely yours,
AMERICAN SUGAR CANE LEAGUE,
Per GEO. L. BILLEAUD, *President.*

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Jennings, La., April 2, 1947.
The Honorable JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRISON: I have just received your letter of March 31 in regard to Roy W. Johnson (ASN-1036428), deceased veteran of World War I.

The certified copy of his discharge obtained from the clerk of court in Tangipahoa Parish is sufficient for our purposes.

Again I would like to thank you for the many times you have given me much needed assistance in the interests of Louisiana veterans and I assure you they are deeply appreciative. Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
ALLEN G. SIBLEY,
Parish Service Officer.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baton Rouge, April 2, 1947.
Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Congress of the United States, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: I wish to acknowledge with thanks your letter of March 27 relative to the availability of certain items, consisting chiefly of tools, to educational and public-health institutions and with which you enclosed a copy of War Assets Administration Regulation 14, Order 7, dated March 3, 1947.

We sincerely appreciate your interest in our program and offer of assistance in acquiring any of the items listed, and should there be occasion for their purchase we shall contact you.

With best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,
S. W. HENDRIX,
State Supervisor,
Vocational Rehabilitation.

EAST BATON ROUGE METHODIST CHURCH,
Baton Rouge, La., March 28, 1947.
Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
House, Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: I am in receipt of your letter of March 24 this morning and naturally received your wire yesterday afternoon advising me of your success in our securing one of the Army chapels.

Jimmy, it goes without saying that we greatly appreciate the effort you have put forth in our behalf and board members want me to express to you their appreciation, and we know as long as we have representation such as you in Washington things of this nature can be made a reality.

I would like to say that your wire came at a very opportune time to build up our pastor's enthusiasm and ambitions to go forward with this little church as it has been a grind through the months for him and his father passed away the day before your wire was received and naturally, when this information was given him, it really did help, which I know will make you feel mighty good to have this information.

I have not had occasion to talk to our friend, Jesse Webb, as he has been out of his office. Again thanking you for your efforts, I remain,

Yours very truly,
EAST BATON ROUGE METHODIST CHURCH,
F. A. NEAL, *Treasurer.*

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *March 26, 1947.*
JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
Hammond, La.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: Your kind cooperation regarding my retirement status recently was greatly appreciated. The information received was just what I desired.

I wrote you directly because I felt assured of speedy results and if at any future date I can return the favor, I shall be very happy to do so.

Thanking you again, I remain

Sincerely yours,
BESSIE K. KIFT.

HAMMOND, LA., *March 19, 1947.*
MR. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: I received your letter of the 12th of March, concerning the hearings of my case by the Board of Veterans Appeals.

I want to thank you for your efforts there and for all of your services. I am waiting for the opportunity to show you my appreciation to better advantage and in a more practical way.

Thanking you, I remain

Sincerely yours,
EMERSORE.
JAMES E. WANNAMAKER,

IBERVILLE PARISH SCHOOL BOARD,
Plaquemine, La., March 13, 1947.
Hon. "JIMMY" MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: I wish to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation of the fine efforts you are making in behalf of better compensation for the school personnel of the State of Louisiana and the Nation. I feel that leaders like you, with the interest you have, can accomplish very much if you receive the backing of the people back home and I want you to know that I am 100 percent back of your efforts to increase State and Federal aid to education.

Please accept my best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
L. P. TERREBONNE,
Superintendent.

ESSO,
Baton Rouge, La., March 14, 1947.
Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR "JIMMY": I received your wire concerning my daughter's request. Thanks a million for your prompt action, which, of course, is nothing unusual. I am going to have to hand you a new title—"The minute-man of Congress." The pity of it all is that we don't have more like you. Just carry on as you are, and nothing can stop you from going places, and upon arrival at your destination I hope you'll continue to do things in a way that will reflect nothing but good for our people and our State.

Thanks again and with kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Yours as B4,
J. A. "JIMMY" MCCURWIN, Sr.

ORLEANS PARISH SCHOOL BOARD,
New Orleans, La., March 13, 1947.
Hon. JIMMY MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: Thank you very much for your kindness in sending me copy of the telegram which you addressed to Governor Davis. We in New Orleans deeply appreciate your intense interest and activity in behalf of public education.

With kindest regards, I am

Cordially yours,
LIONEL J. BOURGEOIS,
Superintendent.

PEARL RIVER, LA., *March 6, 1947.*
Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: You can hardly imagine my great appreciation and thanks for the assistance you gave me when you made it possible to have electricity extended out to my neighborhood in Pearl River. The power company went to work immediately and have already completed stringing up the wires.

My neighbors and I will always remember this good work on your part. We all feel as if we are very much in debt to you for this. All the people in Pearl River know that you were responsible for making it possible to get electricity for the neighborhood.

I have already wired my house and am now using the electric light. My neighbors are wiring their houses as quickly as they can have it done. The electric lights make all the difference in the world when you have not had them before. Now my house seems like a different place for my family. It looks more cheerful and cozy, and now I can get the electrical appliances which I have longed for to make housework more easy.

All of Pearl River is talking about the quick results obtained through your efforts. They will not forget. I can assure you that they will be pulling 100 percent for you in the coming Governor's election. They know you are working all out for their benefit in all matters in Congress.

Again I wish to thank you for what you did for me and my neighbors. This is the quickest service with 100 percent results on anything I have ever received in my life.

Best wishes to you and your continued good work for the people.

Very sincerely yours,
MELVIN J. BRENNAN.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Baton Rouge, La.

Re Shelton, Inez M., ASN O579208.
Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the above-named veteran and this office, please allow me to thank you for your splendid cooperation in obtaining for the above-named veteran his certificate of satisfactory service from the United States Army.

Your cooperation in this matter has made it possible for the veteran to purchase a home here in Baton Rouge, La., under the GI bill of rights.

With every good wish, I remain
Sincerely yours,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
WILLIAM G. ROBINSON,
Assistant Parish Service Officer,
Parish of East Baton Rouge, La.

FARM SERVICE, INC.,
Opelousas, La., March 5, 1947.
Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIMMY: I wish to acknowledge receipt of and thank you for your telegram of February 14 and your letters, with enclosures, of February 26 and 28, concerning the fertilizer situation.

Your interest and attention to this matter are appreciated and will be remembered.

Yours very truly,
FARM SERVICE, INC.,
J. B. BLACK.

EUBANK, RICHEY & RICHEY,
Alexandria, La., February 27, 1947.
Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars I want to express our appreciation for the splendid attention which you gave to the theater project. We are advised that there will be a delay of perhaps 14 days while the title to the property is being transferred. However, now that we have the assurance that the deal is going through, we are proceeding with our negotiations with the architects and contractors and we are looking forward to having the unit in operation within a relatively short time.

Again I thank you for your splendid cooperation and I would like to assure you that the members of the VFW will remember that in you they have a true friend in Congress.

Very truly yours,
GORDON L. RICHEY,
Cochairman, Theater Project.

FIRST STATE BANK & TRUST CO.,
Bogalusa, La., February 12, 1947.
Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIMMIE: We have just received information that the new southbound mail schedule from Bogalusa to New Orleans will come into effect on Monday, February 24. We wrote you asking your assistance in December 1946 and want to thank you very much for the assistance that you gave in connection with the securing of this additional mail service.

With kindest regards, I am
Cordially yours,
W. M. BABINGTON,
Executive Vice President.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *January 27, 1947.*
Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated December 30, 1946.

Although I'm a bit late in writing this letter I want you to know my wife and I were grateful for everything you did for us concerning my Government school checks. I'm happy to say my checks are now received on time.

Thank you very much.
LOUIS V. GAUDET, *a Veteran.*

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, when this so-called Voice of America proposal was first presented, it sounded like a good idea and a number of us were either for it or were at least open-minded on the proposal. The more we got into it as the result of reading the bill, the more apprehensive some of us became. I am now opposed to this bill and shall vote against it. I cannot understand why it was brought up at this session in its present form. In the first place, it is going to be very difficult to justify paying $10 a day to people to come to the United States to study and in addition receive expense money and be entertained, and at the same time pay for the education of our people abroad and pay for the difference between what professors receive in this country and what would be paid to them in other countries. At the same time, it is proposed that we will pay foreign professors the same salaries that we pay to our own professors. It is not clearly determined what these foreign professors are going to teach in this country. The GI's going to school here are going to wonder how we can afford to pay foreigners $300 a month for the privilege of an American education. There is no reason for going into the radio end of this deal, which may have some merit, except that the number of receivers abroad are few and far between.

Egypt in the Family of Nations

REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, though it was not my privilege to hear it delivered, my attention was recently called to the text of a very profound and, at the same time, most interesting address which was recently delivered by His Excellency the Ambassador of the Kingdom of Egypt, to the Woodrow Wilson School of Foreign Affairs of the University of Virginia, an address of such unusual excellence upon a subject of such timely importance that I feel constrained to offer it for inclusion in the records of this day's proceedings as an historical pronouncement of great moment.

The author of this most timely commentary upon developing events, the Honorable Mahmoud Hassan, is one of the outstanding and most highly respected members of Washington's diplomatic corps, a gentleman of extraordinary learning and international understanding, and, it must be added, one of its most popular figures, and justly so.

Mr. Speaker, the Ambassador's address, to which I have just referred, is the following:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my purpose today to bring you greetings from the people of Egypt, from Egypt to these Virginia hills, from the Egypt of today that reaches back into the antiquity of the ages for the roots of her culture, to the Virginia of today that in her past nurtured the beginnings of American democracy and encouraged the growth of the greatest democratic government on earth. I am happy to be here.

As the Ambassador of the Kingdom of Egypt, it is a privilege to speak a few simple words about our past, our present, and, in fact, our future aspirations as a nation. With it, I dare say, you will, out of your own past history find a sympathetic and comprehending tie. And that is good, for the more ties there are to bind the people and civilization of one part of the world to the civilization and people of another, the closer we have come to the simple ideal of world understanding and world peace.

Here, my friends, may I digress just a moment to say a word of tribute to my great friend, your rector and distinguished alumnus of the University of Virginia, Edward C. Stettinius, Jr. As both Under Secretary of State, Secretary of State, and the United States delegate to the United Nations, it has been my privilege to know him in both official and nonofficial capacities. He has brought to his duties a wide experience in government and business, which, with abounding vitality and personality he has contributed to win for his country the high position it now holds in international affairs.

To speak before the Woodrow Wilson School of Foreign Affairs, in my judgment, is a rare and distinct privilege. To one who reads even casually the history of American democracy, the part which Virginia played stands out in plain relief. It reflects to no small degree the thoughts and beliefs of the immortal Jefferson, founder of your university, governor of your State, author of the Declaration of Independence and then President of the United States. Jefferson's outlook on government—all governments—was such that we today can readily subscribe to the tenets that he advocated. And, in the modern sense, what may we say in praise of the idealism of Woodrow Wilson, the Virginian.

Two great Virginians out of the galaxy of famous Americans—Jefferson and Wilson. We do them honor.

"Justice," wrote Jefferson to du Pont de Nemours in 1816, "is the fundamental law of society." "Peace and justice should be the polar stars of America," he reiterated later, and the same thought gained new emphasis when he declared that "the most sacred of the duties of a government is to do equal and impartial justice to all its citizens."

In the dim vistas of the past, in my own country, law and justice have ever been guiding stars. The first written evidence of law comes from Egyptian papyri of four or

five thousand years ago in a fragment revealing a legal proceeding that would have relieved a tenant farmer from the oppression of a greedy landlord. Justice under the law—an aim that today takes new significance when the nations of the world are trying to work out the concept that the Egyptians of the past believed in; that Jefferson echoed out of his fruitful philosophy and that we today embrace in our efforts to direct the United Nations along the same pathway.

Woodrow Wilson followed in the footsteps of his great Virginian predecessor. His 14 points which he laid down as a foundation of peace after World War I were echoed in the 4 corners of the world. The fact that the 14 points failed to achieve the permanent peace to which he had set his heart, does not deprive them of their merits. Following in the same footsteps and on another occasion Woodrow Wilson declared that "the world must be made safe for democracy, its peace based on liberty."

Out of sentiments such as these has been fashioned through the years of travail and suffering a philosophy that finds a modern counterpart in the beginnings of peace in the world, through international cooperation. But it builds on the insecure and shifting sands of impermanence when it overlooks the vital and basic ingredient of justice for one and all, justice for big and small, justice for the poor as well as the rich. In a word, justice under the law.

It has been my pleasure to sit as a member of the delegation representing my country at the sessions in San Francisco for several months at which the United Nations organization was developed, as well as at the later sessions in New York. I recognize that there are handicaps to the eventual success of the undertaking but I must perforce point out that the handicaps are more of the making by the larger, than by the smaller powers. In any organization of this character, the power of veto now incorporated into the Charter becomes at once an obstacle to the normal and progressive functioning of the entire group, and for that reason my Government has indicated a desire for the elimination of this veto provision from the Charter as it now stands. It is my considered view, which I believe is shared by the vast majority of the peoples of the world, that the true purposes of this association of nations cannot be achieved until this veto power is eliminated.

Let us consider the veto first as an obstruction to the free forces of normal argument and logic. No matter if a problem is deemed right, in the sense that it is reasonable after argument, sound as to logic, and overwhelming in the simple question of right or wrong—the veto of a single nation can override it, a veto often based on purely selfish political considerations, on perhaps just the mere whim or passing fancy of a single country. That is one reason why the veto is unsound.

Then, the veto violates, in my judgment, the simple principle of majority rule, on which every fundamental right of free people is based. Scarcely is there a constitution of any nation which does not recognize the majority rule, that the minority must yield to the majority after free discussion and unhampered vote.

It has been argued in this respect that since the big powers assume the heaviest burden, and consequently the greatest responsibility, they are entitled to this special right. But this premise not only has no leg to stand on but also runs against the elementary rules of law. We all know that members of a court of justice enjoy equal standing and rights among themselves, so it is a logical conclusion that members of the United Nations Security Council should enjoy one and all the same equal rights when they consider for their judgment any international situation. In fact, to my mind, the Security Council, with its quasi-judicial powers, should definitely be regarded by reasons of its functions more of a judicial body than a political one. Given the full exercise of its judicial prerogatives, the Security Council could well eliminate many of the possible causes of irritation or war.

We often hear the expression that history repeats itself. Looking at contemporary history we find that it is one of the big powers, and not a smaller one, that has repeatedly been responsible for plunging civilization into the horrors of a world war. The motive behind such aggression is greed for conquest and lust for power. And greed, gentlemen, is insatiable. So the other big powers, if for no other reason than self-preservation, have repeatedly seen to it that such wild dreams come to a halt. On the other hand, if the aggressor is a small power, seeking expansion, it is my belief that the other smaller powers could settle this aggression without the benevolent intervention or undue sacrifice on the part of any of the big powers.

So much for the veto, and now if you will bear with me, I will try to give you a simple and brief picture of Egypt. Egypt's area approximates about nine times the area of Virginia. Yet its total population of 18,000,000 lives in an area one-third the size of this State.

The inhabited areas of Egypt show an average population of about 1,350 persons to the square mile. The Nile River, life giver to all Egypt, is the center of all agricultural productivity. From the South to the North, it traverses the length of our country, overflowing from June to September with the life-giving rain waters of equatorial Africa and giving the fertility to the adjacent land which blossoms into two and often three crops a year.

The Nile is our link to the Sudan, through which flow these regenerative waters from equatorial Africa. It becomes, too, a link that binds us to their people, united as we are through racial ties, through language, and through religion. That is why, in these trying times, we find cause to resent political propaganda campaigns, seeking to alienate us from the Sudanese people and to build in them the feeling that we as Egyptians are trying to make them a subservient people, eagerly proceeding in the colonization of their acres. I feel that these subversive movements shall fail.

I want to stress here the fact that Egypt and the Sudan have been, since time immemorial, united. The mural paintings on the walls of the tombs of the Pharoahs bear witness to this. And when I say united, I mean united in every sense of the word and that implies that neither have been subjugated the one to the other. They are united by bonds of mutual interest especially those sharing the same destiny and the same aspirations. The unity of the Nile Valley is indivisible, just as indivisible as is the unity of your own Mississippi Valley. And, by the same reasoning, the defense of Egypt or the Sudan merges one with the other.

We welcome the idea of a referendum, provided that the expression of the wishes of the Sudanese is free and unhampered. This can only be accomplished if British troops evacute that territory and British officials release their hold on the country's administration. I believe this is a fair request.

The reason behind all these maneuvers is the following: Whenever, in times past, the British grip tightened on both Egypt and the Sudan, they promptly proclaimed through their statesmen that both countries were one and indivisible. In a book recently published, whose author is none other than Mr. Churchill you will find him describing the Sudan as the air pipe connected to the diver in deep sea water. The diver is naturally at the mercy of the one who holds the air pipe. But now that the British are losing their grip on Egypt their tactics have changed, but not the facts.

Gentlemen, Egypt is in a sense the gift of the Nile to which it owes its very existence and livelihood and which supplies her with water and fertility. Good weather and the perennial sun contribute to her richness. A country so endowed, must undoubtedly be mainly an agricultural country, so Egypt has been from time immemorial and so it shall remain, as long as the Nile keeps flowing unhindered. And I repeat: unhindered.

The Khedive Ismail, the grandfather of the present King, described the timelessness of Egypt when he said "Today is here the same as yesterday and tomorrow will be the same as today; and so it has been, and so it will be for thousands of years."

Yet, out of this apparent monotony of existence, new ideas are germinating; new ideas and plans to provide a better standard of living for the average man and woman of Egypt. We realize the precarious condition of an economy depending solely upon the cultivation of a small area of arable and reclaimable land with a rapidly increasing population. We have found the cure in a partial industrialization, enough not only to serve as a haven for the hordes of hard-pressed labor but also to improve the general standard of living. We are developing the vast water power resources that lie unused, for example, in the Assuan Dam, in the upper Nile. We are making available to the populace of Egypt better hygiene facilities and thus improving the public health. We are extending to the physical and economic limits the arable land areas through reclamation and scientific irrigation and thus providing food for the ever-increasing population of our country.

These are but a few of the forward-looking projects that are in the offing for Egypt, in the development of her domestic economy. The measures to accomplish them have been promulgated by the sovereign of Egypt, King Farouk, whose interest in the welfare of his people lights the torch that will lead us into the more prosperous and healthy days that lie ahead.

Egypt, during the recent war, was, as you all know, the veritable center of the early days of the German conquest outside of Europe itself. Besieged and beset by stronger German forces, the Allies were able to win at El Alamein because they had the friendship and active assistance of Egypt. In the conflict, Egypt fulfilled her treaty obligations with Great Britain to the letter, and as a democratic nation, gave the full weight of her cooperation to the Allied Nations fighting Axis powers.

Geographically, Egypt became a crossroads of traffic for the Allies, and she provided air fields for the greatly increased international movement of men and materials, ports for the movement and shelter of Allied fleets, and of her railroad system to carry the tremendous loads of war materials. This was in addition to the great service rendered through the efficient operation and protection of the Suez Canal. Egyptian fliers were constantly on the watch for enemy attacks, either providing an air cover for convoys or driving off attacks to obstruct the canal.

From the year 1819, the University of Virginia has gone a long way, and is still traveling—inculcating in the pattern of liberty and freedom the necessary spiritual and practical ideals which fit the young man and young woman for the intricate problems of life. The present Ambassador to Egypt from the United States has his ties here in these storied halls, as his father, Somerville Pinkney Tuck, the distinguished jurist, graduated from Virginia. In Egypt, education and the visible written record of it stretches back into the centuries of the Pharoahs. We have in Cairo a university still functioning, the University of El Azhar, founded over 1,000 years ago in the year of 937.

While this university has been devoted to the study chiefly of theology and philosophy, we have, in the modern sense given a great and powerful stimulus to education with such other universities as the one in Alexandria and also the University of Cairo, with its general courses of engineering and the arts, and a student body in excess of 10,000 students.

We have compulsory education in our primary schools, a constitutional provision, so that in actuality, we have a high percentage of our youth getting the benefits of modern teaching.

Here in the New World you Americans sometimes express awe at age; you venerate the past, and even we of the Old World sometimes see your competitive spirit splitting on the thin edge of Jamestown versus Plymouth Rock—the year 1607 as against the year 1620, a difference of 13 years. In Egypt, we too venerate the past, the antiquity of the ancients, but perhaps we don't feel that 13 years makes much difference, when some of the studies that we are currently making in the exploration of Egyptian antiquities reach back to 5,000 years B. C., a mere 7,000 years ago.

We draw from the ancients much besides the history of the past and stories of the endless dynasties. We see stories in the culture, the architecture, the painting of the past. We draw something of the spirit from the ancient hieroglyphs which we have learned to translate. This is due to the fact that a man named Bousard, an officer under Napoleon back in the year 1799 when the Little Corporal made his bid for power in the south Mediterranean, happened to have his eyes open while building a fortification in the Nile Delta. Here was a block of granite with three separate inscriptions on it—one in hieroglyphs, one in demotic characters, and the third in Greek. The wise Frenchman took the block and sent it back to France, where under the initial guidance of Champollion, scientists pored over it, studied it, and eventually came up with the identical translation of the three texts—a feat which opened up for study the vast picture story of the pyramids and tombs for the past 5,000 years.

This key to the antiquities is the Rosetta Stone, so named because it was found at Fort St. Julien, near the present town of Rosetta.

In this day of rapid travel, when the airplane has cut down the size of the world, Egypt has become in a sense the crossroads of the modern world, fulfilling a destiny that was hers in the world of the ancients. I think it was Napoleon who said in his first interview with the governor of St. Helena that Egypt was the most important country in the world. He was combining perhaps experience of his past and his opinion of the future in world affairs. So, now let us consider the position of Egypt, the Near East, and Middle East in the world today.

How can the Near East contribute to the peace of the world? That is a question that today is in the consciousness of every country, east or west, north or south. In my judgment, the No. 1 answer will stem out of the actions of the larger nations. Let these larger nations treat the nations of the Middle East and Near East with the sincerity of equality rather than with the patronizing attitude of an overlord; and I am sure they would find a reciprocal friendliness developing overnight. But when one of these powers has the effrontery to speak of taking us as partners in what is exclusively our own domain then we will know how to meet this challenge. We are determined not to tolerate any interference in our internal affairs. It may well be to quote here the words of Jefferson himself when he wrote to President Monroe: "Nor is the occasion to be slighted which this proposition offers of declaring our protest against the atrocious violation of the rights of nations by the interference of anyone in the internal affairs of another."

The countries of the Near East are national entities, with their own history and their own culture extending back for thousands of years. The ties that bind them together are enriched in association through the Arab league, a vehicle for joint effort patterned much along the lines of the successful and influential Pan American Union of this hemisphere. In fact the Arab league has come to constitute a new entity—one and indivisible. Its bonds are growing stronger and stronger. I want to warn those who are trying to sow the seeds of discord among its members to keep their hands off lest they get burnt. It would be advisable for the Big Powers instead to let us quietly settle down to tend our own affairs. For our group constitutes the pivot of security in that part of the world. The Big Powers have everything to gain through our friendship and everything to lose if they choose to antagonize us.

In the case of Egypt, it is pertinent to point out that whenever the ruling hand of the foreigner has held the helm of our Ship of State, our initiative has suffered. We need only to turn back the pages of history to find Egypt a hundred years ago under the benevolent rule of Mohammed Ali, founder of the present dynasty—with less than half our present population—a power of consequence, reaching the heights as a free and enterprising nation. We had our own Army, our own Navy, and in a very real sense our independence. Independence to us today means that the mailed fist of the outsider must relinquish its hold on Egypt; we cannot be free as free men in a free world, no matter how apparently benevolent and kind may be the ostensible gestures of the outside power or powers, until we are truly free from every outside influence.

In this connection, I must confess that I am extremely distressed to see some of your thinkers, writers, and statesmen, in fact, some of the prominent ones among these, accuse Egyptians of suffering from xenophobia when they seek to rid themselves from political and economic imperialism which has been forced upon them by a foreign power. I remember that during the last war some of our older statesmen had been deliberately accused of having pro-Axis leanings because they refused to submit to pressure and domination of a foreign country occupying our soil illegally. I do hope that this unwarranted accusation, this distortion of fact, and misrepresentation of sentiment shall stop, and that in its place an unbiased judgment will henceforth prevail. May I add that Egypt—and this is no illusion—is one of the most tolerant countries in the world, including the United States, if not the most tolerant.

The Second World War has been waged, and won, but the peace seems to be stalemated on the dead center of selfish ambitions, first of one country and then of another.

We had, during the active stages of the war, a pronouncement which came to be known as the Atlantic Charter. It was a lofty declaration of principles; it was the Magna Carta of freedom and independence to the smaller nations of the world—some within, and some without, the sphere of activity of the so-called big nations.

Comes the peace negotiations, first in one capital and then in another, but where are the principles of the Atlantic Charter? Silent as the tomb are the pronouncements of the Big Three or Big Five. And yet we struggle through the growing pains of the United Nations; we fight off the threat of imperialistic ambitions and areas of influence with the hope that somewhere ahead lies the open road to world peace.

We hear often the old term of "zones" and "spheres of influence" which is the English equivalent to the old German practice, that of "lebensraum" of prewar days. It is my firm belief that this was the principal cause which led to international wars in the past. Such a practice should cease. The people of the Middle East are, therefore, genuinely concerned about decisions being taken by the big powers with regard to the future policy to be adopted in the Middle East. The governments, as always, have not even been consulted, and there is good reason to believe that they are not prepared to fit themselves into an already-settled, prearranged policy of zones and spheres of influence. These friendly governments are conscious of their duties and obligations toward world organization, and they cannot, by conviction, tolerate such subterfuges.

The question, as I see it, is the following: Are the powers ready and willing to give up their own privileges in the Middle East? Are they willing to speak frankly and honestly with us along the new lines of political equality within the framework of the United Nations Charter? Then, and only then, will they find us willing to extend a friendly hand. If otherwise, I fear we shall have to resist their imperialistic and aggressive policy, thus increasing the bitterness which has hitherto marked our relations. For creating such an atmosphere of political bitterness, they, and they alone, will be held responsible. I hope that these powers choose the former path of peace and conciliation, which even from a selfish point of view would be the rational policy for them to follow.

To implement this policy we must remember that the free interchange of goods and services is the aim which modern economists set up as one of the necessary means of preserving healthy communities among the family of nations. It is certainly not a new American purpose, for we find Jefferson writing in 1783 that true democracy embodied the freedom of intercourse in commerce. He wrote a friend in these words: "The finest parts of the Old World are now dead to a great degree to commerce, to arts, to sciences, and to society. Greece, Syria, Egypt, and the northern coast of Africa constituted the whole world almost for the Romans, and to us they are scarcely accessible at all."

And today, when we give study to the underlying motives for world peace, we cannot escape the conclusion that a greater freedom in trade and commerce is necessary. We need, for example, in Egypt freedom from the shackles of the dollar scarcity through outside control which forces us to channel all our trade to one country or group of countries. However, we cannot buy from America unhindered unless we have dollars, and these can only be secured if you are willing to buy from us the products we can best offer you and which you can best use. To maintain a high tariff and introduce quota systems would only mean less benefits to everyone concerned. We also need freedom to choose our own companions in business and industry and finance, to pursue those inexorable laws without restriction which are the keynotes of true democracy—to buy where we may do so cheapest, to sell wherever we desire, and to be paid for our goods and services in a medium which we can use anywhere else.

I should like to say a few words about a problem that has recently been receiving a lot of attention, namely, that of disarmament. We have heard that the big powers are thinking seriously of it. But as time passes, we find them dallying with this all-important question. In point of fact, we even hear that there are many difficulties to be surmounted. But we never seem to pause and ask ourselves just what is the source of these difficulties. It is obvious that the very discussion of disarmament suggests the previous existence of armament. What have always been the motives behind armament? Only two—offense or defense. To arm is generally the primary stage for an act of aggression, or, sometimes, the defense of such a possibility. So we ask: Why aggression? The answer again is quite simple.

It is to carry out plans for expansion or colonization, or to maintain the status quo of a colony already acquired by the sword.

So, if you concede me this point, as to the real motive for armament and its eventual aftermath—the declaration of disastrous wars, then you will agree with me that expansion and the search for colonies are at the root of the evil. This evil must be eradicated and under no circumstances should we seek a palliative. If we eliminate this malignant disease we need no more to look for a remedy. All nations would then know that the practice of empire building is dead. Empires, gentlemen, built on the bodies of people weak but certainly innocent, have been the curse of this world. These empires, to the good fortune of our harassed civilization, are now crumbling, because these weak and subjugated peoples are awakening and becoming conscious of their right to live as free people.

In concluding, it would be appropriate to quote Mohammed Ali, founder of modern Egypt and head of the present dynasty, who said, after ruling Egypt for some years: "I had to begin by scratching the soil of Egypt with a pin; I have now begun to cultivate it with a spade; but I mean to have all the benefit of a plow." I might paraphrase that saying that after being in Washington for nine fruitful and interesting years, it expresses my own feeling with regard to the spirit of America, its friendliness, the graciousness of the people, the cooperation of both business and government toward us of another world.

And now may I assure you that you will always find Egypt and the Arab League eager and ready to cooperate with America, provided we enjoy full sovereignty and equal rights so that we all may uphold the ideal of peace and prosperity within the framework of the United Nations Charter. May I also assure you that we will always throw all our weight for the cause of peace, and not of war.

I thank you.

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and accompanying report:

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, June 20, 1947.

MY DEAR SIR: I submit with this letter a copy of a report on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill approved by our Committee on Real Property Law. You will note that the report recommends that this bill be enacted into law.

If our committee can be of any service to you in your consideration of this legislation, I know you will feel free to call upon them.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL B. DEWITT.

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK COMMITTEE ON REAL PROPERTY LAW REPORT ON THE TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is now before the Senate, having been reported out of committee. The bill is the result of years of work, hearings, and consideration by a subcommittee of the Senate which was headed by the senior Senator from Ohio, ROBERT A. TAFT.

The bill recognizes that private enterprise should provide the overwhelmingly greater part of new housing. Not only the explicit declarations of statutory purposes, but also the substantive provisions of the various programs of the bill leave no doubt that the bill does direct itself to the largest private expansion of construction by private enterprise. In fact, the bill restricts public housing within narrow limits which are well outside the scope of private enterprise. The bill contains long sought after improvements in the operations of Federal savings and loan associations, the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal savings and loan insurance corporations, and the Federal Housing Administration, all of which exist to encourage or to insure private investment in housing. The bill contains new FHA plans to enable private enterprise to expand its operations by serving families of low income more extensively than before with home ownership and with rental housing. The bill sets up a new plan to encourage direct investment by insurance companies and other financial institutions in private rental housing. The bill is designed to make it possible for private enterprise as well as public housing to participate more extensively in the development or redevelopment of slums or other areas. The bill contains and explains the low-rent public-housing programs, but explicitly restricts public-housing activities thereunder to the income groups well below those for which private enterprise is building in any community.

REPORT ON S. 866, TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

(Prepared by Charles C. Weinstein for the committee on real property law)

"There is growing recognition that the housing problem facing the Nation is the No. 1 domestic issues at this time. Despite this there has not been adequate realization of the failure of all levels of Government to cope properly with the crisis nor has there been sufficiently considered action to stir the city, State, and national legislatures into immediate action.

"The city of New York unfortunately does not have the funds for new subsidized public housing. The additional State funds appropriated for State-aided low-cost housing, if the people approve at the next election, is only $135,000,000. S. 866 is, therefore, an imperatively necessary bill because it offers a comprehensive program for the solution of the housing difficulties in which we now find ourselves.

"There is no legislation before the Congress which will enable us to meet the housing situation in a faster or more effective way than S. 866.

"Undeniably, the heaviest impact of the housing shortage falls upon veterans and their families. Bureau of the Census surveys of some 70 cities in the summer of 1946 disclosed that, in most cities, between 25 and 40 percent of married veterans are without homes of their own.

"At the start of 1947, there were about 2,200,000 married couples in nonfarm areas living as extra families doubled up in homes with other families and about 300,000 married couples were living in hotels, rooming houses, tourist camps, and similar places. The number of new families which will be formed during 1947 is estimated at about 500,000. Even allowing for the most optimistic estimates as to the number of dwellings which will be completed during 1947, it is obvious that at the end of the year more than 2,000,000 families will still be in need of homes of their own.

"The provision of an adequate supply of decent housing for the American people involves a twofold task. The current critical housing shortage must be overcome, and new house construction maintained in a volume sufficient to accommodate the annual net increase in the number of new families. At the same time our whole housing supply must be raised to levels of quality and decency compatible with American standards of living, through the rehabilitation of substandard dwellings where economically feasible, large-scale elimination of slums and blighted areas, and the provision of decent housing for families who live in those areas and at prices they can afford to pay.

"The preparation of S. 866 was preceded by detailed investigations and committees of the Senate, and every opportunity was given for full discussion of the problem and for the presentation of every side of the question by every affected interest.

"In 1944 the subcommittee of the Senate, headed by the senior Senator from Ohio, ROBERT A. TAFT, examined every aspect of the housing problem and communicated with the major organizations concerned with housing, construction, management, and consumer standpoints. In 1945, extensive hearings were held by the subcommittee and testimony was presented by every source of informed opinion.

"On the basis of these studies and investigations, and the recommendations of the subcommittee, S. 1592, a comprehensive housing bill, similar to S. 866, was introduced in November 1945, under the joint sponsorship of Senators WAGNER, ELLENDER, and TAFT. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency conducted hearings on S. 1592 for a period of several months. After further consideration by a subcommittee, it was taken up by the full committee, reported to the Senate, and passed. Before the House had completed hearings on the bill, the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourned.

"During the early part of the Eightieth Congress, S 866 was introduced by the same three sponsors and was favorably reported to the Senate without amendment.

"The general purpose of the bill is to establish by congressional action a consistent housing policy on the part of the Government, to provide for the coordination of the housing agencies and activities of the Government, and to improve existing statutory tools so as to provide effectively for the housing needs of the Nation.

"This bill gives attention at every stage to the needs of the veteran and at the same time avoids the mistakes of hasty and temporary action. It gives the fullest practicable assistance to private enterprise in filling the maximum housing need within its capacity, and it brings public housing into play for only a minor but important proportion of the need which private enterprise clearly has not met and cannot be expected to meet.

"The bill seeks to create the favorable conditioning factors under which the objective of the construction of 1,500,000 homes a year can be accomplished, with maximum reliance upon private enterprise and local initiative. It would do this by providing for the coordination of the housing functions of the Government through a single agency; by authorizing a program of technical housing research to aid industry in progressively reducing the costs of housing; by perfecting the existing aids to private home financing administered by the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration and the Federal Housing Administration; by providing special supplemental systems of FHA mortgage insurance for families of lower income; by extending the principle of FHA insurance to direct investments in rental housing; and by extending aid to cities for the assembly and preparation of land in slums and blighted areas for redevelopment. At the same time, it recognizes that there are families in the lowest-income group for whom adequate shelter in new or existing housing cannot be provided by private enterprise; and therefore authorizes a carefully restricted extension of the program of aid to localities for low-rent public housing for such families. Provision is made for a program of farm

housing through assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture and an adaptation of the urban low-rent public-housing program to provide similar housing for rural families of low income not living on farms.

"For low-income families, those with incomes below $2,000 per year, private industry cannot now and never has been able to build new housing. For the large middle-income group, those with incomes between $2,000 and $4,000 annually, private builders are finding it increasingly difficult under present land and construction costs and financing charges to produce new dwellings. This latter group is particularly unfortunate in that it falls in a 'no-man's' land, unable to meet the charges of new housing and earning too much to be eligible for accommodations in subsidized public housing. These two groups comprise upward of 80 percent of the population. How to bridge the gap between the needs of the majority of the Nation's families and the housing which private industry can normally produce is the great challenge.

"The Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill which was passed by the United States Senate in 1946 represents a carefully considered plan to meet this challenge.

"What does the bill seek to do? By way of illustration, title VI contains a basic plan for enabling private enterprise to serve middle-income families who have been largely in a 'no-man's' land between private and public housing activities. The title adds three innovations to the FHA system: (1) to make initial purchase easier, the insured loan would cover 95 percent of the cost of the house (as compared with a present 90 percent maximum); (2) to lessen the monthly financing charges, the maximum period of repayment would be extended to 30 years instead of the present 25, and the maximum statutory interest rate would be reduced from 5 to 4 percent; and (3) to encourage participation by builders in this low-priced house program, the FHA would be permitted to issue firm mortgage-insurance commitments to builders up to 85 percent of the value of the house. The title VI plan would likewise assist private enterprise to serve middle-income families with rental or mutual ownership housing projects. It provides for 90 percent FHA insured loans; 40 year maturities; and a maximum interest rate of 4 percent. The title contemplates that FHA will collect premiums to cover both estimated losses and administrative expenses on these new insurance plans.

"Title VII provides for a special program of yield insurance, to be administered by FHA, designed to encourage direct investment by institutional and other large-scale investors in rental housing for families of moderate income. It guarantees, in return for the making of such an investment at an annual return upon outstanding investment ranging from 4 to 3¼ percent, a minimum return of 2¾ percent per annum on outstanding investment (plus 2 percent amortization of the full capital investment) until such time as only 15 percent of the original investment remains unamortized. As in the case of FHA's other programs, a self-sustaining program made possible by appropriate premium charges is contemplated. Altogether, a billion-dollar insurance program is authorized.

"Title VIII sets forth a program for Federal aid to localities for the clearance of slums and blighted areas so as to make such areas available for redevelopment with the active participation of private enterprise. The essence of this plan is that Federal and local aid will be combined to bring the cost of land acquisition and preparation for redevelopment down to the point where its reuse in accord with sound planning principles will be feasible. This write-down is to be accomplished by Federal and local contributions with the requirement that the local contributions must equal (1) at least one-third of the net project cost (i. e., the difference between the cost of the project and the new capital or reuse value of the land comprising the project area), and (2) at least one-half of the Federal subsidy base. Federal aid under this plan extends only to the acquisition and preparation of the land and the write-down of its cost to its reuse value and not the various building undertakings that will be put on the land as it is redeveloped. The title requires feasible methods for both the temporary and permanent relocation of the families who are displaced as a result of the clearance of the redevelopment area.

"For this plan, the title provides $500,000,000 in temporary Federal loans which must be repaid in full with interest within 5 years, and for a 5-year program in permanent loans at the rate of $50,000,000 a year, repayable in full with interest in not more than 45 years. These Federal loans would cover only part of the project costs; most of the borrowing would be local. For the Federal contributions to help cover the write-downs, the bill authorizes annual contributions to be contracted for at the rate of $4,000,000 a year for each of 5 years next following the enactment of the bill, involving a maximum commitment by the Federal Government of $20,000,000 a year in annual contributions at the end of the 5-year period. Such contributions would run for not more than 45 years. These aids would be enough to cover about $1,500,000,000 of land acquisition and preparation for development.

"Title IX provides for the resumption of the public low-rent housing and slum-clearance program needed to serve those families whose incomes are so low that private enterprise, even with the improved aids provided in this bill, cannot hope to service them. In order that the current higher costs of construction may not prevent the provision of housing need for veterans and others of low income, the section authorizes certain increases in cost limitations. For the Federal contributions to help reduce rentals so that they will be within the means of low-income families, the title authorizes annual contributions to be contracted for at the rate of $26,400,000 a year for each of the 4 years next following the enactment of the bill, involving an additional maximum commitment by the Federal Government of $105,600,000 a year at the end of the 4-year period. Such contributions would run for not more than 45 years, as compared with a present statutory maximum of 60 years. This title would not cover more than 500,000 units of public low-rent housing over a 4-year period.

"We have operated under the provisions of the Veterans Emergency Housing Act of 1946 for about 9 months. We have witnessed the substantial increase in the supply of many of the items which go into home construction as a result of the plans formulated under that act. The next step is the passage of legislation to assist in bridging the gap between the housing needs of the Nation's families and the dwellings which private enterprise can produce. The plan to accomplish that goal is contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It should be enacted into law at the earliest possible time."

False Economy's Tragic Blight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following constructive editorial from the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., June 22, 1947, with respect to the importance of adequate flood control, particularly along the Mississippi River and its tributaries, to wit:

FALSE ECONOMY'S TRAGIC BLIGHT

Twenty thousand persons have been driven from their homes.

More than 800,000 acres have been inundated.

Thirty million dollars in direct damage has been done.

That's the rough approximation to date of the present Central Mississippi Valley's flood. A current $60,000,000 Missouri Valley flood is something else—and worse!

There is no way of calculating indirect damage. For the first time in 99 years the price of corn futures on the Chicago market passed the $2 mark. Crop shortage, partly due to excessive rains and floods, plus heavy demand, are responsible.

There is no economy—no savings in floods.

The Commercial Appeal pointed that out last August in opposing President Truman's curtailment of expenditure for authorized flood control works. It said then:

"Curtailment of essential flood control construction very definitely comes under the heading of foolish and wasteful economizing.

"It invites expenditures in emergency situations infinitely greater than the amounts saved by so-called economy restrictions.

"In the case of flood prevention it is something worse—a gamble with human lives."

The Upper Valley flood has already claimed the usual quota of lives.

The Congress has already voted the usual emergency appropriation—in this case $15,000,000.

The flood is tragic, and sad is the fact that it could have been prevented.

It could have been prevented if the Congress had appropriated the funds to construct Army engineer-designed flood control works the Congress itself had approved and authorized. Its effect would have been lessened had there been no Budget Bureau-Presidential interference with spending last year.

The public needs to know these facts:

There is an authorized project for practically every area in which there is inundation in the Upper Valley.

Not a single Army-engineer-built levee or flood control works in the Upper Valley has been topped or crevassed by flood waters.

The destruction has been entirely of local structure of substandard design.

It has been the Army engineers, however, who have had to lead the heartbreaking fight to try to hold substandard levees.

And it will be the Army engineers who will have to go in with the urgent deficiency appropriation of $15,000,000 to do what?

To rebuild destroyed levees to project design? Oh, no! They will repair, restore and strengthen the damaged works to former dimensions.

And the next upper valley flood of comparable stages will knock them down again!

To the $30,000,000 in direct damage to needed crops, farm homes, business property, ruined highways and damaged communications facilities must be added the $15,000,000 emergency appropriation wasted on futile and foolish reconstruction.

The upper valley flood is, therefore, a $45,000,000 flood.

And much of the damage has been done in President Truman's home State.

Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, leading flood control exponent of the Congress, has made an appeal in person to President Truman to submit a supplemental flood control estimate to the Congress.

It would increase budget estimates for general flood control purposes to $200,000,000 and the lower valley estimate (Cairo-New Orleans) to $50,000,000.

After what has happened in the upper valley, the President ought not hesitate one day in so doing. The $24,000,000 allocated the lower valley is grossly insufficient.

The only reason this section will escape the consequences of an upper valley flood is because the Ohio has a relatively low stage.

The flood control appropriations bill will be submitted to the House this week. There is ample time yet for reconsideration of the President's budget estimates and for the Congress to provide enough money to enable Army engineers to ditch the patchwork policy which is being imposed on them.

Floods can be prevented. The designs are at hand. Engineers are eager and willing to do the sort of job they know how to do better than any other agency in this or any other country.

Penny-pinching expenditure policies under which temporary flood-control works are constructed are almost criminally extravagant in the long run. They cannot effect genuine savings, and when politically propagandized in the name of economy are a fraud against the people.

Floods over a 7-month period of 1945 inundated 15,800,000 productive American acres and did direct damage of $103,000,000.

Now comes this $45,000,000 upper valley flood—too near at hand for comfort.

The lower valley's terrible 1927 flood resulted in complete revision and modernization of Federal flood-control policies.

In the 20 years which have passed they have been permitted to become too involved with partisan politics and the sort of political opportunism which hides reckless extravagance behind a penny-wise front.

It is time to get them back on the sound basis of farsightedness and nonpartisanship, where the Seventieth Congress placed them.

Floods cannot be held in check by arbitrary, politically inspired budgetary reductions. A fraudulent savings made for the purpose of keeping a political-party promise is no preventive of the waste which comes when a substandard levee is topped or crevassed.

Present policies which prevent the War Department from building the flood-control projects approved by both its Corps of Engineers and the Congress are policies of waste, futility, and disaster, as is proved by the record of pyramiding flood damage. Real savings can be achieved only through adequate building.

The wet and tragic misery of the people of the central valley is the inevitable consequence of such false economy policies and of bungling political interference.

The whole valley has had more than enough of both.

Redeem Terminal Leave Bonds Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is hoped the Republican leadership which is considering redeeming the GI terminal leave bonds in cash will expedite the matter and get the job done before the administration, under its most recent foreign policy, gives this $2,000,000,000 to the European countries with Russia cut in on the divide.

Members of the House will recall that we of the House in the Seventy-ninth Congress voted by a big majority to give enlisted men their terminal-leave pay in cash.

When this bill went to the Senate the President opposed paying the servicemen in cash, giving the Congress to understand that he would veto such a bill which would leave the GI or enlisted man without either bonds or cash. The Members of this House reluctantly compromised by voting for the bonds.

Along with several Members of the House, sometime back I introduced a bill providing for the cash payment of these bonds. Other bills with the same provision have been introduced by Members. I hope the committee will expedite hearings and report a bill to the House as quickly as possible so that the Congress may have time to enact this legislation into the law before the adjournment of this session.

The President who prevented this legislation 2 years ago and who has recently vetoed the tax bill which would have aided the veterans and everyone, is now planning to donate and loan more billions to foreign countries.

We had better pass this legislation and let the veterans who defended this country get their two billions before it is given away to the other nations of the world.

The Oil Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Herald-American for June 21, 1947:

THE OIL SHORTAGE

If the petroleum shortage in the United States is now the worst in the history of the country, as Government officials at the highest levels are saying, why does the Government continue to permit export of petroleum on a scale that further depletes our dwindling national reserves?

At the very moment eight Cabinet members and the heads of three key Government agencies were conferring in Washington on this critical shortage and calling it the most serious national problem since the end of the war, six Russian tankers were preparing to load more than half a million barrels of oil and gasoline in Los Angeles Harbor.

A spokesman for the Department of the Interior has said the shortage of gasoline, already so severe as to threaten virtual exhaustion of supply, is rapidly getting worse instead of better.

There is even talk in high quarters of a growing need for return to the wartime rationing system.

If all this reflects the true aspects of the situation, it would surely be an unwise national policy to continue unrestrained petroleum exports, even to friendly nations—and to do so in the case of Russia, a nation openly and ruthlessly conducting economic and political warfare against the United States, seems to be an approach to utter stupidity.

The 600,000 barrels of American gasoline and oil currently destined for shipment to Russia is only a small part of the total American petroleum exports to the Soviet Union.

Last year alone, Russia took 2,500,000 barrels of American fuel, including 150,000 barrels of aviation gasoline.

The current shipments are to be delivered to Vladivostok, which is the nearest major Russian port and naval base to Alaska, and in the vicinity of which the Russian Army and fleet recently held full-scale maneuvers for the first time in history.

And as a final irony, all of the purportedly Russian tankers now loading in Los Angeles harbor or preparing to do so are in reality American vessels, merely lent to Russia under the lend-lease program and thus actually American property.

Although the war has been over nearly 2 years, Russia has made no move to return these vessels to their American owners, and has in fact refused to negotiate for their return.

And in considerable degree, the present critical oil shortage in the United States is attributable to our own lack of sufficient tankers for adequate coastal transport service.

There is something incongruous about the contrasting attitudes of American Government authorities in the obviously related matters of petroleum shortage and Russian exports—and indeed something mysterious.

"If the emergency is as acute as Secretary of the Interior Krug says," comments Representative WALTER G. ANDREWS of New York, "those west coast ships should not even start to load."

And as Secretary Krug himself acknowledges:

"The United States had better keep all the oil and gasoline it has."

When former President Hoover warned the other day that our excessive exports to foreign countries and particularly to Russia and the satellites of the Soviet Union are impairing American productive stability and will ultimately impoverish the American people his words plainly fitted the pattern of our policy of national depletion in the case of oil.

Stream Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, on June 17 I offered a bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States.

The New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Compact has been approved by Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. It provides that Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York may also join but imposes no obligation whatsoever on any of those States until such time as they see fit to join.

Each detail of the compact prior to its introduction in the legislatures of the various States was approved by representatives of all the New England States. A representative of the New York State pollution-control agency attended a conference at which the compact was drafted and and expressed informal approval insofar as his State would be affected.

Each State which ratifies the compact will have five members in the Interstate

Commission. The administrative head of each State pollution-control agency will be a member ex officio. The other members will be appointed by the Governor of each State. The compact recommends but does not make mandatory that the Governor appoint members representative of manufacturing, municipal, and fishing and conservation interests.

The Interstate Commission will classify interstate streams in accordance with the present and proposed highest use of their waters and will establish reasonable physical, chemical, and bacteriological standards of water quality deemed satisfactory for each classification of use. Interstate agreement on these matters will permit each State to require that municipal sewage and industrial wastes originating within its boundaries be treated to the degree necessary for the protection of the neighboring State without putting any of its municipalities or industries to the expense of providing a higher degree of treatment than is necessary.

It is my hope that speedy and favorable action will be taken on this bill, H. R. 3875.

Veterans' Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Members of the House will read the following news item from the New York Herald-Tribune of June 20, 1947, regarding one phase of New Jersey's program for helping veterans.

The division of veterans' services, which is part of the Department of Economic Development of the State of New Jersey, has been functioning from about July 1, 1944.

There is also a permanent legislature's veterans' commission, which is headed by State Senator Alfred Littell, which has done extraordinary work in studying the problems of veterans and making recommendations for legislation.

Before being elected to the House of Representatives, I had the pleasure of working with the division of veterans' services as a deputy attorney general of the State, and many of the men operating this State facility are my personal friends, and I have had an opportunity to watch the functioning of the division of veterans' services at first hand.

The Honorable Charles R. Erdman is the commissioner of economic development, under which this division of veterans' services comes. Col. Warren Hood is the director of the division, and Col. J. P. Barney is in direct charge of the loan section, the workings of which are so well set forth in the newspaper article.

New Jersey has taken the lead in showing what can be done in the States and locally for veterans on a sound business basis of helping the veteran to help himself. Many other States are now studying the New Jersey plan because of its great success.

The article from the New York Herald Tribune is as follows:

NEW JERSEY'S VETERAN LOAN PLAN IS MODEL FOR UNITED STATES—12,000 EX-GI'S HAVE BEEN AIDED IN SETTING UP BUSINESSES; MANY PAY UP AHEAD OF TIME, FEW DEFAULT AND STATE IS AHEAD BY $50,000

(By Earl Mazo)

TRENTON, N. J., June 21.—The New Jersey State program of helping veterans to establish themselves in small businesses, farms and professions is approaching its third birthday next month, with a record of success so outstanding that other States are using it as a model for program of their own.

Some 12,000 veterans of World War II have been established, or reestablished, in business during those 3 years with the aid of State-guaranteed loans totaling close to $26,000,000.

The soundness of the program, according to State officials, is evidenced chiefly by these rather astonishing figures:

1. More than 760 of the loans—more than 6 percent—already have been paid back in full, from 2 to 4 years ahead of time.

2. Less than 50 of the loans—a fraction of 1 percent—are in complete default, and the State is having marked success in helping others who are partially in default to get their businesses running smoothly and profitably.

3. Instead of costing New Jersey money, the program already has enriched the State treasury by close to $500,000, over and above all costs of administration. This money is derived from small fees charged for processing the loans, a 10 percent charge which the State levies on the bank's interest from the loans, and interest obtained on the money set aside by the State for guaranteeing payment of defaulted loans.

Only one other State—California—has its own program for helping veterans get started in business, and California is different in that the State makes the loans itself, instead of guaranteeing loans from the banks. However, in recent months legislators and other officials from several States have visited Trenton to study the New Jersey plan with a view to establishing plans of their own. Pennsylvania, according to word received here, may write a veterans' loan law word-for-word like New Jersey's.

The program is administered by the State division of veterans' services, a unit of Commissioner Charles R. Erdman's department of economic development. J. P. Barney, a retired Army colonel, is in direct charge. It became effective July 1, 1944, and the first loan was granted the following September 5.

Under the program veterans can borrow up to $3,000 for 6 years at a maximum interest of 4 percent on the unpaid balance. The banks which lend the money can choose either of two arrangements with the State: the State will guarantee 90 percent of each individual loan, or 20 percent of a total sum which the bank elects to set aside for the program. Most banks have chosen the latter, for the careful screening and checking which the State requires of each borrower virtually guarantees that losses will never reach 20 percent.

Some 2,000 loans have been refused by the State or by banks either because the proposed business ventures were deemed unsound or the applicants unfit. Approval of both State and bank is required.

The plan differs markedly from the Federal Government's program of helping ex-GI's establish themselves in small businesses under the GI bill of rights. The Federal plan guarantees only 50 percent of a loan up to $4,000, and then only to men who already have business credit ratings, so there is almost no occasion in which the State program is not more beneficial to all parties.

HELPS IN TIME OF DIFFICULTY

After enabling veterans to start their businesses, the State also helps them if they run into difficulties later on. A delinquent section of the veterans' agency functions solely to examine businesses which begin to skip payments on their loans. Its investigators suggest means by which veteran-proprietors can get back on their feet. To date some 400 veterans who otherwise might have gone bankrupt have been straightened out by the delinquent section and are now running their businesses smoothly.

Veterans in the more populous northern counties have taken advantage of the program in the greatest numbers. In Essex County some 1,800 have got loans; in Bergen, 1,400; in Passaic, 1,200; in Union, 900; and in Hudson, 800.

The businesses started include everything from grocery stores to pet shops and small newspapers. Six hundred filling stations head the list. There are 296 food markets on the loan roster, 122 electrical appliance shops, 103 ice, coal, and wood businesses, 104 milk routes, 324 restaurants, 226 taverns, 7 pet and 10 antique shops, 10 fishing-boat rental agencies, 1 egg-and-poultry route and 45 florists. Others include glass shops, stores selling greeting cards, hardware, clothes, musical instruments, monumental stone, and almost everything else imaginable.

About 400 have gone into poultry breeding, cattle raising, dairy farming, tree surgery, and other agricultural pursuits. Some have gone in for small manufacturing enterprises.

LEARNED FARMING AT HOSPITAL

Morris E. Reid said he would still be driving a produce truck if it were not for the loan program. Mr. Reid, a 36-year-old Army veteran, learned the fundamentals of farming while recuperating from war wounds in the Valley Forge General Hospital. When he was released he and his wife pooled their savings and made a down payment on a farm near Stratford, N. J. Because there was no money for equipment last year they raised only enough to feed themselves. In February Mr. Reid heard about the State loan. He borrowed the limit, bought a tractor, transplanter, seeds, fertilizer, and other necessities, and with the help of his wife and two teen-aged sons planted 25 acres of tomatoes in addition to a vegetable garden which will produce more than the family can eat.

"We'll do all right this summer," Mr. Reid said. "This State loan is the best thing I ever saw. It beats a bonus."

Robert and William McCalley were grocery clerks. In the war, Robert, 29, served with the Air Forces, and William, 23, was a marine. Recently they pooled their State loans and bought a grocery store, the Village Market, in Fairview, N. J. "We're doing very well," said Robert, proudly. "It feels mighty good to be working for yourself."

Is It an Iron Curtain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. FOLGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer:

IS IT AN IRON CURTAIN?

We are told over the radio and by cable everyday that there is an iron curtain surrounding Russia so that no outsiders can know what is going on in that communistic country.

Is there an impenetrable curtain? If so, can some people see through it, while it is dense to others?

A day or two ago Lt. Gen. Lawton Collins in a speech at Miami, according to an Associated Press dispatch, said that there were 200 divisions of Russians "in the field right now, compared with 10 divisions in the whole United States Army" and that Russia has over 10,000 airplanes—while the United States cannot man 4,000 aircraft today. He added that "Russia's satellites in Europe could provide another 100 divisions." Continuing, General Collins said that the War Department feels that "great ports like New York City would be logical targets; that great industrial centers like Detroit, Pittsburgh and Chicago would be areas of attack, not the military dispositions of troops deployed in the field."

He said attack might come by long-range aircraft strikes across the polar cap and might include atom bombing and bacteriological warfare.

If General Collins has looked behind the iron curtain and seen these marching millions, and if Russia intends to mobilize them against the United States, what is the answer Uncle Sam can and would make? A study of what happened at Hiroshima is the answer. Neither 10 nor 100 divisions of marching men would be a match for the destructive power of the atomic bombs of an improved and more deadly type than the one the United States used to knock Japan out of the war.

If Russia has such a preponderance of men under arms right now, that fact is evidence that it has no atomic bombs while the United States is so far advanced in knowledge of and possession of atomic bombs that they could do in Russia more effectively what they did in Japan and destroy Russia's great cities before it could move its hundreds of divisions.

Missouri River Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of June 24, 1947:

FLOOD TOLL: $200,000,000 AND 3,800,000 ACRES

The fourth, and most disastrous, flood crest in a month moved relentlessly down the Missouri River Valley today, ruining all hope of a 1947 crop in the inundated areas.

The new flood was expected to drown almost 300,000 fertile acres. This would give the Nation a total loss to floods this year of 3,800,000 acres with an immediate monetary loss of almost $200,000,000 in crops, equipment, and personal possessions.

Estimates do not take into account the amount of topsoil ripped away, ruining the land forever. The floods have driven 20,000 persons from their homes in 4 weeks.

The new swell of high water was expected to reach St. Joseph, Mo., today, shoving the United States engineers' surface markers to a height of 21.5 feet. Flood stage is considered 17 feet at St. Joseph.

As it juggernauted down river, the flood ruined some of the finest corn and wheat farm land in America. About 400 miles of bottom land was expected to be overrun in the section where Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska join.

The weather was clear and residents hoped it would hold long enough to permit the river to discharge the overload of water it received from torrential rains last week.

Engineers predicted the river would go over the top of the levee protecting the St. Joseph Municipal Airport. They said the dike probably would collapse under the strain, permitting millions of gallons of water to overspread the field.

At Boonville, Mo., engineers and city officials were attempting to keep the municipal water works intake pit from collapsing. The engineers said that if the foundation walls collapsed the intake would be buried, shutting off the town's water supply.

The crest was moving through the valley like a long, low wave. The river was falling above and below the rise.

At Nebraska City, Nebr., 70 miles above St. Joseph, the surface level fell two-tenths of a foot. At Kansas City, 45 miles downstream, the river dropped slowly to 19.2 feet from the crest to 19.4 feet hit by the previous flood, which was still moving down the river in advance of the new rise.

Verne Alexander, regional river engineer for the Kansas City weather bureau, said the new flood would "beat anything we've had so far this month and clean out the valley for this year as far as crops are concerned."

The Platte River was leveling off at Agency, Mo., where only the housetops showed above the surface.

Rescue workers still sought five persons at Cambridge, Nebr., where eight persons died in a flash flood Sunday. The waters of Medicine Creek and the Republican River had receded today, leaving the streets and houses full of silt.

The week-end flash floods in Iowa and Nebraska were pouring their burden of water into the larger rivers today. Alexander said the Missouri would rise to 6 feet above flood stage at Kansas City tomorrow.

Funds for the United Nations Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the centuries there has been a constant struggle between two groups—those who seek to aid civilization and those who retard it. The world has recently witnessed a great conflict, begun by power-mad dictators who sought to dominate the entire universe. Their aim was to impede progress toward a better civilization using as their chief weapons intolerance and persecution. Fortunately, their armies were defeated, their aims destroyed. We and our great allies emerged victorious and in our victory we realized the urgent need for international assistance and humanitarian action.

Out of this realization was conceived the United Nations organization—a bulwark against tyranny and despotism. This organization was begun by men who were seeking a higher understanding, a finer civilization. Mr. J. Russell Earp, whose extremely worth-while suggestion I submit today, is a good example of this type. Like any average citizen, he is greatly interested in promoting humanitarian projects and is always anxious to support a worthy cause. He recently read a newspaper release about the United Nations organization having difficulty in obtaining funds for the building of their world headquarters in New York. His reaction to this was to suggest to me that a fund be established to which the "little people" of the world could contribute, the money to be used to aid in the construction of the U. N. world headquarters. This is the people's problem, the people want to do something about it and Mr. Earp has proposed a means whereby they can show their interest.

Since the primary purpose of the U. N. is to assist and defend the "little people" of the world, I think Mr. Earp's suggestion should be adopted.

I have written the following letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations organization forwarding Mr. Earp's check for $25 to begin the fund, and I sincerely hope it will be favorably considered:

JUNE 24, 1947.

The Honorable TRYGVE LIE,
Secretary General,
The United Nations Organization,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. LIE: The enclosed check for $25 dollars has been given to me with the express wish that it be submitted to your organization to initiate a fund which would be used to aid in defraying the cost of constructing the world headquarters of the United Nations organization in New York City.

Mr. J. Russell Earp, the donor, has suggested that this fund be contributed to by average citizens, like himself, throughout the world. He feels that the people would want to do this since their future way of life depends to a great extent on the strength of the United Nations. Such contributions could easily be compared to the paying of premiums on a fully covering form of life insurance with the dividends to be of untold benefit.

We are all aware of the tremendous task that lies before the United Nations organization—the preservation of peace throughout the world. In our hearts and minds we join with you that your mission may be accomplished and that acts of aggression, tyranny, and the evils of war may be forever banished from this universe.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

On-the-Job Training for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1947, after several weeks of testimony, H. R. 246, the so-called on-the-job training bill for veterans, was unanimously reported out of committee. For some unknown reason we were unable to obtain a hearing before the Rules Committee and on March 21, 1947, I offered House Resolution 159 making H.

R. 246 a special order of business. Seven legislative days having passed without consideration by the Committee on Rules, a discharge petition—No. 4—was placed on the Speaker's desk, as I was convinced that was the only means whereby H. R. 246 would be brought to the floor of the House. On May 22, 1947, nearly 3 months after the bill was unanimously reported out of committee, a hearing was granted by the Committee on Rules and today, 1 month after the date of that hearing, no action has been taken by that committee.

Briefly, the foregoing is the record on H. R. 246 up to the present time. Over one hundred names have been placed on the discharge petition and it looks from here as though we were getting nowhere fast.

It seems incredible to me that only a short time ago we were telling the men and women in the armed forces that nothing was too good for them. But the shooting war is over and many of us have short memories. I can think of no earthly reason for the Committee on Rules to pigeon-hole action on this bill. It is legislation needed and needed urgently—needed to correct the harm done the working veteran by the passage of Public Law 679 during the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

We have been told not only by individual members of the Committee on Rules but also by other Members of the House that we will get no action—not only on this bill—but also no action on other pieces of veteran legislation so urgently needed. I ask the question—why? Who determines whether this bill or any other bill in behalf of the veteran shall be brought to the floor of the House? It is a tremendous responsibility that rests on someone's shoulders to deny fair and just legislation to the men and women who saved this country of ours so that we could remain free men and women. It is certainly something to wonder at when we can vote millions of dollars to foreign countries but, when we are asked to do something for our own, we are met with the cry "It will cost too much" or "We have done enough for them." I will accept no part of a program which would deny to the veterans the things they are entitled to; and I believe that after hearing of this bill in detail, you will agree it is right and proper that it should be brought to the floor of the House and without further delay.

H. R. 246 concerns itself with the revision of certain parts of Public Law 679 relative to on-the-job training of veterans.

The primary purpose of this on-the-job training is to provide returning veterans with the most direct and best training possible, so as to equip them for suitable employment. It was designed to give the returning veteran a particular skill, through training, so that the veteran could earn a decent living and earn a livelihood for himself and his family. The payment of a subsistence allowance of either $90 or $65 a month during this period of training is designed to aid the veteran to carry on with his current obligations with sufficient income, until such time as his skill became such that he would be capable of producing enough work on his own initiative to enable the employer to consider him as a qualified employee and pay him the wages of an experienced trained man.

Despite the fine purposes of on-the-job training, poor supervision on the part of some States of the programs that the States have the authority to approve or disapprove, lack of knowledge on the part of employers as to what was expected of them, an insufficient number of training officers in the Veterans Administration to investigate these abuses and withdraw the veteran from training, led to certain abuses. Supposedly, for the purpose of correcting these abuses the Seventy-ninth Congress in its closing days of business hurriedly passed Public Law 679 at the request of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Gen. Omar Bradley.

This law placed a wage ceiling on the combined subsistence and wages of veterans in training from all sources of employment. Under Public Law 679, the veteran without dependents has a $175 ceiling imposed on him and a $200 ceiling is imposed on the veteran with dependents. This simply means that no matter how many children a man may have in his family, the veteran's combined subsistence and wage cannot exceed $200. If they do exceed $200, his subsistence is automatically reduced in proportion to the wages received. It means further that while this veteran is still learning his trade, he must be content to feed, clothe, shelter, and provide medical care for his family on $200 per month. The law provides further that the job customarily requires a period of training of not less than 3 months and not more than 2 years of full-time training; and finally, that prior to the States giving their final approval to training programs, they must conform to certain standards established in Public Law 679, for the purpose of achieving some uniformity throughout the United States in the approval of training programs.

The passage of Public Law 679 brought considerable reaction in the public press. Letters from all parts of the country were coming in to Congressmen asking for a change in the ceiling. The Veterans of Foreign Wars conducted a survey that showed the veteran as the victim of Public Law 679, rather than the benefactor. The American Legion made demands upon the Congress for a complete withdrawal of the ceilings because of its drastic effect upon veterans. In no one instance did anyone recommend that the ceiling as it now stands be maintained. It is evident from the barrage of comment from all sides that Public Law 679 was not the perfect medicine for the ill that it sought to cure. Instead of attacking the real causes of the abuses, it attacked the veteran instead.

Thousands of veterans entered on-the-job training with the expectation that they would receive a definite income over the period of their training. With a feeling of security in the hope that some day they would be proficient in the trade they were learning and confident that their income would continue in accordance with their training program, some of these veterans entered into contracts for the purchase of homes, furniture and other household necessities. But the very low ceilings imposed by Public Law 679 exploded their plans, meaning in many instances a foreclosure proceeding took place on their property, their personal possessions, and, further, they lost any further use of their benefits under the loan provisions of the GI bill. Many others had to leave what was a good training situation, providing a low income now, but a promise of a higher income in the future, so that they could take a more lucrative job, but one that offered little or no security in the future.

As evidence of the effect of Public Law 679, the following Veterans' Administration figures for the year 1946 are given, to show the growth and the decline in the number of on-the-job trainees since this law went into existence on August 8, 1946:

Month	Number	Net addition since previous month	Under Public Law 346	Under Public Law 16[1]
January	39,925	12,557	24,627	15,298
February	56,714	16,789	38,952	17,762
March	94,070	37,356	72,198	21,872
April	169,823	75,753	142,205	27,872
May	262,312	92,489	228,523	33,789
June	357,885	95,573	317,822	40,063
July	447,484	89,599	400,527	46,957
August	525,960	78,476	471,313	54,647
September	584,796	58,836	522,991	61,805
October	666,332	81,536	595,541	70,791
November	693,038	26,706	614,882	78,156
December	712,799	19,761	629,157	83,642

[1] Public Law 16 trainees are not affected by Public Law 679.

These Veterans' Administration statistics show that from April to October, inclusive, an average of about 70,000 each month were added to the number of trainees under Public Law 346. About 6,000 per month for the same period were added to the trainees under Public Law 16. However, it is important to note that during the months of November and December 1946, the number added to the trainees under Public Law 346 had declined to an average of 12,000 per month from 70,000, while the trainees under Public Law 16 had maintained the monthly average of about 6,000.

These figures tell a startling story. Employers and veterans both are bewildered. The employers is reluctant to seek approval of worth while training opportunities and the veterans do not know what to expect when they enter training. Therefore, the majority of veterans and employers are marking time awaiting the necessary action by this session of Congress.

The majority of our discharged veterans are not eligible to attend college. Is it fair then to deny this group the opportunities afforded by on-the-job training? Compare the individual cost of training a veteran on the job to the cost of sending a veteran to college. How does the $500 per year plus $90 a month for the married veteran compare with just a plain $90 per month for the veteran taking his training on the job? I believe we will all be saving the taxpayers a lot of money as well as providing the veteran with the opportunity to earn a decent livelihood, to say nothing of giv-

ing the veteran an occupation that he can follow for life, by the passage of H. R. 246.

It is a well-understood fact that the wage ceiling imposed by Public Law 679 is not a limitation on the amount of income that a veteran may earn. It merely calls for a reduction in subsistence allowance where the veteran begins to earn more than the ceiling allowed him. But this ceiling is placed so low that it affects veterans who are located in large industrial and manufacturing centers in the United States, where wages are normally higher and the cost of living proportionate.

A higher wage ceiling and a lifting of the 2-year limitation on training is necessary because of the following reasons:

First. The present wage ceiling prevents a certain group of veterans from entering a bona fide training situation where he is qualified in his present job and is now ready to train for the position of foreman or superintendent.

Second. It encourages the employer to train the veteran, whereas without a subsistence allowance the employer is reluctant to employ a trainee, because his wage payments would be too low for the beginner to earn a living, and the veteran could not afford to take training.

Third. The wage ceiling as proposed in H. R. 246 will benefit the veteran in his current need and still prevent the training monstrosities recently cited in the press by the Veterans' Administration. It strikes an average more in line with the average veteran, rather than the exceptional one who is in a higher wage bracket, and whose salary while in training is ample to support him and his dependents.

Fourth. In 1943, 50 percent of the male workers earned $200 or more per month, and over 30 percent earned $250 or more. Since 1943 the cost of living has risen, particularly on the Pacific coast, large communities in the Midwest, the eastern areas, and in certain southern communities, which reflects a need for higher ceilings.

Fifth. As of July 31, 400,527 veterans were in training. At that time the Veterans' Administration predicted that 55 percent of the veterans or better would have their incomes reduced or discontinued by Public Law 679, at some time in the near future. I ask you, if you consider this a fair way to treat the very veteran who left his job and security to win this war for you and me. Public Law 679 was signed by the President on August 8, 1946, and in the months of November and December the effects of Public Law 679 on the veterans in training became evident. A reduction of from 70,000 to 12,000 trainees was noted while the training under Public Law 16, which was unaffected by the ceilings, maintained its static influx of 6,000 per month. The Department of Labor predicted last July that better than 70 percent of the veterans in on-the-job training would be affected by Public Law 679. The facts most certainly bear out the truth of this contention. Where 70 percent are affected by Public Law 679, the wage ceiling was most certainly entirely too low.

Sixth. The majority of abuses relating to a $500 a month and better income were shown to exist largely among professional people, but the vast majority of veterans training on the job are in a wage group below that figure. The wage ceiling proposed in H. R. 246 prevents an employer from setting up a training program merely for the purpose of subsidizing labor, and does not create a hardship on the veteran.

Seventh. The veteran suffers a period of loss while in training, where he earns more than $110 a month from the employer, until such time as the employer wage compensates for the loss of subsistence. Many employers have reported to me that trainees are reluctant to work overtime as the salary would then exceed the ceiling and the veteran would receive no benefit from the overtime worked, since this overtime would be deducted from the subsistence allowance. H. R. 246 gives the veteran a chance to earn the bare living essentials before any reduction takes place in subsistence, and to encourage employers to set up only those training programs that are really designed as such, and to keep the training programs in those places where there is an actual need and not in the high-salaried brackets.

Eighth. Veterans have entered on-the-job training with the expectation of receiving a definite income over the period of their training. With a feeling of certainty, some of these veterans entered into contracts and obligated themselves for the purchase of homes, cars, and so forth, and now find that the legs of security to meet their payments have been taken away from them by these wage ceilings. They have lost any further benefits under the loan provisions of Public Law 346 and have lost heart with the whole intent of the GI bill.

Ninth. H. R. 246 insists on a wage ceiling. A higher wage ceiling, however, than now in existence. I am fearful that without some reasonable ceiling, and without proper and intelligent supervision on the State and national level, the same unfortunate situation which brought about the enactment of Public Law 679 will again develop.

Tenth. The wage ceilings must be lifted, as proposed in H. R. 246, to accommodate the majority of the veterans who are seriously affected by the present low ceilings and who are living in the high-wage regions of the country. It is true that some veterans in a low-wage area will benefit by a higher wage ceiling, but it is impossible to proportion subsistence payments on the basis of locality, in relation to the customary wages that are paid, because the experience at the end of the last war has proven that one State feels as though it is entitled, and rightly so, to as much as is granted to any other State. Therefore, the higher wage ceiling should be granted between the high-wage areas and the low-wage areas, with the preference being given the majority of the States where the veterans are employed in training. It is contended that H. R. 246 satisfies this requirement.

The House Committee on Veterans Affairs has unanimously endorsed H. R. 246 as being the bill best adapted to apply to this on-the-job training situation. For several weeks we listened to testimony from all sources. We are all agreed that over 630,000 veterans now engaged in on-the-job training are anxiously awaiting the decision that this Congress must make. Some definite action must be taken so that we will not break faith with the men who so honorably served our Nation in its time of need. Their period of readjustment is a most difficult one, and it is our duty to see to it that everything possible is done to provide them with those tools that will help rehabilitate them to the type of life they knew before they went off to war.

I invite all my colleagues to sign Discharge Petition No. 4 in order to correct a wrong to our veterans.

Deport Charlie Chaplin—Clean Up Hollywood and Protect the Youth of America

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter I have just received from Mr. B. M. Dorrity, a leading businessman of Shreveport, La., together with an editorial from the Shreveport Journal of Friday, June 20, 1947.

The letter referred to follows:

SHREVEPORT, LA., *June 21, 1947.*

Hon. J. E. RANKIN,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: Enclosed herewith is an editorial page from our Sheveport Journal in which you and your stand is praised regarding un-American activity of members of the motion-picture industry in the person of Charlie Chaplin, and your tribute to Hon. Lloyd T. Binford, of Memphis, Tenn., who is waging a fight for the youth of our country against unclean and corrupt pictures.

Mr. Binford has been my very close personal friend since 1909, and I happen to know that he has so lived all these years to merit the commendation of all good citizens who appreciate a real man in every sense of the word.

The defense of America with arms against foreign aggression is necessary, but defense of American youth against vice and corruption that will certainly undermine the national fiber of our citizens is much more important, for without the salvation of our youth from moral turpitude we cannot and will not continue to exist.

Until American representatives wake up to the fact that the protection of our children against vice and disease such as is encouraged and promulgated through the medum of many seditious motion pictures, road houses, legalized gambling in public places, saloons, and the greatest of all, horse racing bookie houses, is more important than the cultivation and protection of the livestock of our Nation, we cannot hope to achieve any greatness worth while.

Your courageous fight for America and the protection from her enemies has the approval and sanction of all good citizens.

Very sincerely yours,

B. M. DORRITY.

Here is the editorial to which I referred which appeared in the Shreveport Journal of Friday, June 20, 1947:

CLEAN CENSORSHIP

Lloyd T. Binford, who heads the censor bureau at Memphis, Tenn., gave the Nation an example worthy of emulation recently when he banned from the screen "a rotten picture made by Charlie Chaplin." The quoted words are from a statement in which Congressman J. E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, minority member of the Un-American Activities Committee, commended the censorship official for his uncompromising and courageous decision.

To American citizens interested in wholesome motion pictures and opposed to activities by actors or others who are not unquestionably loyal and patriotic the Binford ultimatum meets with favor. The career of Actor Chaplin, whose degrading affairs have been aired in the newspapers time and again have been such that the mention of his name is read or listened to with resentment by theatergoers who dislike "nose holding."

Chaplin's reputation also is regarded with pronounced disfavor by citizens who have no patience with persons who make fortunes through the years in this country and do nothing to even indicate respect for American principles.

Congressman RANKIN reflected the sentiment of the American people generally when in commenting on Censor Bureau Director Binford's action he demanded Chaplin's deportation on the ground that his movie life is "detrimental to the moral fabric of America," and further commented:

"He has refused to become an American citizen, and deporting him he can be kept off the American screen and his loathsome pictures can be kept from the eyes of the American youth."

Mr. RANKIN is right in his estimation of the non-American actor whose "rotten picture" has been banned from some of the Nation's film houses, and should be banned from all, judging by the comment of the Mississippi Congressman.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WELFARE,
THE WASHINGTON FEDERATION OF CHURCHES,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1947.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JAVITS: I am writing you on behalf of the Social Welfare Department of the Washington Federation of Churches to urge your support for immediate legislative action in the interest of adequate housing for all our fellow-citizens.

Our organization represents more than 200 individual Protestant churches in the city of Washington, with a total membership of approximately 110,000. Many of these people know from harassing personal experience the housing needs of our community and our country; and all of them know from observation that the suffering and frustration being inflicted upon so great a number of our families, who through no fault of their own are denied decent housing, are rapidly undermining the very foundation of our Nation's strength and security—the American home and family.

Such a situation weighs heavily upon our conscience, not only because of the present hardship being worked upon our people, but also because of the countless social, moral, and physical diseases that are being bred as a result of this unmet need in American life. We simply cannot produce a healthy citizenry so long as we permit such a cancerous evil to exist in our land.

We beg of you, therefore, to do all in your power to hasten House action on the bill H. R. 2523 and to bring about its adoption. You can be assured that in urging this legislation you will have the complete support of our organization.

Respectfully yours,
LEONARD S. EDMONDS,
Director.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, every hour of the day the story of life in the United States is being told to the peoples of the world via the short-wave radio and the printing press. It is beamed to six continents in 30 languages. It appears in a vast flood of controlled or influenced publications. It is neither a pleasant story nor an accurate story. It is a story of the United States as an imperialistic menace to world peace, as a center of seething chaos that contains only industrial discord, economic instability, racial conflict, exploited masses, and monopolistic capital. I need hardly tell you that this story radiates from Moscow.

Now it is not necessary to refute these fantastic charges—in the United States. It is essential, however, that they be counteracted abroad where they are doing inestimable harm. I submit that in the conflict of ideologies now loose in the world, we should be derelict in our obligations to this Nation if we let slip any valid opportunity to strike a blow for truth and for democracy. It is for this reason that I should like to comment on H. R. 3342 which is now before us for consideration. This bill as amended has a clearly stated objective:

To enable the Government of the United States to correct misunderstandings about the United States in other countries which constitute obstacles to peace, and to promote mutual understanding between the people of the United States and other countries.

There are few who would disagree with this objective. Its desirability is indicated by the fact that H. R. 3342 was unanimously endorsed by the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. The question which we must answer is whether or not the present bill meets the valid objections which have been raised against a similar program now in operation.

One of the most frequent complaints against the information program currently operated by the State Department is that the foreign policy of this country has been so vague and conflicting that it cannot be projected successfully abroad by a Government service. It seems to me that the solution to this particular problem lies in the clarification and coordination of our foreign policy, not in the elimination of the machinery for publicizing it. In the absence of effective information from this country, those who seek to undermine us in the world will have a free hand to distort our motives to suit their purposes. The Greek-aid program is a perfect example. Broadcasts from the United States explaining our financial assistance to that stricken land depict our true aims and are doing much to frustrate those who describe our efforts in the Middle East as an initial thrust of American imperialism.

Other criticism of this information program has centered on the effectiveness and the personnel of the State Department agency responsible for its execution—the office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. There have been complaints that this office, headed by William Benton, has been extravagant, that it has continued to employ individuals of dubious loyalty to the United States, and that the payroll includes many persons whose non-partisanship on domestic issues is opened to challenge. The committee which examined this bill went into these charges with great thoroughness. I think it accurate to point out that it found that much of this criticism is a carry-over of an understandable antipathy for such wartime agencies as OWI. Mr. Benton is making a determined effort to improve the service, to have it present abroad an objective and honest picture of the United States, its principles and its peoples. In the interests of economical and efficient operation, he has cut back the number of employees in the service from 10,700 in 1946 to 3,000 for 1947. This has also had the effect of removing many undesirables from the payroll. As to loyalty of personnel, the bill as it now stands sets up careful safeguards. Title IX provides for a thorough FBI check of employees. Furthermore aliens can be employed only as linguists and even then strictly in jobs for which suitable American citizens are unavailable. Still another clause of the bill provides that any alien while in the United States under this program may be deported immediately if he engages in activity detrimental to this country.

A specific criticism frequently has been raised against that portion of the program dealing with the dissemination of news. It is held that the Government is competing with the private news agency such as the Associated Press and the United Press. Let me say that this bill makes very clear the intent of Congress in this respect. The State Department is specifically instructed to give every encouragement to private American news agencies and to minimize Government distribution facilities in any area whenever commercial dissemination is found to be sufficient. This program is solely for those parts of the world where, for different reasons, private news channels are not operating adequately.

Mr. Speaker, discussion of the information and education program has centered on the more spectacular features of the service. We have heard a great deal of the "Voice of America" broadcasts beamed by 36 great transmitters in this country and relayed from strategic stations abroad. There are other parts of the story, however, which are of great significance in promoting fuller understanding of this country abroad. The program also provides for student exchange, technical cooperation, information libraries, and motion-picture distribution. The latter is a particularly significant factor. At present, the United States Information Service is showing films in 46 countries to audiences of some 8,000,000 persons per month. The pictures that are being sent out are chosen with a view to presenting a balanced, accurate description of all phases of American life. As long as great care is exercised in the selection of films, this phase of the program can be a tremendous force for understanding and good will.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I should like to point out that H. R. 3342 bears the endorsement of some of our finest public servants. Secretary Marshall has urged it as an important tool of our foreign policy. It has the support of General Eisenhower. Secretary Harriman, former Ambassador to Russia, and his successor, Gen. Bedell Smith, both enthusiastically endorse the program because it is practically the only effective way of getting an accurate presentation of the United States to the Russian people. Outstanding leaders in the radio industry and in the newspaper field are on record as favoring a Government information program of this type.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is essential if the program is to continue through the critical months that lie ahead. Let me make clear that H. R. 3342 does not establish a permanent Government agency. The entire program may be terminated at any time by a concurrent resolution. It may be that Congress will want to go into this entire question very carefully with a view to setting up permanent machinery. Until that is done, however, H. R. 3342 proposes to keep open this important channel of good will with friends and potential friends beyond our borders.

Weak and Unconvincing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the consideration of my colleagues an editorial from the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser.

This editorial by Mr. Clyde A. Wellman seems to be the prevailing appraisal of the President's statement on the labor bill.

It will no doubt interest you to know that the Huntington Advertiser is one of the important Democratic papers of the Ohio Valley, and through the years it has been a consistent supporter of the administration.

The editorial follows:

WEAK AND UNCONVINCING

The reasons President Truman gave in his message to Congress in justification of his veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill were weak and unconvincing.

His radio address later to the Nation, appealing for popular sympathy and support for his action, was equally weak and unconvincing.

The dangers to the public interest that he attributed to the bill to justify his position were ridiculous and fanciful. They were arbitrary, meaningless statements without foundation in fact or the content of the measure.

The House, promptly and without debate, voted overwhelmingly to override the Presidential veto. The vote was 331 to 83, a 4 to 1 majority, whereas only 2 to 1 was required. Seldom in history has a President been so severely rebuked for vetoing a congressional measure. The Senate, at this hour locked in furious debate, should concur in the end on the House's action.

The False Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit herewith the following very fine editorial entitled "The False Voice of America," which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune on Friday, June 20, 1947:

THE FALSE VOICE OF AMERICA

Executives of the Columbia and National broadcasting chains, testifying before a Senate subcommittee, said that their chains could not afford to take over the State Department's Voice of America broadcasts. When the suggestion was made that the networks might operate the foreign short wave broadcasts as contractors for the Government, the two executives pointed out the Department already has studios, technicians, and hundreds of employees. Apparently they don't want anything to do with Assistant Secretary Benton's pay-rollers.

The proponents of this propaganda scheme will no doubt represent the testimony of the network men as proof that the State Department must be given the $34,000,000 that it is asking for these activities, on the ground that no one else can carry it on. They argue, however, on two false grounds.

To begin with, everyone who knows anything about radio knows that the chain broadcasting executives were testifying with guns at their backs. Of all the elements in the radio industry, the chains are most vulnerable to the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission. As long as the same New Deal bureaucracy controls the FCC and the State Department propaganda division, the chain people are going to agree with them in whatever they say. Their testimony, accordingly, can be discounted 100 percent.

Further, the idea that the State Department ought to carry on this propaganda because no one else can, rests on the false assumption that the propaganda ought to be carried on.

There are numerous minor objections to the Voice of America propaganda. Mr. Benton's outfit is honeycombed with Communists and fellow travelers, who, if they oughtn't to be in jail, certainly oughtn't to be working for the Government. The broadcasts lack the technical competence to present a true picture of America or happenings in America. It is also objected, quite properly, that the broadcasts, regardless of content, are valueless because most of the people to whom they are beamed either have no radios or are prevented by the police states under which they live from listening to foreign broadcasts on what sets they have.

Kent Cooper, of the Associated Press, stripped the problem down to its bare essentials, however, in a recent speech in Chicago. The major objection, as he said, to the Voice of America is that it puts the Government of the United States into the propaganda business and our Government oughtn't to be in the propaganda business. That is not a proper or a feasible activity for a responsible republican government.

Backers of Benton's silly plan have been beaten back in Congress until they are willing to compromise on a $6,000,000 appropriation instead of the thirty-four millions asked first, with some restrictions on the type of programs. Whether it spends six millions or thirty-four, the project is as vicious as any that has ever been presented to Congress. The money will be poured down a rat hole. It should be rejected in its entirety.

Facts About Appropriations for Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, much false propaganda has been sent out about the 1948 Soil Conservation Service appropriations. What are the facts? There are at least six appropriations made each year in the name of soil conservation. What are they?

First. Federal appropriations to agricultural experiment stations: These funds are partially used for soil experiments and research. This appropriation was not reduced.

Second. The Extension Service: The Extension Service, with its soil specialists, have for 30 years carried the soil facts from the experiment station to the farm. This agency in 1948 has a $24,000,000 appropriation for general educational work, including not only for soils but for home economics, 4-H Club work, and other projects. This appropriation was not reduced.

Third. Forestry Service: In some areas the farm forestry is the first step to soil conservation. The farm forestry project is retained in full. This appropriation was not reduced.

Fourth. The TVA has distributed free fertilizer: This was distributed largely in the South. A few pounds have been given to one farmer and a carload to another.

Fifth. The AAA program: Part of the appropriation for the AAA has been used to cooperate with the farmer in the purchase of lime and fertilizers. In 1947 this

averaged less than $15 per farm in the United States. President Truman asked in his message to Congress that the educational part of the AAA be added to the Extension Service. This appropriation of some $300,000,000 in 1947 was cut nearly in half. The cut in this appropriation will reduce the amount of fertilizer distributed unless other activities of the program are curtailed. The Senate is being asked to restore some or all of these funds.

Sixth. The Soil Conservation Service appropriations which are $38,437,000 for 1948: This $38,437,000 appropriation for 1948 is the largest appropriation ever made for any year except for 1947. The appropriation for 1940 was twenty-one million; for 1941, sixteen million; 1942, twenty-three million; 1943, twenty-one million, the 1944 appropriation was twenty-two million, the 1945 appropriation was twenty-eight million, the 1946 appropriation was thirty-three million, and the 1947 appropriation was thirty-nine million plus four million for the 1946 Pay Act or a total of forty-three million, and the 1948 appropriation by the House was thirty-eight million.

Then the thirty-eight million appropriated for 1948 is over sixteen million, or 74 percent more than the 1943 appropriation; the 1948 is $15,591,000 more, or over 70 percent more than the 1944 appropriation; the 1948 appropriation is $10,097,000, or 35 percent more than the 1945 appropriation; the 1948 appropriation is $5,226,000, or 18 percent more than the 1946 appropriation, and the 1948 appropriation is $853,000, or 2 percent less than the 1947 appropriation, and including the pay act of $4,000,000 it really makes a cut of 12 percent below the 1947 appropriation.

The thirty-eight million for the Soil Conservation Service was contended by many to be out of line with the twenty-four million for agricultural extension. There is a very strong feeling in Washington to advance the 4–H Club work. Some four million for this purpose have been authorized, though not yet appropriated.

Seventh. Personally, I did not approve of the conclusions of the Agricultural Appropriations Committee. However, if this bill had been recommitted, what would have been the result? It would have gone back to the same Appropriations Committee, would it not? The July 1 dead line might have found all the agricultural agencies in the same position the Maritime Commission now finds itself, with no funds whatsoever.

The sheepmen of America have a soil-conservation program in connection with their industry. On June 16, 1947, nearly all the New Dealers voted to put them out of the sheep business. One-third of the sheep have been liquidated the past 5 years, and the other two-thirds are in danger of being liquidated altogether. On one hand we see livestock farming that is synonymous to soil conservation liquidated, at the very time that we hear so much about soil conservation. Since the New Dealers voted nearly unanimously to put livestock farming on the rocks, we will not hear so much about their interest in the soils of America. Their soil interest is evidently political.

Stassen Opposes Labor Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, because of the national prominence which former Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, has attained for his sound, progressive views on labor matters, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, the following newspaper article which appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of June 21, 1947, reporting his remarks in opposition to President Truman's veto of the labor-management relations bill:

STASSEN LASHES VETO—TERMS LABOR BILL GOOD LEGISLATION

Harold E. Stassen lashed out Friday at President Truman's veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill, declaring there was plainly a need for a new national labor policy.

The 1948 GOP Presidential aspirant, speaking during a question-and-answer period at a Republican workshop meeting at the Radisson Hotel, charged that the bill would not have done some of the extreme things claimed by its opponents.

OPINION STAYS

"I feel that the Taft-Hartley bill was good legislation," Stassen said, "and there was nothing in the President's veto message to change my opinion. His suggestion that Congress draft a new labor bill is impractical at this time."

The former Minnesota Governor said also that Mr. Truman should have indicated earlier this year his displeasure with the bill, instead of waiting to express his feelings by the veto.

President Truman's Tax Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam has extended aid to 59 different countries since the fighting ended. A total of $20,000,000,000 has been handed out in loans, grants, relief, lend-lease, surplus-property credits, and cultural cooperation projects—all to come out of the American taxpayers' pockets. General Marshall, our Secretary of State, now says that it will require at least $6,000,000,000 more per year for the next 3 years to put European countries back upon their feet, economically and politically. This is a staggering load to place upon the American taxpayers' back. It requires some explaining by those responsible for doing it.

In the break-down of the $20,000,000,000 handed out since VJ-day, we learn that France has received $2,000,000,000, plus credit on the purchase of 75 Liberty ships; Great Britain, $4,400,000,000, plus 800 fixed war installations we built there; Italy, $530,000,000, plus her share in the $350,000,000 new European Relief Fund. We begin to realize now what the rehabilitation of Europe is going to cost us before we are through, because these three countries are again seeking more aid.

When we consider the $50,000,000,000 lend-lease hand-out we made during the war—eleven billion of which went to Russia—the $20,000,000,000 hand-out since VJ-day, and the $20,000,000,000 that General Marshall estimates we must yet hand out to rehabilitate Europe, one can easily see that our American tax burden will be a heavy one during the next 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with tax revision the Congress must take into account and decide upon: First, the Federal budget; second, reduction of Government expenditures; third, substantial and regular payments upon the national debt.

The President's budget estimate is based upon the present national income of $166,000,000,000. That is the highest national income in our history. As recently as 1940 our national income was only seventy-seven and six-tenths billions. The President' budget estimate is also based upon the most burdensome tax rates ever known in peacetime. His budget therefore presupposes the continuation of an inflated national income and oppressive war tax rates, neither of which can be expected to continue. The Federal budget must be drastically cut before tax revision can be accomplished.

The first steps in expenditure reduction are now being taken. When the Congress gets through with the appropriations for the next fiscal year there will be a reduction of about $5,000,000,000. An estimated surplus for this year of three of four billion dollars, plus the expected reduction in next year's expenditures, should provide ample funds to balance the budget, to make a substantial payment on the national debt, and to take care of a tax-reduction program.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by David Lawrence, entitled "The Wrong Kind of a President at the Wrong Time":

THE WRONG KIND OF A PRESIDENT AT THE WRONG TIME

(By David Lawrence)

(Left-wing doctrine of leveling all incomes embodied in veto of tax bill. Percentages cited do not give true picture of tax burden. Individual initiative penalized by high rates.)

President Truman in vetoing the tax bill last week said it offered the wrong kind of tax reduction at the wrong time.

This can only mean that to encourage individual initiative and thrift by a downward revision of tax rates from their high level of wartime is, according to the Truman tax doctrine, wrong in principle.

This principle, however, is more important to America than the dollar amounts involved either as savings to the taxpayer or in Government revenues.

Mr. Truman in his message said it was wrong to make a reduction of 30 percent in the lower brackets, 20 percent in the middle brackets, and 10 percent on the taxes paid in the highest brackets. He chose the $2,500-a-year income as an example and said that the taxpayer's take-home pay would be increased under the Republican bill by only 1.2 percent; that is, by only $30 whereas the take-home pay of the man with a $50,000-a-year income would be increased by $5,000, or 18.6 percent. If the Republican bill had be-

come law, Mr. Truman said, "the inequity of these provisions would be frozen into the tax structure."

Mr. Truman juggled his percentages. He did not refer to the fact that a $30 tax saving out of a $90 tax bill is still a saving of about 30 percent for the taxpayer. He chose instead to discuss take-home pay, and he omitted to give the percentages of income retained.

"LEFT-WING" DOCTRINE

Why not be candid and forthright, Mr. President? Why not say what any courageous "left winger" like Henry Wallace or the late Huey Long would say, namely, that the "inequity" stems from the fact that under our economic system some men actually earn $50,000 a year? Why not come out frankly for the abolition of high incomes and the leveling of all incomes? That's the Moscow doctrine and that's what the CIO's "left wing" has been preaching and that's a much quicker way to demolish the American economic system than draining the United States Treasury of billions of dollars to be spent abroad to stop communism there.

The basic premise of communism is that the individual must be submerged and that the State must rule all—that it must fix the incomes and redistribute the ownership of property.

ONE-MAN TAX LAWS

Under the historic American system, ever since the days of the Revolution when a British king fixed the taxes, the American people have submitted to taxation through their representatives in Congress. Never in all our history until 1944 has a tax bill, passed by both Houses of Congress, been vetoed by a President, and in that instance Congress passed it over the veto. Mr. Truman's veto last week was sustained in the House by a narrow margin. The Republicans voted 233 to 2 to override, while the Democratic Party voted 134 to 35 to sustain Mr. Truman. The Democrats who voted to sustain the veto come largely from Northern States where in 1948 the people must decide whether these Democrats shall be replaced by Republicans.

The whole incident will arouse America because it means that tax rates are to be fixed by one man unless the majority party can elect two-thirds of the Members of each House. This means that majority rule on tax matters has been discarded in favor of a two-thirds vote in both Houses. This is the letter but not the spirit of the Constitution, which specifically gives Congress the sole right to levy taxes.

Entirely apart from the vicious precedent thus created which nullifies the expression of the will of the people through a majority in a biennial election, the episode must inevitably lead to demands for a constitutional amendment to change Presidential tenure to 2 years so that when a Congress is elected, a President of the same majority will be elected. "Four years," wrote President-elect Woodrow Wilson to Congress in February 1913, "is too long a term for a President who is not the true spokesman of the people, who is imposed upon and does not lead."

Since the will of the people can be thwarted by a 4-year Presidential tenure, the time has come for change. In Britain, in Canada, in parliamentary governments throughout the world, the people can change their executive overnight. This is a system that is responsive to the people's will. Ours is a rigid system which can give us the wrong kind of a President at the wrong time.

It is, of course, not desirable to have the wrong kind of a President at any time, though there are occasions when the damage is relatively slight. To have the wrong kind of a President at this of all times in our history is a tragedy.

If the Democratic Party does not mean to turn to the left, and if it wishes really to serve the best interests of this country, it will avoid defeat in 1948 by beginning now to plan the nomination of someone else. There is an unwritten law in politics that a President is entitled to renomination for a second term, but this rule should be waived when the future of the party and the country is at stake.

What is needed above all, moreover, is someone with a sense of fairness.

Mr. Truman did not tell the people in his message that the man with a $50,000 income took the deepest kind of cut during wartime. He didn't reveal that the man with the $2,500 income took the least cut.

UNDISTORTED FACTS

Fair play demands that the facts be given without distortion, especially in a Presidential message.

The facts are that in 1939 the man with the $2,500-a-year income, married and with two dependents, had 100 percent "take home pay" and paid no taxes at all, while under existing rates he takes home 96.2 cents out of every dollar.

As for the $50,000-a-year income, figured the same way, the "take home pay" in 1939 was 82.8 cents out of every dollar, and this was cut during the war so that under present rates the "take home pay" is only 51.8 cents out of every dollar.

Under the proposed Republican bill, the $50,000 man would have been able to retain 61.4 cents out of every dollar, whereas the $2,500 man would retain 97.3 cents out of every dollar of income. Is that really an inequity for the $2,500-a-year man?

What it means is that America's most successful, most thrifty, most creative and ingenious minds—the men who managed the war on the industrial front and have the responsibility of maintaining and creating jobs for nearly 60,000,000 persons—are penalized by their President. The more successful you are, the more taxes you have to pay. Why try to earn more?

INDIVIDUAL INCENTIVE

To place a penalty on leadership is to kill initiative. Mr. Truman completely misstated the problem of incentive. He pointed to the billions of dollars in corporation reserves as affording plenty of capital so that there was no need of tax reduction as an incentive to investment. This is misleading. The problem is not corporate incentive but individual incentive. Most of those who earn $50,000 in America do not have an ownership stake in any business. Their capital is their brains and their service at the top level is limited to only a few years. Most of them have worked up through the years from the lowest wages at the workbench.

These men do not work just a 40-hour week. They do not get paid overtime for the long hours of work in their offices and at night at home. They do not go on strike for higher take-home pay. They have worked hard to earn more and more because heretofore the American way of life has been opened to them to accumulate money for old age and for their widows and children if high-blood pressure and strain should suddenly end their usefulness.

Maybe persuasive reasons can be given to support the vetoing of a tax bill at this time but they were not disclosed in the President's message.

Mr. Truman, just after the election last November, publicly promised cooperation with the Republican majority. He said:

"The people have elected a Republican majority to the Senate and to the House of Representatives. Under our Constitution the Congress is the law-making body. The people have chosen to entrust the controlling voice in this branch of our Government to the Republican Party. I accept this verdict in the spirit in which all good citizens accept the result of any fair election."

Mr. Truman has been faithless to that pledge.

We now have a stalemate in Government brought on by the vetoes of a President who is no longer the true spokesman of the people.

A New Era in Public Relations as to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD an editorial of the Washington News of today, which expresses the hope that we are now at the beginning of a new and better era in the relations between management-labor and the public. We have gone through a period of years in which there have been manifested abuses under irresponsible, arrogant labor leadership which all classes of Americans could hope are to be improved for the future by the enactment of the Taft-Hartley labor bill.

The action of the Supreme Court in sustaining the constitutionality of the so-called Anti-Petrillo Act gives additional assurance of the right and ability of the Congress to protect the public against the excesses of management-labor controversies.

This editorial in my judgment gives some advice that may well be soberly regarded by both sides to management-labor controversies, and particularly by the public, who are the principal sufferers of the unrestrained excesses that have been imposed upon the Nation in recent years.

The editorial is as follows:

THE NEW LABOR LAW

The Senate, overriding President Truman's veto, made law of the Taft-Hartley labor bill. And the Supreme Court upheld the so-called Anti-Petrillo Act.

Thus one day brought two events of profound significance to the future of labor relations in the United States.

It marked, we think, the end of a long era in which organized labor, pampered, protected, and made powerful by an indulgent Government, has had the upper hand and has behaved with far too little consideration for public welfare and its own best interests.

It marked, we hope, the beginning of a new and better area.

The union leaders who are breathing fire and threatening defiance of the new Taft-Hartley Act would do well to pause, think, and ask themselves whether it is not time to change the tactics that brought about the inevitable passage of this law.

If they want a timely example of the lack of wisdom in those tactics, there is James C. Petrillo, boss of the musicians' union. He is an outstanding symbol of arrogance, of dictatorial methods, of restrictive practices, of abuse of power. Eminent labor lawyers advised him to defy a law intended to curb his activities. The Supreme Court, they said, would never let Congress do that to him.

But the Supreme Court spoke for itself, Mr. Petrillo now must face trial, and the authority of Congress is sustained. That's thought food for the union attorneys who—just as the Liberty League's 58 famous lawyers did with the Wagner Act in 1935—are taking it upon themselves to declare the Taft-Hartley Act unconstitutional.

Employers, too, would do well to think soberly today. There should be no gloating over the enactment of this new law. Above all, there should be no effort to take undue advantage of its provisions. Any who try to use it as a union-busting instrument will learn quickly that the American people—strongly as they demanded corrective labor legislation—will rally with equal strength in defense of labor's essential rights and demand new restraints on the power of predatory managements.

Congress must be vigilant in watching the operation of the law, and prompt to correct defects, injustices, and wrongs if they appear. The promise has been made that responsible, conscientious unionism is not to be hurt or weakened. That promise must be kept.

Upon President Truman, who found no good in it and who called it unworkable, falls chief responsibility for enforcement and administration of this law. He could insure its failure, if he were so disposed. We trust and believe he will seek to give it a fair trial and a fair opportunity to succeed in its asserted purposes. That is his duty, now that his judgment of the Taft-Hartley bill has been overruled by majorities of 68 to 25 in the Senate and 331 to 83 in the House.

If management, labor, and Government accept in good faith the proclaimed intention of the law, it can be made to work as a program for industrial peace and sound, continuing national prosperity.

Controversy Rages Over Japan's Economic Purge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

CONTROVERSY RAGES OVER JAPAN'S ECONOMIC PURGE

(Article 20)

The liquidation of the Zaibatsu should not be confused with the Japanese economic purge, around which rages a furious controversy. General MacArthur's first purge directive, issued January 4, 1946, directed the arbitrary removal and exclusion from public office of persons who were instrumental in formulating plans for aggressive war. The directive has been complied with. It resulted in a beneficial political house cleaning and was carried out without much fuss.

Since then, however, MacArthur has extended the purge to exclude from positions of important responsibility or influence in industry, commerce, finance, and agriculture "all persons who have been active exponents of militant nationalism or aggression."

Inasmuch as virtually every business in Japan was geared to the Japanese war effort, and all businessmen supported the war either voluntarily or were required to do so, this order has the effect of discharging all the top executives and members of the boards of directors of nearly every Japanese corporation and business enterprise.

Moreover, this order affects not only the businessmen themselves, but excludes members of their immediate families from holding such positions and their relatives to the third degree.

TECHNICIANS NOT AFFECTED

MacArthur himself claims that this order does not affect the technicians and men with the know-how, but only the owners and managers. He believes the businesses can be run just as well without the owners and managers, and that the purge will not have an adverse effect on Japanese production, which he is trying to stimulate.

There are many economists who will argue with him on that score. Not all technicians have managerial ability, the incentive to plan for the future or the versatility to shape their operations in conformity with changing conditions.

While our party was in Japan, Newsweek came out with a blast at the economic purge, claiming that it removed the brains of the entire Japanese business structure and that it struck at the most active, efficient, experienced, cultured, and cosmopolitan section of the nation—the very section that has always been most disposed toward cooperation with the United States.

Newsweek pointed out that a similar purge in the United States would have the effect of retiring all the businessmen who contributed to the American war effort and were members of the National Association of Manufacturers.

MAC ARTHUR DEFENDS POLICY

MacArthur replied immediately and vigorously to the magazine article. He said the purge was ordered in conformity with the directions he was given at the outset of the occupation—whether these came from the War Department or the Far Eastern Commission, he did not say.

He said his action was taken "because any other course would be to ignore the very causes which led the world into war, and by so doing to invite the recurrence of war."

"It was these very persons, born and bred as feudalistic overlords, who held the lives and destiny of the majority of Japan's people in virtual slavery and who, working in closest affiliation with its military, geared the country with both the tools and the will to wage aggressive war," he said.

MacArthur said the press of Japan had been practically unanimous in applauding the purpose of the purge, but he overlooked the fact that a large part of the Japanese press is Communist-controlled.

ORDINARY BUSINESSES UNDISTURBED

"The details of the purge," he added, "have been carefully evolved so as not to disturb the ordinary businessman, nor the technicians whose skill and brains did not influence formulation of the policy which directed Japan's course toward aggressive war. It is fantastic that this action should be interpreted or opposed as antagonistic to the American ideal of capitalistic economy. In my opinion, and, I believe, in the opinion of truly responsible Japanese as well, the action will not unduly disturb the development of a future peaceful industrial economy."

MacArthur went on to say that even if this were the case, even if Japanese industrial revival were impossible without the services of those who are to be purged, the interests of the rest of the world "leave no alternative than that Japan must bear and sustain the consequences, even at the expense of a new economy geared down to the capabilities remaining."

The voice was the voice of MacArthur, but I would be willing to bet a certain gaudy shirt that the words were those of Brig. Gen. Courtney Whitney, head of the government section of SCAP, in whose section the purge directive was initiated.

NEWS CORPS CRITICAL

Whitney is a devout worshiper of MacArthur. Moreover, he is as sensitive to criticism of the supreme commander as a Geiger counter is to radiation waves. In recent months there has been a lot of criticism of the occupation policies from the newspaper corps in Tokyo which has a generous sprinkling of leftists among its members. They complain that the purge has not gone deep enough; that Japanese who directed the war effort are still prominent and influential.

If the economic purge was designed to silence that criticism, which comes from leftists and Communists, it has stirred up a hornet's nest of criticism from the right. Even members of MacArthur's staff are skeptical. Some of them think the purge has gone too deep, that it will result in industrial stagnation and that it will block one of the objectives of the occupation, which is to make Japan self-sufficient to meet its peacetime needs at the earliest possible moment, in order that American financial support may no longer be necessary.

Legislation on TVA Appropriation Bill Amending Section 26 Strongly Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial of the Nashville Tennesseean of June 9, 1947, and one of the Chattanooga Times of June 13, 1947. These editorials have to do with legislation written in the Government corporations appropriations bill which amends section 26 of the TVA act. The people of the Tennessee Valley are tremendously concerned with any attempted changes in the basic law of the TVA. These editorials are typical of the attitude of the power distributors and the people of the Tennessee Valley.

The Nashville Tennesseean editorial is as follows:

NOT IN MIDDLE OF THE GAME

Changing the rules in the middle of the game is not cricket any time. Yet that is what a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee is attempting to do with respect to TVA's repayment of its power investment to the Federal Government.

The proposal to compel the TVA to devote 50 percent of its net revenue every 10 years to the repayment of almost $350,000,000 to the Treasury Department seriously affects the future of the Nashville electric service and 138 other distributors of power purchased from the TVA.

The contract which the city's distributing agency signed with the TVA is based on the assumption that the TVA will make its repayments to the Federal Government under the terms of section 26 of the act establishing the authority. This section gives the directors considerable freedom in choosing how much and when repayments are to be made. The advantage is obvious. The Federal agency is still young, still expanding, still working out sound relationships with the people of the valley. It needs all the elasticity and independence which belong to any other business corporation if it is to succeed to the fullest degree.

The Federal Government put risk money into TVA. For that reason, it did not stipulate any hard and fast basis of repayment. Since it was a new venture, there existed the possibility that the Government might never reclaim its investment in power development. The terms of the act frankly recognized the possibility.

The proposal of the subcommittee is clearly a violation of contract. It puts the TVA in a financial strait-jacket. In so doing, it seriously affects the future of the 139 com-

munity distributors of Federal electric power.

We are convinced that this 40-year strait-jacket should not be applied. The TVA, it is true, is already returning funds to the Government, having paid more than $20,000,000 into the Treasury Department in the past 2 years. There may be times, however, when it is not to the best interest of the TVA or the area served to make more than nominal payments. At times in the next 20 years, for example, it is entirely possible that the development of atomic energy may make it much more advisable from a business point of view to reinvest the earnings and postpone repayment.

Free enterprise, in some respects, applies as fully to a great, decentralized Government corporation as it does to a private business. The Republican committee members are striking at the very principle they so vocally defend in trying to alter the agency's financial program. Friends of TVA in Congress should kill this proposal if it finds its way to the floor.

The Chattanooga Times editorial is as follows:

ANOTHER BATTLE LOOMS

The House bill requiring TVA to repay the United States Treasury a total of $348,000,000 for the Government's investment in TVA power facilities carried in it a not-too-apparent stinger to which supporters of the agency are justifiably opposed.

The bill, sent to the Senate over the unalterable opposition of Representative ESTES KEFAUVER (for which we congratulate him), deprives the TVA of essential flexibility in meeting its payments and saddles upon it the necessity of devoting not less than 40 percent of its net earnings each year to the debt.

Mr. L. J. Wilhoite, chairman of the local electric power board, says that as originally announced the measure would have allowed TVA to take credit in any one year for any previous overpayment of the annual pro rata amount due. In other words, the agency would have been permitted to make overpayments in good years and underpayments, if necessary, in slack periods.

There seems to be no sound reason for this restriction. Certainly, the board of directors of any private concern would not want to hobble its management with any such program extending over 4 decades.

Mr. KEFAUVER also is quick to point out that the bill, although it amends the original TVA Act, is actually an appropriations measure. "This is a poor way to make Federal laws," he says. We agree with him.

TVA's adherents are going to protest any legislation which would hamper it in an orderly process of expansion necessary for the continued development of the region.

A group of TVA distributors, which has carried the fight successfully in the past against crippling legislation, will meet in Nashville June 20 to discuss his newest threat.

The valley is headed into another bitter fight; it is not of the valley's choice, but forces hostile to TVA must learn the region will never fail to join battle for the protection of one of its principal assets.

Fair Play for GI Joe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an editorial written by Cecil R. Warren, of the Hollywood Herald, one of the leading newspapers of Broward County, Fla., dated June 20, 1947:

FAIR PLAY FOR GI JOE

Ever since demobilization of World War II forces, many have regretted that GI Joe, the man called upon to do the actual fighting and dying, didn't get a deal on a parity with his officers.

When his officers were released from duty, they automatically received pay for leave they were unable to take during the days of conflict. But no such provision had been made for little GI Joe. He had lost his furloughs, too, and it appeared he wouldn't get paid for them.

One of the first to decry this injustice is United States Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS, a resident of this county, who took the enlisted man's cause before Congress. ROGERS introduced in the House of Representatives, on September 13, 1945, a measure to provide that enlisted men receive lump-sum cash payments for unused terminal leave.

This measure passed the House unanimously. It was amended in the Senate to provide the men be given 5-year bonds, bearing two and a half per cent interest, instead of the lump-sum cash payments, and further providing the bonds should be non-negotiable. Of course, the Senate had good reason for such an action. It was considered that such payments as lump cash would upset the national budget.

This was late in the Seventy-ninth Congress. There was no time for another proposal, and it was necessary for the House to accept the plan if there was to be any curative legislation adopted in the session.

So the enlisted man was handed his rightfully due recompense, but useless to him for 5 years. At no other time in his life, perhaps, would he need his pay so badly. He stepped from the armed forces into an era of readjustment, of mounting unemployment and living costs.

The period of readjustment, of mounting living costs and unemployment is not yet ended. GI Joe still badly needs his pay.

Representative ROGERS now has another bill before Congress. It is one which would permit the enlisted man to cash his bonds now, perhaps at a premium, and yet will place no burden on the Public Treasury until the bonds mature. This measure will permit the enlisted man to sell his bonds, but not for less than the principal and accrued interest up to the end of the month in which the bond is sold. The Government would not redeem them until the maturity date, 5 years from the date of discharge.

The bonds are good investments, it is believed, and will appeal to bankers and other investors—perhaps be so appealing they may be bought at a premium, since Treasury bonds are now bearing only 2 percent interest.

By its approval of the Rogers measure, it appears, the Congress may right a gross discrimination against the enlisted man, particularly patent because there is no other bond issued by the Government on which the owner cannot obtain cash in from 60 to 90 days.

There still appears to be some opposition to the bill on the part of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget, just why it is hard to discern. This may account for its being stalled in the Armed Services Committee, less than a third of whose members have signed it.

It is to be hoped that the gentlemen who have so far failed to see the merits of the bill, from the standpoint of justice and fair play, as well as timely aid to the enlisted men, will soon give it their sanction.

International Good Will Through the Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1946, when the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, ordinarily known as UNESCO was before the House, I took occasion to express approval of the work of the committee in bringing the bill before us, and I particularly appreciated the work by the gentleman from South Dakota, Congressman MUNDT, who did good work in that instant while a Member of the minority. Now that we are today passing H. R. 3342, generally known as the Voice of America bill, which Congressman MUNDT has sponsored even to a greater extent than the educational bill of last year, I want again to congratulate him and express my appreciation for good work well done. This present bill has had a hectic career in the House, and I feel that it has received far more condemnation and criticism than it should have. Some may feel that Chairman MUNDT's views as to the importance of the bill may be somewhat exaggerated, but I myself feel that this is a very important bill, dealing with intangibles of such a value as cannot readily be computed.

In spite of what anybody says to the contrary, this is one world, and if the human family is not yet ripe for one-world political organization, it is highly imperative that all mankind prepare for such unity, politically as well as culturally. Anything else will mean more devastating war, utter chaos, and destruction. The steps toward one-world political organization may be difficult, and even cultural unity may be exceedingly difficult, but the need to travel in that direction is very great, and such measures as the bill before us today and the measure before us a year ago, known as UNESCO, are proper and important legislative steps in the right direction.

Some have wished to limit this State Department effort solely to broadcast American radio programs, and others have ridiculed the very thought of any radio voice from America penetrating behind the iron curtain. For my own part, I feel that it is imperative that the Voice of America reach around the world and throughout all continents. I cannot understand how level-headed men who recognize the worth of good will in the business world can be so careless and indifferent about political good will among the nations. We have spent an awful price to win this war and to help the victims of tyranny and oppression. Shall we now quibble about any reasonable sum to tell these people about America and about the part that America has played as a savior of distressed peoples, first from tyranny and later from hunger? Is it not wise to spend moderate sums to promote activities aimed at

broader understanding between our own and every other nation? If we do not capitalize on good will, we will have gained less than victory. If we gain good will on the part of the world's millions, as we rightfully should, that is a greater victory than is the military success of our Armies. Long ago a great man said, "The pen is mightier than the sword," and we would do well to remember the importance of the printed—as well as the spoken—word in the history of nations.

On June 9 I had something to say about the exchange of students, calling particular attention to the great bond of friendship between the United States of America and the teeming millions of China, through the education of so many Chinese students in our schools. No one can estimate in mere dollars and cents the value of that international good will through such a wise use of the Boxer Fund. As I see this measure before us today, it would multiply the good will effects between our own and many other nations and thus be a powerful movement toward peace.

Somebody has said, "Battles are but ideas, butting their hard heads together." In this struggle, it may be assumed that good ideas, right ideas, are more powerful and will usually prove to be victors. We sincerely believe that the American ideas of liberty and representative government are right ideas and that they will prevail in a clash of ideologies, but they cannot prevail unless we in America speak so that in all lands they may know of American political ideas. This may be done not only from day to day by broadcasts of the right kind, but it may also be made more lasting in its effects through the proper exchange of instructors and students and the widespread use of the printed word.

Withdrawal of the Federal Supervision Over Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGIA L. LUSK
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the president of the State Welfare Board of New Mexico on Navajo administration:

WITHDRAWAL OF THE FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER INDIAN AFFAIRS

(A paper delivered before the National Conference of Indian Workers, May 28, 1947, by Mrs. John J. Kirk, of Gallup, N. Mex. Mrs. Kirk is an authority on Indian affairs, the wife of a prominent Indian trader, and she is chairman of the State Board, New Mexico Department of Public Welfare.)

In making plans for the termination of the trust of the Indian Office, the first consideration and always the basic touchstone must be "What is best for the Indians? What will lead them most quickly and most successfully into contact with and adjustment to our national life?" Every phase of any plan should be scrutinized from that point of view. The past history of our relations with Indian tribes shows many blunders—serious, soul-searing blunders. We already have made enough mistakes, perpetrated enough injustices.

The second consideration is the matter of Federal responsibility. There are solemn treaties. There is national honor, and our nation ability to meet the needs of the Indian people. There should be a fulfillment of our obligations, then a termination of our trust.

Finally we must consider the position of the States involved. There are Western States who have had Indian burdens imposed upon them, and who should not be expected to assume solely on a State basis the problems of those Indians. There are many States with an already sufficient burden, as in my own New Mexico where almost half the population is of Spanish-American origin, many of whom live on a submarginal basis, without opportunity to better themselves.

Any plan to abolish the Indian Office must be the right plan.

It is not a right policy to keep Indians isolated from the advantages and opportunities, or from the responsibilities of their fellow Americans. Nor is it a right policy to force Indians who are unprepared to meet the competition of modern life off the reservations into the stream of national activities. To find the right plan, it is helpful to see what we have done in the past and wherein we have failed.

POLICY

An early Indian affairs policy was education of Indian children in off-reservation boarding schools. It was believed that three generations at the most would see the Indians educated for and absorbed into American life. The program failed because, among other things, Indians were not prepared in any way for assimilation, and returned students found too little opportunity to make use of their newly learned vocational skills, which seldom were related to the demands of reservation life, or to such opportunities for employment as existed for them off the reservations. Many students returned to the blanket.

A policy of land allotment proved disastrous, as the Indians too readily disposed of their allotments and spent the money, impoverishing themselves and forever losing lands which they needed for a subsistence. In 1871 something like 155,000,000 acres of land belonged to Indians. By 1900 it had shrunk to 75,000,000 and today only a little over 50,000,000 acres of land are owned by Indians, either tribally or in allotments. That land loss is one of the factors responsible for the present woeful condition of many of the Indians of the United States, and pressures still persist which would deprive Indians of lands.

In 1927 the Meriam report exposed shockingly bad conditions among Indians, with an Indian Service too starved for appropriations to do the work assigned to them. As a result of that report, some improvements were achieved, and there was talk of "working the Indian Office out of a job within 25 years." But during the short period of time available to the Wilbur-Rhoads administration little was accomplished along that line.

With the change of administration, some phases of the Rhoads policy were retained, but a new basic philosophy was introduced, i. e., to revive and encourage native Indian cultures and to keep the Indians on reservations with a land-based economy.

I have always considered those premises fallacious. All Indians cannot be supported on a land-based economy, because there is not sufficient land available. And it was a policy of segregation, of keeping the Indians aloof from the currents of modern America, a turning back. For the most part, Indians have not participated in our national economic progress and prosperity nor in our social advances, especially Indians of the Southwest.

There were, of course, elements of good in the policy. Indians regained pride in their heritage and new dignity in the eyes of the American public. Under the Indian Reorganization Act, financial aid was available to tribes who accepted the new law, and a House of Representatives Indian Affairs Committee reported that many tribes have advanced themselves satisfactorily under this arrangement.

From the point of observation of the writer, there were two phases of the new administration's policy. First there were impressive construction of reservation day schools and hospitals, inauguration of much-needed land-conservation and stock-reduction programs, and efforts to obtain additional land looking toward support of Indians on a land-based economy.

Later there was preoccupation with aboriginal culture patterns, which apparently became a detriment to progress of the Indians toward health, education, economic betterment, or assimilation. The program of field and school nurses on the Navajo ceased and opportunities to build new roads were rejected. Many day schools were not successful because the children lived too far away to walk and there were too few roads for bus transportation. So they were closed and money was not allocated to reopen them or to turn them into boarding schools. The Navajos have been discriminated against for many years in apportionment of Indian Office expenditures—although they number about one-sixth of the total Indian population of the United States, only about one-twelfth of Indian Office moneys has been spent on this tribe. The stock-reduction program left them without support and little effort was made to assure alternate means of livelihood. The condition of the Navajos has steadily deteriorated until today they are far worse off than at the time of the Meriam report.

There has been considerable publicity regarding lack of any schools at all for more than 14,000 Navajo children. This is serious, particularly in view of the fact that an elementary education is considered the right of every American child, and further because the Navajos were promised education in a treaty ratified by the United States Senate, the provisions of which have never been kept. But the public generally does not know that even more critical than the educational needs of the Navajos, these Indians must have jobs. They are the poorest, sickest, most neglected, and most hopeless people in America and starvation will not wait. If Indian Office policies had been better, I feel sure that at least some of the ills of the Navajo Tribe could have been prevented or alleviated.

It is difficult to determine what the present policy of the Office of Indian Affairs is or what the basic philosophies are. There should be a concise and inclusive affirmation of policy; reestablishment of a forward-looking program which will help American Indians to become Indian-Americans; this will regain the progress toward assimilation which I feel has been lost in the past few years. Such a policy definition is the first requirement for reform of the Indian Office.

Reforms are indicated because certain Federal functions must continue for a considerable period of time, even though Federal supervision over Indians is withdrawn as quickly as feasible. Indian Office operation in the interim should be efficient and economical. Our Indians deserve a competent agency. They are worth saving. The Navajo contribution to the war effort alone justifies all the expense involved in proposed rehabilitation of that tribe. America cannot permit Indians to be further impoverished or to be released prematurely from Federal supervision to be forced onto dump heaps or into slums.

ADMINISTRATION

Another requirement for reform is improvement of Indian Office organization, administration, financial systems, and of the entire operation. Exactly what those reforms should be it is not possible for an outsider like myself to say. Lines of authority seem fuzzy. Administrative processes have slowed up since the district offices were opened, perhaps because sufficient authority has not been relinquished by the Indian Office or because procedures have not been set up. There seems little liaison at any level between the various divisions. There often appears to be considerable difference between the ideas of the head staff and those of men in the field; and there is too little personal contact between policy makers and those for whom the policies are made. Field staffs are overburdened with demands for voluminous reports, such as the cost estimates. Too many people are required to perform certain work, as handling the heirships of land allotments that have been fractionalized by inheritance. Another defect is that there is no definite budget on the field level for any division or agency.

In order to make a thorough overhaul of the Indian Office administration it is urgently recommended that Congress, through a joint resolution, should hire outside experts, some firm that specializes in industrial-administrative research, to come into the Office of Indian Affairs to make studies of procedures and organization; to have power to subpena witnesses and examine reports; make their findings and then report back for action to the proper committee of the Congress.

Undoubtedly there should be decentralization of the Indian Office, with authority and responsibility placed on the shoulders of agency superintendents. District offices could exercise a supervisory function, and a small staff in Washington should confine itself to policy making, budgeting, and legislative effort. The Chicago office should be eliminated. A broad national policy should be defined, then details of local policy matters left to the agencies, each of whom should make a plan of operation, subject to approval of the Washington staff. Budgets should be set up for each agency and deficiency appropriations should not be necessary unless a real emergency developed. These or similar reforms would do much to solve administrative defects and point out ways to do a better and quicker job with the least money.

It is absolutely necessary that reforms be accomplished. The public lacks confidence in the Indian Office, and the Indians lack confidence. If that confidence is not restored, the Indians will be the main sufferers. They are the ones who need the schools, hospitals, resource development, and other services which they can obtain only from the Office of Indian Affairs, and which an angry Congress may refuse to an inept, archaic Indian Service.

OTHER REFORMS

It is recommended that educational policies of the Indian Office should be examined. There is considerable criticism of the educational system—that it is reservation centered and that on a long-time basis achievements are not satisfactory. Curriculum should be adjusted so all Indian children will be offered the courses of training which will most quickly prepare them for success on or off the reservation. Teachers should not be required to neglect their training duties to fill out innumerable reports or to attend to nonclassroom work.

All resource development that is feasible on reservations, to raise the standard of living for Indians, should be vigorously undertaken; and Indians should be protected and assisted in ownership and use of their lands and resources.

All future developments should include collaboration between the Federal and State Governments. Many States are inclined to be indifferent to unsolved Indian problems because they do not feel responsible. The full possibilities of the Johnson-O'Malley Act should be evoked to achieve State cooperation in all possible efforts and States should be encouraged to assume increasing responsibilities for Indians as rapidly as possible.

Some States extend public assistance benefits to Indians. Others do so on a restricted basis. The two States in which there is the greatest need refuse to aid Indians who live on reservations. I believe New Mexico and Arizona should extend benefits if they are legally responsible, because refusal constitutes a plain case of racial discrimination. But the financial situation of New Mexico is so poor, and relief burdens are so high, that it has been necessary already for the Welfare Department to restrict intake, so little practical good would accrue to Indians even if the State assumes that obligation. If New Mexico and Arizona are not forced to extend assistance to Indians, undoubtedly other States will discontinue doing so.

Solution of this problem could come from (a) variable Federal grants in aid to low income States, so uniform standards of public assistance would apply in all parts of the country for all needy people, including Indians; or (b) special appropriations to the Indian Office to provide adequate assistance to Indians, either through cooperation with State welfare departments under the provisions of the Johnson-O'Malley Act, or directly under the Indian Office. The latter is not recommended because it tends to further segregation of Indians and because the standards of the Indian Office on welfare relief are below those of the Social Security Administration.

It is recommended that the Congress explore the advantages which might be gained for Indians by transfer of the Indian Office divisions of health, welfare, and education from Interior Department into the Federal Security Agency. As of last July, all the major health, welfare, and education activities of the Nation, excepting for Indians, were put under the Federal Security Agency and it would appear discriminatory that Indians are excluded. The criterion for transfer of agencies to Federal Security control is whether the agency is more concerned with human or with other problems. It would be a proper question to ask if the Indian Office is more concerned with Indians as people, or with the land which the Indians own. If the human problems are primary, there seems little reason for objecting to the transfer. If it is impossible to dissociate human needs from land matters, then perhaps the entire Indian Office should be transferred from Interior into the Federal Security Agency, where higher standards for health, welfare, and education prevail than the Indians have ever known.

In any cases where Indian Office functions could be administered as well, and with less expense, by other Federal agencies, transfer should be considered. But if the agency to whom a transfer is contemplated would find it necessary to set up any separate or special unit for such Indian work, care should be taken to determine the potential cost and whether it would truly prove less expensive or more efficient than operation by the Indian Office.

TERMINATION OF THE TRUST

It should be the goal of every citizen that the Indian Office work itself out of a job in the shortest possible time. Definite plans to abolish the Indian Office have seldom progressed beyond rudimentary, over-simplified, bare beginnings. Mr. F. A. Vogel, executive assistant to the Senate Civil Service Committee, outlined some suggestions to me last winter, as follows:

1. Freeing of "ready" tribes at once.

2. Selection of committees to appraise the size of the Indian job in each State and estimate cost of doing it.

3. Passage of legislation and appropriations, based on such committee findings, the money, and the job then to be turned over to the States.

4. Appropriations to be on a diminishing basis, so the States gradually would take over the entire burden.

5. Reservation lands to be owned by the tribe under State corporations, with each tribal member holding shares of stock in the corporation.

There are good points to this plan and there are defects. The Indians must be protected from land sharks. Committees making appraisals of costs should have well-defined standards, else some of them might grossly overestimate probable costs, while others might underestimate and leave the State with huge, unfinanced and unsolved Indian problems. It is a good plan to have committees make studies and recommendations as a basis for further action.

Many States would disapprove accepting Indian burdens with diminishing Federal aid; some States might have political regimes which would ignore or even exploit the Indians. It should be assured that States would not seek funds in excess of those which would be needed by the Federal Government for the same task; and also that States would make a success of any Indian obligations they assume.

Under a resolution (S. Con. Res. 15), now in the hands of the Senate Indian Affairs Subcommittee, it is provided that a joint committee of Congress make plans "to hasten the time of complete emancipation of the Indians" and "for the complete withdrawal of Federal restrictions over Indians."

The committee is especially instructed to ascertain effect of withdrawal upon claims which the Indians have against the Government; methods of distribution of money and lands held in trust for Indians; disposition of agency buildings and property; and dissolution of organizations formed under the Indian Reorganization Act. The committee is also to determine what State legislation would be needed and how much money States would require in Federal contributions, pending the placing of Indian lands on the State tax rolls.

This resolution would be more acceptable if it included specific instructions that Indians are to be protected in their land holdings; that they should be prepared economically and socially before being released; to ascertain the ability and willingness of States to assume Indian responsibilities; and to define when and under what circumstances Indian land should be placed on tax rolls. Also the committee is obliged to report at the beginning of the second session of the Eightieth Congress. It would seem impossible for a committee to make competent studies and plans covering these extensive and difficult problems in the short period of time specified.

Some general premises for a broader plan have been formulated by Mr. J. M. Stewart, superintendent of the Navajo Agency, Window Rock, Ariz., in a paper prepared for the Postwar Resources Institute of the Interior Department. Mr. Stewart presents 6 general premises: (1) Need to change Indian Office policy of land-based economy because of land limitation; (2) Indians who do stay on the land should have economic sized land units; (3) Indians must assume the responsibilities of the Nation; (4) there should be a legislative determination of degree of blood necessary for enrollment on Indian Office census; (5) minimum standards of health, education, economic base, et cetera (based on rural standards of the area) should be defined, these standards to be focal points at which Federal supervision could justifiably be withdrawn; and (6) the right program is the one that eventually will cost the least. Mr. Stewart should be invited to submit a prospectus for a program he believes would accomplish those objectives.

Other pertinent suggestions, particularly analyses of the difficulties of the problem, are contained in a paper read before the National Conference of Social Work last month by Dr. John Provinse, Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs; and Acting Commissioner William Zimmerman, Jr., recently made recommendations to a congressional committee which incorporate the Indian Office ideas for what they consider a satisfactory approach to the problem. Amplification of their ideas into a workable plan should be sought.

In fact, suggestions should be invited from all competent sources, then all the best ideas combined into a satisfactory plan for termination of the trust of the Federal Government over Indian affairs. The completed plan should be comprehensive and sound; with a time schedule for its accomplishment in a manner that will be reasonable and fair to the Indians concerned, as well as to both State and Federal Governments.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that it is imperative to find the right plan. There must not be hasty, ill-advised legislation. We must not make more mistakes. Nowhere is our national honor more at stake than in our treatment of the Indian peoples we have conquered and whose continent we have possessed. In our efforts to help downtrodden peoples of the world, we cannot appear before other nations with clean hands when at home dire Indian distress is ignored and urgent Indian problems are unsolved.

Land Reform Program Brings Japanese Upheaval

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson from the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

LAND REFORM PROGRAM BRINGS JAPANESE UPHEAVAL

(Article 21)

Rural land reform constitutes one of the most drastic upheavals in Japanese society that has been brought about by the American occupation. The story of it can best be told by quoting the original directive to the Japanese government and describing the results which followed. On December 9, 1945, a memorandum was issued by SCAP which stated, in part, the following:

"1. In order that the Imperial Japanese Government shall remove economic obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies, establish respect for the dignity of man, and destroy the economic bondage which has enslaved the Japanese farmers to centuries of feudal oppression, the Japanese Imperial Government is directed to take measures to insure that those who till the soil of Japan shall have a more equal opportunity to enjoy the fruits of their labor.

"2. The purpose of this order is to exterminate those pernicious ills which have long blighted the agrarian structure of a land where almost half the total population is engaged in husbandry. The more malevolent of these ills include:

"ABUSES, OPPRESSIONS LISTED

"(a) Intense overcrowding of land. Almost half the farm households in Japan till less than one and one-half acres each.

"(b) Widespread tenancy under conditions highly unfavorable to tenants. More than three-fourths of the farmers in Japan are either partially or totally tenants, paying rentals amounting to half or more of their annual crops.

"(c) A heavy burden of farm indebtedness combined with high rates of interest on farm loans. Less than half the farm households are able to support themselves on their agricultural income.

"(d) Government fiscal policies which discriminate against agriculture in favor of industry and trade.

"(e) Authoritative Government control over farmers and farm organizations without regard for farmer interests.

"3. The Japanese Imperial Government is therefore ordered to submit on or before March 15, 1946, a program of rural land reform."

The directive then listed in general terms what the program should include.

DIET ENACTS PROGRAM

On December 28, 1946, appropriate legislation was enacted by the Diet. It established local rural land commissions in each farm village, the members of which were to be elected by the farmers and to consist of five tenant farmers, two owner-cultivators and three owners.

Local commissions are to be supervised by prefectural commissions, which in turn are to be supervised by a national commission under the minister of agriculture and forestry. But American military government teams also will be on the job to advise the farmers and see that the reform is carried out.

Under the land reform act, the lands subject to purchase include all tillable land owned by absentee landlords, all tenant-farmed lands in excess of 1 cho (2.45 acres) in Kyushu, Shikoku, and Honshu and 4 cho in Hokkaido, all owner-cultivator lands in excess of 3 cho in the three southern Japanese islands, and 12 cho in Hokkaido, and all tillable lands owned by corporations which do not relate directly to the principal objective of that corporation.

GOVERNMENT BUYS LAND

Lands subject to transfer are to be purchased by the Government and resold to eligible buyers. Tenants on the land as of November 23, 1945, other tenants and persons who wish to cultivate the land have priority to purchase in that order.

The practical effect of this measure is that eventually no farmer on the three southern islands will own more than 7.35 acres of land, while the limit on the northern island of Hokkaido will be 29.4 acres.

The purchase prices are subject to variation within legal limits fixed by the land commissions. The owners will receive part of the purchase price in cash and the balance in bonds bearing 3.65 percent interest and redeemable in 24 annual installments.

Tenants may pay for all or any part of the land at the time of purchase and the balance in 24 annual installments with interest at 3.2 percent. In case of crop failures or low farm prices the Government will either reduce, postpone, or cancel the annual payment.

Other provisions of the law require cash payment of rent for farms which are still operated by tenants and rent ceilings of 25 percent of the value of the production from paddy and 15 percent from upland fields.

EDITORS VISIT FIELD

This is about as thoroughgoing a reform as anyone could imagine.

Our party of editors and publishers made a field trip to a locality near Tokyo where this program is being carried out. On the program it says that we went to Shiki Machi, Kitadachi Gun, Saitama Prefecture, Honshu, Japan, which means that we went for a drive out in the country and wound up in a rural schoolhouse where various American and Japanese officials, interpreters and members of the local rural land commission were waiting to receive us.

Japanese girls served hot tea, which was very welcome because the schoolhouse, like all Japanese buildings, was unheated. A lot of speeches were made, the conclusions of which were (a) the tenants liked the new program and intended to buy the land they were farming and pay for it as soon as possible, (b) the tenants agreed they would be better off financially under the new program than the old, (c) the landlords didn't like the new program and figured they would not be as well off under the new program as they were under the old.

All of which goes to show that human nature in Japan is about the same as it is in the United States.

Filipino Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, my attention was centered upon a communication by Vicente Villamin, internationally known journalist, recognized as an authority in matters affecting the welfare of the Filipino people and the friendly relations between the Philippine Government and the United States. His writings command the attention and respect of well-informed people here and abroad because they are factual, forceful, and eminently fair.

I am deeply concerned about the injustice suffered by the Filipino soldiers who served in the American Army with all the fervor and energy of the traditional American soldier. They fought side by side with their American buddies. They served, suffered, bled, and died together for the flag they loved. They were our soldiers then; they should be treated without discrimination as our soldiers to the day when the Commonwealth became the Republic of the Philippines. They are entitled to all of the beneficial provisions of American law and should be recognized as soldiers of the United States Army. But let me read to the committee the eloquent and irrefutable plea of Mr. Villamin in behalf of his people. It is set forth in more detail and reasonableness than I could express in an offhand, impromptu manner. I am in entire accord with his outline and appeal, and I respectfully call to the attention of the proper committees of the House the urgent need for corrective legislation. American justice and honor demand fair play and the earliest possible action in the solution of this problem. Now, lend me attention while I read the communication which appeared in the Washington Post on June 22, 1947:

FILIPINO SOLDIERS

A COMMUNICATION

The Filipinos who fought under General MacArthur have a story to tell to the American people.

In the last war there were 116,000 foreigners who joined the American Army in the

United States or elsewhere. They are considered veterans and are enjoying veterans' benefits under the law. There were 400,000 Filipinos in that army in the Philippines, but they are not considered veterans and, therefore, not entitled to veterans' benefits, except insurance and pensions for death or disability which are enjoyed by only a small percentage of that number.

Thus a Filipino soldier who was lucky enough to come out of the war unscathed gets nothing except the glory of having fought under the American flag made poignant by the chagrin of being read out as a veteran by postwar legalistic interpretation of his status. He is denied the benefits of the GI bill of rights, the Mustering-Out Payment Act, the Terminal-Leave Act, the Six Months Death Gratuity Act, and other acts.

The claim of the Filipino to recognition as a veteran rests on the fact that on July 26, 1941, the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and acting under the act of Congress of March 24, 1934, ordered the Philippine Army inducted into the American Army, and it was not until June 30, 1946, that it was released from under American military authority by another order of the President.

On April 27, 1942, the Attorney General held that the Philippine Army was thereby placed in the active service in the land and naval forces of the United States. This was the law until Congress, on February 18, 1946, passed the First Rescission Act, declaring that that army was not in such active service and, therefore, not entitled to veterans' benefits, with the two exceptions noted above. Since then the War Department has recommended to Congress a bill extending to Filipinos the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, which will give them their back pay.

On the induction of the Philippine Army 4 months before Pearl Harbor, the American Government assumed its expenses, development, and direction. There was no statement at that time by the President of the United States or law of Congress that suggested even faintly that they were other than soldiers in the American Army. On the contrary, they were made to understand that they were such soldiers. They were proud of it and they fought with more zest.

When they were ordered by the President of the United States, the Filipino soldiers who by law owed allegiance to the United States, could not have refused to comply. The order was as obligatory on them as the conscription act was on American citizens.

The Filipino soldiers were not mercenaries or mere hired workers in uniform to be discharged summarily without benefit of veterans' rights after their combat usefulness had ceased with the war's ending, which they helped to hasten. They had acquired rights, both inherent and derivative, while serving under the American flag, even as the 116,000 foreigners in the American Army had acquired veterans' benefits in full.

The Philippine Army lost its organic identity when it was merged in the American forces and the Philippine Government, which under the law then in force was merely a creature of the American Congress, was in temporary legal vacuum itself. These two facts were made patent at the Japanese surrender ceremonies in Tokyo Bay, where no Filipino representative was invited to sign the surrender instrument.

But the Filipinos were partly reconciled to that symbolic exclusion because their friend, General MacArthur, signed for Americans and for them. They were attached to America by ribbons of service and affection—an attachment so pathetic in its sincerity. And so it is hard for them to realize that the legalists in Washington should now hold that they were not in the active service of the American forces when they ask, as they now do, for veterans' recognition.

It is a fact that recognizing the Filipinos as veterans in these postwar times would cost the American Government money. But the Filipinos had saved America much more money than the cost. Let the two following considerations be taken into account in this connection:

First, General MacArthur has stated that the participation of the Filipinos in the war had shortened it considerably and saved many American lives. If it shortened the war by 50 days, it had saved the United States some $15,000,000,000 at the rate of $300,000,000 of expenditures a day.

Second, if the Philippine Army had not been inducted into the American Army 4 months before Pearl Harbor, the Philippine Government, ever loyal to the United States, would have prepared and waged the war as a separate entity and as such it would have received billions of dollars worth of lend-lease assistance from the United States. As it was, it received no such assistance.

The Filipinos deserve to be considered veterans of the American armed forces. Strict technicality may militate against it, but equity is in its favor and fundamental policy fortifies it.

VINCENTE VILLAMIN.

WASHINGTON.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., June 23, 1947.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: It seemed really good to again hear from you, this time in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway, to which project we are opposed.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8 1947, letters from the executive officials of 31 steamship companies are reproduced, and not a single steamship company among them says it would navigate the St. Lawrence route if this project is adopted. Indeed, they almost unanimously clearly indicate their opposition to the project. Neither General Marshall nor anyone else has offered convincing evidence of the possibility of making the proposed canal self-liquidating by the imposition of tolls, or in any other manner.

We believe our members have not only been informed but misinformed as well concerning the claimed benefits of this proposed waterway to our national defense. Bearing in mind that for nine-tenths of its course from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean the St. Lawrence River flows entirely within Canadian territory and at no point is it entirely within the territory of the United States, one question seems to need a satisfactory answer if our national safety is to be maintained. What would prevent Canada or the British Empire from voluntarily closing the canal to preserve their neutrality should the United States become a participant in a war in which either Canada or the British Empire occupied the status of a neutral power? Remember, please, it is proposed to have the United States heavily participate in the construction of this canal without the formality of executing a treaty either with the Dominion or with the Crown.

Again, with the canal and locks, dams, etc., being located in such sparsely settled territory, it would seem relatively easy for an enemy nation, by the proper placing and discharging of one or more charges of high explosives, to put the canal out of commission and effectively bottle up whatever vessels and war materials we might have located above that point at any given time. Not a very comforting thought when considering national defense.

The remaining points raised in your letter were adequately treated by our witnesses, Colonel McCaffrey and Mr. Mace, in the committee hearings of the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-ninth Congresses, respectively.

It is always a pleasure for me to hear from you; and even though we do not now see eye to eye on this particular matter, I am hopeful that the world is being kind to you and that you will realize the error of your position before it is too late.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS JEFFERSON MILEY,
Secretary.

Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received the attached letter and resolution adopted by the Badger State Sportsmen's Club of La Crosse, Wis.

Inasmuch as the agriculture appropriation bill is now being considered by the Agriculture Appropriation Committee of the Senate, and the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service and research will be included therein, and because I am personally much interested in the good work the Soil Conservation Service has done and is doing in Wisconsin, I include the attached letter and resolution of the Badger State Sportsmen's Club in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BADGER STATE SPORTSMEN'S CLUB, INC.,
La Crosse, Wis., June 10, 1947.

Hon. W. H. STEVENSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Badger State Sportsmen's Club of La Crosse adopted the following resolution at its June 5 meeting:

"Whereas committees of the United States Congress have reduced the 1948 budget of the United States Soil Conservation Service research department from $1,423,000, which was allocated in 1947, to $673,000 for the next fiscal year; and

"Whereas these funds are used for research work throughout the Nation for the improvement of the soil producing agricultural crops as well as grass and other vegetation as cover for the prevention of disastrous dust storms; and

"Whereas it is recognized by conservation authorities that the basis for all wealth of the Nation, as well as our natural resources, is traced to the soil and water; and

"Whereas it is to the best interests of the Nation, especially to those with agricultural pursuits and conservation generally, that budgets allocated to those agencies having to do with the improvement of soil and the furthering of conservation activity be not impaired: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Badger State Sportmen's Club, Inc., this 5th day of June 1947 severely criticize the Congress of the United States for slashing the budgets of soil improving agencies and those branches of the United States Government dealing with conservation; be it further

"*Resolved*, That Badger State Sportsmen's Club, Inc., impress upon its members in the United States Congress that it maintains that conservation has no part in the political picture and have refrained up to the present from becoming involved in politics."

Respectfully submitted.

RICHARD SCHNELL,
Recording Secretary.

Will Sweden Yield Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to call attention to legislators and the public generally, to the following letter of the Honorable Kaarel R. Pusta, Sr., former Minister of the Estonian Republic to Sweden, and the enclosed article from the Baltic Review.

Eyewitness information of this kind is again of the utmost importance in evaluating the results of such aggressions as took place last week in Hungary; just as a few years ago, we needed reports of this kind to inform us accurately as to the full meaning of the Nazi concentration camps.

The letter and article follow:

APRIL 28, 1947.

There was a considerable emotion in Sweden, in November 1945, when the Swedish Parliament and people heard of a secret agreement between their Government and Moscow concerning the extradition of 167 citizens of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, who had taken refuge in Sweden, in May 1945. The Swedes then resented that their free country had been compelled to repudiate its humanitarian conception of the right to asylum under pressure of a foreign power. The government was attacked in the Parliament, protest meetings were held all over Sweden and a flood of protest resolutions reached the King and Government. Nevertheless, the extradition of 147 Balts was performed "for political reasons" as the Foreign Minister, Dr. Oesten Undén, acknowledged in an interview. At the same time Mr. Undén disclosed to the Parliament that already on January 1, 1941, the Swedish Government had recognized the annexation by Russia of the three Baltic republics.

After that event, painful both to the Swedish prestige and some 30,000 Baltic refugees who felt themselves in momentary danger of being delivered to the Russian NKVD, the Balts recovered a certain, however diminished, sense of security in Sweden. Now, it is revealed that the Swedish Foreign Ministry advised, on January 1, 1945, the Swedish pastorate, that all the Baltic citizens who left their countries after August 5, 1940, are to be considered and registered in church books as Soviet citizens. And, on April 20, 1947, an official communiqué was published in Swedish papers saying that since the Soviet law lay under an interdict marriages between Soviet citizens and foreigners, this disposition of Soviet law must be considered as relevant to the "former" Baltic citizens. Furthermore, according to well-informed sources, the Swedish civil registrars and police authorities have received order that from May 1, this year, the Baltic refugees be styled in all the documents issued to them as Soviet citizens.

Although the Swedish press—except the Communist and other pro-Soviet papers—unanimously criticize especially the marriage ban as a challenge to human rights and ethics, the Balts are thinking with sorrow of the experience with the 167 in winter 1946.

The arbitrary sovietization of Baltic citizens in Sweden may have henceforth fatal consequences, as there is no more security against further aims of the Soviet Government and the eventual compliance of the Swedish Ministry with these aims. What if the U. S. S. R. will now remind Sweden that, according to the Soviet Penal Code of 1943, paragraph 58, Soviet citizens who have fled abroad are to be tried and punished (shot) for high treason?

It has been the policy of the western democracies, and understood to be the policies of all the members of the United Nations—except the U. S. S. R. and her satellites— that the Baltic refugees shall not be considered as Soviet citizens, to say nothing of their submitting to Soviet laws in a free foreign country, which granted them sanctuary. Will Sweden, a new member of the UN but an ancient land of freedom, charity, and political decency, be the first to swerve?

KAAREL R. PUSTA, Sr.,
Former Estonian Envoy to Sweden.

[From the Baltic Review, Stockholm, Sweden]

LIFE IN A SOVIET CONCENTRATION CAMP—THE STORY OF AN ESCAPED PRISONER OF WAR

A well-known Estonian patriot who during the last years of the war had fought as a guerrilla both against the Germans and the Russians was compelled to flee from Estonia in the autumn of 1944. Fate threw him into Tchekoslovackia, but, unfortunately, he did not manage to reach the occupation zone of some western power before the armistice. As an Estonian, he was threatened, if not with instant death, at least with certain deportation to Siberia, if he fell into the hands of the Red Army, a destiny which has befallen countless Estonian patriots. In order to have at least a chance, he decided to give himself out as a German, but this did not save him, as he was, after all, sent to penal servitude in Russia along with other German prisoners of war.

Thanks to his excellent health, he was able to bear the life that awaited him for a year and a half, until an opportunity to escape presented itself. The following is the tale of his experiences:

In May 1945 the Tcheks delivered me, along with all the other Estonian refugees, to the Russians. From Prague we were sent to a POW camp in Teplitz-Schönau. Knowing what awaited the Estonians at the hands of the Russians, I decided to give myself out as a German. This was not difficult, as I have sufficient command of the language.

In the Teplitz-Schönau camp, the Russians, first of all, searched the prisoners of war very thoroughly. This was done under the pretext of looking for arms, but, nevertheless, the prisoners were deprived of their watches, knives, forks, spoons, and everything of value they happened to have on them. Even good boots and decent linen they had on were taken from them—altogether, everything that took the fancy of the Russians. While we stood in rows for the search, one of the Russians dropped a revolver amongst us. The provocation was clearly evident. None of the prisoners could have been in possession of a weapon, for the simple reason that to be found with one would have meant certain death to the man in question. When all denied the ownership of the Browning, some chance men from among us were called out and given a thorough beating.

The searching of the prisoners and all sorts of preliminary investigations took several weeks. When this work was finished the Russians began to despatch the prisoners to an unknown destination. In the middle of August 1945 a transport of 1200 was to go off with me among them. We were packed in absolutely dark cattle-vans, 60 men into each, and the vans carefully locked after us. The long journey toward the East had begun. Two Germans managed to escape on the way and could not be apprehended. As, however, the Russian guards accompanying us were responsible for it that the number of men loaded on the train in Teplitz-Schönau should on arrival be complete, they accordingly completed it in a very simple way; on the next station after the disappearance of the fugitives had become known, they seized two German railway workers and locked them into one of the vans to make up for the escaped prisoners.

The food we got on the journey was extremely insufficient: the supply of bread was soon exhausted and we were fed on a kind of liquid porridge, consisting of uncooked flour and water. The men were soon prostrated with weakness, also the weather was very hot and the air in the closed vans absolutely poisonous. We were constantly tormented by thirst as the rations of drinking water were very small. All the men were covered with lice and looked very unkempt and savage. With the arrival on Russian territory the progress of our train became slower with every day as all the stations were crammed with trains.

In addition to prisoner of war transports a great many trains with booty and reparation goods were slowly moving inland. Their platforms were heaped with all sorts of things beginning with cattle and ending with bicycles, sewing-machines, and broken baby-carriages. Our train sometimes stopped for 2 or 3 days at some station and arrived in Moscow at the end of September. The journey had taken a month and a half.

In Moscow we heard that we were immediately to be delivered to some new authorities. But this transfer did not take place before 3 days as both our guards and our new masters had first decided to celebrate and had all got exceedingly drunk. These 3 days of waiting we spent in a yard in the open and without food. It rained all the time, our clothes were wet through and we trembled miserably in our light summer suits.

At last the representatives of some institution appeared in search of labor. Our yard took on the appearance of a slave market. We were treated precisely like inanimate objects and delivered to the officials who had come for us not by name or profession, nor did any documents appear during the transaction—a hundred or 200 men were simply counted out and that was all.

One night a group of 100 men, to which I belonged, was sent on its way from Moscow in the direction of Smolensk. We were to build a public highway across a morass 200 kilometers from Moscow. The first 2 nights were spent in tents under which we sank deep into the mire. Every fourth man got inflammation of the bladder and became unfit for work. Female doctors were appointed to ascertain the fitness of the prisoners and their technique of examination reminded one of the way butchers on cattle fairs handle a cow they buy for slaughtering. The prisoners were handled in the same way by being pinched in the buttocks and then grouped into various categories of fitness. The completely emaciated were sent to another camp to recuperate a little before being sent to work.

The prisoners had to build their own barracks. To encourage them the administrators constantly repeated that if the barracks

are not ready by the beginning of winter, the men will have to freeze to death. All the necessary material was to be provided by the prisoners themselves. At the end of the working day at road building we cut down trees in a neighboring forest and lugged the timber on our backs a distance of 8 kilometers to the spot assigned for the barracks. The men collected barbed wire from wartime trenches nearby and made nails of it. As there was no glass, the windows were covered with thin chips of wood which let in a little light. The keeping of accounts in the office of the camp was also done on such wooden chips as no paper was available. Discarded petrol casks did duty for stoves in the barracks. When they were being heated special fire watchers had to be on the lookout all the time in order to see that the building did not catch fire. When these fire watchers neglected their office heating was forbidden from 24 to 48 hours. The men's clothes often got wet through at work, but there were no facilities to dry them. There was no light in the barracks—after hours the prisoners sat in complete darkness, at the same time suffering from hunger and frost. There were even no matches in the camp. To make fire one had to use fire irons.

The daily ration was 600 grams of bread and half a liter of soup three times a day. This soup consisted of water and frozen potatoes, sometimes with a bit of intestine in it. Almost all the prisoners were swollen all over the body. Every month roughly 200 men in the camp became absolutely unfit for work; the daily death rate was two on an average.

The incredibly undernourished prisoners were constantly hunting for food and even ransacked the refuse heaps looking for fishbones and heads among the dirt and filth. The rummaging in refuse heaps was, however, strictly forbidden as one often caught dysentery eating scraps found there. But with the advent of darkness the prisoners were nevertheless irresistibly drawn toward the heaps and the camp police had to beat them away with sticks.

Rather gruesome was also the recurring trouble with the pig's food. The Russian command of the camp were rearing a pig for themselves and its fodder was naturally taken from the meager rations of the prisoners. Two guards from among the prisoners were detailed to watch the pig day and night. Their duty, however, was not to frighten away possible thieves of the animal—this was unthinkable as the culprits would have paid for it with their lives—but to keep its fodder from disappearing as the hunger-maddened prisoners constantly tried to raid the pig's trough. One of the guards was once severely punished, as he had not only eaten some of the pig's fodder himself but even abstracted a little of it for a comrade.

In the winter of 1945–46 the temperature through the winter was on an average 12° below zero. The clothes of the prisoners were in rags, their boots worn out completely. They were given some wooden shoes, but had no socks, no rags even to wrap round their feet, and no gloves. They stuffed hay into the wooden shoes but that was not much use. Thirty percent of the prisoners had their fingers and toes frozen off.

The prisoners had no facilities whatever for washing. There was a building in the camp which was called a bathinghouse, but it had been constructed in a great hurry, the walls were full of gaps and chinks and it was impossible to get it warm. Moreover, there was absolutely no soap. Every man was allowed two liters of warm water and this was rationed out with the greatest care as if it had been something precious. There was even no well in the camp, water had to be fetched from a long way off or snow melted.

In spite of this inhuman treatment the Russians tried even to make some sort of propaganda among the prisoners. A propaganda-sheet, "News for the POW's," was published in Moscow specially for this purpose. Owing to the shortage of paper every camp got only two copies of it and these were pasted on a board and set up in the middle of the camp for the prisoners to read. The sheet contained intentionally selected information about the misery in the German zones controlled by the Western allies and the great prosperity in the Eastern zone. It stated that Russia had given back to Germany those factories which according to the Potsdam treaty had fallen to her lot. Then followed as a rule news of famine strikes and collisions between the police and the people in England and the USA, as well as reports on the collaboration of the Western Allies with Fascists. The prisoners' paper sometimes also contained some news on the activity of the German military organization "Freis Deutschland," led by Field Marshal Paulus and General Seidlitz.

Even attempts of political reeducation of the prisoners were made. For this purpose a number of prisoners were sent somewhere in the neighborhood of Moscow to be trained into politruks at some political courses. The men destined for this office had to be of radical views and as an enticement they were promised a more comfortable life.

The condition of the German prisoners of war employed as slave labor in Russia is truly catastrophic. Even the fittest cannot survive for more than 3 years under such misery and privation. Of the 3,000,000 prisoners of war now in Russia's forced labour camps only a very few can hope ever to get back home. The lot of civilian prisoners is not better, perhaps even worse, as they have in most cases been deported to Russia with the express intention to let them die a slow death there.

International Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, where does the money come from which a wild and reckless irresponsible group of spenders continue to pour into the sinkhole of Europe?

Who then is he who provides it all? Go and find him and you will have once more before you the forgotten man. * * * The forgotten man is delving away in patient industry, supporting his family, paying his taxes, casting his vote, supporting the church and the school, reading his newspaper, and cheering for the politician of his admiration, but he is the only one for whom there is no provision in the great scramble and the big divide. (William Graham Sumner.)

A large proportion of the daily wage of the forgotten man is being taken from his pocket and sent overseas to benefit not our taxpayers but our exporters. The foreigners are buying our exports with our taxpayers' hard-earned money. "Heads I win, tails you lose" is the game the forgotten man in the United States is forced to play.

The internationalists permit the exporter to flip the coin; our taxpayers foot the bill. I suggest that our great international spenders reflect that "A little debt makes a debtor, but a great one an enemy."

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting the following article by Westbrook Pegler:

AS PEGLER SEES IT—ASSAILS SPENDING OF TAX FUNDS ON GREEK LOAN

(By Westbrook Pegler)

As most of us citizens and our Government seldom remember, the United States was established for the selfish purpose of promoting the general welfare of her people and securing the blessings of liberty to them and their posterity.

To accomplish these purposes and to defend our Nation, Congress was authorized to levy taxes. The original method of taxation was naive by the standards of this day, but the purpose of taxation never has been changed. It was then and it still is to pay the expenses of the operation of our Government and of the defense of our country.

We never had any intention to promote the general welfare of Greece, Turkey, or Great Britain, or to defend them against communism or any other enemy. Our people have never authorized Congress or any President from Washington down to Truman to spend our earned money for this purpose.

No amendment to the Constitution has been adopted which, by any stretch of the imagination or distortion of truth, could justify the collection of income taxes from American citizens for the governments of other nations. Such a proposal would flout the very intent stated in the preamble. The Greek and Turkish Governments may be momentary, as soon to be forgotten and their debts with them, as any of the thousands of June-bug lunchwagons and petty retail stores whose casual and unnoticed failures account for an enormous proportion of our bankruptcy roll, year by year.

Since the start of this century we have seen eight monarchies fall throughout the Balkans, like the bosses of our own underworld. Not half of our own people can remember when Servia, later to be called Serbia, then to be absorbed in Yugoslavia, was a Balkan kingdom, and Montenegro was another. The Balkan borders are elastic, stretching this way and that like battle lines, and the border peoples have no sense of nationality or loyalty. They have seen many occasions when they were on one side at the start of a war and shooting at their own comrades at the finish.

In the last one, the Greeks hailed the poor, luckless English tommies who were sent down to help delay the Nazis, but many of the same Greeks were shooting up other tommies when the Germans had been driven out.

The American people don't know anything about their minute politics and the scurrying changes, so like the frantic rushing about of microbes on a slide, and we never will. These peoples themselves know very little more than that they hate the dirty dogs in yonder valley because of something that happened sometime.

The British nation has been permanent as we reckon permanence among nations, but that mere fact gives Britain no more right to impose taxes on George Spelvin, American, than Greece has. If an American citizen defaults his income tax today and the Treasury gets a judgment and sells him out on the courthouse steps, after the manner of a not-so-olden day, we then have the spectacle of Uncle Sam forcibly taking a citizen's property which he has earned by work and saved by denial and handing it over to some unidentified Englishman.

The Englishman may be one of those sullen miners who decided they would rather see their country die than give an honest day's work to save her. Or he may be a very fine fellow, a hero of the war, a worker and all of that. But, whatever his identity and character, the American citizen has no obligation under our Constitution and our laws to work to earn taxes to support him.

Most of our people have absolutely no recollection of the original debates on the income-tax law and the income-tax amendment. Some were wonderfully prophetic, although the men who warned us then were scoffed at like those later stalwarts who stood red-faced to warn us against the Communist treachery and to commend the Dies committee for its revelations.

These men predicted that, given this great power to practice extravagance and to make the people pay for it by income taxes, future Congresses and Presidents would throw our earnings to the breeze like Saturday night sports in a roaring camp. They warned us that 10,000 spies and catchpolls would be turned loose among us to ask questions about our private affairs which, up to that time, no American citizen had ever had to answer to anybody except when he was sent to prison for a felony.

They predicted that we would become a card-index people listed in data showing how much we gave to support our aged parents, how much to the church, and how much, if any, to maintain a mistress, and this has come true. And they told us, but we would not listen, that for every dollar of tax that we paid under this amendment, we would have to work a length of time at our jobs.

Today a dollar's worth of work is about 45 minutes for most of us, so a man who pays $200 a year in income tax works 150 hours to pay his share. That is almost four 40-hour weeks every year. Now, without any consultation of his wishes, a certain proportion of it is earmarked for foreign governments.

Let us assume that out of his particular income tax our Government gives foreign governments $12.50. That means almost 10 hours, or 1¼ days a year, which is quite a large power to free, involuntary labor when you multiply it by 60,000,000.

In some ways the Americans are very shrewd. In other ways other peoples are shrewder. Nobody ever heard of the people of any other nation being put to involuntary labor for an average of 10 hours a year, unpaid, for the benefit of the people of the United States.

War! War! War!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the June 1947 issue of the National Hibernian, official organ of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, entitled "War! War! War!":

WAR! WAR! WAR!

In St. Paul at the national convention of 1941—1941, mind you—the then national president, Joseph E. Kerrigan, in one of his deeply solemn, scholarly speeches, referred to the "dark clouds lowering in the skies and obscuring the bright sunshine that for more than a quarter of a century has illumined this fair land—the dark clouds of war threatening to descend upon the American continent as upon the rest of the globe." Before 1941 had become 1942, Brother Kerrigan's bold poetic flight had been proved to be prophetic. The clouds had descended. We were at war.

We are not at war now. But the dark clouds are lowering just as in 1941. It was Germany then, and Japan; it is Russia now.

If the war should occur now—or ever—we confidently believe that the outcome would be what it has always been when this righteous democracy has taken up arms in its own defense. God would bless our arms with victory.

We have known war, and we have known victory. Is not victory in modern war a delusion? Millions of Russian men and women—and children—would die; millions of American men—and probably women and children—would die. We should then be burdened with the senseless task of policing Moscow and Leningrad, of feeding a conquered people unable and unwilling to feed itself. And out of the ashes of hate would spring a new enemy—Germany, England, China.

We can outwit war only by following Christ's path. That means turning the other cheek. That means hating Stalinism while we love the benighted mortal souls of the peoples whom Stalin misleads. That means, in modern terms, carrying on diplomatic, ideological, economic war, but not shooting war.

"Everything will depend upon the strength of the nerves of the two opponents," says Dr. Waldemar Gurian of the University of Notre Dame. "One cannot deny the possibility that explosives may go off by mistake, but the necessity of reconstruction may force Russia to postpone her political aims and try for an attempt at economic understanding with the United States.

"We must be more intelligent than the Soviet leaders. To their policy of distrust and isolation we must oppose a policy of patience and responsibility for the world. We must be firm and strong. We must not exclude Russia's return to the world after she has understood that her policies of delay and aggression are of no use to herself. Only the United States is strong enough to teach Russia this lesson."

Truman at His Poorest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal has always been very considerate of Mr. Truman. Its editorial department, however, lambasted him on June 23 because of his veto of the labor bill, in fact, they smacked him twice on the same day. I include the editorials as part of my remarks:

MR. TRUMAN AT HIS POOREST

Careful reading of President Truman's lengthy veto message on the labor bill suggests that he made up his mind to veto the bill for reasons best known to himself and then set out to devise a tortured defense of his action.

He says the bill would reverse the basic direction of our national labor policy by injecting government into private economic affairs. He chooses to forget that we have been injecting government into our private economic affairs ever since we started to regulate the hours of labor, the wages, and the safety and health conditions in factories.

We hit a new high in such intervention with the Wagner Act. What the labor bill seeks to accomplish is to correct some of the abuses that have arisen, many of them because of the one-sided Wagner law.

When the President says that the labor bill moves dangerously toward a totally managed economy, he is talking sheer bunk. And it comes from a man who has long advocated, and associated politically with those who advocate, a managed economy.

The President does not believe that the labor bill would improve relations between employer and employee, but would encourage suspicion and distrust. It will seem to many that such a condition now exists and that the labor bill could hardly heighten it.

Mr. Truman expresses the fear that the bill would weaken the rights of workers to organize and to bargain, and that weakened unions would weaken the country and make it more vulnerable to totalitarianism. This view is hard to follow. First, the labor bill would not weaken true unionism, but would only curb excesses. Second, it would seem that there is more danger of totalitarianism from monopolistic use of unrestricted union power over both members and the public than there is from this bill.

The President fears that the bill would invite long and costly litigation between employer and employee. Well, we have had a pretty good dose of altercations under the NLRB. One wonders whether more or less would result from the labor bill. That would depend on how employees and employers chose to act. The bill wouldn't force litigation.

As to Mr. Truman's statement that the bill contains a consistent pattern of inequality, we can only point out that it may seem to contain unequal restrictions because it is correcting excesses now existing.

The President's logic is sadly lacking when he says the bill would encourage jurisdictional strikes. How? Unions wishing to avoid jurisdictional troubles could settle their difficulties by any sort of arbitration or conciliation they wished to employ. They would still be free to do the right thing.

Mr. Truman says the bill only seems to protect the union shop and security, but actually cancels it. This is such a gross exaggeration that it scarcely deserves reply. And when the President says that the "feather bedding" clauses would keep employer and employee from agreeing on desirable safety provisions, rest periods, etc., he is simply reaching to the moon for an argument.

The charge is made that unions would be less able to discipline members, hence more instability would occur in production. This is cause for a good laugh when one examines the record of work stoppages in plants where unions supposedly did have the power to discipline if they chose. Has the absence of a law promoted stability?

Fear is expressed by the President that the public might be bitterly disappointed in the bill if it failed to stop strikes against public welfare and generally proved unworkable. In other words, the President says it may not work, so let's not try it. Most Americans think it may work, so they want to try it.

The President does not want to see complex labor questions turned over to courts to decide, instead of to the Labor Board. The answer is that the Board so abused its power and acted in so biased a way for years that a little objective court approach might be a great improvement.

When the President says that parts of the bill are contrary to the basic purposes of the Wagner Act, he exaggerates. But, in any case, the Wagner Act is not perfect and unchangeable. It is not even the Constitution. The Wagner Act is an imperfect law with many good points and a number of imperfections which have long needed correction. Mr. Truman erroneously implies that the act is untouchable.

Again and again Mr. Truman stresses his theory that labor disputes should be left to the free agreement of the two parties. We have tried that these many years, and the public usually gets hurt. Labor can have this freedom again any time it can handle the responsibility.

The argument of the President that the press and radio and the labor press would be

stopped from expressing political opinions is ridiculous. Surely the Chief Executive knows that no law, or part of one, can deprive the press of its fundamental liberty. The hundreds of American newspapers favoring this bill are not trying to cut their own heads off.

The President talks as though such a labor law would determine the destinies of this country for decades to come. How could it? If it proved faulty, it could be amended or repealed. America is not so helpless or so weak as he thinks.

AND WORSE, IF POSSIBLE

Mr. Truman, on the radio to justify his rejection of the labor bill, was even worse, if possible, than he was in his veto message.

When the President got through, about the only thing left that would not be interfered with under the bill was the rising and the setting of the sun. We are not sure the President would not have charged interference there—if he had thought of it.

It was a deplorably demagogic effort to arouse fears, without basis in fact, against a measure that was passed in all good faith to protect democracy and make it work. It was a saddening performance from the White House.

What President Truman did with this bill can be done with any bill that ever was proposed or any law that ever was passed. You can torture it if you want to stoop to that.

Should we have laws against murder, arson, and robbery? No. These cause us to build prisons, and the prisons may burn down, involving a loss. Not all the offenders will be convicted, so the laws are unworkable. There will be more court cases, and that is bad. Through a miscarriage of justice, some man may be convicted who is not guilty, so we'll have to call the whole law unfair.

Sounds foolish, doesn't it? Well, that was the level of the President's argument.

The pattern ought to be familiar by this time, for it has been repeated in several instances. When Mr. Truman tries to justify his veto of a bill he ought to have signed, he strikes a low note, indeed.

A Bright Note for the Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Bedford Daily Times-Mail of June 20, 1947:

A BRIGHT NOTE FOR THE TAXPAYERS

The picture of governmental costs and the national debt has been painted as all black in most accounts given since the peak of inflation. But a bright spot has been found by the United States Chamber of Commerce.

It's a small bright spot on a very large picture, but at least it's a start.

The national debt at its peak on February 28, 1946, stood at $279,200,000,000. Since that time, however, it has been trimmed by approximately $22,000,000,000.

The $22,000,000,000 cut, however, didn't come from taxpayers' payments on the debt. It came, according to the Chamber, from the Treasury's cash balance which totaled $26,000,000,000 when the debt peak was reached. On June 5, 1947, the Treasury balance amounted to only $2,500,000,000. So, in reality, we have slipped by a billion and a half during that period.

Nevertheless, curtailment of the public debt is going forward at a much more rapid rate than was anticipated at the time of the President's annual budget message in January. The gross debt stood at $257,200,000,000 on June 5 this year or $3,200,000,000 less than was estimated in January for the end of the current 1947 fiscal year on June 30.

The June 5 total was $1,200,000,000 less than the most favorable estimate in the budget message for June 30, 1948, and $3,000,000,000 less than the total for that date, which did not take account of recommended legislation for continuance of wartime excise taxes and increased postal rates.

Although some might take issue with this statement, it is estimated that veto of the tax reduction bill this week by President Truman likely will enable a substantial further reduction of the national debt during the fiscal year of 1948.

Opposed to this idea are those who believe that a reduction in taxes would have stepped up business and buying power, thereby speeding up the circulation of currency from which the Government would take less per dollar, but more in the over-all picture because more dollars would be spent. But that's a subject for an entire article in itself, and we'll confine ourselves to a discussion of the national debt.

The Senate Finance Committee has estimated that a total of $5,000,000,000 could be applied on the national debt even if the tax reduction had been approved. Add to this the $3.3 billion now killed tax cut and you have a total debt reduction of $8,300,000,000 in 1 year. If this rate of annual payment were maintained for a sufficient period, the national debt could be retired in roughly 31 years. This is not at all likely, however, in view of the fact that these are abnormal times and that all business is due for leveling off, which, of course, will reduce Federal revenues.

The United States Chamber takes the view that a tax reduction now is more urgent than a debt reduction. While not qualifying this belief, it apparently feels that a cut in taxes is necessary to bolster purchasing power of the consumer to meet the much-heralded threat of a recession this year.

A tax cut for the individual would be the equivalent to an increase in pay so far as take-home pay is concerned. A tax cut for business might have paved the way for reductions in prices, thereby further aiding the lot of the consumer and enabling him to buy more of the things he wants.

But talk of a tax cut now is water over the dam.

While the national debt is huge, it does not seem to be the obstacle now that it was sometime ago when it was still on its way up. But dragging it down will be difficult. Strict governmental economy of the kind Congress is presently striving for will be essential for years and years to come.

Farmers Home Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the agriculture appropriation bill is now being considered by the Agricultural Appropriation Committee of the Senate, and inasmuch as the Farmers Home Administration appropriation will be included in the bill, and because I am personally much interested in the good work the Farmers Home Administration is doing and has done in Wisconsin, I include the attached letter, which I received from the Farmers Home Administration supervisor of Richland County, Wis., telling of the type of work being done in Richland County, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RICHLAND CENTER, WIS., *June 11, 1947.*

Hon. WILLIAM STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: From the rumors that I hear I have a feeling that much that the Farmers Home Administration and what it has stood for, supervised Goverment chattel loans, is about to be so badly curtailed that it will virtually be dropped.

Some time ago when we were talking about our county you indicated a desire to be kept informed about some of our families. For some time I have been collecting data to send to you, and now before my appointment is canceled I want to let you know some of the nice things that have happened to borrower families in Richland County.

The task of the Farmers Home Administration has been one of education. We have taken the families who do not get to county-extension or 4–H groups. As they progress in household equipment and community activity, many of them become interested in and then members of their local group. The major problem is explaining the advantages after creating a desire within the members of the family for the benefits of these groups. Sometimes this is a slow process, but when it does happen the good is lasting.

We have helped a total of 919 borrower families in Richland County. Some of them have needed more than one loan to completely rehabilitate the family. Five hundred and sixty-three loans have been repaid in full. Of this number, 438 have paid from normal flow of income, 27 have paid from bank refinancing, 23 have paid from PCA refinancing, and 75 have held sales and gone into other fields of labor. Incidentally, many of the last group are now returning to FHA to be financed in a second farming venture.

The total amount loaned for chattels since the beginning of the program in Richland County is $1,709,785. Of this amount there is an outstanding principal balance at the present time of $242,646. The total amount loaned for tenant-purchase loans is $191,365, of which $81,404.66 is outstanding at present.

Of the 563 paid-up borrowers, 265 are still farming in Richland County and the others have moved on to other locations. We have 144 chattel loans and 18 tenant-purchase loans at the present time. We ran out of funds in March, but could have made 30 or more additional loans to start families from nothing. Approximately one-half of these were veterans with no other source of available help.

Recently one of the bankers in the county made this statement: "For years we have needed just such a program as you have going. You can start off the low-income family who needs supervision. Many are willing but lack the knowledge of what to do at the right time. Your program helps both the homemaker and the farmer and inasmuch as the wife is a really important point in the success of the family, she needs your help."

A few days ago as I sat in the Richland Center High School gymnasium watching the graduation exercises (incidentally our son, Jack, graduated), 4 in the group of 127 were from borrower families. These families could never have sent their children to high school without the help of FHA. There are a total of 12 high-school, 27 grade-school, and 4 normal-school graduates from Richland County borrower families in 1947.

I wish I might give you a picture of the M family. Ten years ago they were living

way back on a hill—no passable road leading to the farm—a good barn—poor house—few furnishings (not nearly adequate for bare existence) and a family of five small children. They were referred to the Farmers Home Administration (then Farm Security Administration) by a neighbor who heard of our work and who could no longer stand the haunting of the hungry, undernourished little faces.

As Mrs. M came to the door she appeared to be seeing an apparition. She was thin, pale, definitely undernourished, and, worse still, utterly discouraged. As we visited and I gradually gained her confidence, I found that except for her mother, I was the first woman she had seen for nearly a year. They had no way to go and too few clothes to appear in, if she went. I found that although she had filled every available jar, the supply of food, inadequate to start with, was completely exhausted. She very hesitantly listed the food in the house and finally admitted that many nights the family went to bed hungry. Like most parents, the children were fed first, then they ate.

As I talked to her and told her of the advantage of the FSA, it was like telling a fairy story to a small child. Her eyes grew brighter and at times she semed lost in another world. Finally she said, "Oh, but they wouldn't consider us. We haven't even clothes enough to cover us." Then she added, "But would you just tell my husband about it anyway?"

I can't express to you the joy that comes from being able to completely set up a family like this. To have the tools to follow through in the home, with the family and on the farm.

They received their loan that year and the next year they purchased a pressure cooker and started and cared for one of the finest gardens I have ever seen. By winter their basement was bulging with 1,200 quarts of canned food, barrels of home produced apples, bins of vegetables and potatoes, and there were six well-nourished little children. Another year a new white kitchen range was added to replace a smoky, worn-out range. As the income permitted, they added other pieces of furniture, beds and bedding, so that only two people occupied a bed, a washing machine, linoleum rugs, and even more important, adequate medical and dental care were included in the budget.

The checking account, established by the family themselves, was an important step. By now there was income, wisely budgeted to include shoes, warm clothes, and overshoes as the need arose. Many of the garments were remodeled from clothing given to them. In 5 years the loan was repaid in full and 2 years later Mr. M. arranged for the purchase of the farm where they lived when they first got their loan and where they continued to live.

In time the oldest daughter graduated from rural school, then high school, and this year from county normal. Mr. Stoffel, the principal, says she has promise of being an excellent teacher. The other evening, as Helen, the second daughter to finish high school, walked across the platform to get her diploma, the lump in my throat wouldn't be swallowed as I recalled the circumstances of my first visit to the family.

Today, respected in their community, paying members of a church, contributors to the better education of families like themselves, this family claims the Farmers Home Administration as their benefactor and continues to praise a program that will give families the things which make living a real pleasure.

Still another family I visited yesterday are showing the benefits of supervision. There were three little girls, also undernourished, when I first visited the family. Today, after 5 years, the picture is different. Their home is better, the house has been covered with asbestos shingles, lights have been added, storage space improved. The barn has been cemented and the dairy herd improved, but if you were to ask this family what has been most helpful to them, I am sure they would tell you as they did me, "those two little girls."

We were able through our health program to set up a plan for Jean to enter the State hospital to receive treatment for rheumatic fever, later to have her transferred to the convalescent home. Today she is home, after nearly 2 years of treatment, leading a nearly normal life.

The second child was ill and the effects were visible in her face. We talked of this and the mother began to study her diet. As she improved somewhat there were still signs of trouble and finally one night the climax came. The child was taken to the hospital with a ruptured appendix. Had the mother been ignorant of the symptoms, the child could easily have died before help could be had.

The Farmers Home Administration has prided itself on its educational help for all members of the family and Mrs. P. said, "You came when everything was dark. Today I am a better wife and mother because of the help I received in all phases of our home life. I came from a poor family, we had few advantages as small children, and went to work, for folks of our own kind, as soon as we were able. Our children can do better than that because we have an improved standard of living. We hope to educate our four little girls so they can be of service in their community wherever they go."

During the war, many of our boys and girls were found to be undernourished. Many who were sound were from homes where the Farmers Home Administration had already made an impression. At one time there were 91 boys and girls from active and paid-up borrower families in service from Richland County.

America needs to be strong, the home life needs to be improved, and made more desirable for farm families. Not always do we find poor living conditions among the lowest income family bracket. Neither is it always lack of income. To make better homes, the desire must arise within the family and not be superimposed. How can a family desire a better standard unless they have a chance to learn what constitutes the important phases of better living?

The Farmers Home Administration encourages adequate income, then as income was available, some of the improvements which would give the children a desire to remain on the farm where they could live as some of their urban friends lived rather than migrating to the city where the glitter of bright lights is only a surface gloss.

America needs to teach people to play and enjoy their homes and we were doing that, too. Recreation was planned, participation in community activities was encouraged. Many of our families were proud to invite homemakers and 4-H clubs to their home for the next meeting.

I found the veterans' wives, in some cases foreign wives, timid in the new communities. There were so many things to learn in this new but desirable land. We talked of many things which might help her to become more satisfied with conditions in and about her new home.

I could go on for hours about the good that has come from this program as it has been set up and working, but I must stop.

By the time you receive this letter I will no longer be with FHA because of the curtailment of the program. However, I do want to express my thanks for the fine support the folks in Washington have given FHA. It is wonderful. Never have I worked at a job which required so much effort to make it a success; likewise, never have I had so much satisfaction or opportunity to help in building a better home life.

I realize that as income goes down, folks are clamoring for less taxes and that Congress has many problems, but before I leave I did want you to know of a few more of the fine things, Washington, through FHA, has been able to do for farm families.

It is possible that some other way is being planned to continue the help to those families already started by FHA and to help those who need and desire the help we have been able to give in the past If this hasn't been done, please give it thought, since there are so many rural families who need help and guidance within their homes, the natural environment in which women work and children are reared.

Kindest regards to yourself and family.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. JOHN PUTTKAMMER,
FHA Home Supervisor.

The Decision of the Supreme Court in the Petrillo Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to consent given me by the House, I present for the RECORD the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of the United States against Petrillo.

The defense in this case was based on alleged constitutional grounds. It was particularly claimed that the information was uncertain to a degree that made it unconstitutional. Among other things the right of Congress to pass this legislation was questioned.

This decision is No. 954, delivered on the 23d of June 1947.

Significant quotations from the decision are as follows:

Here Congress aimed its law directly against one practice, compelling a broadcasting company to hire unneeded workers. There is nothing novel about laws to prohibit some persons from compelling other persons to act contrary to their desires. Whatever may be the limits of the power of Congress that do not apply equally to all classes, groups, and persons, we are satisfied that Congress has not transgressed those limits in the provisions of this statute which are here attacked. * * *

Clearer and more precise language might have been framed by Congress to express what it meant by "number of employees needed." But none occurs to us, nor has any better language been suggested, effectively to carry out what appears to have been the congressional purpose. The argument really seems to be that it is impossible for a jury or court ever to determine how many employees a business needs, and that, therefore, no statutory language could meet the problem Congress had in mind. If this argument should be accepted, the result would be that no legislature could make it an offense for a person to compel another to hire employees, no matter how unnecessary they were, and however desirable a legislature might consider suppression of the practice to be.

The Constitution presents no such insuperable obstacle to legislation. We think that the language Congress used provides an adequate warning as to what conduct falls under its ban, and marks boundaries sufficiently distinct for judges and juries

fairly to administer the law in accordance with the will of Congress. * * *

It would strain the requirement for certainty in criminal law standards too near the breaking point to say that it was impossible judicially to determine whether a person knew when he was willfully attempting to compel another to hire unneeded employees. * * *

But it is not within our province to say that because Congress has prohibited some practices within its power to prohibit, it must prohibit all within its power. Consequently, if Congress believes that there are employee practices in the radio industry which injuriously affect interstate commerce, and directs its prohibitions against those practices, we could not set aside its legislation even if we were persuaded that employer practices also required regulation.

In a concurring opinion, Mr. Justice Frankfurter stated:

I agree with the Court's judgment and opinion because it holds that the Lea Act is not beyond the power of Congress to regulate commerce. I desire, however, to add a few words.

The constitutional basis for the legislation is the same as that upon which the validity of the Sherman law rests. It is too late in the day to require argument or citation of cases in support of the right of Congress to free interstate commerce from obstruction that the exertion of monopolistic power may entail or from interference that may reasonably be deemed to promote monopoly. * * *

It would be a usurpation of the legislative authority for us to find that there was no basis in reason for the judgment of Congress that the public interest called for legislation to deal with what is colloquially called "feather bedding" in connection with the broadcasting business. Beyond that, it is not our province to go.

Referring to the opinion of the lower court, Justice Frankfurter said:

The court conjures up difficulties which I do not entertain. * * *

The District court found constitutional defects in the statute "as it was written by Congress." We find the contrary.

Mr. Justice Reed filed a dissenting opinion, in which Justices Murphy and Rutledge joined.

The dissenting opinion was based solely upon the statement that the information was "too indefinite in its description of the prohibited acts."

The decision of the Court in full is as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

(No. 954—October term, 1946)

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, APPELLANT, v. JAMES C. PETRILLO—APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

(June 23, 1947)

Mr. Justice Black delivered the opinion of the Court.

The district court dismissed a criminal information filed against the respondent, James C. Petrillo, on the ground that the statute on which the information was founded was unconstitutional (68 F. Supp. 845). The case is here on direct appeal by the Government as authorized by the Criminal Appeals Act (18 U. S. C. Supp. V, sec. 682). The information charged a violation of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1064, 1102), as amended by an act of April 16, 1946 (— Stat. —). The specific provisions of the amendment charged to have been violated read:

"Sec. 506. (a) It shall be unlawful, by the use or express or implied threat of the use of force, violence, intimidation, or duress, or by the use or express or implied threat of the use of other means, to coerce, compel, or constrain, or attempt to coerce, compel, or constrain a licensee—

"(1) to employ or agree to employ, in connection with the conduct of the broadcasting business of such licensee, any person or persons in excess of the number of employees needed by such licensee to perform actual services; or

* * * * *

"(d) Whoever willfully violates any provision of subsection (a) or (b) of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or by a fine of not more than $1,000, or both." (Public Law 344, 79th Cong., 2d sess.)

The information alleged that a radio-broadcasting company, holding a Federal license, had, for several years immediately preceding, employed "certain persons who were sufficient and adequate in number to perform all of the actual services needed * * * in connection with the conduct of its broadcasting business." The information further charged that the respondent, Petrillo, "willfully, by the use of force, intimidation, duress, and by the use of other means, did attempt to coerce, compel, and constrain said licensee to employ and agree to employ, in connection with the conduct of its radio-broadcasting business, three additional persons not needed by said licensee to perform actual services. * * *"

The coercion was allegedly accomplished in the following manner:

"(1) By directing and causing three musicians, members of the Chicago Federation of Musicians, theretofore employed by the said licensee in connection with the conduct of its broadcasting business, to discontinue their employment with said licensee;

"(2) By directing and causing said three employees and other persons, members of the Chicago Federation of Musicians, not to accept employment by said licensee; and

"(3) By placing and causing to be placed a person as a picket in front of the place of business of said licensee."

The only challenge to the information was a motion to dismiss on the ground that the act on which the information was based (a) abridges freedom of speech in contravention of the first amendment; (b) is repugnant to the fifth amendment because it defines a crime in terms that are excessively vague, and denies equal protection of the law and liberty of contract; (c) imposes involuntary servitude in violation of the thirteenth amendment.[1] The district court dismissed the information, holding that the 1946 amendment on which it was based violates the first, fifth, and thirteenth amendments.

Two general principles which concern our disposition of appeals involving constitutional questions have special application to this case: We have consistently refrained from passing on the constitutionality of a statute until a case involving it has reached a stage where the decision of a precise constitutional issue is a necessity. The reasons underlying this principle and illustrations of the strictness with which it has been applied appear in the opinion of the Court in *The Rescue Army* v. *Municipal Court* (331 U. S. —, —) and cases there collected. And in reviewing a direct appeal from a district court under the Criminal Appeals Act, supra, our review is limited to the validity or construction of the contested statute. For "The Government's appeal does not open the whole case" (*United States* v. *Borden Co.* (308 U. S. 188, 193)).

First. One holding of the district court was that, as contended here, the statute is repugnant to the due process clause of the fifth amendment because its words, "number of employees needed by such licensee," are so vague, indefinite, and uncertain that "persons of ordinary intelligence cannot in advance tell whether a certain action or course of action would be within its prohibition. * * *" The information here, up to the place where it specifically charges the particular means used to coerce the licensee, substantially employs this statutory language. And the motion to dismiss on the ground of vagueness and indefiniteness squarely raises the question of whether the section invoked in the indictment is void in toto, barring all further actions under it, in this, and every other case. (Cf. *United States* v. *Thompson* (251 U. S. 407, 412).) Many questions of a statute's constitutionality as applied can best wait the refinement of the issues by pleading, construction of the challenged statute and pleadings, and, sometimes, proof (*The Rescue Army* v. *Municipal Court*, supra; *Watson* v. *Buck* (313 U. S. 387, 402); *Borden's Company* v. *Baldwin* (293 U. S. 194, 204, 210), and concurring opinion at p. 213). But no refinement or clarification of issues which we can reasonably anticipate would bring into better focus the question of whether the contested section is written so vaguely and indefinitely that one whose conduct it affected could only guess what it meant. Consequently, since this phase of the appeal raises a question of validity of a statute within our jurisdiction under the Criminal Appeals Act, supra, and is ripe for our decision, we turn to the merits of the contention.

We could not sustain this provision of the act if we agreed with the contention that persons of ordinary intelligence would be unable to know when their compulsive actions would force a person against his will to hire employees he did not need (*Connally* v. *General Construction Co.* (269 U. S. 385, 391); *Lanzetta* v. *New Jersey* (306 U. S. 451)). But we do not agree. Of course, as respondent points out, there are many factors that might be considered in determining how many employees are needed on a job. But the same thing may be said about most questions which must be submitted to a fact-finding tribunal in order to enforce statutes. Certainly, an employer's statements as to the number of employees needed is not conclusive as to that question. It, like the alleged wilfullness of a defendant, must be decided in the light of all the evidence.

Clearer and more precise language might have been framed by Congress to express what it meant by "number of employees needed." But none occurs to us, nor has any better language been suggested, effectively to carry out what appears to have been the congressional purpose. The argument really seems to be that it is impossible for a jury or court ever to determine how many employees a business needs, and that, therefore, no statutory language could meet the problem Congress had in mind. If this argument should be accepted, the result would be that no legislature could make it an offense for a person to compel another to hire employees, no matter how unnecessary they were, and however desirable a legislature might consider suppression of the practice to be.

The Constitution presents no such insuperable obstacle to legislation. We think that the language Congress used provides an adequate warning as to what conduct falls under its ban, and marks boundaries sufficiently distinct for judges and juries fairly to administer the law in accordance with the will of Congress. That there may be marginal cases in which it is difficult to determine the side of the line on which a particular fact situation falls is no sufficient reason to hold the language too ambiguous to define a criminal offense (*Robinson* v. *United States* (324 U. S. 282, 285–286)). It would strain the requirement for certainty in criminal law standards too near the breaking point to say that it was impossible judicially to determine whether a person knew

[1] Another ground, not argued here, was that the act represents an exercise of power by Congress not delegated to the United States.

when he was willfully attempting to compel another to hire unneeded employees. (See *Screws* v. *United States* (325 U. S. 91); *United States* v. *Ragen* (314 U. S. 513, 522, 524, 525).) The Constitution has erected procedural safeguards to protect against conviction for crime except for violation of laws which have clearly defined conduct thereafter to be punished; but the Constitution does not require impossible standards. The language here challenged conveys sufficiently definite warning as to the proscribed conduct when measured by common understanding and practices. The Constitution requires no more.

Second. It is contended that the statute denies equal protection of the laws to radio-broadcasting employees as a class, and, for this reason, violates the due process clause of the fifth amendment. This contention, raised by the motion to dismiss, and sustained by the district court as a ground for holding the statute unconstitutional as written, is properly before us, and we reach this equal protection ground, for the same reason that we decided the question of whether the section was unconstitutionally vague and indefinite.

In support of this contention it is first argued that if Congress concluded that employment by broadcasting companies of unneeded workers was detrimental to interstate commerce, in order to be consistent, it should have provided for the punishment of employers, as well as employees, who violate that policy.[2] Secondly, it is argued, the act violates due process because it singles out broadcasting employees for regulation while leaving other classes of employees free to engage in the very practices forbidden to radio workers. But it is not within our province to say that because Congress has prohibited some practices within its power to prohibit, it must prohibit all within its power. Consequently, if Congress believes that there are employee practices in the radio industry which injuriously affect interstate commerce, and directs its prohibitions against those practices, we could not set aside its legislation even if we were persuaded that employer practices also required regulation. (See *Labor Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.* (301 U. S. 1, 46).) Nor could we strike down such legislation, even if we believed that as a matter of policy it would have been wiser not to enact the legislation or to extend the prohibitions over a wider or narrower area. Here Congress aimed its law directly against one practice—compelling a broadcasting company to hire unneeded workers. There is nothing novel about laws to prohibit some persons from compelling other persons to act contrary to their desires. Whatever may be the limits of the power of Congress that do not apply equally to all classes, groups, and persons (see *Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis* (301 U. S. 548, 584)), we are satisfied that Congress has not transgressed those limits in the provisions of this statute which are here attacked.

Third. Respondent contends here, and the district court has held, that the statute abridges freedom of speech by making peaceful picketing a crime. It is important to note that the statute does not mention picketing, peaceful or violent. The proposed application of the statute to picketing, therefore, does not derive from any specific prohibition written into the statute against peaceful picketing. Rather it comes from the information's charge that respondent attempted to compel the licensee to hire unneeded employees by placing "a picket in front of the place of business of (the) * * * licensee." Yet the respondent's motion to dismiss was made only on the ground that the statute, as written, contravenes the first amendment. In ruling on this motion, the district court assumed that because "there was no charge of violence * * * the placing of a picket must be regarded * * * as peaceful picketing." From this assumption, it concluded that "the application [of the statute] here sought to be made violates the first amendment by its restriction upon freedom of speech by peaceful picketing." Thus, rather than holding the statute as written to be an unconstitutional violation of the first amendment, the district court ruled on the statute as it was proposed to be applied by the information as it then read.

We consider it inappropriate to reach the merits of this constitutional question now. As we have pointed out, we have consistently said that we would refrain from passing on the constitutionality of statutes in advance of the necessity to do so. And the provisions for direct appeal from district courts of certain criminal cases do not require us to pass on constitutional questions prematurely decided by a district court's dismissal of an information.

The information here, up to the place where it alleges the use of particular coercive means, charges in substantially the language of the statute that respondent coerced the licensee. The information's charges up to this point constitute a sufficient basis for a challenge to the statute on the ground that it contravenes the Constitution. Whether this part of the information, or the information as a whole, was adequate definitely to inform the respondent of the nature of the charge against him is another question. (See *United States* v. *Lepowitch* (318 U. S. 702, 704); *Potter* v. *United States* (155 U. S. 438); cf. *United States* v. *Hess* (124 U. S. 483).) Had the district court postponed ruling on the first amendment question raised by the motion to dismiss, or had it denied the motion, respondent could have sought a bill of particulars, apart from attacking the constitutionality of the act. (See *Husty* v. *United States* (282 U. S. 694, 702); *Bartell* v. *United States* (227 U. S. 427, 433-434); *Dunbar* v. *United States* (156 U. S. 185, 192).) So also, if the additional allegations describing the means used to accomplish the proscribed purpose were not definite enough for the court to determine whether they were sufficient in law to charge an offense, and if such allegations were not mere surplusage (see *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.* (310 U. S. 150, 222)) a challenge could have been made to the information (see *United States* v. *Hess*, supra, at 487–488) as distinguished from a challenge to the statute on which it rested. In that event, and upon a holding of insufficiency of the information, appeal by the United States would have properly gone, under the Criminal Appeals Act supra, to the Circuit Court of Appeals, and if inappropriately brought here, that act, as amended, 56 Statutes 271, would have required us to transfer the cause to the circuit court of appeals. But no such challenge was made to the information.

We therefore have a situation in which we are urged to strike down a statute as violative of the constitutional guaranties of free speech when the statute has not been, and might never be, applied in such manner as to raise the question respondent asks us to decide. For the gist of the offense here charged in the statute and in the information is that respondent "willfully, by the use of force, intimidation, duress and by the use of other means, did attempt to coerce, compel, and constrain" the licensee to hire unneeded employees. If the allegations that this prohibited result was attempted to be accomplished by picketing are so broad as to include action which either is not coercive, compelling, or constraining, within the statute's meaning, or could not be constitutionally held to be, the trial court would be free, on motion of the respondent, to strike the particular allegations if they are surplusage. Rules of Criminal Procedure, section 7 (d). Or the Government might amend the information "at any time before verdict or finding if no additional or different offense is charged and if substantial rights of the defendant are not prejudiced" (ibid. sec. 7 (e)).

The foregoing analysis shows that we are asked to rule on constitutional questions that are not yet precisely in issue. The question as it was decided by the district court, was not the question raised by the motion to dismiss—whether the statute is invalid on its face—but whether it is invalid as it is proposed to be applied. And even if our decision could be evoked upon a showing that the statute certainly, but for our intervention, would have punished respondent for peaceful picketing, there is no such certainty here. No final issue had been drawn. The information was still subject to amendment to fit, within the permissible area of amendments, the type of coercive means developed by further pleading or proof. (See *Borden's Co. v. Baldwin*, supra, at 213.) Further pleadings and proof might well draw the issues into sharper focus making it unnecessary for us to decide questions not relevant to determination of the constitutionality of the statute as actually applied. Thus this case had not reached a stage where the decision of a precise constitutional issue was a necessity. Consequently, we refrain from considering any constitutional questions except those concerning the act as written. We do not decide whether the allegations of the information, whatever shape they might eventually take, would constitute an application of the statute in such manner as to controvene the first amendment. We only pass on the statute on its face; it is not in conflict with the first amendment.

Fourth. The district court held, and it is argued here, that the statute, as sought to be applied in the information, violates the thirteenth amendment which prohibits slavery and involuntary servitude. This contention is also rooted in that part of the information which particularizes the means by which respondent attempted to compel action by the licensee, i. e., by causing three musicians to discontinue, and three musicians not to accept, employment. The argument is that employees have a constitutional right to leave employment singly (see *Pollock* v. *Williams* (322 U. S. 4, 17, 18)), or in concert, and consequently that respondent cannot be guilty of a crime for directing or causing them to do so. For the reasons given with reference to the picketing specification, therefore, we consider the thirteenth amendment question only with reference to the statute on its face. Thus considered, it plainly does not violate the thirteenth amendment. Whether some possible attempted application of it to particular persons in particular sets of circumstances would violate the thirteenth amendment is a question we shall not pass upon until it is appropriately presented.

Reversed and remanded.

Mr. Justice Douglas took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

[2] The act does not prohibit radio broadcasters from voluntarily hiring more employees than they need.

Federal Employment Drops, But Still Far Above 1939

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Bedford Daily Times-Mail of June 16, 1947:

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT DROPS, BUT STILL FAR ABOVE 1939

The Nation's taxpayers have been hearing quite a lot recently about reduced governmental budgets, lay-offs of Federal employees here and there. The reduction has taken a toll in Federal Governmental offices here and elsewhere in the State and Nation.

We hear also of Congress' attempt to trim $6,000,000,000 from President Truman's budget estimates for the fiscal year beginning July 1. Many reductions have been made. Others are in the air. In other words, a real battle is on in the Nation's Capital as lawmakers wield the axe.

It might be well, at this stage, to consider what is happening in the Federal Government from the standpoint of employment cuts.

Federal employment during the past 6 years of prewar, actual war, and postwar Government activity was summed up recently by Senator HARRY F. BYRD'S Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The report shows that as of January this year the number of Federal employees on the Government pay roll is nearly two-thirds of the wartime peak—still two and a half times as great as it was in 1939, the last normal prewar year.

The total was 919,776 on June 30, 1939. On June 30, 1945, the total stood at 3,737,896, and in January this year it was 2,261,459. Of course, the January total has been reduced considerably as agencies streamline their operations in preparation for budget slashes next year.

From the wartime peak and January 1947, the War and Navy Departments and war emergency agencies reduced personnel by a total of 1,794,604, but this reduction was partially offset by a net increase of 318,167 in nonwar departments and agencies. Notable among those showing increases in this period were Reclamation Service, which more than doubled; Bonneville Power Administration; Federal prison system; Division of Labor Standards; Office of Secretary of Labor; Office of First Assistant Postmaster General; Office of Fourth Assistant Postmaster General; State Department's Foreign Service; Office of Foreign Liquidation and Prencinradio, Inc.; Federal Security Agency; Public Buildings Administration; Public Roads Administration; and Veterans' Administration.

BYRD'S report also showed that the Washington metropolitan area in January had 221,288 employees. The State of California ran close second, with 212,912 Federal employees; New York had 192,592. The Federal Government in that month had 300,000 employees outside continental United States.

Proof that governmental agencies can slash personnel is shown in BYRD'S study of personnel ceilings imposed on various units. In an effort to check mounting pay rolls, ceilings were applied on the number of personnel in a great many agencies. Between July 1, 1945, and September 30, 1946, no penalties were applied for ceiling violations. During that period, there were 271 violations and 47,278 employees were paid in violation of ceiling limits.

During the last quarter of 1946, however, penalties were invoked for violations—and there were no violations.

Obviously, Washington responds only to pressure, whether that pressure be by some individual or group of individuals seeking some special privilege, or by lawmakers exerting pressure to get some particular job done. Personnel ceilings without penalties are a perfect example of trying to get something done the easy way. And, of course, what happened after penalties were imposed shows the opposing picture.

We cannot expect the Government to reduce its personnel to levels of 1939 or before. We ourselves have supported moves toward greater Government service which requires more personnel. The Veterans' Administration is a perfect example. Before the war, a handful of persons could do the work that now is required by thousands. To cut this personnel item back to prewar would to be wipe out benefits under the GI bill of rights.

And it could easily be fatal to trim the State Department's personnel to prewar levels. World political and economical conditions demand the utmost attention. We are on thin ice internationally. We are fighting communism all over the world to keep that communism from forcing itself upon us.

But a lot of explanation will be required to show the average taxpayer why we need two and one-half times as many people on the Federal pay roll—excluding men in the armed forces—than we had in 1939.

Address of Dr. Charles A. Lory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 23, 1947, a dedication celebration was held at the mouth of the Alva B. Adams Tunnel of the Colorado-Big Thompson project, at which time the first water from the Pacific slope of the Rocky Mountains flowed through the backbone of the Continental Divide to the Atlantic side to be used as supplementary water for irrigation and power-producing purposes.

At this ceremony an address was made by Dr. Charles A. Lory, former president of the Colorado A. & M. College, at Fort Collins, Colo., which I wish to include as part of my remarks. Dr. Lory has lived in the neighborhood of this project during his entire life. Without a doubt Dr. Lory qualifies as an expert on irrigation and reclamation.

The address follows:

The people living in the valleys of the South Platte, Caché la Poudre, Big Thompson and Little Thompson Rivers, the St. Vrain and Boulder Creeks during the devastating drought of the early 30's were certain more water must be gotten for irrigation to prevent diastrous crop losses, but were not generally agreed how more water could be obtained.

For half a century the region had enlarged its supplies for irrigation through additional storage reservoirs and some transmountain diversions, so it was natural to find many seriously advocating construction of more reservoirs. Surveys showed three excellent sites on the Poudre and possibility of enlargement of storage systems on the Thompson and St. Vrain.

However, the region was faced with the fact that its storage systems were empty, and experience showed heavy losses in carrying reservoir water from one irrigation season to another. There was much speculation over probable changes in the climate—whether droughts like the present one had occurred in the past or would occur again in the future. If so, where would the water come from to fill additional reservoirs?

Fortunately, these questions were answered through an investigation by Dr. Arthur D. Moinat, a graduate of Colorado State College A. and M., with a doctor's degree from the University of Illinois. Using the method developed by Dr. A. E. Douglass, of the University of Arizona, in determining the relation of tree growth to precipitation, Dr. Moinat found the growth rings of trees on the water shed of the Caché la Poudre and Big Thompson Rivers correlated well with the weather records of precipitation and of river flow, and that the method of Dr. Douglass so thoroughly tested in Arizona and southwestern Colorado, could be followed with assurance. Using carefully selected pinus ponderosa trees almost exclusively, ranging in age from less than 100 years to more than 360 years, he found 34 years unfavorable to tree growth, hence deficient in rainfall, in the period from 1711 to 1932, and 30 years especially favorable—good water years we would call them now.

The 250-year record of tree growth on the Poudre water shed and in Estes Park showed the average length of a period of successive favorable or unfavorable years—that is above or below average—has been about 2 years. The maximum average period of lean or fat years does not exceed 8 years. During a period of subnormal precipitation, usually only a few years are exceedingly unfavorable.

Interpreting the data on the annual growth of tree rings according to the Douglass method for determining climatic history, Dr. Moinat found no appreciable change in the climate of northern Colorado for the past 300 years.

This information became available when the men at the college were debating the probable value of more storage reservoirs compared with probable diversion from the Colorado River, and turned the final decision strongly in favor of diversion, and the conviction that water from "Grand Lake" was absolutely necessary to stabilize the water supplies of northeastern Colorado and prevent the recurrence of disastrous crop losses due to water shortage.

You know the rest of the story—how the Institution worked for the "Grand Lake Diversion", cooperated with the Northern Colorado Water Users Association, gathered information for our Representatives in Congress, and for the Secretary of the Interior, carried on a vigorous educational campaign, and cooperated in securing the legislation authorizing the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District. It participated in the celebration of starting construction of the keystone feature of the Colorado Big Thompson project, and rejoices with you and all Colorado on this happy day when water is first diverted through the Alva B. Adams Tunnel, the longest irrigation tunnel in the world.

New Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Star of June 24, 1947, which presents a moderate and sane view of the labor bill just passed by Congress.

It presents the exact view that I took of this measure when it was before the House for consideration; namely, it is not a drastic law nor will it crush or destroy labor unions.

The editorial follows:

NEW LABOR LAW

The most impressive thing about the bill which now becomes a new labor law is the extent of its popular support. President

Truman fought the bill with every means at his command. He brought every conceivable argument, both sound and unsound, to bear against it. Nevertheless, the bill was passed over his veto—in the Senate by a vote of 68 to 25, and in the House by 331 to 83.

On this record, only those whose minds are closed will deny that a new deal in labor legislation is desired by the people. And there is need for such a new deal. For years the legislative trend was in the direction of protecting and strengthening organized labor. Nor can there be any real doubt that there was need for legislation designed to bolster labor. But as always seems to happen in this country, Congress went too far. Very soon after enactment of the Wagner Act, it became apparent that the scales were weighted too heavily in labor's favor, and that something was needed to redress the balance. This new law is the first significant step in that direction.

It is not a drastic law. It will neither crush labor nor destroy unions. While a few of its provisions are of doubtful wisdom and may prove unworkable, the law as a whole is moderate and is aimed at correcting abuses which the unions could not or would not correct of their own accord.

There has been some reckless talk to the effect that the law will meet with widespread union defiance. And it is unfortunate that the President has said some things in criticism of the law which may tend to encourage defiance. But responsible union leaders will be extremely ill-advised if they take the position that the law is not to be obeyed. If they want to work for repeal of the law by seeking the defeat of the Members of Congress who voted for it, that is their privilege. It would be quite another thing, however, to undertake to defy the law because they do not like it. The chances are that such an attitude would result only in the adoption of drastic, punitive legislation, and that, in turn, might well produce some of the evils which the President mistakenly believes will flow out of the present law.

The most urgent need now is for an awareness by all concerned that ours is a democratic system and that this new law has come into being through an impressive functioning of the democratic process. For labor leaders, the President or anyone else to overlook this central fact could easily be productive of a real threat to our democratic system.

Truman Blocks a Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Bedford Daily Times-Mail of June 18, 1947:

TRUMAN BLOCKS A PAY INCREASE

President Truman took a pay increase away from every worker in America when he vetoed the tax bill. The President said, "It represents the wrong kind of tax reduction, at the wrong time." What he actually meant is that the bill was the product of a Republican Congress, and that next year is election year.

While President Truman has moved quite a way from the New Deal, he did learn the lesson of maintaining a perpetual emergency. It is quite significant that there has been an emergency every single minute since March 4, 1933, when Franklin Roosevelt was inaugurated. There was an emergency then, and the spectacular appeal of closing the banks worked such amazing political success, that we have been saddled with an emergency ever since.

Right now, the emergency seems to be great responsibilities for international relief and rehabilitation. This means the purchasing of large amounts of grain, at the highest prices in history, and indulging in what is becoming popularly known as Operation Rat Hole.

Mr. Truman decries the rising spiral of inflation, yet the policy of the Federal Government in buying food for Europe is right now the most important factor in high prices. The President also overlooks the fact that taxes are one of the biggest expenses of business today, and that high prices always go hand in hand with high taxes. Somebody has to pay taxes, and all through history, the ultimate taxpayer has been the consumer—the little fellow Mr. Truman wants to protect.

Also overlooked in the President's message is the fact that tax reduction brings in increased revenue. The last time there was a reduction in Federal taxes was during the administrations of Presidents Harding and Coolidge, when Andrew Mellon was Secretary of the Treasury. Tax collections were higher at the lower rates than had been before the reduction. The reason is obvious. Taxes responded to the same law as other items of mass production. When prices are reduced, more buyers enter the field, sales and profits go up. It has been more than 20 years since the Nation has had a chance to prove that well-established economic fact. The Congress presented such an opportunity to Mr. Truman, but evidently he thought more of New Deal financial theory than he did of proven economic policies.

It is true that taxpayers in the higher brackets would get a greater relief in dollars, but the percentage would be exactly the same. It is grossly unfair to make the statement about take-home pay. In the $2,500 bracket, which the President mentions, the increase in take-home pay would depend entirely upon the family status of the taxpayer. The single persons would save $67 a year; the married man $48; the man with a wife and child would save $29; and the family with two children would save only $10. Thus the percentage savings run from 2.9 percent for the single man to one-half of 1 percent for the family of four. It would be just as dishonest to talk about the saving of 2.9 percent as to stress the one-half of 1 percent.

The significant feature of the vetoed bill is that it was equitable. All taxpayers got some relief. In fact, it was a straight 20-percent cut across the board. Very few workers get less than $1,000 a year today, and very few get more than $300,000. The bill would have given relief to everyone. It would have stimulated business, the vital turn-over of money from which taxes are derived.

The President has not been reading recent financial news when he says there is no shortage of funds to expand industry. The absence of new financial issues is the best evidence of his error. Even such a financial giant as the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. withdrew a sale of its securities from the market because of poor public support. The best index to business prosperity is the amount of new financing, most of which is spent for plant expansion. That index is pointing down.

One thing is sure—a very important issue of the 1948 Presidential campaign has been created. The Republican Congress was elected by a majority of the voters. It kept its word. It had promised tax reduction, and provided the means to achieve the promise. The President elected to follow the plan of "tax and tax, spend and spend."

Colorado-Big Thompson Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado-Big Thompson project is almost one-half completed. The first water from the Pacific slope of the Rocky Mountains flowed through the 13-mile Alva B. Adams Tunnel, which pierces the backbone of the Rocky Mountains, on June 23, 1947. The celebration of this event was a historic affair. Mr. Michael W. Straus, United States Commissioner of Reclamation, delivered the principal address at the dedication ceremony held at Loveland, Colo., June 23, 1947, and as part of my remarks I wish to include his address:

THE LONG TRAIL AHEAD

That historic ceremony at the tunnel portal today when the first Pacific slope irrigation water came through the backbone of the continent to the Atlantic side was just the beginning and not the end. In reclamation when you put a tunnel to use or dedicate a dam, you have only reached the turn of the race—the finish is still ahead. The Colorado-Big Thompson project is less than half completed. Today's jubilee is but a symbol of things to come. But it's a good start and it's a good race. The Bureau of Reclamation is glad to be in partnership here with the Northern Colorado Conservancy District.

I have been here often before in the past 10 years, and I hope to be here again. Last time, less than a month ago, the snow was deep. We flew over the Divide to see both sides of the project. There were flooded areas along the Colorado over on the western slope then. That snow and water went down the river to the sea unconserved this year. But when we get done with our job, we will be saving that snow for the long dry summer months for the irrigation farmer here in this valley and for thousands of miles all the way down the river, which should be our first great western river that becomes fully utilized.

You are particularly fortunate today as the first water came through the Divide, making a dream of half a century come true. You are fortunate because you got started early and established your plan and your rights. The Bureau of Reclamation has been building this project for 9—almost 10—years during which we have had a depression, a boom, and the greatest war the world has ever seen. But always through it all, the project was kept going and moving forward. Nothing can stop its completion now.

But if it had not started when it did—a child of the depression of the early 30's, and I well remember that day in 1935 when I made the announcement of the first Federal Public Works Administration allotment of funds for surveys and plannings—you would not be able to start it now. You would not now be able to start it because you could not get the water of the Colorado. Since you began this work, the world has found out that it needs many more projects that depend on Colorado River water than there is water in that mighty stream. Twenty-five years ago Colorado and her sister States of the

Colorado Basin undertook to divide the waters by compact among themselves. In this year of 1947 we have the silver jubilee of that undertaking, and the task is not yet done. Colorado, together with her six sister States of the Basin, has a responsibility to complete that compact. You have recognized this responsibility and even now are seeking to discharge that duty. Please hurry the task so that other projects may be built in other valleys bringing them new food, new wealth, and new comfort and so that they may have the joy and happiness that comes to you with new water today.

Please lean back and take a broad view of what we are celebrating here today. Around the world people are hungry—hungrier than anybody has ever been in the South Platte River Valley or anybody ever will be in this valley. Around the world men are putting their water works in order, getting the water on the land to raise the crops that stay hunger. To the Bureau of Reclamation pour in demands for aid and counsel from India, from Morocco, from China, from New Zealand, from Egypt, from Europe, from Asia, from Tunisia, from Afghanistan, from all quarters of the globe. If you look, you can see the technicians of those lands studying their problems most any day in the world's reclamation headquarters in Denver. In this postwar world awakening to the needs for land and water, I regret to report that at the moment the effort to achieve is more determined in other lands than in the United States—probably because they have made less progress in the past and their awakening is therefore ruder than ours. In order to bring water to the land, and food and power to the people, nations that we consider poor and backward are investing, at the moment and in proportion to their ability, more determinedly than this the richest land in all the world. But our concern, great as it is about what happens in the rest of the world, is principally about what happens in the arid and semiarid sections of the United States.

Tonight we are in the Missouri Basin profiting from water brought there from the Colorado Basin. In the Missouri Basin—one-sixth of the whole Nation—you are going forward with the coordinated and integrated Missouri Basin plan—a plan that you have developed to meet your vital needs, the first such great basin-wide plan that has ever been generated anywhere in this world. It is a plan thought out in advance, inspected, corrected, and tailored to meet local requirements. It is intended to avoid the pitfalls of waste and ruination and to get the uttermost out of your resources. Part of that plan is being carried forward by your Bureau of Reclamation—your service agency to do your work.

The Missouri Basin is an integral part of this Nation that the whole world is talking about and looking to for guidance. Just to bring it down to fact and relate it to those hungry peoples, each year the Missouri Basin has supplied enough bread to fill half the Nation's bread basket, butter enough for one slice out of every five slices of bread eaten in the United States, a slice of beef for one sandwich out of every five, about one-quarter of all the lamb, one-sixth of all the pork, and nearly half of all the poultry meat. That among other things is what the Missouri Basin is to the United States.

Let's get still closer to home. Colorado is but one of the many States of the Missouri Basin, and Colorado is no novice in irrigation. You have had it before; you have it now. You sampled reclamation back in 1860 and found that it pays dividends. You in the South Platte Valley can find that there is proof of that in the North Platte Federal Reclamation project, not far from here, which has grown in population at a rate three times as great as that of the surrounding areas. Even during the drought decade, the population there increased while in other high plains areas it declined. They know what reclamation means in the North Platte Valley. That is why 53 percent of the lands in the one county there are now irrigated and the agricultural production in 1940 was six times that of 1908, when irrigation was started.

Uncle Sam also knows what irrigation means. He put about $16,000,000 into the North Platte project, and the water users there are paying back that $16,000,000 in fine style through repayment contracts with the Secretary of the Interior. But that is only a part of what Uncle Sam is getting back. Not only are the citizens on the North Platte project paying back the $16,000,000 but Uncle Sam's tax collector has gone in there. I have been peeping over his shoulder and notice that that project has already yielded to the United States Treasury more than seventeen million additional dollars in Federal individual income taxes alone. That is one of the best investments Uncle Sam ever made, and we don't expect any less in the North Platte Valley for which Uncle Sam is laying out far more cash.

Now, to get to the Adams tunnel and the Colorado-Big Thompson project and fit them into the world's mosaic. Right here today we have celebrated as fine an example as there is anywhere of the wedding of land and water, citizens and their Government, the State and the United States. It is only by such projects as the Colorado-Big Thompson and by the intelligent and full use of the resources with which we are blessed and which are the source of all our true wealth, that we are going forward in strength and happiness. That is what you have embarked upon here today.

I am not going to attempt to recite the detail, the glory, and the statistics of the Colorado-Big Thompson project or decorate it with description and adjectives. But, remember, this is only the beginning. The proof of the worthiness of this effect still lies ahead. It is always a happy day when the first water comes through. But it is a long, long road down which the Government, in partnership with its citizens, must go before there is new water in the ditch and new production in the fields. Also, there is a still longer road down which we must go together to protect and to guard this project until all the promises are made good and we win our final reward.

The Colorado-Big Thompson project is costing a lot of money to a lot of people. Taxpayers from all over the Nation will pay for it under the reclamation laws until the immediate beneficiaries pay back what they must pay back. It is going to cost a lot more than we figured 10 years ago, but it is also going to be a better project and it is going to be worth a lot more than it would have been 10 years ago. Today it is worth more to you in dollars and cents for your increased farm products—worth more in the benefits it brings to you. It is going to cost more because there has been a war and we have moved from a prewar depression economy into a postwar economy. It is going to cost more because the cost of blasting a yard of rock, moving a yard of earth, or setting a yard of concrete to build the project has gone up just as the price of building a barn or the price of the extra tons of sugar beets and alfalfa, the extra bushels of barley, or the extra hundredweight of beef that Colorado-Big Thompson will bring you has gone up. It is going to cost you more under the reclamation law, but it is still a bargain—a better bargain than if Uncle Sam waited and if you waited, as you wisely decided not to do, until construction costs come down, if they ever come down. If we had waited, this community, for want of water, would be losing an annual increase of $21,000,000 in farm production plus cheaper power bills and other benefits. That loss would go on year after year until the project was built and you got the water. It is such facts as that which, when folks back East doubt if Uncle Sam can afford to go ahead with these western works, cause reclamation to respond that we can't afford not to drive forward.

The agricultural economists figure that a full supply of Colorado-Big Thompson water to the district lands will yield an additional $21.01 gross crop production for each of the 615,000 acres benefited. Likewise, they figure land values will increase, depending on their present water status, up to as high as rises of $100 per acre and for the whole district some $18,732,000 accompanied by increases in population, assessed valuation, and new wealth. All of their calculations, both those of the conservatives and of the optimists, are that this valley cannot lose on this water project.

Even with all that, you people in the irrigated area will never be repaying the major part of the interest-free Federal irrigation funds used on this project. Owing to the magic of the Colorado River waters flowing through the Rocky Mountain backbone of the continent and then tumbling 2,900 feet down the eastern slope, power will be your real paying partner. Coming down those mountainsides, it will be working for you before it even gets to your irrigation canals and ditches. It will be turning turbines hitched to great generators from which lead transmission lines to Denver and many places in Colorado and on for hundreds of miles into Nebraska and Wyoming, where your neighbors cry for kilowatts. So, in this multiple-purpose project, protect and cherish those transmission lines. They not only will carry electrical energy to yourselves and to your neighbors, cheaper power than can be had anywhere else hereabouts, but will also carry back to the Colorado-Big Thompson Project the revenues without which this magnificent project and your irrigation water would never have been possible.

A lot of people will be watching because this is one of the great water projects of the world. If it fares well and fulfills its promise, the rest of the plans—the plans that will move forward for almost a century in both the Missouri Basin and the Colorado Basin—will proceed. If it fails, the plans will falter and the hopes of many of your neighbors will be dashed.

Cherish and preserve this project. It is a project of all the people—all the people of the valley and all the people of the Nation. Let no man abuse it. Watch your property, keep up your canals and ditches, maintain your gates and drains, guard and protect it, and, in turn, in dry seasons and in times of drought and dust, it will guard and protect you.

Tonight we are in a troubled world. There are storm clouds of international affairs around the world, and in Washington there is talk of curtailing vital western resource development. Here in Colorado we are looking far forward toward new horizons—horizons beyond which you have had the courage and the foresight to see new comforts, new wealth, and a better life. The horizons of all must widen. One horizon that I hope will widen is that of what constitutes extravagance and what constitutes economy. I hope that horizon widens so far that we, all over this country, can recognize that the greatest waste in this Nation—a waste so great that it cannot be measured in dollars and cents—is the extravagance of water wasting to the sea in a land that cries for food and power.

As we talk of far horizons, let our horizons be broad enough to realize that what we celebrate today is only the start—the start of a good partnership down a long, long trail toward the final success of this project—a long trail on which reclamation is happy to be embarking as a partner with the citizens of Colorado.

Enforcement of New Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan from the New York Herald Tribune of June 25, 1947:

HAMSTRINGING OF NEW LABOR LAW BY OFFICIALS AND UNIONS DOUBTED—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS KNOW IT IS WILL OF PEOPLE, WHILE UNION LEADERS REALIZE OWN RECALCITRANCY BROUGHT IT ON

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, June 24.—In the atmosphere of Washington, following enactment of the labor law, the principal characteristic has been talk of controversy and bitterness. Much of this dwelt upon the idea that the new law might be hamstrung. One innuendo said that labor leaders and unions would make the law difficult to enforce. A parallel innuendo said that enforcement of the law by officials now in the Truman administration, and others to be appointed by him, might be lukewarm.

Both innuendoes arises largely from possibly the most unfortunate of several unhappy characteristics of Mr. Truman's course in his veto of the bill and subsequently. Not only did he say the law was bad and say it in many forms and in emotional words. He declared also that the bill was unworkable. This, it was said, would give justification to labor leaders to prove that the law was in fact what the President said it was. Further, it was said that the President's characterization would give color to the attitude of enforcement officials under him.

An objective judgment might doubt all this. As to enforcement officials whom the President is yet to appoint under provisions of the law, these must be confirmed by a Senate which already has strongly expressed its support of the law. As to enforcement officials already in office, here are good reasons why they should enforce the law in good faith. One is the character of the most important enforcement officials. Some of the most highly placed are conscientious men, determined to enforce the law in the spirit of conformity to high standards of practice. Another reason is realization that the law expresses the overwhelming will of a Congress which will be in existence for another year and a half. Added to this is an assumption of the possibility that the Republican Party, which controls Congress and is responsible for the law, may also control the executive department of Government after the 1948 elections. The new labor law is the expression of a settled determination by a large majority of the people. It has almost the force of a quiet revolution. Any calm judgment must expect the law to be permanent, with only such modifications as may appear necessary.

ATTITUDE OF LABOR LEADERS

As to the attitude of labor leaders and unions, there is a condition not taken into account in the current excitement. Some labor leaders are undoubtedly men of recalcitrant temperament. But others realize that the new law is a result of a recalcitrancy in the past on the part of some labor leaders which other leaders already deplored. A majority of the more seasoned labor leaders, while carrying provisions of the new law to orderly judicial tests, will discountenance any suggestion of hamstringing the law in operation.

Besides, there are the workers, the union members, as distinguished from the union leaders. Running through the new law is a spirit which gives to workers and members of unions greater immunity from dominance by their leaders than they formerly had.

When Republican leaders and other proponents of the labor legislation called it a "bill of rights for workers" they were not using that term as a mere slogan. It was their earnest purpose that workers should be free from domination by leaders. The labor committees of the House and Senate, through weeks of patient hearings, learned that some of the most flagrant examples of unreasonable strikes and intolerable practices took place against the wish of a great majority of the workers involved. Protection for these assurances to workers of a larger opportunity to act upon their own wishes and judgments is a central purpose running through the new law and specifically assured by many provisions. Any policy of leaders to harass industries for the purpose of proving the new law unworkable, if such a policy should be attempted, would be checked by the new power of workers to control their unions and their relations with management.

CONTROVERSY EXAGGERATED

The whole spirit of controversy that exists now in the closing days of enactment of the labor bill is much exaggerated and rests on an incorrect assumption. This was no controversy between large groups evenly matched. It was resistance by a small group against an overwhelmingly large one. Determination to write new labor legislation was held firmly by an immense majority of Congress. The determination was the more firm because Congress felt that its own prerogative was at stake, as against the comparatively small section of the national community represented by the labor leaders, and also as against the executive department. What took place was the protest of a recalcitrant minority, some of them adept in stirring up emotion. That kind of resistance can make much noise, and this one was very raucous.

If there is a wave of demands by labor during the coming year, they will not arise from the new labor law nor be incited to prove the new law unworkable nor to influence the election next year. They will be caused, if they come, by rising prices and cost of living. That is a condition calling for more attention right now than the aftermath of a concluded controversy over labor legislation.

Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a recent very thoughtful and timely article on air safety which appeared in the Boston Traveler of June 16, 1947.

The air editor of this publication has made long, careful studies of air-safety measures and related subjects, and his commentary recommending more careful check of pilots is deserving of consideration in connection with the efforts of Congress to reduce accidents in the air. The article follows.

AVIATION CHANGES URGED FOR AIR SAFETY—STANDARDIZED EMERGENCY PROCEDURES, STRICT PILOT CHECKS SEEN NEEDED

(By George Akerson and Bob Sibley)

(George Akerson, assistant to the publisher of the Herald and Traveler, is a former lieutenant colonel with the Twentieth Air Force and an expert on multiengine aircraft and their operation, including emergency procedures. Bob Sibley is aviation editor of the Traveler and chairman of the board of governors of the Aviation Writers Association. This is one of a series on this important subject.—EDITOR.)

The time has come—and the conclusion is unmistakable from recent events—for the establishment of standardized emergency procedures and strict, periodic checks for airline pilots.

These standard procedures for emergency situations, and the frequent testing of pilots in successful usage, are needed so that there will be no further incidents in which a pilot, with only a limited number of seconds in which to make the right moves at a critical moment, fumbles his way into a tragic error or series of errors.

CHECK OF PILOTS

It may be asserted without hesitation that there are pilots operating aircraft on some United States air lines whose ability to cope with an emergency situation is open to question.

It may be asserted without reservation that there are pilots flying commercial planes today who have failed in tests, at one time or another, designed to determine the pilots' capabilities in an emergency.

There should be standardized procedures and pilots' checks to determine proficiency, and this matter should have the immediate attention, to this end, of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Air Transport Association of America, and the presidents and operating heads of all United States air lines.

How many thousands of hours an air-line pilot may have is a matter secondary to the question of how capable he is when one or more engines cut out, especially on take-off; when he is running out of runway, or when he gets a fire warning in a nacelle, or when there is need for a quick decision on a "go-around" problem, whether to feather or some other crisis.

ARMY'S METHOD

During the war the Army Air Forces, as part of its training program for pilots of multiengined aircraft, put into effect a detailed set of procedures for emergencies, conducted strict training, and required pilot checks from time to time to make sure that the men handling large aircraft were competent to meet emergencies.

The procedure, the moves to be made under a given set of circumstances, were standardized. Pilots were required to be able to follow through on these moves swiftly and surely.

An amazing and significant fact in connection with these procedures is the fact that some pilots who entered the AAF from the airlines were unable to pass these tests sufficiently well to qualify them for instructors, although some of them were excellent instrument pilots and became instrument instructors.

And an added fact, fully as amazing and thoroughly disturbing, is that some of these airline pilots who failed to pass the emergency procedure tests are now back flying airline routes.

These facts are matters of record.

AIRMAN FOR 27 YEARS

The man who developed and designed the emergency procedures program for the AAF during the war was Brig. Gen. Carl B. McDaniel, one of the Army's outstanding fliers,

a command pilot and veteran of more than 27 years as an airman.

What is obviously needed is a standardized program, the McDaniel plan or something similar to it, for use by the airlines.

Some of the airlines have excellent training programs covering emergencies. The programs differ in detail. On the record, from time to time, is evidence that such training has been neglected by other airlines.

What this lack of a standardized plan has meant in the past, and may continue to mean in the future, will be shown in subsequent articles in the Boston Traveler.

Address of Dr. Joseph F. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith insert an address delivered by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, rector of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., and associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs. Dr. Thorning treats a timely topic in scholarly fashion. His studies in the field of sociology and economics qualify him to discuss some of our important problems. Fortunately, this Maryland educator, author, and lecturer offers constructive solutions in complete harmony with our democratic liberties.

The address follows:

Fifteen years ago today, in the Oxford Union at Oxford University, England, I heard a young undergraduate student, with no little mixture of eloquence and humor, describe the United States of America in the following terms:

"There is this that is unique about America: the people of the United States are passing from the stage of adolescence to that of decadence,—without the intervening period of civilization."

The remark, of course, was meant to be humorous. And yet, it carried enough sting, if not truth, to suggest that we examine our consciences, on a patriotic occasion such as this, asking ourselves to what extent, if at all, the jibe can be justified.

One of the obvious replies to the former Oxford student, if he lives today, would be to remind him that, some years after his prophecy of disaster for America, he himself and his fellow citizens in Great Britain are able to survive, in a starving world, at least in part, because of the bounty of the 'uncivilized' American people.

Would not the assembly here tonight of the Elks and their Frederick County friends constitute another commentary on our country's state of civilization? Are not benevolence and fraternal charity, two conspicuous marks of the order, signs of civilized wisdom, foresight and generosity?

Turning to domestic critics of American civilization, we find ourselves face to face with the angry denunciations of Mr. Henry A. Wallace and other Soviet sympathizers. According to these dissatisfied patriots, the United States is now riding high on the tide of reaction, monopoly capitalism, interracial injustice, and atomic-age imperialism.

Each of these criticisms, it seems to me, ought to be considered separately. And, in our discussion, both sides can agree that it is a wonderful blessing of providence that Mr. Wallace and all the rest of us reside in a part of the globe where the give and take of free speech is something more than a window dressing, theoretical right, good only upon paper. There has been no more heartening display of the basic principles of American democracy than the Nation-wide crusade of Henry A. Wallace to present views on foreign policy that conflict with the administration's line of action. As one who thinks that Mr. Wallace is wrong and that President Harry S. Truman is right in trying to meet the challenge of world Marxism, I am happy to be free to uphold opinions that do not coincide with the pro-Soviet apologies of the editor of the New Republic. To protest or to disagree does not mean consignment to prison or a concentration camp. Wherever ideas are free to circulate, men are free. To that extent, at least, we are not slaves to reaction.

On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that the tendency in the United States toward monopoly capitalism is both real and dangerous. In upholding the individual's right to own a home, a shop, a farm or factory, we are not obliged to close our eyes to the production and price-fixing practices of giant corporations. Big business, in many cases, has yielded to the temptation to swallow little businesses. In Senate Document No. 17 (80th Cong., 1st sess.), the acting chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. R. E. Freer, reports that there have been 1,800 corporate mergers in 7 years. This averages out as a ratio of one for every working day. Year by year, month by month, and day by day, independent firms are being merged into, or acquired by, industrial giants. The greatest number of acquisitions took place in the food and beverage, textile and apparel, chemicals, farm machinery, and air transportation equipment industries. If this trend continues, it means that two or three companies will produce and price all the clothing for 140,000,000 people.

The same report indicates that a new wave of mergers is under way in the dairy industry. This development bears a striking resemblance to that of the late twenties, which witnessed the emergence of giant corporations and the elimination of hundreds of small dairy companies. Since 1940, acting Chairman Freer reports "the Borden Co., the second largest firm in the industry, has acquired 14 different concerns." In fact, most of the recent acquisitions in this field have been made by Nation-wide firms, which not only purchased other concerns in the dairy industry, such as creameries and ice-cream plants, but also expanded into such unrelated fields as fisheries, sardine canneries, and breweries.

In meat packing, acquisitions consisted of the purchase by large packers of small, strategically located meat-packing houses, as well as the absorption of firms in such divergent lines as poultry and eggs, creamery products, coffee, macaroni, and canned goods.

These are commodities, it should be observed, that have a direct relationship to the economy of Frederick County, whose meat and dairy products are justly famous. Every producer and every merchant in the community, as well as the consuming public, should be concerned about a concentration of economic power that, increasingly, is getting a strangle hold on mines, mills, building materials, fuel, publishing houses, and drug supplies. Unless the trend is reversed, most markets, whether for buying or selling, will be controlled by a handful of big corporations.

If all good citizens agree that political supergovernment is to be halted and corrected, how important it is to curb the rapid growth of private supergovernment in industry. Otherwise, what will happen to honest competition, "the American way of life," and "freedom of economic enterprise"? Everybody talks about free enterprise; it is time to do something about it.

With respect to interracial justice, Mr. Wallace is an echo of the Soviet propagandist, Ilya Ehrenburg. The latter, as a guest of the United States Department of State, toured the United States. Upon his return to the U. S. S. R., he singled out two features of the railway station in Atlanta, Ga., for special attention—the "marvelous invention of a luggage locker, where, for 10 cents, you could store goods"; and the nearby "waiting room for Negroes, squalid, dirty, and small."

To be sure, good Americanism and good Christian principles alike teach the hideousness of discrimination. All citizens, according to the Constitution, have equal rights before the law. Whenever an issue in this sphere has reached the Supreme Court of the United States, it has been decided on the broad grounds of humanity and fairness. Influential groups of people, in every part of the United States, including the South, are engaged in the task of intercultural education. No small progress has been made. Mr. Wallace knows this, as should Mr. Ehrenburg. To overlook the positive, constructive contributions that have been made with respect to interracial justice in the past 20 years is to perpetrate a libel, more apt to injure than to promote equity.

The charges of oil-scented imperialism, alleged by Mr. Wallace, are likewise subject to analysis. It is true—and I believe every administration official may as well admit it—that the people of the United States have an interest in the oil of the Near East. Iran and Iraq and Saudi Arabia contain almost 66 percent of the known reserves of petroleum in the world. It is the richest stake of unexploited oil on the face of the globe.

Our own supplies have a verifiable limit. For that reason, we are concerned about the fate of Turkey, Greece, and Italy—three countries that command the Mediterranean. What was once simply the "life line of the British Empire" is today a vital artery in the corporate life of nations. Every patriotic citizen wants to keep that artery intact. If it is cut or choked off, by totalitarian Red Fascists, it may mean stagnation or death for America.

The issue is not academic. The crisis is here. Either the lives of 300,000 American boys were sacrificed in vain and tax moneys to the amount of $300,000,000 were wasted, or a dictator, worse than Hitler, has to be stopped.

At home we can do the job by maintaining civil liberties, by enacting laws to eliminate the present trend of corporate mergers and acquisitions, by practicing the divine command to love one another, and by supporting Secretary of State George C. Marshall in his gallant effort to seize the initiative in world affairs.

We can strengthen democracy in the United States by rooting out abuses in the economic and social order; we can promote democracy abroad by making it abundantly clear to the Nazi-minded followers of Karl Marx that if ever again our sacred heritage of freedom be imperiled, we Americans of all races, nationalities, and creeds pledge to the Nation and to our flag our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

A Reply to Mr. David Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am

including herewith a statement of Rev. Philip S. Dodson, S. J., director of the Institute of Industrial Relations of St. Peter's College, Jersey City, N. J., replying to an article by Mr. David Lawrence, which appeared in the Jersey Journal and many other newspapers throughout the country on June 16 last. The statement of Father Dobson taken from the New Jersey Journal of Friday, June 20, follows:

LAWRENCE VIEW OF CHURCH GROUP STAND HIT BY FATHER DOBSON

Rev. Philip S. Dobson, S. J., director of the Institute of Industrial Relations of St. Peter's College, today issued a statement replying to an article by David Lawrence in the Jersey Journal, June 16. Father Dobson wrote:

"David Lawrence, in his syndicated column of June 16, says: 'Some time ago this writer took occasion to protest against the statements on current issues expressed by a Protestant group—the social research department of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America—because it appeared to be going beyond the application of moral influence to economic questions.'

"In the same column of June 12, Mr. Lawrence singles out for attack the statement of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference on the Taft-Hartley bill, saying: 'Now a Catholic agency comes in for criticism because the principle in both cases is the same.' Later, in the same column, Mr. Lawrence says: '* * * for any church unit, functioning as an institution, to mix in as a pressure group on specific laws in the economic or political field is to involve America in unfortunate controversies * * *.'

"From these and other passages in Mr. Lawrence's article, we can sum up his position as follows: No church group should pronounce publicly on the morality of issues involved in economic legislation."

CONCERNED WITH ARTICLE

"It is not my purpose here to discuss the statement of any particular church group. I am concerned with Mr. Lawrence's statement that it is not the function of any church unit to discuss legislation of this nature in terms of moral issues. In effect, he tells the church: 'Mind your own business.' Then he proceeds to tell the church just what its business is. He goes on to say that morality should no longer be discussed in the field of technical economic legislation.

"Herein, Mr. Lawrence indulges in the very practice for which he chides, 'any church unit.' Allegedly, any church group is so inexpert in the technicalities of political economy that it is not qualified to decide upon the morality of the issues involved. Yet he, a layman, sets himself up as an arbiter in the field of public morals. Morals come down to a question of what is right and wrong. Obviously, the question of right and wrong enters into the field of economics and laws. While basically simple, the science of morals requires study and research, as does any other branch of knowledge. Mr. Lawrence, apparently, considers himself sufficiently proficient in the science of morals to outline for church groups how far they should go in applying the principles of morality to legislation."

SPEAKS AS INDIVIDUAL PRIEST

"In no sense do I take it upon myself to assume the role of official spokesman for the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, or for any other group. I am speaking as an individual priest, a role which Mr. Lawrence, in his column, has conceded as proper. I am speaking, however, on the point which Mr. Lawrence raises, i. e., the right of a church group to offer moral guidance on subjects that concern, in some way or other, the spritual welfare of our people.

"Of course, if a church group is to pass judgment on the moral aspects of the Taft-Hartley bill, for instance, the members of that group should have read the bill carefully. They should have an adequate knowledge of the basic economics involved—in order that they may know adequately the impact of the bill on the rights of the people and the consequences in store for our industrial relations.

"I am acquainted with a few of such church groups. They have among their number, men with doctorates in economics. These groups have been in consultation with lawyers and professors with broad experience in this field. It seems to me that these church groups are armed with technical economic knowledge, sufficient to enable them to judge the moral issues involved, and in degree, this is probably greater than the knowledge Mr. Lawrence could claim in the field of morals."

NOT PRESSURE GROUP

"Further, I deny that pronouncements on moral issues by a church group in this field must lead to the conclusion that it is a pressure group. Admittedly, the teaching of correct applications of moral principles is designed to lead men to the truth. Truth is independent of and above the political fortunes of any particular party. No church group, which has moral guidance to offer to people, must be stifled into neglect of duty by the too ready application of tags of vote-getting or pressure group.

"Mr. Lawrence's position is not a new one. From time immemorial attempts have been made to circumscribe the activities of the clergy on moral issues by those who would restrict religion to Sunday and to the pulpit. Some of these people have been sincere but misguided, others have desired to be free as pagans in their business and recreational life.

"The question has been bandied about under such labels as separation of church and state, business is business, religion and science do not mix, the church should stay out of politics. It would take a whole series of articles to point out the half truths and the whole heresies in this jargon."

SMOKE SCREEN

"Suffice it to say that God, the maker of man, has commanded not only clergymen but all mankind to do good and avoid evil in every sphere of life. In the sense that the first amendment to our Constitution specifies that there shall be no official church in our country, we have—and we are glad that we have—a separation of church and state. From the time of our founding fathers to the present day, however, with hardly an exception, our statesmen have repudiated any separation of God and His laws from the state and its government. It is not the function of the church to advise nuclear physicists on the technical questions of the splitting of the atom. It is the function of the church to pass upon the morality of the use of the atom bomb as it affects human life. Religion and business do not mix in the sense that it is not the function of the church to advise Henry Ford II on the type of axle he should use in a new model. It is the function of the church to pass upon the general moral question of a living wage for his workers and a fair profit for himself. So we could go on to disperse the smoke screen raised by this litany of superficial slogans.

"A pronouncement by a church unit does not enjoy the same authority as would a pronouncement representing the official thought of the church as a whole. However, when a church unit, composed of men, who by the very nature of their calling have made a special study of the science of morals, makes a pronouncement on moral issues, that church unit should be regarded as a more reliable source of moral guidance."

SOCIAL STRUCTURE COMPLEX

"Mr. Lawrence is correct when he says the clergy should strive to foster in individual citizens personal sanctity and high ideals. He errs when he bids the church to stop there. I believe Mr. Lawrence is sincere in saying this, but he has been misled by his philosophy of individualism. With the passing of the years our social structure becomes more and more complex. At the same time, the social question remains basically a moral problem, i. e., the basic question remains—what is right and what is wrong. The people are clamoring for moral guidance on these basic moral problems. Individual clergymen, church units, and churches as institutions would be failing in their calling, if they did not go beyond the question of personal sanctity, and offer moral guidance on these problems, as did Christ our Lord.

"The limits of this article precludes a discussion of the Taft-Hartley bill, section by section. I have not been impressed by the caliber of organized labor's opposition. For the most part, it has been too emotional and not sufficiently specific. It seems to me that a more convincing refutation of the bill would have consisted in taking the bill, section by section, and pointing out the consequences of each section."

BILL HAS SEEDS OF TROUBLE

"I have discussed the sections of the bill with lawyers experienced in industrial relations. We have come to the conclusion that the bill contains the seeds of industrial warfare which might last for several years. We hope that we are wrong, but can we afford to take the chance? At this crucial period of our country's relations with a sick world, neither we nor the rest of the world can afford such turmoil. Our labor-relations problem cannot be divorced from the problem of world peace and the salvation of other nations.

"To oppose this bill is in no way tantamount to one's being blind to the abuses of some of the sections of labor and management in the past. The recognition of such abuses, on the other hand, in no way binds one to canonize any piece of legislation that may come out of the congressional hopper, as being a suitable remedy for such abuses.

"The whole problem calls for more light and less heat, more study and less invective, more honesty and less greed. All church groups, operating within the province of morals, have the duty of leading both labor and management toward the practice of these higher ideals, that we and the rest of the world may enjoy more fully the blessings of God."

Dividing the Nation on Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, apropos to the labor bill which was recently passed over the President's veto and is now the law of the land, I include herewith two editorials, one from the Portland Oregonian and the other from the Oregon Daily Journal, both published June 21, 1947, which are worthy of consideration in connection with this important legislation. The editorials are as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg, of June 21, 1947]

DIVIDING THE NATION ON LABOR

The Republicans in Congress who insisted that corrective labor legislation should be bundled into one omnibus package invited

the veto which President Truman accorded it Friday. This may have been good political strategy for the 1948 campaign, but it is not the best way to make laws. It was not difficult for Mr. Truman to find fault with some parts of the Taft-Hartley bill, and to reject the entire measure on that account.

The veto irrevocably makes labor legislation a No. 1 issue in the 1948 presidential campaign. Though Mr. Truman himself requested, and renewed the request in his veto message, certain mild labor law reforms, the political result of the veto is to put him in the position of a defender of organized labor. This is a role he must assume, politically, though not long ago he was asking Congress to draft strikers into the Army.

The decision to veto was made easier by the conduct of the big unions, which have been on their good behavior this year. The public concern which brought widespread demand for protection of the whole public against paralyzing strikes in transportation, steel, coal and utilities has been lulled somewhat. But the Republican majority in Congress, much criticized for not producing labor legislation at the drop of a hat, worked carefully and deliberately to enact legislation which was not simply retaliatory but which would lay down a solid, long-time basis for employer-employee relations.

The determination of Congress to put its program into effect, as represented by the substantial House vote to override the veto, points the direction of the next campaign. Though Democrats joined in enacting it, the Taft-Hartley bill is the Republicans' baby—and it faces a rugged childhood. The 5,000 words of the President's veto message were not expected to change votes in Congress, but to establish his position with the public.

It has been the opinion of this page that Congress erred in subscribing to the demand of Senator Taft and others for an omnibus bill, and refusing to consider each major change in the labor statutes, such as outlawing the closed shop, cooling off national strikes, and preventing jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts, on its individual merits. Had the legislation been separated, the President would not have been given the opportunity to knock it all on the head and to emerge in the unfamiliar role of the champion of labor.

Additionally, while this page has approved the intentions and a good share of the omnibus program, it has entertained serious doubts as to the practical effects of other portions. One can see no justification for a political maneuver which unfairly establishes the Republican Party in the minds of many working men as the enemy of labor, and the Democratic Party as its friend. The need for improvement in labor relations is so important to the national welfare that a political division on those lines, wholly artificial, establishes us as a Nation of dunderheads.

[From the Oregon Daily Journal, Portland, Oreg., of June 21, 1947]

POLITICS SUPREME

To the political Taft-Hartley labor bill President Truman has applied a political veto. Yesterday the House voted, 331 to 83, to override the veto, thereby leaving the issue in the hands of the Senate.

But in overriding the veto the Congress will not take itself from the spot on which the President's veto message placed it. The message was so well constructed that, political as it was, the President can expect more popularity, and more votes, as public reaction to the overriding of the veto, than if the Congress had sustained him. His decisiveness in handling both this and the tax bill add to his political stature.

It was not a good bill. Its flaws were dispassionately recognizable. Otherwise, everything else about the passing of the bill, its veto and the House vote to override, was passionate and at high pressure almost without precedent.

The President acknowledged the labor abuses which he said the Taft-Hartley bill would increase rather than solve. He said there is still time at the present session of the Congress to pass a bill that will win his signature.

Therefore, if law can solve labor-management problems wholly or in part the Congress should have the President's aid rather than his silence as to the specific provisions the law should contain.

It is unfortunate that the merits and demerits of the labor control bill have been lost to sight in political controversy. It is unfortunate that political considerations must trespass upon economic situations and human relations. It is unhappy that the essential spirit of cooperation has not been brought more to the fore as to the ultimate solution of what's wrong between labor and management.

Assume that the Senate will also vote to override. For a while, at least, there will be untold confusion and unmeasured bitterness. There will be thousands of lawsuits. So much red tape will wind about and through the fabric of labor relations that good collective bargaining will have short shrift.

It is for this situation that the Republicans, in overriding the veto, make themselves responsible. Since unrest and economic consequences are bound to be serious, the usual impact of contending elements in 1948 becomes the more certain. Strongest statements in the President's message are these:

"I share with Congress the conviction that legislation dealing with the relations between management and labor is necessary. * * * But this bill is far from a solution of those problems.

"The bill taken as a whole would reverse the basic direction of our national labor policy, inject the Government into private economic affairs on an unprecedented scale and conflict with important principles of our democratic society. Its provisions would cause more strikes, not fewer. It would be a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy. It contains seeds of discord which would plague this Nation for years to come."

Every life every day in this Nation, now and in the future, is affected for the worse by labor relations that create pandemonium and by legislation that increases it. America's millions call for a solution that will rise from the low of politics to the high of public security.

Government Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following editorial on the subject of Government economy from the Nashua Telegraph, of Nashua, N. H., of June 23, entitled "Congress Represents the People":

Recently the governors of most of the far-Western States met and jointly denounced the action of the House in heavily reducing appropriations for the Reclamation Bureau which would have largely been used for the construction of tax-exempt Government electric-generating plants and related facilities. The governors announced that they would make a concerted demand on Congress to restore the funds to their original figure on the grounds that the future welfare and industrial development of the West is at stake.

Here is a perfect example of why economy in government has become so difficult a goal to achieve. The plain and ominous fact is that we have come to look on the Federal Treasury as a bottomless pit which may be raided at will for any region's pet projects. All of us are strongly in favor of a reduced budget—so long as budget reductions don't affect us. Governors, Senators, Representatives, mayors, and a host of minor officials shriek to high heaven whenever a nickel is sliced from an appropriation for their States and towns.

Another plain and ominous fact is that we have lost local independence and local self-reliance. We want the Federal Government to spend billions for purposes which are clearly within the provinces of local government or of private business enterprises. And thus, we are surely and swiftly building a supergovernment with all the threats to freedom and independence that supergovernment inevitably implies.

It is senseless to blame Congress for waste and prodigality when the people at home who cast the votes demand a continuation of unnecessary spending. Congress simply represents a distillation of the voice of the people. In the long run, the people are given what they ask for—and it is the people who must choose between supergovernment, whose end is always some form of dictatorship, or our constitutional government of limited powers with its firm guaranties of maximum freedom for all.

Outlook for Success of Taft-Hartley Labor Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very interesting analysis of the new labor bill recently made by Gustaf A. Nordin, a Washington correspondent of the St. Paul Pioneer Press, in the June 15, 1947, edition of that paper. Mr. Nordin is a seasoned reporter with much experience in the field of labor-management relations. His analysis of the operation of the law and the probable difficulties to be avoided should, therefore, be of interest to the Members of the Congress. The article entitled "Outlook for Success of Taft-Hartley Labor Plan" follows:

WASHINGTON.—The success or failure of the Taft-Hartley bill to bring about industrial peace in this country will rest in the hands of two groups currently taking opposite positions on the measure.

Most important of these two groups is the executive branch of the Government. Poor administration of the law could discredit it in the eyes of the public.

Of secondary importance, but a distinct factor, is the employer group. Failure on the part of employers to recognize the responsibilities which must be assumed by them along with the greater freedom of action offered business by the Labor Relations Act could do much to tear down its effectiveness.

There is always present, of course, a third group. That is organized labor. At present, labor union leaders are doing everything possible to break down administration approval

of the law, and are applying the squeeze on every legislator, including some of the authors of the act.

At first, labor unions will buck the law. Resistance is bound to be strong for months as various provisions are tested. If the courts uphold Congress the labor resistance may die out. It will, that is, if in administering the law the executive branch of the Government demonstrates that the law, in the right hands, need not be harmful to labor.

It is at this point that the measure enters the field of politics. With 1948 a presidential year, some Government leaders may see the value of showing that the Taft-Hartley Act is unworkable. Should that happen, legitimately or otherwise, it would help discredit the Republican leadership which fostered the act.

It is unlikely that such a thing will happen, but with proper prodding from groups deathly opposed to the act, it is a possibility.

Employers could help this situation along, too, by being arbitrary and unreasonable—feeling their oats after a period under the Wagner Act when they feared to open up against organized labor.

There are freedoms in this act which the employer now inherits and, if misused, would help destroy the very instrument management has been clamoring for. For instance:

An employer hereafter decides the terms of employment in his plant or office. He may grant the union shop, but not the closed shop, and he need not dismiss a man who is not acceptable to a union as long as that man pays his union dues.

The employer will be able to sue the union for damages and through the National Labor Relations Board can tie a union into knots with injunctive powers. If carried too far, this procedure could boomerang on business just as the failure of some unions to live up to bona fide contracts hurt labor.

Likewise, the employer need not bargain on an industry-wide basis; he need not bargain with his foremen, even though they may be organized; he need not consider any union demands not written into a contract during the life of that contract.

If he can show that there is a Communist holding office, either in the local or international with which he must deal, the employer can refuse to bargain collectively and be perfectly within his rights. Some employers may try to use this wedge by seeing Communists where they are not.

The employer will receive the right to talk to his employees without being accused of an unfair-labor practice. He can talk against unionization of his plant, but to carry this too far, because of personal dislike of unions, could result in future trouble.

Secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes between two unions, and attempts to organize a plant by calling a strike are all illegal and thus remove from management problems which weighed heavily upon its shoulders. As the burden is lifted, the danger is that some may try to play one union off against another and thus stir up interplant friction which might break both unions, even though it meant temporary trouble for the industry.

There are dozens of ways in which unions could be hamstrung temporarily. But to do so, an employer risks peaceful relations and, worst of all, he risks the loss of public opinion.

The Taft-Hartley bill creates a check against such an eventuality—the failure of either the administration, business, or labor to give the act a chance. It establishes a joint committee to study and report on basic problems affecting friendly labor relations and productivity. An appropriation of $150,000 is set up. The first report is due February 15, 1948, a final report, January 2, 1949.

Minnesota's Senator JOSEPH H. BALL is talked of as chairman for that committee. Any attempt, by any side, to wreck the law which he helped write will not be gently handled by BALL, of the committee.

Tax-Reduction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Daily Ardmoreite, Ardmore, Okla., of Sunday, June 22, 1947:

MR. TRUMAN DOES DUTY

If President Truman had been seeking popularity he would have approved the tax-reduction bill.

It is a lot easier to give than to take. The Republicans were elected to office on a tax-reduction platform and they want to make their promise good although they know the people ought to be required to sit steady in the boat and keep earning and keep paying until a dent is made in the huge indebtedness of the country.

Business does not need money. Business, for 5 years, has had all it could do. The greatest earning period in the world's history was through the days of this world war. The war brought these profits, the war brought the spending that made the profits possible and the business of today ought to bear the principal part of the burden of the heavy taxes.

Mr. Truman's entire cabinet had advised him to veto the tax measure. The war giveth and the war taketh away. These heavy taxes should not be allowed to stand at peak for the boys to pay off when profits are lean and business is poor. Sure it would be pleasant to have taxes reduced but the burdens of Government must be borne.

If we had not had money to spend as we did then victory could not have been ours and after all that is said and done the money we owe saved business all it has and business must pay whether it wants to or not.

Aviation Research and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gen. George C. Kenney at Massachusetts Institute of Technology alumni day symposium, at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.:

At the conclusion of any operation, whether it be the building of a bridge, manufacturing a lot of 1947 model automobiles, or fighting a war, it has become standard procedure to sit down and study the reports, analyze the events that occurred, see what mistakes were made, why they were made, and how much they cost. From this analysis we are supposed to find out how to do the job better next time. In the case of the bridge builder and the automobile manufacturer, the scheme works quite well. The bridge builder keeps right on building bridges and the automobile manufacturer starts on his 1948 model as soon as he has finished with the 1947 line. The conditions of the problem do not change much from one operation to the other.

In warfare, on the other hand, a period of 20 years or more elapses between wars. New weapons are developed which in turn influence tactics and strategy and even dictate the location of battles and campaigns. If military men do not keep abreast of such development and correctly evaluate their influence, they are liable to be accused of trying to fight the last war instead of the present one. The losers in most wars, as a matter of fact, have done this very thing. Napoleon defeated a lot of generals who were still thinking in the past. In World War I, the stalemate and the continual slugging match that won or lost a few yards of ground, can be attributed to the fact that both sides were merely continuing their previous wars. The blitz warfare of the Second World War with its use of air power and mechanized forces smashing through the strongest defensive positions and quickly gaining the decision, almost gave Germany world dominion. Hitler was finally defeated only after the Allies had learned how to outblitz him.

After 6 years of struggle and the subsequent analysis of events, there are certain definite conclusions that we can make—certain methods and weapons which should be further developed—others that should be modified to meet changed conditions and still others that should be discarded as obsolete and no longer worth spending our national defense appropriations on.

Air power has become the decisive element in warfare. The conflict is opened by air power and the first action is an air action. Air power is the only means of defense against air attack and the battle for control of the air must be settled before the surface forces of the winner can get under way. In fact, the winning of the air battle has become so decisive that in the future the role of surface forces may very well be that of mopping up die-hard detachments and guerrillas and completing the victory by occupation and administration of the enemy country. The world today is at the mercy of the airplane.

Air-borne operations, with the flying of troops, supplies, and reinforcements to the scene of operations and the evacuation of casualties, will bring us up to date on an age-old basic principle of war illustrated so picturesquely by Gen. Nathan Forrest, when he said, "Git thar fustest with the mostest."

Our analysis of past battles and campaigns, however, must be more than cultural. To analyze Pearl Harbor simply as a sneak attack would be wrong. To simply conclude that aircraft could sink or damage naval vessels would be insufficient. Actually we had known that for years. The real lesson was that our national defense organization was wrong. We had plenty of warning. We had had enough fighter defense to defeat the Jap air attack. We had everything necessary except the appreciation of what air power could do and the organization to insure that something was done.

We are now in the throes of trying to correct that defect, by unifying the Army, Navy, and Air Forces under a single head. As a matter of fact that will give us the organization we had to come to in both the European theater and the Pacific before the war was over.

In February 1945 Corregidor, the Gibraltar of the East, stood blocking the utilization of Manila Bay and the docks and harbor facilities of Manila itself. Corregidor was bristling with coast artillery, antiaircraft guns, and machine guns, and machine-gun positions. It had ample supplies of food and ammunition and was manned by a garrison

of around 8,000 fanatical soldiers, ordered to stay there and hold the position at all costs for the glory of the Emperor and greater east Asia.

Four thousand tons of heavy bombs in 10 days reduced the defenses to rubble, a parachute regiment of 1,800 men descended on the parade ground on the western end of the rock and 2,000 more men rowed across the harbor entrance from Bataan and landed on the beach. A few scattered rifle shots and Corregidor was again American territory. Mopping-up operations to dig the Jap survivors of the bombardment out of their caves took a little longer, but the so-called impregnable fortress had fallen to the bomb.

The lesson went beyond the facts that this operation was brilliantly executed, and that it was successful. It settled for all time the question as to whether or not we should spend our national defense appropriation on fortresses. It sounded the death knell of the fortress.

An analysis of World War II also brings out the tremendous advantage that superior equipment carries with it. With anywhere near equal forces, that force with the superior equipment wins. This was particularly true in aviation. Neither the Germans nor the Japanese could match our bombers. They had more range, carried bigger bomb loads, were faster, and were better defended than anything produced by our enemies. While at times both the Germans and the Japs produced fighter aircraft that excelled ours in some particular characteristic, ours had more range, better bullet-proof tanks, better armor, more structural strength, and were better all around combat weapons. The record of victories bears this out in both theaters.

The lesson here is to keep ahead of any possible enemy in technical development of aviation. If we maintain a lead in technical development of aviation, we will have gone a long way toward insuring that we win the air battle in any future war. If we win the air battle, we cannot lose the war.

In planning for that air battle we must visualize the weapons we and the enemy will have at that time and keep modifying our tactics and strategy accordingly.

We must constantly look ahead 5 to 10 years. Nine years from the time we began planning for an airplane like the B–29 it began flying over Japan. It was actually 5 years from the drawing board to its first operational mission. Even under the drive of wartime effort and with unlimited funds we were unable to get a new airplane into operation between December 7, 1941, and August 14, 1945. We fought that whole war period with aircraft types already in production when the Japs hit us at Pearl Harbor. Today we must be developing the aircraft and the weapons with which to defend the United States in 1952 and 1956. If we stop development today, it will not necessarily plunge us into war in 1948 or 1949, but it will leave us wide open to attack in 1952 if other nations go ahead with their development while we stand still.

In a few years our existing equipment will be obsolete. Others besides ourselves will have atomic bombs. Jet and possibly rocket-driven aircraft will be standard equipment everywhere for air combat and bombing. There seems to be no practical limit in sight for speeds and ranges, particularly if atomic-energy power plants are developed for aircraft. The time elapsing between the decision by some future aggressor to attack us and the actual attack itself is rapidly becoming a matter of a few hours. Unless we can find a way of defeating that attack or can show so devastating a power of retaliation that no one will dare to risk the consequences of war against us, we may suffer so appalling a casualty list in the first 24 hours that, coupled with the accompanying destruction of our industry, the Nation may be unwilling to endure further punishment and decide on capitulation.

We need a warning service extending as far out from our centers of industry and population as possible. We need fighters, constantly on station to take off on receipt of warning that strange aircraft are headed in our direction, challenge such aircraft and force them down, or shoot them down, if they cannot identify themselves as friendly. We already do this with surface vessels. That is what we have the Coast Guard for. No ship steams into our harbors without getting the proper clearances before they leave their home ports. We will have to do the same thing with aircraft.

Our primary insurance, however, will be our long-range striking force of bombers and their accompanying fighters capable of striking any target anywhere in the world at a moment's notice. This force should be capable of matching bomb tonnage with any possible enemy. No would-be Hitler of the future is going to attack us if we cannot only defend ourselves but by retaliatory action can destroy him. No future aggressor would even hesitate to attack us if we are defenseless or cannot trade punches with him.

This brings us to the part to be played by science and industry, both of which you represent. We need a lot of things that only you can produce. I will mention a few as illustrations. There are many more and the chemists, the physicists, and the engineers of the world are looking for the answers.

We need lighter, tougher, and more heat-resisting metals. Suppose that our pistons could stand a few hundred degrees more heat and let us utilize 50 percent of the power in our aviation engine fuel instead of about half that amount as at present. Our B–29 bomber would then go twice as far as it does now or achieve its present range with a saving in fuel weight alone, of over 9 tons. In the structure of the airplane itself, lighter and tougher metals will save us a lot more weight which can be put into more fuel, more bombs, more people, or more freight.

With greatly increased speeds, we need much higher rates of fire and much higher muzzle velocities in our aircraft machine guns that we have at present. Before these increases can be made we must have metals that will stand up under the terrific heats generated by pushing bullets through the machine-gun barrels at the rates we want.

The development of our ordnance is already far behind the development of our aircraft. We need metals of better conductivity to save weight in our electric wiring systems and our generators. When you consider that the wiring in the modern airplane is measured in miles, you can see that there is a substantial saving possible in this field alone.

There are thousands of such examples of the application of lighter and tougher metals which are more resistant to heat. Whether such alloys can be made or whether we have to get into the ceramics, I don't know. That is your problem.

The miracle of radar and its possibilities is continuing opening our eyes, but we must utilize it still more and get rid of some of its present limitations. It needs to be smaller, lighter, have a lot more range, and a whole lot better definition. At present, the early pick-up of an airplane approaching at low altitude is impossible. We need to cure that situation. We want to watch the whole world and see what it is doing. If our ground stations can't see far enough, we will have to carry our radar eyes on patrolling aircraft. The speeds of tomorrow will make our present warning service not only obsolete but useless. As a matter of fact, when every nation can see day and night what the rest of the world is doing, it may be impracticable to plan on a war, and we may have peace. However, just to counter to many hopes along that line, we need a camouflage against the radar. It's all right for us to pick up the approach of enemy aircraft, but we want him to be unable to pick ours up. We want to know what he is doing, but surprise is still a powerful ally to have on your side.

Our airdromes are getting too big, and it takes the engineers too long to build them for us. We need devices to launch and lend aircraft in shorter distances. We need faster means of making an airdrome or to be able to utilize any reasonably level piece of ground that is reasonably dry without first compacting it and then covering it with concrete or steel mat.

Our radio is still too big, too heavy, and not sufficiently reliable. It cannot be tuned close enough, and the static still knocks it out. The frequency bands are so crowded now that it is often difficult to get a message through at any distance. Finer tuning will help immensely, but progress along this line is disappointingly slow.

The big hazard of flying today is from fire. In peacetime the crash too often results in the loss of the entire passenger list and the crew by fire. Our military aircraft cover their fuel tanks with rubber to keep enemy bullets from setting the tanks on fire in air combat. While of inestimable value in air combat, this covering does not help much in a crash and the weight is a serious penalty. In a B–29, for example, the bulletproof covering of its fuel tanks weigh over 6 tons.

We need a fuel that does not burn except in the engine—something like coal. It only burns in the stove. No one ever heard of the coal in a coal truck catching on fire just because the driver ran into a tree or a telephone pole. You can even shoot a bullet through a bomb without detonating the TNT and releasing the power contained in it. We desperately need an aircraft engine fuel solid or liquid that does not constitute the combat and crash fire hazard that we have now.

We need better and more efficient fuels with more energy per pound for reciprocating engines, jet engines, and for rockets. There must be room for still more progress along these lines in spite of the tremendous advances made in the last 20 years.

We hear a lot of talk about engines driven by atomic energy. There is some work being done along that line now, but I wonder if we are moving fast enough to insure that someone else does not outstrip us in the race. If we are second in this race, we should realize that in a future conflict it is going to be a case of the winner takes all.

The long-range radio-controlled missile of tomorrow must be countered. We not only must be able to detect the fact that it is on the way but quickly find the frequencies on which it is being operated and then cut in with our own radio control and prevent it from reaching us—the target. We may have to intercept it with a type of target-seeking antiaircraft kind of guided missile of our own.

We need an automatic position finder giving our guided missiles a continuous position fix and hooked into the controls so that the explosive charge will be detonated at the exact latitude and longitude of the target. The lack of accuracy at long ranges today makes it impractical to even approach precision bombing unless the bombardier can actually see the target and direct the bombing from his own airplane or from a mother ship for one or more "drones."

Aircraft speeds are about to pierce the so-called sonic barrier. Actually we know about as much about this new field as the Wright brothers knew about what they were getting into in 1903 just before they took off on that December morning down at Kitty Hawk, N. C. We need a lot of research on airfoil sections and fuselage shapes which are to fly at velocities above the speed of sound. What happens to our aircraft controls at these speeds? Can we even trust the human being to operate controls manually and hope that the pilot will not black-out every

time he touches them? Where are our instruments for the supersonic airplanes? What will happen if you shoot a gun out of an airplane traveling at, let us say, 2,000 miles an hour? Can you open bomb-bay doors and drop bombs from a bomber traveling at that speed? The list of questions is endless but the answers are still to be worked out.

What about the use of sound as a weapon? I mean sounds that are not picked up by the human ear but which may have a serious effect on the human system. The familiar dog whistle may give us an example. This sound, inaudible to you, is heard by the dog but it does not make him happy. His reaction is a nervous one, he is startled into attention. It may be just another newspaper story, but I read the other day of a man who is now being checked over by the British medical people after working in a laboratory testing new jet engines. The story was that his nervous system was out of gear from exposure to sound waves above the range of perception by the human ear. An airplane equipped with a sort of super dog whistle, conceivably could fly around a city for a while and upset the nervous systems of the whole population. I believe we need to do some research along this line. It may be just a fantastic dream. It may not.

Light waves offer a similar field. Above the infrareds and below the ultraviolets there may be weapons of future warfare as devastating as the atomic bomb. Other nations may find them. We must keep pace in order to be able to counter or defend against such threats.

Weather is a field of research that offers tremendous possibilities. On a limited scale we can already break up clouds and start rainfall where and when we want it. Instead of allowing rain clouds to drive past arid and semiarid sections, we should be able to shoot them down and put the rain where we need it. If we can extend this process, we can stop rain from falling where it has been falling for ages. It is not inconceivable that the Nation that first learns to plot the paths of air masses accurately and learns to control the time and place of precipitation will dominate the globe.

The change of a few inches of rainfall a year in many parts of the world would mean the difference between normal crops and starvation. We must not fall behind in this line of research.

While I have covered a lot of points that may seem to imply that our brains should be harnessed to the problem of how to obliterate the whole human race, you will note that practically every one of them can be utilized to benefit humanity and give us greater civilization.

If mankind is determined to exterminate himself, he probably will succeed. If he tries hard enough, he may even turn this globe of ours into a cinder some day.

If the weapons of warfare become too terrible, that fact may drive some sense into the brain of what we are pleased to call "homo sapiens" and induce him to find a way of settling his disputes without exterminating his opponents. Gas warfare has not been used since 1918 primarily because it was too easy for both sides to use it and neither combatant dared to risk retaliation in kind. Perhaps when every nation possesses all the diabolical weapons that can be devised they will be afraid to start the slaughter. There is no profit in winning a war if in the process you also are destroyed. If the world ever wakes up to the fact that in modern warfare both sides lose, we may have peace.

In the meantime we cannot let down in research. The laboratories of the world are burning the midnight oil these days searching for newer and more deadly weapons. If we fall behind in this race, we will some day find ourselves defenseless.

If we neglect our defenses and are unable to protect ourselves and the ideals and principles for which we stand, those ideals and principles will perish and we will perish with them.

In the councils of nations the strong are listened to, the weak are ignored. Weakness will not give us peace. It will invite the four horsemen—war, pestilence, famine, and death.

Robert Stoltz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein two recent articles concerning my friend, the distinguished and eminent composer, conductor, and musical genius, Mr. Robert Stoltz:

[From Stars and Stripes for May 1947]

ROBERT STOLTZ, THE VIENNESE COMPOSER OF "TWO HEARTS IN THREE-QUARTER TIME," IS EN ROUTE TO THE STATES TO WRITE MUSIC FOR THE AUDIENCES HE LOVES

(By Julia Edwards)

In Soldier's Field, Chicago, at New York's Lewisohn Stadium, around the Hollywood Bowl, GI whistles and stamping feet greeted the soft melodies of Vienna. Back in Vienna, Robert Stoltz admits he loved it. "American audiences are the best in the world," he said, "especially when there are some soldiers on hand."

Conductor, composer, pianist, and discoverer of stars, Stoltz is a success because he likes what the people like and still can make the highbrows bow to his art. He works hard, 18 hours a day, according to his wife. You don't compose 1,200 songs, 53 operettas, and the music for 15 films between 9 and 5.

Long before he became the GI's favorite conductor, Stoltz made a jittery world laugh by announcing that he had written Hitler's funeral march. What's more, he told the Austrian press, he would be only too glad to play the dirge at the fuehrer's funeral. Then came the night of March 12, 1938. It didn't look much like Hitler's funeral. As his radio blared the news of the Anschluss, Stoltz pulled suitcases out of a closet. Downstairs his automobile waited, the engine heated and running.

Stoltz took a final, unhappy look about him. On this trip, you couldn't take along the best piano in Vienna. You couldn't carry a Tyrolean breakfast nook. You could take the music, but not Spring in Vienna. He turned, locked the door and left.

The guards at the Swiss border knew him. To the north, the Germans were marching into Austria.

"What are you doing here, Mr. Stoltz?"

"A concert in Zurich. Back in a week."

But Stoltz didn't return—not that way. His music verboten, Europe nevertheless continued to hear familiar Viennese tunes, such as Two Hearts in Three-Quarter Time, attributed to composer unknown. The next Europe heard of Robert Stoltz came from Nazi propaganda, which claimed the French had jailed him, the British treated him badly, and America ignored him.

Meantime, Stoltz was creating a sensation with his OWI broadcasts from New York City. Even without Vienna to inspire him, he worked on. He composed Let Freedom Ring, wrote the score for White Horse Inn, and even did a song of the range: My Thoughts Are Roaming Tonight. While Stoltz stresses that he remained true to his own style, America crept into his music. After all, he had writen Salome, the first European foxtrot, and in 1913 the score for the first European musical film. He never wrote jazz, though.

Johann Strauss, like many another composer, flopped as a conductor. In the States, Stoltz drew less than only Toscanini and Stokowski for a concert, more than Bruno Walter. His agent and best promoter, the dark-eyed Austrian beauty Stoltz married in France, explains that the paying customers crowd in to hear music that appeals to a broader public played with the perfection only the best symphony orchestration can give it.

As soon as he could, Stoltz returned to Vienna. On a chill day last November, he knocked at the door of his apartment. A Russian major opened it, invited him in to tea. There were the grand piano, the Tyrolean paneling, and the French antiques. Only one change startled him. The cuckoo clock whistled. The Nazi proprietor had altered its voice because the cuckoo sounded too much like the radio signal for an air raid. Stoltz moved in with the Russian. Later Soviet authorities ordered the major to move.

"I see Vienna as she always was," said Stoltz. "I prefer not to see the ruins of the buildings or the ruins of the Viennese people."

But was it the same? Not for music. "Music must keep up. Serious things have happened. Light music of the past seems dated. Even when writing of long ago you have to appeal to the understanding and feeling of today's audience."

The composer's latest operetta, Three From the Danube, will have its premier in Vienna next fall. It will reopen the bombed Gärtner Platz Theater in Munich, rebuilt with military government help, and the damaged Metropole Theater in Berlin. The story tells of learning trades along the Danube.

Stoltz learned his music from his father, who conducted the first performance in Vienna of Tannhauser. At the age of 12 he traveled from his home in Groz to Berlin and studied under Humperdinck, the composer of Hansel and Gretel.

When Stoltz returned to Austria his home town christened a street Robertstoltzgasse. The first named after a living composer, it links Franzschubertstrasse with Richardwagnerplatz. Vienna made him an honorary citizen. The University of Vienna gave him the title of professor. The four Allied Powers invited him to Germany. But Stoltz is returning to Hollywood to do the music for the film, "Reunion in Vienna," and to become an American citizen. This time, though, he is taking his piano and his breakfast nook along.

Europe used to send talent to America, but American artists now are coming to Europe, Stoltz noted. The Nazi era stifled talent in Europe, he said, while the United States began climbing toward her golden era of music. When European directors ask him to recommend talent he names Americans, and the directors have learned to take his word on an artist. From a little Jewish theater in Berlin he picked Hans Moser for his first big role as a comedian in a Stoltz production. Maria Jeritza and Ilona Massey are feminine discoveries of his.

Invited to a wedding in a New York synagogue, Stoltz heard a golden tenor. Today the voice of Mario Bernini is heard at the Metropolitan Opera. A St. Louis girl, Helena Bliss, heard he gave others a start and rang the doorbell of the Stoltz apartment on Central Park West.

"This is my last try," she said. "Either I commit suicide or I start raising babies." She didn't commit suicide, and she hasn't had a baby yet. A reporter dropped in later that day, and Stoltz introduced the girl as a future star. She got her chance in the musical, "Song of Norway."

Usually Stoltz likes to let his wife talk for him. After 7 years in the States he still has trouble with English and prefers the international language of music. But his eyes light up and the words flow rapidly when he brags about his discoveries. He has known more than one generation of music. His reminiscences run to 400 pages in a book soon to be published. And he likes young people, new talent, and fresh music.

[From the magazine Variety of April 9, 1947]

STOLTZ, SET FOR NEW METRO MUSICAL, NAMED HONORARY VIENNA CITIZEN

VIENNA, April 1.—Robert Stoltz, called by Viennese the Johann Strauss of the present century, has received the rarely bestowed honorary citizenship of the city of Vienna. It is only the third time since the war ended that the award has been made. First recipients were Albert Basserman, veteran German stage star, also making a postwar comeback in Europe, and Gen. Mark Clark. On the same day that Stoltz won the award, he was granted the title of professor by the Austrian president.

Stoltz leaves soon for Paris where he will score the French film Bal Tabarin before going back to Hollywood where he reports to Metro for musical version of Reunion in Vienna. Full import of the professor title is realized when known that such titles are granted usually only after a lifetime of teaching. Burgomaster General Koerner in presenting the honorary citizenship complimented the composer of Two Hearts in Three Quarter Time and scores of other Viennese hits for having brought the laughter and spirit of Vienna to the world, especially through Stoltz' conducting of Night in Vienna concerts with top United States orchestras from coast to coast.

Stoltz took a well-advised powder from this part of the world shortly after the 1938 anschluss. Although Aryan, he had little hope of anything better than concentration camp from the Nazis, after publicity throughout the world for composing Hitler's funeral march for Hitler. After a stay in England, Stoltz went to New York and Hollywood. He will receive final United States citizenship papers this year.

Stoltz returned here last fall and has been active in rounding up loose ends. He also presented and personally conducted a new operetta, Fate With Music, at Apollo Theater. Production folded without expected prospects of later United States presentation. Another Stoltz operetta is set for world premiere at Vienna's Stadttheater in September. It is titled "Three on the Danube." The composer is scheduled to return here in August for rehearsals, and will make some outdoor concert appearances in July.

Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the various housing authorities established by the President, or by the Congress at the request of the President, have spent millions of dollars and consumed tons of paper in the preparation and distribution of countless orders designed by the daydreamers downtown to lick the housing shortage and provide homes for veterans. So far as we have been able to notice in Montana, their accomplishments have been practically nil. It is refreshing, therefore, to find occasionally that the good old American spirit of resourcefulness and enterprise is still with us and accomplishing results. I would like to quote from a Dillon, Mont., newspaper the story of how one young veteran whipped the housing shortage which, incidentally, is just as serious in the small cities and towns of Montana as it is anywhere in the Nation:

Last Thursday, County Attorney W. G. Gilbert, Jr., was an active member of the local chapter of frustrated home builders. Sunday evening—3 days later—Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert had a handsome and brand new brick house virtually completed, and neighbors still hardly believe their eyes.

Months ago Attorney Gilbert acquired the building lots. With perseverance the concrete foundation, basement, and first-floor covering were achieved. Then scarcity of labor, scarcity of materials.

Mrs. Gilbert recently visited her home in Great Falls, where she told the family of their predicament. To a man the Murphy brothers stepped into the breach—six of them. "Just get the materials," they told her, "and some week end we will come down and build the house."

Last week piles of brick, tiles, cement, window and door casings appeared on the lot. Friday morning the Murphy brothers descended on the job with three helpers and went to work. Soon passersby were stopping and staring. Brick walls grew. A power cement mixer turned out the mortar. When the others stopped for lunch the mortar man had a chance to catch up. On Saturday showers slowed up the work at intervals, but the walls reached up and over window and door frames and two fireplaces took shape and were completed. Sunday morning the last courses of brick and tile were being laid and partitions were erected. By Sunday evening the walls and chimney were completed and it was ready for the roof.

This was the sight that excited the neighborhood last week end. The Murphy brothers? Well, Owen is a Great Falls architect who has not lost his skill with brick and trowel; Joe, John, and Vincent are journeyman bricklayers; Pat, who is a clothing salesman, is an A–1 hod carrier when necessary; Frank is a master carpenter. W. G. Gilbert, Jr., and his brother Bruce, who is a Helena attorney, were general helpers. Bill Tayne, local man who has had building construction experience, was the "guest star" and wheels a mean wheelbarrow full of mortar. Two others who carried hods the first day had to give up. Such was the cast—and it was solid World War II. The job would have been finished sooner but Mr. Murphy, the father, who is an expert bricklayer and his sons' mentor, caught a cold and couldn't come.

Let's Have Florida Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMORY H. PRICE
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Let's Have Florida Time."

Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known and accepted fact that the State of Florida is known as the Sunshine State, and perhaps it would be appropriate to introduce a bill in Congress which would have for its purpose the establishment of an official Florida time. However, such action on my part would probably call for the immediate introduction of about 47 other bills calling for "Maine time" all across the country until someone even may suggest California time, all of which would probably cause so much confusion that the citizens of our country would have to spend most of their time trying to figure out what time it was.

Nevertheless, I believe that the best time anyone could have would be Florida time—all of which reminds me that my time must be about up.

The article follows:

LET'S HAVE FLORIDA TIME

Florida, the Sunshine State, is primarily interested in merchandising sunlight.

Sunlit hours are of such a premium that in many States, even during the longest days of the year, time is advanced 1 hour.

We Floridians, engaged in the business of selling sunshine and its accompanying advantages, should, in my opinion, create our own year-round Florida time by permanently advancing our time by 1 hour.

Such action by the citizens of Florida would create an invaluable promotional aid for the merchandising of our year-round recreational advantages of fun in the sun. Our customers and ourselves could have greater utility from our sunlit hours.

Permanently advanced Florida time would eliminate the seasonal controversy and confusion of moving from one time to another. It would simply establish Florida time in the same recognized categories as Eastern time, Central time, Mountain time, and the Pacific time.

Promotionally acute Floridians insist that Florida must lead the Nation with its State promotional program. Our partnership with the sun suggests to me that Florida should be the first to greet it each day of the year.

The advantages of Florida time justify the temporary inconveniences of adjusting ourselves to its schedule.

JAMES T. LARIMORE.

Reply to the President's Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, in his annual message to Congress, President Harry S. Truman stated:

The Congress and the President, during the next 2 years, must work together. * * * We shall be risking the Nation's safety and destroying our opportunities for progress if we do not settle any disagreements in this spirit, without thought of partisan advantage.

Despite the fact that the President's entire political program has been in the field of foreign affairs, and the Republican Congress has backed him to the *n*th degree in this program, the President has broken his pledge of cooperation, for purely partisan advantage. Into the tax-reduction program of the Republican Party, Mr. Truman has

injected the false issue of class discrimination.

Mr. Truman based his veto on two grounds. He said this is, first, the wrong time; and, second, the wrong kind of a tax reduction. To substantiate his position, he advanced no new arguments, presented no new or convincing evidence, but resorted to the political trick employed by his party of making the issue one of class, thereby avoiding and clouding the true issue of whether the tax bill is timely and meritorious.

I. THE WRONG TIME

In summary the President's argument stressed the possibilities of increased inflation if the tax cut was effected. He argued that employment is on the increase; that national income is higher than it has ever been. From this he argued that there is "no evidence that a recession is imminent" and that tax reduction would increase "inflationary pressures." Disregarding basic laws of economics the President argued that there was no need for tax reduction to permit necessary investment and business expansion, for he stated there are in the hands of corporations and individuals nearly $200,000,000,000 in liquid funds which could be used for these purposes. He argues that unemployment is now at a peacetime low of 2,000,000. The President expressed a fear that the tax bill would not conform to sound fiscal policy of economy, and indicated that the additional revenue is needed to meet necessary obligations of government arising out of the war and present foreign commitments. He expressed the thought that it was imperative that we reduce the national debt.

II. THE RIGHT TIME

If employment is on the increase and the national income is higher than it has been, then under a program of tax reduction, revenue will not decrease, but might well increase, for the tax base will be broadened. The fear of further inflation is less than the fear of recession. Businessmen recognize that the best cushion against recession is investment in new enterprise and that tax reduction is one of the most effective means of providing investment incentive.

The President makes much of the fact that there exists $200,000,000,000 idle and available for investment and business expansion. Why is this $200,000,000,000 idle? Because this $200,000,000,000 in liquid funds will not be used for investment so long as there is risk involved in every business enterprise or expansion, and so long as there is no reward under present confiscatory tax laws to warrant business investment and expansion. It would be better for the Nation if this $200,000,000,000 were invested and was creating additional businesses and goods and employment and wealth.

The President proudly points to the small number of unemployed. If this $200,000,000,000 were invested in new or expanding businesses, that would allow $100,000 per unemployed person. Certainly with the investment of $100,000 there should be employment for one individual.

We have high prices and are worried about inflation. We have inflation today. High prices alone are not undesirable. They are a boon to an expanding economy but disastrous to a static or declining economy. Greater production, through business expansion, will bring a lowering of prices, normally, and not by mild recession or violent depression. The President is worried because the $2,500 wage earner will take home 1.2 percent more of his pay. Costs of living for this earner can well absorb this percentage increase. The family with an income of $500,000 would take home an increase of 62.3 percent. But, remember, there are less than 1,000 who earn more than $302,396. These families' increases will not add to inflationary tendencies. Despite confiscatory taxes, their needs are met and there is little they desire that would add to inflationary pressures. In fact, their take-home pay increase will not be buried in the mattress at home, but will be turned into investment and expansion of business, creating more jobs and more wealth for our Nation.

Our public debt is tremendous; even the interest each year is so great that it is impossible to conceive of its magnitude. Obligations of our Government can only be met under an expanding economy. This debt can only be reduced if national wealth increases, and our Government gets out of business and does not continue its policy of throttling business investment and expansion through excessive taxation. If we return to low prices and low wages, our debt proportionately increases in magnitude. The alarm the President expresses over the national debt is not convincing. His Budget Bureau requested $37,500,000,000 for 1948. Congress has set a goal of reducing his budget by more than the tax bill H. R. 1 would reduce Federal income. The Senate Finance Committee made the determination that in 1948 there would exist a surplus sufficiently large for both tax reduction and a very substantial cut in the national debt. It is difficult to believe that the President is sincere when he warns us to cut our national debt. Every department under him has come in asking for more funds than it ever received in a peacetime year—departments which were not directly concerned with the war, and whose obligations do not arise out of the war.

No; Mr. President, this is not the wrong time for this tax bill. It is not the wrong time to start economy in Federal expenditures; it is not the wrong time to release our free economy from a strangling yoke; it is not the wrong time for business and employment and production to expand and increase; it is not the wrong time to add to our national wealth both in dollars and goods. It was, Mr. President, the wrong time to veto a good, fair, and equitable tax bill.

III. THE WRONG BILL

In summary, the President stated that H. R. 1 reduced taxes in the high brackets to a grossly disproportionate extent as compared to the reduction in the low brackets. He has set forth figures showing that the savings of the $2,500 family would be less than $30, whereas the $50,000 family would receive a $5,000 reduction, and the $500,000 family would receive nearly $60,000 decrease. The President shows how the take-home pay of the $2,500 family would increase by 1.2 percent; of the $50,000, by 18.6 percent; and of the $500,000, by 62.3 percent.

In fact, the President is not arguing, but is injecting a false issue of class discrimination, in an attempt to stir up the enmity of the low-salaried employee against his boss. Politically this is effective; but it is dishonest. The President did not make a fair appraisal of the facts, but distorted them with "thought of partisan advantage," contrary to his pledge of January 6.

IV. THE RIGHT BILL

The President's veto message showed a premeditated desire to inject class consciousness into tax issue. The President neglected to point out that at the present the $2,500 earner takes home 96.8 percent of his earnings while the $50,000 earner takes home only 52 percent of his. If you are going to afford any tax relief at all to all taxpayers, it will necessarily be true that the big taxpayer will take home a bigger percentage of his pay because taxes on the high-income earner today are confiscatory; they are so high that any reduction will look big on a percentage basis. Under H. R. 1 the $50,000 earner will take home $5,000 more but he will still pay over $20,000 into the Treasury, or more than 40 percent of his income. The $2,500 earner would pay but 2.6 percent to the Government instead of 3.8 percent as he does now.

Mr. Truman's party, under his predecessor, the champion of the common man, instituted the present tax program, which reaches down into the pockets of the small wage earner. In 1932, a single man had an exemption of $1,000 and a married couple an exemption of $2,500. This exemption was reduced several times until in 1941, still before the war and war taxes, the exemption of a single man was lowered to $750 and that of a married couple was $1,200; further the exemptions of other dependents were lowered. It was the Democratic Party which resorted to taxing the man in the low-income group. Now why all this emotion for the common man the Democrats first decided to tax? To complete this brief history look at the Democratic tax reduction in 1945. That was a straight, pure and simple, across-the-board cut of 5 percent. This bill increased the take-home pay of the $2,500 earner 2.8 percent; the $50,000 earner, 11.9 percent, and the $1,000,000 earner, 61.2 percent. Yet, this was only a 5-percent reduction. This 1945 bill did not allow a greater cut to the low-income brackets—31,000,000 taxpayers; it did not remove 1,400,000 persons over 65 years from the tax rolls; it did not provide 71 percent of the reduction to go to those making less than $3,000 per year. But H. R. 1 would do all these things.

If the cuts proposed in H. R. 1 by the Republicans were unfair and discriminatory, it is because the Democrats were unfair in their tax program before, for the Republicans simply applied the tax cut to the Democrats' table of graduation and made additional cuts for low-salaried and aged taxpayers, and allowed

less of a cut for those earning fabulous salaries over $302,396.

The President declared that H. R. 1 was risky from the standpoint of Government finances. In 1945 he recommended that Congress repeal the excise-tax rates bringing over $1,000,000,000 in revenue. Congress rejected this proposal. Less than 2 years ago he accepted a $6,000,000,000 tax-relief bill for corporations. Chairman KNUTSON, of the Ways and Means Committee, asked, "Why is it equitable to vote tax relief for corporations one year and not equitable to give individuals some consideration in another year?" The entire reduction would amount to $4,000,000,000 spread among 49,000,000 individual taxpayers.

There can be only one of two conclusions from all this argument. Either the Democrats do not wish to cut taxes, but wish to keep the Treasury swelled with your dollars and mine to perpetuate the tremendous spending program which has threatened the economic stability of the Nation, or else President Truman wants to be on the band wagon when a tax cut is made. If it is the former, the President is to be condemned for misleading the public in his veto message, deploring the huge public debt, professing the need of sound practices of economy in government. If it is the latter, the President is breaking faith with the Congress in his pledge to work together with them "without thought of partisan advantage." For this he should be condemned. In either event, under either conclusion, the President is using his high office and revered position as President of these United States to create ill-will between the rich and the poor. He is inciting class consciousness when that is not an issue. This is outright dishonesty and is contemptible.

No, Mr. President; this is not the wrong bill. It is the right bill. It provides relief for all. It gives the greatest relief to those who by your words, but not by deed, you profess to protect. H. R. 1 was a bill which would provide tax relief when tax relief is direly needed. It would not hinder but would enhance our economy. Mr. President, it was the wrong time to veto the right bill.

Government Should Get Out, and Stay Out, of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have received many communications recently from the secretaries of chambers of commerce throughout the State of Oklahoma. In nearly every instance they have been accompanied by resolutions adopted by their respective chambers of commerce, or by the boards of directors of such chambers. All have expressed themselves as being in favor of the free-enterprise system and opposed to Government ownership and operation of business in competition with private capital.

In each and all of these resolutions there has been expressed an emphatic opposition and protest to the making of appropriations of Federal funds by Congress for the use of the Southwestern Power Administration for the purposes for which it is seeking an appropriation at the hands of this Congress.

Among the many such letters and resolutions, which I have received, I am happy to give my colleagues the benefit of the views expressed by the Nowata, Okla., Chamber of Commerce, for it is typical of the views that have been expressed in all these letters and resolutions.

The following is the letter I received from Mr. Chester V. Fleming, secretary-treasurer of the Nowata Chamber of Commerce of Nowata, Okla.

NOWATA, OKLA., *June 16, 1947.*

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: Inclosed is a resolution passed by the board of directors of the Nowata Chamber of Commerce in session Tuesday, June 10, 1947.

Each one of the nine members present at this meeting urgently request that you give this resolution your careful consideration.

The writer of this letter wishes that you could have attended this meeting and heard what the average businessman thinks of free enterprise and goverment ownership. For an hour and a half this thing was discussed. I can tell you that each man present was very emphatic in his opinion that the Government should get out and stay out of business, stop using taxes to engage in business, and cut taxes at once.

Everyone present seemed to be heartily in favor of the grand old American system of free enterprise.

Thanking you and asking you to come and visit with the Nowata Chamber of Commerce anytime that you are in this neighborhood, I am

Yours respectfully,
CHESTER V. FLEMING,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The following is the resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Nowata, Okla., June 4, 1947, and referred to in Mr. Fleming's letter:

"Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of Nowata, Okla., favors private enterprise as opposed to Government ownership; and

"Whereas electric energy is being produced and distributed successfully and efficiently, at rates established and regulated by State and Federal agencies, fully protecting consumers in the use and enjoyment thereof; and

"Whereas the Southwestern Power Administration, a Federal agency, was created by executive order of the President of the United States during the late war as an emergency measure, but now proposes in times of peace to construct many thousands of miles of transmission lines and numerous large, gas or coal-burning, steam-driven electric generating plants in areas in Oklahoma and adjoining States, which areas are now adequately served by privately owned electric systems; and said Southwestern Power Administration has requested, and the Congress of the United States has under consideration, appropriations of public funds to carry out the proposed plans of said Commission, which proposed plans, if put into effect would duplicate, interfere with, and obstruct electric power service now being adequately, economically, and efficiently supplied by private industry: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Nowata Chamber of Commerce, That it favors private enterprise and opposes nationalization of industry; that it opposes and protests the making of appropriations of Federal funds by the Congress of the United States for the use of the Southwestern Power Administration for the purposes proposed by it, and urges that such funds, if appropriated as requested by said Administration, will result in encroachment upon private industry in a field now adequately and efficiently served by privately owned electric systems; and be it further

"Resolved, That the officers of this organization be and they are hereby authorized and directed to mail copies of this resolution to all United States Senators and Congressmen of Oklahoma, and to the proper Senate and House Appropriation Committees.

"Dated at Nowata, Okla., on the 4th day of June 1947."

The undersigned, L. F. Merrill, president, and Chester Fleming, secretary, hereby certify that the above resolution was formulated and passed by the Nowata Chamber of Commerce on the 4th day of June 1947.

L. F. MERRILL,
President.

Attest:

CHESTER FLEMING,
Secretary.

Address by Hon. Bernard M. Baruch Before Industrial College of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and thoughtful address delivered today before the Industrial College of the Armed Forces by Hon. Bernard M. Baruch.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My experience in two world wars, the aftermaths, and the endeavors to make a lasting peace, make me marvel at the regularity with which errors are repeated. One of the errors that most frequently recurs is failure to study and understand the records of past experience. It seems as if my hearing aid is out of kilter—the voices and arguments are the same.

At my first meeting with the then Under Secretary of War, Robert Patterson, he asked, "Why is it that we don't start off where we finished in the last war? Why don't we adopt what was learned?" Later, the Under Secretary of Navy and others propounded the same question.

They may have had in mind, among other things, an outline of action that we drew up at the War Industries Board, covering America's participation in the First World War. I sent it to President Wilson, and he accepted it as the mandate for our existence. It is as true today as it was on November 10, 1918—30 years ago. Time has tested the formula and found it good. It will be equally true of our next war, which the fates forbid.

I read it:

"Wars are fought and won—or lost—on the land, on the water, in the air, and on those

battle lines behind the front where the civilian forces stand.

"It is not enough to mobilize the Nation's military strength. There must be a mobilization of her full economic resources—industrial, agricultural, and financial. These must be organized, coordinated, and directed with the same strategy that governs the operations of the purely military arms of service.

"The prodigious strain upon the world's productive capacity must be met and balanced to provide the means of warfare and to maintain the civilian population as well as to preserve the economic fabric.

"To control and regulate industry in all its direct and indirect relations to the war and to the Nation, the President has created the War Industries Board and placed the responsibility for its operation in the hands of the chairman. * * *

"It is not only the duty of the War Industries Board to stimulate and expand production in those industries making war essentials; it is equally the Board's duty to protect, as far as may be, those industries not immediately essential to the war program.

"The War Industries Board is a method of control devised by the President to equalize the strain placed upon the American industrial structure by the war.

"Further, the Board regulates all and controls certain other industries of first-rate war importance, it fixes prices through the price-fixing committee, it creates new and converts old facilities, it clears the national business requirements, and it leads to conservation, which is needed to bridge the gap between the extraordinary demand and the available supply, a gap which exists in almost all the great commercial staples.

"The War Industries Board embraces all and each of the Nation. Food and fuel are separately administered, but with every other article of military need and of ordinary life the Board has a direct connection, and it has a basic relationship with food and fuel, too, for both require in production and distribution the materials that the War Industries Board provides. Its strength lies in the full and patriotic cooperation that American business, including both the employers and employees, gives in working out the problems common to us all.

"The abnormal conditions of the war demand sacrifices. It is the price of victory.

"Only actual needs, not fancied wants, should and can be satisfied.

"To save heavy and long privation, temporary deprivation must be the rule.

"America's willingness to accept these conditions marks her ability to quicken the end of the conflict."

Despite all of the foregoing learned in World War I, many of the same mistakes were made over again in World War II. Faltering step by faltering step we moved toward controls, but those controls were never sufficient and far-reaching enough. If they had been applied immediately many lives would have been saved, our casualties lowered, and billions saved. Despite warnings of graver danger, the English and French made even more mistakes.

Also, as a result of piecemeal price control we are now faced with inflation which, next to human slaughter, maiming, and destruction, is the worst consequence of war. It creates lack of confidence of men in themselves and in their government. If from the beginning there had been an effective, over-all price-control law including everything—regulation and control of all prices, wages, rents, and food—there would have been a quicker ending of the war, a lessened cost, and less dissatisfaction among all classes. But after having granted favors to one class, group after group fought for favors, until we found ourselves upon economic stilts. Then restrictions were removed while peace was still distant. Although the shooting war is over, we are in the midst of a cold war.

The armed forces had an M-day plan which would have saved precious lives and the wasted wealth, but they were not permitted to put it into effect. We were told this was a different kind of war and none of that "Old World War stuff" was wanted.

We must not again make the mistake of not being properly organized in case another war is thrust upon us.

You are now making plans again. You have studied the results of the last two wars. I would like to see definite plans—blueprints—ready to draw out, as you were ready before, with a public better educated as to what total war needs are. With the new instrumentalities of mass destruction, we will not have time to improvise. Bravery or resources will not overcome an enemy who has destroyed us.

War preparations must be governed by a desire for peace and security. The armed services today have to be versed not alone in war but in government, politics, the humanities—economic, social, and spiritual—necessary to work constantly for peace. We know our country has no will for war. It has the will for peace. Thus, preparedness takes on the symbol of peace.

Here is the minimum program that should be placed on the statute books, ready to function, should war come:

1. Mobilize the full might of America—militarily, economically, and spiritually.

2. Have universal military training.

3. All men and women subject to mobilization with a work-or-fight clause. The same applies to all professions, science, callings, crafts, industrial and agricultural efforts, including labor of all kinds. In other words, there should be a pool of all our manpower—brains and brawn—ready to be tapped at any moment for war purposes.

4. An industrial plan ready to go into effect with full control of production, distribution, and prices, with the power of allocation, priority, and even exclusion for everything. The wisdom with which we organize our resources, men, money, and materials will make for the greatest of all—winning morale.

5. Taking unfair profits out of war and preventing inflation through an over-all price regulation, tax, and savings program. There must be only enough profit to keep our economy and production going. That cannot be done by favoring any one segment of our society.

6. While we must keep our civilian structure alive, skeletonize by restricting materials and manpower for unnecessary wants. In the last war too much went for wants rather than needs.

7. An organization to export materials in demand by other nations and to buy the things our Nation needs or desires to keep from enemy hands.

8. Accumulation of critical imports.

9. Retention of war plants, particularly synthetic rubber plants.

10. Intensified scientific research.

11. A standard form of contract set up now.

12. An Intelligence Service enlarged far beyond what now exists.

13. Information and propaganda organized, gone over, and continually improved to be ready when action demands.

14. Until some effective international guarantee of security has been established or resort to war eliminated, we cannot disregard the dangers inherent in developing mass housing in cities. Surveys must be made of underground industrial establishments, refuge for civilians, and dispersal of populations.

15. These organizations should be planned in considerable detail and gone over every 3 or 6 months by the National Resources Board. Competent men should be trained to fill the key positions. The Chiefs of Staff should make recommendations to the Resources Board for such changes as they deem wise and necessary. Setting up of industrial and social machinery should not be left to M-day.

16. All organizations continually exposed to the proper congressional committees, keeping them in touch with defense plans. The American people must be taken into the fullest confidence. They will do anything required of them if they are told why. Do not try to fool them.

Universal military training must be regarded as the apex of a pyramid grounded upon the broad bases I have outlined above. It has neither purpose nor effect except as part of such a structure. To believe that our national security can be assured through universal military training alone is to deceive ourselves and to waste the precious time of our youth. Only if combined with a sound and comprehensive program for our national security can it be really effective.

And I stand with the Secretaries of State, War and Navy and the Chiefs of Staff of both services, in favoring uniform hemispheric training and armament. We should make South, Central, and North America a complete unit.

Just a few words about the utilitarian aspects of your training which has brought you in touch with government, production and distribution, management and labor, and widened your horizons. It has equally widened the horizons of civilians. This gives added value to your future work. Daily, men are claimed from the Army, Navy, and Air Forces for the highest posts in our political, educational, industrial and social life. This is evidence we train a nation for war and peace, and that soldiers and sailors are trained as much for peace as for war.

The armed forces' horizons must be as deep and as wide as the problems they have to meet. It is time and energy well spent. That is what you, of this graduating class, get here.

In spite of my name, I am no son of a prophet. But there are certain phases of the time immediately before us which I see with eyes sharpened by years of experience.

We face a future that is unrestful but not alarming.

I see no war with Russia as an immediate threat. With others of my countrymen, I feel deep irritations, but I do not fear explosions.

We have been just and generous, but there has been a lack of cooperation on the part of those whose friendship we solicit.

Perhaps they expect our economic collapse. If so, they will be disappointed. We shall continue long after their experiment has failed.

We dedicate ourselves to the individual. The others elevate the state into a god head.

But in the cold war that is being waged against us we must always remember that their objective is our unrest. We can guard against that by a firm belief in ourselves under the magnificent flowering of our century and a half of national life.

We resent the continued efforts of Russian sympathizers to change our system of government and life. But we can make ourselves secure against their machinations by bettering our conditions. That we are doing slowly but surely.

Let us watch England. She is conducting a great experiment. I do not believe she can be successful, but I maintain that she has the right to pursue any course she elects.

Can Britain go on with her collectivism, her socialism, her regimentation without imperiling those great democratic principles for which Britain, and this country, too, fought so long and so devotedly, and to which Britain and this country are wholly dedicated?

"Ancient Right unnoticed
As the breath we draw,
Leave to live by no man's leave,
Underneath the law."

However convinced we may be by our vision of peace—and General Eisenhower would not be quitting if peace were threatened—it should not be permitted to affect the need to be ready for the worst.

We should be well prepared for any contingency we may have to face.

To that purpose this class, this institution, are devoted.

You are the protectors of our safety. You are the guardians of our security.

My congratulations and best wishes to you all.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on labor legislation, delivered by Joe A. Wilson, general representative of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, at the Southwest Conference of Printing Pressmen and Assistants, at Galveston, Tex., on June 16, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, officers and delegates of the southwest conference, greetings: I bring to this ninth annual southwest conference of Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union the greetings and felicitations from the office of the president and board of directors of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America.

It was my privilege to have had the opportunity to address this convention 1 year ago in Fort Worth, Tex. The eighth annual conference was a wonderful gathering of the members of our craft. Much knowledge was exchanged and it is hoped that during the course of this convention a constructive and workable program will be planned and that the delegates upon return to their respective homes will proceed to place into effect the programs that are worked out here for the ensuing year.

Since your last convention, many National and State legislators have drafted vicious antilabor legislation and many of these bills have become laws. These antilabor laws have restricted our rights as workers. The process of collective bargaining is being usurped by greedy antilabor forces whose sole ambition is to destroy the rights of the workers. These antilabor forces are a threat to our democracy. It is the sole intent of these antilabor laws to threaten, coerce, and browbeat the workers of America. The rights of the workers, that were once protected by law, become the mere servant of the feudal masters. Labor has a long history of hardships, the workers have toiled, suffered, struggled for an existence to survive; his only tools have been his hands, body and mind, and his hands have forged the mechanical devices so that his labor would become more practical in a simplified manner. The workers have advanced and by the same token those who hired him have advanced in knowledge and wealth.

We are all interested in carrying on our democratic way of life in America. It is the duty of our elected representatives to the various State and national legislative bodies to be more tolerant in the type of laws that they pass, since the restrictions placed upon the workers will in the due course of time backfire on those who wrote laws so vicious in nature and character.

We all remember World War II. That war was fought, we are told, for the freedom of the people of the world—was it? In World War II it was our hope to destroy the "isms" and to keep the world free from "ismized" false leaders. Two large governments "ismized" their people. They started out just as we are doing now in America—first, by destroying labor and its rights, and by placing restrictions upon the masses. I think that we should have learned much from this last war—why should we repeat the mistakes of the past? If we hold our way of life, we will have to revert to the proposition that all people are created equal and that our Government is run by the people, for the people, and of the people, it being operated by the Constitution of the United States of America which holds that man has an inalienable right.

President Van Buren in 1840 promoted a law establishing the 10-hour day—prior to that, workers had been compelled to work 16 hours a day without overtime pay. Wages in those days were small and factories ran 6 days a week. In 1932, President Franklin D. Roosevelt further reduced the hours of work to 40 hours per week, by the establishment of the wages-and-hours law, and for the first time a national minimum wage scale was established for all the workers coming within the interstate commerce provisions. The law covers all plants engaged in commerce among the various States and Territories of the United States of America.

Many people, often including professional men and women, have the idea that unions are organized to destroy capital, but this is not true. The object of the union is to make working conditions better, to keep wages at a standard that will permit a man or woman to give his family a comfortable living, and to raise their children in a decent and honorable manner.

We have three important obligations in life that we must fulfill: First, we must establish our religious standing in the community; second, when men and women reach maturity they must become associated with some type of fraternal organization to enhance their social standing in the community; and, third, they should join a trade union of their craft in order to earn a standard wage so that they can finance these latter two organizations in the community in which they live. Wage standards have been set in various industries by labor unions through collective bargaining. No nonunion man or woman can set wage standards, since they are not in the family of collective bargaining. They have no way to speak for themselves—the union is the instrument for collective bargaining; it has long been recognized as such.

Doctors of medicine have their medical societies, businessmen and women have their organizations, lawyers have their associations; every known trade or profession is organized through some form of club—association, league, union, or what not. Man has organized his activities from the beginning of time and will continue to do so until time is no more. Without organization, governments would fall and destruction would prevail.

My firm advice to the politicians is that they give consideration to the people whom they represent and not legislate against certain groups or classes of people and business. If we are going to operate our Government on the basis of the Constitution, we will have to turn to that document for advice and counsel before we make our laws against certain groups. Today the politicians are driving labor and the workers to underground methods. The same was done to their people by the "ismized" governments of Europe. First they destroyed labor, then controlled capital, and placed the people under government regulation and full government control. We, as Americans, do not want this to happen here; but don't be fooled—it can happen here, so let's be on guard.

The open shop is supposed to be open to both union and nonunion labor, but it never is. Why? The open-shop idea is part of a program of the Manufacturers Association, known as the American plan, to have and not to have. The union shop is job security, and those who elect labor representatives should have the right to require those who want to float on the tail end of the coat to become members of their particular craft organization. If a majority of the members pay dues, the minority should be required to do likewise, since this is a country run on the majority rule, rather than the minority rule; therefore, the minority is duty-bound to become a part of the majority organization and to abide by its rules and regulations.

All of us, regardless of sex, color, or creed, have a big job to perform in seeing that we secure an everlasting peace. It is the voice of the people of the world that must impress upon the governments of the world the need of the brotherhood of man. With a complete understanding of the causes of war, we can by universal thinking abolish the causes of war. It is the duty of our people not to harbor superstition, which is the basis of fear and distrust of one's fellow man. The people of the world are duty-bound to live and let live, to aid and assist those in want. It devolves upon each and every one of us to be brothers of good will, to see that mankind is not destroyed by the greed of just a few selfish leaders. The people of many lands should select honest leadership among themselves. The leaders are placed in office by the mandate of the people. If the leaders fail to carry out that mandate, it then becomes the duty of the electorate to remove from office those who do not carry out the will of the people.

We would have a splendid world to live in if we could abolish the word "fear." When that word is abolished from the minds of men, then we will have the answer to the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" We can then walk through the valley of life and expect an everlasting life of tranquillity for us all.

The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an open letter which I have addressed to the workers of my own State of Wisconsin and to all of the other working men and women of America.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKERS ON THE PRO-AMERICAN LABOR LAW

DEAR FRIEND: I am writing this letter to the American laboring man, in particular, to the working people of my own State of Wisconsin. My purpose is to present my views on the labor legislation which has been enacted by the Congress. My constituents are entitled to know my views.

May I first point out the labor legislation was enacted only after the most thorough consideration by both the Senate and House of Representatives. During the extensive hearings, every opportunity was given to the representatives of organized labor, of business, of agriculture, to present their views on it. A comprehensive bill was prepared and after the President vetoed it, the veto was overridden by the House by a vote of 338 to 83 and by the Senate by a vote of 68 to 25.

MAIL ON LABOR BILL

I received a very large volume of mail on both sides of this issue from laboring men—affiliated with the CIO, the A. F. of L., the railroads, independent unions and others. I was glad to get the benefit of the judgment of the people of our State, although, in some cases, I did not agree with certain individuals' conclusions. That is, however, a part of our American way of life—that we can talk things over or write to one another from different points of view, while still respecting one another's viewpoints.

NAME CALLING ON BILL

The law, Public Law 101, has been smeared as a slave-labor law, as reactionary, as designed to destroy the rights of labor, to bust unions, and many other attempts have been made to besmirch it. Probably it is more properly called a bill to free labor—to free it from racketeer exploitation. But the workingmen of Wisconsin are interested in the issues of the bill and not in mere generalities or name calling. Our workers want to learn the truth on this bill—the truth that sets men free, free from doubts, free from misrepresentation, from misinformation and lack of information.

MY SUPPORT OF LAW

I personally voted for the law with the interest of American workingmen in mind and with the interest, too, of American management, American agriculture, and most important of all, the American public.

This bill is propublic, pro-American, not for any one segment alone of our population. What is it against? It is against the concentration of power in a few hands which always makes for violation of the rights of the public, whether it is in industry or labor. This law helps to restore the checks and balances of the American system of private enterprise.

It is a forward-looking law, designed to protect America from industrial warfare in the atomic age.

I know that Wisconsin labor and all American labor is concerned about the strike situation as well as about high prices, about inadequate housing, and about other problems. I can understand their feelings, for I have been a laboring man myself. I have worked in the sawmills of northern Wisconsin for 15 cents an hour, 11 hours a day. Today, I am a workingman myself and am proud of it, for I work 60 hours or more a week, Sundays and holidays.

STRIKE DAMAGE

America's workers deserve a fair labor law, and I believe they now have the best one that could be obtained under present conditions—a law that will help repair the terrific damage done by years and years of labor boss dictatorship which should now come to an end.

Our State's working men knew that last year alone 116,000,000 man days were lost directly in ruinous strikes. What a staggering loss this was to the community in terms of lost pay rolls, dissipated savings, doomed dividends, lost profits, injured public confidence, diminished supply of goods. Yes, America's workingmen have suffered terrifically from inflation brought about by underproduction.

QUESTIONS TO OPPONENTS OF LAW

To those who opposed this law, let me ask a few questions. Do you believe that the Congress should have remained motionless and permitted another disastrous railroad strike to paralyze the Nation; another terrible steel strike, coal strike, auto strike, electrical strike, farm machinery strike? Do you believe that Congress should have remained motionless while Communists and labor boss racketeers used unions for their own notorious ends? Do you believe that the Congress should have done nothing in the face of brutal assault upon workers by union thugs? Do you believe laboring men should be denied the right to go to work and earn their daily bread because they are not a member of the union because they cannot pay an outrageously high initiation fee?

FAILURE OF LABOR LEADERS TO ACT

Let us remember that for years and years the Congress has solicited from the leaders of American labor their suggestions as to ways and means of improving labor-management relations. But the labor leaders offered no constructive suggestions whatsoever. They refused to clean their house of crooks and Reds. They took a stand-pat position that nothing was wrong and that nothing could be done to improve conditions. As a consequence, Congress had no alternative but to write its own law.

PROVISIONS OF LAW

What are the major provisions, then, of the new law? Here they are: I have suggested many of them myself during my years in the Senate and have introduced legislation along these lines. You might ask yourself as you read these sections whether you are opposed to them or whether you favor them.

(1) No union may now be certified or may enjoy National Labor Relations Board assistance unless all its officers swear that they are not Communists or Communist sympathizers.

(2) Absurd jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts which have wrought such tremendous havoc in American labor are outlawed. Injunctions against them may now be sought by the NLRB.

(3) Unions may now be sued for breach of contract and for damages which they inflict in jurisdictional strikes and boycotts, just as corporations may now be sued. This merely makes for equality before the law.

(4) The closed shop is forbidden. Let me point out that every poll of American public opinion shows that the American people are overwhelmingly opposed to the closed shop which requires that a man be a member of a union before he can get into a job. A poll in January 1947 showed that only 8 percent of our people favored the closed shop, 18 percent the union shop, while 66 percent favored the open shop, and 8 percent expressed no opinion. The law does allow the union shop, but it and other compulsory union membership devices are permitted only if the majority of workers vote in favor of them in a secret ballot. That is in the spirit of American democracy.

(5) Unions are required to render financial accounts. Here again the American people, by popular opinion polls, have overwhelmingly endorsed this provision. In December 1946, 84 percent of the general public stated its endorsement of unions' financial accountability, while 80 percent of union members favored it. Why should not unions' finances be open just as corporation finances are public?

UNFAIR PRACTICES

(6) Unions' unfair labor practices are, for the first time, defined just as heretofore management's unfair labor practices have been defined. Among these union unfair practices are refusal to bargain, attempts to coerce workers, excessive union fees, featherbedding (or made work), and coercion of employers into industry-wide bargaining. Here let us note that the American people have always been opposed to certain feather-bed practices of unions—that is, requirements to hire extra workers that aren't needed on a given job. In 1946, three out of every five Americans stated their endorsement of legislation prohibiting feather-bedding.

(7) Any threatened strike which might endanger the national health or safety may now be enjoined for a period of 80 days. During that period a Board of Inquiry would investigate the facts and the workers would vote on acceptance or refusal of their employer's last offer for settlement. This waiting or so-called cooling-off period has been endorsed in public opinion polls. It is necessary in the public interest.

(8) The Labor Department's Conciliation Service functions are removed from that Department and are vested in a new, independent agency—the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

(9) Employers are released from any obligation to bargain collectively with foremen who have the authority to hire and fire workers. Obviously, were foremen unionized, it would make for chaos and confusion in labor-management differences.

(10) Strikes by Federal employees are forbidden. We remember the wise words of President Calvin Coolidge: "There is no right to strike against the public safety by anyone, anywhere, any time." America endorses the concept of no strikes by Government workers.

JOINT HANDLING OF WELFARE

(11) Welfare funds may be set up with employer contributions but only if the employer has an equal voice with the union in their management. This is in the principle of fair play and control.

(12) Unions are barred from making expenditures in connection with political campaigns, just as corporations are barred.

(13) New procedures and democratic organization are prescribed for the NLRB.

What reasonable man can say that any of these provisions is unwise or uncalled for in the public interest?

(14) The NLRB is expanded by two members to a total of five. Its review division is abolished. Its general counsel becomes autonomous and is in charge of all field work such as investigating complaints and initiating prosecutions. He alone decides what cases are taken up. This is in full accordance with the American principle that the same organization cannot be both the judge and the jury at the same time.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

That in sum constitutes this amendment of the Wagner Act. What reasonable man can say that any of these provisions is unwise or uncalled for in the public interest?

How can these provisions be possibly construed by reasonable persons as "anti labor?" They are only propublic, I repeat.

WHAT THE LAW DOES NOT DO

What doesn't this law do?

First. None of the provisions impairs the original intent of the Wagner Act or infringe upon any of labor's legitimate rights thereunder.

Second. None of these provisions establishes standards on unions which are not already established on management. These provisions simply make for equality before the law—a basic American principle for labor and management. After all, we are proud of the fact that we are a Nation of laws.

Third. None of these provisions interferes unduly with union affairs, except to the extent necessary to protect the individual rights of employees.

Fourth. None of these provisions repeals the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act or restores the abuses which prevailed prior to the establishment of that act.

Fifth. None of these provisions destroys the right of collective bargaining or the right to peaceful picketing or any other

peaceful or lawful persuasion. I fervently endorse these rights of labor.

Sixth. None destroys the right to strike but merely makes it consistent with the public interest and the rights of the individual employees.

Seventh. None of these provisions permits the interstate transportation of strike breakers or any other condition which existed prior to the Byrnes Act.

CONCLUSION

The law itself will not cure all of America's labor problems. It will not bring about a millennium overnight. It will, however, be a major step toward the solution of industrial problems if labor and management will cooperate. With the aid of all of us, it can be a dynamic instrumentality for stabilizing our economic difficulties in the field of labor.

This is particularly true if the administration of the law by Government is fair, efficient and adequate. We know that the Wagner Act was mal-administered in a one-sided fashion, thus bringing about the chaotic conditions which the present law seeks to cure.

It is the prayer of 140,000,000 American people, including 58,000,000 workers, that this fair, pro-American law will be administered in a pro-American way to protect the rights of all of us. If this is done, it will mean full pay envelopes for American workers and full production for American industry.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Price Reduction With Increased Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a most illuminating statement was made this morning before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, by Mr. Fowler McCormick, chairman of the Board of the International Harvester Co.

The testimony is significant in many respects. Of great importance at the moment was the declaration by Mr. McCormick that the International Harvester Co., which now enjoys satisfactory bargaining relationships with a number of international unions, including both AFL and CIO, contemplates no change whatever in its dealings with these unions as a result of the recently enacted amendment of the National Labor Relations Act.

The burden of Mr. McCormick's testimony has to do with the policy of the company of reducing prices to its customers and increasing wages of its employees. This highly salutary result, he explained, has been obtained by greatly increased production.

The full text of Mr. McCormick's statement is of such value that I feel it should be incorporated in the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that his testimony on how to reduce prices and increase wages be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is Fowler McCormick. I am chairman of the board of the International Harvester Co., whose main offices are in Chicago. I am appearing at the request of the committee for the purpose of discussing some recent actions by our company which may be of interest to the committee in connection with its inquiries into economic matters.

I do not appear before you as an economist, nor with specific suggestions as to legislation. It will rather be my purpose to review with you what our own company has done this year in regard to prices and wages and our reasons for taking the actions we did.

With your permission, I should like to give you a few facts about our company and the scope of its operations, so that the committee will have that information as a background against which to consider our actions.

Our company now consists of 23 factories and raw materials operations in the United States, as well as more than 100 sales branch houses. We are a manufacturing company and our selling activities are largely in the field of wholesale selling although we have a number of retail establishments to sell our motor trucks. Most of our equipment is sold to users by approximately 9,000 International Harvester dealers and distributors.

We are engaged in several different industries and our company is therefore organized into several operating divisions. Our sales for the first 6 months of this year were as follows:

	1947	Percent of total
Sales of regular products in the United States:		
Motortrucks, service and service parts	$128,034,000	37.4
Farm implements and service parts	59,419,000	17.4
Farm tractors and service parts	59,711,000	17.4
Industrial equipment and service parts	25,809,000	7.5
Steel, pig iron, and coke by-products	13,272,000	3.9
Binder and baler twine	3,979,000	1.2
Refrigeration equipment	1,452,000	.4
Miscellaneous	893,000	.3
Total	292,569,000	85.5
Sales to subsidiary companies:		
To International Harvester Co. of Canada, Ltd	9,880,000	2.9
To International Harvester Export Co. (for export)	39,762,000	11.6
Total	49,642,000	14.5
Grand total	342,211,000	100.0

We have at the present time about 40,000 stockholders. We have about 87,000 employees in the United States, most of whom work in our manufacturing plants. The great majority of our employees are members of one or another of a large group of labor unions with whom we bargain collectively. At present we have a bargaining relationship with more than a dozen international unions represented through more than 170 locals. The unions with which we deal include CIO unions, A. F. of L. unions, and a few independent unions.

It has been suggested that you would be interested in hearing from me about our price reductions of last March, with special reference to the reasons for them and the factors that made them possible.

These price reductions were announced on March 8 and affected 163 basic models of tractors, farm machines, industrial power equipment, and motortrucks. We estimate they will save the users of our products approximately $20,000,000 a year. The price reductions covered 12 models of farm tractors, 123 models of farm machines, 16 models of industrial tractors and engines, and 12 models of motortrucks as well as certain motortruck attachments.

Individual reductions ranged from $2.50 to $300 and from 1 to 23.8 percent. We could not reduce our products uniformly and some we could not reduce at all, for some products were making money, others were breaking even, and a few were losing money.

So we reduced prices where we could and as much as we felt we could. For example, on our largest selling farm tractor, the Farmall-H, the price reduction was $125, or 10.6 percent. The automatic pick-up hay baler was reduced $75, or 4.1 percent. The self-propelled combine was reduced $122.50, or 3.4 percent.

To explain how we were able to reduce prices and why we did so requires an examination of our postwar planning on the one hand, and of our fundamental policy on the other.

Our postwar planning began in 1943, as soon as we found that we could carry on our war work satisfactorily and still devote some time to consideration of the future.

One of the first results of our planning was to reorganize completely the management set-up of our company from the old functional basis to a divisional basis. That reorganization was carried out both to improve our war production and to improve our postwar production. It has been highly effective in both respects.

Toward the end of 1943 we made a complete review of the engineering design of all our products. We laid plans to make modifications and improvements in our existing products to bring them fully up to date. We then turned our attention to totally new products upon which our engineers had been working and we found that engineering had progressed to a point which made it practical to plan the manufacture of important new machines at the war's end.

Among these were the Farmall Cub tractor, now in production, which is the smallest real farm tractor ever made; the mechanical cotton picker; the one-man automatic hay baler; the sugar beet harvester; the self-propelled combine; six new models of motortrucks designed for west coast and mountain use; and our new TD-24 crawler type tractor, which is the largest tractor of its kind yet built.

Having listed these products as ready to go, we studied the estimated demand for both our revised products and our totally new products. We projected that into estimates of manufacturing space and equipment that would be required. It was immediately apparent that our capacity was entirely inadequate to fulfill the requirements.

We acquired additional plant sites. Having previously purchased a site at Memphis, we next bought sites at Wood River, Ill., and Fort Madison, Iowa. We planned a building program. With the end of the war, however, we found that our building program had largely become a buying program, for several reasons. First, scarcities of building materials and other factors made it evident that building new plants would be a long process. Second, the level of building costs made it financially desirable to buy existing space if possible. Third, customer demand was extremely urgent.

We therefore purchased from the Government an airplane plant at Evansville, Ind., which became our refrigeration factory; an airplane plant at Louisville which became our cub tractor factory; an airplane engine plant at Melrose Park, Ill., which became part of our industrial power division; and a gear plant in Chicago which we have converted into a manufacturing research center. In addition we bought from private owners a small malleable iron foundry at Waukesha, Wis., and a small plant at Stockton, Calif.,

for use in west coast farm implement production. We leased a small factory at Emeryville, Calif., for motortruck production and we have proceeded with construction of our large new Memphis works, which we expect to occupy this summer, and which will produce the cotton picker, the hay baler, and a line of southern implements.

In connection with this program we sold a small farm implement factory at Chattanooga and discontinued operations in a small implement factory at Huntington Park, Calif. So we have a net addition of six plants. The planned total employment of these new plants is approximately 21,000 men and at present they employ about 10,000.

In addition to the new plants, we have made sizable investments to improve and reequip our existing plants.

This whole program of organization changes, product engineering and acquisition of new plants, incomplete as it is, is the thing that has made it possible to produce in far greater volume than before the war.

The greatly increased production resulting from this program has brought with it an increase in our profits which made it possible to undertake our program of price reduction and wage increases of last spring.

The other factor underlying our price and wage action was a policy which is the cornerstone of all our other policies and procedures. We have held for many years that when a company attains a certain size, he becomes in a sense a social institution, and should be operated not in the interest of any single group, but equally in the interests of the three groups most vitally concerned in our business—our stockholders, our employees, and our customers. As will be readily recognized, this is not new as a concept for it has been expressed from time to time by businessmen and others. The novelty lies in the fact of a company openly proclaiming this to be its basic policy and endeavoring to carry it out to the best of the management's ability.

Examined in the light of this policy, our actions in the months from February to April of this year form a rounded picture of execution of that basic policy.

When we became aware in February of the levels at which our sales were running and made estimates of our earnings for the first quarter, we raised the quarterly dividend on the common stock to a rate of $4 a share yearly. The payment in the previous 3 years had been $3 a share.

Following this action, we reduced our prices in March on those products on which it was possible to do so, and in April our negotiations with the unions terminated in wage increases which followed in general the pattern of the electrical and automotive industries.

Stated in dollars on an annual basis, the three groups benefited from our increased production as follows:

Ratio of profits to sales dollar values

Stockholders	$4,000,000
Customers	20,000,000
Employees	25,000,000

We thus, by virtue of our increased sales and earnings, have been able to act in the interests of stockholders, customers, and employees, and in doing so we were carrying out our well-established policy.

It is not particularly unusual for a company with rising earnings to increase its dividend rate to stockholders. It is also quite common for a company with rising earnings to consider increasing the wages of its employees. It is unusual, however, for a company with rising earnings to reduce prices when it is not compelled to do so by competitive conditions or a decline in demand.

Prices are ordinarily reduced if they have risen too rapidly or too much. But that was not our situation. From January 1941 to March 1947 our prices had not gone up so much or so fast as many other prices. For example, the average price increase for all manufactured products during that period was 63.7 percent, and for metals and metal products the increase was 41.2 percent. Yet our motortruck prices had risen an average of 35 percent, our industrial power prices an average of 34 percent, and our farm machine prices an average of only 25 percent.

Prices ordinarily are reduced, too, if they are out of line with competitive prices or if they encounter resistance by customers. That was not our situation. Our prices were comparable to those of competitors and the demand for our goods was such that we could expect to sell all we could make this year and for a considerable time in the future.

In addition to these factors, there were important uncertainties in our picture. One of these was the size of the possible increase in our wage and salary bill. At the time we reduced prices, there was no established national pattern on wages and we did not know what our ultimate wage settlement would be. Similarly, we were in a period of considerable uncertainty as to the prices of materials and purchased components.

There was one thing, however, that was very clear to us. That was that industry seemed to be caught in a vicious upward spiral of wages and prices. Businessmen hesitated to reduce prices because they could not be certain what the future held as to wage rates or business volume. Yet the increasing of prices or failure to reduce them necessarily had a tendency to limit volume and to encourage further wage demands. To us, the only way out of such a vicious circle of higher prices appeared to be to break through.

A few months earlier, the American people had insisted that the Government withdraw from its attempts to control prices in peacetime. That restored to business and industry its historic share of responsibility in the establishment of prices. We recognized fully that not all business could reduce prices. We knew that not all business could reduce prices by the same amount.

But our company felt a duty to act as promptly as possible and in our case, the business outlook made it possible to move toward the goal of lower prices. We took what the Army calls a calculated risk in the hope of accomplishing something worth while.

Summing up, I would say that our price reductions were the result of two factors: First, our long-time policy of operating in the interests of customers, employees, and stockholders; second, our desire to contribute whatever we could toward checking the upward movement of prices.

In discussing our action at the time, we stated that it was our view that "Any price is too high if it can be reduced." That is still our belief and our continuing policy.

The Interstate Oil Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, Mr. Hiram M. Dow, one of New Mexico's leading lawyers, and, for that matter, one of the outstanding attorneys of the entire Southwest, recently addressed the Producers' and Royalty Owners' Association, at Amarillo, Tex. In his address Mr. Dow discussed something of the petroleum industry in general, its service to the American people, and the extremely important part that industry plays in the Nation's economic life. But, particularly, Mr. Dow discussed the interstate oil compact and the work and authority of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. He is especially fitted to discuss this subject, for Mr. Dow has been a member of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission since it was first authorized, a little more than 12 years ago, and is its present chairman. He was one of those who first conceived the idea and helped to bring into existence an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas and to prevent physical waste thereof from any cause.

Today, when so much is being said about oil and gas and the possible exhaustion of these great natural resources, the remarks of Mr. Dow are timely and appropriate.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dow's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL

The petroleum industry in America today is a peculiarly American industry, founded and discovered by Americans, and making progress by typically American methods. With persistence and self-reliance, it has contributed so much to the progress and welfare of the United States and so much to the happiness and comfort of all the world, that, though having some shortcomings as is inevitable in all human effort, its record of accomplishments is one of the proudest in the world today.

The oil business has experienced glorious years of early discoveries, of sudden riches, endless supply, and magnificent waste; and has now grown to maturity and to the realization for the need for conservation. It has reached a position of settled dignity with far less speculation involved in its operations. Today it is the best example of industrial service to the American people in that its products are so closely allied with the American way of life. The American petroleum industry contributes more than any other industry in the way of useful commodities so necessary to the progress of the American people and bears a direct relation to the incomparable high standards of living enjoyed by our people. To this the American public must agree, for only the automobile, meat packing, and steel industries exceed it in volume of sales. The demonstrated efficiency of this industry in providing for adequate production of petroleum supplies has enabled the United States Government to defend itself against all enemies; its war record being publicly cited by Senator O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Senate Oil Committee. O'MAHONEY's statement in a report to Secretary of the Interior Krug, stated: "It was the production of petroleum in the United States that made possible the victory of the United Nations."

American oil wells have supplied the peoples of the earth with 30,000,000,000 barrels of oil, yet proved reserves amount to 21,000,000,000 barrels, and geologists estimate we can find in this country at least another 50,000,000,000 barrels.

This means that, although the United States owns only one-eighth of the number of acres of potential oil lands in the world, it has, under its system of free enterprise, produced two-thirds of the world's oil. And Americans, American methods, and Ameri-

can tools, have found almost all of the other oil fields in the world.

This country's annual oil output can do the work of 4,500,000,000 men toiling 8 hours a day, 6 days a week; that is to say, it provides the equivalent of 32 able-bodied servants for each person in the United States.

Ten thousand persons are employed and $50,000,000 is spent annually by United States companies for research in their never-ending quest for new and improved products. Work now being done in petroleum research laboratories will be reflected in more and better products to be used tomorrow in agriculture, industry, and in the home.

Industry experts believe that American oil reserves will last for generations. Synthetic fuels from natural gas, coal, and oil shale can be produced whenever necessary. Gasoline will be produced commercially from natural gas this year, and other synthetic liquid fuels being developed in company laboratories assure the Nation of a virtually inexhaustible supply of such fuels.

Research has made vast strides not only in the art of finding oil, but also in the extraction of oil already found. A few decades ago it was not unusual to recover only about 20 percent of the oil in a new field. Today as high as 80 percent is recovered and supposedly worked-out fields are again in production.

COMPACT

Just a little more than 12 years ago, I sat with Colonel Thompson and the representatives of seven States in a meeting in Dallas, Tex.

We were engaged in charting a course specially sanctioned by the Constitution of the United States, which provides in effect that one or more of the sovereign States may enter into agreements, which agreements or compacts become binding when approved by Congress. The meeting lasted 2 days. Out of it came the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, which now has been approved by legislatures of 20 States and the Congress of the United States. The purpose of the compact is stated in understandable English as follows:

"The purpose of this compact is to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause."

Each State bound itself to enact statutes, or if such statutes had been theretofore enacted, to continue same in force, providing in effect that oil or gas produced in violation of its valid oil or gas conservation laws or any valid rule, order, or regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be denied access to commerce, and providing for stringent penalties for the waste of either oil or gas.

The compact specifically provided: "It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations."

And further provided: "Each State joining herein shall appoint one representative to a commission hereby constituted and designated as the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, the duty of which said commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances, and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about conservation and the prevention of physical waste of oil and gas, and at such intervals as said commission deems beneficial it shall report its findings and recommendations to the several States for adoption or rejection.

"The Commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several States within their several jurisdictions to promote the maximum ultimate recovery from the petroleum reserves of said States, and to recommend measures for the maximum ultimate recovery of oil and gas. Said commission shall organize and adopt suitable rules and regulations for the conduct of its business."

The great oil- and gas-producing State of Texas played the most important part in the formation of the compact and it has, since the formation of the compact, had a continuing and lively interest therein. It has been my good fortune to have remained New Mexico's representative on the compact commission from its inception to now. Throughout the years, I have come to know and respect the men who have represented Texas on the compact commission. Colonel Thompson was the first. In my opinion, there is no other man in the world who, as a public official, has had more to do with problems concerning conservation of oil and gas than Colonel Thompson. His record on the Railroad Commission of Texas is what we lawyers would describe as res ipsa loquitur (it speaks for itself) and it speaks loud and long. The next member from Texas was Judge J. C. Hunter, from Abilene, respected and loved by every man in the oil industry. Then, Sydney Latham, a former secretary of state of Texas; and today, your Governor, Beauford Jester.

The success and accomplishments of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission clearly demonstrate the practicability of voluntary cooperation between the States in the solution of mutual problems.

Formed and existing for the sole purpose of conserving and protecting irreplaceable natural resources—oil and gas—the compact has grow and expanded without precedent in the Nation's history. The compact commission is founded upon the premise that those closest to a situation can best understand and control it. The officials of the individual States know more about the oil and gas industry than any Federal official. The power of enlightened public opinion is the commission's sole weapon. It forms the basis of an educational program. The compact commission used the combined experience and talents of States and industry. It has no powers of compulsion. It seeks none. Its strength lies in its ability to weld the bands of cooperation. The States work together in the solution of mutual problems.

The Interstate Oil Compact Commission is a voluntary cooperative association of oil- and gas-producing States. It had been aptly called a "bulwark against Federal control" and referred to as "an example in self-rule." It is strictly an interstate agency, operated by and for the 20 member States. The member States produce 90 percent of the Nation's natural gas and 80 percent of the Nation's oil.

The functions of the commission are:

1. To prepare, recommend, and distribute the best forms of oil- and gas-conservation laws, rules, and regulations for the information of the governors, legislatures, regulatory officials, and the industry.

2. To accumulate, analyze, and distribute the best available engineering and other scientific information and data concerning natural gas to prevent waste and obtain the greatest ultimate recovery.

3. To conduct an educational program on conservation.

4. To provide a forum or round table where all National and State officials and the industry may meet to discuss common problems.

5. To encourage and assist oil- and gas-producing States to adopt efficient rules and regulations for conservation.

6. To impress upon all citizens the importance of conservation.

7. To provide a headquarters office where all pertinent information concerning oil and gas may be available to all concerned.

8. To point out the need for a general program and at the same time to show that variations are necessary in the various States and even in individual pools which require the attention of local authorities.

9. To promote a conservation program by State agencies with the assistance and cooperation of the industry that will clearly demonstrate the generally accepted principle of American democracy that the best government is by cooperation rather than by coercion.

10. To accomplish this program under the authority of individual States and eliminate any necessity for Federal control or regulation.

Now in its twelfth year, this cooperative advisory body is still without power of compulsion or the need of it and has demonstrated clearly the practicability of voluntary action among States in the solution of mutual problems.

To the commission's quarterly meetings are brought the Nation's top-notch scientists and engineers. They discuss the latest developments in waste prevention. The commission's standing committees make continuous studies of more advanced conservation practices.

I read an editorial from Chicago Journal of Commerce, April 23, 1947:

"OIL—THE COMPACT VINDICATED

"(By Keith Fanshier)

"Down at Birmingham, Ala., tomorrow the petroleum industry again gives the world an example of the peculiarly successful functioning of the American idea as it is expressed in application to a great natural resource industry.

"That idea could be defined as enlightened self-interest, cooperation, the minimizing of dependence on centralized bureaucratic regulation, and a consciousness of the implications of sound conservation.

"The occasion is the quarterly meeting of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, now a healthy 12 years old despite the fact traducers of individual and State powers and rights in petroleum plotted constantly against the compact plan in its infancy.

"The compact and the organization which gives effect to it today are so well established that they have virtually driven the Federal control advocates under cover and it no longer is popular, even in Washington, to espouse views of strong Government control of petroleum.

"The enemies of an industry and State partnership in the service of the public were extreme in their vituperation at the start and grew more agitated as it flourished early. A Secretary of the Interior readily given to unlovely excesses of language tried repeatedly in the public prints to convince the country the compact could not possibly succeed.

"But the petroleum industry and the oil States refused to be intimidated. They went ahead. By now, working in harmony, they have demonstrated fully how needless and how potentially mischievous is strong, concentrated regulatory design. They have shown, by contrast, how it is possible to progress in serving industry and public alike through a loosely knit but effective entity that comes about the nearest thing to being an embodiment of the Golden Rule that any industry affords today.

"Nineteen States are now working together in the compact, or shortly will be. These include virtually all the oil-producing States and by far the great bulk of the Nation's oil production.

"The petroleum industry has been kept out of the hands of power-hungry, ambitious Government officials. American principles of individual initiative have been affirmed.

"Sitting as an unseen guest at Birmingham will be the spirit of a man who would have approved thoroughly the compact and its commission, Thomas Jefferson, whose one-hundred-and-fourth birthday has just been

celebrated. He is the man who said the best government is the least government."

All commission members and members of numerous committees, drawn from State regulatory bodies, the oil and gas industry, and the public, are exerting themselves to the utmost in this great conservation work directed to the prevention of waste of oil and gas.

Under the compact method, the individual States are trustees of their own natural resources. Thus the authority is placed where it can be best administered; cooperating through the compact commission, the States are safeguarding that sacred trust.

Clark Hill Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement made by me before the House Committee on Appropriations:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity of being permitted to appear in behalf of continued Government construction of the Clark Hill dam, and I compliment the committee on its fair, impartial, nonpartisan hearihg.

To begin with, may I say that the part of this project which is located in South Carolina is entirely in the district it is my honor to represent in this Congress. I can sincerely and truthfully say that at least 90 percent of the people in this valley area are in favor of Government construction of this dam. These same people whom I represent are in favor of economy, against Government interference in business, and for the return of our Government to the people. At the same time, they believe, and I believe, that the waterways and principal rivers of this country by nature are for the benefit of all the people, and the various uses to which these rivers can be put, and has been so held by the courts.

This controversy that has arisen over the construction of this dam by the Government is not a new one in this country. In the development of our inland waterways since the adoption of the Constitution in 1787, this difference of opinion has been expressed from time to time. Many of the great leaders in the early history of our country advocated Government improvement of inland waterways and trade routes. Many canals were constructed by State governments, principally in Ohio, Illinois, and New York, though these were sometimes aided by Federal grants. Many canals were constructed by private enterprise.

Consequently, we have had the same controversy all through the history of this country that we are having today over this dam except that today it is principally a controversy of power rather than navigation. Fundamentally, the principle is the same. Many of these great leaders of both parties advocated inland waterways as a means of equalizing and bringing down railroad rates.

The United States Senate, under President Grant's administration in 1872, adopted a resolution calling for the appointment of a committee to investigate the subject of transportation routes to the seaboard in order that the people and industry might have cheaper facilities to reach the tidewater. This committee reported that water routes were not only the cheapest and best known means of transportation for heavy commodities but they were natural competitors and effective regulators of railway transportation.

A controversy which stirred up a great deal of bitterness, and a long struggle between private enterprise and the state, was when DeWitt Clinton in 1815, in New York, advocated immediate construction of a canal from Lake Erie to the Hudson River. An act was finally passed providing for the construction of this project, and this waterway was completed and formally opened in 1825.

In 1899, Governor Roosevelt, of New York State, appointed a commission on canals. This commission recommended the construction of a 12-foot barge canal between Buffalo and the Hudson River. The New York Legislature in 1903 finally passed an act appropriating $101,000,000 for this project, and it was completed and opened to traffic in 1918. This project was constructed by the government of New York State but it did much to lower and equalize freight rates and benefited industry and the people generally.

My argument today for the Clark Hill Dam, the same as it has been for generations, is to give the people of the Savannah River Valley and the southeastern section of the country cheaper power rates than they could otherwise obtain. The courts have upheld the validity of this type of Government enterprise and the power companies have been given ample opportunity to construct this dam but they did not, and at one time even advocated Government construction of the dam.

Mr. Chairman, this project is not interference with private enterprise. In fact, Government construction of this dam, and the making of this power available, will greatly stimulate private enterprise in various small industries in the Savannah River Valley, which is greatly needed. Not only that but it will help enhance the farm economy of this section of the country, and we are all aware of the individualism and tendency toward private accomplishment of the farmers of this country.

May I say that the great achievements that this Nation has made in water-power developments since the turn of the century have been nonpartisan. Forward-thinking, progressive men of both parties have advocated Government development of inland waterways toward the attainment of better navigation and lower power rates. I do not believe in the squandering of billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money in useless projects and in digging ditches and filling them up again, and have never believed in or supported such a program, but I do believe in the Federal Government developing the resources of this Nation in the form of power, forestry, erosion control, flood control, and things of that nature. It is a function of the Federal Government, and in many cases can only be accomplished by the Federal Government, thus bringing to the people of this country power they could not otherwise get. America must build up its resources to guard against future depressions and possible war.

In this particular Savannah River Valley section, where this dam is now under construction by the Federal Government, there was not 1 hour lost during World War II by strikes in any of its vast network of cotton mills. The foreign-born population in this valley is less than 0.14 percent. In fact, in the very county that gave this dam its name of Clark Hill, the County of McCormick, there are only three foreign-born citizens in its entire population. In this valley we find one of the worst eroded areas of the United States. We find some of the poorest people in America, with less income on the farms than any other section of the country. The boll weevil hit the cotton section of this valley in 1921, and the farm income of its people has steadily declined. They badly need cheaper power, protection from floods, and an effort made to arrest the erosion of its soil. I ask to submit at this point some astounding statistics on the average income per farm in the counties in the Savannah River Valley as compared to some of the other States of the Union. Also, the number of farms being operated today in this valley and the number operated at different periods during the last 20 years. There has been a steady decline in the number of farms and a decrease in annual income, which creates a situation not like any other in America, and consequently, a greater need for the final completion by the Federal Government of this dam already begun.

Gentlemen of the committee, in this long fight between private enterprise and Government development of its rivers and inland waterways, the rights of the people over monopolies and selfish interests has generally prevailed. In fact, in the history of America, the Government's determination to keep its rivers, inland waterways, and trade routes open and free has led to the development of private enterprise, and the greatest free industrial economy that the world has ever known. I sincerely believe in this same principle of continued development of rivers to furnish the people of this country flood control, less erosion, navigation, and, most of all, in making power available to the people. Just as the construction of the Erie Canal lowered railroad rates, so the continued development of Federal power projects, such as Clark Hill, will tend to economize, stabilize, and bring down existing power rates so that all the people of our country can have the benefit of our natural resources, thus promoting a better farm economy and private enterprise.

In my home town, the city of Greenwood, power rates have been reduced five times since the completion and construction by the Federal Government of a dam on the Saluda River a few miles from the city. This dam is furnishing hydroelectric power for Greenwood and many other communities and small towns and private manufacturing enterprises in that entire area. This dam, at the time known as Buzzard's Roost, was a test case before the United States Supreme Court for all Federal power projects, including TVA, Bonneville Dam and Boulder Dam. This reduction of rates in Greenwood is characteristic of the millions and millions of dollars saved by the users of electricity all over the United States of America, not to mention the thousands of farm homes that have been able to secure electricity.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I hope this subcommittee will see fit to recommend the completion of Clark Hill Dam by an additional appropriation, thereby enabling another section of our Nation to have the benefit of lower power rates, better navigation, less erosion and a more stable economy.

AVERAGE INCOME FROM FARMS IN SAVANNAH RIVER VALLEY SECTION

These figures are from the 1945 census conducted by the Department of Agriculture and cover the year 1944. There were no net income figures but the following represent the average per year per farm of products sold or used at home:

South Carolina counties

Abbeville	$970
McCormick	934
Edgefield	1,647
Anderson	1,346
Greenwood	996
Oconee	1,019

Georgia counties

Franklin	$962
Hart	1,216
Elbert	945
Lincoln	816
Columbia	1,091
Washington	1,388
McDuffie	1,638

The following represents the average per year per farm of products sold or used at home for States listed:

Arkansas	$1,687
Kansas	4,633
Michigan	2,418
North Carolina	2,090
Pennsylvania	2,712
South Dakota	4,557
Texas	2,953

Number of farm operators for specified counties in Georgia and South Carolina (Censuses of Agriculture, 1920 to 1945)

	Jan. 1, 1945	Apr. 1, 1940	Jan. 1, 1935	Apr. 1, 1930	Jan. 1, 1925	Jan. 1, 1920
GEORGIA						
Columbia County	909	1,200	1,394	1,253	1,417	1,914
Elbert County	1,956	1,893	2,276	2,427	2,720	3,316
Franklin County	2,247	2,139	2,355	2,631	3,157	3,378
Hart County	2,413	2,308	2,549	2,593	2,882	3,103
Lincoln County	860	1,032	1,614	1,481	1,239	1,668
McDuffie County	1,002	995	1,312	1,193	1,259	1,735
Washington County	2,980	2,506	3,112	3,288	3,187	4,031
SOUTH CAROLINA						
Anderson County	6,371	6,430	7,887	8,200	8,216	8,910
Edgefield County	2,311	2,151	2,817	2,724	2,928	3,991
Greenwood County	1,995	2,099	2,785	3,084	3,027	4,005
McCormick County	1,270	1,290	1,813	1,812	2,003	2,911
Oconee County	3,722	3,595	3,988	4,438	3,704	4,183

Population in Savannah River section showing number of foreign-born residents (according to 1940 census)

	Number	Foreign born
South Carolina counties:		
Abbeville	22,931	18
McCormick	10,367	3
Edgefield	17,894	15
Anderson	88,712	124
Greenwood	40,083	77
Oconee	36,512	42
Georgia counties:		
Franklin	15,612	7
Hart	15,512	18
Elbert	19,618	98
Lincoln	7,042	4
Columbia	94,333	5
Washington	24,230	14
McDuffie	10,878	17

Total population for area, 319,824; total foreign born, 442; total percentage of foreign born, 0.14 percent.

NAM Promises and the Price of Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, last summer the National Association of Manufacturers and other selfish lobby groups pressured the Congress into dismantling the OPA law and thus destroyed the price-control program. The NAM promised the American people at that time that if price controls were eliminated, the laws of demand and supply would shortly bring prices down. The present cost of food and clothing exposes the NAM lobbyists as misleaders and false prophets—as men of no integrity who have placed their own selfish interests above the living standards of the American people. In this connection, I wish to include in the RECORD the following editorial from the June 21, 1947, issue of the Trainman News, the official publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen:

CONSUMER GETS ANOTHER SOAKING—CURRENT PRICES OF MEAT INDICATE BLACK MARKETEERS WERE PIKERS IN DAYS OF OPA

Railroaders and other workers who must have plenty of strength-giving meat to perform their strenuous labors this week saw it disappearing from their tables and lunch pails—banished by the zooming prices.

Retail meat prices were rising 10 to 20 percent throughout the Nation and it was a sad indication that other food costs will increase soon:

THERE'S TROUBLE AHEAD

Declared a spokesman for Farm Research: "Those soaring prices spell trouble ahead and a terrific squeeze on the consumers."

And Jack Kranis, president of the National Meat Industry Council, admitted that meat prices were "higher than they were in the black market during the days of the OPA."

He pointed out that the cost of beef on the hoof is now 28½ cents a pound, compared with 18 or 19 cents under OPA regulation and 21 cents on the black market.

The price of steak in retail stores this week was 7 cents a pound higher than last week. Lamb chops were up 4 cents, leg of lamb 6 cents and pork loin 6 cents.

The new price boosts put the costs of retail meat way above the OPA ceilings of a year ago and considerably more than the black market prices prevalent at that time.

Here are a few examples:

	June 1946		Last week
	OPA ceilings	Black market	
Porterhouse steak, per pound	$0.56	$0.75	$0.90
Veal cutlets, per pound	.50	.65	.73
Pork loin, per pound	.36	.45	.73

Last year during the battles for abolition of the OPA, labor and consumer spokesmen cautioned that removing the price controls would offer only temporary and artificial relief from a meat shortage which would be followed by a really severe scarcity.

OFFER POOR REASONS

Meat industry and Government officials presented several reasons for the sudden spurt in meat costs and they bore contradiction.

One explanation was that European buyers are more than willing to pay high prices and that has upped the costs.

To counteract this, it was cited that only 2 percent of the country's meat supplies are sold abroad.

Another reason was that meat prices always increase in summer months.

But it was pointed out the current spurt began 3 months ago at the wholesale level.

A third reason was that cattle raisers have been withholding livestock from the market.

This explanation was discounted, too, when it was cited that the supply of cattle on the hoof is no higher than usual.

Despite the reasons offered for the increased prices, the fact that meat costs are out of range again came as disheartening news to the multitudes of American laborers whose wages have not kept pace with high living costs.

BALLYHOO IS RECALLED

And it caused Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public to recall only too well the ballyhoo that big industry peddled last year when it conducted its successful drive for the death of OPA. Consumers were assured that prices would drop to a normal level once the price regulations were lifted.

Chester Bowles, ex-OPA director, who fought vigorously for continuation of price controls on meat, declared:

"I probably sound like 'I told you so,' but we knew a year ago it was going to happen. The supply simply isn't there."

American Influence Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

Not all Moscow's blustering broadcasts about reviving prosperity in the European states can hide the horrible fact—behind the iron curtain terror is supreme.

Nor can the United States quite wash its hands of responsibility for this useless human suffering. No amount of official explanation can eliminate the fact that Washington acquiesced in handing over once-free peoples to a government whose brutality at home boded ill for the fate of other peoples under its control. We have at least a negative responsibility for all the frightfulness that Moscow is labeling "liberation."

For instance in Rumania.

Absolutely authentic information from Rumania makes even this hardened newspaperman feel a little sick.

Terror, inflation, pillage, and one partial crop failure have brought about complete economic ruin and starvation. The aim is to ruin the Rumanian middle classes without precisely installing Soviet communism. That will come later.

In Moldavia, one of the richest food-growing countries of the world, the peasants are eating roots and grass and dying like flies. Swedes who have recently returned consider conditions as horrible as those the Germans introduced at Buchenwald. Anybody who had any wealth or social position before is treated as vermin.

In the capital city of Bucharest there is practically no bread.

The turncoat Foreign Minister, Tartarescu, is being attached by his Communist associates. If you are a Communist or support the party, you eat. If not, you cannot open a shop, teach at the university, plead in the law courts.

Rumania has become to all intents and purposes a Soviet province. A Communist "legal" coup d'etat similar to the one in Hungary is expected at any time.

This situation raises the all-important question, What is the United States going to do about it? Obviously, here is a situation that defies treatment under the Truman doctrine.

Which raises the second question, What could we do?

The answer is, Not much. We are committed to preventing the further spread of

"Soviet democracy." But where Russian rule has been established with our consent, the American people are obviously not going to wage war to eliminate it.

The question should be, therefore, What can we do short of war?

Some Americans believe that ultimately Russia may consent to exchange these victim peoples against a sufficiently big American loan as their ransom.

If so, we must seize the opportunity. But meanwhile?

A seasoned American observer who has just returned from more than 2 years behind the iron curtain offers the following answer:

"First of all, we must not break off diplomatic relations. Not because it would offend the satellite governments. But because it would not help the peoples they are oppressing.

"Our American (and British) aim must be to keep up the courage of our friends. They have been a part of occidental civilization. We should see to it that they remain part of it.

"One instrument could be the attitude of our diplomatic representatives in Warsaw, Bucharest, and so forth. Officially, these diplomats must be accredited to the stooge governments. Actually, they should consider themselves accredited to the opposition parties, who constitute the majority. This does not mean that they should oppose the regular governments. Nothing would be accomplished by this. Still less does it mean that our diplomats should urge the opposition to conspire or revolt.

"But just as Soviet representatives in bourgeois countries always consider themselves really accredited to the Communist opposition, so our diplomats in capitals under Soviet rule must concentrate on preserving the faith of these peoples in us.

"A second instrument of incomparable value is the cultural work of the State Department. American Congressmen obviously do not suspect the mischief they are making in suppressing American cultural attachés, libraries, and broadcasts.

"Assistant Secretary Benton got off on the wrong foot when he tried to set up the Voice of America on a 'talking to Russia' basis. There is little or nothing that we can usefully say to the Russians. These people have been thoroughly conditioned by 30 years of bolshevism. Broadcasts to the Soviet Union could only begin to pay dividends after 10 years.

"Broadcasts to the satellites are necessary now. These are captives to whom we alone can bring the promise of ultimate freedom.

"Freedom to them does not mean the American way of life. Freedom means the recovery of their own way of life which Russians and local Communists have taken from them. Therefore, they do not want American crooning. They want world news which is being withheld from them, news of American policies, of American power. For in this last lies their only hope."

To which this writer adds a fervent "Amen."

Terminal-Leave Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 1947

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Legislature has passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, requesting the passage of legislation providing for cash payment to veterans for terminal-leave pay, that is H. R. 4051, introduced and sponsored by my good friend the gentleman from Florida, DWIGHT L. ROGERS.

Mr. ROGERS has been a pioneer in this field of legislation. It has been my pleasure to support his legislation and our colleagues in the Florida delegation are proud of the work he has done on it. The holders of these terminal-leave pay bonds in many instances are badly in need of cash. Homes are to be built and furnished, subsistence allowances need to be supplemented, doctor bills have to be paid, new babies are coming to veterans' families; all of these take cash, and it is rather foolish to say, "All right, hold your bonds and go out and borrow in the money market and pay the interest demanded." It is not sound economically. It is not fair to the veteran. It is a debt we must ultimately pay. The time to pay it is when it will do the veteran the most good.

I would like to urge that the bill be passed promptly, and hope it may be taken up soon and bespeak your support.

Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a worth-while editorial which appeared in the Bridgeton (N. J.) Evening News entitled "Playing Politics With Family Incomes," which very ably discusses the implications of the President's veto of the tax-reduction bill.

The editorial follows:

PLAYING POLITICS WITH FAMILY INCOMES

President Truman's veto of the Republican income-tax-reduction bill is a slap at every wage earner in America. Playing politics with the family pay envelope is dangerous business. The people won't forget it in 1948, although the Democratic strategy is based upon loss of memory on the voters' part next year.

In the 1946 congressional elections the people's mandate was plain and convincing. They wanted a stabilized administration in Washington. They wanted, economic relief from the staggering burden of taxes saddled on them for a decade or more. So Congress was provided with a Republican majority.

The first duty of the Republicans in Congress was to carry out the wishes of the majority of the people. They devised a bill to reduce the tax on all incomes. It would have been un-American to reduce only certain brackets. It had to be a law that would give everybody relief.

The war ended in August 1945. Nearly 2 years later the enormous levy on every American's wage is practically the same as it was during the conflict. This tax is in addition to the scores of other forms of taxation levied upon the people.

There may be some estimable traits in the cardinal principles of the Democratic Party. Economy has never been one of them. No American wants to evade his fair share of maintaining a free system of government. But the shameful waste of his precious dollars has become a national outrage. He finds his living costs almost beyond reason. Prices of such articles as food, automobiles, shoes, and other things remain shamefully high.

How can President Truman justify the same tremendous levy on his fellow Americans that they were forced to pay in wartime? How can he justify his fattened budget, designed only to keep patronage at the highest peak, and his desire to make the Government a heavy buyer in commodities so that they will remain scarce and therefore expensive?

The Democrats feel that next year when their Presidential hope comes forth with a cry for reduced taxes, the people will forget about relief in 1947. In that they probably will be sadly mistaken. There may be plenty of cash around, but unemployment is increasing. Soon our factories will be producing more than consumers can buy only because their pay is shaved one-fifth weekly to keep the New Deal heavily oiled with money.

In putting his veto to a tax relief bill, Mr. Truman has acted in bad faith with the public. He knows full well that millions of families are desperately in need of relief from wartime taxes. Yet he has actually dared to defy the wishes of the voters expressed so plainly in last year's election.

Little wonder that the resentment expressed in Washington reflects the overwhelming sentiment of the Nation. The President is an astute politician, but this time it seems he has overstepped the mark.

Playing politics, with an eye on 1948, and an apparent desire to be the author of a tax reduction bill of his own, isn't going to help the President. If anything, it will probably doom any chances for another 4 years in the White House.

The people are sick and tired of New Deal expediency, extravagance, and reckless disregard of last November's mandate.

United States Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANKLIN J. MALONEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, in the past few months many pessimistic pictures have been brought before us concerning our merchant marine. On May 22, at a dinner given by the Propeller Club of the United States, port of Newport News, Harvey Klemmer, economic adviser to the United States Maritime Commission, gave a careful analysis of our merchant marine's future. His views are neither pessimistic nor optimistic but tell a true story of what we are to expect and I believe it would be beneficial to have his speech written in the RECORD, as follows:

The outlook for American shipping, once viewed with too much optimism, is now viewed with too much pessimism.

The pendulum, as pendulums have a habit of doing, has swung from one extreme to the other.

A short time ago we were talking about a merchant marine second to none, of continuing to occupy a dominant position at sea, of an active fleet of 20,000,000 dead-weight tons. Where are the dreams of yesteryear? Today there are few experienced shipping people, either in the Government or without, who believe that we shall be able to salvage more than 10,000,000 or 11,000,000 tons from the wartime fleet. Some of our most

distinguished prophets foresee an even greater shrinkage, while there are not wanting those who believe that the American position is all but hopeless.

Rose glasses have given way to blue glasses; in some cases to black glasses.

Neither type, in my opinion, gives the true picture. The glasses which we formerly wore were too bright; the glasses which some of us are wearing today are too dark.

It was not in the cards that the United States should build and operate the world's ships any more than it was in the cards for Britain to build the world's automobiles. We shall continue to build and operate some ships, and Britain no doubt will continue to build some motor cars, but neither of us is likely to displace the other from positions which are the result of economic forces exerted over a period of many years.

If this were a peaceful world—where there was never any danger of conflict, either military or economic—it might make sense for the United States to concentrate on automobiles and for Britain to concentrate on ships. However, this is not a peaceful world; hence it becomes necessary for us to maintain a merchant marine, and for the British to maintain a motorcar industry. We understand Britain's need for engine-building capacity (she would have been in bad shape during the recent war without it) and we hope that she will attempt to understand our need for ships (without which we would have been in bad shape).

The Postwar Planning Committee of the Maritime Commission, of which I was privileged to serve as executive secretary, projected a seagoing American fleet of 10,500,000 to 11,000,000 dead-weight tons. These figures were based on a number of extremely favorable circumstances, all of which are not likely to materialize. We shall be fortunate, in my opinion, if we are able to operate—on a sound, long-range basis—more than 10,000,000 tons of oceangoing shipping under the American flag.

This figure includes both dry-cargo vessels and tankers, engaged in both domestic and foreign trade.

Ten or eleven million tons of shipping may not seem large in relation to the wartime fleet of 55,000,000 tons. Nevertheless, there is no reason for undue pessimism in the outlook from here on. There was never any reason to assume that we could run all the ships built during the war, any more than we could fly all the planes or use all the equipment built in other categories. The bulk of our ships, like billions of dollars' worth of other materials, must be written off as a war expenditure. The surprising thing, so far as shipping is concerned, is not that we have saved so little but that we have been able to save so much.

The American merchant marine is today in a vastly improved position over that which it occupied prewar.

In the first place, the postwar fleet—regardless of the size at which it is ultimately stabilized—will probably have a carrying capacity considerably greater than that of the prewar fleet. And carrying capacity, not size, is the true measure of shipping effectiveness.

Our fleet, prewar, was largely obsolete. Today we have one of the most efficient fleets in the world.

We have the greatest reserve of vessels ever assembled. Idle vessels are not the equivalent of active vessels, to be sure, but they are a force to be reckoned with in assessing the maritime potential of the United States.

The industry is in a greatly improved position.

The area of shipping know-how, both in the yards and in the offices of shipping companies, has been vastly expanded.

Hundreds of thousands of men and women have gained valuable experience in the building and operation of ships. And there is increasing evidence that those men and women who are still in the industry realize the necessity for some cooperation on their part if American shipping is to endure.

The public understands, as never before, the necessity for a merchant marine of some proportions as part of the machinery of national security.

The leaders of our armed forces saw what merchant ships did in the war; they know that a defense establishment which does not include ships is incomplete, and they ask that the commercial fleet be preserved.

The Congress, although seemingly critical at times, is alive to our problems and anxious to further the legitimate aspirations of the shipping industry.

Our friends abroad admit, much more freely than they formerly did, America's need for ships; it is not too much to hope that they will support—rather than oppose—the moderate program now being followed by the United States.

Low rates in domestic trade, which have all but destroyed some segments of the industry, are in process of being corrected. Domestic services may never recover their former stature but those which survive will probably be on a much sounder basis than they were before the war.

The principal weakness in our present position is, of course, the shipbuilding picture. The building of ships in this country is rapidly coming to a stop. We can hardly go on building ships for which there is no need; on the other hand, we cannot afford to permit the dispersal of trained staffs and the closing of our yards.

Shipbuilding in this country has long been either a feast or a famine. That is not the right way to build a healthy industry. During the next 2 or 3 years, we must fill in certain gaps in our maritime edifice—particularly in the field of passenger vessels—and we must put the existing fleet in first-class condition. After that it behooves us, if we want to preserve a shipbuilding industry worthy of the name, to make replacements in a much more orderly manner than has been the case in the past. Only thus, it appears, shall we be able to preserve an enduring structure to serve as a counterpart of the fine new fleet now sailing the seas.

Planting by Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions on the floor of the House and in committee meetings I have called attention to the wonderful work of reseeding our grasslands by airplane distribution of pelletized seed. Especially have I mentioned the work of Dr. Lytle S. Adams during the last few months under contract with the Government to reseed 50,000 acres on Indian reservations in Arizona. I am happy to see that the present Interior appropriation bill contains a fairly generous appropriation to continue this work during the next fiscal year. Knowing the interest of the conferees in this vital work, I have full confidence that the report will assure a continuation of the airplane reseeding work so well started during the past year. Restoring the ranges is very important to our Indian stockmen.

This fruitful idea has attracted great attention. At least a half dozen publications of Nation-wide circulation have had illustrated articles showing the Adams' method of pelletizing the seed and of distributing such pelletized seed rapidly over vast acreage in the minimum of time. Not only have magazines published such articles but movie films have been made and widely shown. One such standard film was recently shown in the auditorium of the Interior Department and witnessed by many Members of Congress. Since Secretary Krug could not be present on the evening of the showing, he was later furnished a private showing of the film, and on that occasion he brought with him the venerable elder statesman, Bernard M. Baruch, who took a great interest in the film, and also in the actual pellet-making machine which was being displayed in the auditorium. This machine Dr. Adams had just been using on the Papago Indian Reservation in southern Arizona, to pelletize the seed used to cover 10,000 acres on that reservation.

Both the pelletizing machine and the mechanical distributor attached to the airplane and used for distributing the seed in a wide swath from the airplanes are interesting inventions. In fact, it is hard to say which is the most significant idea, the machines to make and distribute the pellets or the idea of the pellets containing and protecting the seed. In any case, the combination of these two scientific ideas make it likely that nature will be greatly aided in restoring some of the grasslands which have been overgrazed and are wasting through erosion.

Among the many interesting articles concerning this process, I find one entitled "Planting by Air" in the May 1947 issue of Arizona Highways. This article is accompanied by numerous pictures which are highly instructive. It pertains to the actual work of reseeding done last year on the Papago Reservation in southern Arizona and also on the Hopi Reservation in northern Arizona. The magazine article is as follows:

PLANTING BY AIR

(By Western Ways)

Atop a purple mesa in the land of the Hopi a mounted Indian shaded his eyes and looked into the northern Arizona sky. There in the hot blue a tiny airplane appeared, grew larger. As the roar of its motors increased, he could see that it was dropping something—trailing behind it was a cloud of brownish specks. It swished low past him, raining its hard little bombs in an even swath, and raced onward.

He dismounted, walked over and picked up one of the brown pellets. What was it, this hard little pea? Why was it dropped on his homeland—his reservation? What could it mean?

Simply put, the meaning was this: The United States Government, through the Department of the Interior, was investing an initial $175,000 in an Arizona experiment. If successful, part of the gamble would be taken out of farming. If successful, it would furnish means of replanting denuded lands in the most efficient manner possible. That small pellet, perhaps, would stop the snowball of erosion that threatens our land.

The first seed pellet planting by air was done on Arizona's Papago Indian Reservation at Sells in May of last year. It was a singularly appropriate site for this newest quirk in farming, for this land was one of America's first—and most discouraging—farmlands. Papagos have been tilling the brown, hard

soil of the Arizona desert for centuries, wresting their living from its reluctant yield of beans and pasture. These years of planting and grazing had left little resistance in the land. Several dry years plus an increase in the number of Papago cattle had ruined the Papago land.

When the Government decided to finance Dr. Lytle S. Adams in testing his invention of pellet planting by air, they decided that if he could make the Papago land bloom, he could turn any of the desert country of the United States into a garden.

In May the airplane rained its first pellet bombs down onto the land of the Papago. July saw Dr. Adams reseeding the San Carlos Indian Reservation near Globe. Early fall, and Polacca in northern Arizona was receiving its shower of drought-resistant Lehmanns Lovegrass encased in the brown pills.

In all, some 30,000 acres have been planted in this vast experiment. Another 20,000 are to be bombarded. Indications even now show that planting pellets by air is successful. Whether the wholesale planting of thousands of barren acres will be practical from an economic viewpoint is being tested on the wastelands of Arizona.

If Arizona's land blossoms, much credit will go to stocky, bronzed, white-thatched Dr. Lytle S. Adams. It will not be his first successful invention, for when "Doc" Adams mulls over a problem he is likely to come up with a solution so simple it has been overlooked by experts.

When the resourceful, retired dentist learned that approximately 130,000,000 acres of public land were in an appalling condition, he determined that something should be done. How would it be possible, Dr. Adams wondered, to replant this land, accurately and economically?

Nosing around into the problems of the farmer, the doctor learned something everyone knew but couldn't stop. Of the millions of tons of seeds planted in this country each year, only a small percentage mature and yield a crop. That, he felt, was a difficulty that should—and could—be solved.

Another problem was the lightness of seeds. To plant rapidly, they should be sowed from the air, but they were not heavy enough to insure their dropping in the right place.

A seed pellet was the obvious answer to both problems. A tiny earthen bomb which may revolutionize farming was Dr. Adams' solution.

He had noticed that the most reliable planting was that done by nature. An animal—a rabbit for example—would nibble at a cactus fruit. Later, new cacti popped up wherever there were rabbit droppings.

Obviously, Dr. Adams reasoned, this was because the seeds were stripped of their husks and then replanted, amply surrounded by a fertilizing agent. He could do the same thing artificially: husk the seeds and mix them with a fertilizer. But hundreds of seeds were carried off each year by ants or eaten by rodents. Unfettered by knowledge of what could not be done, Dr. Adams mixed insect-rodent repellent with the seeds.

The first step in making the pellets is performed by a hammer mill which pulverizes to a fine silt the earth for the pellet's coating.

Ingeniously the pellet machine blows the dirt from a hopper in a trough. There jet nozzles squirt enough moisture into the dirt to hold it together while another jet sprays in the insect-rodent repellent. The husked seed, dusted with fungicide drops through a small slot, allotting enough seed to provide each pellet with from three to seven seeds.

After powdered fertilizer is sifted in, the mixture is poured into a funnel, which feeds it slowly to revolving disks which pack the mixture into tiny, uniform balls, pellets, or pills.

Dr. Adams worked with the pellet machine, modifying, improving, changing until the present model turns out 6,000 pounds of pellets each 8 hours. The cost of manufacture of the pellets—exclusive, of course, of the cost of seeds—is less than $2 an acre.

(The seeds, incidentally, which are used in this experiment were imported from Africa by the Department of the Interior. They are Lehmanns lovegrass, which is drought-resistant and provides good forage for cattle. The pellet-process may be applied to other types of seeds to advantage since they space planting.)

The final job of inventing required of Dr. Adams was a seeder to be attached to the airplane which would feed the pellets to the ground. The centrifugal device now used whirls at a uniform speed, flinging the pellets out in a pattern, about one per square foot. Cutting a swath 1,000 feet wide, one acre per second is average for the plane-planting.

On the hard ground the pellets lie, self-contained, unappealing to gophers, birds, and insects. Then one day the Arizona sky will become cloudy and raindrops will fall. One will touch the tiny pellet, and within 2 days a sturdy stalk of Lehmanns lovegrass will sprout.

It will be a quiet process, miles from civilization, in the fastness of the Hopi Reservation. No trumpets will herald the sprouting of these blades of grass. Yet, as the clay splits open and the tender green leaves appear, it may well be a signal of revolution in farming.

The subdued snap may be the doom of eroded land.

Conservation Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay written by Julian Stoutamyer, of the elementary school of Front Royal, Va., on conservation farming. This essay won the award in the contest in the Lord Fairfax soil-conservation district.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION FARMING, 1947

(By Julian Stoutamyer, elementary school, Front Royal, Va.)

The late war has taught the American people the great need of the conservation of productive soil and natural resources. There seems to be no end to the great demands upon the soil. Our food, clothing, and shelter all come from the soil. People in most parts of the world are asking for food, clothing, and shelter.

There are less than 2 acres of arable land per person in the world. We are told that erosion should not be allowed to destroy any more land anywhere.

Many good farmers have known the value of using and conserving their productive soils. Other farmers did not seem to know about the value of soil conservation. Rains have carried their fields into streams and rivers, filling reservoirs with silt and increasing flood and property damages. Many fields are still losing good soil where conservation practices are not followed. Some still think that nothing can be done about soil erosion, but a good beginning has been made. Many good farmers know that conservation farming is the wise and correct use of the land; using the land for what it is best adapted, then treating the fields, pastures, woodlands, and wildlife areas according to their needs for good production and soil protection.

Growing the right crops, using lime, fertilizers and manure to suit the fields, the crops and pastures, protecting woodlands from fire and grazing, planting trees where needed, using grassed waterways, farm ponds, and a lot of other conservation practices that will give greener fields and woodlands, clearer streams, and lasting security. These practices should spread quickly to all lands.

It has been said that even "America is only 6 inches from becoming a desert—6 inches straight down. The topsoil on which all life depends is only about a half foot thick." Every day we lose enough of these precious soils to cover 200 40-acre farms. Wind steals it, water runs away with it. As we look around we can see where the topsoil, fences, woodlands, buildings, the people, and most of the wildlife have gone from fields that were at one time good. Their real value and beauty have gone too.

Almost 300,000,000 acres of land are already ruined along with the people that were trying to farm it. It has been said there is a lot of science—a knowledge of natural laws—in the correct handling of the land. A combination of the art and science of good farming is needed.

Many good farmers and neighborhoods show what good land will support when the land is farmed correctly—the conservation way. Beautiful homes and happy people, productive fields and woodlands and clearer streams, and an abundance of wildlife, fertile fields producing good crops annually, good schools and good business. This is better than eroded and gullied fields, burnt-over woodlands, muddy streams, poor schools, and poor business. All good things come from good soils. We should be thankful for every effort to protect the land. I am glad to be one of the many boys and girls trying to write an essay on conservation farming in the Lord Fairfax soil conservation district. I believe every farmer must be better satisfied with conservation farming where the rains do not steal his farm away along with the seed, lime, and fertilizer he buys.

Recently over 10,000 farmers reported to the United States Department of Agriculture. They said farming the conservation way had given 35 percent bigger yields of better crops—crops made better food and better feed. They had more money for more needed improvements. They all found farming on the level easier and more profitable. It is mostly called contour farming. Not up-and-down-hill farming. They liked all the conservation practices for saving their good soils.

The correct use and conservation of all our natural resources will help to keep us an independent Nation—a happy people, enjoying so many of the good things of life, but soil erosion has changed all of this for many people.

Will we practice soil conservation now?

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD, two telegrams urging the sustaining of the President's veto of the labor bill; one from the Joint Council of Teamsters, No. 37, Phil Brady, president; the other from M. E. Steele.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 19, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This wire is to refute the statement made by Alvin Wilder over the air, Free American program, 7:45 p. m., June 17, ABC network, that teamster unions in Portland, Oreg., charge $500 initiation fees, that quotation or statement by Alvin Wilder is contrary to fact. In all Oregon, teamster locals range from $5 to $50 and not 1 cent more. Such statements as made by Wilder are ample proof of the propaganda of those who seek to destroy the American labor movement and shackle labor to misery and persecution. In the name of free American labor we plead with you to sustain the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley bill.

JOINT COUNCIL OF TEAMSTERS,
No. 37,
PHIL BRADY, *President.*

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 19, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In a broadcast over the ABC network at 7:45 p. m., June 17, Radio Commentator Alvin Wilder made the statement that teamsters union in Portland charged new members a $500 initiation fee, when the facts are that these initiation fees range from $5 to not more than $50. This is another example of how certain interests are propagandizing the public in favor of the Taft-Hartley bill. Urgently request you sustain veto of this bill if the President so acts.

M. E. STEELE.

The Palestine Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to the President of the United States by Billy Rose, dealing with the statement of Bartley Crum regarding the Palestine situation, which seems to me to merit attention. The letter was published in the Washington Times-Herald of June 25, 1947.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I think you ought to send out for a copy of Bartley Crum's new book, Behind the Silken Curtain. And when you read it, sir, have a cold towel handy. It's going to make your face awfully red. Especially chapter 2—The Secret File in the State Department.

This San Francisco lawyer reports that, shortly after you appointed him in 1945 to the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine, he was handed a document containing confidential communications between our State Department and the Arabian potentates of the Near East. Crum writes: "It was a sorry and bitter record for an American to read. According to this file, since September 15, 1938, each time a promise was made to American Jewry regarding Palestine, the State Department promptly sent messages to the Arab rulers reassuring them, in effect, that regardless of what was promised publicly, nothing would be done to change the situation in Palestine."

Now let me say right here, Mr. President, that I'm not writing this piece to add my 2 cents' worth to the Palestine question. What I want to talk about is secret diplomacy—Honest John talk in high places and skullduggery in the lower echelon.

Crum goes on: "It was clear that the State Department continued playing both ends against the middle under President Truman's administration. On August 16, 1945, President Truman revealed he had discussed Palestine with Mr. Churchill and Mr. Attlee at Potsdam and that they wanted to let as many Jews into Palestine as possible. But on October 23, in a confidential cable to Baghdad, Cairo, Damascus, Beirut and Jidda, the State Department explained that President Truman and the prime ministers 'engaged in exploratory correspondence on this subject * * * but there has been no change in this Government's previously announced attitude on Palestine'."

Not very fragrant, is it, Mr. President? Either you have been guilty of some pretty fancy double talk, or your State Department has been sending these cables without your knowledge—in which event you ought to blush every time you endorse your salary check.

I often wonder what makes you politicos think you have the right to gamble with Joe Citizen's life and fortune without letting him peek over your shoulder at the cards? Is it because you think you're so talented, so smart, so wise? And that 145,000,000 of us are so dumb?

How did you get up there anyway? At some liquored-up convention hall, the boys with the expensive cigars made a guess as to who would bring in the vote. After the nomination came the banners, billposters, beer parties, and buttons. A fellow read some numbers over the radio on a Tuesday night in November and a bit later, a few ordinary human beings found themselves running the country.

O. K., what does that make you? Jefferson, Lincoln, Einstein, Thomas Edison? Not in my book. You've got to prove it first.

Well, what have you done? So far, what single piece of management or administration has come out of the whole kit and kaboodle that any industry boss would pay a decent salary for?

If the State Department has a secret file on Palestine, how are we to know it hasn't similar folders on Greece, Spain, Turkey, and Argentina? And if it has, where do you gents get the gumption to make life and death decisions without first telling us the why's and wherefore's?

When the boys in the silk toppers decide to make up my mind for me, I at least want to know what they know. I'm not much impressed with this business of pointing to a brief case and saying, "Sssh." There are too many little white crosses around the world for me to buy that mumbo jumbo.

Instead of worrying about whether we should recognize the new government of Hungary, isn't it about time you insisted on the State Department's recognizing the old Government of the United States? Isn't it about time you and General Marshall got a couple of fly swatters and went in and cleaned out some of the well-barbered pests who operate the State Department as if it were a private country club?

It sounds like insanity when you put it on paper, but it looks as if there might be another war. I think the kids who will be asked to fight that war would like to know whether they're going to be fighting for their country or for some self-declared experts in the Department of State.

As you may have heard, there's a Presidential election coming up pretty soon. I think a lot of fellows like me are going to sign their campaign checks and mark their ballots according to results, not rhetoric.

From Bartley Crum's books, I gather that you and some of the boys in the inner circles haven't faith in the judgment of the people.

Don't be too surprised in '48 if it works both ways.

Sincerely,

BILLY ROSE.

Labor-Management Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Labor Reform Bill Becomes Law," published in the Arkansas Democrat of June 24, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR REFORM BILL BECOMES LAW

Your democratic government in Washington lives and functions. In proof of this Congress, which represents the will and majesty of the people, has overridden the President's veto of the labor reform bill.

The Senate, by a vote of 68 to 25, followed the lead of the House in annulling the veto by a vote of 331 to 83. Both of our Arkansas Senators joined the prevailing majority, as all seven of our Representatives did in the House.

Congress thus showed that it has not forgotten, if the President has, events of great seriousness and meaning in our recent experience.

It has not forgotten the railroad strike of May 1946 or that the President, faced with a threat of national paralysis, then asked Congress for a law far more drastic than anything in the bill just passed over his veto—the right to draft workers, which Congress refused to give him.

Congress has not forgotten the coal strike of last fall, when the President was forced into injunction proceedings against John L. Lewis and his miners, to start up the mines, so that homes could be warm, streets lighted, and the necessities of life produced and transported.

Congress has not forgotten that, largely because of those strikes and others which imperiled the Nation's welfare and security, the people voted for an overturn in Congress—sick and disgusted with its previous refusals to check the high-handed course of many unions.

Nor has Congress forgotten the strikes of this year, or the refusal of the unions to cooperate in writing any measure to curb their power.

Now Congress has acted. The new law sets up safeguards for the public. It is impressively fair, in view of the record of so many

unions. It will not prevent all strikes, will not destroy the unions, or "enslave labor."

It is, above all, a reassurance that our democracy is a living force.

The President's Veto of the Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, when action is taken by any man in public office on issues about which strong and determined views exist, there is always much speculation and comment concerning incidents, and even motives, which inspired the official. Sometimes such comments are mere guesses, dressed up and proclaimed with an air of authority. Less frequently, but entirely too often, irresponsible misrepresentations are deliberately indulged in by those who have some kind of an ax to grind. Seldom is the truth told; seldom are the actual facts and circumstances revealed.

Many have been the statements and reports about the President's veto of the labor bill and the events leading up to it. Not from any direct contact or information, but from years of service with the President when he was a Member of this body, and especially from association with him on the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, I believe I am in a somewhat better position to understand and appreciate his actions and motives than are those who have not been so privileged. Therefore, I think I can say that when a statement or news account about the President, the way he has acted, or what has moved him, is published, I believe I can with some accuracy evaluate and judge the correctness of such an article.

In the Sunday issue of the New York Times there appears a news story written by Mr. Cabell Phillips. It sets forth what seems to me to be a fair estimate and truthful report of many of the circumstances surrounding and leading up to the President's veto of the labor bill. Judging it, as I have said, from my own knowledge of the careful, thorough, and painstaking approach the President makes to all problems, I am convinced that the article is remarkably accurate, and comes as near to stating the truth about the situation as any which has been written.

The details given show, at least in part, some of the meticulous care with which the President approached the problem of whether he should sign or veto the so-called Taft-Hartley bill. It should completely refute the unfortunate and entirely unwarranted charge made by Mr. HARTLEY that President Truman had not read the bill when he vetoed it. That accusation had better been left unmade and unsaid.

The truth, Mr. President, as I happen to know, is that President Truman had read the bill, not once but as many as four times. He carefully read and studied the conference report at least twice. No man ever gave more thought and care to a problem than President Truman gave this bill and his subsequent veto message. That is the manner in which the President does things.

No man in public office has entertained or can entertain any more earnest desire to perform his full duty with complete fidelity and integrity than does President Truman. Sometimes I think the President actually goes to an extreme in his conscientious effort to understand the more intricate details of all problems.

It is well known that I disagreed with the President as to his ultimate conclusion on this matter, but I am glad to read an article which fairly recites the true circumstances and conditions. Because I think the article to which I have referred is such a good one, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of what the able Senator has said with respect to Mr. HARTLEY's suggestion that the President of the United States never read the bill, it seems to me, from some of the statements made by Mr. HARTLEY since the bill became law, that perhaps Mr. HARTLEY himself has not read the bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN AND HIS TEAM STAND UP TO CONGRESS—PRESIDENT, HAVING TAKEN COUNSEL WITH ADVISERS, DECIDES TO FIGHT

(By Cabell Phillips)

WASHINGTON, June 21.—The President likes, in his crisp, chipper way, to tell visitors who inquire about his health that he is feeling fine. "I haven't had a crisis in 24 hours," he is likely to remark.

But it is doubtful if he passed this pleasantry with any of his callers this week, for it has been one of the most momentous weeks of his entire term in the White House. He has been faced with two decisions of unparalleled political and economic significance—the tax and labor bills—and the making of those decisions must have taxed his judgment and analytical powers to the limit.

Mr. Truman has developed a defensive mechanism for avoiding discussions in which he does not wish to engage, a somewhat brittle unconcern for the problems with which he is wrestling. Today, for example, as the Senate went into the twenty-sixth hour of continuous wrangling created by his veto of the labor bill, he left the White House with a party of friends to attend a ball game—to see the Senators defeat the St. Louis Browns, 5 to 4. He was apparently in a much calmer frame of mind than the Senators at Capitol Hill, who finally adjourned at 4:30 p. m. after agreeing to vote on the Presidential veto at 3 o'clock Monday afternoon.

But this carefree facade was broken earlier in the week when he snappishly reminded a visiting Democratic politico from Alabama that the latter's gratuitous advice that the Taft-Hartley bill should be signed was unwelcome. To observers this was a clear indication of the stress under which the President was laboring.

LABOR BILL THE HARDER

It is reasonable to assume that the veto of the tax bill earlier in the week took less soul searching on the President's part than did the later rejection of the labor bill. His record on the question of tax reductions is clear and unequivocal and has been reiterated many times both by himself and his appointed spokesmen.

It is interesting to examine the background against which Mr. Truman had to make his decision to veto the omnibus labor bill; the favorable and unfavorable alternatives through which he had cautiously to pick his way. Among the factors influencing him favorably toward the measure were these:

(1) There is indisputable evidenece that the country as a whole wants some remedial labor legislation. If any one fact was proved conclusively by last November's elections, it was this. Abuses of power by organized labor have offended large segments of the population, including many liberal and normally prolabor groups. The President is acutely aware, moreover, that a continued high level of prosperity is dependent upon labor-management peace, and that this peace is not likely of achievement unless some reforms are brought about—and soon—by legislative means.

PRESSURE APPLIED

(2) The pressure for the Taft-Hartley bill was just as insistent, if not as voluminous, from the middle and right-wing segments of his own party as it was from the Republicans and from industry generally. One of his most trusted Texas lieutenants warned him that a veto would stir up the same sort of revolt in Texas, and possibly other Southern States, as split the Democratic Party at the time of the last Chicago convention.

(3) Mr. Truman has demonstrated his own inclination to place some new restraints on labor. At the time that a railroad strike threatened the Nation a little over a year ago, he hastily urged upon Congress one of the most drastic and punitive labor bills of recent history. More recently, he has enunciated his extreme distaste for the dictatorial power of such labor leaders as John L. Lewis, and he has condemned such wasteful labor practices as the jurisdictional strike. Close observers agree that the President is imbued with an innate conservatism in such matters which makes him more akin spiritually to the GEORGES and CONNALLYS of his party than to the PEPPERS and KILGORES.

ON THE OTHER SIDE

These were the major factors influencing the President to accept the bill. Working in the other direction, and, as it develops, with greater weight, were these:

(1) His honest and reasoned conviction that the bill as passed threatened more labor disunity than labor harmony. Aides state that no measure yet presented to the President has received the elaborate and minute analysis that this bill has. On the basis of the views of nearly a dozen of his closest advisers and upon his own conclusion, he believes it to be harmful and administratively unworkable; that it is worse than no bill at all.

(2) To have accepted the bill would have completed the incipient revolt of labor against the Democratic Party. The thread now holding the two groups together is already frayed and is incapable of withstanding any such strain as the passage of this bill would have placed on it. And the labor vote is as essential to Democratic success at the polls in 1948 as is the solid South.

(3) To have signed the bill would have given approximately the same impetus to the third party movement around the country as the recent speaking tour of Henry Wallace. It would have given these dissidents a clear-cut domestic issue as challenging as the foreign policy issue which is now their major support. Aid and comfort to the third party advocates is one boon the Democrats wish most to avoid.

SNAP JUDGMENTS

Early in his career as President Mr. Truman evidenced an unhappy weakness for rendering snap judgments. Spot decisions and hasty remarks led him into some embarrassing difficulties. As he fought to get his eyes above the morass of confusion that encompassed him when he was catapulted into the White House he became more temperate and cautious. He also began to exercise his considerable administrative talents to get an organization together that would prepare the ground work for future judgments he would have to make. The performance of this White House team is well demonstrated by the evolution of the veto message.

When the completed bill was placed on his desk on June 6, President Truman turned it over to his ebullient, ruddy-cheeked principal aide, John Steelman, who bears the unique title the Assistant to the President. Steelman was asked to get not only the routine commentary on the measure from the Bureau of the Budget and the various interested departments, but to comb every phrase and sentence with the finest analytical comb he could devise. The President then set off for a round of visits that took him to the sickbed of his mother in Grandview, Mo., the reunion of his World War I buddies in Kansas City, a state visit to Ottawa, and to the commencement exercises at Princeton.

ADVISERS CALLED IN

Mr. Steelman called in for a series of conferences the principal Cabinet officers concerned with the bill, along with their lawyers and technical advisers. Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach received a major job of over-all analysis to do. The Attorney General was asked to examine all the legal aspects and to assess the possibilities for litigation. The Secretary of Commerce was asked for his views on the industrial implications. Secretary Krug, whose Interior Department is the unhappy custodian at the moment of most of the Nation's coal mines, was asked what effect the bill would have in thwarting another coal strike. (The answer, it is reported, was an emphatic "None.")

Chairman Herzog of the National Labor Relations Board was asked to study the administrative problems. Presidential Counsel Clark Clifford helped guide these conferences and devoted himself particularly to a study of the bill's legislative history and the voluminous committee reports.

Days and nights of conferences ensued, most of them in the Cabinet room adjacent to the President's oval office. Reams of comment and memoranda were gradually reduced to a series of relatively concise reports on each separate provision of the bill, the good and bad points of each being cited and weighed.

When the President returned from Princeton on Tuesday evening the end product of this elaborate spadework was placed on his desk—a tan leather briefcase bulging with these boiled-down reports. They were so organized and segregated, it is understood, that had the President decided to approve the bill instead of vetoing it, he would have had at his fingertips the documentation to explain his stand.

DECISION IS MADE

But with all the evidence in, and with the unanimous agreement of his Cabinet, he elected to veto. Wednesday and Thursday were devoted to the writing of this message, with Mr. Clifford and Press Secretary Charles Ross applying the last finishing touches shortly before 10 o'clock Thursday night.

While Mr. Truman already has explained his action in considerable detail, it is understood that one of the most compelling arguments affecting his decision was that presented by Mr. Herzog and Mr. Clifford on the difficulties of administering the new Labor Board which the bill provided. The responsibilities assigned to this Board would, the argument ran, necessitate a personnel of such gigantic proportions that the economy-minded Republican Congress would refuse to appropriate adequately for it.

The Board would thus have not only an "impossible" task to perform but would be constantly "over the barrel" for failing to perform it.

None but the most intemperate prophets are attempting at this early stage to tell how the President's political balance sheet has been affected by the week's events. All that is certain is that a number of brittle arteries have come perilously close to bursting and that the city has been treated to one of those dizzy, dramatic week-ends reminiscent of the more tumultuous days of the New Deal.

Communist Infiltration in Countries South of the Rio Grande

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I received from a Mr. Samuel E. Giudici, of Lima, Peru, regarding plans for preventive measures taken by the American Legion against Communist infiltration in the countries south of the Rio Grande. Included with the letter are resolutions adopted by Peru Post No. 1, American Legion, of Lima, Peru.

I wish to commend the American Legion for its constructive work in establishing American Legion Posts in Latin America and the Caribbean area, and circulating the true gospel of American democracy.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: You may remember that I spoke to you relative to a plan I had developed to hold a conference of the posts of the American Legion located in Latin America and the Caribbean, in order to implement in that part of the world our fight against communism. That conference took place under the personal guidance of Mr. Paul H. Griffiths, the national commander. The date was June 1 and 2, at Ancon, Canal Zone. You will be interested to know that after prolonged discussions it was unanimously decided that a committee be appointed by the chairman to prepare a plan of action for posts of the Legion located in our territory to combat communism and a method of liaison and cooperation with the interested agencies of the Government of the United States. Each of the members of this committee has had a great deal of experience in matters of this kind. Their services were used in similar capacities during the recent war.

An important resolution was passed by the conference of Latin-American posts of the American Legion, dealing with the danger from Communist infiltration into this hemisphere generally and into the United States specifically.

Whereas the membership of the American Legion is made up of over 3,300,000 veterans of World War I and World War II, who have pledged themselves to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America, to maintain law and order, to foster and perpetuate a one hundred percent Americanism; and

Whereas the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy are in jeopardy due to the infiltration of communism in our country and elsewhere, and, as these Communists are undermining the prestige of the United States of America by a constant attack in the press and other public means of propaganda: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the here assembled posts of the American Legion, situated in Latin America and the Caribbean area do hereby: 1. Constitute themselves into a conference, in order to more efficiently combat communistic ideologies and propaganda, and, 2. that these posts of the American Legion prepare a program looking toward closer cooperation with the duly constituted agencies of the Government of the United States of America and the governments of the various countries in which they are located, subject to the laws of those countries, and to offer all cooperation possible to the above-mentioned entities to combat communism; and be it further

Resolved; That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the 1947 Annual Convention of the American Legion for action, and to the Department of State, and that copies be distributed to the press.

Whereas the House of Representatives has refused to renew the appropriation to continue the informational and cultural program of the State Department; and

Whereas we believe that this program is essential and important in the political and commercial interests of the United States; and

Whereas the dissemination of information on various phases of American life, the maintenance of libraries, the exchange of students, and other features all materially help to promote better understanding of democratic ideals and attainment; and

Whereas this recommendation represents an extensian of our Legion Americanism program to an international level; Therefore be it

Resolved, That our position be referred to the national headquarters, the American Legion, for appropriate action; be it further

Resolved, That American tourists visiting foreign countries be provided with instructions in methods of how to conduct themselves so they will make friends for the United States of America in the foreign countries visited: and be it further

Resolved, That this be handled through the national headquarters, the American Legion.

No Loafers, They

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief editorial appearing in the Journal-Every Evening of Wilmington, Del., on Friday,

June 20, 1947, relative to membership in the "52–20 Club."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO LOAFERS, THEY

Ever since this State was founded, Delawareans have been an independent lot, proud to stand on their own two feet. We are glad to see the same spirit coming out in the latest generation like an outcropping of granite in the Brandywine hills.

For the past year or so there has been a lot of talk about the "52–20 Club"—the veterans who decided to take it easy for a year on the $20 a week furnished by the Government instead of looking for a job. In the country as a whole, 3 out of every 100 veterans who filed claims were full-fledged members of the club; that is to say, they drew compensation for the full 52 weeks.

As can be seen from this, the percentage of veterans who preferred loafing on Government pay to working was not actually very high anywhere. But Delaware's record puts the national average to shame. In this State, according to Albert Stetser, chairman-executive director of the Unemployment Compensation Commission, only 287 out of the 14,978 veterans who have filed claims under the GI bill of rights since September 1944, or about 1.9 percent, qualify as full-fledged members of the 52–20 Club. The great majority of this State's 30,000 veterans lost no time getting back to their old jobs or finding new ones.

In peace, as in war, these young men of Delaware have proved themselves a good, sound lot.

To the Boards of Directors of American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the June issue of Fortune magazine appears an unusual and challenging editorial. it is addressed to the boards of directors of American business. The suggestions made in this editorial invite the thoughtful consideration of all American citizens, as well as the American businessmen to whom it is addressed.

Every American who comprehends anything of today's tremendous issues and the evils which they may portend, should be spurred to clearer and broader thinking by the daring and venturesome thoughts expressed by the editors of Fortune magazine.

The first paragraph of the editorial is:

If peace could be purchased, what would you give for it? Suppose peace, like a great mill that had fallen on evil days, was actually for sale by the tired and inadequate men who had inherited it and could not make it go. How many hours would it take you on the long-distance telephone to organize a syndicate to buy t in? Again: What would you give for it?

What would we pay for peace? Any price, Mr. President, is my answer. No sum could be too great for us or other nations to pay to avoid the catastrophic horror of another war. No sum paid for peace could compare with the total destruction of life and property which another war would cost all of us.

An unemotional, straightforward, businesslike approach to peace is the subject with which the editorial in Fortune magazine deals so vigorously and with such courage and vision. In the hope that it may have wider distribution, and that intelligent thought may be provoked, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I have had an estimate made of the cost of printing the manuscript in the RECORD. It will be $159.75.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Boards of Directors of American Business:

Greeting: If peace could be purchased, what would you give for it? Suppose peace, like a great mill that had fallen on evil days, was actually for sale by the tired and inadequate men who had inherited it and could not make it go. How many hours would it take you on the long distance telephone to organize a syndicate to buy it in? Again: what would you give for it?

Let us start the bidding ourselves. We will offer $100,000,000,000 for peace. This is not for outright purchase, you understand; we have no illusion that anyone can take perpetual title to peace for that or any other sum. Instead, we will put up our $100,000,000,000 for a 50-year lease on peace, and an option to renew at a negotiated figure for a further half century.

You have just finished buying a war. The Federal Treasury estimates that you paid $341,000,000,000 for 3½ years of it, or about $100,000,000,000 a year, against the minuscule $2,000,000,000 a year that is our present proposal for peace. There is no need to discuss the return on your war investment. But even as you shudder at the desolation and chaos of that terrible forced loan to Moloch, there is talk of a preferred issue in something with hideous glibness called "World War III." That indeed will be the end of you, and of everything else associated with you, including this small group of editors who have been trying for the last 17½ years, through a tragic depression and an infinitely more tragic war, to act as your historians.

That is why we are writing you this open letter. We think you still have a chance to retrieve, for the future, the fragmented assets of the world and set it on its course again. There never was a larger job attempted in all history, or one calling for greater courage and imagination. It can fail. But we have reached this point, hopeful and terrifying: if the United States businessman does not thrust the weight of his thoughts, his policies, and his dollars, in short, the whole business process as he has developed it over the years, into helping save the world, the world will not be saved. It is as flat as that. Will you accept this challenge?

I

Lawrence Henderson, late professor of chemistry at Harvard, used to speak of the Hippocratic method as the only one so far proved successful in the business of living. Roughly paraphrasing Henderson, let us set down its three elements:

"Hard, persistent, intelligent, responsible, unremitting labor" at the locus of the problem—e. g., for the physician, at the sickbed, not in the library.

"Accurate observation of things and events going on there.

"The judicious construction of a theory concerning them.

"On his point of theory, Professor Henderson was quietly and sweetly eloquent: 'Not a philosophical theory,' he said, 'nor a grand effort of the imagination, nor a quasi-religious dogma, but a modest pedestrian affair—a useful walking stick to help on the way.' "

Thus invited not to vie with the higher Utopians, can the American businessman and his understanding friends feel their judicious way toward a theory about peace: a "modest pedestrian affair," a "walking stick to help on the way?" It would seem that they must have the courage to try.

Such a modest businessman theory of peace might be that if peace were ever to arrive on earth, it might at last make its way riding on the shoulders of plenty. However politically complex the causes of modern wars may be, they are, in part at least, reducible to the proposition that there is not yet enough of anything to go round—not enough food, or shelter, or goods, or energy—and that aggression springs from the fierce, barbaric lust of one nation to wrest from another the plenty it can imagine achieving only at the other's expense. Our theory takes no account of religious wars, or of the elements of psychosis that cause mass murder. It is thus some good to us, but not much, in considering the hundreds in India or the Near East. But it can serve as a starter.

Now, although our theory of the equivalence of peace and plenty is at best partial, it has one good thing in its favor: it has never been given a fair chance and proved wrong. Throughout that part of the nineteenth century that we now understandably call the halcyon days, there was a go at it in terms of British free trade—subject to the heavy limitations of nineteenth-century capacities to produce and transport. The United States in those days was too young and weak to take much part in it. The extremely promising effects of the theory—but not the theory itself—were destroyed by Prussian militarism in 1914. But this tragic end to a promising experiment is not by itself any reason for not trying again with larger scope and greater understanding. If the British, who were the commercial and banking masters of the nineteenth century, had chosen not to invest in the United States, it is hard to imagine what would be the shape of the United States A. D. 1947.

What makes the world situation look so depressing today is that there seems so little achievement of plenty left possible. It is less the destruction of wealth than the blind chaos where once there was economic order. If this remains so, waning Britain and waxing Russia, at their present rates of opposite progress, may meet and pass on some sordid subsistence level in another decade. There remains, the globe over, only the United States of America with a continuing organized capacity to produce and reproduce. The idea of putting that at the service of the world, not for purposes of altruism, but of world policy and for profit—that is what we are talking about in this business magazine. It is not a very radical idea; it is unfamiliar only to people whose sense of dimension has not caught up with modern times and a diminished global diameter.

II

So what do we really mean by this idea of spending money and effort to gain peace? Where does the $100,000,000,000 come in? We have some rough ideas to outline just below. We would confidently predict, however, that if enough United States businessmen were to orient themselves to the outer, unfamiliar world, as all these ideas presuppose they must, they would find it impossible to spend a net $100,000,000,000 because so much of it would insist on coming back to them so quickly. Instead, we believe that $100,000,000,000, invested in peace now, would amortize itself and begin returning net profits long before the first 50 years of our leasehold had run its course.

The first way in which the businessman, in our opinion, should begin his $100,000,000,000 investment in peace is through a 15- to 20-percent reduction in the United States internal price level—a reduction that would admittedly be made, in the beginning, at the expense of profits. It would cost some three-quarters of a billion dollars a month, if it began tomorrow, and that works out to about 5 percent of the national income at present levels. But does anyone think of this as a static 5-percent impost on the businessman's margin? Then let him go back to his primer and remember that as prices decline, purchasing power rises, and, credit conditions being stable at present as they are, the volume of business rises with it—the balance is struck, not at a 5-percent levy on profits, but in an area of actual profit increase—if the businessman's resourcefulness is equal to its task (something he himself seldom denies). Henry Ford proved that equation once and for all, more than 25 years ago.

Are there enough enlightened businessmen to dock their prices tomorrow, and have they the economic power to force reductions beyond their own fields of direct action? Recent weeks have seen a growing concern over the level of prices today, particularly in the light of the size of some corporate profits. There have been some enlightened statements from business leaders that these prices must come down. There have even been some actual reductions, and to the men who have initiated them the American public should offer thanks and congratulations. But none of this is yet enough. A principle is involved here that goes beyond price slashes or bargain offerings.

III

More than 10 years ago, this magazine published an article, The Trouble With Capitalism Is the Capitalists. It was written by Dr. Harold G. Moulton, head of the Brookings Institution, and it stated the basic argument that was later elaborated in such convincing detail in the famous series of Brookings studies that appeared in substantial book form. And what was Dr. Moulton's and Brookings' complaint about what the capitalists had done to capitalism? That they had failed to obey the primary commandment of capitalistic dynamics, which is: constantly expand markets by an orderly, systematic, and slowly continuous passing on of technological improvements to the consumer in the form of lower prices.

How many businessmen are familiar with these monumental Brookings works, whose logic is so clear and presentation so compelling? How many businessmen are aware that in failing to exert a constant downward pressure on prices they are betraying the American way to which they profess such constant devotion? The question has never before arisen in such monumental terms.

We are not talking about Newburyport plans. We are not talking about opportunistic wriggles in the spot price markets. We are not talking about apostrophes to prosperity; we are talking about a long-range price policy that would engender a plenty which has never before been achieved even in the United States; a plenty to be derived by constant money encouragement of research, coupled with a policy of business statesmanship whereby consumers' prices would be set on a slow downward gradient to last for a period of years. Consider the coal industry, about which this magazine has been writing for some months past. Much of the coal industry is full of righteous pride because its productivity is roughly five tons per man-day against the miserable one ton per man-day that the British can produce. This is fine, except that it is the ambition of a few United States engineers of the soundest reputations to devise ways to produce 100 tons per man-day, and not stop there. They are close to success. The resulting reductions in price can be conjured within every home in the land—in terms of extra purchases of other goods.

So long as business, along with Government, permits itself to be chased in a circle of raise-wages-raise-prices we are not on any true course; we are in a hard, dangerous spin. But a reduction of prices, with its corresponding increase in real wages, is another thing altogether; it benefits no one class but diffuses a net gain through all society. And that is why this is our first proposal for the businessman's peace. Domestically, it proposes a conception of plenty to eclipse our best efforts so far. So far as other nations are concerned, it leads us straight to our second point, which is that concurrently with increasing plenty at home we must begin to export it as fast as we can.

In return for what, does someone ask? In return for a franchise to live and do business in peace at a profit is our answer. It is an investment, gentlemen, full of all the risk and venture you used to demand as a right whenever a wartime Government passed an order of restriction. Here is your right, handed to you on a glittering platter. Take your risk and make a trillion.

IV

It was in 1937, year of pretragedy, that Winston Churchill observed that the greatest contribution the United States could make toward world peace was the maintenance and growth of its own prosperity. History must record that the contribution could not have been sufficiently great. We were, after all, in full flower with the WPA that year, in default of more spontaneous economic activity. And we could scarcely export what we did not have.

Although everything we have said above must indicate our belief that Mr. Churchill's conservative judgment still holds good, we no longer believe that it is enough by itself. A 15- to 20-percent reduction in prices will make the purchase of United States goods by foreign markets a shade more possible in the tragic, suffering world outside United States shores, but these goods certainly cannot be bought without aid. And so the next step in our $100,000,000,000 program is a series of massive United States loans or grants abroad. As to which of these alternatives to use, obviously the conditions must fit the circumstances. It might be better to grant money to England than to loan it; the reverse would probably be true in more frontier economic areas like Latin America. Then, too, the amount of governmental money used would depend on the willingness of private capital in the United States to seize boldly on the greatest chance, the greatest venture it has ever faced. We think the sums involved could pile up to $20,000,000,000 without occasioning a flicker of alarm among those who truly believe in the United States and the United States system. Some of this money would come out of the hides of American wage earners, businessmen, and entrepreneurs at first—i. e., the governmental portion would show up, in taxes, on the cost side of everybody's ledgers. But what might show up on the income side as a result? Again, that is as you make it—as in all returns on risk. Here we are quite content to rest our case on one sentence from that brilliant fiscal intelligence, Beardsley Ruml. In discussing the desirability of a generous United States loan policy, Mr. Ruml asserted that nine-tenths of the money loaned would be spent in the United States for United States goods. His simple statement: "It has no place else to go." So we hope we are making it clear that in proposing a generous loan policy, to be underwritten with your resources, we are not indulging in altruism.

V

Instead, we are urging something so simple that the temptation is always to dress it up in more complex terms than it warrants. We are asking the United States businessman to think of Wendell Willkie's "one world" not in fancy geopolitical terms, but merely in market terms. Is there any stovepipe manufacturer in Kokomo who does not really see the point? No; we think we have something on our side here that he knows to be true out of his own experience. His father sold stovepipe to the limits of the horse-and-buggy roads that radiated from his little nineteenth-century establishment; today the son has 10 district sales offices and as many regional sales managers, and he sells stovepipe in strange places indeed. But was this expansion from local ironmonger to national distribution ordained to stop there? The task of extending trade in stovepipe from national to international is a tricky and often exasperating business, but there is money in it. Suppose the globe were as well off as Kokomo. Might it not be a profitable world for a man whose life was in stovepipe?

Manifestly, in thinking of the world as one market, the United States businessman will have to do something else. It will not cost him a penny of the $100,000,000,000 either, although it may cost him a final sentimental wrench. He will have to reject utterly the philosophy of that wing of the Republican Party that would return to the days of high protective tariff philosophy, and instead do everything he can to foster United States imports. Here he will encounter tough, ignorant opposition from the farmers of his own Nation. In his battle to make the farmers' legislative mouthpieces see, he is well buttressed by that spectacularly successful businessman turned statesman, Will Clayton, who recently expressed his documented belief that the United States could bring its import level up to fifteen to twenty billion dollars with nothing but good effect.

But there is a concomitant to these policies that calls for further drafts of venture from United States business. Several weeks ago Dr. Robert P. Russell, president of Standard Oil Development Co., made a stimulating speech in New York on what Jersey Standard was doing, with the plant hormones and selective weed killers that it and fellow industrial concerns have developed, to raise the level of Latin-American agriculture. His topic was, Technology: An American Export, and his over-all theme was that since this country has now a near monopoly on mass industrial and agricultural skills it must, in its own self-interest, share them widely, and still more widely, since it cannot live in a decaying world. As a commentary on Dr. Russell's theme, this magazine expresses the belief that where United States money goes there should go United States engineering and technical missions, to help in the most efficient spending of the sums loaned. Certainly the British, in helping the expansion of American industry in the nineteenth century, acted not merely as bankers collecting a percentage from a remote outpost. Now that the situation is precisely reversed and England needs American money, she should have it, with the friendly collaboration of technical staffs. It is a little too much to hope that she can reconstitute her deplorable coal industry without our help, for example. She may not like this, but those must be the terms. They must be the terms wherever United States money goes. We do not want control of foreign industry; we simply want it productive.

All over the world American dollars, American tools and machines, and American engineers and supervisors have a colossal task to perform in unison—not to exploit but to build up and nurture, and not out of altruism but with an eye to the profits that come from markets made healthy. To perform this task is something much nobler than sitting back and yammering at the State Department about policy, as if we of the business community were not part of that policy and could not develop a policy in our own terms. If the idea of world reconstruction through a

businessman's concept of peace is not sound, then Texans should have left untouched the shattered remains of Texas City.

To cut prices; to encourage loans; to foster imports; to send engineering missions into the far places, that is our specific four-point proposal for applying a businessman's theory of Peace with profit, via Plenty. Might it be tried? It is too much to hope that it would happen spontaneously. It is not too much to hope that it might be organized, conjunctively between business and Government. What is the Department of Commerce for? Is it only to organize statistics, or standardize pipe sizes? Was not the idea behind its belated establishment in 1903 precisely the idea of a concert of policy between business and Government, even in the days before such momentous problems of economic, political, and human survival had arisen in the world? Is the National Association of Manufacturers only a lobby for organized selfishness? Is the International Chamber of Commerce merely a sounding board for stuffed shirts—or could these all together organize this businessman's theory of peace into his practice?

VII

What are the alternatives to the $100,000,000,000 risk-and-venture proposal that we are setting forth? As we see it, there are only two, both final. One is the Last World War—the one that will never get into the history books. The other is that Russia wins the world by default. Neville Chamberlain believed in 1937 that the world could do business with Hitler. Henry Wallace in 1947 believes that we can do business with Stalin. We believe both proposals to be identical fallacies. We believe that a world contest is indeed in progress, but that it need not, and cannot, end in World War III. Yet, as we see it, we have no weapon against this outcome, except Plenty—manufactured and diffused from the United States on a scale never before known. For this, so far as we can see, we have everything except a requisite imagination and a firmly tested courage. These we could acquire from an emulation of the American past.

If we do not take the road to Plenty for ourselves, the best economic thought is that we will instead produce an economic crash. Gentlemen of American Business, ask yourselves: What would enchant Russia more than to see her only adversary suddenly prostrate before the world? An economic collapse in the United States would leave no room for classroom debate as to which system, which way of life was better. We would have met and failed our test so suddenly that Moscow could scarcely have time for glee, and the prewar American isolationist's dream would be fulfilled beyond his most passionate imaginings. But the alternative to this agony could be, and in our opinion would be, the greatest epoch in the world's history. It is the United States businessman who at present holds in his hands an almost everlasting power of choice, in what he does during the next 6 months.

Letter to Lord Inverchapel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I have sent to Lord Inverchapel, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Great Britain:

The Right Honorable the Lord INVERCHAPEL,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
Office of the Embassy of Great Britain,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I respectfully draw your attention to the need for you to intercede with your Government to prevent the execution of Meir Nakar, Abshalom Habib, Jacob Weiss.

The sentences of death are awaiting confirmation by the British High Commissioner. The pronouncement of these death sentences occurred the day the United Nations Committee on Palestine arrived in the Holy Land. Although it might be deemed a strange coincidence that such pronouncement took place when it did, it cannot be deemed fortuitous should confirmation of the death sentences ensue. That would impose too much of a burden upon our credulity.

Any interference cannot now be said to be sub judice.

The United Nations Palestine Committee has passed a resolution earnestly requesting the Palestine authorities and your Government not to execute these death sentences. The Palestine Committee has taken this action in the interest of peace, law, and order. Your Government cannot disregard or flout the admonition of the Palestine Committee. To do so would bring the United Nations itself into disrepute. Great Britain may soon find that it cannot with impunity ignore the recommendations or orders of any United Nations committee. Such negative conduct may boomerang. Soon another committee of the United Nations will consider the controversy between your country and Egypt concerning the Sudan. Soon also your country will be called before another United Nations committee concerning the Italian-North Africa colonies. Great Britain may then find herself in the uncomfortable position of having established a precedent in disregarding recommendations of the United Nations committee.

We recall that Sir Alexander Cadogan specifically went out of his way to congratulate the delegate from Norway who urged the resolution that peace and order be maintained in Palestine during the Committee's investigations. Your Government was very quick to interpret this statement by the Norway delegate in unilateral manner as only applying to Jewish activities in the Holy Land and to so-called illegal immigration (immigration which is legal, of course, in accordance with the Balfour Declaration and the mandate which is the only legal instrument that permits your Government's presence in Palestine).

The words, however, of the Norway delegate were meant to cover British activities in Palestine as well as Jewish and Arab activities. Execution of these three youths at this time would not only be a challenge of international authority, but it would clearly indicate that your Government does not want peace in Palestine. It would prevent a just settlement of the question which is wanted and needed by the people of Palestine. The execution of these three lads would be a most provocative act. It would make more difficult the task of the Jewish organizations which are trying with might and main to proscribe and, in their own way, stop the terrorists activities of the Irgun and Stern groups.

We deplore terrorism from any source, be it from the British or the Jews in Palestine. Execution of these boys would only encourage terrorism. Certainly the British should have learned from its experiences in Ireland and India that executions prove nothing and conclude nothing.

It must be noted, too, that these boys were tried by military courts which in their conduct are in effect political courts.

It is hoped you will convey this message to your Government.

I await your reply.

Respectfully yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

The People Versus the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a most penetrating analysis of the peculiar tendency of democratic peoples to evade or even rebel against the kind of government they themselves vote for at free elections. It throws light on the problem presented by those who, for example, demand economy but insist on appropriations for every good cause, thereby preventing economy.

The article was written by Bertrand de Jouvenel, a distinguished French journalist who has specialized in the field of political philosophy. It is reprinted from Human Events.

THE PEOPLE VERSUS THE PEOPLE

(By Bertrand de Jouvenel)

Significant events have taken place in France recently. Enraged chiefly by the dearth of bread, but also by the general inadequacy of supplies, the population has, in several towns, invaded the seat of authority, the prefecture or underprefecture, demanding bread, breaking furniture, making bonfires of files used for the control of distribution. Such was the temper of the crowd that the prefect of the Nievre was held by the Government to deserve the Legion of Honor for standing up to the rioters; while the prefect at Lyon let himself be marched off to the radio station where he had to announce on the air that he rescinded a former decision relating to bread.

Certainly one should not draw an overcolored picture of such incidents, unattended by any serious violence. But the historian cannot fail to liken them to similar events closely preceding the fall of the monarchy at the end of the eighteenth century. Let me remind American readers that the Government of France is strongly centralized, with local government mainly exercised by an administrator known as the prefect, to whom the underprefects in each department are responsible. The prefecture, or underprefecture, is thus the local seat of central authority, to an extent for which American Government has no parallel.

Just prior to the French Revolution, as now, "affameurs" (starvers) was the popular cry. Then, as now, the representative of the central government (the intendant, father to the prefect of today) was taken to task by the crowd. Then, as now, the "papers" were burnt, as a symbol of liberation from distant administrative rule.

If not the King, the King's government was held responsible. It was rumored that there was "a conspiracy to starve the people," a potent psychological factor in the ensuing revolution. Now practically the same mutterings can be heard: "They want to starve us."

II

While the psychologist recognizes the perennial nature of crowd reactions, the constitutional lawyer holds up his hands in horror and dismay. What has been happening is

to him the height of absurdity. How can the people suspect a government which is no longer the king's government, but actually that of the people. How can they treat the prefect, their servant, as they did the intendant, who was the king's servant. How can they revolt against rulings which are not imposed by arbitrary power but made by their own chosen representatives.

Not only is there no conspiracy against the people but the very measures the people revolt against were adopted for their benefit, at their request, with their approval: They are the embodiment of a conspiracy in favor of the people.

The dearth of bread cannot be denied. But it follows from measures which the people demand; they wanted bread to be cheap. It was kept cheap; the price of wheat was kept down. Incidentally the peasants thought it wise, under those conditions, to grow other crops.

Take the clogging regulation of distribution. It was adopted to ensure that, regardless of buying power, each family should get its equal share of foodstuffs and essential goods. Repeatedly the people have stated that they want this regulation preserved. They refused votes to those requesting a return to the free market. They insisted that controlled prices be kept low, even too low to reward the producer.

They saw goods vanishing from the controlled market; shifting to the black market. But the cure they demanded was repression, and they cheered when "free traders" were threatened with the death penalty.

Yet the papers they now burn are the very papers which this policy of planned economy requires. Let us then state it frankly: It is a revolt of the people against the people's decisions.

III

To those who like to deal in abstractions, nothing can be more unpalatable than this statement of the facts. That the people's decisions and the people's representatives should be resented by the people as a tyranny, that the sovereign should revolt against the sovereign, is an utterly unacceptable fact. With relief, one seizes upon a way out: the will of the sovereign has changed.

But there is no such escape. It is not true that the will of the electorate has changed. Very probably an immediate plebiscite would reaffirm the adherence of the electorate to the protected measures.

This situation should not be puzzling to the American student of government. Is it not a fact that the people in the States decided for prohibition, that individually they broke their own law, that this violation was so widespread that it may well be termed general; and that nevertheless, for a long term of years, the people did not go back on the decision they daily flouted?

The present attitude of the French people offers a close similarity with that experience. Two themes of conversation succeed each other in the average modest home. The wickedness of the black market is denounced; it is held responsible for the prevailing shortages; tales are told of scandalous fortunes, of scandalous complicities in governing circles. Then one passes on to exchange of black market addresses; occasionally one will deplore the closing of a source of illegal supply, possibly by the very police action one has strenuously demanded. But such interventions are rare; the black market gets protection.

Condemnation of the black market and resort to the black market are equally universal. The consumer who buys in the illegal free market refuses, as citizen, to legalize the free market. When he is thinking politically, he learns nothing from his own daily behavior.

Thus it is not strange that he should, as man in the street, revolt against the very powers which he votes for, as elector. It all goes back to the fundamental fact that the man who buys in the black market and the man who condemns the black market, the man who demands stringent measures of government and the man who revolts against administrative rule, while they are united in one body, are yet two men.

The member of the sovereign people who pronounces on what should be done learns nothing from his own day-to-day experience as subject of his own laws. When he acts as ruler, his whole disposition of mind is different from his humor as subject. The two qualities pertain to him but are not united and reconciled within him.

Surely there is nothing here to surprise the psychologist. It is a general trait of man to formulate, in the abstract, general laws to which his own conduct gives the lie. The best treatise on the duties to one's children was written by Rousseau, who abandoned his own offspring. Nor should this trait be noted in a spirit of irony and skepticism. When we state what should be done, we legislate for ideal men. When we act, we act as real men; as sinners. It does not disqualify our dreams, except as practical politics.

Much is being said about educating the people for democracy. What is actually done is the proliferation of primers simplifying the monetary problem, the problem of Europe, or something as complicated.

IV

I submit, with all due respect, that this is fallacious education, that sketchy and rash generalizations are substituted for facts. Not only is the knowledge provided inadequate, but it is misleading: the reader gets the impression that social problems are simple and susceptible of simple medication. Nobody believes anatomy can be taught from a doodle drawing of a man with four sticks representing limbs. Yet getting a political education from primers is substantially that.

Primers take as their theme the widest possible subjects. Because they are wide, they have to be treated in sweeping terms: All the details are disregarded; all the living truth is left out. Such so-called education leads the people to hold strong opinions on matters that they have not grasped. Ignorance becomes complacent.

The further away one gets from the individual, the more one deals in millions, the more free one is from the complexities of life and nature, the more contentedly and freely one can move in an unresisting world of pure inadequate notions.

Our great moralist Alain holds that the process of thought unchecked by continuous contact with reality and a daily effort to get positive results, creates a dream-world. Verbal mythology, he says, is the source of all madness; and labor against the concrete, the source of all true knowledge.

It follows that political education is not provided by the statement of wide issues in grossly oversimplified terms. Wisdom comes with the opportunity given to every member of the sovereign to put his opinions on how things should be done into practice, and by the ensuing adaption of his opinions to reality. The answer to the problem is old: it is local self-government. So much self-government and so local that no one is debarred from being a magistrate; on such a minute scale that everyone realizes his rulings are going to apply to himself.

If France is the home of abstract general ideas in politics, it is doubtless because there has been little self-government, and what there has been was lost long ago. If England on the other hand was long blessed with a remarkable sense of political reality, it was because there was much self-government. Germany has not always been politically mad: it went mad with the centralization of government

A world government would of course be the ideal agent for the most sweeping measures, and the least adapted to actual living men. This is not said in criticism of the idea of world government, but as an overdue warning that representative government cannot endure unless John Doe the ruler begins to learn from Joe Doe the ruled.

What Is Americanism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the average American citizen these simple questions:

What is Americanism?
Do you know?
Do you believe in it?
Do you practice it every day?
Do you live up to its principles?
Are you proud of it?

You have no greater heritage to be proud of than the fact that you are an American. You should know what Americanism is. You should believe and have faith in it. You should practice it every day. You should live up to its principles. You should be justly proud of it.

If you have any doubt of what Americanism is, or if you want to revive your faith in it, read carefully the following editorial from the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine, Foreign Service, giving the opinions of prominent citizens of what they think Americanism is. It is well worth your time to read and remember it.

WHAT IS AMERICANISM?

On July 4, 1947, the American people will celebrate the 171st anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. This is the date on which a radical new form of government was introduced to the world back in 1776 by a courageous group of people who believed that every human being has a God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is the birthday of a way of life we know as Americanism.

To give greater clarity and emphasis to those beliefs and ideals symbolized by Independence Day, Foreign Service asked some of the Nation's most prominent citizens for their own personal definitions of Americanism.

Their answers prove an important point. American leaders disagree on many things but in their concept of Americanism—the fundamental principles governing our way of life—they are in accord.

The group that was asked for definitions of Americanism presents a cross section of American life. It includes men and women prominent in many different fields and representing opposing schools of thought, in many instances, on various economic, political, and social issues. Included in the number are labor leaders, representatives of big business, Government officials, military men, an educator, screen and radio artists, a religious spokesman, and others.

Yet, the personal definitions of Americanism of all these people are remarkably alike, illustrating dramatically the tie of a common belief and a common set of ideals that binds all true Americans.

In defining Americanism, most of these leaders stress the dignity and worth of the individual. They mutually condemn the totalitarian concept that glorifies the State or leader, and subjugates the individual. Americanism, in the opinion of these leading Americans, goes beyond the definition given by Wester—"attachment or loyalty to the United States, its traditions, interests or ideals." They hold Americanism to be not only a way of life guaranteeing the right to live, work, and worship in freedom and happiness, but also a positive, active effort to constantly make that way of life more wholesome and satisfying.

"To me Americanism is founded upon the spiritual dignity of men equal among themselves and before the law. It is a way of life characterized by tolerance and cooperative effort; richly productive for all who share its privileges and responsibilities."—Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, United States Army.

"This country was founded by men who had faith in themselves and the courage to assume their responsibilities, with a love in their hearts for freedom and a knowledge that none of these things could exist in the autocratic state, nor could they survive under hereditary rule. It was clear to them that the processes of freedom must not be to level down the ablest to the mediocre but to establish a system under which the leadership of the ablest would work to the benefit of all. To my mind, therefore, an American is a man with sufficient love of country and sufficient love of freedom to be willing to make the necessary contribution and to assume the responsibilities of life unto himself personally, rather than to want the state to assume them."—M. W. Clement, president, the Pennsylvania Railroad.

"In my judgment, the twelfth Scout law is the basis of Americanism because it emphasizes tolerance for others as well as reverence toward Almighty God. 'A Scout is reverent. He is reverent toward God. He is faithful in his religious duties, and respects the convictions of others in matters of custom and religion.' "—James E. West, Chief Scout, Boy Scouts of America.

"Political democracy and economic private initiative, supplementing each other, form the basis of our existing American social order."—William K. Jackson, past president, United States Chamber of Commerce.

"Americanism is a concept of freedom which upholds the rights and dignity of the individual against any form of dictatorship or oppression. It is government with the consent of the governed, law based upon justice, and rule by the majority without denying to any member of the minority the right to express and to continue fighting for his own views"—William Green, president, American Federation of Labor.

"Americanism is dedication to our liberal national tradition of constantly seeking a better life for all our people. In a world of disordered production, poverty, and fear of spreading totalitarian concepts, America stands as a symbol of hope to all men who would control their own destinies and receive the benefits of their own honest labor. By adherence to our principles, and through ever-increasing productivity, we must fulfill our responsibilities to help the world find peace and security"—W. Averill Harriman, Secretary of Commerce.

"Americanism is equality of opportunity, freedom of thought and action, government by consent of the governed—in short, orderly individual liberty under the law"—JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Speaker of the House.

"Americanism embodies all those things for which our great Nation stands—tolerance, understanding, loyalty, and freedom"—J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"The inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is just as important to Americans today as it was 171 years ago when our forefathers declared that all men were created equal. A true American, then as now, can always be distinguished by his irresistible will to translate these precepts into action. The right to work, to choose freely where and under what conditions he shall work, and the expectancy of reasonable economic security in a peaceful and democratic land is the birthright of every American"—Earl Bunting, president, National Association of Manufacturers.

"Americanism is a way of life that stems from the Divine—a way that the founding fathers created that man may live and work and enjoy in freedom the life given him by the Creator of all life. It respects the worth and dignity of human personality as a basic part of true democracy—where the state is the servant of the people. It is the hope of the human race."—Tom Clark, Attorney General of the United States.

"Americanism is covered by the Constitution of the United States of America and right now our Constitution needs a full reading and interpretation. It is being badly mauled by some subversive groups who wish to use it to justify their caprices. Americanism is founded on belief in God. Enemies of the American way of life say this is old-fashioned. Americanism emphasizes the right of every individual. Its opponents would place all in the hands of one individual. They are loud on liberty, freedom, and equality to the point of license to barge in on the liberty, freedom, and equality of others."—Bing Crosby.

"To me, an American is one who says 'How are you?'—not 'Who are you?' An American is a person who believes in and respects the rights of every other human being—without prejudice as to race or color or religious belief. An American is one who is educated and dedicated to world cooperation and kindness and the brotherhood of man—and to him, mutual trust, hope, and helpfulness are as natural as breathing. An American is one who is hard at work building a world in which peace and understanding will predominate—forever."—Kate Smith.

"I do not believe that Americanism is a quality susceptible to easy definition. It is a living force brought into being by our forefathers and gaining vitality with the years. It is best expressed through the actions of those individual citizens who tackle today's problems with determination to find solutions in keeping with our traditions of freedom, respect for the dignity of the individual, equality of opportunity, and a government responsible to the will of the people."—Dean Acheson, former Under Secretary of State.

"To me Americanism means the inalienable rights and inherent freedoms which go to make the American and democratic way of life. We must ever keep watchful to preserve these rights and freedoms for which we have paid so dearly with the very life blood of our youth since 1776."—C. W. Nimitz, Chief of Naval Operations.

"Americanism is the embodiment of the moral and political principles upon which our free society is based; which place primary value upon the dignity of the individual as a creature endowed with God-given rights; which appraise all existing and proposed institutions in the light of their effect upon the individual; and under which society strives constantly to improve the opportunities of its humblest member."—L. B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor.

"The essence of Americanism is the right of each man to define it according to his own conscience. To me it means belief in the democratic process and the dignity of man, regardless of color, race, or creed. Conversely, it means antagonism to repressive legislation, bigotry, and intolerance. Finally it means the willingness to get along with our neighbors."—Philip Murray, president, CIO.

"Americanism is the generating and motivating force which reaches beyond the industrial leadership and military might of our great Nation and makes possible our material supremacy. We may define this spirit as the cherished and inherent desire of men who seek to govern themselves with wisdom and tolerance. The edifice of freedom we have thus constructed points the way for struggling nations to emerge from the tyranny of war and live among men in lasting peace."—James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy.

"Americanism is often defined as an attitude. However, it is more than flag waving and pledges of loyalty. Americanism is patriotism in action. It means constant, clear-headed defense of our form of government. It means actually working to strengthen our liberties and opportunities. Americanism means helping to build national welfare without thought of reward or profit. True Americanism describes the many ways in which we put our loyalty into action during times of peace as well as in war."—Louis E. Starr, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

"Americanism is the unique combination of social and political ideas developed in the United States which are necessary for a free and harmonious people to operate an economic system based on private ownership and the profit motive but committed to the ideals of social justice and equality of opportunity."—James B. Conant, president, Harvard University.

"Americanism is the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount, the Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence rolled into a single code of conduct which recognizes the dignity and the true worth of every human being."—Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War.

"Americanism is well expressed by Lincoln: 'As I would not be ruled by others, so I would not rule another. That, I conceive, is democracy.' This dynamic resolution has released untold energy, as we have turned from the conquest of other men to the conquest of nature. Free from designs over others, he has learned to live with others. His house stands on an open lawn, not behind brick walls. The boundaries of his human relations are not too rigidly prescribed. Americanism is this constant effort to probe the true meaning of freedom in human relations."—Everett R. Clinchy, president, National Conference of Christians and Jews.

"Americanism is a way of life in which every man can walk in freedom and dignity. It is a glorious heritage left by our ancestors who struggled and fought to establish a form of government affording all its citizens protection against tyranny, injustice, and intolerance. It is a dynamic spirit directed toward constantly improving our way of life and increasing its benefits for ourselves, our descendants, and all others who seek true freedom."—Sally Cannon, national president, Ladies Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Annual Memorial Services of Catholic War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Maurice Simmons, past national

commander, United Spanish War Veterans, at the annual memorial services of Catholic War Veterans at Father Duffy's Monument, New York City, May 25, 1947:

Father Duffy is an American symbol. He left us an unforgettable spiritual heritage. He is an exemplar of the millions of our Catholic countrymen who have given of their courage, devotion, and generosity to the fulfillment of the American dream. Nor was he unmindful of the links that bound him to his ancestral home. Its tragic history he felt as his personal tragedy. For 800 years Ireland had been drenched in blood. But at long last the Irish underground humbled the Saxon conqueror. The Easter Insurrection of 1921 was the beginning of the end for British intolerance, misrule, and massacre.

Today another persecuted people is being scourged by the Black and Tans whose cruelties scarred the Irish landscape. Palestine is the present battelfront, and again, in the familiar underground, Irishmen are helping in the struggle of the Jewish people to recover their ancient homeland.

In the Bible it is prophesied, "For God will save Zion and will build the cities of Judah; that they may dwell there and have it in possession." That also was the decree of the 55 members of the League of Nations, nullified all too soon by British chicanery. To underpin its colonial imperialism, England is trading Jewish blood for Arab oil, and has become accessory to the not unlikely extinction of the million and a half Jewish survivors of the most horrible mass murder of all time.

Fascism and anti-Semitism were the twin spearheads of Hitler's drive for world power. The Jew was the scapegoat for "Deutschland Uber Alles." Before the butchers were stopped 6,000,000 innocents had perished in furnaces, gas chambers, and concentration prisons. This total is 22 times the casualties of the United States in World War II, which numbered 230,000, and 17 times that of the British Empire, which listed 325,000. In the First World War 116,825 Jews died in the ranks of the Allies, a number double that of our American dead.

The nations pledged their sacred honor that Palestine should become the haven of those who had fled the Nazi persecutors. But men of good will failed to reckon with Hitler's diabolical use of anti-Semitism. He poisoned not only European but American soil. Almost everywhere intolerance has shut the doors to Jewish immigration. They are even being barred from Palestine, the promised land, vouchsafed to them by God's covenant with their forebears. To save its crumbling empire the United Kingdom is using Nazi technique against the wretched exiles. The might of a lawless police state has unloosed tanks, bombers, and ships for use against the unhappy Holy Land. Not even in their destined Biblical abode can the wanderers rest their broken bodies.

The Balfour Declaration, formulated by the British Cabinet in 1917, pledged the Government "To facilitate the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people." In 1919 President Wilson announced that "The allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth." The Allied Supreme Council in 1922 gave Britain the mandate for the express purpose of effectuating the Balfour Declaration. That same year our Congress, by joint resolution, unanimously expressed the approval of the United States. Our major national political parties, in convention assembled, have made the same pronouncements. Every American President, from Woodrow Wilson to Harry S. Truman, have concurred. But the pledges of Great Britain have become a mere rope of sand in the hands of the Government that, as a prelude to World War I, indicted the Kaiser for tearing up, as a scrap of paper, the treaty guaranteeing the inviolability of Belgium.

The cradle of the Prince of Peace is to be made into a war base for obsolete imperialism. All its devious propaganda will not cloak Britain's motives for lavishing money and munitions to bolster up the ugly feudalism of the Arab chieftains—the exploiters of the ragged, illiterate, and diseased tribes of the deserts. Under the pretense of democracy these puppets of the blundering Blimps of Whitehall are demanding that the United States recognize Palestine as an independent Arab state. Never did there exist an independent Palestine nation, except during the long Jewish reign and the brief occupation of the Crusaders.

How can these oriental tools of fascism speak of democracy? At a high crisis of World War II the Government of Iraq fomented the Axis-inspired revolt which, had it succeeded, would have given the Near East to our foes by effecting the junction of the advancing armies of the Japs and the Germans. That encirclement was frustrated by the heroism of British troops and Palestinian Jewish volunteers. When Rommel's tanks thundered across Africa, almost to the locks of the Suez Canal, did Egypt lift a finger in self-defense? Or did its rulers conspire with the then seemingly conquering armies of the Hun, for the betrayal of the Allies? One fourth of Montgomery's Imperial troops in the Egyptian desert were Jewish volunteers. Their flesh helped stop the German bullets at Tobruk and El Alamein. The Jews turned Palestine into an arsenal for the Allies, while the Arab leaders were working with the murderous Mufti of Jerusalem who, in Berlin, was plotting with Hitler the defeat of the Allies and the extermination of Jewry.

In World War I Palestine was taken from the Turks in the campaign spearheaded by the fighting Jewish legion and the famous Zion Mule Corps. The Arabs stood mute. In World War II Palestine sent into the armies of freedom 27,000 Jewish volunteers, while with double the population, less than one-half that number of Arabs joined the ranks.

Today ruthlessness rules British statecraft. In her concentration camps former storm troopers guard the remnants of the Nazi purge. Jews gave treasure, blood, and life to the Allied cause. How has the pledge to house them in their historic homeland been redeemed? Palestine was practically closed to Jewish immigration by the British white paper of 1939. That act of stultification shocked the conscience of mankind and was repudiated by the League of Nations. Winston Churchill, who later denounced Britain's "senseless and squalid war against the Jews," condemned the paper as a violation of solemn obligations. By its enforcement hundreds of thousands of them, trapped in countless European communities or fleeing to the Holy Land for shelter, fell into the clutches of the Nazi fiends. Unseaworthy vessels, laden with refugees, have been driven from the shores of the promised land by British warships, resulting in the drowning of hundreds of men, women, and children. While barring persecuted Jews from entry, the illegal immigration of Arabs has been encouraged. In callous disregard of the bill of rights and the elemental decencies of law, thousands have been exiled to the barbed-wire camps of Cyprus, the fever-ridden islands of the Indian Ocean, and the equatorial hell holes of Africa. Untold scores have been held incommunicado, tortured, and hanged for the crime of daring to protest the despotic rule of the invader.

Jewish books have been burned in the streets of Tel Aviv. A Nazi bonfire beneath the Cross of St. George. The Holy Land is governed by a body of anti-Jewish laws, as drastic as those clamped on Nazi-ravished Europe. In defiance of the law of nations and the guaranties of treaties to accord equal rights to all our citizens without discrimination, the American of Jewish faith is excluded from immigation and forbidden land ownership, even though he may be an Albert Einstein, a Bernard Baruch, or a David Lilienthal.

To keep its alien foothold, Britain has used its traditional device of divide and rule. Before it came, Jew and Arab lived in friendship. Anti-Semitism was as unknown as the platypus. The seeds of hatred were first planted in the Arab's breast by British agents. During the pillage of their villages the Jews were deprived of arms needed for self-defense, but the Arabs were secretly armed for offense. In Tripoli, where both groups had lived as good neighbors, the first anti-Jewish pogrom was instigated under British military rule—this in the perfidious pattern of the czars, who, to divert from themselves the wrath of the exploited masses, unleashed the black hundreds against this ever-martyred minority.

The Arab menace, as a justification for the policy of appeasing Arabs, is the invention of British duplicity. The Arab League was set up as a barrier for the reenforcement of British imperialism. Without consulting the other powers signatory to the mandate, the major portion of Palestine was handed to the Arabs. Trans-Jordania, a British satellite, was organized under its controlled tribal chieftain, a kingdom that encroaches on three-fourths of the mandated area. That amputation left Palestine with an area of 1,800 square miles—less in size than the State of Vermont. The sparsely populated Arab countries have an area of 1,500,000 square miles.

Like our own pioneers, whose plows broke the prairies into fields of wheat and corn, the 600,000 Jewish pioneers have redeemed the soil of their forefathers. Before the Turks came like the locusts, it was a land of milk and honey, of shining pastures and olive trees. For more than a thousand years under Turkish rule it wasted into a barren desert of desolation—a Godforsaken country. Then, fleeing Russian pogroms and Nazi butchery, these exiles flocked to the Promised Land, in quest of their Biblical heritage. Under their touch the desert blossomed as the rose, cities of breath-taking beauty lit up the waste places, modern schools and hospitals opened their portals to Jew and Arab alike. In the remaking of Palestine the Jews spent their treasure without stint. The Arabs' contribution was a minor factor. Although the Jews contributed 75 percent to the cost of government, the British have restricted them to ownership of 5 percent of the land. Despite discrimination, discouragement, and deadlock, the Jews have brought about the highest standard of living in the Middle East. Palestine is the marvel of the Orient. Arabs from all points are attracted to this shrine of plenty. Small wonder that greedy Oriental politicians seek to grab it, under the guise of an independent Arab state. Unmolested by the intrigues of power politics, the Jew can make Palestine a bridge of understanding between East and West, the interpreter of our western civilization to a vast area enslaved by ignorance, poverty, and superstition.

Today 120,000 British soldiers are patrolling Palestine. Their maintenance costs British taxpayers $400,000,000, yet England asks us to relieve her of the burden of maintaining her 30,000 troops in Greece, one of her bastions of empire. If she lifted her armies from the backs of the Jewish pioneers she would have less need for bleeding our taxpayers for more billions of American dollars to relieve her economic ills. No grown-up is fooled by her crocodile tears that chaos will follow the withdrawal of her troops. Seventy-thousand Jewish war veterans in the Palestinian underground know how to defend their sacred soil. They are the spiritual comrades of the patriots who, at Bunker Hill,

did not cringe before the world's mightiest empire. The American, Irish, and Palestinian wars for independence were all waged to break the British yoke. Yesterday it was Nathan Hale; today it is Dov Bela Gruner; both dangling from the British hangman's noose. Gruner is not dead. "His body lies a-moldering in the grave, but his soul goes marching on." In revolting Palestine, as in revolutionary America, "resistance to tyrants is obedience to God."

Not all the might of Britain's armadas on land and sea and her conscripted millions can crush the eternal Jewish soul. Every empire that scourged the Jew has tumbled into the twilight of history. As the heroes of the underground lift the bars to their promised land, they echo the pledge of their ancestors: "If I forget thee, oh Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its cunning and let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth."

British Troops, Fliers, Navy, Help in Jap Occupation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

BRITISH TROOPS, FLIERS, NAVY, HELP IN JAP OCCUPATION

So far this series has given the impression that all the work of occupying Japan is being done by the American ground forces. Let's hasten to correct that impression. The British Commonwealth Occupation Forces and the American Navy and Air Forces are doing their share.

The British forces are composed mostly of Australians and Indians with some New Zealand and United Kingdom troops. It also includes Royal Air Force and Royal Indian Air Force Spitfire Squadrons, Royal Australian Air Force Mustang squadrons, Royal New Zealand Air Force Corsair squadrons, and various units of the Royal Navy.

The British occupation zone comprises 20,000 square miles of Japan having a population of 11,000,000. It includes five prefectures in southern Honshu and the entire island of Skikoku, on which there are four prefectures.

The British land forces are under the operational command of the American Eighth Army; their air forces form a part of the Fifth United States Air Force and their naval units work in cooperation with the American Navy.

RESPONSIBLE TO MAC ARTHUR

British commander in chief is Lt. Gen. H. C. H. Robertson, who is responsible to Supreme Commander Douglas MacArthur, to whom he has direct access. The British have no responsibility for the military government of Japan because that, by allied agreement, is the sole job of the United States.

The British, however, have the task of cataloging all the Japanese war equipment in their area and supervising the destruction of that which is not required for the occupation. They also patrol southern Honshu by land and sea to prevent illegal entry of Koreans and supervise repatriation centers in their area.

One duty the British share with the Americans is the mounting of ceremonial guards at prominent buildings in Tokyo, including the Imperial Palace, foreign embassies, and legations.

AMERICAN ADMIRAL COMMANDS

Vice Admiral Robert M. Griffin, USN, is in command of all naval units in Japanese waters. He has two forces, one American and one British, consisting of a cruiser and four destroyers each, which patrol Japanese coastal waters, and another force which patrols the straits between Korea and Japan.

The Navy's job is to supervise the Japanese warship-scrapping program and to direct the operations of 145 Japanese mine sweepers which are still looking for stray mines in Japanese waters. It also controls the Japanese merchant marine. One of its biggest jobs, which is now almost completed, was to assist in the repatriation program.

Lt. Gen. Ennis C. Whitehead is commanding general of American Far East air forces. He commands the Fifth Air Force in Japan, the Thirteenth Air Force in the Philippines, the Twentieth Air Force at Guam, the First Air Division at Okinawa, and the Pacific Air Service Command.

Our fighter planes and light bombers have taken over Japanese airfields. Our heavy bombers are based at Guam and other outlying Pacific islands.

NO RUSSIANS SERVING

There are no Russian or Chinese forces in Japan. The Chinese have taken over the island of Formosa, which has been restored to Chinese sovereignty. The Russians made some inquiries about sending troops to Japan, but they wanted the Japanese or somebody else to supply them with uniforms and even with the cost of transportation from Moscow to Tokyo. They were told they would have to supply their own uniforms and pay their own transportation costs and in addition provide food and equipment for any occupation forces. That seemed to discourage them.

The function of the air forces is to be on the job in case any trouble should break out. No trouble is anticipated from the Japs. They have no air force left, not even a single training or commercial plane. But the Russians have airfields and planes in northern Korea, Sakhalin, the Kuriles, Vladivostok, and northeastern Siberia. And so we patrol the air over Japan, just to make sure that nothing does happen.

Our Gasoline and Oil Going to Foreigners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the oil and gasoline situation surely presents a conflicting picture for the citizens of the United States. Here in Washington, we have one agency of the Government telling about petroleum products, that we have sufficient but that there is some need to have additional supplies in the future to preserve our own, and that gasoline and oil should be imported. Today I find that the defense arm of the Government says that beginning now it is necessary to import oil, gasoline, and petroleum products to the eastern seaboard of the United States from the Middle East in an amount of 400,000 barrels last month alone, for national-defense purposes. On the west coast in the Los Angeles area, we have the picture of the Maritime Commission permitting Government-owned tankers of the United States hurrying back and forth from Los Angeles to Vladivostok as fast as they can turn around, taking gasoline and oil from America. Since January 1947 these tankers owned by the United States and loaned to Russia without pay, have taken from the Pacific coast 614,022 barrels of oil and gasoline, to the detriment of our national defense which is obliged to import nearly one-half million barrels of petroleum products a month on the eastern seaboard.

The gasoline and oil taken to Russia from the Los Angeles area is reported to have been loaded at supply stations and refineries of the Sun Set Oil Co., the Standard Oil Co., the Richfield Oil Co., and the General Petroleum Co., all of Los Angeles, Calif.

If that were not a sufficient drain on American gasoline and oil which are now being rationed to the distributors throughout the country, I am informed that there has been exported to foreign countries from the United States since January 1, 1946, down to May 1, 1947, the sum of 191,000,000 barrels of petroleum products, including 56,000,000 barrels of gasoline by the people of the United States. Of course, under our American way of life the citizens of the United States privately own and control the petroleum industry and it seems that there are those engaged in the petroleum industry whose love for the people of the United States is less than its feelings for foreign nations, in that these millions of barrels of oil have been taken away from the citizens of America and the Government of the United States for its defense purposes. With this information and the matter of tankers owned by the United States Government, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will commence hearings to investigate the taking away of American gasoline and oil from continental United States to foreign countries in American and foreign-flag ships, with gasoline and oil supplied by the oil and petroleum companies of the United States.

The open hearings will commence Friday at 10 o'clock a. m. in the committee room of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Employment for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of our soldiers and sailors are having a most serious problem to secure employment, since they have returned to their homes. One boy, who resides in the city of Washington, who had a rather impressive service in the late war, seeks to secure employment. Recently he wrote

a letter in which he sought to secure a position, whereby he could support himself, and I am including his letter herewith for the information it imparts. It is my hope that this young lad may be able to secure a job, so he may pursue his education, as he indicates.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my own remarks the letter this veteran wrote, which is self-explanatory:

JUNE 26, 1947.

In view of the fact that I am at present a resident of the unrepresented District of Columbia, I am taking the liberty of calling upon you, in the hope that you will intercede in my behalf for an appointment to a doorkeeper's job in the United States Senate or House, which will enable me to complete my education in medical school at George Washington University.

For your information, while a senior in high school I enlisted in the United States Navy at the age of 17, because having two brothers already overseas I was anxious to do my part in the war effort. The day after graduation I left home for Great Lakes, Ill., to begin boot training. Upon completion of boot training I was assigned to the U. S. S. *Boise* and remained aboard this gallant ship for 22 months. Unfortunately, we of the District of Columbia have no Representatives in Congress.

I am proud and happy that I had the privilege and honor to serve on the U. S. S. *Boise* and would like to cite a few of her accomplishments while aboard: Invasion of Halmahara and supporting land operations on Morotai; invasion of Leyte, Philippines; invasion of (Mindoro), invasion of Lingayan Gulf, Luzon, invasion of Corregidor and Bataan (bombarded for 4 days), invasion of Mindanao, invasion of Tarakani, invasion of Brueni Bay, Borneo.

After numerous and unsuccessful attempts by Jap suicide planes to crash-dive the *Boise*, she then proceeded with MacArthur on a tour of the Philippines. After receiving five battle stars we then went into the Atlantic and continued to return our troops back to the United States of America until she was ordered into Reserve Fleet.

Thanking you for any efforts which you are in a position to put forth in my behalf.

Sincerely,

JIMMIE HUNTER.

A Lock-Out of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr: Speaker, under date of June 23, 1947, I received a letter from one of my constituents who is employed by the United States Maritime Commission in San Francisco. She informs me that on the above date about 324 employees of the Maritime Commission in the San Francisco Bay area received a form letter notifying them of a payless furlough.

I think that all Members of Congress will be interested in this lady's comment upon the action taken by the Maritime Commission, as follows:

This action is considered by all an incredible injustice. In the lower grades, after deduction of income-tax and retirement-fund money, both of which are necessary, there is barely enough to meet living expenses and pay insurance, now that prices of food have so increased.

Personally, I have always worked with an honest effort to increase efficiency and there are many good workers in the same status. After 22 years of service, 5 at one period and 17 the last period, my salary check every 2 weeks is only $77.62. I have an excellent efficiency rating. All of this I am telling you, not for personal reasons, but that you may be informed of the way many substantial and conscientious workers are made the target for cuts, reductions, et cetera.

We will greatly appreciate your assistance in obtaining a deficiency appropriation to cover our badly needed and hard earned wages. We have been asked to work on this payless furlough and are on the job.

I would also like to direct the attention of the Members of the House to the following excerpt from the column, The Federal Diary by Jerry Kluttz, which appeared in the Washington Post yesterday, June 25:

Lockout: That's exactly what has happened to the 2,800 Maritime Commission employees here.

The employees have been told not to work until July 1, and that they won't be paid if they do. It's a pure and simple lockout by the Congress which refused to okay a last-minute switch in funds to pay the employees, a brutal piece of business.

Any employer who denies his workers the right to strike, like the Government, should also protect them against lock-outs.

Loyalty: What price loyalty and hard work? A lay-off notice.

Remember, last year when a leave contest was conducted by this column? Well, the winner who had turned back the most annual leave was Herman Buchholtz, a 62-year-old Maritime employee, who had forfeited 568 days and 3 hours of leave in his 26½ years of service. Buchholtz had averaged 1 day of annual leave a year. He has an excellent efficiency rating.

Talk about long and faithful service—Buchholtz' record was tops.

Well, Buchholtz got his reward yesterday. He was ordered fired along with 1,100 other Maritime employees. And 800 of the 1,100, like Buchholtz, are career employees.

The mass lay-off was ordered because of a sharp budget cut approved by the House. An appeal will be made to the Senate for more money and more employees.

The Congress can never get the loyalty and confidence of employees of such cruel treatment. There would be cries and demands for congressional investigation if a large private employer would pull a similar trick.

Old-Age Security—H. R. 16

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the national convention of the Townsend National Recovery Organization at Washington, D. C., June 26, 1947:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, I join with my colleagues in the Congress in welcoming you here to the Nation's Capital. It is fitting and proper that you are holding this great convention here at the seat of our Government. The outcome of your deliberations and the inspiration and help from your devoted and sincere counsel will materially aid and encourage us in solving our Nation's problems in these crucial times. I deem it a high honor and privilege to participate in your program and to have a part in presenting to the Congress the laudable and worthy objectives you espouse. Before I discuss Social Security so close to your hearts, let us appraise our world of today.

Momentous decisions are being made here. The eyes and hopes of the war-torn world are centered here. The fate of whole nations is at stake. Here in the Capital you will be able to feel the pulsebeat of the last remaining world power dedicated to individual freedom. You will find here your own country in a place of world leadership, which presents a challenge to you and to me and to every citizen of this great Nation. Indeed, we are at the crossroads of history, and you will be able to see history in the making. It is not too much to say that the fate of civilization itself hangs in the balance, and what America does today and tomorrow will, indeed, chart the course of many generations to come.

Twice, in our own generation, we have seen millions of our young men, yes, and women, too, go overseas in the defense of this liberty for which we stand in a vain effort to bring peace to the world. Over 300,000 of them in the last war did not return. We poured over four hundred billions of your money into this effort. The world is sick, bled white by war, bankrupt and torn asunder by aggression, lust for power, clashing ideologies, suspicion, greed, selfishness, and even now the threat of an atomic war and total destruction. The war-devastated nations of the Old World face a coming winter of pestilence, famine, and starvation. The nations of the Old World are depending upon America to lead them out of this wilderness of despair, want, and suffering.

Indeed, Britain's indomitable leader, Winston Churchill, recently said of the Europe of today:

"But what is Europe now? It is a rubble heap, a charnel house, a breeding ground of pestilence and hate. Ancient nationalistic feuds and modern ideological factions distract and infuriate the unhappy, hungry populations.

"Evil teachers urge the paying off of old scores with mathematical precision, and false guides point to unsparing retribution as the path to prosperity.

"Is there then to be no respite? Has Europe's mission come to an end? Has she nothing to give to the world but the contagion of the black death? Are her peoples to go on harrying and tormenting one another by war and vengeance until all that invests human life with dignity and comfort has been obliterated? Are the states of Europe to continue forever to squander the first fruits of their toil upon the erection of new barriers, military fortifications, and tariff walls, and passport networks against one another? Are we Europeans to become incapable, with all our tropical and colonial dependencies, with all our long-created trading connections, with all that modern production and transportation can do, of even averting famine from the mass of our peoples? Are we all, through our poverty and our quarrels, forever to be a burden and a danger to the rest of the world? Do we imagine that we can be carried forward indefinitely upon the shoulders—broad though they be—of the United States? The time has come when these questions must be answered. This is the hour of choice, and surely the choice is plain. If the peoples of Europe resolve to come together and work together for mutual advantage, to exchange blessings instead of curses, they still have it in their power to sweep away the horrors

and miseries which surround them and to allow the streams of freedom and happiness and abundance to begin again their healing flow.

"This is the supreme opportunity, and, if it be cast away, no one can predict that it will ever return or what the resulting catastrophe will be."

Uncle Sam has been more than generous in giving relief to these stricken peoples. The Congress has been more than magnanimous in rushing food, clothing, medicine and credits to these distressed and starving hordes of the war-torn nations. There is a limit, however, to Uncle Sam's largess. He has a public debt of $257,000,000,000 and an immense tax load to carry and his own old folks are in need and pleading in vain. The Congress has just passed bills opening the Public Treasury to send $750,000,000 more overseas which, according to plan, is to be used for developing the resources and economy, for the relief of the peoples of foreign lands, some of whom did not join with us in the recent war. The United States, since the war's end, has made available for world aid, $21,058,422,818, as follows:

Contributions:	
UN	$29,289,349
UNRRA	2,700,000,000
World bank	3,175,000,000
World fund	2,750,000,000
Lend-lease	2,163,000,000
Other advances:	
Surplus property	1,148,000,000
Loans to Great Britain and Philippines	4,390,000,000
War Department grants	1,771,926,293
Export-Import Bank	2,931,209,176
Total	21,058,422,818

Against this background of uncertainty, foreboding, and disaster, it is interesting to note, in the economic report of the President, transmitted to the Congress on January 8, 1947, in accordance with the Employment Act of 1946, an inventory of the blessings and natural resources of this great Nation of ours, so lavishly bestowed upon us by a divine Providence, namely: A fabulous wealth of natural resources; large and efficient industrial plants; ample bank credits and other funds for business expansion; a large and skilled labor force; higher consumer spending power than before the war; a backlog of unsatisfied domestic and foreign demands; unsurpassed high standards of living.

This report states:

"Maximum production and employment this year would allow a substantial increase in the available supply of consumer goods and services, especially in the area of durable goods. This requires higher real purchasing power to take the goods off the market. If price and wage adjustments are not made—and made soon enough—there is a danger that consumer buying will falter. Orders to manufacturers will decline, production will drop and unemployment will grow—unless consumers resort to large additional borrowing and use of past savings to buy the increased supply of goods. These temporary expedients are limited in power and even if available would only postpone the day of reckoning. During this year the underlying favorable factors are strong enough to maintain high prosperity. But this year brings us face to face with maladjustments and unfavorable possibilities which, if not corrected or prevented, could cause a recession in production and employment. The Government will watch the situation and be prepared for action if needed. The race is on—the race against time—to decide whether, over the next few years, we can make these adjustments in our economy that are needed to avert a major depression in the fifties."

Thanks to a divine providence our America is not war-torn and devastated, we are not famine-ridden or dominated by a dictator, our churches are open, we have free speech, free schools, and private property. We are the last great refuge of freedom. The European and Asiatic nations are drifting away from the freedoms of democratic processes and into the troubled waters of dictatorship. However, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Our fate is in our hands. It is for us to decide, here in America, whether we have the foresight and the vision and the courage to utilize to the full these great resources and the economic and scientific knowledge and abilities of our people. We face the challenge to keep the Nation on an even keel, off of the rocks of depression, and on the high road of great endeavor and achievement and out of the clutches of devastating war. Civilization cannot survive another world war—an atomic war. Spiritual, moral, and humanitarian forces under divine guidance alone can save it. America can lead the way.

The Advisory Commission on Universal Training says:

"Everything points inescapably to the conclusion that there is no real security for this country or any country unless war is abolished through the establishment of the reign of law among nations."

Why not, then, do something about that, too, and now?

"A strong, united, healthy and informed Nation. This our No. 1 security requirement. It is the bedrock on which all our military preparations depend. The vigor and vitality of our democracy, as expressed in improved health, education, productivity, and morale of the American people, are of paramount importance not only for ourselves but also for millions subject to the deception of totalitarian philosophies abroad."

There are many of us here in the Congress who fervently believe that the opportunity is ours here in America to demonstrate to the world that we can outlaw war and that our democratic processes will work; that we can and will steer the ship of state away from another world-wide depression; that we will utilize to the full our natural and industrial resources, technical and scientific knowledge, and maintain the United States on a high level of production and employment, assuring a stable economy and prosperity.

Those of us who are sponsoring H. R. 16 in the Congress believe that it is a major factor in this whole program to provide full production and employment and adequate security for our elderly citizens. Townsend friends, I want to commend you for your zeal and enthusiasm in such a worthy and righteous cause, and for the outstanding work you and your associates and predecessors have done down through the years in advancing the cause of old-age security. The hopes of thousands of our elderly citizens in need in this great land of plenty are pinned on you. I know that at times you must have been discouraged, as I have been, by reason of the apparent apathy and failure of the Congress to enact long-range legislation providing for adequate annuities for our elders. However, I believe that we can take heart in the knowledge that definite and worth-while advances have been made in this whole field of old-age assistance in the past decade. Much of the social legislation that has been enacted by the National Congress and by the several States for our elderly citizens has been due to the loyal and untiring work you in this organization have displayed. Our undying gratitude is due the great humanitarian leader of this movement, Dr. Francis E. Townsend, the founder of the program for social security for the old folks in America. I know you will be interested in knowing of the esteem and high regard in which Dr. Townsend is held by the friends of the movement here in the Congress. Recently, at a meeting of the sponsors and supporters of the Townsend program in the House of Representatives I proposed a resolution commending Dr. Townsend for his great contribution to the oldsters of our country, and it was adopted unanimously. Let me read it to you:

"Inasmuch as there was no such thing as a Federal old-age pension law 14 years ago when Dr. Francis E. Townsend startled the Nation with the first draft of his Townsend plan; and

"Inasmuch as since that date, with the friends and workers for the Townsend plan constantly keeping their objectives before the Congress, the first Social Security Act was enacted and amendments in two other Congresses have liberalized its provisions;

"Now, therefore, it seems fitting that this group of congressional friends of the Townsend plan here and now go on record as complimenting the 80-year-old father of old-age pensions in America, Dr. Townsend, for his activity and integrity and continuing fight in the cause of America's senior citizens."

The London magazine, Bookshelf, recently said under the caption "A Prophet—Outside His Own Country":

"Dr. Francis E. Townsend is one of the greatest thinkers in the field of economics; * * * it will not be long before the entire United States will recognize the eminence of the father of the Townsend plan."

My friends and coworkers in this great cause, I want you to know that while thus far we here in the Congress have been unable to enact legislation covering the Townsend program, our zeal for it has not wavered or in anywise diminished. We will continue the battle unabated for this worthy cause until we are successful in placing upon the Federal statute books a Nation-wide annuity law for all citizens 60 years of age or over.

It is significant that the basic principles underlying the Townsend national recovery program have now been approved by the Social Security Board. This itself is a long step forward. In the last report of the Board, before its functions were transferred to the Social Security Agency, it recommended amendments to the social security law which, if adopted would put into effect much of the Townsend program.

Federal Social Security Administrator Watson B. Miller is now recommending the following sweeping changes in old-age and survivors' insurance under the social security program:

Liberalize monthly benefits, extending the maximum from the present $44 to $74.25.

Extend coverage to agricultural, domestic, and self-employed workers (the last-named group includes business and professional men).

Extend benefits to cover workers permanently and totally disabled at any age.

Lower the age of female beneficiaries to 60 years from the present 65 years.

At the beginning of the year 1946 nearly half of all civilian jobs were excluded from coverage by social security. The Social Security Board's report for the fiscal year 1946 showed that in June, 6,800,000 persons aged 65 or over were without income from employment. Of these only 1,300,000—about 1 in 5—were beneficiaries of old-age and survivors' insurance or of retirement benefits from special systems for over-age and Government workers. More than 6,600,000 aged persons are not receiving any public assistance or social security retirement, yet the social security fund has accumulated over eight billions and the average monthly retirement benefit was $24.65 per month—$24.15, I am sorry to say, in my State of Oregon. Uncle Sam has collected for old-age pensions and survivors' insurance over $9,000,000,000, yet has paid old folks only a billion and a half. The rest was squandered.

At best, the social security law we now have is a haphazard program which, in effect, is largely financed by the general public, but the benefits of which are shared by only a few selected groups. It encourages inflation by collecting a huge fund currently used for deficit spending. These dif-

ficulties would be overcome by the adoption of H. R. 16, which would cover all citizens 60 years of age or older, and the obligations and benefits of the program would likewise be shared by all. It would be all-inclusive in its provisions and therefore would supplant existing State and Federal relief and old-age assistance, and would, for the first time, set up in our country an old-age security program which would insure all of our elderly citizens against the hazards of old age. It would build up no reservoir for deficit spending, it would not add $1 to the public debt, and the moneys collected would go back into the channels of trade each month, stimulating production, providing local markets for American goods and buying power for our aged citizens. The whole problem of social security, and particularly for the aged, is one of deep concern to all of the citizens of the United States, and the Congress has been dilatory in giving it consideration and making adequate provision for our old people.

It costs a $5,000-a-year income family $12,750 to rear a child to 18 years of age. This forcibly brings to our attention the heavy investment the old people of America have made in rearing their families and providing the Nation with its citizens. The families of yesterday made possible the citizens of today who are fighting our wars, protecting the liberties of America, and maintaining our industries. Unfortunately most of these elderly people, some ten or twelve million of them, in fact, having expended their funds in rearing their families and providing for themselves, are now in want. Some receive assistance averaging $25 a month, most of them receive nothing.

The Census Bureau has just released a report showing that the median income for American families living under one roof rose by $169 during 1945 to a total of $2,378. This means that half of the 40,075,000 family units of America receive an annual income of $2,378 or less. Certainly the heads of such families with children to support with the high cost of living today cannot provide the funds for taking care of their own fathers and mothers who are in need.

I maintain that justice demands that, while making these huge expenditures for the peoples of foreign nations, the Congress should grant some relief to the old folks here in America as well. There are in excess of 10,000,000 American citizens over the age of 60 years, many of them in want and distress, yet the Congress has denied their appeals down through the years. Many of them receive a stipend of old-age assistance of less than $10 per month, and the average, as I have said, is a little more than $25 per month, while living costs are mounting skyward. Do you know that the cost of a market basket of the following essential staple foods in 1933 was $3.26 and the same items now cost $8.50 or more?

Contents of basket: 3 pounds round steak, 2 pounds bacon, 1 quart milk, 1 pound butter, 1 dozen eggs, 1 pound lard, 1 can tomatoes, 1 pound coffee, 1 loaf bread, 1 peck potatoes, 3 pounds cabbage, 1 dozen oranges, 1 can corn, 1 can peas, 5 pounds sugar.

We in America, as a nation, have attained a position of outstanding accomplishment and influence that is the envy of the world. We are a country of great and varied natural resources. More important than that, we possess the scientific knowledge, techniques, and industry, and the know-how to turn these natural endowments into channels of the widest utility for our people's welfare. We have developed an industrial system under free enterprise which is the foundation of our success. Our living standards are the world's highest. If free enterprise is to continue and we, as a free nation, are to survive, we must make sure that the great mass of our people, the men and the women who work with their hands and brains to gain a livelihood, shall have the opportunity for employment and the right to share in the fruits of production. We must make sure that there shall not be a recurrence of the bread lines and the millions of unemployed that existed during the 1930's. We cannot forget the 12,000,000 or more unemployed during those fateful depression years who were unable to find gainful employment sufficient to maintain themselves and their families in decency and health. It was not until World War II was thrust upon us and the demand for increased war production in every line put every able-bodied citizen in our Nation back to work that this unemployment hazard was corrected. In the last full year of the war—1944—Government expenditures amounted to approximately one-half of the total production, namely, $100,000,000,000. This proved conclusively that our free-enterprise system and industrial capitalism here in America has the power to produce sufficiently to supply the needs of all and to keep everyone employed.

However, we must not depend upon a war to keep our people employed. We should be able, in times of peace, to utilize our social and economic forces to maintain ample production to meet the demands of our people. First of all, we must have an expanding market to absorb the output resulting from full production. We here in America have the greatest potential market in all the world. It is only necessary to provide our people with an opportunity for employment to enable them to obtain the buying power to support this increased productivity. The science of production has outrun the science of distribution. The very achievement of our goal—maximum of production with minimum of employment—has undermined our economy by reason of our failure to provide that distribution shall keep pace with production.

It is logical to assume that if any group of our citizens is to be retired from participation in industrial production, the elderly citizens should be the ones entitled to retirement first. This group of oldsters, through no fault of their own, cannot take part in production by reason of the demands of industry for younger men and women. The very industrial system which has profited by their labors and has made it impossible for them to retain their positions, should provide for their retirement in their declining years. This the Townsend recovery program will do. It is recognized by all forward-looking citizens that disability and old age, as well as unemployment, are hazards in our society of free enterprise against which provision must be made if our American way of life is to survive.

My friends, with your help and the loyal support of your coworkers from every State in the Union, we may confidently look forward to the day when such a system will be made a part of the Nation's program when every adult citizen in the United States will have equal basic Federal retirement, insurance and protection against the hazards of disability. Let us not despair nor grow weary in welldoing. In the words of the immortal Lincoln: "Trusting to Him who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well."

House Vote on Labor-Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 23, 1947

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the following editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star of Saturday, June 21, entitled "The House Was Not Terrified":

THE HOUSE WAS NOT TERRIFIED

It was by a vote of 331 to 83 that the House of Representatives override Mr. Truman's veto of the labor bill.

Keep that figure in mind the next time you go to a play or a movie or listen to a commentator or read a book, the chief purpose of which or whom is to break public confidence in the Government of the United States.

You must have been asleep for some years if you are not aware of the great number of plays and books and commentators of the type that work along that line. Half the shows in New York are built around the idea that Congress is composed chiefly of knaves and fools. They are pictured as venal, pompous, stupid, lacking in human feeling and patriotism. Shows where you can't get a job in the orchestra without carrying a Communist Party card speak in grand tones of their interest in democracy. And audiences which don't know what it's all about applaud enthusiastically.

It took nerve on the part of most of those 331 Congressmen to vote to override the labor-bill veto. Leaders of the AFL and CIO have been spending millions in their campaign to defeat that measure. These leaders make it plain that they do not intend to forget those who supported the bill. There are many close districts in which the taking on of such a burden of settled hostility is not a light matter for the incumbent Congressman.

Congress, being a human institution, is not perfect. But it is the opinion of this newspaper that in patriotism and intelligence and courage the politicians who make up most of the Congress of the United States rank higher than comparable groups in the business, professional, and labor worlds. They trim and play politics, but on matters of principle a surprising number of them put the good of their country above their own political self-interest.

A Better Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial, A Better Tax Bill, which appeared in the Dispatch, Lexington, N. C., on June 23, 1947:

A BETTER TAX BILL

Chairman KNUTSON now says that his Ways and Means Committee will write such a good tax bill that President Truman simply cannot afford to veto it. That is both interesting and encouraging, coming as it does from the committee chairman whose first reaction was that the President was playing politics outrageously when he vetoed the bill that came to him early last week.

We think Mr. KNUTSON was wrong in his judgment of President Truman's action. One just doesn't play good politics by vetoing bills providing for tax cutting. It takes a good deal of courage to veto any bill that cuts taxes, regardless of judgment as to soundness and justice of the provisions of such a bill. The popular thing, some political philosopher has observed, is to cut taxes and raise appropriations.

Mr. KNUTSON's statement is not only encouraging, but it is in part at least a confession that he does not expect it to be very hard to write a better tax bill than the one his committee fashioned at the current session of Congress.

The best tax bill, it would appear from this lay seat, would be one that would bring the most good to the largest number of people. One means to reduction that would affect every taxpayer to the same extent would be to increase the personal exemption back nearer the level of necessary living expenses. A second step might well be the elimination of many of the excise taxes, such as those on soaps, toilet powders, and other articles that are both essential and necessary for personal cleanliness—and particularly needful in bringing to maturity the Nation's most precious output—its babies. The 20-percent tax on motion-picture admissions and on admissions to sports and other recreation events costing a half dollar or less should come off or be reduced. Exemptions were lowered and excise taxes made more numerous as a last resort. They were put on last, more or less as emergency measures, so logically should be first to be reduced or removed.

In fact, it would seem to be good policy for the Federal Government to recede as much as possible from the excise-tax field and leave this to the States. It doesn't set well with us Tar Heels who pay a 3-percent State sales tax on many articles to have the Federal Government come along and put 20 percent more tax on the same articles. That is rather vicious double taxation.

Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal:

PLAIN LOGIC SUPPORTS VETO OF THE TAX BILL

President Truman's veto of income-tax reduction was no surprise. On the other hand, this newspaper, for one, would have been not only surprised but shocked if the President had acted otherwise, for he would then have abetted a move which was contrary to the principle and practice of sound public husbandry and which, besides, was plainly stamped as a device of vote-catching politics.

Except as to the latter point, Mr. Truman's message to Congress covered the ground completely. His arguments elaborated the statement of his premise, that "this bill represents the wrong kind of tax reduction at the wrong time."

As he put it, there is first the obvious fact that business, employment, and national income are extraordinarily high. The amount of liquid funds in hands of corporations and individuals is nearly $200,000,000,000. Tax reduction is not now needed to provide additional funds for business expansion.

Mr. Truman also rejected the idea that tax reduction is likely to bring lower prices by putting more money in hands of consumers for spending and therefore for inducing higher production. There are too many inflationary pressures which are not altogether natural. The price structure is abnormally unstable because of human as well as economic factors, which are in turn both international and domestic.

There followed the clear statement of a fundamental principle: "A time of high employment and high prices, wages, and profits, such as the present, calls for a surplus in Government revenue over expenditures and the application of all or much of this surplus to the reduction of the public debt." Tax reduction would cut revenues in the face of enormous uncertainties as to our obligation to world readjustment, which means peace.

The President continued: The proposed reductions are not fair and equitable, but give small relief to the low-income taxpayer (the average family man getting $2,500 a year) and large relief to those in high-income brackets. If the bill were to become law, he pointed out, these inequities would be frozen; and this fact brought him naturally to the companion argument. What the country needs now is thorough-going revision of the tax system, not an arbitrary manipulation of tax rates without touching the necessities of complete reforms and adjustments in the entire field of tax revenues.

However, with all this and its undeniable soundness, the President did not attack the crowning defect of the bill. He did not do so because he chose the high ground of reason rather than the shambles of political debate. But he could well have pointed out that the very fact that the tax-reduction bill was H. R. 1 is a betrayal of its purpose. It was the first bill dropped into the hopper when the new Congress convened last January. It came before there was any discussion or examination of the needs of government. It was branded by the very haste of its creation as arbitrary and unsound, the reflection of a dogged intent to cut taxes for the mere sake of cutting and as partisan political play that was all too transparent.

There are some who will suggest that the President is himself looking to the political skies, that he will be heard later on proposing a tax reduction of his own. But we find ourselves going along with him and his veto on the simple logic of his arguments. It is no time to cut taxes when debts are so great, needs so uncertain, and, above all, when taxes are least burdensome.

DAR Immigration Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from today's Washington Daily News:

BISHOP RAPS DAR'S IMMIGRATION STAND

A Catholic bishop said today the Daughters of the American Revolution would find their "patriotism slipping" if they'd "put down their lorgnettes long enough" for a good look.

Bishop James A. Griffin, of Springfield, Ill., chided the DAR and other organizations which oppose legislation to admit Europeans into the United States.

INDIANS ONLY

"The only inhabitant of this country who could, with any grace whatsoever, protest against the proposed immigration of Europe's displaced persons is the American Indian," the bishop said in a statement to a Catholic relief conference here.

"The rest of us," he said, "were either displaced persons ourselves at one time, or else our forefathers were."

Bishop Griffin strongly endorsed a pending bill to allow entry to 400,000 displaced Europeans.

"Those who clamor that America is not large enough to embrace these prospective newcomers are blind to statistics," he said.

"If the members of such organizations as the Daughters of the American Revolution would recall the names of Kosciusko, Von Steuben, and Lafayette, and would put down their lorgnettes long enough to get a good wholesome American look at the suffering of the descendants of those Revolutionary heroes, I'm sure they'd discover their patriotism was slipping."

"If other congressmen of decades past, in utter disregard of Christianity and Americanism, had refused entry to displaced persons of other generations," the bishop continued, "perhaps our foes in this last war might have numbered among their heroes men named Eisenhower, Nimitz, and Patton."

FOLLOW DAR'S SUIT

NEW YORK, June 26.—Delegates to the national convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs yesterday voted 556-341 to condemn pending legislation to admit displaced persons in this country.

The losers are preparing to offer a substitute resolution approving such legislation. To maintain yesterday's position, they said, will hold up the club members to censure by the "right thinking people of the world."

The Significance in the Action of the Congress in Enacting the Taft-Hartley Labor Bill Over the President's Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address that I made on Tuesday evening, June 24, before the National Republican Club in New York City:

A month ago I was privileged to address the National Republican Club, and in the course of that address I stated that the general impression in Washington was that the President would sign the labor bill in spite of the temporary estrangement this might cause between the President and the so-called labor leaders. This was, of course, because the signing of the bill would bring to the President strong public support and in anticipation that he would make opportunity, in the way a President can, for renewed good will from the representatives of labor between now and Election Day next year, and that in any event labor would support Mr. Truman, rather than the Republican candidate for President.

This surmise was thrown out in many conversations in Washington between persons considered astute in political matters, because it was believed that such a course would be what might be termed "better politics" than a veto would be, followed by the almost certain passage of the bill, overriding the veto.

The feeling, so far as I have heard it expressed, still is, and stated with even greater emphasis, both by the President's friends and by his critics, that it would have been better politics on the part of Mr. Truman had he signed the labor bill.

Assuredly by his veto of the tax bill and the labor bill the President destroyed the spirit of cooperation which he had promised the Republican Congress, and by the same

token diminished any reasonable expectation of any course on the part of Congress, actuated wholly or partly by a spirit of cordiality toward and cooperation with the President.

However, Washington conversationalists are now saying that one of the impelling motives which actuated the President to veto the labor bill was the dreadful nightmare of a third party led by Henry Wallace, in case the President should sign the bill, believing that a Presidential veto would cut the ground from under the feet of Henry Wallace and his fellow travelers, greatly diminishing, if not annihilating, the likelihood of a Wallace third party.

Some of you may remember that I predicted in my remarks here a month ago that Henry Wallace would form a third party. Others have made the same prediction and some say that it was as much to head off such a movement that the President vetoed the labor bill as it was to strengthen his ties upon organized labor.

Perhaps the President's veto of the labor bill will kill the organization of a third party and doubtless it has insured the articulate support next year of the labor leaders, if not the support of the mass of union membership, which has many and grievous faults to find with the conduct of certain of the leaders of labor.

Of course, it had begun to seem probable that if the President signed the Taft-Hartley bill a third party under the leadership of Henry Agard Wallace would have been formed. Now that the veto of the labor bill, as I said a moment ago, cut the ground from under the feet of Henry Wallace and his fellow travelers, perhaps in referring to Mr. Wallace today we may take the initial of the first name "H," annex that to his middle name "Agard," and call him "Haggard" Wallace. If the nickname "Haggard" Wallace sticks to Mr. Wallace as a result of this suggestion here this evening, I accept the responsibility.

But if one thing could be abundantly clear above all others, it is that the large scale protest strikes of organized labor already in progress because of the passage of the labor bill and the prediction freely made that a large proportion of all organized labor will go on protest strikes within a week, demonstrate beyond question the desirability and even the need for the labor legislation which has been enacted and perhaps for an even stronger control of the conduct of labor unions than the statute which has just become a law now provides. Of this more at a later date.

And we may as well call a spade a spade when we are talking here together. The fact is, the so-called protest strikes, because the Congress of the United States in the exercise of its sworn duty and its constitutional duty to serve the public welfare has enacted legislation of which these pressure groups do not approve, is but a short step removed from anarchy and the destruction of constitutions, laws, and the existing social order.

One would think that the President's face today would be very red indeed as he saw the newspaper reports of these strikes, completely refuting the justification of his veto of the labor law and completely supporting the action of Congress in overriding this veto.

Important developments are under way. Meanwhile, all honor to the 20 Democrats who placed the interests of the Nation in a category superior to that of party and partisan dictation and who disregarded the fetters of party fealty in the interest of the general welfare; and all shame and condemnation for the 22 Democrats in the Senate, who considered party ties and partisan dictation to be superior to the public good.

Finally, it seems to me that the enactment of the Taft-Hartley labor bill by the overriding of the Truman veto and the decision of the United States Supreme Court upholding the Lea Act, intended to curb some of the activities of James Caesar Petrillo, both coming the same day, are events of profound and reassuring significance as affecting the future of labor relations in the United States.

Now, for the judicial enforcement of both the Taft-Hartley law and the Lea law, conditions in the Untied States, industrial, economic, and political, will be observed to be following an upward curve.

I thank you.

Livestock Production in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Mississippi is rapidly coming to the front as one of the greatest beef cattle and livestock-producing States in the Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I herewith include an editorial from the McComb (Miss.) Enterprise-Journal of date of June 23, 1947, stating facts that Mississippians have long known, and which are fast becoming known outside of Mississippi:

K. C. STEAKS

There was a time when a person in Mississippi wanting a good stead would ask his butcher or the waiter in a restaurant, "Have you any K. C. steaks?" The K. C. in this instance, of course, means Kansas City, and the idea of a K. C. steak was the suggestion that the meat came from the West. Western meats were then far superior to meats produced in the South, particularly in the case of beef.

But this situation is different today. If you want a good steak you can go to your butcher or your restaurant and say, "I want some good native beef."

The situation has changed. Your best meat today is produced in Mississippi. Once only scrub cows roamed the woodlands of Mississippi. Today Mississippi has beef cattle as good as are produced anywhere. This applies to the cattle right here in Pike, Amite, Franklin, and other nearby counties. Your butcher has learned to say, "I have some good native beef."

So when you want a good steak you do not have to ask for something that came from the West. As a matter of fact we would be giving good counsel to the people of the West, especially the Kansas City area, if we should say to them, "Go to your butcher and ask for a good Mississippi steak." Brother, we don't mean maybe. We mean sho' nuff.

H. R. 2 Provides for Optional Cash Settlement of Terminal-Leave Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before the members of Subcommittee No. 10 of the House Committee on Armed Services and urged favorable consideration of H. R. 2 which I introduced on the first day of the Eightieth Congress and which provides for optional cash settlement of terminal-leave bonds.

My statement in behalf of H. R. 2 is as follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 10 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 2

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing before you in behalf of H. R. 2, which I introduced in Congress on January 3, 1947, to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 by providing optional cash payment of terminal-leave bonds and for other purposes. At the time of the passage of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, the majority of the House membership advocated cash payment of terminal-leave benefits. However, the Senate insisted on the bond method of payment, whereupon the House reluctantly agreed in order that the bill would not fail. Thus, the bond method became the first step in the direction of final settlement since it enabled the veteran to obtain a certificate showing his entitlement to a certain amount of terminal-leave pay.

The average size of bonds issued up to date is $208.60. Excluding those veterans entitled to less than $50, and who were paid in cash, the total face value of terminal-leave bonds now outstanding is $1,800,000,000. When all eligibles have received their bonds, the value will amount to approximately $2,800,000,000.

Speaking of the total number of persons eligible for terminal-leave bonds, including those already awarded bonds, the number is approximately 14,500,000, which includes the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. While 14,500,000 veterans are eligible for terminal-leave benefits, applications have been received from approximately 10,500,000.

I repeat again that at the time of the passage of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, the majority of the membership of the House favored cash payment in the same manner that officers received terminal leave benefits. The intent was to avoid any discrimination by treating officer and enlisted personnel on the same basis. My bill, H. R. 2, is designed to carry out such an intent. Under existing law, terminal leave bonds earn interest at the rate of 2½ percent, and since the face value of the bonds is part of our national debt, it is evident that cash payment of these bonds will eliminate not only the interest charge, but, in addition, will result in further savings to the American taxpayer by reducing the public debt.

My bill, H. R. 2, provides for optional cash payment of terminal leave bonds. It is difficult to prophesy how many veterans may exercise the option to cash their terminal leave bonds. In this connection it is interesting to observe that following World War I, Congress provided for the optional cashing of adjusted compensation bonds, commonly referred to as the "soldiers' bonus". According to information furnished by the Veterans Administration, of all the bonus bonds issued, 88.2 percent were redeemed prior to maturity, the remaining 11.8 percent being held to maturity. While there were 3,800,000 veterans eligible in World War I, we have 14,500,000 eligible in World War II for terminal leave benefits. Nevertheless, the experience following World War I may be viewed as a good criterion.

It should be kept in mind that under the GI bill, recent figures of the Veterans' Administration discloses that 2,500,000 veterans have received educational benefits, 6,500,000 unemployment insurance benefits and 500,000 loans on real estate and for business purposes. However, many of these veterans have received loans, unemployment insurance and educational benefits with the result

that the total number of veterans receiving assistance under the GI bill approximates 7,000,000, leaving nearly 8,000,000 veterans who have received no benefits except mustering out pay and terminal leave bonds.

There is no denying that the entire veteran population of World War II is in dire need of financial assistance when one considers the cost of living today. The disabled veteran who receives compensation for his wounds is finding the high cost of living a difficult problem, and he needs the cash value of his terminal-leave bonds at this time. Let us not forget that the 8,000,000 veterans who have received no benefits under the GI law will be greatly helped. Who will deny that they have waged a valiant battle in returning to civilian life and in striving to keep their heads above water without Government assistance?

Every Member of Congress knows the sentiment of the veterans of World War II in regard to the cash payment of terminal-leave bonds. The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States have heartily endorsed the principles of H. R. 2 as evidenced by letters received from Mr. John Thomas Taylor, director, national legislative committee of the American Legion, and Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director, national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

My bill (H. R. 2) was the first bill introduced in the Eightieth Congress to provide for the optional payment of terminal-leave bonds. Since its introduction, I have had the opportunity to develop information concerning technical defects in the measure.

In cooperation with the Government agencies concerned, certain changes have been suggested to me which will perfect H. R. 2.

For that reason, I would like to suggest to the committee that changes be made in the language of my bill. On page 2, line 6, subparagraph 4 should be amplified to eliminate administrative difficulty that may develop when a veteran who has already applied for terminal-leave benefits in the form of a bond requests settlement in cash when H. R. 2 becomes law.

In addition, I realize that a definite date should be established allowing ample time for the development of the necessary procedure to effect cash payment of the bonds.

I also believe that H. R. 2 should provide a specific section in regard to the method to be used in cashing the bonds.

Finally, I believe that the necessary language should be added to my bill to strike from the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 section 6 (d) (1), which provides for the assignment of terminal-leave bonds for United States Government life insurance. The reason for this recommendation is evident, as there is no longer any need to assign a bond after enactment of H. R. 2.

In regard to the suggestions I have made to perfect my bill, the language necessary to effect these changes is left to the discretion of this committee.

In conclusion, I want to thank the chairman and members of this committee for the opportunity of appearing in behalf of H. R. 2. I respectfully request your approval of the bill.

Address of Hon. William T. McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a sound and powerful address made by Hon. William T. McCarthy, United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts, on June 16, 1947, to the graduating class of the Somerville High School, of Somerville, Mass.:

My dear young men and women, on occasions like this it is indeed a rare privilege for us of the older generation to join with you in the happiness of your hour of achievement.

Commencement exercises or, if you will, a graduation program are both distinct terms of art with definite meanings and profound connotations. Their common place in the American educational scheme has bred in us a casualness which is apt to make us forget their true meaning.

It is not my intention to be overserious. Truly, this is an occasion for joy—a time for happiness in accomplishment—a place along the pathway of your careers where we all may pause and rejoice with you.

But as the designation of the occasion tells us, it is not the end, or even the climax, of your educational process. It is the commencement of the next period of your development—your graduation up the ladder of learning to the next stage of training for responsible citizenship.

And in this light this delightful moment should be seized as a time for reflection and stock taking.

Throughout your high-school courses you have had the priceless opportunity to participate actively in what I conceive to be the most precious process in the world today—the program of American training for high privileges and duties of American citizenship.

In your classrooms and under the guidance of your teachers you have acquired skills, memorized facts, knowledge, techniques, ideals, values, and other patterns of conduct as a result of feeling, perceiving, thinking, and doing.

You have been the active agents in your own education. The teachers, your parents, and the spirit of your school and your society have been merely the molders, the directors, the providers of opportunity, and the guideposts for you.

You have educated yourselves by your conscientious participation in all of your school and social activities—by reading textbooks, solving problems, writing themes, asking questions, reciting answers, taking examinations, playing in the orchestra, participating in sports, experimenting in the laboratory, attending entertainments, listening to explanations, observing and describing what goes on about you—and thus gradually coming to the knowledge that learning is a process of growth.

Although you may not have realized it throughout your courses, your opportunity to do all this was planned and arranged for you by the efforts, the sacrifices, and the devotion of your teachers and parents.

Your first debt, then, is one of gratitude to those who have made it possible for you to experience the joy and sense of accomplishment which attends this moment.

In their behalf, however, I can tell you that their primary purpose in affording you the opportunities of education was not to win your thanks. While they do and will appreciate your gratitude, I can assure you that they had a higher motive.

It was simply a purpose, born of their hopes and prayers, that through you they could preserve, improve upon, and perpetuate the glory and the traditions of our American democratic heritage.

You boys and girls—young men and women, are the generation of light. In all history, no other generation has ever witnessed such political upheaval, social catastrophe, and worldwide disturbance.

Within the very space of your high school career, you have seen the climax of the greatest of wars and advent of an atomic age.

It is because of these things that we, going before you, are so anxious that you should succeed in preserving our civilization. Many of your own contemporaries left, or were taken from, the pleasant pursuits of school days to fight in mortal combat the forces of evil that would have destroyed every ideal which you have been taught here and every democratic concept which your country stands for.

In thanks to Almighty God for giving us victory over those evil forces, therefore, what is the duty that is yours and mine?

It is many-fold, and only to the degree that we perform it shall we be able to say that we are worthy of the heritage that has been handed down to us.

We must subscribe wholeheartedly and without reservation to the principle that our salvation lies in belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Without that faith national harmony, international concord, or peace through a United Nations will never be achieved. Regardless of your religion—whether you be Catholic, Protestant, or Jew—in that principle and in its true practice you will find the strength and the comfort so necessary to withstand the rigors of the adult life upon which you are about to enter.

Secondly, in the civic and political area, you have a bounden duty to exert all your energy and devote al your loyalty to the principles of American democratic and constitutional government. As you probably know, today your beloved America is the greatest and most powerful nation on earth. Unfortunately, in certain lands and among certain peoples it is also the most hated. This hatred stems from envy and frustration—envy of our national resources and productive genius—and frustration by our willingness to fight and die for the way of life which we believe essential to individual and national dignity.

This way of life is the American way—the way you have been taught to follow and cherish throughout your schooling. It is the way, not of the "four freedoms" alone, but rather the way of unnumbered liberties and blessings which makes our democracy unique. It is the only way along which you can travel as free human beings, and maintain the community and the society which have grown vigorous and strong under the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

All this means simply that the lessons of your civics, government, social science, and history classes must be applied by you in the form of active and intelligent participation in all phases of your community and social life. The rights, privileges, and blessings which go with your priceless gift of American citizenship cannot be preserved unless you realize that they entail duties and obligations to God, to home, to the State, and to the Nation.

It will not be easy for you to assume these duties and obligations. I can think of no period of history which compares in difficulty with the one which you are about to enter.

Yet you would not be the youth of America if you did not face the problems of your coming age with confidence and determination. Your faith in God, your hope in His mercy, and your love for your fellow man will sustain you. For these are the eternal principles which will survive even an atomic age, and enable men in any generation to perform great deeds and achieve a high destiny.

Be mindful of all the moral yardsticks that serve as a medium by which to help make good citizens. Be mindful of the advice of your spiritual leaders and the example of those great men and women that have helped to make this country what it is. Be mindful of your obligation to give a practical demonstration of the meaning of the word "worship" by making your private and public lives living examples of the value of the truths of American citizenship.

Pray for the assistance of Heaven to maintain these high standards. Be faithful to yourselves not only in great things, but in small things. Be charitable.

Permit no foreign ideology to interfere with your chain of thought. Be tolerant, permitting no racial or religious prejudices to cross the pathway of your thoughts. Hold fast to your liberties.

Never sell God or your country short and you may be certain that your future life, not measured by dollars and cents, but measured by the eternal principles of truth and justice, will be a success.

Stalled Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marquis Childs, from the Washington Post of June 25, 1947:

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)
STALLED SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The farther we get from the war the more we are inclined to forget the lessons of the war. In so many ways we seem to be lapsing back into the past or, rather, into a convenient dream of the past.

We learned in the war the paramount importance of scientific research and development. We saw what the efforts of our own scientists brought about—the proximity fuse, atomic fission, DDT, a whole host of discoveries, most of them with direct application to better peacetime living as well as to war.

Supposedly we learned in the war the criminal folly of our draft policy. Unlike our allies, we drafted young men out of science and scientific education. And thereby we robbed our science of 4 years that can never be made up.

Supposedly we learned that we had to try to make up for this folly. In the immediate aftermath of VJ-day, there seemed to be a great deal of enthusiasm for supporting scientific research with Federal funds. Almost everyone seemed to agree that such a program was necessary so that we could begin to make up for the grave loss we suffered during the war in pure research, in medicine, chemistry, physics, in every field. We were told that the Soviet Union was appropriating vast sums for research and exploration.

So—action. But before action, argument. As in so many instances, it seemed difficult to agree on how we should proceed.

One source of disagreement was how the Federal money should be distributed and who would get the gains. The Federal funds would be made available in grants to business for research and to nonprofit laboratories run by universities and foundations. But what about the patents that would come out of this research?

Democrats on the liberal-labor side, such as Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE of West Virginia, wanted to write into the law that any and all business firms should be able to use the inventions achieved with Government money. Conservatives said this would take away incentive. They argued that it was contrary to the free-enterprise system.

Little less than a year ago this column told how a Federal science foundation bill was buried in the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It had been passed by the Senate with the Kilgore patent provision.

Now another science foundation bill seems to be stuck in the same committee. Like the first one, it has been passed by the Senate. In deference to the conservatives, the present bill does not contain the provision making patents available to all. When it was up in the Senate its sponsors said that in the beginning about $20,000,000 a year would be spent for scholarships, for research, for all-around promotion of science, including the exchange of scientific information with foreign countries. It is, then, a more modest bill and far less controversial with respect to changes that it might or might not bring about in the present organization of our society.

This time the opposition has come from another source. It is led by Frank B. Jewett, president of the ultraconservative National Academy of Sciences. He has been conducting a one-man crusade against the science foundation bill.

Jewett has argued that such a Federal foundation is unnecessary. He insists that the money to advance science must come, as in the past, from private contributors. To encourage such contributors, he proposed special tax exemption on donations to science and education, which is a dubious proposal since it would require several years to institute and then it is doubtful how much money would be realized for basic research.

Running through Jewett's propaganda is the fear of Government interference. That is understandable. We believe passionately in the right of free inquiry and free research.

But it sometimes seems that we carry this so far as to bend over backward into complete distrust of any common effort for the general good. It begins to look as though only in war can we unite in a common cause.

Backing for science now, as approved in the Senate bill, is a minimum for national security. The time has come to prove that we have learned at least this one small lesson out of the war.

Hon. Fred E. Busbey Replies to Mr. William A. Benton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following letter which was delivered to Mr. William A. Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, today:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 26, 1947.*
Mr. WILLIAM A. BENTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENTON: Under date of June 16, 1947, you transmitted to me an analysis of my speech in the House of Representatives May 14, 1947, wherein I expressed my personal objections to certain persons employed in your division of our State Department.

Notwithstanding the fact that the analysis is dated June 2, 1947, and it was released to the press on June 10, 1947, I appreciate your sending it to me, even though I did not receive it until June 16, 1947.

In your covering letter of June 16, you state you would welcome my comments. I appreciate your invitation to comment and assure you I would have done so without solicitation. Because of certain constructive changes that have recently been made, as well as those contemplated in the near future, in the personnel of the State Department, which, in my judgment, will be for the good of the service, I have purposely refrained from sending you my comments until after the Mundt bill successfully passed the House.

Your letter states, "the attached analysis was prepared by one of the members of my staff." Evidently Mr. Sargeant did not inform you as to the total number of employees of the State Department who worked on the analysis of my speech, for if he had, I am sure you would not have stated that it was prepared by a single member.

I note in the memorandum purported to have been prepared by Mr. Howland Sargeant for you, he chooses to completely ignore the following specific charges in my speech of May 14 against the activities of your Department, which are fully amplified by supporting data:

1. That the Department has misled Congress and the country regarding the difficulties of access to Soviet and Soviet-controlled areas.

2. That it has broadcast innocuous and oftentimes harmful material at great expense to the Government.

3. That Communist publications have easy access to confidential information in the Department.

4. That the Department has cooperated with well-known Communist organizations and individuals known for their Communist sympathies.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating, Mr. Benton. Of what value is it to cite a long list of meaningless biographical references to the key persons in your Department; namely, Haldore E. Hanson, Charles A. Thomson, and William Treadwell Stone, when they have by their very activities indicted themselves as persons whose judgment is either disastrously faulty or whose loyalty is open to serious question, or both?

In the case of Mr. Hanson, the reference to him as a "smuggler, soldier, and diplomat" very obviously is an error, and I freely admit it. But this does not mitigate the fact that Mr. Hanson did undeniably possess the confidence of the Chinese Communists. Can you cite for me a single correspondent who is not pro-Communist in his sympathies who has ever been permitted entry inside the lines of a Communist Army? If various press agencies have chosen to employ such a man for any special purpose, it does not justify his employment by the State Department. State Department employees, particularly top-level policy makers like Mr. Hanson, should, like Caesar's wife, be above suspicion.

In a grapevine effort to whitewash Mr. Hanson, it has been amusing to note the type of rumors being circulated on the "hill" to the effect that it is a case of mistaken identity and that he wrote the articles in his youth, etc. It is also interesting that you do not make this defense in writing.

Furthermore, in regard to Mr. Haldore E. Hanson, I am, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to investigate the State Department, herewith making a formal demand on you to furnish me a photostatic copy of Mr. Hanson's form 57, copies of all correspondence pertaining to any and all deferments he received from serving in the armed forces of our country during World War II, as well as an explanation as to why he was ever employed by the State Department.

I am indeed surprised that exception should be taken to my reference to the association of Mr. William T. Stone with Mr. George Shaw Wheeler. You evidently do not know and were not informed by Mr. Sargeant of the circumstances surrounding Mr. Wheeler's clearance by the Civil Service Commission. Mr. Wheeler was cleared by the Civil

Service Commission as a direct result of pressure by certain individuals like former Congressman John M. Coffee and others with a significant list of Communist-front affiliations and sympathies. Mr. Wheeler can be proven to have been a Communist stooge inside the Socialist Party. Men who have returned from Germany have testified to his pro-Communist activity in that important strategic area. Files in my possession show that David A. Morse "contacted William T. Stone, Chief of the Foreign Economic Administration in London and told Stone that he (Morse) wanted a statement from the FEA that Wheeler was trustworthy and could be continued on Morse's staff; that a day or two later Stone talked with Morse and stated that he (Stone) was convinced in his judgment that Wheeler was not a disloyal man, that Wheeler was completely trustworthy and should be continued in his present post and that as far as Stone was concerned there was no question or reservation in his mind." This clearly indicates that someone is lying in connection with this case.

In further reference to Mr. Stone, you say that the editorial board of Amerasia, of which he was a member, never met. Would you consider sound the judgment of an individual, in such an important spot as Mr. Stone, who allows his name to be used on the masthead of a magazine involved in espionage activities (see case of Philip Jaffe), which has advocated without protest from Mr. Stone, a negotiated peace with Hitler's Germany, and which numbered among its contributors Frederick V. Field, whose Communist views and record are a matter of public knowledge? Mr. Stone's connections with Amerasia cannot be properly defended, nor can his employment by your Department.

In reference to Mr. Thomson's article in Foreign Policy Reports of May 1, 1938, he could well have cited such men as Norman Thomas, Luis Araquistain, and others as to the disruptive activities of the Communists in the Spanish Loyalist forces. Mr. Thomson's statement, however, is one of unreserved praise.

Reference to Abel Plenn as former chief propaganda analyst at the American Embassy in Spain can be found in the Daily Worker of April 7, 1946, page 10; April 3, 1946, page 13; New York Times, April 2, 1946, page 26; Daily Worker, May 8, 1946, page 12; April 19, 1946, page 13. He has contributed to the New Masses.

As to the quotation from the speech of Mrs. Esther Brunnauer, it seems to me that the most elementary kind of diplomacy would require that our representatives do not support charges made against us by a nation which is vilifying this country throughout the world.

The analysis states, "In the course of his speech [Busbey] made allusions to 15 persons by name. Only 4 of these persons are now employed by the Department."

This, of course, if true—and I assume it is—is extremely gratifying to me. I will appreciate it if you will kindly supply me with the names of the persons to whom I referred who are no longer in your Department, along with the following information:

1. The date their employment was severed with the State Department.

2. For what reasons were they detached from the State Department pay roll?

3. Were they transferred to some other division of the State Department or to some other agency of the Government? Please advise me of their present location and position.

4. What is your reason for retaining the last 4 of the 15 I criticized on the pay roll?

Now, Mr. Benton, if you will discuss in detail the rest of my speech and refute the charges made there, I would appreciate it. Where I have made a demonstrable error, I have admitted it. Will you do the same?

Finally (a matter of extreme interest to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments) would you please advise me at the earliest possible date whether you or any of your staff have enlisted the services of one or more advertising agencies for the purpose of promoting a campaign in behalf of the activities of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, and in behalf of an appropriation for such purpose? If so, will you please let me know the name or names of such firms? Furthermore, I would like to have a statement from you as to who engaged such firm or firms and paid for the services and expenses.

Very truly yours,

FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress.

Equal Rights Under the Law Means Equal Justice for Women and Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1947, I had the honor and pleasure to introduce House Joint Resolution 62, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The amendment reads as follows:

That equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

This amendment shall take effect 3 years after being ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

Seven other distinguished members of the House have introduced identical resolutions as follows: Mr. CLIPPINGER, of Illinois; Mr. DAWSON, of Illinois; Mr. HARRIS, of Arkansas; Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas; Mr. POTTS, of New York; Mr. REED, of New York; and Mr. FARRINGTON, of Hawaii.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWO COSPONSORS

This proposal is nonpartisan and nonpolitical. Our distinguished colleague, Hon. FADJO CRAVENS, Democrat, of Arkansas, in the Seventy-ninth Congress rendered outstanding service in cooperating with more than 70 other Members of the House and myself in advancing this legislation.

One hundred other distinguished Members of the House, Democrats and Republicans, have joined Mr. CRAVENS and myself as cosponsors in supporting this proposed amendment in the present Congress. Their names and States are as follows: Representatives FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama; RICHARD F. HARLESS and JOHN R. MURDOCK, of Arizona; OREN HARRIS, WILBUR D. MILLS, and W. F. NORRELL, of Arkansas; JACK Z. ANDERSON, WILLIS W. BRADLEY, CARL HINSHAW, GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, RICHARD M. NIXON, JOHN PHILLIPS, and HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California; ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE and JAMES T. PATTERSON, of Connecticut; J. CALEB BOGGS, of Delaware; JOE HENDRICKS, J. HARDIN PETERSON, EMORY H. PRICE, DWIGHT L. ROGERS, and GEORGE A. SMATHERS, of Florida; W. M. WHEELER, of Georgia; ROY CLIPPINGER, THOMAS L. OWENS, and WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois; GEORGE W. GILLIE, EDWARD A. MITCHELL, and EARL WILSON, of Indiana; PAUL CUNNINGHAM and HENRY O. TALLE, of Iowa; WINT SMITH, of Kansas; W. HOWES MEADE, THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON, and BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky; JAMES DOMENGEAUX and OTTO E. PASSMAN, of Louisiana; GEORGE H. FALLON, HUGH A. MEADE, and EDWARD T. MILLER, of Maryland; ANGIER L. GOODWIN and EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts; HOWARD A. COFFIN, ROY O. WOODRUFF, and HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD, of Michigan; H. CARL ANDERSEN and EDWARD J. DEVITT, of Minnesota; WAT ARNOLD, CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL, MARION T. BENNETT, WALTER C. PLOESER, and ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, of Missouri; FRED A. HARTLEY, JR., of New Jersey; WALTER G. ANDREWS, WILLIAM T. BYRNE, EDWARD J. ELSAESSER, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, BERNARD W. (PAT) KEARNEY, ARTHUR G. KLEIN, W. KINGSLAND MACY, JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, DAVID M. POTTS, DANIEL A. REED, and KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York; HERBERT C. BONNER and MONROE M. REDDEN, of North Carolina; WILLIAM LEMKE and CHARLES R. ROBERTSON, of North Dakota; HENDERSON H. CARSON, P. W. GRIFFITHS, and J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio; GLEN D. JOHNSON, TOBY MORRIS, and WILLIAM G. STIGLER, of Oklahoma; HOMER D. ANGELL, of Oregon; FRANK BUCHANAN, ROBERT J. CORBETT, WILLIAM J. CROW, HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, WILSON D. GILLETTE, MITCHELL JENKINS, JOHN MCDOWELL, FREDERICK A. MUHLENBERG, ROBERT F. RICH, GEORGE W. SARBACHER, JR., and HARVE TIBBOTT, of Pennsylvania; WIRT COURTNEY and DAYTON E. PHILLIPS, of Tennessee; WILLIAM A. DAWSON, of Utah; J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR., JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., and HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia; HOMER R. JONES and THOR C. TOLLEFSON, of Washington; E. H. HEDRICK and MELVIN C. SNYDER, of West Virginia; JOHN C. BROPHY, ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, and WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, of Wisconsin; FRANK A. BARRETT, of Wyoming; and JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, of Hawaii.

EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW

Over the stately and magnificent Supreme Court Building chiseled in the marble are the words "Equal justice under law." The Supreme Court interprets the Constitution, the acts of Congress and the laws of the several States. It is not within the province of that great Court to make the laws. There can only be equal justice under law provided there is equality in the laws themselves. The suffrage amendment wiped out the discrimination on account of sex in giving voting rights to women. Until that amendment was adopted there could not be equal justice under the law. The equal rights amendment, if adopted, will grant men and women equality and equal justice under the law regardless of sex and will forbid discrimination against men or women on the basis of sex. If this amendment is ratified future laws of the Congress cannot deny or abridge

equality of rights merely on account of sex, and no State law can deny or abridge equality of rights under the law, either to men or women on the basis of sex. This does not mean uniformity of the laws enacted by the legislatures of the 48 States. It merely forbids any State passing any law which denies or abridges equality of rights to men or women on account of sex. One State may adopt laws that are radically different from the laws of other States. For instance, the Legislature of the State of Ohio may pass laws that differ widely from the laws passed by the State of New York. They can do this provided that such law or laws do not deny or abridge equality of rights on the basis of sex to the citizens of the State to which the laws apply.

This proposed amendment preserves State's rights and also equality of rights which will mean justice under the law. There are many gross discriminations in the laws against men as well as women in the several States based on sex, and there are discriminations under the Federal laws against women as well as men based entirely on sex. There may be a difference as to the effect of the laws on men and women in the same State but such differences cannot be based on sex. We earnestly contend that this is not right and it results in a failure of many of our citizens to receive equal justice under the law.

NONPOLITICAL AND NONPARTISAN

The Republican National Convention platforms in 1940 and in 1944 each contained a plank approving this legislation. The Democratic National Convention in 1944 adopted a plank approving this legislation in principle, and as I recall, President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey accepted the provisions of their respective platforms, including these planks. President Truman has approved this legislation. This is the second time this amendment has been endorsed by a President of the United States. Speaker of the House JOSEPH W. MARTIN, in speaking of the movement for the equal rights amendment plank in the 1944 Republican platform, said in June 1944:

I am for the amendment absolutely and unqualifiedly.

Hon. Harrison E. Spangler, chairman of the Republican National Committee, in June 1944, at the Republican Convention, endorsed the equal rights amendment, as follows:

I am for the equal rights amendment and have no doubt but what the Republican Party will adhere to its traditional stand for justice and equality and again endorse the amendment.

Former Senator John W. Townsend, chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, in June 1944, said:

The Republican Party is proud to have been the first to carry the banner of equality for women. I am wholeheartedly for the amendment and believe it will not be long before it will take its place beside the suffrage amendment in our Constitution.

Senator Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, recently appointed United States member of the Security Council of the United States, said in June 1944:

This proposed amendment is very close to my heart and I am particularly gratified that it will be placed in the Republican platform. I had the honor of submitting the favorable report of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate to the Senate in the spring of 1943, and I am very happy that it has now been approved by the whole Republican Convention.

Senator Austin, on the floor of the Senate in July, 1946, in speaking in support of this amendment, said:

I favor the proposed constitutional amendment primarily because I believe in the principle it seeks to establish. * * * The amendment does not deal with rights in the abstract. The amendment deals with certain rights, namely, rights under the law. It says that no State shall deny equality of these rights under the law on the sole ground of sex. A discrimination on the grounds of sex alone is perfectly absurd.

Hon. Carroll B. Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee, on May 3, 1946, addressed the following telegram to the National Women's Party, West Central Regional Conference, Hotel Fort Des Moines, Des Moines, Iowa:

All good wishes for your conference and the sincere hope that the adoption of the equal-rights amendment will not be longer delayed. Our party has twice gone on record in national convention for this measure—in 1940 and 1944. I need not recall to you the part played by the Republican Party in winning the women suffrage amendment. We are proud of that record. We are also proud of the record of our party up to the present in support of the equal-rights amendment. It was a Republican Senator, Charles Curtis, of Kansas, later Vice President, who first introduced the equal-rights amendment in the United States Senate. It was a Republican Representative, Daniel R. Anthony, of Kansas, nephew of the great Susan B. Anthony, who first introduced the equal-rights amendment in the House of Representatives. In this Congress the equal-rights amendment has been favorably reported by both Senate and House Judiciary Committees. Republican Members of both these committees took a leading part in securing these favorable reports. This measure is now on the calendar of both Houses. Action is due the women of the country. In my opinion if our party were in power there would be no question about the immediate submission of the equal-rights amendment.

CARROLL REECE,
Chairman, Republican National Committee.

President Harry Truman, as United States Senator on April 20, 1944, approved the equal rights amendment in a letter to Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, a leading Democrat and chairman of the Congressional Committee of the National Woman's Party and a leader in the fight for the equal-rights amendment, and which letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, April 20, 1944.

DEAR MRS. MILLER: I understand you are going to visit the great State of Missouri and will address the Federation of Women's Clubs in St. Louis.

Please express my sincere regret at not being able to attend the meeting to which I received an invitation, but due to other engagements it is not possible for me to be present.

Say to them that I am in sympathy with their fight for the equal-rights amendment because I think it will improve the standard of living by setting a level on wages equal for both sexes.

I have no fear of its effect on the home life of the American people. Nearly every man has his woman on a pedestal anyway, and this will only make the legal aspects of the situation more satisfactory from the standpoint of the legal rights of the women of the country.

I am sure you will have a cordial reception in the great city of St. Louis, and I know you will enjoy being a guest in the great State which I represent in the Senate of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Hon. James A. Farley approves the equal-rights amendment in a letter to Miss Anita Pollitzer, who is now president of the National Woman's Party of the United States and who has rendered most distinguished and effective service in the advancement of equal rights for women. The letter is as follows:

NEW YORK, *May 4, 1945.*

DEAR MISS POLLITZER: As I have been away considerably during the past few weeks, this is the first opportunity I have had to acknowledge your letter of the 17th relative to the equal-rights amendment.

I am in favor of the passage of this amendment and I sincerely hope and trust that it will be accomplished. I quite agree in your statement equal legal rights for women seem the logical conclusion of the suffrage amendment.

With my best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. FARLEY.

Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, the present Postmaster General of the United States and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, on May 3, 1947, sent to Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, a Democrat and a distinguished advocate and worker on behalf of women, the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 3, 1947.*

MRS. EMMA GUFFEY MILLER,
Des Moines, Iowa:

On behalf of the Democratic Party we want to extend best wishes for the success of your convention. The Democratic Party included the equal-rights amendment in its platform in 1944. We still stand on that. The Democratic Party has taken the lead in giving the women representation in party organization and in Government and our party will continue to be deeply concerned in all that relates to the advancement of women.

ROBERT E. HANNEGAN,
Chairman, Democratic National Committee.

Cardinal Dougherty, of Philadelphia, approved this equal-rights amendment in the following letter to Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy and Dr. Mary Sinclair Crawford:

CARDINAL'S OFFICE,
Philadelphia, Pa., September 22, 1945.

MRS. CECIL NORTON BROY,
DR. MARY SINCLAIR CRAWFORD,

MY DEAR LADIES: Apropos of the equal rights amendment to the Constitution, according to which it is proposed to give women full constitutional rights, I am glad to hear from you that his Excellency, President Truman, and also the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives are heartily in favor of this amendment. Personally I agree with them in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

D. CARD. DOUGHERTY,
Archbishop of Philadelphia.

A similar endorsement comes from Rev. Donald B. Cloward, of the Baptist Church of White Plains, N. Y.:

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y., *September 18, 1945.*

The equal-rights amendment is a constructive measure and should be passed. Any legislation ought to protect individuals in accordance with need or the hazard of the job, and until wages and salaries are adjusted to meet basic family responsibilities women in commerce and industry should receive equal pay with men for the same skills and performance.

Numerous laws on the statute books seemingly enacted to protect women actually discriminate against them in favor of men. Only a uniform national law such as is proposed in the equal-rights amendment will correct this inequality.

The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, Pa., had the following to say about the equal-rights amendment:

We wish to draw attention also to a recent survey of some of the great documents of human freedom in England and the United States by a distinguished jurist, William Draper Lewis, director of the American Law Institute. This survey begins with Magna Carta, the Petition of Right, the Bill of Rights, and ends as follows:

"It is a comment on the immaturity of civilization that the recognition of woman's political equality with man did not come in the United States until 1920. The fight to gain for her full legal recognition as a human being has neared its culmination in the presentation to Congress of the equal-rights amendment."

Believing that the time has come for Congress to submit this resolution to the State legislatures for their consideration, the Committee on the Judiciary voted, February 21, 1946, to report this resolution to the Senate with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

Rev. Beverley M. Boyd, executive secretary, Department Christian Social Relations, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, joins others in commending the equal rights amendment:

NEW YORK CITY, *September 28, 1945.*

Senator CARL A. HATCH,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Subcommittee,
Washington, D. C.:

I regard it as just and fundamental to have the principle of legal equality for men and women as stated in the equal rights amendment incorporated in the Constitution. I urge immediate favorable report of this amendment by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee and wish this individual statement be laid before the committee as part of the hearing proceedings.

BEVERLEY M. BOYD,
Executive Secretary, Department Christian Social Relations, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

THIRTY GOVERNORS APPROVE

Twenty-three Republican and seven Democrat governors have made public statements in support of the equal rights amendment. I am unable to furnish the names and States of the seven Democrat governors. The Republican governors and their respective States are as follows: California, Hon. Earl Warren; Colorado, Hon. John C. Vivian; Delaware, Hon. Walter W. Bacon; Idaho, Hon. A. C. Bottelfsen (former Governor); Illinois, Hon. Dwight H. Green; Indiana, Hon. Ralph E. Gates; Iowa, Hon. Robert D. Blue, Iowa, Hon. B. B. Hickenlooper (former Governor); Kansas, Hon. Andrew F. Schoeppel; Kentucky, Hon. Simeon Willis; Maine, Hon. Sumner Sewall (former Governor); Massachusetts, Hon. Leverett Saltonstall (former Governor); Michigan, Hon. Harry F. Kelly; Minnesota, Hon. Edward J. Thye (former Governor); Montana, Hon. Sam C. Ford; North Dakota, Hon. Fred C. Aandahl; Oregon, Hon. Earl Snell; Pennsylvania, Hon. Edward Martin (former Governor); South Dakota, Hon. M. Q. Sharpe; Vermont, Hon. Mortimer R. Proctor, Vermont, Hon. William H. Wills (former Governor); Washington, Hon. Arthur B. Langlie (former Governor); Wisconsin, Hon. Walter S. Goodland.

Many State legislatures have approved this proposed amendment. Among these was the resolution adopted in March 1945 by the New York State Legislature at a time when the Republicans were in control of both houses of the legislature and declared as follows:

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is respectfully memorialized to adopt and submit to the several States the equal rights amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which amendment is now pending before the Congress.

On February 28, 1947, the North Dakota Legislature memorialized the Congress to pass the equal rights amendment to the Constitution, and submit same to the several States for their approval and adoption. The Republican leader in the House of Representatives, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, who gave valuable assistance in the movement to have the equal rights amendment plank in the 1944 Republican platform, said in June 1944: "I am for the amendment absolutely and unqualifiedly."

This proposed amendment strongly appeals to men and women in every walk of life, who believe that there should be no discrimination against any man or woman merely on the basis of sex.

Irving Fisher, political economist and author, recently deceased, endorsed the equal rights amendment, as follows:

It seems to me that the same reasons which justified giving the franchise to women apply to other rights.

One of these reasons is that women are not fully represented by men. The life of a man is largely centered on preserving property and earning a living. The life of a woman is largely centered on preserving life and caring for children. War costs both property and life. But the latter cost is the greater and this fact is more appreciated by women than by men. If world peace ever comes, it will be largely due to the love of the lives of the family in the hearts of wives and mothers. Whatever adds to the prerogatives of women promotes world peace.

IRVING FISHER.

Dr. Frederick May Eliot, president, American Unitarian Association, adds his approval, as follows:

It has long seemed to me that the equal rights amendment to the Federal Constitution ought to be adopted because it simply makes explicit and definite what I think the vast majority of the American people really want. Indeed, I suspect most Americans still take it for granted that the woman suffrage amendment guarantees equality of rights for men and women, and when they discover that this is not so I am confident almost all of them would be ready and eager to take whatever steps may be necessary to accomplish the end they have in mind. If the use of my name would be of any value in the effort to promote the campaign for the adoption of this amendment, I should be very glad to have you use it.

Raymond Gram Swing joins with other distinguished Americans in approving this proposal as follows:

The guaranty of full equality to women would complete the historic catalog of the first freedoms which are embodied in the concept of Americanism. The grant of equality to women has been delayed by complex and secondary considerations, chiefly the effect it would have on legislation designed to protect working women from exploitation. Democratic society tends to tie itself into such knots, where the major principle is tangled up with the consequences of well-meant compromises. Then comes a time when the compromises themselves, however well-intentioned, hold back the acceptance of a vital principle. That time has come in this question of full equality for women. It needs to be affirmed and established as the basic law of the land. The inconvenience of readjusting past compromises is insignificant. The principle is vital. America cannot be a vigorous democracy while withholding any fraction of full equality from half of its citizens.

RAYMOND GRAM SWING.

Prof. Arthur Meier Schlesinger, professor of American history, Harvard University, and president of the American Historical Association, commends this legislation as follows:

Many well-meaning persons have opposed the equal-rights amendment on the ground that it would deprive women of special statutory protection in industry. In recent years, however, legislation has extended to men wage earners most of the advantages earlier granted exclusively to women. Hence, no substantial objection of a practical character remains for treating the two groups of workers differently, whereas the principles of democracy require that they should be treated alike. For these, as well as for other reasons, I favor the proposed amendment.

ARTHUR MEIER SCHLESINGER.

Thirty great national women's organizations have expressed their approval of this legislation and are engaged actively in promoting its adoption by the Congress and ratification by the States. These organizations are as follows: National Woman's Party; General Federation of Women's Clubs; National Education Association of the United States; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; Industrial League for Equality; National Association of Women Lawyers; Women's National Democratic Club; American Medical Women's Association; Women's International Association of Aeronautics (board of directors); American Society of Women Accountants; American Women's Society of Certified Public Accountants; Osteopathic Women's National Association; We, the Mothers, Mobilize for America; National Association of School Secretaries; National Council of Women Chiropractors; Women's Auxiliary to the National Chiropractic Association; Mothers and Women of America; Association of American Women Dentists; American Federation of Soroptimist Clubs; American Council for Equal Legal Status; National Association of Women; National Association of Colored Women; Mary Ball Washington Association of

America; Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; Congress of States Societies; Pilot International; St. Joan Society; Alpha Iota Sorority; Avalon National Poetry Shrine; Wheel of Progress; Delta Phi Epsilon; Americans United; Quota International.

The executive committee of the National Council of Women of the United States, an organization with an affiliated membership of 5,000,000 women (the United States branch of the International Council of Women), endorsed the equal rights amendment. These organizations represent a total of about 8,000,000 women, and from every walk of life.

POPULAR INTEREST AND SUPPORT INCREASES

The equal-rights amendment was first introduced in the Senate in 1923 by the Honorable Charles E. Curtis, of Kansas, later Vice President of the United States. It was first introduced in the House of Representatives the same year by the Honorable Daniel R. Anthony, Member of Congress from Kansas and nephew of the great suffrage leader, Susan B. Anthony. The amendment has been introduced in every subsequent Congress.

The support back of the amendment was slight at the time of its first introduction, but has grown steadily. In particular, the following progress has been made during the past few years, and as a result the amendment now stands in a more favorable position than ever before:

The two major parties endorsed the equal-rights amendment, for the first time, in 1944; previously it had been endorsed only by the Republican Party.

The President of the United States, Hon. Harry S. Truman, endorsed the amendment. This was the second time the amendment had ever received Presidential support.

The Judiciary Committees of both Houses of Congress reported the amendment favorably, for the first time, in the last Congress; previously only the Senate committee had taken this action.

The numbers of sponsors in the House of Representatives has grown from 3 in 1941 to over 100 in the present Eightieth Congress. This increase shows the growing sentiment for the measure.

The Senate voted on the amendment in 1946, for the first time. A majority vote was secured, although not the two-thirds necessary for a constitutional amendment.

The chairmen of both major political parties gave their support in 1944, the first time that the chairman of any political party had taken such action.

Over 30 governors have endorsed the equal-rights amendment during the last 3 years; previously only 1 governor of a State had given his endorsement.

For the first time, in 1943, a leading newspaper gave editorial support to the amendment. This honor went to the New York Herald Tribune. A few weeks later the Christian Science Monitor followed with editorial endorsement, and since then editorial support has been given by leading papers from coast to coast.

The National Woman's Party, always a leader in the movement for justice for women, formed a joint committee of women's organizations in 1943 to work for the amendment. This was the first time that joint action for the amendment had ever been taken by women's organizations.

During the last few years religious leaders of practically all denominations have come out in support of the amendment.

The organized teachers of the country gave their support to the amendment for the first time, in 1944, when the National Education Association, by the almost unanimous vote of its national convention, gave its endorsement.

Furthermore, in 1945 the United Nations Charter was ratified by our country. This Charter declares, in unequivocal terms, for fundamental human rights—the rights of men and women.

These forward steps were taken at a time when the work for any reform movement was hampered by great difficulties—the war, railroad strikes, coal strikes, shortage of help, hotels, transportation. But through perseverance and devotion on the part of the women of the Nation, the work for justice for women was carried on through the difficult war years, as through the preceding peace years, and this great progress achieved.

Each one of us elected to the House and Senate in 1944 is committed to the principle laid down in this proposed amendment. We are committed by the platform pledges of the two great political parties. I consider it a high honor and a great privilege to be one of the 102 sponsors of this historic measure to wipe out discrimination on account of sex.

I congratulate the millions of patriotic and intelligent women, as well as many men, in their steadfast efforts to keep our Nation in the vanguard in this great movement for justice and equality. I congratulate them on what has been obtained. It is my sincere belief that in the end victory will crown the efforts of those who contribute to this splendid cause. We are eternally right—and right and justice in the end must prevail.

H. R. 2007, THE RED HERRING

The equal-rights amendment has grown so rapidly in popular esteem that those who opposed it have collaborated together and had introduced H. R. 2007, which, in effect, would set up a commission to study the biological differences between men and women. It requires no commission to make such a study at this time. The people of this Nation are already fully advised of the biological differences between men and women.

The purpose of H. R. 2007 is merely to obstruct and delay final action on the equal-rights amendment by the Congress. Some have denominated H. R. 2007 as the red herring.

On March 10, 1947, the Federation of Women's Republican Clubs of New York State, Inc., at their annual legislative conference, the members of which were made up of 272 Republican Women's Clubs from 60 of the 62 counties in New York State, recorded their unalterable objection to H. R. 2007. They said, in part:

> It represents a philosophy with regard to economic, civil, social, and political discriminations against women that in the past has proved a political liability to those who have held that philosophy. We criticize H. R. 2007 for the futility of its purposes. It can serve no useful purpose, save only to delay women in their achieving that equal status under law which all citizens of a free country should in right and justice possess. Specifically, we object to the assumption that the economic, civil, social, and political status of women requires at this late date investigation and study and research by a Presidential commission. The economic and civil status of women has already been the subject of comprehensive investigation and study and report by the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women, and other organizations, and these studies are presently available to the Members of the Congress for their enlightenment on the subjects proposed for commission study.

They also point out that those who are most vocal in support of H. R. 2007 in the years past opposed the granting of suffrage to women and other measures helpful to women.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, I introduced House Joint Resolution 132, which would authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, as provided by the Canadian-American agreement on March 19, 1941. On May 9, I introduced another resolution—House Joint Resolution 194—which incorporated self-liquidating provisions into the original resolution.

I might say that two of my colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] have also introduced similar bills. Furthermore, this same measure has the sponsorship of some 15 Members of the other body, from both political parties, and including the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Great Lakes region—of that great midwestern section of the United States which embraces some 20 States and 40,000,000 people—have long hoped for the construction of the seaway project. These people know that the well-being and prosperity of the Midwest requires the waterway. The people of New York and New England are also beginning to realize that their future is closely linked with the development of the Midwest, and are now convinced of the feasibility of the project. In fact, all Americans who sincerely desire the fullest development of the Nation's resources and who have the future prosperity and security of the Nation at heart, now favor the St. Lawrence project.

It is most natural that the seaway should command the support of a majority of Americans. The arguments in favor of the project are so overwhelming that no other conclusion is possible—the construction of the waterway is the

logical and rational thing to do. It is a necessary step in the development of the natural resources and commerce of the great Middle West.

In my opinion, congressional action during this session to enact the St. Lawrence seaway proposal into law is desirable for the following reasons:

First. The seaway will result in greatly reduced transportation costs and will therefore encourage the development of commercial relations between the Great Lakes area and the Eastern States. The Midwest will be able to ship grain, automobiles, iron ore, and other products to the Eastern States and receive in return the textiles and other manufactured goods from the New England area. The seaway would also make the markets of the world accessible to the Great Lakes area, and the lower transportation costs will enable many foreign countries to buy American grain rather than turn to our competitors. It has been estimated that from Duluth to Liverpool, the shipping costs on wheat will be reduced by 5.2 cents per bushel or $1.74 per ton as a result of the waterway. This will mean an expansion of American grain sales abroad. The same will be true of many commodities—the opening of the Great Lakes area to deep-sea traffic with reduced shipping costs will mean that both the Middle West and the Eastern States would enjoy a great volume of business.

Second. The seaway is necessary as a source of cheap electrical power. It is estimated that the power generated from the St. Lawrence project would amount to nearly 2,000,000,000 kilowatts per year, twice as much as now generated by Boulder Dam. The cost of producing this power would be only about one-tenth of 1 cent per kilowatt-hour. Thus New York and New England would have abundant cheap power available to allow for industrial expansion in these areas—the St. Lawrence project would act as an industrial shot in the arm for this entire region.

Third. The St. Lawrence waterway is necessary from the point of view of the national security of the United States. This deep waterway would provide the United States with additional inland shipping facilities, a thousand miles of protected navigation, and additional shipbuilding yards, not to speak of the power so necessary to war effort.

And fourth, the waterway project is necessary for the development of the raw materials of the Great Lakes—our vast peat, taconite, low-grade ores, and forest resources. The high-grade ores of Minnesota are running low, and our future prosperity requires the transportation facilities that the waterway would afford.

In spite of these arguments which justify the St. Lawrence waterway project, the people of the Great Lakes States have been disappointed time and again as Congress after Congress has yielded to the "dog in the manger" alliance of the private power, coal, railroad, and aluminum interests. Year after year, these selfish lobby groups have allowed their picayunish private interests to take precedence over the welfare of the Nation.

It would appear from all reports that sectional interests have again triumphed over the general welfare during this session of Congress. Again the representatives of certain seaboard interests, the coal and railroad lobbies, have been able to stymie the efforts of the proponents of the waterway in the other body.

It seems to me that it is high time for the Congress of the United States to stop listening to these selfish interests who are sacrificing the well-being of the whole people for narrow sectional reasons. It is the duty of every Member of the Congress to do his duty by enacting into law as soon as possible the St. Lawrence waterway project which is so essential to the future prosperity of not only the Midwest, but the people of all the 48 States.

The Co-Ops Grow Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of the House, I submit herewith two very interesting and well-written editorials from the issues of the Indianapolis Times for June 17 and June 23:

[From the Indianapolis Times of June 17, 1947]

THE CO-OPS GROW UP

The Indiana Tax Equality committee has compiled a list of 81 cooperatives doing business in Indiana that have made major expansions during the past year, bought or built new plants, or spread out into new fields of enterprise.

Although this is only a partial list of such co-op growth, it reveals the astounding size to which such operations have grown in this State. They own grain elevators, oil refineries, mills, warehouses, insurance companies, commercial refrigeration plants, fertilizer factories, coal mines, hatcheries, farm implement factories, lumber mills, oil wells and pipe lines, river barges and docks, building materials, production and distribution concerns, livestock marketing organization, bulk oil plants, wholesale and jobbing enterprises and retail stores.

Many of them are the biggest businesses in the cities in which they operate. One in Indianapolis last year reported a business volume of $25,900,000, and another a gross business in excess of $37,000,000, for the year.

The interesting feature about all these businesses is that they pay no Federal taxes. Cooperatives are exempt from such taxes on the theory that they enable a group of neighbors, especially farmers, to get together and buy and sell cooperatively and thus save themselves a little money.

We haven't any way of knowing, of course, about the profit structure of the two big Indianapolis co-ops we just mentioned, nor any exact means of estimating just how much they save by paying no taxes. A private business doing a gross volume of $25,000,000 a year might be paying as much as $5,000,000 in tax, and some pay more on such a business volume.

Assuming that each of these co-ops did save $5,000,000 in tax last year, just for the purpose of discussion, that would be $10,000,000 saved by these two. But the Federal Government hasn't saved anything. It still needs the $10,000,000 to pay its running expenses. So where does it get the money?

Why, it just adds that $10,000,000 right on to the tax bill of the rest of the people in Indianapolis—and they pay it. And so on for all the other 79 co-ops that have made big expansions this last year. The taxes they don't pay still have to be paid—they are just shifted to other people.

In general those taxes are shifted to their competitors the privately owned stores and filling stations and refineries and insurance companies and coal yards and so on, which are also doing business in those communities. Thus the co-ops are able to sell merchandise a little cheaper, and quite often, lately, to drive those private competitors out of business, or buy them in to add to their own business. Thus the Farm Bureau Co-op of Hobart and Lakes Counties last year bought the Roper & Roper feed mill, grain and coal business, and the P. & C. Family Foods, cooperative, bought French's supermarket in Veedersburg, and the Clay County Farm Bureau bought the Griffith grain elevator, for $100,000, in Clay City—and so on all over Indiana.

There is nothing to indicate that cooperatives can do business at any less cost than any well-run private company in the same line.

They have to pay wages, and rent, and all the other running expenses that anyone else has to pay to do business. Because they have, in many cases, attained large volume, they are thereby able, perhaps, to buy merchandise for resale at slightly lower cost, though, of course, no lower than a private competitor who buys on the same scale.

Their big savings is in taxes. It is a double-barrel saving. It takes the tax cost off their shoulders and adds it to the tax bill of their competitors.

That gives them an unfair competitive advantage over the business that is paying its share—and theirs—of the cost of running the Government. That advantage shows up very clearly in Indiana, in the large growth of the co-ops and in the growing number of communities in which their operation has forced their competitors out of business.

Carried to its logical conclusion, this trend would ultimately result in all business being cooperative—and all exempt from tax.

Wonder who woud pay the cost of running the Government then?

[From the Indianapolis Times of June 23, 1947]

CO-OPS AND TAXES

We were not, of course, surprised to find the officers of cooperative business enterprises in disagreement with us on the matter of taxes, at least to the extent that we believe co-ops should pay taxes and they believe they should not.

Mr. Harry Goss, an editor of Farm Publications, Inc., one of those who disagrees, has asked for a statement of our policy on this whole subject. That is a reasonable request and one with which we are happy to comply. This is it:

Complete equality in taxation.

Every individual and every business should pay taxes on exactly the same basis as every other individual and every other business. All share alike in the benefits of government, and all should share alike in its cost. We know of no other way to levy taxes justly and fairly under a democratic form of government.

It is proper that a church, for instance, be exempt from taxes, but only if all other churches are likewise exempt. But if a church should decide to buy and operate a department store, we do not believe the store should be exempt from any tax that is paid by any other department store.

The same principle, it seems to us, should apply to businesses run by cooperative or mutual benefit groups. These are organized in such a way that their customers are also their owners, and thus share in whatever profit they make. Of this we have no criticism. What is manifestly unfair is that these owners should get what amounts to a Government subsidy in the form of exemption from a tax that a competing business, owned by someone else, has to pay.

In Indiana cooperatives operate hardware stores, grocery stores, filling stations, and a long list of other businesses that are in direct competition with other hardward stores, and so on, not owned by co-op groups. Why should one store pay a tax and the other pay none?

Thirty-fifth Graduating Class of the Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very challenging and thought-provoking address delivered this morning by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] to the thirty-fifth graduating class of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CHALLENGES TO AMERICAN LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. Chairman, Director Hoover, fellow Americans, I am sincerely grateful for the opportunity to address this outstanding group of American law-enforcement officers.

This occasion marks your completion of a memorable, significant experience in your lives. It likewise marks part of your contribution to the American job of maintaining peace and order in every community.

You came to the greatest capital on earth to receive light, information, and insight into your problems through one of the greatest and cleanest government institutions on earth—the FBI. I doubt if there are more than a handful of other Government units anywhere in the world which can boast so unsullied a record, so wholesome a hard-hitting history of service in the public interest as does the FBI.

No mention of this outstanding organization would be complete without paying deserved tribute to its splendid leader, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, whom I count as a friend and whom you know to be so important in helping to maintain our American way of life.

THE FBI ACADEMY

Since Director J. Edgar Hoover organized it in July of 1935, the FBI National Academy has been functioning effectively as an educational force in law enforcement.

At the time this unique institution of higher police training was initiated, lawlessness and the rapidly spreading moral leprosy of gangsterdom was a desperately serious menace to our country's welfare.

This academy was founded for the express purpose of instructing police officers and executives active in law enforcement and allied fields. The academy and the men it has produced have made an outstanding contribution to the fight against crime. I understand that the kind of training given you here in Washington has, through your graduates, been made available to more than 100,000 police officers in the field.

WISCONSIN POLICE TRAINING

The law-enforcement officers of my own State of Wisconsin have always been closely allied with the FBI National Academy, and a representative from the police department of Superior, Wis., is graduating here today. He will be the thirtieth Wisconsin police official to graduate from the academy.

If I may be pardoned a further reference to my own State of Wisconsin, I might add that last year 39 FBI law-enforcement training schools were held in the State. The Wisconsin Sheriff's Association, the Wisconsin Chiefs of Police Association, banding together with the FBI, have created a committee which plans police-training schools throughout the State. Individuals attending these schools will be issued certificates bearing the seals of the three departments mentioned.

Thus far this year, some 22 training schools have been conducted in Wisconsin, and it is contemplated that 25 additional schools will be held before the end of the year. There have been general police-training schools in 22 Wisconsin cities, and in 1946 there were specialized law-enforcement training schools in seven Wisconsin cities.

MEANING OF ACADEMY'S WORK

To us in Wisconsin and to observers in every State the work of the academy is tremendously impressive. It is impressive because it is a cooperative working partnership between Federal, State, and local officials.

Principally, however, it is impressive in the accomplishments of its graduates which have brought credit to the individual officers, their departments, and fellow graduates of the academy—accomplishments written on the pages of contemporary American history in stories of courage, loyalty, and patriotism at a time when courage, loyalty, and patriotism are so essential to our national life.

OUR SUBJECT TODAY

I should like to sketch briefly the historical backdrop for the drama of American law enforcement and then discuss the role which each of you men are playing in it.

HISTORY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

It is an ironic indictment of our high-octane civilization that the list of statutory crimes has lengthened with the growth and development of modern life. With the increased number of statutory crimes, there has been a corresponding increase in the complexity of law enforcement.

In ancient times "the outlaw was said to have caput lupinum (a wolf's head) and might be knocked on the head like a wolf by anyone that should meet him." It wasn't until the reign of England's King Edward III in the fourteenth century that this power was restricted to the sheriff when armed with lawful process.

Until recent history, except in periods of civil disorder, crime was largely a local phenomenon. But, as one writer pointed out—

"The Kansas town into which sweeps a squad of high-powered cars to depart amid a cracking of machine-gun fire, after a bank has been expeditiously rifled, can count no native sons among the bandits; nor can hue and cry rouse the townsfolks to effective pursuit. Local police are equally impotent to act."

LEVELS OF ENFORCEMENT

All of this means that there has been an increasing responsibility on local law enforcement. It means moreover that there is an increasing necessity for a closer integration of all of the law enforcement and investigative agencies of government—local, State, and Federal.

There are probably shadowy twilight zones between the effective jurisdiction of local police officers, county police officers, commonwealth police officers, and Federal officers, but the work of all of these units must be coordinated.

There is no national police force as such. The reason that the Federal Government has been called into many cases has been that with respect to some offenses it alone is competent to act.

Appeals to the Federal Government for assistance in law enforcement have not gone unanswered. Laws directly involved with the problems of law enforcement have been a small, but important, part of approximately 66,000 laws which have been passed by Congress since 1789, though some of these laws have been repealed or superseded or otherwise eliminated.

PRESENT TRENDS

During the colonial period, law enforcement was largely left to the local sheriff and constable, a process which sometimes brought stagnation in law-enforcement procedures.

At the present time the trend is to centralize and to coordinate control of law-enforcement agencies at all levels through appointed administrators who have tenure during good behavior and during efficient administration.

It is my firm conviction that tenure is essential not only for the administrative positions, but for police personnel if progress is to be maintained. Tenure supplies added stability and incentive for continued study in learning and developing new techniques of crime detection. This learning and these techniques are essential to effective law enforcement, and nowhere do we find that better illustrated than here in the academy.

As you know, speaking in general terms, law enforcement today is divided among three groups—Federal, State, and local. Congress has endeavored to enact legislation which will aid these groups. This congressional action has been essential because the country is large, the population is highly mobile, and crime knows no State boundary lines.

FEDERAL JURISDICTION

It is perhaps desirable to point out at the outset that the Supreme Court in an opinion handed down in 1812 held that the courts of the United States have no common law jurisdiction over criminal cases, because such jurisdiction was not among the concessions made by the several States to the Federal Government.

Nevertheless, while the Federal Government does not possess a general jurisdiction on police power, this does not mean that it does not exercise police powers in connection with other broad constitutional grants. In conjunction with these other grants, article 3, section 8, of the Constitution confers upon Congress the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers * * * in the Government * * * or in any department or office thereof."

For example, to enable Congress to control interstate and foreign commerce, it may be necessary for Congress to employ means which have in them characteristics of police regulations.

STATE AND FEDERAL POWER

In general, it may be said that in respect to laws of this character, the exercise of police power by the State must yield whenever Congress legislates upon the precise subject matter conferred by the Constitution upon the Federal Government.

Actually, the powers reserved to the States to protect the public health, safety, and morals are not absolute but subject in certain instances to the paramount authority of the Government of the United States.

Let me cite some examples of the use of broad constitutional power by Congress to aid law enforcement: The National Firearms Act of June 26, 1934; the National Motor

Vehicle Theft Act; the National Stolen Property Act.

I mention these few laws as illustrations of the interest and the efforts of Congress in providing the Nation-wide dragnet of Federal assistance in the relentless prosecution of criminals.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

I might also mention the act of June 6, 1934, in which Congress gave consent to any two or more States to enter into agreements or compacts for cooperative effort and mutual assistance in the prevention of crime and the enforcement of criminal laws and policies.

For example, there could be a compact which would give authority to the officers of the enacting State to cross a State line and continue the pursuit in the cooperating State. There could be a compact giving authority to officers of an enacting State to return a fugitive after arrest in the cooperating State without following the customary rendition procedure. There could be a compact whereby one State would agree to supervise parolees released by another State upon the latter's agreement to supervise parolees released from the first State.

There are many possibilities under this authorization. The extent of State cooperation is almost unlimited and it is up to each State to decide to what extent it will effect mutual compacts with other States for better results in law enforcement.

FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

Further action and assistance from the Federal Government may be necessary. There are some who favor Constitutional changes which will permit the consolidation of all law enforcement, but that could afford a convenient and a dangerous approach to the corporate state to which I will shortly refer.

There are those, however, who insist that greater cooperation among governmental units and coordination of their activities is the answer to the present crime problem of this country.

One thing is certain and that is that the mere enactment of new laws or the amendment of old laws is no substitute for proper education and training in good citizenship or for good old-fashioned devotion to law and order.

NEED FOR GOOD CITIZENSHIP

I am greatly concerned with this last point because I believe it is the real answer to problems of crime and delinquency. It is not enough for us to have effective law enforcement.

It is not enough for us to have infallible police systems.

Perhaps our greatest need in the problem of crime is the need for education—character education in the home, spiritual education in the church, and civic education in the school.

If we can insure that the character lessons learned in the home are retained in our national character, then there need be no fear that law and order will be swamped in a national crime wave.

If we can insure that the spiritual lessons learned in the little churches and the great cathedrals of our land are incorporated in our daily lives, if these lessons throb in our hearts and minds and in our national blood stream, then we need not fear the crimes of violence which result from man's inhumanity to man.

If we can insure that every school in our land teaches the real vital meaning of democracy and the great rights and duties and privileges of American citizenship, then we need not fear crimes against the state.

The character of a nation is, of course, merely the composite expression of the character of its individual people.

OUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS CITIZENS

If there exist in our land corrupt big city political machines; if there exist in our land well-organized gambling syndicates; if there exist in our land sinister white-slave rings or a spiderlike national network of dope peddlers; if there exist in our land at any time a lengthening underworld shadow—it is an indictment of us as individuals and as citizens; it is an indictment of our educational process; it is an indictment of our failure to keep the trust with the lessons we learned at the family hearthside; and it is an indictment that we have failed in the law-abiding faith of our fathers.

I repeat that in my judgment it is not enough for us to be concerned with good law enforcement. We must be concerned with creating good citizens so that the problems of law enforcement will never be created.

CHALLENGE TO GRADUATES

Your group has completed a special program of instruction and training. As a part of the great body of law-enforcement officers comprising Federal, State, and local units, you represent the long line of historical progress of law and order to the present time.

You have at your disposal highly specialized, trained laboratory and scientific assistance. Your achievements will bear a direct relationship to the use you make of this assistance, to the intelligence and to the initiative which you bring to your work and to the extent that you cooperate wholeheartedly with other law-enforcement officers and units.

I have every confidence that you will do these things, that you will make the finest possible utilization of your training and facilities which are offered to you.

IMPORTANCE OF YOUR JOB

Yours is a big and important job, although at times it may seem drab and monotonous. I recall the thought of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes that every job, however humble, can be a great job if greatly performed. Yours is a great job. You are the custodians of America's great values. We are looking to you now more than ever to protect us from the influences of crime on the one hand and from the influences of anti-American and un-American ideologies on the other.

Every youth in our land looks to the policeman on the beat. In his eyes there is no more important official in the community. As a youngster, I can recall seeing the officer in my little community and respecting him with greater esteem perhaps than that accorded the other public officials. Today, as then, our youngsters are looking to you as models of American manhood, clean living, clean thinking, clean acting.

But every American adult looks to you also. You are the protectors of our homes, our lives, our fortunes, material and spiritual. At times it may seem that you are not appreciated, that you are performing your dangerous work at great personal risk to yourself without the gratitude of the American public. As W. S. Gilbert said, "A policeman's lot is not a happy one."

But I say to you that the American people in their underlying wisdom and common sense do recognize the indispensable job you are doing.

LAW-ABIDING OFFICERS VERSUS GESTAPO

Certainly you have unique positions in the world today, a world in which the so-called secret police state is still known for its concentration camps, its brass-knuckle justice, its drumhead courts, its lethal chambers and its mass executions. You men are servants of the law, of government, unlike foreign Gestapos sold into moral slavery as servants of a personal fuehrer or leader. We know that in these dictator states every policeman on the beat is an agent of the secret police. He respects the civil liberties of no one. He enforces arbitrary rules, his personal hates and the personal hates of his dictator master.

But we are a nation governed by law and not by men. You men enforce that law. In so doing, in administering the law, you help make the law. I am sure that through your training here, you will be better able to execute the law and establish precedents for protection of civil rights, while protecting the community from crime and foreign-thinking ideologies.

YOUR ANTIRACKETEERING ROLE

We know that there are various kinds of racketeers. There are political racketeers, labor racketeers, and economic racketeers. But probably more serious than all these is the racketeer who strikes at the morality of a community, who would sabotage our youth and make them criminals, who would termite our American traditions and the American values of which you are custodians. A racketeer, simply speaking, is one who will not abide by the rules of the game, but who wants to make only his own rules in spite of the harm he may inflict on his fellow human beings. You men constitute, in part, our front-line defenses against racketeering.

CONCLUSION

Gentlemen, I am grateful to have had the privilege of addressing you on this splendid occasion.

We have briefly looked at American law enforcement and at your individual roles.

You in your uniform are the center of all eyes, whether you know it or not. The attention of your community is focused upon you. What you say, what you do, how you act, has a direct bearing and reaction in your community.

We send you forth with the blessings of your Government. You have now been, figuratively speaking, cradled in one of the greatest institutions of its kind. I know you have been inspired by its effectiveness and by the way it is devoted to the public welfare. You go out with the blessings of all of us.

It is our prayer, too, that in furtherance of your work we may constitute every home and every school and every church as a potential laboratory in the prevention of crime.

If we strengthen the moral fiber of our people, and if we build high the bulwarks of American character, we need have no concern for the future of our land.

How Can We Strengthen the American Family?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a short article by Dr. George J. Schulz. This article was selected as particularly outstanding by the judges in the recent Town Hall of the Air contest for the best contribution of 750 words on the subject How Can We Strengthen the American Family? For it Dr. Schulz was awarded the Town Hall certificate of merit.

Although I am sure that many Members of the House still remember Dr. Schulz as our erstwhile Director of the Legislative Reference Service—1935–37—I include the following brief biographical statement:

Dr. Schulz is an alumnus of the Johns Hopkins University, the University of Maryland, George Washington University, American University, and National University. He holds, among other degrees, that of doctor of jurisprudence, conferred by National University. He was professor of political science and head of the department of history and political science at the University of Maryland and associate professor of political science at National University. He was in charge of the investigations in flood control undertaken in 1927–28 by the House, and later, in 1928, by both House and Senate in the Boulder Dam legislation. He was consultant and adviser to Senator James Watson, of Indiana, during the debates in the Senate on the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

Among the publications of which he is the author are the following: Election of the President by the House of Representatives; Stream Pollution in the United States; Vocational Education in the United States; Creation of the Senate; Creation of the Federal Judiciary; editor in chief, Annotated Constitution of the United States; Subversive Materials in Textbooks Used in American Schools.

The article follows:

HOW CAN WE STRENGTHEN THE AMERICAN FAMILY?

We can strengthen the American family by realizing the contribution that the American home has made to our national unity, our national security, and our international renown. The realization of that contribution can come from a study of the lives of America's forefathers and foremothers, the sacrifices they made to establish homes even in the wilderness, and the virtues with which they endowed those homes.

We can strengthen the American family by retracing the steps of our national progress and learning again or anew the spiritual and the moral values that were fostered and developed in those early American homes and that have pervaded our national consciousness so profoundly since the building of the first home on American soil. Ours is the history of an exemplary national ancestry.

We can strengthen the American family by realizing that in our colonial homes virtuous mothers observed the tenets and taught the principles of a victorious faith by precept and conduct. Our colonial mothers courageously overcame the vicissitudes of a strange and rugged environment and they endowed their children with courage; they were prudent in the management of their affairs and they left their children a heritage of wealth; they were temperate in their desires and in the use of their possessions and they left their children a heritage of modesty and thrift; they dealt circumspectly and they left a heritage of discretion and wisdom; they practiced justice and they left a heritage of tolerance; they excelled in the spiritual virtues and religious morality prevailed in their homes; they devoted themselves to the needs and the cares of their families and they gave the Nation a race of notable men and praiseworthy women.

We can strengthen the American family by realizing that the endowment that flowed from our colonial homes was recapitulated in every settlement in the fertile valleys and plains beyond the mountains. Environment made the settlers of America self-reliant and independent. Aspiration for home ownership made for the solidarity and unity of the family and the Nation. Our early American families were self-sustaining units in the national economy.

We can strengthen the American family by meeting the present threat to its continuance from the increasing substitution of so-called dwelling units in artificial cliffs high above city streets for the American home as it existed for more than 300 years. We can meet that threat by building in suburban and even in semirural areas houses for all who need and want homes and who are eager to perpetuate the individual home ownership that characterized our formative years. We possess the genius, the ability, and the means for such enterprise.

We can strengthen the American family by utilizing for the development of home and family more of the abundant leisure created by our modern industrial economy. We must cease wasting that abundant leisure in perishable pleasures. We must cease dissipating it in alluring but debilitating entertainment. We must curtail our lavish expenditures for extravagant nonessentials. We must make the American home a place for victorious living.

We can strengthen the American family by realizing that there is much in our modern way of living that tends to destroy the family unit and by adopting measures to prevent that destruction. We can preserve the family unit when our men find the same thrilling experience in establishing homes as did our forefathers and when our women devote themselves to homemaking with the same diligence as did our foremothers. We must cease deserting the American home for the club, the bar, and the cocktail lounge.

We can strengthen the American family when we reestablish for our juveniles the edifying ideals of our earlier excellence. We must develop in them by conduct and precept a sense of responsibility and impress upon them the concept that rights and privileges imply duties and obligations. We must recapture our earlier habits of temperance, thrift, and morality.

We have come a long way as a Nation. We have conquered a continent. New responsibilities in international relations have been imposed upon us. We stand in the role of international leadership. But back of all our national greatness and our international prominence stand the homes of America—millions of them—heirs to the spiritual, moral, and cultural excellence of an exemplary national ancestry. We can strengthen the American home. We can and we must strengthen the American family.

GEORGE J. SCHULZ.

VIENNA, VA.

Argonne National Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have delivered to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a documented statement from the citizens of Du Page County, Ill., protesting the location of the Argonne National Laboratory in their community.

It is their contention that the Atomic Energy Commission has not shown any sufficient reason for causing Argonne National Laboratories to leave its present satisfactory site in a remote part of the Cook County forest preserve, where it has ample room for expansion, to take 3,500 to 4,500 acres of residential farm property in suburban Du Page County at a needless cost of millions. Further, that the Commission has ignored the undeniable fact that other sites, including its preferred present site and the Elwood ordnance site, are available at less cost and without dispossessing anyone.

Congressman CHAUNCEY REED, in whose district this project would be placed, joins me in bringing this matter to your attention.

United States Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in connection with Reorganization Plan No. 2, with particular reference to the retention of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor, which is so essential.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I agree with the views of most of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that the United States Employment Service should be permanently located in the United States Department of Labor. I don't see how there can be any serious question that the United States Employment Service belongs in that Department. After all, the employment offices are concerned entirely with seeing that workers get jobs and that employers get the workers they need. This type of activity attempts to bring about the necessary balancing of labor supply and demand in the labor market. I know that the Department of Labor, through its various bureaus, is properly concerned with a wide variety of labor problems, all of which are related in one way or another to the kind of activities carried on by the United States Employment Service. It makes good sense to me that the United States Employment Service should therefore be permanently a part of the Department of Labor.

If we do not support the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2, 1947, the United States Employment Service will revert to the Federal Security Agency. I am deeply sympathetic with the important programs administered by the Federal Security Agency. I know how great is the contribution these programs make to the welfare of our people. I have a high regard for the work of the United States Public Health Service and its efforts to control the spread of communicable diseases. I also recognize the valuable work that is being done by the United States Office of Education in its relationships with State and local educational authorities. By the same token, I am appreciative of the programs which provide public assistance to the aged and the needy and the blind. These are all fine programs and they properly belong in the Federal Security Agency. But I should hate very much to have our public employment system made a part of an agency whose primary responsibility lies in the field of health, education, welfare, and relief activities. I do not believe that our workers or employers would use the facilities of the public employment offices in the same way as they have in recent years if these offices were

part of a governmental system concerned with welfare and relief functions.

The people of my State are entitled to have an employment service program which will provide them with the maximum of job assistance and employment counseling. I am fearful that if the United States Employment Service were to become a part of an agency whose primary concern is with welfare and relief activities that the activities of the public employment office would suffer. As you know, Mr. President, we have a Federal-State system of public employment offices. The employment offices in my State are financed entirely from Federal funds. They receive a great deal of technical assistance, advice on the most successful methods of operation, and occupational and labor-market information from the United States Employment Service. I have been advised by the employees working in the employment offices in my State that employers are now using the facilities of the employment service to a greater extent than ever before. I am told that since the United States Employment Service has returned to the Department of Labor, where it was originally placed by an act of Congress, the employment service program has been greatly strengthened and developed so that it provides more effective service to both employers and job seekers.

Just the other day I received a letter from Mr. Harley, who is the director of our South Carolina Employment Service. I know that he did not realize that I would discuss the content of his letter on the floor of the Senate. Nevertheless, I am sure that he would agree with me that the information contained in this letter should be brought to the attention of this body so that you might properly have the facts in deciding on the permanent location of the United States Employment Service. Here's what his letter says:

"DEAR SENATOR: I have just learned that the Senate Labor Committee has voted 8 to 5 to retain the United States Employment Service permanently within the Department of Labor, and it will probably come to a vote on the Senate floor very early next week.

"As you know, some are supporting a bill to return the Employment Service in the Social Security Board. Inasmuch as the Social Security Board administers all types of insurance, such as benefits to the needy, the blind, old age, and unemployment compensation, it is naturally 'insurance-minded.' The Employment Service was under the Social Security Board from April 1939 until the fall of 1942, when it was transferred to the War Manpower Commission and then the Department of Labor. The records will show that the performance of the Employment Service while under the Social Security Board could not equal in any way its present high standards, with its present professionalized personnel which has been trained under the Department of Labor. We are getting much better public acceptance from employers over the entire State than in the history of the Employment Service, and I am certain that a vast majority of workers in this State would prefer that the Service remain with the Department of Labor rather than return to the Social Security Board.

"The reason some are in favor of returning the Employment Service to the Social Security Board is because they realize that they can then have a worker accept any kind of employment, whether suitable or not, rather than claim unemployment compensation to which he is entitled when suitable employment is not available.

"You further remember, as Governor of this State, the difficulties you experienced on more than one occasion with the Employment Service and the regional office of the Social Security Board.

"Due to the above-mentioned facts and others too numerous to mention, I would appreciate it very much if you could see your way clear to vote for the permanent retention of the Employment Service in the United States Department of Labor.

"I regret to have to worry you with these things, which probably seem very minor to you, but they are very important not only to the personnel of the Employment Service in this State but to the thousands of workers which we serve daily.

"With kind personal regards, I am,

"Sincerely yours,

"W. RHETT HARLEY."

Mr. President, I want the employers and workers of my State to have an effective public-employment service. I am sure that is the wish of all the Senators for their respective States. One of the surest ways of developing a strong sound system of public employment offices is to provide for the permanent location of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor. In this way the United States Employment Service will be able to devote its full time and energies to giving assistance to the State employment services. If the United States Employment Service were to be removed from the Department of Labor, it is my conviction that its activities would be diverted to the purposes and objectives of programs not concerned directly with labor problems. For this reason, I heartily endorse the committee report to continue the United States Employment Service permanently in the Department of Labor. I urge my colleagues to support the committee report by voting against House Concurrent Resolution No. 49, thereby supporting the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2.

Security for the Masses and Not Just Classes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my address on the subject, Security for the Masses and Not Just Classes, delivered at Uline Arena, June 26, 1947:

You who are gathered here tonight have had a busy day and are hardly in the mood for any startling performance at this point. For that reason alone, I am going to forego the pleasure of serenading you, for when I burst into song, I assure you it is a startling performance. The reason you were almost subjected to what might have been one of the greatest vocal triumphs of all time is that my sentiments of this evening are perfectly expressed in a song popular some years back. You may remember, it began like this: "I offer you congratulations, I really mean it from my heart."

Every one of you deserves congratulations. You are here to further an ideal. You have come great distances at great expense, not only in money but in energy as well, to do all in your power to make a positive contribution to the American way of life. You are here, not in the all-too-frequently encountered spirit of getting, but in the spirit of giving to this great Nation a workable plan for discharging one of its most sacred duties, the provision of economic security to the masses, rather than to certain classes. You are here because you believe with St. Paul, that the great moving forces within mankind must be faith, hope, and the charity which is love of one's fellow men. With the God-given power derived from your faith, your hope, and your love for mankind, you will go on to win the goal for which this great organization has been working for these many years.

Selflessness and generosity are the very foundations of the Townsend movement. It truly has been said that necessity is the mother of invention, and the need could not have been greater at the time Dr. Townsend came forward with the idea he had evolved for a nation-wide old-age pension plan to be administered by the Federal Government. At that time we were in the midst of an economic depression, the ghost of which still haunts this outwardly prosperous land. There are those, of course, who say we have never actually recovered from that violent disruption of our economy. They point to the facts that artificial pump priming and a devastating world war have provided the misleading appearance of prosperity, without restoring actual health to our economic system. Unfortunately, we may learn more about that within a very few years unless we are willing to look about us and find new answers to the vast problems besetting us on every hand.

You know, we in the United States are prone to regard our own Government as the most progressive and enlightened in the world. I frequently wonder whether or not this is a good idea. Is there not a danger that we will fall into a rut of complacency, and like the hare in the old fable, fall asleep while the slow but steady tortoise passes us and wins the race to the finish line?

Today the world is moving very swiftly. Changes are taking place in countries all over the world which completely alter the old world picture as we have known it. We, as a Nation, and as individuals will have to bend every ounce of effort at our command to keep up with these new developments. We want to retain world leadership because we are convinced that the fundamental concepts upon which this republic is built are in the best interests of all mankind. But we cannot hold our place as a world leader by force of arms or by utilizing our vast resources to buy our way to the top. Humanity today is awakening all over the world, and demanding its rights to dignity and peace and security.

If we are to maintain our position as a progressive and enlightened Nation, we must listen to those demands and examine them with an eye to doing our share in fulfilling them. It is a mistaken notion that only the people of India, of Africa, or of some far-off South sea island are lacking in security, peace and dignity. Let us look at France, which has been called the most civilized nation on earth.

The new French constitution, wrought out of suffering, despair, and near-death of a great nation testifies to its leaders' recognition of the responsibilities of a modern government. At the very top of its preamble, the French constitution puts what the Townsend Plan envisions for the citizens of the United States: I quote from the preamble to the French Constitution: "The nation assures the individual and family of conditions necessary to their development. It guarantees to all, and especially the child, the mother, and the old worker, health protection, material security, rest and leisure time."

At the present time a White House family conference is being planned for 1948. Now, everyone knows that the basic need of the family today is for security. In the Committee on Ways and Means of the United States House of Representatives today lies a bill, H. R. 16, introduced way back on January 3 of this year, which would provide real security to every adult citizen. This bill has not even been discussed by a committee. It has been pigeonholed, as has every bill embodying the Townsend plan since I came to Congress. In the Senate is another bill, S. 57. It has been decreed the same fate.

I say to you now, as I have said to the Members of Congress, "A pigeonhole is no place for a bill ardently desired by millions." Before we go to the trouble and expense of another conference at the White House, why not at least take a look at a bill designed to provide not only the security needed by the family, but also the means for increasing the tempo of our economic life so that markets for our goods and services will be expanded?

Many of you may have heard me voice my opinion that prosperity depends on the movement of money, not the amount of money at hand. Velocity rather than amount is the important factor. The plan espoused by you who are gathered here tonight takes that simple truth into account.

Sometimes I wonder if it is not the very simplicity, the straightforward character of the Townsend plan which creates opposition in bureaucratic circles. Perhaps it is too reasonable. Perhaps we should do it up nicely in yards of red tape. Perhaps the bills before Congress should be doubled or tripled in length, and obscured by legalistic phrases, so that the sense of the provisions would be safely hidden from the average citizen.

That, I greatly fear, is what happened when our present Social Security Act was passed back in 1935. How many of you have read that famous piece of confusion confounded? Whenever I have cause to refer to it, I am reminded of Mr. Winston Churchill's famous summation of Russian foreign policy. You remember he characterized it as "a mystery wrapped in an enigma." Well, to me that is a pretty apt description of the law under which our present so-called Social Security System operates.

As is so frequently the case, complicated language, in this instance, is used in an attempt to cover a basic confusion in thinking. Time is not sufficient tonight to go into the shortcomings of the Social Security Act. However, I want to call to the attention of every person in this audience an article which appeared in the May issue of the Reader's Digest, a publication I am sure all of you know well. The author, John T. Flynn, calls his piece "Our Present Dishonest Federal Old-Age Pension Plan." My personal feeling is that it might better have been called our confused, misleading, or unworkable old-age pension plan, but I must admit that Mr. Flynn makes an impressive argument for his own adjective. Every one of you in this audience will want to read that article, if you have not done so already. It is the second article in the May issue, on page 4. The utter inadequacy of the present system of old-age pensions is cited, chapter and verse, in the kind of clear English I learned to appreciate as a boy in a country school back in Ohio.

This article makes abundantly clear the present need for renewed efforts on the part of sincere and honest advocates of old-age and disability pensions for the masses, not just for the classes.

There are those, you know, who pat supporters of the Townsend plan on the back and say kindly, "You have contributed toward securing our present social-security measures * * * your job is done. Go home and be good boys and girls. You have got what we wanted for you." These are the real betrayers of those who seek to provide security for all, not just a part, of our population. So long as 30 percent of our employed workers, even, are not protected, the job has not been finished. And the number of our senior citizens still unprotected is growing in this country today, not decreasing.

Let us look at the facts. Every year science adds a little to the sum of human knowledge. Every year medicine and other fields of scientific research turn over to us new methods of prolonging human life. Diseases which once swept whole communities and wiped out human beings like flies have become rarities in this country today. Improved surgical techniques are responsible for keeping tens of thousands of Americans alive every year.

In 1940 one out of every 15 people in this country was 65 years of age or older compared with 1 out of every 40 just 80 years earlier. By 1980 it is estimated that one out of every six will be over 65.

At the same time it is becoming increasingly apparent that in our highly industrial society the older person is finding it harder and harder to find gainful employment. In my work with the veterans committee of the House of Representatives, I have seen more than my share of pitiable examples, men who truly sacrificed the best years of their lives in order to help defend their country, managed to survive a great world conflict only to find upon returning that they are no longer wanted on their old jobs, and are "too old" to be hired elsewhere.

Are we to stand idly by and let these men become a lost generation? I say we cannot afford such indifference, either from humanitarian considerations or from an economic standpoint. Another group who must not be cast aside are the widows with young children.

Those who for selfish reasons oppose all efforts to broaden and equalize our provisions for the aged have criticized the Townsend plan, saying that other groups would be bypassed, groups which need help as much or more than those over 60.

The present form of H. R. 16 completely neutralizes these objections—objections which were designed as camouflage in the first place. The bill now would provide equal basic Federal insurance for those 60 and over, for certain citizens under 60 with total disability, and gives protection to widows and children, as well.

On every hand the citizens who originally espoused the Townsend plan have shown their willingness to revise and amend their proposals in every possible way to make them practical and acceptable to those people of good will who had honest objections to certain provisions of the plan as it was first conceived by Dr. Townsend.

The original plan for raising the revenue needed to pay the benefits contemplated provided for a transaction tax, which economists felt would eventually be passed on to the consumer in the form of a sales tax, thus indiscriminately penalizing the lower-income groups. This provision no longer is a part of the bill. The present provision for financing the plan is eminently fair and reasonable and could not be shifted.

You are all familiar with the provisions of H. R. 16. Mr. Flynn, in his article, was not lobbying for the Townsend plan, but as an expert he had this to say, and I quote:

"The Government old-age-security plan is merely a Government insurance agency. Therefore old-age benefits, like life insurance and other contingent benefits, must be paid out of the income of the people concerned, earned by them in the very year when the benefits fall due. If there are 50,000,000 workers employed and 5,000,000 retired, the 50,000,000 must each year, by their contributions, pay enough to support the 5,000,000 on pension. There is no other way. The payments may be masked or disguised in whatever form a timid politician wishes to hide them. But that stern fact must be faced, and any honest system of old-age pensions must be built on it. The Government does not provide the money. Its only role, like that of the insurance company, is to act as the agent which collects from the employees and employers and pays the benefits to those who are retired.

"In the case of old-age pensions the great role which the Government can play is in bringing all workers into it, giving it the permanence essential to the plan and protecting it from disintegration by making it compulsory for all."

There is no question but that the Townsend plan faces these "stern facts." Title II of this bill directs that there shall be levied, collected, and paid a tax of 3 percent of the gross income of all persons or companies derived from any and all sources except in personal incomes there shall be an exemption up to $100 a month. By means of the collection as a tax of the stipulated 3 percent of gross income, the money to provide for the payment of the benefits set forth in the general title of the bill would be raised, mind you raised currently and paid currently; not a mortgage on the future to be carried and refinanced over an indefinite and vague period of time; not something borrowed or gone into debt for; not an obligation to be borne by generations yet unborn. The idea is simple and old fashioned, yet bureaucratic financial policies being what they are, it sounds revolutionary.

There is no need to labor the point of total coverage. We all know that to be a fundamental concept embodied in the Townsend plan. Today not only all over 60 but disabled citizens between the ages of 16 and 60, and widows who have the care of children under 18, would be awarded an annuity to be used immediately to fill basic needs.

So far I have talked about the concrete aspects of the Townsend plan. But sometimes, perhaps always in the long run, intangibles are even more important. I am thinking now of the mental and emotional anguish our senior citizens suffer even in cases where there is not yet physical hardship.

All of us know the basis of fear and anxiety is insecurity. We know the difference between real insecurity and psychological insecurity.

We know almost one-third of our workers are unquestionably insecure in a very real financial sense—and I am putting it mildly when I use the word, "insecure." I might more accurately say they are desperate. They know the Federal old-age pension will never reach them. They have been cast aside.

Because of the many flaws in our present system, an even greater number of workers among those technically insured are today the victims of psychological insecurity. They fear that this technical insurance, based on a system too involved for them to understand, will not "pan out" when they need it. Actually there is real ground for their apprehensions. Perhaps they know that in 1946 the families of retired workers got an average pension of $6.40 a week. How far does that go today? Perhaps they have read the report of the Public Affairs Committee showing that although more than 41,000,000 people had money to their credit in the old-age insurance accounts in 1940, by no means all of them would receive benefits. Is it any wonder they look forward to the future with misgivings?

Now we know that insecurity breeds fear and distrust. We know fear and distrust are among the most important factors involved in social unrest and wars between nations. If we are to do our utmost to avoid war and revolution in this time of change and uncertainty throughout the world, we must look for causes and find cures. We here tonight are convinced that the need for a feeling of security is fundamental with all men and women. We believe we have a plan which will give all our people assurance of financial security when they have become unable to work and support themselves and their families, through no fault of their own.

All we ask is that this plan be brought forward and studied—not pigeonholed. We will continue to work, and eventually we will win out over the bureaucrats prejudiced against the Townsend plan because they are selfishly unwilling to give up their private car on the "gravy train" which some day will be taken off and replaced by the "equality

special" where all are allowed to ride. Let our slogan be, "Security for the masses, not for just the classes."

Arms for Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of June 25, 1947:

ARMS FOR LATIN AMERICA

The appearance of Secretary of State Marshall and Secretary of War Patterson before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to urge prompt congressional authorization for the inter-American military cooperation bill focuses public interest upon an important aspect of our foreign policy.

The purpose of this bill is aptly described by its title. It aims to weld all the military ertablishments of the Western Hemisphere into an effective defense organization, using identical arms, and operating under the same strategical and tactical concepts, the United States being the arsenal and coordinator.

The result of such a system would be that, in case of a threat to hemispheric security, the entire military forces of the New World could be quickly mobilized into a homogeneous fighting machine. It should, of course, be understood that close coordination already exists between this country and Canada. Its extension to the whole of Latin America would make the system all-inclusive.

The need for pan-American military coordination was vividly illustrated during the last war. Then, as now, there was the problem of a full score of diverse forces, with different arms, training, and concepts. Most of the Latin-American Nations buy their equipment abroad and train their forces under military or naval misisons which naturally instill their respective ideas. Under the proposed set-up, the United States would be the source of all these matters, including replacements. Existing armaments of other origins would be taken over by us and replaced by our equipment. Thus, homogeneity in all respects would be quickly attained.

The advantages of this method appear so obvious, both for ourselves and for the other nations of the Western Hemisphere, that opposition here at home would appear unlikely. Yet such opposition does exist, though with various motivations. One objection is the expense to us, though the War Department estimates it would not exceed $10,000,000 per year. Others are that it might encourage armaments competition, strengthen dictatorial regimes, and by-pass the United Nations. However, Secretary Marshall appears to have made an effective rebuttal by assuring proper administration and pointing out that there is nothing in the UN Charter which prevents such a regional agreement.

The Secretary went on to utter the warning that this was a golden opportunity which should not be lost. If we do not provide arms and training, the Latin American countries will get them elsewhere, with all the unfavorable consequences that might thereby accrue. The test of our intentions will arise at the forthcoming Inter-American Conference at Rio de Janeiro, tentatively scheduled for August, at which a hemisphere defense pact will be discussed. The proper implementation of such a pact will require congressional action on the pending military cooperation bill. It would therefore seem to come under the heading of "must" legislation.

Aid to Europe?—Yes, but Within Our Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD today an editorial from last Sunday's Akron Beacon Journal. Editor and Publisher John S. Knight hit the nail on the head. If it were possible to have an editorial printed in neon lights or to have it set in bold-face type this would be most desirable as Mr. Knight expresses the thoughts of an overwhelming majority of the American people. His editorial follows:

AID TO EUROPE?—YES, BUT WITHIN OUR MEANS

When an individual contributes to the support of the needy, whether they be less fortunate relatives or a deserving charity, his gift normally bears some relation to the state of his own finances.

The balance sheet of his assets and liabilities determines what portion of his income he feels can be used for helping others without jeopardizing the security of his own family.

Thus, a sense of prudence and self-preservation guides his thinking because he realizes that mismanagement of his financial affairs will in time not only reduce his own standards of living but directly affect his ability to assist the indigent.

A comparison can be made in the relationship between nations. The sole difference is that the United States is the only country with the money and the resources to help rehabilitate the war-stricken areas. Therefore, the hungry and impoverished peoples of the earth look to the United States for salvation.

If we agree that they should be helped, and I hold strongly to that view, the only question is: To what degree can we afford to help them?

For a nation, like an individual, ultimately finds that its capacity to pay can be exhausted. If we ever permit ourselves to fall into that dilemma, the United States will wind up in the hands of a Communistic receiver.

The record of our generosity to date shows that billions have been poured into China without achieving economic stability in that unhappy country; money and credits extended to Russia's satellites have been used for further expansion of Soviet power and one-half of the British loan of three and three-quarter billions has already been exhausted.

At the time Congress supported the Truman doctrine by appropriating $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey, the Beacon Journal opposed the loan on the theory that it was unrealistic to believe that we can stop communism with dollars.

The soundness of that view was demonstrated recently when Russia took over Hungary without firing a shot and, as one Soviet leader said, "before the United States could rub its eyes."

We predicted, also, that if the Truman doctrine were carried out to its logical conclusion wherever communism was on the march, the cost to the United States within the next few years would run from $17,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000.

The accuracy of that prediction is now supported in the recommendation of Secretary of State Marshall that a new program calling for gifts or loans of five billions a year is necessary for world rehabilitation.

The Secretary tells us that "in many countries confidence in the local currency has been severely shaken." What he did not tell us is that, with the exception of England, these countries have made little effort to live within their means; that they have tried to escape their financial obligations by printing money; that because of their political and ideological vagaries, it is doubtful whether they will ever mend their ways.

It is true that Secretary Marshall is striving for a joint program, but here again, what course shall we pursue if Russia decides it is not to her advantage to participate?

Do we go it alone—and foot the entire bill?

How is Europe reacting to our latest venture in world paternalism?

In France, the newspaper Franc-Tireur explains that the motivating force behind the Marshall plan is fear of a business depression. This newspaper reasons that overproduction of goods is forcing us to look to world markets.

The Communists in France, according to George Weller, of the Chicago Daily News foreign service, have decided not to shoot Santa Claus so long as thousands of superfluous functionaries can be carried on the pay roll. The Communists in Italy have decided that they want plenty of any money that is being handed out.

In England, where our funds are being poured into a hopelessly inefficient economy, Graham Hutton, of the British Information Service, says frankly that "everyone knows Britain is living on the American and Canadian dollar loans, and that those dollars are fast running out, like sand out of the hour glass."

Mr. Hutton urges the British to face the truth that they cannot afford what they would like to buy, that the Nation must get to work with the utmost efficiency, and that precious human beings must not be wasted in the confusion of hopeless red tape caused by tying up more of Britain's working population in government offices than any nation in the world.

From his vantage point in Paris, George Weller writes that "no Communist, and, indeed, few Europeans of any political flavor, can understand why the United States, plagued by strikes and housing and tax troubles, is willing to throw any further moneys into Europe without asking anything in return."

A rapidly growing number of Americans are today beginning to ask themselves the very same question.

Four steps suggest themselves as essential if the American people are to support further aid to Europe:

1. We should follow Herbert Hoover's recommendation that all governmental agencies having anything to do with foreign relief, international finance, and exports be coordinated. This step would eliminate much of the present interdepartmental conflict and confusion.

2. Our capacity to extend aid must be carefully surveyed so that we do not bankrupt ourselves while endeavoring to aid others.

3. Create a bipartisan committee to plan and supervise the administration of an overseas economic program. In other words, we should have something to say about the way our money is spent.

This suggestion stems from the British experience where 52 percent of the American loan has been exhausted without any of us having the faintest idea where the money

has gone. In fact, no break-down is available from the British.

In other words, simply pouring out American funds to pump oxygen into dying economic systems is neither good charity nor good business on our part.

4. If we are actually frank enough to admit that the ultimate purpose of the Truman and Marshall doctrines is to stop Russia's expansion, why can't we see the folly of being economically interventionist and militarily isolationist?

As an example, we have spent between three and four billions dollars in China for economic relief and political prestige, but the coastal bases, fixed garrisons, and airports remain in Soviet hands.

The same experiment, conceded to be a colossal failure in China, is about to be repeated in Greece and Turkey.

Why can't we see, as George Weller says so succinctly, that creditable as both the Truman and Marshall plans may be, the hard core of military reality is missing? Both plans are soft at the center because they make America responsible for Europe but ignore the very security they aim to achieve.

I believe that Mr. Truman, who says this is not time to reduce taxes, will find his new $24,000,000,000-aid-to-Europe program meeting tremendous opposition in Congress.

Certainly the people who pay the bills are entitled to know just how, where, and why the money is to be spent before they place their approval on a single cent of such a staggering appropriation of funds.

Our hearts go out to the less fortunate peoples of other lands but experiences of the immediate past give little hope that these additional gifts will be used effectively for their own best interests.

We should never agree to let the Government sign our names to another blank check without knowing all the facts and having our eyes wide open.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

The Role of the United States in International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address delivered by me at the sixtieth annual convention of the Tennessee Pharmaceutical Association at Chattanooga on June 19, 1947. The address is as follows:

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AS THEY AFFECT OUR NATION

The United States, at the present time, lies in the middle of the onrushing stream of history. We will either have to guide and direct the turbulent waters in which we find ourselves or be swept away by them. Based on this truthful premise the American people have but one choice—it is to intelligently direct the course we are to pursue. In doing this, every person, business, and association has a direct stake and a definite responsibility. This is true of the pharmacists and of all other businessmen, large and small.

In the short space of 30 years this Nation has come to the point where we have no choice but to assume this awful responsibility. It is not that we wanted it to be that way but the course of world affairs has directed that it should be. We have been converted from a Nation secure by our boundaries and largely self-reliant upon our resources into a Nation thrown into the middle of perplexing world problems and issues. We have found from our experience in two World Wars that we are no longer protected by the broad oceans that surround this continent. We have come to find that the things that take place in Europe, Asia, and Africa concern us immediately and directly. The might of this Nation was mustered in magnificent fashión to play the decisive role in winning World War I and World War II on the battlefields. We fumbled our opportunity of securing a just and lasting peace after World War I. We are learning now that, while we have had success on the battlefield, World War II has actually not been carried through to victory. The war is still on. We find that in this twentieth-century era we cannot fight in the manner of the knights of old. We cannot defeat our enemy and then be content to restore the sword to its sheath and return home and consider the job done. It is just as important, although not as exciting and glamorous, that our efforts be devoted to restoring order and settling the chaotic conditions resulting from the war as it is to win victories on the battlefield. This Nation, and this Nation alone, may be able to avert the decline of Western civilization and a reversion to as dark an age as history has ever known.

The present situation with which we are confronted was not altogether unexpected. Famine, pestience, suffering, and a complete economic and political dislocation were the inevitable consequences of war. The sad fact is that there can be no real security—there can be no real peace until some sort of order is brought out of the present chaos. There is no need of minimizing the distressing condition as it exists today. Germany is divided and broken. Belgium is scarred by old wounds and ancient animosities. France, politically and economically bankrupt, lies torn and confused. Communism is strong in France and seems to be on the ascendancy in Italy. Confusion, chaos, and political want mark the condition in China, India, and through the Near East. In China civil war is weakening in tempo.

We do not know what may develop in India when British control is removed. The war has destroyed the wealth and assets of the world, and a large part of the people in all of the nations, save those of the Western Hemisphere, is ill-fed, poorly clothed, and has lost its stamina to make an immediate comeback. It is important to consider the plight of Britain. The British are barely holding on by their bootstraps. The power of the British pound and the might of the British fleet have lost their magic charm. The people of England, stripped of the wealth of empire and bound under a crushing burden of taxation, are no longer able to bring stability and order in many parts of the globe which were previously considered under the British sphere of influence. This means that vacuums are being created in many unstable regions of the earth. And it has developed another ideology which is ready to fill any vacuum and which thrives upon confusion, want, and instability. There can be no doubt of the aggressive and expansive policy of the Soviet Government. There can be no question but that the Soviets intend to supplant democratic rule with communism in any part of the earth where they are given the opportunity. Until the day comes when the Soviet policy of expansion and aggression is ended in favor of a desire for truly peaceful relations, it is this Nation that is going to have to bear the brunt of preventing the growth and expansion of this pernicious control.

We compromised and appeased the Soviet as long as we could. It became necessary to make a stand somewhere. With bipartisan backing the Truman doctrine of aid to Greece and Turkey was used for the purpose of taking our stand. It was this doctrine which enabled us to say to the Soviets that we had had enough—that we do not expect to be pushed out of Europe. We said to them in the Truman doctrine that the democracy of this country was still active and vigorous and that we intended for free nations to have an opportunity of choosing in carrying out a representative form of government if they desired to do so.

I think, though, it must be pointed out that aid to Greece and Turkey is only a stopgap measure and that unless we are willing to continue our leadership and to take other measures to help broken nations get back on their feet our assistance will be of little lasting benefit. We find ourselves in a dilemma. We want to prevent expansion of communism and at the same time we do not want to allow a strong Germany to again come into existence to threaten the peace of the world—and yet—France, Denmark, Belgium, and many other European nations have secured steel, coal, and other raw materials and manufactured goods from Germany in the past. It is these things they need to get their own production going. So, recently, Herbert Hoover and others have recommended that German heavy industries be allowed to operate to a greater extent. At Potsdam you will recall a formula was adopted authorizing only the operation of light German industries. Our leaders want fuller German production and yet we appreciate the necessity of keeping a strong finger on this nation which has plunged the world into two horrible conflicts.

Recently, Secretary of State George Marshall has proposed the Marshall plan. This is intended to augment and perhaps be later substituted for the so-called Truman doctrine. Under the Marshall plan it is required that an over-all canvass of the economic needs of Europe be made and that ways and means be devised, as economically as possible, to restore the economy of Europe. The plan contemplates that the distressed nations will largely pull themselves through by their own efforts. For instance, in France the problem seems to be of getting more coal from the German Ruhr with which to operate French factories. If enough coal can be imported to France her economy should soon be on a fairly good basis. The same is partially true of Italy and of other European nations.

Then in connection with the over-all economic survey of Europe, it is proposed that this country consider what it can afford to do—not for just 1 year, but over a period of years. Senator VANDENBERG, Herbert Hoover, and I think this idea has the support of Secretary Marshall and President Truman, feel that we should make an estimate of just what help and assistance this Nation can render without bankrupting ourselves. Senator VANDENBERG, after the whole matter is presented, wants the plan carried out by a bipartisan agreement. I think the Marshall doctrine, together with an appraisal under the Vandenberg plan of what we can do to help get the world going again, is the sensible way to approach the present distressing situation.

It is important that the nations of the world realize that they are going to have to do most of their rehabilitation themselves. They should know now that they cannot count indefinitely upon tremendous sums of money from this country. They should know that we are willing to do our part to help them in their immediate emergency and to assist them in getting back on their feet but that a great part of their recovery must be through their own efforts. While we want to do all we can, it is unquestionably true, as

has so well been pointed out by Senator VANDENBERG and Secretary Marshall, this country itself must remain strong and productive. A strong and productive America can render greater assistance than a bankrupt and depressed America.

It is also incumbent upon us to use to the utmost those agencies and organizations that have been set up to assist in world recovery and to maintain peace among the nations. The United Nations has had its share of rough going, but, of course, its activity is now somewhat limited by the direct conflict of economics and ideologies between the Western World and Russia. However, the United Nations is a going concern, and it has accomplished a great deal. It has at least kept all of the parties involved at the conference table and as long as discussions and genuine efforts to settle disputes are in progress there is hope for a solution. The International Bank has now been launched, and through it loans can be made for world recovery and currency stabilization which are so necessary if order is to be restored. These organizations must continue to have our full and hearty backing, and this must be done regardless of what any other nation or group of nations may say or do.

There are some other bright spots in the picture. This Nation, and the principles and ideas we represent, still has many friendly allies, and we can know that the great majority of the people, even though they may be in Communist-controlled countries, would like to join with us in our effort for freedom and peace. We also find comfort in the fact that we are still economically the strongest nation of the earth. We have great resources, and we have ingenious and strong people.

But let us not mistake the magnitude of the task we have and let us all appreciate the fact that the greatest things we have to sell are our American ideas. It is necessary in this difficult time that our public be well-informed as to the facts with which we are presented. It is necessary that each citizen appreciate his individual responsibility. To meet the test it is required of us that we make democracy work better and more efficiently than do the ideologies and other forms of government with which we must compete. It is high time that we be impressed with the necessity of considering our Government and the solution of the international problems ahead of selfish aims and ambitions. Management and labor alike must put aside some of their disputes. This is no time for stoppages in work. This is no time for petty gains or selfish advantages to be put above the welfare of the Nation.

Also, it has been very discouraging to see, of late, so many people placing the objective of their pet creed or race above the welfare of the Nation and of the world. For those who do this must remember if we lose in this great effort the world, including this country, may be in a condition where they will not even have the opportunity of advocating the causes in which they are so greatly interested.

What does this mean to the individual druggist? It means that you like every other businessman and every other citizen are going to have to put first things first. The thing to come first is to appreciate the fact that regardless of the cost, the personal inconvenience or the sacrifice that any of us may be called upon to make—all of these are worth while if we can bring about an orderly world in which we and our children will have an opportunity of living as a free people under a free government which fosters continued individual opportunity. When compared with this great ambition our petty difficulties seem trifling and yet that is the decision the American people are going to have to make. I think there needs to be a rededication to ideas we have always held so dearly. There needs to be a firm determination in every citizen's heart to do his share to carry through toward the fulfillment of those purposes for which the war was fought. If we have this resolution there is no obstacle that we cannot overcome and I am convinced that when the issue is fully understood the American people in this decisive hour will not be found to be lacking.

Henry Clay as an American Symbol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the brilliant young South American leader, Dr. Luis Gonzales Barros, first officer of the diplomatic department of the Colombian Foreign Office, made some very stimulating historical remarks recently when he was in Washington at the opening of the third annual Institute on the United States in World Affairs, at the American University. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The figure of Henry Clay was chosen as the symbol which unites the peoples of this continent in a single aspiration of fraternity and justice. Henry Clay lifted his voice in every struggle of civil life from the day he first appeared, a vigorous and gallant youth in the American Congress, to the day when full of years and laurels and disillusions, his mortal remains received the last tribute of homage from the peoples and the nations in whose behalf he had so long labored.

Among the great discussions touched by his fiery tongue from the beginning was the political independence of this hemisphere.

Henry Clay lifted congressional debate from the limited sphere of purely local interests and dispositions to the transcendent things of human liberty and the future of the American continent.

He emphasized the wonderful extension in character of the countries to the south and, turning the eyes of his fellow representatives toward those distant horizons, he made them see the riches of Mexico and of Guatemala, the potential wealth of New Granada, and of Venezuela, and the future of Brazil soon to break her colonial bonds, as well as the prospects of the United Provinces of the River Plate. Crossing the Andes, he paused to give eulogy to Chile and Peru, concluding with these words: "Each of those several parts is sufficient in itself to be a powerful state; even the smallest is in population enough people to make it a solid republic." He dreamed the dream of the Americas.

Clay's attitude, always ardent and never failing in its advocacy of the new independent governments, had its reward when the House of Representatives of the United States in February of 1821 approved the resolution proposed by him declaring that the "House will give its constitutional support to the President of the United States whenever he may deem it expedient to recognize the sovereignty and independence of any of the said provinces."

Clay lived to see the realization of one of the fervent desires of his heart. He wrote to his great friend Torres, the representative of Colombia: "The cause of South America has at last prevailed. The House yesterday adopted my resolution which has for its object, substantially, the recognition of the independent governments. I congratulate you on the occasion. It has been to me a day of proud and big satisfaction. What is much more important, its moral tendency will be deeply felt everywhere."

One of Clay's biographers referred to him in these words: "One of the most brilliant champions in the cause of humanity and the rights of man; an apostle whose generous words in the decisive and strategic moment were always heard on behalf of the emancipation of the peoples of this hemisphere; a statesman whose spiritual contribution gives him a place among those great benefactors worthy of the undying gratitude of the American nations."

Letter From National Association of Postal Supervisors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter from Mr. Wilt Grossman, of Cleveland:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
POSTAL SUPERVISORS,
Cleveland, Ohio, June 5, 1947.

Hon. GEORGE H. BENDER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENDER: For a great many years supervisors in the postal service who, when the needs of the service required, worked daily overtime have been allowed this overtime off when they could be spared from their duties, without cost to the Department.

This administrative practice is authorized in article 47, page 90, of the July 1943 Official Postal Guide.

On June 6, 1946 the Comptroller General of the United States issued a ruling as follows:

"Without raising any questions here regarding the propriety or legality of the past practice of granting supervisory employees compensatory time for all overtime in excess of 8 hours a day, the granting of compensatory time to them on and after July 1, 1945, is limited by the provisions of section 3 of the statute, supra, to services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays. That statute does not provide for the granting of compensatory time for work performed in excess of 8 hours on other days, etc., etc."

As a result of the above ruling, some of the supervisors, namely, route foremen and clerks-in-charge assigned to the duties of route inspections, and station examiners who because of the nature of their work, which requires them to work overtime, are being denied this time off.

For example, on route inspections the 1945 pamphlet, Form 1360, Supervision of City Delivery Service, section 49, states, "All classes of mail available to the carrier must be routed and taken out for delivery and all delivery trips must be completed, overtime being used if necessary."

Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, states:

"SEC. 2. Hours of duty: Employees shall be required to work not more than 8 hours a day except as provided in section 4.

* * * * *

"SEC. 4. Overtime: In emergencies or if the needs of the service require, employees may

be employed in excess of 8 hours per day and for such overtime service they shall be paid on the basis of 150 percent of the annual rate, etc., provided that the provisions of this section shall not apply to railway mail service, etc., etc., and supervisory employees."

The enacting clause of Public Law 134 states, "That the term 'employees' wherever used in this act shall include officers, supervisors, and special delivery messengers, in offices of the first class, etc., etc."

From a study of the above sections of Public Law 134 it can readily be seen that it needs amending to eliminate the unfair practice of supervisors working overtime without being properly recompensed.

On April 16, 1947, Congressman HOMER JONES of Washington introduced H. R. 3075, a bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors.

On behalf of all postal supervisors who are affected by the ruling of the Comptroller General, I appeal to you to contact Congressman EDWARD REES, chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and ask him to hold early hearings on H. R. 3075.

As an example I have over 130 hours of daily overtime accumulated since April 1, 1946, other supervisors have more, some less. The Department has been able in the past to grant this overtime off without cost so that there should be little or no objection to early enactment of this meritorious bill.

Thanking you for your many acts of kindness to all postal workers, and with best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

MILTON GROSSMAN,
Legislative Chairman, Branch 46, National Association of Postal Supervisors.

Here Are Some Air Crashes Traced Directly to Defective Motors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is vitally concerned about the numerous air crashes that have been occurring throughout America and in all parts of the world.

What can be done to bring an end to these catastrophes is a great problem confronting the Nation today.

Certainly every possible cause or clue should be discussed and brought out into the open for all to see and ponder over.

Therefore, with this in mind, I desire to place in the RECORD a statement from Joseph H. Leib, who is well qualified to speak on these matters. It will be remembered that he was directly responsible for the investigation of the Curtiss-Wright plant at Lockland, Ohio, and at Buffalo, N. Y., by the Senate War Investigating Committee some years ago. He also brought about the investigation of the Consolidated-Vultee plant at San Diego, Calif. In each of these investigations Mr. Leib's charges were upheld by congressional committees and by a grand jury at San Diego, Calif.

His statement follows:

HERE ARE SOME AIR CRASHES TRACED DIRECTLY TO DEFECTIVE MOTORS

(By J. H. Leib)

On June 19, 1947, the Nation's newspapers carried blazing headlines of another aircraft disaster involving a Pan-American Constellation.

Twelve persons were killed, 10 injured, in the Syria crack-up.

What caused this crash?

Well, the Associated Press reported that this clipper was the same plane which had turned back at Gander, Newfoundland, on the out-bound flight a few days earlier that week, after developing engine trouble, delaying the trip for several days. (Source, banner headline Washington Times-Herald, June 19, 1947.)

Then 24 hours before this tragedy—on June 18—the Washington Star carried another Associated Press dispatch that the globe-circling Pan-American Constellation with a party of American editors and publishers had landed at the London Airport with only three of its four engines functioning. These gentlemen of the press were indeed fortunate that the dead engine did not catch on fire.

In this connection, it is worthy to note that these type planes are equipped with Curtiss-Wright motors, made by the same corporation that the Senate War Investigating Committee had denounced on two separate occasions—once under Senator Truman, on July 10, 1943 (S. Rept. No. 10), and again under Senator Mead, on July 26, 1945 (S. Rept. No. 110).

For what it may be worth, here is what the old Truman committee had to say about this company: On page 18 of Senate Report No. 10 there appears the following charges:

"The committee found that the company was producing and causing the Government to accept defective and substandard material. This was accomplished in the following ways:

"1. By the falsification of tests.

"2. By destruction of records.

"3. By improperly recording results of tests.

"4. By forging inspection reports.

"5. By failing to segregate substandard and defective material.

"6. By failing to promptly destroy or mutilate such defective and substandard material.

"7. By orally changing tolerances allowed on parts.

"8. By circumventing the salvage committee set up to pass on the usability of parts outside tolerances.

"9. By allowing production to override the inspection force, thereby destroying morale of both company and Army inspectors.

"10. By skipping inspection operations."

It is important to point out that these shameful, unpatriotic, and disloyal practices took place when our beloved Nation was at war and when millions of our boys were fighting and dying throughout the world in defense of this great Republic.

In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 13, page A4903, there appeared my report on the untimely death of a former Member of Congress—Jack Nichols, of Oklahoma. In this story I told how this man lost his life in an ill-fated Army plane (B–25) powered by defective Curtiss-Wright motors that directly caused the crash.

It will be recalled that Mr. Nichols, prior to his resignation from the Congress, was chairman of the House Select Committee To Investigate Air Accidents. This writer had assisted the chairman in the investigation of safety conditions, etc.—and then suddenly the committee was abolished.

Soon afterward Mr. Nichols became vice president of the Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc.

I had often pleaded with Mr. Nichols to assist in bringing about a study of manufacturing methods employed by the Curtiss-Wright Corp.—but my efforts in that direction were in vain as far as he was concerned.

And sadly enough this former legislator met his death in a plane crash caused when a Curtiss-Wright motor flunked out.

This is not all.

Even in the days of the First World War it was the late Gen. Billy Mitchell who was also charging this company with making faulty "flying coffins."

About a year ago (July 12, 1946), when the Constellations were grounded it was reported in official circles that the cause of the crashes was due to defective wiring in the fuselage. Certain pilots flying these ships expressed the opinion that a definite fire hazard existed in the induction system of the power plants and would continue to exist despite all precautionary measures. At the same time it was said that a new type Curtiss-Wright motor would be installed in all Constellations—known as the fuel injection engine.

However, regardless of what is being done, motor trouble is still piling up Constellation disasters.

What are the factors behind these engine failures?

That is the question befuddling aviation experts.

No one seems to know the answer—and that is why I have mentioned the above history of the manufacturer who makes these motors.

The Congress may well deliberate the above facts in the realization that some constructive action must be taken in order to spare and save human lives in the future.

Everyone agrees that accidents are inevitable. Yet on the other hand it is of public record that at least some of these very crashes could have been avoided had proper action been taken by Government and certain aircraft officials.

Finally, here is another version of the possible cause of some of these unfortunate disasters. The following speaks for itself:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 24, 1947]

"DC–4 PILOTS BLAME CONGRESS, CAA, AIR LINES FOR CRASHES

"NEW YORK, June 23.—The men who fly the DC–4's—the giant four-engine planes that have figured in America's three worst domestic crashes within the past month—blame Congress, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and the air lines, in approximately that order, for United States aviation's tragic recent record, a survey disclosed today.

"Congress gets the rap because it arbitrarily cut off funds for intermediate weather stations in its headlong economy drive. The CAA is blamed for failing to insist that war-developed safety equipment be designed into planes on the drafting boards. And the air lines are charged with balking at the heavy expenditures involved in safety rehabilitation of aircraft.

"This reporter flew 6,000 miles on the survey, talking to DC–4 pilots in flight, at ground stations in a dozen cities, and as they relaxed at the dinner table. The cities covered included New York, Newark, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Chicago, Detroit, and Washington, among others.

"Everywhere the pilots were unanimous in the opinion that the DC–4 is the best all-purpose commercial plane flying today, capable of standing up ruggedly to storms, lifting tremendous loads, and giving passengers as smooth a ride as they have reason to hope for.

"There is, of course, a 'but.' That is the DC–4—which carries 44 to 60 passengers, depending on seating arrangements—wasn't basically designed to include all the safety aids that the war has made available to aviation."

When will those in power, who are under oath to protect the interest and welfare of the American people, do their jobs properly and efficiently, regardless of whose toes they may be forced to step upon?

The Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a speech delivered by the Honorable Alf M. Landon, former Governor of Kansas, on the subject of our foreign policy The speech was delivered Thursday night at Philadelphia, Pa., at the annual banquet of the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHETHER PEACE

I am talking tonight not as a Republican. I am speaking as an American citizen.

There is a growing realization that this is the year of crisis in foreign affairs. The Nation realizes the world situation is extremely critical.

In such a situation it behooves every patriotic American to do everything in his power to support and aid the Government of his country.

We Americans have our bitter family difference on domestic issues. Frequently our purposes cross each other.

Two ambitious and ruthless attempts to conquer and rule the world have learned to their destruction—in the lifetime of this generation—that when the Republic is in peril we Americans have no other consideration but our Nation's safety and security. The American breed is never discouraged.

This is no time for pessimism. It is a time to be on guard. We are the strongest Nation in the world. American influence in the world has never been as great as it is today.

The greatest problem of all at this time is the wise use of that strength.

This is neither the time nor place to review the damage done by the ill-advised handling of our foreign policy.

The administration is now embarking on a new and superprogram.

At the same time the Kremlin—through its weakness—and fears born of that weakness—is overreaching itself.

That kind of situation can create a sudden and terrific explosion.

However, I anticipate instead a long, arduous, expensive road ahead of us. The information furnished by the administration to the American people regarding that road should be accurate and ample.

Instead it has been too much like running a river steamer without lights or acquaintance with the shifting sand bars.

I stanchly supported the basic objectives of the Truman doctrine as enunciated by the President. As I understand it, that objective is to block Soviet aggression and expansion wherever it may evidence itself.

I did not and I do not now consider that policy as interfering in the internal affairs of Russia. I do not consider the Truman doctrine as in any way challenging the right of Russia to run its own internal affairs.

But that inherent right does not carry with it any right to interfere in the internal affairs of any other country—near or far—either by mailed fist—economic power—or terrorist pressures.

Imperialist totalitarian aggression of any kind has always been abhorrent to the American people.

It is abhorrent because it is immoral and because it threatens the peace of the world.

Right is right, and wrong is wrong. The world cannot live in peace based on immorality.

It doesn't matter what ideology it parades under—imperialistic aggression is still evil.

The world cannot hope for peace, and mankind cannot look for a future of reconstruction and progress as long as any nation commits the immorality of aggressive imperialistic expansion by force.

In declaring early my support of the Truman doctrine I acted as an American citizen first and above all other consideration.

That is the only basis a patriotic citizen can act in time of national crisis. There can be no partisan, personal, or other considerations.

I accepted the Truman doctrine as a declaration of national foreign policy. I agreed with the basic objective of that policy because it was aimed against an international evil. I am still in favor of that basic objective.

But I have earnestly hoped for a comprehensive constructive plan to back it up. The Truman doctrine needs that badly if it succeeds in avoiding another war.

The real test of the Truman doctrine is yet to come—probably in Italy, Germany, or France.

It is no secret that those major sections of Europe are in great danger of a Communist seizure of power. France and Italy are in the coils of government upheavals. What will our Government do about that? Has it a plan of action in accordance with the basic objectives of the Truman doctrine?

It is not sufficient to invoke the United Nations. Every American is desperately eager that the United Nations fulfill its great purposes.

But realities are realities. There is no use fooling ourselves that the United Nations today has any real power to enforce the peace of the world.

It is no solution of the perils we face to invoke the threat of the United Nations—especially when our Government proclaimed a national policy that was outside the United Nations.

I believe it is now incumbent upon the administration to fish or cut bait.

It must formulate a definite, comprehensive plan and execute it without any quibbling.

The popular thinking now in administration circles is to underwrite politically and financially—to the tune of twenty or more billion dollars, spread over the next few years—some kind of a union of the nations of western Europe. That is in effect a blood transfusion. And we should first find out how much we can spare.

That policy must be more intelligently and efficiently managed than was the case with the fantastic administration of the UNRRA.

In his Harvard speech Secretary of State Marshall made offers to the European nations.

It is generally assumed that policy implements the basic objective of the Truman doctrine.

Naturally I would like to support it. But the people of the United States still are in the dark as to the real meaning of Marshall's declaration.

He leaves many vital questions still unanswered—questions that have not yet been clarified or even discussed by administration spokesmen.

There is prevalent throughout the Nation a profound and widespread feeling of uneasiness and concern over the world situation. Our country is against imperialistic expansion. But the American people also want peace.

But I am convinced that profoundly as they want peace they are prepared to accept the responsibilities to go with enforcing peace.

But the American people want to know what the administration is doing to insure peace. They have a right to that information because it is the people who—in the final analysis—will pay the price.

The demand of Americans that the administration lay its cards frankly on the table does not mean that people approve of discordant and ill-advised criticism of the administration and its policies.

The great mass of American people view such outcries—especially on foreign policies—with disgust and disapproval.

But at the same time they feel that the administration must be honest and frank with the country. The people know that great and grave decisions face the Nation and them.

They want those decisions made with their full knowledge and full understanding. And, without any official attempts to minimize the hazards involved.

Only in that way can national unity be preserved and maintained.

Also, such national unity can only be secured if the administration has a definite and constructive policy. The American people want their Government to be bold and vigorous in defense of peace. The American people want their Government to act forcefully—intelligently and steadfastly for peace.

I believe I am voicing the sentiment of the Nation in saying that the people are prepared to make great sacrifices for enduring peace.

Whether the plan of Secretary Marshall's for a European union is successful or not I renew my previous suggestion of a consultative committee from the legislative bodies of Britain, Canada, and America. The need is becoming more apparent every day. It should be broadened to include France at least. I believe it should be based more now on the reconstruction problem than the atomic one—for the former is much more urgent.

To me, it seems that other certain steps are essential if the decent, peaceloving peoples of the world have the best chance of heading off another war.

In that group I include the Russian people, Hungarians, Yugoslavs, and Chinese, as well as Americans.

The common peoples of the world do not want war. It comes only through the blunders and ambitions and fears of their political leaders.

The first step is to boldly and vigorously push real and genuine disarmanent with all the safeguards including inspection and control by a reorganized security council of the United Nations.

I do not mean any ratio hocus-pocus—any attempt to fix ratios of any kind.

I mean, for the first time in all history, an honest attempt to bring about complete universal disarmament.

The most simple means of restoring and preserving civilization—I speak of disarmament—seems the most difficult. We are not aggressively pushing the most obvious design of mutual international understanding and cooperation. Honest disarmament is more than the next step in the policy proposed by Secretary of State Marshall. It is the primary step in restoring, not only the world but our own country, to health.

The conflict between communism, socialism, and capitalism can then be safely left

to the mutations of time, and settled without national animus or aggression.

Tensions and fears—of a third world war—now creating an unhealthy apathy would vanish.

World-wide record-breaking production for peace would be released. Currencies would be strengthened. Relief problems on a national scale would disappear.

As a part of that program there should be internationalization of all the key spots in the world. I mean, the Panama Canal, Suez, Gibraltar, and the Dardanelles.

The alternative to genuine universal disarmament is to push vigorously United States military preparedness.

There is no use of my reminding you that the burden ninteen million men under arms in the world today puts on civilization is in reality a millstone about our necks.

Nor is there any use of my working up hysteria by discussing the horrors of the world's armament race.

It means living in an armed camp. It means our standard of living of necessity would be lowered to finance that arms race. In the atomic age it means dismal life in an insecure fortress. That means a rising militarism engulfing eventually our Republic.

The moves for disarmament must be inspired from our highest governmental quarters. Any organized and active moves along that line—at this time—must be conducted so they will not embarrass our Government in their negotiations with foreign countries.

In other words, it has to be a matter of good timing. We cannot afford any premature move on disarmament, but that should be our immediate goal.

Until the whole pattern of world affairs makes disarmament conversations feasible the American people will close ranks behind the President in any controversy with foreign power. We have proved in two great wars our ability to work and to fight for life and liberty.

All other things—our business, taxation, political parties, the things that concern us today—fade into insignificance beside this one gigantic fact. Another war may come. It would relegate them to mere trifles. The battle to survive alone would count.

Time is running out. Just a few years remain in which to work out a functioning world organization able to maintain the peace. It is our only hope. It must be done.

Today we are the most powerful nation on the face of the earth. We—and Western civilization—have the atomic bomb. In a few more years Russia, and communism, too, will have it. Then the world will be divided into two armed camps, each fearful of the other, and awaiting for the explosion that will touch off the conflagration.

The United Nations—either with or without universal disarmament—can become the means of averting another world tragedy. We must press, with all the power at our command, for the rapid setting up of a world police force to be used at the direction of a functioning United Nations security council.

We must demand the elimination of the veto, and at once. We must risk our fate in the hands of other people of the world. It seems a small risk compared with the greater one of war.

If the Soviet Union continues to stall for time, and to fight the elimination of the veto, and real genuine universal disarmament, we should seek with full dispatch to make the United Nations function—preferably with Russia—but without her, if necessary.

An organization for world peace without Russia merely would give practical recognition to conditions as they exist today. It would be no insurance against war. Although it would be better than we now have. This United Nations—without Russia, and without universal disarmament—could mobilize its world police and decide conditions under which it would be used.

Such a result would permit huge economies on armaments within the member nations. They would save billions by naval union alone. By sharing the staggering burdens of armament western Europe's recovery could be financed out of the economies instead of having to raise fresh billions by taxation or borrowing.

Two conflicting ideologies must learn to live together—even as two strong personalities. Western civilization with its freedom, its competition, and rewards is colliding with a doctrine of expanding oppression—that refuses to recognize any reason but force—in which the citizen is the servant of the state. The real test is before us. A test to determine which can offer more liberty, a higher standard of living, and greater prestige for the individual. I believe we know the answer.

The Pennsylvania State Senate and State Assembly Oppose St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania State Assembly, mindful of the welfare of the citizens of that great Commonwealth, calls to the attention of the American people through a memorial to Congress the adverse effect of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project to the taxpayers of the United States.

With our Nation staggering under a huge national debt and with the peoples of the world looking to the United States for financial assistance the economic fallacy of the St. Lawrence seaway proposal is plainly evident.

The following resolution, No. 27, was approved by the Pennsylvania State Assembly on May 26, 1947, and concurred in by the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania on the same date.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolution 27

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will produce no practical benefits for the people of the two countries, it is designed to serve; and

Whereas the general assembly and the citizens of this State are greatly concerned about the effect the completion of this project would have upon them; and

Whereas the construction of the project would burden the taxpayers of this Commonwealth and the United States with an initial sum estimated at from $543,000,000 to $1,350,000,000, and experience in similar public works would indicate that this project would cost much more; and

Whereas existing facilities, the Welland Canal, which bypasses Niagara Falls and the Great Lakes channels amply provides for the present lake traffic. The railroads on both sides in the United States and Canada have demonstrated that they are prepared to handle all through traffic offered; and

Whereas with its channels closed to navigation for about 5 months of the year due to ice and weather conditions, it would be unreasonable to expect the railroads to perform the required service during the period that navigation is closed and to be in a position to handle the peak load. The railroads would be required to maintain equipment that would be idle or little used for 60 percent of the time and have the added problem of maintaining the personnel organization. Great numbers would have to seek employment elsewhere while tonnage was moved by Government subsidized competitors. This situation would greatly affect the ports of Erie and Philadelphia; and

Whereas seagoing boats cannot travel this great distance for nothing, and the saving in transportation costs would be exceedingly small, if any; and

Whereas it would be disastrous to Great Lakes shipping, injurious to American rail, highway, and inland waterways services, and seriously harmful to the American coal and iron ore industries; and

Whereas electrical energy that would be generated could only be used at nearby points as it has been demonstrated that the cost of transmission over long distances greatly exceeds that generated locally; and

Whereas such an agreement if ratified would reduce the exportation of manufacturing, mining, and agricultural products of this Commonwealth, and result in loss of employment and contribute to increased taxation: Therefore be it

Resolved (if the senate concurs), That the General Assembly of Pennsylvania hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States not to approve the agreement for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chief clerk of the house to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

Japanese Mix Politics and Labor Unions in New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

JAPANESE MIX POLITICS AND LABOR UNIONS IN NEW DEAL

General MacArthur's new deal for Japan has given the Japanese people two new toys to play with—political parties and labor unions—and they are as busy as a couple of boys with a new electric train figuring out different combinations of track on the day after Christmas.

Party politics and the organization of labor unions are closely entwined in the new Japanese order.

The Potsdam declaration called for the establishment in Japan of a peaceably inclined and responsible government chosen in accordance with the freely expressed will of the Japanese people. Consequently political activity of all kinds is encouraged by the occupation authorities.

But the occupation has another objective, which is based on General MacArthur's vision of future profitable trade relations between the United States and Japan and other

oriental countries. As MacArthur sees it, this will be possible only if the labor standards in Japan are raised, so that cheap Japanese labor will not compete unfairly with American labor.

UNIONS ARE ENCOURAGED

For that reason labor union organization is encouraged by the occupation authorities. The labor division of the economic and scientific section of SCAP has obtained literature put out by a number of labor organizations in various parts of the world, including the CIO in the United States and the International Labor Organization, has translated it into Japanese and distributed it among Japanese labor unions. This literature tells the Japanese how to organize, how to draft constitutions for labor unions, how to bargain collectively with employers and how to prepare contracts.

Another reason for seeking to elevate labor standards in Japan, as given by Anthony Costantina, chief of the labor-relations branch of SCAP, is that a depressed labor force is not interested in democracy. Thus it is hoped that higher labor standards will help to establish and preserve democracy in Japan. In addition, Japanese labor unions are encouraged by the occupation authorities to take part in politics, which they do with a great deal of zest.

CONFUSION OBSCURES MOTIVES

Consequently Japan is seething with labor unrest and political ferment and it is sometimes difficult to distinguish whether strikes and demonstrations are actuated by political or economic motives, or both.

The Communists are extremely active in both political and labor organizations. According to Brig. Gen. Courtney Whitney, head of the government section of SCAP, the Communist party is the only one in Japan with a clearly defined philosophy and purpose. Other party labels mean little or nothing. Yet the Communists elected only five of their candidates at the 1936 election.

At that election, there were 268 parties with 1 or more candidates, but only 30 parties elected members of the Diet. Since the election the party alinements have been changing, as various independents join the predominant parties or form new ones.

PARTY PICTURE CHANGING

Thus, the Liberals, who might be dyed-in-the-wool conservatives, won 140 seats at the election and now have 148; the Progressives won 93 and now have 111; the Social Democrats won 92 and now have 99; 2 minor parties combined to form the Cooperative Party, which has 44; another group of independents joined to become the People's Party; the Communists elected 5 and now have 6; the Independents elected 82 and now have 21, and there are other minor parties without any affiliations.

At the last election all candidates had to fill out questionnaires which were posted at the balloting places 15 days before the election. This permitted the neighbors of the candidates to determine whether the answers to the questionnaires were accurate and helped the occupation authorities screen out candidates who were not eligible for public office because they had been active in the Japanese war effort. The names of the candidates were not printed on the ballots, consequently all the voters had to be able to write.

FACTIONS BEING CONSOLIDATED

Since then a new election bill has been drafted, under which candidates whose parties polled 2 percent of the votes at the last election or who elected 25 members to the Diet will have their names printed on the ballots, with blank spaces to permit the names of other candidates to be written in.

This is expected to cut down the number of parties and eventually give more stability to Japanese politics.

Meanwhile the Japanese people seem to be brimful of enthusiasm for the new order. Parades can be organized at the drop of a hat, either to demand higher wages or the resignation of the cabinet or to protest the wearing of pants by Japanese women.

PARADES ARE ORDERLY

Nearly every week crowds will gather on the plaza of the Imperial Palace, across the street from General MacArthur's headquarters in the Dai Ichi Building. They will listen to speeches all morning and then spend the afternoon parading.

They always seem to be good-natured and orderly. A Japanese policeman holds up his hand at a street intersection and the parade stops. Then a song leader takes over and the section of which he is in charge begins to sing. American songs, particularly those of Stephen Foster, seem to be favorites.

At the end of the day everybody is tired and has had a good time. One wonders how people who are so poor, who lack many of what we would consider the necessities of life and have none of the luxuries, can afford to take time to parade and demonstrate. But that is democracy, American style, in Japan today.

Need Him Where He Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Need Him Where He Is," which appeared in the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal on June 13 as a tribute to our distinguished calleague the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

This editorial, from a great newspaper in my State, correctly describes the esteem and affection which all the people of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi hold for the Senator from Louisiana. He has been their champion, their advocate and their counselor, without respect to the point or place from whence they came. The flood-control program on the lower Mississippi River is, in large measure, a monument to his leadership.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED HIM WHERE HE IS

Would-be political strategists in Louisiana recently sent up a trial balloon which involuntarily cast Senator JOHN H. OVERTON in the role of prospective gubernatorial candidate.

Louisiana's senior Senator and foremost expert of the Congress on flood-control matters has effectively, characteristically exploded that myth by asserting that he wouldn't have the Louisiana governorship "if offered to him on a gold platter." Coming from him, as Louisiana well knows, that's the last word on the subject so far as he is concerned.

It isn't so far as we are concerned. We prefer to add that neither Louisiana nor the alluvial valley could afford to have Senator OVERTON in a post other than the one he now occupies. On flood-control matters he has no peer, and he has worked as earnestly in behalf of the safety of every valley State as he has the one he officially represents.

To make Senator OVERTON Governor of one State would be to deprive six other valley States of the most earnest and successful champion of their safety they have. The alluvial valley needs and wants him just where he intends to stay—in the Senate.

The Philippines—Land of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from P. W. Reeves, who served as Director of Personnel, Engineer Service, of the War Department in the Philippines, during the year 1946.

His letter so dramatically expresses his own observations and views and describes the conditions in the Philippines as he saw them that I feel it would be of interest to my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

His letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 26, 1947.*

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your request that I incorporate in a letter certain facts gathered by me, as well as observations I made, during my stay in the Philippines from April 1946 until March 1947. I am very glad to comply because I believe the information obtained will be of interest to you.

The seeds of communism being sown all over the world also are being sown in the Philippines. The same subversive groups are in Manila and the Philippines just as they are in China, Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, France, Germany, Italy, and some parts of South America. General MacArthur has been able to stop the advance of communism in Japan, but the followers of Marx and Stalin have a foothold in Korea. The Huks are the greatest menace to the Philippines today! The Huks are better known as Hukbalahaps, a militant rebel organization which was first organized in Central Luzon. Labor leaders came to Manila from China and organized the tenants (peasants) into units. These labor groups are being schooled in communistic theories, and they are being taught military discipline. They are taught to hate all forms of capitalism. These Huks are anti-American and at their meetings they denounce the United States and praise Russia. It is an undisputed fact that the Huks in the Philippines are linked with the 'Reds' of China. The Huks are all supplied with arms and ammunition. Their objective is the overthrow of the Philippine Government.

During the past few months the government of the Philippines, with the aid of Philippine Army intelligence officers, conducted an investigation of the Huks and their activities. A connection between the Huks of the Philippines and Moscow was definitely established. The Philippine Army disclosed that documentary proof was found showing conclusively that the Huks of the Philippines have as their leaders well-known Communists, who receive their instructions from Moscow.

At meeting places where the Huks assembled, communistic literature, pamphlets, and so forth, were found in great quantities. In all of the meeting places of the Huks

hammer and sickle flags were found. Captured Huks and others who have surrendered admitted that the Huks were taught the principles and teachings of Lenin. They were taught to organize and spread their ideology. They were taught that the solution of their ills, poverty, and hardships is the overthrow of the Philippine Government and the establishment of a Communist dictatorship. What I am telling you can be verified by reference to investigations made and reports filed by the Philippine Government since President Roxas assumed the office of president. Congressman Villareal headed the committee which conducted the investigation and made the report. The investigation and filing of the report consumed almost one year, and the report was released in Manila the 24th of May 1947.

Unlike the Communists in America, the Huks in the Philippines do not hesitate to resort to armed violence. Luis Taruc, the Huk leader, has publicly announced that he will very soon issue orders from Malacanan Palace in Manila. The Huks permit no opposition. The Huks have a meeting and then make unreasonable demands upon the landowners for money, rice, food, etc. If their demand is denied they murder the landowner and burn his home. Out in the provinces I saw many houses which had been burned or blown to bits by the Huks. In Manila I read daily accounts of brutal murders committed by Huks. In July 1946, Rev. Father Limlingan addressed a group of Huks and urged them to cease their lawless activities. The night following the afternoon on which this priest addressed the Huks, he was murdered. Yes; this priest was murdered in such a way that would cause the caveman to bow his head in shame. Four carabaos were tied to the priest—one carabao to each arm and one to each leg, and the carabaos were driven away in four directions, thus tearing the body of the priest into four parts. This happened 50 miles from Manila in July 1946.

The peasants (tenants) formerly received 40 percent of all they produced. An increase to 50 percent was granted. President Roxas granted another increase to 60 percent, and then another increase to 70 percent. The Huks have demanded 80 percent of all they produce. Their objective is to get 100 percent of everything they produce—leaving nothing for the owners of the land (the taxpayers). The uprisings in the provinces have increased, and thus more followers for the Huk army are made. The Huks started out with a small organization in Central Luzon. Their followers are now scattered, and rapidly increasing, in many of the provinces. I recently read a statement from Gov. Angeles David of the province of Pampanga. Governor David charged the Huks with spreading communistic doctrine in the Philippines and attempting to overthrow the Philippine Government. I quote the following from Governor David's statement issued a few weeks ago: "* * * The Huk organization recognizes no law but anarchy and lawlessness and has no love of country because it advocates communistic principles, uses the red flag in all of its demonstrations, and celebrates November 7 (the birth of the Third International) every year with a big parade."

We talk about Pearl Harbor, where, in a few minutes on December 7, 1941, the people of the United States were taught a terrible lesson in blood. We are reminded that our brave men died at Guadalcanal, in New Guinea, at Tarawa, at Iwo Jima, at Bikini, and elsewhere. We are told about the men who died on the cruiser *Houston* in the Java Sea, and about the death-dealing submarines off Midway and in the Aleutian Islands. We have heard speeches about the bombing of Dutch Harbor and about the loss of lives in the fall of Singapore. The death march of Bataan was grimly brought to our attention. But we treat this onrushing tide of communism with indifference. The greatest stronghold of the Communist Party (outside of Russia) is China. The Communists are growing stronger in Brazil, Chile, and Cuba. The Communists are in charge of the government in Hungary. Although General MacArthur is doing a great job in Japan, and has to a certain degree checked the increase of the Communists in Japan, in 1946 there were 2,000,000 party members (Communist Party) in Japan.

We all know the objectives of communism are the creation of strikes, chaos, disorder, unemployment, poverty, misery. It is easy to understand how easy it was for the Communists to launch their movement in China. I saw Chinese in Shanghai grabbing garbage from barrels with their hands—and I saw them devour what they found like a pack of hungry wolves. The Communists believe that the poverty-stricken peoples of the world will turn to communism because of the glittering promises made by communistic leaders. From the time of Lenin every Communist has been made to believe that mankind is divided into two groups—Communists in one group and the rest of the world in the other group.

To every people who worship God, He is the personification of their code of morals. Where there is no belief in God there is no ideal of virtue. The most remote savage African tribes, the Taoists, the Buddhists, the Mohammedans, also the worshippers of Mumbo-Jumbo, all have their God and preserve their deity. In America those of us who profess religion hold our deity inviolate. Upon God and the teachings of His Son are based everything that we hold precious and necessary to a good life. Communism has legislated God out of existence. Communism strives by force to drive God out of the hearts of men, not only our God but the gods of every other race and every other tribe. Creeping over the world is a way of thinking which denies both the existence and necessity of a God. This force is anti-God. The name of this force is communism. If this letter could be read by your colleagues in the House it would cause them to think more about this menace of communism, as I have seen it.

It has occurred to me that you might be interested in the geography of the Philippines, and what these little islands have to offer pioneering souls in the way of opportunity.

The Philippines are the largest island group in the Malay Archipelago. They were discovered by Magellan in 1521. In 1565 they were conquered by Spain. The Portuguese contested Spain's right to the archipelago until Spain and Portugal finally united. In 1577 Sir Francis Drake arrived. Thomas Cavendish's expedition arrived in 1587. The Dutch came in 1596. These expeditions were seeking trade rather than colonies. In 1762 Manila was captured by a British expedition. In 1763, by the Treaty of Paris, Manila was restored to Spain. Not until 1814 were foreigners permitted to establish themselves in Manila. It was difficult for foreigners to get trade on account of the constantly changing Spanish policy of opening ports to foreign trade and then suddenly closing the ports to foreign trade. Finally on December 10, 1898, by the Treaty of Paris, the Phillipine Islands were turned over to the United States on payment of $20,000,000.

Thus since 1898 the Philippines have been closely tied to America. The islands have wonderful natural resources and afford unlimited opportunities. The mountains are rich in minerals. Between the mountains and the sea are immense fertile plains, well watered. The average temperature is 78 degrees in winter and 84 degrees in summer. There are 7,083 islands in the group known as the Philippines. Four hundred and sixty-two of these islands have an area of 1 square mile or more. Two thousand four hundred and forty-one of the islands are named. Four thousand six hundred and forty-two of the islands are not named. The largest island is Luzon, on which Manila is situated, with 40,814 square miles. Mindanao is the second largest island with 36,906 square miles. Panay Island has 4,448 square miles. Palawan Island is next with 4,400 square miles. In 1939 the population of the principal cities were: Manila, 653,000; Cebu, 145,000; Zamboanga, 132,700; Davao, 97,000; Iloilo, 88,000; Bacolod, 58,000; Baguio, 24,120. The total population of the islands in 1939 was estimated to be about 17,000,000. The population today is estimated to be between eighteen and nineteen million.

There are many large banks in Manila, two of which are American-owned, National City Bank and the Bank of America. Freedom of the press and religion and the right of assembly are guaranteed in the bill of rights. The chief agricultural products are unhusked rice, copra, hemp, sugarcane, corn, tobacco, and manguey. The principal fruit is the banana. Other fruits are mangoes, papaya, lanzones, mandarins, chico, and oranges. Forests provide large quantities of timber for cabinet and other household necessities. Rattan wood is made into many useful articles for the home. This is a large and growing business, since the market for rattan-made articles is rapidly expanding. The mining of gold, silver, lead, zinc, copper, iron, coal, petroleum, chromite, asbestos, and manganese is extensive throughout the islands. Clay, marble, and salt can be found in abundance. It is estimated there are between 80 and 100 square miles of coal fields containing lignite and bituminous. There are many American businessmen in the islands and there will be many more as soon as machinery and equipment for contemplated new business concerns can be sent to Manila.

Americans are not wanted in India, Japan, or China. On account of poverty and disease in India and because of China's civil war, Americans are disinclined to live in or invest money in China and India. Certainly, Americans do not wish to live in or invest money in a destroyed and defeated nation like Japan. There is no hatred of Americans in the Philippines, and the Filipinos are eager for Americans to join them in their efforts to industrialize and rebuild their country. In the Philippines the corporation tax is 12 percent as compared to 38 percent in the United States. Income tax in the Philippines ranges from 3 to 60 percent (in the large brackets) as compared to from 20 to 91 percent (in the large brackets) in the United States. In the Philippines there is no excess-profits tax. Filipinos like American goods, American automobiles, American movies.

On account of the vast amount of money which was spent in the Philippines in getting ready for the attack on Japan—about $700,000,000—and on account of the huge Army and Navy installations maintained in the islands since liberation, there is more money in the Philippines today than at any time in the history of the Filipino people. The working class in the Philippines today has money to spend, and they are spending it for anything and everything that is for sale.

On account of the bombardment of Manila by the American troops in driving out the Japs, every Government building in the city of Manila was wholly or partly destroyed. The Manila Hotel is the only first-class hotel left. About 40 percent of the homes in Manila were partly or entirely reduced to shambles. Practically all of the bridges and most of the roads were destroyed or badly impaired. If all of the large construction companies in the United States were to go to Manila to rebuild the city they would have enough work to keep them busy for the next 5 years. Before the Japs occupied the Philippines there were about 50

sugar centrals operating. Today only 12 sugar centrals are in operation. Until machinery is sent to the Philippines to rebuild and repair the sugar centrals the prewar production of sugar (more than a million tons per year) cannot be maintained. The sugar production in the Philippines at this time is estimated to be less than 100,000 tons per year.

The Filipino people have an almost fanatic love for the same type of freedoms exemplified by America. They have great respect for the United States and its democratic processes. Wherever I traveled I found Filipinos of all walks of life discussing with considerable fervor and intelligence the various issues of the day. One of the most discussed subjects were the charges hanging over the head of former President Laurel, who served his people as president during the Japanese occupation. He is being charged by his political enemies with collaboration with the Japs. Laurel has been trying unsuccessfully to bring his case to trial.

Wherever I talked to a Filipino, the question always arose, "What about that man Laurel who served as President during Japanese occupation?" So many distorted statements and so much misinformation has been sent to America about Laurel, I have decided to give you some facts about Laurel and his illustrious and unparalleled service to his people. The facts which I have gathered in the Philippines will be a revelation to you.

While living in Manila during the major part of 1937 I heard Dr. Laurel speak at a public function and I was fascinated by his great learning. When I returned to Manila in March 1946, to serve as Director of Personnel, Engineer Service, United States War Department, I sought an introduction to Laurel. I left Manila February 28, 1947. During my stay in Manila in 1946 and 1947 I discussed with many people the charges against Laurel. I talked with high Government officials. I talked with members of the supreme court and former members of the supreme court. I visited in the homes of members of the Roxas cabinet and others who are close to President Roxas. I talked with the middle classes, the working classes, and with men in the streets who did not have jobs. I made a thorough investigation of the life of Laurel, particularly that part of his career when he served his people as President of the Republic during Japanese occupation. It was my pleasure to talk with President Roxas on two occasions. Once I called on him when he was taking his rest and he received me in his pajamas. I visited in the home of Elpidio Quirino many times during 1937. Also after Quirino became Vice President of the Republic I talked with him in his home on four occasions during 1946 and 1947. When I left Manila in February 1947, Mr. Quirino gave me his picture autographed "To my dear friend."

In the Philippines there are millions who believe that, intellectually, Dr. Laurel has no peer among the living or dead. Laurel's enemies will not challenge this statement. Laurel has more earned degrees (not honorary) than any other Filipino has ever received. A few of the certificates, diplomas, degrees, et cetera, which I noted on the walls of the study in Dr. Laurel's modest home are: A. B., LL. B., LL. M., M. A., D. C. L., LL. D., and Ph. D. He has attended and received degrees at the following places of learning: University of Philippines in Manila, University of Santo Tomas in Manila, Tokyo Imperial University in Tokyo, University of Paris in Paris, Yale University in New Haven, and Oxford University in England. Space will not permit my listing the honorary degrees which have been presented to him. He speaks and writes five different languages fluently.

My investigation causes me to express the opinion that no man has served his country more conspicuously and faithfully than Laurel. From 1909 until 1923 when he was quite young he served his government as clerk, chief clerk, law clerk, under secretary, secretary, etc. Gov. Gen. Leonard Wood appointed Dr. Laurel as head of the Interior Department in the famous "Wood Cabinet." From 1925 to 1931 he served as a senator in the Philippine Senate. In 1935 he was a delegate to the Constitutional Convention and he was one of those selected by the convention to write the Constitution for the Commonwealth of the Philippines, which constitution was adopted when the Philippine Republic came into being. In 1936 he was appointed by President Quezon to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. On December 24, 1941, after war was declared on Japan, President Quezon again appointed Laurel—this time to one of the most important positions in Philippines—the post of secretary of justice. When President Quezon was preparing to go to Corregidor because of the imminence of the fall of Manila he (Quezon) named Jorge Vargas, Quezon's most trusted and loyal friend, to be ranking member of the Quezon cabinet. Quezon also made Vargas mayor of the city of Greater Manila. Quezon sent for Dr. Laurel and told him he wanted him to accompany him in an advisory capacity. Laurel hurriedly packed a bag and was ready to go with Quezon. He wanted to remain with his people but he had never failed to answer the call of his country in time of need, and he was ready to go with Quezon on the flight to Australia. However, at the last hour Quezon decided, on account of Laurel's popularity with the Filipinos, that Laurel should stay in Manila, and he, therefore, instructed him to remain and help protect the people. Quezon took Justice Santos with him. Quezon told Laurel to do whatever was necessary to protect the people short of taking the oath of allegiance to Japan. Upon invitation from President Quezon, Dr. Laurel accompanied President and Mrs. Quezon to the boat that was to take them to Corregidor. Quezon's instructions to Laurel were given with the knowledge and approval of General MacArthur. MacArthur's instructions were that the Filipino officials could serve in the Japanese-sponsored organization in order to better protect the people, but he admonished them that they must not take the oath of allegiance to Japan, otherwise they would be shot by his order upon his return to the Philippines.

From the fall of Corregidor on May 12, 1942, until October 1943, Jorge Vargas was head of the Philippine Executive Commission. During this same period, Dr. Laurel served as Commissioner (or head) of Justice. This was the same post which Laurel held under Quezon by appointment in December 1941. In October 1943 Laurel was made President of the Republic of the Philippines by order of the Japanese who were occupying Manila. Laurel was carrying out Quezon's instructions to remain and cooperate with the Japanese in order to better protect the people. Laurel served as President from October 1943 until February 1945, when, over his protest, he was taken by the Japanese to Tokyo.

The late President Quezon was a patriot of the highest order. No man ever accused Quezon of being a traitor. When the Japs were approaching Manila, thousands of Filipinos fled to Baguio and to the mountains. It is a matter of record that Quezon, in the presence of several prominent Filipinos, requested Laurel to remain in Manila and help the people. This was a signal honor paid Laurel by the famous Filipino President. Here is further proof as to the high regard which Quezon entertained for Laurel. Mr. Sotero Laurel, a law graduate of Harvard University, and who is now taking a postgraduate course at Harvard, is the son of Dr. Jose P. Laurel. At the time announcement was made in the press that Dr. Jose P. Laurel had been selected as President of the Philippine Republic by the Japanese, Mr. Sotero Laurel was serving in an official capacity with the Commonwealth Government of Philippines in Washington, D. C. At this same time President Manuel Quezon was residing at the Hotel Shoreham in Washington, D. C. Under date of September 27, 1943, Sotero Laurel sent a letter to President Quezon, from which I quote the following paragraph:

"I am sure that Your Excellency will understand my feelings. Despite my firm belief in the honesty, courage, and patriotism of my father, I feel that I have no right, as his son, to stay within the Commonwealth Government because of reasons of delicacy and because it might be embarrassing to you and the Commonwealth Government. In this situation, I feel that I should resign, but I have thought it best to first submit the matter for your personal consideration. Anything you might decide, I am sure, will be for the best."

Under date of September 30, 1943, President Quezon sent a reply to Sotero Laurel, from which I quote the following:

"Your letter of September 27 touched my very soul. I am not convinced that your father is a traitor either to the United States or to the Philippines. I know him personally and have been closely connected with him officially for many years. I believe he is doing what he honestly believes is in the best interest of the Filipino people for the time being. After saying what I have said, it is a matter for you to decide what you should do. If you are loyal to America and to my Government, stay on the job. If you are not, resign and I will accept your resignation forthwith."

Further proof that President Quezon did not question Laurel's integrity or patriotism, and that he appreciated the service Laurel was rendering the Filipino people during Japanese occupation, can be found in the book The Good Fight which was personally written by the late President Quezon just before his death.

In February 1947, I dined in the home of one of the most outstanding Filipinos in Manila. This man held a high post under President Quezon and President Osmena. In 1946 he was appointed to a high post by President Roxas. When I asked this man what he thought of Laurel, he replied: "Laurel is one of our greatest patriots. He has devoted his life and has given the best there is in him for the betterment of his people."

I sailed from Manila February 28, 1947 Just 10 days before I left, I called at the home of Hon. Elpidio Quirino, Vice President, Philippine Republic. I was accompanied by Justice Sabino Padilla, a member of the Supreme Court of the Philippines. During our talk I showed Mr. Quirino a photograph which had been given to me by Justice Padilla. It was a photograph of three young Filipinos who were classmates and bosom friends at college. The three young men were devoted friends in youth before entering college, and their friendship and admiration for each other has remained steadfast down through the years up to the present time. These three men have been honored with high offices many times by the Filipino people. Justice Padilla served 10 years as assistant attorney general. He served 17 years as a judge of the court of appeals. He is now serving as justice of supreme court, Philippine Republic, by appointment of President Roxas. Thus Padilla served under President Quezon, President Osmena, and President Roxas. Hon. Elpidio Quirino was a member of President Quezon's Cabinet, and he is now Vice President of the Philippine Republic, having been elected on the same ticket at the last election with Presi-

dent Roxas. Dr. Jose Laurel, the third man in the photograph, was a State senator for 6 years. He was selected by the constitutional convention to help write the constitution when the Commonwealth of the Philippines was formed. In 1936 he was appointed by President Quezon as associate justice of the supreme court. On December 24, 1941, after war was declared on Japan, Quezon appointed Laurel to his Cabinet as Secretary of Justice, a very important post in the Quezon Cabinet. As has been stated, just before leaving Manila, President Quezon's last act was to designate Laurel to remain and help protect the people. The Japanese, upon entering Manila, soon learned that Laurel was the idol of his people. The Japanese wanted to win over the Filipino people to their cause, and they thought the appointment of Laurel as President would help them in this objective. The Japs made Laurel President of the Philippine Republic. As Vice President Quirino held the photograph in his hand on Sunday, February 16, 1947, he said: "Yes; we have worked hard and have gone quite far, but, my dear friend Reeves, of the three of us who started out together, Laurel has outshone us, has rendered greater service, and has gained more glory." It should be borne in mind that the foregoing statement was made by the No. 2 man in the Philippines, the Vice President of the Philippine Republic, and the statement was made on February 16, 1947, after the evidence against Laurel was widely known and discussed by all.

The people of Manila had their places of business destroyed, their homes blasted to shambles. Fathers, mothers, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, and loved ones were killed. And yet when Laurel was brought back to Manila in July 1946, the streets of Manila were lined with countless thousands screaming words of praise for Laurel. Banners were carried by many thousands announcing "Laurel is back." Circulars were scattered throughout the entire city of Manila. Here is one of the circulars which I picked up on the streets:

"Laurel has returned to his beloved country. In times of stress he stood for us and with us. He fought for us in every step when the Japs would have totally destroyed us. When all seemed to be lost he still tried to defend us against great odds. He did all within his power to prevent a greater evil upon his beloved country and his beloved people. Most of us are alive today because Laurel was the wall that delayed our wholesale martyrdom. He is back. The least we can do is show our appreciation for him."

On August 18, 1946, the people of Laurel's home province of Batangas paid Laurel the highest honor he had received throughout his eventful career. A mass demonstration and parade in honor of Laurel took place in Manila. All Manila streets were filled to overflowing. What pleased Dr. Laurel most was the fact that many thousands of residents of Batangas came to Manila to participate in the parade. Additional thousands from farflung provinces of Llocos, Cagayan Valley, Bicol Peninsula, and Pangasinan poured into Manila. For 2 days before the Laurel parade in Manila there was a continuous stream of cars and various forms of vehicles on all roads leading from Batangas to Manila. And with tears rolling down his cheeks, Dr. Laurel said to me: "Mr. Reeves, that was and that is my answer to the charges which some have brought against me."

An unusual story appeared in a Manila newspaper. It described an imaginary conversation which could have taken place in Manila in July 1946 if President Roxas had met Dr. Laurel when he returned to Manila. Actually president Roxas did not go to the airport to meet Dr. Laurel. Here is the story which I copied from the newspaper:

"ROXAS. Welcome home, Joe. It is good to see you again. We are free, Joe! The Philippine flag flies all alone!

"LAUREL. Hello, Manoling! During my time the Philippine flag also flew alone, except in Japanese military installations.

"ROXAS. I have a Council of State.

"LAUREL. So did I.

"ROXAS. I have called into service Quirino, Rodriguez, Tirona, Yule, Zuluela Abello.

"LAUREL. So did I, and remember, Manoling, you also served in my cabinet."

In January 1947 a leading physician of Manila told me:

"During our period of reconstruction and rehabilitation, we need Laurel to guide us now as never before. President Quezon was pro-Spanish and a large number of his appointments to high places were given to Spaniards who changed their citizenship and became citizens of the Commonwealth. President Osmena was pro-Chinese because he is part Chinese. He favored the Chinese at every opportunity, and, as a result, the Chinese have a strong foothold in Manila's business world today. President Roxas is pro-American and seems more anxious to please Americans than Filipinos. The people know Laurel is a statesman, an intellectual giant, a fighter. His aims are to serve his country and his people. Filipinos worship Laurel because he is pro-Filipino."

One of the most badly damaged districts in the Philippines was represented in Congress by Hon. Jose B. Laurel, son of Dr. Jose P. Laurel. The people in this district were embittered because of the damage done to their people and their property by the Japanese. Because of the fact that his father was in Sugamo Prison in Japan, Congressman Laurel was undecided about making the campaign for reelection to Congress. Those who were trying to crucify Dr. Jose P. Laurel (father of Congressman Laurel) were bitterly opposing the Congressman. Just 1 month before the election (the same election which elected Roxas as President), Congressman Laurel launched his campaign for reelection. The charges against his father were issues in that campaign. When Congressman Laurel was overwhelmingly reelected to Congress, he stated: "My great triumph was achieved because of the great admiration which our people still have for my father."

Friends of mine in Manila told me about this campaign of Congressman Laurel. When I mentioned the subject to Dr. Laurel, he said to me: "Mr. Reeves, if you had been in that congressional district and heard the charges made against me, you would have thought I was running for Congress instead of my son. That great victory won by my son made my heart feel good."

In the campaign of Dr. Laurel's son for reelection to Congress, the issues against the father were presented to the people by the opponent of Dr. Laurel's son. The verdict of the voters speaks for itself.

When Rafael Alunan, a member of President Laurel's Cabinet, was tried in Manila in 1947, the trial was in reality a trial of Dr. Jose P. Laurel rather than the trial of Alunan. Mr. Alunan was acquitted on all charges.

An interesting report on Laurel was made by Capt. R. Espiritu, a guerrilla leader who was an operative of the Allied Intelligence Bureau. This report is on file in the prosecutor's office in Manila today. In 1944 President Laurel offered to Col. Alejandro D. Garcia the position of Governor of Nueva Ecija. Colonel Garcia was undecided about accepting the post. He told President Laurel he would like to take up the matter with General MacArthur. However, his doubts about accepting the post were dispelled when President Laurel handed him a piece of paper on which were written the following words: "My loyalty to America can only be removed by cutting off my head. (Signed) Laurel." Colonel Garcia was later taken prisoner by the Japs. The note above quoted was found by Captain Espiritu when he discovered some private papers and effects which Colonel Garcia had left behind. Colonel Garcia was working under cover, receiving instructions from President Laurel, when he was taken prisoner and shot. Supposing Colonel Garcia had lived. No doubt, some would charge him with collaboration just as some have charged Laurel. Suppose Laurel had been killed while carrying out instructions given to him by Quezon to cooperate as best he could and help protect the people. I hardly think anyone would have charged Quezon with being a collaborationist. To say that Laurel collaborated with the Japs is to impugn the motives and challenge the patriotism of Quezon.

Rafael Alunan was appointed by Laurel as a member of the Laurel Cabinet during Jap occupation. After liberation by the American troops, Alunan was charged with collaboration and treason. Alunan insisted on a trial. The same facts, the same evidence brought out against Laurel were used in the trial against Alunan. On February 26, 1947, Alunan was acquitted and completely exonerated. Alunan did not have the following which Laurel has. Laurel has insisted on a trial. The political enemies of Laurel are holding off the trial because they know Laurel will be acquitted and vindicated. The Intelligence of the Army and the Navy and the United States Office of Strategic Service have investigated and have tried unsuccessfully to pin something on Laurel. The enemies of Laurel in Manila—the political enemies who fear his increasing power and popularity—have turned heaven and earth to blacken the name of Laurel. They have all reached the same dead end of the street. The facts dug up have conclusively proven that Laurel is a true patriot and not a traitor. From October 1943, until February 1945, during the period of Jap occupation when Laurel was President, the searchlight has been turned on every move, every act of Laurel. Every document he signed and every order he issued as President has been carefully scrutinized by those who have undertaken to stop Laurel. They have given up all hope of convicting Laurel. The handful of men still fighting Laurel have concentrated their efforts on preventing the trial taking place.

It is a matter of record that while Laurel was President the Japs were insistent that Laurel arrest and punish members of the Philippine constabulary who were connected with the guerrillas. President Laurel promised the Japs that an investigation would be made, but the record discloses that no arrests were ever made. It is common knowledge in Manila that Laurel was aware that many officers in Laurel's presidential guard were active in the guerrilla movement. On one occasion the Japs insisted on arresting Major Vargas, who was one of Laurel's guards ir Malacanan Palace. Laurel declined to surrender Major Vargas to the Japs. When the Japs came to Malacanan Palace to take Major Vargas, Laurel gave instructions to the head of the presidential guard, Colonel Salgado, to line up his men and resist the Japs.

The Japs demanded that President Laurel declare war on the United States. The Japs also wanted conscription in the Philippines. In October 1943, Premier Tojo called President Laurel to Tokyo and reiterated his demands about war and conscription. Tojo wanted the Philippines to follow the steps of Burma. Laurel used all of his resourcefulness to thwart the will of the Japs. Laurel explained to Tojo that the Filipinos could not be made to fight the Americans. He pointed out that Japan would lose much and would destroy in the minds of the Filipinos the estimation of the "independence" which Japan had so graciously granted to the Philippines. With great courage, Laurel stood before Tojo and unhesitatingly and unflinchingly presented his reasons for failure to comply with

Tojo's orders. According to Filipinos who were present at the conference between Tojo and Laurel, Laurel displayed iron strength and courage in his argument to Tojo, and he finally convinced Tojo that he, Laurel, was right. After Davao and Legapi were bombed by the Americans, the Japs again demanded that Laurel declare war against the United States. Laurel called his cabinet together and advised there were three courses open. One course would be to refuse and flee to the mountains. The second course was to make a stand at Malacanan Palace with the presidential guard. The first course was ruled out, because the Japs had placed guards around the President and all members of his cabinet. Flight to the mountains was impossible. The second course would mean sure death to Laurel and every member of his cabinet. Dr. Laurel told me that death was not the determining factor that caused abandonment of the first two courses. Laurel knew that the Filipinos would suffer by his death. Laurel knew that when he and his cabinet were wiped out, the Japs would take over and govern directly, or would name some rabid pro-Japanese to succeed him as President of the Philippine Government. The third and only course left open was to "play ball" and declare a state of war by Presidential proclamation. Laurel's clever mind was too much for the cunning Japs to cope with. Laurel issued the proclamation, but added there would be no conscription of manpower. Laurel knew that a presidential proclamation recognizing that a state of war existed, without conscription of man-power, would be a mere joke. The Japs were thus satisfied but thoroughly outgeneraled by Laurel. Laurel points with pride to his next act, which was the cleverest act performed by him during his rule as President. He went on the air and by radio told the Filipino people there would be no conscription. Laurel's purpose, as his friends fully understood and as he explained to me recently, was to tie his own hands so he could not later disavow the promise he had made to his people that there would be no conscription. In all his life Laurel had never failed to keep a promise made to his people. He had an ace in the hole in case the Japs insisted on conscription. Laurel wanted to be in a position to tell the Japs that if he went back on his word to his people his usefulness as President and leader would be at an end. The Japs were again fooled by Laurel's cleverness. By Laurel's act in refusing to order conscription, the lives of hundreds of thousands of Filipinos were saved. When the Americans landed in Manila, from all directions they were met by hundreds and hundreds of thousands of Filipinos, all waving American flags and screaming with joy. One Army officer in Manila told me that if the Filipinos had had guns in their hands instead of American flags when the Americans arrived, at least 200,000 Filipinos would have been slaughtered. Another Army officer told me that Laurel's wonderful leadership saved the lives of possibly 300,000 Filipinos. Yes, Laurel fed, protected, and saved the lives of his people while he was President during Jap occupation.

Another incident during the reign of Laurel which showed the side he was on was related to me by a prominent man in Manila who is a member of Roxas' official family. Certain accused persons were brought before the bar of justice for trial. They were Japanese sympathizers. The Japanese would endeavor to have the accused acquitted or have the indictments thrown out of court. Also in some cases the Japanese were anxious that certain persons be convicted, and the higher Jap officials would talk to the judges and prosecutors. The judges and prosecutors resented this interference. Also President Laurel did not like it. President Laurel issued a circular and placed it in the hands of all Jap officials to the effect that there would be no more meddling in court affairs. When the circular was issued, Laurel was taken to Fort Santiago for questioning by the Jap military police. Fort Santiago was known as the "butcher shop" and 99 percent of Filipinos who were called to Fort Santiago never returned. Laurel's friends thought he would not return. At Fort Santiago Laurel was told to withdraw the circular. Laurel refused to withdraw the circular and he was able to convince the Japs that the circular was necessary.

During Japanese occupation a maddened guerrilla went out of his mind and tried to murder Laurel. Three shots were fired into Laurel's body and all hope of saving his life was given up. There are millions of Filipinos who believe that Laurel lived so that he might save his country. The guerrilla who tried to assassinate Laurel stated he thought Laurel was trying to favor the Japanese. The only purpose in relating this story of the attempted assassination is to bring out the fact that the chief defender of Laurel was Manuel Roxas, now President of the Philippines. General Roxas told the guerrilla that Laurel was not a traitor but a true patriot.

The Japanese offered Manuel Roxas many posts. Roxas refused to accept all offers on the grounds that he was a very sick man. The Japs went to Laurel and told him they had made up their minds to liquidate Roxas. Laurel was Roxas' friend. Laurel was alarmed over the fear that his friend Roxas would be killed. So Laurel persuaded Roxas to accept the position as chairman of the Economic Planning Board. As such he was an ex-officio member of Laurel's cabinet. The Japs were not satisfied. They had commenced to be suspicious of Laurel. Again the Japs went to Laurel and demanded the head of Roxas. The chief of the Japanese military police told Laurel that Roxas must die. It was then that Laurel showed more of the steel of which he is made. His ultimatum to the Japs was that before he would surrender Roxas, they would first have to shoot him—Laurel.

The food shortage in the islands was a difficult problem for Laurel to handle. In the provinces the production of rice had fallen down terribly. Another problem was the lack of transportation. Again Laurel called on Roxas for assistance. Laurel and Roxas worked out a plan that materially helped the shortage of food. They saw to it that the needy received rice rations. The records which I have seen and the facts which I developed while in Manila are convincing proof that Laurel was not a puppet or a quisling or a collaborationist or a traitor. He was, indeed, a great patriot. You cannot say Laurel is a collaborationist without including Roxas. You cannot say Laurel collaborated without making the same charge against Quezon, the man who asked Laurel to cooperate as best he could and help protect the people. Laurel and Roxas collaborated to help the Filipino people. During Jap occupation Laurel and Roxas worked together in many ways—and that is why, up to this good hour, President Roxas has uttered not one word of criticism or condemnation of his friend Laurel.

Finally the Japs commenced to learn the truth. They went to Laurel and told him of their discontent, dissatisfaction, and disappointment over the way he was handling affairs. They demanded that Laurel give key positions in the Laurel government to Japanese sympathizers. Laurel refused to favor pro-Japanese with appointments. He did make one or two minor appointments, but this was not satisfactory to the Japs. The Japs finally decided to take drastic action. They organized the "Makapili" which was supposed to be a military organization only. Soon the Makapili seized all civil power in a great many of the municipalities. By force the Japs took President Laurel, also his cabinet, also General Roxas, together with other ranking officials, to Baguio. At Baguio they were held as prisoners. Thereafter, with the exception of Manila, it was the Makapili which ran the government of the Philippines. At Baguio it was understood that the Laurel government would be dissolved and the government of Makapili would be created. The timely return of the American forces prevented either plan being carried out.

Laurel stood foursquare to every wind that blew. He faced one crisis after another. He never faltered. He never compromised with the truth. He never surrendered his convictions. He never failed to show the true steel in his make-up. He ranks by the side of Rizal. Laurel has just reason to feel proud of the faithful service he has rendered to his people—all throughout his wonderful life.

Many outstanding members of the legal profession in Manila have volunteered to defend Laurel—if and when he is brought to trial. Pedro C. Mendiola, a prominent lawyer of Manila, was one of the first to offer his services in the defense of Laurel. Senate Floor Leader Vicente J. Francisco is another who has offered his services to aid the defense. The Lawyer's League of Manila has announced it will aid in the defense of Laurel. Congressman Timoteo Ricohermoso of Marinduque held the rank of major in the Philippine Army. He saw active service in Tayabas, Marinduque and in Manila. He was awarded the bronze medal for gallantry in action. He issued a statement about Laurel which I read in a Manila newspaper, from which I quote the following:

"Dr. Laurel is not a traitor to his country. Wisdom dictated his course of action to 'play ball' with the vicious and cunning Japs. No one else could have done differently under the same circumstances. At heart, Dr. Laurel is a true Filipino imbued with deep-rooted patriotism and sincere love and devotion for his country. Dr. Laurel in his acts and pronouncements clearly revealed his courage, bravery and patriotism."

Laurel is not afraid to face trial. For months he has pleaded for an early trial. The politicians know that the people are solidly behind Laurel. The charges of collaboration have come from people who fled to the hills when the Japs poured into Manila. An overwhelming majority of the people who did not flee to the hills but who remained in Manila to face the Japs know that Laurel is not guilty of any charge which has been brought against him. This is not a trial of one man—Laurel. The trial concerns from 18 to 20 millions of Filipinos who benefited from the patriotic service which this patriot of patriots rendered.

An elder statesman of Manila, a man who is respected by everybody, told me that in order to appreciate the high regard in which this former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is held, one has but to remind himself of the references made to Laurel in the classes in the universities and law colleges, in the courts of justice, and in other branches of the government. He mentioned the following references which are often quoted: "According to Laurel's Administrative Law and Practice, etc."; "Reference is made to Laurel's Cases on Political Law, etc."; "The Supreme Court, speaking through Laurel, holds, etc."; "Laurel's Procedural Reforms in Philippines," etc."; "Laurel, speaking for the Supreme Court, says."

Ariston de los Trinos, an attorney of Manila, sent a letter to a Manila newspaper. I wish to quote the letter:

"Laurel's name is linked with the progressive administration of justice in the Philippines and strengthens the faith of the people in the courts as dispenser of that justice. His pen is the mightiest and most powerful in the Philippines. His term as a member of the supreme court enhanced the prestige and honor of our courts and gave lustre and dignity to Philippine jurisprudence such as it never before enjoyed."

Law professors in the colleges and universities in the Philippines have a prepared textbook of Laurel decisions and these decisions are used in teaching law students. Some of the more celebrated decisions of Laurel are in the cases: *Planas* v. *Gil; Angara* v. *Electoral Commission; Cristobal* v. *Labrador; Calaeng* v. *Williams*. Many other noted Laurel decisions could be mentioned but space will not permit.

After the war ended Laurel was selected as chancelor of the National Teachers College of Manila, a leading educational institution of Manila. It is hardly probable that he would have been thus honored by an educational institution if taint surrounded his name.

From the Manila Bulletin of February 17, 1947, I read that Dr. Laurel was invited by the Mapa High School of Manila to make the principal address. Dr. Laurel made the address, which closed with these lines: "I plead with all students to be true to God, to country, to themselves and to their fellowmen and the consequences will take care of themselves." Many other invitations have been extended to Laurel since liberation.

In the Manila Bulletin of February 18, 1947, reference was made that Dr. Laurel was elected Honorary President of the Young Democrats League as a result of his speech before the student body of Mapa High School on February 17, 1947. I read in the Manila Times of February 16, 1947, that Dr. Laurel had accepted an invitation to speak at Bohol Junior College in Manila and would be the guest of honor on February 22, 1947. In the Manila Bulletin of February 24, 1947, mention was made that the University of Philippines Lawyers' Circle would hold its round table forum at the Manila Hotel on March 1, 1947, and that Dr. Laurel would be the guest speaker. I could cite many instances during 1946 and 1947 when Dr. Laurel was the guest speaker or the guest of honor at various functions in Manila. These invitations, these honors, put at rest the charges that Laurel was a collaborator.

My talks with Filipinos in all walks of life convinced me that Laurel is the most loved man in the Philippines. I feel that I have shown by the facts I have produced that Laurel was not a collaborator, a quisling, a puppet, or a traitor. He was selected by the Japanese to head up the Philippine Government because the Japs knew they had to select a man who would be able to guide the Filipinos. The Filipinos trusted Laurel before the Japs arrived in Manila. They trusted him during Japanese occupation. They trust and love him today. The Filipinos are better able to pass judgment on Laurel and Laurel's acts than a small group of power-seeking politicians who challenged Laurel's patriotism. My study of Laurel and my investigation of his record prompts my prediction that 7 out of every 10 Filipino voters will vote for Laurel for any office within the gift of his people. I talked with many Americans in Manila and other parts of the islands. They all readily admit that Laurel ruled justly, fairly, honestly, and with the welfare of the Filipino people uppermost in his mind at all times. They were all willing to concede that he has the most brilliant mind in the Philippines today. They also admitted that he saved thousands and thousands of lives by his courageous acts. I talked with hundreds and hundreds of Filipinos and not a single Filipino uttered a word of criticism against Laurel. They acclaimed him as their savior.

Before I close this letter I should like to briefly refer to the chief charge which was brought against Laurel—the charge of being a collaborationist. What is collaboration? Collaboration implies willingness. The facts I have gathered, and from which I wrote the foregoing letter, do not disclose any willingness on the part of Laurel to work against the interests and the welfare of the Filipino people. The Filipinos were inadequately prepared and were quickly beaten by the Japs. Notwithstanding the Filipinos were at the mercy of a ruthless enemy, they remained loyal to America. Some of the Filipinos "played ball" with the enemy because they knew that eventually they would be liberated. Some Filipinos disguised their real feelings in order to survive until liberation came. Yes; some few Filipinos "played ball" with the Japs because they thought the Japs would be victorious. Those few made a lot of money. The record will show that Laurel dealt brutally with this latter group of traitors. This small group of Filipinos who thought the Japs would win are bitter against Laurel and they have charged him with being a traitor. When the war ended Laurel was a poor man. Today he lives in a small house, poorly furnished, but his conscience is clear. He holds his head high and looks in the faces of his fellow men because his fellow men love and trust him.

On February 25, 1947, just 2 days before I left Manila, Dr. Laurel asked me to have lunch with him at a small, not-too-impressive restaurant in downtown Manila. When we walked into the restaurant all who were sitting at tables and at the lunch counter crowded around their idol, the man they loved, the man who had saved them during Japanese occupation. I was seated at a table and I waited almost 30 minutes for Dr. Laurel to join me. He just could not get away from his friends. Finally, when he reached my table and we started to have our lunch, I asked Dr. Laurel for a statement. He asked for a piece of paper and started to write rapidly and without a pause. The following is the statement which this great man handed me:

"Before the Pacific war I was an Associate Justice of our Supreme Court. After the outbreak of the war I was made Secretary of Justice and thus became a member of Mr Quezon's war Cabinet. I was to accompany him on his flight from Manila, but at the last hour he asked me to stay and help the ranking member of his Cabinet (who was his executive secretary, Jorge Vargas) protect the civilian population.

"President Quezon left the Filipino leaders behind with instructions to do their best to protect the people, and he authorized us to do whatever was necessary to this end, short of taking the oath of allegiance to Japan. This was done with the knowledge and approval of General MacArthur.

"The Filipino leaders endeavored and tried their best under the circumstances. They refrained from taking any step calculated to help the Japanese in their military objectives, and if anything was done which might give the impression of rendering aid to the enemy, this was done either under force or duress under military occupation. This is evident, for instance, in the case of the declaration of a state of war where the Filipino leaders refused to authorize conscription of the Filipinos for military purposes of the enemy. Many more instances can be mentioned.

"The fundamental objective of the Filipino occupation's leaders was to enable the people to live and to prevent their extermination by the cruel and barbarous enemy. This was not only the duty of the Filipinos to themselves, but the moral obligation of the United States after the Filipinos had been abandoned to their fate. We were faced with an actual situation, not with theories, and we did our best under God and in loyalty to our people.

"I am not insensitive to the demonstrations of affection of my people wherever I go, and I shall continue to serve them in my retirement with loyalty and courage.

"JOSE P. LAUREL."

"FEBRUARY 25, 1947."

Dr. Laurel is a deep thinker, a man of great learning, a far-sighted man. In talking to me about Russia in the early part of February 1947, he said:

"The United Nations needs oil in its machinery. It is not functioning properly. This great body can do a world of good if reorganized and made workable. Russia is not greater than the United Nations and Russia should be made to understand this in plain language. If Russia wishes to oppose all free peoples then it is better for the world to have Russia outside the family of United Nations."

Laurel's greatest obsession is his uncompromising opposition to communism. He is alarmed because a number of former liberty-loving countries are shifting or have shifted to socialism. One day when we were driving along Dewey Boulevard on the ocean front, he looked into the open sea and said:

"Mr. Reeves, communism is the greatest menace to the world today. Communism has spread throughout Europe and it is gaining rapidly in Asia. It has ruined China and reports indicate it has a strong foothold in South America. Thank God, MacArthur has not permitted it to make any headway in Japan." I told Dr. Laurel that communism would not make any headway in the United States, whereupon he added: "You Americans seem to think this Red movement cannot take root in your country because of your great wealth. Red infiltration has made considerable headway in Brazil, the richest country in South America. This should serve as a warning to America."

This man Laurel seems to have been endowed with that extraordinary clarity of vision, that vivid imagination, which is the mark of the truly great man. There is not a coarse fiber in his make-up. He is kind, humane, and quiet-spoken. He loves children. On once occasion I found him in the rose garden in front of his home. He was wearing khaki shirt and khaki trousers, watching a little girl romp and play among the flowers.

The example set by Dr. Laurel will forever stand out as a beacon light, typifying the quality and character that go to make up a great man in all senses of the word. He fought for the Filipinos before the commonwealth was established. He fought for Philippine independence. He fed, he clothed, he guided, he protected his people during Japanese occupation. Today he is using his energy and resourceful mind to oppose the onrushing tide of communism. Before the war and during Japanese occupation the name of Laurel was a living symbol of national assertiveness, of dignity and of patriotic ardor which enrich the mainsprings of a noble heritage. The war did not change the genuine metal of his greatness. Today he has more friends throughout the Philippines than he had before the Japs arrived in Manila.

Laurel has used his great talents to advance the cause of justice. He has given his all to the cause of righteousness. His only concern is the triumph of justice. He has fought against every form of oppression and discrimination. He has used his wisdom, his influence, his energy, and what material means he had to assist those who needed his help and guidance. His intelligence, his strength, his greatness has not caused him to lose the common touch. His pulse beats for the common man. He is the champion of the common man in the Philippines today. He represents the ideals which Rizal fought for. By his devotion to principle, his austerity, his refusal to compromise, his love of country, he has won millions of followers to his banner. He spent himself utterly, with never a thought of his own comfort or his own welfare. The one impelling force which has guided this man throughout his life has been his desire to help his people.

When Laurel's time has come to an end historians of the future will present the true size and stature of this great patriot. They will rank him with Rizal, Bonificio, General Luna, Mabini, and Quezon. It will be said

that his understanding mind, his profound sympathy, his human kindness, his moral courage, his iron will, his rugged fearlessness will serve as an inspiration for unborn generations to come, and an illustration of how a great personality can utilize the opportunities of the land he so deeply loved.

Whatever verdict awaits cannot disturb Laurel's conscience. Justice cannot fail this great man whose sacrificial service now shines in the fullness of its grandeur within the contemplation of a grateful people. Laurel thinks that what he did was for the best interests of his people, and he has publicly stated he would do it all over again. Such a man of steel will always remain in the hearts of his people.

This has been a long letter, Harold, and I hope that you have taken time to read it through carefully. The welfare of the Philippines and the Filipino people is still a matter of vital importance to the United States—of more importance than we may now realize. It would be a disaster to his country if Laurel's effectiveness as a leader were in any way impaired. There may be a time in the near future when the exponents of democracy will need every strong friend they can muster in the fight to keep the insidious forces of communism from spreading throughout the Philippines.

Give my regards to the staff and keep up the good work.

Regards,

P. W. REEVES.

The Budget-Cutting Fizzle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun of June 25, 1947:

THE BUDGET-CUTTING FIZZLE

How goes the great Republican economy drive in Congress? Representative ALBERT GORE (Democrat, Tenn.) has been keeping tab. He presented his findings in the House the other day, and they stood up well against the crossfire of the Republicans.

At the beginning of the session, the House leadership talked big about slashing $6,000,000,000 off President Truman's proposed expenditures. The Senate decided to cut only $4,500,000,000. Under the Congressional Reorganization Act the two Houses are supposed to get together early in the session and adopt a legislative budget as a guide to all appropriations and tax bills. That has never happened. The legislative budget is defunct—still tied up in conference.

Most of the major appropriations bills having passed the House, it is now possible to measure performance in that branch against the promise of a $6,000,000,000 cut. By Representative TABER'S own claim, the savings to date total only $3,700,000,000—a discount of about 40 percent.

But the really interesting part of the story, as pointed out by Representative GORE, is that the claim itself is wildly misleading. He estimates that actual reduction of expenditures amounts to $1,800,000,000. The rest of the savings are paper transactions representing no actual cut in outlays at all.

For example, the Republican leaders claim to have saved $800,000,000 in tax refunds. That is, they estimate the Treasury will have to pay out $800,000,000 less for this purpose than Mr. Truman estimated. But the Treasury's liability for tax refunds is not controlled by anybody's estimates. If taxpayers have legitimate claims, they will be entitled to collect, whether this year, next year, or some other year. Any saving here is purely on paper.

Another saving is accounted for by the House decision not to cancel $642,000,000 in Commodity Credit Corporation notes held by the Treasury. These notes represent money already spent by the CCC in pursuance of its congressional mandate. Some day, as Congress intended, the notes will have to be canceled. Carrying them on the books a little longer does not save a dollar of the taxpayers' money.

Representative GORE cites many other cases of agile bookkeeping. The House "found" $500,000,000 by figuring that the Government would sell more surplus ships than anticipated; but no expenditures are thereby cut. The House takes credit for some downward revisions in the budget made by the President himself. It commits the Government to certain expenditures, such as construction of veterans' hospitals, but postpones the actual outlay until next year or later. Other savings are made in the sure knowledge that they will be dissipated by deficiency appropriations next winter.

So the budget seems to be working out about as expected. The GOP majority has managed to hobble some valuable functions of Government, such as enforcement of the wage-hour laws, but has not begun to accomplish the spectacular cuts so gaily promised for purposes of winning the 1946 elections.

The Courier and His Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most beautifully written article entitled "The Courier and His Creed," by Rev. Pierce Harris, pastor of the First Methodist Church, of Atlanta, Ga. During the many years that I have been associated with the Civil Service I have never seen such a beautiful tribute paid to the letter-carrier as is this one paid by Pastor Pierce Harris, and I particularly call attention to the fact that he signed it in his own handwriting.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COURIER AND HIS CREED

Riding recently along Peachtree one of those hot afternoons when the sun blazed down and the hot tar oozed up from the pavements, I saw trudging along the sidewalk a postman bowed over with a back-breaking load of mail. He was not accompanied by any band. He was not keeping step to any martial music. Nor was he discharging his duty to the sound of trumpets—just a postman—delivering the mail.

I remember another day, chill and windswept, with cold rain washing the sidewalks, when out on the edge of the city I saw another postman bearing about the same burden and plodding steadfastly along from house to house.

Then there came to my mind some words my wife and I years ago copied from the cornice of the great post-office building in New York, "Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stops these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." Checking these couriers against their creed and observing without their knowledge how nearly they came to living up to its high principles, I felt like stopping my car, getting out on the hot street, and lifting my hat in respectful salute.

So accustomed have we become to a postman recognizing his place in the pattern of living, being at the right place at the right time, and discharging his humble duty as though there depended upon its faithful performance the destiny and well-being of an entire city, we give it little thought. Yet—it is the basis of victorious living. If in the church and community, the individual citizen could bring himself to a similar height of fidelity and do humble, yet important, duties of church membership and citizenship, what a great surge forward the whole program of life would take.

When next you see a postman trudging along, remember his creed—and remember yours—and ask yourself if you are doing as good a job.

PIERCE HARRIS.

The Rescue of Europe—The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, Congress is tremendously interested in the recent plan for the rehabilitation of Europe proposed by the Secretary of State, George Marshall. Congress is also interested in the reaction of Europe nations to the proposal. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial of the London Observer of June 22, 1947. The Observer states that the editorial was prepared by its editorial staff with the help of some members of the Institute of Statistics at Oxford and that the editorial staff had the benefit of consultation with Lord Beveridge, Sir Arthur Salter, M. P., and Sir George Schuster.

The editorial is as follows:

Mr. Marshall, in proposing that the United States should back a joint reconstruction program to cover all Europe, including Britain and Russia, proposed a radical departure in American policy—the financing of an international new deal. We cannot expect his proposal to be accepted by the United States Congress unless the potential beneficiaries respond with an equal readiness to depart from habit and precedent.

The joint economic program, cutting across national boundaries, which the European nations have been invited to produce, would be an audacious experiment. But without such an experiment, Europe, including Britain, is heading for economic decline. At present Europe's economy is held from a dangerous collapse only by dollar credits to some countries, which are fast being used up, and UNRRA help to others, which ends soon.

There are 350,000,000 Europeans. They live in an area which produces far less food and

raw materials than they consume. Moreover, it is wastefully cut up into a number of separate national economies. This huge population grew up and flourished in Europe during the nineteenth century because of one basic fact: It had a virtual world monopoly of industrialization and could, by trade, draw upon the food and raw-material resources of almost the whole globe.

This nineteenth-century basis of European prosperity has disappeared forever through the effects of two wars and the enormous developments outside Europe. The United States now produces more steel than the whole of Europe has ever produced, and her industrial technique is the most efficient in the world. Russia has developed a closed economy of gigantic proportions. In Asia, Japan has become industrialized and much of China's trade flows to America. Thus, Europe, her industrial supremacy gone, is thrown back on her own limited resources and those of her remaining dependencies, which lie mainly in undeveloped Africa. But Europe's population has not diminished. There are still 350,000,000 people in Europe used to a civilized living standard.

SINKING UNDER A LOAD OF DEBTS

At the same time physical war destruction has greatly reduced Europe's own productive capacity, both agricultural and industrial. Economic nationalism, so far from subsiding, has been intensified. The productivity of Europe's greatest industrial unit, Germany, was partly destroyed by war, and its recovery is being intentionally reduced for political considerations.

Finally the impoverished economy of Europe carries new mortgages—on the one hand the reparations claims of Russia, herself equally devastated by the late war, and on the other the sterling debts of Great Britain to all parts of the world. Moreover, Russia has tied much of the production of East Europe to her own 5-year plan, causing a further drain away of resources from Europe as a whole.

If these circumstances continue, it is patently clear that Europe must continue to decline. Unless there are radical changes, 350,000,000 people cannot possibly go on living in Europe even at their present reduced standards of living. All will be forced to lower their living standards even further. Many will have to emigrate or starve. The world, however, no longer contains fields for mass emigration, and people will not resign themselves quietly to starvation. Economic collapse in Europe would, therefore, lead to political upheavals of incalculable magnitude.

The economic collapse of Europe has been staved off in the last years only by running into piecemeal dollar debts to the tune of about £750,000,000 annually. Of this, only a very small part—less than £100,000,000—has been used for productive purposes. The rest has been first aid, mostly food.

HOW DOLLARS MUST BE USED

These dollar credits are now nearly used up, and Europe is faced with an inability to go on "buying" from America the food and raw materials which she needs merely for current consumption. This so-called "dollar crisis" is the hard proof of Europe's basic economic maladjustment or present inability to live unsupported.

The Marshall offer is intended to give Europe the chance to overcome that maladjustment, to change the basic conditions which at present oblige her to be a perennial beggar from the New World. Europe is offered even larger amounts of dollars, just at the moment when dollar asphyxiation is imminently threatening, on one condition: that this time the dollars should be used on a joint program that really provides a cure.

This means much more than the mere repair of war damage. It means that Europe must adapt herself to her new circumstances, change her patchwork nineteenth-century structure into an integrated twentieth-century structure, and thus be enabled to produce as much from her own resources and those of her dependencies as is physically possible. The object of the program must be for Europe, within a limited number of years, to become capable of balancing her trade account with the outside world, while maintaining a tolerable standard of living for her 350,000,000 people.

In this program of modernization the most important single item without which lasting success cannot be expected is the gradual economic integration of the participating countries. Unless this is achieved they cannot obtain the benefits of a continent-wide economy such as the United States of America and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at present alone enjoy.

Trying to put each European country separately on its feet would, in the conditions which have developed in the last 30 years, be attempting the impossible. That is why Mr. Marshall has rightly made a joint program the condition of American aid.

This condition has acute political implications which must be faced. First, those countries which take part in a joint European economic program will, in the process, lose some of their economic sovereignty. It might be possible formally to disguise this. No explicit surrender of sovereignty need be asked for in the initial agreement. But countries pledged to adapt their economic life to a supranational program will become so interdependent in fact that their sovereignties must in part become merged. For their joint efficiency the countries within the scheme will have to exchange economic hostages; they can do this only on the assumption that they will never again be at war with one another. Such a recognition of interdependence may be historically overdue in Europe and a condition of her present survival. But it is a revolutionary step for the individual countries to take.

Secondly, no joint European program can work unless its participants are enabled to disregard the most-favored-nation clause in their dealings with each other. For trading purposes the European house must be allowed to drop its internal divisions while retaining the house walls.

WORKING TOWARD A CUSTOMS UNION

Ultimately the area of the joint program must become a currency and customs union in which goods, services, and labor can be interchanged freely in accordance with the needs of the over-all program. This, of course, could be achieved only gradually, over a period of, say, 10 years. But in the meantime there must be an intermediate period of adjustment by preferences and special tariffs. This involves a departure in favor of Europe from what has hitherto been the established American policy regarding multilateral trade. Europe, during the period in which it develops toward full customs union, would have to be regarded as an economic union "in gestation," entitled freely to assist and protect internal trade within its prospective boundaries. Without such a concession, American dollar injections into any part of Europe could not have their full effect on the recovery of Europe as a whole. America would be stifling what she intended to revive.

The draft charter of the International Trade Organization states that "the contracting parties recognize that there may in exceptional circumstances be justification for new preferential arrangements requiring an exception to the provisions in this agreement." The Marshall offer is an "exceptional circumstance."

The third and largest problem arises from the present state of American-Russian and European-Russian relations. Russia has up to now most decidedly opposed every move toward European unity. The fact that this particular European program would be sponsored and financed by America will arouse her instinctive suspicion. Without the consent of Russia, the eastern European countries would hardly be able to join the scheme.

Mr. Marshall, however, has made it explicit that the American offer includes Russia herself. It is conceivable that the economic advantages which Russia could derive from participation in the American-aid program might be such as to outweigh, in her own evaluation, her objections to the economic unity of Europe.

What are these advantages? It is hard to envisage a program which would lump Russia and Europe together in an integrated economy. It could scarcely be the American hope to create a united economy for the entire space which stretches from Brest to Vladivostok or her intention to integrate Europe into the Soviet 5-year plan.

But if Russia cannot be made a part of an economically integrated Europe, she can receive American aid within the scheme, both indirectly and directly. The scheme would have to take account of the Russian reparation claims against the ex-enemy states. If Russia agrees to European reconstruction, a reviving European economy could produce German, Italian, Hungarian, and Bulgarian reparations for Russia without collapse; a bankrupt continent could pay nothing, whatever Russia's claims.

Nor should the possibility of direct dollar grants to Russia be excluded. Clearly, America, in the present political situation, is unlikely to offer a loan to Russia, if Russia flatly opposes the Marshall scheme for Europe. But if Russia agrees to and cooperates in the project, and does not make impossible demands intended to wreck it, the political atmosphere would be electrically changed. Direct American aid to Russia would even appear probable within the framework of a scheme permitting the joint recovery of Europe, including east Europe.

RUSSIA AND THE BASIS OF PEACE

Another consideration which should not be absent from Russian minds is that if Russia adheres to the scheme, she will, as a sponsoring power, have an influence on the way it is worked. If she holds aloof, she has indeed the power to restrict the scheme to western Europe, but she would be creating the very western bloc she fears and foregoing any influence on its development.

From our point of view Russian adherence might add to the internal tensions and delays in working an already difficult scheme. But it would be well worth even that. A parallel and conjoint reconstruction of Russia and Europe would make for peace, while a reconstruction race between Russia plus eastern Europe on the one hand, and western Europe backed by America on the other, must almost inevitably turn into an armament race. Europe, moreover, is a sounder economic proposition than western Europe. The west and east of Europe are roughly complementary in their products, western Europe having the industry, eastern Europe the food. Together they can help each other tremendously, and thus the world. Their economic reunion and integration may well be the decisive factor in attaining stable peace.

Even if Russia returns a negative answer now and the joint program has to begin with the western European nations only, the door must be left wide open for the eastern European nations and Russia herself to come in subsequently.

After the present diplomatic parleys, the obvious meeting place for the first conference on the Marshall offer would be the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, established in Geneva. Voting in

the commission is by simple majority, with no big power right of veto. It offers the ideal medium for discussing the scheme. But if Russia takes a violently obstructive attitude, a special conference of European states might have to be called.

ELECTION YEAR IN AMERICA

Whatever and wherever the conference, there must be no delay in calling it or slowness in its deliberations, for two vitally important reasons. One is the extreme physical urgency of Europe's dollar needs. The other is that 1948 is Presidential election year in the United States; no favorable decision can be expected from America during that year. Unless Europe replied in time for America to make her decision in the latter months of 1947, Europe would have to wait until 1949. And she cannot wait till then.

This leaves us with only about 3 months to agree on the essentials of the joint European program for which Mr. Marshall asks. Can a full plan possibly be drawn up during that time? How much can be achieved may greatly depend on the preparatory work which individual governments get done within the next weeks.

The great mistake which the conference must avoid is to misinterpret the whole purpose of the Marshall offer by producing nothing better than a combined shopping list of urgent requirements. The least that the representatives of countries agreeing to participate must do, if the scheme is not to fail by default, would be:

1. Principles: To pledge their countries in general terms to the principles of joint economic action in a declaration of interdependence.

2. Priorities: To decide on a hard core of productive capital investment of incontestable urgency, together with a budget of current consumption needs for the area for 1 year.

3. Funds: To estimate the total dollar requirements for a complete scheme of reconstruction and capital development for the whole participating area.

4. Administration: To outline the administrative machinery—which would necessitate a central development agency—required to elaborate and carry out the programs, insuring proper use of the credits provided.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARVE TIBBOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by Dr. Beatty H. Dimit, a very able teacher at State Teachers College, Indiana, Pa., before the House Committee on Education and Labor on Federal aid to education:

STATEMENT OF BEATTY H. DIMIT, LECTURER OF THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE GRANGE

Dr. DIMIT. I am Beatty H. Dimit, lecturer of the Pennsylvania State Grange. I am speaking for the grange in opposition for Federal subsidies for elementary and secondary education.

The grange, because of the farmers' dependdence on the working of natural laws, has always sensed the mutual dependence yet delicate balance inherent in the order of the universe. Rainfall and sunshine, heat and cold, birth and death, plant and animal life, insect and bird population, all are interdependent yet a balance must be maintained.

Man in all his relationships is subject to these same universal principles. Our forebears who gave us this Nation in which a higher value is placed on human life than in any other nation, recognized this principle when they devised a form of government with numerous checks and balances yet definitely interdependent.

Complementing national and State governments were established. Legislative, executive, and judicial divisions within each form were instituted. Church and state were separated. All powers not expressly given to the Federal Government were reserved to the States or to the local communities. All government was of the people, by the people, and in the interest of safeguarding the sacredness of human personality.

Always there has been a struggle between this type of democratic government and the centralized, power grasping, totalitarian form dominated by a single party or dictator.

Our Federal Constitution made no provision for the establishment of an educational system. This omission was intentional and was made out of fear of the consequences to democracy when education is controlled and dominated by the State.

Germany, Italy, France, Russia, Japan, and most South American countries have or have had state-controlled education. The results have been antidemocratic.

For this reason the grange vigorously opposes all moves toward Federal subsidies for elementary and secondary education, and toward the establishment of a Bureau of Education with a Secretary, with a possible Cabinet status, which is the ultimate goal of many organizations advocating these subsidies.

That the grange is justified in its fear of eventual Federal domination if subsidization is accepted, is proved by the experience of our farm people with so-called agricultural food subsidies, which parenthetically are really consumer subsidies but paid to the farmer.

The program of research and interstate regulation carried on by the Department of Agriculture since its inception has been most beneficial not alone to the farmers but to all consumers. With the institution of food subsidies and the action programs the deadening hand of Federal bureaucracy and control began to be felt. Fines were imposed on farmers who accepted subsidies but produced more food than the quota allotted by the AAA. In a test case brought before the Supreme Court of the United States in the summer of 1942, this highest court ruled that "The Government has the right to regulate that which it subsidizes."

This decision showed that the insights and fears of our founding fathers were well fixed, that Federal support entails Federal control. It further confirms the soundness of the grange position insisting on local control and State support of education in the common schools.

But while vigorously opposing Federal subsidization of elementary and secondary education, the grange has since its very inception consistently fought for increased education and for more adequate financial support. The need for increasing State support has been driven home to us by reason of the fact that the rural districts produce 52 percent of the children. Less than 22 percent stay on the farm and yet the rural districts must educate these boys and girls.

We have therefore learned first-hand the necessity for greater financial support and have suffered teacher shortages even before the war made the condition universal. Nevertheless, we hold that State and local support rather than Federal subsidies can adequately finance our schools and pay teachers salaries commensurate with their service to society.

Even in 1943, before the forerunner of the present subsidy bill had been formulated, the Pennsylvania State Grange in its educational report recommended that the department of public instruction raise the minimum teaching unit to $2,000 per teacher and advocated a sales tax to furnish the necessary funds.

That they have kept pace with the needs of education is proved by this further action quoted from the proceedings of the October 1946 session:

"We recommend that the minimum reimbursable unit now fixed at $1,800 be raised immediately to $2,400 and progress in succeeding bienniums to $2,600 and $2,800."

But concurrently with their insistence upon increased State support, their proposition in regard to Federal support is shown by Resolution No. 18 unanimously adopted and quoted in full from the 1946 Journal of Proceedings:

"Whereas certain groups are advocating Federal appropriations for the support of the public schools as a means of improving our educational standards, and

"Whereas we are convinced that the adoption of such a policy would speedily result in undermining local control and initiative in educational affairs and the establishment of just one more giant bureaucracy at Washington, and

"Whereas the Federal Government is now burdened by the most colossal debt ever accumulated by any nation in all history, approximately $265,000,000,000, while the fiscal affairs of practically all the States are in good condition: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Pennsylvania State Grange hereby reaffirms its long-established policy in favor of State and local control of our public-school system; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we strongly oppose Federal appropriations for primary education, on the ground that such a departure would strike a blow at the independence and sovereignty of the States and weaken the fundamental principles underlying our dual system of government."

That the above stand is in accord with the viewpoint of the National Grange is evident from the action taken by the eightieth session of the National Grange at Portland, Oreg., in November 1946 and appearing on page 180 of the 1946 Journal of Proceedings. The action follows:

"Since the days of its inception the Grange has been a staunch friend of education. There is justification for saying that during its long career it has done more to promote sound progress in the field of education than any other farm organization in the country.

"Our public school system, which in the older States has been in successful operation for more than a century, is at once the pride of our people and one of the chief bulwarks of free institutions of government.

"At present our public schools are facing a crisis, just as they did during the inflationary conditions that existed during World War I and for a short period thereafter. The chief difficulty is that salaries of teachers have not kept pace with the rising cost of living occasioned by wartime conditions. Tens of thousands of experienced teachers have left the classroom in quest of more remunerative employment elsewhere.

"Many States and school districts have taken steps to meet this emergency. Where this has not been done, since most of the State legislatures will be in session during the coming winter, proper provision should be made to correct the situation and to do justice to the teachers, who are among our most worthy public servants.

"Your committee does not believe that the remedy for our present difficulties in the field of education is to be found in securing Federal appropriations for the support of the public schools. Our best hope of preserving American democracy lies in preserving the

independence and sovereignty of the States. If the States want to remain sovereign and independent, they must perform the functions that naturally fall within their sphere. Education is one of those functions.

"The Grange has always stood for local and State control of our public schools, because in that direction only lies the path of true progress in educational affairs. In the long run, Federal appropriations for public schools and Federal control would go hand in hand.

"Because we are against bureaucracy and all the evils that go with it and because we are opposed to the evils of Federal control of education and in favor of continued State and local control of our public-school system, we must oppose Federal appropriations for elementary and secondary education except the already existing vocational educational program."

A recent striking development in our American life, no doubt a reflection of totalitarian trends throughout the world, is the manner in which organizations are designed and set up ostensibly to serve various public interests, but in reality to control them.

Here was the United States building a series of bureaucracies, whole organizations of persons that should be engaged in productive effort which are supported by public appropriation. Infinite numbers of forms must be filled out, and infinite numbers of records must be kept and classified and regularly audited at an increasing cost.

No less an educator than Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler has stated:

"Overcentralization has taken place in education. Too many persons are engaged in supporting supervision and recording work for other persons. There has been a temptation to lay more stress upon the form of education rather than its content. Statistics displaced scholarships."

The glory of education in the United States has been the ability to reflect the needs, and ambitions and capabilities of local communities. Its success has been due to its ability to keep touch with the people themselves.

Now it is proposed to bring into the educational system of the whole United States a control, while giving the most solemn assurances that nothing of the kind is intended.

For Americans to accept the oversight and direction of our schools from Washington, which can easily follow subsidies, can only mean we have failed to learn the plainest and most weighty lessons of two world wars; likewise to tap an already overburdened Federal Treasury in the guise of aiding States and to establish another organ of bureaucracy in Washington.

A permanent movement in our educational system in that direction would effect such a great revolution in our American form of Government as to sooner or later threaten its perpetuity.

We oppose Federal subsidies and hold to local and State control and support of our public schools, since this very support and control is a phase of continuing or adult education. It is on-the-job training and education in the principles and practice of democracy itself. Furthermore, it is a tenet of pedagogy and sound education "that he who does for a pupil what the pupil can do for himself does that pupil harm."

By the same token, when the Federal Government does for a State or local community what that State or local community can do for itself, it does them harm.

Moreover, all funds expended by the Federal Government must come, in the last analysis, from taxes which the citizens of each State pay either directly or indirectly. Neither science nor the Federal Government can create something from nothing. We the citizens pay the Federal expenditures and debt. When they become too onerous, investment in and ownership of homes is discouraged. Thus we weaken the stability of the home, the bedrock upon which democratic education rests.

One of the chief arguments advanced for this bill rests on the assumption that the effectiveness of education depends on the amount of money expended. The criteria has been the cost per pupil or teacher salary rather than the product of education, the character of the pupil itself.

But while figures do not lie, they oft lead to an erroneous conclusion, a fallacy into which many educators and statisticians have fallen. Costs differ markedly. Living and housing costs differ between rural and urban areas, between north and south, between the standards of dress, social prestige, etc., required of teachers in one community but not in another.

Thus from my own personal experience as a teacher, it required almost 50 percent more to maintain a comparable academic and social standing in New York City than in a community of 10,000 or 20,000 population. The cost of raising my four boys was much more per boy in the large city than in the smaller city or rural community.

Finally it is the history of all Federal subsidies that even though started in a modest way, other demands are made, additional funds are appropriated, and Federal control increases. This tendency in the present instance is revealed in the introduction of S. 199, the so-called Aiken bill, which, going further than the present bill, provides for reimbursing private or parochial schools not to exceed 60 percent of expense for transporting pupils, for school health examinations, and for purchase of nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment.

Likewise, the Taft bill, S. 472, provides that the Federal funds may be disbursed to nonpublic educational institutions for any purpose for which State and local funds are disbursed except interest, debt service, and capital outlay. Thus Federal subsidies to elementary and secondary education may be used to further breach that vital but uniquely American constitutional provision, the separation of church and state.

In conclusion, speaking on behalf of the Pennsylvania State Grange and the National Grange, we are opposed to Federal subsidies for elementary and secondary education because they violate our democratic system of checks and balances; they can lead to Federal control and domination as experienced by our farm people under AAA. This danger of Federal control becomes more real in the light of the Supreme Court's decision when it ruled that the Federal Government could regulate that which it subsidized.

We contend that the Federal Government, with its colossal debt of $265,000,000,000, is not in a position to assume this extra burden which rightly and constitutionally belongs to the States. The States are in much better financial condition to raise the funds required for increased educational costs and higher teachers' salaries. Contrary to the oft-expressed popular belief that funds received from the Federal Treasury cost the individual citizen nothing, we indicated that all Federal subsidies must be paid directly or indirectly by us, the citizens. If postponed by borrowing, the payment will have to be made in the future, in many cases by our boys who fought in World War II.

This bill is opposed, since it must be considered as an entering wedge by which Federal usurpation of State and local responsibility may lead to the establishment of yet another huge bureau, the break-down of our established principle of separation of church and state, and the use of our educational system to instill the propaganda of a dominant party or dictator in the minds of our youth. This fruitage is only too evident in the totalitarian countries with whose ideologies we are now in a life-and-death struggle.

Medical Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, the House approved H. R. 3215, a bill to revise the Medical Department of the Army and Navy by the establishment of a Medical Service Corps in both the Army and Navy. The Army provisions are contained in title I and the Navy provisions in titles II and III.

It proposes to establish in the Medical Departments of the Army and Navy a Medical Service Corps, which will be composed of pharmacists, sanitary engineers, optometrists, psychologists, bacteriologists, business administrators, and similar skills, all of which have served with the Medical Department of the Army and Navy. Experience during World War II demonstrated the advisability of including these scientific and highly trained specialists of the Medical Department in a single corps.

The mission of the Medical Departments of the Army and Navy in the treatment of the sick and injured and the preservation of health in conservation of the strength of the military and naval forces entails the performance of numerous duties which do not require the application of professional technical training in medicine, dentistry, or veterinary medicine. These duties such as certain phases of medical supply, personnel management, laboratory investigation, psychiatric social work, clinical psychology, sanitary engineering, and others can be performed adequately by scientific specialists and skilled administrative personnel.

H. R. 3215 proposes to establish the Medical Service Corps of the Army and Navy with three sections initially, a pharmacy, supply, and administration section, a medical allied science section and an optometry section; however, the Secretary of War and Navy may establish such other sections as may later be deemed necessary.

The bill provides for the strength of the Army Medical Service Corps to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, and the Navy Medical Service Corps to be 20 percent of the Medical Corps of the Navy. Grades are established for the Army from second lieutenant to colonel and for the Navy from ensign to captain. A limitation of 2 percent is placed on the number of full colonels for the Army and captains for the Navy.

A chief of the corps, appointed by the Secretary of War from officers of the corps in the permanent grade of major or above is provided for in the Army title. Provision is made for the Surgeon General of the Army to designate assistant chiefs, who will be section chiefs and consultants to him in activities peculiar to that specific section.

Provisions are made for the transfer of officers from already existing corps,

abolished by this legislation, without detriment to their status, as to pay and seniority, and requirements for initial appointments are established.

The grouping of these highly skilled and especially trained individuals into one corps without lessening their individual responsibilities, will enable the respective Surgeons General to utilize more effectively and economically, these skills and training to the better advantage of the respective medical departments and the Army and Navy.

The Surgeon General of the Army and the Surgeon General of the Navy, in testifying before the committee, emphasized the shortage of doctors, explaining that this bill, if it becomes law, would be some relief—that personnel of the Medical Service Corps would carry on administratively, releasing the doctors for the practice of medicine and surgery.

Our Aged Come to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the aged people of our country have come to Washington to personally inform the Congress of their needs and we welcome their visit. I believe that there should be old-age security as a matter of right.

The present social-security program could be greatly improved.

The most important change to make it real, in my opinion, is to pay benefits as a matter of right to every aged citizen.

To more than 2,000,000 aged American citizens the only income is old-age assistance payments, and these are made only on the basis of need. None of these toil-worn 2,000,000 aged people are permitted to feel that this meager amount is a matter of right.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that this is not a mere question of words. The cold fact that aid to the aged is not given as a matter of right, takes the heart out of every aged person. It means that rigid limitations are placed on the aged person's little income, if he is to be granted old-age assistance.

Personally, I have known an aged woman who was obliged to spend the few hundred dollars she had saved for her funeral, before she could have the so-called aid for the aged.

The relief agencies can and do pry into the little private affairs of our old people, some States requiring our worthy aged to turn over their meager savings, even a little home, household goods, and personal property, before aid is given to the aged. The field investigators snoop in the homes of these aged people to make sure the budget is as low as possible. In many States every effort is made to keep from paying the maximum to the aged, even with the Federal Government paying one-half of the amount. Such indignities brought about by the so-called means test, have no place in our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, there are more humane ways and I believe the best way is to provide old-age security insurance as a matter of right without red tape and the indignities of the present system. The existing old-age and security-insurance program does not cover all our people who reach old age.

Therefore, I believe the present program should be changed to one of security for the aged as a matter of right.

Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, one of the true pioneers of the air, retired last week from active duty in the United States Army Air Forces. The loss occasioned by his departure is a great one to the entire country. However, he is accepting retirement in order to champion an all-important cause—that of making our Nation aware of the danger we face if we allow ourselves to become weak in the air. If General Eaker succeeds in this mission, he will have made as great a peacetime contribution to his country's security as he did a wartime contribution to its victory.

His earnest philosophy is well expressed in the words he used before one of our committees recently in urging adequate provision for a first-rate air force "to have the second best air force is just like having the second best poker hand." General Eaker believes in an air force second to none so sincerely that he has seen fit to give up the second highest position in his Nation's Army air program in order to work toward that goal unhampered by the limitations his uniform and stars placed on him. This spirit of allegiance coupled with his unequaled Army achievements make him a true patriot.

The New York Times, one of the great independent newspapers of this Nation, pays Ira Eaker a deserved tribute. I hope every Member will take the opportunity to read it.

GENERAL EAKER RETIRES

One of the great commanders of the Second World War, Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, will doff his three stars tomorrow and go back to mufti after 30 years in the Army. As Deputy Commander of the Army Air Forces he will be sorely missed in the high councils of security. His retirement at 51, however, is the result of a deep conviction that he can be of more service outside of uniform than in. He intends to devote himself to the cause which he cherishes so earnestly—the cause of making this Nation aware of the peril in which it stands if it allows itself to become weak in the air.

No man is better fitted to preach the gospel of peace through security and strength than Ira Eaker. The man who dared to pick up the torch of Billy Mitchell and crusade for air strength when this subject was unpopular inside and out the services is the same man who also dared greatly as an active pilot. In 1929 he flew the Army Question Mark, first aircraft to stay aloft 150 hours, refueling in flight. In 1936 he made the first transcontinental blind flight. He led personally the first raid of Flying Fortresses over Europe as commander of the Eighth Air Force. But General Eaker has qualities other than those of the moral and physical courage of leadership. He is articulate as are few other men in the armed services, with an orderly and incisive mind and the gift of persuasive and convincing speech. We are sure that the country will have reason to be grateful to him in retirement, as it has reason to be grateful for his distinguished Army career.

Address of Hon. Katharine St. George, of New York, Before Federation of Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a portion of an address delivered by me before the General Federation of Women's Clubs in New York City on June 26, 1947:

CURRENT LEGISLATION

It is the fashion to picture Congress in the person of a rather stout old hayseed unshaven and gray, with the expression on his face of an old sheep, being lead to the slaughter.

As a matter of actual fact, I have found no such individual in the present House of Representatives. We have a great many young men in the Eightieth Congress, all veterans of the last war; they have the enthusiasm and the courage of youth and they are insisting on going full steam ahead.

It has been said that Congress is slow; in my opinion the Congress could be criticized for acting too fast. In a little over 3 months the House has cut the budget, passed a tax bill, and a labor bill. I do not remember ever hearing of three such important pieces of legislation being passed so rapidly.

The passing of a law under our system of government is bound to take some time, and it is very right and proper that it should.

Our Government, being based on law and a written Constitution, makes it mandatory to hear evidence for and against any proposed legislation.

This is done in the committees first. Under the new Reorganization Act—and the present Congress is the first to operate under it—each Congressman serves on one committee only, except in the case of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and the Committee on the District of Columbia; members of these two committees can serve on another committee as well.

The fact of belonging to one committee has the great advantage of giving a member the chance to familiarize himself with his subject and to become a specialist in it. In this age of specialists and in this age of size (everything is colossal, especially the Government of these United States) this is perhaps a good thing.

I feel that we have started in on an era of reform. I think that most of our current legislation is slanted in that general direc-

tion. The American people are slow to anger and of great kindness, but ever so often they demand a thorough cleansing of their body politic, and they are very definitely demanding it today. They are impatient at any delay.

They want relief from the twin burdens of high taxes and high costs. The basic reason for both is the high cost of government. The cost of government has gone up 460 percent since 1939.

The high cost of government is one of the major factors in the high cost of living. Taking into consideration all taxes paid—Federal, State, and local—the average wage earner is working about 1 day out of every 3 for the Government. That is an intolerable burden on any economy.

This year's Federal budget, as submitted to the Congress by the President, is over three times what the last peacetime budget was. Who pays to support the Federal Government? Where does it get its wealth? The Federal Government does not produce one dollar and we should know that. The Federal Government, all government for that matter, is paid for by the average citizen, not by the multimillionaire. If every large fortune in the United States were confiscated tomorrow, it would keep the Federal Government going for only a few weeks.

No, it is the average man and woman who has his or her tax taken before he or she gets the pay envelope, who is supporting the thirty - seven-and - one-half - billion - dollar monster.

How does this affect prices? It is so simple that even a child can understand it. It is an inevitable spiral, a chain reaction. In order to pay more to the Government we must earn more; in order to earn more, wages must be raised.

The extent of wage increases is shown by the fact that average weekly earnings take-home pay increased from $24.83 in August 1939 to $47.47 today. The latter figure is for a 40-hour week and is actually the same as the wartime peak for a 45-hour week. No one, of course, wishes to deny any merited wage increases, but to argue that substantially higher wages can be paid without affecting prices is just plain nonsense. The important thing about a dollar received in wages, is how much will it buy?

Taking one of our key industries as an example, United States Steel, the other day, raised their wage scale 15 cents an hour. This will increase the cost of production $75,000,000 per year. Where is this money coming from? From the consumer; and it has to be passed right along the line to make up for the higher taxes that result from the higher cost of Government. These same higher taxes necessitating high wages, so that the workers in turn can pay for this Government.

The farmer also has to pay more and higher taxes. True, he has had subsidies, but again where does the money for these subsidies come from? Right out of his own pocket, of course. Food will cost more when it costs more to produce, and is scarcer because we are trying to feed the world. A world starving as a result of two world wars in half a century.

Reckless and ill-timed buying by Government agencies of food for foreign relief, resulted in pushing up, or keeping food prices up. An example was the action of the Commodity Credit Corporation when it purchased 19,728,647 bushels of wheat on one day, January 20, 1947. That resulted in an almost instantaneous increase of about $1 per bushel in the price of wheat. It should be remembered that food accounts for more than 40 percent of total cost of living index figures.

The big question is how to bring this Government down to what one of my southern colleagues calls "frying size."

The job of passing legislation to curtail extravagance and waste is fraught with political pitfalls, one has to have courage to do the job; your present Congress has shown that courage already, many Members have had their homes picketed, they have been abused and insulted by pressure groups. One new Member made the best reply to one such group who promised to see that he would be defeated if he ran again, he said: "Don't threaten me with votes," that is the spirit we need if we are ever to reform abuses in Government, if we are to truly represent the people who sent us to Congress, we must have courage to do what we believe to be right.

The legislation that has been passed, the tax bill, labor bill, Greek-Turkish relief and Greek-Turkish loan, all are highly controversial. The present cuts being attempted in the various appropriations bring forth loud cries of agony from those living off the Government.

We come up against the interesting fact of the Civil Service Commission, requiring $24,900,000 additional money for the purpose of investigating and dismissing disloyal persons on the Federal pay rolls. What a farce to give an agency that has been so lax or so inept, more money to get rid of people that should never have been put on the Federal pay roll in the first instance.

Finally, I want to urge you as women to take a more active part in your Government, by running for public office. It is not all fun, but we women of America have got to do our share and not expect to have everything handed to us on a silver platter. No nation in the world has done so much for its women, and no women in the world owe so much to their country.

It is truly shocking that we have only seven women in the House of Representatives, and none in the Senate, and no one is to blame for this but the women themselves.

Some English ladies came to interview some of the women in Congress the other day, and one of them said to me, "Don't you find that you have to educate your men?" I said, "No, I find that we have to educate our women."

Women have a great contribution to make to Government. First of all, in most cases, they cannot take up a political career until after they have brought up their families, this gives them a mature, as well as a maternal viewpoint that is invaluable. They also stand for the family, which is the greatest political unit of all. They are greater individualists than men, which at times serves as a useful break on the herd instinct. And, in the field of economics, women can make a very real contribution, they control 80 percent of the private wealth of the country as proved by their income-tax payments. They live on and regulate the family budget, they know full well that evtravagance and waste spell ruin in the home and in the Nation.

You cannot successfully tinker with the laws of nature, for in the end nature will get her revenge with interest.

You cannot tinker with economic facts, supply and demand, production and costs; without these same laws asserting themselves to the confusion of the individual.

We must reduce the cost of Government first, because Government produces nothing. We must increase our productivity now more than ever when we are undertaking to care for most of the world. Our motto should be that we will support no drones and no parasites in or out of Government.

The laborer is worthy of his hire; no more, no less. Prices will be forced down automatically by production. Wages will be kept high by production and expanding markets.

The legislation before the Congress now is merely the tidying up of the last appropriations, etc., before adjournment. The big bills have all been taken care of.

Your Congress has worked with unusual speed and, I might add, with great courage.

We are the children of revolutionists and pioneers, if we are to progress we must practice eternal vigilance and self-control. We must discipline ourselves, because we do not tolerate any other kind of discipline.

No one can take away our freedom. But we ourselves will lose it if we are too lazy to assume our responsibilities.

Labor Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr., chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

Last Wednesday, at Princeton, N. J., President Truman said he had not read the Taft-Hartley bill. He said he had not studied arguments for or against the bill.

Yet, less than two days later, on Friday morning, he vetoed the bill, and with his veto submitted to Congress a message of 5,500 words.

Who wrote the veto message? Certainly the President did not. The President, I think, is an honest man. But the veto message is studded with misrepresentations, half-truths and distortions.

They are the same misrepresentations, half-truths and distortions that left-wing lawyers for the CIO and left-wing lawyers for the Labor Board have been circulating for weeks.

Without taking time to study the volumes of evidenee that committees of Congress received during their long hearings and evidently without even reading the debates in Congress on the bill, the President has swallowed whole what the left-wing lawyers fed to him, and has adopted their extreme, untrue assertions.

Extreme New Dealers made every one of these assertions in the halls of Congress while the Taft-Hartley bill was under consideration. Congress debated every one of them, considered them, weighed them, and by tremendous majorities in each House, rejected them for what they are—false and untrue. And far more Democrats, members of the President's own party, voted for the bill than voted against it.

The Congress that passed this bill believes in collective bargaining, believes in the right of workers to organize, believes in the trade-union movement and wishes it to grow and develop on a sound basis. It passed a good bill, a fair bill, and one that, far from undermining the Wagner Act, strengthened it, gave workers greater protection under it, and made it work in the public interest.

Now, why did the President veto this bill? The answer is in the veto message, camouflaged in a mass of double-talk and innuendo, but there nevertheless.

In brief, the President has surrendered to the New Deal politicians. He has surrendered to the Wallaces, the Peppers, the Marcantonios of the once great Democratic Party; and he has given his blessing to the unholy alliance by which they, conniving with unscrupulous labor leaders, seek to regiment the working men and women of our country, to exploit them for political and personal advantage, to dictate to them how they shall vote, and to use their money for objects that many of them oppose.

Repeatedly he complains that the new act gives workers new rights to vote by secret ballot upon matters that concern them. That is the democratic way. But it is not the New Deal way. The New Deal way is to

dragoon the workers, and to deliver them, bound hand and foot, to corrupt politicians and to unscrupulous labor bosses. The current scandals involving the corrupt Pendergast machine in Kansas City, to which the President is so loyal, illustrates the New Deal way.

He complains that the new act forbids unions to use members' dues to support political candidates whom the members may oppose, just as it forbids corporations to use stockholders' money to support candidates whom the stockholders oppose. To strengthen this complaint, he comes to the far-fetched conclusion that this clause might infringe upon the freedom of the press. But he knows, or ought to know, that a clause like this governing corporations has been on the books for 25 years. Had he paid the slightest attention to what supporters of the bill had to say, he would have known this assertion was groundless. But he did not care about the facts. Giving the workers a new and real political freedom touches the President and his New Deal satellites in a tender spot. Any reason for vetoing this clause was good enough for the President.

Another indication of the President's real motive in vetoing this bill we find in his strictures against those clauses that rid the labor movement of Communist influence, domination and control. These clauses, too, touched the President's left-wing friends in a tender spot. So repudiating the majority of the Congressmen in his own party, he gives his blessing to the specious arguments by which the fellow travelers in the labor movement have tried to save their necks.

Again, he complains of clauses that give union members the right to know what their leaders do with the members' money. Is he fearful that members will object to unons' using their money, not for their benefit, but for the benefit of left-wing politicians and of labor racketeers?

Yet again, he complains of abolishing the closed shop and limiting the grounds on which unions can deprive workers of their livelihood. He thus betrays his interest in continuing the power that New Dealers and labor racketeers now have over unionized workers, and particularly their power to dictate the workers' politics.

The President omits one assertion with which his left-wing friends have attacked the bill. He does not call it a "slave labor" bill. This is understandable in view of the President's own proposal last year that we draft workers and compel them to work a bayonet point—the only "slave labor" proposal to come before Congress in 100 years.

The President argues by assertion. He says the bill is inconsistent with "principles of our democratic society," that it leads toward "a totally managed economy," that it would "weaken our trade-union movement," and that it is "a clear threat to the successful working of our democratic society." The President does not say how the bill would have these results, and he cannot, for nothing in the bill supports what he says.

But even so, who is best qualified to judge the effects of the bill—the President, who had not even read it Wednesday night, or the more than 500 Senators and Representatives who spent months studying the problems and weeks debating the clauses of the bill, and who, every time it came before them, voted for it by tremendous majorities? Or does the President imply that only he, of all the people concerned with this bill, has the interests of our country at heart? Or does he think that Members of Congress, elected last year, do not know what the people want?

No; he knows better than this. But he puts his faith in the power of big city politicians, Communists, fellow travelers, and labor racketeers to dragoon the workers and to deliver their votes. What he overlooks is that the workers themselves have tired of regimentation, and that millions of them voted for a change last year.

Let us look at some of the things the President says. He complains that the act makes the Government "an unwanted participant at every bargaining table." Does he not know that the Government has been at every bargaining table for the past 12 years, but on only one side of the table—the union's side?

He says that cooperation between management and labor "cannot be achieved by force of law." Is he, then, suggesting that we repeal the Wagner Act, which for 12 years has exerted force of law upon one side, but only one side, of the labor-management relation? Is it not better, if we believe that the force of the Wagner Act promotes industrial peace, to bring its pacifying influence to bear upon both sides?

The President, of all people, talks of leaving collective bargaining to the bargainers and against bureaucratic procedures in collective bargaining. Is his memory so short that he does not recall that his meddling, and the meddling of Hatless, Hapless Henry Wallace, his then Secretary of Commerce, and the meddling of his fact-finding panels, more than anything else, were responsible for the disastrous strikes of 1946, and for the inflation that followed them?

Does he not know that, as well as the Wagner Act, other laws, including the Wages and Hours Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the antitrust laws, govern the terms of collective agreements? Does he wish to repeal them all? The only new limit that the Taft-Hartley Act puts on bargaining is one that restricts the power of labor bosses to deprive a man of the right to work upon arbitrary or fictitious grounds.

He says that if no-strike agreements become binding upon unions, then unions will not agree not to strike. If such agreements do not mean anything, then of what use are they to employers? Of what use are they to employees who want to work, not to strike? Of what use are they to the public, which wants stability and peace, and the output and low prices that go with stability and peace?

Here is an interesting thing. The President talks of terrible things that, according to his left-wing lawyers, might, perhaps, possibly, maybe, happen under the language defining "feather bedding." He says this definition might outlaw agreements concerning safety, rest periods, and other legitimate practices. The Taft-Hartley Act does not define "feather bedding." The original Hartley bill did. But the definition was deleted in conference, and does not appear in the act the President vetoed. One wonders, more and more, if the President read the bill, and if so, which bill.

Another thing the President complains about is a clause saying that so-called welfare funds must be used for the benefit of the workers for whom they are intended. This is an odd complaint. It follows the pattern that the President, through his Secretary of Interior, established in settling the coal strike last year.

In part 3 of the veto measure, we find the President's left-wing lawyer friends weeping over the effect of the Taft-Hartley Act upon employers. It seems strange that they should be so saddened by things that employers themselves have not complained about at all.

The clauses the President complains about here substitute for the empty promises of the Wagner Act a real right of workers to select bargaining representatives of their own choosing. Employers far and wide, and workers by the thousands, know from experience that the New Deal policy of forcing upon workers unions they do not want does not promote industrial peace. The Taft-Hartley Act lets workers do their own choosing.

The President professes to fear that thousands of minor grievances, instead of being settled in established grievance procedures, will result in a multiplicity of lawsuits to harass employers. Nearly everyone, except, it seems, the President, knows that no one can go to court if another method of settling a dispute exists by contract.

Sometimes directly, sometimes by sly misstatements the President, following the technique of his left-wing friends, misrepresents many other clauses of the bill.

He says unions will be subject to suit for acts of violence by members, wildcat strikes by members and other unlawfulness by members. That is false. The act clearly says that unions shall be responsible only for acts of their agents. If the President does not know the difference between a member and an agent, his left-wing lawyer friends surely do.

He says an employer can fire a man for union activity, pretending it was for cause. This is false. The Labor Board can decide, in every case, why the man was fired, and reinstate him if he was fired for union activity.

He says the act reduces the responsibility of employers for unfair labor practices committed in their behalf. This is false. Employers are fully responsible for what they and their agents do, but the Board no longer may hold them responsible for things they did not do, did not authorize, or, indeed, forbade.

He says the provisions enabling the President to enjoin for 80 days strikes that imperil the public health or safety would authorize "inequitable injunctions." This is false. It is only when the President and the courts agree that an injunction should issue, that a strike can be enjoined. If the President cannot trust himself to be fair, he surely can trust the courts.

He says this procedure would be "ineffectual." The President used a similar one in the coal strike last year. It worked, although not to the satisfaction of the President's left-wing friends whose views he now adopts.

He says the strike vote procedure that the act calls for in emergency strikes is like that provided for in the War Labor Disputes Act. This is false. Strike votes usually took place under the War Labor Disputes Act before serious bargaining began. Under the Taft-Hartley Act they are upon the employer's final offer, and after each side has had an opportunity to fully present its position to the workers.

He says the act operates upon workers and employees. This is false. The President slyly uses the words "workers" and "employees" where he ought to say "unions" and "labor leaders." It is only unions and their agents who come within the prohibitions of the act. The act forbids them to abuse their powers in such a way as to injure "workers" and "employees." He says the act imposes on unions "burdensome reporting requirements" not suffered by employers. This is false. Employers already, under State and Federal laws, including the income tax laws, are required to make more, and more "burdensome" reports than unions must make under this act.

He says the act weakens "the protections afforded to the right to organize. This is false. The language of the original Wagner Act protecting that right from interference by employers is in the new act. If the President means that employees no longer have the "right" to be beaten up to force them into unions, he is correct.

He says the act will injure "smaller unions far more than larger ones." This is false. It injures no legitimate union, large or small. Many of its clauses, smaller unions asked for. These clauses forbid the Labor Board to annihilate small unions, as it has done in the past.

He says that it will force unions that have Communist officers to strike instead of going to the Labor Board. This is false. The unions can get rid of their Communist officers—an alternative distasteful to the President and his left-wing friends, but to the advantage of workers whom they wish to exploit.

He says that separating the functions of the Board would be "burdensome and unworkable." This is false. Having one Board as prosecutor, judge, and jury has proved unfair and unworkable.

All the way through, the veto message is the same—double talk, sham, distortion, abuse; farfetched, strained, and tortured interpretations of clear and simple clauses; hysterical grasping at any argument, however invalid, to thwart the will of Congress.

The truth is that the act is a good one. It reflects the considered judgment of 400 of the 500 Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate. Many of its clauses, Congress has considered more than once. Some of them, William Green, himself approved when they appeared in a bill that, in 1940, a Democratic House of Representatives passed by a vote of 2 to 1.

The act is designed, in the interest of all our people, and in the interest particularly of our working men and women, to promote industrial peace, not politics; to provide real, not sham protection for organizing and collective bargaining, and to strengthen the Wagner Act and make it work.

In vetoing the bill, the President was true to the tradition of one-man rule that the New Deal fostered in our country for 14 years. He was true to the policy of corrupt politicians and left-wingers to regiment and exploit our working people. But he was false to the great majority of his own party in Congress, false to the people as a whole, false to his pledge 6 months ago to cooperate with Congress, and false to his duty, under the Constitution, to let Congress legislate.

GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD a statement that has been sent to me by the Catholic War Veterans Post, No. 606, of Belleville, Ill. I agree wholeheartedly with this veterans' organization that the Congress should restore the full benefits provided by the original GI bill of rights.

A BREACH OF FAITH

The amending of the educational feature of the GI bill during the closing session of the Seventy-ninth Congress was one of the most flagrant violations of confidence in the history of our country. This breach of faith activated in the amending of the GI bill, insofar as it provided, for Government subsistence, to those participating in the apprentice and on-the-job training program and the educational program, has upset the economic apple cart of large numbers of vets who laid their plans on the terms of civil occupation.

Lives were ordered and visions directed toward the future on the basis of legislation existing at the time its glowing picture was painted to the boys upon their separation from service. The action of the Seventy-ninth Congress encouraged by the Veterans' Administration, most certainly has disrupted the vets' entire thinking and have them questioning the alleged generosity of veteran benefits that were so widely ballyhooed. New fields of employment, forced decisions to abandon college courses—yes, a complete new start has been the assignment this revision gave the vet.

The intent of the original legislation was to encourage the returning veteran, man and woman, to complete their education—the result of this amendment, violating the original intent, is to discourage the vet in this desire. The intent of the original legislation was to encourage the returning serviceman to enter apprentice training or on-the-job training despite the lost opportunity, and advanced age, caused by service to his country. Congress by its amending action has shattered the hopes, weakened the confidence, and undermined the foundation of all veteran legislation. It committed a serious breach of faith with those who served.

The program of CWV for 1947 contemplates encouraging the Eightieth Congress from the day of its opening session in January to reestablish those features of the GI bill ruptured by the amendment and thereby proving to those who served that the Nation is truly grateful.

Less Oil for Export

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the House has extended to January 31, 1948, the President's authority to control or ban the export of petroleum to meet a serious emergency.

Since January 1, 1946, and while the President had the same authority he permitted gasoline and petroleum to go out of the United States for foreign nations, to May 1, 1947, about 191,000,000 barrels of gasoline and petroleum products with some 600,000 barrels of gasoline alone being carried to Russia from Los Angeles in lend-lease ships paid for by the citizens of the United States since January 1947.

Of what good is this further vested authority when it has been utterly ignored for nearly 2 years. There must be positive bans and restrictions by the Congress to stop the flow of gasoline and petroleum to foreign nations. The President should not have the continued discretion to export gasoline and petroleum. The Congress should take quick, positive action banning gasoline and oil shipments from the United States to foreigners.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the following bill:

A bill to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That no gasoline, Diesel oil, bunker oil, lubricating oil, nor any petroleum products whatsoever, shall be moved or transported from the United States to a foreign country, unless the Commerce, Navy, and War Departments shall certify in writing that any such gasoline, Diesel oil, bunker oil, lubricating oil, or petroleum products to be moved or transported from the United States, will not prejudice nor impair the national defense nor the continuous nonrestricted use of gasoline, Diesel oil, bunker oil, lubricating oil, or petroleum products by the people of the United States.

Give the Law a Fair Trial—Amend if Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much misrepresentation and so many misleading statements made about H. R. 3020, the labor-management relations bill, by the President in his message, statements over the radio and in the press, that I feel it not out of place to review some of the important provisions of this bill and the very careful consideration it has been given over a period of 5 months by appropriate committees of the House and Senate and by the House and Senate.

On June 23, the Senate, by a roll call vote, passed the bill over the veto of the President by 68 to 25. On last Friday, June 20, the House passed the bill over the President's veto on a roll call vote by 331 to 83. Only 71 Democrats voted to sustain the veto. 106 Democrats voted for the bill and against the President's veto. I do not recall when a President was so overwhelmingly repudiated by his own Party. This is more unusual because the President, in a 5,500 word message, denounced every part of the 30-page printed bill. It was all wrong according to the message. There never was a message that contained so much misrepresentation, misstatement of facts, illogical and misleading conclusions as this veto message. Many persons are convinced that the President never read the bill and did not, in fact, write this veto message. It clearly is a partisan political message and many believe that it was largely written by CIO and other labor lawyers. According to press reports the President stated on Wednesday, June 18, that he had not made up his mind on the labor bill because he had not read it, but on Friday morning, June 20, his long veto message, denouncing every part and provision of the bill, was sent to the House and Senate. He did not have time to read and study the bill or to write the message. The CIO has taken the lead in denouncing each and every provision of the bill and denouncing all of those who favored the bill.

WAS LEGISLATION NECESSARY?

The President, in the opening part of his message, uses this language:

I share with the Congress the conviction that legislation dealing with the relations between management and labor is necessary. I heartily condemn abuses on the part of unions and employers, and I have no patience

with stubborn insistence on private enterprise to the detriment of the public interest.

Government statistics show for the 6 years next before the passage of the NIRA—Blue Eagle—in 1935 in this country we had on an average per year not more than 700 strikes in which not more than 300,000 workers were involved. However, each year since that time, there has been a steady increase in the number of shut-downs and the number of workers involved. The latest statistics available are for the year 1946. They show there were 4,985 strikes in that one year involving several million workers, with the loss of 119,000,000 man-days of work. In some large industries we have had 2 within a year and others threatening. These do not include the immense number of workers whose plants or shops were shut down by reason of these strikes.

It is difficult to estimate the loss to workers, to the employers and the American people as a whole. This loss runs into many billions of dollars and great inconvenience to the American people.

I have always believed in the right of workers to organize, to bargain collectively and to strike where it is necessary to secure justice. However, I believe that strikes should not be employed except as a matter of last resort. I helped to pass the first law giving the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively and to preserve their right to strike. I have not changed my position. No one, through the years, has been more consistently friendly to those who toil than I have.

You know, I was not born with a silver spoon in my mouth. I was born the son of a poor tenant farmer, and my parents died before I was 16. I worked for many years on the farm, by the job, in railroad shops, malleable iron works, sawmills, and at anything I could find for my hands to do. Eighty or 85 percent of the Members of the House and Senate likewise helped to make their own way in early life by manual labor and I think we know something about the problems of those who toil and we are deeply interested in their problems.

I helped to pass the Railway Labor Adjustment Act and it has now been on the statute books for many years and it has worked the best of any labor law that has been passed by Congress. In 15 years, they have had only one strike. Two of the 20 brotherhoods engaged in a strike for 2 days or less. The other 18 brotherhoods, under that act, submitted their differences to voluntary arbitration.

The President, in his message, agrees with the American people and many of us that there are three groups involved in this important legislation:

First. The workers;

Second. Those who invest their money in industries and business enterprises to create jobs; and

Third. The American people as a whole.

Of course, we recognize how deeply labor and management are vitally interested in this legislation but the American people as a whole are likewise interested. The American people as a whole include labor and management and are the consumers of the products of labor and management.

I know of no bill that was more carefully and thoroughly considered than H. R. 3020, the labor-management bill, and no important, controversial legislation that received such overwhelming support. This would indicate that there was a universal demand from the American people as a whole for the Congress to pass legislation that would, if possible, improve the relations between labor and management in industry.

BILL WAS CAREFULLY PREPARED AND CONSIDERED BY HOUSE AND SENATE

An overwhelming majority of the House and Senate fully appreciates that labor, management, and the American people as a whole each have rights that should be and must be respected and protected. No one could be more sincere to protect the rights of the workers of this Nation than myself. The record that I have made through the years establishes that point beyond question. At the same time I would be false to my oath of office if I was unwilling to give just and fair treatment and no more to those who invest their money and create jobs and also to the 140,000,000 Americans. With this purpose in mind, the Committee on Labor, for 7 weeks, heard witnesses testify on this subject for or against the bill. Representatives of labor and management and scores of others appeared and expressed their views on the bill. Then the bill was considered at length by the committee. Nineteen members of the Labor Committee which included three or four members of one of the great national labor unions voted to report this bill favorably and only three members voted against the bill. This bill then came to the House where it was read word for word and line by line. Many amendments were offered and perhaps more than one hundred speeches were made on the bill and amendments. I recall one of the able speeches in favor of the bill was made by a Member who belongs to the American Federation of Labor. Some of the amendments were adopted and others were defeated.

On a roll call, 308 Members voted for the bill and 107 against it. You can see at once it passed the House by nearly 3 to 1. The bill then went to the Senate where it was considered by the Senate committee and after several days of hearings and consideration, it was reported to the Senate. The bill was approved by a record vote in the Senate of 54 to 17, more than 3 to 1. There were some differences between the House bill and the Senate bill as usual. The bill was then referred to a conference committee made up of five Members of the Senate and five Members of the House. These 10 able experienced men, Democrats and Republicans, spent about 10 days considering the two bills. They finally worked out a compromise bill which was approved by 7 of the 10 members of the conference committee. Two of these seven were Democrats. In fact, in practically all of these votes a majority of Democrats as well as Republicans voted for the bill.

The House first took up this compromise bill and passed it on a record vote by 320 to 79. The Senate adopted the compromise bill by a record vote of 68 to 24. Of course, during all of this time, Members of the House and Senate were interviewed by representatives of labor, management, farmers, veterans, and other groups of the Nation, and many telegrams and letters, for and against, were sent to them. Then the bill went to the President, and he comes along with a political veto and denounces the bill from top to bottom—a bill that he had never read or studied, but the Members of the House and Senate had made a most careful study of the bill over a period of 5 months, and the House passed the bill by a vote of 331 to 83 over his veto. The President, through his appointive power and other great powers, can wield a tremendous influence in the House and Senate if he has right, justice, and reason on his side. Only 71 Democrats voted to sustain the President on his veto. One hundred and six Democrats voted to override his veto and pass the bill. About one-half of the Democratic Senators voted against the President on the veto. The fact that Democrats and Republicans in the House, by a record vote of 4 to 1, passed the bill over the President's veto, and the Senate did likewise by a vote of nearly 3 to 1, must lead honest, sensible people to believe that there must be a great deal of merit in this bill, and they must know that it is not a slave bill and will not be unfair to labor, management, or the American people.

The bill must be based upon an informed opinion on the part of the House and Senate and based upon a desire to do the just thing and the right thing for labor, management, and the American people. There never was a bill in all of my experience and service in the House that received more thorough and sincere consideration than the present bill. Although the President and the American people said that some improvement should be made in our management-labor relations laws, I regret to say that the Congress did not receive any cooperation from the leaders of labor. Some of them did as they have always done for a number of years now and that is to denounce every effort made to improve management-labor relations.

Although strikes have been on the increase and reached the high-water mark in 1946, with 4,985 strikes involving millions of workers and with 119,000,000 man-days of labor lost by workers involved in these strikes, the Congress was disappointed that in view of the President's statement that legislation was necessary, yet in his 5,500-word message he made no suggestion whatsoever as to what changes should be made. He claims now, with Henry Wallace barking at his heels and with a threat of a third party, that this bill was unfair to labor and management. It has only been about a year ago that the President rushed to Congress one day and demanded they pass a bill authorizing him to put the railroad workers in the Army and subject them to Army court-martial regulations if they went on strike, and on that he misled the Congress that the

strike was on, and we were confronted with a national disaster. It turned out that the two railroad unions that had threatened to strike had called off their strike and were willing with the other 18 brotherhoods to arbitrate their differences with railroad management.

The President's antistrike railroad bill was the most vicious of any bill that has been presented to Congress during my service. I said on the floor of the House that the President's veto of the tax relief bill and the veto of the labor bill was to stop the Honorable Henry Wallace and a third party. It certainly is bad to play politics with such an important matter as this, but I believe that is the very thing that was done.

CONCILIATION, MEDIATION, AND VOLUNTARY ARBITRATION

The railroad workers are not included in this bill. The relations between railroad workers and railroad management are governed by the Railway Labor Adjustment Acts. The original act was passed about 1925. The central points in that act were that the railroad workers had the right to unionize, select their own bargaining agents and bargain collectively with railroad management.

Conciliation and mediation boards were set up to hear disputes between labor and management and to aid them in adjusting their differences and also to encourage voluntary arbitration in the settlement of these disputes and it provided for a cooling-off period of 60 days, giving the representatives of labor and management and the conciliation and mediation boards time to work out and settle amicably the disputes. That has worked very well. While this bill retains the essential rights of labor in industry, it also, in the main, follows the Railway Labor Adjustment Acts. We cannot help but believe that if labor and management will use common sense and friendly cooperation, this bill will prove to be quite an improvement over our present labor laws.

THIS IS NOT AN INJUNCTION BILL

We have pointed out that the central purpose of this bill is to settle the differences between labor and management by collective bargaining and through the orderly processes of conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration. I doubt if Congress has the power to force labor and management to arbitrate. This bill does not undertake to force them to do so. The use of the injunction in this bill is more limited than in the present law. Under the Railroad Labor Adjustment Act, the injunction may be used in a very limited field, and that is where the national health and safety are involved. This bill provides that where there is a shut-down of an industry that threatens the national health and safety it will be the duty of the President, as under the Railroad Labor Adjustment Act, to make a thorough investigation and, of course, through competent and fair-minded men, get the facts in dispute and make a finding of the facts known to the American people. The stoppage of such industry will be held up for 60 days in order to secure and report on the matters in dispute and, if necessary, the President may order the Attorney General to apply to the courts for an injunction to prevent the stoppage of such industry until this report is made, and the President is given 15 days in order to study these facts and of course, during all of this time, the parties themselves, the mediators and conciliators, can be busy too, trying to settle their differences, and if this is not done within 15 days the President must in 5 days report the whole matter to the Congress.

Now, this only applies to those great industries the stoppage of which endangers the national health and safety. It cannot be used where the stoppage of a plant involves only a community or section of our country. The threat must be Nation-wide and it must endanger the public health and safety. What reasonable man would be unwilling to hold up a strike or lock-out that would be Nation-wide in its serious effects on the health and safety of the Nation? The worker, of course, would receive his pay. All parties would have time to cool off. Public opinion would aid in the settlement. All but one instance in the last 15 years under the Railroad Labor Adjustment Act a settlement has been arrived at. This provision is in the interest not only of the American people as a whole but in the interest of labor and management as well, in my candid opinion. Every individual and group ought to be willing to use every reasonable means to prevent such a disaster. Such a strike or lock-out would put millions of other workers out of work. It would bring distress, want, and death to people of our cities and in our hospitals.

This bill outlaws the jurisdictional and so-called sympathy and wildcat strikes. The National Labor Board set-up in this act can issue a restraining order against such a strike. Labor leaders have denounced the jurisdictional strikes. That is where two small unions, belonging to the same big union, or any two unions, with contracts, fall out among themselves, break their contracts, and strike. This bill does not prohibit strikers themselves from boycotting their employers, but it does forbid using the boycott by members of some union in a distant section or State to break their contract and go on strike when some other union has broken their contract and gone on a strike. Almost every day we hear of some wildcat strike, some workers breaking their contract and going on a strike, often against the instructions and will of their national leaders. The employers cannot get an injunction in these cases. The Labor Board must take such action, and, of course, they could take action if the employer tried to engage in an unfair employer practice against the workers.

Now what union man can reasonably claim that he has a right to break his contract and engage in a jurisdictional strike or to engage in a wildcat strike or break his contract and engage in a so-called sympathy strike and strike against some employer that is not in fault at all? Should the employer in these three cases, who has a contract and who is doing his full part under the contract, be subjected to strikes and stoppages when he is in no way at fault?

CONTRACTS SHOULD BE CARRIED OUT

I have always defended the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively by representatives of their own choosing. This law protects those rights. The purpose of honest collective bargaining, of course, is for labor and management to arrive at a contract and when a contract is once made and terms agreed upon, it should be lived up to in good faith by both parties. If they are not to do this, why waste the time and expense of making these collective bargaining contracts?

The observance of a contract fairly entered into has been approved by fair and honest men through the centuries. I have heard many labor leaders say that they favored the observance of contracts by both parties. This bill provides that where one party breaks a collective bargaining contract, the party not at fault can recover damages from the party at fault. These suits can only be instituted against the union by the employer and suits do not lie against the members of the union, and the union, if it has been damaged by the employer shutting down his plant and throwing his workers out of work, or damaged them in any way by violation of the contract, they, of course, can sue the company and not the individual stockholders of the company. I do not see how anyone can object to this provision in the law. It has been recognized as the law by men, companies, and organizations a hundred years or more.

GIVE IT A FAIR TRIAL—AMEND IF NECESSARY

A bill that has received the long and thorough study given to H. R. 3020 and which has been approved by both Houses of Congress by such an overwhelming majority, must have something in it that will be helpful; therefore, would it not be fair on the part of labor and management to give this law a fair test? No one claims that it is perfect. Much of it is embraced in our present laws relating to labor and management in industry and relating to management and labor of our railroads.

The Labor Board has pledged themselves to do their very best in administering this law justly and fairly, and it is gratifying to know that President Truman has issued a statement calling upon both management and labor to cooperate with the Labor Board and with him in carrying out the provisions of this law.

The bill expressly provides for the appointment of a committee composed of seven Senators and seven Representatives to make a careful review of this whole subject and to observe the administration of this new law to determine if the law is being honestly, fairly, and efficiently administered and if there are any provisions in the law that are unfair to labor, management, and the American people, amendments are in order. It has been the purpose of an overwhelming majority of the House and Senate from the beginning, and it is their purpose now to make this law as nearly perfect as possible to insure just and fair treatment for labor, management, and the American people as a whole.

I see in the press where some labor leaders have been urging President Green of the American Federation of Labor to encourage a general strike of workers against this bill but President Green has declined to entertain such a proposal. He wisely suggests that labor avail themselves of the courts if any of their just rights have been taken from them by this bill and if the measure turns out as some claim it to be, Congress will be called upon to repeal the act. I have been informed that President Murray of the CIO has taken a position similar to that of Mr. Green. If these reports are true, I wish to commend each of them. I regret to say, however, that quite a sizable number of workers have quit their employment and have closed down many places in resentment to this legislation. I wonder how many have really read this law. Undoubtedly no harm has come to them as yet by reason of this law because it will not go into effect until August 22, 1947, and there are provisions that preserve the present collective bargaining contracts entered into between labor and management.

I sincerely trust that those workers who have abandoned their contracts and have gone on a strike will reconsider. This bill does have a provision in it against wildcat and unauthorized strikes. So far as I have been able to learn, President John L. Lewis of the Mine Workers has not ordered anyone to strike and I doubt if he will do so. I also wish to express the earnest hope that the miners and operators will, in the very near future, enter into a collective bargaining contract. They can enter into an industry-wide collective bargaining contract under this law. Neither side should make unreasonable demands and I also express the hope that the Conciliation and Mediation Board provided under this law will become active just as soon as they can and if all these fail, that labor and management will agree to voluntary arbitration of their differences and save the country as well as the miners and industry from another coal-stoppage disaster. Should this happen, it will, of course, cause great loss to the country as a whole and to the miners and the operators themselves.

CLOSED SHOP, UNION SHOP, AND CHECK-OFF

In some lines of industry and in some shops and mills there are closed shops, union shops, and also the check-off system, through collective bargaining. This bill provides in the first instance for a union shop. If the workers desire to organize and form a union shop, they can do so by a majority of the workers, in any plant or industry, voting for a union shop, and under this bill the workers can strike if they vote for a union shop and are denied a union shop, and 30 days after the forming of a union, as prescribed by this law, workers in that particular plant or shop may be required to identify themselves with the union, but the check-off is eliminated. No one can be required to have any part of his wages taken out of his pay. He will be free to pay into his union or not pay. He cannot be forced to do so.

No one can be discharged because he belongs to a union, and he cannot be discharged if he does not belong to a union. He cannot be discharged to satisfy the whim of some officer or member of his particular union or by his employer. There must be just cause and good ground for him being discharged.

A careful poll of the American people shows that only 8 percent or less favor a closed shop and a check-off. A larger number, but not a majority by any means, favors a union shop. In fact, only about one out of three or four of the workers of this country belong to a union. The others are nonunion. I might say that if I were a worker, I would belong to a labor union and strive to make it as helpful to the members as possible within the bounds of reason and justice, but we must bear in mind that the Railway Labor Adjustment Act, which the railroad workers helped to pass, expressly excludes the closed shop and the check-off system and a large majority of the railroad workers has consistently opposed the closed shop and the check-off system. They claim that they strive to make their organization so attractive that their brother railroad workers will want to be a member of their organization and pay their dues without being forced to join and pay their dues.

Under this bill, however, labor and management have a wide field of discretion when it comes to collective bargaining. All must admit that the railroad workers and railroad management have carried on, under the Railway Labor Adjustment Acts, their labor-management relations most amicably, effectively, and efficiently for many years.

Why should not labor and management get together and through collective bargaining settle their differences? If they cannot, then why not welcome the aid of unbiased conciliators and mediators in adjusting their differences and then, if all of these fail, why should they not avail themselves of voluntary arbitration by an impartial board? Sometime, somebody, must settle these differences or we must have lock-outs and strikes until one or both parties wear themselves out, with great loss to management, labor, and the American people.

USE OF FUNDS FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

This bill forbids the officers of a corporation or a business association from using the funds of the company or association, and which belong to the stockholders, for political purposes. These officers cannot use these stockholders' funds to promote the election of a President, Vice President, Representative, or Senator in Congress. Such use of the funds would be palpably unfair because the stockholders are often divided themselves as to party affiliation or as to choice of candidates, and it certainly would not be right for the officers to use such stockholders' funds to help promote a party or a candidate that they are against.

This has been the law for many years as to corporations and business associations. I have never yet heard any of our union friends condemning such a law as to corporations and associations. This new labor law carries this same provision and also forbids the use of the funds of a labor union to be used by the officers for political purposes to help elect a President, Vice President, Senator, or Representative. These funds belong to all the members of the union and it is common knowledge that members of the union do not always support the same party or the same candidate, and therefore it is certainly unfair for an officer or officers of a union to use the funds of members for a certain party or candidate when the members themselves favor some other party or candidate. The officers and stockholders and the officers and members of a labor union have the right to contribute their own funds for political purposes.

I know of no fraternal, patriotic, or church organization where the officers claim the right to use the funds of the lodge, church, or association to promote any particular party or candidate. The purpose of this law is to protect the funds of stockholders, of business concerns, and the members of labor unions and to promote fair, clean, and honest elections. I never did call upon either one of these groups to contribute to any campaign of mine and, so far as I know, neither group has ever put any money in any of my campaigns. They do have the right to carry on their trade journals, union journals, magazines, and to write editorials and make favorable or unfavorable comment on parties or candidates, but this law does not forbid them from doing that very thing, according to some very high legal authorities, and this law would likely benefit the labor unions more than it would the corporations. The corporations might have more money to spend in elections than the labor unions.

VIOLENCE AND LAWLESSNESS

This law forbids the use of violence and lawlessness on the part of employers or labor unions in an effort to accomplish their purposes. I might say that many laws have been passed on this subject and I know of no laws that were passed heretofore and now in force that upholds violence or lawlessness on the part of either management or labor unions or others. This is not the American way of settling differences. Employers have indulged in coercion, violence, and lawlessness against labor unions and labor unions have indulged in the same practices. This law attempts to eliminate these practices on the part of labor and management. Such tactics by either labor or management has never served in the end the best interest of either one of them.

This law should bring about a better relationship between labor and management and a full appreciation on the part of both groups and the American people that each of these groups have rights that should be and must be respected and protected and that each of these groups must fully realize that when they cooperate and pull together it will serve the best interest of labor and management and the American people.

The American people should produce to their fullest capacity and thereby provide for the great demand now being made by the American people for themselves and to provide and have a surplus which may be bought and consumed by people throughout the world. If we get

ourselves lined out in this country, we should have a long period of continuing prosperity that will redound to the benefit of labor and management and the American people, and if this bill in any respect should be proved to be unfair, either to labor or management, I shall be one of the first to support amendments that will correct such unfairness or inequity.

Palestine Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, the Billy Rose article appearing in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of June 24, which is in the form of a letter he addressed to the President, presents the Palestine question in an interesting and pointed manner. With permission granted in the House today, I submit it for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PITCHING HORSESHOES
(By Billy Rose)

Mr. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I think you ought to send out for a copy of Bartley Crum's new book, Behind the Silken Curtain. And when you read it, sir, have a cold towel handy. It's going to make your face awfully red. Especially chapter 2, The Secret File in the State Department.

This San Francisco lawyer reports that shortly after you appointed him in 1945 to the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine he was handed a document containing confidential communications between our State Department and the Arabian potentates of the Near East. Crum writes: "It was a sorry and bitter record for an American to read. According to this file, since September 15, 1938, each time a promise was made to American Jewry regarding Palestine, the State Department promptly sent messages to the Arab rulers reassuring them in effect that, regardless of what was promised publicly, nothing would be done to change the situation in Palestine."

Now let me say right here, Mr. President, that I'm not writing this piece to add my 2 cents' worth to the Palestine question. What I want to talk about is secret diplomacy—Honest John talk in high places and skullduggery in the lower echelons.

Crum goes on: "It was clear that the State Department continued playing both ends against the middle under President Truman's administration. On August 16, 1945, President Truman revealed he had discussed Palestine with Mr. Churchill and Mr. Attlee at Potsdam, and that they wanted to let as many Jews into Palestine as possible. But on October 23, in a confidential cable to Baghdad, Cairo, Damascus, Beirut and Jidda, the State Department explained that President Truman and the Prime Ministers 'engaged in exploratory correspondence on this subject * * * but there has been no change in this Government's previously announced attitude on Palestine'."

Not very fragrant, is it, Mr. President? Either you have been guilty of some pretty fancy double talk or your State Department has been sending these cables without your knowledge—in which event you ought to blush every time you endorse your salary check.

I often wonder what makes politicos think they have the right to gamble with Joe Citizen's life and fortune without letting him peek over their shoulders at the cards. Is it because they think they're so talented, so smart, so wise? And that 145,000,000 of us are so dumb?

How did they get up there anyway? At some liquored-up convention hall, the boys with the expensive cigars made a guess as to who would bring in the vote. After the nomination came the banners, billposters, beer parties and buttons. A fellow read some numbers over the radio on a Tuesday night in November, and a bit later a few ordinary human beings found themselves running the country.

Okay, what does that make them? Jefferson, Lincoln, Einstein, Thomas Edison? Not in my book. You've got to prove it first.

Well, what have you done? So far, what single piece of management or administration has come out of the whole kit and kaboodle that any industry boss would pay a decent salary for?

If the State Department has a secret file on Palestine, how are we to know it hasn't similar folders on Greece, Spain, Turkey, and Argentina? And if it has, where do you gents get the gumption to make life and death decisions without first telling us the whys and wherefores?

When the boys in the silk toppers decide to make up my mind for me, I at least want to know what they know. I'm not much impressed with this business of pointing to a brief case and saying, "Sssh." There are too many little white crosses around the world for me to buy that mumbo jumbo.

Instead of worrying about whether we should recognize the new government of Hungary, isn't it about time you insisted on the State Department's recognizing the old Government of the United States? Isn't it about time you and General Marshall got a couple of fly swatters and went in and cleaned out some of the well-barbed pests who operate the State Department as if it were a private country club?

It sounds like insanity when you put it on paper, but it looks as if there might be another war. I think the kids who will be asked to fight that war would like to know whether they're going to be fighting for their country or for some self-declared experts in the Department of State.

As you may have heard, there's a Presidential election coming up pretty soon. I think a lot of fellows like me are going to sign their campaign checks and mark their ballots according to results, not rhetoric.

From Bartley Crum's book, I gather that you and some of the boys in the inner circle haven't much faith in the judgment of the people.

Don't be too surprised in '48 if it works both ways.

Sincerely,

BILLY ROSE.

The Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, more than 100 Townsend-plan delegates from Maine visited me this morning. From my office they went to the Ways and Means Committee hearing and later to the House gallery. These people in urging consideration of the following resolution presented petitions of several hundred signers:

Resolved, That we Townsend people have changed the course of history. But for our activities, there would be now, no old-age pension at all—even the meager and inadequate one which is now on the statute books.

We shall keep our original objective constantly in view and may have renewed courage that what we believe in and anticipate, is already in sight. This is the sentiment of our entire delegation from Maine—over 100 strong.

Mr. Speaker, I have filed these petitions and a copy of resolution urging committee and House action on the Townsend plan, H. R. 16.

San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to bring to the attention of the House one of the finest gems of literary description of San Francisco which has come to my attention in many years.

The value of this very excellent article is greatly increased when it is recalled that Mr. Hal Boyle, an AP staff writer, is now on tour of many American cities.

SAN FRANCISCO: A CITY OF FAITH—A CITY THAT NEVER WAS QUITE TRUE
(By Hal Boyle)

(Hal Boyle is on a Nation-wide tour writing a series of articles on his observations on and views about the various cities he visits.)

San Francisco—this isn't really a city—it's a matter of faith.

There is no such thing as San Francisco. You can see it on the map, and drive through it, and get run over by a motorcar in it. But it isn't really there.

This is the second time I've been in it, but you can't convince me it really exists. It is like London in Shakespeare's day or Paris for restless Americans in the 10 years after the First World War.

It is Nineveh and Tyre and a mist-ridden Babylon—well policed. It is the Far East in transfusion, and the Old West wrapped in amber. It is a melting pot where the ingredients mix without anger.

San Francisco is a product that sells itself. The people who make up the place are glad to see you when you come, but they wouldn't give you a lead nickel to induce you to stay. They would pay money to keep from being a second New York, and they'd mortgage their homes to prevent becoming another Los Angeles.

They are one of the most history-conscious communities west of Cairo, but they never have got the idea that history doesn't keep on happening.

There is always a fog coming up here, and there is always a breeze to blow it away. That is what is known locally as the climate.

It is the only settled place in America where a stranger wishes in summertime he had brought along his long woolen underwear. When the hot sun sets, he starts

looking around for the penguins. Nature air-conditions it to the temperature of a Kansas movie theater in July.

San Francisco is grown up. Like New Orleans, it believes in food. It is the happy hunting ground of the finicky alimentary canal, a palace of the palate, be it steak-hungry or in quest of tapioca-tasting oriental bird's nest soup. A shrimp is shrimp-sized here as it is in Copenhagen. If you want what the stature-worshiping Manhattanites call a shrimp, your pocketbook is in pawn to a "prawn."

You have heard of the Hollywood diet? You will never hear of a San Francisco diet. A fat man here doesn't have to apologize every time he reaches for the olive oil. He isn't embarrassed to stick his fork into a well-flavored calorie.

San Francisco is one of the few places left in the world under a million population that is still lusty, gusty, sentimental, and individual. It builds the country's most modern underground garage—but it wants to get out its six-shooters when somebody tries to abolish its historic cable cars.

It stands on as many hills as Rome—but stays on the level. It tamed the Barbary Coast without destroying the exuberance that made it. It has both Alcatraz, the symbol of quarantine, and Treasure Island, which carried on the legend of the Golden Gate.

It built the two great bridges of tomorrow without letting go of its bridge to yesterday, when the gold miners and clipper ships gave it the peculiar luster it has never lost.

But San Francisco still isn't so. It's the fabled city that never was quite true, like Athens of old, the city that everybody wants to be in, and never wants to leave. It's a long municipal romance without a Carthage ending.

It doesn't exist and never did. Yet here it is. And while you're here—you have to believe in it. For San Francisco is purely a city of the heart, a projection of whatever you came to find.

Wagner-Ellender-Taft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Boston, Mass., June 22, 1947.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMRADE KENNEDY: It is with pleasure that I carry out the mandate of the Suffolk County Council, VFW, to write a letter of thanks to you for your earnest and driving efforts on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill in Congress.

It is such striking evidence of sincere actions such as this that justifies the confidence we place in our elected officials.

Again offering our sincere thanks to you, our comrade, in behalf of your sterling efforts, I remain, with kindest regards from our Suffolk County Council, VFW,

Yours in comradeship,

JOHN J. SULLIVAN,
Adjutant.

Taft-Hartley Labor Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., entitled "Mr. Truman Does a Disservice":

In vetoing the Taft-Hartley labor bill last Friday President Truman frankly confessed, by his action, that he places political expedience far above national welfare and the common good.

There can be no other interpretation of the veto. The bill which was originally approved in the House of Representatives by a vote of 320 to 79, and in the Senate by a vote of 54 to 17, contained certain controls over irresponsible labor leaders and practices that drew the fire of labor.

Mr. Truman is going to be a candidate to succeed himself in 1948. You may be sure of that. And it is rather certain that he is not going to be elected without the wholehearted support of labor. His motive for doing his best to kill the bill thus is as clear as crystal.

Certainly legislation worked out through long months of thoughtful deliberation and compromise, which finally won the approval of such huge majorities of the people's representatives in both the upper and lower chambers of Congress, cannot be construed as viciously constructed, dangerous to the Republic, unworkable, or totally worthless, as it was termed in effect by the President in his veto message.

The Members of the House of Representatives were so certain their legislation was good that they reaffirmed their faith in their original judgment, and expressed their lack of faith in the President's judgment by an overwhelming vote of 331 to 83 on the proposal to override his veto. The action by the House came so swiftly on the heels of the bill's reading, as to be considered an additional affront to the President.

The President knew he was not speaking the truth when he branded the entire measure as a bad bill. He knew when he made that statement that it was not true, for there are in the measure many changes in the present law which he, himself, had advocated in the past, and which prominent labor leaders in their testimony before House and Senate committees had definitely said should be enacted.

To brand an entire measure as bad merely because some portions of it might not suit his personal ideas is to stamp his entire message as insincere and actuated by purely political purposes.

It would have been far better had Mr. Truman recognized the admittedly good features of the proposed legislation, and then picked out the few with which he disagreed and stressed them as his reasons for not approving.

It would have materially strengthened his position had he complimented Congress for the elements in the measure with which he agreed, singled them out, and told why he was for them. For it is a well-known fact that many of the changes incorporated in the act were ones which he, in the past, had indicated that he favored, and were based on actions which he, himself, had taken in connection with labor disputes under authority given him in the War Powers Act.

It would have strengthened his position had he stressed these points of favor, urged that they be enacted in a future law, and then pointed out those things with which he did not agree and stressed the point that it was because of these, and these alone, that he felt it incumbent on him to veto the measure.

A great building cannot be branded as all bad because of some flaw in its arrangement, any more than a boy can be branded as all bad because of some peculiarity in his nature with which his friends might not find favor. One would not tear down the whole building to correct the little things that were wrong, any more than they would put out of the way the boy who did not measure up wholly to the rules as some others might wish. They would correct those flaws without impairment to the good that admittedly existed.

Mr. Truman could have sent to Congress a constructive, thoughtful, helpful message, instead of one that was so filled with insincerities, misinformation, malconstruction and political implications as to shake the faith of the great American public in the stability of thinking that emanates from the White House.

To have done so would have enhanced his position with the people, and with Congress. It would have gone far to restore confidence on the part of the people in the good faith of the executive branch of our Government at a time when such is so sorely needed.

It is sometimes difficult to follow the line of reasoning employed by Mr. Truman.

The fact that Mr. Truman's advisers may have told him that the proposed law was unworkable, does not establish that fact. It must be borne in mind that those advisers are Mr. Truman's personal appointees, whose decisions would be weighted heavily in the direction toward which they believed the boss wished them to be.

Some of the greatest scientific and political advancements in history were declared unworkable when first announced, yet when put into operation and developed proved just the opposite. Therefore it cannot be said truthfully that the new labor legislation is unworkable until it has been put into operation, thoroughly tested, and tried out to the fullest. Only by such means is it possible to know the whole truth. Only by such means will it be able to determine what, if any, flaws there might be in the new law, so that future Congresses can rectify them.

Headlining the provisions of the bill are those which would require union responsibility. Is Mr. Truman opposed to such a widely recognized principle of democracy as that of living up to one's word? The bill would oblige unions to live up to their contracts or risk civil lawsuits. Is there anything wrong with that idea?

Again the bill would outlaw jurisdictional disputes—those interunion arguments that are neither fish nor fowl, and in which no self-respecting union man ever wishes to become involved. It would outlaw secondary boycotts—and such abuses should never have been permitted by responsible union leadership. Thus, is Mr. Truman opposed to orderly processes of union behavior in its relationships with management and industry? What is wrong with those so-called curbs?

The bill would end wildcat strikes, those old devices by which one man or a handful of men can close down whole plants and destroy the earning power of thousands of innocent colleagues. What union man or woman would find fault with such a provision as this? Is Mr. Truman against enforcement of union regulations? Unions do not, in their charters, either countenance or encourage wildcat striking.

The workers in the Nation's plants and the public have a common bond. The workers wish to earn, that they may maintain themselves and their families in an orderly manner. The public wishes to be free of the constant threat against public health, public utility service, fuel, and the very food of life.

In some of its provisions the bill attempts to make certain that these elements can be met to the satisfaction of workers and the public, even though labor leaders must be relieved of some of their most stubbornly held powers.

On and on through the bill, one can find provision after provision intended to help the Nation rid itself of labor-management chaos, and get back to a rational basis of steady work and consistent production.

As it has been pointed out before, all of the law may not have been good. But is there anything to prevent Congress from amending its legislation from time to time, when the need arises? There is not.

Had Mr. Truman given this law a chance to work, its errors would soon have manifested themselves. They could have been and would have been corrected. Now, unless the Senate, under the most terrific pressure it has faced on a domestic issue in years, strikes straight through with a repudiation of Truman's veto philosophy, and turns this labor bill into law with a vote to override Monday, this country may face a labor-management situation the like of which no one ever before dreamed.

This situation cannot be considered simply a controversy. It can become a national calamity.

It is to be hoped the country's thinking Senators will be sufficiently numerous to poll the needed strength to vindicate the Nation's confidence in its law-making body as a whole.

Seven Thousand Dollars for a Flagpole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 1947

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith a letter I received from the Secretary of War and my reply thereto. I call particular attention to the item of a flagpole, which was estimated to cost $3,500 at Hawaii, $5,000 in Puerto Rico, and $7,000 in Alaska, all for the same size and type of flagpole.

Secretary Patterson's letter to me follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1947.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Chairman, House Subcommittee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ENGEL: In connection with the supplemental estimates of appropriations presently under consideration by your committee for the three cemeteries in Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, I desire to emphasize the importance and urgency I attach to the necessity of providing funds for the early development of these cemeteries. Due to changes in the status of possible locations for these cemeteries and other factors, it was not possible to complete detailed plans and process estimates of appropriations for the establishment of these cemeteries at an earlier date.

These cemeteries constitute an integral part of the program for the return of World War II dead. Unless their development can be started at an early date, the repatriation program, which is already under way, will be seriously delayed. In most cases, the next of kin have already been polled as to their desires in returning the remains to the locality of their homes. Unless these three cemeteries are suitably and promptly developed to permit the interment of such remains, it will be necessary to delay return from overseas, or to hold the remains in temporary cemeteries or in the limited above-ground storage space available. This, of course, would entail increased costs in addition to causing disappointment to the next of kin who naturally desire the early return of the remains and the interment in a fitting cemetery.

In the event any additional information is desired by your committee in connection with the above, I hope that you will call on me.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

My reply to Secretary Patterson:

JUNE 25, 1947.

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
The Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I received your letter of June 14 regarding the supplemental estimates under consideration by my subcommittee for three cemeteries—one in Honolulu, T. H., one in Juneau, Alaska, and the third in Puerto Rico.

We have examined the records and are informed that there is no legislative authority upon which to base an appropriation for either Alaska or Puerto Rico and that there is legislative authority for Hawaii with a limitation of $50,000. The request for the appropriation for a cemetery at Hawaii aggregates $746,400 or almost 15 times the amount authorized by law. I do not see how my committee can report this appropriation which has no legislative authority. I would suggest that the War Department go to the proper legislative committee and obtain such authority.

Before I close I want to comment upon certain items in these justifications which seem to be outrageously high.

CEMETERY IN HAWAII

1. Clearing 44 acres of land at $1,270 per acre—total request $55,880.

2. Subdrainage under the grave section not including subdrainage of road system, 30 acres of land at $675, total request $20,250.

3. Six thousand and three hundred feet of temporary fencing at $3 a foot, total $18,000.

4. Top soiling 44 acres at $5,700 an acre, total $250,800.

5. Landscaping and planting 44 acres at $680 an acre, $29,920.

You have $52,700 in the request for a six-room lodge and administration office. You have $50,400 for the first unit of utility group for comfort rooms, locker and shower rooms, garage, etc.; one flagpole $3,500. You have added on the total amount a 15 percent engineering, field supervision, inspection and contingency item aggregating $97,360. Total to develop a 44-acre cemetery $746,400.

PUERTO RICO

Total acres purchased, 75 acres; to be developed, 14 acres. The first item that comes to my attention is 75 acres of land at $600 an acre, total $45,000.

Clearing and grading 14 acres at $1,190 per acre, total $16,600.

Subdrainage of area under the grave section not including subdrainage of road system, 14 acres at $630 an acre, total $8,820.

Entrance gates, $24,500; enclosing 5-foot wrought iron picket fence with masonry base at $35 a foot, $70,000.

Temporary enclosing fence, 2,300 lineal feet at $2.80 a foot, $6,440.

Top soiling 14 acres at $4,800 an acre, $67,200.

Landscaping and planting 14 acres at $630 per acre, $8,820.

Superintendent's lodge, office and comfort rooms, $35,000.

Flag pole, $5,000.

Engineering, field supervision and inspection, $50,000.

The total cost of this cemetery in Puerto Rico is $423,500 with only 14 acres of 75 acres of land to be developed.

JUNEAU, ALASKA

Entrance gate, $32,000.

One thousand and fifty lineal feet of fencing at $50 a foot, $52,500.

One thousand two hundred and seventy-five lineal feet of temporary fencing at $4 a foot, $5,100.

Eight hundred lineal feet of curb and gutter including excavation at $5 a foot, $9,000.

Topsoiling, humus, fertilizer, and seeding 6 acres, at $7,600 an acre, $45,600.

Landscaping and planting 6 acres, at $900 an acre, $5,400.

Superintendent's lodge, office, and comfort rooms, $50,000.

Temporary utility building, shed-type, approximately 1,750 square feet, at $8 a foot, $14,000.

Flag pole, $7,000.

Designing, engineering, field supervision, and contingencies, $45,500.

The total cost of this 20-acre cemetery with only 6 acres to be developed is $348,700, or almost $60,000 for every acre developed.

Your letter reads in part as follows:

"Unless their development (the cemeteries) can be started at an early date, the repatriation program, which is already under way, will be seriously delayed. * * * Unless these three cemeteries are suitably and promptly developed to permit the interment of such remains, it will be necessary to delay return from overseas, or to hold the remains in temporary cemeteries or in the limited above-ground storage space available. This, of course, would entail increased costs in addition to causing disappointment to the next of kin who naturally desire the early return of the remains and the interment in a fitting cemetery."

These estimates seem to me to be outrageously high. When you pay as high as $7,600 an acre for topsoiling, $7,000 for a flagpole, $50,000 for a superintendent's lodge, office, and comfort rooms in a little 6-acre cemetery, $50 a foot for permanent fencing, $4 a foot for temporary fencing, $14,000 for a comparatively small temporary shed-type utility building, and add 15 percent engineering overhead and supervision, $600 an acre for land in Puerto Rico, I believe you are going beyond all reason, and these expenditures are not justified not even for the cemeteries for our war dead. These dead come from all walks of life. Some of the fathers and mothers of these soldiers are low-income people who pay heavy taxes, and they would be the last to ask such outrageous costs for a cemetery.

You mention in your letter the delay and expense. The war in Germany ended in April 1945 and the war with Japan ended in August of the same year. You had had nearly 2 years to make plans for these cemeteries and yet the justifications we received were dated May 19 of this year and the President's message did not reach us until we were almost through with the hearings on this bill. Your witnesses could not give us any information as to costs. They took these costs out of the air. When I asked them how many cubic yards of dirt they were to move or any other itemized detail, they could give us absolutely no information. If there is any delay or additional expense, the War Department and not the committee is responsible.

If a private group, incorporated or otherwise, presented Congress with a claim for cemeterial costs such as these they would be accused of racketeering. It is up to the War Department to obtain authorization for this appropriation from the proper legislative committee and bring their costs somewhere down to earth.

Yours truly,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

The Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Samuel Grafton:

I'D RATHER BE RIGHT
(By Samuel Grafton)

Congress boasts that its voice is the voice of the people. Whether it sings an ominous basso profundo on the reform of labor, or a frightened falsetto on raising rents, in each case, we are informed, the song comes from America's heart.

If this theory is correct—and it is the theory we live by—one wonders why certain large groups of the American people should have as much difficulty as they have today in establishing communications with Congress, or in raising an answering signal.

There are, for example, 41 States in our country which have passed laws authorizing local public housing authorities. That is an amazing thing, you know, for 41 States, 5 better than three-quarters, to kick along with a social idea. As a result of these enabling acts, public housing authorities have been set up in cities with a total population of 60,000,000. All these want the Wagner-Ellender-Taft public housing bill passed. Yet somehow, this enormous appeal from the heart of America doesn't seem to register on the congressional recording apparatus.

Maybe Congress should use radar, or something, to cure this break-down in communications.

The National Public Housing Conference, which represents about 40 of the country's biggest organizations, totaling, again, about 60,000,000 people in all religious groups and both labor federations, occasionally gets a faint answering signal from the Senate on its plea for the W.-E.-T. bill. Could it be static, of course.

Sometimes it seems to hear a far-away voice in the headphones, saying: "This is TAFT. I am for you. This is TAFT. I am for you," but the volume is so low it could be just a mere feed-back.

From the House it doesn't even get a superheterodyne whistle. The National Public Housing Conference has designated June 25 as a kind of frantic fight-for-housing day, during which many of its member organizations will send emissaries to Washington to try to set up contact with Congress. Some suggest smoke signals, others believe the situation is urgent enough to warrant a desperate tapping in Morse on the Capitol's steam pipes.

It does seem odd that it should be so hard to get through. Only in April the Republican, an official publication of the Republican Party, sent questionnaires to 3,500 Republican Party workers asking them to say which of the problems then before Congress were, in their opinions, urgent. More than 54 percent of these party functionaries listed solving the housing shortage as very important and urgent—more than voted for tax reduction.

But tax reduction has already passed, while it seems impossible to catch Congress' eye on housing whether by hand signals, handkerchief waving, ear-wiggling, or any other common device.

The W.-E.-T. bill has opponents in the real estate industry, and if housing does not pass it will, unfortunately, look at the end of this session as if these have had better luck in getting their points of view through. That will be bad for the voice of the people theory. How many people have to line up on an issue to get a clear channel?

How much will the average Congressman bet against the proposition that there are more Americans concerned about housing than about curbing the labor unions, or cutting taxes, or both together.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in April of this year I caused to be printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, the president emeritus of Columbia University, opposing the admission of Hawaii as a State in the United States. I have now received a letter from Mr. Gregg M. Sinclair, president of the University of Hawaii, on the same subject, and I ask that Mr. Sinclair's letter also be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, June 23, 1947.

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler—in his letter of April 15 to you and his letter of March 7 to Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug, in both of which he objects to statehood for Hawaii—proposes another solution to our long, long plea for adequate representation in Washington and the right of American citizens in Hawaii to select those who govern them. Because of Dr. Butler's eminence, I believe that his proposal and his statements should be analyzed carefully.

Dr. Butler states that the admission of Hawaii to the Union would end the United States as it has been. We had thought this question was settled nearly 50 years ago, when Hawaii was annexed; certainly, the question was discussed vigorously in 1898, but it has not received much attention since. By that act of annexation the United States extended its border beyond continental shores and changed the United States "as it has been."

Speaking practically, is it not truer to say that science and invention have ended the United States as it used to be? Is it not really wisdom to recognize that the United States will never again be the same as it was in the days of our grandfathers? Dr. Butler, with his forward-looking life—as anyone who has read his two excellent volumes, Across the Busy Years, will testify that it was a forward-looking life—should be the first to agree that a cry to "return to the good old days" is hopelessly contrary to the scientific, economic, and political factors of 1947.

By any contemporary test, Hawaii is closer to the Capital of our country than any State—after the first 13—was at the time of its admission. Science has so minimized time and space that Hawaii is next-door to Washington. We heard the fireside chats as soon as Dr. Butler did; our newspapers carry the great news services, "with today's news today"; we have airplane service to the mainland with several planes daily. During the war a member of the Military Government Division of the Army left Washington on Monday morning; I dined with him on Tuesday evening, and he had had several hours of business in San Francisco and several more in Honolulu before our dinner.

In the free exchange of ideas as well as in the transportation of goods, Hawaii is closer to Washington than any State—again excepting the original 13—was at the time of its admission. Take two examples, Vermont and Arizona, the first and last States to be admitted. In 1791 what were transportation, mail service, and "exchange of ideas" between Montpelier and other Vermont cities and New York? How soon did the people of Vermont learn of Jay's Treaty or of George Washington's quarrel with the Congress over that treaty? In 1912 how long did it take to go from Arizona to Washington? How fared "exchange of ideas" between this new State and the capital? To pose these questions is to answer them. Surely science and invention have changed the United States "as it has been," but statehood for Hawaii has nothing to do with this fact. (In lumping Hawaii with Alaska and Puerto Rico, Dr. Butler confuses the issue. Statehood for Alaska or Puerto Rico will be decided on its merits, and not at all on whether Hawaii becomes a State.)

Last year Honolulu was host to many world-famous scientists passing through for the Bikini tests. To listen to these scentists was to realize how far our world has traveled from the United States as it has been. To realize from their talk the significance of the new world created by the use of atomic power was to appreciate how people in the age of chivalry must have felt on the discovery of gunpowder. These highly intelligent men, when speaking of statehood, posed a question which Dr. Butler might have raised to better purpose: In this new atomic and Pacific world, is it not to the advantage of 140,000,000 Americans to have Hawaii as a State? Hawaii's whole statehood campaign is based on an affirmative answer to that question. (In this letter it is not necessary for me to do more than to suggest a phase of that campaign, which I shall do in closing.)

Dr. Butler's statement, "Think of what would happen were the vote of one senator from Alaska or Hawaii or Puerto Rico to defeat the ratification of an important treaty affecting the policy and good order of the world," really involves two questions:

1. Is our American system of ratifying treaties a bad one in that it gives a Senator from any State—Vermont or Arizona or Hawaii—too much power in possibly casting the deciding vote in an important treaty ratification? I think Dr. Butler is too good a constitutionalist to say so. And in any case a State, to possess such power as Dr. Butler instances, would have to be joined by at least a third of the country to make a negative vote effective and by nearly two-thirds of the country to make a positive vote effective. Therefore, why be especially afraid of Hawaii?

2. Is Hawaii's electorate capable of choosing Senators worthy of standing with Senators from other States? We say "Yes." With practically no illiteracy among the Hawaii born and with 85 percent of our people born in the islands or on the mainland, with a citizenry more interested in government and public affairs than is the electorate in many States—whereas throughout the Nation only 56 percent of those eligible to vote cast ballots in the 1944 Presidential election, 86 percent of Hawaii's electorate voted in the same election, and our votes were cast for local candidates only—with as great a proportion of university-trained men and women as in other States, we see no reason why our Senators should not be worthy. Hawaii is ready to be judged by her elected officials, her legislators, her Delegates to Congress, her mayors of Honolulu. The Larcade

committee pointed out how progressive our laws were. Visitors to Hawaii have often commented on the high quality of our local leaders. We have no doubt that we shall be able to elect two Senators of quality and character.

Regarding Dr. Butler's main proposal that Hawaii be set up as an independent, self-governing country, except in the control of its foreign affairs, and further subject to the supremacy of the United States Supreme Court, this suggestion seems to us to be anachronistic. Hawaii, like Texas, was once an independent, self-governing country. For mutual assistance—and I stress mutual—the United States and Hawaii agreed to annexation, with every assurance that after a trial period as a Territory, Hawaii would become a State. It is a little late in the day to propose that we return to our former status, and what would be the advantage for either Hawaii or our country? (The one merit to this proposal is the recognition that Hawaii's status should be changed; that it has been a Territory long enough.)

Our objections to this proposal are three: (1) It very definitely does change the United States "as it has been," and we wish we had Dr. Nicholas Butler on our side to point out this fact to the American people. History and precedent unite in proving that the culmination of territorial status is statehood, not "restricted" independence. (A friend has pointed out that our country is called "The United States of America," not "The United States and Territories of America.") (2) Whether this proposal is not unconstitutional is a serious question. In *Downs* v. *Bidwell* (182 U. S. 254) Justice Brown, in a concurring opinion, stated: "When the Constitution has been once formally extended by Congress to Territories neither Congress nor the Territorial legislature can enact laws inconsistent therewith." In another case (*Rasmussen* v. *U. S.* (273 U. S. 284)) the Supreme Court held that a law passed by Congress which would have provided a jury of six for the Territory of Alaska was unconstitutional since it was not consistent with the incorporated status of a Territory, and the opinion seems to indicate that Congress cannot change incorporation after it has been established. (3) Now that Hawaii has fulfilled every qualification demanded of Territories before being admitted to the Union, this proposal has the appearance of an attempt to deprive Hawaii of that for which, in good faith, it has striven for nearly 50 years. When I first read Dr. Butler's proposal, I had a feeling of moral collapse. Hawaii wishes to be considered as a candidate for statehood—statehood and only statehood.

Has not Hawaii fulfilled every qualification? Ten years ago the joint committee of the Congress reported: "Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted of Territories." The Larcade committee concluded: 'The Territory of Hawaii now meets the necessary requirements for statehood." The 1937 committee did suggest that the Territory learn how substantial was the local majority in favor of statehood. A vote was taken in 1940; 66 percent voted in favor. (It should be pointed out that in 1940 international conditions were confused, and that as a consequence some people were suspicious of certain elements in our local population. Since then Hawaii's boys—especially the sons of those very elements—have made such a highly commendable war record, and our citizens generally such a superb record of cooperation with the military in bond purchases, blood-bank contributions, civilian defense generally, etc., that many voters who were doubtful in 1940 would be favorable today. A vote for statehood for Hawaii in 1947 might run as high as 10 to 1.)

What are some of Hawaii's other qualifications for statehood? Limited in land area as it is, Hawaii would not be the smallest State in the Union; and placed as it is geographically, it would continue to be in a choice position to render incalculable service to the other States and to the Union, as it did in World War II, and World War I and the Spanish-American War. Our population of over half a million is greater than that of several States now and exceeds that of every other State but one at the time of its admission. Hawaii is economically sound; it has always paid its way. Until recent war expenditures—and perhaps even including them—Hawaii has always sent to Washington every year more money than it has received in return. Our Federal income-tax returns exceed those of any one of fourteen States, and the percentage of individuals filing Federal income-tax returns exceeds that of 26 States. "Taxation without representation," fighting words once, is an active phrase in Hawaii. The assessed value of our real property exceeds that of every State at its admission except one. Since Admiral Nimitz's testimony and the testimony of General Herron, there is no longer any feeling that Hawaii should be kept a Territory for military purposes.

What other tests must Hawaii pass before being admitted to the Union?

Not only is Hawaii economically, socially, educationally, and politically worthy of statehood, but also as a member of the recent Larcade Committee pointed out, "The stature of the United States would be increased by incorporating such a forward-looking community into the Union." One far-seeing Congressman put it bluntly, "Hawaii is asking for statehood not solely because her citizens want representation, but also because of the great advantage which will accrue to the Nation with the addition to our Congress of four capable men with a knowledge of the Pacific area. In the development of a Pacific policy by the United States, statehood for Hawaii will have the effect of increasing our stature greatly in the eyes of the world and in the eyes of the people bordering the Pacific Ocean." This latter fact should be stressed, and it was stressed at the hearings of several Congressmen. One, who had had experience in the Pacific area and in China, stated, "It will focus attention throughout the whole vast Pacific basin on the capacity of our form of government to inspire the loyalty and cooperation of people of many racial and national origins. I am sure that such an example will have an immeasurable value in strengthening our relations with every people of the Pacific Ocean area."

It seems to me, therefore, that Dr. Butler's proposal is untenable; that history and moral obligation and the facts of the situation all are opposed to it; that on the contrary the arguments are all in favor of statehood for Hawaii, and statehood for Hawaii now.

With warm Aloha!

Sincerely yours,

GREGG M. SINCLAIR,
President.

A Sane Voice Speaks to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, owing to the great confusion, misunderstanding, and desire for information concerning the recently passed Taft-Hartley bill, the enclosed editorial from the Indianapolis Star commending Dan Tobin, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, is constructive and enlightening.

Mr. Tobin gives constructive advice to all labor and wage earners in America, as set out in the accompanying editorial.

I, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, opposed the so-called Taft-Hartley bill, but now that it is a law by act of Congress, any of its provisions should be legally tested in the courts. If any of its provisions are unconstitutional, our courts are open to both the employer and the employee to test the same. The American people will, in due time, give the verdict as to amendments or the possible repeal of this law.

The editorial follows:

A SANE VOICE SPEAKS TO LABOR

"Anyone who advocates wholesale breaking of union agreements through a general strike is, in my judgment, an enemy of organized labor and of our Nation as a whole." With these words Dan Tobin, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, spoke out against those who would incite labor to strikes in defiance of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. Tobin has set an example of restraint, common sense and leadership that other labor leaders should follow. This is no time for any group to weaken our democracy by inciting disrespect of law. "The citizenship of any nation striking against its government means nothing but revolution," said Mr. Tobin. "The working people of this Nation are not revolutionists." Communists and others who now are trying to turn them toward revolution have only one aim—to keep American labor in constant turmoil. Thus they would destroy democratic processes and in the end fasten a repressive dictatorship over all our people.

Free people do not need to use the methods of conspiracy and violence to gain their just ends. The ballot box is their means of obtaining justice, for in America the Government belongs to the people.

Labor's leadership should have realized by now that the Taft-Hartley law was not foisted upon America by unfair or illegal means. It was voted by men and women who were elected by the majority of our people. It was a response to the people's demand that certain labor abuses be rectified.

The Star has supported the Taft-Hartley Act. Unlike Mr. Tobin, this paper sees more good than bad in it, for we believe that it is about time that union leadership became responsible to the same principles of law that govern other American institutions. But if injustice to either labor or management develops under this new act, they can and will and should be rectified at the next session of Congress. This is what Mr. Tobin seeks to bring about through the orderly process of democratic government.

Meantime, in Dan Tobin's words, "Now is the time for men to keep their heads and use their brains." Those who wish to destroy our freedom want nothing more than to create division and unrest among us. Let us not play into their hands.

High Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, Congress should act immediately to bring

relief to the American people. Relief from high and rising prices.

The Representatives of the American people cannot recess without having taken the steps which will balance the housewife's budget.

There should be a bipartisan effort to meet this acute problem.

The Democrats are willing to cooperate.

Since the great majority of Republicans, with a small minority of Democrats, swept away the consumers protection last summer and since the Republicans now control Congress, the responsibility for initiating action is theirs.

The housewife and her family cannot eat studies, charts, and NAM philosophy.

She needs action—and now.

Since last year, the food she buys has gone up 33 percent.

The clothes she needs—20 percent.

Household replacements up 20 percent.

Her pocketbook will not stretch. She cannot buy what she needs, now—and prices are still rising.

America's housewife is in trouble.

The $12,000,000,000 net corporation profits after taxes in 1946 will not help her.

The $15,000,000,000-rate of profits after taxes in the last quarter of 1946 will not help her.

The first quarter corporate earnings for 1947, the highest in our history, will not help her.

Increased dividends for the first quarter of 1947 over 1946 will not help her.

Nor will corporation assets of $104,000,000,000—$49,000,000,000 over 1939, help her.

They are not reflected in her pocketbook.

They do not help her to buy ground round steak at 85 cents a pound, milk at 17 cents a quart, butter at 76 cents a pound. Pork chops at 73 cents a pound. Coffee at 47 cents a pound.

We are not talking about roast beef and steak budgets.

We are talking about three-fourths of America's families who earn less than $3,500 a year, or less than $70 a week.

We are talking about the 40 percent of America's families who earn less than $2,000, or less than $40 a week.

So that we know what this 40 percent have to live on, let us break it down.

Twelve percent of America's families in the peak year of 1945 had a family income of between $1,500 and $2,000.

Nine and one-tenth percent of America's families struggled with an income between $1,000 and $1,500.

Nine and five-tenths percent of America's families struggled with an income between $500 and $1,000.

Nine and seven-tenths percent of America's families struggled with an income between $0 and $500.

To bring home even this income it often takes two or three wage earners per family.

The Heller budget tells us that a family of four needed $70.52 a week in 1946 to live at a minimum of decency.

One overcoat for the wage earner only every 6 or 7 years on this budget.

And living has gone up 20 percent since 1946.

The housewife is left holding the bag. Congress must act now.

To pass legislation that says one thing and does another is not the answer.

The Taft-Wolcott so-called price control bill which killed price control last June is the cause of all the housewife's trouble today.

The Taft-Wolcott so-called rent control bill which was written to kill rent control and will kill rent control will be the final death blow to the budget of 15,000,000 renting families.

No one speaks for the desperate housewife whose budget has had a ceiling on it for 3 years.

Dispute rages rather around the so-called "high" wages of organized labor.

The time has come to consult his wife Molly.

In January 1945, the average pay in John Worker's pay check was $47.50. This was the peak wage year.

Today, the average pay in John Worker's pay check is the same in dollars.

But Molly Housewife and John Worker cannot live as they did in January 1945, during the war. It costs 20 percent more to live now than it did then.

For every dollar Molly spent for food last April, she has to spend $1.33 now.

For every dollar Molly spent for clothes last April, she has to spend $1.20 now.

Every week, Molly Housewife and her babies are short $9.50 of what they had to spend in January 1945.

It is simple. They eat $9.50 less or they do not buy the pair of shoes or the shirt that keep other people at work.

Congress must act now if Molly and all the other housewives and their families are to have enough to live on.

Second San Francisco Bay Crossing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made to the San Francisco Bay Area Council by Mr. Fred Cox, chairman of the Southern Alameda County Committee for a Second San Francisco Bay Crossing. This statement was made at a meeting of the committee held in the Lemington Hotel, Oakland, Calif., on May 19, 1947:

A joint Army-Navy board, acting under a resolution adopted in the House of Representatives, has made a comprehensive study of a second crossing of the San Francisco Bay. This board recommended a crossing from a location opposite the foot of Army Street in San Francisco to a point opposite Fifth Street in the city of Alameda, including the auxiliary facilities, such as a tube under the estuary separating Alameda and Oakland.

A recommendation has come from the California State Department of Public Works urging the construction of a bridge paralleling the present San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, which to many of us is not an acceptable solution for a grave transportation problem.

Mr. Cox, in his following statement, points out the cogent reasons for supporting the more southerly crossing as recommended by the joint Army-Navy board:

In our consideration of a second San Francisco Bay crossing there are some points on which we can all agree and other points on which we disagree. Some of our disagreements seem irreconcilable, while on other points we can come together through logic, reason, and compromise.

Point No. 1, on which we can all agree, is that we need a second crossing; furthermore, we must have it at the earliest possible date.

Point No. 2 is location, and this is the one on which we probably most radically disagree.

Other points, such as type of bridge, number of traffic lanes, whether we shall have rails carrying main-line trains into San Francisco, appear to be within the range of agreement through reason and analysis.

With the immediate need for a bridge accepted by all, and with other features being subject to decision by logic, compromise, and economics of the situation, we seem to find the one question of location to be the subject of greatest difference of opinion.

On the one hand, we find the location from Army Street, in San Francisco, to Alameda, on the East Bay side, recommended by the joint Army-Navy board after extensive hearings. The impartiality and competence of the men on this Board cannot be doubted. The thoroughness of their work cannot be questioned. The practicability of a crossing as recommended by this board must be accepted by all.

On the other hand, these same things must be granted as to the men who prepared the report of the California Department of Public Works for the California Toll Bridge Authority.

And so we arrive at the conclusion that experts disagree on this point of great importance—the location where the second crossing shall be built. Shall we accept the recommendation of the experts of the Joint Army-Navy Board, or shall we accept the conclusions of the experts of the California Department of Public Works?

Inasmuch as the experts cannot agree and both claim equal authority as to the engineering features of the two locations, and inasmuch as the location of the second crossing will vitally affect the economic future of a vast segment of California's population and will determine the industrial destiny of great areas of the State, this one question of location should be finally decided by the people who will suffer or profit by the decision.

The people, themselves, who will use the bridge and who will pay for it with their tolls, should determine the location. The people should demand this right. In the spirit of real American democracy, they should tolerate no other decision than their own. So long as we have an American system by which the majority of the people have the right to say what they are to get for their money, those people should be the ones to say where their bridge is to be built.

The purpose of the Joint Army-Navy Board was to give all interested parties a chance to present their plans and the arguments in favor of them. They fulfilled this purpose admirably. All interested parties had their chance to present plans and to argue for their plans. Many individuals and groups representing widely different interests at-

tended the meetings of this Board. They presented their plans and arguments.

Certainly the proceedings of the Joint Army-Navy Board were fair, open, complete, and impartial. The Board was composed of men of unquestioned reputation, ability, and standing. Now public officials of California have disregarded the recommendation of that Board and have introduced dissension into public thinking on the subject of the second bay crossing.

DISTANCES

The California Department of Public Works engineers say that the majority of traffic comes from the near vicinity of the present bridgeheads on both sides of the bay. All of us knew this would happen more than 20 years ago when the present bridge was seriously under consideration. Traffic always concentrates around a bridgehead. That is the point where there is the most concentration. This result was a foregone conclusion. It is natural and inevitable.

Now because there is the concentration of traffic in the congested areas of San Francisco and the East Bay, the California Department of Public Works engineers say that we must build a second bridge in the same location to relieve that congestion which the first bridge has created. They know, and every thinking layman knows, that to put this second bridge in the same area, within 300 feet of the present bridge, will cause further concentration and congestion of traffic. Then in another few years there will have to be a third bridge another 300 feet north or south of the second bridge to relieve that concentration. And in another few years more there will have to be a fourth bridge within another 300 feet. One bridge after another will have to be built close to all the others to relieve the concentration of traffic at bridgeheads, which started with the first bridge and which will be magnified by the building of other bridges, according to the thinking of the engineers of the department of public works. There is no direction and no end to this vicious circle of false reasoning. According to this kind of thinking there will be no place to stop. And all the time traffic from the more remote areas will have to travel the same long distances to cross the bay.

We have two great concentrated population areas in San Francisco and the East Bay. At this moment we have only one street between these two large populations. Now it is proposed, in effect, that we merely widen the present street and keep all the traffic on the widened street and dump it on both sides in the same areas.

TWO BRIDGES

If, at the time of the construction of the present San Francisco-Oakland Bridge, the order had been given to build two bridges, where would they have been built?

If anyone has seriously proposed building them parallel to and within 300 feet of each other, the proposal would not have been taken seriously. If such a proposal had been made, it would have been branded ridiculous. And yet that very proposal is being made today by our State engineers. It is just as ridiculous and unfair today as it would have been 20 years ago.

To have proposed two bridges side by side and within 300 feet of each other at the time of considering the first bridge would have been considered just as preposterous and would have received far less attention than the recently demised Reber plan. We do not want a bridge located where it will hamper industrial development of the entire San Francisco Bay area, where it will retard growth. We want the second bridge located so it will encourage such development and growth. We want it located so its influence will reach out into the rich fertile valleys of Northern California. We need it where it will become an intelligent and logical part of the great bridge system of the future, consisting not only of two bridges; but of perhaps as many as a dozen. We do not want all of our future bridges side by side and within 300 feet of each other. We must have them where they will contribute most to the full development of the entire San Francisco Bay area. Such a plan for future bridge construction deserves the endorsement and support of every city and district, every organization, every citizen and every individual in the entire San Francisco Bay area. Anything less than this is a crime against posterity. Anything less than this would constitute a plan for hampering an unparalleled industrial development program for the future. It would constitute a course that will choke the growth that lies ahead of this gateway to that part of the world where the greatest development will occur in the century that now lies ahead of us.

SPREAD TRAFFIC

If we solve this problem by putting the second crossing in the location recommended by the Joint Army-Navy Board we spread the traffic and also serve a much wider area. Further, by locating the second crossing in accordance with the recommendations of the Army-Navy Board we find that the people north of the present bridge are no further from the center of San Francisco by the Army-Navy route than the people of East Oakland and the others to the south and east are from San Francisco by the present bridge. By following the recommendations of the Army-Navy Board we get a balanced traffic condition. We get better distribution of traffic instead of further concentration. We contribute to the development of the area where growth is possible instead of creating further confusion where there can be no further growth because the areas are filled.

In a recent meeting I spoke to a man who is a large industrialist in the area north of the present bridge. I asked him what he thought about the location of the second crossing. Here is what he told me: "If the second bridge is built within 300 feet of the present bridge we will have two bridges. If the second crossing is built from Army Street to Alameda or Bay Farm Island, we will still have one bridge. We cannot get hurt."

RIGHT-OF-WAY VALUES

What will happen to our future highway-development program as a result of the construction of the second bay crossing. One answer to this question can be found by looking at what has already happened.

In the proposed $200,000,000 Alameda County highway program we find two projects which take nearly one-half of the $200,000,000. One of them is 4 miles of construction from Santa Clara Avenue in Alameda to MacArthur Boulevard, which is to cost $50,000,000. The other is 10.1 miles through the heart of Oakland which will require $46,485,000. One of our supervisors has told us that the reason for the high cost of these two projects is that the rights-of-way will cost a majority of these two sums.

Another bridge in the same location will ultimately require morelhighways in the same area for heavier traffic with costs running into many millions of dollars for more rights-of-way.

To deliberately make a bad situation worse instead of spreading traffic so it will not create this worse condition does not make good reasoning.

POPULATION

Bridges should be built to serve people who will use them. A study of the population figures shows that of the 743,000 people living in Alameda County, 391,271 live in the southern part of the county. Yet according to the proposal of the California Department of Public Works, the second bridge would be built at a point where it would serve the minority of the county's population without consideration for the majority.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Industrial leaders through the East Bay area have been saying for the past several years, "Industry and population have only one direction for growth in Alameda County—to the south and east." They repeat constantly that there are no more large industrial areas in Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland, and that the only sites remaining open are from San Leandro south through Hayward and on to Niles, Centerville, Newark, and San Jose.

To build a new bridge adjacent to the present one would throttle and discourage this industrial development in the only direction in which it can go, while to build the second crossing on the location recommended by the Army-Navy Board would encourage such development.

On the San Francisco side it is also true that the only possible direction of growth is to the south. A second crossing to the south would bring these two potential industrial areas on both sides of San Francisco Bay closer together and contribute greatly to our entire Bay area industrial development.

In this connection, it is well to remember that the 10 years after the first World War saw the greatest industrial growth in the history of Alameda County. We should plan to encourage the even greater industrial growth that will take place in Alameda County during the 10 years following World War II.

Emphasizing this industrial growth during the next few years in Southern Alameda County, listen to this information taken from the annual industrial report of the Oakland Chamber of Commerce. "Magnitude of the industrial change since pre-war days of 1939 is revealed in a percentage gain of 73.4 for Alameda County in its production workers, as compared with 44.1 percent increase for San Francisco.

"Moving to welcome even greater industrial development, the board of supervisors endorsed a zoning study of the area between San Leandro Bay and Hayward.

"At the suggestion of Harold D. Weber, general manager of the chamber, and Don Follett, manager of the Alameda County New Industries Committee, they instructed Wallace Boggs, county surveyor, to plot prospective residential districts in that territory. The remainder will be allocated for industry.

"The industrial report predicted 1947 will be Alameda County's greatest year for industrial expansion. Future development, it predicted, will place large plants of national firms in the 1,056 acres of industrial land being developed by the port of Oakland around San Leandro Bay and the nearby 3,000 acres to the south."

To know these facts, to have this information in our hands, and then to build the second bay crossing where it will handicap such development rather than to encourage it, is to follow a course that it is difficult to reconcile with reason and intelligence.

POPULATION GROWTH

It is a fact that the population of California has doubled or more than doubled in every 20-year period during the past 100 years. And it is a further fact that authorities state that the only possible direction for substantial growth for both San Francisco and the East Bay area is to the south.

A recent survey of new home building in the Hayward area reveals that there are now under construction or planned for early construction more than 4,000 new homes. This points the trend of population growth emphatically.

If the California Department of Public Works made its recommendation for a second San Francisco Bay bridge in ignorance of

these facts, or if the department knows these facts and chooses to ignore them, then they are committing a serious and damaging offense against the areas of greatest future growth and the areas most in need of a second bay crossing.

SUPPORT OF SOUTHERN CROSSING

It should be of much interest to everyone who is attempting to get a second crossing built at the earliest possible date to know that the people of the affected areas have already expressed their wishes on this subject through various groups.

We find that the San Francisco Police Commission recently voted unanimously to oppose the California Department of Public Works' recommendation and at the same time to support the recommendation of the Army-Navy Board.

Further we find that more than 50 city councils, chambers of commerce, labor unions, service clubs, improvement clubs, and civic organizations have endorsed the location recommended by the Army-Navy Board. They are opposed to the location parallel to the present bridge.

When American citizens express themselves so emphatically, their wishes must not be ignored.

"The construction of proposed solid fill and rip-rap side slopes would form a fine protection from southeast storms to the bay area north thereof including the south shoreline of the city of Alameda, making said bay area a perfect set-up for recreation, yachting, and boating."

(2) "The type of crossing that can be built economically under the fundation conditions will provide only one long channel opening and other shorter bridge spans or fills which will obstruct the anchorage areas to a considerable degree, and may affect channel maintenance."

But the Army-Navy engineers have suggested a type of crossing that is acceptable to them and they are the ones who are responsible for watching the interests of the Army and Navy in the anchorage areas. If a crossing at this point is acceptable to the Army and Navy, then no one else can offer any logical objections.

(3) "Because of harbor facilities it must have its east bay terminus south of the estuary. This requires a freeway through Alameda and additional tubes under the estuary of sufficient capacity to handle future traffic to the center of traffic in Oakland."

Of course, the East Bay terminus of the second bay crossing should be south of the estuary. All the area north of the estuary should be kept entirely free of any more obstructions. Huge developments will take place in this area in the future, and there should be no construction of any kind that might interfere with such developments. This should be apparent to anyone.

And, of course, additional tubes will have to be built under the estuary to serve Alameda-Oakland traffic. Both Alameda and Oakland have been crying for such additional tubes for years. If this is a necessity of the future, by what line of reasoning can it be cited as an objection to the building of a bridge in this proposed location?

(4) Traffic on the present Bay Bridge will be reduced by not over 20 percent because of the location of the East Bay terminus. A normal increase in traffic on the present bridge will probably make up for this diversion within a few years, with the result that the relief for the acute congestion on the present bridge would be temporary only.

SUMMARY

In summary the conclusion must be very definite that Army and Navy men of unquestioned ability and competence have thoroughly studied and considered the whole San Francisco Bay Bridge problem.

They have selected as the best location for a second crossing the Army street area as the most desirable location for the bridgehead on the San Francisco side of the bay. They have selected the southern shore of Alameda as the best location for the bridgehead on the east side of the bay. These men are eminently qualified. Their integrity cannot be questioned.

The engineers of the California Department of Public Works are men of equally high standing but their reasoning is so apparently short-sighted. They count immediate needs as of first importance without due consideration to the still more important future requirements. They count cost when the saving of a few million dollars now will cost the entire San Francisco Bay area many times the amount saved.

When experts disagree, then fairness and justice to the people who will pay for the bridge with their tolls should determine the location.

The real problem that faces the people of California is not merely the building of a second bridge across San Francisco Bay now but the building of several bridges over a period of many years.

If the California Department of Public Works wants to render the kind of service to the people of California which it should be capable of rendering it should study the possibilities of bringing all bridges that now cross San Francisco Bay from the Golden Gate to Dumbarton under one operating head.

The Golden Gate Bridge, the San Francisco-Oakland Bridge, the San Mateo Bridge, and Dumbarton Bridge should all be put under the control of the California Toll Bridge Authority and all of them should charge a 25-cent toll. All tolls collected should go into one general bridge building fund and should be used to pay off the balances of existing indebtedness and also pay the cost of building additional bridges as fast as increasing traffic demands.

Such a program would give the State engineers an opportunity to do constructive long-range thinking. They could then do some planning that would mean intelligent preparation for the great future that is in store for the entire San Francisco Bay area.

Let us think in terms of practical planning for a brilliant future for this San Francisco Bay area as well as in terms of providing for pressing needs of the present.

The entire San Francisco Bay area is a single economic unit. It is desperately in need of vision and leadership. That fact is a challenge to all of us.

A Great Blow to California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of June 26, 1947:

A GREAT BLOW TO CALIFORNIA

That the decision of the United States Supreme Court awarding title to coastal lands between low-water mark and the 3-mile limit is a great blow to California and to all other States similarly situated is evident. It is not only a blow but an unexpected one, since it upsets more than a century of precedent, acceptance, and custom. And it seems to have some aspects of a blow below the belt, also, since some of the reasoning in the majority opinion written by Mr. Justice Black appears to be irreconcilable with common sense and with the history of the United States.

The main question, however, is where this decision leaves us and what to do about it. That the State should seek a rehearing, even though such applications are seldom granted, is the first thing to be said. The second action that should be taken is to press for passage by Congress of an act quitclaiming the tidelands to the States which always have been supposed to own them. Congress passed such an act in 1946 but it was vetoed; but the coastal States can try again.

One point about the decision can be emphasized: the Court does appear to recognize the claims of the States to lands under bays, harbors, and rivers, and to the lands between low-tide and high-tide marks. What the decision gives the Federal Government is the land beyond low-tide mark.

This land, where it contains oil and other mineral deposits, is worth a vast amount of money. The State of California and municipalities have obtained revenues amounting to $12,000,000 a year from the royalties resulting from drilling only a small portion of this subsurface area; so the stakes involved are high.

To most people it will seem that the court majority has made in this case not a law decision at all, but a political decision, such as should be made by the President and Congress. This is the opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, pointed out in his dissent. To assert claim to property is not the job of the Supreme Court; and in this matter Congress has not only repeatedly refused to claim the coastal belt but has sought to repudiate it. The claim was made by an executive agency without any specific authority from Congress and after Congress had declined to grant such authority.

As for the reasoning in the majority opinion, it appears in spots to be nonsensical. One quotation will illustrate: "The United States stresses that the Thirteen Original Colonies did not own the marginal belt; that the Federal Government did not seriously assert its increasingly greater rights in the area, until after the formation of the Union, that it has not bestowed these rights on the States but has retained them as appurtenances of the national sovereignty * * *."

The concept of a Federal Government existing and having rights "before the formation of the Union"—since it was the Union or at least the people of the Union that created the Federal Government—is something unheard of before this opinion was written. It has no historical basis. It looks as though it were drawn out of thin air to sustain the Government's case. This concept is no accident; without it, the court could not say, as it does, that the Thirteen Original States did not own their tidelands, which passed to them from the crown of England.

The Court's assertion that in the Pollard case, decided in 1845, only title to land covered by inland waters was involved may possibly be a valid distinction. But if the distinction is valid, the Court then is claiming for the United States unclaimed land, as pointed out by Justice Frankfurter, and is invading the province of Congress. Congress has never asserted that this belt is part of the national domain.

The majority opinion also contends that possession of this belt is necessary to the Federal Government, because that Government must defend it in war or conduct diplomatic negotiations with regard to it. But Mr. Justice Reed pointed out in his well-reasoned dissent that ownership by the States would not interfere with the needs and rights of the United States in war or peace. "The power of the United States is plenary over

these undersea lands, precisely as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation," Justice Reed said.

The original States, said Justice Reed, were sovereigns in their own right over these submerged lands and the States later admitted were taken in on the same footing.

In no war that the United States has waged has the supposition that submerged lands belonged to the States interfered in the least with their defense by the National Government. The Federal Government has always exercised its rights to regulate navigation in coastal waters, without any reference to who owned the land beneath them, nor has such regulation ever been challenged by any State.

But whether this decision is sound or unsound logically, it has been made; and unless the Court can be induced to reconsider, the only recourse of the coastal States is an appeal to Congress.

Tributes to the Late Senator David I. Walsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have an editorial from the Herald News, of Fall River, Mass., and another editorial from the Union, of Manchester, N. H., relating to the late Senator David I. Walsh, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that his many friends here in the Senate may read them.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fall River (Mass.) Herald News of June 14, 1947]

DAVID I. WALSH

The passing of David I. Walsh recalls a chapter without parallel in Massachusetts political history. That it was an honorable contribution he made to his State and Nation will be admitted even by those who sometimes were confused by his forthright convictions. He was not given to double talk. At a time when most of his party deemed it little short of treason to disagree with Franklin D. Roosevelt, he disagreed with him. Not because he was unsympathetic with the hopes and needs of the underprivileged, but because he saw the need of perpetuating the old and tested values. It was when Roosevelt decided to pack the Supreme Court that this characteristic found its most impressive expression, except, perhaps, in that earlier day when he stood shoulder to shoulder with the elder Henry Cabot Lodge in opposition to Wilson's League of Nations. He was an isolationist.

Senator Walsh trod a middle path between conservatism and what is defined as liberalism. He represented a great industrial State, and he recognized both the needs of labor and capital. He was a protectionist.

He was chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee as the United States moved toward the Second World War. He was one of those alined in favor of strict neutrality, and in some quarters there was some uneasiness lest his neutrality affect his judgment relative to the need for a powerful Navy. Under his chairmanship, the United States Navy grew to be the most powerful in the world.

Senator Walsh had many warm friends in Fall River. "Fall River has always been very good to me," he said, on his most recent appearance here. When he surrendered his seat in the Senate to the younger HENRY CABOT LODGE, his political star had set. But the record of honorable service he had rendered down through the years remains, and Fall River joins with the rest of the country in respectful tribute.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union of June 13, 1947]

DAVID I. WALSH

People throughout all New England will join in an expression of sympathy and respect over the death of former Senator David I. Walsh. Mr. Walsh was one of those stalwart figures that have marked New England's record in recent years.

People did not always agree with him, but they always respected his ability and integrity. Throughout the more than a quarter of a century that he represented Massachusetts in the United States Senate, Mr. Walsh had strong convictions that he did not hesitate to follow in the face of strong opposition.

A stanch Democrat politically, he often found himself out of step with that party's leadership. He opposed President Wilson on the League of Nations issue, and balked several times at Roosevelt's policies. The Roosevelt attempt to pack the Supreme Court aroused his ire as an affront to the Constitution. Senator Walsh swallowed the Roosevelt third term with some hesitation, but he balked completely at the proposal of a fourth term as a violation of a precedent that should be respected. Incidentally, these revolts against Roosevelt's policies and practices were not forgotten in Roosevelt circles, and played a part in the Senator's ultimate defeat in 1946 by HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

Prior to Pearl Harbor, Senator Walsh was an ardent isolationist. He opposed lend-Lease, the trading of 50 destroyers with Britain, the establishment of convoys, and other measures designed to strengthen the opposition to the challenge of Hitler. After Pearl Harbor, however, his attitude changed completely. He declared then that since the United States had been attacked, there was nothing to do but to defend ourselves.

From that time on he supported the war with vigor and determination, performing valuable service as chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee in promoting every means possible to make the United States Navy equal to the responsibilities of the war. In fact, during the period when Senator Walsh was preaching isolationist doctrines, he never wavered in his belief that a strong Navy was an important asset to American protection.

Throughout his entire career Senator Walsh's chief desire was to be known as a humanitarian. It was in this field that his deepest interest lay. Born amid humble conditions and fighting his way up the hard way, he never lost his fellow feeling for the unprivileged classes. Of Irish extraction, this same feeling made him the ardent apostle at all times of Irish freedom.

Although he had taken an active part in many national problems, in his later years he was accustomed to refer with most earnestness to such achievements as his campaign to help establish extension courses in State-supported universities and the regulation of State employment of labor. Throughout his life Senator Walsh was the friend of labor. Whenever he could, he sponsored its cause.

The Nation has lost one of its strong leaders. Both political friends and foes will join in a declaration of respect for a life lived in the American tradition.

Japanese Police Knocked From Fearsome Pedestal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

JAPANESE POLICE KNOCKED FROM FEARSOME PEDESTAL

(Article 25)

In a police state, such as Japan has been for generations, it is the policeman who comes in daily contact with the people and whose job it is to enforce the decrees of the dictatorship which rules the country.

The occupation authorities recognized this and realized that if any of the proposed reforms were to be effective there would have to be a thorough reorganization of the Japanese police system.

This was done, by issuing appropriate directives to the Japanese government. But we went further than merely effecting a reorganization. We took steps to make the new police force an effective instrument to help guide and develop the people in their new-found enthusiasm for democracy.

We discovered that the Japanese are group thinkers, that they were willing to cooperate with us and that they would do all and more that we asked, provided they understood what we wanted of them. What could be better than to make each individual policeman a salesman of democracy in his district? That, at any rate, is what we have tried to do.

In the old Japan there were 66,000 policemen who had the power of life and death, of freedom and confinement over the people they ruled. They supervised every activity of the individual from birth to death, from licensing midwives to issuing burial permits. They even inspected spring house-cleaning activities, and bawled the housewives out to a fare thee well if they didn't do a good job.

They wore shoulder boards, a symbol of the emperor, and carried swords, a symbol of authority. People bowed to them as they would to a superior being.

In addition to the regular police, there were "thought police" who had the right to throw anyone in jail whom they believed was thinking dangerous thoughts or who spoke disrespectfully of the emperor.

The jails were filthy and overcrowded. Persons could be held without charge and, if tried and acquitted on some charge, could be immediately rearrested at the whim of the policeman.

"THOUGHT" CORPS ABOLISHED

We directed the Japanese government to abolish the "thought police" and to repeal all laws against dangerous thinking and free speech. We fired 5,000 of the top police officials, and began a reorganization which resulted in 90 percent of the old police force resigning and new men being appointed in their places. The police no longer wear shoulder boards or swords, in fact, they are unarmed except for batons.

We have established a bureau to handle offenses by juveniles and we are training a force of policewomen. The jails have been cleaned up and the prisoners segregated.

But few of the jails require any locks on them. So deep is the inherent respect for a policeman that in ordinary cases he doesn't have to make an arrest. He merely notifies a suspect that he is wanted and the suspect

promptly reports to the jail and asks to be admitted.

PRISONERS STAY PUT

Do you believe that? I didn't until I saw it. We visited a jail at Yokusuka. Three women were being held for minor offenses. There were no locks on the cells and the police station door stood wide open. But they never even thought of walking out.

There is only one link between the new and old Japanese policemen. They are allowed to salute American and Allied officers and our officers return their salutes.

We have also begun a reorganization of the Japanese fire departments which formerly were under the police departments and were badly neglected. There were only 60 fire alarm boxes in Kyoto, a city of 867,000 population and these were all torn out during one of the Japanese wartime scrap drives. The fire departments had to get their gasoline from the police and if the police didn't want to give them any they were unable to respond to alarms.

FIRE EQUIPMENT OBSOLETE

Fire hose was leaky, equipment obsolete and inadequate, and the Japanese never had a fire prevention program, a system of inspection or building codes. They took a fatalistic attitude toward fires—if there was a fire eventually it would burn itself out.

Nothing of course could have stopped the fires started by our mass bombing attacks. But in 1946 there were 14,000 fires in Japan which caused a loss of 3,000,000,000 yen.

Besides reorganizing the police and fire systems in Japan, we are preparing to establish a Japanese coast guard. Formerly it was the navy's job to prevent smuggling and to render assistance to vessels in distress. But the Japanese no longer have a navy, so we are organizing a coast guard to perform these duties and also to take over the enforcement of the maritime laws and to maintain a lighthouse service.

The Roosevelt Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the 25th of June, at Warm Springs, Ga., a very touching ceremony was held when the Little White House was dedicated as a shrine, in the custody of the State of Georgia, in memory of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. One of the stirring addresses delivered on that occasion was one entitled "The Roosevelt Faith," by the former Secretary of the Navy and the former Ambassador to Mexico, Hon. Josephus Daniels. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many of us come here today out of affection for a man, but those of us who loved him most, I believe, come also in devotion to the things to which Franklin Roosevelt gave his life. It was his genius that he could speak clearly in warm-hearted leadership for us in an American period of difficulty never equaled in the history of our Nation. It is our fortune that in leaving this shrine he also left us here a parable which will go on teaching long after the last of us have followed him to the end of living. What we say here will be soon forgotten. On this day we are only a little group of the millions who will come not merely for aid in the ills of the body but for help in the deeper sicknesses of the spirit. The parable here will persist across the ages.

We do not merely come to the place where one of the great American Presidents died. We come to these springs to which a young man came. How young and debonair, striding and strong he had been. I am glad I can remember not only that he was great but that he was beautiful as well. He came here a cripple to recruit his strength. It is sad but instructive to remember that he came in the early twenties when the world also, which had been so strong, so beautiful in its purposes for democracy and for peace, was crippled with the paralysis of bitterness at home and abroad.

It is fitting that we come here in a like hour today when there seems to be more hate and confusion than love and purpose in the world. In New World and Old World alike recent allies of courage and sacrifice are made in their victory to seem implacable enemies across an impermanent peace. There are men among us who would defend democracy by infringing its liberties. There are more who think that the democratic faith depends for defense upon military force rather than the steady fulfilment of its promise for plenty and freedom together and everywhere. We live in a time when the last and greatest discoveries of our scientists seem only the basis for the most primitive fears. A great and beautiful Nation, equipped as no other Nation ever was for the leadership of mankind, is a cripple also and once again. And in a sick world we seem more concerned with contagion than energetic in cure.

It is not necessary for me to point the parable which these hills will hold to the end of time. It was on this ground that Franklin Roosevelt understood first—here he made the faith—and here also we may possess it.

We need not be the captives of our fears.

Only the already lost can think of our future as besieged.

We have more to give than to guard.

Our powers are not weapons but tools with which to build the promise of democracy into the purposes of mankind.

Sometimes that faith is hard to hold. Even to an old man, who has seen many years, these times seem dark. But this place is lit with courage. Indeed, it is illumined with faith. At Warm Springs today our task is not to dedicate a shrine, but here and now to rededicate ourselves.

How Can We Halt the Spread of Russian Power in Europe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject, How Can We Halt the Spread of Russian Power in Europe? broadcast by me over the Town Meeting of the Air, originating at Pueblo, Colo., June 26, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Before we can answer the question, How can we halt the spread of Russian power in Europe? we must answer the question, Do the American people really want to stop the spread of Russian communism in Europe? If we don't, we should. If we do, we, as a people, better start squaring our actions with our professed desires. The time has come for us to stop fooling ourselves, and above all else, the time has come to stop playing partisan politics with the peace. In my opinion, we are fast losing the peace while Russia continues to win the war. She has overrun Poland and Yugoslavia, now Hungary, and the Balkans are fast becoming her puppet satellites. She is playing for time.

We will never be able to stop the spread of Russian communism in Europe until we first stop the spread of economic isolationism here at home. As I sit in the Senate and observe day in and day out the shocking selfishness of various pressure groups doing everything they can to take economic advantage of the domestic dislocations brought about by the war, I am filled with dismay and despair. Some way, somehow, the American people must be brought to their senses, and quickly, in regard to what it will mean to the destiny of our Nation if we lose this peace. Right now is the time for each one of us to subordinate his personal selfish interests to the Nation's interest in winning the peace if this democracy is to survive.

The need for complete national unity and full devotion on the part of all of us to our patriotic obligations was no greater on the day of Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, than it is at this hour. The difficulty is that the need is not as dramatized as was the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor.

My mail shows that an increasing number of Americans are permitting their own selfishness and lethargic disinterest to be used as weapons for sneak attacks upon the peace. They are afraid we are being asked to pay too high a price for the peace. They want lower taxes, high tariffs, cheap labor, the emasculation of great pieces of social legislation and a quick return to the laissez-faire economic pattern of the 1920's. Even many of them think a depression is probably necessary to get back to the good old days of boom and bust.

Through such a program they are spreading Russian communism in Europe, but blinded by a myopia of greed, they do not see it. They do not see that if we fail to make democracy work in America, we cannot prevent the spread of communism in all of Europe. Too many of our politicians are telling them what they want to hear, but not what they should be told.

Our system of political and economic democracy, based upon the two foundation rocks of individual liberty and private property, are worth paying high taxes to retain, and unless we are willing to pay a high price for the peace I am convinced that it will be only a matter of time before we will have to pay the incalculable price of another war. We need to remember that a continuation of the present economic depression and collapse in Europe and Asia will make it impossible for us to enjoy prosperity here at home after our present surplus economic demands are filled by our increasing production supply.

There are millions upon millions of people in Europe and elsewhere who have nothing or little to lose in going from their present economic system, under which they are suffering and starving, to Russian communism which at least promises them food and shelter although its revolutionary propaganda feeds upon human suffering. Upon the promise of such a mess of pottage Russian communism is spreading through Europe, while we here in this country quarrel among ourselves over such things as giving needed support to the Truman doctrine, industrializing Germany, feeding the starving peoples

of Europe, and helping France, Italy, and England regain that necessary degree of economic stability so they once again can become self-sustaining nations.

I strongly favor the Truman doctrine, particularly as expanded by Marshall's Harvard speech, but it doesn't go far enough. It is not enough to make clear to Russia that we intend to resist with firmness any attempt on her part to overrun the freedoms and individual liberties of the people in the weaker nations of Europe. We must also make clear to her that we are ready to help rehabilitate war-torn Europe with or without Russia's assistance and in spite of her resistance. I think such a course of action is our best and only hope of bringing about peace in Europe and understanding with Russia.

We must keep ourselves strong and united at home, so that at all times we can demonstate to the world that we are strong enough to preserve the peace until such time as the other nations of the world, including Russia, acting through the United Nations, demonstrate that they want peace.

If free governments and personal liberties are to be protected from the police-state methods of Russia, nations which believe in the principle of self-determination of peoples must join in abolishing the veto and insisting that Russia abide by majority rule in the United Nations. If that fails, the peace is lost.

America's Leadership for Freedom and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege yesterday to broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System an address on America's opportunity for leadership in international affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Freedom and peace are the primary goals of all peoples. Certainly they are the primary goals of the people of the United States, who, from the time the Nation was founded until now, have cherished the belief that mankind is capable of establishing a social and political order under which the individual shall be free to live his own life and under which war may be avoided.

Now, however, after two world conflicts fought within the space of 30 years, with a fury and destructiveness that defy imagination, it is becoming apparent that it is much more difficult to achieve peace than it is to win unwanted wars. Men are already hopelessly talking about a third world war to be conducted with weapons more terrible even than those which were used in the last one. It becomes imperative, therefore, if we desire to avoid such a catastrophe to attempt frankly to face the facts both with respect to ourselves and to the other nations of the world.

Surely we are not deceiving ourselves if we say that the people of the United States have amply demonstrated in the two terrible conflicts of this century that they have no ambition for conquest or aggrandizement. Now, as after the peace of 1919, we recognize the right of self-determination for every other people. We do not attempt to constitute ourselves a monitor to compel the adoption of our institutions elsewhere, but when free institutions are overthrown in any nation or self-determination is denied to any people, we have in the past at least recognized that such applications of force, internally or externally, are destructive of the fundamental hopes of all people, namely, the attainment of freedom and peace.

Throughout this century our people have cherished the confidence that mankind can perfect a world organization to provide peaceful settlement of all international disputes, promote disarmament and banish war. If we have failed in attaining these objectives, the failure has been due not to any purpose of preserving opportunity to gain dominance over any other people or area, but solely because of human frailty in selecting the proper course of action to gain the desired end.

Personal rivalry and purely partisan rivalry have impeded us in taking the effective world leadership which we should take in the effort to establish permanent peace and freedom. But a more serious impediment than either of these has been our failure until now to understand that there can be no political liberty without economic freedom, and, therefore, that the first step in the attainment of the great objective of all mankind is the establishment at home and abroad of economic liberty. This proposition has been stated over and over again by our leaders in the past. It was the heart and center of the Atlantic Charter, and it has once more been currently enunciated by Secretary of State Marshall.

"Our policy," he said in his address at Harvard University on June 5, "is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist." Surely this is a plain and unmistakable statement of our fundamental purpose—to help peoples everywhere, through free institutions to achieve triumph over misery.

What do we mean by "free institutions" and what threatens them? When we speak of free institutions, we speak of social and political conditions under which authority proceeds from the people themselves. What threatens the existence of such institutions? Obviously they are threatened by arbitrary power. That is to say, by the infliction upon people of authority which they are forced to obey, but in the establishment of which they have had no part.

If we ask ourselves whether or not arbitrary power exists anywhere in the world today, we must in all frankness answer ourselves that it does. It dresses itself, to be sure, sometimes in the habiliments of nationalism, sometimes in the garb of imperialism, sometimes even in the cloak of democracy. But no free person wherever he lives, whatever his background, can mistake arbitrary power whatever the disguise. It is the rule of the many by a few. By whomever it is exercised, it is a repudiation of every principle of political and economic life which has activated the people of this Nation from the beginning. Free men, whoever they are or wherever they are, cannot safely delude themselves into compromises of principle with arbitrary power. You cannot appease a tyrant. That does not mean that you should go to war with every tyrant. It means only that in dealing with him you make it as clear to him as to yourself that you know his character, that you are not deceived.

If any people in the world freely choose a program of socialism, no other free people can honestly or rightfully complain. Whatever program any nation adopts for itself is the business of that nation, and not of any other. This is not the case, however, when any program is imposed upon a people by arbitrary power. Americans in their efforts to win freedom and peace for mankind must not lose sight of this proposition. Nor should they close their eyes to the fact that the Soviet government in our time is a dictatorship.

When I hear men, who call themselves followers of Franklin D. Roosevelt and defenders of his ideals, urge the people of America to disregard the facts about the Russian Government, I am reminded of the speech which President Roosevelt made to the American Youth Congress in Washington on February 10, 1940, before we became involved in the war. It will be remembered that resolutions were being adopted at that time by naive conventions condemning American loans to Finland on the charge that they constituted an attempt to force the United States into an imperialistic war. President Roosevelt, in this speech of February 1940, took cognizance of these "futile resolutions," as he called them, and then said:

"More than 20 years ago, while most of you were very young children, I had the utmost sympathy for the Russian people. In the early days of communism, I recognized that many leaders in Russia were bringing education and better health and, above all, better oportunity to millions who had been kept in ignorance and serfdom under the imperial regime. I disliked the regimentation under communism. I abhorred the indiscriminate killings of thousands of innocent victims, I heartily deprecated the banishment of religion—though I knew that some day Russia would return to religion for the simple reason that four or five thousand years of recorded history have proven that mankind has always believed in God in spite of many abortive attempts to exile God.

"I, with many of you, hoped that Russia would work out its own problems, and that its government would eventually become a peace-loving, popular government with a free ballot, which would not interfere with the integrity of its neighbors.

"That hope is today either shattered or put away in storage against some better day. The Soviet Union, as everybody who has the courage to face the fact knows, is run by a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world. It has allied itself with another dictatorship, and it has invaded a neighbor so infinitesimally small that it could do no possible harm to the Soviet Union, a neighbor which seeks only to live at peace as a democracy, and a liberal, forward-looking democracy at that."

That was before Hitler turned upon his ally in the ruthless faithlessness that is always characteristic of the dictator. When we became involved in the war, we aided Russia, just as we aided Britain, and we fervently hoped that when the peace came and the arbitrary power of Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito was destroyed, the great people of Russia, in the words of Roosevelt "would eventually become a peace-loving popular government with a free ballot, which would not interfere with the integrity of its neighbors." We know now that arbitrary power is being imposed upon the peoples of many small countries in Europe with the connivance and support of the Soviet dictatorship. We know now that the pledges of Yalta and Potsdam have been violated and that little peoples are suffering at the hands of Soviet arbitrary power in the postwar period just as little Finland suffered in the prewar period.

These are facts which we must face. That does not mean that we should go to war against Russia. On the contrary, it means that we should undertake to prove to Russia and to all the peoples of other nations, that a free democracy can produce a higher standard of living than is possible under arbitrary power and we should do this by eliminating all possibility of arbitrary controls in our own economy.

Secretary Marshall, in describing the international policy of this government, has declared that, "Any government that is willing

to assist in the task of recovery will find full cooperation in the part of the United States." The purpose, proclaimed under the leadership of President Truman, is to aid Europe in its own economic rehabilitation. It is not a program of handouts, but a program designed to bring about economic rehabilitation and freedom by the same sort of cooperation that won the war. It is a program in which Russia may join. It is a program of work and production, and, after all, men cannot live except by work and production.

The leadership is ours. Never has this or any country had a greater opportunity to serve mankind. We have the largest national income ever achieved. We have substantially full employment. Profits are high and wage rates are high. World peace depends upon our example and we cannot afford the luxury of a class war, or even of petty quarrels over a slightly better share of the Nation's production. Few in America need more than they are now getting, but millions abroad live in misery and serfdom. We can produce. We can show Europe that by united determination to work in a free economy, production, and peace can be achieved for all the peoples of the world. The responsibility is ours. We must not fail.

Making Democracy Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address on the subject Making Democracy Work, by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The address was delivered yesterday at the closing session of the Thirty-eighth Annual Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, at the Lincoln Memorial, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is fitting that we should gather at this great national shrine of human rights and rededicate ourselves to the principle that there shall be no discrimination in our democracy because of race, color, sex, or creed. Would that every American could come frequently to this memorial spot on the banks of the Potomac and renew his faith in the principles of individual liberty and of representative government which are epitomized in the spirit of the great emancipator who, seemingly alive but in the silence of stone, looks down upon us.

We assemble today at one of the cathedrals of American democracy conscious, I am sure, of the fact that there are still wide gaps between the universal truths of man's responsibilities to man, so simply stated in the teachings of Lincoln carved into the granite walls of this memorial, and our practices as a people one toward another. We cannot come within the spiritual and patriotic atmosphere of this historic edifice without being reverently moved by the realization that Lincoln saw democracy as Christianity put to practice. Too frequently in our national life we limit our devotion to great spiritual and political truths to special occasions but fail to practice those truths in our day by day actions. In this critical hour in the history of our Nation and of the world we dare not run the risk of paying lip service only to equality of justice and opportunity under law in these United States. Faith in democracy is deserved because it is the only system of government of which I know that is predicated upon the proposition that all men are created free and equal. It is the only system of government of which I know that recognizes in principle the dignity of the individual as being above the dictates of the state.

No police state, Fascist or Communist, can match the guarantees of individual liberty, human rights, and justice by law of our democracy. True it is we have yet to eliminate all political, social, and economic injustice from the workings of our democracy. Nevertheless, we have succeeded in protecting the rights and advancing the opportunities of the individual in his pursuit of happiness far beyond that of any other nation or people in all history.

We must not, and cannot afford to, rest, even momentarily, upon our accomplishments because there is still much to be done if we are to make democracy work in carrying out its full potentialities for human happiness through self-government. We, as individuals, must never forget that we are individual parts of our Government. In a very true sense we, the people, are the Government. The great majority of the American people have it within their power to determine the trends and policies of our Government by exercising the most precious right which free men can enjoy in a democracy—the right of a free ballot.

I am one who seeks to extend that freedom to all Americans irrespective of the color of their skin or the district in which they live. I maintain that such a freedom should be considered a Federal right under our Constitution beyond the trespass of any class or race consciousness.

Likewise, I believe that if we are to square our democratic principles with our political and economic actions we must remember that bigotry and democracy cannot be reconciled. Intolerance toward minority groups and the Declaration of Independence are not compatible. Economic discrimination in employment practices, a form of economic slavery, outrages the Emancipation Proclamation. Lynch law repudiates the Constitution and its precious Bill of Rights.

If we as a people are to be true in our actions to the principles of representative government so vital to the preservation of our political liberties, then we must insist that our elected representatives exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues as they find them, irrespective of the terrific pressures which selfish groups may bring to bear upon them. As Lincoln said:

"No one who has sworn to support the Constitution can conscientiously vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, however expedient he may think it; but one may and ought to vote against a measure which he deems constitutional if, at the same time, he deems it inexpedient."

Lincoln was right. These are days when men in office must be willing to put to a test that principle of representative government, having confidence in the fact that once the majority comes to understand the basis for opposition to bad legislation, they will approve, rather than disapprove, refusal to follow a temporary majority.

In closing I would say that if we lovers of democracy are to perpetuate it we must never forget that its ability to protect and advance human rights depends in no small measure upon lawmakers following a course of legislative action which seeks to protect the economic weak from the exploitation of the economic strong and accomplishes it within the framework of our private-property economy and in accordance with our Constitution and its Bill of Rights.

American Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio interview between Mr. Charles Parmer and myself, which was broadcast yesterday over Station WEAM, Arlington, and Station WDEL, Wilmington. The subject of the broadcast on the "Parmer From Washington" program was America's plan for defense in the atomic age.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DYNAMIC DEFENSE FOR AMERICA

Mr. PARMER. Senator WILEY, what do you regard as the most important single problem facing our country today?

Senator WILEY. Charlie, the biggest single issue that the Congress and the American people have to face is adequate defense in this atomic age.

Mr. PARMER. Why do you regard it as so important?

Senator WILEY. Because we can't afford another Pearl Harbor with America asleep at the switch. The next war may be decided in minutes or hours.

You and I know, Charlie, that in spite of the world's hunger for peace, the Second World War did not make for peace. We know, of course, that the world today is still trying to rehabilitate itself from the disastrous effects of the war.

Yet there is still suspicion, envy, distrust, and hatred between the nations. You remember, Charlie, that after the First World War we signed the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact that was to outlaw war, but we found that mere words on documents didn't solve our problem. So I repeat that the biggest issue today is defending America against any emergency in the future.

PREVIOUS DEFENSE SUGGESTIONS

Mr. PARMER. You've made numerous suggestions for defense, haven't you, Senator?

Senator WILEY. Yes; I have. I have urged that we prepare push-button plans against a possible push-button war of the future. I have stated that we must stock-pile vital materials; that we must coordinate intensive research into atomic energy, guided missiles, etc. We must plan for legislation by television, if necessary. We must insure adequate succession to the office of the Presidency in the event that an atomic bomb wipes out the President and the Cabinet. Such succession, I believe, should place the highest ranking military or naval official next in line.

The Army and the Navy must snap out of the squads-right rut so that the Nation will be adequate to meet any challenge. We know that ours is a contracted world because of man's ingenuity. Time and space exist for us no more. It is essential therefore that we plan and execute adequately in advance; plan for manpower mobilization, industrial mobilization.

Mr. PARMER. Senator WILEY, you don't regard the world picture as completely gloomy, do you?

Senator WILEY. No, of course not, Charlie. America has striven valiantly in the 2 years since the United Nations organization was established, giving of her worldly goods and service to mankind. The so-called Truman

doctrine and the Marshall plan should prove effective instruments for peace if the other nations will play ball. But we must not blind our eyes to the realities. Peace is not here. Not only America, but all nations, must demonstrate the will, intent, and purpose for peace before it arrives.

Mr. PARMER. Well, Senator, what do you propose now to supplement your program for American defense?

POLITICAL DECENTRALIZATION

Senator WILEY. Charlie, I have prepared a several-point program which I submit the Congress and the people should realize. Here are the points:

First, the Congress ought to plan for the progressive decentralization of our Federal Government from Washington, D. C., out to the grass roots of the Nation. Just think this over for a minute, Charlie. If one atomic bomb were to strike us here in the future, it could with one blow destroy the very nerve center of our entire economy. The War Department, the Navy Department, and all of our civilian units would be smashed with one attack. That is why I believe that we should begin to decentralize personnel and functions out to the smaller communities of America.

Mr. PARMER. If I may interrupt, Senator, are there any other advantages to such decentralization?

Senator WILEY. Yes, there are several, Charlie. First, decentralization is necessary for national security in the atomic age. Next, it is necessary for purposes of efficiency in government. For example, if a Government unit is located close to the work which it is supposed to handle, it can better understand the people's problem instead of getting swivel-chair notions as to how the people's business should be run from Washington, D. C.

Then, too, decentralization is necessary for government economy. We won't have to build up a big bureaucracy in Washington, D. C., to duplicate the work that is done in the field offices. Decentralization will also make for better relations between citizens and public officials. Businessmen won't have to travel, for example, a thousand miles in order to present some problem that might have better been handled at the crossroads of America. Lastly, decentralization is economically sound, because it will help spread government payrolls into the lifestreams of many small communities instead of concentrating all those pay rolls in the Capital.

AMERICA'S CAPITAL

Mr. PARMER. You think a lot of our Capital, however, Senator, don't you?

Senator WILEY. Of course, I do, Charlie; we all do. We glory in its beautiful buildings and thoroughfares, its historic landmarks. But there is no good reason why all the major governmental business of America must be performed in one teeming, jam-packed "telephone booth," so to speak. Washington could well lose 100,000 or so of its one-quarter million Federal employees without being impaired as our Capital City.

I presented these facts to the Government's Bureau of the Budget in a recent letter. Unfortunately, however, the Bureau's response did not evidence a sense of awareness of this problem, nor a willingness to begin action along the line I suggested.

Mr. PARMER. Well, what are you going to do about decentralization?

RESOLUTION TO DECENTRALIZE AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Senator WILEY. Well, Charlie, tomorrow I am going to introduce a resolution to have the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee begin a test study of decentralization. My resolution will require this Agriculture Committee or a subcommittee to make an intensive 6-month study of the ways and means by which the Department of Agriculture may be decentralized. Right there are more agriculture employees in Washington, D. C., then there are in any single State of the Union. One-eighth of the total force of the Department is concentrated in crowded, congested Washington, D. C.

But, I say, why shouldn't the Dairy Division of the Department of Agriculture be centered in the dairy section of the United States, the Cotton Division in the cotton area, the Wheat Division where the wheat is grown, etc.?

If the Agricultural Committee can make the sort of study that I envision, it might serve as a model for every other committee in the Congress to make a similar study so that the advantages of decentralization that I have mentioned may accrue.

Mr. PARMER. Well, Senator, decentralization then is the first point in your program for dynamic defense in this atomic age. What are some other points?

Senator WILEY. Another major point is that our American business leaders should begin now to think in terms of decentralizing their industrial plants. There is no reason why the great industries of America should all be concentrated in the larger cities of our country, thus laying them open to atomic attack. You and I know that there are tremendous advantages from having factories set up in small towns, economic advantages, social advantages, spiritual advantages. We know that problems of labor-management relations can, by and large, be more easily solved in smaller cities than in the larger centers.

The Government can encourage this decentralization in awarding its military and naval contracts. But our business leaders have to take the initiative in this work. I know it's not going to be easy. I know there is inertia and complacency, but I say that our businessmen are challenged here to show the business horse sense by serving themselves and their country through this means.

Mr. PARMER. All right, Senator, political decentralization and business decentralization, there probably is some connection between the two.

Senator WILEY. There certainly is, Charlie. I believe that our businessmen, our laboring men, our farmers, and everyone else should urge that political decentralization and business decentralization should go hand-in-hand. I believe that chambers of commerce, committees for economic development, labor organizations, should form advisory committees at the national and State levels on decentralizing industries for purposes of national security and the other advantages which I have stressed.

ECONOMIC STRENGTHENING OF NATION

And, Charlie, while I am on this point, I want to mention that one of the strongest possible ways by which America can insure dynamic defense is to make certain that she is economically sound at the core. A great forward step toward this objective was taken by the enactment into law of the labor bill last Monday. I believe that if it is fairly and efficiently administered it can open a new era in peaceful labor-management relations that will make for full production.

There are, however, some indications that the executive branch may not execute Congress' intent along this line, either in its formal administration or in its legal activities which may ensue in the courts over this law. Congress is going to have to oversee the Executive's handling of this problem through its joint labor-management committee.

But the American people will be the principal ones who will supervise the job that the administration does. It is up to the administration to respect the mandate of the American people and of the Congress by applying the letter and the spirit of the labor law.

Mr. PARMER. Well, Senator, what about that tax bill that the President vetoed?

Senator WILEY. Charlie, that was very unfortunate for the economic soundness of our country. Had the 30 to 10.5-percent tax-reduction bill been enacted, it would have exerted a powerful influence toward preventing any trends toward recession. It would have strengthened America's role in international diplomacy by insuring adequate purchasing power for our own people. Unfortunately, the President chose to ignore the demand of the people and the Congress for this legislation. In so doing he has at least temporarily denied relief to 45,000,000 American taxpayers. This bill would have given proportionate relief by increasing take-home pay from the lowest to the highest brackets.

Mr. PARMER. Well, Senator, are there any other points in your program for dynamic defense in the atomic age?

Senator WILEY. Yes, Charlie, there is one other point, and that is what we might call spiritual mobilization. By that I mean that every American must make sure that he is not slumbering in a false security in these critical times. We have just won the greatest victory of all time, but there is no reason for smugness or for complacency. It is up to each of us to recognize that although we are living in one world geographically we are living in two worlds economically, politically, and spiritually.

UNITED STATES VERSUS RUSSIA

We are contending with the Russian form of government not only for the governments of the world but for the minds of men. The Russians are a powerful nation, newly amalgamated by victory, a nation of over 70 races which has felt the flush of triumph and which stands at the threshold of realizing age-old imperial ambitions.

We are divided with Russia on almost every count, politically, economically, spiritually. We are contesting for the resources of the world, and yet I believe that we can achieve a basis of understanding and ccoperation with the Russians. We, however, here on this side, must "keep our powder dry." In the words of old, "eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty."

Defense, however, begins in every American home. It begins with a spiritual sense of the need for national unity, the need for peace on the home front, for cooperation.

SUMMARY

Mr. PARMER. Well then, Senator, summarizing your points, you have spoken of the need for political and business decentralization, for economic strengthening of the home front, and for spiritual mobilization.

Senator WILEY. Yes, Charlie, those are the points which I have made. I would like to have the suggestions of our citizens on them. Let our citizens write to me and to their own Representatives and Senators and to the White House. Let them think on these problems now and in the future. We remember the words in the Book of Books: "Without vision, the people perish," and if the blind lead the blind, they shall both fall in the ditch.

America will display the necessary vision, I am sure. The American people have their eyes wide open to the challenges which face them. I am sure they will be adequate to their responsibilities in the days up ahead.

Krug Disapproves Mining City Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal

on June 19, 1947, concerning a letter written by Hon. Julius Krug, Secretary of the Interior, to Hon. Tom Wallace, editor of the Louisville Times.

In the letter Mr. Krug opposes the building of a dam at Mining City on Green River in Kentucky, upon the ground that its construction and the consequent impounding of Green River would seriously damage Mammoth Cave.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KRUG DISAPPROVES MINING CITY DAM—CITES LOSS TO STATE AND NATION BY DAMAGE TO MAMMOTH CAVE

The proposed Green River Dam at Mining City would cause "a serious financial loss to Kentucky and a grave scientific and cultural loss to the Nation," Secretary of the Interior Julius Krug yesterday told Tom Wallace, editor of the Louisville Times.

The National Park Service and the Department of the Interior, Wallace quotes Krug as saying, are under a moral obligation and a congressional mandate to preserve the park.

Wallace last week wrote an article in the Times warning against the damage of a dam at Mining City. He is national president of the Izaak Walton League, and an appointee of former Secretary Harold Ickes to the National Park Service's advisory board on national parks.

WAR HALTED WORK

The proposed Mining City dam is one of a series of flood-control projects recommended in a special United States Engineering Department report drafted after the 1937 Ohio River flood. Initial congressional appropriations were used to construct dams in the upper Ohio Valley, but work on the series of reservoirs was suspended by World War II.

Officials of the Louisville office of the United States district engineers, said the Mining City project, with an estimated cost of $37,000,000, eventually would contain power-generating and soil-conservation features. Primary purpose of the reservoir, however, is to prevent floods on the Green and Ohio Rivers, they added. The Green is a tributary of the Ohio.

ONLY FUNDS ARE LACKING

Wallace released the following statement from Secretary Krug to him:

"As I understand the situation, so far as the Louisville district is concerned the Mining City proposal is the first-priority project for the Green River basin, and construction, in one form or another, awaits only the appropriation of funds. It appears further that whatever plan of operation is adopted, regardless of whether power generation is included, will cause longer, and at some river stages, higher floods in Mammoth Cave than if the dam were not built.

"Damage to the cave will follow periods when flood control is practised by retention of water above elevation 421.2 in Green River. Preliminary plans for the dam, however, provide for flood retention as high as elevation 450. Any retention above elevation 421.2 will interrupt trips in Mammoth Cave, not only during the period of that retention, but for a considerable time thereafter during which repairs must be made to bridges, boats, and trails in the cave, and while sludge and debris are being removed."

DISAGREES WITH CORPS

"I am told that the Corps of Engineers is entirely aware of the serious damage to Mammoth Cave that will follow the construction of any dam at Mining City. It appears to be the contention of the corps, however, that the economic loss from this effect will be slight in comparison to the downstream benefits from flood control. In this I am inclined to disagree.

"Mammoth Cave National Park is one of the Nation's most famous natural wonders, and is the outstanding tourist attraction in the State of Kentucky. It is intimately related to the large travel industry throughout Kentucky and southeastern United States. Moreover, its operation provides a substantial return to the Federal Treasury as well as to the State and county governments. To preserve its principal commodity, its tourist interest—a commodity that can be sold over and over again—it is essential that the unique scientific features of the cave be not subjected to extended, sporadic inundation which would not only be damaging to natural formation, but would also cause constant rumor and uncertainty as to its accessibility for visitors."

OPPOSES DAM STRUCTURE

"One cannot, of course, reduce to mere dollars and cents the value of such geological phenomena, or the pride shared in Mammoth Cave by Kentuckians and the Nation's citizens alike. However, I am convinced that the damage that would result from the continued flooding of Mammoth Cave would eventually prove to be a serious financial loss to Kentucky and a grave scientific and cultural loss to the Nation as a whole. This must be weighed against other economic benefits.

"The 50,000 acres, purchased at a cost of approximately $3,000,000, represents a gift, in the form of a national park, from the State of Kentucky to the people of the Nation. This department and the National Park Service are under a congressional mandate, as well as a moral obligation, to preserve such parks, 'the scenery and the natural and historic objects and wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.'

"I oppose any dam structure on Green River at Mining City, or any flood-control structure between that site and the upstream limits of Mammoth Cave National Park."

Federal Incentive Income Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tax proposal by Frank Wilbur Main:

A REVISED PROPOSAL FOR A FEDERAL INCENTIVE INCOME TAX PLAN

(Revised April 30, 1947, from the original proposal of April 1945 to conform with current economic problems)

(By Frank Wilbur Main)

(Frank Wilbur Main is senior partner of Main & Co., certified public accountants, with offices in New York, Houston, Harrisburg, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh. He is past president of the American Society of Certified Public Accountants, is past president of the Pennsylvania Institute of Certified Public Accountants, and is a member of the Council of the American Institute of Accountants.)

One of the Nation's greatest needs is an income-tax program offering incentive and encouragement to individuals and to industry.

Such a program of income taxation will have as its purposes:

1. Securing of adequate revenues for the conduct of the United States Government, with a balanced budget.
2. Substantial reduction of the national debt.
3. Maximum encouragement for the maintenance of the Nation's buying.
4. Stimulation of the highest possible level of employment.
5. Encouragement of investments, particularly in new and "risk-taking" opportunities.
6. Elimination of the inequity of double taxation on the returns from investments.
7. Maintenance of the current high level of national income upon an economically sound basis.
8. More spendable income in the hands of all people, thus definitely raising the standard of living.

It is sincerely believed that the incentive income tax plan will lead to the attainment of these objectives.

The explanatory remarks following merit careful consideration.

EXEMPTIONS AND DEDUCTIONS

This plan to be effective with the following deductions and exemptions:

1. All deductions for charitable contributions, interest payments and taxes, as well as all other allowable deductions, as at present.
2. Single person, $1,000.
3. Married couple, $2,000.
4. Each dependent, $500.
5. Corporation, $2,000.

Dividend income to be exempt from taxation on the stockholder.

All taxes on undistributed profits to be eliminated.

No change is proposed in the present law affecting all income taxpayers as to gains and losses from the sale or other disposition of capital assets, allowances for depreciation and depletion, or other allowable deductions.

INCENTIVE TAX RATES

The annual income of individuals and corporations to be taxed as follows:

From gross income received from wages, sale of goods, services rendered, etc., deductions and exemptions are taken, leaving a net taxable income of—	The tax will be—	Maximum tax
Not over $2,500	15 percent	$375.00
Over $2,500 but not over $5,000	$375.00 plus 17½ percent over $2,500	812.50
Over $5,000 but not over $7,500	$812.50 plus 20 percent over $5,000	1,312.50
Over $7,500 but not over $10,000	$1,312.50 plus 22½ percent over $7,500	1,875.00
Over $10,000 but not over $12,500	$1,875.00 plus 25 percent over $10,000	2,500.00
Over $12,500 but not over $15,000	$2,500.00 plus 27½ percent over $12,500	3,187.50
Over $15,000 but not over $17,500	$3,187.50 plus 30 percent over $15,000	3,937.50
Over $17,500 but not over $20,000	$3,937.50 plus 32½ percent over $17,500	4,750.00
Over $20,000 but not over $22,500	$4,750.00 plus 35 percent over $20,000	5,625.00
Over $22,500 but not over $25,000	$5,625.00 plus 37½ percent over $22,500	6,562.50
Over $25,000 but not over $30,000	$6,562.50 plus 40 percent over $25,000	8,562.50
Over $30,000 but not over $35,000	$8,562.50 plus 42½ percent over $30,000	10,687.50
Over $35,000 but not over $40,000	$10,687.50 plus 45 percent over $35,000	12,937.50
Over $40,000 but not over $50,000	$12,937.50 plus 47½ percent over $40,000	17,687.50

All net taxable income exceeding initial $50,000 to be taxed 50 percent.

ANTICIPATED YIELD AND OTHER REVENUES

From available authentic statistics of income and from estimates of tax yields published by the Government, it is apparent that the incentive-income-tax plan will yield in the calendar year 1947 at least $18,500,000,000—assuming income payments to individuals of $165,000,000,000, and $24,000,000,000 of corporate compiled net profits (after excluding dividends received by corporations, tax exempt interest, and special credit for life insurance companies). Assuming income payments to individuals of $175,000,000,000 and the consequent increase in corporate compiled net profits, the yield will be about $21,200,000,000.

Revenues from sources other than direct taxes on individuals and corporations for the fiscal year 1947 were estimated by President Truman in his January 1947 message to Congress in the net amount of $12,365,946,000. These revenues would not be affected by the incentive-income-tax plan. Therefore, the total of all taxes and other revenues will be at least $30,800,000,000 with income payments to individuals of $165,000,000,000; and $33,500,000,000 with income payments of $175,000,000,000, assuming corporate compiled net profits as stated.

For the calendar year 1947 it is estimated that under present law there will be 46,000,000 income taxpayers and that income payments to individuals will be approximately $165,000,000,000.

With income payments to individuals of approximately $165,000,000,000 it is estimated that under the incentive-income-tax plan there will be 27,000,000 income taxpayers.

HOW IT WORKS

(Net taxable income as used in these examples represents the net income after present allowable deductions are taken, and before the exemptions indicated)

Example No. 1

MARRIED COUPLE—WITHOUT DEPENDENTS

Net taxable income	Exemption	Balance	Tax rate	Incentive income tax [1]	Tax under Knutson bill [2]	Tax under present law	Tax under 1939 law
$1,500	$2,000	0		0	$66.50	$95.00	0
2,000	2,000	0		0	133.00	190.00	0
3,000	2,000	$1,000	15 percent	$150.00	304.00	380.00	$8.00
3,500	2,000	1,500	15 percent	225.00	387.60	484.50	26.00
5,000	2,000	3,000	$375 plus 17½ percent over $2,500	462.50	638.40	798.00	80.00
8,000	2,000	6,000	$812.50 plus 20 percent over $5,000	1,012.50	1,261.60	1,577.00	248.00
10,000	2,000	8,000	$1,312.50 plus 22½ percent over $7,500	1,425.00	1,748.00	2,185.00	415.00
15,000	2,000	13,000	$2,500 plus 27½ percent over $12,500	2,637.50	3,237.60	4,047.00	924.00

Example No. 2

SINGLE PERSON—WITHOUT DEPENDENTS

$1,000	$1,000	0		0	$66.50	$95.00	0
2,000	1,000	$1,000	15 percent	$150.00	228.00	285.00	$132.00
4,000	1,000	3,000	$375 plus 17½ percent over $2,500	462.50	554.80	693.50	304.00
8,000	1,000	7,000	$812.50 plus 20 percent over $5,000	1,212.50	1,375.60	1,719.50	78.00

Example No. 3

HUSBAND, WIFE, AND TWO DEPENDENTS

$3,000	$3,000	0		0	$133.00	$190.00	0
5,000	3,000	$2,000	15 percent	$300.00	471.20	589.00	$48.00
7,500	3,000	4,500	$375 plus 17½ percent over $2,500	725.00	934.80	1,168.50	146.00
10,000	3,000	7,000	$812.50 plus 20 percent over $5,000	1,212.50	1,489.60	1,862.00	343.00
20,000	3,000	17,000	$3,187.50 plus 30 percent over $15,000	3,787.50	4,712.00	5,890.00	1,469.00
25,000	3,000	22,000	$4,750 plus 35 percent over $20,000	5,450.00	6,817.20	8,521.50	2,327.00

Example No. 4

CORPORATIONS

$25,000	$2,000	$23,000		$5,812.50	No change under Knutson bill	$5,750.00	$3,525.00
50,000	2,000	48,000		16,737.50		19,000.00	9,500.00
100,000	2,000	98,000		41,687.50		38,000.00	19,000.00
500,000	2,000	498,000		241,687.50		190,000.00	95,000.00
1,000,000	2,000	998,000		491,687.50		380,000.00	190,000.00
2,500,000	2,000	2,498,000		1,241,687.50		950,000.00	475,000.00

[1] With stockholder relieved of taxation on dividends, savings under Incentive Income Tax Plan will be further increased by the amount of taxes now paid on dividends.
[2] Passed as H. R. 1, by House of Representatives, Mar. 27, 1947.

WHAT THE INCENTIVE INCOME TAX PLAN WILL ACCOMPLISH

1. Every individual taxpayer will have more spendable income.

2. Elimination of double taxation on dividends will encourage a free flow of investment funds and thus a continuation of prosperity.

3. Income after taxes will provide reserves for anticipated or unexpected contingencies.

4. Easing of tax burden—particularly on low income groups.

5. Equal taxes on equal net taxable incomes will be paid by individuals and corporations.

6. Since penalty taxes on undistributed corporate profit will be eliminated, surplus funds may be retained for basic needs.

7. Tax revenues will remain relatively constant irrespective of salaries paid corporation officers holding stock; the higher the salary, the more the individual will be taxed—and the less the corporation will be taxed.

8. Congress can, if it desires, when making fiscal year appropriations, adjust the incentive income-tax rates so that adequate funds can be secured. Such change would entail no particular complications.

9. Taxpayers will save time and effort in preparing returns. Government audit will likewise be simplified.

10. The incentive and encouragement of this simplified tax structure will stimulate prosperity.

CORPORATE TAXATION

Under the incentive income-tax plan, corporations will pay a tax of 50 percent on all net taxable income exceeding $50,000. The ceiling of corporation taxes under the present law is 38 percent.

A large number of corporations will not have sufficient earnings to reach the 50-percent bracket.

For many corporations, this plan will eliminate vexatious questions as to officers' salaries and undistributed profits.

Elimination of double taxation of dividends will mean that most stockholders will receive a larger net return from their corporate investments than they now receive.

Elimination of double taxation of dividends will encourage corporate managements to substitute capital stock for bonds and other forms of indebtedness, with their heavy fixed charges which slow down commercial expansion, stagnate business, hasten and deepen depression.

If, as expected, the incentive income-tax plan aids in the expansion of the national economy and national income, all corporations will benefit from the enlargement and enrichment of their markets. A 50-percent maximum tax on an enlarged income will be less burdensome than a 38-percent maximum tax on shrunken earnings.

This proposal does not mention the status of tax-free municipal and State bonds, taxation of cooperatives, capital gains and losses, and other related subjects in the income-tax structure. Consideration has purposely been omitted, since they are beyond the scope of this proposal.

The pay-roll deduction pay-as-you-go principle is as adaptable to the incentive income-tax plan as to any other income-tax program.

Race Relations in North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, a few days ago I had inserted in the RECORD the account of a heroic act on the part of a white boy in Raleigh, N. C., who lost his life by drowning in a lake, in an unsuccessful attempt to save the life of his Negro companion. Another equally heroic act occurred last week in my own home town of Shelby, N. C., when a Negro maid daringly risked her life in a successful effort to save the life of the child in her care from drowning.

These two incidents more nearly portray the real life of the people of both races as they live side by side in North Carolina, than the race crime stories given such sensational play when they happen to occur south of the Mason and Dixon Line. There is no such race sensitivity in that State as we find manifest where the race agitators have full play. The story to which I refer was written by Mrs. Erma Drum, the accomplished columnist on the Shelby Daily Star, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hello! I'm back again—and this time with a wonderful story of devotion and courage that will warm your heart, and make you glad you know the people it concerns.

It happened last Friday morning at the home of Bill and Hanson Lineberger on East Suttle Street, and the principals in the story are their little son, Billy, Jr., 2, and their colored maid, Sally Black.

Bill and Hanson are installing a heating system in their home and have had a huge hole dug in the backyard in which they plan to sink their oil tank. The hole is approximately 7 feet deep, 4 feet wide, and 12 feet long, and after last Thursday afternoon's heavy rainstorm it was left about half full of water. As a result, on Friday morning the Linebergers had what was practically the equivalent of a young swimming pool in their backyard.

Sally, the maid, went into the backyard to hang out some clothes, taking Billy with her to ride his tricycle while she worked. One moment he was there in the yard with her, then she turned her back to hang a piece of clothing on the line, heard a splash, and when she turned both he and the tricycle had disappeared.

Sally ran to the edge of the yawning hole and could see only the child's little feet sticking out of the water. He had landed head first and both he and the tricycle were submerged, with the exception of his feet.

The depth of the hole was much over Sally's head. She didn't know how deep the water was in it, and she couldn't swim. However, she doesn't remember thinking of any of those things. Without any thought of the danger to herself, she just jumped in and rescued Billy, saving him from drowning. She doesn't remember exactly how she got into the hole or how she got herself and Billy back out—a feat which, you must admit, took quite a bit of doing.

Once out of the hole she held Billy up by his heels and shook the water out of him. Then she determined that he was still alive and breathing, and hurried into the house to get both the child and herself out of their soaking wet clothes and warm and dry again.

When Hanson, who had been away during the morning teaching in Bible school, returned home about 11 o'clock, the excitement was over and both Billy and Sally were safe and serene again.

Hanson and Bill were already fond of Sally because she is an excellent maid. Now they are doubly attached to her because they know they owe their child's life to her, and they'll be forever grateful to her for what she did for them.

Congress and Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me on the subject of Congress and labor legislation, broadcast from station WOL in Washington June 28, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate the honor of being invited by one of America's greatest progressives, Mr. LaGuardia, to talk to you on this broadcast about the Congress and labor legislation.

It was only a week ago today that I was engaged in a filibuster to prevent the Taft-Ives-Hartley bill from coming to a vote before Monday at 3 p. m. I knew that severe criticism would be heaped upon those of us who made that fight because few people would stop to find out the principle we were defending in that filibuster. We did not seek, as in the ordinary filibuster, to prevent a bill from ever coming to a vote. Rather we sought to resist the steam-roller tactics of a majority in the Senate which, on this occasion, showed no consideration whatsoever for the rights of a minority under the Senate rules. They sought to have us, under the unanimous-consent rule of the Senate, agree to vote on the President's veto message last Saturday at 5 p. m. before either the Members of the Senate or the people of this country had a chance over the week end to study the veto message and make doubly sure that they wanted the law passed. We urged out of consideration to the President, to Members of the Senate who were absent last week end, to those of us who wanted time to consider and debate the veto message and to the American people who, we thought, were entitled to the week end in order to make their views under our representative form of government known to Congress, to postpone the final vote from Saturday to Monday. What fair-minded person can really say that our request was unreasonable? Yet the Republican leadership of the Senate, in violation of the spirit and intent of the unanimous-consent rule, told us, in effect, if we didn't lie down and let their political steam roller pass over us by accepting their demand that we vote Saturday at 5 o'clock they would force us into a filibuster. I thoroughly disapprove of filibusters but I also disapprove of the destruction of minority rights by a tyrannical majority such as was attempted by the majority in the Senate last week end.

The responsibility for that filibuster rests squarely on the shoulders of those leaders of the majority who took the position that unless we agreed to their unanimous-consent request to vote Saturday at 5 o'clock, rather than on Monday at 3, we had better start talking. Their tactics were no better than, nor different from, those labor bosses who say to an employer without any collective bargaining at all, "Accept this agreement or else." Well, we didn't accept the coercive tactics of the majority in the Senate of the United States and, even though we didn't like to do it, we did start talking and before we finished, the majority accepted the very agreement to vote on Monday at 3 o'clock which I offered to them before the filibuster ever started. We gave them the licking they deserved. We protected minority rights under the unanimous-consent rule and I think also, judging from my mail, that we gave the public a much better understanding of the injustices of the Taft-Ives-Hartley bill than it had before. As I said in that filibuster, I don't approve of filibusters and I shall continue to work for a change in the Senate rules that will prevent filibusters and also for a change in the Senate rules that will prevent the majority from forcing a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate upon the merits of an issue when a minority in good faith wants the debate to continue for a reasonable time.

When I think of that great piece of labor legislation, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, written into the law such a short time ago as March 23, 1932, by those two great liberals and friends of the legitimate rights of labor, George Norris and Mr. LaGuardia; when I think of the needed protection from union-busting practices of antilabor employers given to the workers of this country by that great friend of human rights, Senator BOB WAGNER; and, then, when I think of the unjust, unworkable, antilabor provisions of the Taft-Ives-Hartley law, I wonder if it is right to say that "time marches on." I guess it is. But the very adoption of the Taft-Ives-Hartley bill is proof that the mere passage of time does not necessarily bring progress or assure the strengthening of our freedoms.

The passage of the Taft-Ives-Hartley bill shows that we are in the trough of another wave of reaction in America. Through this full-employment bill for America's lawyers, the pattern has been laid for much legal conflict between workers and employers. Cause has been established for greater suspicion and distrust of employers on the part of workers than has existed in this country for many years. Seeds of a class-conscious economic war have been sown and the labor issue is bound to become one of the major issues of the 1948 campaign. Its political significance cannot be and should not be ignored in our democracy in which the right to vote is the most precious freedom we have because all of our other liberties depend upon how wisely we exercise the franchise.

Some labor legislation is needed in the interest of the public as well as in the best interest of workers and employers alike. Secondary boycotts, jurisdictional disputes, breaches of contract, "a sign here or else" attitude on the part of some labor leaders, and similar unfair labor practices by unions are all abuses which should be checked by fair and workable legislation. I proposed and worked for such legislation in Congress and I believe that the bill which we reported out of the Senate committee was a bill which all progressives could and should have supported.

But then the forces of reaction took control of Congress. Unsound and crippling amendments were added to the legislation on the floor of the Senate. And then when the bill went to the conference committee one emasculating procedural change after another, some 30 of them, were added to the bill, with the result that these so-called sleeper amendments have changed the Taft-

Ives-Hartley bill into a hypodermic needle to be injected into any union which seeks to awaken the workers of this country to an understanding of their legitimate rights.

The most disappointing thing about the congressional action on the Taft-Ives-Hartley bill is that so many of the men who fought for it admitted, on and off the floor of the Senate, that it has many unsound provisions in it which are going to have to be changed, but that they were voting for it because they thought it was the best compromise that could be worked out in this session of Congress. Then, too, they argued there was a great public demand for the bill. Don't be fooled by such alibis. Both of them should have been rejected, particularly by alleged progressives whose names are to be found on the roll call of those who have shackled our economy with this unworkable, trouble-making piece of legislation.

No Member of Congress has any right to vote for a piece of legislation which is so imperfect that he knows in advance of voting for it that it must be changed before it can work in fairness to all concerned.

What are some of the act's imperfections? One of the most serious is the damage which the law does to the Norris-LaGuardia Act. It throws into question once again the whole issue of labor injunctions. Almost all of the experts and authorities in the field of labor relations admit that any attempt to return to the old evils of government by injunction in the handling of labor disputes is a backward step away from the goal of friendly and cooperative employer-employee relations.

Its definition of employer-agent will make it possible for antilabor employers to return to the system of labor spies, strong-arm methods, and company stooges which made up part of the union-busting techniques used by antilabor employers before the Wagner Act, and which techniques were so clearly disclosed by the La Follette investigation conducted a few years ago.

The many grounds for litigation provided for in the act will make it possible for any employer to keep a union treasury bankrupt. The litigation procedure itself is cleverly devised in the act as an instrument for delay and delay and more delay. The employers know full well that from the standpoint of the workers time is of the essence in the settlement of a labor dispute. Union leaders in the ordinary cases simply cannot hold the confidence of their men if they cannot succeed in settling a dispute quickly and without great cost of litigation.

This act will provide a field day for lawyers but little justice for workers. It lays down many procedural and legalistically technical red-tape requirements which unions must comply with before they can even petition the National Labor Relations Board for a certification election.

We Republicans have been talking about taking the Government out of bureaucratic control of the economy. But I say, without fear of successful contradiction, that the Taft-Ives-Hartley Act contains more bureaucratic red tape in it and more Government interference with the economic life of our citizens than any other law on the statutes. I venture to guess that when those employers in the country who recognize that the prosperity of all of us is dependent upon cooperative relationships between workers and employers they will throw up their hands in despair and wish that they had never heard of the Taft-Ives-Hartley Act. True those employers who want to destroy unions in their particular businesses may get some satisfaction out of the Taft-Ives-Hartley Act, but their vindictive satisfaction will be short-lived. Once justice-loving Americans come to realize that the propaganda campaign which sold them this bill through the aid of their politicians succeeded only in selling them an unworkable legal monstrosity they will demand either its repeal or drastic revision.

It is the minority labor-hating employers of America who will attempt to make use of the union-busting procedures of the Taft-Ives-Hartley Act. It is such men who have urged the inclusion in this act of special rules of procedure and evidence to be applied only to the National Labor Relations Board as an exception to the uniform Administrative Law Procedure Act passed by the last Congress, rules which do not apply to the railroads under the Interstate Commerce Commission or to industry generally under the Federal Trade Commission or to the radio industry under its Commission.

That is the trouble with the Taft-Ives-Hartley Act. It is unfair class legislation. The voter in this country who has been criticizing so severely those of us who have fought this bill just have not taken the time to study and see through the unfair and cleverly devised legal procedures which have been slipped into this act in order to accomplish the damage to the legitimate rights of the workers of this country which will flow from the act.

Take, for example, the special rule of the act which says to the States that the national labor policy regarding interstate commerce may be entirely disregarded and superseded by the States if they desire to impose some restrictive labor policy on the same subject matter. The proponents of the bill in the debate called this a minor change. A more pointed instance of antilabor bias could hardly be found. The Congress cannot justify delegating in any respect to the State its constitutional authority over interstate commerce in a manner which is bound to produce a great lack of uniformity of labor policy in this country. That lack of uniformity itself will cause strikes. It will cause something else. It will cause unfair competitive advantages developing in those States which for a time may be able to beat down labor by way of vicious antilabor State legislation and give to employers in those States the competitive advantage of cheap and exploited labor.

Some of my friends in the Senate, particularly in the industrial States in the North and the East, should be called upon to chew that one over when explaining their votes. It cannot be reconciled with that sound principle that as to Federal jurisdiction there should be but one law with the application of equal justice to all.

Thus one can go through the Taft-Ives-Hartley law and find one unfair provision after another in it. Although I am just as critical of the Taft-Ives-Hartley law now as I was before it was passed, I want to make clear that, in my opinion, everyone in this country—labor, employer, farmer, politician, and consumer—generally should recognize that it is now the law of the land. We cannot condone violations of it. Criticisms of it, yes, should continue, because only through critical discussions of it and a continuous pointing out of its injustices and its failures can we, under our democratic system, change it. However, it is one thing to criticize the bill and work for modifications or repeal of it, but it is quite another thing to fail to enforce it, or to fail to abide by it as long as it is the law, or to fail to try to administer it efficiently and effectively. Hence I want to say to those who both approve and disapprove of the law, we owe it to our system of self-government to stand united in support of the proposition that this law should be enforced.

As I said on the floor of the Senate day before yesterday. "We cannot have government by law in this country unless we take the position that the laws shall be enforced." Those of us who disapprove of the Taft-Ives-Hartley law can best show up its weaknesses by insisting upon its strict enforcement. Those who approve of the law can best learn for themselves that such a law is administratively unworkable and unjust, also by insisting upon strict enforcement.

How Can We Strengthen the American Family?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne, of Huntington, W. Va., on the subject How Can We Strengthen the American Family? The letter was written by Mrs. Payne in a contest conducted by America's Town Meeting of the Air, and for her splendid letter she was awarded a certificate of merit in the Town Hall's Nation-wide letter-writing contest.

I may say that Mrs. Payne was one of 62 winners in the Nation out of a total of 6,219 who participated in this contest from every State in the Union. Mrs. Payne is an outstanding citizen of the State of West Virginia. The certificate of merit awarded her is in keeping with her fine service as a leader in the civil life of our State. I want to extend to her my personal congratulations upon this award. Her achievement is a credit to the State, and the letter she has written is filled with wisdom and inspiration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In trying to strengthen the American family we must glance, in retrospect, at the obvious and persistent factors which have tended to weaken it. The modern age has produced—through propaganda and moral laxity—a national phobia of challenging everything, everywhere, which in the past was accepted as fundamental and sound. The attacks have touched the home, the school, and the church with deadening effect. From the beginning of time mankind has been helped onward and upward only when he believed in something and I submit that we cannot strengthen the American family unless, and until the home, the school, and the church unite in teaching and practicing respect for, faith in and allegiance to the American concept of living which, being interpreted, means freedom for spiritual, material, and individual growth under the guidance and protection of the family unit.

Against this background of gratitude for our American heritage we can logically consider a few simple—though profound—solutions to the problem in question. Obviously, the prerequisite for a stable, happy family is the concept of marriage held by the contracting parties at the altar. They must believe in the institution of marriage—its sacredness and its function as the strength and bulwark of the individual, the community and the Nation. When they so believe, the strains and stress on the marriage vow, from whatever source, only serve to rally them to its defense.

Rearing a family is really our greatest business and should be considered as such. I realize the romantic connotation is lacking here, but it will glow with radiant brilliance if we have the courage to face the facts. The family should have a working acquaintance with domestic psychology, economics, salesmanship, and the patience of Job. The latter because in the course of human events families sometimes boil over, individually and collectively. Why should

the same temperaments, irregularities, and idiosyncrasies which we meet and master in our business and social contacts completely floor us when we meet them in the family relationship? Because we do not employ the same courtesy, respect for others' opinion and rational solutions which we must employ to make the business and social relations successful.

A personal experience which has proven successful might be helpful. As our three children grew older and the school and community interests demanded more and more of their time outside the home, I realized they would soon be engulfed in the activities of a society which is overorganized to the point of physical and mental exhaustion, and that we must continue (with greater thought and devotion) the family-at-home evening, which we had followed for many years. This is not a plug; my friends will verify it. Each Thursday evening the family is in. We have dinner, group singing, discussion of current events, games, "town meeting," and refreshments. Rarely do we accept invitations on this night, because by mutual consent we are working on a great project—the preservation of the American family. We love it. It's fun.

This simple formula has succeeded because it provides a togetherness with enough varied stimuli and mutual interest to develop group understanding, affection, and family life.

We need to get back to the simple verities of living. The greatest progress the prodigal son ever made was when he decided to go back to his father, and there is a lesson here for all Americans. Material things change with passing time, but the test of character is that we recognize the spiritual values which "made and kept us a nation" and live accordingly.

Summarizing: The elixir of life needed to strengthen the American family is simply this: Let this generation of adult Americans—both parents and teachers—by precept and example—

First. Teach children to believe in God and the American concept of freedom and living.

Second. Teach them to believe in the institution of marriage as sacred—the strength and bulwark of the individual and the Nation.

Third. Practice the common courtesies with relatives and let the finesse used in business become the adjudicator when "waters are troubled" in the family.

Fourth. Provide regular, meaningful, happy home situations for the entire family.

There are many excuses and a few reasons for the disintegration of the American family, but by and large we can conquer them successfully if we challenge every attack on the home and family with common sense, courage, confidence, and consideration, knowing, as we ought to know, that "it is our God who worketh with us."

Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne.

Huntington, W. Va.

The Hall of Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commencement-day address entitled "The Hall of Heroes," delivered at Upsala College, East Orange, N. J., on June 7, 1947, by Dr. Frank Glenn Lankard, dean of Brothers College, Drew University, Madison, N. J.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the volume, Christ and the Fine Arts, by Cynthia Pearl Maus, there is a story by an author who prefers to remain unknown that goes like this:

"Suddenly I found myself standing before a great building. There was a wide entrance, approached by a long flight of broad steps, at the top of which in the shadow of a great doorway stood a man. When I went up to him and asked, 'Will you please tell me what this building is?' he answered very graciously:

" 'This is the Hall of Heroes. Would you like to see through it?'

" 'Thank you very much,' I said and followed him in.

"When we entered I found myself in the center of a magnificent hall, around the inside of which ran marble staircases leading to the different floors. All was silent, and when my guide spoke to me, his voice was echoed along the high walls and balconies like the soft deep notes of a cathedral organ. 'Here we enshrine,' said he, 'the memories of all heroes from the least unto the greatest. Let us go in.'

"Turning, I saw opposite me an open door; and over the door was written, 'Heroes of Battle.' I think that you would be able to tell the names of a great many whom I saw there as I walked slowly down the long aisles of that great chamber. Men who had fought and won great victories, men whose defeat had been glorious because they had all their wounds in front. Leonidas, who fell at Thermopylae; Horatius, who kept the bridge; Nelson, with his armless sleeve; and Gordon, without a weapon. There, I saw, too, heroes of the World War, many of whom I had known, and I was overwhelmed with a feeling of sadness as I thought of the sacrifice of so many young lives lost in battle. I saw that the face of my guide was shadowed with sorrow, too, as we came to the end of the room and passed out into the great hall.

" 'Let us go to the next floor,' he said. 'Some day the nations of the world will learn to love each other and then "Men will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks, and nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.'

" 'I wish that were true today,' he said.

" 'It will surely be true some day,' he answered. 'And you can help to bring it to pass if you will.'

" 'I will do all that I can,' I promised, and my guide's face brightened as he turned to me and smiled.

"When we reached the landing at the top of the stairs, I saw before me a door over which was inscribed 'Heroes of the Lonely Way.' Here were the pioneers—men who had cut their way through the jungles of dark continents, who had scaled unconquered mountains, crossed waterless deserts, discovered the source of rivers, sailed over unknown oceans, and pushed their way along the very rim of the earth. I felt ashamed that I knew so few out of that brave multitude; but I knew Columbus and a few others, and my guide stopped me every now and then, and told me stories of deeds of courage and faith and endurance which have done more for the world than all the conquests of the sword.

"As we ascended the second flight of steps my guide pointed to an open door before us, over which was written 'Heroes of Truth.' Then he spoke as I had never heard man speak before of the glory and beauty of truth, of the conflict that is waging between truth and error, and of the certainty that truth will triumph in the end. With my heart aflame at his words I entered the room and saw the hosts who had stood bravely for the truth in places where error was powerful and had many followers. Socrates was there, with the cup of hemlock in his hand; and Luther was there, who defied the Pope as he nailed his thesis to the door; and all the noble army of martyrs was there, from Stephen to Margaret Wilson, who was tied to the stake in Solway Firth and drowned by the rising tide because she refused to deny what she believed to be true.

"I could have stayed a long time in that glorious chamber, but my guide led me on, and we came to the last staircase of all. It was broader than all the others, and was made of something which hushed every footstep into silence. On the steps were written the words 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.' Over the door which opened for us into this gallery was inscribed 'Heroes of Love.' My guide did not enter this room in front of me as he had done each time before, but, standing at one side, motioned with his hand that I should pass in.

"I found that this room was the great dome crowning the building which I had seen from the outside; but it was bigger and higher than I could ever have thought. At first I imagined it was empty, but it was the marvelous light that blinded my eyes. Then, in the very center, I saw a cross, with a man crucified upon it. A moan escaped from my lips. 'Jesus!' I whispered half to myself. As I grew accustomed to the light I found that the room was not empty; indeed, it was the fullest of all; for the walls seemed to stretch away in the distance, and the dome seemed to rise into mist, and all the mighty space was filled. Slowly I began to distinguish faces: I saw David Livingstone, who gave his life for the people of Africa; I saw James Chalmers, who gave his life for the savages of New Guinea; I began to see quite plainly the multitude that cannot be numbered of the heroes of the cross. Then I caught the sound of music. It came up from the bottom of the huge building, as if every kind of hero, from the least to the greatest, was joining in one mighty chorus. It filled the room in which I stood. I heard the words at last, 'Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might, be unto our God forever and ever. Amen.'

"I felt I could endure it no longer. I turned and left the room, and ran down the staircase with the music ringing in my ears and a great throbbing in my heart. In the hall at the foot of the staircase my guide was waiting for me. He walked with me to the great entrance, and said in the kindliest voice, 'You will be here some day?' "[1]

I dare say any one of us may find a place in the Hall of Heroes if we should come to possess certain qualities and develop certain habits of mind and heart. What are some of these qualities?

I

A lecturer of international reputation once appeared before an audience of young people and threw them back on their heels with this question: "What have you ever done for the world to justify your necks not be wrung in the next 5 minutes?" Most of these young people had little or no defense.

Some young folk act as if the world will give them something for nothing. I know a young lady whose father has given her $200 on each birthday anniversary and on Christmas Day from the time she was a baby. She is now 26 years of age. Such parental handouts can make it very easy for some undisciplined young people to get the idea that life is a gigantic Santa Claus. I beg of you not to believe that slogans, or cleverness, or even a college education will give you something for nothing.

[1] From Christ and the Fine Arts, Maus, pp. 641–643. Published by Harper & Bros., New York 16, N. Y. Used by special permission.

Do you aspire to become a writer? You will need, then, to prepare yourself in the most exacting way for the task. Do you aspire to achieve power in oral expression and become an accomplished public speaker? You might recall that Cicero shaved his head and forced himself into seclusion until he had mastered the art of oratory. And don't forget that Demosthenes, the greatest orator of the ancient world, stammered in his youth and had a weak voice. Demosthenes, with indomitable courage, according to tradition, spoke with pebbles in his mouth until the stammering disappeared, and practiced hour after hour before the pounding waves of the sea to make his voice strong.

There may be parental hand-outs in external things, but in the things of the mind and the spirit we never get something for nothing. We have been passing through a very dangerous and troubled period in our national life and we have tried strange social and economic experiments. Perhaps it is not too early to issue a call for the return to the good old-fashioned American doctrine of hard work.

II

Have you a right to expect to start in life where your parents are now? If your father drives a Packard or a Cadillac, do you have a right to expect to start with one, too? The chances are that he didn't. Some people are fond of telling the story, or variations of it, of the young chap just out of college who, when applying for his first position, inquired, "Is there a vice presidency open?" There is something laudatory about this attitude but there is a very real danger in it. In a city where I once lived, two young people got married and went to Europe on their honeymoon. While the young couple were away, their doting parents decided to surprise them by purchasing for them a beautiful home and furnishing it with all of the latest appointments. These young people were soon so bored with life that life itself was a burden. What was the trouble? It was certainly not that they had nothing to eat, or to wear, or a place to lay their heads. On the contrary, they had too much. They had so many things that they were sated—they were fed up. By their parents and their own false sense of values, these two young people had been robbed of all anticipation and the joy of realization.

It is fun to dream and plan for the future. When things come too easy there is no struggle, no planning, no anticipation, no delayed but happy realization; and life goes sour. Recently, a young chap in Miami, Fla., lost his job. He had been making a lot of money. It was a bad bump. "It's an awfully bad set-back," he said. Perhaps it was not nearly so bad as he thought. And, it was well that it happened while he was young. There are few things in life more dangerous than succeeding too fast. There are more people than we realize who are living disappointed lives for this very reason. Witness the young man who achieved an officer's rank in his country's service and who must reconcile himself to living his life as a clerk or in some other non-managerial work.

It is well to remember that your parents have been all of their lives climbing to the place where they now are and they have had all of the fun and anticipation of its accomplishment. Do not expect to start where they are now. Life just isn't built this way. And don't want it this way, for you would lose all of the thrill that comes from climbing and achieving.

III

If you would have a place in the hall of heroes, you will need some fundamental convictions by which to order your lives.

When you step into a department store and consider a dozen articles of purchase, you are aware that each article has a definite price. What determines the price? Quality, cost of production, transportation, all enter into the determination of price.

We behave in certain ways. Why? Our behavior is determined in part by custom, habit, and, to a certain degree, also by our convictions or our sense of values. We say, for example:

Honor is better than dishonor.

Honesty is better than deceit.

Happiness is better than gloom.

Chastity is better than promiscuity.

Fair play is better than poor sportsmanship.

Justice is better than injustice.

Why are the things in column left better than the things in column right? One further consideration: Will the things which we count most valuable today change altogether in the next decade? What is it that gives stability to some things so that they remain in column left century after century? It is at this very point that some fundamental convictions come into play. There are those of us who are convinced that honesty, honor, happiness, chastity, fair play, and justice remain as great stabilities century after century because they are reinforced by a universe that is structurally built this way. These qualities, we are convinced, are as much builded into the framework or structure of our universe as supports and girders are builded into a skyscraper. We are talking about nothing less than the fundamental characteristics and the ultimate behavior of the universe in which we live. We either take the position that our universe is erratic, mechanistic, and unintelligent or that it is reasonable, dependable, and friendly.

Like it or not, you have to come to terms with these fundamental convictions in life and make some commitments of your own, if you're not to be a copycat. If you choose to have any independence at all, you are forced to live your life by certain choices. You will line up, sooner or later, by choice or habit, with column left or column right and these convictions are your price-tag. They constitute your sense of values and determine what you stand for.

IV

Please allow me to set before you a modern trinity. This modern trinity consists of faith, courage, and grit.

Some people who pride themselves upon being very practical sometimes do very foolish things. They contend that they will move forward only as the facts dictate; that is, when knowledge stops, they stop. But is this really good sense? If Columbus had acted on this theory he would be sitting on the deck of the Santa Maria in Genoa's harbor yet; and if, in turn, everybody else had been equally hard-headed and practical, the Indians would still be chasing the deer and the antelope over the open spaces, and hunting buffalo on the Great Plains.

The men and women who get there first, open up new horizons, and push back the curtains of ignorance are those who have faith. For faith, in the final analysis, is a willingness to venture forth on a reasonable hypothesis. Some young people want to become lawyers, doctors, or ministers. They can have no absolute assurance guaranteed in advance that they will be successful in these careers. They can only appraise their assets, submit themselves to the rigorous training required, and then have faith that they will succeed in their chosen professions.

Some of us are not altogether satisfied with our world. It is not exactly a good world by any standard. There is still too much poverty. Wars occur all too frequently. There are too many pressure groups. Famines occur all too often. Management and labor are still too far apart. Nationalism is much too arrogant and irresponsible. But is a better world impossible? It is not impossible to men and women of faith. The future always holds something for the man who keeps faith in it.

You will need courage, too. Only 20 years after the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock a man had pushed through the dangers and wilds of New England and had climbed to the summit of Mount Washington. This kind of courage became so characteristic of early Americans that the courage of the pioneer became proverbial.

But there is also another kind of courage. We have had in our college four desperately handicapped students. One was totally blind, but in spite of this handicap he made almost a straight "A" average. I recall that one day a group of students were standing in the foyer of the college building and bemoaning the terrible state of the weather. After awhile the blind student spoke up and said, "Oh, this isn't bad." Everyone seemed suddenly to feel ashamed and there were no more gripes against nature.

When a soldier deliberately draws fire to himself (as many of them did) so that the enemy location might become known and his buddies saved, courage has not perished from the earth. But we shall need a lot of courage of another kind. We shall need to have the courage to try again and again in the face of the most discouraging disappointments. We shall need to take up where local and international conferences have failed just because we are convinced that we must master the technique of living together in a family of nations.

Perhaps even more than courage we shall need grit. When we were children we were delighted by the fable of the tortoise and the fleet but fickle hare. Many people make a fast start, then falter and fizzle out. It takes perseverance to run life's race under the most trying circumstances and finally win. Have you come upon a dream or an ideal that for the moment means everything to you? Cultivate, then, the virtue of persistency until you become like the prophet as described by Horace Traubel: "He said: 'I see.' And they said: 'He's crazy; crucify him.' He still said: 'I see.' And they said: 'He's an extremist.' And they tolerated him. And he continued to say: 'I see.' And they said: 'He's eccentric.' And they rather liked him but smiled at him. And he stubbornly said again: 'I see.' And they said: 'There's something in what he says.' And they gave him half an ear. But he said as if he'd never said it befcre: 'I see.' And at last they were awake."

Many a man has won in life just because he would not accept defeat, in other words, by sheer grit. He lost his job but he secured another. He lost his money but he earned it back again. His friends lost faith in him but he won new friends. He lost his health but by careful living regained it. He didn't have a formal education but he pulled himself up by his own boot straps. When storm clouds gathered he always managed, somehow, to see the silver lining. He just kept on keeping on.

V

I suggest that you have an obsession. Yes; I am aware that obsessions are usually dangerous. Obsessions are akin to fixations and the psychologists tell us to beware of them. There are, however, some obsessions that are so glorious that, when they become a habit of life, they take on the proportions of magnificence. Some years ago Lloyd C. Douglas wrote a book in which his principal character made a thrilling discovery. When someone did him a favor or ministered to a special need with money, kindness, friendliness, or encouragement, he was quick to repay it. But instead of returning the favor to the one who had helped him, he passed it on to someone who really needed it. This experience was so amazingly gratifying and so compelling that it was called

the magnificent obsession, and gave the book its title.

And so I suggest that you have an obsession, but let it be a noble one. Any one of us can have a magnificent obsession. There are in our city a very kindly man and his wife who get great satisfaction from seeking out poor but deserving boys and girls and making it possible for them to have voice lessons or other educational advantages which otherwise they could never have. It is really great fun to send a kid to camp who otherwise would be forced to play in crowded and dangerous streets and spend all of his summer nights within stifling walls.

Develop an obsession but make sure it is a magnificent obsession.

VI

Be quick to give encouragement.

Recently I was driving through Morristown, N. J., where they train the seeing-eye dogs. I saw a man come up to the curb with his dog. He was perhaps 45 or 50 years of age. "Pathetic!" you say. We agree. But, in the next block there was a young man in the uniform of the United States Army being led by another faithful dog. Here was a young man standing on the threshold of life. He will need a lot of encouragement before he is through with life.

Almost anyone of us can give encouragement, and no one can begin to tell what astonishing results it may achieve. Let me illustrate what I mean. It was a beautiful afternoon in the autumn season and thousands of people had gathered in a great stadium to witness athletic games and races. The chief event of the afternoon was the 5-mile race. Eight splendid-looking young Americans came up to the starting line amid the plaudits of the crowd and, at the sound of the gun, were off on the long, grueling race. For a time they kept well together, but after several laps one of the runners began falling behind. At first no one paid any attention to him until he seemed to be well nigh out of the race. Occasionally a thoughtless person in the crowd would taunt him and call out, "You might as well drop out and give the cinder track a rest!" This taunting mood was contagious and soon there were many people laughing at him and calling out witty expressions at his expense. It was clearly evident that he was thoroughly discouraged and was rapidly falling behind. At the moment when he appeared to be hopelessly defeated, a man in the grandstand said, "It is poor sportsmanship to treat the poor fellow in this manner. He needs encouragement and I propose that we try an experiment." The next time the tired and discouraged runner came in front of the grandstand our kindly gentleman clapped his hands in applause. The runner was startled and looked up as if surprised that anyone should be interested in him. The next time, our friend was joined by several others who added their encouragement. What effect, if any, did it have on the discouraged runner? He reacted as if he were suddenly connected with a dynamo. A new courage flamed up in his breast, and renewed strength went coursing through his tired limbs as he overtook and passed one after another of his fellow contestants. Ten thousand people now were standing and cheering as the runner sped forward. And, with a phenomenal burst of speed that only moments before seemed utterly impossible, the once discouraged runner threw himself forward and finished second in the race. No one needs to point out the moral of this story; but the fact remains that without encouragement he would have been hopelessly beaten in the race.

Some of us are handicapped by physical infirmities. Some of us have bad health. Others of us have poor heredity. All of us are in need of a cheering word now and then. Giving appreciation and encouragement are not only great fun but the results are truly amazing.

VII

The law of life is give and live. It would be quite possible to respond to the multiplicity of financial appeals and finally land in the "poor house." But there is another kind of giving. It is the giving of oneself. This kind of giving is like a lighted candle. It retains its own light while giving a light to thousands of other candles.

In Palestine there are two seas. They are both fed by the Jordan River that gathers its headwaters from the rugged mountains of Lebanon and the snows of majestic Mount Hermon. The Jordan, which is known to the natives as "the descender" because of the rapidity of its fall, pours its sparkling waters into the beautiful Sea of Galilee. There are numerous little villages that dot its shores. Trees grow on the banks and birds find welcome there. The waters of the sea are teeming with fish and a familiar sight is the fisherman toiling with his nets. The Sea of Galilee is a sea of life and beauty. The Jordan flows on in its tortuous path, weaving and bending, but keeping a southerly course until it ends in the Dead Sea. The sea is well named for it is a sea of death. There are no villages dotting its shores. Trees have not attempted to grow in the saline soil. There are no fish living in its waters. Birds have no place for their natural habitation. A steaming wave of heat rises constantly from its surface. It is, in reality, a dead sea.

What is it that makes these two seas so unlike one another that one is teeming with life while the other is heavy with death? It is the same river and the same water that flows into both seas. What makes the difference? The Dead Sea receives and holds and dies. The Sea of Galilee receives and gives and lives. It is a parable of life. The law of life is give and live.

May I urge, in closing: Do not expect something for nothing. Do not expect to start where your parents are now. Hold onto some fundamental convictions by which to steer your lives. Hold before yourselves the modern trinity of faith, courage, and grit. Have a magnificent obsession. Be quick to give encouragement. And believe that the law of life is give and live.

These are some of the qualities that will give you a niche in the Hall of Heroes.

Houses and Hospitals for Paraplegia and Other Veteran Patients

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JUNE 25, 1947.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: This is in further reply to your request of June 9, 1947, for a report on H. R. 2101, Eightieth Congress, a bill to provide housing units for veterans of World War II who lost, or lost the use of, one or both legs as the result of service in the armed forces. You further requested that the report cover the variances from H. R. 2101 as contained in H. R. 3532, Eightieth Congress, A bill to enable the Veterans' Administration to provide housing units for certain disabled veterans of World War II.

The purpose of H. R. 2101 is to provide suitable housing for veterans of World War II who are entitled to compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the loss, or the loss of use, of one or both legs, and for the families of such veterans. The bill would authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs: (1) to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, sites for the construction of "housing projects" for such veterans and their families; (2) to provide for the construction, by contract or otherwise, of such projects, together with all necessary facilities; (3) to arrange for the sale of housing units within such projects to qualified veterans at one-third actual cost to the United States, funds expended by the Administrator to make up the remaining two-thirds; and (4) to establish a procedure under which qualified veterans would be required to submit application within 1 year from the effective date of the act and be permitted 6 years from such effective date to complete payments of total purchase. Section 2 of the bill would authorize the appropriation from time to time of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the enactment not to exceed an aggregate in an amount which is not specified but for which a blank is indicated in the bill.

From a technical standpoint, it may be noted that the requirement of "loss, or the loss of use, of one or both legs" in H. R. 2101, does not particularize as to whether the loss or loss of use must involve the entire leg, and whether the term "legs" is broadly used to include the thigh. If further consideration is given the bill this language should be appropriately clarified to indicate precisely the extent of the loss or loss of use required. Since the bill provides for "housing projects" and the sale of "housing units within such projects" it might be construed as not authorizing the construction of individual dwellings in widely separated locations. If the intention is otherwise, the bill requires clarification in this particular.

H. R. 3532 would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide suitable housing facilities for veterans of World War I and World War II suffering from spinal-cord disease or injury with paralysis of the legs and lower part of the body as a result of their service in the armed forces, provided the veteran is entitled to compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration on account of such disability. Upon application by any such veteran, the Administrator would be authorized and directed (1) to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site, (2) to construct or cause to be constructed thereon an appropriate dwelling, and (3) upon completion thereof, to convey to such veteran by quit-claim deed title in fee simple to such dwelling and the land upon which it is situated. Section 3 would vest in the Administrator for purposes of carrying out the enactment, the authority now or hereafter vested in him for the construction of hospitals and would make Veterans' Administration appropriations for the construction of hospitals available for the purposes of this measure.

Neither of the bills describes a standard of cost for the individual housing unit, thus rendering the definition of "suitable housing" and "appropriate dwelling" open to broad interpretation. There is a discrepancy between the title and the body of H. R. 3532, in that the title refers only to veterans of World War II whereas the body includes veterans of World War I as well as World War II.

The Veterans' Administration is not vested by law with any authority relative to veterans' housing or construction of buildings for the use of individual veterans, other than indirectly in connection with the financing of real estate purchases under the loan pro-

visions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. The Seventy-ninth Congress enacted several measures designed to expedite the construction of housing for veterans and to extend effective priorities to veterans in securing housing. These laws are administered by the National Housing Agency. The committee may wish to obtain the views of that agency on the pending legislation.

Both of the bills would involve a material extension of the traditional policy of the Congress in providing veterans' relief. The Congress has developed through the years a legislative program affecting disabled veterans, which at the present time consists basically of three distinct but integral parts. The first is medical care, hospitalization, and prosthetic appliances. The second is vocational training. The third is compensation. Blind and paralytic veterans and veterans suffering from amputations are paid compensation at rates which are designed to enable them to obtain the services which they require. These rates for wartime cases range from $240 to $318 monthly where the loss or loss of use of two limbs is involved. This is in sharp contrast to the normal wartime rate of $138 per month for total disability. Where there are additional complications the awards may run as high as $360 per month.

The proposals here considered are apparently based upon the view that the Government has a further obligation to veterans of the groups described because of their peculiar need for special housing facilities. With respect to this need, it is understood that primary concern has been manifested for those with spinal-cord conditions resulting in paralysis of the lower part of the body to the extent that regular or frequent use of a wheel chair must be made. In cases of this kind, if the veteran's condition permits him to reside outside the hospital, many difficulties are encountered in attempting to make use of ordinary housing, and special arrangements, such as wide doorways, ramps, and appropriately designed bathrooms, are desirable.

However, H. R. 2101 would not be limited to the wheel-chair cases and might include many veterans whose loss or loss of use of a limb would not prevent them from traveling without the aid of a wheel chair. On the other hand, H. R. 3532 is limited to the spinal-paraplegia group and would not extend to other veterans who may habitually use wheel chairs, such as some hemiplegics, severe arthritics, severe cardiac cases who do not have the cardiac reserve to walk but may sit, poliomyelitis patients who have been unable to become rehabilitated sufficiently to walk again, and those with severely crippling head wounds or severely deformed extremities.

It is believed that piecemeal legislation on this subject would be ill-advised and that if any such legislation is to be enacted it should apply as nearly as practicable to all veterans with service-connected conditions resulting in a distinctive need for special housing facilities. Therefore, if the benefit is geared to conditions necessitating the permanent use of wheel chairs, it should be available to all veterans so circumstanced, and should not single the paraplegia group out for preference.

With respect to the paraplegia cases the following factual information is submitted as bearing on the matters under consideration. There are approximately 2,400 of these service-connected spinal-cord cases from World War II and a very few of them from World War I, a majority of the World War I group having died within a period of months after their period of injury. There are approximately 1,300 of the spinal-cord-injury cases now in Veterans' Administration hospitals. Of this number, it is estimated that 600 to 700 will eventually be able to leave the hospital. However, all of those who have left the hospitals or may be expected to do so will require rehospitalization from time to time for further medical and surgical care and rehabilitative measures. It is anticipated that 500 or 600 of the most difficult cases will never be able to leave the hospitals, either because of the severity of their injuries or of their wish not to leave or their lack of interest in their own rehabilitation. These must always have available good medical and nursing care. The majority of the 1,800 who have left or will leave the hospitals will not require extensive medical care thereafter, but the majority of them will need good attendant care, whether from a member of the family or from a hired professional attendant.

While hospitalized, a complete medical rehabilitation program is prescribed for these paraplegia patients. This includes a great amount of physical therapy, for they require much hydrotherapy, massage, and heat. They are prescribed occupational therapy in order to loosen up and develop dexterity of the upper extremities as needed. The medical rehabilitation program is started as soon as possible, and includes the process of learning to move about from place to place in bed, to move from the bed to the wheel chair, to dress, and finally, in many cases, to put on braces, to crutch-walk up and down stairs, cross streets, up and down curbs, get into busses and even automobiles, and learn to drive their own cars by means of special attachments. Much of this work is taught by corrective physical rehabilitation supervisors. In addition, educational therapy and manual-arts therapy is available for these patients. Many of them have not graduated from high school, and the opportunity is given to finish their high-school subjects while in the hospital. Others are taught office management, clerical work, and educational subjects commensurate with their mental and physical capabilities. The manual-arts-therapy program has been developed to provide motivation for these patients, this being a very important factor in their rehabilitation. By means of this program the patient may go into any of several shops, such as woodworking, radio repair, typewriter repair, jewelry making, and watchmaking and repair. The latter course has been most interesting to these patients, as it provides a good income in a vocation in which they may easily engage in spite of their disability. There are over 70 of these men at the Bulova School of Watchmaking, at Woodside, Long Island, completing their course, and there will be another 25 or 30 ready to go to the school by July 1, 1947. All of these men started the course while still in the hospital; after discharge they continue at the Bulova School and are given credit for their work done in the hospital.

It will be seen from the foregoing information that a large number of the paraplegics will not be able to leave the hospitals and therefore would not require the special housing benefits which would be afforded by H. R. 2101 or H. R. 3532. Moreover, the rehabilitation program will enable many of those who leave the hospitals to supplement their disability compensation by their own earnings. An outright grant of special housing to all of the paraplegics would therefore affect some who will not need the benefits and others who might be able to contribute substantially to the acquisition thereof.

The needs of the veterans with paraplegia or other permanent conditions requiring the use of wheel chairs relate primarily to special housing facilities which are not available to them in conventional dwellings. If the Government should pay the entire cost or a major portion of the cost of such specially designed housing units, there would appear to result a discrimination against many other seriously disabled veterans who can utilize ordinary dwellings but must acquire them, if at all, at their own cost. It would seem, therefore, that the Government's obligation in these cases should not extend beyond defraying such percentage of the housing cost as may be adequate to take care of the increased expense incident to the extra facilities. This program might well be undertaken for the purpose of equalizing the opportunities of veterans in the wheel-chair group with those of other disabled veterans in obtaining houses for their own use. Such a plan would likewise harmonize with the rehabilitation program which is aimed at the maximum development of the individual's ability to supply his own wants, for though he would be assisted by the Government he would not be relieved of the responsibility for making a substantial contribution to the acquisition of a home.

While H. R. 3532 is considered too broad because it would provide for the outright gift of a house, it is noted that H. R. 2101 involves a sharing of the cost of special housing by the Government and by the veteran. However, it is believed that two-thirds of the cost, which would be the Government's contribution under that bill, would be excessive beyond the actual pro rata cost occasioned by the special design and facilities. While the Veterans' Administration is not possessed of accurate information indicating the average cost of such special-purpose houses, it is considered that a liberal and adequate amount for this purpose would be approximately 50 percent of the over-all cost. In order to ensure that the Government would not be required to bear an unreasonable part of the cost of an unnecessarily expensive dwelling, it is further believed that a stated amount should be prescribed as the maximum of the Government's obligation.

A program of the character suggested would also be more equitable because it would probably be taken advantage of only by those veterans who actually intend to retain the homes for their own use and occupancy. An outright gift of a home, such as provided by H. R. 3532, without any requirement that the veteran shall use and retain the same, would permit some veterans unable to leave the hospital and others who may have homes, to apply for the benefit with the purpose of immediately disposing thereof for their own monetary gain.

It is suggested, therefore, that consideration be given to legislation which would authorize the Government to pay 50 percent of the cost, not to exceed $10,000, of a suitably equipped housing unit for each veteran of both the peacetime and the wartime service who is entitled to compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration on account of permanent disability which will require the regular or the frequent and periodical use of a wheel chair. In view of the permanent character of the benefit, it is not believed that it should be restricted to wartime veterans. Furthermore, if the veteran is to contribute half of the cost it would appear preferable that the responsibility for acquiring the housing unit should be upon the veteran so that his individual tastes may be indulged, and that the Government's obligation should be discharged under appropriate procedures by which the Government would pay the specified proportion of the cost which the veteran has incurred in his own transaction.

It is impossible to furnish a cost estimate of either H. R. 2101 or H. R. 3532 for the reasons that information is not available as to the number of potential beneficiaries and no cost limitation is described by either bill for each home and the land on which it is situated. However, as indicated above, there are approximately 2,400 World War II veterans in the spinal-cord-paraplegia group. The number of World War I veterans in this group is not known, but they are very few. The number of World War II veterans that

would be affected by H. R. 2101 by reason of the loss, or the loss of use, of one or both legs cannot be indicated because of the indefiniteness in the definition of the disability, as heretofore explained. If legislation were enacted along the lines suggested, including all wheel-chair cases entitled to compensation, the number affected would be larger than those in the paraplegia group, but no information is available to indicate how many veterans have disabilities which require the regular or frequent and periodical use of wheel chairs.

In this connection it should be noted with reference to the paraplegia group that it is estimated that the total cost of hospitalization for those in this group is between $18 and $20 per day each. However, as indicated, if these veterans were furnished houses, they would still require occasional hospitalization, the exact cost of which cannot be estimated. It is apparent, however, that there would be a material saving in hospitalization and treatment expense in any case where a veteran is able to leave the hospital and live at home.

For the foregoing reasons, the Veterans' Administration is unable to recommend favorable consideration of H. R. 2102 and H. R. 3532 in their present extensive form.

There has been insufficient time to clear this report with the Bureau of the Budget. When advice is received from that Bureau as to the relationship of these bills to the program of the President, the Committee will be advised.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army,
Administrator.

The Choice Is Between Democracy and Totalitarianism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the motto of the American Veterans' Committee is "Citizens first!" In the cynical self-seeking of the postwar world, the hard-headed, practical idealism of the American Veterans' Committee has been a heart-warming thing, even though it has thereby earned the denunciations of the red-baiters.

In the convention which AVC held at Milwaukee the "middle-of-the-road" slate headed by Chat Paterson, whom most of us have known and liked as the legislative representative of AVC, was chairman, and AVC moved into a new position of enlightened political and economic leadership of thoughtful and civic-minded veterans who believe that service to their country in peacetime is as much a part of the job of citizenship as service in wartime.

It was, I think, typical of the AVC's aims and ideals that for a second time they should choose as their principal convention speaker a prince of the Roman Catholic Church who is beloved of all Americans, the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago, my friend, and the friend of man everywhere.

Bishop Sheil carries on, with a practical Christianity and an innate goodness which brings to mind the words of St. Paul: "Faith without works is but naught." With supreme courage and clarity, he supports his good works with an articulate philosophy which rings with the sincerity of his passionate belief in democracy and in men.

It is with pleasure and appreciation of that belief that I insert in the RECORD, under leave, the text of Bishop Sheil's address to the AVC; and I urge you, Mr. Speaker, and all the Members of the Congress, and all Americans who believe in America and value our way of life, to read and ponder his words.

I am pleased to note that he repeats what I have said so often: that our choice, not in the future, but now, is between democracy and totalitarianism; and that he denounces intemperate red-baiting, avaricious vested wealth, and communism and fascism with equal vehemence.

The text of his address follows:

ADDRESS BY THE MOST REVEREND BERNARD J. SHEIL, D. D., AUXILIARY BISHOP OF CHICAGO, DELIVERED AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE ON JUNE 20, 1947, AT MILWAUKEE, WIS.

In the life of every nation comes a moment when that nation must study once more its basic principles. It must reexamine those basic ideals which are the source of its greatness; and it must examine itself to see whether it is still following those ideals. Such a moment has arrived for the United States. It is a moment crucial in its implications not only for us but for all humanity. In the tragic war which scourged our world and in the social revolution now sweeping the earth, there is and there shall remain but one issue: Man, and the freedom and justice belonging to him. It is imperative then, that we be neither ignorant nor uncertain of what the American ideal is; for it is an ideal which, in the destiny of this Nation, was meant to be a model and a hope for the people of the world.

The ideal of America is a society of free men enjoying the fruits of justice; men free to think, to speak, to worship; men free to govern themselves without arbitrary domination by self-appointed masters; men free to live their lives without fear or oppression or want; men free from any economic strangulation which would make freedom a hollow catch-word. This is the American ideal, an ideal which is the very life-blood of a genuine and organized democratic society.

Americans have always sought freedom and justice for all men. They have sought freedom and justice, because only in such an atmosphere can the human person flourish in the manner God intended. Freedom and justice are not luxuries which only the rich and privileged can afford. They are not merely an expensive addition to fine living. They are an absolute condition of life. They are God-given rights, not something bestowed by a paternalistic government or a kindly superstate. They belong as of right to all men and to every man individually.

The key to the interpretation of American history is the persistent struggle to keep alive this ideal of freedom and justice; to vindicate it and to expand it against every force which would seek to destroy or restrict it. That struggle has never ended, and each generation of Americans must not only protect and consolidate the hard-won gains of the past; it must also move forward by making freedom and justice vital realities in every sphere of life for ever-increasing numbers of people.

DEMOCRACY VERSUS TOTALITARIANISM

To us, the possessors of this noble heritage, has fallen the high duty of preserving and expanding this freedom and justice from the growing threat of totalitarianism—the most powerful single danger to the entire concept of democracy. The choice, not of the future, but of the present, is between democracy and totalitarianism; between a social order based upon human freedom and one founded upon the idea of the state as the complete and unquestioned arbiter of human life. The successful conclusion of the war has only intensified the urgency of choosing the social order of the future. I repeat: the choice is between democracy and totalitarianism.

We Americans believe that our democracy, of all the political systems in the world, is the one which now most closely corresponds to the needs and rights of men. It is based squarely upon the deeply religious foundations of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Its roots lie deep in the soil of Christianity, so that it is impossible to understand democracy correctly apart from its religious background. Above all, it derives its strength from the Christian belief in the absolute and unique value of the human soul, which transcends all the power and glory of the world. In our democracy, man is the foundation and the end of the state; man is the shaper, the maker, not the tool of the state. Only at our grave peril can we neglect the religious foundations of our American democracy; for without this foundation, democracy cannot remain itself. Without this foundation, freedom and justice and equality will have only a tenuous hold on the minds and wills of men.

And there are suspicions of a fading concern for freedom and justice within this Nation. Our concern for these things is fading because we are not quite sure what they are. It is strange and sad that we who possess the only decent political form of life hesitate and grope when we should be firm and decisive. For many of us, our glorious tradition is in tattered remnants. In the land of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, in the land of noble avowals of devotion to freedom and justice, shameful compromises abound. There are Americans who have never understood America. And they have consistently acted against the best interests of the country. We cannot, of course, doubt their integrity; but we are justified in questioning their practical wisdom.

TAFT-HARTLEY BILL DENOUNCED

A glaring example of this unenlightened action is the Taft-Hartley bill. Without any doubt, this bill is aimed at hamstringing all unionism. The alleged interest in the freedom of the individual worker is an ironic play with words. The bill is out of line with the American tradition because it unduly restricts freedom and interferes with that justice which is every man's due. It is almost entirely punitive in nature, and as such, it will cause more ills than it is designed to cure. The satisfaction of spiteful revenge is not calculation to produce beneficial results for the Nation.

The desire to weaken unions is not shared by everyone; but it is common among powerful groups. And we must remember that it is the unions who delivered the workingmen from their bondage. It is the unions who have given justice to workingmen; for this alone, unions deserve our most fervent and devoted support. Through the unions, the working people have tasted economic justice and have enjoyed the fruits of economic freedom. All the Taft-Hartley bills in the world will not make them forget that freedom and that justice. The memory of such rights, once enjoyed, will never die.

Only in the past years have labor unions come into their own as an acknowledged and responsible social force in the United States. Yet, they have, by and large, shown

an anxiety for the welfare of the Nation that industry itself might well imitate. In their over-all concern for justice the labor unions have pointed the way to their colleagues. The unions, unquestionably, have done more than any other economic group to bring justice to ordinary men; by and large, they have been more democratic within their own ranks than have their managerial counterparts. It would be most unfortunate for the United States, if any serious harm were done to the cause of unionism now; unfortunate for the very things for which America stands: liberty, justice, and equality.

There is still much muttering about what the opponents of social progress are pleased to call Government interference. One of the reasons businessmen complain about Government interference is that for generations no government dared question the actions of business. Naturally, therefore, when legitimate and necessary Government intervention began, there was weeping and gnashing of teeth. Much of the resentment at Government intervention is in the nature of hurt surprise, like that of an undisciplined child that is suddenly made to do what he should have been doing all along. Let us not, however, carry this analogy too far. For the abuses of our industry have not been the actions of a child. They have often been heinous crimes against society.

There would never have been any Government interference if business had regulated itself; and if business had shown at least as much concern for workingmen as for profits. What they call interference is a result of their own failure to concern themselves with the well-being of the people. Recent social legislation is the result of the full, unreserved recognition that the Government has the fundamental duty to secure citizens in the peaceful enjoyment of their natural rights. This includes the fundamental right of providing for themselves and their dependents a decent livelihood by honest and efficient labor. If private industry is unable or unwilling to afford men the opportunity of honorable employment, government is bound by its very nature to employ all its resources to secure to all citizens this essential right to work. This is not a new truth, and Leo XIII gave it excellent expression when he said: "It is the first duty of every government to make sure that the laws and institutions, the general character and administration of the commonwealth, are such as to produce of themselves public well-being and private prosperity. Above all, the public administration must duly and solicitously provide for the welfare and the comfort of the working people." The people who pay the price for economic blunders are not the bland, well-tailored leaders of the business world; but unhappy men and women trembling for their jobs.

NOW THE BOURBONS REJOICE

Recent rumblings against social advances are unpleasantly reminiscent of the time when the sphere of business was an absolute; even God Himself, it seemed, could not enter. In the past several years I have detected, I fear, a carnival air among certain of the rich, as if the happy hunting days are about to return. There is rejoicing in the camp of the bourbons; and they charge, with unseemly haste, to push the sweaty people back behind the barricades. The anarchistic, communistic unions are about to be broken. Once more the worker's inalienable right to starve will stand as one of the foremost pillars of free enterprise; once more a total disregard for human dignity will be accepted as an avowed principle of commerce. Once more the almighty dollar will be elevated to the altar, to be worshiped as the one true God. Once more the devout followers of Mammon are in control of the sacred edifice of business, which can no longer be touched by morality or law. After all, business is business; we can hope for no further revelation. I have no quarrel with the rich. I will readily grant that there is nothing more pleasant than the sight of the privileged classes enjoying their privileges; but I must admit, even more readily, that there is nothing more heart-rending than the sight of the underprivileged grubbing for the basic decencies of life.

Another example of this state of mind is seen in the tax law sent to the President, and fortunately vetoed by him. With tender concern for those in the upper income brackets, our lawmakers evolved a tax reduction which adds to the average man's income the princely sum of $30 and to the rich man's income anything from $1,000 up. I do not by any means advocate "soaking" the rich; but the President was certainly right when he said this plan gave too much tax relief too soon to the wrong people.

PLEADS FOR REFUGEES

Yet another indication of our failure to live up to our ideals is the languid interest in the Stratton bill. This is the bill which would permit 400,000 displaced persons to enter the United States over a 4-year period. Probably the strongest opposition to this bill comes from our own indifference to the pitiful plight of these people. They hunger not only for food and drink, but for justice and mercy. They do not wish to return to their native lands, for reasons that are perfectly obvious. They look to the United States as to an island of light in a sea of darkness. They are ready and eager to live again, if we will just give them a chance. The opposition comes also from the professional Americans, interested, they allege, in preserving us from alien influences, although the bill expressly provides that undesirable persons will be excluded. Our racially pure patriotic groups have quite forgotten that we are all the descendants of immigrants. To them and to all who think like them, I should like to repeat these lines:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

The greatness of America has come from just such groups. Our welcome to these people would strengthen our position in the world as the leading exponent of liberty for all men.

There is another example of our waning care for justice and freedom. This is the regrettable tendency to find communistic influence in almost every proposal for legitimate social and economic improvement, and those who favor such measures are arbitrarily accused of being Communists. It is a mystery why there must be a Communist plot in these measures. We have been told that if we just let free enterprise alone big business would bring us straight into a modern garden of Eden. Those who dared to protest were immediately labeled Communists. Even now, if anyone points to the evils of modern industrial society, the smear brigade goes into immediate action.

Does a speaker have the temerity to state that anti-Semitism is un-Christian and un-American? He is a Communist. Does he dare take the part of labor? That is sufficient proof to label him a Communist. Was he against scrapping the OPA? Does he mention that the wholesale price of food products has risen 40 percent since OPA was done to death? Does he remind the propagandists of free enterprise that they promised to bring prices down if controls were removed? Does he remind them that profits and prices have spiraled dizzily while wages have not kept pace? If he does, he is labeled a Communist.

Naturally, our good social laws are positively **not** communistic; they are normal outgrowths of our Constitution. The anguished wails of the opponents of improvement serve only the communistic movement. They arouse a fear of progress which plays directly into the hands of the Communists, who thereupon appear in the public eye as the sole defenders of the common man. If the high tide of national prosperity recedes, many citizens may turn to communism, in the mistaken apprehension that the Communists are the champions of the underprivileged.

COMMUNISM IS WRONG

At the same time it would be the height of folly to think that there can be any compromise between communism and democracy. Communism is intrinsically wrong, under any form, in any possible combination of circumstances. And we detest its fruits just as we detest the fruits of fascism. Now, I do not believe in hysterical ranting or in witch hunting. But I do believe in intelligent appraisal of realities and of men. Time after time, Communists have proved themselves unworthy of the trust and respect of men of integrity. Time after time, worthy organizations have found themselves dominated by a few persistent and clever men. Time after time, these worthy organizations have lost the support of decent people because of the actions of their few Communist members. Today a growing number of true progressives are realizing that the Communist affiliation is the kiss of death. We can never forget that American Communists are the spiritual cousins and the servile lackeys of totalitarianism. And we instinctively recoil from lackeys, whether in the service of the well-to-do or their totalitarian counterparts.

These and other problems in America can be solved in freedom and justice if we act in unity. When the war ended, the unity that had joined us in wartime was revealed in its true light: a temporary partnership designed to cease when the last shot was fired. Many short-sighted Americans forget that, while war is a hard, dirty business, it is just as difficult to fashion a true peace. They have forgotten that without the complete and unselfish cooperation and guidance of America the world cannot win a real peace. And only a united America can lead the world to peace. Apparently, some of our prominent men have not learned that what happens in Timbuktu has repercussions in Toledo; that when the life and liberty of a Pole are threatened, the life and liberty of a Philadelphian are in jeopardy.

We can achieve this unity only in a common belief that man is a creature of unique dignity; that his rights are inalienable, for the very reason that they come to him from God. There is no other road to unity. But unity can make us successful in the fight for justice only if we have the right motives. We cannot be motivated by some vague sentimental affection for the common man, or by hatred of the rich. We must be motivated by solid, real concepts, by the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. These are the beginning of all human relations; they are the bed-rock foundation of enduring peace. Only when we realize that human rights are derived from God can we effectively fight unbridled social and economic exploitation. Only then do we have the right motives for granting to others that liberty and justice which we demand for ourselves.

How long do you think our present Congress would fumble if, united in this way, we demanded immediate action to provide decent housing, with only incidental regard for the hitherto sacred right of plentiful profit? Here we are, a Nation of 140,000,000 people, with a demonstrated capacity to produce war material in an unending stream; but we bog

down completely in the effort to provide adequate housing for our citizens, the majority of whom are returned veterans. The answer is greed; the greed of a few who seek to profit at the expense of the many. We see the congressional leaders of this Nation which spent billions to develop the destructive energies of atomic power hold up their hands in horror at the prospect of spending even a little money to provide low-cost housing for millions of our people. And how long do you think our cities would be fettered by racial restrictive covenants if we, the people, spoke in unity to demand that our courts cease to mock the justice they are sworn to uphold? How long do you think we would be forced to watch the disgusting spectacle of some of our Representatives dutifully fulfilling their obligations to their campaign backers in voting for legislation that "has been strenuously pressed upon" them?

AMERICA CRIES FOR ENLIGHTENED LEADERSHIP

In the practical order, we must work swiftly to effect the reign of justice and charity. And I know of no group in America today that is better equipped and better situated to accomplish this work than the veterans' groups. You of the American Veterans Committee possess an enviable opportunity for heroic achievement. The people of America are crying out for leadership; they are sick of selfish groups who think only of their own interests. They are appalled by would-be leaders who go about fomenting dissension and suspicion only to take advantage of the resulting confusion.

Gerald Vann has remarked that "we of the modern West are the only people in the whole history of the world who have refused to find an explanation of the universe in a divine mind and will. * * * And is it not worth wondering whether, perhaps, that refusal is not at the root of the chaos and misery in which we find ourselves. Without a sense of ultimate purpose, without intelligible answer to the ultimate why and whither, what else could we expect?" Because we are without this sense of purpose we have not yet provided the world leadership which God intended us to have when He so richly endowed us.

The hour is late, but we still have time. Pius XII in a recent address said that we are living in a time of panic and pessimism; and he called for a great upsurge of Christian faith and love which will sweep the world like a "mighty breath of pure air." Only a spiritual rebirth can bring about a genuine solution to our problems. Mere material remedies can never cure the evils of hatred and cynicism and greed, evils that exist only in the souls of men. The Pope calls for a fearless courage, rooted in "a love as ardent and as vast as the world." Such a love would purge our society of the hatreds which plague us and would drive away the fear which, in the words of the Pope, "* * * hides under the appearance of Christian prudence, and under this pretext remains silent when duty should require it to utter a fearless 'non licot' to the rich and powerful."

I have said that the choice for today and for tomorrow is between democracy and totalitarianism. And if there is a war in the future, it need not be a war of arms. It must be a war of ideas and of competing social systems. The domains of this conflict are no longer located in geographical areas; they are now located in the bodies and souls; in the minds and hearts and wills of men. The techniques of this new warfare then must be spiritual. The aim is not to reshape the map of the earth but to reshape the thoughts of the human; to create new objects for the aspirations of the human heart; new ideals for the human souls. The aim is to enkindle the flame of quenchless hope in lives that now know only the darkness of despair. The aim of this spiritual warfare is to teach every child of Adam that his destiny is not to grovel in the slime like beasts that perish but to walk among the stars as the sons of God.

While Congress Fiddled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop:

WHILE CONGRESS FIDDLED

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

Something has been quietly in progress in Chicago and Detroit which may in the end have a more profound effect on the future of the American labor movement, and indeed on American politics as a whole, than the controversial new labor act. One of the slickest maneuvers in labor history has been going on in the CIO's United Automobile Workers, the biggest CIO union. This maneuver is designed to oust Walter Reuther, anti-Communist UAW president, from the union's leadership and replace him with George Addes, dark-faced ambitious secretary-treasurer, who has consistently worked with the Communists.

If the trick succeeds, the results are entirely foreseeable. Unions representing something close to a majority of the total membership of the CIO will then have fallen under tight Communist control or deep Communist influence. The situation will be quite beyond remedy by Philip Murray, the CIO's sincere but vacillating president. And for the first time in American history a really important segment of the American labor movement will be at the beck and call of the Communist Party. In the light of this possibility, the commotion about the labor law looks pretty much like fiddling while Rome burns.

The history of the maneuver is interesting. For a long time there have been jurisdictional UAW troubles between UAW and another CIO union, the small farm-equipment workers. The farm-equipment workers are tightly held by the Communists. The political position of Grant Oakes, farm-equipment president, may be deduced from the fact that he has endorsed a subscription drive of the New York Daily Worker, a journal to which he frequently grants exclusive interviews. Nevertheless the CIO leadership, Reuther included, has repeatedly attempted to arrange a merger between the UAW and the FEW, to do away with the jurisdictional complications. The FEW has always pulled away from simple amalgamation, on instructions from the party, claiming that the union needed a "better deal."

When the FEW turned down a specific merger proposal made by the CIO's jurisdictional committee, which the UAW has accepted, a committee of the UAW was established to negotiate with a similar committee from the FEW to find acceptable terms. The UAW committee was headed by Joseph Mattson, and the other members were Arnold Attwood and George Burt. All three are Addes men. Mattson never reported any specific progress to the UAW board. In March, Reuther offered to help along negotiations. A number of meetings between the two committees were called, to take place in Reuther's office. All were canceled at the last moment by the FEW.

The regular board meeting of the UAW took place in Chicago from June 9 to June 13. On June 10 the FEW issued a statement that a proposal for a merger had been submitted to Philip Murray. Questioned on this, George Addes claimed that he knew nothing about it, and so did his men on the board. Walter Reuther announced during the meeting that he would have to leave on the last day, Friday, the 13th, for Washington at 11:15 that morning. Murray never received the proposal.

At 10 o'clock on Friday the Addes wing of the board suddenly produced a merger agreement. It transpired that this agreement had been worked out in final form in the same hotel in which Reuther was staying. But Reuther, as president of the UAW had never been told that the work was going forward. Reuther was given 15 minutes in which to read the agreement through. He immediately objected to its terms, and asked for a special meeting on the matter for the week of June 23. The Addes-controlled executive board ordered, over Reuther's objections, a referendum on the merger to be completed by July 15.

Reuther's objections were not to the merger, which he himself had attempted to promote, but to its terms. The agreement was full of "gimmicks," too complex to describe in this space, but largely designed to give the political influence of the FEW a disproportionate weight in the UAW. The real meaning of the proposed merger may best be grasped in terms of last year's victory for Reuther, which was by a slim 124-vote margin. The FEW claims a total membership of over 75,000. Its actual membership is probably less than 40,000. But even this membership would give the union 400 votes at the UAW convention next fall. It is easy to see why a union politician, quoted in Detroit's labor paper, the Wage Earner, remarked that there is "enough dynamite in the issue to blow Reuther out of and Addes into the UAW presidency."

But the dynamite is not confined to the auto workers' presidency. It would mean that the process by which Communists all over Europe have gained the whip hand over governments, by the economic power of their control over union labor, would be immeasurably advanced here. The process might be so far advanced that the vast non-Communist majority of the CIO would probably be powerless to stop it. It is further noteworthy that no one who has studied the matter believes that the Taft-Hartley Act could possibly stop it. It is a process which has elsewhere led again and again to the terrible final split between extreme left and extreme right which is the disaster of Europe. It is not too much to say that the future of the United Automobile Workers in the next few months will closely affect the future of the United States.

Oil to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission granted me, I am making a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 25, 1947.

It has to do with the sending of oil to Russia about which so many of our people are disturbed. It follows:

WHY SEND OIL TO RUSSIA?

It is high time Congress undertook a full-scale investigation of the Government policies under which vast quantities of oil are being shipped to Russia when the United States is threatened with an oil shortage.

For several weeks Congressmen have been sounding the alarm that there is something peculiar about the large quantities of oil

being purchased in this country by the Soviet Government. They have pointed out that Russian tankers were loading hundreds of thousands of barrels at West Coast ports and have professed to see some similarity between this policy and that of supplying scrap iron to Japan before Pearl Harbor.

Meanwhile there have been warnings that the United States would face a shortage of fuel oil this winter and hints that the Government might be compelled to resume gasoline rationing.

Also, fears were expressed by Army and Navy aviation officials that some service planes might be grounded in the near future due to a shortage of aviation gasoline.

Yesterday three important developments brought the oil issue out in the open.

The Department of Commerce, through its office of international trade, announced the reimposition of wartime controls on the export of petroleum products.

The Standard Oil Co. of Indiana announced that sales of gasoline to dealers would be rationed in 15 midwestern States during the summer months.

Congressman ALVIN F. WEICHEL, chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee, revealed that the tankers in which American oil is being transported to Russia originally were built for the United States Government. He would like to know how Russia got them and, if they were transferred to Russia during the war under lend-lease, why they have not been returned.

The policy of permitting shipments of oil to Russia at a time when Soviet propaganda organs are denouncing the United States in hostile terms and when our own oil supplies are in short supply appears to be another example of the right hand of the Government not knowing what its left hand is doing.

Also, it seems peculiar that the Department of Commerce controls will not become effective until next Monday, just 24 hours before the emergency law authorizing such export regulation is due to expire.

This raises the question of whether the Department is primarily interested in conserving the United States' supply of oil, or in persuading Congress to extend its wartime powers.

The Department said that 168,306 barrels of oil had been transported to Russia during the first 4 months of this year. But WEICHEL reported that 125,500 barrels of oil and 12,895 barrels of gasoline had been shipped to Russia in the past 2 weeks alone, and that three more Russian-operated but American-built tankers are loading in California ports and are due to sail before the United States embargo will go into effect.

Something smells bad here, and it is more than just the odor of oil. A thorough investigation may disclose another Teapot Dome with an international angle.

Address of Hon. George A. Dondero, of Michigan, Before the Roanoke Rotary Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, "ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Until truth gains and holds mastery over the minds of men, the subtle, disrupting, infiltrating anathema of communism will continue to spread its cancerous growth to degrade, pollute, and finally destroy its only direct antithesis—democracy.

No member of this body can render a greater service to the Nation than by carrying to the people, with relentless and uncompromising conviction, the unvarnished truth anent the black and despicable horror of the essence, purpose, design, and threat of communism to our way of life.

With characteristic candor, force, eloquence, and courage such a service was rendered by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] in an address delivered before the Rotary Club at Roanoke, Va., on June 26, 1947.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith Mr. DONDERO'S address:

THE ROAD TO SURVIVAL LEADS TO THE RIGHT

It is pleasant for me to come to Virginia and make my first speech in the Old Dominion State, the land of Washington, Jefferson, and Lee. In this State history was made and history still lives.

I would like to share with you, at least for tonight, the pride that must be yours in cherishing the heritage of your freedom-loving first settlers, who established at Jamestown not only the first permanent English settlement in America but ideals for the ages.

It is especially pleasing to me to be invited to the home city of my warm and close friend, Cliff Woodrum, your former Representative in Congress. You of Virginia, and especially of Roanoke, may well be proud to claim him as your fellow citizen. He was one of the ablest and best men in the Congress of the United States. He always defended and advanced the principles upon which the Nation was built. Our country lost a superb legislator when he voluntarily withdrew from public life.

In his place you have sent to Washington a worthy and distinguished successor in Judge LINDSAY ALMOND. We have become well acquainted, and I respect and admire him greatly. He brought with him to the Nation's Capital not only the traditions of the Old Dominion State but every mark of a gentleman and the philosophy of Jefferson; namely, keeping the Government close to the people. To be in his home town is another reason why I am happy to be in Roanoke tonight.

As long as I have been a Member of Congress, I have never known a time when Virginia needed to make any apology for its delegation in our national law-making body. On the contrary, you might well have a deep sense of pride for the type and caliber of men whom you have sent to the Nation's Capital.

A third reason is that it makes me feel like a truck driver, for it has given me an opportunity to run into so many nice people. In fact, if you were all sitting in the dining room of the First Methodist Church at Royal Oak, Mich., tonight, I would swear you were all Republicans.

What makes it most gratifying to be here is to know that I am to share the evening with an audience of splendid Americans.

In the Capital City of Washington resides an old lady who is well beyond her ninetieth birthday. Her mind and memory remain unimpaired and a rich luster still kindles her aging eyes.

More than 85 years ago, when she was but a stripling of a girl, she stood on the balcony of a hotel, recently torn down in Washington, with her father and the sixteenth President of the United States. They were his guests. The occasion was a review of young manhood marching off to war.

As the measured tread of the boys went by, the tall sad-faced man in black placed his hand on that little girl's head and said, "My child, what a world we live in today."

More than fourscore years later, in the present decade in which we now live, death and destruction rained down without mercy upon helpless and defenseless women and children. Long-established principles of justice and equity, which once guided nations and men in orderly conduct toward each other, have been swept away. Powers, heretofore unknown, have been discovered and developed, which now threaten civilization itself. Brute force rules the world.

Hatred and passion run deep and an ideology which challenges Christianity, denies God, and feeds on misery has risen to plague a distressed and distraught world. As memory brings back recollections of 1861 to that gracious old lady in 1947, we can echo the sentiment expressed to her by Lincoln and say, "What a world we live in today."

It is an anxious world and a troubled world; a world gone mad; a world that has been in the process of destroying itself and seemingly forgotten God. Sound and tested principles, on which mankind has traveled far along the road of history, are cast aside in our modern conception of living. We are prone to destroy old landmarks and tear down the truths of centuries. What we once thought of as permanent is now challenged. Yet Scripture reminds us, "Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set" (Proverbs 22: 28).

It may seem trite to recall the admonition, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," but it is my opinion that not since the founding of our Republic has liberty been so seriously threatened as it is today by the forces of darkness. The lights of freedom are going out all over the world and our own lamp is burning low.

For the first time in history an issue has been raised, which is world-wide. That issue is whether Christian civilization, as we have always known it, is to survive, or whether a foreign ideology known as communism, founded on violence, terror, and force, shall rule this earth. Our Nation has been moving to the left, and it presents a challenge to every patriotic American. There can be no compromise with communism; there is no middle ground. Communism and freedom cannot exist side by side. One or the other must die.

Nearly 20 years ago Russia gave notice, and I quote: "The world-wide nature of our program is not mere talk, but an all-embracing and blood-soaked reality. Our ultimate aim is world-wide communism."

It is the thesis that the state is god and master; that the rights and privileges of the individual must be surrendered to the state. It is another way of saying that the common man must be kept common. If that theory is embraced, we are on the road to the destruction of individual liberty, and the very foundation of the greatness of our country.

Under communism no one can own a foot of land, a news stand, or a barber shop, nor employ anyone. There is but one employer, the state. You work for it or starve. There is but one political party, one ticket, no choice. You hear, read, and see what the state permits—and no more. You cannot invite anyone to your home or apartment for you do not own any. One room is standard for a family in Russia and has been so since the Communists took over. You cannot absent yourself from work; labor cannot strike; one cannot travel without a permit or be friendly with a foreigner. There is no freedom of assembly; no freedom of speech, or religion, or of the press.

In short, there is no freedom behind the iron curtain.

There is no such thing as a trial of justice and equity as we know it in America. There is no jury trial. To steal in Russia may not be a serious crime, but to utter an opinion

against the government means a slave labor camp or the firing squad.

About 1 Russian in every 13 is in a slave labor camp. In all, there are more than 15,000,000 in such camps. No one seized by their secret police, whether guilty or innocent, has any right to protest; and only about 5 percent are ever released. They die a slow death.

Their whole government is founded on fear and terror, and its two instruments of administration are the secret police and the firing squad.

Communism calls itself "democracy," but it denies the basic principles of democracy; namely, government by the consent of the governed. Yet this insidious menace is on the march. One country after another is crushed by fear and force. Its immediate plans for the future in Europe bode ill to America.

Within a short time we may expect Russia to announce the formation of a Balkan confederation, then a central European confederation, and the invasion of Greece and Turkey. She plans to divide Italy from east to west to control the rich northern industrial and agricultural part of the country, thereby starving into submission the southern or poorer section of that country. It is reported that France has already been sufficiently infiltrated with Communists to be taken over by a telephone call.

Its heel has been planted on our shores. Communism is here among us. It is in our Government, schools, labor unions, churches, business, politics, clubs, veterans' organizations, and nearly every other activity of American life.

Every device known is used to bore from within. It stops at nothing. Deception, fraud, concealment, falsehood, subtlety, and slander are all used to obtain its objective, namely, the overthrow of our Government. It feeds on misery, unemployment, hunger, and discord. Strikes and confusion are but part of its program.

Two things actuate the motives of all of us—fear of punishment and the hope of reward. Under communism hope dies and fear is increased.

To combat communism our people must be informed how it operates, for it is a menace which threatens our very existence.

If our people who enjoy the highest living standard on earth could know more about living standards under communism; if those who have seen the free-enterprise system followed for 160 years as the greatest instrument for human advancement could know more about industry and management in the Soviet Union;

If farmers could know what the Soviet system of agriculture is like; if American labor had better working knowledge of the status of labor in Russia, especially the system of forced labor which is so common; if people who believe in God, the Christian faith, and who value a free conscience, could know how religion fares behind the iron curtain;

If those in this land who have been flirting with the idea of bringing about a change in our free representative government had a clear perception of methods and government under communism, with its planned existence and central control of education;

It would halt the march of communism as nothing else could.

LABOR

Labor is forbidden to strike. There is no legislation, but the unwritten Soviet law prohibits striking against the Government. The standard of living, wages, and output per man are much lower than in the United States. Millions toil by force and under police discipline. They receive a miserable keep for their work.

TRANSPORTATION

Russia, after 30 years of communism, produced in 1938 and 1939 but 200,000 vehicles, of which seven-eighths were trucks, and all motor vehicles in the Soviet in 1941 totaled but one million, also mostly trucks. This despite the fact that they have all the material, resources, necessary to manufacture them. In the United States in 1941 we produced 5,000,000 motor vehicles, 80 percent of which were passenger cars for private use; and in the same year we had over thirty million registered automobiles.

EDUCATION

In every phase of education in the Soviet Union, the doctrines of communism are the only ones which are or can be presented to the students. There is no such thing as free study of other forms of government. If they controlled education in the United States, that would also be our fate.

RELIGION

The Russian Government says that religion is the opiate of the people. There were 46,000 churches in Russia in 1917; only 4,200 were left in 1941. These figures speak louder than anything I can say. Communist Russia no longer permits legal marriages in the churches of Poland. The ceremony in a church is allowed, but it must be legalized before a Communist civil officer. Former Ambassador Harriman informed me but a few weeks ago that where Moscow formerly had about 1,000 churches—less than 40 now remain.

These are some of the things that touch everyday life. We would not like them in the United States; therefore it behooves all of us to be vigilant and aggressive against this insidious menace, if we desire to preserve undiminished our heritage of American freedom.

On a day in September 1787 when he signed the new Constitution of the United States, Benjamin Franklin was asked: "What kind of a government have you given us?"

"A Republic, if we can keep it," was his prompt reply.

Seventy-six years later, the same question was asked at Gettysburg in different language: "Can a nation conceived in liberty long endure?"

Now, more than four score years later, we are asking the same question. It is the great issue before us and the world today. We are engaged in a life and death struggle for the preservation of principles among men.

This Nation cannot endure half American and half Communist, and ours is the decision to make. There is no North nor South, East nor West, on that question. We survive or perish together and, in my judgment, the only road to survival leads to the right.

We must return and restore the time-tested principles on which this Nation was founded, if we hope to remain free and to progress as a great Nation. Three times since the tragic War Between the States we have demonstrated to the world that we are a united people, whenever freedom and our beloved land were threatened by a foreign foe.

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are not granted by man. They come down to us from heaven. We inherit them at birth. They have been woven into the fabric of our Government.

The flower of American manhood has died in all parts of the world that those principles might live. Upon us, the living, falls the sacred trust to preserve them.

Liberty has always provided the urge and the initiative for men and women to go forward to create benefactions for themselves, their country, and the world. It is the reason why millions in all ages have died for that precious thing, freedom. It is a moral thing and it will be defended only when every heart and hearthstone is stirred to a deeper appreciation of its value.

The rise of the United States to a degree of achievement unequalled in history resulted from the freedom, independence, and protection against the collective crowd, which our Constitution gives to each citizen. This protection released the energies of men, making it possible for them to accumulate capital, create inventions, and provide better tools than the world had ever known before. The result has been a higher standard of living, better housing, more food, and a larger portion of the material and good things of life than any people in history have ever had.

We represent about 6 percent of the world's population and occupy 7 percent of the earth's surface. In 160 years, under our American way of life, that small percentage of people, occupying that small area of the earth's surface, we have produced and possess 30 percent of the wealth of the world and 35 percent of its income. We have 80 percent of the automobiles, 60 percent of the telephones, 35 percent of the railroads, a vast majority of the radios of the world, and spend more on education that the rest of the earth combined.

We produce 60 percent of the world's goods. We have 67 percent of the world's fighting ships, 60 percent of the battle planes, 70 percent of the merchant ships, 75 percent of the transport planes, and we produce more than one-half of the world's horsepower.

Each of 34 States has more automobiles than all of Russia. Seven States have more than Great Britain. California alone has more automobiles than Great Britain, France, and Italy combined.

We have five times as many trucks as Russia and 50 percent more than the entire world; and enough paved roads. (about 1,400,000 miles) to encircle the globe 41 times, on which to operate them.

In spite of that enviable record, not surpassed nor even equalled by any other nation on earth, we have some folks in this favored land who are insane enough to believe that we should scrap or abandon our way of life, our competitive system of free enterprise, our government of freedom, and import this foreign ideology of communism. They believe that through some mysterious manner we would be a happier people, raise our standard of living, and somehow we would dwell in some kind of a Russian utopia.

It is the sheerest kind of nonsense, and it would be humorous if it were not so tragic.

If we as a people would survive and preserve the freedom we have, we must revive the fundamental principles upon which the Government was founded. To do so, we must take the road that leads to the right.

Taxation of Federal Property by States and Municipalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which attempts to remedy an inequitable situation by providing for the taxation by States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions of certain real estate held in the name of the United States or one of the Government agencies.

As the Federal Government has expanded its functions and activities, and in part as the result of wartime necessities, the title to more and more real property has been vested in the United States, thereby acquiring immunity from local taxation and throwing a corre-

spondingly greater burden upon all other taxpayers in the community affected.

According to reports which have been brought to me, not only has the administration done nothing to check this tendency and alleviate the hardship on municipalities resulting from the trend, but actually has actively contributed to the creation of an increasingly intolerable situation.

To illustrate, the Defense Plant Corporation by statute was made liable for local taxes. This provision was enacted in recognition of the fact that properties acquired for defense purposes such as factories, warehouses, dockage, wharves, and the like were to be used for purposes not ordinarily associated with governmental activities, received full local services such as police and fire protection, and should bear their proportionate share of the expenses of local government in the same way as if they were privately owned. Otherwise, the removal of these properties from the tax rolls by transfer to the Government would work an obvious injustice upon every other taxpayer in the community, resulting in higher taxes, higher rents, and increased costs of all products and services.

The corporation counsel of the city which I have the honor to represent informs me that the title to each one of these federally acquired properties, so far as he can determine, could have been taken in the name of the Defense Plant Corporation, but has in fact been taken in the name of the United States in a manifest effort to avoid this tax liability. In fact, I was even told of one instance where, apparently through error, the title was first taken in the name of the Defense Plant Corporation and then, when this fact was discovered and it became clear that taxation would ensue, a deed was drawn and recorded transferring ownership to the United States.

Here we have the spectacle of our Government, which is quick—and properly so—to crack down upon those who use all and sundry devices to avoid Federal taxation, attempting by a legalized contrivance to deprive local taxing authorities of their just dues, amounting in my community alone, I am told, to about $130,000 a year. The result is that the few in a particular locality pay for a benefit conferred upon the many throughout this country.

What possible justification can there be for a large building owned by the United States and leased for manufacturing purposes or for storage warehouse purposes to be exempt from local taxation?

The measure which I have submitted provides that the United States or the Federal agency owning such a property shall make payment to the local taxing authority of an amount equivalent to the taxes which would be levied if the property were privately owned, with the proviso, however, that if it can be shown that the property does not receive some particular local service, the cost of such service may be deducted from the amount of the payment. A statement of the sum due must be sent by the municipality to the Federal agency involved, after which payment must be made or appropriate steps taken to review any alleged erroneous determination of liability on the part of the local authorities.

As to school taxes, a special provision is included in this bill creating a Federal liability only when officers, agents, or employees of the United States reside on the Government-owned property. In that case the United States must pay to the local school taxing authorities an amount equivalent to the fair tuition charge as determined by the United States Commissioner of Education, for the pupils of school age residing on this property.

Concededly there are many, in fact most, types of uses of Federal property which probably should be excluded from such taxation. It would be a rather startling suggestion, for example, to tax post offices and courthouses, which might be said to serve peculiarly the interests of the people in a local area in the same manner as the buildings which house the administrative or governmental functions of the State, county, or city. Also Federal office buildings and installations employing and bringing to the community large numbers of people are usually the subject of vigorous competition between various localities, since they normally enhance local values, increase business, and substantially improve the appearance of the municipality. There seems to be no adequate reason why in such cases the locality which is enjoying such incidental benefits should receive the additional and unexpected windfall of payments in lieu of taxes.

In the case of Army and Navy posts, camps, and stations which ordinarily receive little, if any, local benefits or services furnished by the municipality other than educational facilities, these are separately treated in this bill. They usually provide their own fire and police protection, their own roads and sewers and they are normally located in rural or semirural areas. It would seem inequitable to require them to pay an ad valorem tax on the high valuation of their real-estate development.

It is therefore provided in this legislation that Federal office buildings, courthouses, mints, assay offices, customhouses, laboratories, experimental grounds or buildings, testing stations, jails, penitentiaries, reformatories, detention farms, hospitals, cemeteries, national parks or monuments, or Army and Navy posts, camps, garrisons, stations or yards are exempt from the provisions of this new taxing statute.

Only this week I have received a communication from Mr. Morgan Strong, executive secretary of the conference of mayors and others municipal officials of the State of New York, transmitting a resolution adopted at their annual meeting held on June 20, wherein they petitioned the Federal Government to provide substantial payments to local governments in lieu of taxes on federally owned property in municipalities.

Effort has been made to draw a bill, the equity and fairness of which will appeal to the Members of the Committee on Public Lands, before whom a study of this important problem already is under way. It is respectfully submitted that there is an urgent need to end promptly the inequities and abuses which have developed in connection with the increasing acquisition of property by the Federal Government.

Atomic Power for Peaceful Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting and important topics of discussion in the United States today is the iron curtain which has thus far surrounded our post-war policy concerning the development and use of atomic power for peaceful purposes.

It is easily understood why our Government is withholding all information about the basic methods of producing atomic bombs and other military weapons in which nuclear energy may be used, and there is no complaint on that score. Until such time as satisfactory agreement is reached for international control of atomic power, the United States will continue to preserve inviolate all such scientific secrets which are in our possession.

But the question looms large as to why the American people should not be kept informed of the practical possibilities of applying atomic energy to domestic uses at the earliest possible time, and be given an opportunity to formulate a national policy for the beneficial development of this greatest scientific discovery of all time. It is recognized, of course, that the new Atomic Energy Commission has been in existence only a very short, short while. There is no disposition, on the part of those who think as I do, to criticize the distinguished Chairman of that Commission, Mr. David E. Lilienthal, and his colleagues for failing to make any premature announcements as to their long-range program.

However, there is a distinct apprehension among progressives in Congress and elsewhere that very powerful influences may be actively at work to delay as long as possible the use of atomic energy for industrial and social purposes. Great vested interests, with enormous investments in oil and coal, are confronted with the possibility of heavy financial losses if atomic energy should replace their products, to any large extent, in the production of heat and electricity. The vast electric utility companies must face great financial outlays to convert their plants for the use of this new form of energy. Other radical changes in established forms of business will be necessary. So there is more than a mere suspicion that these powerful interests do not desire to see any practical application of atomic energy to our domestic economy in the immediate future.

On the other hand there is every reason to believe that if the American people were thoroughly informed about the revolutionary improvements which atomic energy will eventually bring about in

their mode of life they would insist that there should be no deliberate delay in putting it to work. No disclosure of scientific or military secrets need be involved in speeding the day when the American economy is converted to the atomic age. Our Government should and would continue to retain and safeguard all secrets which are vital to our national security and defenses. All that the American people need to be told is how they can use atomic energy after it has been produced under Government supervision.

Our people have already been told, in vague and unsatisfactory terms, that atomic energy may be available, for every day uses, in from 20 to 50 years. But independent scientists, experienced in nuclear research, declare that we can have atomic energy to use, if we want it—millions of kilowatts of it—in 2 or 3 years In about 10 years, these scientists assert, we ought to be well on our way to an atomic standard of living They picture cities without smoke, mechanized homes with a multiplicity of conveniences which are now merely a dream, and a constant stream of production of goods without long hours and disagreeable toil for our workers

The American people are standing on the boundary of a new frontier, with possibilities so vast and limitless that they stagger the human imagination. But thus far the rank and file of the American people have been given no real opportunity to exercise their imaginations in a practical way about the uses to which the atom can be put for their welfare and happiness. In some devious psychological way they have been made to feel that it is dangerous to pry into the possibilities of using atomic energy for peaceful purposes—that it is essentially a military force which must be shrouded in secrecy until some indefinite time in the future.

If I may be permitted to employ the vernacular of the street, allow me to express the opinion that this is all "bunk." Indeed, I am convinced that it is the duty of the average American citizen to do a lot of thinking about this all-important subject right away. He should squarely face the fact that the big interests of American industry and American finance are not only uninterested in speeding up the advent of the atomic age into our every-day lives, but that those powerful interests are already doing everything they can to delay it. And if the average citizen does not get together with his peers and force the issue the big interests are going to have their way for a long time to come.

Demand for atomic energy for peaceful purposes as soon as possible may well become a paramount political issue in the immediate future.

The Northern California Association of Scientists, in a report recently prepared for the Carnegie International Peace Endownment, declares that the atom is already competitive with coal at a delivered price of $6 a ton. This is a startling statement when it is realized that most of the people of the world will never be able to buy coal at such a price again. In simple terms, it means that scientific experts in my State of California know how atomic energy can be used to produce heat today more cheaply than coal can do at current prices. This statement is a sharp contradiction of the vague and discouraging information previously given us that we must wait at least 20 years before we can hope to realize any practical benefits from the atom.

The fact that the American people are not now further along the road to the atomic age is unquestionably due more to political inertia than to scientific or technical difficulties. So it seems reasonable to conclude that active political measures will have to be employed if we do not wish to permit the atomic millenium to be postponed indefinitely. The time has come for public opinion in America to wake up on this all-important subject. If we were living under a sovereign dictatorship, the situation would be very different; but here in the American democracy public opinion can accomplish wonders. And the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes will usher in an age of wonders for all humanity.

Up at Hanford, in the State of Washington, three huge atomic piles have been in operation for about 3 years. These piles generate as much power as Bonneville Dam, but the power is not in usable form for industrial purposes. The piles were constructed during the war exclusively for the production of plutonium for bombs. Instead of being converted into commercial power, the heat generated at Hanford is dissipated into the Columbia River through the use of a mammoth cooling system. Experts say that the task of converting this heat into steam for the generation of electricity would not have been more difficult than was the construction of the tremendous cooling plant which now makes the heat useless after it has produced plutonium. It is estimated that the amount of energy which now goes to waste at Hanford would be sufficient to satisfy the basic needs for power of a city the size of Seattle. One authority on atomic research is responsible for the assertion that if a quarter of the scientists and engineers who collaborated on the atom bomb were put to work today on nuclear power plants, the United States could have half a dozen 500,000 kilowatt units in operation by 1950.

Many serious misconceptions about atomic power are widespread in this country today, and there is sound reason to suspect that some, if not all, of them have been deliberately disseminated by the protagonists of a delayed atomic age. It is said, for instance, that atomic power plants will be dangerous and difficult to manage, and that we must develop a new generation of scientists and specialists to assure their safety. This rumor is flatly denied by nuclear scientists. They admit that the construction and maintenance of the plants will require great skill, but they assert that plants properly constructed and maintained will be as easy to operate as an automatic coal furnace.

Other widely circulated misstatements are that atomic power plants will be prohibitively expensive, that atomic energy will not reduce the present cost of power, and that the requisite raw materials are so scarce as to minimize its usefulness. In refutation of all of these alarmist reports, nuclear scientists in my home State declare that the atom will prove to be a limitless source of amazingly cheap power.

Recently all of the San Francisco daily newspapers quoted Bruce R. Prentiss, an engineer assigned by the General Electric Co. to atomic-energy problems, as saying that in 25 to 50 years it will be possible to produce all of the electric power now used in San Francisco from an annual supply of only 300 pounds of atomic material. This expert opinion disposes effectively of several of the pessimistic reports which I have recounted, but other distinguished nuclear authorities disagree emphatically with the General Electric engineer in his estimate of the time that must elapse before atomic energy can be made available for general use. They assert in effect that all that is necessary to make the atomic age a reality during the lifetime of the present generation is the will to do so.

Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor of the University of Chicago, said more than a year ago that atomic energy can bring untold blessings to humanity in the immediate future. Availability of atomic power for industrial and other economic uses, Dr. Hutchins declared, will make possible the location of important industries in communities which are remote from present sources of fuel supply. In the atomic age new industries can be created anywhere, because the cost of transporting materials from which atomic energy is produced will be unimportant.

Dr. Hutchins described the discovery of atomic energy as being as important to the biologist and the doctors as the invention of the microscope. Radio-active carbon and radio-active iodine are ready to revolutionize vital areas of medicine and biology. New methods of diagnosis and therapy, and new industries for the manufacture and distribution of materials will be created.

As Dr. Hutchins says, these are not dreams; they are realities. New industries, new communities, more leisure, better health and longer life—these are among the blessings which atomic energy puts within our grasp. It offers a higher standard of living for all the world.

The American people must not allow these blessings to be withheld from them indefinitely. The control of the time element is in their hands. It is up to them to exercise this control.

Gangster Pictures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Lakewood News-Times of June 19, 1947, a newspaper published in Lakewood, Long Beach, Calif., well sets forth the unfortunate effects of gangster pictures on the youth of the land. It is fortunate that

we have editors who understand so clearly that these gangster pictures are one of the elements in our increased juvenile delinquency:

An effort is being made to induce Hollywood studios to cut down on the production of gangster pictures. Juvenile authorities and others concerned with the high rate of crime involving youngsters, feel that gangster pictures contribute in some degree to lawlessness.

Even though these movies are supposed to emphasize the crime-doesn't-pay theme, they actually incite adolescents in some instances, to emulate screen gangsters.

In addition to their effect on our children, gangster films also give the citizens of other countries a very distorted view of the United States and its people. A statement made by Ingrid Bergman, who now reigns as the first lady of moviedom, illustrates the point. Said she:

"When I came to America for the first time, I thought the Americans were either millionaires or gangsters. That was what I learned from the American movies. Everything was the biggest in the world, the fastest, or the most money, or gangsters. I had my child with me. I was very worried all the time. I was sure she would be kidnapped the minute I let her out of sight.

"And then I discovered that it wasn't so—that the people here were very much like my own people in Sweden."

Miss Bergman now knows the facts. But not every moviegoer in the scores of nations to which American films are sent gets the opportunity to come here and find out the truth.

Nation Needs Teamwork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert herein an article by Mr. Harry R. Nightingale, recently published in the Topeka Daily Capital of Topeka, Kans.:

NATION NEEDS TEAMWORK

"What shall it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" In a like manner, what shall it profit industry, labor, and politicians to gain temporary selfish objectives, but lose the principles of democracy and with it the highest standard of living in the world? As Abraham Lincoln so wisely said, "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

Democracy is that form of government instituted among men for the preservation of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for all its members. Cooperation is not just a sentiment—it is an economic necessity.

Our economy is in a turmoil, occasioned by the fact that various groups, instead of working together for the general welfare of the Nation, have sought individual advantages that are detrimental to the American standard of living and are wrecking the very life of America. Our very existence as a democracy is being threatened. Some people think we should adopt some kind of an "ism." Why take chances of losing our freedom when by using reason and common sense we can preserve the system that has outdistanced all other forms of government and made us the strongest nation on earth? The road to serfdom is reflected in "isms" of any kind and we are only gambling with our future by adopting any of them.

The Nation is sick and will require the combined conscientious services of four doctors to effect a cure—Dr. Industry, Dr. Labor, Dr. Government, and Dr. Public, all working together to save the life of the patient, Uncle Sam. They must work together like "the Three Musketeers—one for all and all for one."

We as human beings have a bloodstream and when this bloodstream gets clogged our bodies cannot function normally. The bloodstream of a nation is business and in a like sense when the nation's bloodstream gets clogged the nation canpot function normally. People who are employed (regardless of what kind of work they are doing) are part of the business structure and are just as important and have equal responsibilities to business as have the people who own the business—one simply cannot get along without the other. A baseball team is a good illustration of the importance of every individual. If you were asked which player on a ball team is most important you could not give an accurate answer, because without the services of a single player the game could not be played. In the same manner of reasoning business cannot function without the cooperation of everybody. The workers need the job and industry needs the worker. If there were no such thing as business or private enterprise the country would be in the same pitiful condition as many countries in Europe and other lands. The interests of business must be safeguarded by the worker because it furnishes his living. On the other hand business must recognize its humanitarian reponsibilities to the worker and look upon him as a human being and not as a commodity. Human values are the greatest values in the world and must be reckoned on this basis.

World War III can be prevented, but only if we of the United States have the moral stamina to remain as strong and unified in the days ahead as we were in the war years just past. To be any less will be to break faith with men dead and babes unborn.

HARRY R. NIGHTINGALE.

TOPEKA.

The Fallacy of Truman's Argument Opposing Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the most significant proposition in the President's argument opposing tax reduction "at this time" was based on the supposition that any reduction in taxes would lead to an increased tendency toward inflation. A sound economic analysis of this proposition fails to substantiate Mr. Truman's position. On the contrary, it reduces his argument to sophistry.

The ultimate effect of both inflation and taxation is essentially the same. The only notable exception being that in the case of inflation, after the Government has withdrawn goods and services from the market, a great quantity of money is placed in circulation. In the case of taxation, the Government withdraws goods and services from the market, but the quantity of money in circulation is left unchanged.

Now, let us suppose that the expression of the will of both Houses of Congress, in their attempt to relieve the taxpayers of the Nation, had not been restrained by the indiscreet use of the Presidential veto. In such an event, the quantity of goods and services that the Government could withdraw from the market would have been reduced by that amount which the tax reduction, in dollars, could command. In other words, the public would be left with more take-home pay with which to purchase the goods and services the Government would ordinarily have withdrawn from the market. The excess quantity of money left in the hands of the public would be offset by the increased quantity of goods made available for public consumption. How then can the President argue that if taxes are reduced an increased tendency toward inflation will necessarily follow? Such a conclusion must be preconceived, for logic does not bear it out.

The most that can be said, in the event of a tax reduction, is either no change in the tendency toward inflation will occur, or, if any change does manifest itself, it is more likely to decrease rather than increase the force of the inflationary spiral. In any event, a change in either direction will be negligible, and any attempt on Mr. Truman's part to appear unduly alarmed seems to be motivated by a desire to play the role of an amateur actor attempting to convince his audience that he is truly an artist.

Was Mr. Truman advised, or does he not know, that the veto power of the President was never intended to be used for political purposes, but was given to him to protect the Nation from legislation which might not be for the best interests of the general welfare of the Nation? When was tax reduction not for the general welfare of the Nation at a time when one out of each three dollars earned goes for taxes? His veto of the tax bill may have serious effects on our foreign policy.

Here is an illuminating editorial by David Lawrence on that subject:

FOREIGN POLICY MAY BE IN PERIL

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, June 13.—It's a far cry from a tax-reduction bill to the bipartisan foreign policy which it is the task of Secretary of State Marshall to carry out. But the connection between the two is so important that it is no exaggeration to say that by vetoing the tax bill, President Truman could imperil our foreign policy. Everyone who has followed these dispatches for the last several years knows that this writer has said that American economic aid to Europe was essential to the restoration of peace and to world progress. But the problem is wrapped up tightly in whether the Republican and Democratic Parties can work together in Congress to authorize such a policy.

On the horizon the clouds of discord are looming up. For several weeks the storm signals have been apparent. President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall may not be aware of it, but a break between the White House and Congress at this time will come close to wrecking the whole international economic program, which is so vital to Europe and to America.

To make any bipartisan policy succeed there must be an era of good feeling. Mr. Truman's veto of the tax bill will inaugurate an era of bad feeling. It is not the failure to benefit by the relatively small amount of money derived from the tax reductions which will bring resentment but the principles involved.

The tax rates which the country was asked to bear during wartime were high. Individuals in all income brackets gladly endured the cut in income because of wartime needs. Then came the repeal of the excess-profits taxes for corporations in order to assist in the reconversion process. The general understanding in Congress was that relief from individual income-tax rates would follow immediately after the repeal of the excess-profits taxes.

Now it begins to look as if the President is not going to keep faith but will play politics. His own party went on record in favor of tax reduction at this session of Congress but urged a different formula.

Experience in the 1920's was that the lower the tax rates the higher the receipts. This is because tax reduction is a stimulus to the turn-over of business and individual transactions. Some "left wingers" have been trying to argue recently that reduction in taxes in the 1920's caused the boom that ended in the 1929 collapse but the very thing which really caused that break is present today—a critical world situation.

A similar situation could arise today. The export trade of the United States exceeds the amounts we buy by a sum estimated at $3,000,000,000 a year. To pull the bottom out of world trade now may precipitate a depression.

There is only one way to avert it—to eliminate class warfare in the United States, stimulate business and production, and to finance the world trade that is so essential to the development of a strong Europe.

Unless the Republicans in Congress cooperate on this program, it will fail. If Mr. Truman vetoes the tax bill a partisan fight of such bitter proportions will ensue that the foreign economic program will be lost in the shuffle.

When the country elects a majority in both Houses of Congress from one political party, the President ought to pause considerably before injecting a one-man veto into the situation and starting an era of bad feeling that cannot but hurt the Nation in the long run.

Police Exposé in District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Post, Tuesday, June 30, 1947:

POLICE EXPOSÉ

Washingtonians have been living in a fool's paradise. So far as their personal safety and the safety of their possessions are concerned, they have been grossly misled as to dangers that confront them every day in the year. The police have concealed hundreds of crimes. We have been led to believe, through the release of official statistics, that the police have been solving an astonishingly high percentage of the robberies committed in the District. The Post's exposé of the department's secret files shows that this record was attained only by keeping out of the official statistics more than 600 "pocketed" reports of robberies over a period of 11 months.

Even more serious is the fact that the Police Department has been crippling itself by withholding information about local crimes from its own men. As fully explained by Robert Bruskin and John Singerhoff in their detailed story in the Post of yesterday, crimes on which reports have been withheld from the police teletype system become known only to a few detectives and the police of one precinct. Many citizens who have been knocked down with a blackjack or held up at the point of a gun and robbed of substantial sums of money in the last 11 months now know that their cases were never reported to the police as a whole. Nor have they been reported to the community to give an awareness of how serious its crime problem is. Neither the full power of the police themselves nor of an aroused public indignation has been utilized in the fight against crime.

What is the purpose of this dangerous concealment? Inspector Robert J. Barrett, who is scheduled to be sworn in as superintendent of police tomorrow, says the practice "just grew up over the years." At the same time he admits that "nobody has the power to hold legitimate cases." The fact that hundreds of reports of robbery were held in the precincts in the last 11 months at the behest of the Detective Bureau, which Inspector Barrett heads, may indicate only negligence and careless administration. But this system, or lack of system, could be used to conceal and shield underworld operators. The surest way to prevent the arrest of criminals is to hide the information that a crime has been committed.

It is obvious, too, that such loose reporting practices expose our law-enforcement officers to ready opportunities for corruption. If reports of robberies can be withheld from the police teletype system and from the press, thugs will not be slow in offering bribes to officers who are in a position to bring about such concealment. We do not charge that corruption has followed in the wake of concealment. But the fact that the door to it has been opened is serious enough to warrant a thorough investigation. It is well to remember that the Post's exposé has dealt only with robbery cases. Indications are that crime reports have been "pocketed" in various other categories of cases. The whole story can be exposed to the light of day only through a searching inquiry, and we think that task should be undertaken by the House or Senate District Committee, or, preferably, a joint committee representing both.

The Detective Bureau's belated effort to close as many "pocketed" cases as possible after the Post's investigation got under way is an admission of past laxity. The Inspector's statement Sunday, promising a complete check of the Detective Bureau's crime reporting methods at once and a survey of the entire department after he is sworn in as Police Superintendent, constitutes a prompt acknowledgment of the importance of accurate reports and a commendable promise to secure them. We hope that this move to set its own house in order will prove effective and that the Department will begin the new fiscal year under orders from within to report every crime of which the police acquire knowledge. But clearly that is not enough. The extent, purpose and effect of this concealment ought to be fully disclosed by an impartial body of public servants. Only in that way can the community hope to secure effective correction of this abuse of discretion and to formulate a sound judgment as to what the needs of the Department are.

What National Health Insurance Would Mean to You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to say something about a proposal that I, together with some of my distinguished colleagues in the House and Senate, are offering to provide the American people with a greater measure of health security. I refer to the National Health Insurance and Public Health Act of 1947. This proposal is embodied in my bill H. R. 3579, H. R. 3543 offered by Representative DINGELL, and S. 1320 offered by Senators WAGNER, MURRAY, PEPPER, CHAVEZ, MCGRATH, and TAYLOR.

Now I am deeply concerned as are my colleagues with this problem of medical care, of how difficult it is under ordinary circumstances for the average American family to meet the relatively heavy burden of hospital and medical costs that result from illness. For the average American family, medical care, unlike food, clothing, and the other necessities of life is not a budgetable item. Illness is unpredictable and the costs resulting therefrom are even more so. This problem, therefore, is one that I am sure deeply affects every American family. Some are fortunate in being able to take advantage of the benefits offered by voluntary health insurance plans, such as the Blue Cross, group-health plans, and others sponsored by industry, unions, fraternity organizations, and the medical societies. But these plans have not been able to provide the American people as a whole with preventive and curative services at a cost that they can easily afford. In fact little more than 3 percent of the population gets full care through such plans. And so, there is a very real and widespread need for a more adequate and fully comprehensive program—a program that will help to make our Nation a more healthy and secure one in time of peace as well as in time of war.

In a special message to the Congress on May 19, 1947, the President of the United States urged the enactment of a national health insurance program. He pointed out, and I quote:

> If the financial risk of illness is spread among all our people, no one person is overburdened. More important, if the cost is spread in this manner more persons can see their doctors, and will see them earlier. This goal can be reached only through a national medical insurance program, under which all people who are covered by an insurance fund are entitled to necessary medical, hospital, and related services.

The proposal to which I referred a moment ago is the national health insurance proposal recommended by the President. This is how it would work. Let us take the case of Mr. Sam Jones, a constituent of mine who lives in the city

of New York. He has a wife and three children and earns $45 a week. He would pay 67½ cents a week into the national health insurance fund, and his employer would put in an equal amount. When Mr. Jones or any one of his family was sick, he would call in or go to see a doctor, any doctor he chose, the same as he does today. Only he would pay nothing to the doctor. The doctor would be paid from the insurance fund to which Mr. Jones contributed. So also with a hospital, if he needed hospital care.

The national health insurance fund would be divided up among the States, and the States in turn would allocate money to each locality. The health insurance fund would pay the doctors and hospitals, through a local committee in which both doctors and people would be represented.

If Mr. Jones belonged to a voluntary health insurance plan which furnished adequate services, he could continue to be a member and receive services from the plan. The health insurance fund would pay the plan for serving him. Mr. Jones and all other self-supporting families would be able to get medical care as a right, not a charity. The very poor who cannot pay the insurance would be paid for out of local and State tax funds, with Federal aid. The doctors would not be Government employees but would be in practice as they are now, only they would not have to worry about uncollected bills.

Terminal-Leave Bonds Should Be Made Negotiable for Cash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made before the Subcommittee on Pay and Administration of the Armed Services Committee in favor of terminal-leave pay in cash for our veterans:

Mr. Chairman, I fully realized the need for legislation for cash payment of terminal-leave benefits to veterans early in this session when I introduced H. R. 117 which provided for terminal-leave pay in cash or in bonds which could be held or converted into cash at the discretion of the veteran.

Cash payments of terminal-leave pay will bring greater economy. Through cash payments, interest on bonds which otherwise would have been issued will be saved, and there will be some reduction in the national debt.

At the present time, rising costs of living have created additional hardship for veterans who have tried to take advantage of the various aids to their rehabilitation under the GI bill of rights. Payment of terminal-leave pay in cash will provide immediate cash for many deserving veterans who need money to buy or build homes. It will help other veterans in their business ventures. It will be a great aid to student veterans who need extra cash immediately to supplement their meager subsistence allowance.

Terminal-leave benefits have been approved for these veterans. No additional money is involved in these bills. No new benefits are provided. Cash payment of terminal-leave benefits will only make available to the veteran immediately money already granted to him for future payment.

The veteran today is establishing his place in postwar America. Today his need is greatest for every assistance which will enable him to make his own position in the future secure, whether he is establishing a home or a farm, a business, a trade, or seeking the knowledge which will enable him to enter professional, scientific, or technical fields. He is entitled to terminal-leave pay, and he is entitled to this payment now in cash.

I urge the members of this committee to act favorably on this legislation, and to send a bill to the House which will provide for cash payment of terminal-leave pay.

The Case for the Bureaucrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate that during the war years the Army and Navy built up large staffs which they now would like to keep. I have always urged that nonessential Federal employees be dispensed with. But, on the other hand, I have deplored the false economy with which many valuable and experienced employees are forced out of Government service by cutting off funds or by refusing pay commensurate with the work they do, so that the very corporations which protest the most about Government expenditures are able to offer better salaries and take away the best public servants.

I can recall the names of many in recent years who, during their tenure as Government employees, were assailed and denounced as braintrusters and bureaucrats because they performed their sworn duty to uphold the laws and to save and protect the interest of the people, and who were then hired by private interests at big salaries. The economy I want is the economy of efficient operation and not the false economy of cutting out needed and useful services by blind bias.

In that connection I have read discussion of the situation which reminds us that most civilian employees of the United States Government serve faithfully in carrying out services which the people have demanded and the Congress has authorized.

Many of the Members will remember the author of this article, entitled "The Case for the Bureaucrats," appearing in Pageant for May, as a congressional employee. His name is Jack Pollack, and his background enables him to speak with authority. Under leave granted, I insert the text of the article in the RECORD.

THE CASE FOR THE BUREAUCRAT

(By Jack H. Pollack)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author of this article is a former Senate committee investigator, Department of Justice, and war-agency official. He is now a contributor to the leading national magazines.)

Chances are your newspaper or radio tonight will remind you that the Federal Government is still swarming with bureaucrats. The very word grates on your nerves as you conjure up a vision of chair-warming, clock-watching parasites dreaming up new ways to make your life miserable, squander your taxes, and keep themselves feeding at the public trough.

It would be surprising if you had a different picture. For years this serio-comic figure, the bureaucrat, has been depicted and denounced by Congressmen, newspaper, magazine, and radio oracles hell-bent for economy.

Uncle Sam's pay roll does harbor some drones. So does any large public or private organization. But the vast majority of Government workers are sincere, hard-working men and women. I have never seen people work more devotedly and unselfishly than in Government service, with their chief reward the satisfaction of performing a useful public service despite below-the-belt criticism.

Politics, obviously, is behind most of the clamor against the Federal worker-scapegoat, and most of the agitation is irresponsible. A fair-minded Vermont Republican, Senator GEORGE AIKEN, recently warned that, if recent retrenchment moves do not cease, the Government will lose "some of its most capable employees." As it is, President Truman complains that he is having great difficulty in persuading competent Democrats and Republicans to work for the Government.

Government workers did not appear out of a clear sky. Federal agencies long have been created by Congress to perform various services. It takes people to carry out these services.

Back in 1789, the War, State, Treasury, and Justice Departments were established for our protection. Forty years later, the Post Office Department was set up. Today, if we recklessly lop off poorly paid postal workers, as some politicians would like to do, your mail and mine will be delivered, sorted, and collected that much slower.

All along the line, fewer Federal workers means less Federal service. Reducing Agriculture Department employees means that farmers will get less attention to their problems; cutting Commerce Department employees means that businessmen will get less help; slashing Labor Department employees means that organized and unorganized workers will suffer.

Federal agencies have been created as the need has arisen. The Federal Deposit and Insurance Corporation was established to protect your bank deposits up to $5,000. The Securities and Exchange Commission was set up to safeguard your stock investments against unscrupulous speculators. The Social Security Act was passed to give you unemployment compensation and old-age benefits.

There are countless other Federal services which you now take for granted. The Food and Drug Administration protects you from misbranded and adulterated food and drugs. The Federal Trade Commission is your watchdog against false advertising and unfair trade practices. There is even a Government agency called the Panama Canal which guards the Canal Zone.

Naturally, Federal workers in these and other agencies can be dispensed with, if we so desire. We can discharge Veterans' Administration employees and give our GI's less medical and hospital care. We can even scrap GI loans so veterans won't get into debt, as Congressman JOHN TABER wishes. We can fire employees in the United States Forest Service and risk more forest fires. We

can do without the custodians of our national parks and visit other places in the summer. We can slash the Coast Guard, United States Coast and Geodetic Service and lighthouse workers—and risk our lives at sea.

Contrary to common belief, all Government workers don't sit at desks and push pencils and pieces of paper around. They are engaged in virtually every type of work from vital scientific research to guarding prisons.

During the war a group of Agriculture Department employees in Florida had the strange task of lying on their stomachs and allowing 40,000 lice to bite them. As a result, Agriculture Department scientists developed an effective new louse powder.

Many Government employees do work which private industry would reward with far fatter salaries and many toil a lot harder in the Federal service than they would elsewhere. Indeed, many Federal employees literally have worked themselves to death, putting in long overtime hours without thought of extra pay or glory. Many have patriotically given their lives in the United States Public Health Service, the border patrol, and other lines of Federal duty.

Charles M. Hay was one such Capital casualty, during the grim Battle of the Bulge days, when the Army was desperately demanding a last-minute civilin labor draft. Acting head of the War Manpower Commission, Hay fervently believed it was unnecessary then, as did his boss, Paul McNutt, who was touring the European battlefields. For grueling weeks Hay was on Washington's hottest seat, testifying before hostile congressional committees egged on by the Army.

After a tormenting session before the House Military Affairs Committee, Hay wearily sighed, "That bunch won't give anybody a fair trial." That was the last time I ever saw overfatigued Charley Hay alive. He went home to take a nap—and moved on to a higher bar of judgment.

Joseph B. Eastman, who kept wartime America moving on trains as head of the Office of Defense Transportation, also died in the line of Federal duty. Eastman was a Washington work horse, arriving at his office 8 a. m. 7 days a week and only sneaking time out for dinner between 5:30 and 6 p. m. Back at his desk, he would toil until midnight. If he got home for Sunday dinner, he considered it a holiday. Joe Eastman gave his life to his Government, including 25 years as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, though repeatedly he was offered 20 times his Government salary by private industry.

But all the Government casualties aren't headliners. Most are obscure little people who unselfishly serve above and beyond the call of duty. Olive Jack, a former assistant in the Library of Congress law branch, was one. For years she toiled 14 hours a day and even part of Sunday when the Library was officially closed, just in case a Member of Congress might need some information. She once worked all night on a research job for an investigating legislator who wanted the material by morning. He thanked her, of course, but when he moved on to the Supreme Court, he forgot her, as did the others.

Though she never took time off in all her years at the Library, Olive Jack suddenly decided to do so. Her friends, worried about her failing health, were delighted. But their joy was short-lived, as was Olive Jack. Friends later found out that her "vacation" was spent at the Mayo Clinic, where she went for a grave operation.

Judges may lead tranquil lives elsewhere, but not in Washington. During the long wartime sedition trial, Judge Edward E. Eicher took a merciless heckling from public, press, and defendants. The Department of Justice made his task a thousandfold greater by trying the accused together rather than individually. Anxious not to delay the trial, conscientious Judge Eicher toiled day and night. His friends warned him to take it easy. He said he would when he got caught up. The Grim Reaper caught up with him first, on a day when he felt ill and refused to go home.

Here are some facts for critics of bureaucrats to ponder:

1. There are a million fewer Government workers today: Since VJ-day over 1,500,000 Federal employees have been released. Uncle Sam then had 3,500,000 civilian workers compared to today's less than 2,000,000.

2. All are not in Washington: Only 200,000 of those 2,000,000 now work in the Nation's Capital. About 300,000 work outside United States boundaries; the rest in the 48 States. So, if 10 Federal workers are fired, only 1 will be discharged in Washington.

3. War agency workers have virtually disappeared: War agencies have vanished faster than Congress or the administration believed possible.

4. Federal workers are fired: Though some people would like to have you think otherwise, once an individual lands on Uncle Sam's payroll, he is not there for life. President Truman reveals that during the past year the Government fired over 100,000 employees because they were idlers, tardy, immoral, subversive, or what not. This figure does not include the vast number dismissed when their war agency work stopped.

5. We must decide what Federal services we want stopped: The question is not one of arithmetic but of what present Government services we want curtailed or expanded. If Uncle Sam is to continue serving us, Washington, D. C., can never become a ghost town, no matter which party is in power. Wise planning of our Federal employment instead of irresponsible cutting and slashing ought to be our national policy. If we cripple or wipe out Government services, it may cost us taxpayers money in the long run.

Wreckage of Hiroshima Impresses Touring Editors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

WRECKAGE OF HIROSHIMA IMPRESSES TOURING EDITORS

(Article 24)

A visit to Hiroshima, the first of two Japanese cities to be blasted by the atomic bomb, was the most dramatic and impressive event of the far eastern tour of American newspaper publishers and editors.

In outward appearances the destruction is typical of that which was visited on all Japanese cities which felt the intense fury of American bombing attacks.

But the awe-inspiring thing about Hiroshima is that what happened there took place in a matter of seconds and that the great devastation and loss of life resulted from a single raid by a single plane carrying a single bomb, instead of by repeated visits of fleets of planes carrying tens of thousands of tons of bombs.

Moreover, close examination reveals many peculiar effects of the atomic blast, due to its tremendous force and heat, some of a freak nature.

One of the members of our party, stumbling through the ruins of what had been the main post office, came across a bottle which told a mute story of the effect of the atom bomb. It was about the size of a Coca-Cola bottle, but there the resemblance stopped. It had been flattened by the crushing force of the blast. In addition, the neck had been curved, so that when the bottle lay on its side, the mouth pointed nearly straight up. The heat had been so intense that the bottle was in a semimolten state when the blast flattened it, so that the glass was not even cracked or chipped.

On the railings of a bridge near the center of the town there are two ornamental stone lanterns. One had been pushed out of place about a foot to the right. The other had been nudged a similar distance to the left, leading experts to calculate that the center of the blast had been directly overhead.

A round marble ball on a Japanese tombstone had been pushed over on its side. But before it rolled back into position, bricks from the cemetery wall had been blown under it, with the result that the stone is now permanently tilted.

The bottom walls of a church had been blown completely away, leaving the top part, with the steeple intact, to settle crazily on the ruins of the foundation. Surfaces of smooth, dense marble were chipped and flaked by the heat and radioactivity, presenting a scorched appearance. Shadows, however, seemed to protect flat surfaces from radiation burns.

At the Red Cross hospital, which still bears ghastly scars of the explosion, although it is more than a mile from the center of the blast, the visiting newspapermen saw a reenactment of John Hersey's noted story of Hiroshima. It was staged by members of the original cast, including the six characters whose experiences Hersey related.

In addition to these, the British Commonwealth Occupation Forces, whose jurisdiction includes Hiroshima, and American military government officials exhibited victims of the blast who are still undergoing treatment at the Red Cross hospital.

Among them were a farmer, Taro Mitsushima, whose nose is partially gone and whose ears were burned off; and a dentist, Dr. Kiyoshi Kikukawa, whose back is almost completely covered with a large keloid, a purple-covered fibrous tissue caused by radiation burns. He was standing with his back to the explosion and put his hands over the back of his head when he saw the flash. Both hands were frightfully burned and the tendons in his wrists and arms shriveled.

All of the victims told of seeing a blinding light. Some thought it was purple, others yellow. This was followed by clouds of dust which obscured the sun. Then came fires and hurricane winds.

WHITE REFLECTS RAYS

Some people wearing white garments miraculously escaped without burns, as white cloth appeared to deflect the rays. But black cloth absorbed them, and caused deep burns underneath.

Bandages and salve had no healing effect on the burns. Many of those who were treated in this manner now are afflicted with the keloid scar-tissue growth. Frequent washing of the wounds with cold water and exposure to the air brought the best results.

A Jesuit priest, Father Peter Arrupe, cared for 60 victims of the blast at the Catholic monastery located on one of the hills surrounding Hiroshima. All but one of his patients survived, which was the best record of recoveries made in any of the temporary hospitals set up after the explosion. Father Arrupe spent 10 months at the St. Stanislaus Novitiate, 5629 State Road, Parma, in 1938 and 1939.

Father William Kleinsorge, S. J., of the Catholic mission, one of the principal characters in Hersey's book, was asked to give his opinion of the book.

"Well," he said with some hesitation, "it was historically accurate, but the way he told it, it seemed more interesting."

Father Kleinsorge said there was no particular hatred of Americans among the survivors at Hiroshima because of the atomic bomb. They took the attitude, he said, that "if we make war, we must bear the consequences."

They regarded the atom bomb as one of the consequences, to be borne philosophically and without complaint, just as other Japanese cities bore the 1,000-plane raids and showers of fire bombs.

It never occurred to the Japanese to regard the atomic bomb as an atrocity until they began to hear criticisms to that effect from American sources, Father Kleinsorge said. Then some of their agitators took up the cry.

Father Hubert Schiffer, S. J., of the Catholic Mission, said there was a question in his mind whether it was right and humane to drop bombs on civilian populations.

"But if that kind of warfare is accepted," he said, "I see no difference between one bomb of the atomic variety and 1,000 of the other kind."

All the priests, and Rev. Kiyoshi Tanimoto, the Methodist clergyman whose experiences, also were described in the Hersey book, said they did not believe the fact that the atomic bomb was dropped by a nation which professes Christianity had had a detrimental effect on the teaching of Christianity in Japan.

On the contrary, they said, there was a greater interest in Christianity among the survivors at Hiroshima than there ever had been before.

At the time the atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima its population was approximately 245,000. It has been estimated that deaths from the explosion and its after effects totaled approximately 100,000. The radiation sickness was not always fatal. Thousands who were affected by it have recovered. Most of the survivors have returned.

The city is slowly being rebuilt. Shacks and temporary structures dot the burned-out area. One enterprising Japanese is all set for the tourist trade. He has opened a store which he has named "Bookseller Atom."

Ownership of California Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

IN RE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DECISION UPHOLDING FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S CLAIM TO OWNERSHIP OF CALIFORNIA TIDELANDS: RESOLUTION URGING IMMEDIATE ADOPTION OF LEGISLATION BY CONGRESS RESTORING RIGHTS TO STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND OTHER STATES AND THEIR SUBDIVISIONS

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of the *United States of America* v. *State of California*, by a 6 to 2 decision, yesterday held that the ownership of lands from a point beginning at low tide and extending 3 miles to the sea, is in the Federal Government and not in the State of California; and

Whereas the decision is of far-reaching importance, not only to the State of California and to the coastal States similarly affected, but is also detrimental to the best interests of the cities of Los Angeles, Long Beach, Santa Monica, and other municipalities throughout this State and Nation, which have invested millions of dollars of public funds in the construction of ports, harbors, and other installations, some of which are located on inland navigable waters and along the seacoast within such 3-mile belt; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in approximately 50 prior decisions, held that such lands belonged to the State or to its successors or grantees who have received title to such lands from the State and thus have full and complete title and ownership to such lands; and

Whereas House Joint Resolution 225 was adopted by the Seventy-ninth Congress, but subsequently vetoed by the President, to quiet the title of the States, their successors, and grantees to such lands lying from low tide and extending 3 miles to sea, in order to remove the cloud created by the claims of the Department of Interior; and

Whereas it is imperative to protect the interests of the State of California, the cities of Los Angeles, Long Beach, Santa Monica, and other cities in Los Angeles County, that corrective legislation be enacted similar to House Joint Resolution 225 introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States to rectify the inequities arising out of the Supreme Court's decision, in order that there be restored to the State of California and to its subdivisions their rightful property; and

Whereas such legislation would not interfere with the paramount right of the United States to control navigation or to provide for the common defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles as follows:

1. That the Congress of the United States is urged to immediately adopt at this session of Congress, legislation to correct the inequities which will follow from the Supreme Court's decision and restore to the State of California, other States and their subdivisions, property rights in accordance with the rule promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States nearly 100 years ago that the States are the owners of all their navigable waters and the soil of the beds thereof, which rule has up to this time been consistently adhered to.

2. That the board of supervisors of the county of Los Angeles pledges its support to join in such a campaign to secure such corrective legislation at this session of Congress.

3. That County Counsel Harold W. Kennedy is directed and authorized to participate in the drafting and passage of such legislation, subject to further orders of the board of supervisors.

4. That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary of the Department of Interior, and to each Member of the congressional delegation representing the State of California, and copies released to the press.

Needed and Desirable Changes in Federal Corporate Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by James D. Mooney, president and chairman of the board, Willys-Overland Motors, Inc., before the House Ways and Means Committee:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is James D. Mooney. I am president and chairman of the board of Willys-Overland Motors, Inc., Toledo, Ohio.

At the outset, let me assure you that business executives throughout the country have a most sincere and practical appreciation of the responsibilities imposed upon this committee and upon the Congress. The Government must be financed; our public debt must be courageously managed; everything must be done to encourage industrial activity and high employment. In other words, the Government must prosper and the taxpayer must prosper. There is but one answer: production. In our way of life, that means production at a profit.

Taxes are one of the problems of industry with which I deal as an operating executive. Although I certainly do not presume to be an expert in tax theories, I have had to live intimately with the practical side of taxes for many years as a manager charged with taking capital and making a prudent return on it. Industry is subject to many different types of taxation. I shall confine myself to the practical effect on production of present tax rates on the income of corporations and on the earned income of corporations' employees.

I shall present two difficulties that managers of industry like myself face because of present tax rates. Industrial health is seriously impaired by the requirement of so high a proportion of cash outlay for taxes, while at the same time industry is handicapped in attracting outstanding men.

Today industry is faced with many problems as a result of the war. Uncertainties of war have given way to uncertainties of reconversion, and along with reconversion problems, industry is plagued by the uncertainty of the future. Shall we plan against a gloomy economic period or a golden age of industrial expansion?

CANNOT EXPECT ABLE MEN TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITIES WITHOUT INCENTIVES

To cope with these problems, industry needs well-trained, intelligent men of high caliber, capable of assuming the responsibilities of executive positions. We find great difficulty in securing such qualified men. Men properly expect an incentive in the form of an adequate return for their services. Let us take a look at what has happened to the compensations which such men receive for their services.

In 1939, a man who was head of an average family and received $20,000 per year paid a Federal income tax of $1,247, thus having a net income after taxes of $18,753. Today this same man pays a Federal income tax of $5,178, thus receiving a net income after taxes of $14,822. Another factor which must be taken into consideration when making this comparison is the cost of living. In March 1947, the cost of living index was 156.3 on a 1935–1939 base of 100. Expressing the man's actual net income in terms of 1939 dollars, we find it is only $9,483—approximately half of what it was 8 years ago.

Many men needed by vital industries reason that they can do better financially in other channels of work with fewer headaches. The operating executive is not alone in this reduction of purchasing power which has been partially caused by our high rate of taxation. In 1939, an average family man receiving an annual wage of $3,000 paid no Federal tax based on income. Today, this same man pays a Federal income tax of $228. He receives a net income of $2,772 which, when expressed in terms of 1939 dollars, is only $1,744 of real purchasing power.

DANGEROUS DRAIN UPON VITAL ASSETS OF OUR CORPORATIONS

My second point is that current taxation rates threaten corporate entities. Corporate

surpluses from 1936 to 1939 decreased about $1,600,000,000. During this period, many corporations were losing money. Others were distributing dividends larger than they earned. This condition improved somewhat in 1940, and during the succeeding 4 years, surpluses increased by over $21,000,000,000. A survey by the National Industrial Conference Board of 14 manufacturing industries indicates that in the period 1939 to 1944, surpluses had risen in a general range of from 30 to 95 percent.

This increase was before the impact of reconversion. Now that we are well along in the reconversion period, I believe that a period of expansion lies ahead. Present capital reserves will be strained to finance it. Industry is faced with real problems of long-deferred plant maintenance. The current dependence is on prewar plants which are geared to a rate from a third to a half lower than the rate in prospect. The world is hungry for goods that for a time only our country can satisfy. The shortage of venture capital may eventually be one of the principal bottlenecks in sustaining high employment. Finally, these and other pressures upon supply in certain other industries portend prices much above the prewar levels. It is evident, therefore, that there will be a considerable drain upon the assets of corporations.

The solution to many of these problems lies in the surpluses, reserves, and future retention of profit by the corporations. Upon analysis, few corporations have what may be termed a position of excess liquidity. The ratio of cash to sales has not risen. The National City Bank Monthly Letter of March 1947, has an anlysis of the balance sheets of 130 manufacturing corporations having a sales or total assets over $5,000,000 which indicates that for the period December 1940, to December 1946, the ratio of current assets to current liabilities declined. This would imply that many of the new resources accumulated during the war period are needed even now to support the current levels of business, and that in many cases, capital and cash positions are none too strong.

QUARTERLY SCRAMBLE TO MEET HUGE TAX BILL IN CASH

In view of these obstacles, the present tax program is definitely not designed to lend a helping hand to the corporation when it is most needed. In 1939, corporations were taxed at a rate of 19 percent, while today they are assessed a normal tax of 24 percent and a surtax of 14 percent, or a total of 38 percent. It should also be borne in mind that these taxes are not payable by the corporations in raw materials, notes receivable, or finished products. They are payable in cash. This means that four times a year the management of the corporation must arrange the finances of the corporation to meet the tax bill.

Many corporations have been faced with the necessity of borrowing to meet their current obligations. During 1946, bank loans for commercial, industrial, and agricultural purposes increased by over 40 percent. This borrowing to meet tax obligations not only puts another obstacle in the path of corporation progress at a time when cash resources are sorely needed, but also imposes upon the corporation a penalty for services rendered during the war period.

Another factor in the corporate tax picture is the effect of this taxation upon profits. We have become the greatest Nation on this earth through industrialization, and profit has been the incentive for encouraging industry. Unless we are to change our way of life, we must allow investors to realize a fair return on their investment. This does not mean that they should be allowed to retain an exorbitant profit, but they should be adequately compensated for their risk. No individual will continue to invest in industry and risk losing his capital if he can realize the same return from gilt-edged securities. While corporate taxes have been somewhat eased by the repeal of the excess-profits tax, the taxation rate is still sufficiently high to keep net earnings at a relatively low level.

Our present 38-percent tax rate has imposed on industry additional burdens in draining industry's cash and discouraging venture capital.

MORE TAX DOLLARS, MORE EMPLOYMENT, AND MORE BUSINESS AT LOWER TAX RATES

Many individuals have advocated continuance of high taxation rates in order to reduce the national debt and combat inflation. Let us, for a moment, take a look at this theory. In view of the rising cost of living and high taxes, management has had to increase the workers' wages in an attempt to maintain their purchasing power. This has, of course, done nothing more than increase the cost of manufactured products, which, when added to the high-tax burden imposed upon the corporations, has made it necessary for the manufacturer to raise the selling price of his product to cover increased cost.

Within reasonable limits, this process may occur with no apparent ill effects. However, whether we like it or not, sooner or later a basic economic law will come into operation. That law is the law of supply and demand.

As the manufacturer is forced to increase gradually the selling price of an article, the demand for that article decreases. As the demand for the article decreases, the manufacturer must decrease production. As production decreases, unit cost increases because of fixed charges of the manufacturing plant. This process continues until the manufacturer is either forced out of business or is able to reduce cost to bring the selling price of the product down to the point where there is again a demand for it.

It is my opinion that by reducing the corporate-tax burden substantially at the present time, the inflationary spiral will be broken. A manufacturer, because of decreased cost, will then be able to lower selling prices and consequently increase his production and distribution.

Would reduction of tax rates tend to increase, or at least hold constant our national debt which, for sound economy, should be decreased? The law of supply and demand is not limited to products, but applies equally to money. By increasing production, we would provide more employment, and in providing more employment pay out more dollars which would be subject to Federal tax based on income.

In all probability, although the rate of taxation would be lower, we would actually receive more dollars in taxes than under the present high rate of taxation. This basic law of supply and demand is recognized throughout industry. Experience shows that when we reduce the rate of income for each product we sell, we take in more dollars of income through increasing volume. Present high rates, on the other hand, set the law of diminishing returns into motion.

MUST NOT CONFUSE TAX RATES WITH TAX DOLLARS

What I am attempting to point out is that, at present, we are confusing rates of taxes with dollars of taxes. It has been proven in industry and applies equally well to taxes that a reduction in rate increases rather than decreases the actual dollar return.

I should like to reiterate that I feel the solution to the present reconversion difficulties faced by industry and the reduction of the national debt will be hastened by reduced tax rates. Both as an industrial manager and as as an American vitally interested in the sound future of our country, I should then look to the future more confidently in the knowledge that industry did not have an excessive cash hurdle to jump every 3 months, and that we could offer incentives to attract top-grade men without whom our industry must decline.

Now I realize that you gentlemen would like, finally, some concrete suggestions for improving tax rates in the field of industry, so that you can arrive at the most practicable solution of helping industry and, in turn, collect the amount of money under such rates that is required to sustain the expenses of the Government. I have already commented upon the corporate rates.

INCENTIVE FOR EXECUTIVES

I should like to suggest that in this problem of providing incentives for industrial executives, the tax rates be set generally on the common-sense presumption that it is not fair to ask any man to work over half of his time for the Government. In other words, although of course I am not qualified to prescribe rates and schedules, I can give you one basic principle which must be applied, namely: That every worker must be able to earn enough after taxes to maintain his family and to encourage him to increase his earning ability. If you were to provide that earned income should in no case be subjected to a higher rate than 50 percent, I am confident that executive positions would hold and attract that type and caliber of man which industry must have if we are to meet its present and future problems.

PRINCIPLES FOR FINANCING INDUSTRY

Now let me make a final suggestion with respect to the actual financial problems which industry faces in maintaining its everyday job of maintenance and replacement, and in expanding its plant and facilities to meet future demands. Again, I can give you one controlling principle: In order to attract capital from private sources, the private investor must be assured of a return on his capital in the course of time, and of a return upon his investment commensurate with the risk we ask him to take. After all, there are only three sources from which a business enterprise can obtain funds: (1) from private sources, such as individual investors and financial houses; (2) from its own accumulated earnings and profits—and it is, of course, accountable to its stockholders for their use; and (3) from the Government. Unless the return after taxes is sufficiently attractive to keep sources (1) and (2) open and available—and I am confident that this Congress and our country will insist that this be true—then industry, bit by bit, slowly but surely, must turn to the Government.

Let me give you an example. As an executive planning to construct a new plant—which, in the course of 2 or 3 or 4 years, will be employing thousands of men and presumably making profits—I must convince each owner of the funds I wish to use that the amount of my proposed expenditure will be returned through profits in a reasonable period of time; that he will be able to obtain his capital back within a reasonable period of time; and that I can pay him for the use of his capital. I point out to you that as a practical business executive I must now convince that private owner that all three of these things can be done after taxes. I need not add that this is an exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, task for me at the present time. In fact, we are now making capital expenditures, expanding our plant, improving our product, increasing the efficiency of our production, and seeking new markets today, solely in the hope that tax rates tomorrow will be at levels which will justify our expenditures.

Again, it is quite impossible for me personally to suggest tax rates and tax schedules which will produce this result. I merely present to you the very practical principle. I am confident that no one will take serious issue with this principle. You gentlemen are far better prepared than I to formulate the definite, specific tax policies, and to fix the rates so that industrial management can

provide an assurance to investors that we can repay their capital and give them an attractive return after taxes.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I trust that my practical approach as an industrial executive will assist you in the tasks that now confront you. I am confident that the tax policies you establish for the next few years will have a tremendous and continuing effect upon the future of American industry, upon employers and employees, upon buyers and sellers, and upon the entire country. It has been a real pleasure to be with you.

Vivisection as a Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, vivisection of dogs, the torturing of dogs—man's best friend—is still going on. It is still practiced in every State. Hearings were held on my bill, H. R. 5572, during the last Congress. Hearings have been held on my bill, H. R. 462, in this session. The evidence submitted on H. R. 5572, if carefully examined, I am sure will convince any person that vivisection of dogs is no longer necessary or even beneficial to the medical profession.

All that can be learned from cutting up dogs—from torturing dogs—has been learned long ago. If anything further remains to be learned, it can be learned from a fox, a wolf, or any other member of the dog family, or from a dead dog, or any other dead animal. The only reason the dog has been used so extensively is because he trusts his master. It is the betrayal of the confidence of the dog that makes him an easy subject for vivisection.

I hope that every Member of Congress will sign Petition No. 3 at the Speaker's desk so that we may bring H. R. 462 up for discussion and disposition on its merits. Full hearings have been held. There is no reason for longer delay. In signing Petition No. 3 you will help to make the human race at least humane as far as man's best friend—the dog—is concerned.

It is with pleasure that I insert in these remarks an article, Vivisection as a Business, by Dr. A. V. Allen, of Chicago. Dr. Allen was for many years chief surgeon of the Commonwealth Edison Co. He is a fellow of the American Medical Association and a member of the Chicago Medical Society. Until his semiretirement a few years ago he was a member of the National Conference Board of Physicians in Industry. Dr. Allen is a graduate of the Chicago College of Medicine and Surgery (1909) and is a life member of the National Anti-Vivisection Society.

Here is the article:

VIVISECTION AS A BUSINESS

Few persons seem to realize that vivisection is a business. Men enter this business for the same reason they enter any other business—to make money and to further their own interests. Some critics have advanced the theory that men practice vivisection because of idle curiosity, or that they are sadists who enjoy seeing animals suffer. Except in rare cases, that is not true. The chief incentive for this type of work is self-advancement—making money by cruelty to animals.

It is not only the large salaries received by directors of laboratories or the fees for testing various products that make this business attractive; it is also the publicity—the self-advertising through newspaper stories, magazine articles, and radio talks. Without this publicity, stemming directly from vivisectional experiments, many a well-known vivisector would have remained engulfed in the great sea of professional and financial mediocrity.

PHONY RESEARCH IS KEY

Under the pretense of being engaged in research vivisectors have been able to establish expensive laboratories in our schools, where our dumb animals suffer the tortures of hell so that a few men may hold themselves up as great scientists. The leaders in this business must know that it is a phony; but there are, no doubt, many people under them who conscientiously believe they are cogs in a scientific machine, and as such are aids to science. I have known such doctors personally, and they were fine fellows except for their willingness to be cruel to animals. This they had learned from callous teachers. The responsibility lies with us for allowing our schools to feature such instruction.

Perhaps the best way to puncture the vivisection balloon is to tip off the public to some of the tricks regularly employed by the vivisectors and to expose the sharp practices by which they continue to fool the public year after year.

HOW VIVISECTION PAYS OFF

One of the most common tricks is to give press releases to the newspapers. These releases usually tell in glowing terms about how the vivisector involved is about to solve the mystery of some disease, or about a wonderful discovery he has just made thanks to animal research. They nearly always make the front page of the newspaper—when, in reality, they should be in the paid advertising column. Whenever you encounter articles of this nature, please remember two things: First—the medical profession is not supposed to advertise, and, second—true scientists do not issue statements boasting about their accomplishments for public consumption. Further, a careful check will usually show that the great discovery has been known for years.

Take for example a story which has appeared in various forms every so often for a decade or more. It runs about like this: "Dr. So and So sees cure of angina pectoris by surgical operation. The method was discovered in the Blank laboratory, and was worked out on dogs. Dr. So and So is professor of Hokum in Blah University." There you have the technique of this cunning system of advertising. It means publicity for the vivisector, an advertisement for the school, a boost for vivisection, and a kick in the teeth for the dog.

USELESS AND MISLEADING

Let us consider the reaction of the reader of this surreptitious advertisement. If he is a sufferer from tuberculosis, cancer, ulcer, angina, high blood pressure, or colds (for all of these have recently been the subjects of news releases) he will say "Thank God for Dr. So and So. Thank God for the Blah University. I certainly am in favor of using dogs for experimental purposes." To these poor sufferers the statements are like zephyrs from heaven. But also—the cures never come.

Another form of deception is the frequent appearance of magazine articles lauding vivisection and claiming that practically everything worth while in medicine was due to animal experimentation. I would grant research men the right to defend the practice in this manner if they would stick somewhere near to the truth. But nearly all of these articles are full of unsupported statements such as "If it were not for vivisection, millions of babies would die annually." This is the sheerest nonsense and every such claim can be easily disproved by anyone who takes the time to check the facts. Comparable logic runs about as follows: "We tested Army blankets by wrapping 20 dogs in them and then throwing them into the refrigerator to see if they would freeze. Therefore, if it were not for animal experimentation, all of our boys in the Army would have frozen to death." Such statements are an insult to the intelligence of any thoughtful man.

FALSE CLAIMS ABOUT PENICILLIN

One of the more recent contentions of the vivisectors is this: "If it were not for vivisection we would not have penicillin or the sulfa drugs." When they are reminded that the sulfa drugs were discovered by a chemist and penicillin by a biologist making studies under a microscope, they said: "Well, the uses and dosages were worked out on dogs." In order to determine how much truth there was in that statement, I personally studied the briefs of every article published about penicillin from the time of its discovery to the present—and what did I find? Nine out of every ten articles dealt with trials on humans. Arranged chonologically, nearly everything tried on dogs had been determined previously through human experience. In the long list of diseases for which penicillin is recommended, there are only a meager handful which can even be simulated in dogs.

Then who did work out the uses and doses of penicillin? The answer is that it was the internists in our great hospitals, and the doctors in active practice, who, through their combined experiences and judgments, did the work. No small group—especially not the vivisectors—should get the credit.

The basest and probably the most despicable of all the vivisectors' tricks is the giving of interviews by these champions of cruelty during dog week, or at some other time when the dog is being honored for his faithfulness to man. These interviews purport to show the vivisectors' great love for the dog, and usually stress (with a cunning that outrivals that of the fox) that the dog "deserves to be honored for his great service to the people through his use in the vivisection laboratory." Every reader with one beat of kindness in his heart should write the papers that publish these interviews and protest such use of the news columns.

ARE WE GUILTY?

We have all heard and read with great indignation about the terrible experiments performed by the Germans on helpless civilion prisoners during the recent war. But do you know that practically every experiment thus performed on humans in Germany is today being done in our own country? The only difference is that these atrocities are being perpetrated on animals in this Nation. It is accepted that the German people are equally as guilty as their doctors for permitting such barbarism. By the same token, are not we Americans equally guilty if we do not loudly and consistently protest what is going on in our own vivisection laboratories every day? I think we are.

Let us work and pray for the abolition of this cruel business.

A. V. ALLEN, M. D.

Warning to Newsprint Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I concur with what has been said here by Representative KING, and I should like to join in his warning to the newsprint industry.

There is probably not a Member of this House who has not received complaints from one or more publishers in his own community about the current lack of newsprint. I have not only received complaints, I have received specific complaints from publishers who tell me that, while they cannot secure enough newsprint to keep in normal operation at the recognized price of $90 a ton, they can go into the gray market and receive print at anywhere from $230 to $300 a ton.

Our House committee now investigating that situation has found many reasons for this, which will doubtless appear in its report, and I will not attempt to list them all now. But I will say that just horse sense will tell us that when newsprint production is at an all-time high, and when newsprint is unavailable at market prices, but can be secured on the gray market, something is fishy, to say the least.

At a time like this we are faced, as Representative KING has previously pointed out, by an open defiance of United States laws by a corporation which protects its head in the United States and waggles its tail in Canada. We can feed the face, but we cannot pull the tail.

I join in this protest, because I believe that every Congressman should make it his business to be on the side of the Department of Justice in this investigation. If this scheme of American ownership and subterfuge is successful in newsprint, it will be used as a basis for new and terrifying monopolies and cartels to prey upon the American people.

But principally I am up in arms at the extent to which this dodging corporation, defying the laws of the United States, is actually meddling with the freedom of the American press. It is dictating to all intents and purposes what American readers shall read, for it is making it impossible for new papers to be established, and it is making it impossible for old, established newspapers to continue publication.

There have been few cases of newspapers closing because of complete lack of newsprint, but as the situation becomes worse, more and more of them are threatening to close, and may be forced to. Those which will go first are the little fellows, who operate on small profits, in small communities, and have never been able to build up huge fortunes which they can now tap to meet gray market prices. The readers of those newspapers are going to be forced to read the newspapers which are big and powerful and rich and fat with profits—or read none at all.

And this newsprint monopoly, with its production in Canada and its ownership in the United States, will fatten on that kind of misfortune.

If we are to protect a free press in this country we will have to start by letting these newsprint people know that we will not sit idly by and have them flaunt the laws of our country. The Department of Justice in this fight must know that it has the backing of this Congress to the extent of legislation, if that is necessary.

I, too, would like to see a report from our special committee on this subject before we adjourn. I know that this committee is planning a long-range program which will remove the press of the United States from dependence upon foreign newsprint, and I believe that in encouraging this American industry our committee is doing a tremendous and worthwhile job.

But I should further like to suggest that our committee investigate this corporate phase of the newsprint industry—this international monkey business which allows Americans to do business in America while defying American justice with Canadian corporate identities.

I hope our committee will find out one thing—are these people Americans, or international cartel operators who, with immunity, can play a grey-market game with one of our most cherished freedoms?

Resolution of Mahaska County (Iowa) Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Mahaska County (Iowa) Bar Association is very much interested in favorable consideration being given H. R. 1639 to limit venue. This bill was favorably reported to the House from the Committee on the Judiciary on June 19, 1947, and is now on the House Calendar. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include the resolution adopted by the Mahaska County Bar Association:

A regular meeting of the Mahaska County Bar Association was held on the 29th day of May 1947 at the Blue Mill Cafe. President Ned P. Gilbert presided.

The matter of pending legislation in the Congress of the United States, commonly referred to as House Resolution 1639, introduced by Mr. JENNINGS in the House of Representatives on the 13th day of February 1947 was brought up at the instance of President Gilbert.

It was moved by Harold J. Fleck, seconded by James L. Devitt, and after a full and complete discussion of all matters pertaining thereto, that the following resolution be adopted:

"That Mahaska County Bar Association go on record as approving the provisions of House Resolution 1639 introduced by Mr. Jennings on the 13th day of February 1947; and further,

"That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each Senator and Representative of the State of Iowa."

Passed unanimously.

Thereafter the meeting on motion adjourned.

NED P. GILBERT,
President.

Attested to by:

JOHN S. SPROATT,
Secretary-Treasurer, Mahaska County Bar Association.

MAY 29, 1947.

Uncertainties Concerning Reduction and Equalization of Income Taxes Should Be Settled at This Session of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, the Congress should not delay a determination as to when and by how much individual income taxes should be reduced. It is my view that during the present session a new tax bill, effective January 1, 1948, should be enacted.

The new tax bill ought to include a substantial percentage reduction in the lowest income brackets and extend to all married taxpayers the "income splitting" privilege now enjoyed solely by citizens of the community-property States. Even before H. R. 1 was reported to the House I urged the Ways and Means Committee to incorporate this combination of tax reduction and tax equalization into a single bill. Sentiment now strongly favors this proposal.

It is especially important that the "income splitting" privilege be incorporated into a reduction bill rather than a revision bill. In this connection, under leave heretofore granted, I incorporate into my remarks a statement made to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on June 19, 1947:

STATEMENT OF ALBERT L. REEVES, JR., BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 1947

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the purpose of my appearance before the Ways and Means Committee today is to urge the enactment of appropriate legislation to correct the discriminatory application of the Federal income tax laws against citizens of the 36 remaining noncommunity-property States.

That such discrimination exists is not seriously questioned by anyone. The Federal Government recognizes the community-property system and permits husband and wife in the community-property States, of which there are now 12, to divide their income, each reporting and paying the income tax upon one-half of the community income. In this period of extremely high surtaxes the result is that incomes in the community-property States pay substantially less in income taxes than identical incomes in the 36 noncommunity-property States. The inequalities of this situation are recognized by the Treasury Department. Stanley S. Surrey, tax legislative counsel for the Department, who has favored universal application

of the split income principle is the source of tables which clearly illustrate the tremendous tax advantages enjoyed by taxpayers in the community-property States. The tables are as follows:

TABLE No. 1.—*Comparison of tax liabilities of married couples (with no dependents) in community-property and in non-community-property States*

Net income before exemption	Total tax on married couples		Tax saving in community-property States	Tax saving in community-property States as a percentage of tax liability in non-community-property States
	Non-community-property State (only 1 spouse has income)	Community-property State (income divided equally between spouses)		
				Percent
$5,000	$798	$760	$38	4.8
$10,000	2,185	1,843	342	15.7
$15,000	4,047	3,154	893	22.1
$25,000	9,082	6,460	2,622	28.9
$50,000	24,795	18,725	6,070	24.5
$100,000	63,128	50,274	12,854	20.4

TABLE No. 2.—*Aggregate tax savings of married couples (with no dependents) in community-property States in the income years 1937 through 1946* [1]

Combined net income before exemption	Aggregate amount of tax savings
$5,000	$320
$10,000	2,864
$25,000	20,633
$50,000	53,144
$100,000	132,187

[1] Tax for non-community-property States is computed on the assumption that only 1 spouse has income, and in community-property States that income and exemptions are divided equally between the spouses.

Various State legislatures, the American Bar Association, and many other organizations have urged the Congress to enact legislation to rectify this manifest inequity.

Under the existing situation most of the non-community-property States are experiencing a loss of capital, business, and income to the community-property States. It is common for an individual of means to carry on his business or profession in a non-community-property State, where he earns his income, and to maintain his domicile in a community-property State in order to enjoy a more favorable tax status. In self-defense, several States, such as Oklahoma, have very recently adopted the community-property system, although with considerable reluctance because it creates problems affecting estates, domestic relations, and commercial credit. Congress should not, by failing to take action on the matter, compel other States to take so serious a step. Many are contemplating it as a last resort, if the Federal laws are not changed.

Sentiment in the Congress and throughout the country overwhelmingly favors extension of the right to split incomes for Federal tax purposes to all married taxpayers.

Early in this session of Congress I introduced H. R. 1759, which would accomplish this purpose. Under its provisions a husband and wife could elect to file a joint return of all their income. The tax would be computed upon one-half the aggregate income, and then multiplied by two. The result is exactly the same as though each filed a separate return on one-half the income, but the number of returns would be greatly reduced. The bill provides also necessary adjustments in the standard deduction. It seems to be agreed by many that a simple and effective approach to the problem is provided by this method, and a number of identical or similar bills have been subsequently introduced in both Houses of Congress.

But the change should be included in a tax reduction bill, not in a tax revision bill as the committee apparently contemplates. I shall endeavor to show why.

Extension of the privilege of splitting income to all married taxpayers is not actually a matter of revision of existing laws. The tax advantages now enjoyed by citizens of the community-property States does not arise from anything inherent in the internal-revenue code. It arises out of a situation altogether extraneous to the Federal tax laws—namely, the existence and characteristics of the community-property system in a limited group of States. In this respect it differs from matters which could be reached only by revision—such as the double taxation of dividends. I do not mean to take a position at this time on the question of double taxation of corporation income, but it is an excellent illustration of the kind of situation which inheres in existing law and is subject to revision, in contrast to the extraneous origin of split-income practice.

Moreover, extension of the split-income privilege would not affect all taxpayers in all States. With relatively minor exceptions, it would affect a geographical segment of the population—that is, taxpayers in the 36 non-community-property States only. In addition—and more important—the amounts involved are larger than ought to be included in a revision bill. As examination of table 1, above, will show that the split-income privilege would reduce the tax liability of a $25,000 income by 28.9 percent, or by $2,622. Such a reduction cannot properly be regarded as a revision; it is a substantial tax cut.

But there is a vastly more important reason for including the split-income privilege in a tax-reduction bill, rather than in a revision bill. It is reported that in consequence of the veto of H. R. 1 it is proposed to offer a new tax-reduction bill, providing percentage cuts, early in the next session, and to follow it with a revision bill which among other things would extend the split-income privilege to all married taxpayers. I submit that if a straight tax-reduction bill is passed, it will be impossible thereafter to extend the split-income privilege to the non-community-property States.

If a new tax-reduction bill were to provide, as did H. R. 1, a 30-percent reduction in the lowest brackets and a 20-percent reduction in the medium and higher brackets, extension of the split-income privilege would be effectively foreclosed by the fact that, taken in conjunction with the tax reduction, it would discriminate in favor of the surtax brackets. For example—referring again to table No. 1—the percentage reduction of 20 percent (assumed), coupled with the percentage tax savings realized from the split-income privilege, would give total reductions of more than 30 percent at the $10,000 income level, almost 40 percent on a $15,000 income, and 45 percent on a $25,000 income. At the $50,000 level the total tax reduction would be about 40 percent, and at $100,000 and above only slightly less. The result would be extraordinary tax relief in the middle and higher brackets, far exceeding the moderate reductions provided in the lowest income brackets. For this reason if the Congress first passes a straight tax-cut bill it will find itself unable to authorize universal application of the split-income privilege with its additional advantages to the surtax brackets only. Thus the inevitable effect of a straight tax reduction would be to perpetuate the existing tax discrimination against the 36 non-community-property States, and to enable the community-property States to continue to exploit their advantage by further siphoning off business and wealth from the non-community-property States.

It is, therefore, my conviction, and my urgent recommendation to the Ways and Means Committee, that a single bill be prepared which would combine a graduated percentage cut in the lower brackets with the "split income" provision, the latter being of benefit only in the surtax brackets. To illustrate: A substantial percentage cut, of 30 percent or perhaps more, should be provided in the lowest income brackets. The split-income privilege should be made of universal application. Income splitting alone would provide a reduction of 20 percent or more in all income brackets above about $12,500. In surtax brackets below $12,500 percentage reductions should be made which, in combination with the split-income feature, would provide an aggregate cut of 20 percent. At the $10,000 income level, for example, the split-income privilege would produce a reduction of only 15.7 percent. A total tax reduction of 20 percent could be accomplished by a percentage adjustment in the appropriate surtax bracket. The same formula would result in a uniform 20-percent reduction (if that percentage of reduction is agreed upon) in still lower surtax brackets where the benefits of income splitting are less—as at the $5,000 level, where income splitting reduces the tax liability by only 4.8 percent.

Preparation and passage of such a combination bill is still possible in the present session of Congress, even though the time remaining is short. I feel that in all justice we should not leave the people of this country without definite assurance of relief from the terrible burden of taxes they are now carrying. Uncertainty as to whether, and when, income-tax reductions will become effective is creating confusion and exerting a sharply depressing effect on business activity.

Strong equities support the kind of a bill I have proposed. It should be made effective January 1, 1948, which is the effective date of the "income splitting" bill I have already introduced. I do not think it would encounter a veto. If it did, sentiment for adoption of the "income splitting" proposal is sufficiently strong in both House of Congress to assure that it would be overridden.

This recommendation is not made lightly, or without encouragement from others in the House. I earnestly urge the committee to give immediate consideration to the introduction at this session of a tax-reduction bill, designed to accomplish the objectives I have outlined, and effective January 1, 1948.

We have an obligation to the American taxpayer to clarify the Federal tax situation and to tell him in advance how he may plan his affairs for next year.

Veteran Expresses Appreciation of Care Given Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PARKERSBURG, W. VA., *June 25, 1947.*

MRS BOLTON: I am a World War II veteran and want to congratulate you, the Veterans' Administration staff, and all concerned with all Veterans' Administration hospitals.

I have been a patient in three: Huntington, W. Va., Dayton, Ohio, but the best one in my opinion is at Oteen, N. C. They do everything possible there, and just a little bit more. They make you feel like you are one of the big generals.

I want to congratulate General Logan, Dr. Mathews, Dr. Kelly, Dr. Sneed, Nurse Adkinson and all of the staff.

Best regards,

JOSEPH B. RICE.

Wool Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Denver Post of June 27, 1947:

PROVING OUR GOOD FAITH IN A BIG WAY

President Truman's action in vetoing the wool bill was a victory for the State Department, the Boston wool trade, the wool-textile industry, and the wool producers of Britain and the dominions.

It was a defeat for the Department of Agriculture and the National Wool Growers Association.

There was little doubt where the President's affections would lie or that he would disapprove the bill. The best the wool growers can hope for is a new bill, as suggested by the President and already approved by the Senate, to support domestic wool prices at the 1946 level.

The vetoed bill would not have required the President to impose import quotas or import fees (tariffs), although it would have submitted him to numerous pressures to do so.

The President undoubtedly was right in saying that the approval of the wool bill would have been interpreted by other countries as indicating this country was returning to the principle of high tariffs and economic isolationism.

Such an interpretation would be false, of course, but it would have been made nevertheless, with all the stops of the British propaganda organs pulled out.

The significance of the President's veto as advocated by the State Department may be, but should not be, lost on the world in general. The State Department at the moment is trying to promote world trade by getting nations to agree to enter into an International Trade Organization.

That organization would have as its objectives the elimination of cartels, state monopolies which subsidize exports, restrictive tariffs, import and export quotas and other checks on free competition and the free flow of goods.

At the present time Britain and the dominions are dealing in wools, of which they produce by far the greater part of the world's supply, through a state monopoly, the Joint Organization. The JO, as it is known, probably constitutes a greater threat to free competitive world trade than the wool bill ever would have been if the President had signed it.

Apparently without even suggesting that the British disband the JO, the State Department went all out to defeat the bill. The Department is determined to prevent the building of any trade barriers at home regardless of how willing or unwilling other countries will be to go along with the Department's plan. No international trade organization has been formed as yet, and no one can foresee when it will be, but the State Department is acting as if firm commitments already had been made.

The world should be tremendously impressed with the sincerity of the State Department's trade policy. The Department might have used the wool bill for trading purposes to persuade other countries to abandon restrictive practices of their own but it did not do so.

The effect of the veto will be to give Australia, New Zealand, and other British wool-producing areas a definite assurance, not that they will be able to sell as much wool in the United States as they did before the war, but that they will continue to enjoy the greatly enlarged market opportunities in this country they acquired during the war.

The veto of the wool bill is a supreme example of disregarding the self-interest of a country for the sake of a world trade principle which other countries have not even indicated that they will accept.

Let us hope it has the effect the State Department believes it may produce.

Shipment of Gas, Oil, and Petroleum Products to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the report of heavy shipments of oil and related products to the Soviet Union, I am pleased to introduce herewith in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of South Gate, Calif., in which the council expresses its opposition to further shipments of "gas, oil, and petroleum products to the Soviet Union Republic or to any other country in the world not in sympathy with our American way of life."

It was moved by Councilman Beckley and seconded by Councilman Bunnett, that the following resolution be adopted:

"Whereas it has been recently reported in the public press that our gas and oil resources are rapidly being depleted and that this country may soon be faced with a gas and oil famine; and

"Whereas our gas and oil and petroleum resources are of vital interest to the people of South Gate and the United States generally; and

"Whereas the public press has recently reported that 12 Soviet oil tankers are presently in San Pedro harbor awaiting quantities of gas, oil, and petroleum products for shipment to the Soviet Union Republic; and

"Whereas in the years before the last war, one of the most costly in thousands of American dollars and American lives, the United States did build up the war machines of those countries with whom we later fought, and whose ideologies were even then inimical to the democratic ideals we nurtured, and shipped to such countries the goods and products so necessary to the creation of their war-making organization: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the city council of the city of South Gate, Calif., for and on behalf of its citizens, who will be among the first to suffer should we be unfortunate enough to be forced into another war in defense of our ideals, does strenuously oppose further shipments of gas, oil, and petroleum products to the Soviet Union Republic or to any other country in the world not in sympathy with our American way of life and that this policy be exercised to all other products of our economy including any and all resources which may be used in or conveyed to military use or used to propagate unholy ideologies through the democratic world."

The foregoing resolution was passed and adopted by the following vote: Ayes—Councilman Weaver, Grant, Beckley, Bunnett, and Mayor Olsen.

I, H. C. Peiffer, city clerk of the city of South Gate, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the city council at its regular meeting of June 16, 1947.

[SEAL] H. C. PEIFFER,
City Clerk of the City of South Gate, Calif.

Adequate Old-Age Pensions Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have on many occasions raised my voice on behalf of more adequate pensions for our aged. I have the feeling that those of us who stand for better treatment of our elderly citizens are receiving more and more support from our colleagues in the House of Representatives.

During the week of June 23 to 28 Washington was host to over 4,000 delegates of the national Townsend pension group. These delegates held meetings at which Members of Congress appeared and discussed the need for more adequate pensions.

On Friday most of the delegates visited the House of Representatives and formed delegations to call on their Congressmen. In almost every instance they were well received by the Representatives. I was very much impressed by the fact that the delegations were well informed on their subject. Their sincerity was unquestioned. I sincerely hope that their pilgrimage to Congress will have an activating effect on those Representatives in Congress who to this date have demonstrated a reluctance to provide more adequate pensions to the elderly people of this country.

There is a great deal of talk in recent weeks about an impending business recession. The Wall Street Journal has repeatedly pointed out that our export market will take a decided dip due to the lack of American dollars abroad. This means that our manufacturers and businessmen must depend more and more on domestic consumption.

There is already a great deal of talk about "loaning" funds to European countries for the purchase of American produced commodities. We all know that these loans are nothing more or less than outright gifts.

If we feel that we can afford these loans to foreign countries, then we should not hesitate to inaugurate a program whereby the elderly people of this Nation can live in reasonable security and comfort for the remainder of their lives. I contend that the passage of H. R. 16 will have a manifold effect on our whole econ-

omy. It may be the very cushion our economists are looking for in connection with the threatening recession.

Action now is imperative.

Pandora's Box of Labor Law Is Reopened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alfred Friendly, which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, June 29, entitled "Pandora's Box of Labor Law Is Reopened":

PANDORA'S BOX OF LABOR LAW IS REOPENED

(By Alfred Friendly)

For 5 months the debate on the Taft-Hartley Act has been so all absorbing that it has served to drive out of the public mind the fact that we have other labor laws, still on the books.

Of and by itself, the new law does not constitute an entire labor code, just as the Wagner Act before it was not the be-all and end-all of union law.

The Taft-Hartley Act is only the latest of a sizable series of legislative enactments and court decisions (which had the effect of law) setting out the ground rules of conduct for American labor.

Most of these previous laws and judicial rulings will be affected by the new statute—how fundamentally, only several years of Supreme Court rulings will disclose. And, by the same token, the Taft-Hartley Act itself is conditioned to some extent by the earlier laws and their interpretations. It takes on meaning, in a large degree, only in the perspective of the legislation and policy which have gone before.

Someone, some day, will write a summary of history of American labor law in such an unorthodox fashion that it will not begin with the story of the Philadelphia cordwainers. This is not it.

In 1806 a group of cordwainers (shoemakers, working particularly in cordovan leather) united in a club. They framed some piecework wage schedules and presented them to their employer with the demand that he adopt the new rates.

The employer went to court. Philadelphia Recorder Levy had no trouble with the case. He decided it on this basis:

"A combination of workmen to raise their wages may be considered from a twofold point of view; one is to benefit themselves, the other to injure those who do not join their society. The rule of law condemns both."

For 30 years these sentiments were more or less the law of the land, although they were not without challenge. They rested on two related premises in common law: That conspiracies and restraints of trade were illegal.

The basis of the first was that a number of persons acting together possess power to do wrong which is not possessed by each one acting as an individual. The basis of the second was that each person, and the public, has the right to have the course of trade kept free of unreasonable obstructions and to demand that no one, by agreements or other acts, unreasonably diminishes that trade.

These two premises, taken together, made effective union activity extremely difficult; the opposition needed only to go to court to get the union slapped down.

LOOPHOLES OPENED

Fortunately for the young labor organizations, the bland but absolute decision of Recorder Levy was not followed everywhere. With the famous cases of *Pennsylvania* v. *Carlisle*, in 1921, and *Commonwealth* v. *Hunt*, in 1942 in Massachusetts, some considerable refinements were added.

Combinations to raise wages were declared to be, in themselves, not necessarily unlawful. Tests of motives, and the means used to obtain those ends, were recognized as the controlling ones in cases of alleged conspiracy.

Workers' combinations were declared unlawful if the intent—as decided by the court—was to injure someone or to benefit themselves to the prejudice of the public.

Similarly, with respect to restraint of trade, a test of "reasonableness" came to be applied. The element that stamped a combination in restraint of trade as an unlawful conspiracy was the coercion that may have been used.

Finally, the concept of "just cause" came to be important. If the workers had "just cause" for seeking a certain objective, their combination could be considered lawful, even though in the course of their action they might have injured an employer.

These were very slim justifications for unionism. Subjective to the highest degree, the standards depended on the whim—and economic predilections—of the courts. Unions could never be certain of how their acts would be interpreted.

Yet these common law doctrines, variously interpreted at different times and places, modified and demodified, were the controlling law over unions for more than 100 years. Finally they were replaced by Federal statutes.

HIGH COURT UPSET

By the 1890's, unions thought they saw some hope for relief from the twilight land in which they dwelt. It was in the form of State laws guaranteeing the right to organize. But the hope was barren. The Supreme Court declared these State laws invalid.

The case which did it was *Coppage* v. *Kansas*, in 1915. The Court held invalid a Kansas law which had sought to prevent employers from discriminating against union workers. The Court declared that an employer had the right to discharge a worker because the latter refused to sign a pledge to quit his union.

Seven years earlier, in the Adair case, the Court had said the same thing with respect to a Federal law. It had declared unconstitutional a section of the Erdman Act which made it unlawful to fire an employee because of union membership. The Justices held that the Constitution guaranteed an employer the right to discharge or to refuse to hire a man because of union membership and that this right was unqualified.

These decisions simply validated "yellow dog" contracts. These, used as early as 1870, were pledges, written or oral, by which a worker obligated himself, as a condition of employment, not to join a labor union. They were used in plants employing a total of several hundred thousand workers. More important than their extent was that they were used at precisely those places where the unions were trying to gain footholds.

BOLSTERED BY INJUNCTION

In 1917, in the Hitchman decision, the Supreme Court added a further blessing to "yellow dog" contracts. Before that time they were legal, as mentioned above, but not enforceable in a court of equity. In the Hitchman decision, the Court said the employer not only had the right to exact a "yellow dog" contract but was also entitled to be protected in that right, as in any other legal right.

The value in this judicial gift to the employers lay not in the opportunity to sue a worker for breaking his pledge, but rather in the ability to slap an injunction on any union organizer who sought to sign up the workers. For in that very act the organizer was seeking to deprive the employer of a right guaranteed him by law.

From the foregoing, it can be seen that at this stage of American labor law—or rather judicial interpretation of the common law, for there were few specific Federal statutes yet—for the union, things were tough all over.

They got even tougher.

For a 50-year period, the age of government by injunction, there was an almost automatic employer response to a strike. The employer hied himself to the nearest injunction judge and received a tailor-made order to suit his purpose, stopping all overt strike acts—picketing, exhortation, paying strike benefits, urging workers to walk out, printing of any literature, etc. In one case, an injunction even forbade the singing of hymns by the striking workers.

Unions were entitled to conclude that there was nothing more under the sun that could be applied to them to thwart their aims. But they had another think coming.

LOST THEIR EYE TEETH

In 1890, Congress passed the Sherman act, declaring that every contract, combination and conspiracy in restraint of trade was unlawful, and that anyone injured by such acts could sue the perpetrators to recover his damages threefold.

It is doubtful that the law was meant to apply to trade unions, acting alone. But within a few years the courts ruled that labor organizations were indeed within its scope. The brutal payoff came in 1908 with a case which dragged through the courts for 7 years. It was *Loewe* v. *Lawlor*, better known as the Danbury Hatters.

Members of the United Hatters of North America attempted to organize the shop of one Loewe, in Danbury, Conn. Their organizing strike was ineffective, so they put Loewe on an "unfair list" and boycotted his products throughout the country.

The company went to court, alleging it had been injured in the amount of $80,000. The Supreme Court found the boycott an illegal combination under the Sherman act.

Triple damages were awarded. The homes and savings accounts of 197 union members were placed under attachment. They lost the latter and recovered the former only after 14 years. In all, the union and the AFL were stuck to the tune of $234,000. Only 2 of the 197 union members sued were prominent in the union; many had not attended a meeting in years and testified that they did not even know of the boycott.

THE CLAYTON "REPEAL"

From the union viewpoint, the Danbury Hatters doctrine, reinforced by a somewhat similar case involving the Coronado Coal Co., appeared to be the final nail in the lid of the labor organization coffin. But in 1914 there seemed to be a ray of hope, with the passage of the Clayton Act. It purported to say that legitimate union activities could not be construed as falling afoul of the prohibition in the Sherman Act.

The hope was illusory. For, in 1921, in the Duplex case, with Justices Holmes, Brandeis, and Clarke dissenting, the Supreme Court majority ruled in effect that Congress meant nothing at all when it passed the Clayton Act. It said that the Clayton Act was merely declaratory of what had been lawful and what had been unlawful theretofore.

The case involved a refusal of machinists to install printing machinery made by a nonunion company. There were three other

printing-machinery manufacturers in the country, all unionized. They were being driven out of business by Duplex's price undercutting, made possible by the lower wages it paid. From the viewpoint of the machinists, either they had to organize Duplex or see themselves driven out of the printing-machinery field.

The Court could not see it that way. Past, present, or prospective employees of the Duplex Co. might be able to strike against it legitimately, the decree said, but machinists working elsewhere (i. e., those who boycotted the products) did not have the privilege of concerted action. They were not proximately or substantially concerned.

The Clayton Act was thus construed until the end of the 1930's.

THE MAGNA CARTA

At this stage of the game a union man could conclude not only that he had no laws to protect him, but that such laws as there were, operated as weapons for the other side. Here was the darkness before the dawn. In itself, however, it held the seeds of light.

For an inescapable legal conflict was being evolved and its resolution could not be avoided. There was a right which no amount of court decisions or laws could suppress—the right of labor to organize and act in concert to promote its own economic and social welfare.

But this was in conflict with what the law held to be the employer's common-law right to hire and fire as he chose, to have his channels of trade held open for him against obstruction or diminution and to be freed from effective concerted action against him.

A large part of this conflict was resolved by the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932. It, more properly than even the Wagner Act, may be considered labor's magna carta. It was to be a guaranty of labor's right of self-help.

It specifically outlawed the yellow-dog contract. Most important, it defined a whole series of legitimate union activities against which no Federal court could issue a restraining order or injunction.

Significantly, in defining what was a labor dispute which could not be enjoined, the act specified that it could be a controversy between persons regardless of whether or not the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee. In other words, while this did not legalize the boycott it at least declared that boycotts could not be enjoined in Federal courts.

COURT COMES AROUND

With a series of baby acts patterned after it in the States, the Norris-LaGuardia Act ended the age of government by injunction.

In addition, the Supreme Court became obliged to read the other laws which had gone before, and the common law, together with the new act. In a series of three famous cases—Apex Hosiery (1940), Milk Wagon Drivers (1940), and Hutcheson (1941)—the Court looked at the Sherman, Clayton, Norris-LaGuardia, and new Wagner Acts all together.

The conclusion of the Court was far reaching. It was a new broom sweeping aside almost every major decision in the past.

Overruled were the Coppage, Adair, and Hitchman cases (validation of yellow-dog contracts and refusal to honor laws forbidding antiunion discrimination). There could not be another suit for treble damages under the Sherman Act, such as that in the Danbury Hatters situation. The boycott in the Duplex case could not be enjoined and the notion of limited interest in that case was tossed overboard.

The Wagner Act of 1935 can, like the Norris-LaGuardia Act, be seen as another aid to union self-help. It guaranteed workers the right to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. It applied penalties against employers who sought to obstruct that right. It barred company spies and company-dominated unions.

But it was not merely a self-help law. As Senator WAGNER made clear in the debate on the bill, this was to be an act positively encouraging union organization, lending the Government's help to unions for a specific and distinct economic purpose—to raise wages and thereby create a more stable and healthy national economy.

For a development of this argument and the corollary one to the effect that the law was not one-sided, the reader is referred to the chapter by Leon Keyserling, Senator WAGNER'S aide and now a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, appearing in The Wagner Act: After 10 Years (the Bureau of National Affairs, Washington, 1945).

OLD CASES RESURRECTED

It is clear, although it has been largely overlooked, that the new Taft-Hartley Act is not merely a modification of the Wagner Act. Its outlaw of boycotts and jurisdictional strikes, its revival of certain types of injunctions against them and its new concept of what are legal and what are illegal kinds of union action also affect the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

It very definitely raises the question of a reexamination of the Sherman and Clayton Acts and such decisions under them as the Apex, Milk Wagon Drivers, and Hutcheson.

One example, that of the jurisdictional strike, will suffice to show how new problems are raised.

In the Hutcheson case, Justice Frankfurter argued that there was nothing in the Clayton Act which distinguished between a plain strike and a jurisdictional one. Both appeared to be nonenjoinable under the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts. Frankfurter observed of the jurisdictional strike:

"Such strife between competing unions has been an obdurate conflict in the evolution of so-called craft unionism and has undoubtedly been one of the most potent forces in the modern development of industrial unions. These conflicts have intensified industrial tension, but there is not the slightest warrant for saying that Congress has made (the protection in the law) inapplicable to trade-union conduct resulting from them."

The new law, however, changes all this. First, it provides a great stimulus to craft unionism, giving craft unions much greater leeway in "severing out" of industrial plant-wide organizations. But, on the other hand, it outlaws the jurisdictional disputes which may be intensified by this very severing out.

Once again, unions are back in a land of uncertainty. Only a long series of Supreme Court decisions over the next several years will dispel the doubt and tell them where they stand.

Redeem Terminal-Leave Bonds Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, surely the Republican leadership will carry through during the first session of the Eightieth Congress the proposal of redeeming the GI terminal-leave bonds. There is every reason for our taking prompt action on this. I appeared before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services to express my keen interest in this matter. Certainly no one could have any good reason for opposing this early action. Everyone agrees that we should reduce the national debt. The obligation to pay these bonds represents a part of the national debt and a part that is outstanding at a comparatively high rate of interest. I saw no reason why terminal-leave bonds should have been issued in the first place. The amounts were not sufficient to mean much to the individuals 5 years from the time they received them. The average amount of these bonds per man amounts to only about $250. Some of these men hold only a $50 bond. Many of these men have no facilities for safekeeping, and the chances are great that the bonds themselves may be lost or destroyed. Some of these men are carrying these bonds around on their persons and the chances are that they will be worn out before the time comes for them to cash them.

The program should provide that these bonds never become negotiable. They should become redeemable at national banks and post offices wherever these men may be and be able to provide suitable identification. If these bonds were made negotiable it would defeat the purpose, as the national deft would not be reduced, as the bonds would fall into the hands of people who would prefer to hold them to maturity. Furthermore, the men holding these bonds should not have to be placed in any position where they might be called upon to sell them at a discount or pay any service charges in connection with their redemption. The bonds should be redeemed at accrued interest.

The redemption of these bonds should be made voluntary so that those who desire to retain them may do so. There is nothing to the concern of some that the redemption of these bonds would be inflationary. Many of the holders of these bonds have borrowed money at higher rates of interest than the bonds themselves pay, and the money borrowed would be paid up by the proceeds obtained from the redemption of these bonds. Were it true that these bonds were held in any sizable amounts, there might be some advantage in their being held for future needs. That is not the case. The bonds are held in small amounts and their redemption now or at any time that a holder desires to redeem them may prove a great convenience. I therefore strongly urge that immediate action be taken, and I intend to support this action.

Signs of a Nation-Wide Republican Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a splendid address recently given by Hon. Arthur W. Coolidge, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, at the forty-second anniversary ban-

quet, John Ericsson Republican Club, of Massachusetts:

SIGNS OF A NATION-WIDE REPUBLICAN VICTORY

The Republican Party is big enough to hold the widest variety of sincere views. But it also is united enough to face great issues and to solve them in the spirit of teamwork. Republican willingness to avoid extremes is the reason why our party today represents the overwhelming majority of Americans.

The problem of responsible government is to steer a middle course between the reactionary and the radical—between the skinflint and the spendthrift—between Scrooge and Santa Claus.

As the barbarians looted the temples of an ancient civilization, there are today swarms of political vandals who through inefficiency, laziness, and graft would pilfer the public purse.

You and I are sworn enemies of waste and corruption. But we must not overlook that at the other extremes are the Pontius Pilates who wash their hands of civic responsibility. So long as they can munch the fruits of inherited or acquired wealth, they have no concern about the plight of their unfortunate neighbors. With them the New England conscience has lost its pep. They have no more community spirit than a hermit in a remote Eskimo igloo.

Both extremes are bad because both stem from selfishness. In a modern-age government must be the guardian of all human rights. As such it must preserve and advance freedom, security, and opportunity, and that, as I see it, is the goal of the Republican Party of Massachusetts.

IRRESPONSIBLE OPPORTUNISTS

After years of sitting beside Democratic legislators in the Massachusetts House and Senate and observing the Democratic crazy-quilt pattern in other places, I am convinced that our political opponents are frequently irresponsible opportunists who seek partisan advantage more than public service.

Too often they peddle half-truths in order to bewilder and misrepresent. Too often they seem willing to sabotage any public benefit proposed by Republicans in the fear that Republicans might gain credit for its success.

Let me cite one example. For years the ailing Boston Elevated System has been unable to provide sufficient transportation to prevent the traffic strangulation which has brought partial economic paralysis to Boston. The railway has been financially unable to remove the eyesore elevated structures whose darkness dooms homes and whose noise is the death knell of business.

This year a Republican administration and a Republican legislature have tackled the problem, and we are well on the way to solving it.

The district blighted by the elevated's spiderweb of steel is inhabited by Democrats. The majority of the population in the cities and towns crushed by the elevated deficits are Democrats. Rank-and-file Democratic men and women stand to benefit if the Boston transit disease is cured.

But are the bulk of the Boston Democrats in the house and senate fighting for an improvement which will aid their constituents? It is not. These nearsighted solons are so afraid that Republicans will get the credit for a major improvement to Greater Boston that they are fighting us tooth and nail.

They are trying through the use of costly eminent-domain proceedings to postpone public ownership until a Democratic administration can come along and reap the credit for what Republicans started.

FORESEES GOP SWEEP

I think they are wrong on two counts. The bill will go through in spite of their road blocks, and no Democratic administration is going to win either in Massachusetts or in the Nation in 1948.

A second characteristic of our political opponents is the never-ending campaign of bunk to deceive working men and women into believing Democratic politicians are their only friends. During the past few weeks certain Democratic leaders have revived their smear campaign, trying to picture Governor Bradford and the Republican administration as the cold-blooded enemies of the poor and friendless.

Over their $25-a-plate banquets they have spilled their crocodile tears. From mouths stuffed with epicurean delicacies they have told how their hearts—their hearts alone—ache for the unfortunate. Again they are dragging out their perennial issue of class hatred. Once more they are demanding public services and yet vilifying everyone who suggests paying for public services. Their left wingers are plotting a new depression in order to blame it on business.

But I believe that an enlightened, modern public is fed up with old-fashioned demagogues and hypocrites. I have faith that the public will continue to support the Republican Party here in Massachusetts and in the Nation, for the Republican Party today speaks for most Americans.

MANDATE FOR WISE ECONOMY

The last election was a mandate to bring about wise economy and to curb the excesses by certain labor czars, who like Pied Pipers were leading labor over the precipice.

Under our own JOE MARTIN the Republicans in Congress have overcome Democratic stalling and have carried out that mandate. They have this week enacted what JOE MARTIN tells us is fair labor legislation which makes Uncle Sam the boss of John L. Lewis and all his imitators.

And they are about ready to slash the income tax. If President Truman in an effort to appease the Wallace wing of crypto-Communists, vetoes either measure, he might just as well buy a one-way ticket to Missouri. If he vetoes either measure, the Republicans will again sweep Massachusetts in a landslide.

The Republicans on Beacon Hill also are carrying out the national mandate to prevent waste and to enact laws that give both management and labor the chance to resume their partnership which did so much to produce the goods that won the war. The Slichter committee report and other progressive legislation are evidence that we believe in a square deal for both the employer and the employee. We do not believe in death-sentence legislation that kills business and therefore destroys the jobs which are made by business.

REDUCING GOVERNMENT COSTS

Governor Bradford's recent request for a recess commission to study intelligent and effective ways of reducing all kinds of government costs is only one further proof that Republicans are enlisted in an endless war against extravagance.

But in emphasizing thrift let us not be so unfair and so blind to realities as not to recognize that State government today is beset by certain postwar financial difficulties. The beans or prunes for which a State institution paid $1 before the war today cost $1.47. The price of nearly all other materials has gone up accordingly.

Without breaking the law and proving false to all principles of Christian charity, we cannot reduce the number of mental afflicted, cancer and tuberculosis patients, needy war veterans, homeless children, penniless blind and aged on our relief rolls.

Nor should we overlook certain factors which increase the amounts which the commonwealth and the municipalities pay for education. From 1870 to 1940 the population of the United States has tripled. In that same period the number of pupils attending American high school increased 90 times.

In 1870 there were 14,000 in Bay State high schools. In 1940 there were 168,000. With students returning from war work and war service, the rolls are going up today. The middle of the road is leading toward more universal education.

Democracy in an atomic age depends on a trained and skilled coming generation. Democracy in a world threated by communism depends on youth who are sufficiently educated to know the history, and appreciate the value of democratic institutions and the free enterprise system. We cannot afford to underpay teachers because the schoolhouse is the chief fortress of democracy.

I do not describe these conditions as a tear-jerking alibi for profligate spending. But no responsible party—and the Republican Party is a responsible party—can in honesty ignore these facts.

HATE BOTH CORRUPTION AND WASTE

As Republicans we advocate the proper services of government. But we as strenuously oppose the unnecessary burdens of government. We hate both corruption and waste because both rob the recipients of aid and both rob the taxpayer.

A system of overlapping jobs and pay rolls stuffed with unnecessary civil service, and other appointees, has grown up in the war years and lush days and has been handed down to the present administration.

In this era of rising prices your State administration had to take the rap for the boners and dreams of predecessors from away back. You can be sure that drastic economy moves are under way—and do not be surprised when you hear some of the patronage hold-overs squeal.

Expense accounts which in former days resembled a maharajah's spending allowance have been stopped. Employees are not allowed to commute by airplane anymore with the taxpayers footing the bill. Supplies are purchased for use and not for storage and possible spoilage. Drones and chiselers have been dropped from relief rolls. Santa Claus reindeer no longer are parked on the State house driveway.

Investigations are in process to find the best way to eliminate the fat in State services without injuring the vital parts which public need and public demand have created. Otherwise we should be false to our ideals of sound and economical government.

PARTY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The majority of the Massachusetts House and Senate since the Civil War have been Republicans. That Republican-dominated general court again and again has led the entire Nation in initiating progressive laws on labor, education, health, welfare, and veterans' benefits.

We, as Republicans, can deny our heritage and spurn the example of our generous fathers. We can crawl shame-facedly to the rear of the procession of backward Bilbo States. But I know we will not revert to the days of the poorhouse, sweat shop, and snake pit.

I believe we will encourage business because the pay rolls of workers depend on prosperous industry. I believe we will encourage thrift because that saves the taxpayers from extra burdens. But I also believe that we will go forward, as fast as we are financially able, to greater advances in humanitarian government. I believe that the party of Abraham Lincoln will never retreat from the spirit of brotherhood in which the Republican Party was founded.

That is the path between extremes. That is the middle course. That is the road to both freedom and plenty. That is the will of America.

Address of Secretary George C. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE GEORGE C. MARSHALL, SECRETARY OF STATE, AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY ON JUNE 5, 1947

I need not tell you gentlemen that the world situation is very serious. That must be apparent to all intelligent people. I think one difficulty is that the problem is one of such enormous complexity that the very mass of facts presented to the public by press and radio make it exceedingly difficult for the man in the street to reach a clear appraisement of the situation. Furthermore, the people of this country are distant from the troubled areas of the earth and it is hard for them to comprehend the plight and consequent reactions of the long-suffering peoples, and the effect of those reactions on their governments in connection with our efforts to promote peace in the world.

In considering the requirements for the rehabilitation of Europe the physical loss of life, the visible destruction of cities, factories, mines, and railroads was correctly estimated, but it has become obvious during recent months that this visible destruction was probably less serious than the dislocation of the entire fabric of European economy. For the past 10 years conditions have been highly abnormal. The feverish preparation for war and the more feverish maintenance of the war effort engulfed all aspects of national economies. Machinery has fallen into disrepair or is entirely obsolete. Under the arbitrary and destructive Nazi rule, virtually every possible enterprise was geared into the German war machine. Long-standing commercial ties, private institutions, banks, insurance companies and shipping companies disappeared through loss of capital, absorption through nationalization or by simple destruction. In many countries, confidence in the local currency has been severely shaken. The breakdown of the business structure of Europe during the war was complete. Recovery has been seriously retarded by the fact that 2 years after the close of hostilities a peace settlement with Germany and Austria has not been agreed upon. But even given a more prompt solution of these difficult problems, the rehabilitation of the economic structure of Europe quite evidently will require a much ment with Germany and Austria has not been foreseen.

There is a phase of this matter which is both interesting and serious. The farmer has always produced the foodstuffs to exchange with the city dweller for the other necessities of life. This division of labor is the basis of modern civilization. At the present time it is threatened with breakdown. The town and city industries are not producing adequate goods to exchange with the food-producing farmer. Raw materials and fuel are in short supply. Machinery is lacking or worn out. The farmer or the peasant cannot find the goods for sale which he desires to purchase. So the sale of his farm produce for money which he cannot use seems to him an unprofitable transaction. He, therefore, has withdrawn many fields from crop cultivation and is using them for grazing. He feeds more grain to stock and finds for himself and his family an ample supply of food, however short he may be on clothing and the other ordinary gadgets of civilization. Meanwhile people in the cities are short of food and fuel. So the governments are forced to use their foreign money and credits to procure these necessities abroad. This process exhausts funds which are urgently needed for reconstruction. Thus a very serious situation is rapidly developing which bodes no good for the world. The modern system of the division of labor upon which the exchange of products is based is in danger of breaking down.

The truth of the matter is that Europe's requirements for the next 3 or 4 years of foreign food and other essential products—principally from America—are so much greater than her present ability to pay that she must have substantial additional help, or face economic, social, and political deterioration of a very grave character.

The remedy lies in breaking the vicious circle and restoring the confidence of the European people in the economic future of their own countries and of Europe as a whole. The manufacturer and the farmer throughout wide areas must be able and willing to exchange their products for currencies the continuing value of which is not open to question.

Aside from the demoralizing effect on the world at large and the possibilities of disturbances arising as a result of the desperation of the people concerned, the consequences to the economy of the United States should be apparent to all. It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist. Such assistance, I am convinced, must not be on a piecemeal basis as various crises develop. Any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative. Any government that is willing to assist in the task of recovery will find full cooperation, I am sure, on the part of the United States Government. Any government which maneuvers to block the recovery of other countries cannot expect help from us. Furthermore, governments, political parties, or groups which seek to perpetuate human misery in order to profit therefrom politically or otherwise will encounter the opposition of the United States.

It is already evident that, before the United States Government can proceed much further in its efforts to alleviate the situation and help start the European world on its way to recovery, there must be some agreement among the countries of Europe as to the requirements of the situation and the part those countries themselves will take in order to give proper effect to whatever action might be undertaken by this Government. It would be neither fitting nor efficacious for this Government to undertake to draw up unilaterally a program designed to place Europe on its feet economically. This is the business of the Europeans. The initiative, I think, must come from Europe. The role of this country should consist of friendly aid in the drafting of a European program and of later support of such a program so far as it may be practical for us to do so. The program should be a joint one, agreed to by a number, if not all European nations.

An essential part of any successsful action on the part of the United States is an understanding on the part of the people of America of the character of the problem and the remedies to be applied. Political passion and prejudice should have no part. With foresight, and a willingness on the part of our people to face up to the vast responsibility which history has clearly placed upon our country, the difficulties I have outlined can and will be overcome.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on June 21, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, just as soon as Congress recesses for the summer my plans call for an extended speaking tour everywhere in our patriotic district. It will, therefore, be a most intriguing summer for me, because the pleasantest part of this job is getting home to meet with you folks personally.

Invitations already tendered me to speak this summer in the counties of Broome, Chenango, and Madison number over 50, with many more to come. I want to visit as many Legion, VFW, and DAV posts as I can, because to talk with you veterans is to gain much.

The granges of our section are as well organized as anywhere in the country. They speak for our farmers and dairymen. While time precludes my joining any other club or group, I have always been an enthusiastic member of Preston Grange in Chenango County. I will appear before nearly all of the 43 granges in my district before the summer is out.

It goes without saying that I welcome requests to speak before veterans' organizations. Several years ago, an undercover attempt was made to pour cold water on my appearances before these veterans' groups.

"Hall is playing politics," they shouted, "and trying to grab the veterans' vote!" That was a silly statement and it is sillier now because I am not a candidate for re-election this year.

As a matter of fact, you vets know it is of advantage to both you and me to have a meeting with your Congressman. It is to your advantage because you can tell me what you want Congress to do for you. However, it is to my advantage because knowing what you veterans want, I can try to get you what you want.

Therefore, I urge you to ask your Commander or his program committee to afford me the opportunity sometime this summer to speak to your post. It is of vital importance to me as well as to you that I be granted this courtesy. Since I visited your post before, a lot of water has gone over the dam, many new veterans have joined your patriotic body, and countless new problems have presented themselves to you. Further, you may have changed your opinions about certain things and will want to acquaint me with them.

So, remember, I look forward to meeting with you veterans, not only with posts that have already kindly invited me, but also with those from whom I have not yet heard.

A few days ago, our locality was distressed no end with the news of the sudden death of Mr. Charles Kirk, vice president of International Business Machines Corp. I believe a tribute to this gentleman's memory is timely on this program.

Much has been said in praise of Charlie Kirk by leaders here in the Triple Cities. What I would like to add is that on many occasions during my several years' knowing him, this gentleman was always cooperative with me for the good of our area in general.

Unlike a few executives I have met, Charlie Kirk was not arbitrary or pompous. I found him always to be friendly and democratic.

He was not afraid, like some I could mention, to be seen talking with his Congressman. In fact, he apparently believed that being friendly with me was not a sacrilege, but went for making a better Government.

I have been honored on at least two occasions in the past by being included as a speaker during ceremonies conducted by IBM at which thousands of people from Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott attended. Mr. Kirk, I am sure, heartily endorsed the idea of my being there as a speaker, because his respect for the will of the voters of our congressional district was sufficient to laud my appearance at these great mass meetings. I would be ungrateful if I did not point out this evidence of his defense and tolerance of our American form of Government.

One day several years ago, when I visited IBM, Mr. Kirk told me he wanted me to meet the workers. Refusing to delegate to one of his assistants the job of introducing me, he took me personally to the main entrance to the IBM plants on North Street in Endicott. Here we stood late that afternoon while thousands and thousands of IBM employees poured out of the plants. He didn't introduce me to all of them, but he certainly covered a lot of ground and we shook hands with a great many until my hand swelled.

Our valley of opportunity has lost a truly American leader with the passing of Mr. Kirk, a fine example of the free enterprise system if there ever was one. His active life was a factor in building the successful operations of a great company and he will be sorely missed.

Among the most important of my speaking engagements at home this summer are several before our Women's Republican Clubs.

This evening I am due in Endicott to meet with my loyal friends, the Women's Republican Club of Greater Endicott. I don't know of a finer, more public-spirited group than this one and I anticipate their picnic at the En-Joie Boathouse as I have many times in the past.

Next Wednesday evening, June 25, I will speak to the Broome County Women's Republican Club at Ross Park, Binghamton, and will certainly derive real pleasure seeing those dear friends once again. The same evening, I will address a large dance sponsored by the Kirkwood Republican Club at Benjamin's Pavillion in Kirkwood.

I certainly welcome the chance to be with you, dear friends, and will have messages of interest for you on all occasions.

Shades of Quisling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, on June 11, 1947, I addressed the House in condemnation of the un-American activities of Henry Wallace and asked how much longer the American people had to tolerate his false preachments which incite human emotions toward riot and insurrection in violation of the spirit and intent of the laws of the United States. Since then I have been deluged with telegrams and letters from border to border and coast to coast, some in approval and others in denunciation of what I had to say about this evil tool of those who would destroy America.

The messages in approval have been heartening; those in criticism have been most revealing and some have served to acquaint me with many torrid and bitter invectives hitherto foreign to my vocabulary.

Once honored with the high office of Vice President of the United States and only a heartbeat removed from the Presidency; twice a member of Roosevelt's Cabinet and now the red stooge of Joe Stalin. Shades of Quisling, what a transition.

Mr. Speaker, what I have had to say about this menace to our American way of life has also been the subject of editorial comment and because of the fair spirit in which it is written I insert at this point, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, an editorial from the Arizcna Daily Star and letter in reply thereto, equally fair in spirit, from Paul R. Yewell, of Tucson, so that all members may have an opportunity to read and weigh them. The editorial and the letter follows:

[From the Arizona Daily Star]

ANGER SPEAKING, NOT REASON

Representative HERBERT A. MEYER, Republican, Kansas, speaking on the floor of the House of Representatives, demands that Henry Wallace be tried for treason.

The Congressman speaks in anger and, as is frequently the case in such instances, without reasoning well the full meaning of that which he recommends.

Henry Wallace is guilty of a number of things. In that we will concur. But treason is not one of them. Wallace has displayed an amazing lack of good taste in going abroad to criticize his own country and its Government, a Government of which he was recently a part. He has shown almost adolescent ineptitude in his inability to document with proof the many shortcomings he charges to the United States or the multitude of advantages he would have his listeners believe are available to his oft-mentioned "common man" under the benevolent regime of the Communist Party in the Soviet Republic.

He has been guilty of careless errors in fact in his attacks on the Truman doctrine, and has quoted baseless propaganda statements without checking their accuracy. He has been and still is guilty of preaching a fraudulent political doctrine which if it were to be saddled upon the Nation would lead to poverty and chaos.

All these things Wallace has done and more. He has been and still is guilty of these and other political sins of omission and commission. But he is not, even by Representative MEYER's own definition, guilty of treason.

Treason, according to the Constitution, which protects Henry Wallace in his folly the same as it protects any other American in his wisdom, presupposes giving peace and comfort to our enemies, adhering to them or making war against our own people. In his political attacks upon our Government, Wallace is merely enjoying that constitutional right of all Americans—the right to make a fool of himself in his own fashion. In his exaltation of things Russian he is not giving aid and comfort to an enemy as the term would be defined in court. Perhaps Congressman MEYER has forgotten, or would like to, but Russia at this time is still "our fighting Ally."

We bow to no one in our disgust with Wallace's campaign and the gospel which he is spreading. At a time when our Nation is striving to hold back the aggressive, acquisitive policies of Russia, it is shameful to see a man who has been more than once honored by the Nation permit himself to become a stalking horse for those same policies here at home.

But nothing Wallace has done could be termed treason. To accuse him of that is to clothe him in a martyr's cloak which he does not deserve, since the charge could not be substantiated.

YEWELL RESEARCH LABORATORY,
Tucson, Ariz., June 21, 1947.

EDITOR ARIZONA DAILY STAR,
Tucson, Ariz.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: This letter refers to your editorial of Friday, June 13, 1947, entitled "Anger Speaking, Not Reason," in which you accuse Representative HERBERT A. MEYER of speaking in anger and of not reasoning well when he recommends that Henry A. Wallace be tried for treason.

Just because the Representative spoke in anger is no proof whatsoever that he did not reason well on the subject of his anger. History and experience abound with cases where men have reasoned well, which reasoning produced not only anger but war.

To justify Representative MEYER's position, two things have to be proven: First, that Russia is our enemy; second, that Henry A. Wallace has given aid and comfort to that enemy. There is but one definition of treason which will apply in this case and that is the one set forth in the Constitution of the United States, which says that treason against the United States consists "only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving aid and comfort to them" (Constitution, art. 3, sec. 3). Please, Mr. Editor, note the grammatical conjunction "or" in this definition.

For a definition of enemy, let us go to Webster's Dictionary, which defines enemy as: "1—One hostile to another; one who seeks the overthrow or failure of that to which he is opposed; 2—A military foe." It has been a common error of most of our people to think of an enemy only as a "military foe." People are prone to think that, as a nation, we have no enemy unless we have a military foe. This is loose thinking and poor reasoning, for we have many people in the United States who are seeking the overthrow of our Government. Some of them are citizens.

You will note that our Constitution gives two definitions for treason against the United States and that our best authority gives two definitions of enemy. If we use these two definitions of treason and the two definitions of enemy, it is quite evident that the framers of our Constitution had both definitions of enemy in mind when they defined treason.

These definitions match up as follows:

Treason against the United States defined as: (1) in levying war against them; (2) in adhering to their enemies, giving aid and comfort to them.

Enemy defined as: (1) a military foe; (2) one hostile to another; one who seeks the overthrow or failure of that to which he is opposed.

Now that the definitions are clear, let us apply reason, which you suggested Representative MEYER did not use. Reason cannot be developed without knowledge, and knowledge cannot be had without study. In order to gain the knowledge on which to base our reasoning, I suggest a study of the following:

1. The writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, including the so-called Communist Manifesto.
2. The Little Lenin Library, by V. I. Lenin.
3. The Manifesto of the Third International.
4. The writings and speeches of the more recent Russians who have expressed themselves on government and economic philosophy.

So much for the words we should study. Let us now briefly study the actions of Russia. Russia is hostile to any type of representative democracy and has not permitted that form of government to exist in any

country over which she has military control. Being hostile to representative democracy, Russia is doing everything within her power to overthrow the Government of the United States. (Definition No. 2 of enemy.) In doing this, Russia is following implicitly the dictates of Lenin, who quoted the following from Engels: "The great classic on the nature of the state capitalist democracy and proletarian revolution. * * * The replacement of the bourgeois by the proletarian state is impossible without violent revolution." Lenin writes further: "Revolution is undoubtedly the most authoritative thing possible. It is the act in which one section of the population imposes on the other, by means of rifles, bayonets, cannon, i. e., by highly authoritative means, its will, and the victorious party is inevitably forced to maintain its supremacy by means of that fear which arms inspire in the reactionaries. * * * In depicting the general phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to a point where war breaks out into open revolution and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat."

The Russians have not deviated one iota from the theories and practices of the founders of their communistic state. Witness the situation in middle Europe today and the purges now taking place in Hungary. To argue that Russia is not hostile to our political and economic way of life, which they call bourgeoisie, that she does not seek the overthrow of our Constitution and the failure of our form of government is silly. The record on this point is abundantly clear. (Please read Trained To Raise Hell in America, by Junius B. Wood; Nation's Business, April 1947.)

By both writings and actions Russia has proven that she is hostile to our state and seeks to overthrow all other forms of government, ours included. Therefore, Mr. Editor, Russia, by definition and action, is our enemy, and it is about time the American people woke up to the fact. If further proof is needed that Russia is our enemy, please study the writings, speeches, and actions of the Russian agents and the American Communists in this country. When reasoning on this subject, please remember all the while that we are in that phase of the revolution which, to quote Lenin again, is "the most general phase * * * the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society." Russia knows that her work in this country is not far enough along to bring the revolution to the point where war breaks out.

One question remains, namely, Is Mr. Henry A. Wallace "adhering to our enemies, giving aid and comfort to them"? To a true American, with an understanding of what is happening in this "veiled civil war" the answer is "Yes." You will want reasons for so saying. Here they are. If you are a Republican do you secure an internationally known Democrat to speak at your sponsored rally or on your lecture platform? Conversely, if you are a Democrat do you secure the services of a prominent Republican to give aid and comfort to your party? The answers to these questions are your own, Mr. Editor. Your reasoning will be simple and your conclusions correct.

Again, if you are a Republican you adhere to the fundamental principles of that party and follow the leaders of that party. You give aid and comfort to that party when you can. If you are a Democrat, you follow the fundamental principles of that party and give aid and comfort to its leaders and help in the election of its candidates. In either case, you back the party which has the political and economic philosophy in which you believe. The Republican and Democratic Parties are both American parties. Neither one of them is hostile to the American form of government. They may seek to overthrow one another, but not our Constitution nor our representative republican form of government.

Mr. Henry A. Wallace is accepting the sponsorship of known Communist organizations. On every occasion offered him he has been hostile to the American Government's efforts in its foreign and domestic policies. He is exciting in the minds of our people an animosity toward our Government. He is not known to be even mildly critical of Russia or the Russian agents of American or foreign birth. One does not have to be a card-carrying Communist to give aid and comfort to that philosophy. There are few Russian agents that have done more for our enemy Russia than Henry A. Wallace. Mr. Wallace recently remarked, "Maybe the Communists follow my line." This remark does not indicate any difference in the "line," merely a difference as to its origin.

Representative HERBERT A. MEYER may have spoken in anger, as any American would do who had a knowledge and understanding of what is happening to our country. He was correct. Henry A. Wallace is a traitor.

Yours very truly, PAUL R. YEWELL.

Capitalism Has Freed More Slaves Than Communism Has Enslaved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the great human tragedies of our modern world is the tremendous number of human slaves now enduring the miseries of life in concentration camps as the political prisoners of Communists overlords. As a gruesome corollary to the use of political prisoners in slave-labor camps, the Communist regimes of the world today must also shoulder the indictment of providing for their laboring classes far fewer of the benefits derived from their production systems than is true of capitalistic countries.

In the following newspaper article by former Congressman Samuel B. Pettengill, of Indiana, the great contributions of our free-enterprise system to the cause of human dignity and human happiness are dramatically portrayed. Its careful study is recommended to any who may be misguided into some credulous belief that under the fictitious promises of communism there may be some alluring benefits to be derived by the laboring men and women of the world.

WHO DOES THE WORK?

(By Samuel B. Pettengill, the gentleman from Indiana)

We swallow costly political patent medicines because we are ignorant of one basic fact. That fact is that the advance of civilization comes chiefly from shifting the hard work of the world from human backs to slaves of iron and steel. This has done more to raise wages, shorten hours, lower costs, reduce drudgery, and eliminate poverty than all the social welfare workers, labor leaders, and politicians put together.

A rough yardstick of the scale of living is the amount of mechanical horsepower available. It builds churches, colleges, and hospitals, as well as factories and electric refrigerators.

Let us look at this basic fact. The work of the world is done by three kinds of energy: human labor, animal power—horses, mules, and oxen—and mineral energy—coal, oil, natural gas, and water power. Add a few Arctic dog teams, windmills, and sailing ships and you have it.

In 1850 the world was reading the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels in which they charged that the drudgery and poverty of that time were due to human greed, and they, therefore, preached the gospel of class hate and socialism.

Consider what happened in the 90 years from 1850 to 1940. In 1850 the work done by human backs was two and a half times that done by mechanical energy. The work done by animal power was three and a half times that of human labor and mechanical energy combined. Only 7 percent of American work was done by mechanical power in 1850; today, 90 percent. Animal power has dropped from 79 to 6 percent; and human labor from 14 to 4 percent of the total, despite the vast increase of population. That is how the load has been lifted from human backs.

Believe it or not, as late as 1900 animals and men did more work in America than coal, oil, and water power. The horsecar was still in use. The famous Boraxo 20-mule team was the largest aggregation of animal power under the control of a single driver. Today, the frailest woman in an automobile controls three times as much power and may go 50 miles an hour, or faster, in place of 8.

The Consolidated Edison Co. in New York produces in a single day power equal to 3,000,000 horses, or 30,000,000 hard-working men. Electrical energy costs 1 to 4 cents, animal energy 50 cents, and human labor $10 per horsepower hour. Not only was the load shifted from human backs, but costs came down from $10 to from 1 to 4 cents per horsepower hour. These reduced costs brought the luxuries of kings into millions of homes.

In 1850 America produced only 1,000,000,000 horsepower hours of energy from mechanical power. Today, 261,000,000,000 horsepower hours. To help him do the work, in 1850, each worker on the average had .50 horsepower from animals and minerals. Today, 2.7 horsepower. If productivity per worker had remained the same as in 1850, it would have taken 290,000,000 men to have produced the goods we did produce in 1944 with only 60,000,000 men working 47 hours a week as against 70 hours in 1850.

This amazing progress of more wealth produced per man-hour has been due to invention, science, competitive enterprise, plowing back profits, and better tools. Factory wages have advanced from $1 a day to $1 an hour and higher. The great humanitarian has been business despite its faults. The only reason American wages are the highest in the world is that we have the best tools in the world.

All this is set forth in America's Needs and Resources, just published by the Twentieth Century Fund. It is optimistic of our future if we do not wander from this basic fact into the swamp of political nostrums, confiscatory taxation, and class war.

Address of Hon. Dean Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fol-

lowing text of the address of Hon. Dean Acheson at Wesleyan University as published in the Washington Post of June 16, 1947:

TEXT OF ACHESON'S ADDRESS AT WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

One who is bringing to an end a considerable period of service in the field of foreign affairs is naturally in a mood of appraisal and review. Have we conducted ourselves in the great world in these past 6 or 7 years true to the traditions of our Republic and to the interests of the American people? I am, of course, prejudiced, but the answer seems to me not difficult, I think it is, yes, we have.

To judge this answer, we have to ask, What are these traditions and these interests? They seem to me simple, even platitudinous. The basic, underlying, never-varying tradition of this republic is insistence upon the liberty of the individual, the worth of the individual, the ultimate test of truth by reference to the individual.

This has been our political, social, and moral mainspring. It has also been the motive power of our vast development. By unleashing the enormous power of individual effort, imagination, energy, this country has attained its material position. It seems true in society, as in nature, that the greatest energy is created by releasing the power of the smallest unit. In one case, the individual; in the other case, the atom.

History and philosophy gave us this doctrine. Geography and experience have confirmed it. One of the great achievements of statesmanship in this country has been to adapt government to the furtherance of this release of the individual and not to its limitation and frustration. An outstanding illustration has been the way in which, under Mr. Lilienthal's guidance, a great governmental project, the TVA, has made power available over a vast area, not to be used by bureaucratic direction, but vastly to enlarge the individual productiveness of millions of Americans.

This belief in the individual is in our blood. It is our most fundamental characteristic. It gives a certain typical disorderliness to our behavior which baffles some foreign observers. But it can no more be separated from us than our idea of humor, our generosity toward anyone in trouble, and our mobility—we are forever going somewhere. Even though this is so, we have no desire to force our behavior and ideas on other people. If, for reasons incomprehensible to us, they want to act differently and—to us—quite misguidedly, that is their affair. But we don't like them to push other peoples around—particularly when those other peoples are trying to live as we think all decent people should live.

With these traditions and interests the American people approach their relations with other countries. They have a sound and unshakable belief that liberty cannot exist here or anywhere, unless there is peace founded on freedom from aggression and unless there is ever-increasing productivity throughout the world. They know that while every people must attain and preserve their own liberty and free government, they can lose them from forces beyond their control when faced with fear of the attack of a foreign enemy, or with the loss of their means of livelihood.

This presents problems for those who work in our State Department. Americans want to be free and prosperous themselves. They want other people who wish to be free and prosperous to achieve those goals. But they sometimes believe that these ends can be reached by machinery or gadgets or through merely moral fervor, and without the pain of hard thinking, hard work, and some real risk and sacrifice.

Some, encouraged by eminent philosophers, have thought that liberty was the natural state of man and that its universal growth and acceptance was inevitable. I do not believe that for a minute. It seems to me that liberty has come to those whose stout hearts and hard heads have won it. Here, again, we must conclude with Justice Holmes that the mode by which the inevitable comes to pass is effort.

Certainly during the decade of the 1940's this country has devoted its supreme efforts toward the preservation of the liberty of nations and individuals. In the opening years of the decade we bent our efforts toward assisting those whom the Axis was attempting to subjugate, and toward impeding its bid to dominate the two most populous continents on the globe. This may have accelerated the attack upon us. But I think that few now doubt the necessity and rightness of our course, or the extreme danger in which any other course would have placed us. The war has now been won and the threats which caused it have been eliminated. But serious threats to the continued existence of liberty have not been eliminated. These come not only from the inevitable consequences of the war itself but also from the course pursued by certain governments.

During the war constructive foreign policy was not in abeyance. It followed two objectives closely related and mutually dependent—established the unity, mutual confidence, and cooperation of the great powers; and to create international organizations, necessarily based on the assumption of this unity and cooperation, in which all nations could together guarantee both freedom from aggression and the opportunity for both the devastated and the undeveloped countries of their own free choice. These, as you have seen, were historic American objectives. They were also the stated purposes of the Allies throughout the war beginning with the Atlantic Charter.

We did not pursue these objectives merely by exhortation or joint declaration and agreement. No people has ever given more tangible or extensive evidence of its good will and intention. Particularly is this true in our attitude toward the Soviet Union. One need mention only the most outstanding examples.

During the war we contributed to the Soviet Union $11,500,000,000 of the most vitally needed supplies. After the war, through UNRRA and governmental credits, we made available another half billion dollars worth of goods for relief and reconstruction.

In our military operations we pursued purely military objectives. The cross-channel invasion of Europe was directed solely toward the destruction of the German armies, not the occupation of territory. And when we overran our estimated and agreed objectives we withdrew to previously agreed zonal boundaries. These were acts, not words, based upon the premise of adherence to an agreement and of mutual confidence and loyalty.

Nor were these acts all. The whole series of arrangements for settlement in eastern Europe, Germany and the Far East recognized to the full Soviet fears and interests, and were based upon confidence in their intention to carry out the pledged purposes of cooperation in Germany, respect for the right of other nations to determine freely their own course of recovery and government, and the creation of a vigorous European and world recovery.

At the same time that these steps were being taken we pushed forward the establishment of international organization. This consisted not only of the United Nations Charter designed upon the foundation of Allied unity to guarantee international security, national liberty, and individual freedom, but of a whole series of special agencies which were to make sure that a favorable environment was created and maintained in which the broader purposes could be accomplished.

These were designed to provide relief in the early postwar period, to assure funds for reconstruction and development, and to stabilize currencies over the longer run, to raise the level of agriculture both as the source of food and as the activity of most of the world's population, to promote and safeguard trade between nations, to protect the health of nations against epidemics, to facilitate the exchange of ideas, knowledge and skills, to aid in the development of international transportation by air and sea—practically every activity which could encourage and make more safe, simple, and beneficial relations between nations.

Unhappily the whole course of recovery and the international pursuit of happiness has suffered deeply by the failure to attain or maintain great power unity. This has come about by the Soviet Union's pursuit of policies diametrically opposed to the very premises of international accord and recovery. In eastern Europe the Soviet Union, over American and British protests, has used its dominant military position, to carry on a unilateral policy, contrary to the Yalta agreements, by which free choice of their destiny has been denied those peoples. Even more important, the minority Communist regimes fastened upon those peoples have acted to cut them off economically from the community of Europe, curtail their productivity, and to bind them to exclusive economic relations with the Soviet Union.

In the Far East, the Soviet Union has dismantled the industries in Manchuria, has obstructed economic and political unification of Korea, and has not carried out its commitments for the return of Dairen to Chinese administration as a free port. These actions have seriously retarded economic recovery and political stability and have contributed vastly to a continuation of poverty and demoralizing uncertainty throughout the Far East.

In the Middle East, Persia has been for some years in turmoil, first through Soviet occupation of its northern territories and then through Soviet-sponsored local attempts to separate those areas from Persia.

In Greece, torn and destroyed by the war beyond any other area, the incalculably difficult task of rebuilding its plant, its production, its people's health and morale, and its governmental services, has been threatened with total defeat by Greece's northern, Communist-controlled neighbors.

Similar disappointment has followed attempts to establish a just and sound peace. It is unnecessary to recount the weary course of the Italian and Balkan peace treaties from London to Moscow to Paris to New York, or to describe the substance of those negotiations. We can note without surprise the cynical and barefaced coup d'etat in Hungary on the very eve of the Hungarian treaty's coming into effect. We note also, 2 years after Potsdam, that by reason of Soviet unwillingness we have not achieved German economic unification or written an Austrian treaty. As a result the recovery of Europe has been long delayed—tragically long.

This by no means exhausts the catalog but it is enough to outline the difficulty and to indicate why it is that the United Nations, founded as I have said on the premise of great power unity, has so often been unable to apply the principles set forth in its Charter and has instead had to furnish the forum for bitter, unprofitable, and inconclusive dialectics.

It would be quite wrong to leave the impression that the factors I have mentioned have been the sole cause of our present problems. It would have been serious enough that the great area east of the Stettin-Trieste line, which contributed so much to Hitler's European economy, has been exploited, disorganized and cut off from western Europe. Nature and man have added other problems. Disasters do not come singly.

Two years of crop failures in Europe and one in the Far East, the most severe winter in half a century which drained the meager coal supplies of England and Europe, and the inefficiency of the industrial plant, due to depreciation, failure of fuel and raw materials, lack of labor, and many other causes—all these have upset all calculations of recovery. Europe has had to use its resources of foreign money and credits, carefully husbanded to restore and improve equipment, merely to keep alive.

Billions of precious dollars saved for machinery, rails, locomotives, harbor equipment, etc., have been spent for wheat and coal, and the heavy shipping charges to carry them. Financially, Europe is bleeding to death, and the period of shock and crisis will come next year. Nor will the crisis be purely European. We are today selling twice the value of goods which our customers can pay for with their sales to us. This is not merely true of stricken Europe, but of our nearest neighbors, Mexico and Canada. The loss of these sales will have—as it has had in the past—a profound repercussion throughout this land.

This is a depressing but not overdrawn report. The outlook, as Secretary Marshall has recently said, is serious. But it has been blacker within the past few years. The winter of 1941–42 was such a period. The dangers of those years were overcome by determination, by courage, and by endless effort. Today's problems can also be surmounted. Tragic as it is that we cannot achieve the whole promise which once seemed almost within our grasp, that is no excuse for not doing what we can. If our power to help is limited, so is the power of others to impede. And upon our side are the great urges of individual spirits throughout the world to rebuild in some way and to push on to a better day.

We can do—and are doing—many things. We can expose for all to see the shams and frauds behind which peoples are deprived of their liberty by little groups supported by foreign power. The methods have not changed basically since the days of Maximilian in Mexico, merely improved in organization, and brutality and propaganda techniques. But they dislike exposure, and it remains to be seen whether they can survive much longer than Maximilian did the withdrawal of the foreign bayonets.

We also can, and should, help within the limits of our capacity those who wish to help themselves. It was such an action that President Truman proposed to the Congress on March 12 in connection with Greece and Turkey and to which the Congress so overwhelmingly responded. This was not a novel proposal or an invitation to a crusade. It was typically and traditionally American.

This country always has responded to people struggling to attain or maintain their freedom. We have done so because it is important to us that they shall succeed. Sometimes we can do much, sometimes little, but the response is always there. It was there in the case of Greece over a century ago, and in the case of Hungary and Poland and Italy. It was there throughout the nineteenth century in the struggle of the Latin-American states to obtain and keep their freedom from the encroachments of European powers. It underlay our efforts for decades to help China in her struggle against foreign subjugation.

So President Truman was acting and the Congress was acting in the truest and soundest American tradition. The case was an extreme one because Greece was near the abyss. But the principle was as old as our country. It is a sensible and hard-headed principle that where our help can be effective to enable people who are sincerely striving to remain free and to solve their own problems, that help will be given.

We should, and I hope will, continue to act in this way—not waiting for extreme crises to develop, not attempting to carry all the burdens of the world or to solve all its problems, but responding in a thoroughly realistic way to the proposals of those who are exhausting every possibility of their own efforts and powers of cooperation with others to maintain places where free men may remain free.

This, as I see it, has been the course of our foreign policy over these last few years. And it is our present course. It has not created the world of our dreams. But that is not our fault. It is the best course I know of, in the world as we find it, to preserve the possibility that a better world may some day eventuate. It is the best course to preserve all that we hold most valuable in life. It is a course that requires determination, intelligence, courage, and effort. It requires that Americans be made of good stuff.

"Citizens," said Milton, "it is of no small concern what manner of men ye be whether to acquire or to keep possession of your liberty."

Unification of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter which I have received from Claude J. Krieger, adjutant of the Mon Valley Detachment of the Marine Corps League of McKeesport, Pa., and copy of resolution adopted at their regular meeting on June 17, 1947, with reference to the proposed Armed Forces unification bill:

MARINE CORPS LEAGUE,
MON VALLEY DETACHMENT,
McKeesport, Pa., June 27, 1947.

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Naturally a marine or a former marine is always interested in the United States Marine Corps. From information available to us and we believe our source of information to be reliable, it appears that there is a definite possibility of the sabotage of the Marine Corps in the proposed armed-forces unification.

As you know from your knowledge of the history of our country, the Marine Corps has always held up their end and in many instances have gone far beyond the ordinary call of duty to maintain the interests and the integrity of the United States whenever and wherever they are called upon.

The Mon Valley Detachment of the Marine Corps League and the individual members have no objection to a unified military service as the history of World War II has shown time and time again the importance and wisdom of unity, but we are, one and all, definitely opposed to the apparent present plan to practically deactivate the Marine Corps.

We would therefore request that you work to the end that when the armed forces unification bill comes before your Chamber of the Congress, the United States Marine Corps be given such a place in the unification as their past history in the service of this country justifies.

I therefore enclose herewith a copy of a resolution passed by the Mon Valley Detachment at their regular meeting held June 17, 1947 and would ask that this resolution and this letter be very seriously considered by you as representing the wishes, desires, and direction of more people than you know, when you vote on the proposed armed forces unification bill.

Very truly yours,

CLAUDE J. KRIEGER,
Adjutant.

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a certain bill generally and commonly known as the Armed Services unification bill; and

Whereas under the terms of that bill, the United States Marine Corps is relegated to a very minor role in the defense of our country and there is a grave and definite possibility of the United States Marine Corps being totally deactivated and to exist in name only; and

Whereas the United States Marine Corps is the oldest fighting and military unit in the Armed Forces of the United States and during the more than 170 years of its proud history it has nobly defended this country and upheld the integrity of this Nation on many foreign soils, and it is the only armed force of this great Nation whose landing on foreign soil in pursuit of its normal duties does not constitute an act of war; and

Whereas it is not the will of the people of the United States that such a proud unit of their Armed Forces be divested of their outstanding position in the defense of this country to satisfy the whims and pleasures of any bloc or clique which places their own individual ambitions far above the welfare of this Nation; and

Whereas the valor of the individual marine and the outstanding exploits of the United States Marine Corps as recorded on the pages of history are too great to pass unnoticed and unrecognized when planning for the defense of our great Nation and the proper defense and welfare of this Nation requires and demands that such a military unit be granted a position of proper responsibility in keeping with their proven ability to properly defend the honor and integrity of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Mon Valley Detchment of the Marine Corps League, in regular meeting assembled at McKeesport, Pa., do hereby and herewith petition the Congress of the United States to amend the so-called Armed Forces unification bill to the extent that the identity of the United States Marine Corps be not lost in the unification of the Armed Forces and that the United States Marine Corps be given a place in the unification of the Armed Forces in keeping with their past achievements and record in the defense of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Mon Valley Detachment, a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS and Hon. EDWARD C. MARTIN, of the United States Senate, and Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, of the House of Representatives, the Congress of the United States, now in session in Washington, D. C.; and be it further

Resolved, That their active interest in the Armed Forces unification bill be petitioned and prayed for to the end that the purpose of this resolution be achieved.

Witness the hands of the commandant and adjutant of Mon Valley Detachment of the Marine Corps League, at McKeesport, Pa., this 17th day of June, 1947.

MON VALLEY DETACHMENT,
MARINE CORPS LEAGUE, INC.
By JAY KACSAN, *Commandant.*

Attest:

CLAUDE J. KRIEGER,
Adjutant.

A Salute to the Solid South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. David Lawrence in this week's edition of the United States News:

A SALUTE TO THE SOLID SOUTH

(By David Lawrence)

The solid South holds the balance of power today in America.

Without the support of 20 Democrats in the Senate and 106 Democrats in the House—virtually all of them from the Southern States—the labor bill could not have been enacted last week over the Presidential veto.

Without the support of the southern delegation in Congress, there can be no tax reduction while Mr. Truman is President.

Without the preventive power of the southern Democrats, America today would be in the throes of industrial disintegration.

The solid South has kept the balance in America. It has saved America from radicalism of either the communistic or the fascistic sort.

"Left wingers" may ridicule the South on the radio and attack its Senators and Representatives in the public prints as "reactionary," but the true "reactionaries" are those who want special privileges for themselves and expenditures of public funds for their special projects.

The "liberals" are those who stand up for the traditional American principle of initiative and free enterprise and against State socialism.

To say that the southern Democrats fight "liberal" legislation is to overlook the fact that the Wagner labor-relations law was enacted in 1935 predominantly with the aid of the southern Democrats. These Democrats likewise supported nearly every New Deal measure in the prewar years from 1933 to 1941.

The truth is the southern Democrats are ready to accept "liberal" legislation in the economic field and give it a chance when it appears to be for the public good, but they are just as ready to vote for amendment or repeal when they see mistakes or abuses in the operation of any law.

AVERTING RADICALISM

The Democratic Party cannot be a radical party for any prolonged period as long as a substantial Republican minority and a substantial Democratic minority form a majority coalition in Congress, placing principle above petty political advantage or partisanship. Defeat in the congressional elections in 1946 was a blow only at the radical leadership of the Democratic Party in the North. It would be a mistake, therefore, to assume that the Democrats in the South see eye to eye with northern republicanism on everything.

The Democrats of the South, for instance, divided on the matter of tax reduction. They did not follow their Republican brethren who voted solidly for it. This did not mean, however, that the southern Democrats were opposed to all tax reduction. When they saw, after the veto, the true implications of the Truman message and began to weigh the consequences of such a radical program, there developed a desire to review the whole matter.

A TAX BILL FOR 1948

Last week House Republican leaders agreed that a tax bill effective January 1, 1948, would get a two-thirds vote. Southern Democrats indicated they would support a new measure. Senator BYRD, of Virginia, who had voted against the tax bill because he thought passage should wait till the Budget figures for appropriations were available, stated that he would support the same tax-reduction bill that was vetoed by the President, provided the Republicans agreed to a clause making it effective January 1, 1948, instead of July 1, 1947. Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, another able leader, concurred in that plan.

Inasmuch as the choice apparently is between some tax reduction now and no tax reduction for a long while, the Republicans should welcome the opportunity to clear up the situation and give the taxpayers of America notification of what their own budgets will be for the calendar year 1948.

When the pay-as-you go plan of tax collection was enacted, Congress changed a basic piece of timing in the finances of the individual. Previously, when a tax bill was passed, the taxpayer did not pay at the new rates on his current year's income until March 15 of the following year. He had some time to adjust himself to high rates, or, in the case of tax reduction, he knew several months in advance and could make plans for expenditures.

With the present pay-as-you-go plan, on the other hand, a damaging uncertainty can arise. Persons who do not know what the amounts available for disbursement will be next year hesitate to buy needed articles out of this year's income when they might have to set aside certain sums for other items next year. To promise that a tax-reduction bill will be passed next April or May and that it will be made retroactive effective January 1, 1948, is confusing and injurious to the planning of an individual's budget.

If there is to be a tax reduction for 1948 and every taxpayer can be told this summer what his tax rate will be for the coming year, there can be advance planning and even the disbursement of some sums now on articles that might require installment buying, such as automobiles or housing.

To know now that taxes will be reduced is to stabilize the flow of goods in America and to underpin the whole American economy—its wage levels and its capital uses—against the uncertainties that face us both in world trade and in a fluctuating domestic demand.

To divert three or four billions of dollars from Government spending to private spending is a healthy step, especially when the expenditures are for goods needed to maintain our normal standard of living.

COUPLING DEBT AND TAX REDUCTION

Senator BYRD, of Virgina, has wisely coupled his suggestion for a new bill on tax reduction to take effect next January with the requirement that a definite sum be set aside by Congress for debt reduction out of the surplus expected for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, and ending June 30, 1948. Incidentally, the reduction in revenues affected by changes in tax rates would be related only to the second half of the coming fiscal year, in which a substantial surplus is expected.

There is no evidence, moreover, that a reduction in tax rates will cause as big a drop in revenues as the Treasury estimates indicate. Experience after World War I revealed that as the tax rates went down the total volume of receipts increased. This is because when business is brisk and profits are rising, the tax collector gets a higher return. While the percentage rate in a tax schedule may be lower, the same percentage applied to a larger and larger total volume of business and to a larger and larger individual income brings in larger gross receipts to the Government.

A SOUND FISCAL POLICY

Senator BYRD's proposals are the essence of economic statesmanship. The Southern Democrats have it in their power to stabilize the American economy by insistence that debt reduction and tax reduction go hand in hand in an orderly plan that will exhibit to all the world the soundest kind of fiscal policy.

The Southern Democrats did not uniformly support the tax reduction bill when it was last voted on because all the figures were not yet available on Government appropriations for the coming fiscal year. Before Congress adjourns this summer such figures will be available. Mr. BYRD hopes that the President would then sign a tax reduction bill but, in any event, the Virginia Senator says a two-thirds vote can be mobilized to override a veto.

The move made by Senator BYRD affords the President a way out of his dilemma. It enables the Republicans to make good on their promises, too. It helps the American taxpayer to plan his own 1948 budget and enables American business to be sure of a steady demand for goods which, in turn, will help toward a reduction in the price level.

It is the uncertainty of demand that has to a large extent kept prices from being reduced. If business men knew now that a larger and larger volume of goods could be bought by the public, they would be justified in taking a chance on a gradual reduction in prices.

A new tax reduction bill can underwrite American prosperity and overcome a business recession.

The solid South has been standing solidly for constructive legislation and can now save America from economic and political stagnation by using its influence to adjust our system of inequitable wartime tax rates.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the innate statesmanship of the Southern leaders in Congress who place the public interest above special interest and principle above party. This is genuine Americanism.

Don't Fire the Cop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very thought-provoking editorial written by one of the editors in my congressional district, Mr. Hugh V. Haddock, and published in the Rockport Pilot of Rockport, Tex.:

DON'T FIRE THE COP

President Truman's concern over the country's armed forces and the urgent recommendations of his advisory commission for universal military service have a sinisterly familiar sound.

For those who read their newspapers closely and with any degree of thoughtfulness, the significance is almost frightening. The President and his commission leave the distinct impression that they are pleading with the country to read between the lines of their messages. If that is so, then we should be thoroughly frightened, frightened badly enough that we will come to life and do something.

Twice before, within the memory of this writer, have Presidents of the United States sounded similar warnings. Twice before has the country ignored the warnings. Twice before have we been caught pitifully unprepared by savage wars and ruthless warmakers.

We are an optimistic people. We like to believe that everything will turn out for the best. Let some optimist with a peanut brain

and a silly smirk on his face come along and tell us everything is fine and dandy, and we'll believe him. We are more than optimistic. We are decidedly on the gullible side. We laugh at the yokels who buy Brooklyn Bridge from the city slicker, then turn around and do the same thing on an international scale.

Just now, the international Brooklyn Bridge which we are buying is Russian good will. For those who believe in its reality the editor recommends reading Patrick Henry's speech in the Virginia House of Burgesses. Substitute "Soviet Russia" for the name, "George III," especially in the passage which begins, if our memory serves after 35 years: "We have no light for our feet save the lamp of experience."

Henry Wallace, chief salesman of Russian good will in this country, admitted to this writer in press conference at Austin a few weeks ago that Russia is playing for a depression in the United States to gain its desires. Meantime, the steady Soviet push to grab off helpless small countries in Europe goes on relentlessly. Russia has already wrecked the effectiveness of the United Nations since Stalin has found that it cannot be made a tool. Every day's demand for the atom bomb and the accompanying refusal to permit international inspection add to the grim warning of the news.

Nevertheless, on the radio, from the platform and through print, propagandists scream almost daily that we have tried preparedness for war, tried being strong, then ended up in war.

They urge that we try brotherly love for a change.

These gentlemen either are woefully ignorant of the facts of current and recent history, or they willfully twist the truth.

We have not tried being strong. We have been temptingly weak, a Pollyanna nation, sprawling over a large and rich section of the globe and refusing to believe that the big bully across the way really means what he says when he tells us that he is going to beat the tar out of us when he gets around to it. We know that the big bully covets our marbles and yet we are naive enough to doubt that he intends to take them, even when he says so.

As for brotherly love, we know all about it. It's fine business. Just why else have we been playing Santa Claus to the rest of the world for a quarter of a century and more? It doesn't seem to have gotten us too far.

By all means lop off silly, boondoggling Government expenditures. Quit paying people to create shortages in commodities so that prices will stay up, so that strikes for higher wages will result, thus creating more shortages. Quit paying Government bureau chiefs according to the number of employees instead of by the importance of the work done.

But let's not cut the expenditures of our national insurance policy, the armed forces. Let's not fire the cop on the corner simply because the house was not burglarized last night.

Let's remember one thing, too. War certainly is destructive, but the maintenance of a strong peacetime force is a good thing for the Nation's employment and business situation. For every man in service, a half dozen others will have civilian jobs concerned with supplying that man.

Money which business pays out in taxes will return in profits. Two million men in service making jobs for themselves and 10,000,000 more is better depression insurance than 12,000,000 on WPA. And they're a lot better jobs for both workman and the country.

The Federal Government has made Army and Navy service at least equal to civilian employment in pay and opportunity. In many cases a young man can earn more money in service than out. Educational programs have been set up to supply college training that some young fellows couldn't possibly get outside the service. Add to that the beneficial effect of discipline and it is hard to conceive of a better break for a young man than universal military service can give.

By all means, Congress should work out such a program.

State Convention of Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the proposed platform for the 1947 State convention of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., Hotel Edison, Lynn, Mass., June 27, 28, and 29, 1947:

PROPOSED PLATFORM FOR 1947 STATE CONVENTION OF THE ITALIAN-AMERICAN WORLD WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, INC., HOTEL EDISON, LYNN, MASS., JUNE 27, 28, AND 29, 1947

In the year that has intervened since the last assembled convention of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., the economic and social progress of this Nation has not been compatible with our democratic ideals, our unparalleled productive resources, and our wartime victory. We have not moved ahead on the domestic front toward the effective implementation of the ideals for which the war was fought and won. Today, an impoverished world looks to America as its sole source of economic assistance. The success or failure of our domestic economy is the difference between starvation and survival for the people of the world. We must fight the forces which are inconsistent with our fundamental freedoms whenever and wherever they arise.

There has been presented to your committee a great number of resolutions, and we therefore report for your approval as the consensus of those gathered at the State convention of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., assembled on the 28th day of June 1947, the following measures stated below:

HOUSING PLATFORM

The No. 1 domestic issue in the United States today, as it was a year ago, is housing. We believe the country has failed in its obligation to house the veterans of World War II.

We urge that rent control be continued until the housing shortage is largely eliminated; we ask for the immediate passage of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft and Douglas bills; we ask for the continuation of a vigorous program to assist producers of new building materials and industrialized housing; and, finally, we ask for the development of a comprehensive financing program to encourage home purchasing and low-cost rental housing.

VETERANS' UNEMPLOYMENT

Inasmuch as there is a consistently increasing and abnormally high rate of unemployment among veterans, we urge appropriate Federal, State, and local government agencies to inquire into the cause of such unemployment and take prompt and effective corrective action to arrest this trend.

COMMUNITY TAX

We urge the passage in Massachusetts of the so-called community-tax bill, and we urge appropriate Federal Government action to provide for joint returns for taxpayers in all States as the best method for eliminating the discriminatory tax advantage now enjoyed by residents of community-property States.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Our country is a Nation of many races and creeds, and no particular nationality, religious, or ethic group can take full credit for its achievements. When Congress enacted barriers to immigration and naturalization based upon race and color, it turned its back upon the lessons of our history. We call upon the Eightieth Congress to remove all barriers presently existing to the immigration and naturalization laws.

TERMINAL-LEAVE PAY

We urge immediate passage of legislation by Congress for the conversion of terminal-leave bonds to cash, and the extension of the September 1, 1947, dead line for terminal-leave benefits to September 1, 1948, in order to give ample opportunity to apply to all veterans who for one reason or another have been unable to submit their applications.

COMPENSATION, PENSIONS, AND REHABILITATION

1. Granting of a determination of service connection for cases of active tuberculosis where there was no evidence of tuberculosis noted at the time of induction or enlistment and it appears either during service or within 3 years of discharge.

2. Extension of the present 1-year statute of limitations for appeal from an adverse ruling of the Veterans' Administration on claims to a period of 3 years.

3. Extension of the period during which pension claims must be filed in order to have the award run from the date of discharge from 1 to 2 years after discharge.

4. Allowance of credit for the purpose of old-age pension and retirement under the social-security laws for time spent in military service.

5. Extension of the time limit allowed for certain veterans to apply for naturalization without the usual waiting period and elimination of the requirement of their having entered the country under a quota.

COURT MARTIAL (MILITARY AND NAVAL JUSTICE)

If we are to maintain an Army by volunteer recruitment and maintain our international commitments, it is absolutely necessary that some cure be found for the festering sore in the military and naval services which is most responsible for the poor morale and lack of interest. We recommend a complete overhauling of the court-martial system.

REVIEW OF CERTAIN COURT-MARTIAL CASES

We urge the further consideration and review of the cases of Michael DeBartolo, of Squantum, Mass., and Frank A. Barbato, of Tomkinsville, N. Y., with a view to ascertain with finality whether or not complete justice was one in their cases.

By virtue of the nature of the administration of the court-martial system, men were often tried, convicted, and sentenced because of the whim of a commanding officer. Courts martial were administered by nonprofessionals—people unskilled in judicial technique.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

We endorse the conduct of the Veterans' Administration under Gen. Omar N. Bradley.

Committee on Resolutions: Henry Selvitella, Chairman; Albert Germano, Angelo Auricchio, Amato Mastrommattia, Joseph DiPrima, Paul A. Carbone, Pasquale Caggiano, Raymond Parise, Thomas Ciamma, Dr. Ezia N. Tesone, Alexander Buonammo and Domenic Cavallon.

Fifteen Percent Rent Boost Bill May Mean 25 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from PM, Sunday, June 29, 1947, by Sidney Margolius:

FIFTEEN PERCENT RENT BOOST BILL MAY MEAN TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT—RISE WILL BE ADDED TO "HARDSHIP" INCREASES

(By Sidney Margolius)

Rent hikes of around 25 percent instead of the anticipated 15 percent boosts are now in prospect as the result of the rent measure expected to become law Tuesday.

The likelihood many tenants will find themselves paying even higher rates than they feared was uncovered yesterday when it was learned the Federal Rent Control Office here has loosened its regulations governing hardship rent-hike petitions. It will now be possible for landlords to pyramid boosts by first securing a new easy-to-get "hardship" increase of as much as 10 percent and then negotiating with the tenant for a 15 percent increase with a lease through 1948, as provided for by the forthcoming law.

FIFTEEN PERCENT BOOST ON TOP

Negotiated 15-percent boosts will be possible on top of hardship increases already granted and also on those that may be allowed after June 30, rent experts here believe. The regional Rent Control Office here has called a conference of officials for Monday to establish an official interpretation.

A mandate from rent-control officials in Washington requiring quicker processing of landlord applications for rent raises under hardship provisions is responsible for the liberalization of these grants, it was learned. As a result, regional investigators have been instructed to discontinue audits of landlord's books and to sanction the request for a rent boost, if the landlord's own figures in support of his petition look "reasonable."

SAMPLE CHECK ONLY ONE MADE

The only check rent offices will now make will be a sample check of petitions already approved, much like the sample dipping to income-tax returns performed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. In case this scattered checking does turn up any unjustified increases, the grants can be revoked retroactively.

Besides waiving the audit of the landlord's figures the rent control office now no longer notifies a tenant that his landlord has petitioned for a raise. Previously the tenant had been called in and asked for his side of the case. Under the new procedure, the only notice the tenant receives is the announcement that his rent has been raised.

Regional rent officials, however, will continue to grant tenants the right to ask for review of a rent increase sanctioned by a local rent office.

Hardship increases are granted landlords if they show their current financial operations compare unfavorably with the average of any 2 years since 1939.

Before the order came from Washington to keep current on landlord hardship petitions, rent officials had been granting these increases at an approximate rate of 400 dwelling units a week in New York City alone. The increases granted usually range from 5 to 10 percent and in some exceptional cases have been as high as 22 percent in this region.

Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, recently there was brought to my attention certain correspondence from the group terming itself "the Shareholders Committee of Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association of Long Beach, Calif." This group, over the signature of its chairman, Mr. Paul L. Mallonee, alleged that Mr. John H. Fahey, Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, had abused his authority in placing a conservator in charge of the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association. At the time that this letter was being circulated to Members of Congress, this matter was before the Supreme Court of the United States.

On Monday, June 23, the United States Supreme Court, by unanimous decision, upheld the constitutionality of the law under which the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration is empowered, when necessary, to appoint a conservator for a federally chartered savings and loan association. The Court further sustained regulations of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, providing the grounds for which a conservator may be named, which had also been attacked.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the decision by the Supreme Court:

[Supreme Court of the United States—No. 687. October term, 1946—*John H. Fahey and A. V. Ammann, individually and respectively as Federal Land Bank Commissioner and conservator for the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association, appellants* v. *Paul Mallonee, et al.*—Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California—June 23, 1947]

Mr. Justice Jackson delivered the opinion of the Court.

A specially constituted three-judge district court has summarily, without trial, entered final judgment ousting a conservator who, on orders of the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner, had taken possession of the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association. It granted this and other relief on the principal ground that section 5 (d) of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933, as amended, violates article I, sections 1 and 8 of the Constitution.

The Federal Home Loan Administration on May 20, 1946, without notice or hearing, appointed Ammann conservator for the association and he at once entered into possession. The grounds assigned were that the association was conducting its affairs in an unlawful, unauthorized, and unsafe manner, that its management was unfit and unsafe, that it was pursuing a course injurious to, and jeopardizing the interests of, its members, creditors, and the public. Plaintiffs at once commenced this class action in the right of the association against the conservator and Fahey, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the association as a nominal defendant, and several others not important to the issue here. The complaint alleged that the conservator and the chairman had seized the property without due process of law, motivated by malice and ill will, and that the seizure for various reasons was in violation of the Constitution. It asked return of the association to its former management, permanent injunction against further interference, and other relief. Other parties in interest intervened. Temporary restraining orders issued and a three-judge court was duly convened.

Personal service was secured upon Ammann, the conservator, but Fahey, the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner, officially an inhabitant of the District of Columbia, could not be served in California. A motion for substituted service, therefore, was granted and process was served upon him in the District of Columbia. It was believed that this was authorized by Judicial Code (sec. 57, 28 U. S. C., sec 118). Ammann moved to dismiss the complaint on the ground that it failed to state a cause of action. Fahey appeared specially to move dismissal or quashing return of service on him upon the ground that he could not, in his official capacity, be sued in California and had not been served properly with process. Neither had answered the complaint, nor had their time to do so expired, when final judgment was granted against them.

The three-judge court set a variety of pending motions for argument; and after argument, mainly on the constitutionality of section 5 (d), with only pleadings and motion papers before it, held the section unconstitutional, ordered removal of the conservator, permanently enjoined the authorities from holding an administrative hearing on the matter, permanently enjoined an apprehended merger, restored the institution to its former management, ordered the conservator to account, and enjoined these authorities "from ever asserting any claims, right, title, or interest" in or to the association's property. The case is here on direct appeal (50 Stat. 752–753; 28 U. S. C., secs. 349a, 380a).

It is manifest that whatever merit there may be in various subsidiary and collateral questions, this drastic decree can stand only if the section, as applied here, is unconstitutional.

Its defect is said to consist of delegation of legislative functions to the supervising authority without adequate standards of action or guides to policy. Section 5 (d) of the act gives to the Board "full power to provide in the rules and regulations herein authorized for the reorganization, consolidation, merger, or liquidation of such associations, including the power to appoint a conservator or a receiver to take charge of the affairs of any such association, and to require an equitable readjustment of the capital structure of the same; and to release any such association from such control and permit its further operation" (48 Stat. 133, 12 U. S. C. sec. 1464 (d)). This, the District Court held, was unconstitutional delegation of the congressional function. It relied on *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388), and *Schechter* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495).

Both cited cases dealt with delegation of a power to make Federal crimes of acts that never had been such before and to devise novel rules of law in a field in which there had been no settled law or custom. The latter case also involved delegation to private groups as well as to public authorities. Chief Justice Hughes emphasized these features, saying that the act under examination was not merely to deal with practices "which offend against existing law, and could be the subject of judicial condemnation without further legislation, or to create administrative machinery for the application of established principles of law to particular instances of violations. Rather, the purpose is clearly disclosed to authorize new and controlling prohibitions through codes of laws

which would embrace what the formulators would propose, and what the President would approve, or prescribe, as wise and beneficent measures for the government of trades and industries in order to bring about their rehabilitation, correction, and development, according to the general declaration of policy in section 1." (*Schechter* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495, 535).)

The savings and loan associations with which section 5 (d) deals, on the other hand, are created, insured and aided by the Federal Government. It may be that explicit standards in the Home Owners Loan Act would have been a desirable assurance of responsible administration. But the provisions of the statute under attack are not penal provisions as in the case of *Lanzetta* v. *New Jersey* (306 U. S. 451) or *United States* v. *Cohen Grocery Co.* (255 U. S. 81). The provisions are regulatory. They do not deal with unprecedented economic problems of varied industries. They deal with a single type of enterprise and with the problems of insecurity and mismanagement which are as old as banking enterprise. The remedies which are authorized are not new ones unknown to existing law to be invented by the Board in exercise of a lawless range of power. Banking is one of the longest regulated and most closely supervised of public callings. It is one in which accumulated experience of supervisors, acting for many States under various statutes, has established well-defined practices for the appointment of conservators, receivers and liquidators. Corporate management is a field, too, in which courts have experience and many precedents have crystallized into well-known and generally acceptable standards. A discretion to make regulations to guide supervisory action in such matters may be constitutionally permissible while it might not be allowable to authorize creation of new crimes in uncharted fields.

The Board adopted rules and regulations governing appointment of conservators.[1] They provided the grounds upon which a conservator might be named, and they are the usual and conventional grounds found in most State and Federal banking statutes.[2] They are sufficiently explicit, against the background of custom, to be adequate for proper administration and for judicial review if there should be a proper occasion for it.

It is complained that these regulations provide for hearing after the conservator takes possession instead of before. This is a drastic procedure. But the delicate nature of the institution and the impossibility of preserving credit during an investigation has made it an almost invariable custom to apply supervisory authority in this summary manner. It is a heavy responsibility to be exercised with disinterestedness and restraint, but in the light of the history and customs of banking we cannot say it is unconstitutional.[3]

In this case an administrative hearing was demanded and specifications were asked as to the charges against the management of the association. The hearing was granted and a statement of complaints against the management was furnished.

The causes for the appointment of a conservator as therein set forth by the Board included withdrawals by the president without proper voucher therefor; payment of salaries and fees not commensurate with services rendered; a director's unlawful removal of a cashier's check in the amount of $50,000 during an examination by Federal home-loan bank examiners; leasing properties of the association for a 20-year period on terms which would not provide adequate consideration to the association; use of the association for personal gain of one or more officers and directors; failure to maintain proper accounts and to make proper reports; and falsification of records. It also charged certain manipulations of the affairs of an-

---

[1] The rules and regulations for the Federal Savings and Loan System provide in part as follows:

PART 206. APPOINTMENT OF CONSERVATOR OR RECEIVER

Section 206.1. Receiver or conservator; appointment. (a) Whenever, in the opinion of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, any Federal savings and loan association—

(1) Is conducting its business in an unlawful, unauthorized, or unsafe manner;

(2) Is in an unsound or unsafe condition, or has a management which is unsafe or unfit to manage a Federal savings and loan association;

(3) Cannot with safety continue in business;

(4) Is impaired in that its assets do not have an aggregate value (in the judgment of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration) at least equal to the aggregate amount of its liabilities to its creditors, members, and all other persons;

(5) Is in imminent danger of becoming impaired;

(6) Is pursuing a course that is jeopardizing or injurious to the interests of its members, creditors, or the public;

(7) Has suspended payment of its obligations;

(8) Has refused to submit its books, papers, records, or affairs for inspection to any examiner or lawful agent appointed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration;

(9) Has refused by the refusal of any of its officers, directors, or employees to be examined upon oath by the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration or its representative concerning its affairs; or

(10) Has refused or failed to observe a lawful order of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration

the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration may appoint the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation receiver for such Federal association, which appointment shall be for the purpose of liquidation, or the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration may appoint a conservator for such Federal association to conserve the assets of the association pending further disposition of its affairs. The appointment shall be by order, which order shall state on which of the above causes the appointment is based. Any conservator so appointed shall furnish bond for himself and his employees, in form and amount and with surety acceptable to the Governor of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, or any Deputy or Assistant Governor, but no bond shall be required of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as receiver. The conservator or receiver shall forthwith upon appointment take possession of the association and, at the time such conservator or receiver shall demand possession, such conservator or receiver shall notify the officer or employee of the association, if any, who shall be in the home office of the association and appear to be in charge of such office, of the action of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration. The Secretary of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration shall, forthwith upon adoption thereof, mail a certified copy of the order of appointment to the address of the association as it shall appear on the records of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration and to each director of the association, known by the Secretary to be such, at the last address of each as the same shall appear on the records of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration. If such certified copy of the order appointing the conservator or receiver is received at the offices of the association after the taking of possession by the conservator or receiver, such conservator or receiver shall hand the same to any officer or director of the association who may make demand therefor.

Section 206.2. Hearing on appointment: Within 14 days (Sundays and holidays included) after the appointment of a conservator or receiver for a Federal association not at the time of such appointment in the hands of a conservator, such Federal association, which has not, by its board of directors, consented to or requested the appointment of a conservator or receiver, may file an answer and serve a written demand for a hearing, authorized by its board of directors, which demand shall state the address to which notice of hearing shall be sent. Upon receipt of such answer and written demand for a hearing the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration shall issue and serve a notice of hearing upon the institution by mailing a copy of the order of hearing to the address stated in the demand therefor and shall conduct a hearing, at which time and place the Federal association may appear and show cause why the conservator or receiver should not have been appointed and why an order should be entered by the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration discharging the conservator or receiver. Such hearing shall be held either in the district of the Federal Home Loan Bank of which such Federal association is a member or in Washington, D. C., as the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration shall determine, unless the association otherwise consents in writing. Such hearing may be held before the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner or before a trial examiner or hearing officer, as the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration shall determine. Such Federal association, which has not, by its board of directors, consented to or requested the appointment of a conservator or receiver, may, within 7 days (Sundays and holidays included) of such appointment, serve a written or telegraphic demand, authorized by its board of directors upon the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration for a more definite statement of the cause or causes for the action. The time of service upon the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration for the purposes of this section shall be the time of receipt by the Secretary of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration.

Section 206.4 Discharge of conservator or receiver: An order of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration discharging a conservator and returning the association to its management shall restore to such Federal association all its rights, powers and privileges and shall restore the rights, powers, and privileges of its officers and directors, all as of the time specified in such order, except as such order may otherwise provide. An order of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration discharging a receiver and returning the association to its management shall by operation of law and without any conveyance or other instrument, act or deed, restore to such Federal association all its rights, powers, and privileges, revest in such Federal association the title to all its property, and restore the rights, powers, and privileges of its officers and directors, all as of the time specified in such order, except as such order may otherwise provide. Twenty-four C. F. R. Cum. Supp., sec. 206.1 et seq., as amended, 24 C. F. R. 1943, Supp. sec. 206.1.

[2] Bank Conservation Act of March 9, 1933 (sec. 203, 48 Stat. 2–3, 12 U. S. C. sec. 203); Banking Act of 1933 (sec. 31, 48 Stat. 194, 12 U. S. C. sec. 71a); National Housing Act (sec. 406, 48 Stat. 1259–60, 12 U. S. C. sec. 1729). E. g., New York Banking Law (sec. 606, 4 McKinney's Consolidated Laws of New York 708–709 (pocket part) 125–26); Page's Ohio General Code Annotated (sec. 687); 1 Deering's California General Laws (act 986, sec. 13.11); Massachusetts Laws Annotated (ch. 167, sec. 22; ch. 170B, sec. 4); Jones Illinois Statutes Annotated (sec. 14.40).

[3] See note 2.

other institution by the president of this institution.

The plaintiffs nevertheless demanded and obtained an injunction to prevent the administrative hearing and they have therefore cut off the making of a record as to whether these charges are well-founded. Nor did the trial court take evidence on the subject. We must assume that the supervising authorities would be able to sustain the statements of fact and to justify the conclusions in their charges for the purpose of determining the case without trial. We are therefore unable to agree with the court below that the section is invalid and hence that regardless of the charges the management was free to go on undisciplined and unchecked.

But even if the section were defective, which we think it is not in a constitutional sense, another obstacle stands in the way of ousting this conservator.

The Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association was organized in 1934 under section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, subsection (d) of which is now sought to be declared unconstitutional. The present management obtained a charter which provided that the association "shall at all times be subject to the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, providing for Federal savings and loan associations, and to any amendments thereof, and to valid rules and regulations made thereunder as the same may be amended from time to time," and that it might be "liquidated, merged, consolidated, or reorganized, as is provided in the rules and regulations for Federal savings and loan associations." In 1937, upon the association's request, an amended charter was issued which likewise provided that the association was to exercise its powers subject to the Home Owners' Loan Act and regulations issued thereunder.

This is a stockholder's derivative action in which plaintiffs sue only in the right of the association. It is an elementary rule of constitutional law that one may not "retain the benefits of the act while attacking the constitutionality of one of its important conditions" (*United States* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 16, 29)). As formulated by Mr. Justice Brandeis, concurring in *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288, 348), "The Court will not pass upon the constitutionality of a statute at the instance of one who has availed himself of its benefits."

In the name and right of the association, it is now being asked that the act under which it has its existence be struck down in important particulars, hardly severable from those provisions which grant its right to exist. Plaintiffs challenge the constitutional validity of the only provision under which proceedings may be taken to liquidate or conserve the association for the protection of its members and the public. If it can hold the charter that it obtained under this act and strike down the provision for terminating its powers or conserving its assets, it may perpetually go on, notwithstanding any abuses which its management may perpetrate. It would be intolerable that the Congress should endow an association with the right to conduct a public banking business on certain limitations and that the Court at the behest of those who took advantage from the privilege should remove the limitations intended for public protection. It would be difficult to imagine a more appropriate situation in which to apply the doctrine that one who utilizes an act to gain advantages of corporate existence is estopped from questioning the validity of its vital conditions. We hold that plaintiffs are estopped, as the association would be, from challenging the provisions of the act which authorize the Board to prescribe the terms and conditions upon which a conservator may be named.

There are other important and difficult questions raised in the case which it becomes unnecessary to decide.

Objection is made to the administrative hearing upon the ground that it is before the same authority which has preferred the charges and that it cannot be expected, therefore, to be fair and impartial and that the act does not provide for judicial review of the Board's determination on the hearing. We cannot agree that courts should assume in advance that an administrative hearing may not be fairly conducted. We do not now decide whether the determination of the Board in such proceeding is subject to any manner of judicial review. The absence from the statute of a provision for court review has sometimes been held not to foreclose review. *Stark* v. *Wickard* (321 U. S. 288); *Federal Reserve Board* v. *Agnew* (329 U. S. 441; Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. A. sec. 1009). Nor do we mean to be understood that if supervising authorities maliciously, wantonly, and without cause destroy the credit of a financial institution, there are not remedies.

One of the allegations of the complaint is that it was intended that this institution would be merged with other institutions to the injury of its shareholders. The allegation seems to be based on the fact that a different institution with which the management of the Long Beach institution was connected was merged by the authorities in a way that was highly objectionable to some of the shareholders and aroused concern of the public authorities. We find no explicit threat to merge the Long Beach institution and there is no such finding by the court below. The Government has assured us at the bar that there is no plan for such a merger in contemplation. Nevertheless, such a merger was enjoined. In view of the absence of a finding of the threat or of evidence to sustain one, we accept the Government's assurance that merger will not follow and, hence, we do not consider it necessary to discuss the legality of hypothetical mergers.

Since the judgment that has been rendered against the conservator, who was duly served with process, must be reversed, we find it unnecessary to decide whether Fahey was an indispensable party or was properly brought into the case by substituted service.

It is obvious that there is more to this litigation than meets the eye on the pleadings. The plaintiffs' charges that ill will and malice actuated the supervising authorities, as well as the charges of the defendants that the institution has been mismanaged and that the management is unfit, are alike undetermined by the courts below, and we make no determination or intimation concerning the merits of these issues or as to other remedies or relief than that in the judgment before us.

Our decision is that it was error in the court below to hold the section unconstitutional, to oust the conservator or to enjoin any of his proceedings or to enjoin the administrative hearing, and this without prejudice to any other administrative or judicial proceedings which may be warranted by law. The judgment is reversed.

Mr. Justice Douglas concurs in the result.

Mr. Justice Rutledge concurs in the result and in the Court's opinion insofar as it rests upon the ground that the controlling statute, section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, is not unconstitutional.

[Supreme Court of the United States—No. 133, miscellaneous, October term, 1946—*Ex parte John H. Fahey and A. V. Ammann, Individually and Respectively as Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner and Conservator for the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association*—June 23, 1947]

Mr. Justice Jackson delivered the opinion of the Court.

This petition by John H. Fahey, individually and as Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner, and A. V. Ammann, individually and as conservator for the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association, invokes the original jurisdiction of this Court. They ask leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition and/or injunction against Judge Peirson M. Hall, of the United States District Court for the Southern District of California to vacate his order allowing fees to counsel in *Fahey* v. *Mallonnee*, decided today, to prohibit any further allowance therein, and to enjoin any payments heretofore allowed.

While an appeal in the principal case was pending in this court, application was made by various counsel for the plaintiffs and associated interests therein for allowance of fees aggregating some $125,000. The district court allowed counsel for plaintiffs $50,000 as a partial payment on account of services, but withheld action on other applications. Certain costs and expenses of the plaintiffs in the amount of $17,295.13 were also ordered reimbursed.

The petition involves serious questions of law and of fact. Whether, because of the pendency of the appeal and the stay order granted therein, the district court had power to entertain the application, whether before the final outcome of the case could be known an allowance was premature, whether the source of the fund on deposit with the court was so related to the services as to be subject to disbursement for their compensation, and whether one judge can make allowances in a case before a three-judge court are, with other questions, much contested. We do not decide any question as to the merits.

Mandamus, prohibition, and injunction against judges are drastic and extraordinary remedies. We do not doubt power in a proper case to issue such writs. But they have the unfortunate consequence of making the judge a litigant, obliged to obtain personal counsel, or to leave his defense to one of the litigants before him. These remedies should be resorted to only where appeal is a clearly inadequate remedy. We are unwilling to utilize them as a substitute for appeal. As extraordinary remedies, they are reserved for really extraordinary causes.

We find nothing in this case to warrant their use. An allowance of $50,000 will hardly destroy a $26,000,000 association during the time it would take to prosecute an appeal. The status of one of the applicants in the principal case is now settled so that he has standing to take all authorized appeals. We hold that the applicants' grievance is one to be pursued by appeal at the proper time and to the appropriate court, rather than by resort to our original jurisdiction for extraordinary writs.

The petition is denied.

Story of Jap Calamity Told by New Buildings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

STORY OF JAP CALAMITY TOLD BY NEW BUILDINGS

(Article 26)

Before concluding this series on Japan and tackling the problems of Korea, it might be

well to jot down a few additional notes and observations on life in an occupied country.

At first glance the bomb damage in the Japanese cities does not appear to be very extensive. There are no huge piles of rubble and masonry as in Europe and the gaunt shells of burned-out and bombed-out buildings are the exception rather than the rule.

Then you notice vast areas of vacant space, dotted by the framework of small, one-story buildings constructed of new yellow lumber, and you begin to appreciate what happened.

These areas were completely burned out by the fire bombs. And, since most of the buildings were made of wood, they were completely consumed, leaving no rubble to show where they had been.

ONLY FOUNDATIONS REMAIN

But the outlines of the former buildings are marked by the foundations on which they once rested. And where new buildings are not being erected the ground within these little squares has been made into garden plots in which hardy winter vegetables are growing.

The industrial sections of the cities were badly wrecked. Miles of twisted steel and shattered buildings testify to the accuracy and potency of our air raids. Thousands of persons are living in shacks and hovels patched together from pieces of iron sheeting and other waste material they have gathered in these desolate cities.

There is no street lighting in Tokyo and except for the Ginza, once the principal shopping center, the streets have no names. The occupation authorities have attempted to remedy this by assigning letters to the principal avenues, but a stranger could never find his way around at night and would have difficulty doing so in the daytime without a guide. Traffic keeps to the left in Japan, which is another cause of confusion to American drivers and pedestrians alike.

About every fourth or fifth Japanese you see on the streets wears a gauze mask over his or her nose and mouth, in the hope that this will afford protection from influenza and pneumonia.

HOSPITALS ARE REFORMED

One of the jobs of our military government teams is to inspect Japanese hospitals and see that they are kept in a sanitary condition and operated efficiently and in accordance with the best medical practices and equipment available. One of the reforms has been to discourage the practice of relatives sleeping and cooking in the rooms where patients are being treated.

There is no word in the Japanese language to convey the meaning of public assistance. But under our direction the Japanese Government has set up a relief program for the indigent. Originally this program consisted almost entirely of distributing surplus food and clothing from Japanese Army and Navy stores. It now includes a school-lunch program.

The Japanese railroad system was not damaged by the war to any extent. We had not gotten around to that before the surrender. If an invasion had been necessary, the rail system would have been smashed a few days before the landings to impede the movement of Japanese troops.

The Japanese Government operates 13,981 miles of main track and private railroads operate 4,702. Featherbedding has reached a high degree of perfection on the Japanese lines. They have 40.8 employees per mile of main track, as compared with 6.23 in the United States. But the unions will not permit any reduction in the number of employees and both the Government and the occupation authorities recognize this as a sort of subsidy or form of work relief.

Railroad traffic is heavy, but the hauls are short, averaging 15 miles in Japan, as compared with an average haul of 100 miles in the United States. Japanese railroad cars, streetcars, and busses are jammed, making sardine cans appear roomy by comparison. The last coach on most Japanese trains is reserved for Allied personnel.

The Japanese started the war with 6,000,000 tons of merchant shipping. During the war they built an additional 4,643,000 tons, making a total of 10,643,000. They ended the war with 1,791,000 tons, which means that they lost 8,831,000 tons during the war, or more than they started with. The submarine service disposed of a large part of it.

Of the remaining ships, all of steel construction over 5,000 tons are marked for reparations. Nine hundred locomotives and 30,000 freight cars also have been put on the reparations list. The rail equipment is of small gage, however, and could be used only in the Philippines, Formosa, or South Africa.

One of the problems of the occupation forces is to provide housing for dependents. By the end of January, 3,795 families of American officers, enlisted men and civilian personnel had been shipped to Japan and Korea and 5,269 were waiting for transportation and housing.

SCHOOL PROBLEMS TACKLED

The arrival of the families precipitates another problem, that of establishing schools for American children. No money has been appropriated for this purpose yet, so members of the American colonies in the various occupied areas get together, organize a school, select teachers and make arrangements for bus transportation for the children.

Even Kwajalein, a Pacific atoll which is just barely large enough to provide a landing strip for the big transport planes which cross the Pacific on their daily flights, has a school for 28 American children.

This report on Japan would not be complete without an attempt to describe the majestic view of Mount Fujiyama from the air. It appeared in the distance shortly after our plane took off from Haneda air base on Tokyo Bay.

As we approached, its perfectly symmetrical snow-capped cone seemed to pierce through the swirling layer of clouds which, part of the time, concealed the jagged mountain ridges, deep canyons and tree-covered slopes surrounding it. Our four-motored plane plowed steadily through the air toward it, but it was not a marker that one could flash by like a pylon at the air races.

For nearly 5 minutes it seemed as though the right wing tip was almost scraping the edge of the giant cone, but actually we were a quarter of a mile away from it.

That was our last view of Japan, a scene of glorious splendor never to be forgotten. Four and one-half hours later we landed at the American air base near Seoul, Korea.

How Strong Are China's Liberals?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Century of June 18, 1947:

HOW STRONG ARE CHINA'S LIBERALS?

(By Frank Wilson Price)

In an earlier article I suggested that a new hour of opportunity has dawned for China's liberals. But where are those liberals to be found? And what hope have they of becoming a united and effective political force?

Liberals predominate in the new Chinese coalition government, in the left wing of the Kuomintang, in the non-Communist minor parties and in various socially-minded independent groups. Are there moderates in the Communist Party? General Marshall believes that there are some Communist liberals "who put the interest of the Chinese people above ruthless measures to establish a Communist ideology in the immediate future." The extremists are in the saddle now but when the Communists signify their readiness to reopen discussions with Nanking they will find the present liberalized government prepared to meet them halfway. "If the Chinese Communist Party abandons its policy of seizing power by force and cooperates to achieve the unity of the nation," President Chiang said, on April 18, "it still has an opportunity to join the Government and to participate in the work of national reconstruction."

A second source of liberal strength is public opinion and the press. The independent Ta Kung Pao was progressive and fearless during the war and has continued its outspoken policy since the war. Other newspapers, even Government organs, are offering more and more independent editorial comment. A highly critical Communist daily was published for many years in Chungking and has only recently been discontinued. Other papers and periodicals presenting a leftist point of view continue to circulate in nationalist China.

The people are becoming more vocal. Two Shanghai newspapers recently took a public-opinion poll, a new venture in China. While only a few thousand replies were received, yet they revealed strong opposition to the civil war, to certain features of the constitution, and to many Government policies. The great majority objected to interference by any foreign power in China's internal affairs and declared that China must settle her own disputes. Only 9.5 percent favored American-Soviet mediation (such as proposed by Theodore White) and only 7 percent United Nations mediation. One surprising result was the evidence of the continued prestige of Chiang Kai-shek in spite of criticisms of his Government. In one of the polls for the next elected President of China, Chiang won a 5-to-1 majority over the Communist leader, Mao Tse-tung, who was given the second largest number of votes. This indicates what Chiang's majority would probably be in a Nation-wide election.

Another liberal-minded group is the intellectuals—teachers, students, social workers, rural reconstruction leaders. University presidents and professors have been generally independent in their thinking and have at times shown great courage. A surprising number of men in the new Government have been educators at one time or another. Immature high-school and college students are easily swayed by demagogues and propaganda, but they are a force to reckon with and a source of liberal leadership in the future. Graduates of high-school level and above and returned students from abroad would not altogether make up more than one-half of 1 percent of the population, yet their influence is out of all proportion to their numbers. Some "intellectuals" are much more interested in political affairs than others, but the group as a whole is a dynamic force for democracy.

EDUCATIONAL MOVEMENTS

The People's Education Movement (comprising James Yen's Mass Education group, Liang Shu-ming's Village Government group, the late Heng-chih Tao's Education-for-all movement, and the new National College of Social Education) is a strong force making for liberalism. President Chiang's proposal for a 10-year Education-for-Democracy movement and a nation-wide literacy campaign is based to a large extent upon the notable experiments of these far-sighted

social workers who are now banded together in a National Association of Social Education.

China can well be proud of her diplomatic corps, which is one of the most capable and cultured in the world. Chinese ambassadors, consuls, and representatives in the United Nations have won high praise. The Chinese delegation at the UNO conference in San Francisco representing four political parties including the Communist, was outstanding. Most of these men who represent China abroad have received both Chinese and Western education and are favorably disposed to Western political liberalism. Their influence on political developments in China has been generally constructive. Few have ever been accused of exploitation of public office for private gain.

STIRRINGS AMONG THE MASSES

China's 80 percent of farmers and laborers are potential revoluntionists. Whether they will support a program of liberal reform and good government or participate in a radical social revolution depends on many unpredictable factors in the coming years. Intellectuals are coming from the masses and some are returning to guide the masses, either as liberal social reformers or as Communist revolutionists. Liberals agree that farmers and laborers need to develop their own educated and progressive leadership. This is certain: from now on no Chinese Government that exploits the common people, can hope to remain long in power. China's liberals know that.

Another growingly important liberal force in China is the Chinese Christian Church. Freed from its former connections with the unequal treaties and tested in the fires of wartime suffering and sacrifice it is displaying remarkable intellectual and spiritual vigor. Many church leaders, Protestant and Catholic, are familiar names throughout China. Christian laymen are serving in the government; 15 percent of the new state council and cabinet are Christians. The Catholics have been more conservative on social and political questions than the Protestants; they have taken a belligerent anti-Communist attitude and have been suspected of wanting to form a Catholic political party. Protestants, while opposing the materialistic philosophy and destructive tactics of the Communists, have tried to study the reasons for the Communist appeal and to propose a positive answer. They have also criticized the Government more freely and have at times made bold demands for reforms. Both Protestants and Catholics are preaching moral and spiritual regeneration through Christ and are active leaders in social service and reconstruction. The Christian Church is making a definite contribution to the moral fiber of the nation.

MESSAGE FROM NEW PREMIER

Thus in spite of the tragic civil war in the north, national China seems to be making a new start. Law and order have been largely restored in the four-fifths of China under national control. There are signs of slow economic convalescence. A constitution has been adopted and elections will be held this year for the National Assembly, which will choose a president, and for the 622 members of the Legislative Yuan, or Parliament. An interim coalition government has taken office. The liberals have another chance. They are aware of this and also of the rocks and shoals ahead. "The situation in China is extremely difficult," said Chang Chun, the new premier, in a letter to me written on April 15, "and the size of the new responsibility I am about to shoulder is enormous."

The liberals realize that in unity will be their strength. They must be a unified force even though serious disagreements on policy and method arise. Personal rivalries and selfish quarrels could easily wreck the movement. Their responsibilities are indeed enormous. China wants to be modernized and yet avoid the evils of too rapid westernization. China wants to be socialized and yet preserve the freedom of the individual and the independence of the nation. China needs to be industrialized and yet preserve the best in her rural culture and ancient skills and crafts. China seeks peace in a world that is not yet at peace. China, with Dr. Sun Fo, looks forward, but cannot and should not break completely with her rich heritage. All these problems are not new. But today new men are tackling them, the people are to be given more voice in their government, and hope is reviving in many hearts.

THE RIGHT KIND OF INVESTMENT

The implications of these recent trends in China for American policy in the Far East deserve our serious thought. We have a stake in China, a free and peaceful China, but we must avoid all suspicions of imperialism and exploitation. Relief and rehabilitation are still needed, especially as UNRRA withdraws. The total of lend-lease aid and sale of surplus supplies to China (both of which must be repaid) and of UNRRA relief has been less than $3,000,000,000. Through United Service to China, Americans have given through the war and postwar years nearly $50,000,000 for private relief and reconstruction projects—disaster relief, medical aid, industrial cooperatives, mass education, rebuilding of Christian colleges and the like. This year's campaign is lagging. Yet the needs are still appalling, for food, for tools, for cotton, for industrial and railway equipment, for libraries and laboratories. The new government has voted that all foreign loans shall be for economic recovery.

President Truman said in his March 12 address to Congress, "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free people who are resisting subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures." Does this apply to China? A liberal and democratic China could be a bulwark of peace in Asia. Certainly the American people will not fail in their sympathy and friendship for the people of China, who suffered from so devastating an invasion and are painfully reaching today toward a better life. There should be no objection to American aid in economic reconstruction and to continued relief for the Chinese people. This kind of investment will, I am sure, return large dividends of friendship and will strengthen our hopes for peace in Asia.

If China's liberals fail today I can see China turning back to one-party dictatorship or swinging over to communist totalitarianism. Either of these dangerous possibilities would hasten the outbreak of World War III.

Housing Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement which has been sent me relative to the need for housing legislation at this time. The statement is as follows:

When we faced the electorate in 1946 we promised to rescue them from the throes of the present housing crisis. To the homeless veterans, to the veterans' families living a harassed, uncomfortable existence in trailers, furnished rooms, the squalor of slums, or crowded together with other families in a one-family apartment, we made a solemn pledge that we would take prompt action to get them into a decent home of their own.

We had better make good on that promise. When we face the people back home in 1948 are we going to run on a platform of more promises or on a record of accomplishment? If we hope to stand on our accomplishment we dare not delay action any further. The best housing bill in the world, if passed at the last minute before we adjourn, will still be only a promise—not actual houses.

Housing takes time to produce. The best measure introduced to stimulate housing production—the Taft-Ellender-Wagner National Housing Commission Act, which in the House is H. R. 2523—is an excellent bill but will not produce actual houses overnight. After the bill becomes law it will take time to get the housing push organized. Communities will have to perfect their plans, and make loan applications. Specifications will have to be redrawn in the light of needs and cost factors as of that time. Contracts will have to be sought and awarded. Even if the general housing bill were enacted by both houses this week, precious time would elapse before a single shovelful of dirt would be turned.

In the meantime the plight of the homeless and the badly housed grows more desperate. The grace period for making good on our campaign promises of last year is running out. Every day's delay means the loss of actual housing that would be started under this bill. Every day's delay increases the danger that, when we face the voters again, we will have to resort to worn-out promises.

But if we act now and pass the legislation that we know in our hearts is inevitable, we will be able to point to a great quantity of actual housing and rightfully say that our action made it possible.

Soviet Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Soviet Dilemma," appearing in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET DILEMMA

(By Barnet Nover)

MOLOTOV PHONES THE KREMLIN

In his 8 years as Soviet Foreign Minister, Viacheslav Molotov has been in many a tough spot. Private reports that have reached Washington from Paris indicate that he has never been in a tougher spot than now. What is more, he knows it.

That is why, insiders at the three-power conference are convinced, Molotov and his aides completely monopolized the telephone line from Paris to Moscow for many hours last Friday, following the first meeting of the Russian, British, and French foreign ministers.

Exactly what Molotov said to Stalin and the other members of the Politburo is, of course, a deep secret. There are reasons

to believe that in the course of his telephonic conversations with his bosses in the Kremlin, the Soviet Foreign Minister asked for new and more liberal instructions.

At the first meeting of the three Foreign Ministers, Molotov discovered, what he certainly must have known beforehand, that Russia's views regarding the carrying out of the Marshall proposal are wholly unsatisfactory to Great Britain and France.

More important, he also discovered that Great Britain and France could not be bluffed, browbeaten, or bludgeoned into accepting these Russian views.

The Soviet Foreign Minister learned that Ernest Bevin was speaking not only for himself but also for a determined if uneasy Bidault when he declared, as he did the eve of the Paris meeting, that the western powers would go ahead without Russia, if Russia took an obstructionist line on the Marshall plan.

The last thing the Kremlin desires is such independent action by Great Britain and France.

An economic arrangement designed to rehabilitate western Europe alone would not do the job that needs to be done in Europe.

Western Europe cannot thrive without eastern Europe, the great granary of the continent. But an economic federation of western Europe would, in British and French eyes, be infinitely preferable to the spreading chaos which is infecting almost every Old World nation today.

Great Britain and France are, in a very real sense, nearing the end of their financial rope. Aid must come quickly if they are to be saved from a catastrophe.

This mounting sense of an impending economic doom has blunted any political fears they may have had regarding the consequences of Russian abstention from and hostility to a European federation plan.

Molotov has to take into account more than the present mood of Great Britain and France. He also has to keep in mind that the Marshall plan has an enormous attraction for Russia's own satellite states.

They, too, are desperately eager to get on their feet.

Russia cannot help them in this regard at all. The United States can. So can a more closely integrated western Europe whose industrial plant has been put on its feet.

In his opening speech at the Paris conference, Molotov did not ignore the views of Russia's satellites.

On the contrary, his speech was designed to support the thesis that Russia is particularly solicitous not only of the economic needs of her satellites, but also of their political and economic independence.

Every nation, Molotov proposed, should draw up a bill of particulars regarding its own needs, with these demands pooled into one over-all budget. At the same time the United States, he demanded, should be asked to make known just how far it is willing to go and just how far Congress will permit the United States to go, in aiding Europe.

Russia's satellites will not be fooled by the Kremlin's apparent solicitude for their welfare. Molotov's cliches cannot fill the stomachs of their hungry people, warm them, clothe them, and give them employment.

What Poland and Czechoslovakia are interested in, no less than are Great Britain and France, is a real program of reconstruction.

The same is true in western Europe. The dyed-in-the-wool Communists in France and elsewhere can be expected to support the Russian line wherever it leads. But the fellow travelers may be antagonized by Russian obstructionism.

Molotov knows that too. That is why he has sought new instructions from the Kremlin. He knows that if Russia is saddled with the blame for a complete deadlock at Paris and for the postponement of whittling down on the Marshall plan which has given encouragement to millions of Europeans, it will be increasingly difficult for the Soviet Government to hold its satellites in check. Yet while he cannot afford to reject the Marshall plan outright he cannot, without new instructions from the Kremlin, make any real approach to the British and French views on the subject. It is up to the Kremlin to decide. It is not an easy decision for the Politburo to make.

States and United States School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "States and United States School Aid," which appeared in the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal under date of June 20, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES AND UNITED STATES SCHOOL AID

Of 18 State governors who have replied to a questionnaire circulated by the National Education Association, 16 have stated that they favor Federal financial aid to State schools. We are happy to say that Florida's Gov. Millard F. Caldwell was one of the 16. Said Governor Caldwell:

"I would favor Federal aid to education without Federal control for those States which are financially unable to finance minimum standards."

Other southern States whose governors went on record in favor of Federal aid include Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, South Carolina, Tennessee, and West Virginia. Virtually all of them stress their opposition to any direct Federal control of State school systems. But by that very emphasis they show their belief that aid without control is possible. This is a telling blow against the myth that the people in the Southern States oppose Federal aid on any terms whatever.

Senate bill 472 has been reported favorably by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It carries an annual appropriation of $300,000,000 to be allotted to the States on the basis of effort as well as need, and in indirect proportion to State and local ability to finance the State and local public-school systems. Federal control of educational policies in the States is specifically prohibited in the act.

We have heard many pious words from every quarter regarding the plight of the teacher and the shortcomings of our schools. Let us now have some action in the form of passage of this bill.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave already granted me, I include as part of my remarks the following article by Robert L. Norton, which appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Post of June 9, 1947:

CONGRESSIONAL HYPOCRISY AND RENT CONTROL
(By Robert L. Norton)

WASHINGTON, June 8.—In the debate over the 15 percent voluntary increases in rentals, several Senators conceded that failing to sign a lease for their own apartments would subject them to possible eviction by their landlords. This was an admission that the present bill gives the tenant, as a practical matter, no other alternative, except to sign a lease boosting his rent 15 percent in return for a lease extending beyond December 31, 1948.

NO ALTERNATIVE

Entirely apart from the question of whether rent increases and abandonment of controls is justified the fact is that proponents of the present bill are attempting to give renters the impression that they have some say in the matter. This is not the fact. There is nothing voluntary whatsoever. Either the tenant accepts the 15 percent increase and the lease, or else with the expiration of the rental control he is subject to an immediate boost at any figure which the landlord decides upon.

It is sheer hypocrisy to contend otherwise. To quote the forthright Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire:

BIG BOOST LATER

"It means that the landlord will say, 'Come across and agree, or else.' It will mean that the tenant will get it in the neck by an increase he will not like unless he comes across and agrees to an increase in his rent." This much was tacitly admitted by Senator HAWKES, of New Jersey, leading the fight for the increase and for abolition of rent controls. The Senator said the average tenant would rather strike such a good-faith bargain now than take a chance on a landlord's choice rent boost of 20 to 100 percent next spring.

Beyond doubt the Hawkes' amendment amounts to a 15-percent increase across the board which is what the real-estate lobby here has been fighting for. Any tenant who expects to live in a place after February 29 next year when the Rent Control Act expires must agree to a 15-percent increase in his rent immediately. If he does not agree he is likely to be evicted next winter, or at least his rent will be increased by the landlord to a much higher figure, in order to be sure that he receives the money he would have received if the tenant had voluntarily agreed to a 15-percent increase.

TAKES OFF CONTROLS

An attempt is being made to deceive people into believing that they still have rent control, when in reality there will be no rent control under the pending bill. For one thing, it would extend rent control only until February 29, 1948, a matter of approximately 8 months. There are other provisions in the bill, as for instance that which provides for the decontrol of all residential hotels and tourist camps. According to official estimates a number in excess of 300,000 married couples are now living in hotels, commercial rooming houses, trailers, and the like. Senator TAYLOR, of Idaho, offered evidence to show that when controls were taken off the rents, people who had been living for years in tourist camps were raised 2 to 300 percent.

The national fair-rent committee points out that further threats to tenant security lie in the bill's provisions exempting from controls housing accommodations created by breaking up a single dwelling unit into several smaller rental units. Anxious to obtain the unlimited rent allowed for these exempt units, many landlords will immediately give tenants eviction notices on the ground of alleged necessary remodeling. Many cases of psuedo remodeling are likely to appear.

SPECULATOR'S FIELD DAY

It is also held that the removal of strong eviction controls will undermine what remains of the rent-control program. Both the Senate and the House bills, it is maintained, will permit real-estate speculators to evict tenants from apartment houses by selling stock in phony cooperative building associations. The scheme works this way. The purchase of the stock entitles the buyer to a proprietory lease on a particular apartment from which the tenant thereof can then be evicted.

FALSE BILL OF GOODS

This racket became so bad that the OPA in 1945 was forced to amend its rent regulations to prohibit such evictions except where at least 80 percent of the tenants in an apartment building agreed to buy stock in the cooperative. This did not prevent tenants having a genuine desire to form housing cooperatives from doing so. By the time the OPA adopted this restriction in February, rent controls were seriously threatened in several large cities. Thousands of tenants had become alarmed and demoralized at the prospects of bidders paying outrageous prices for stocks, or being evicted.

The net of the present situation is that it appears Congress is selling the renters of the country a false bill of goods on the pretense that they are getting an even break, which is not the fact under some of the present amendments, and assuming that the bill finally becomes law.

Alaskan Shipping Contracts of Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Maritime Commission advised by make-believe experts is the classical example of mishandling Government money. As disclosed by the Appropriation Committee and the Comptroller General in the past few days, the Martime Commission again demonstrated what not to do with Government money. The same group seem to do equally well with what not to do with the Alaskans, according to a statement from the good people of Alaska which I include herewith:

STATEMENT ON THE ALASKA SHIPPING DISASTER

In November 1945 when Government operation of commercial vessels was drawing to a close and the ships were to be returned to private operation, the Alaska steamship operators demanded that their rates, already by far the highest of all coastal, intercoastal, and off-shore rates, be increased to 218 percent of the prewar level.

Alaskans, knowing that any increase would be ruinous, went to bat through the Governor, the Delegate, the Attorney General of Alaska, and the Alaska Development Board. They felt that all hope of developing and building up of Alaska was futile if the already excessive and burdensome rates were further increased. So they hired expert legal, accounting, and economic talent which completely riddled the carriers' fantastic estimate. That estimate, after a year's hearings was totally rejected by the Maritime Commission.

Congress meanwhile had interested itself in this national problem—wartime transportation to Alaska—and by joint resolution provided a subsidy for the Alaska shipping trade after its return to private operation. The subsidy included ships to be supplied at a nominal rate, with the insurance and depreciation to be borne by the Federal Government.

The operators, however, despite this generous subsidy, and the rejection of their rate increase demand, proposed to the Maritime Commission that their rates for this subsidized operation be increased 66 percent for freight and 22 percent for passenger above the prewar level. The subsidy is worth about $2,000,000 annually. The demanded increase would amount to another $4,000,000 levied wholly on the people of Alaska. The increases sought were not only excessive and unjustifiable, but grossly discriminatory against Alaskans, with proposed increases of $5 a ton on north-bound cannery supplies and on south-bound canned salmon but of $12 a ton on consumer goods. Thus the canned salmon industry which is chiefly owned in the State of Washington would continue to enjoy the preferential rates which it has hitherto enjoyed, while Alaskans would be charged more than double the increase for the necessities of life. Alaska therefore presented a strong factual brief asking for suspension of these rates until after a hearing. (The last Alaska Legislature meeting early in 1947 had, by a vote of 38 to 1 denounced and rejected the operators' proposal of any rate increase without previous hearing.)

Nevertheless the influence of the operators was sufficiently great that the Maritime Commission denied Alaska a hearing and put these rate increases into effect immediately, May 21. For good measure the Commission granted these Seattle operators' contention that only they would be granted the benefit of the congressional subsidy. No other operators either from Seattle or any other port such as Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, or Prince Rupert can qualify.

It was the intent of Congress that this subsidy would help the people of Alaska. As it turns out, by virtue of the Maritime Commission's action, Alaska is more heavily burdened than ever. The new rates are ruinous and the Alaska economy cannot stand them. Thus at one swoop the national policy to develop Alaska is dealt a crippling blow. Alaska has been set back incalculably and cannot move forward unless lower rates are ordered. These increases run directly counter to the President's announced policy of lowering prices since they will drive the already high cost of living in Alaska to further heights. They will inevitably incite strikes for higher wages both in the unstable Seattle shipping trade and in Alaska, thus further reviving the inflationary cycle.

The Federal subsidy and the profits of the rate increases go largely to one man, the principal owner of the two larger of the four subsidized carriers. These are Alaska Steamship Co., in which Mr. Gilbert Skinner is the majority stockholder, and the Northland Transportation Co., in which he and his son own two-thirds of the stock. The other two carriers, Alaska Transportation Co., and Santa Anna Steamship Co., are small and relatively unimportant.

No more crippling blow has been dealt to Alaska and Alaskans in a decade, and Alaska cannot and will not take it lying down.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Juneau, June 25, 1947.

Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WEICHEL: Governor Gruening has asked me to send you a copy of the Attorney General's release on the subject of freight rates to, from, and within Alaska. I am very glad to do so and hope that the material in question will be of interest.

As you know, Congress recently adopted House Joint Resolution 122 authorizing the Maritime Commission to allot Government-owned ships to carriers qualified to operate in the Alaska trade, with the Government to assume the hull risk upon such ships. The object of such indirect subsidy was to tide the Territory over the present postwar period of readjustment. Alaska is now so important to the national interest that its advancement and development is a matter of national concern.

It was thought that such indirect subsidy would enable the carrying out of the Alaska operation without a material increase in freight rates, and it was hoped that some ships would be allotted to a shipping concern operating out of Portland, Oreg., as well as some consideration for Briggs Steamship Co., an American flag company operating between Prince Rupert, British Columbia, and southeastern ports. However, the Maritime Commission not only inserted exclusive clauses in contracts with three Seattle-based carriers, but declined to suspend increased tariff schedules pending outcome of a hearing. The Territory is not only penalized with increased rates which are loaded largely on north-bound freight, making an approximate 50-percent increase on such freight over wartime rates, but is throttled by exorbitant handling charges at Seattle caused by inadequate dock facilities and resultant stand-by time for trucks whose drivers are endeavoring to unload at the dock.

Needless to say, all good Alaskans are trying their best to emancipate the Territory from such handicaps so that it may fulfill its local destiny as well as serve its purpose in the national interest.

Very truly yours,

RALPH J. RIVERS,
Attorney General.

RELEASE BY ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE RE FREIGHT RATES TO AND FROM ALASKA, MAY 20, 1947

The new tariff schedule covering passenger fares and freight rates to and from Alaska by the Seattle waterborne carriers deserves comment and analysis since the raise will increase revenues to the carriers in excess of $4,000,000 per year and the welfare of the Territory and its people is at stake. No effort should be spared to obtain equitable adjustments and fair play. For purposes of clarity, I wish to point out that there are three issues involved: (1) What level of freight rates should be justly allowed? (2) Are the freight tariffs (without respect to the over-all level of rates) uniform and nondiscriminatory? (3) Are the provisions in contracts entered into by the Maritime Commission with the Seattle carriers, which give said carriers the exclusive benefits of recent congressional legislation, compatible with the public interest?

In a previous release following my return from Washington, D. C., on May 12, I showed that restriction of the indirect Federal subsidy involved, in the form of free ships and hull coverage, exclusively in favor of carriers operating out of Seattle was monopolistic and conducive to inefficiencies and featherbedding practices on the part of operators and labor unions, with a consequent increased cost of shipping to Alaska and adverse to the public welfare. In said release I also indicated that a general 35 percent increase over existing rates, on top of free ships and hull coverage, was an exorbitant increase. To avoid repetition, I will limit this discussion to inequities and discriminations which are inherent in the new tariff schedule. In passing, I might say that the petition filed by the Territory with the Maritime Commission raised all three propositions, thereby forming the basis for a thorough study and analysis by the Commission at the hearing which has been set at Seattle for next September 8.

Regarding discriminations mentioned, I submit as follows:

(a) The new specific rates are prejudicial to year-around Alaska residents and tend not to correct but enhance the inequities which have existed in previous rate structures in said trade.

1. Passenger service to Alaska before the war was costly and at present the cost of such service by Seattle-based shipping companies has increased at a substantially greater rate than the cost of handling freight. However, the new tariff proposes only a 5 percent increase on passenger charges as against an average increase of 43 percent above present rates on freight. Our suggestion that passenger sailings be curtailed to lift the burden of an unsatisfactory and largely outmoded passenger service from the shippers and receivers of goods who are now obliged to pay freight charges based upon passenger losses, has so far been ignored. We contend that passenger fares should have either been raised in the same proportion as freight rates, as such fares strike largely at the itinerants instead of resident Alaskans, or said carriers should discontinue all uneconomical passenger operations except those absolutely necessary, such as for the Gulf of Alaska ports.

2. In the southeastern Alaska trade the carriers have submitted schedules calling for the operation of more vessels than the need justifies. A comparison of the cubic capacity of the combined Northland and Alaska Transportation fleets in 1939 (both of which companies serve only southeastern Alaska) and the fleets which are proposed for said companies under the contracts with the Maritime Commission now enjoyed by said carriers, illustrates the point. Combined vessel capacity in 1939 for reefer cargo (refrigerated cargo) was 121,000 cubic feet and for dry cargo, 661,000 cubic feet. The proposed fleet for these two companies to serve southeastern Alaska under said contracts would make available 1,044,000 cubic feet for refrigerated cargo and 1,033,000 for dry cargo. It may be conceded that reefer traffic to Southeastern Alaska has increased, but it has not increased 800 percent. Dry cargo needs have also increased, but not 50 percent. This is a notable example of over-tonnaging a trade, with resultant increased costs and higher rates than necessary. It is obvious that the carriers in question wish to administer as many ships as possible under the subsidy plan and run up tonnage costs thereunder as a foundation for later obtaining exorbitant rates when the private operators take over entirely on their own accounts.

Under the contracts approved by the Commission, capital costs are virtually eliminated. The Commission will charter all necessary vessels at $1 per year and will assume all risks and hull-insurance costs, both on the Government-owned ships and the few privately owned ships which are involved. It was the intention of Congress in permitting this arrangement to provide for the lowest possible freight charges by limiting the costs which the shippers of freight should bear to the carriers' out-of-pocket costs. On the basis of 1946 operating expense, which does not include the fourth quarter during which the ships were not running, private operation would have resulted in a net loss of $144,000. As to stoppages similar to the 1946 fourth-quarter maritime strike, some improvement could be postulated from the national labor legislation now pending in Congress. Notwithstanding stoppages in 1946, the new rates, had they been in effect, would have caused an increase of revenue during that year in an approximate amount of $4,331,000. Thus, on the basis of the new rates, the carriers would have received from the 1946 operation about $4,000,000 more than necessary for an efficient service. This fact alone would justify our strong objections even though the new rate structure were nondiscriminatory, which it isn't.

(b) Specific items in the new tariff showing discrimination against year-around Alaska residents are as follows:

1. Canned salmon moving from Kodiak to Seattle will pay $12 per ton or $5 more than in 1941, while general freight northbound will pay $27 per ton or $10.50 more than in 1941. No justification has ever been advanced by the carriers for such discrimination. There is no justification. It is simply a case of collusion between the Seattle transportation companies and the canned-salmon industry. The "ease of handling" argument does not explain a rate of $14.60 per ton in favor of seasonal shippers whose servicing requires the year-around capital costs of a freighter to be incurred for a movement extending over slightly more than one-third of the year. Neither does the "value of cargo" argument explain such spread. There are extremely few commodities subject to the general freight tariff which would equal even one-half the present value of canned fish, ton for ton.

(c) Throughout the new tariff the impact of rates is greater for town freight than for cannery freight. Illustrations are as follows:

Cannery items	Amount	Town freight	Amount	Percentage measure of discrimination
Box shooks	$10.40	Shingles	$13	25.0
Cordage, rope	12.00	Wire rope	17	41.7
Canned fish, south-bound	10.80	Dry groceries	15	38.9
Second-hand machinery, south-bound	7.00	Washing machines and typewriters	17	142.9
Labels	12.00	Newsprint	17	41.7
Wire, fish trap	10.00	Fence wire	17	70.0

Attention should be called to the so-called junk rate. This is a discrimination in favor of industries sending highly valuable iron chinks and can-forming machinery to Seattle for repair. Virtually no junk in its conventional meaning moves under this tariff to Seattle.

(d) The proposed rates are not only discriminatory as between commodities but also as between ports, as shown by the following rates between Seattle and the ports named:

	Ketchikan	Juneau	Cordova	Kodiak	Dillingham
Canned fish, south-bound	$10.00	$10.80	$12.00	$12.40	$13.60
Dry groceries, north-bound	12.00	15.00	23.00	25.00	27.00
Cans, fish, collapsed	11.20	12.00	13.20	13.60	15.00
Freight, n. o. s.	14.00	17.00	25.00	27.00	29.00

The proposal seeks $15 more per ton between Seattle and Dillingham than between Seattle and Ketchikan for groceries and n. o. s (not otherwise specified) freight, but only $3.60 more for southbound canned fish and only $3.80 more for unformed tin cans northbound. No such differences can be ascribed to handling costs. If running time explains the need of the spread indicated between Ketchikan and Cordova for town freight, why is there such a small differential between those two ports for cannery items? What justifies for town freight a charge in Kodiak double the charge for cannery freight in that area? What justifies a rate from Dillingham to Seattle for canned fish less than the n. o. s. freight rate from Seattle to Ketchikan? There is no justification; it is simply a case of the outside interests ganging up on Alaskans.

There was little justification for these discriminations before the war. There is absolutely no justification for their continuance and enhancement under the present circumstances, in violation of the spirit of the arrangements which Congress authorized providing subsidies to assure the Territory of steamship service at something less than exhorbitant rates. The carriers are about to resume private operation at the peak of the Alaska season. All the traffic they can carry awaits northbound service. All the economies of full-capacity operation are to be enjoyed. Primarily the business of the carriers is freighting, the cost of which to the carriers has been shown to have increased much less than passenger service since the prewar period.

I will conclude this discussion with a few cost-of-living items covered by the new tariff, as follows:

Percentage increases over 1941 for freight from and to Alaska

Article:	*Seattle to Juneau*
Autos, trucks	80.0
Beer, carbonated beverages	80.2
Building materials	32.7
Cement	73.3
Butter, ice-cream mix, refrigerated	63.6
Freight n. o. s	73.5
Fruits and vegetables, hardy	63.6
Furniture, wooden container, set up	71.4
Groceries	66.7
Lumber, common, not over 32'	77.8
Meat, refrigerated	74.2

Comparable increases are to be found for shipments to other ports.

The foregoing facts and figures so glaringly illustrate the inequities imposed upon Alaskans that you will inquire why the United States Maritime Commission allowed same to go into effect, even temporarily pending the outcome of a hearing. I believe the answer is this: The Seattle carriers months ago threatened that if the Territory, through its intervention, succeeded in suspending their proposed over-all 35-percent increase in rates, they would discontinue operation in the Alaska trade. With promise of some service by Briggs Steamship Co. from Prince Rupert and prospects of some service from Portland, the Territory, acting through the legislature and its administrative officers, challenged the carriers to carry out their threat on the grounds that we would rather suffer severely for a short time in order to achieve a long-range equitable solution of our problem than to be victimized indefinitely at the point of a pistol.

However, the Army and Navy have extensive construction projects in Alaska which are vital to national security and which require adequate shipping service. The Maritime Commission was aware of this, and, in my opinion, a majority of the members of the Commission were intimidated by the threat of a stoppage of service. It was easier to assure uninterrupted continuance of service by victimizing the Territory than to run the risk of being saddled with the responsibility of securing service from other ports. As an appeasement, the Commission, in its order, assured a fair hearing on the merits at the earliest possible date. This date has been set at September 8. In the light of economic study necessary, the time lag between now

and September 8 is not unreasonable. However, the good intentions of the Maritime Commission will be shown only by expediting a fair decision based on said hearing. Dilatory tactics could result in several months going by before the examiner would render a report, and many more months could be allowed to go by before the Commission made its decision. In other words, the Territory is in a position where it could be put off for the entire period of the subsidy operation. Time alone can tell whether Alaska will get just treatment on the merits.

Mr. Speaker, in order that inquiry might be made, I have appointed, from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN], the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER], with the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN] chairman, as a special committee to immediately investigate the dealings of the Maritime Commission covering Alaskan shipping contracts and other shipping relief requested by the people of Alaska.

There Are DP's Here, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there appeared a timely editorial in the Kenosha Evening Times on June 26 entitled "There Are DP's Here, Too." It raises the important question as to just how we would handle the DP's in case the Stratton bill was passed.

Mr. Speaker, the heart of America goes out to these unfortunate people and we must admit that we have some responsibility to help solve the problem. It would seem, however, that our first obligation is to our own people and that is the tenor of the editorial.

I commend it, Mr. Speaker, to all Members who are interested in the Stratton bill. It follows:

THERE ARE DP'S HERE, TOO

In a meeting here this week, a group of thinking Kenoshans, who realize a world problem exists in Europe's 850,000 displaced persons, met to discuss local participation in a national movement for the formation of citizens' committees to aid the program.

Stimulus to the situation has been given by the fact that the Stratton bill now pending before Congress would provide for the bringing of 100,000 homeless Europeans to this country for each of 4 years until a total of 400,000 of the unfortunates abroad have been assimilated.

Opinion on the need of European DP's is practically unanimous on the point that something must be done and that the 850,000 persons who might well become paupers dependent upon the well-meaning nations of the world for their livelihood and a place to live are a cancerous plot on civilization.

Authorities have pointed out that the displaced persons, because of their discontent and the problems that they create as a large body of population unattached and unwanted, might easily become the source of another major world conflict.

It is a fact and a recognized one that all such persons should be aided in some way.

With that fact established, the meeting of Kenoshans was held to crystallize local feeling as to the manner in which the problem should be handled. In the meeting, two directly opposed views were revealed and a goodly number of middle grounders were disclosed.

Few laymen in the situation know what they want to do for the DP's.

A few who are well-meaning and in all probability have the best interests of those who are downtrodden at heart want the passage of the Stratton bill and the alien homeless admitted.

Representatives of several veterans' organizations of the city stood united in opposition to that plan for the control of the situation.

They point out that the war was fought on far-flung battlefronts not to assure the "four freedoms" in the United States, because those freedoms were already available here. The war, they declare, was fought to assure every man in the world the right of freedoms that are a part of the dignity of the individual. If those rights are not available to DP's of Europe, then the peace has not yet been formed, and if it is already recognized that the disinherited persons of the European nations can never return to their homelands without fear of reprisal and persecution, then it is already conceded that the peace has been lost.

Former servicemen feel that the diplomats of the world must meet the displaced persons situation in an honest and straightforward manner and that provisions for the well-being of those unfortunates must be made in their own homeland.

It is pointed out here that the war did not leave this Nation unscathed in spite of the fact that shooting was elsewhere. The United States is licking wounds of war that will take many years of economic endeavor to overcome.

Opponents to the plan to bring DP's to America point out that there is a housing shortage over the Nation that approaches the level of a scandal. Veterans who are home from the war and seeking a place for their families and employment for themselves have found jobs but in many instances have not found homes.

Kenosha itself has a DP problem. Homeless families here are living in the city and county jails, in emergency quarters of every kind and many are doubled up in an uncomfortably cramped situation. In the families living on an emergency basis in public buildings alone there are 59 children who are without proper home conditions.

The Kenosha situation is not unique. The housing shortage is general throughout the country. Shall we then bring in 400,000 more persons for housing here and for a further strain of the national resources?

Kenosha Post, No. 21, American Legion, Opposed to Stratton Bill Under Present Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2910, known as the Stratton bill, has stirred up considerable controversy, for and against. In the city of Kenosha, Wis., a public meeting was held by prominent citizens who are interested in the problem of displaced persons. From all reports the group attending was fairly representative of a cross section of the citizenry of that city.

Subsequent to this meeting Commander Carl Gardner of Kenosha Post, No. 21, American Legion, issued a statement setting forth the opinion of his post on this legislation. It is clear and unequivocal. And Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I include, as an extension of my remarks, the statement of Mr. Gardner:

LEGION STAND ON IMMIGRATION QUESTION GIVEN

Following a stormy session of the citizens' committee on displaced persons last night in which the controversial question of immigration laws was placed before Kenoshans, an official statement regarding the position of the American Legion in the dispute was released today by Carl M. Gardner, commander of Post 21.

The theme of the statement of the Kenosha post was, "When we have properly taken care of our own, then we can and should help the strangers at our door." Citing figures from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other official sources, the Legion commander pointed out the possible detrimental effects of lowering immigration bars at the present time.

CITES LEGISLATION

"Residents of this community," the statement pointed out, "are considering a proposal to support a House resolution known as the Stratton bill, H. R. 2910. The purpose of this bill is to permit displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy including relatives of citizens or members of our armed forces to be admitted to the United States.

"The American Legion is unalterably opposed to any change in our immigration laws. At the Chicago national convention, September 1944, the following was approved as a resolution: 'That all immigration be barred from the United States from the date of cessation of hostilities of the present war until such time as, (a) unemployment in this country shall have dropped to less than 1,000,000; (b) all veterans shall have been afforded the opportunity of gainful employment.'"

SEES HOUSING PROBLEM

"At our San Francisco convention in September 1946 a resolution was approved requesting the Congress or the President to take steps to restrict all quota immigration due to the severe housing shortage. This condition of housing has not improved and there is but faint hope that it will be corrected in the immediate future. The Legion is striving to correct this deplorable condition. There are today possibly as many as 3,500,000 of our people who are half-housed, ill-housed, or actually unhoused. Our veterans are in the unfortunate majority. At the present time under the guidance of the chamber of commerce, and the active assistance of all veterans' organizations of this city, a house-to-house survey is being conducted locally to alleviate this condition in Kenosha.

"As of this date there are 8 families with a total of 59 children without a home in Kenosha. Two of the families are residing in the city and county jail. A total of 42 children are living in the Gillette School and other city buildings.

"Proponents of this legislation are asking that we take our 'fair share' of displaced persons. They have set a starting figure at 400,000. Department of labor figures show that 2,330,000 Americans were out of work and looking for jobs of March 31 of this year, and of these 850,000 were veterans.

The influx of the proposed 400,000 will only add to this condition and it could well result in economic chaos.

"Legal immigrants are entering this country at the rate of 154,000 a year. That amounts to 425 per day. However, for every legal immigrant there are at least 10 illegal immigrants. Examples of this type of skullduggery can be cited. Seamen, many of them in name only, are jumping ship in American ports.

"Foreigners arriving in transit to other lands make a permanent 'sit' right here. Aliens dropping in on visitors visas, manage to get lost in our wide open spaces. Overseas students come here to study and make it life jobs. How many are crossing the Mexican and Canadian borders and over the Caribbean waters is unknown. We are determined to see that this abuse is stopped.

"Gerhard Eisler, alias Hans Berger, the No. 1 Communist in the United States, is product of this immigration flow, legal and illegal. Former Ambassador Bullitt testifying recently before the Committee on Un-American Activities said that 60 percent of the Communists in this country are immigrants."

NEEDED IN EUROPE

"For those who argue that immigrants would be an asset now to our economy, the American Legion says that if they are valuable workers and producers, as claimed, then no country needs them as much as their own. Half of Europe is in ruins. Skilled workers and men with trained minds are sorely needed for the reconstruction of war-devastated nations.

"Immigration means competition for American veterans and other citizens, for jobs, housing, and consumer goods.

"When we have properly taken care of our own, then we can and we should help the strangers at our door."

A Social-Science Comprehensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I commend to all Senators, since we are interested in the field of political science, the survey of a course given at the University of Florida, entitled "A Social-Science Comprehensive," by the Honorable William G. Carleton. I ask permission to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the survey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOCIAL-SCIENCE COMPREHENSIVE

(By William G. Carleton)

A REPORT OF 12 YEARS' USE OF THIS COURSE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

For 12 years now, the University of Florida has had a genuine social-science orientation course conceived in the philosophy of general education. It is required of all entering students, extends over the entire first year, meets four times a week, and gives 8 hours of credit for the year. Perhaps no institution of higher learning has had as much experience with such a course, with the exception of the University of Chicago, and our experience at Florida has been more significant for the ordinary college or university because our students are average students while those of the University of Chicago represent a selected group.

There are over 2,000 students now enrolled in our course, more than 60 sections are in operation, and about 25 instructors, some full time and others sharing time with upper-division courses, are engaged in teaching it. Scarcely a day passes that we do not receive inquiries about our course, requests for our syllabus and our tests, and offers to publish our syllabus. Thus far, we have resisted all offers of publication, for even at this late date we do not feel our task completed. Some areas of our syllabus are, perhaps, in almost definitive form, but in other areas we are still experimenting, questioning, altering, pruning, and expanding. As a result of our experiences of more than a decade, we have come to some rather definite conclusions about the nature of a general social-science course and what areas should and should not be emphasized.

Our course is composed of subject matter drawn from history, political science, economics, and sociology. These subjects are never studied per se, but material from all these areas is drawn on and combined in such a way as to analyze the significant economic, social, and political trends in the world, particularly in the United States, today.

The course differs from the conventional introductory course in history, for it demands of history a greater degree of relevance to the significant trends of the present. Conventional historians would feel compelled, for the sake of historical continuity and completeness, to include much that it regards as remote and relatively unimportant. It differs from the conventional introductory course in economics, since our emphasis is on institutional, rather than on theoretical or classical, economics. It differs from the conventional course in political science, because our instructors emphasize functional politics rather than the mere machinery and structure of government. Our course differs from the conventional introductory course in sociology in that it contains much less social theory and gives much less attention to such specific questions as divorce, crime, ameliorative institutions, and so forth, on the ground that such questions are marginal and peripheral, rather than central. In setting up criteria for an 8-hour comprehensive course in the social sciences, however, we naturally do not claim to give the student all the values he would get if he were to take additional work in history or political science or economics or sociology.

The University of Florida course differs somewhat from other comprehensive courses now being developed in other colleges and universities. In many institutions the comprehensive course consists of a broad survey of the history of civilization. We have some of the same objections to such a course that we have to the conventional introductory course in history. We believe that a survey of the history of civilization goes too far afield and contains too much that is relatively remote from the interests of the present day.

In some other institutions, the comprehensive course consists of a study of specific social and economic problems—the race problem, crime, marriage, divorce, labor, taxation, public finance, propaganda, international relations, and so forth. We object to a problem course on the grounds that it does not differentiate sufficiently between marginal problems and central problems, gives too much emphasis to the current by failing to provide enough historical background, runs the danger of giving the impression that society is static and its problems isolated, does not sufficiently reveal the dynamic, fluid, interdependent nature of society. In our opinion, a course which gives as much attention to propaganda as it does to the basic economic and social forces behind the New Deal or socialism or communism or fascism is guilty of a grotesque distortion of values. Moreover, whether consciously or unconsciously, a problem course is almost invariably nationalistic in outlook. Most of the problems treated are American problems, and they are treated almost exclusively from the American point of view. Incredible as it may seem, some of the problem courses of today do not even so much as make mention of fascism or socialism or communism. In fact, an examination of the indexes of some of the textbooks used in problem courses is most revealing. The parochial nature of these courses is not cured by tacking on a few chapters on foreign relations. These are almost invariably discussed with American preconceptions, sentiments, and biases. We Americans must learn to cooperate with the world as it is and not as we would wish it to be, and courses which treat foreign relations solely from the American point of view will not help us to make this adjustment.

Our course stands somewhere between a history of civilization course and a problem course. It is more specific, more concrete, more contemporary than a general survey of the history of civilization. On the other hand, it is broader than a mere problem course and makes much more use of historical material for purposes of background, causation, and integration. To repeat, our course is a study of the significant and central trends of the twentieth century, and an analysis of their nature, where they come from, where they seem to be going, how they are interconnected.

We are often asked, "Upon what basis do you determine what trends are important enough to be designated as the important trends of this century? What test do you use in selecting and discarding material?" Our test is a pragmatic one. It will surprise many academicians. It is this: We include and emphasize those materials which in our opinion would enable the student to classify, evaluate, and understand what Walter Lippmann, Dorothy Thompson, Samuel Grafton, and other columnists and publicists are talking about. If the time ever comes when Walter Lippmann and Dorothy Thompson devote most of their attention to such problems as crime, juvenile delinquency, and divorce, then we shall do so. But so long as our top-flight publicists emphasize business cycles, depressions, growing class conflict, the drive toward statism, war and peace, international organization—in short, so long as they emphasize the revolutionary forces of this mid-twentieth century, the struggle of classes and nations for position and power—then we shall do so. We feel that their sense of what is significant and important is essentially correct. For instance, we believe the depression of the thirties and the recent war have had a greater impact on the family than have all the combined problems usually studied as family problems.

The significant trends and questions of our century upon which the University of Florida course concentrates are:

1. Increasing material comforts and higher standards of living brought about in the Machine Age, and also, paradoxically enough, the increasing insecurity felt by all classes in this Machine Age.

2. The various answers to this problem of insecurity given by important schools of thought today—conservative capitalism, New Dealism, socialism, communism, fascism.

3. Why government has steadily increased its functions and become more centralized during the past 50 years.

4. What have been, and what are, the results of this increasing governmental centralization on civil liberties, representative government, democracy?

5. To what extent have the two great wars and the extreme tensions in international relations characteristic of our century been

produced by the feeling of insecurity at home and the failure to solve the problems created by the Machine Age?

These trends and questions are treated again and again and approached in various ways and from different points of view. How we actually make our approach may be seen from the following outline which includes most of the topics and units studied in the course:

1. The nature of culture, how culture changes, and theories of cultural changes.
2. How modern capitalism arose in western Europe from feudal and guild beginnings.
3. The rise of nationalism in western Europe.
4. The development of representative institutions in Britain and western Europe. How representative institutions were transferred to America. The development of representative institutions in the United States.
5. The industrial revolution in Great Britain.
6. The spread of the industrial revolution outside Great Britain. The development of the industrial revolution in France, Germany, the United States, Japan, and the Soviet Union.
7. Population trends and urbanization since the industrial revolution.
8. The factory system, specialization, large-scale and mass production, modern industrial capacity to produce.
9. The business revolution that came out of the industrial revolution: the corporation and business consolidation.
10. Free enterprise and monopoly.
11. Concentration of ownership and changing methods of control; methods of minority control in business.
12. The business revolution and agriculture.
13. The business revolution and the consumer.
14. The business cycle.
15. The distribution of wealth and income.
16. The business revolution and changing classes: The decline of the old middle class, the rise of the new middle class, the growth of labor and labor organizations.
17. Alternative solutions of the problem of an industrial economic order: A positive program of laissez faire, controlled capitalism, the democratic service state, socialism, communism, fascism.
18. The rise of political democracy.
19. How democracy functions through political parties.
20. The trend toward centralization in government.
21. Government and industry.
22. Government and financial agencies.
23. Government and labor.
24. Government and agriculture.
25. Government and social security.
26. The trend toward integration in government: the problems of modern administration.
27. The trend toward executive aggression.
28. Civil liberties.
29. The crisis in democracy.
30. Modern nationalism.
31. Imperialism and national conflict.
32. The European balance of power and the world balance of power; the United States and the balance of power.
33. Socialist and Communist revolutions in Europe; Fascist counterrevolutions; the Second World War.
34. The revolt against imperialism in Asia.
35. Postwar political trends in Europe.
36. Problems of reconversion and economic reconstruction.
37. World organization to keep the peace.
38. The future in international relations—world organization or the balance of power?

Many think that this is a rather formidable order for freshmen. We admit this. It is formidable. When we began this course and attempted to fit it within the framework of a program of general education, there were those who predicted that we would err on the side of superficiality. Old-fashioned educators prophesied we would "water down" education and give students vague generalizations, catchwords, canned conclusions, catechetical answers, pap. This criticism is heard no more. Mental wrestling with the baffling problems of the twentieth century, presented against the background of rich factual material, can be made as intellectually respectable as the old and traditional disciplines and manyfold more significant, relevant, useful. Indeed, many of our students now find that courses in the upper division are thin and anticlimactic by way of comparison. Mere mark seekers, those who expect to get by as the result of getting lessons from day to day and making an assiduous display of the right attitude, are frightened by a course like this. Not only is the subject-matter intrinsically fertile, but the teacher cannot be apple-polished into giving a good mark, because marks are set on the basis of achievement made in comprehensive examinations centrally administered. This has proved a Waterloo for many of our promising athletes; and many public-school teachers, attending the University of Florida summer session and accustomed to a system where daily lessons and attitude count, show a tendency to shy away from our course.

As it has turned out, then, if we have erred at all, we have erred in the direction of making the course too difficult rather than too easy. Few believe, however, that it is really too difficult. Real achievement is high. Marks are based upon scores and not upon percentiles. The rate of failure has steadily declined. In the beginning, failures were sometimes as high as 15 or 20 percent. Now failures rarely exceed 5 percent and, with the influx of the serious-minded and mature veteran student, they have declined to 2 percent and, in a single instance, to 1 percent. Veterans, more mature and experienced in the ways of the real world, naturally take to this course, as do those who genuinely want to understand this complicated world in which we live. There is no doubt of the impact of this course on students' thinking. Students gather in knots after the lectures to debate and argue. They spontaneously write themes in other courses about the questions raised in this one. Instructors in the upper division report that students are no longer satisfied with mere facts; they demand concepts, ideas, generalizations, points of view. No doubt, some students go too far in this direction and demand patterns of thought where none can honestly be drawn from the facts. During the war, many of our former students, in the armed services in all parts of the world, wrote back to tell us how much the course had aided them in clarifying their understanding of the world situation and making sense of the war. We have many such letters.

The heart of the course is to be found in the syllabus prepared by the staff, but assigned and recommended readings are made in a variety of books representing all points of view. The open shelves in the library devoted to our readings contain copies of almost every college textbook in the social sciences. But we do not stress textbooks. In addition to textbooks, we have numerous copies of such books as the Economic Basis of Politics, by Beard; the Modern Corporation and Private Property, by Berle and Means; the End of Economic Man, by Drucker; the Managerial Revolution, by Burnham; the Road to Serfdom, by Hayek; Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time, by Laski; the Good Society, by Walter Lippmann; and many others. This list is merely representative; we have multiple copies of literally scores of such books. These, and not textbooks, are the sort of books we encourage our students to read.

At the present time, each student enrolled in the course goes to his discussion class 3 days a week and to a large lecture section once a week. Lecture sections contain from 300 to 500 students. We have done considerable experimenting with the lecture-discussion method. In the beginning we had one lecture for every discussion period. This resulted in too many detailed and factual lectures and in insufficient time for discussion. Then, for a time, we abolished the lectures entirely and had only discussion classes. This, too, resulted in certain losses. We missed the sweeping vistas afforded by good interpretative lectures. Since the student did not come into contact with members of the staff other than his own discussion instructor, he missed the play and clash of personalities, the different points of view typified by the various lecturers. The present system of one lecture and three discussion periods seems best. The lectures always cover enough units to assure their being broad and interpretative. Students again see in action almost all the best-known and most dynamic members of the staff. Instructors of the various discussion classes are kept on their mettle; they feel themselves in intellectual competition with the lecturers.

Possibly one word of caution is in order here: There is nothing so damaging to morale as a poor lecture. Members of the staff who do not lecture effectively should not be asked to lecture at all, even though some susceptibilities are wounded thereby. The vitality of the course should never be allowed to suffer merely to bolster the supposed prestige of staff members.

Examinations are given each month and at the end of each semester. These examinations are objective, prepared by the staff, and centrally administered by the university board of examiners. One of our greatest difficulties has been in finding staff members who can write, and who like to write, pertinent objective questions. We have such instructors, but they are rare. The tendency of the average instructor is to write questions which are either too narrow and factual or too broad and obvious. Our aim in any test is to use a large number of questions which are broadly interpretative but which call for answers that require a fund of information.

Each instructor is free to have as many essay tests and as much other written work in his discussion sections as he may desire. However, no satisfactory way has been found of computing this written work in the final mark, and, up to this time, probably not enough written work is required of the student. To encourage all the written work desirable would require a much larger staff and much smaller classes than most institutions today can afford.

Certain difficulties and potential dangers inhere in any comprehensive course in the social sciences centrally directed and administered. Let us examine some of these.

One is the difficulty of securing competent instructors. Instructors must be thoroughly trained in at least one of the social sciences and must have a broad interest in, and some familiarity with, all the social sciences. They must be broadly gaged and equally at home in factual and interpretative material. They should have the thoroughness often associated with pedants, but they must not be pedants. They should have the facility often associated with superficiality, but they must not be superficial. They must, above all, be good teachers and genuinely interested in teaching. In our experience, good teachers have come from each of the social sciences, but we have discovered that sensitivity to social and political movements, the feel for trends, is to be found a little oftener, perhaps, in the historian than in men drawn from the other social sciences. We have experienced our greatest difficulty in finding good institutional economists; too many economists want to be classicists and theoreticians. Moreover, we have discovered that men who like to philosophize about educa-

tion and to write about teaching goals, instructional objectives, and classroom techniques too often do not know how to apply their theories to actual teaching conditions. The proof of the pudding is in the eating; effective execution is in the doing; one ounce of practical teaching is worth a pound of theory. Our best teachers, without a single exception, have been those primarily interested in content and subject matter and only secondarily interested in pedagogical devices. Also, general education should be wary of the "junior college" type of teacher. A man who does not know enough to teach in the upper division has no business in the lower division. Teaching comprehensive courses requires more information, more breadth, more insight, and more real wisdom than is generally required in the average upper-division course.

A potential danger involved in comprehensive social-science courses such as ours at the University of Florida is that the course may emphasize concepts and trends too much, that it may become too pat and even doctrinaire. Indoctrination must be avoided like the very plague, and it can be, by insisting that the course be rich in factual material, by appointing to the teaching staff men of various and even conflicting points of view, and by seeing that readings are widely representative of different schools of thought.

The greatest difficulty in teaching a comprehensive course in the social sciences consists in the subject matter itself. We cannot escape the very nature of our own materials. We cannot run away from the staggering problems of our century. In the social sciences we are dealing with vested interests and human emotions. We are dealing with economics, in which men fight over wealth. We are dealing with politics, in which men fight over power. Teaching the social sciences will always be an adventurous and a dangerous business, but it is especially so in this revolutionary century in which we live. After all we social scientists did not produce the troubled world of this century; we are only trying to account for it. In spite of the difficulties and the dangers, we specialists have a positive duty to help discover the basic trends of our time, to analyze them, to explain them.

The dangers inherent in raising the vital questions of our age are increased tenfold when these questions are raised in 60 different classrooms by 25 instructors—all at the same time. Timorous administrators may be deterred by this ever-present threat to a college's public relations, but real educators will be challenged and stimulated thereby.

The Retirement of Dean Acheson, a Distinguished and Outstanding Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, June 30, Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, left the official service of the Government of the United States. I feel a deep sense of regret that this extremely capable and courteous public official is leaving us, but I am hopeful that we will continue to have the benefit of his sound and understanding counsel. That his going into private business will be a distinct loss to us, goes without saying. No official, in my 5 years in Congress, has been so courteous and sincere; no public official will be missed more.

Dean Acheson and I have not always agreed on policy, but we have been able to understand each other's point of view. He has fostered and perpetuated a close contact with the Congress and he has given of his great understanding unstintingly. A distinguished American, a great citizen, a believer in human rights are the attributes which have endeared him to all who knew him. I sincerely hope he, with his family, will be able to enjoy the rest he has so justly earned. I hope, also, in the difficult days ahead, that we will avail ourselves of his knowledge because I know, as always, that he will be willing to contribute to our Government his great ability toward the solving of our problems.

I should like to insert at this point in my remarks the text of a Washington Post article detailing his last day in Government service and the awarding to him of the Medal of Merit. No one has ever deserved this honor more because Dean Acheson has been, in the words of the citation, "One of the Architects of Victory and of the Struggle for Peace."

ACHESON GIVEN MEDAL OF MERIT AS HE ENDS FEDERAL SERVICE

(By Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr.)

Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson stepped back into private life yesterday with a Medal of Merit from President Truman and extraordinary tributes from all sections of the Government.

His retirement, taken at his own request for financial reasons, came after 6½ years in high office at the State Department. For many months of that time he had served as Acting Secretary while Secretaries Byrnes and Marshall were away at conferences abroad.

His Medal of Merit came as a surprise on his last day in public office. He was summoned to the White House shortly after noon to find Mrs. Acheson, Secretary Marshall, former Secretary Byrnes, and a group of official and personal friends waiting for him.

PRESIDENT READS CITATION

The citation read by the President commended him for "outstanding services to the United States." It summed up his recent career in these words:

"Mr. Acheson, as a private citizen in 1940, was among those who first saw clearly the Fascist threat to our national existence. He exerted his distinguished advocacy to rally his fellow citizens in favor of the delivery of American destroyers to beleaguered Britain.

"As Assistant Secretary of State from February 1, 1941, to August 16, 1945, and as Under Secretary of State until today, he has been one of the architects of victory and of the struggle for peace.

"In his relations with the Congress Mr. Acheson fostered a responsive relationship between the executive and legislative branches of the Government in the field of foreign affairs; and he brought to the councils of Government a long view and a genius for bold design typified by the Acheson-Lilienthal plan for international control of atomic energy."

HONORED BY CABINET LUNCHEON

Farewell tributes unusual in the Government occupied his last day at the Department. The Cabinet gave a luncheon in his honor after the medal ceremony at the White House.

In the afternoon, ranking officials at the Department trooped into the Under Secretary's high-ceiling office with an inscribed water carafe and tray as a good-by gift. Later there was open house in his office so that other officials and stenographers could shake hands with him and give him their good wishes.

In the evening Secretary Marshall gave him a farewell dinner at the Mayflower.

Official business also crowded into the last day's schedule. In the morning Acheson met for almost an hour and a half with the so-called "9:30 group" of top officials with whom he had met morning after morning during critical months and years in the Department.

CONFERS WITH CONNALLY

What was described as "routine business" took him to Capitol Hill in the afternoon for a talk with Senator TOM CONNALLY, ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Late in the afternoon he had a visit from the Belgian Ambassador, Baron Silvercruys.

Acheson plans to spend a month at his farm at Sandy Springs, Md., and then have vacation in the Canadian Rockies before resuming private law practice with the Washington firm of Covington, Berling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb.

His successor, Robert A. Lovett, New York banker and former Assistant Secretary of War for Air, will be sworn into office today as Under Secretary. Former Ambassador Norman Armour, who will be Assistant Secretary in charge of all four geographic offices at the Department, will also be sworn in today.

Prices of Rationed Articles in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, to those in our country who try to glorify conditions inside Russia, the following clipping from the current issue of United States News would be very interesting reading:

Just to show you the degree of strain in Russia, using official prices for rationed goods, a Russian worker can buy this with a week's income:

Of bread, a Russian worker can buy 22 loaves with a full week's income. Bread for the family may take almost all of his income. An average United States worker could buy 394 1-pound loaves of bread to the Russian's 22.

Of milk, a Russian worker can buy 7.55 quarts with a week's income. A United States worker can buy 276 quarts of milk with his week's income.

Of sugar, a Russian worker can buy 16.9 pounds with a full week's income. A United States worker can buy 503.7 pounds with his week's pay.

A suit of clothes of undisclosed quality costs a Russian 7 weeks' pay. A United States worker can buy a $50, high-quality suit for 1 week's pay.

A pair of shoes costs a Russian about 3 week's pay. A United States worker can buy six or eight pairs of shoes with 1 week's pay.

Actually, the Russian cannot even make his pay stretch as far as these figures suggest because there are rationed goods available for only 40 percent of his pay. He must pay unofficial prices, about four times as high as official prices, when he spends the remaining 60 percent of his income.

Workers in Russia are about half as well off as in prewar, when they had an extremely low living standard. United States workers are better off than in prewar.

Motion Picture Duel in the Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SOCIETY OF INDEPENDENT
MOTION PICTURE PRODUCERS,
Beverly Hills, Calif., June 25, 1947.

Hon. DONALD L. JACKSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: My attention has been directed to the remarks of Congressman RANKIN on the subject of the motion picture, Duel in the Sun, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of June 19, 1947.

I feel Mr. RANKIN has done this motion picture and Mr. Selznick, its producer, a grave injustice, and, as president of the Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers of America, each of whose members feels as I do, I wish strongly to protest this injustice. I feel further that it is fitting that you, a fellow southern Californian, who has had an opportunity over a long period not only to observe but to appraise the sincerity, integrity, and responsibility with which Mr. Selznick and his colleagues approach the production of motion pictures, should gainsay Mr. RANKIN, for the RECORD.

Mr. Selznick is conceded to be one of the most outstanding and distinguished producers in the motion-picture business. He has a world-wide reputation, gained over many years, through his responsible and dignified effort as the producer of Gone With the Wind, Rebecca, Adventures of Tom Sawyer, David Copperfield, Tale of Two Cities, Dinner at Eight, Little Women, Little Lord Fauntleroy, Bill of Divorcement, A Star Is Born, and Intermezzo, as well as many other distinguished motion pictures.

For the record let me state that at the outset, as Mr. Selznick approached the production of Duel in the Sun, he had the assurance of the censorship division of the Motion Picture Producers Association (which is administered by Joseph I. Breen, under the leadership of Eric Johnston) that in producing Duel in the Sun he would be making a motion picture acceptable to Mr. Breen's office and fully in accordance with the motion-picture code, which for many years has been the official objective standard, compliance with which has heretofore justified a producer in believing that he moved with propriety and safety.

During the progress of the production of Duel in the Sun, Mr. Selznick continuously solicited the aid, as well as the advice and counsel of that office, and upon the completion of the picture received the certificate of approval of that office.

Thereafter, following the customary and almost traditional procedure, this motion picture was shown by Mr. Selznick to the Legion of Decency, which accorded it a B rating, which is the same rating as was received by the motion pictures Blue Skies, The Best Years of Our Lives, The Sign of the Cross, and many other outstanding and distinguished pictures of recent years.

The picture subsequently was submitted to the national board of review, and passed by that board, then to the New York State board of review, and in turn to the official censors of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio, Kansas, and Virginia, and was passed. It also has been approved and passed by many cities which has special censor bodies, including Boston, Atlanta, Detroit, Milwaukee, Chicago, and Portland, and it is to be noted that where any of these bodies made a reasonable suggestion for a cut or deletion it was entertained and followed by Mr. Selznick. In the whole United States only the city of Memphis, Tenn., saw fit not to pass it.

If Congressman RANKIN had taken the time to ascertain the facts before making so unfair a charge on Duel in the Sun and, consequently, on the character and reputation of Mr. Selznick, he would have found that Mr. Selznick approached the project of this production in good faith, and that throughout its production and release he has comported himself with propriety, having acted not only in accordance with the tenets of the code of the so-called Eric Johnston office (which is otherwise known as the Motion Picture Producers Association), but additionally, accepted and adopted the standards of all other duly constituted and responsible State, municipal, and religious censor bodies.

I trust that you will find an occasion to state for the record on the floor of the House the facts of this case in an endeavor to obviate the wrong done to Mr. Selznick and to his production, Duel in the Sun.

Sincerely,
DONALD M. NELSON, *President.*

Stop Oil and Steel Exports to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, before this Congress goes home it is my opinion that we should pass the bill introduced by Representative WEICHEL, of Ohio, in an effort to conserve our petroleum and its products in this country against exportation to foreign countries, particularly to Russia. Even though you extend the power of the President to control this exportation of the oil and oil products for national defense and for the use of our people you cannot be certain that the power of the act will be carried out.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out that since January 1, 1946, while the President had this authority and power, the administration permitted the exportation of 191,000,000 barrels of gasoline and petroleum products? May I further point out that between January 1, 1947, and May 1, 1947, the administration has permitted the exportation of 600,000 barrels of gasoline and petroleum to Russia from the California coast? That vessels are being loaded and are there now for the continuance of the loading of this scarce product when the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana is now rationing its products in the Middle West.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of maintaining sufficient gasoline and power for our farmers for greater production for food for our people and the world, and in order that we may have sufficient fuel oil to heat the homes of the people in this country, I believe the Weichel bill should be passed, which will prohibit the exportation of petroleum products unless it has been certified by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Navy that such exportation can be made without endangering national defense or restricting the use of such petroleum products which are needed in the economy of this country.

Mr. Speaker, may I go further and say that we should stop the exportation of pipe for use in the production of oil to any country because we need more pipe for the production of oil in this country than it is possible for the producers to obtain. One of the reasons for the shortage of petroleum products which may cause rationing on a wide scale is the lack of steel tank cars for the transportation and for steel for oil-carrying pipe lines and steel for the casing of new wells. Oil is an absolute necessity for national defense and for the economy of our Nation and this administration should cooperate in every way possible with the Congress in an effort for greater production on the home front and less exportation of these products to other countries.

We should pass the Weichel bill to further tighten up and restrict the exportation of petroleum products. We should stop now all exportation of oil and oil products and all steel to Russia. Russia should not on her past record be furnished these products. They are vital to our national defense and to the welfare of our own people.

The Capital of the World Greets Its Older Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, for 4 days last week, Washington had the pleasure of entertaining the elder citizens of many of the States. It was the annual convention of the advocates of what is known as the Townsend plan, or annuity plan for the older citizens. Those Members of the Congress who have taken the time to study the proposals contained in it, are quite convinced the plan contains elements or principles which link it automatically to periods of prosperity or recession, and that such a program, while directly helping the aged, would at the same time improve the economic health of the Nation.

Many Members of the Congress attended the convention meetings, or spoke on the convention program. I have been requested to ask leave to put in the RECORD the few remarks I made the opening night. Under leave to extend my remarks I include my comments at that time:

It is a pleasure to meet with you this evening. It is an honor to be asked to take part in your program. This is the evening of the first day of your national convention; a meeting of men and women from all parts of the United States who believe that the economic welfare of the elder citizens of this great country has a direct relationship to the economic health of the Nation itself. It is a pleasure to have Dr. Francis E. Townsend with us, here in Washington. You come from the North and the

South and from the East and from the West and I am glad to see, looking over the room this evening, evidences that many of you come from my own State—California.

You who do not have the privilege of coming from California will pardon those of us who do if we seem to lack a little reticence when we speak of California, or of its people, or its climate, or its progressiveness on the subjects in which you are directly interested.

I am one of California's 23 Representatives in the Congress. I come from the Twenty-second District of California, which comprises the three counties—Orange, Riverside, and Imperial, all of which have been interested from the start in the Townsend movement. Another reapportionment will give us in Congress, in 1953, six or seven more Representatives than we have now. Every month, since the war, 20,000 new people are crossing the State line, to live in California. Twelve thousand of these are veterans of World War II. The problems of employment, and of social security, are not academic problems in my State; they are very real problems.

California has always been a leader in matters of the sort in which you are interested. We believe that increasing pensions, or aid, for older citizens are economically sound. We have increased the monthly amounts as the years have gone by. We have provided for increasing aid for the blind and for the deaf. We have tried to make it possible for people to take care of themselves. We prefer to have people live in homes, rather than in institutions, and we want them, as long as possible, to take an interest and an active part in the economic and the social life of the community. For years, before coming to the Congress, I was the chairman of the committee in the California Senate before which all such bills were heard, and I have had a personal part in many of the progressive steps which California has taken.

I said, something over a year ago, when I appeared on your behalf before the Committee on Ways and Means of the Congress, that I could remember a time, and it did not seem to me to be a very long time ago, when the subject of annuities for the older citizens of the United States was something very new. It was new when I was in college in Pennsylvania. I wrote an article, supporting the idea of pensions for older citizens. The generation before mine had inherited a custom by which the older members of families were cared for by the children, or perhaps they went into the limited number of homes for the aged. Just as we no longer drive horses and buggies, so we no longer have big houses in the country in which we can take care of our elderly relatives, and much more important, we no longer believe in the United States that this is the proper way to take care of our older citizens. In one generation, the thinking of the people of the United States has so changed that the idea of taking care of aged citizens through insurance payments or annuities is now an accepted and approved feature of our economic and social structure.

These problems naturally come before the Congress of the United States. That is why I think it is significant that you men and women are meeting in Washington this week. You have come not only to the Capital of the United States, but you have come to the Capital of the world. It is a great city, a beautiful city, a city of unending interests, and you have already discovered that it is not only a magnificent city in itself, but it is a city of magnificent distances. I suggest that you do not try to see it all in 1 day, nor to walk everywhere you want to go. After you have been here a few days you will have an increasing sympathy for our own "Senior Citizens" of the Congress, the Members of the Senate, who have provided themselves with a little railroad train, to get from the Senate Office Building to the Capitol. We of the younger and more virile House of Representatives tramp back and forth through the long summer days to convince some colleague that there is really a quorum still here in Washington, or perhaps to vote millions and more millions for the other nations of the world, while we talk of the need for economy at home. There is a little joke that has been going the rounds in Washington, about the school boy who was asked where the Capital of the United States was, and he replied that he thought a good deal of it had been loaned to the other nations.

As of a few weeks ago, when I made this calculation in preparation for a speech on the Greek and Turkish aid problem, which I made on the floor of the House, we had given away, without including the costs of war, the following amounts:

To UNRRA	$3,000,000,000
To Great Britain	3,750,000,000
To France	1,300,000,000
To China	500,000,000
To the International Bank	2,750,000,000
To the Monetary Fund	1,500,000,000
Total	12,800,000,000

I think I could add to this, with your approval, the sum of $31,000,000,000 spent on lend-lease, which gives us the staggering total of $43,800,000,000.

Since then we have voted:

To European relief	$350,000,000
To Greece	250,000,000
To Turkey	150,000,000
To IRO	73,000,000

and we are proposing additional loans and advances day by day.

The amount you asked for, under the Townsend program, to help stabilize the economy of the United States by removing people from the older-age groups, instead of permitting a repetition of the conditions of the early thirties, when boys coming out of school and college found themselves unable to get jobs, is no longer the startling figure it once was before we began to deal in astronomical figures, in a desire to support the world.

The United States, whether we want the job or not, is today the strongest and most influential nation in the world. It is my desire that we should remain strong. It is my belief that unless the United States does remain strong, it will be impossible for us to lead the world out of the slavery of its present governmental and economic ideas. I am convinced that the strength of the United States is not an accident. I am convinced that this Nation was founded for free people, and to lead the way for free peoples of all nations and all ages. I am convinced therefore that this Nation was founded and has been sustained under the guidance of divine providence. That is evident if anyone will read the records of the Continental Congress and of the early days of this Republic. In fact, the very form of government under which we operate, known as the Republic, has its Biblical foundation and background. Strong world leadership requires internal strength, in any nation. Internal strength requires economic and social security.

I would speak to you about the present foreign policies of the United States, if I could discover what those foreign policies were. That is one of our difficulties in Washington. I can only say that it is a fallacy to believe that in the United States, or for the world as a whole, the troubles and the catastrophies of this moment can all be solved by a beneficent Uncle Sam, carrying a check book in one hand, and with the other hand picking up the remnants of the imperialistic doctrines that once governed Europe or the Orient. I believe that those of you who come from the West will agree with me that the future of the United States looks more to the Orient than it ever has in the past and that the present unwillingness of the State Department, or of the Government, to accept that situation as of equal importance for the future, with the situation in old Europe, does not give us either happiness nor peace of mind in our part of the Nation.

We here in the Congress feel that the United States must seize the leadership which has been given it, that we must accept it as a privilege as well as an obligation. We must give examples of leadership, on foundations of integrity, and sound business, and good policy. We built this Nation on such foundations. Economic security, and particularly economic security for the aged citizens of the country, while perhaps not the cornerstone itself, is a very important stone in that foundation.

During your convention, other people will talk to you about the legislative situation in Congress, about the financial situation of the country, about the mechanical problems of putting bills through Congresses and through legislatures. I suspect you will get all kinds of advice.

The success of any measure, or of any principle, rarely if ever arrives as quickly as you want. We have a saying here in Washington, "It takes a little time." It is disturbing to us as individuals when we do not see the bills we want put through the Congress and made into laws in a few weeks. Then we remember that the slowness of the process, while adversely affecting the things we want, works to protect us against the things we do not want. Success here is a matter of careful analysis, of persistence, of endless patience, and of continuity. You have all of those characteristics.

Few groups have ever brought to the Congress so well prepared analyses as those of Dr. John Donaldson, supporting your bill of a year or so ago. You have displayed patience and persistence, and I hope you will continue to display continuity of organization and of action. I can say to you as a "mechanic" of legislation, speaking to those who require the services of similar mechanics if a bill is to become a law, that the simpler the bill, the more probable its success.

A united movement is always stronger than a divided movement. This has been so since the days of the Roman father who took the bundle of sticks and showed how difficult it was to break them as a bundle, but how easily they could be broken individually. It is true today. Group after group has been sent back to every State in the Union—and I could give illustrations from California this year—and told to work out their differences at home and bring a united recommendation to the Congress. The advocates of the Townsend plan have the respect and the confidence of the Congress. I know that you will maintain it.

Individuals, or groups, who attempt directly or indirectly, deliberately or thoughtlessly, to divide the strength built up by your group over a period of more than 13 years, not only do a disservice to the elderly citizens of the United States, but throw what could be an insurmountable handicap in the pathway of progressive legislation.

Your plan has the merit of being national rather than local. It has the merit of being financed and supported by a direct tax, as we support the highway system of California; it has the merit of offering a tax which is as painless as any tax could be. There is no such thing as a completely painless tax, any more than there is such a thing as a painless dentist. It has the advantage of providing features which increase the circulation of money at times of distress, and which are related definitely to the periods of economic recession. It is the only plan of that kind known to me. It has the further advantage of preventing the hoarding of money, to become part of an estate, and

it removes many of the difficulties of Government regulation and supervision which otherwise would be required.

I was a member of the California Assembly when the first Townsend resolution passed any legislature in the United States. I voted for it. I have been glad to be of help over the years. I do not think that you need much help; I think you are self-reliant and confident. You have a good program and a good organization. You have many friends in the Halls of the Congress.

I have seen your movement pass through its childhood and its adolescence, and come into its maturity. I am proud to have had a part in that progress. I think it is significant that this convention, this demonstration of your unity and your strength and your constancy, is being held in the Capital of the United States, which is today the capital of the world. Your presence and your resolution and your patience give us courage, here in the Congress. In turn, I look to the day when Congress, representing the people, may add to its laws an adequate recognition of the position of the older citizens in the economic structure of the Nation, by the passage of constructive legislation based on what we know and recognize today under the familiar name of the Townsend plan.

The Flood Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

THE ANNUAL CURSE

The worst flood in 103 years is reaching its crest at St. Louis today. Some 30,000 people are homeless and 1,500,000 acres of farm land are under water. Volunteer workers are being recruited in a last-minute effort to prevent further damage. Millions of tons of precious topsoil are being washed from the Midwest to join other millions of tons in the Gulf of Mexico.

Every year this sorry business of floods confronts the Nation as a reproach to its energy and intelligence. If the proper management of a great river valley were an esoteric matter beyond the skill of man, the country could be excused. But it has already been demonstrated in the Tennessee Valley that floods can be controlled. Why isn't the same method used in the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys?

Senator MURRAY, of Montana, wants to know the answer to this question. The author of the MVA bill joins Chairman Strong, of the region committee for MVA, in requesting President Truman to appoint a commission to study the Missouri Valley's problems.

Such a commission should be composed of men who are capable of giving fair-minded consideration to what should be done about flood control and other elements of regional development, and whether it should be done through the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau or through an MVA.

The Commission would give the people of the valley every opportunity to be heard at a time when they must have a good deal to say.

Mr. Truman's record on Missouri Valley development thus far is not one in which he can take pride. As a candidate for Vice President he made speeches which meant, if they meant anything, that he would support an MVA. As Vice President, he went out of his way to refer MVA legislation to a viciously hostile committee of the Senate. As President, he has provided no leadership whatever in the Missouri Valley development.

Two subcommittees of the Senate headed by Senator OVERTON, a mouthpiece for the Army engineers, have gone through the motions of hearings on the MVA bill, and the bill is now in the hands of a committee headed by Senator REVERCOMB, one of the most extreme reactionaries in Congress. Neither Senator OVERTON nor Senator REVERCOMB could possibly give MVA a fair hearing.

Sham consideration of the subject isn't enough. The needless floods that are destroying crops and property in this region again this year, as they do almost every year, should serve stern warning on the President and Congress that they cannot permanently evade their full responsibility, either by hypocritically going through the motions as in the Overton hearings or by meeting only part of the responsibility as in the Pick-Sloan plan.

The needs of the valley, and the wishes of the people of the valley, should be consulted. And the time to do that is now, when the valley is suffering from its annual curse. Has it not by this time become crystal clear that the old methods of river control practiced by the Army engineers simply do not work? Has it not by this time become apparent that only by applying the principles and practices of the Tennessee Valley Authority can the Missouri Valley save itself from the recurring disaster of floods?

Investigation of Air-Line Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH A. MEADE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Air Line Pilot, by David L. Behncke:

NO BETTER REASONS

Glaring inefficiencies in the accident-investigation procedures of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board, both bitter bureaucratic opponents of an independent Air Safety Board which would take air-line-accident investigation away from their political hearth, were never more glaring than in the American crash at Stephenville, Newfoundland, on October 3, 1946.

The crash was one of the worst in history of the commercial air lines, surpassed only by the recent crashes at LaGuardia Field, Port Deposit, Md., Leesburg, Va., on May 29 and 30 and June 13, respectively. Thirty-nine persons were aboard the AOA plane as passengers and crew members. The fatalities numbered 39—39 of the best reasons on earth why accident investigation responsibility should be taken from the hands of the CAB and CAA and placed under the jurisdiction of an unbiased, unfavored, and nonsubservient independent air-safety board.

In a recent letter to the Aviation Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Senator PAT MCCARRAN (Democrat, Nevada), who recently introduced bill S. 269 to create an independent Air Safety Board, said that the investigative procedures followed by the CAA and CAB in the Stephenville accident indicate that "the present investigations by the CAB and CAA leave something to be desired." The chief something, he said, is an independent agency which will point out specifically the ways in which CAB regulations can be improved and the ways in which the CAA under these regulations can be tightened up.

MCCARRAN said the facts disclosed that Capt. William Rogers Westerfield, of AOA, was making his first flight in full charge of an AOA passenger plane, and that although Stephenville was both a refueling and alternate airport, Westerfield in the course of his AOA training had not been required to land or take off at the Stephenville airport. However, it is understood that he landed and took off from this field as an Army pilot.

The plane, MCCARRAN pointed out, took off on a runway in direct line with a mountain and struck the mountain about 40 feet from its top—a runway, which, because of the mountain, was restricted for use by the Air Transport Command during the war. Why, he asked, had the CAA not likewise restricted the use of this runway?

MCCARRAN's letter also stated: "The CAB claims that due to the condition of the terrain, including the steepness of the slope, loose rocks and mud, it was considered extremely dangerous to move or thoroughly inspect individual parts, and it was also considered that nothing could be gained by a detailed inspection due to the almost complete demolition of the aircraft." This, then, was the CAA and the CAB making a thorough investigation of one of the worst accidents in the history of air transportation. Even though the terrain was bad and the difficulties great, it is rather hard to understand how the CAA and the CAB could have concluded their investigation at the scene of this accident on October 4. Surely, one of the worst crashes in history is entitled to thorough study at the scene and more of an examination than the perfunctory statements quoted indicate was made in this instance."

The air-line pilots, 7,000 strong, concur with Senator MCCARRAN'S stand that there are too many unanswered why's in the air-line accident investigation procedures today, in this case: Why was the investigation conducted with such glossed-over incompleteness? Why was the pilot not thoroughly route checked? Why was a civilian plane permitted to use a runway that even expendable military operations classed as hazardous?

This case is only one of the hundreds that will leave thousands of unanswered why's in air-line accident investigation—why's which will remain unanswered because they could conceivably have embarrassing effects—until there is revival of an independent air-safety board.

On the other side of the ledger, there is one why that has 1,107 irrefutable answers.

Why, weakly asked the opponents of an independent air-safety board, do we need such a board? The 1,107 answers are in the number of air-line fatalities which have cast a black mark on aviation safety—473 of them prior to the advent of the independent air-safety board, which established a world record for air-line safety with over 17 months without an accident, and up until January 12, 1947, 634 since its demise.

Within a 2-week period, from May 29 to June 13, 3 horrifying crashes added 145 more reasons to this already too long list of death and tragedy.

The question today is: Are we going to do something about it? Or, do we still need more good reasons? For thinking people there is but one answer: Reestablish the watchdog of air safety—the former independent air-safety board.

DAVID L. EEHNCKE.

Navy Using Nazi Wind Tunnel That Helped Develop V–2 Rocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ansel E. Talbert from the New York Herald Tribune of June 22, 1947:

NAVY USING NAZI WIND TUNNEL THAT HELPED DEVELOP V–2 ROCKET—DEVICE IMPROVED, REASSEMBLED AT WHITE OAK, MD., IS AT WORK ON PROBLEMS THAT WILL THROW LIGHT ON SPEEDS SO FAST AIR BECOMES A VIRTUAL SOLID

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

WHITE OAK, MD., June 21.—The United States Navy is preparing here to peer beyond the speed region between 600 and 800 miles an hour where the air becomes a virtual solid and conventional airplanes tend to disintegrate under tremendous forces not fully understood.

This insight is of prime importance to the Navy. Its top strategists are organizing the Navy into an instrument that keeps abreast of the most advanced scientific development, which can strike with speed and effectiveness to neutralize any danger to the United States at its source. These strategists foresee aircraft, rockets, and guided missles of supersonic speeds launched from both surface and undersea carriers as their spearhead of attack.

BRASS MODELS GO TO PIECES

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics recently pointed out in its annual report that rocket and jet power plants capable of exceeding the speed of sound are available, but that aircraft in which to install these power plants are not available, although several experimental models have been built. Tests with brass models of conventional planes disclosed that they often burst into bits when subjected to supersonic conditions.

Although missiles have been fired at more than the speed of sound, control surfaces to guide them in accurate courses over long trajectories are in the same category as aircraft.

In an effort to solve problems connected with designing new shapes for supersonic aircraft, the Navy has reassembled at its new ordnance laboratory at White Oak, the world's most advanced supersonic wind tunnel. This is the one located first at Peenemunde and later at Kochel in Germany on which German scientists completed all theoretical work for the V–2 rocket weapon.

Nine key German scientists who designed and operated the huge wind tunnel came to the United States a year ago to assist Navy engineers. They brought with them their charts and data sheets showing how measurements on the V–2 covered the entire range of supersonic speeds up to 4.4 times the velocity of sound.

Navy scientists believe that with the improvements incorporated during the reassembly of the wind tunnel, the Naval Ordnance Laboratory will have the world's finest facilities for supersonic research. The flexibility of the test section permits instant access to models under test and any special instrumentation from above, below, or from either side.

Changes for creating different supersonic velocities require less than 5 minutes, and the German tunnel can be operated with great efficiency on a fraction of the power required for other tunnels of comparable size. Optical instruments make it possible to photograph the air flow about supersonic projectiles under test while measuring devices record the pressure distribution on the projectile's surface.

NAVY ACCOMPLISHMENTS CITED

Although Navy scientists connected with the White Oak project admit freely that Germany was ahead of other nations in the field of supersonic aerodynamics, they also point out that this was a result of special emphasis during a period, rather than special ability. They note the Navy's impressive series of achievements, which include the first crossing of the Atlantic by air, the first employment of the radio compass in aircraft, the first use of observation of heavenly bodies for fixing aircraft position in flight, and the operation by a naval officer of the first wind tunnel in America at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

During the war years the Navy developed the rocket motor which will be used in the Bell SX–1 this summer to poke further into the trans-sonic region with the idea of learning more each flight about the unknowns of stress and loads

Since 1943, when Capt. LeRoy Simpler, commander of a Navy air squadron that shot down 77 Japanese planes, made the first take-off from a carrier with the aid of rocket booster units, the Navy has been using this development to assist heavily loaded planes of all types into the air in short take-off runs.

The Navy's Truculent Turtle, which broke the world's distance record by flying from Perth, Australia, to Columbus, Ohio, used these Jato rocket units in taking off with its heavy load of fuel. Last week this correspondent was permitted to take part in a series of tests at the naval air station and test center at Patuxent, Md., which demonstrated clearly that use of rocket booster charges reduced normal take-off runs from 33 to 60 percent and gave the pilot of an aircraft an ever-present extra source of power for use in emergencies, thereby adding to the safety of operations.

The Navy air arm's safety record with Jato has been almost perfect, and the Jato units manufactured by Aerojet Corp., of Azusa, Calif., with special fuels developed by the Texas Co., have been granted the first approved-type certificate for rocket engines ever issued by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for use as auxiliary power plants on passenger-carrying aircraft.

Jato motors resemble small compressed air bottles, each having a small orifice at one end from which the burning gases are released. Attached to the wings or fuselage of aircraft they are discharged electrically according to the wish of the pilot when he needs them.

One of the draw-backs to the use of rocket booster charges on carriers has been the smoke created, but development work on the creation of a smokeless unit is under way.

Safety of Airplane Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH A. MEADE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me June 27 over Station WBAL, Baltimore, Md.:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, because I have been so deeply concerned by the large number of serious air accidents in the past few weeks, I have introduced a bill in the House of Representatives which would provide for:

(1) Compulsory insurance of $10,000 for loss of life or permanent total disability with lesser amount of partial disability according to the degree of disability incurred, patterned along the lines of the Workman's Compensation Act.

(2) Registration of all persons to whom airplane tickets are sold, such registration showing the name and address of the traveler and the name of a person to be notified in case of accident.

(3) All passengers to be furnished with parachutes and to be instructed in the use of them and how to operate all emergency exits on planes, prior to the take-off.

It is a grim and terrible thing to contemplate that in a space of 2 weeks, from May 29 to June 14, 145 people lost their lives in airplane crashes. Most of those accidents could have been prevented had the Civil Aeronautics Board used the authority vested in them by the Congress.

The United States Government Manual gives the following résumé of the duties of the Civil Aeronutics Board in part as vested in the Board by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 as:

(1) Economic regulations: The Board issues certificates of public convenience and necessity to air carriers and permits to foreign carriers; regulates the filing of tariffs; regulates rates for the carriage of persons and property; prescribes rates of compensation for the carriage of mail; and regulates accounts, records and reports, mergers, loans and financial aid, methods of competition, and interlocking relationships.

(2) Safety regulations: The Board prescribes safety standards, rules, and regulations and has the power to suspend and revoke safety certificates after hearing (including the disposition of any petition for the reconsideration of the denial by the Administrator of an application for the issuance or renewal of an airman certificate under Sec. 602 (b) of the act.

(3) Accident prevention: The Board makes rules on notification and report of accidents involving aircraft; investigates such accidents and reports the facts, circumstances, and probable causes; makes its reports and investigations public in such manner as it deems to be in the public interest; investigates complaints and conducts special studies and investigations to reduce aircraft accidents and prevent their recurrence.

That is very impressive language but let us examine the personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Board and their qualifications for the job they are doing:

Hon. James M. Landis, Chairman, was a former Harvard law professor and member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Hon. Oswald Ryan, whose entire background has been in the legal profession.

Hon. Josh Lee was head of the Speakers' Department in the University of Oklahoma, a lawyer, a United States Senator.

Hon. Harllee Branch was an outstanding newspaperman and former Second Assistant Postmaster General.

Hon. Clarence M. Young was a former vice president of the Pan American Airways but without technical experience.

I have no fault to find with these gentlemen as administrators but I am wondering if it might not be a little more to the point if at least a part of the Board were men with technical aviation background. Imagine sending a Harvard law professor to Bainbridge, Md., to investigate the horrible accident which occurred there on May 30, but that is just what was done. I was told by the Civil Aeronautics Board on June 24 in response to an inquiry as to what the findings on that accident were, that the report on that accident had not been written up. Eye witnesses of that accident said the plane exploded in the air. It will be interesting

to know, when the Civil Aeronautics Board gets around to writing up that report, just what they thought caused the accident, especially when they are technically responsible for issuing the certificate of airworthiness on that ship.

It will be argued by some that the Board has technical advisers. That may be true but with the top-notchers in aviation being gobbled up by the large airplane companies at fabulous salaries, the Government must of necessity take second-best advisers at the salaries they are allowed to offer.

The so-called Safety Board is solely responsible to and under the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board. All investigations and reports are signed by the Board. The certificate of airworthiness given to each airship is made out under the authority Board. Minimum safety standards are also determined by the Board, and let me repeat, the members of this Board have no technical knowledge of aviation.

Would anyone be so foolish as to place a layman at the head of a surgical division of a hospital? Of course not, but the comparison is not any more ridiculous than to send a law professor out to make an investigation as to what caused an explosion in a ship for which he had issued a certificate of airworthiness.

On June 15 the President appointed the following board to make an investigation into air safety. The members of the board are Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; Brig. Gen. M. W. Arnold, vice president of the Air Transport Association; James M. Landis, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; H. B. Cox, American Air Lines pilot; and Theodore P. Wright, Civil Aeronautics Administrator.

It is a sad commentary that we must wait until 145 people lost their lives within a short space of time before we decide to make an investigation into air safety. It will be interesting to see what their recommendations will be.

In the House of Representatives on June 16, Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, had the following to say in reference to the President's Air Safety Board:

"As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that in the course of the committee's extensive hearings on air safety the committee has had occasion to hear the testimony of all of these men or representatives of the organizations which they represent. The committee heard both Mr. Landis and Mr. Wright, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, respectively. Mr. John W. Crowley, Jr., acting director of research, appeared before the committee on behalf of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. General Arnold, as well as Mr. Ramspeck, a former Member of this House, appeared on behalf of the Air Transport Association. Finally, the Air Line Pilots Association was represented by its president, David L. Behncke, and members of the association employed by different air lines appeared; Ernest A. Cutrell, American Airlines; Robert N. Buck, Transworld; J. E. Wood, Eastern Air Lines, in addition to John M. Dickinson and Brant W. Phillips, appeared before this committee and gave testimony.

"It will be the purpose of this committee to make available to the new investigating board appointed by the President all of the testimony and other information supplied to this committee by over a hundred witnesses who appeared in the course of the committee's air-safety investigation. It is my fervent hope that the new board will be able to further add to our knowledge as to how to prevent recurrences of these accidents.

"I assure the House that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will continue its own investigation of all air accidents in recent months, and, of course, include those that have so recently happened."

Mr. WOLVERTON did not add, however, that his Republican-dominated committee had been procrastinating about air safety since the beginning of the Eightieth Congress in January and that up until this very day, no report has been forthcoming from the committee.

On June 16, 1947, Congressman BENDER, of Ohio, introduced a resolution in the House calling for the immediate installation of radar altimeter equipment in all licensed aircraft. The resolution also instructs the Civil Aeronautics Board to require immediately the installation of ground control approach equipment at all airports from which commercial aircraft are licensed to operate. The resolution also requires the Civil Aeronautics Board to order the immediate installation of omnidirectional systems of radio beams on all commercial airways and a complete report by the Board of their safety regulation service.

Without further legislative authority from Congress, the Civil Aeronautics Board had the authority to prevent the kind of air disaster which snuffed out 145 lives on May 29, May 30, and June 14. It has a moral and legal obligation to use that power and the House of Representatives should demand that they use that power at once.

Howard Hughes has voluntarily begun the installation of radar altimeter equipment in all the TWA planes. It is his statement that four of the six recent airplane disasters could have been prevented if the planes had been equipped with proper radar altimeter equipment. The Army Air Forces employed this equipment throughout the war. There is no reason whatsoever that this equipment cannot be installed. I am confident that the great electrical manufacturing industry would give priority to the manufacturing of such equipment. Why does not the Civil Aeronautics Board act?

Throughout the war the Army employed ground control approach equipment. It has been said that the installation of such equipment at airports would be expensive. This consideration dwindles into insignificance when we realize that human lives are at stake, that the airplane industry is a great and growing one, and before all else must guarantee the safety of its passengers. The Civil Aeronautics Board has the authority. It can refuse to license the operation of commercial aircraft from any field which does not have such equipment.

There were several plane crashes in southwest Virginia during the past few months in which the pilots were blown off their radio beam and were lost. These crashes occurred at night. The investigators of these crashes stated that if the proper radio-directional equipment, namely, the omnidirectional system, or radio beams had been in use, these plane crashes could have been averted.

More than 50 people lost their lives in the Eastern Air Lines crash in Maryland on May 30. Newspaper reports on that air crash indicated that some machinist had unwittingly filed a connecting bolt when he should not have done so. The Civil Aeronautics Board is also responsible for the adequacy of maintenance work. The air lines have expanded rapidly; they have introduced new equipment but they have failed to keep their ground-maintenance work up to proper standards. It is time that the Civil Aeronautics Board did something about correcting ground-crew maintenance work.

The pilot of the American Airlines which crashed at LaGuardia Airfield on May 29 stated that he could have used a longer runway but that the longer runway had undulations and many bumps in it and, in his opinion, should not be used. The Civil Aeronautics Board is responsible for the checking of airport conditions. When we remember that this experienced pilot chose to take a shorter runway rather than one which he knew to be of adequate length because the longer runway was in bad condition, when we remember that 40 people lost their lives because that runway was in such shape that the pilot chose to use another one—a shorter one—it fills me personally with intense rage. The Civil Aeronautics Board has got to be made to face its responsibilities.

In the past 10 years the aircraft industry received more aid from the Federal Government than any other industry probably in American history, with the exception of railroads. The Government has financed airports throughout the country. The Government has financed aircraft research and development work. An entire generation of Americans has been sold by the Government during the war on the romance and glamor of the aviation industry. During the war the Government trained 2,000,000 young men either as pilots, mechanics, ground crew, or service personnel. Equipment has been sold to the air lines. In every possible way the Government has assisted the aviation industry, actually with what amounts to billions of dollars either in terms of publicity, research, training of the labor supply, building of airports, transfer of equipment. There is no industry in the country today that has had so many of the things necessary to it underwritten by the Government or provided by the Government and probably there is no industry in the country which will make as much money or has such a tremendous future before it.

It is absolutely imperative that the Government exercise its authority and guarantee safety insofar as this is humanly possible within the aviation industry.

Surely from among that 2,000,000 trained aviators and aeronautical experts in this country we could find men highly trained in air safety to head the Civil Aeronautics Board. If I were a member of that Board, in the face of the recent air disasters, I would quit and ask the President to appoint someone in my place who might be able to do something to prevent future air catastrophes. But be that as it may, the Civil Aeronautics Board is charged with the responsibility of using every possible precaution to assure air safety, and there is no reason why further procrastination should lead to the loss of a single life in unnecessary aircraft disasters, but unless the President's committee tells the Civil Aeronautics Board what must be done to prevent future accidents, then it is high time the Congress did something about the matter.

Address by Gen. Omar Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn that Mr. Chat Paterson has recently been elected national chairman of the American Veterans' Committee at their recent convention in Milwaukee, Wis. From my association with him, I believe he possesses the good ideals and qualities of leadership which will guide and direct this veterans' organization properly.

General Bradley addressed the convention on June 20, 1947, and stressed a challenge to all veterans in solving the problems of our Nation. I believe his

remarks are worthy of careful consideration by all of us.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the full address of General Bradley before this recent convention:

Many years ago as a young officer, I learned that good judgment comes from experience and that experience grows out of mistakes. If your generation has salvaged anything from the wreckage of this last World War, I hope it is the wisdom to see how tragically those before you failed.

For there is no such thing as an inevitable war. If wars can be provoked, they can also be averted. But they can be averted only if the peace-loving peoples of this world love peace enough to oppose aggression in whatever form it may recur. We cannot ignore the kindling sparks if we hope to avoid a conflagration. We cannot halt imperialism with moral indignation. If the United States is to exercise its conscience in world affairs, it must be prepared to back its moral indignation with realism, resources, and credits.

Our chief enemies in the world today are fear, poverty, and chaos. Their threat to the nations that value freedom is greater than that of rival armies, more dangerous than that of rival doctrines. We dare not forget that starvation, joblessness, and despair can so agonize the minds of men that they would risk freedom in their hunger for security.

America's self-interest in this world is threatened by empty stomachs. Until the nations of Europe can build a sound economic basis for their own sound political life, time will work on the side of confusion and confusion on the side of eventful war.

It is not enough for you veterans simply to have won the war. Unless the American people learn that noninvolvement in peace means certain involvement in war, your victories shall be forgotten in another climactic struggle between the nations of this world. You dare not forget that there is nothing man can invent with his genius, nothing man can devise from his knowledge, nothing man can create from his science that war if it comes cannot destroy. Far more than the skills with which to make a living, youth is in need of a world in which to practice those skills in peace and security.

War is not only a tragic, stupid, and costly folly; it has became the actual threat of doom. There is not enough room in the world for both civilization and atomic conflict. If we once again risk disaster by turning our backs on the world, we shall not be given another chance. Twice the United States has snatched victory out of defeat as the arsenal of democracy. In the event of another war, we shall become the target.

We must recognize that it is even more difficult to avert wars than to win them. The achievement of peace in this shattered world is a task requiring greater intellect, more daring, and perhaps even sterner sacrifice than we showed in winning the war.

To meet this challenge, the American people must be prepared to sustain a bold foreign policy equal to our responsibilities in a world from which we cannot retreat.

We must strive for economic security, freed from the hazards of depression, and give those nations that look to us for guidance greater confidence in the wealth and productivity of our American system.

And we must contribute willingly to the maintenance of armed strength essential to the security and stability of this world in which we live.

Your organization has accepted as its creed the assertion that veterans shall find their best interests in the welfare of this Nation.

For all their bonds of comradeship, American veterans have no economic identity of their own. They have no political identity of their own. Their prosperity, their happiness will come from the prosperity and happiness of the Nation at large.

Despite its vast dollar resources, the Federal program of veteran readjustment is totally dependent upon the economic, social, and political forces which together guide and direct our Nation's life. The veteran with his billion-dollar benefits can recover no more quickly and progress no further than this Nation of which he is a part.

Despite the baleful warnings of other pressure groups, veterans of this conflict have demonstrated they will not employ their strength for special privilege at the expense of the Nation.

In their strident ambition to build a better life for themselves and their nation, veterans grow impatient at delay and their inability to find ready acceptance of new ideas, new methods, new programs. They resent the sometimes painfully slow processes through which changes must come in a democracy. And they become increasingly angry in the long-drawn-out search for the security and comfort which promised to be accessible in peacetime. But they must remember that the welfare of the Nation demands the happy adjustment of all interests in the common good rather than the satisfaction of any one group. The veteran will obtain the things he wants when those things are available to all citizens.

Many of those who seek additional benefits and special privilege through the expenditure of Federal funds fail to reckon the eventual cost to themselves of those aids. At a time when the prosperity of the Nation is at a record peacetime high, the opportunities for complete self-dependence cannot justifiably be wasted. If veterans are to call for more and more governmental help, we shall be compelled to admit that opportunity is not enough, that our economy does not have room for all our people. There is no such thing as a free ride on the Government for any taxpaying citizen. Veterans who demand unwarranted expenditures now are saddling themselves with an unreasonable tax burden in future years.

If the American people are to match the faith of their young veterans in the future of this country, they must grant them opportunity for job security. Where we were once compelled to defend democracy with the strength of these young men, we must now show that democracy can work for the enrichment of their lives.

For democratic government, to survive, must grant to its people continuing opportunities for greater economic security. These are the guarantees we must have for freedom. Only as long as freedom remains a force for human welfare, will men cherish freedom in their hearts and defend it with their lives.

We shall merit loyalty to democracy on the part of our young veterans only as long as we prove the superiority of democracy through its achievements. We cannot meet the challenge of other ideologies with labels and reaction. The American people must offer young veterans progress and the opportunity for constant self-betterment throughout their busy lives.

It is not enough to dedicate ourselves to the preservation of free initiative and the guarantee of free expression. These are rights—and if they are to be maintained they must be bulwarked with equal responsibilities. We shall safeguard those rights only as long as we can assure men protection of their opportunity for economic, social, and political progress.

Three weeks ago, on the third anniversary of D-day, I could not help but contrast the certainty we felt then with the uncertainty that troubles so many of us now. I thought it strange that soldiers could face the ordeal of invasion with confidence in their ability to complete the job, and now confess uncertainty in their ability to gain security.

I wonder if the people of the world—and if Americans in particular—are not badly in need of a stronger faith in themselves. I wonder if those who talk so glibly of another and inevitable war are not tragically in need of trust in the ability of nations to achieve a realistic peace. And I wonder if those defeatists who warn us that another depression is on the way, those doubters who tell us that America lacks the resources, the unity, the strength to create prosperity in peace as well as in war are not terribly in need of faith in the people of this Nation.

For sometime, I am afraid the doubters have taken hold, that we are sailing into this postwar world half convinced in our panicky minds we cannot make it work.

Democracy cannot lose if given the chance to work. But we must admit it can lose by default. It can lose through the fears of its people, through their failure to trust in its strength, through timidity in meeting problems at home and confusion in solving problems abroad.

We need the confidence that comes from youth, the assurance with which you fought the war. We need faith in ourselves, faith in our Nation, faith in our ability to build a lasting peace.

Romulo and Filipino Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday July 1, 1947

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, we are doing today an act of justice which is in accordance with the American tradition of fairness. The Filipino veterans, who fought for the American flag, and in defense of the American principles of freedom of democracy were our soldiers when they were fighting in Bataan and Corregidor. They took their oath of allegiance to the American Constitution and they fought under American officers. They have covered themselves with glory. In approving this act making the Missing Persons Act applicable to them, we are fulfilling an obligation that we owe them as much as we owe to our American soldiers.

I must mention in this connection how deeply I regret that today we do not have with us on the floor the former Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, who during his term as the Filipino spokesman in the United States Congress tried to do all he could for his fellow Filipino veterans. I remember how he came to me and to other Members of Congress several times to oppose the Rescission Act and how he spoke on the floor against it inserting in the record a statement made by President Truman against the provision in said act which prevented the Missing Persons Act from being applied to Filipino veterans. Unfortunately he was at that time overruled. But he kept on exerting his best efforts to plead the case of the Filipino veterans.

Today when we approve this act, which does justice to the veterans of the Philippines, in all fairness mention must be made of General Romulo, who, since his return to the United States after the granting of Philippine independence, has conducted a one-man campaign on the platform, radio, and the press to get for

the heroic Filipino veterans the justice they deserve. I am happy to make this acknowledgment on the floor of this House in fairness to a man who at all times has fought for his Filipino comrades in arms.

Sound and Popular Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following editorial which appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on Saturday, June 28, 1947:

SOUND AND POPULAR VETO

Unlike his tax reduction and labor bill vetoes of last week, President Harry S. Truman's official disapproval Thursday of the wool price support measure that had been passed by both branches of Congress was overwhelmingly popular, because the bill's provisions were against the best interests of the Nation and most of its people and would have benefited only a relatively small number of wool growers, who already are receiving far greater Government aid than they merit.

The growers in this country produce only 50 percent or less of the wool used by American industry, yet to protect their prices they have persuaded Congress in the past to impose a tariff of 17 cents a pound on the other half of the necessary supply that must be imported from Australia and New Zealand. Furthermore, the American growers secured from Congress legislation whereby the Federal Government supports a price of 42.3 cents a pound to them by purchasing any and all wool offered for sale here below that figure. Not content with those rich benefits, the growers prevailed upon the current Congress to pass this latest bill authorizing even higher tariffs and trade barriers against foreign wool imports, which the President disapproved quite properly.

Taking a position in his veto message duplicating that of Secretary of State George C. Marshall and the United States State Department, President Truman objected to features of the measure he felt would have an adverse effect on international relations and said that enactment of the law would be a tragic mistake. The Chief Executive stated further that it would be a blow to American leadership in world affairs to pass a measure providing for additional barriers to the importation of wool into this country just at a time when the United States Government was taking a leading part in the United Nations conference at Geneva, Switzerland, which was called for the purpose of reducing trade barriers and to draft a charter for an international trade organization.

That argument alone justified President Truman's veto, but if further proof was needed he could have directed attention to the fact that the bill would have given the wool growers additional Government assistance that they do not need or deserve, at the expense of the rest of the American people. If successful, it would have had harmful effect upon the textile woolen manufacturing industry, which made the matter especially interesting to Greater Lawrence and its people, and would have added considerably to the prices paid by the public for all woolen goods. For more important reasons than one, the President's action was as sound and laudable as it was popular.

Civilian Board of Final Review of Armed Forces Discharges and Dismissals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced in the House a bill, H. R. 4019, which would create the Civilian Board of Final Review of Armed Forces Discharges and Dismissals and grant it full authority to review any discharge or dismissal during World War II and to issue a new certificate if the facts show that an injustice has been done.

The purpose of this bill is to provide a final court of appeal, free from any charges of bias or prejudice, to any former member of the armed forces during World War II who feels that his discharge or dismissal is unjust. It would accomplish this by setting up a five-man board of civilians, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, with full power to review any discharge or dismissal upon application by any former serviceman whose dismissal or discharge was adjudged or executed after the beginning of selective service and before the official termination of World War II. The board would be given power to review all records and decisions on the case, and by majority opinion to make any changes in the type of discharge or dismissal previously given. Jurisdiction could be assumed by the board on recommendation of two or more of its members following application by the former serviceman.

Prior to the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the final power to correct injustices in military records was vested in the Congress. The Reorganization Act, in an attempt to reduce the legislative work-load, banned the introduction of private bills of this character. As a substitute, the act empowered the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Treasury—with respect to the Coast Guard—to create boards of civilian officers or employees of their respective departments, and through them, to authorize the correction of any military or naval record where in their—the Secretary's—judgment such action was necessary to correct an error or to remove an injustice. In other words, the Secretaries of the various departments were given the same jurisdiction as had formerly been possessed by the Congress in this respect.

The effect of this provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act has been, in practice, to deny the veteran's right of appeal. By leaving the power of review at the discretion of secretaries of the departments. Congress has, in effect, asked the impossfble. It has asked that a fair and impartial review be granted by the same "judge" who has previously approved of the decision in the case. Thus, in the regulations governing the proceedings of the Secretary of War's Board, the Board is prohibited from reviewing any case "wherein final action has been taken by the President of the United States, the Secretary, the Under Secretary, or the Assistant Secretary of War." Not only does this provision of the act, therefore, vest final jurisdiction in the armed services, thereby breaking a historic precedent in the sequence of military appeal, but it seriously limits the granting of an opportunity to be heard. I do not believe that this was the intent of Congress.

I believe that the intent of Congress can best be carried out by the provisions of H. R. 4019. It divorces the services entirely from final review of discharges and dismissals. It removes any charge of prejudice or bias on the part of the reviewers. It insures finality of review, yet it attempts to prevent wholesale reexamination of military records by laying down strict but fair requirements for acceptance of jurisdiction. It will not interfere with the system of military or naval justice. I believe it will correct a legislative error which is causing a grave injustice to be done to many former servicemen.

The text of this bill follows:

H. R. 4019

A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to create a civilian board to review discharges and dismissals from service in the armed forces, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby created a Civilian Board of Final Review of Armed Forces Discharges and Dismissals (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Board"), to be composed of five civilians appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate one of the members of the Board as its Chairman. Each member of the Board shall receive a salary at the rate of $15,000 a year and shall hold office until such time as the Congress shall, by concurrent resolution, determine that the Board has fulfilled the duties placed upon it by subsection (c). Any vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the manner prescribed for original appointment to such Board.

"(b) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia. The Board is authorized to appoint such personnel and to make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the Board to review the type and nature of the discharge or dismissal from service in the armed forces of the United States of any former member of such forces who is not under sentence adjudged by a court martial where (1) such discharge or dismissal was executed, or was adjudged by a court martial, after September 15, 1940, and prior to the official termination date of World War II as designated by the Secretary of State; (2) such former member or, if such former member is deceased, the surviving spouse, next of kin, or legal representative of such former member files with the Board a request for such review (A) within 10 years after the date of the execution of such discharge or dismissal, or (B) within 2 years after the date of completion of the sentence adjudged by court martial or of death while serving such sentence, whichever of the dates determined according to (A) and

(B) is the later; and (3) after preliminary investigation by the Board, at least two members of the Board believe that the type or nature of such discharge or dismissal may be unjust. Review by the Board shall be based upon all available records relating to the service in the armed forces of such discharged or dismissed former member and such other evidence as may be presented by such former member or the surviving spouse, next of kin, or legal representative. Witnesses shall be permitted to present testimony, either in person or by affidavit, and such discharged or dismissed former member or the surviving spouse, next of kin, or legal representative shall be allowed to appear before the Board in person or by counsel: *Provided*, That the term 'counsel,' as used in this subsection, shall be construed to include, among others, accredited representatives of veterans' organizations recognized by the Veterans' Administration under section 200 of the act of June 29, 1936 (Public Law No. 844, 74th Cong.). The Board shall, on the concurrence of three or more of its members, have authority to change, correct, or modify any discharge or dismissal in accordance with the facts presented to it and to issue a new certificate with respect to the separation from the service of any former member of the armed forces. Where the Board has fully reviewed any discharge or dismissal, such review shall be final.

"(d) In the case of any certificate of separation issued pursuant to subsection (c), no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the date on which such certificate is issued.

"(e) The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury (with respect to the Coast Guard) are authorized and directed to furnish the Board with certified copies of such of the available records relating to any former member of the armed forces as the Board may, from time to time, request."

SEC. 2. Section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing in this section shall authorize the correction of any discharge or dismissal which has previously been fully reviewed by the Civilian Board of Final Review of Armed Forces Discharges and Dismissals created by section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended."

In Answer to the Attack of W. W. Lynch on the Brazos River Transmission Electric Cooperative, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 1947, Mr. W. W. Lynch, vice president of the Texas Power & Light Co., appeared before the Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations of another body. He presented in testimony some very skillfully worded statements and extended his remarks in opposition to the rural electrification program, and particularly to the generating plant now being built by the Brazos River Electric Transmission Cooperative, located between Temple and Belton, Tex. Mr. Lynch seeks to plant suspicion of the program's objectives and operations, and to promote restrictions which would cripple effective administration of the Rural Electrification Act.

So many misinterpretations and distortions are contained in the testimony of this Texas Power & Light Co. vice president that I feel that some record should reflect at least a partial answer. The following points illustrate some of the type of statements which are calculated, if not intended, to mislead the Members of this Congress:

First. He gave a very misleading picture of his company's ability to supply dependable service.

Mr. Lynch presented 13 voltmeter charts, most of which showed voltage regulation on the order of 1 or 2 percent, as "evidence of the high standard of service rendered." These charts mean nothing. First of all, there are 43 points of delivery. Mr. Lynch said nothing of what exists at the other 30 points. Moreover, each chart that Mr. Lynch did present gives the picture for a single day. The particular days used were selected by the company. Obviously, the company would not select days on which the poorest service was rendered. Mr. Lynch failed to present any charts at all for 12 out of the 20 cooperatives served by T. P. & L. and which, according to recent studies by independent consulting engineers, had instances of voltage regulation of as much as 14 percent.

Here is a picture of some of the other 30 points of delivery that Mr. Lynch did not mention and that open to question his entire presentation. The Houston County Electric Cooperative, for example, had a voltage regulation of 14 percent between April 21 and May 5, 1947. The Cooke County Electric Cooperative Association had a voltage regulation of 9.1 percent on May 28, 1946.

The Navarro County Electric Cooperative for which Mr. Lynch showed a 2.88 percent regulation on August 9 and 10 was found to have a voltage regulation three times as great or 8.5 percent on October 7, 1946.

The Comanche County Electric Cooperative Association reported on March 20, "We are having quite a number of complaints from our members on account of the almost daily outrages we are having at the present time, due to the overloaded Texas Power & Light equipment."

These actual cases of poor service demonstrate that Mr. Lynch's statement is certainly not representative.

Second. He attempted to cover up his company's record of poor service by discrediting the co-op facilities.

The cases of inadequate service reported to the company by distribution cooperatives—

Mr. Lynch stated—

were due to the loaded cooperative's facilities at delivery points and to the unduly long lines of the distribution cooperatives.

Every competent engineer knows, however, that it is impossible to have proper voltage regulation on any system unless good regulation exists at the source of power. As has already been shown, the member cooperatives of the Brazos River Transmission Electric Cooperative are not receiving dependable service at the Texas Power & Light Co.'s delivery points.

Mr. Lynch is undoubtedly aware of these facts; yet his only explanation of poor service is a statement the purpose of which is to confuse the problem of inadequate power at the delivery points with the problem of distributing power over the co-op systems. These are separate problems. It is a fact, however, that the Brazos cooperatives have distribution troubles because the power company transmission lines were designed primarily to transmit power between urban centers and as such are not an efficient source of power for the load centers of cooperatives serving rural territory.

Third. He attempted to explain away the serious problems of inadequate delivery points.

In his testimony, Mr. Lynch states that the Texas Power & Light Co. will furnish more points of delivery than the Brazos River Transmission Electric Cooperative to its member cooperatives. Yet, Mr. Lynch obviously knows that the number of points of delivery is in itself meaningless since it is the location and adequacy of the delivery points that make for dependable service.

Mr. Lynch alludes to an offer of his company to establish delivery points at the co-op load centers. But he neglects to say that for 10 years the cooperatives were not able to obtain bona fide discussion of the program designed to meet the power needs of the cooperatives. It must be noted that the company's proposal of February 22, 1947, came 9 months after the co-ops had obtained an REA loan to proceed with their own generation and transmission facilities—a fact which indicates that this offer, as has been the case with others, was advanced purely as a means of embarrassing and obstructing the co-op program.

Fourth. He disregarded history in order to claim rate leadership.

Mr. Lynch described his company as one which has been a leader in working out proper wholesale rates for cooperatives. Actually, his company has made no reductions, except as forced by circumstances. Here are the facts:

When the first REA financed co-op was put into operation at Bartlett, Tex., in 1936, the T. P. & L. refused to sell them power at all, except at the retail rate. The cooperative was forced to get its power from the Diesel-operated municipal plant at Bartlett.

A year or so later, the Bellfalls Electric Co-op was organized east of Temple. It was only able to get consideration at the hands of T. P. & L. after Mr. Carmody, then head of the REA, had suggested that he would loan it enough to build a steam-generating plant.

As soon as this suggestion was made by REA, the T. P. & L. agreed that it would sell this co-op, and, as required by State law, would sell all co-ops, wholesale power at 1.5 cents per kilowatt-hour.

The first general reduction in the T. P. & L.'s rates to farmer-owned cooperatives did not come until 1940, just after negotiations were commenced in regard to the organization of the Brazos River Electric Transmission Coopera-

tive, Inc. The T. P. & L. officials say that their rate reductions were not associated with competition.

Be that as it may, this first reduction occurred just a few weeks after the first negotiations between Members of Congress from the area and the officials of the R. E. A. with regard to the establishment of a generating and transmission system.

The second cut in rates was made shortly after the REA announced it would finance such a generating and transmission co-op.

The third cut was made on March 20, 1941, just 12 days after the initial REA allocation to the Transmission Cooperative when the company made a further reduction in its discount which brought the average rate down to approximately 65 cents per kilowatt hour, or a total reduction of approximately 60 percent during the formation of a competitive generation and transmission system.

In July 1945, just as the Transmission Cooperative was anticipating a resumption of construction work stopped by the war, the company placed in effect a rate purporting to be 56 cents per kilowatt hour. This rate, however, was restricted to rural loads of less than 50 kilowatts. To larger loads, a substantially higher rate was applied. In other words, the Company sought to put itself in a position where it could dictate the cooperatives' service policies.

Such is the background of this strange statement by Mr. Lynch:

> It took time to appraise and understand working with the cooperatives, and setting proper rates and charges.

Fifth. He gave a deceptive picture of his company's level of rates.

Mr. Lynch claims that the level of rates charges by Texas Power & Light Co. to rural cooperatives has been consistently below the national average of such rates and is presently one of the lowest in the country.

The facts of the case are quite the contrary. The rate which the company was charging when the Brazos area cooperatives began plans for their own generation plant was higher than the national average for wholesale power purchased at that time by REA cooperatives from all sources, and it was higher than the cost of power from private power companies.

What Mr. Lynch should have said is that since the Brazos River Cooperative came into existence, the rates of Texas Power & Light Co. have been lower than the national average.

The fact that the T. P. & L. rates are lower than the national average charged by power companies does not—Mr. Lynch to the contrary notwithstanding—reflect any credit upon the T. P. & L. It is a fact, revealed by a study of Brazos' own engineers, that the cost of generating power with fuel-burning plants in the Texas gas fields, because of the available low-cost fuel in Texas, is scarcely more than half what it is in some sections of the country.

Sixth. He attempted to make his rates look good by citing a Georgia rate study that had nothing to do with Texas power loads.

Mr. Lynch's claim that his company is a leader in low rates to cooperatives is based on a report compiled by the Georgia Public Service Commission. The Georgia Commission applied the rate schedules of 93 power suppliers to the power demand and energy consumption of 12 selected Georgia cooperatives. Consequently, the report shows what the 93 rate schedules would mean to those 12 Georgia co-ops. The experience of those cooperatives in other States who actually purchased power from the 93 suppliers shows quite another story.

The T. P. & L. average rate when applied to the load of the 12 Georgia cooperatives was 5.537 cents per kilowatt-hour. The cost to the Texas co-ops which actually bought power from T. P. & L. was 5.9 cents. Bonneville's rate applied to the Georgia co-ops was 4.1 cents. Actually the co-ops buying Bonneville power pay 3.6 cents.

The TVA rate applied to the Georgia co-ops was 6.688 per kilowatt-hour. Actually the co-ops buying power from TVA pay 5.4 cents. Accordingly, by using the Georgia report, Mr. Lynch was able to show his company lower than TVA whereas in actual experience co-ops buying power from TVA pay less than those buying power from T. P. & L.

Seventh. He made statements regarding Brazos costs and rates that betray his ignorance of the facts.

Mr. Lynch states, "The estimates of the costs of carrying out this unnecessary program are such as to indicate that more money must be allotted to finish the job. The 10,000-kilowatt steam power plant, for example, is estimated to cost $1,219,000, which is about 70 percent of the present cost of a plant of this size. The anticipated costs of wholesale electric power for resale to the farmers must be increased. The company's engineers are of the opinion that these costs will be nearly double the amount that the cooperatives are now paying for purchased wholesale electric power."

The facts are that the expenditure for the 10,000-kilowatt steam plant amounts to less than 20 percent of the expenditure for the Brazos system from presently available funds. Much of the Brazos system has already been constructed. Contracts have already been let for considerable additional construction and there is absolutely no indication at the present time that the cost of wholesale power to the member cooperatives will be even a tenth of a mill more than was estimated when the last loan was made for the development of Brazos. Moreover, changes in design and additional tie-ins with other power suppliers can be expected to result in cost of power to the Brazos cooperatives even lower than was estimated.

Eighth. He erroneously appraised the "advantage" to the member co-ops of buying wholesale power from his organizations.

Mr. Lynch claims that "the company's wholesale electric power rates to REA cooperatives are lower than the transmission cooperatives can make available to its member cooperatives."

Here are the facts: The T. P. & L. wholesale rate is 0.56 cent per kilowatt-hour for rural loads of less than 50 kilowatts and 0.91 cent per kilowatt-hour for larger loads at 50-percent load factor. The cost of power under this rate for enough power to meet the co-ops' needs including normal development of rural business, is higher than the price at which Brazos—as contemplated under present loans—will supply it. Furthermore the co-ops can look forward to further decreases when loads warrant further expansion. It is conservatively estimated that such Brazos rates will be 20 percent lower than the latest T. P. & L. offer made in an effort to destroy Brazos. What is more, when the farmers of the Brazos River area pay up the loan on their facilities they will own a substantial property instead of a stack of receipted bills.

Ninth. He claims that his company's rates are lower than a number of public power authority rates.

Let us see how the T. P. & L. rates compare with both public and private power rates in cities where they do not face competition.

In Belton and Cameron, the T. P. & L. charges $2.18 for 40 kilowatt-hours, but in San Marcos and/or in Lampasas the LCRA charges only 95 cents for this same 40 kilowatt-hours. If you use more current the T. P. & L. will charge you $7.44 for 250 kilowatt-hours in Cameron or Belton, while the LCRA will charge you only $4.25 in San Marcos or Lampasas.

In the larger towns we find the people of Temple still paying the T. P. & L. $2.18 for 40 kilowatt-hours just like the people of Belton, Cameron, or Hillsboro. If they use 250 kilowatt-hours, Temple citizens must likewise pay the power company $7.44 just like their smaller neighbors. On the other hand, Luling, with a municipal plant, pays $1.65 for 40 kilowatt-hours or $6.05 for 250 kilowatt-hours, and the people of Vernon pay their municipal system only $1.20 for 40-kilowatt-hours or $7.25 for 250 kilowatt-hours.

When we get into cities of a still larger population bracket, we find that the power company does reduce the rate, but certainly not in the same proportion that municipal plants do. Waco citizens pay $1.91 for the same 40 kilowatt-hours that Austin citizens buy for $1.71 through their municipally owned system from the LCRA, and in addition, the city of Austin received in 1945 $107,580 in lieu of the $63,528.56 taxes that the city of Waco received from the taxpaying T. P. & L.—but do not stop here—in addition to a lower rate, and more money in the city's general fund than Waco got in taxes, the city of Austin was paid an additional $935,000 in net profits for the year's operations. No wonder the power company can give anyone who threatens its monopoly a rate lower than TVA, but is it not plain that the power company gives these rates at the expense of the electrical users of the cities where they do not face any kind of competition?

Tenth. He suggests that the energy to be produced by the co-op plant is not needed in the area.

Mr. Lynch describes the power resources of his and associated companies in the area and says that they "should

without question insure a continuance of the company's ability to provide ample power for the REA distribution cooperatives in this area when needed." He forgot to mention that the plans for the generating facilities which he describes were made public after the Brazos Cooperative announced its plans to build 10,000 kilowatts of capacity.

All along, the T. P. & L. has said there was no need for this 10,000 kilowatt capacity, and yet at the same time the company and its affiliates have announced that they are going to build 160,000 kilowatts of capacity in the same area. How could their increased capacity be now needed if there were no need for the 10,000 kilowatts of co-op capacity all these years. And even more remarkable, Mr. Lynch has added 30,000 kilowatts to the capacity which he says his companies will build since January 1947. In that month he wrote the president of the Brazos Co-op and stated that his companies planned to construct 130,000 kilowatts. Now he says 160,000 kilowatts. The need for power in Texas must be growing very rapidly. As a matter of fact, Mr. Lynch has always insisted that the REA should be held to accountability planning in view of the acts that his company takes after REA action is likely to find that REA foresight was better than T. P. & L. hindsight.

Eleventh. He attempted to leave the impression that Brazos project is socialistic.

Throughout his testimony, Mr. Lynch, by subtle insinuation and direct statement, sought to imply that the Brazos Cooperative is a tax-free, subsidized, government-owned agency. This is completely false.

The Brazos River Electric Transmission Cooperative is owned by the Brazos area rural electric co-ops which in turn are owned by the farmers they serve. These farmers have borrowed money to finance the Transmission Cooperative and when they have paid off their loan, they will own their facilities.

The Brazos co-op pays interest on its loan. It pays taxes. It is free enterprise. It is local ownership. And if the T. P. & L. cannot—as Mr. Lynch sees as possible—"survive in the same area" it will simply be because T. P. & L. cannot furnish power as efficiently, as cheaply, and as dependably as the Brazos farmers. If this happens it would be strictly according to the rules of competition that have always prevailed in a free-enterprise system.

The entire attack presented by Mr. Lynch, upon cooperatively owned generation or transmission facilities directly and upon the entire rural electrification program through innuendo, adds one more chapter to the growing record of powerful interests who would willingly retard the Nation's welfare in order to advance their own private gain.

The electric cooperatives, financed by REA, are showing their worth everywhere you go across the country. They are doing a job that the private power companies at first said could not be done, and now that the co-ops have shown it can be done the private power companies are waging a concerted drive to regain that monopoly over rural power that they once had.

The guiding principle of the Rural Electrification Administration in its entire loan program, whether for cooperatively owned distribution systems or for the limited number of cooperatively owned generation and transmission facilities, is that farmers are entitled to have electric power at the lowest possible rates consistent with good business management of their electric systems. The private power companies in their dealings with farmers, as the record shows, have been motivated by a totally different principle: "Charge all the traffic will bear." And this, as the record shows further, has been the guiding principle of T. P. & L. in the past and, it may be deduced from Mr. Lynch's testimony, remains its guiding principle today.

Probe Bares Plight of Vets Under GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of June 27, 1947, and justification from the report to accompany H. R. 246:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

PROBE BARES PLIGHT OF VETS UNDER GI BILL

NEW YORK.—Cases of hand-to-mouth existence on the part of veterans attending college under the GI bill of rights and a consequent rapid draining of their savings are reported by the social research laboratory of the City College of New York, department of sociology.

Incidents of financial hardship, inadequate housing, and resulting discouragement of student-veterans are cited by the research laboratory following a 6-month survey of living conditions of 267 married and single veterans and 25 nonveterans.

The sampling of veterans was taken from among those living at home, in Army Hall (a housing project located at One Hundred Thirty-eighth Street and Amsterdam Avenue for single veterans attending metropolitan colleges), and at the Camp Shanks housing projects for married veterans.

The survey was carried out in cooperation with the college's Veterans' Association.

EXPENSES CITED

The report showed that the average married veteran attending college is forced to spend $181.92 monthly and the average single ex-GI $84.95, in order to live with a minimum of comfort.

It pointed out that there is a considerable gap between these expenditures and subsistence allowances under the GI bill, which permits married veterans a monthly maximum of $90 and single veterans $65.

Acording to the report, the most important and consistent sources for meeting the deficit between expenditures and income are personal savings and cashing in of Government bonds. The average monthly withdrawal by married veterans was given as $35 and for single veterans, $30.25.

In the case of married veterans, some of the deficit is made up through income from wives' full- and part-time jobs.

SAVINGS NEARLY GONE

"It is apparent," the report continued, "that the average veteran's savings cannot last much longer. Also, the chief purpose for buying bonds is in itself being defeated by the very fact that the veterans who can benefit most from savings bonds are being forced of necessity not only to stop purchasing them, but to cash them in before their maturity value has been reached."

The report asserted that the student-veteran's financial hardship can be laid to the fact that the GI bill, which was passed before the end of the war, did not anticipate the inflationary rise in living costs.

Housing inadequacy was another problem revealed by the survey. Of 69 married veterans queried as to adequacy of quarters, 35 percent stated that their housing facilities were inadequate for study; 42.05 percent said that their homes were inadequate for entertainment; 15 percent maintained that facilities were inadequate for comfort; and 16 percent complained they did not have privacy.

The report concluded that, while veterans, both married and single, are not looking to the Government for total support, student-veterans feel that a minimum of $119.18 for married, and $92.60 for single veterans, is necessary to make ends meet even though the veterans themselves have no intention of asking their wives to stop working or of giving up their own part-time jobs should subsistence increases be granted.

[From H. Rept. No. 77 accompanying H. R. 246]

JUSTIFICATION

The committee had before it for study numerous bills on the subject under consideration. Extensive hearings were held at which representatives of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans of World War II, the Regular Veterans Association, Members of Congress, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs expressed their views on the subject.

The principle of a ceiling governing the payment of subsistence alowance was enacted into law by Public Law 679, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 8, 1946. Immediately after its enactment numerous complaints were received from on-the-job trainees, veterans' organizations, labor unions, and others to the effect that the ceiling had been set at a figure which tended to make the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act less appealing to the veterans for whom it was designed. The existing ceilings are considered so restrictive as to cause a great number of veterans to refrain from entering upon a course of education or on-the-job training, or to discontinue such courses as they had already undertaken.

Your committee believes that this objectionable situation can justifiably be relieved by this bill. A ceiling is deemed an effective administrative device for establishing the boundaries for the payment of subsistence allowances in the on-the-job training program. At some point Government subsistence is no longer warranted but, in the judgment of the committee, this point is not exceeded by the figures set out in H. R. 246, as amended.

In the proposal in section 2 of the bill, which would amend paragraph 11 (b) 2e of paragraph VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to require not more than 4 years of full-time training in lieu of the present 2-year limitation, your committee takes into consideration those bona fide job-training courses which, while not apprenticeable, nevertheless cannot be concluded in the space of the 2 years provided in the original standards. Certain of these courses had been embarked upon by veterans prior to introduction of the criteria contained in paragraph 11 (b) of Public Law 679, and it is felt

that the trainees should not be prejudiced by their curtailment. Moreover, the retention of the other standards will tend to stabilize the program and prevent the undue extension of courses beyond their legitimate objective point.

Blueprint for Total Labor Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Fiorello H. LaGuardia, from PM for June 29, 1947:

BLUEPRINT FOR TOTAL LABOR UNITY

(By Fiorello H. LaGuardia)

The passage of the Republican-Democratic labor law is not a political accident. It is not a legislative freak. It is symptomatic. The law typifies the present trend in our country. It is only a manifestation of a determined plan to revert to a small ownership class and obtain complete control of the very lives of the working class.

This plan is engineered by capable men and covers not only our own country, but has been injected into our foreign policy. The humane principles, the more equitable distribution and the economic leveling off of the New Deal was most contagious. An antidote has been provided in the form of economic pressure. The American people have been caught unaware. They have lost control of their Government. We are back to the old days of trusts, big money, and predatory wealth—a sordid period in our history halted by Theodore Roosevelt. The New Deal initiated by Frankling D. Roosevelt is for the moment dead. Nothing short of a sudden awakening of the American people and smashing the present political partnership between the leadership of the two parties can prevent a period of frenzied finance, legalized exploitation and return to power of concentrated wealth.

No one in the know, or in any position of responsibility, can honestly claim surprise at the final outcome of the bipartisan labor bill. It was all according to schedule. Shrewd political manipulators are shaping policies and guiding legislation.

Progressive forces, liberal groups, independents, and organized labor are routed. They have been busy fighting each other. This situation, too, is not accidental. The Democratic machine, no matter what happens, has absolute control of one group of progressives. This in and of itself will neutralize any action another group may take. Labor has been so cleverly maneuvered that—unless it comes to its senses—the labor vote will be split. Twelve inspiring years devoted to human rights and a better life for the people—12 long, lean years for the special interests—have made the reactionaries cagey, cautious, conniving, and cunning. There will be no boners pulled. Here is the last chance to regain all lost special privileges for the few and return to the laissez-faire system.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES HAVE NO CHOICE BUT TO KEEP IN LINE

There will be no rough stuff. There will be no sudden shock. Foreign countries will be kept in line—they have no choice. The present undisturbed and unhampered march of selective wealth and well-distributed poverty has had a good start and has sufficient momentum to keep going for some time.

There will be great solicitude for the individual. For some time yet there will be full freedom of speech. Anyone who has enough money to buy a press and start a newspaper will be free to do so. Of course, no labor organization is permitted to publish any political news out of its own money. There will be free and open elections as usual; yes, a two-party system with one control, two parties with a single thought. There will not be the slightest interference or even remote attempt to interfere with religious freedom. There will be plenty of organized sports for the recreation of the workers and plenty of good, wholesome, clean literature for their edification, and to keep the mind off such subversive and crazy ideas as a better and fuller and happier life. There will be no ruthlessness or shoving around; just a gradual and systematic reduction in the pay envelope. A plutocracy within a democracy. Individual liberty with economic limitations. Personal freedom but financially fenced. All this is in the making and will happen before we know it unless there is a quick awakening.

GENERAL GOOD MUST BE CONSIDERED OVER PERSONAL AMBITIONS

The situation is too serious to become angry. Calm, cool, deliberate planning is necessary. Personal ambitions must give way to the general good. Generosity and sportsmanship are necessary to bring about a united front. This present push backward might yet be stopped in 1948. It will be extremely difficult but not impossible if all progressive forces work together. Otherwise it will continue till 1952.

All this talk about resisting the provisions of the labor law does not make sense. It is playing right into the hands of the unified command of the forces of reaction. Strikes will not be suppressed by the use of force. They will be permitted to run along peacefully until the workers' credit at the bakers and grocers is exhausted. In the meantime, savings and Government securities will dwindle and interest rates will go up. Fits right into the picture.

Union lawyers must exercise great restraint. The mistake of the portal-to-portal pay claims should not be repeated. I would suggest a legal advisory board, composed of the best available legal talent.

Organized labor must remember that the stakes are enormous. Not only the existence of labor unions but the very well-being of every workingman's family is involved. There will be many provocations to get labor to start legal proceedings when and where it will best suit the "old dealers." Labor simply must get together. The strategy must be thoroughly studied and a definite plan adopted by all.

LABOR MUST PREPARE ITS DEFENSE OR LOSE EVERYTHING

There is much to be done. A great deal of organization from scratch must be started. Labor in the meantime must prepare to defend itself—or lose all.

Machinery for the avoidance or immediate settlement of jurisdictional strikes must be adopted at once by every labor organization. Labor must not be trapped into a test case of this provision of the law. It will surely be held valid. Organized labor must invite a test case on the prohibition against labor union political activity. This test should not wait until 1948. Such an established and recognized publication as Labor of the Railroad Brotherhoods should test the law in this respect. It should issue one of its special editions in behalf of a candidate and give notice that it is doing so from funds provided by the labor organizations. It is safe to predict that this part of the law will be declared invalid, null, and void.

It is well to realize now that the Labor Law is the natural result of a present trend toward reaction. Nothing short of a shift in public thinking and public opinion will change the law or prevent more regressive legislation. Agriculture is next. The farmers will soon see that the very forces that have been agitating against labor will turn against them. Labor should stand by the farmer, even though many of the farmers have been misinformed and misled in their attitude toward labor. It will all come out in time.

I shall continue pleading for unity. There are many public-spirited men and women who are making every effort to reconcile the various progressive and independent groups. This must be brought about.

THE WORKERS WILL SUFFER UNLESS ORGANIZED LABOR GETS TOGETHER

In the meantime, organized labor must get together. Unless it does, the workingmen and women of this country will suffer. A united labor front, with a consolidation of progressives, liberals, and independents, can break the present Republican-Democratic combination.

To start, what we need is one great national labor organization. I have in mind one parent organization, say, the American Congress of Labor, divided into four national departments under its jurisdiction:

A merger of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, taking in all trades and skills except those classified as belonging to other departments:

Transportation, which would include railroad, water, air, and land.

Mining, which would include coal, all minerals, and oil.

Professional and entertainment.

Each of these departments of the national parent body would have its own head and its own executive board. The executive boards of all four would constitute the American Congress of Labor. The heads or presidents of the four departments would consitute the executive committee of such congress.

All charters of locals would be issued by the national departments. The departments would have control over all locals and disciplinary power of their own. Nation-wide strikes would require the approval of the parent body, the American Congress of Labor. Industrial strikes involving more than one employer, not affecting the national economy, would require the approval of the department.

HOW TO ELIMINATE JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES

Such an organization would eliminate entirely jurisdictional disputes, would be tremendously influential in removing local individual abuses. I want to make it clear that I am not suggesting that such an organization could be forced by legislation. It would require voluntary decision and willingness to cooperate. It would not be a governmental agency, but would remain entirely independent and under the control of labor itself.

We are fortunate in that leadership on the very top level of labor in our country is intelligent and honest. They have their troubles mostly, I believe, because of the weakness of the structure of the national organizations. It seems to me that labor has outlived its present system of national organizations, now archaic and not in keeping with the advancement made by large and powerful industrial and commercial organizations.

The proposal has many difficulties, yet they are not insurmountable. Vision, understanding, fairness and courage on the part of all would soon bring about a plan which would ensure industrial peace, increased production and more permanent employment for the next 50 years. It may be different after that.

Security As a Matter of Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 27, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the aged people of this country are entitled to security as a matter of right. I am including the following petition of the aged from my district setting forth their views:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I believe in a national mutual insurance program on a pay as you go basis that will provide security for the aged, physically disabled, and widows with children. This security is proposed in the Townsend plan and I respectfully request your support of this bill.

H. H. Smith, C. N. Hakes, Fred Anderson, Mrs Ruth Anderson, New London; Mr. and Mrs. Owen M. Porter, Wakeman; Boyd Livingston, Jennie Livingston, S. J. Wilson, Leon Reed, Charles Kinion, I. G. Rambaugh, Elizabeth Ellis, Roy Gray, Belle Chambers, W. L. Chambers, Carl Ellis, Greenwich; Miss Irene B. Stoll, A. C. Brod, Thelma C. Fortcher, Andrew Fortcher, Mrs. Viola C. Brod, Collins; Cora Edna Kellogg, H. Fulstow, James B. Lee. Lois Meyes, Edward Meyes, Norwalk; Martha Bostdorf, Mrs. Clara Grove, Erwin Epple, Lulu Rossbach, George J. Rossbach, Miss Ethel Dunlap, Mrs. Nellie E. Hoffmann, Mrs. Jean Cassen, Mrs. Elmer Stickles, Freida Haas, Mrs. Clifton Howard, Mrs. George Limmer, George Limmer, Perrysburg.

Mrs. Susan Shue, Mrs. Mary Steinline, Joe Steinline, Harry Thomas, Mrs. Harry Thomas, Hulda E. Schneider, Charles J. Schneider, John Schneider, Emma Rossbach, Fred L. Millen, Eva Metcalf, A. B. Metcalf, Minnie Miller, Laura Metcalf, Leslie Charles, Mrs. Leslie Charles, Mrs. Anna C. Henry, J. L. C. Henry, Mrs. Christina Eklundh, John G. Eklundh, Lester Limmer, Elmer Stickles, Mrs. Harley Wells, Mrs. Ida Wambold, Harley Wells, Amelia Schneider, Mrs. John Buckenburger, Mr. Georg Lovejoy, Milton C. Lovejoy, H. A. Muir, Harley M. Wells, Evan J. Gabb, Mrs. Vivi Holmes, Ada Sarah Gabb, Mrs. Jewel Muir, Mr. A. Bazaih, Lulu Kazmaier Mrs. Esther Wambold, Nellie Finck, Charlie L. Hartsing, Perrysburg.

Edna M. Hastsing, John Beckley, Mrs. Nellie Mason, James Mallon, Ethel C. Simmons, Mrs. Wm. Phillips, Perrysburg; George W. Michael, Mrs. G. W. Michael, Eleanor Lash, Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Sump, Mrs. Mabel Echelbarger, John F. Biddle, Clarence W. Sump, John J. Rothenberger, Henry C. Green, Almyra M. Smith, Mrs. Eva Howard, Marie Smith, Emory F. Howard, Frank Horvath, Mrs. Foska F. Foor, Mrs. C. P. Brandeberry, John Cook, Portage; Dorothy M. Schenfler, Paul J. Scheufler, Vickery; William Leflev, Burgoon; Fred Stahl, Mrs. Fred Stahl, Wm. Nesbitt, Emma Nesbitt, Mrs. Effie Booze, H. C. Grunenwald, Mrs. H. C. Grunenwald, Mrs. Robert Yantz, Mrs. Flora E. Porter, Mable Buehler, Carl F. Buehler, Mrs. Harry Galbraith, Mrs. S. A. Warren, Mrs. Llye Heslet, Paul E. Clark, Mrs. Pearl Rowe, Freemont.

Lyle B. Heslet, Mrs. Ruth E. Clark, Laura E. Kraemer, Gayle L. Ball, Mark F. Ball, Mrs. Clara Lejeune, Mrs. Cora B. Smith, Mrs. Geo. Kuhn, Mabel Kuhn, George L. Kuhn, Chas. Cook, Mrs. Paula Althesen, Mrs. Clara Stout, G. G. Hollinger, Hattie Forgerson, Willard Forgerson, Mrs. N. T. Eck, Mrs. Flora Binkley, Mrs. May Terry, Henry Elim Siegenthaler, Mrs. Estella Carnicom, Mrs. Thelma Carnicom, Mrs. Stella Winters, Fremont; B. Ringlein, Gibsonburg; Fred Seiger, Roman J. Ruffing, Margery Ruffin, Bellevue; Albert Stout, Marcus Burpee, Jack Bown, Alfred A. Geiger, Gover Whit, C. G. Gemberling, George Brownell, Levi Streeter, T. T. Hensinger, Elmer Bowers, V. F. Wahl, H. Annie Jones, Minnie Smears, Clyde.

Cora Evy, Irving W. Jones, Mrs. J. C. Maatz, Mrs. J. H. Laremore, J. H. Laremore, Mrs. Carrie Birtch, L. T. Signs, W. A. Fowler, Edith B. Fowler, James S. Laremore, Ray Murphy, Mrs. Ray Murphy, Alva A. Walden, Rilla A. Walden, Otto Evert, Monty Evy, Donna Signs, Clarence Wood, Ellen Wood, Anna E. Smith, Mrs. Anna Evert, F. C. Pergrin, G. L. Strouse, Eugene Porter, Ira Streeter, Frank R. Roberts, E. L. Spencer, Lynne Gemberling, Samuel E. Musser, Mrs. Madge Strong, Mrs. L. H. Meek, Marcus Burpee, David H. Alspaugh, Mrs. Edith Alspaugh, Sophia White, Mrs. James McClellan, William L. Tressler, Melba L. Avers, J. N. Vandergrift, Geo. W. Parker, Clyde.

John H. Bubb, Mrs. Ray Heft, Mr. Ray Heft, Mrs. Treasa Vandergriff, Miss Rose Hirschberger, Mrs. Mae Strouse, Mrs. Carrie Pergrin, Mrs. William L. Tressler, Mrs. Hazel Strouse, Mr. W. H. Strouse, Rev. Charles W. Strong, H. G. Mesnard, Mrs. Leona Mesnard, Alice Albaugh, Jennie Ellsworth, Ralph Keller, Mrs. Bessie Van Volkenberg, Georgia Moore, Mrs. Ralph Mears, Mr. Ralph Mears, Bernice Gelow, Mr. Jacob Benrilheft, Mrs. J. C. Russell, Clyde Russell, Burt Aldrich, Mr Rolland Kastor, Henry Long, Charlie M. Smith, Norna Rhapstock, Frank Rhapstock, Mrs. Rolland Kastor, Mr. E. W. Wood, Mrs. E. W. Wood, Dora Tanner, Nella Smith, Mrs. Rose Thuston, Voyce Bennehoff, Mrs. Jacob Bennehoff, Frank Sartor, Edward B. Van Volkenberg, Clyde.

F. F. Gilmore, Edwin C. Reams, Samuel E. Musser, Mrs. Stella Bubb, Mary Streeter, Paul H. Avers, L. H. Meek, Claude Diment, Bert A. Stokes, Mrs. Myrtle M. Baker, Maude Biddle, Mrs. Goldie Sartor, H. J. Conger, Esther Parker, William Nusby, Allan C. McCleary, John Durnwall, Mrs. Irma Haynes, Mrs. Carrie Blair, George Ayers, Mrs. George Ayers, Mrs. J. D. Stanley, J. D. Stanley, Mr. Rolla Kistler, Frank E. Baker, Mrs. Rolla Kistler, Ella Heslet, B. E. Heslet, Mrs. O. M. Ball, O. M. Ball, Clyde; M. F. Baker, Bessie Baker, Mrs. Floyd Baker, Bettsville; Mrs. Mary Strausbaugh, Mr. Everett Armstrong, Mrs. Everett Armstrong, Mr. Selden Strausbaugh, Mr. C. U. Strausbaugh, Mrs. Alma Reed Strausbaugh, Elsie R. Selvey, Green Springs.

D. C. Bardsall, Mr. and Mrs. A. W. Van Volkenberg, Manley B. Selvey, J. Clarence Myers, Mrs. J. Clarence Myers, Green Springs; Celestia Hansen, Bloonville; Virginia Schade, Minerva Detillian, W. S. Detillian, Emma Harpster, Mrs. Rhoda M. Maloney, Ethel Stagger, Charles R. Henry, Mrs. Joan J. Henry, Clyde Kimble, Helen M. Kimble, H. W. Faber, Donald E. Countryman, Dora E. Weaver, Earl F. Weaver, Mrs. Dayton Walter, Lennie Bonnell, E. L. Bonnell, Dayton Walter, K. D. Thrailkill, Mrs. Nettie Platner, Mrs. Esther Thrailkill, Elma R. Cornelius, Miss Jessie Strausbaugh, Mrs. Geraldine Davison, James Kever, Mrs. Lena Wilt, Mrs. James Kever, Miss Grace Wilt, Mrs. Florence Raymont, Mrs Mary J. Hartz, Albert Raymont, Helen Williams, F. D. Horn, Fostoria.

Mrs. Anna Graves, Harley Rinehart, Mrs. Harley Rinehart, Amos Groves, Frank Weaver, Fostoria; Charles Wm. Mason, Mrs. Blanche Watson, A. A. Watson, Clarence W. Price, Ella L. Price, M. E. Wyatt, H. J. Auble, V. F. Breighner, Clinton Apple, Frank C Hippler, W. H. Grabach, Ed Strobel, O. E. Kretsinger, Mrs. Mattie M. Wyatt, Rollia Myers, Henry Myers, Mrs. Clinton Apple, Republic; Mrs. Roy Gregory, Roy Gregory, Sycamore; Earl Mitchell, Ida Mitchell, Mrs. Carma Keiser, Kansas; Mrs. Anna C. Walter, Bascom; Nora Young, Mrs. Anna Shelt, Anna Bender, Dottie Drum, John H. Young, Mrs. Amelia Welter, Eva Parkin, Mrs. Ella Kuebbe, Emma Lange, Mrs. Nora Herbert, Mrs. Lewis Traunero, Hermina Zell, Tiffin.

Mrs. Evaline Wolf, Elnana Schirer, Mrs. Arthur Distel, Mrs. George Smith, Mrs. Stella Russell, Martha Robison, Mrs. Myrtle E. Schedinger, Hugh W. Miller, Mary Miller, Anna Rose Miller, Mattie Williams, Mrs. Maude Beck, Margery Heffner, Olivia Funk, Mrs. May Funk, Mrs. Phebe Colvin, Mr. and Mrs. J. G. Egbert, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Kleinkauf, Harry L. Allbaugh, George Allbaugh, William Galaher, Fleming Reedy, James Terry, Mrs. James Terry, W. J. Brincy, Martha Robison, Leonard Robison, Minnie Bloome, Jennie Reister, E. H. Shumaker, C. A. Smith, James Shumaker, Roman J. Perrung, George Kressling, Mrs. Neal McLlory, Mrs. Anna Balbrech, Lustin Smith, Mrs. John Wagner, Fred Smith, Jesse LeClar, Tiffin.

Lotta Strausbaugh, Dorada Herrick, Martena Riemer, Mrs. Maud B. Miller, Floyd Reister, John J. Argenz, Mrs. Harold Shetterly, Mrs. William Smith, Augusta Reister, Mrs. E. Weisbaker, Miss Anna Mae Rose, Mrs. Harvey Rose, Byron Miller, H. R. Park, Arthur Pyne, Ada Peterman, Mrs. E. C. Argenz, Harvey R. Rose, Myrtle Park, Elizabeth C. Welly, Claude C. Rex, Roman J. Perrung, Mrs. Lulu McAroy, Miss Clare Brick, Mrs. Mary Croft, William Earth, Caroline Hoffman, Minnie Gross, Mrs. A. D. Haines, Mrs. A. Stiverson, Mrs. Henry McFerren, Bertha Schwartz, Mrs. Ellen Kirchner, Mrs. Earl Morris, Mrs. Maude Long, Mrs. Grace H. Baxter, G. C. Reiter, Bertha I. Reiter, Glen Strausbaugh, Ann Tritchler, Tiffin.

Margery E. Bonnell, George R. Bonnell, Callie Mosier, William A. Miller, Hattie L. Baker, Mrs. Glen Strasbaugh, J. F. Mare, Mrs. Anna Herrig, Laura Wright, Catherine Mongold, Urban Kistler, Minnie Briedinger, Curtis Drew, Gladys McFarland, Walter McFarland, Mrs. Fannie Shuay, James O'Donnell, George Klingshirn, Bomoald De Rose, J. C. Whitaker, James F. McConnahay, Mrs. Stella McConnahay, Cecil C. Warnement, Mrs. O. M. Nusbaum, Florence Ruffing, Dorada Herrick, Emma Diller, Mrs. Nellie Ingman, Nina M. Melroy, Henry Ruffing, Blanche B. Remsberg, Bertha Mather, Anna De Busman, Bertha B. Schwartz, Ervin D. Keiser, Mrs. Anna Wentz, Delia Yarham, Mrs. Clara Dorman, Mrs. Elenora Sulheimer, Mrs. Frances Kennedy, Tiffin.

Rose Karp, Mrs. Jas. McConnahay, James F. McConnahay, May Brinnon, Mrs. Ellen Kerchner, John Eader, Charles Wolfe, Mrs. James Deibert, Mrs. W. E. Wilson, Joanne E. Moberly, Mrs. R. J. Dryfuse, Edith C. Dryfuse, Francis Kerchner, Mrs. Glenna Mooney, Mrs. Carl Galster, Mrs. Charles Ricker, Mrs. Nettie Deibert, A. J. Sours, Mrs. Carrie Maule, Wm. Leffler, C. H. Brugh, Alice Lelterhis, Mrs. C. C. Sands, Mrs. Clyde Defibaugh, Mrs. Harry Diemer, Marguerite Quickle, Jesse Remsberg, Mrs. Hallie C. Coffman, Mrs. Opal Turner, Claude Shaull, Anna Daywalt, Idella Wagner, G. A. Cox, Lucy Moris, Cecilia Dill, Mrs. Guy Jump, Doris E. Moberly, Geneva Dill, Mrs. Wm. Taylor, Helen Shaull, Tiffin.

Clara E. Eader, Miss Mary Nusbaum, Mrs. J. J. Argenz, Mrs. Myrtle Bowman, Mr. John J. Argenz, Elizabeth C. Willy, Tiffin; Mrs. Minnie Heim, Venice; Elizabeth Connors, Huron; Mrs. B. Brownell, Agnes Bickley, Mrs. C. Coombs, Old Soldiers' and Sailors' Home; Mrs. Helen Powell, Granville Powell, Mrs. E. A. Darst, Mrs. William Py, Ruth Yontz, Mrs. Bessie Tanner, William Holzaepfel, James O'Day, George Palmer, Mrs. Rose Palmer, Thomas Heledund, Mrs. Lillian Rhynas, Mrs. Anna Hedelund, George Reynolds, Mrs. A. Cunningham, Edward J. Voss, Mrs. Mildred Rogers, Earl Rogers, Louise Carson, Mrs. Charles Jay Cox, Charles C. Reeme, Rhea Printice, Mrs. James Hill, David Snowden, Millicent G. Kolb, Adam G. Kolb, Mrs. Ralph Saxer, Catherine Schmidt, Mrs. Frances J. Schmidt, Sandusky.

Fred Griner, Mrs. Laura Maurer,, Mrs. Fred Griner, Mrs. Otto J. Michel, J. P. Sharpe, Mrs. Lenore Schanpelberger, Arthur E. Ham, Hugo Schanpelberger, Martha Disbrow, Clyde Coffman, Mrs. Martha Horn, Miss Verna Horn, William H. Barber, Harry J. Horn, Mary Munaldini, John Mans, Fred Schafer, Emma Pretschman, Elisa Lehrer, Mrs. Mary Barber, H. George Brengadny, A. H. Metz, Mrs. Marguerite Maurer, Betty Lou Colman, Edward F. Brengartner, Mrs. Mabel Coffman, Eugene Goodsite, Mrs. Caroline Goodsite, Miss Ruth A. Michel, Mr. Otto J. Michel, Miss Marguerite M. Michel, Eva C. Barnett, Mrs. Clara Blainey, Miss Marion Blainey, Mrs. T. H. Curtis, Louise Brengartner, F. Wesley Ortman, William P. Lemke, Mrs. Viola Willinger, Mrs. A. H. Metz, Sandusky.

L. C. Maurer, Mrs. Earl Behlmer, Harry S. Parker, T. H. Curtis, Mrs. Perry Mischler, Lena Horn, Elizabeth A. Lorenzen, Mrs. F. Wesley Ortman, Mrs. Helen Engelhorn, Mrs. Leo P. Weber, Virgil F. Bigelow, Mrs. Elda Bigelow, Mary Wild, Mrs. E. N. Oliver, E. N. Oliver, Mrs. Fred Griner, F. J. Bechett, Mrs. Ruth Peet, Roy W. Peet, C. W. Prentice, Fred Kirner, Mrs. Evelyn Gochenour, Earl J. Behlmer, Mrs. Emma Westcott, Rosalind E. Jones, Mrs. Nedda Paul, O. G. Amburn, Mrs. P. J. Christiansen, Mrs. O. G. Amburn, August A. Gavey, Mrs. Rollin Schwanger, Anna M. Marshall, Ray Marshall, Mrs. Jessie Ward, Mrs. Hazel Cheslock, Mary Stein, Otto Carl Wolf, Fred J. Beyer, Ruth Emch, Mrs. Jacob Rader; Sandusky.

Mrs. Beatrice A. Beyer, Mrs. Frank Aust, B. G. Ryan, G. Reidy, Gene Stark, Edw. A. Bungartner, A. F. Saxon, Mrs. Florence German, W. C. Bashold, Mrs. William Bashold, William Sorenzen, Harold Schaeffer, Emma L. Gardner, Marjorie Stein, George Bromm, Michael J. Cheslock, Rollin Schwanger, Hills Supply, Mrs. Olive Holzmiller, John Young, Tinie Miller, Mrs. G. Bromm, Bettie Miller, M. Ehrhardt, Clara McGeachie, August Corso, George Bahnsen, Mrs. Leo Kaufman, Mrs. Anna Zuber, Leo Kaufman, Leon W. Kaufman, P. McGeachie, Mrs. Dorothy Pfann, Mrs. Emma Bromm, Mrs. John Weltlin, Miss Marilyn Butts, Carl M. Rittman, Jack Fischer, Herbert J. Fischer, Mrs. Lee Mears, Sandusky.

Margaret Gessner, Margaret Hoffman, John Gessner, Mrs. Mary L. Byington, Mrs. Louise Scheufler, Mrs. C. Bossetti, Carl Simpson, William E. Miller, Donald Simpson, Robert Simpson, Beverly Miller, Gertrude Simpson, Lena Magi, Joseph Nolder, Alfred L. Schemenauer, Mrs. George Schemenauer, W. R. Schemenauer, Erma Schemenauer, Lina Magi, Emrico Magi, G. C. Biehl, Mrs. Florence Biehl, Elmer Biehl, Mrs. Eleanor Mack, Bessie Hill, Willie Taylor Mrs. Herbert Guse, Charles G. Buckholz, Mrs. Frank Schultz, F. G. Liupold, Anna Scheid, George Puckrin, Norma Barnett, Mrs. Henry Bechtel, Henry Bechtel, Frank J. Brengartner, Arthur Brengartner, Ada M. Brengartner, Fred Griner, Edward Rudolph, Sandusky.

Mrs. Laura Kirner, Isabelle R. Saxer, Ralph Shea, Warren L. Oliver, Mrs. Marion Oliver, Alice Mae Coleman, James Hill, Carl Mainger, Frances Peters, Tony Canino, Joe Carson, Miss Annamae Casanova, Ethie Mickel, Emma Pietschman, Carry Johns, Emealia Tritchler, Mrs. M. F. Gerfen, Mrs. F. J. Beckett, J. W. Livingston, Mrs. J. W. Livingston, Herman Hartleib, Christiene Schade, Katherine Hartleib, W. H. Essig, Mrs. Martin Lupold, Orilla Freeman, Ray Barnett, Mrs. Florana Barnett, Mrs. Helen Montgomery, Mrs. Emily K. Coles, Miss Clara M. Rotsinger, Amelia A. Wagner, John G. Wagner, Jr., Mrs. A. Murphy, Frank Lafase, Verna Essig, Mrs. P. Austin, Henrietta Brownearth, Louise Van Fleet, Carl G. Barnett, Sandusky.

John W. Stahl, Mrs. Iva Barnett, Ed W. Pasch, Mrs. Katherine Guenther, Lillie Reeme, Edna M. Heffner, John G. Wagner, Frank Beverich, Alfred Brandt, Mrs. Alfred Brandt, Mrs. Dorothy Pfanner, Mrs. Margaret Webelhurst, Mrs. Rosalind Jones, Mrs. Ada Beverich, Mrs. George Puckrin, Mrs. Elmer Beverich, Mrs. Schneider, Mrs. Vena Schell, Mrs. Emeline E. Reece, Mrs. Edna Subrusky, Ann M. Smith, Harry John Smith, Mrs. Lottie L. Nemitz, Mrs. Amelia Kistner, Mrs. Abbie White, Mrs. Laura Slocum, Frank S. White, Frank L. White, Mrs. Edna Ranft, Frank J. Ranft, Mrs. Ida Yontz, Mrs. Laura Griffiths, John Fuchs, Flora Fuchs, Philip Gerber, Mrs. Atwood, Mrs. Carl A. Schmid, Mrs. Leona Wright, Mrs. Cora Wilk, Mrs. D. Ortner, Sandusky.

William J. Henrick, Gerald L. Wright, Mrs. Helen Henrick, Mrs. Rose Wagner, Mrs. John Lindsley, Mrs. Anna Hug, Edward Hug, Helina Henner, Frank L. Henner, Earl Kistner, Fred David, Mrs. Barbara Milkey, Mrs. Al Schaufelberger, Mrs. Mary Beckley, Gertrude David, B. L. Greek, Mrs. Pecelia McFarland, Otis Lewis Eschenauer, Clara Berridge, Mrs. Elizabeth Eschenauer, Mrs. John Saitor, Mrs. Martin Thomson, Mayme Elsner, Mrs. Celia Leasa, Jim Leasa, Mrs. Omar Meyer, Jr., Margaret M. Hess, Paul C. Dennewtz, Henry A. Knoll, Mrs. John Maus, H. G. Gillett, Miss Norene Wightman, Alex Moore, Mrs. Anna Moore, Mrs. A. Laface, J. C. Hare, L. J. Hudson, Ellsworth C. Wobret, Rose B. Buckholz, Franfa DeGrande, Sandusky.

Dulcie DeGrande, Mrs. Fred Hess, Jr., Lee Brady, Jr., J. Neuman, G. E. Galloway, Andrew Melchor, Mrs. Ursula Antel, Mrs. Mary Stooky, Mrs. Ed Salmon, Louise Moosbrugger, Mrs. John Curtis, Roerlee Cramer, Mrs. W. L. Shadle, Mrs. Chas. Rudolph, Charles P. Rudolph, Mrs. W. Dahm, Mary B. Kinney, Mrs. Monica Fievet, Roland F. Thiem, Merritt C. Scheuflu, Mrs. Lee Coutcher, Mrs. Frank Kerbach, Mrs. John Souter, Mrs. Wade Byington, Lillie E. Perry, Gertrude Grundelsberger, Mrs. G. Subel, Mrs. D. Bickley, Mrs. John Opfer A. Scheltine, Mrs. John Kessler, Mrs. Laura A. Stein, Norman H. Jessen, Mrs. Norman H. Jessen, Willis F. Schlett, Mrs. Carl Werner, Estella C. Thiem, Rene Fievet, Tom Tolutt, Sallie Fischer, Sandusky.

Edward Gochenour, Peter Schlett, Mary Schlett, Dorethy Schlett, Manella Butts, Eloise Butts, Mrs. C. Hothmann, Mrs. Mary Werner, Mrs. Edith Rickenbaugh, Edith A. Hudson, Mrs. W. H. Jones, Beatrice Poggioli, Mrs. C. Wobser, Walter C. Mack, Mrs. George Barrington, Mrs. Eugenia Morey, Harry Skillman, Mrs. Paul E. Leber, James Thayer, Mrs. Mary Gysun, Mrs. Leo J. Lauber, May Ohlen, Fred Butts, Edyth M. Thayer, Elinor Whitacre, Urbano Zurma, Mrs. Urbano Zurma, Mrs. Clara Scheid, Mrs. J. Risk, Mrs. A. Schettine, Mrs. Sarah Jones, Marie Ritzenthaler, Charles Swank, Carrie Swank, John R. Russell, Mrs. John Russell, Jeannette Luipold, Hedwig W. Clark, John Souter, Marguerite A. Zeck, Sandusky.

Jack Widmaier, Carolyn McGeachie, Caroline Stroud, Mrs. Edward Albert, Mrs. Henry Eckhorstt, Mrs. William Guss, Mrs. M. Schwartz, Mrs. B. B. Tanner, Mr. J. M. Linpold, Richard Werner, Donald Schlett, Mrs. Lydia Ebeling, Mrs. Bernice Jones, Mrs. Fred Orr, Mrs. Lawrence Steensen, Valeria Kibler, Freda Potter, Helen M. Yontz, Mrs. Alice Jackson, Mrs. Anna Schemenauer, William J. Kane, Henry Lawrence, J. D. Porter, Helen Martin, Antonette Curth, Mrs. Mary D. Kane, Emogene Hardin, Gladys P. Aust, Joe Taylor, Norma H. Marquart, Sandusky.

Louise Mears, Sophia Peck, Mrs. Joseph Nolder, Elizabeth Brown, Ellen Schaefer, Mrs. Mabel Hoover, Mrs. Susan Miller, Mrs. James Sanders, Mrs. Mildred Fortuna, Marian Till, Mrs. George Bailey, Mrs. Anna Unko, Mrs. Donald Leech, Mrs. Sam Lorenz, Mrs. Carl Spregel, Mrs. Emma Bauer, Mrs. Peggy Mineo, William Ohlemacher, Miss Jeannette Wederman, Mrs. Mathilda Zink, Leonard Bickley, Mrs. Laura Beckley, Mrs. Esther Smith, Mrs. Alta Wightman, Mrs. Nora Ohlemacher, Mrs. Louisa Otto, Mrs. William Kaltenbach, Mrs. Sophia Schweinfurth, Mrs. Fred Hirs, Sr., Mrs. Albert Wilt, Mrs. Norma Hudson, Sandusky.

Advocating Adoption of Title 28, United States Code, as Revised, and the Committee Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the pending measure, H. R. 3214, is by its title declared to be, "A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code, entitled 'Judicial Code and Judiciary.' "

I. HISTORY OF THIS PIECE OF LEGISLATION

Of course, it was introduced by the chairman of the subcommittee on Revision of the Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is the product of 4 years of work under H. R. 3190 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, which became the act of June 28, 1943—Chapter 173, 57 Statutes, page 220—in and by which there was appropriated $100,000 for the complete revision and codification and enactment into law of title 18, the Criminal Code, and title 28, the Judicial Code. Of course, this bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The preliminary study was authorized and begun by the then Committee on the Revision of the Laws, with which the Committee on the Judiciary and the experts of the West Publishing Co. and the Edward Thompson Co. collaborated. Upon the enactment and approval of the Reorganization Act of 1946 the Committee on Revision of the Laws became a part of the Committee on the Judiciary, the work theretofore done in collaboration by the two committees was taken over, and is now done by the Committee on the Judiciary. The same staff of experts was continued. The work has now been completed. Title 18 has been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary and has been adopted by the House. Title 28 has also been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, speaking through its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION], of its Subcommittee on Revision of the Laws, in accordance with the order of the full Committee on the Judiciary by unanimous vote, with one committee amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Twice, upon the calls of the Consent Calendar of the House, the consideration of H. R. 3214 has been passed over without prejudice at the request of members of the Ways and Means Committee.

II. THE ISSUE

This is not, in any sense, an attempt on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary to usurp any part of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Nor do we of the Judiciary Committee seek to increase our jurisdiction or take on any new duties.

Fifty-two percent of all the bills that have been introduced in the Eightieth Congress have been referred to our committee—more than we can possibly say

grace over. Our prayer to Congress is: Not more, but no more!

In fact, without shirking our duty or any part of it, we are seeking relief from as much of the disproportionate burden that has been placed upon us as may be consistent with logic and wise congressional policy.

The Committee on the Judiciary of the House is 134 years old. From its creation—as its name implied—one of its prime duties has been to study the judiciary and recommend its improvement.

The Committee on the Judiciary has never sought to intrude into the prime field of the Ways and Means Committee to study and improve tax law.

Whenever our attention has been brought to a needed reform of judicial procedure, proven by the evidence submitted, we have conceived it our jurisdiction and duty to recommend to the Congress a remedy. We have consistently sought to correct mistakes of the judiciary in interpreting congressional intent.

Here we are faced with a problem which we conceive to be clearly within our province since it involves erroneous interpretation of the law, or of procedure thereunder, although, incidentally, it also affects decisions and procedure in tax cases.

The Ways and Means Committee has unquestioned jurisdiction of the writing of tax law. It is expert in that field. We do not even claim to be. However, we respectfully submit that practically all the functioning of the judiciary relates to some subject within the jurisdiction of some other congressional committee. If the suggestion of improvement in the functioning of the judiciary is to be denied our committee merely because it would relate to some phase of the jurisdiction of some other committee, the Committee on the Judiciary might as well be abolished.

The issue here presented involves only two questions:

First. Shall the Tax Court of the United States be made a Court of Record?

Second. Shall the decisions of the Tax Court of the United States be subject to review as are the decisions of the district courts?

While this bill comprises 189 pages, some 173 chapters, or 3,000 sections, and revises and codifies the entire Judicial Code, these two questions are the only two as to which difference of opinion has arisen.

III. CHARACTER AND PROCEDURE OF THE TAX COURT

The Ways and Means Committee, as a part of the Revenue Act of 1924, created the Board of Tax Appeals. Review of the committee hearings, reports and the floor debates relating to the Revenue Acts of 1924 and 1926 will make it perfectly clear that the primary purpose the Ways and Means Committee sought to subserve was that the taxpayer could litigate his liability before having to pay, for many taxpayers were unable to pay the excess amount set up and declared due by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and had been driven into bankruptcy as a result. The Secretary of the Treasury recommended in 1923 the creation of a Board of Tax Appeals. The taxpayers have always had the right to pay and then sue in the district court for refund of any wrongful exaction. This has been true since the 1924 Revenue Act, even though not paid under protest. If I recall correctly, either the request of the Secretary of the Treasury for the creation of the Board of Tax Appeals or the revenue bill of 1924 as passed by the House, or both, indicated that the proceedings before this Board should be "informal", but in the conference report which became the law of 1924, this provision for informal procedure was deleted and the Board was authorized to adopt and promulgate its own rules of procedure. This was done and the procedure thereunder has prevailed until the present time, a pertinent part for the purpose of this discussion being that each taxpayer's case should be tried before one member of the Board, and only one. By reason of this provision, the Board was enabled to try and dispose of an exceedingly large number of cases which would not have been possible had it been required that the Board as a whole, or a quorum thereof, sit in each case. Each of these one-man decisions is reviewed by one man and only one—the presiding Board member, or, since the name of the Board of Tax Appeals was changed to the Tax Court of the United States, by appropriate provisions of the Revenue Act of 1942, the presiding judge of that court. As a result of this simplified procedure the number of cases disposed of has been exceedingly large—an average of more than 5,000 cases for each of the years since its creation.

From the creation of the Board of Tax Appeals there has been no question but that it performed judicial service, but while it has been denominated as an independent agency in the executive department of our Government, its judicial characteristics have been frequently noted. For instance, President Coolidge, upon approving the Revenue Act of 1924, said:

> The provisions of the bill, however, with reference to the Board, make it in all its essentials a court of record.

The report of the Committee on Ways and Means of the revenue bill of 1926, dated December 7, 1925, said:

> No other court in the world tries cases which in the aggregate involve such great amounts.

And again:

> The procedure is made to conform as nearly as may be to the procedure in the case of an original action in a Federal district court.

And again:

> In the view of the committee the decisions of the board are judicial and not legislative or administrative determinations. Review of judicial decision may be had by direct appeal to the courts as well as by petitions to the courts for the enforcement of an administrative order, or by extraordinary remedy and suits for refunds. Further no rehearing may be provided before the reviewing court, and the review of the decision of the Board may be limited to the record made before the Board.

The report of the Finance Committee of the Senate on the same bill is in substance the same as that of the Ways and Means Committee and follows almost its exact language. Senator GEORGE, in the Senate debate, is quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as having said:

> Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I may suggest that every reasonable effort has been made to bring this Board out of the class of a mere administrative body into the status of a court; and I think the rules of evidence to which the Senator refers have been amply cared for in this provision.

Just before Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone passed on to his reward, while my bill, H. R. 2181, to fix the salaries of certain United States judges was being considered, the Chief Justice called me over the telephone and in our conference which he requested and which ensued, he said in substance, "Judge, I want you to understand that I am not lobbying. I am merely calling your attention to what I think must have been an oversight of yours. In your bill increasing judicial salaries you did not include the judges of the Tax Court." I replied, "Mr. Chief Justice, I thank you for the suggestion, but while this omission may have been an error of judgment, it was not an oversight. The reason that the judges of the Tax Court of the United States were not included in my bill was that this court has never been a title III court. It was created as the Board of Tax Appeals and has been always regarded as an independent agency in the executive department. Its name was changed to the Tax Court of the United States only a couple of years ago and while I have high regard for its judges, I did not think that they should be included among the beneficiaries of my bill." Chief Justice Stone replied, "For a long time we have been reviewing their decisions and I can tell you out of my experience and close scrutiny of their work that they not only perform judicial service but that they do it well. I hope that you will reconsider and amend your bill so that it will include them." My reply was, "Of course I would not for a moment set my opinion up against yours. I understand that such an amendment will be offered. I have no zeal for the position I have felt impelled to take, nor would I feel it my duty to fight such an amendment except to state my position and the reasons for it, but I cannot agree to offer such an amendment nor consent to its adoption."

By bills written by the Ways and Means Committee which have now become law, the name of this agency in the executive branch of the Government has been changed from Board of Tax Appeals to the Tax Court of the United States. The length of tenure of the judges thereon has been fixed at terms of 12 years and an amendment adopted in the Senate to the judicial salaries increase act fixed their salaries at the same fixed by the same act for judges of the United States district courts.

The manifest intent of the Ways and Means Committee in proposing the creation of the Board of Tax Appeals was to expedite the administration of justice in tax cases. The same procedure for judicial review of its decisions by the courts of appeals and the Supreme Court was provided as for the review of decisions of the district courts. After the

Board of Tax Appeals had performed most efficiently for some 18 years the great service it was created to render, its name was changed to the Tax Court of the United States. It continued to render the same service. The provisions for review of its decisions remained the same as had applied to the Board of Tax Appeals and to the district courts. The Ways and Means Committee from time to time wrote new tax laws, and no one has ever questioned their exclusive jurisdiction so to do.

IV. CONFUSION

The Supreme Court has rendered several upsetting decisions—*Dobson* v. *Commissioner*, in 1943 (320 U. S. 489), the *Bingham case* (325 U. S. 365), in which Chief Justice Stone sought, apparently, to cure the Dobson decision, but then the *Kelly case* (326 U. S. 521), which, while not expressly overruling the Bingham decision, wiped out its curative effectiveness, and left the Dobson doctrine again supreme. Then in 1947 the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals handed down Lincoln Electric Co., 1947 Commerce Clearing House General Tax Service, paragraph 9282, June 11, 1947, holding that the Tax Court was an administrative agency in the executive branch of the Government and that its decisions were administrative, not judicial deliverances.

In 1946, the Administrative Procedure Act became law. Section 8 thereof provides that review of the decisions of administrative agencies when the initial decision was made by one man should be reviewed first in the agency by a majority of its top-ranking administrators. This act was never intended to affect decisions of the Tax Court.

Three untoward results have ensued. First. Rich taxpayers who can afford to pay their tax assessments may do so and file suit in the district courts for what they conceive to be excessive exactions and the decisions of the district courts may be reviewed both as to questions of law and fact by the courts of appeals, and, if certiorari be granted, may also be reviewed as to questions of law and fact by the Supreme Court, whereas the poor taxpayers who cannot afford to pay their tax assessments have no such recourse. Second. The poor taxpayer must apply to the Tax Court for review of his assessment and the expeditious one-man decision, reviewed only by the presiding judge of the Tax Court, is abolished and it must be heard by at least a majority of the 16 judges of the Tax Court. Under the former procedure, wherever a tax case may have originated, the court sent one of its judges there to try the case. So the 16 judges may be scattered widely over the Nation. The poor man's initial review then must be postponed until 9 of the 16 judges are free to be assembled in Washington to try his case on this initial review. Unless this is changed, this one fact alone makes it impossible for the Tax Court to function expeditiously enough to dispose of its average case load of more than 5,000 cases a year. Congress must, therefore, increase greatly the number of judges unless the court is to fall behind tragically in its disposition of cases, or else restore one-judge decisions and uniform review. Third. Even after the poor man has obtained initial review by at least nine members of the Tax Court, the decision in the Dobson case denies him the right which the length of his purse grants to the rich man. Judicial review of a judicial decision—as of a district court—differs from judicial review of an administrative decision in that such review of a judicial decision is considered on the merits of the case whereas such review of an administrative decision assigns to a decision of the Tax Court a special finality as to certain types of tax questions. Unless the Dobson decision is corrected both the Government and private litigants are denied a fair judicial review. Prior to the Dobson decision it was assumed by all the courts, including the Supreme Court, that on appeal from the Tax Court all questions of law were fully reviewable, and that questions of fact were subject, in general, to the same degree of limited review that prevails in appeals from district courts.

In the Dobson opinion, however, for the first time the Supreme Court thought that it found the congressional intention that the jurisdiction of certain courts of appeals to review decisions of the Tax Court should be narrower than their jurisdiction to review decisions of district courts. Under the rule which the Supreme Court there set forth, no question of law decided by the Tax Court is reviewable by the circuit courts of appeals except those questions of law which the Supreme Court termed "clear cut." The effect of such a holding is that as to questions of law considered to fall short of being clear cut, the Tax Court is held to have a final power of construction, subject to no judicial review. This gives to a body inferior to the appellate courts an unreviewable power of construing tax laws even greater than the regulation-making power given to the Treasury Department, inasmuch as the validity of a Treasury regulation is subject to review by the appellate courts. Considerable confusion has resulted in attempting to construe the Dobson decision, because it is hard to distinguish clear cut questions of law from other questions of law which involve congressional intent in the taxing statute. This confusion has been all the more evident because of an intimation in the Dobson opinion that if the problem of construction before the courts is a problem of accounting, in the sense that the Tax Court is charged with determining what the intent of Congress was with reference to an accounting question, the conclusion of the Tax Court as to such a question seems, under that decision, not reviewable. These confusions amply justify the Committee on the Judiciary in proposing the committee amendment, but even if there were no such confusion, the effects of the Dobson decision would be undesirable and should be eliminated.

The pending bill would simply make the Tax Court of the United States a court of record; and by the committee amendment, its decisions would be subject to judicial review on the merits of each case, exactly as is now the law with respect of the judicial review given decisions of every district court of the United States.

We respectfully submit that these are matters clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary and our actions seek no possible intrusion upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. We have the highest respect and regard for the Ways and Means Committee, its jurisdiction, and each of its members, but the Committee on the Judiciary would have been recreant to its trust if it had not done its duty to present to the House this revision of Title 28 of the code including the necessary corrections recommended. This bill should be passed not only because of the importance and need of the code, but also of its vitally necessary improvement.

Needy War Widows and Fine Print

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following editorial which appeared in the Boston Daily Record, Monday, June 30, 1947, relative to national service life insurance:

NEEDY WAR WIDOWS AND FINE PRINT

It seems odd, indeed, to find the Veterans' Administration playing what amounts to a legal shell game in the disbursement of insurance funds to the widows of our fighting men in the last war.

There is nothing crooked in it, of course. The accounting is accurate and the procedure sanctioned by the signature of the widow herself upon a carefully guarded and technically worded choice of payment method.

The trouble is that unless the widow is an expert at reading the fine print of contracts, and unless she has the business training to read between the lines of fine print, the result is that she goes without her insurance money for months, or in far from isolated cases she finds that she owes the Government money for longer than a few months.

This is how it works:

According to the National Service Insurance Act of 1940, the beneficiary receives payment in 240 installments at the rate of $5.51 per $1,000 of insurance coverage.

Then, by a congressional amendment of August 1, 1946, the beneficiary is permitted to change the payment schedule to a smaller amount but a longer period if she outlives the 20-year payment interval.

The joker is that if the widow has already received under the first law payments in excess of what she would receive under the second, the difference is reckoned as a debt which must be repaid either in cash or by foregoing payments sufficient to make up the balance.

Furthermore, once the payment schedule is changed it may not be withdrawn to its original terms.

The result is that many veterans' widows and their families find themselves penniless for a period of time.

They are penalized when they can least afford it for taking advantage of what seems at face value a generous and advantageous offer.

There is nothing in the official communications of the Veterans' Administration, or in the forms to be filled out to change the method of payment, that would simply, clearly, and factually warn the veteran's beneficiary of the consequences.

Veterans insurance is pitifully small, but in a great many cases it represents the difference between subsistence and actual want.

Korean Partition Develops Touchy Fuze to New War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

KOREAN PARTITION DEVELOPS TOUCHY FUZE TO NEW WAR

(Article 27)

Korea is an unhappy land. It escaped the ravages of war, but it is an occupied country. It has been freed from Japanese control and exploitation, but it is now governed by two other foreign powers, the United States and Russia.

The Koreans think they are capable of governing themselves and they want immediate independence. But the big powers have ruled otherwise. They have decreed there must be a period of trusteeship, during which the Koreans are to be taught how to govern themselves.

The result is that the Koreans are confused and divided among themselves and many of them are resentful and bitter toward the United States and Russia and suspicious of their motives.

The manner in which this situation came about makes a long and complicated story. It begins with the Cairo declaration, which promised that, after the defeat of Japan, Korea would be granted its independence "in due course." The Koreans interpreted that phrase as meaning "in a few days."

JAP FALL BROUGHT PROBLEM

Then came the sudden collapse of Japan, bringing with it the problems of how to deal with the Japanese armed forces in Korea and how to administer the civil affairs of the country after the Japanese civilians were removed.

A hasty decision was made by the Allied Governments that Russia and the United States should share jointly in the occupation of Korea. The thirty-eighth parallel was arbitrarily fixed as the dividing line between the two occupation zones. The Russions took over the territory north of this line; the American forces moved into the south.

This decision is one that we have had cause to regret. The only excuse for it was that, in those days, Russia was regarded as an ally of the United States, not as a competitor in the political and economic sense.

The result of the divided occupation is that the thirty-eighth parallel has become a military frontier. This line is where the armed forces of the United States and the Soviet Union are in closest contact in the Far East. We patrol one side of it, the Russians patrol the other.

SHOOTING GROUND PROVIDED

If a shooting war should start, that is probably where the first shots would be fired. But just to make sure that one does not start spontaneously, the American outposts are a mile or so below the line, so that our soldiers do not come in actual contact with Russian troops.

There is one exception to this. A small peninsula in eastern Korea is in the American zone, but it can be reached only by going through the Russian lines. So once a week, by prearrangement, a convoy of American trucks, taking supplies to the American garrison on this peninsula, drives up to the border where it is met by armed Russian guards who escort it through their lines to its destination.

The thirty-eighth parallel is also a political and ideological frontier. The Russians have promoted communism in northern Korea and have succeeded to a marked degree, according to information we have been able to get from that area. They have established a police state in their territory and have raised and equipped a north Korean army 125,000 to 150,000 strong.

COMMUNISTS FIGHT DEMOCRACY

In contrast, we are attempting to promote democracy and a representative form of government in southern Korea, but our efforts are hampered by Communist activities, the utter irresponsibility of the Koreans themselves, and their irrational demands for immediate independence, despite their obvious inability to govern themselves at the present time.

Finally, the 38th parallel has become an economic frontier. The iron curtain prevents the exchange of any commodities between north and south Korea. Practically all the manufacturing facilities and mineral wealth of Korea are in the Russian zone. The American zone is largely agricultural, although much of the land is useless because of rugged mountain ranges which have been stripped of their timber and from which the soil has washed away through centuries of erosion.

COMMERCE IS HALTED

The Russians wanted to import grain from southern Korea into their zone. Although southern Korea has a crop deficiency and is not able to feed itself, we agreed to exchange grain for coal from the northern zone. But the Russians refused to permit any coal to be exported from their territory to the south. Consequently, there is no trade of any kind between the zones.

We have to import coal from Japan, which does not have enough for its own needs, in order to keep our troops in Korea warm, and they are not too warm at that.

The American zone comprises 36,700 miles of territory. At the beginning of the occupation it had a population of approximately 17,000,000. Since then, however, the population has increased to about 19,000,000, due to the repatriation of Koreans from Japan and the infiltration of Koreans from the north. The population of the Russian zone is thought to be about 10,000,000.

JAP INFLUENCE ELIMINATED

One of the first jobs of the occupation was the elimination of Japanese influence in Korea. A total of 179,277 members of the Japanese armed forces surrendered. They were disarmed and evacuated to Japan.

A registration of Japanese civilians disclosed there were 625,957 in southern Korea. These have all been sent back to Japan, in addition to 221,867 who streamed into the American zone from north of the thirty-eighth parellel in order to escape from the Russians.

We are policing southern Korea with one Army corps, the commander of which is Lt. Gen. John R. Hodge. He came into Korea with the first occupation army in September 1945, and is the only member of the original force left. All the rest have been replaced.

YANKS ROUGH IT

Occupation duty in Korea is not popular among American soldiers. The country is bleak and bare. The people are not too hospitable. Moreover, Korea is at the end of the line, as far as rations, fuel, post-exchange supplies, and recreation are concerned. Korea gets what is left over, or is neglected entirely.

Let there be a meat shortage in the United States, or a longshoremen's strike on the west coast, and 2 months later the American soldiers in Korea feel the effects of it.

Nevertheless, every effort is being made by the American officials to make the best of their meager resources. In spite of hardships, the morale of the soldiers is not bad, since most of them can look forward to leaving Korea after a comparatively short period of service.

Reasons Why Wool Bill, S. 1498, Should Not Become Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the reasons submitted by the Boston Wool Trade Association as to why the wool bill, S. 1498, should not become law:

I. THERE IS NO NEED OF LEGISLATION SUCH AS S. 1498 BECAUSE THE WOOL FARMERS ARE NOT IN FINANCIAL DISTRESS AS CLAIMED BY THEIR LEGISLATIVE AGENTS

A. Prices received by farmers (U. S. Department of Agriculture) for lambs have advanced in past year until they are now more than 250 percent of 1939 (20 cents versus 7 cents). Wool prices in open market are 170 percent of 1939 (38 cents versus 22 cents). Mutton prices are over 210 percent of 1939 (8.2 percent versus 3.9 cents).

B. Over 85 percent of the sheep product by weight is sheep (mutton) and lambs and less than 15 percent is wool (U. S. Department of Agriculture).

C. The cost of production of the wool was not taken as 15 percent by the statisticians of the United States Tariff Commission, but at around 45 percent of the whole sheep and lamb operation. Thus the figures used as proof of the cost of raising wool were highly inflated. The United States Department of Agriculture statistics were not used.

D. The sources of the basic figures used as proof by the United States Tariff Commission were certain farms under debt to the Farm Credit Administration and not representative of the wool farmers as a whole.

E. Not a single individual instance of sheep farmer financial distress was introduced at the hearings.

F. With reference to the assertion by the sponsors of S. 1498 that this bill is justified because the 1909–14 base for parity is unfair to wool by at least 25 percent, no evidence whatever was introduced regarding this contention. All the available statistics fail to support any such assertion.

G. There has occurred a decline in sheep population of almost 20 percent but higher prices will not stem this decline. The decline accelerated with the Government boosting of prices during the war. Curiously, sheep population seems to increase when prices decline (Example: 1926 to 1931 an increase of 40 percent while price declined 40 percent). The farmer evidently sells heav-

ily when the market is favorable, and vice versa.

II. THE HIGH SUPPORT LEVEL FOR DOMESTIC WOOL IN BILL S. 1498 NATIONALIZES A FREE-ENTERPRISE INDUSTRY AND PENALIZES THE TAXPAYER

(Definition: Government support of a commodity becomes nationalization when the level of support is higher than the level of the open market, since thereupon Government becomes sole buyer.)

A. The fixed-support level specified in S. 1498 for 1947–48 for wool is the wartime and 1946 level of 42.3 cents per greasy pound. The open-market competitive price of wool is 38 cents and has not been in excess of 38 cents for more than 20 years. Thus the Government must necessarily outbid free-enterprise buyers and monopolize the domestic raw-wool industry.

B. The fixed-support for wool in S. 1498 at 42.3 cents is higher than 100 percent of present parity. If parity recedes to its wartime level, then 42.3 cents will be 130 percent of parity. The Government support level for practically all major commodities is by the Steagall amendment 90 percent of parity. Wool does not warrant special treatment beyond the average and all supports should be based on parity.

C. The high support level of 42.3 cents of S. 1498 will increase prices to the consumer, who will pay indirectly as taxpayers since the substantial losses and costs involved must be met by the United States Treasury.

D. The high support level of 42.3 cents, because of being 10 percent above the open market, eliminates free enterprise from the domestic raw-wool business, and as a peacetime program will have a permanent and socialistic effect upon the entire industry.

United States production and sales of sheep and lambs and wool (as reported by the U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Division of Statistical and Historical Research, and published on p. 1415 of the printed hearings of the Special Committee to Investigate Wool, U. S. Senate, 79th Cong.)

Year	Sheep and lambs and wool	Sheep and lambs	Percentage sheep and lambs to total production	Percentage wool to total production
	Million pounds	*Million pounds*		
1909	1,906	1,596	83.7	16.3
1910	1,984	1,678	84.6	15.4
1911	2,215	1,913	86.4	13.6
1912	2,238	1,960	87.6	12.4
1913	2,217	1,951	88.0	12.0
1914	2,109	1,858	88.1	11.9
1915	1,867	1,626	87.1	12.9
1916	1,823	1,579	86.6	13.4
1917	1,517	1,280	84.4	15.6
1918	1,711	1,457	85.1	14.9
1919	2,012	1,742	86.6	13.4
1920	1,767	1,516	85.8	14.2
1921	1,897	1,655	87.2	12.8
1922	1,771	1,543	87.1	12.9
1923	1,868	1,638	87.7	12.3
1924	2,020	1,782	88.2	11.8
1925	2,047	1,794	87.6	12.4
1926	2,161	1,892	87.5	12.5
1927	2,144	1,855	86.5	13.5
1928	2,243	1,928	86.0	14.0
1929	2,341	2,013	86.0	14.0
1930	2,569	2,217	86.3	13.7
1931	2,891	2,515	87.0	13.0
1932	2,596	2,245	86.5	13.5
1933	2,609	2,226	85.6	14.4
1934	2,920	2,551	87.4	12.6
1935	2,698	2,336	86.6	13.4
1936	2,654	2,301	86.7	13.3
1937	2,699	2,342	86.8	13.2
1938	2,829	2,468	87.3	12.7
1939	2,815	2,451	86.1	12.9
1940	2,838	2,463	86.8	13.2
1941	2,971	2,580	86.8	13.2
1942	3,339	2,947	88.2	11.8
1943	3,423	3,039	88.8	11.2
1944	3,151	2,804	89.0	11.0
1945	2,758	2,435	88.3	11.7
Total	87,609	76,176	86.9	13.1
Yearly average	2,368	2,059	86.9	13.1

United States lamb prices received by farmers

(Per 100 pounds)

(As reported by the U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics)

Year:	*Annual averages*
1910	$6.16
1911	5.17
1912	5.62
1913	5.99
1914	6.36
1915	6.98
1916	8.34
1917	12.71
1918	13.96
1919	12.83
1920	11.64
1921	7.13
1922	9.90
1923	10.52
1924	10.80
1925	12.43
1926	11.66
1927	11.46
1928	12.21
1929	11.88
1930	7.74
1931	5.64
1932	4.46
1933	5.05
1934	5.90
1935	7.28
1936	8.05
1937	8.87
1938	7.05
1939	7.70
1940	8.10
1941	9.58
1942	11.74
1943	13.00
1944	12.50
1945	13.00
1946	15.60
Average 37 years, 1910–46	9.33
Average 20 years, 1921–40	8.69
1939 average	7.70
May 1947	19.80
1947 monthly average:	
January	19.00
February	19.40
March	20.00
April	19.60
May	19.80

NOTE.—Official prices as of June 1947 not available but expected to be at a new high level.

United States sheep (mutton) prices received by farmers

(Per 100 pounds)

(As reported by the U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics)

Year:	*Annual averages*
1910	$4.99
1911	4.01
1912	4.25
1913	4.52
1914	4.83
1915	5.30
1916	6.28
1917	9.58
1918	10.75
1919	9.26
1920	8.17
1921	4.55
1922	5.96
1923	6.55
1924	6.62
1925	7.57
1926	7.19
1927	7.00
1928	7.64
1929	7.17
1930	4.74
1931	3.10
1932	2.19
1933	2.38
1934	2.85
1935	3.75
1936	3.77
1937	$4.52
1938	3.58
1939	3.90
1940	3.95
1941	5.06
1942	5.79
1943	6.57
1944	6.01
1945	6.38
1946	7.49
Average 37 years, 1910–46	5.63
Average 20 years, 1921–40	4.95
1939 average	3.90
May 1947	8.28
1947 monthly average:	
January	7.13
February	7.74
March	8.28
April	8.55
May	8.28

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and also an editorial from today's Washington Post entitled "Lesser Evil":

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY,
SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE
AND PLANNING,
Cambridge, Mass., June 25, 1947.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KENNEDY: As dean of an architecture school and as a practicing architect in San Francisco, I have observed the need for an over-all Federal leadership and financial aid in a housing policy. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is a good start in the right direction. This will urge immediate hearings on the companion bill, H. R. 2523.

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM W. WURSTER,
Dean of Architecture and Planning.

MASSACHUSETTS MAYORS
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Boston, Mass., June 27, 1947.

Hon. JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KENNEDY: At a recent meeting of the Massachusetts Mayors Association, the enclosed resolution was adopted.

The mayors of Massachusetts are deeply concerned at the complete lack of a Federal housing program. They feel that immediate action by Congress on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is imperative.

This resolution attempts to express that feeling. It is hoped that you will give it careful and earnest consideration.

Sincerely yours,
DAVID G. NAGLE,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS MAYORS' ASSOCIATION, INC., ENDORSING TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

Whereas the Massachusetts Mayors' Association, Inc., whose membership includes all of the 39 mayors and the two city managers, in the 39 cities of the Commonwealth,

is of the opinion that the need for housing in Massachusetts for veterans and other citizens of the Commonwealth is rapidly approaching disastrous proportions; and

Whereas the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has already taken notice of this critical situation and has enacted legislation authorizing cities and towns to take advantage of any Federal aid for low-rent housing and slum clearance and to borrow and expend money for their own locally financed veterans' housing programs, and has provided for State contributions toward any losses that cities and towns may incur; and

Whereas high costs of construction and other factors are making, and for some time will make, it impossible for either private enterprise or the cities and towns to meet adequately the demands without assistance in some form from the Federal Government; and

Whereas despite the fact that the Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate has reported favorably on S. 866 (the National Housing Commission Act), no further action by the Congress is scheduled for this term: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Mayor's Association, Inc., recommends:

1. That the immediate passage by both Houses of Congress of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill (S. 866 and H. R. 2523) is of utmost importance both to the immediate and long-range housing problems confronting Massachusetts.

2. That Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., Senators in Congress be urged to seek immediate consideration of S. 866 and that they bend their efforts to effect its passage.

3. That the Representatives in Congress from Massachusetts be urged to seek immediate hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee on the companion bill to S. 866, H. R. 2523, and to request its consideration and passage in the House of Representatives prior to the adjournment of Congress.

4. That the secretary of the Mayors' Club of Massachusetts be authorized and directed to send copies of this resolve to all of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Massachusetts and to President Harry S. Truman; Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; Senator Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire; Representative Jesse P. Wolcott, of Michigan, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee; and Mr. Raymond Foley, Administrator of the NHA.

[From the Washington Post of July 2, 1947]

LESSER EVIL

The Housing and Rent Act of 1947 which the President signed with understandable indignation means the relinquishing of all control over a large segment of the rental dwellings available in the United States, a sharp relaxation of control over the remaining segment and repeal of almost all the aids to construction of new housing contained in the Veterans Emergency Housing Act of 1946. Whether this proves actually to be a lesser evil than the outright abandonment of rent control which would have resulted if the President had refused to sign the bill depends on the efforts which may be made to enforce its inadequate provisions. Unless Congress increases the funds it has made available for enforcement, the measure will be an unadulterated hoax.

Some of the conditions which impelled Congress to establish rent control originally still exist. There is a demand for homes, particularly for low-cost homes on the part of veterans, far in excess of the supply. The only way to eliminate the need for rent control is to increase home construction. But Congress has been as delinquent in affirmative action as it has been hasty in lifting of ceilings on the homes available. The President took occasion in connection with his message on the rent measure once more to urge action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The urgency of such action is underscored by the rapid movement in the direction of decontrol. It ought to be taken before the current session ends. "One of the most stubborn obstacles in the way of any constructive housing program," Mr. Truman said forthrightly, "has been the opposition of the real-estate lobby." This lobby has now had its way in bringing about decontrol. It should not be allowed to impose upon the country a continued housing scarcity which effective governmental efforts could overcome.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over Station WNBF on June 28, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, this week I have attended and spoken before many Republican gatherings throughout our district.

The Women's Republican Club of Greater Endicott was most gracious to me, as were the Broome County Republican women at Ross Park. I was honored by the Kirwood Republican Club and spoke during an intermission at their large dance at Benjamin Hall.

An especially significant conclave was held at Greene Thursday evening, where I was the guest of the Chenango County Republican Committee. This was a successful occasion indeed.

These Republican meetings gave me a long-sought opportunity to tell about the accomplishments of the first Republican-controlled Congress in a dozen years.

Nothing is quite as irritating to me as to listen to some radio commentator or read in some columnist's remarks how lacking Congress has been this session in any activity whatsoever. That report is precisely what you are hearing, and I, for one, as your Congressman, deeply resent the inaccurate picture these propagandists are showing you.

To say that I am satisfied with the performance of Congress lately is not true. I have never been entirely satisfied with the record, whether Republicans or Democrats happened to be in the saddle. There is always much to be desired. Too many worthwhile bills are buried in committee and sometimes legislation is passed which is anything but good.

For example, I do not feel we have given enough time this session to the veteran. There is a haughty attitude on the part of some I know in Congress toward all veterans' bills. These men look down their noses whenever the subject of helping the veteran or his family comes up.

Of course, nothing makes me see red faster than hearing these reactionary gentlemen rant and rave about how much the Government has done for the soldier and what little gratitude he shows in return.

Such reasoning is an outrage, to my way of thinking. It is usually sprung from a selfish heart and ought to be treated with contempt and scorn. Those in Congress with such feeling toward the veteran are definitely small in number, but they have succeeded thus far in making a lot of noise. That noise hampers and blocks all honest efforts to get veterans' legislation out of committee for action.

The best demonstration of their blind opposition to measures benefiting our veterans is the shabby treatment they are giving the proposal of several—myself included—to pay off terminal-leave bonds to veterans in cash. Time and time again these short-sighted men have refused to give us standing room. They are not interested, they say, in helping the veteran to that extent.

Personally, I am amazed that such a miserable outlook on the part of an elected official can be tolerated by the folks back home. Yet, they seem to get away with it. But sooner or later they will surely be caught up with.

I started out tonight with the statement that the Republican Congress had not let the people down, and I want to enlarge on that point a little. When I say the veteran has not been aided as he deserves, I don't in any way mean the blame rests on any particular party. After all, the individuals who are responsible spring from both parties.

But I believe the American people can thank the majority in Congress for saving them from communism. What has been accomplished since January may not look spectacular or get newspaper headlines. But because of laws recently passed by Congress, the country has returned to constitutional government and direct representation is once again a fact.

At least a good start in the right direction has been made. It remains for the people to bombard their elected representatives with messages telling what they expect to be done. Only by hearing from you am I able to reflect the will of the majority. Only by your letting me know what you want can all of us prevail upon Congress to give us laws designed for the benefit of all Americans.

Thank you.

European Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky from the Washington Times-Herald of July 2, 1947:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The President has appointed several committees here and in Europe to consider questions leading to conclusions with regard to our foreign policy, particularly the question as to how much we are to lend or give to the countries of Europe.

Secretary of State Marshall delivered an address at Harvard University which was completely misunderstood by most of the European countries except Soviet Russia.

Apparently the Russians grasped the fact that George Marshall could not, as Secretary of State, determine how much, if any, we are to give or lend the Europeans.

He would have to go to Congress for the money and it is not likely that Congress will provide a blank check.

This is a curiously muddled situation which reflects unfavorably upon the Secretary of State's capacity to organize in the field of international economics. It is not his field. Unfortunately, George Marshall walked into a frightful situation not of his making. But that would have been true of any man who became Secretary of State at the moment of the worst degeneration of our relationship with our former allies, both the Russians and the British.

The Greco-Turkish aid, called the Truman doctrine, was a domestic success, but the Hungarian coup d'etat and the inability to

get a loan for China from the Export-Import Bank were embarrassing.

Marshall apparently felt that he could save western Europe from communism by pouring huge exports of goods and machinery to countries that cannot ever repay. Neither President Truman nor Secretary of State Marshall seem to grasp the extremely simple fact in economics that not money but goods must be exported; not printed paper but wheat, iron, meat, steel, and all sorts of commodities, much of which is unavailable for export.

The appointment of various fact-finding committees by President Truman will solve no problem, as the Paris conference could solve no problem. The bare facts have always been available.

Those of us who for 2 years now have been demanding a survey of the economic condition of the United States, particularly in relationship to gifts and loans in Europe, never meant that a helter-skelter committee containing odds and ends of public men under the chairmanship of Averell Harriman could do more than pull together data available in the statistical abstract of the United States or the World Almanac.

More is needed than that. An over-all appraisal of this data; an analysis of its relationship to the future of this country; the projection of data, say to cover the next quarter of a century; a correlation of American with European data—this task requires extraordinary intelligence, knowledge, and experience far beyond the capacity of most of the personalities appointed to these various committees.

True, there are some fine persons on these committees and one hates to question their services for any reason except that the national welfare requires more.

Some time ago, I suggested that Herbert Hoover, Bernard Baruch, and Karl T. Compton could serve as such a board to analyze the data and to indicate a course. That suggestion apparently was unacceptable just as all suggestions, from whatever source, which could cut the Gordian knot of our extremely complicated situation, have proved unacceptable.

The reason is that no one dares to admit that a single error has been made in our foreign policy since 1937. These errors stand out like ugly peaks; the false Atlantic Charter, the Singapore conference, Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, the Morgenthau plan, JCS 1067, the Spruille Braden policy following the wild Good Neighbor policy, the lack of clarification as to the use of the veto, and so much else.

This country is like a neurotic woman, all tangled up, who dares not confess. Each new step leads to further complications. Each misstep involves new schemes of deception.

If the entire picture were disclosed frankly, faithfully, unashamedly, the American people would not be more shocked than they are by the maddening shiftings and retreatings and sudden ejaculations which always end in a denser fog of confusion. It was hoped that George Marshall, the soldier, would do what politicians and diplomats avoid—hit straight to a bull's-eye. He has not done so.

Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. SOMERS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith my statement to the press on the presentation of petitions to the President urging his veto of the bill to lift rent controls:

Congressman ANDREW L. SOMERS, Democrat, of New York, presented to the President the names of more than 5,000 persons in the district he represents, petitioning against any change in the present rent-control law.

The petitions were obtained through the Committee for the Retention of the Present Rent Control Law of which the Honorable Irwin L. Steingut is chairman. Mr. Steingut, minority leader in the New York State Assembly, and former speaker of that body, obtained these petitions because he feels this legislation is not only inflationary but also it definitely destroys the veterans' housing program. New York State laws are inadequate and are not as effective as the people were led to believe. The lifting of controls at this time when New York City is facing the most desperate housing shortage in its history will bring about a condition chaotic beyond conception.

Through this act, such a large portion of the people's earnings will be extracted for housing that there will be little left for food and clothing and our people will be reduced to the pitiable condition of the low living standard of a great many of the foreign countries who are now appealing for aid. This law will create such a harrowing emergency that the safety of the Republic will require the President and the courts to use all the emergency powers of the Government to protect the people against this flagrantly defective legislation.

Congress, in order to put the President in a critical position, has struck a savage blow at the American home and the American way of life. The American people will consider the President an outstanding benefactor and conscientious public servant should he call the Congress into special session to restore the controls in housing.

This is a fine example of boomerang politics of which the Republicans are past masters.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of Mayor deLesseps S. Morrison of New Orleans, before the United States Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee regarding St. Lawrence seaway and power project Thursday, on June 12, 1947:

My name is deLesseps S. Morrison. As the mayor of the city of New Orleans, I appear before this committee on behalf of all of the citizens and all of the interests of our city.

Senator WILEY has directed that our testimony in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project should be confined to the national defense and self-liquidating phases of Senate Joint Resolution 111. These are extremely broad subjects and although we feel that there are other phases equally deserving of consideration, we welcome the opportunity to testify on these grounds.

For many years, proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway have been coming to the Senate for approval of this highly questionable and expensive project. In 1934, when the late President Roosevelt called on the Senate to approve it as a treaty, the Senate decisively defeated the plan. Later it was embodied in an omnibus rivers and harbors bill. Again it was defeated. The many reasons in opposition to the St. Lawrence must be valid ones to have held up for so many years.

During the recent war it was my good fortune to serve with the Army Transportation Corps as a port commander on the channel and later in Belgium, Holland, and in Bremen, Germany. In the Bremen-Bremerhaven port area I served as chief of staff to the commanding general. Before going overseas, I was stationed at the Army's port of embarkation in New Orleans. I feel that this has given me an invaluable picture of the part played by port cities in time of war.

Because it is pertinent to the national defense of the Nation, I would like to say a few words about the Mississippi Valley and the port of New Orleans. The Mississippi River was described by Abraham Lincoln as "the greatest thing in America." If you look at a map on this hemisphere you can see the sound logic behind Lincoln's unqualified judgment. Spanning the Nation as its very backbone is the world's greatest river system and river valley—14,000 miles of navigable waterways serving 32 States, flowing out of the richest and most populous section of the Nation. It is the region of our greatest diversified agriculture and industry, where 51 percent of the population live and work. It is the very heart of the United States.

Strategically located as the gateway to this great midcontinent area of the country, New Orleans occupies an increasingly important position as a world transportation center. The greatest inland United States port is the natural funnel of travel and trade between the Americas. It also is inseparably linked with the national defense of the United States, as are many other ports of the Gulf and the eastern and western seaboards. In this time of international uncertainty our ports and harbors must be maintained in the interest of national security.

Without these ports we could not have transported in record time the men and materials so necessary to both the European and the Pacific theaters of war. New Orleans, I might add, was an embarkation port for both of these areas.

During the war we saw the construction of submarines, landing ships and cargo vessels in the upper Mississippi Valley and on the Great Lakes. The great majority of these craft were floated down the Mississippi. They were completed, outfitted, and sent out on their missions from the port of New Orleans.

Is it consistent, I ask you, for a nation blessed with the finest and most extensive system of natural waterways in the world to go over its borders into another country to spend funds for a seaway and power project whose need has not been properly established? Why not spend these millions improving what we already have—the harbors and port facilities from which the armed services of the United States operated so successfully?

Here in the United States we have done so much less to develop our God-given waterways resources than have other nations. In Great Britain and on the Continent I have directed and observed operations at the man-made ports of Avonmouth, Antwerp, Ghent, and Amsterdam. Here are artificial canals that have become great ports. I urge this committee to consider that here in the United States we have many vitally needed projects ahead for the perfection of our own harbors before making capital outlays in another country.

And that leads to this important point, which I commend for your most thoughtful

consideration. This proposed seaway would run over 1,000 miles through a foreign country. And friendly allies that we are today, let us not forget that Canada is a dominion in the British Commonwealth of Nations, united by allegiance with the British Crown.

You have already heard the testimony of Under Secretary of War Kenneth Royal that this project is not vital to the Nation's national defense. We believe there is ample evidence to prove that it is most questionable from this standpoint. For 5 months of the year the Great Lakes and the Upper St. Lawrence River are locked in ice. If we were attacked by an enemy at this period of nonfunctioning, the waterways and power facilities could easily be put out of action before they had a chance to make a single contribution to our national defense.

In the recent treason trial of Canadian scientists and Government officials who were convicted as agents of Soviet Russia one of the exhibits was a telegram from the Kremlin. This message asked about the natural resources that Canada could mobilize in case of war—her coal, oil, rare metals, water power, etc.

The interest of the Russians appears rather obvious. Canada lies on the forefront of the transpolar air route between the Soviet Union and the United States.

I am enough of a soldier to know that if attack should come to the United States it will probably be from the North. Why then, should the taxpayers of the United States spend hundreds of millions to build a seaway and power plant on Canadian soil which, in event of attack, would become one of the first casualties of such an attack? If the United States Congress has the funds for expensive navigation and power projects we earnestly urge that these funds be expended within the borders of our own Nation where our taxpayers will receive the full benefits and where United States citizens will receive employment on such projects.

If you polled the sentiment of the American people, I feel sure that you would find it to be this: Money for the national defense of the United States should be spent in a direct way—on the Army and Navy. It does not make sense that we should cripple our armed services on the one hand by denying them needed funds and at the same time throw millions into a project on foreign soil under the label of national defense.

The Mississippi Valley Association has estimated that if the seaway is completed and is used to the extent its proponents claim, a considerable percentage of present traffic now moving down the Mississippi River from the great midcontinent region of the Nation will be diverted away from its natural North-South trade route in our own river valley to the east-west St. Lawrence route. If this estimate is correct, then millions in commerce now being handled by the Port of New Orleans would flow out to the world through the Canadian port of Montreal. The New Orleans Board of Port Commissioners estimates that realization of the seaway's aims would mean a diversion of much of this natural Mississippi Valley traffic away from the United States ports to a Canadian river.

You will hear (have already heard) a representative of the Board of Port Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans testify in detail as to expected revenue losses and their adverse effect upon the port of New Orleans. So I will not go into detail on that. But let me stress that 79 cents of every dollar of income in New Orleans derives directly or indirectly from its port activities. The welfare of our entire community is at stake here.

It is not plausible for the Federal Government to spend tax moneys for a project which will damage the huge investments which State and municipal governments and private enterprise have in port facilities on the three coasts of the United States. This would mean the Federal Government using our tax funds to put us out of business. And if business suffers, we have unemployment, reduced buying power, and depression. It becomes a matter of our own Government competing with Louisiana and other coastal States of the United States, to our detriment.

Now a few words on the toll and self-liquidating feature of the proposed seaway.

We feel that the advocates of this project are advancing this feature as a smoke screen to cover the valid objection that the tremendous costs involved are out of all proportion to the benefits to be received by this Nation.

I have seen a number of cost estimates for this project. They usually vary, but all have one thing in common. They are constantly being revised upward. The United States Army Engineers estimate that construction will take four to six years and that the cost of the United States' portion will be in excess of $300,000,000.

In view of the recent actions by the Senate of the United States in favor of economy—for reduction of unnecessary governmental expenses—it is difficult for those of us in the lower Mississippi Valley to understand how this committee or this Senate can consistently approve the costly expenditures involved in this dubious project. It appears to us that the United States people, through their Government, would be shouldering a terrific tax burden for years to come—a tax burden that would help the few and hurt the many. And by the many I mean each and every taxpayer of the United States. In New Orleans, we who would directly suffer most from the seaway also would be contributing to support this maritime Frankenstein. Can you imagine anything more unfair or unjust?

What sound arguments can be advanced regarding the self-liquidation feature? The costs would be so great that no reputable engineer or economist can say when this cost would be amortized under the self-liquidation plan. The self-liquidation would have to run over such a long period of time that it will not be much relief. And who would the tolls benefit—the United States or Canada? It is all very vague. There is every reason to believe that the talk about self-liquidation is simply an attempt to explain away the legitimate criticism of high cost to the American taxpayer who must bear the burden of expense.

It has been suggested in some quarters that we of New Orleans and the lower Mississippi Valley are selfish in our attitude on this project. Gentlemen, may I say to you that if you consider it selfish to protect the position of the world's greatest river valley and its gateway port—if it be selfish to put the economic and military needs of this valley and its gateway port ahead of the interests of a Canadian river and a Canadian port of entry, then, gentlemen, we are indeed selfish—selfish in the same manner that any patriotic citizen places the welfare of his Nation before that of other nations, however friendly.

In summation, let me emphasize these points:

1. The St. Lawrence seaway and power project is neither economically sound nor in the interest of the taxpayers of this country. It is unfeasible and unsound.

2. Competent witnesses have said that the proposed seaway is not vital to the Nation's national defense. Moreover, because of its location in a foreign country and the fact that it would be ice-bound 5 months of the year, the positive value of the seaway from a national defense standpoint is most doubtful.

3. Its construction will adversely affect the economy of the Nation's greatest river valley and its gateway port of New Orleans.

4. Since the economic well-being of the Nation is extremely important in the overall national defense picture, the damage to the valley and port of New Orleans is far in excess of any material good this seaway might accomplish for the United States. Any damage to the port of New Orleans is per se harmful to the national defense of the United States.

5. If the United States Government has funds for waterways construction, we urge that such funds be expended in the improvement of ports and harbors on United States soil. Spend on developing what we have.

6. The excessive costs and long time required for amortization of these costs makes the self-liquidation claim of questionable justification.

I believe in a solid front among the nations of the Americas, in international cooperation. In New Orleans we heartily subscribe to the good-neighbor program. Our city government is the only one to my knowledge which maintains a department of international relations. We believe the United States should do all it can to assist other nations. But Canada does not appear to be among those nations which desperately need vast sums from the United States to remain stable and sound.

Your approval of this doubtful project can have only a harmful effect on the national defense of the Nation and on the economy of the great valley region our port serves, and it could well mean economic disaster for the city of New Orleans.

I thank you.

Address of C. M. Marino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following address delivered by C. M. Marino before the graduating class of the Burgettstown-Smith Township High School, June 4, 1947:

I am grateful for this opportunity to be with you this evening at this inspiring and unforgettable moment in your lives. I am also grateful for the opportunity of presenting this diploma to you. It is a mark of distinction and the climax of at least 12 years of effort and sacrifice both on your part and on the part of your teachers and other members of the faculty. I want to congratulate you and your teachers as well as all others who have made it possible for you to attain this glorious graduation. I know you will remember this occasion for the remaining years of your lives.

This graduation comes at a time when the entire world is debating the future not only of the individual, but the future of modern and democratic civilization as we know it here in America. At this particular time when America is trying hard to lead the world in the making of a just and lasting peace, we must not lose sight of the fact that it is our duty to strengthen our prestige at home on the same measure that we enlarge our prestige with other people and other nations. And, with an eye to the future, we must give special attention to our young people.

We have all heard the old saying that "boys will be boys." However, it must be borne in mind that with time "boys will be men." These boys and girls will be the men and women of tomorrow, the pillars, the supporters, the mechanics, and the leaders of the world.

Many things go into the making of these future men and women. The home alone is not enough. The school alone is not enough. The church alone is not enough. It takes the entire community with all its institutions to make possible a clean, wholesome, safe background where our children can learn one of the most important lessons of their lives and that is to respect the rights and liberties of others. Playground, swimming pools, or recreation centers are not enough. We must have trained leaders in our schools, churches, and recreation centers who can give our boys and girls proper guidance consistent with the full responsibility of fellowship.

I do not believe that girls or boys are bad, but if they are, then there must be some factor or factors which have contributed to that condition. We all agree that there is something wrong and as a typical American, Will Rogers, once said talking about the weather "Nobody does anything about it." We all have a tendency to blame others for what is wrong, but we never blame ourselves when we are the ones that are responsible.

Our schools are not what they should be. I do not mean to be critical of this school, but I am referring to all schools throughout the Nation. I know, too, that some people are of the opinion that if the schools are not what they should be the board of school directors, teachers, principals, and supervisors must be at fault. Far from that, however, the fault lies on the shoulders of every citizen within the respective communities. All of us must become a little more school-minded. We should take more interest in school activities; we should watch more closely all movements within the school district and we should attend all or at least some of the school-board meetings. Remember that in so doing you are helping to build a better America and a better world, because this or any other nation cannot be any better than its citizens.

At this point I would like to quote from a good American the following statement: "The American people have entered the valley of decision. If the United States makes full use of the opportunity afforded by its position, its power, and its resources, it can determine the destinies of humanity. It can save western civilization."

Now, let us face some of the hard, cold facts regarding our school system. Today we have far less teachers in the Nation's schools than during any normal school year in the 1930's. More than one out of every eight teachers lacks the education or personal qualifications normally required of teachers.

During the year 1945, the American people spent about $55 per capita on drinks, while in the same year the per capita spent on schools was only $17. According to the 1940 census there were 3,000,000 adults with no schooling, 10,000,000 illiterates who could not even read or write as well as a child in the fourth grade. Among the young men who registered for the draft, there were 350,000 who could not even write their name. There were nearly 3,000,000 boys and girls between the ages of 7 and 17 years who were not in school.

There are States where many children go to school less than 5 months a year.

The average annual salary for classroom teachers and administrators in 1940 was only $1,441. More than 350,000—over one-third of the competent teachers employed in the school year of 1940–41—have left the profession. Only one-half of the teachers employed in 1940–41 are teaching today. Only 15 percent of all elementary and high school teachers are men. There are about 75,000 vacancies in the different schools as of today.

The February 15, 1946, edition of Business Week gave some estimates of the present average income of certain groups compared with 1939. Farmers have an increase in average spendable income in terms of 1939 dollars of 155 percent; coal miners, 61 percent; business and professional men 25 percent, and teachers at the bottom of the list with a 20 percent drop in real income. We all recognize the fact that neither the farmer nor the coal miner has too much income, but it is or should be a surprise to learn that the school teacher has suffered a 20-percent loss. Is it any wonder then if we continue paying our teachers less than the garbage collector or the common laborer that our teachers will leave the classroom in search of better paying positions. This is a very serious and dark picture for the future of America.

We all agree that the teaching profession is the most important of all the professions. Without teachers there cannot be any progress, there cannot be science or development in scientific research. The situation will be disastrous, the ultimate outcome tragic and dark. What can we do to prevent such a calamity? Here is the answer. We need more State and Federal aid for the Nation's schools. There is nothing new about State and Federal aid to schools. In the history of the United States Congress more than 150 bills have been passed to provide Federal aid for education.

There should be a minimum educational standard established by the State and Federal Government based on the principle that every boy and girl is entitled to a free education through high school, with advanced study for those of demonstrated ability. There should be an adequate minimum wage salary and proper security for teachers. In making these statements, I consider it to be the duty of our State and Federal Governments, as well as of the Nation, to see that every American has an opportunity to receive an adequate education, free from discrimination because of race, creed, or color. When we ask for more State and Federal aid to schools, we do not fear what some people believe to be too much control over the education of our children. That cannot happen as long as the local control system of education remains in effect.

American education is based upon the great public school system and recognizes the place for the home, church, and the private school. Public schools are functioning with great hardships and therefore need more aid. The church schools have found their place in the American system and are contributing to the evolution and development of their own objectives as well as to the growth and development of American democracy. They too, need aid. The private schools are too well established and are functioning too successfully for the benefit of America. However, it is not advisable to handicap their work. On the contrary, they also should be aided.

Now when there is much discussion and debate on the question of One World, let there be no disagreement on the question of One Nation. Our Nation, dedicated to a program of equal opportunity for all, must afford to the children of America equal opportunity in the field of education.

Of all the subsidy programs established by Congress, none is so important as the program of education. I believe the time has come for our State and Federal Governments to spend money where it will really do some good for everyone by raising the standard of our citizenship during the coming generation. The boys and girls of America are worth more than any other subsidy. These boys and girls are the future of America.

If freedom and equality are to be preserved, then it is time for the State and Federal Governments to spend some money in the direction of education where it will do concrete and lasting good to the people of present and future America. If freedom is to be preserved, let it not be only against foreign aggression, but also against home-grown ignorance.

Let us all do our share to preserve and to improve our ideals of democracy. Let us all do our share to assist these graduates here and all others throughout the land so that in time they will be able to make our ideals—the American way of life—a most realistic system over all other systems. Our system cannot and shall not be secondary to any. Let us save American democracy by improving the American school systems. Let us help to save America for this and future generations.

Tax Discrimination Against Non-Community-Property States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, our thoughtful and able colleague from Missouri, Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR., the author of the original measure providing in tax returns for income splitting between husband and wife, delivered an address to the New England Council at Manchester, Vt., on June 21, which deserves the careful study and serious consideration of the Members. Copies may be obtained from him, though, for reasons of economy, he has urged that it not be set forth here in full.

The existing inequity which permits a taxpayer residing in one of the 12 community-property States to report and pay a substantially smaller tax than one from the other 36 States on the identical income cries aloud for corrective treatment.

This is a matter seriously and unfairly affecting not only those directly involved as taxpayers but also all residents, workers and businessmen, large and small, who live in the States adversely affected, like New York and Missouri. Capital is being siphoned off, factories are being moved, employment sources are being eliminated from the noncommunity property states to the benefit of those states where this anomalous tax advantage can be enjoyed.

I share my colleague's view voiced in this address, that, despite the President's veto of the tax reduction measure, further efforts should be made before adjournment to enact legislation which will assure relief as of January 1, next. To that end, I have reintroduced, with modifications to give even greater consideration to the lower income groups who suffer most severely from the oppressing tax burden, a bill, similar to one I offered last March, providing for a graduated reduction. I am in thorough accord with Mr. REEVES' suggestion, if feasible, that the elimination of the discrimination against which his bill is directed be combined and meshed in with a general tax reduction measure.

I commend this illuminating address of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri to the earnest study of my colleagues.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial from the Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn., May 3, 1947, entitled, "Striving for Education," as follows:

STRIVING FOR EDUCATION

Deploring a "disparity of educational opportunity in different parts of the country (which) is so great as to be unbelievable," the National Education Association calls upon the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to approve a Federal-aid program insuring a minimum annual expenditure of $50 on each pupil. And a spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, seconding this plea, stated Wednesday that "a large segment of our population is going to waste" for lack of schooling.

The Taft bill now before Congress would limit Federal aid to States that spend at least 2.5 percent of their own income on schools. In these cases, it would supplement local appropriations to bring the total spent to $40 a year for each pupil. Some object even to this modest Federal contribution as diverting the taxes collected in States that do their full duty toward their own children to be spent on other States which are delinquent in that respect

This objection, the New York Herald Tribune points out, is based on an erroneous assumption. When a State fails to provide adequate school support, it is very seldom due to lack of effort on the part of that State's citizens. The reason that Mississippi for example, spends the least on its schools is that it is the poorest State. In fact, it devoted 3.41 percent of its income to education in 1939, compared with New York's 2.6 percent. And even that contribution provided only $400 per classroom unit in Mississippi, against New York's $4,100.

Presidential Succession Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are greatly interested in pending proposal to change the Succession Act of 1886. A bill for this purpose has passed the Senate and is now pending in the Judiciary Committee of the House. The Honorable E. E. Patton, a prominent citizen and former public official of Knoxville, Tenn., wrote an interesting discussion of the Presidential Succession Act which recently appeared in the Knoxville Journal. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the article by Mr. Patton, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION IS PROVIDING SOLUTION OF WHAT MIGHT BE DANGEROUS NATIONAL SITUATION

(By E. E. Patton)

Many people believe that there is never any uncertainty about a successor in a monarchy but in this they are very much mistaken. The record shows that this is true of every nation in Europe which has had a monarchy, absolute or limited.

When our Constitutional Convention met in May of 1787 to revise the Articles of Confederation but really to frame a real Constitution, their task was no easy one.

There were precedents for everything that was put into the Constittuion except the electoral college, and it has given us more worry, more concern, than anything else in the Constitution. It provided that each State should have as many members in the electorial college as the State had Senators and Representatives. Each State had two Senators as they have now. But the representation in the House is based on population.

Until 1801 the electors met in their respective State capitals and voted for two men, one of whom should be designated as President and the other as Vice President. That worked very well until 1800 when Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr each received the same number of votes.

When the election goes to the House of Representatives the vote is taken by States and not by individual Members.

The contest between Burr and Jefferson was long-drawn out and bitter.

The method of electing then was changed and the electors voted for one man for President and a different person for Vice President, and the successful man must have a majority and not merely a plurality. This worked until 1824, when the candidates were Henry Clay, William C. Crawford, John Quincy Adams, and Andrew Jackson.

Jackson got a plurality, but not a majority. The act provided that the House might vote on the three highest. Since Henry Clay got fewer than anyone else, he was eliminated from the contest, and Adams was elected. He made Henry Clay Secretary of State and this raised the hue and cry of "bargain and corruption."

There was perhaps no truth in the charge but it got so hot that Clay and John Randolph fought a duel over it.

The Hayes-Tilden election is too well known to be rehearsed here.

There was another incident that might have eventuated into something embarassing in 1912. There were three candidates: Roosevelt (Theodore), William H. Taft, and Woodrow Wilson. Taft and Roosevelt split the Republican vote and Mr. Wilson overwhelmingly was elected. But let us suppose that no one had received a majority. The election would then have gone to the House of Representatives. Since there were 48 States, it would have required 25 States to elect. But four of the States were neutralized because their House membership was 50–50 Democrats and Republicans. That would have left 44 States to take part in the election. Of those 44 States, the Democrats controlled 22 and the Republicans 22. There would have been a tie. Mr. Taft was President and in this country an executive officer holds office until his successor is elected and qualified. Would Mr. Taft have held office for another 4 years or would the Vice President elected that year have become President?

The Constitution and the laws are silent on such a contingency. Until the election of Grover Cleveland in 1884, the President and Vice President would have been succeeded by the President pro tempore of the Senate. Mr. Thomas A. Hendricks, the Vice President, died, and the President pro tempore of the Senate was a Republican. Had Mr. Cleveland died, the political complexion of the Government would have changed. This would be the case today if Mr. Truman's wishes should be carried out; he wants the Speaker of the House to become Chief Executive.

The law was changed when Mr. Hendricks died, and it was provided that the Cabinet should succeed, beginning with the Secretary of State. But it still is nebulous, as I shall show.

The Senate is a continuous body; one-third of the Members are elected every 2 years. Why not provide, by law, that in the event of the death of the President and all of those who are in direct line to succeed him, the chairman of the following Senate committees shall meet and select a President: Judiciary, Foreign Relations, Finance, Appropriations, and Armed Services? The act could, and should, provide that the person selected by this committee should be of the same political faith as the deceased President; and that he should not be a member of this selecting committee.

If this law were enacted, there would be no possible chance of failure to have a President unless every person in line and every Member of the Senate should be killed. Think it over, and if you can devise a better method of guaranteeing a President under all circumstances, let it be known. The Journal editor is amenable to suggestions and he will print them.

Income-Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on March 11 I introduced a bill to give income-tax relief and increase the take-home pay of the overburdened taxpayers of this country. This measure approached the problem by a reduction in the rate of taxes by seven percentage points. The effect of adopting this plan would have been a graduated tax reduction from 35 percent for those in the lowest income brackets on net incomes under $2,000 to about 8 percent for those in the highest brackets with net incomes over $80,000 a year. I expressed my opposition at that time to the straight "across the board" principle of tax relief.

The bill which finally passed both Houses embraced this graduated plan to a certain extent in providing reductions ranging from 30 to 10½ percent. Now that a Presidential veto has thwarted our efforts for this year to relieve the harassed taxpayers, we naturally turn our thoughts to 1948 and must appraise the fiscal situation for that year to determine what we can and should do, with financial soundness, careful solicitude for the best interests of all our people, and due consideration of the wholesome furtherance of the national economy.

We are advised from all sources that there will be a Treasury surplus for fiscal 1947, although there are rather wide variations in the estimates given us regarding the amount of that surplus.

For fiscal 1948 we were told in the President's budget message that he anticipated revenues $1,500,000,000 in excess of expenditures. He gave us the figure of $37,500,000,000 as the rock-bottom amount required to operate the Federal Government for the coming year. Testimony, however, taken before the various appropriations subcommittees has disclosed countless instances of extravagance, waste, duplication, and

overstaffing embraced within the concept of a $37,500,000,000 budget. Although it is not yet determinable with certainty to what exact figure this budget will be reduced, it is conservative to estimate that $4,500,000,000 will be cut from the President's figure, thus yielding at least a total $6,000,000,000 surplus of receipts over disbursements for fiscal 1948.

Just this week, by unanimous action of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, a bill has been reported favorably providing for the retirement of $1,800,000,000 of the national debt by permitting enlisted men to convert their terminal-leave bonds into cash. For those who actually have a pressing need, this is our first obligation. This money has actually been earned. It has been paid to officers in cash. There is no justification for the discrimination practiced on our enlisted men by requiring them to wait 5 years for their money. I quite agree that the terminal-leave bonds are a fine investment for those able to retain them. I shall urge all who can hang on to do so. But many of these young men need this money now, when they are trying to get started in business, or just getting married, or going through the readjustment period. I sincerely trust we will not delay further in settling with these creditors who, when their country called, responded unhesitatingly and unsparingly.

We are informed that the outstanding bonds are about $1,800,000,000. Undoubtedly the surplus for fiscal 1947 will be sufficient to meet this item in full, or nearly so. Assuming, however, the most pessimistic view that all of these men elect to cash their bonds and none of the national debt, thus liquidated, can be met from the 1947 surplus but must come from fiscal 1948 funds, that reduces the $6,000,000,000 figure to $4,200,000,000. This is the amount available, apart from any 1947 surplus, for tax reduction and further debt retirement in fiscal 1948, a figure which I emphasize again has been computed with extreme conservatism.

Today I am reintroducing a tax-reduction bill effective next January 1 which represents a modification of my previous bill in only one respect. It is recognized universally that there is a bare minimum of income which should not be subject to any charge upon it for a contribution to the cost of running the Government. That minimum is now fixed at $500 for a single man and $1,000 for a married man without children. I stated last March, and repeat now, it is my settled conviction that these amounts should eventually be raised to a more realistic figure.

I appreciate the force of the argument that the narrowing of the tax base and elimination of taxpayers from the rolls may create among them a certain undesirable apathy toward excess in governmental spending. For that reason, it is contended, the best interests of the country require that as many as possible of our citizens be rendered tax conscious, in order that they may never forget the fundamental principle that the money which the Government spends must come out of the pockets of the people. This argument, of course, carried to the ultimate, would preclude any exemptions and throw upon every earner, no matter how meager his wages, a certain share of the tax burden. Yet no one who accepts the principle of ability to pay as one of the fundamental criteria in fixation of tax liability seriously contends for such a proposition.

By this legislation I propose to raise the personal exemption $100 to $600 for a single man and $1,100 for a married man without children. Frankly, this is not as far as I would like to go, but represents, of course, a narrowing of the tax base which I realize will encounter opposition from some quarters. It is estimated that it will remove about 4,700,000 taxpayers from the rolls and will cause an annual loss in revenue of $1,500,000,000, or $750,000,000 for the half of fiscal 1948 here involved.

The effect in dollars and cents of this combination of increase in personal exemption with reduction of tax rates by seven percentage points can best be illustrated by example, that is, a man now earning $100 a year above existing personal exemptions who now pays $20 would pay nothing. One with a net income of $200, now paying $40, would pay $13—a reduction of 67½ percent. One with a net income of $1,000, now paying $200, would pay $117, at 41 percent reduction. The $2,000 net income man, now paying $400, would pay $247, a 38 percent reduction. The $4,000 net income man, now paying $840, would pay $545, a 35 percent reduction. The percentage reduction decreases as the income increases, with the result that in the highest brackets the reduction would amount to about 8 percent.

The cost to the Government in lessened revenue by the plan suggested is estimated at $4,900,000,000 for a full year, or one-half of that, $2,450,000,000, for the half fiscal year with which we are here concerned. The addition of this sum to the $750,000,000 reduction resulting from increase in the personal exemption makes a total of $3,200,000,000. Since there is still available $4,200,000,000 after provision for payment of terminal bonds, this indicates at least $1,000,000,000 additional for further debt reduction or such other purposes as may be determined.

We should not embark upon this course without a full realization of what it might entail for fiscal 1949, the budget for which will be the subject of intensive study after we reconvene next year. The $100 extra exemption and the seven-point reduction in tax rate would, we are told, cause an annual reduction in income of about $6,400,000,000, resulting, on the assumption of no change in other Federal income, in total revenues of $32,600,000,000 as against $39,000,000,000 anticipated for this year. Certainly if we can cut the budget this year to $33,000,000,000, everyone anticipates that it will be reduced next year to $30,000,000,000 or less, which would permit retirement of the national debt to the extent of $2,500,000,000 or more, based on the figures which I have set forth. It seems abundantly safe, therefore, to assume that, once having established this reduction, it should not under any normal circumstances be necessary for us to retrace our steps and again increase the tax in order to put or keep our financial house in order.

It is earnestly hoped that the Committee on Ways and Means, whether or not they conclude to report out before adjournment some tax reduction measure, will give serious and careful study to the plan embodied in this bill. Probably, like much of the legislation which comes before us, it may not receive the enthusiastic endorsement of many who vigorously contend for this or that method of approach to this big problem. It is offered in the hope, however, that it might set a possible pattern for reconciliation of the many divergent and conflicting views.

It is my firm belief that the American public would like to see this Congress, despite the President's rebuff, once again endeavor to adopt at this session a law which will assure them for next year, relief from the heavy burden of taxes which is now their lot. I am confident this bill merits and, upon favorable report from the Committee on Ways and Means, would receive from both parties in this House, overwhelming support, so emphatic in its unanimity that the Chief Executive would not be likely a second time to withhold his approval of a measure so eminently sound and fair, and that if he should decide to take that step, a veto would be promptly overridden.

Greece and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of July 1, 1947:

GREECE AND THE UN

A good deal of complaint was heard some weeks ago about the United States bypassing the United Nations in embarking upon its policy of aiding Greece and Turkey to maintain their independence. Whatever merit this criticism may have had at the time, it is now wholly overshadowed by the vigorous manner in which Warren R. Austin, the United States representative to the UN, is prosecuting the case for peaceful settlement of the Balkan dispute through the Security Council. His demand that the Security Council make use of its machinery to settle border disputes between Greece and her Communist-dominated neighbors is now meeting resistance from some of the very forces that were so recently chiding the United States for working outside the UN.

What Mr. Austin asks is that the Security Council establish a commission to aid in restoring normal conditions along the frontiers between Greece and her neighbors—Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania—thereby assisting in the establishment of good neighborly relations. The commission would investigate frontier incidents and complaints by any of the governments concerned. It would use its good offices to settle disputes, to secure the adoption of conventions for peaceful adjustment of controversies growing out of border incidents, and at the same

time keep the Security Council informed of developments in this trouble spot. With a commendable sense of restraint, Mr. Austin is asking the Security Council to act under Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter which gives it authority merely to make recommendations for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

If the encroachments upon Greece's independence should continue, it is clear that the United States will ask the Security Council to move against the nations responsible as aggressors. The findings of the UN Commission of Inquiry make it evident that Yugoslavia has already been guilty of surreptitious aggression. But all that Mr. Austin now asks is abandonment of these assaults and orderly settlement of any future disputes with the aid of a Security Council agency which can make objective findings on the spot. It is precisely this function that the United Nations was created to perform, and if it is permitted thus to cope with the threat to the independence of Greece, American aid can be devoted wholly to reconstruction in that war-torn land. Thus far, however, the reasonable Austin proposal has met with stiff resistance from the Russian and Polish representatives on the Council. If the UN is thus prevented from assuming its normal function in dealing with disputes of this sort, there will be no shadow of doubt as to where the responsibility lies.

New Haven Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the record of hearings on the War Department civil functions appropriation bill for 1948 insofar as it pertains to the New Haven, Conn., Harbor as appears on page 274 of the report. The authorized project provides for the deepening of the existing 25-foot main channel of the New Haven Harbor to 35 feet, and is a necessary step toward the proper development of the harbor and the surrounding areas. As conditions are now, the channel is not deep enough and cannot take the modern ships and tankers. The justification of the project is set up in the report, as follows:

Item No. 1—New Haven Harbor, Conn.

Total estimate Federal cost	$4,428,000
Allotments to date	1,503,000
Tentative allocation, fiscal year 1948	200,000
Additional to complete after fiscal year 1948	2,725,000

One reading the above schedule would get the impression that $1,503,000 had already been appropriated for this particular project. However, only $500,000 of that amount should be allocated to this project. The balance of $1,003,000 represents funds that have been spent on the harbor during the past 50 or 60 years. Therefore the correct recapitulation of this situation is as follows:

Item No. 1—New Haven Harbor, Conn.

Contract figure	$3,460,000
Appropriation for 1947	500,000
Proposed for 1948	200,000
Additional to complete after fiscal year 1948	2,760,000

The contract for the deepening of the existing 25-foot main channel to 35 feet has already been awarded and work will be commenced on the same in September 1947. Many witnesses testified before the Subcommittee on Appropriations as to the advisability of the immediate completion of this project. As a matter of fact, the consultant engineer of the American Marine Institute stated that the New Haven Harbor project was a very urgent one and entitled to completion. The Bureau of the Budget has cut the appropriation to $200,000. I had also understood that the Army engineers were in favor of the completion of this project. In view of the fact that the contract for this work has already been awarded and work will be started upon it in September, and the $700,000 now available will not carry through until the next fiscal year, it will mean that the contractor will have to abandon the work, remove all his equipment from the project, and return at a later date, which may result in greatly increased cost of the project to the Government. In my opinion, the action in recommending only $200,000 now in view of all the circumstances, is false economy.

Our Northwestern Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to apprise the House of the virtues of the State of Connecticut with particular reference to the scenic beauty of Litchfield County, and include the following article by Charles Pease of Salisbury, Conn., which appeared in the June 1947 issue of the Community Service Bulletin Board, Lakeville, Conn.:

OUR NORTHWESTERN CORNER—WHERE THE JOY OF LIVING AND THE "FOUR FREEDOMS" PREDOMINATE

(By Charles Pease)

We are living in the best country in the world, and the best part of this country is the New England States, and the best part of the New England States is Connecticut, and the best part of Connecticut is Litchfield County, and the best part of Litchfield County is its northwestern corner, and the best part of this northwestern corner is in the towns of Salisbury, North Canaan, Canaan, Cornwall and Sharon.

These northwestern-corner towns are blessed with a paradoxical combination of natural attractions—the finest scenery among our valleys and mountains (including the highest land in Connecticut—Bear Mountain), and the beautiful lakes and rivers where the followers of Izaak Walton enjoy their piscatorial hobby to their hearts' content. Yet, with all of these natural attractions, we are within a few minutes' drive over fine roads from any part of our country environment to several fine trading centers with the advantages enjoyed by city dwellers; in other words, we are literally so near and yet so far, because, even if many of these locations are so near to our business centers, they are yet so far that the commercial world is out of sight, and only the fine country scenery, invigorating atmosphere in our higher altitude, and the quiet of an ideal outing life are in evidence. Our residents enjoy a life of combining pleasure with business every day in the year.

It was of Twin Lakes, in the town of Salisbury that Henry Ward Beecher once said: "For more beautiful sheets of water and more beautiful sites upon which to look at them, one may search without finding." And of Sage's Ravine at the extreme north of Salisbury's boundary, Reverend Beecher again wrote: "It's worth a trip from New York every month in the year to visit this place."

Nor is this all. There is no more attractive and scenic drive in the famous Berkshires than on route 7 from Canaan down through the Cornwalls following the Housatonic River and winding around between the mountains and the river to Kent, where Kent Falls is another attraction.

The Cornwall Hills, in the midst of which is Cream Hill Lake, are attractions that are calling outside people who enjoy a really wild country life, and where, in some cases, the rocks are so generously distributed over some of the farmers' pastures that it was once a common saying that they had to file the sheep's noses so they could get the grass between the rocks.

Sharon has attractions common to the other corner towns and enjoys the reputation of being one of the finest residential villages in the State, surrounded by fine building sites and farming lands.

It's too long a story to enumerate all of the fine things here in our northwestern corner, but they are legion.

What is claimed to be the most extensive cave in New England has its entrance near the south shore of Lake Washinee (the southern of the Twin Lakes); it is so extensive that it has never been completely explored. The entire circuit of the cave is a walk of about 1,400 feet, and it is claimed to be possible to descend into it for a half mile. The entrance is somewhat obscure, and the cave is not attracting attention now, but it was quite famous in the 1870's and visited by hundreds of people. History tells us that this cave was discovered years ago by a fox hunter whose dog chased a fox into the entrance hole and the dog went in after it. As there is no record of the dog ever coming out it is surmised that it may have become lost in the labyrinth of chambers and passages—or perhaps it is still chasing the fox.

Every year more people who know a good thing when they see it are learning of the attractive features of this corner of our Nutmeg State and are buying property, establishing summer homes or camps, and in many cases, building fine residences or remodeling old farm houses for year-around permanent homes, but there are still many desirable sites available.

United States Aid to Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Cincinnati Post, June 19, 1947, entitled "United States Aid to Schools":

UNITED STATES AID TO SCHOOLS

One of the questions certain to rise during and discussion of Federal financial aid for the public schools has been, Does this mean

that Washington eventually will run the schools?

The answer is "no," if one may judge fairly from the "preferred" Federal-aid bills now being considered by House and Senate committees of Congress. Both the Taft bill in the Senate and the McCowen bill in the House authorize the States to distribute the grants as they choose with the reasonable restrictions only that Federal money shall not be used to pay debts or erect buildings.

The serious interest in this legislation is due to the spreading conviction that the National Government shares responsibility with State and local governments to assure every American child a good education. This philosophy represents an evolutionary growth. Once an American child's education depended upon the parents' willingness and ability to pay a tutor. A century ago education became a community responsibility and a few decades ago the States began to bear a part of that load.

A good education is the birthright of every American boy and girl. This is the firm faith of virtually every citizen. Some children in the low-income States are not getting such an education today. The one practical solution appears to be help from the National Treasury.

Automobiles for Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I favor the enactment of H. R. 3583 authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay for the purchase of automobiles for certain disabled veterans. This bill extends the present law so as to authorize the purchase of cars for veterans deprived of their sight.

In approaching all veteran legislation we should be guided by the fundamental principle that our first responsibility is to the disabled veteran. The enactment of H. R. 3583 would be a manifestation of our appreciation of the tremendous sacrifice made by our disabled veterans toward the winning of the war. I urge that the Rules Committee grant a rule providing for the early consideration of H. R. 3583.

I recently received an interesting letter from a constituent of mine dealing with the urgent need for the enactment of this legislation. I insert it here:

Hon. EDWARD J. DEVITT,
Member of Congress, Fourth Congressional District, Minnesota, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DEVITT: It is very seldom that I ever write to a Member of Congress on any issue, but these are unusual times.

There is now before the House—in the Rules Committee to be exact—a measure which would give automobiles to blinded veterans. I ask your active interest in this measure because I feel that it is a measure which is definitely in the public interest. It is not only in the public interest in equity—it is a part of the public debt.

I am a veteran of the late war—fortunately able bodied—I ask nothing for myself. The Federal Government has been overgenerous in my case. But in the case of a veteran who has had his eyes shot out in direct combat with the enemy, there is no such concept as "overgenerous." Such a person lives in your district—my brother, to be exact. He was an active boy interested in athletic competition and now he stumbles in blindness over a chair in his own home. This is but one instance where an automobile would aid immeasurably in his mobility, self-confidence, and rehabilitation. His wife would be able to drive him around and to distant places where his handicap would cause him not to attempt use of the public common carrier.

He would buy his own car, but today in St. Paul the cash for a new car is prohibitive to anyone who is not wealthy.

This bill which I refer to is H. R. 3583; it is in the Rules Committee, which apparently will be its grave unless it is saved and brought out to a vote. It must be saved soon or it will perish in apathy. Surely the Congress is not made up of Members so hardened that such will be the case.

To assist you in your action on this measure, I will propose, fight for, and urge a resolution upon the Fourth District American Legion of which I am an active member. While I have no direct authority to do so, I feel that I can assure you of the support of all veterans' organizations in the district.

My brother, above referred to, is the chairman of the Minnesota regional group of the BVA and as such also assures you of the full support of this organization. If you are interested in the views of a local blinded veteran, I suggest you write to him at his home. He can speak with authority for every blinded veteran in the State.

Unification of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 2, 1947:

UNIFICATION AT THIS SESSION

With the Senate scheduled to begin debate today on the bill to unify the armed services and a House committee ending its hearings today on a similar measure, there is every indication that a decision will be reached at this session of Congress. Opposition in both chambers is expected to be lively but not large.

Unification is a prerequisite to the formulation of any intelligent military policy for the United States. As long as it remains a disputed legislative matter no really long-range planning can be done. It has been almost two years since the guns were silenced in the Pacific and high time to be about molding the peacetime Military Establishment we need. The longer a decision is delayed the more frictions will develop among the services in their campaigns for appropriations and congressional preference and the longer costly duplications will continue.

In overriding some of its armed services committeemen in the House, who apparently favored an interminable continuance of hearings until every Navy officer who objected could be heard, the Republican leadership has shown political courage and statesmanship. Recent testimony by naval officers before the House committee had raised no new points of objection to the basic principle. Most of it has been along the pattern of "Yes, but" and the putting forward of alternatives that in many cases would be as weak as no unification at all.

Fortunately, unification has not been made a partisan issue. President Truman is vigorously in favor of it. So, apparently, is the leadership of both major parties. The Secretaries of War and Navy and the ranking commanders of Army, Navy, Air and the Marine Corps have all put their stamp of approval on the proposed legislation. There is a time for discussion and a time for decision. On unification the time for decision has arrived. Delaying tactics in either House should not be sanctioned by the leadership. The quicker unification can be put into practice the sooner we shall have that integration of policy and of services which was so obviously needed during the war and is just as necessary today.

Against Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, here is a most scholarly presentation of the arguments against the Federal Government participating, influencing, controlling, or otherwise affecting education in the States by Robert A. Millikan:

THE MOST VITAL PROBLEM IN AMERICAN EDUCATION TODAY

(By Robert A. Millikan)

One of the elements of greatness of Anglo-Saxon civilization is that many of England's most inviolable laws are not found at all upon her statute books, but are rather the customs which because of the general intelligence and insight of her people have gained the force of law. Here is the finest flowering of the spirit of freedom.

Again, the American educational system, stemming originally from English ideals of freedom, is unique in two respects. First, the whole huge elementary and secondary school system, the greatest business in this great land, though tax supported and free to all, indeed in 42 of our 48 States, coupled with the required attendance of every boy and girl from age 5 to age 16 (in California and in at least 4 other States, to age 18) has been thus far practically wholly in the hands of the local communities, which not only tax themselves to support it but control it through their locally elected boards of education.

The second element of uniqueness is that the higher, or college and university, system consists of institutions about half of which are controlled by self-perpetuating boards of trustees and are privately supported through endowments, contributions, tuitions, and fees. The other half are locally tax-supported schools controlled by different municipalities in some instances and by the 48 States in others, but in no case as yet by the Federal Government.

This local self-government in education is one of our most priceless American heritages. According to the greatest thinkers of the past, Spinoza, Montesquieu, John Locke, and our founding fathers, it is the key to the maintenance of the freedom of a great republic. It is the great safeguard against the malignant disease politely called patronage, better called political corruption, which is the chief device through which the party in power in Washington can, and to no small extent already does, seek to indoctrinate the public in the interests of the maintenance of its own power. Local cancers in humans or in the States can be eliminated before they have spread throughout the whole body.

but when the whole system has become infected the patient dies, whether that patient be a man or a great federal republic.

Listen to the exact words of the great historian and political philosopher Montesquieu (1747) whose writings were carefully studied and were also very influential with our founding fathers:

"If a republic is small, it is destroyed by a foreign power; if it is large, it destroys itself by an inner vice. So it is very likely that men would have been forced to live always under the rule of one man (a despot) had they not imagined a constitution which combines the advantages of a republican government and the external force of a monarchy. I mean a federal republic. Made up of small republics it enjoys the high political quality of each (such small republic), and toward other powers it has by virtue of a federation all the advantages of monarchies."

No clearer statement of the menace to the freedom of a great federal republic that arises from the loss of local self-government through the unnecessary concentration of power in the Federal Government has ever been made. That is why the founding fathers, who have been said to have had greater wisdom, insight, and understanding as a group than any assembly ever brought together anywhere, so definitely limited the authority of our Federal Government and reserved all unallocated powers to the constituent States and local communities.

But I do not need to go back to Spinoza, Montesquieu, and the founding fathers for pointing out the menace which they all saw, particularly in the centralization of education in a great republic like the United States. A joint report was put out in March 1945 [1] by the Problems and Policies Committee of the American Council on Education and the Educational Policies Commission of the NEA. It states the views of some 20 of the most distinguished educators in the United States. The following quoted paragraphs are taken from this joint report, the first four of them from the section entitled "The Drift Toward the Federalization of Education in the United States." These paragraphs read as follows:

"The first purpose of this document is to warn the American people of an insidious and ominous trend in the control and management of education in the United States. Its second purpose is to propose policies and procedures by which citizens may resist and reverse this dangerous trend.

"For more than a quarter of a century and especially during the past decade, education in the United States, like a ship caught in a powerful tide, has drifted ever farther into the dangerous waters of Federal control and domination. This drift has continued at an accelerated rate during the war. Present signs indicate that, unless it is sharply checked by an alert citizenry, it will continue even more rapidly after the war.

"It is the deliberate and reasoned judgment of the two educational commissions who join in the appeal which this document makes to the people of the United States that the trend toward the federalizing of education is one of the most dangerous of the current American scene.

"How did this trend come about? Do the people of the United States really want to place their schools and colleges under the predominant control of the Federal Government? We are sure that they do not. It should be remembered that the control of education is reserved to the States under the tenth amendment to the Constitution. The people have shown repeatedly during more than a century that they want to keep education primarily under State and local control and administration. Furthermore, in a recent public-opinion poll, our citizens favored keeping the predominant control of public education in State, rather than in Federal, hands by more than 3 to 1.

"It is the mature conclusion of the commissions responsible for the issuance of this report that a continuance of recent and current trends in Federal and State relations in education will, within a measurable period of time, transfer predominant responsibility for the control of education in the United States from the States and localities to the National Government. Already we have traveled farther along that road than is generally realized.

"Recent decades have witnessed a mounting tide of centralization. It has swept into government and other spheres of life. It is world-wide as well as Nation-wide.

"Is this an irresistible trend, inherent in the industrial revolution and other momentous changes in the affairs of mankind? Have forces been released which are beyond human control—forces which are destined to place all phases of life under centralized domination—including the education of children and youth?

"The commissions responsible for this statement reject the gloomy conclusion that impersonal forces beyond the control of men are destined to submerge the individual, the home, and the local community in a rising tide of indiscriminate centralization. While it is recognized that new factors in contemporary civilization require closer organization and increased centralization of some areas of life, other areas can be permitted to come under central control only at our peril. The fact that the National Government must be the predominant authority in waging warfare and in determining the routes of transcontinental highways does not mean that it should similarly dominate such areas as the distribution of news and the education of the young.

"Education should be placed high on the list of services to be continued under State and local control. The ability to make distinctions as to what should be and what should not be centralized permits some nations to preserve their liberty. Those which cannot so distinguish succumb first to totalitarianism and then to despotism."

Nothing that I might be disposed to say could add any cogency to the foregoing warning issued as the collective judgment of a distinguished group of modern educators. The extremity of the peril could scarcely be more strongly stated.

I cannot, however, urge entire confidence in the soundness of the report merely because of the prominence of the signers, for I find myself in some disagreement with parts of the last half of this document. Here it seems to me to fail in providing the safeguards for which it sees so clearly the necessity. Indeed, I cannot myself see that this part of the report offers any practical suggestions that could be effective in staying the dangerous trend which the first part of the report states so clearly and deplores so strongly.

In trying to explain how this "Federal encroachment on education" (to use the report's own words) has come about its authors criticize and lay the blame upon the way, during the depression and the war, the relief measures for the schools were handled by the Federal agencies, the WPA (Works Progress Administration), the PWA (Public Works Administration), the NYA (National Youth Administration), the Lanham Act, the GI bill, the CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps). The latter part of the report implies that if these agencies had distributed the money to the States instead of disbursing it themselves as Federal agents all would have been well.

That suggestion seems to me quite unrealistic, even naive, for when Congress voted these funds does any informed person suppose that politics, i. e., votes and patronage, did not enter in any way into their distribution?

Here we are touching the altogether fundamental reason for Spinoza's advice to keep the central government as far as possible out of the field of education as such, for he was convinced that if this were not done the group or party in power would inevitably use its power to indoctrinate the public in the interest of the maintenance of that power. I may indicate later where I think the lines may be drawn to preserve liberty, but I suspect that Spinoza had analyzed the safe-guard end of the problem better than does the joint Educational Policies Commission and the Problems and Policies Committee.

In a word, if under the extreme exigencies of the 1932 depression and the 1942-46 war it was found necessary temporarily to pour Federal funds into American education I suspect that in practice it had to be done directly and about as it was done in order to meet the emergency, the danger lying in the fact that it became necessary to do it at all rather than in the precise way in which it was done.

Let me present an analogous case. In 1940, when the isolationists were trying to keep us out of the war on the plea that we would lose our souls as well as our shirts if we went into it, Edwin F. Gay, one of our greatest economists, rose in a meeting which I attended and said, "Gentlemen, it is true, as the isolationists say, that we cannot get into a war against totalitarian Hitler without becoming for the time being to a large extent a totalitarian state ourselves. We cannot fight this kind of a totalitarian war otherwise, but if we do not go in, what is the alternative? We shall merely become a part of Hitler's totalitarian world anyway, whereas if we fight to retain our freedom and win I, for one, have enough confidence in the Anglo-Saxon's genius for freedom to count on our ability to throw off our war-built totalitarianism and get back to a free system as we did after World War I. In other words, if we make peace with Hitler we shall be forever the slaves of his totalitarian world, but if we can conquer him we have at least a good chance of returning again to our system of freedom. We have no other alternative if we want to remain free men." I hope Dr. Gay's faith in the Anglo-Saxon genius to preserve freedom and to throw off the totalitarianisms which we had to submit to in war will be justified.

My criticism, then, of the last part of the report of the Joint Policies Committee is that it seems to me to hold out the expectation that we can find a mechanism of accepting large Federal subsidies for education continuously without suffering the consequences and acquiring a corresponding measure of Federal control of education. In this I think the authors of the report are in error, for in the long run "the man who pays the piper is the man who calls the tune." Even the United States Supreme Court has decided that this is a legally sound statement, for in a test case brought before it in the summer of 1942 this highest court ruled that "the Government has the right to regulate that which it subsidizes." This decision shows that the insights and fears of our founding fathers were well grounded that Federal support entails Federal control.

---

[1] This is issued in pamphlet form under the title "Federal-State Relations in Education," the signers of the report for the Committee on Problems and Policies being Edmund E. Day (chairman), Oliver C. Carmichael, Harold W. Dodds, Charles E. Friley, Luther H. Gulick, Henry H. Hill, J. L. Morrill, William F. Russell, Alexander J. Stoddard, George D. Stoddard, Ralph W. Tyler, William E. Wickenden, Herman B. Wells; and for the Educational Policies Commission, Alexander J. Stoddard (chairman), Francis L. Bacon, James Bryant Conant, Prudence Cutright, Edmund E. Day, A. C. Flora, E. W. Jacobsen, Edwin A. Lee, Paul T. Rankin, Maycie Southall, George D. Stoddard, Mabel Studebaker, Pearl A. Wanamaker.

Another element in the second part of the report which in its present form is misleading and which tends to perpetuate a common but obviously a fundamental fallacy is found in the heading: "State and local resources alone are inadequate." That seems to me at least a very unfortunate statement, for taken the country over State and local resources are, of course, all the resources there are. The man who penned the foregoing phrase slipped into a fundamental economic error which the great labor leader, Sam Gompers, warned his followers against making, telling them essentially that in general socialistic measures are necessarily made at the expense of the economic well-being of the worker; that they also tend to destroy individual initiative, which is far and away the greatest restoring, or antidepression, force in existence, hundreds of times more potent than anything government can do.

The nearest approach to an ideal system of raising and spending tax funds is to get these two operations of raising and spending tax money as close together as possible. If graft or inefficiency then appear those who suffer from it are on the spot to check it. You catch the cancer at its inception. This is just what Montesquieu was saying when he was lauding the virtues of small republics. This, plus the education of all the citizens in the art of self-government, is the reason for his statement that large republics are destroyed by an inner vice while small republics are relatively free from such corruption.

It is actually more costly in taxes to any community to get its funds through the Federal Government than through its own local government. In a word, anything a local community gets from the Federal Government it itself pays for and at an unnecessarily excessive rate, too, unless it steals what is raised in, and rightfully belongs to, some other community and this no self-respecting community wants to do.

But when the system of getting funds for a community from a common pot collected by the central government once becomes the recognized procedure, then every community must fight continually with all the others to get its share, as it says, but what it actually does under such a system is to try to get as much more than its share as it can. As a result, vice and corruption in all their forms become rampant and there is no solution except the ultimate rise of the despot, who takes control and cleans out the small grafters by putting himself as a big grafter in their place. Liberty is then gone and tyranny has replaced freedom and justice.

But so far I have not touched the case which the advocates of large Federal subsidies for education bear down upon most heavily. This argument runs thus: There is an uneven distribution of educational load and financial resources in different sections of the Nation, and our ideal is to give every boy and girl as nearly as possible an equal educational opportunity.

This kind of egalitarianism seems to spring from commendable humanitarian ideals. But it is a part of the paternalistic, socialistic, collectivistic philosophy which is the antithesis of the American free enterprise philosophy. For this latter philosophy tries to stimulate individuals and communities alike to self-improvement by providing rewards for social effectiveness instead of doles for ineffectiveness. The first question to ask is, to what extent is the inequality of opportunity real in this case, i. e., how bad is it, and is the suggested remedy a real one, and to what extent is this merely a lawyer's argument put forward to make the most of a good sentimental slogan for his clients. This last is what its critics claim, and they cite the prevalence of the promises of increased pay for teachers through Federal subsidy. The next question is, how big a price do we pay for the suggested change?

To answer the first question I present some official Government figures which give for each State the percent that current expenditures for public schools by each State is of the total income-tax payment of that State. The average for the whole United States is 1.50 percent, and it is simply amazing how little fluctuation about this average figure is found anywhere in the country. This table shows that the States that spend the largest fraction of their total income on their public-school sysem are: Idaho, 1.83; Minnesota, 1.98; Montana, 2.28; New Mexico, 2.41; Oklahoma, 2.01; South Dakota, 2.21; West Virginia, 2.38; Wyoming, 2.24. These 8 are the only States that spend more than 1.8 percent of their available income on their public schools. Also, keeping in mind that the average for the country is 1.5 percent it is interesting that there are only 11 States that spend less than 1.3 percent of their available income on their public schools. These are: Alabama, 1.29; Delaware, 1.11; Florida, 1.06; Georgia, 1.24; Maine, 1.16; Maryland, 0.98; Nevada, 1.22; Oregon, 1.14; Rhode Island, 1.16; Virginia, 1.15; Washington State, 1.23. All the rest of the States oscillate between the narrow limits 1.3 and 1.8, and the publication of these figures actually constitutes the strongest possible incentive to backward States to emulate the example of their neighbors. Under a Federal-dole system this, the most powerful possible force operating toward improvement, is largely removed.

Again, another interesting comparison is found in the current expenditures for public school education per child between the ages 5 to 17 years. This averages throughout the country $71.15 per year, and there are only nine States that spend less than $45 per child, as follows: Alabama $28.22, Arkansas $26.22, Georgia $32.06, Kentucky $32.66, Mississippi $24.26, North Carolina $34.78, South Carolina $31.37, Tennessee $35.08, Virginia $41.71. Again, there are but six States that spend more per child than $92, which is then to be compared with the general average of $71.15. These six States are California $126.99, Connecticut $94.89, Nevada $98.58, New Jersey $118.05, New York $129.13, Washington State $93.77. But far be it from me to use "dollar payments" as a yardstick of educational adequacy. That is a well-known and accepted fallacy.

From the standpoint of both of these criteria the differences seem to me surprisingly small, in general—with one or two exceptions—scarcely more than the differences in the cost of living in different States, and the way they oscillate between rich States and poor States suggests that the cause of the differences lies more in the interest in education in different States than in the financial capacities of the dwellers in different States. Indeed, nothing could bring out better the folly of assuming that Congress under its existing political pressures has the capacity actually to equalize educational opportunities through any system of dollar doles that could have any chance of passing, is shown by this one striking fact that Utah, which ranks thirty-second among the 48 States in ability to support education, is ranked in statistical educational studies by President Hughes and his co-authors at Iowa State College as the first State in the Union in its educational performance. In a word, this whole Federal-dole approach is a wrong one. It cannot in actual practice accomplish what it claims to do.

In this connection it will be interesting to hear the testimony of Dr. George S. Benson, president of Harding College, Searcy, Ark., who exposes as follows the unsoundness of much talk by educators who call loudly for Federal subsidies for education. He says:

"I am representing the taxpayers association in a State which is forty-seventh in per capita income ($512.00) and which is forty-sixth in value of school property per pupil in attendance ($116.00) and which is forty-seventh in per capita expenditure per student enrolled in the public schools ($34.18). But I am here to testify that the members of the Arkansas Public Expenditure Council believe that Federal aid to education is neither necessary nor desirable.

"As taxpayers in Arkansas we are fully aware that Arkansas' educational advantages are inadequate. We are determined that they shall be improved. We believe the greatest obstacles to be overcome in Arkansas, however, are political, not financial. We believe that Federal aid to education would serve to increase these political obstacles rather than helping to remove them. We believe that Arkansas can and must reorganize and adequately support its own educational program. * * *

"Mississippi is the only State with a per capita income lower than Arkansas and the only State which in the past has been paying its school teachers less than Arkansas, or which has provided less money per pupil for education than Arkansas. Mississippi has, like Arkansas, found a great deal of oil during recent years and her revenue in 1943 increased to $63,602,000, which is about 33 percent above the revenue for Arkansas for the same year—although the population of the two States is about the same. Mississippi's expenditures in 1943 were $10,706,000 less than her receipts from revenue, thus creating a surplus of almost $11,000,000 in that one year alone. The Arkansas surplus over several years has climbed to a present total of $45,000,000.

"Since Mississippi and Arkansas are the two poorest States in the Union, and since Arkansas is able to provide adequate educational facilities, and since Mississippi created an $11,000,000 surplus last year, what I am saying for Arkansas and which appears to be true of Mississippi should be representative of all the States in the Union.

"While the States of the Union have been improving their economic status during the past 15 years and while they have been decreasing their indebtedness, the Federal Government has been increasing its indebtedness by leaps and bounds. We will most likely close the World War with a Federal debt of $300,000,000,000. So with the Federal Government carrying such a superload and with the States in a greatly improved condition it seems absurd to undertake to place on the Federal Government the burden of aiding education throughout the States. Gentlemen, I insist that the States are much more able to take care of their own educational needs than is the Federal Government."

Those are the inspiring words of a real American. But is his thinking correct? If you want more evidence listen again, this time to the voice of one of the finest and ablest men in the United States, a distinguished Congressman from Texas, Hatton Sumners, who after serving for 30 years in Congress with a great record, as all his congressional associates will testify, has recently resigned for the sake of devoting his remaining energies to the spread of the following great message:

"Our whole political system is based on the principle of local self-government. But two forces have been destroying this principle. One is the demand of the people for Federal Government to intervene in problems of every community and every class. The other is the ever-growing practice of passing all these problems on to the Government in Washington. The last war gave this a big push. The postwar dislocation hurried it. The great depression raised it to avalanche proportions. The present war is completing the job. Every town and State, every trade association and trade union, every class and group of desperate minority, brings its problems to Washington. And Washington is gladly accepting that responsibility."

Listen again to what the greatest educational expert in the United States, Nicholas Murray Butler, had to say on this subject a few years ago:

"One of the most noteworthy of recent developments in American life is the zeal with which machinery is designed and built, ostensibly to serve various public interests and undertakings, but in reality to control them. Perhaps in no other way is the decline of faith in liberty so clearly marked. * * *

"So far as education is concerned there has been overcentralization for a long time past. * * *

"There is not enough money in the United States, even if every dollar of it were expended on education, to produce through Federal authority, or through what is naively called cooperation between the Federal Government and the several States, educational results that would be at all comparable with those that have already been reached under the free and natural system that has grown up among us. * * *

"Unless the school is both the work and pride of the community it serves, it is nothing. A school system that grows naturally in response to the needs and ambitions of a hundred thousand different communities will be a better school system than any which can be imposed upon those localities by the aid of grants of public money from the Federal Treasury, accompanied by Federal regulations, Federal inspections, Federal reports, and Federal uniformities."

Similar statements can be quoted from recent presidents of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. But coming up to date, the Eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Indiana adopted in January 1945 the following:

"House Concurrent Resolution 2

"Indiana needs no guardian and intends to have none. We Hoosiers—like the people of our sister States—were fooled for quite a spell with the magician's trick that a dollar taxed out of our pockets and sent to Washington will be bigger when it comes back to us. We have taken a good look at said dollar. We find that it lost weight in its journey to Washington and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted. We have decided that there is no such thing as Federal aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States.

"So we propose henceforward to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves. We are fed up with subsidies, doles, and paternalism. We are no one's stepchild. We have grown up. We serve notice that we will resist Washington, D. C., adopting us.

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the Senate concurring). That we respectfully petition and urge Indiana's Congressmen and Senators to vote to fetch our county courthouse and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue. We want government to come here.

"Resolved further, That we call upon the legislatures of our sister States and on good citizens everywhere who believe in the basic principles of Lincoln and Jefferson to join with us, and we with them, to restore the American Republic and our 48 States to the foundations built by our fathers."

But another State also officially opposes Federal aid:

"On April 28 Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a concurrent resolution recently adopted by the legislature of the State of Michigan urging the Senators and Representatives from that State 'to exert all their efforts in attempting to stop, or at least reduce the offering of Federal-aid to the several States and Territories.' The Michigan Legislature in its resolution called attention to the recent action of the Legislature of Indiana along the same line (see RW No. 112) and asserted that since 'our Nation is financially embarrassed to the amount of one-quarter of a trillion dollars' it 'should divert so-called Federal-aid toward reducing its indebtedness.' The resolution also declared that the State of Michigan and most other States 'are in sound financial condition, able to handle their own fiscal responsibilities.' " (Quoted from 'Round Washington, May 5, 1947.)

Also, here is testimony from Oklahoma. Steve Stahl, executive vice president of the Oklahoma Public Expenditure Council, stated before the House Committee on Education and Labor on May 13, 1947:

"I am here because I am gravely concerned over existing trends in Federal-State financial relationship and because I believe Federal aid to education is both unnecessary and undesirable. * * * In the first place, every one of our 48 States is in a better position to bear the cost of education than is the Federal Government with a debt of some $260,000,000,000 whereas the 10 low-ranking income States had at the end of 1946 an aggregate balance of $306,414,000."

Listen again to what the National Grange has to say:

"The Grange has always stood for local and State control of our public schools, because in that direction only lies the path of true progress in educational affairs. In the long run, Federal appropriations for the public schools and Federal control would go hand in hand.

"Because we are against bureaucracy and all the evils that go with it and because we are opposed to Federal control of education and in favor of continued State and local control of our public-school system, we must oppose Federal appropriations for elementary and secondary education except the already existing vocational educational program." ('Round Washington, May 12, 1947.)

And may I add that the fact that we teachers are joining the scramble shuts our mouths from protesting against, from an international standpoint, the most vicious of subsidies, such as shipping and export subsidies.

At this hour fortunately the danger that we may be destroyed by a foreign foe is gone. But is our great Republic, then, to be destroyed after the war by its internal vice? That depends, if Montesquieu was right, upon how you and I vote and talk in this postwar period on the preservation of local self-government.

But what concrete evidence have we that Montesquieu was right? I quoted his lines, not to hold him up as a superman. Indeed, if his spirit is here in invisible form in this room today, as it may well be, I can hear him entering a protest at the importance I have apparently been attaching to his statement of one of the greatest truths of human history. I think I hear him say:

"Pray, do not believe that I would for a moment arrogate to myself the authorship of the ideas behind those lines of mine. The words chosen may indeed be mine, but the ideas represent the sum and substance, the distilled essence, of both the thinking and the experience of mankind in its age-long struggle to eliminate the despot, the totalitarian state, and to achieve free, stable, representative government on earth. Pray, do not for a moment assume, for example, that those extraordinary men who devised your Constitution got the ideas that underlie it from me. They were all, on their own account, profound students of the best thought and experience of mankind. That is where those ideas came from. We all drank from the same fountain of history. That is why they, on their own account, came to devise a federation of small republics, now numbering 48, and reserved to these and their constituent local communities all powers not specifically delegated to the central government, which was to exist, as they clearly planned it, primarily for defending these United States against external aggression, a Federal Government which was not designed to encroach in peace upon the powers of the States or of their constituent communities. If now the 150 years of history which you have had in developing, on the sound basis of those ideas, the highest standard of living for the common man that has ever existed anywhere in history, if that is not enough to establish their validity, then give the credit for these ideas not to me but to the parallel history of the oldest and unquestionably the most successful people in the exercise of parliamentary government, the British Commonwealth of Nations. For Britain, until quite recently, has guarded the principle of local self-government throughout her empire during the last hundred years more jealousy than has the United States, and she has also kept herself much freer in that period from political corruption than has the United States.

"Probably the greatest political document of all history is the Statute of Westminster of 1931 which created the British Commonwealth of Nations, whose constituent parts are federated practically only for one purpose—defense against a common foe, but which are otherwise a world encircling group of completely independent communities. Nowhere in history has the principle of local self-government been more strikingly or more beneficently applied."

Now, having listened to the spirit of Montesquieu, supported by the teachings of history, let me try to apply the foregoing to the critical problems of the ensuing peace.

For the sake of winning the war we had to become very largely, for the time being, a totalitarian state. We knew, as Edwin Gay said, that in war this was inevitable, but if we retain in peace this now highly centralized totalitarian government, if we do not combat at every opportunity this insidious, terrible centralizing tendency, and restore, insofar as present conditions make possible, the principle of local self-government, then if history means anything we shall quickly be destroyed by the inner vice of all totalitarian states and our sons will have died in vain.

The greatest and most insidious danger lies in my own field, the field of education, which must be kept as free as possible from further encroachment from the influence of the central government. All authorities are agreed upon that. Look at what within the last two decades the control of education by central governments has done in Europe. It has substituted for education the indoctrination of whole peoples in the ideologies of the group in power and in the interests of their retention of that power. It is that kind of indoctrination for world conquest that has destroyed the souls of great peoples and made two world wars. Our votes alone, and your influence, American citizens, can prevent that kind of a catastrophe from happening in the United States. Let us remember this when we go to the polls and when we exert our influences in our local groups.

MAY 22, 1947.

Terminal-Leave Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, if one is to believe what he reads in the news-

papers, the Republican leadership has finally decided to bring out a bill to authorize the cashing of our soldiers' terminal-leave bonds. I am delighted to learn of this action, and I only hope that the majority party now will not see fit to further kick this bill around, but will pass it in time for it to go to the President before adjournment.

Since the distinguished Member from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] introduced the original bill on January 3, I have fought with him to bring it to the floor, despite the fact that we knew that the majority party would probably change the name of the author and bring it out as a Republican measure, with a view to the next election.

The payment of terminal-leave money in bonds which are non-negotiable and uncashable constituted one of the most discriminatory acts ever committed by this Congress. Apparently a majority of the Members of at least one House of this Congress did not give our enlisted men credit for having enough judgment and ability to manage their own money, and paid their money in bonds to protect them, while at the same time they paid our already high-paid officers terminal leave in cash.

I am extremely disappointed that this injustice was not rectified during the earlier days of this Congress so that our GI's could now be enjoying this hard-earned and deserved money.

Ideas Have Legs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, no one who reads the headlines these days can fail to feel the challenge to democracy to prove itself or go under. Our best answer to the ethics of other ideologies abroad and at home is to set such a pattern that other people will want to follow the road of freedom. Nowhere is this more urgent than in the field of industrial relations. We need to serve notice to the world that, despite the bitterness stirred by recent labor debates and legislation, labor and management are determined to tackle the tasks of full production in a spirit of teamwork.

Last week end I took a trip back to my home city of Detroit to see what was being done in this regard. On the train I met representatives of the United Nations, Congress, the State Department and War Department, management and labor—both CIO and AFL. This unusual medley of travel companions was all going for a special labor-management night arranged by leaders of Detroit, including members of the civic labor-management committees of both Detroit and our neighboring Canadian city of Windsor across the river.

The feature of the evening was a performance of Ideas Have Legs—the most entertaining and convincing dramatization I have seen of the only force that can make American democracy work. This was the fifteenth and final showing of this revue, which has been attended during this past month by over 28,000 of my fellow Detroiters. I understand many hundreds have had to be turned away each night and that the impact on my city has been tremendous and widespread.

People on opposite sides of industrial disputes who could be brought together in no other way have met in the lobby of the theater, and in at least one instance, I am told, a strike was settled the next day. A committee of invitation headed by the mayor brought this revue to Detroit following first performances in Grand Rapids, Lansing, and Benton Harbor. Mr. Allan B. Crow, president of the Economic Club, our city's leading industrial forum, called the attention of its members to the play as most timely and dramatic. Michigan labor has responded equally. Officers, shop stewards, and the rank and file of the UAW and other unions, both CIO and AFL, have attended. "This is it. This has punch," commented one CIO official.

Dr. H. H. Sih, a distinguished Chinese diplomat, who represented his country at the Paris Peace Conference last year, came to Detroit especially to see the revue. He is now taking part in the UN Balkan Inquiry at Lake Success. Speaking at one of the events of the week end, he said:

> In Greece thousands of people are starving more for ideas than for bread. Aid to Greece is necessary—money, bread, ore and industrial products—but what they need more is the right spirit and the right idea. I have found here dramatized the answer to the peace conference and the present difficulties.

Speaking at dinner before the revue, Dr. Sih stated the world need I think we all feel very deeply just now. Referring to the subversive forces, he said, "They have got the weapon of disunity. If we don't want to wage another war of arms, we have to have the new unity." Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the revue, Ideas Have Legs, points the road to national and world unity.

I understand that this new revue owes a great deal for its production to one of the world's foremost athletes, H. W. "Bunny" Austin. Many of you know him as a Davis Cup tennis star. You may not know that he served for 3 years during the recent war in the American Army. As a civilian he has worked for this country without salary for the better part of the past 8 years in the program of moral rearmament.

Thousands of Americans from coast to coast have come to love and know this great Ambassador of Britain, who has so loyally and sincerely served the best in the common ideals of our two nations and has been the means of inspiring thousands more to fight for the democratic ideal that alone can bring the nations into harmony and peace.

I have seen many favorable comments on the revue. I have heard messages, including that of Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd, who said:

> I want to say with all the emphasis at my command that this movement gives you the chance you have been looking for to go into action to save civilization.

Mr. Speaker, having seen the play myself, I can second all these comments unreservedly. I think one secret of the power of the play is that it is so real and down to earth. Every scene is based on practical experience, including the actual words of our founding fathers in the American heritage sequence, and the letter written by a GI the day before he was killed by Japanese machine-gun bullets at Okinawa.

It is put on by a cast of 150 citizen volunteers—members of a moral rearmament task force—including veterans, teen-agers, housewives, workers, and businessmen. They are doing this without salary solely because of their desire to have a part in helping democracy to pull together. They have been staying in the homes of labor and management throughout the city and helping transmit that spirit to the families who have welcomed them.

Many of you in this House will remember The Forgotten Factor, an industrial play for national unity, which I understand was presented at the National Theater here in Washington in May 1944, by a committee of invitation under the cochairmanship of then Senator Harry S. Truman and our honored colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. Since then this play has been shown to hundreds of thousands of people across America and Europe, and last month was credited by one of England's leading weeklies with lifting production to its highest point in the British coal fields.

On June 10 Mr. WADSWORTH introduced into the RECORD an address of Dr. Frank Buchman, who initiated the Oxford group and its world-wide program of moral rearmament. Speaking from Caux, Dr. Buchman was introduced by Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd, who also sent a special message to Detroit commending Ideas Have Legs to the attention of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this latest weapon, Ideas Have Legs, is a Michigan product, having been developed at the North American Assembly for Moral Rearmament at Mackinac Island, where the State of Michigan has for six consecutive summers made facilities available. Thousands from the United States and 20 other nations have come for training in this program of sound homes, teamwork in industry, and national unity.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress I have been considerably heartened by what I have seen through this force. At a time when it seems our hopes for a new world are constantly dashed on the rocks of national and international selfishness, it is gratifying to find at work on a world scale a fellowship of people who are ideologically equipped and whose program is rooted in practical human experience. I believe this force points the road to world reconstruction.

Regular Veterans' Association Active in Legislative Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to cooperate on many occasions with the officers of the Regular Veterans' Association in connection with legislation pertaining to the welfare of servicemen and veterans.

Its national commander, William M. Floyd, is probably as well known to legislators on Capitol Hill as any one leader of veterans' organizations. He has made for himself a reputation for aggressive tenacity which has paid off over the past few years. Commander Floyd is considered an authority on legislation pertaining to veterans' affairs.

In the June 19 issue of Stars and Stripes appeared an article entitled "Regular Veterans Well Led and Prestige is Growing." Because the article outlines quite completely the program of the Regular Veterans' Association, I am including it in my remarks.

REGULAR VETERANS WELL LED AND PRESTIGE IS GROWING

The small but strong Regular Veterans' Association is establishing an enviable record for promoting the passage of veterans' legislation and for leading a fearless attack against the spread of Communist doctrines in America.

Under the leadership of energetic National Commander William McKinley Floyd, the RVA is recognized favorably on Capitol Hill. "It takes an act of Congress to get things done," says Floyd.

The RVA is no newcomer as a veterans' organization. It has had its national headquarters in Washington since the early 1930's, but the organization is much older than that, tracing its origin back to 1880, when small groups of veterans organized for the purpose of representing the interests of members of the Regular Establishment. The growth of the movement was slow and fitful, finally culminating in the RVA, a hard-hitting veterans' outfit organized along modern lines to stay and grow.

Unique among veterans' groups, it did not spring out of any war. It was founded with the express purpose of helping to maintain the rights of Regular service enlisted men who served their country both in peace and in war.

After the outbreak of World War II, the RVA widened its policy of membership eligibility, because a considerable number of its members had suddenly become war veterans. It opened its ranks to all members of the armed forces, officers as well as enlisted personnel, and thus became an association of active, retired, disabled, and honorably discharged members of the armed forces of the United States. However, the RVA is emphatic in its refusal to accept in its ranks any person who advocates or who belongs to any organization which advocates the overthrow of the United States Government.

From the beginning, the RVA has been famous for needling Congress into protecting the rights of the members of the Regular Establishment. Back in its early days, it succeeded against heavy odds in preventing an unreasonable slash in the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration which would have adversely affected many veterans.

LEGISLATIVELY ACTIVE

"Today, the RVA stands ready to be of assistance to all veterans, whether or not they are members of the organization and whether they are in or out of the service," asserts Commander Floyd.

Floyd recalls that in the early 1930's, the peacetime veteran suffering 100-percent disability was receiving a pension of but $30 per month. A little later an Executive order increased the pension to $45. Then, in 1939, the RVA caused S. 522 to be introduced. Its enactment increased total disability pensions for peacetime veterans to $75 per month, and the situation then remained static until Floyd was elected national commander.

His first legislative endeavor was aimed at securing greater parity in the disability compensation of peacetime and wartime veterans. Through his efforts, the RVA introduced H. R. 4999, now Public Law 469, Seventy-eighth Congress, and he was instrumental in securing its enactment. This law granted a 15-percent increase in peacetime pensions, retroactive to June 1, 1944, thus bringing compensation for total peacetime disability to $86.25.

Not content with this program, the RVA again sponsored and fought vigorously for H. R. 3908, which became Public Law 659, Seventy-ninth Congress. This legislation brought the compensation for total disability to $103.50 per month. It resulted in an increase of pension for thousands of Regulars disabled in line of duty. Today this law provides a greater measure of protection to enlisted men still in the service.

The RVA, however, is not permitting its drive for parity to rest on its accomplishments thus far. At the present time, the organization has sponsored H. R. 1335, which, if enacted by the Eightieth Congress, will grant compensation of $124.20 per month for total peacetime disability, as against the monthly compensation of $138.50 received by war veterans for the same disability. The organization is throwing all its resources into a fight to secure passage of this bill, and invites all veterans interested in fair play to join in its battle to secure justice for men and women of the Regular Establishment.

Commander Floyd calls attention to the fact that the RVA was also instrumental in getting the Reserve retirement bill enacted into law. This would make it possible for enlisted personnel of the Regular Establishment to retire at 50 percent of base pay after 20 years of service and at 75 percent after completion of an additional 10 years of Reserve duty.

It is notable that while Commander Floyd has done trojan work for the benefit of peacetime veterans, he has extended his wholehearted cooperation to other veterans' organizations in all reasonable legislation. Last year the RVA helped to enact H. R. 6811, now Public Law 662, Seventy-ninth Congress. It protects veterans against a cut in compensation while hospitalized. This measure, explains Floyd, assures the veteran that his compensation or retired pay will not be reduced during the first 6 months of hospitalization.

Other legislation, secured principally by the RVA, is a law increasing the pensions of widows and dependents of deceased disabled Regulars. The organization cooperated in the passage of the 20-year disability retirement law for enlisted personnel. It also sponsored legislation making pension laws applicable to all men and their dependents who served in the United States Coast Guard prior to 1930.

Emphasized by Commander Floyd is the fact that the RVA is continuing its vigorous fight for better legislation for veterans. It seeks passage by the Eightieth Congress of H. R. 262, to provide adjusted pay for service personnel at the rate of $4 for each day of overseas service and $3 for each day of service in the United States during World War II. "The provisions of this bill make a lot more sense than the so-called GI bill of rights," declares Floyd.

The RVA also urges passage of a number of other veterans' bills, among them measures to provide more adequate pensions for disabled servicemen and their dependents, annuities for the widows of deceased retired servicemen, awards of $60 monthly to veterans afflicted with arrested tuberculosis, double-time credits on retirement to enlisted personnel and warrant officers for foreign service, and elimination of any and all taxes on active and retired servicemen's pay.

BOLDLY ANTICOMMUNIST

A resident of Unalaska, Alaska, Commander Floyd is presently seeking improved conditions for veterans who wish to settle in the Territory. Alaska offers opportunities for the veterans, he says, but he declares that it will take legislation, time, and money to realize those opportunities to the fullest.

Quick to recognize the threat of communism to America, the RVA has been conducting a zealous anti-Red campaign in Washington for the past 2 years. In August 1945 the RVA demanded that the Department of State, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the Department of Justice, and its FBI conduct immediate investigations of all Communist activities in the United States.

In March 1946, Commander Floyd and the RVA called on the armed forces to throw out all Communists. "Communists should be kicked out of the Army and Navy and be forced to wear a red discharge button," Floyd declared at that time. Charging the Reds with instigating World War II and planning to sabotage American industry, Floyd asserted, "We Regulars don't want any Communists or other subversives in the postwar Military or Naval establishment."

In February 1947, the RVA demanded that the Administration clamp down on admission of alien subversives to the United States. Charging the immigration service with serious laxity in allowing alien subversives free entry to the country, it now calls on the Eightieth Congress to effect sweeping remedies.

Appearing before the House Committee on Un-American Activities recently, Commander Floyd urged passage of a bill which would abolish the Communist Party in the United States.

Pointing to State Department and Justice Department inaction, despite repeated requests from RVA, Floyd called for congressional action to eliminate the scourge of communism. As additional safeguards, the RVA has strongly recommended that universal fingerprinting be required, that lists of known Communists be published for information of the general public, and that all aliens in the country be required to register.

The RVA has its ups and downs, Floyd says, but since its inception the membership has consistently increased by a few thousand each year. During that time the RVA has fought steadily for the rights of veterans. The national commander offers a guaranty that the RVA will continue its all-out support of better legislation for veterans and its strongest opposition to the spread of communism in America.

FLOYD IS WAR VETERAN

The RVA stands for sound legislation for all veterans according to its national mandates. "But," says Floyd, "there are right now hundreds of disabled peacetime veterans who are not supporting the RVA program even though they are receiving the benefits of its efforts. At the present time, its greatest support comes from wartime veterans who have a deep-seated belief in the justice of its broad program. Some of these veterans have served in peacetime and many do not now have disabilities, but they continue to sup-

port RVA instead of hanging on to its apron strings."

A seasoned veteran himself, and four times national commander, Floyd was born in 1897 in Norris City, Ill. He joined the Army in 1914 and went to Tientsin, China, to serve with the Fifteenth United States Infantry. In December 1917, while in China, he volunteered to return to the United States for overseas duty in France.

He joined the Fourth Infantry at Newport News, Va., in January 1918 and sailed for France shortly thereafter. He served with the Third Division throughout World War I and was one of the first in the division to receive a citation for gallantry in action, the Distinguished Service Cross, on July 13, 1918, at Les Evaux, France, while serving as a private in Company L, Fourth Infantry. He saw action in six different engagements and was wounded in September 1918.

After the war Floyd received his discharge at Camp Lewis, Wash., to play professional baseball. Until 1931 he resided on the west coast, later moving to Alaska, where he has made his home ever since. He still owns property in Alaska and claims his rights as a resident of the Territory.

ACTIVE IN ALASKA DEFENSE

At the outbreak of World War II Floyd was made chairman of the Unalaska Defense Committee. He was present at the Jap attack on Dutch Harbor on June 3–4. During the attack he was in charge of evacuating civilians, in command of civilian demolition squads, and responsible for all transportation in and out of the area. Later, at the request of Delegate Anthony J. Diamond, he journeyed to Washington, D. C., to make a full report of the Jap bombing, bringing with him a fragment of a Japanese bomb which damaged the civilian hospital at Dutch Harbor.

Floyd became a member of the RVA in 1942. In September 1943, in recognition of his work among the service personnel in Alaska, he was elected national commander and has served continuously in that post up to the present time. He is a tireless worker in the interests of veterans, and can be found on this job 24 hours a day. After completion of his term of office he plans to return to his home in Alaska, where he will continue his ardent fight for veterans.

The RVA will hold its national convention this year at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., August 28–31.

Beyond the Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post today on the President's veto on the wool price support bill:

BEYOND THE VETO

The President's veto of the wool price support bill was due to the inclusion of a provision authorizing him to impose import quotas or import fees on foreign wool. The enactment of such a measure at a time when the United States is taking the lead at Geneva in a movement to lower trade barriers would, as the President says, be a "tragic mistake, a blow to our leadership in world affairs." Since Congress is not prepared to override the veto, the administration is rescued from a most embarassing position that threatened to bring about the collapse of the Geneva Conference.

The President has signified his willingness to accept a bill continuing wool support prices at 1946 levels until the end of 1948. Following this suggestion the Senate has repassed, with minor changes, the price-support bill it originally approved which did not contain the offending import-quota and import-fee section. Since failure to act would leave the country without any wool-support program, the pressure on the House to accept the modified program will be very strong.

While enactment of the bill just passed by the Senate would provisionally solve the international problems growing out of congressional efforts to support domestic wool prices, it would do so at a high cost to the consumers and taxpayers of this country. For, by keeping domestic wool prices at artificially high levels, above parity, the Government will either have to sell most of the huge wool stocks now held by the Commodity Credit Corporation at a loss, or else keep those stocks in storage and add to them, in order to support prices at the legislatively decreed level. Moreover, foreign wools entering the country over existing tariff barriers will be sold at ultra-high levels, thereby benefiting foreign wool growers at the expense of domestic users of wool and woolen products. In short, as Senator SALTONSTALL points out, the bill just passed by the Senate at the urging of the President would put and keep the Government in the domestic wool market, making it the sole buyer of the domestic wool crop unless the prices exceed the price of 1946. It also would compel the Government to buy wool at a price above parity, and maintain the price of clothing, so far as wool is concerned, at artificially high levels.

Although relieving the tension in Geneva, the Presidential veto leaves the whole problem of price support just where it was. Indeed, his veto message emphatically indorses price support for wool growers at an elevated level, although the price support program is in final analysis the root cause of the maladjustments that led Congress to approve of import quotas for wool. Eventually we shall have to recognize the fundamental inconsistency between the administration's foreign trade policies and our agricultural price support policies, as applicable to wool and other commodities. We can dodge this awkward issue for the time being, since wool presents an exceptional case of an important agricultural product in which we are deficient, while the world demand for agricultural products of which we have a surplus is so pressing that there is no need, for the time being, of governmental price supports. Even so, cotton export subsidies have been and are still being paid to facilitate export buying of American cotton. Such payments are in principle quite as inconsistent with the liberal trade program of the administration as import quotas.

The real test will come when countries now heavily dependent upon us for foodstuffs and other agricultural raw materials have restored their economies and demand for our products declines. When that time comes, it will be necessary to review and revise our price support policies in the light of changed conditions. The great majority of our agricultural economists are opposed to the existing price support system for many reasons, apart from its effect on foreign trade. They regard the present parity price formula as outmoded, and claim that it distorts price relationships. High support prices also tend to freeze production patterns and lead inevitably to extensive governmental control over agriculture.

A limited amount of price support or other forms of aid to the farming population may be necessary in periods of depression and could be so managed as not to interfere unduly with competitive fixation of prices. But, to repeat, if we cling to a system of agricultural support prices that prevent the operation of competitive forces, we shall find our export outlets drying up, domestic market channels contracting, and Government-bought surpluses accumulating when the present abnormal demands are satisfied and inflationary forces begin to subside. Then the Government will no longer be in a position to advocate freer foreign trade while following domestic price support policies that create obstacles to free movement of goods, "America Must Choose," as Henry Wallace once said.

American Colleges Train Leaders of Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, over 100 years ago American missionaries began establishing schools and hospitals as well as churches in the Near and Middle East as well as elsewhere in the world. Those institutions have grown steadily in stature and in favor with the peoples of Turkey, Syria, Egypt, Iraq, and later in Greece and Bulgaria. Thanks to the vision and faith of those hardy pioneers, the Near East has a group of high grade American-type educational institutions ready and on the job for training the leaders of those crucial areas in the ideals and practices of free societies and democratic governments.

Americans of yesterday did a job because it was right. Today it is paying big dividends.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Washington Post describing the work and the strategic importance of those Near East colleges:

IDEALS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY, WAYS OF LIFE BEING TAUGHT TO YOUNG MEN AT ATHENS COLLEGE

(By M. W. Fodor)

PSYCHICO, ATTICA, GREECE, June 30.—In the foothills of the violet-wreathed Attic Mountains, surrounded by the towering peaks of the Parnes, Pentelikon, and Hymettos, where once gods, nymphs and satyrs were wont to roam, lie the American-looking buildings of Athens College. The bare slopes on the mountainsides remind us of Utah, yet along the road, next to pepper and locust trees, the rose-and-white-colored full blooms of the oleander make the countryside look almost lush.

In Athens College, founded by lovers of Hellas in America, Egypt and Greece, ideas of American democracy and of American ways of life are being brought home to the young men of Hellas. In Athens College, as in the many other universities and schools of the Near East College Association, we possess a pivot to spread our moral influence.

This is terribly important at a time when from Stettin to Trieste, from Vienna to the Russian steppes, a big battle is being waged between the oriental idea of communism and the occidental conception of democracy. We, in our innocence and ignorance, have started with unequal odds. Soviet Russia fully realized for years what she wanted. Thus clandestinely, yet carefully, she educated a new crop of leaders fit to be the bosses in the Soviet-dominated countries.

Let's look around. Who are the leaders in those countries? Marshal Tito, Alexander Rankovitch, and Edvard Kardelj, of Yugoslavia; Georgi Dimitrov, Vassilij Kolarov, and Tsola Dragoisheva, of Bulgaria; Emil Bodnarash and Anna Pauker, of Romania; Clement Gottwald, of Czechoslovakia—they are all graduates of the Lenin Institute of Moscow. In this institute they have learned the rudiments of Soviet administrative methods, of police and secret-police oppression, of demagogy and propaganda, all essential to the Bolshevik way of life.

Have we nothing to pitch against this physical and psychological invasion from the East? For the last quarter of a century public-spirited Americans maintained various colleges in the Near East which have contributed a rather important chapter in educating the Levant to our own ideas and ways of life. The list of these colleges is impressive, indeed. The Near East College Association maintains the Athens College at Psychico, Greece; the International College and the American University at Beirut, Syria; Roberts College on the Bosphorus in Turkey, the American School for Boys in Baghdad, Iraq; the Istanbul Women's College, the Damascus College in Syria, and the American College at Simeonovo, Bulgaria. In addition, missionary organizations maintain the Pierce College for Girls at Kelleniko, near Glyphadia, Greece, and Anatolia College in Salonika, while another group maintains the important farm school in Salonika, Greece. Again, another group supports the American University in Cairo.

Athens College was founded at a period which in its violent political and economic fluctuations recalls the situation of today. Greece was engaged in an almost continuous warfare from 1911 to 1922. Then, in the wake of the defeat by Turkey in 1922, 1,500,000 refugees were dumped into this small country.

In those days a group of public-spirited Athenians realized the necessity of an improvement in Greece's educational system as a basis for the moral rejuvenation of the country. In 1925 Greek benefactors furnished the campus and the buildings of Athens College at a cost of $600,000, while the American board raised an endowment of the same amount. A faculty of Americans and Greeks began to work on building an institution which would imbue American ideas of education in this most enlightened people of the Levant, meticulously observing, however, the fundamentals of Greek mentality and spirit. The college began in 1925 as a private house with 15 students. At present the campus at Psychico can board 600 students, while the Athens campus houses another 100. There are 63 members of the faculty, of whom 10 are Americans.

Nothing characterizes better the popularity of the college than the fact that last year 3,000 applicants had to be turned down and that the list of applicants for admission is full right up to the end of 1954—provided the college can raise funds badly required to maintain its educational mission.

This correspondent, who for a year and a half toured Russian-occupied Europe, is firmly convinced that within a few years the Communist-ruled satellites will rid themselves of their present rulers. The future leaders of that new eastern Europe will come from these colleges. The ideas of the police state imbued into the Communists in the Lenin Institute will be replaced by the future leaders of free states—leaders who learned their ideas in these colleges.

When I visited Sofia last year, I had the opportunity to talk to the secretary of one of the "big bosses." The young lady was highly intelligent and in her fluent English one could feel, "between the lines," her enthusiasm for American ideas.

"Where did you learn your English? Where did you come across American ideas?" I asked.

Coyly she answered:

"I was studying at the American College at Simeonovo."

This college is now closed. But the buildings still stand and many a Bulgarian remembers the days when he spent happy times on this magnificent campus.

Once upon a time Roberts College on the Bosphorus educated Greeks, Macedonians, Bulgarians, Serbs and Turks. Now the pupils are mostly Turkish, but many of the old pupils still live and remember.

The leaders of Syria and Lebanon today are pupils of the American colleges of yesterday. Many leading personalities in Egypt's political and public life studied at the American University in Cairo.

But let's go back to Psychico and Athens College. I had the opportunity to eat with the students in their dining room. The students vary from the age of 9 up to 19. When they graduate, their grade corresponds to junior college. Many of them go to Columbia University in New York or to other American colleges from here; while those who want to become future engineers of Greece try to get into MIT, or other American technological schools, after their graduation.

About half of the students are sons of rich people and pay high fees. Another half live on scholarships, the funds for which are being raised in the States by the Near East College Association. About 40 orphans of the Albanian war are being admitted to the school on scholarship basis.

Among the great Greek benefactors of Athens College we must name the late Emmanuel A. Benaki, a rich Greek from Alexandria, Egypt, and his son-in-law, Stephanos Delta, the single largest donor to the college, who is now 87 years of age.

The president of the college is Dr. Homer W. Davis of Coram, Long Island. He studied at Hamilton College and at the University of California. He taught for 4 years at Roberts College in Turkey, and then in 1925 it was his idea to start a college in Greece based on American principles. Dr. Davis is the brother-in-law of John Ehrhardt, who until recently was political adviser of the State Department, with the American Forces in Austria.

The Fourth of July 1947—State of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, on the Fourth of July 1947 freedom is more than a word throughout the world. In our own country it is the most calmly accepted, matter-of-fact, almost wholly ignored commodity on our list. Elsewhere it is a remote dream utterly unknown in practice. Get up on a soap box in nine-tenths of the nations on the face of the globe and chances are very good, indeed, that you will shortly find yourself in the local hoosegow. If you attempted to read the Declaration of Independence on most of the European Continent, or even the no-less famous French Declaration of the Rights of Man, you would find yourself on the list of "enemies of the state" in jig time.

We have our troubles in America, to be sure. But so long as we retain the basic determination to listen to the arguments of the other fellow, no matter how distasteful they may be, we stand a fairly good chance of arriving at a workable solution of our problems. We blow off our indignation in the public press, freely; we organize protest meetings; we buy time on the radio to argue our case. These are rights which we regard as inalienable. Elsewhere they are nonexistent.

To those who urge us to abandon our way of life as outmoded, let us remember that all that is new is not necessarily better than what is old. We have built in free America a land which has served as a model and a challenge to the nations and the peoples of the earth, because we have given man the chance to exercise his brain, his muscle, his ingenuity, his total capacities to the utmost of his abilities, freely and unfettered. Let us determine on the Fourth of July, that come what will, through labor disputes and tax quarrels, foreign problem and defense emergencies, this shall continue to be our goal.

Veterans' Home Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MONROE M. REDDEN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Monday the Reconstruction Finance Act became law but it did not contain previous authority for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase veterans' obligations given to secure indebtedness incurred by the veterans in connection with the construction or purchase of a home. This, to my mind, was a serious mistake because the veterans will be unable to finance their homes in full without such authority.

In other words, there will be no market for these obligations, and thousands of people who have undertaken to help the veterans by loaning them various amounts of money to construct homes will be unable to dispose of the obligations, even though they accepted them on a temporary basis. That leaves both the veteran and the nonveteran without proper means of disposing of these obligations. Thousands of banks loaned money to veterans on their newly constructed or purchased homes because they believed that the RFC would take over these loans at any time in the future they might be called upon. In addition, there are many thousands, even millions of veterans, who now contemplate the construction or purchase of a home and will be absolutely unable to do so unless steps are taken to restore this provision.

I introduced a bill yesterday to amend the Reconstruction Finance Act and

grant authority to purchase obligations created by the veterans purely for home construction or purchase. This bill ought to pass immediately. We have plenty of time left before the adjournment of Congress to enact this bill into law. No hearings are necessary. We know conditions that exist. I hope every member of the Banking and Currency Committee to whom this bill has been referred will immediately join in making a favorable report. If so, I am convinced that this House will pass the bill by overwhelming majority, and there is no question about favorable action in the Senate.

Army-Navy Bill Is Analyzed as Costly Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune on Monday, June 30, by Admiral Frederick C. Sherman, USN, retired. To many people, mergers or consolidations indicate economy and efficiency. We know that that is not always the case. We know that mergers sometimes stifle healthy competition. Great improvements have been realized as a result of sensible competitive spirit. Reserving my final judgment with reference to the advisability of the so-called merger, we must do nothing that will hamper the illustrious Marine Corps or stifle the splendid spirit of the United States Navy.

ARMY-NAVY BILL IS ANALYZED AS COSTLY DREAM

(By Frederick C. Sherman, admiral, U. S. Navy, retired)

Considerably amended from its original form, the bill to unify the Army and Navy has been approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee and efforts are being made to enact this legislation prior to the July adjournment of Congress. It has yet to be passed upon by the House Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments.

In attempting to satisfy all elements of the services, many changes in the wording have been made. One of these was a clause advocated by Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, head of the Marine Corps and valiant hero of Guadalcanal, to insure that the Marine Corps could not be abolished under the new set-up. Another paragraph states that it is intended "to provide for their [that is, the Army, Navy, and Air Forces] authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control, but not to merge them."

BILL WOULD INCREASE COSTS

A naval officer of high rank who must be nameless has said that the bill means different things to the different services. He has further stated that the agreement does not extend to basic principles and, in his opinion, it would be disastrous to pass it in its present form. It is doubtful if any bill can be written which will put in plain language just what is intended, unless some one gets perfectly frank and writes one which states that the intention is to permit the Army General Staff to control the Navy.

From the standpoint of economy, the bill will completely fail to accomplish any useful purpose. It is admitted that it will result in increased costs over the near term and only promises some vague savings in the indefinite future. The increased expenses of two new executive departments, the Department of Air and the new super Secretary of National Defense, will all be administrative and will add no combat strength to our armed forces.

"TOO MUCH POWER FOR ONE MAN"

Other objections to the present bill may be summed up as follows:

1. It is so poorly drawn that it means different things to different people.

2. It gives too much power to one man, short of the President. No one man can possibly be well informed on all branches of the services and be competent to administer them all. He will depend on his advisers, and under the proposed arrangement the Navy will be in the minority, and the weight of advice reaching the supersecretary will favor the Army at the expense of the Navy.

3. The control of the budget by the supersecretary could be used to atrophy any branch of the service, such as naval aviation or the Marine Corps, in spite of the supposed safeguards written into the bill.

4. The proposed elevation of the Army's strategic air command into a coequal department of the air is unsound. The Army's long-range bombers have no greater importance than the Navy's air arm. There is no more reason for a separate department of Army bombers than there is for a separate department of naval aviation.

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS OPPOSE

Col. Melvin J. Maas, president of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association and formerly a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee, appeared before the House Committee on Executive Expenditures in opposition to the present bill. He stated, among other things, that the creation of the separate air department for the Army was actually a step backward, that it is absolutely essential for aviators to be in the highest commands, naval and military, and that the day has arrived when the Army and Navy will have to be run by aviators, to a large extent, if not entirely.

Colonel Maas also stated that it was common knowledge that 95 percent of naval officers are opposed to this legislation.

FURTHER STUDY NEEDED

It is the opinion of this writer that the Congress should defer action on this bill for further study and hearings. If necessary to act now, at least the bill should be amended to eliminate the separate department of air and the supersecretary of national defense.

The powers of the latter should be given to the National Security Council, as recommended by Fleet Adm. E. J. King, former wartime Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations. The provision for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which functioned so successfully during the war, should be retained and placed on a permanent basis. Another desirable feature would be a requirement that the Chief of the General Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy be aviators.

New Jersey Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that 171 years ago today the great State of New Jersey in its provincial congress which was in session at Burlington adopted a combined declaration of independence and a new State constitution and thereby asserted its independence 2 days before our national Declaration of Independence was adopted in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776.

By such action the people of the State of New Jersey not only became the first of the Thirteen Original Colonies to declare its independence from the Crown of Great Britain but also was the first State to give tangible evidence of that love of liberty which identifies the people of our beloved country.

In this connection, it might also be remembered that the State of New Jersey was the first State to ratify the Bill of Rights. All through the life of our great Republic, New Jersey has been prompt in its answer to the call of the needs of the Nation and has contributed its share and more in every way to our national defense. It is a small State in area compared with many of the other States, but it has a heart and a fervent patriotism which is as big as the Atlantic Ocean which bounds its coast.

Problems of the Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to see the greater interest that is being taken in the problems of the oil industry. It seems to take a pinch in the supply to get many people to notice that industry. We were all very conscious of it during rationing days and now all the talk of shortage that is coming chiefly from persons with little information—that is building up quite a public interest.

As a matter of fact there is every possibility that the supply situation will work out all right, given some decisive action by Congress on the things that Congress alone can do, and a general hands-off policy on the part of those who have no business trying to give advice to any industry that knows its answers and asks merely to be allowed to apply them. I have said before that we are suffering from an overproduction of oil experts. Some got that way by working awhile for the OPA or the FEA and drifted down the street to some other agency that inherited the furniture and the philosophy of those dear departed outfits.

Let us keep our eyes on one thing: There is not a shortage of crude oil. If we will use a little intelligence we need not have any trouble over oil supply. We are doing a lot of talking about exports of our oil but we are ignoring the thing that causes more trouble and will continue to cause more trouble than anything else. I am talking about exports of steel and particularly the casing and tubing that we use in oil wells and

the pipe that is needed for new oil and gas pipe lines.

Oil shipments to Russia should be stopped right now and shipments of steel and pipe should also be stopped immediately until we get our petroleum industry built up to the point where it is ready to meet any and all emergencies. It seems we never learn. We are again going down the line feeding supplies to Russia as we did to Japan but a few short years ago.

4-H Club Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks I have been waiting for a time and place to call a matter to the attention of this Congress which I think is of the utmost importance. Here in the midst of national and international problems, tremendous issues of the day, we are likely to lose sight of those down-to-earth, everyday features and attributes of American life.

I refer particularly to 4–H Club work being directed by the extension service of our agricultural and mechanical colleges, more particularly that of Texas A. & M. College Extension Serivce. At this point in the record I wish to pay tribute to those sincere and hardworking county and home demonstration agents, whom I know from actual experience and observation have rendered the most unselfish service, and whose accomplishments are obvious to the farm people of my district and surrounding territory. I do not believe there is a more conscientious group of people than our county and home demonstration agents and those who direct their activities from Texas A. & M. College. Their job is not easy, and from my experience and observation a great majority of them have gone beyond their actual duty to perform services wherever possible to make farm life more livable, more profitable, and more desirable.

This serving as a preface, I wish to inform the House that this year the State winner of the Maggie W. Barry scholarship—the No. 1 award for Texas 4–H Club girls—was a young lady of my district. She is Wanda Jean Heine, of Roscoe, Nolan County, Tex. The award climaxes 8 years of intensive 4–H Club work for Wanda Jean, during which time she has been a gold-star 4–H Club girl, and last fall was chosen as a delegate to the National 4–H Club Congress in Chicago.

I point with pride to the accomplishments of Miss Heine as a goal toward which many of our young Texas farm boys and girls aspire. Through learning by doing, as it is practiced in 4–H Club work, not only Texas but every State in the Union will be more aware of the fullness of life enjoyed by eager, alert, and ambitious members of this organization.

Perhaps it will be interesting to you to know the accomplishments of this young lady, which were considered in the contest for the signal honor bestowed upon her. She conducted individual demonstrations in sewing, wardrobe planning, poultry raising, gardening, bedroom improvement, swine production, calf feeding, and record keeping. In the past 4 years she has designed and made 98 garments, and ranked high in the clothing revue of the 1946 4–H round-up at Texas A. and M. College. She has been president of her 4–H Club on two occasions, and at present is vice chairman of the Nolan County club for older 4–H Club girls. Incidentally, her income from demonstrations has been more than $4,000, which she has put into bonds and savings for her college education. These savings are now supplemented by the scholarship, valued at $300.

Miss Heine's personality is reflected in the fact that she was elected best all-around girl in Roscoe High School this year by taking a leading role in all high-school activities, and maintained the highest scholastic average in her class last year, and was the highest for the first semester of this year.

Wanda Jean certainly has had the inspiration and training which have resulted in the above-mentioned accomplishments. Her mother, Mrs. M. M. Heine, has been active in home-demonstration club work for years, and her father has long followed scientific practices in the operation of his 160-acre farm near Roscoe.

I am sure you join with me in extending congratulations and hearty good wishes to Wanda Jean Heine, and wishing for her a future filled with all the good things of life, for which she is constantly striving, not only for herself, but for the betterment of farm living every place. The time is long past when the country should be more conscious that the farm and farmers are really the backbone of the Nation, and to whom the Nation must look for sustenance.

Civil Rights and Minority Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD what I regard as one of the greatest speeches made in recent years in defense of civil rights and minority rights. I refer to the address made by the President of the United States last Sunday at the Lincoln Memorial exercises.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS TO NAACP YESTERDAY

The text of President Truman's address yesterday at the thirty-eighth annual conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:

"Gentlemen, I am happy to be present at the closing session of the thirty-eighth annual conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The occasion of meeting with you here at the Lincoln Memorial affords me the opportunity to congratulate the association upon its effective work for the improvement of our democratic processes.

"I should like to talk to you briefly about civil rights and human freedom. It is my deep conviction that we have reached a turning point in the long history of our country's efforts to guarantee freedom and equality to all our citizens. Recent events in the United States and abroad have made us realize that it is more important today than ever before to insure that all Americans enjoy these rights.

"And when I say all Americans—I mean all Americans.

"The civil-rights laws written in the early years of our Republic, and the traditions which have been built upon them, are precious to us. Those laws were drawn up with the memory still fresh in men's minds of the tyranny of an absentee government. They were written to protect the citizens against any possible tyrannical act by the new government in this country.

"But we cannot be content with a civil-liberties program which emphasizes only the need of protection against the possibility of tyranny by the Government.

"We cannot stop there.

"We must keep moving forward, with new concepts of civil rights to safeguard our heritage. The extension of civil rights today means, not protection of the people against the Government, but protection of the people by the Government.

"We must make the Federal Government a friendly, vigilant defender of the rights and equalities of all Americans. And again I mean all Americans.

"As Americans, we believe that every man should be free to live his life as he wishes. He should be limited only by his responsibility to his fellow countrymen. If this freedom is to be more than a dream, each man must be guaranteed equality of opportunity. The only limit to an American's achievement should be his ability, his industry, and his character. The rewards for his effort should be determined only by these truly relevant qualities.

"Our immediate task is to remove the last remnants of the barriers which stand between millions of our citizens and their birthright. There is no justifiable reason for discrimination because of ancestry, or religion, or race, or color.

"We must not tolerate such limitations on the freedom of any of our people and on their enjoyment of the basic rights which every citizen in a truly democratic society must possess.

"Every man should have the right to a decent home, the right to an education, the right to adequate medical care, the right to a worth-while job, the right to an equal share in the making of public decisions through the ballot, and the right to a fair trial in a fair court.

"We must insure that these rights—on equal terms—are enjoyed by every citizen.

"To these principles I pledge my full and continued support.

"Many of our people still suffer the indignity of insult, the harrowing fear of intimidation, and, I regret to say, the threat of physical injury and mob violence. The prejudice and intolerance in which these evils are rooted still exist. The conscience of our Nation, and the legal machinery which enforces it, have not yet secured to each citizen full freedom from fear.

"We cannot wait another decade or another generation to remedy these evils. We must work, as never before, to cure them now. The aftermath of war and the desire to keep faith with our Nation's historic principles make the need a pressing one.

"The support of desperate populations of battle-ravaged countries must be won for the free way of life. We must have them as allies in our continuing struggle for the peaceful solution of the world's problems. Freedom is not an easy lesson to teach, nor an easy cause to sell, to peoples beset by every kind of privation. They may surrender to the false security offered so temptingly by totalitarian regimes unless we can prove the superiority of democracy.

"Our case for democracy should be as strong as we can make it. It should rest on practical evidence that we have been able to put our own house in order.

"For these compelling reasons, we can no longer afford the luxury of a leisurely attack upon prejudice and discrimination. There is much that State and local governments can do in providing positive safeguards for civil rights. But we cannot, any longer, await the growth of a will to action in the slowest State or the most backward community.

"Our National Government must show the way.

"This is a difficult and complex undertaking. Federal laws and administrative machineries must be improved and expanded. We must provide the Government with better tools to do the job. As a first step, I appointed an Advisory Committee on Civil Rights last December. Its members, 15 distinguished private citizens, have been surveying our civil-rights difficulties and needs for several months. I am confident that the product of their work will be a sensible and vigorous program for action by all of us.

"We must strive to advance civil rights wherever it lies within our power. For example, I have asked the Congress to pass legislation extending basic civil rights to the people of Guam and American Samoa so that these people can share our ideals of freedom and self-government. This step, with others which will follow, is evidence to the rest of the world of our confidence in the ability of all men to build free institutions.

"The way ahead is not easy. We shall need all the wisdom, imagination and courage we can muster. We must and shall guarantee the civil rights of all our citizens. Never before has the need been so urgent for skillful and vigorous action to bring us closer to our ideal.

"We can reach the goal. When past difficulties faced our Nation, we met the challenge with inspiring charters of human rights—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Emancipation Proclamation. Today our representatives, and those of other liberty-loving countries on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights are preparing an international bill of rights. We can be confident that it will be a great landmark in man's long search for freedom since its members consist of such distinguished citizens of the world as Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"With these noble charters to guide us, and with faith in our hearts, we shall make our land a happier home for our people, a symbol of hope for all men, and a rock of security in a troubled world.

"Abraham Lincoln understood so well the ideal which you and I seek today. As this conference closes we would do well to keep in mind his words, when he said:

" 'If it shall please the Divine Being who determines the destinies of nations, this shall remain a united people, and they will, humbly seeking the Divine guidance, make their prolonged national existence a source of new benefits to themselves and their successors, and to all classes and conditions of mankind.' "

Research Laboratory, Quartermaster Corps, Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I made to the Armed Services Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, in opposition to House bill 612, which would authorize the expenditure of $6,000,000 for a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE IN CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 612, JUNE 27, 1947

I wish to voice my opposition to H. R. 612 which would authorize the expenditure of $6,000,000 for a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps at or in the vicinity of Boston.

It is just a little over 1 year ago that I appeared before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations in charge of the War Department's appropriation bill in opposition to a similar proposal. Reading back over the statement that I made on June 6, 1946, I am unable to find an argument that I then advanced in asking rejection of the prior proposal that I would care to amend in the slightest degree, for actually while I considered those arguments most compelling at that time, I am now more certain that in these swiftly changing times they are more pronounced than ever.

First and foremost, it is difficult at a time when every Member of Congress is pledged to eliminate all unnecessary expenditures, to reconcile an appropriation of $6,000,000 for the construction of a new building for research purposes when there is the alternative of increasing the size of the laboratory now engaged in the Army's research program at Philadelphia, or by the conversion of one of the several large buildings which were erected at the quartermaster depot at Philadelphia during the war period. Such an operation I am sure could be accomplished for a sum vastly less than the $6,000,000 now proposed for new construction.

In the light of the acute shortage of building materials which is causing every Member of Congress grave concern, the alternative here recommended should be adopted.

As I review the architects' sketches, I seriously question whether this building could be constructed in today's market for $6,000,000, an estimate that was made many, many months ago. The committee should also inquire if this figure includes essentials such as a cafeteria, equipment utilities, much of which are now available at the Quartermaster depot at Philadelphia.

In addition to my desire to reduce governmental expenditures and to conserve building materials needed for our housing program, I also desire to emphasize the resultant natural advantages in the consolidation of all the Army's research activities now scattered throughout the country with the work that has been performed at Philadelphia for some time. None of this work is now performed at Boston.

Prior to the retirement of General Gregory, such a plan to consolidate these activities at Philadelphia was proposed by him, and General Middleswartz has also stated that the Department was satisfied with a consolidated laboratory in Philadelphia.

The logic of both these proposals is well understood in view of the proximity of several of the War Department's other agencies which have much in common with the research program, i. e., the inspection unit now located at New York City and other agencies located in the city of Philadelphia.

I have discussed with the officials of the Quartermaster General the research program contemplated for future years, and quite frankly I cannot find any reason why this work cannot be carried on at the Philadelphia depot.

In the development and interpretation of textile test methods the research laboratory, if located in Philadelphia, would be in the very center of the textile industry and its allied fields, particularly the rayon industry, which includes Du Ponts at Wilmington, Del., and the Viscose Corp. at Marcus Hook and Lewistown, Pa. There are also located in Philadelphia 22 manufacturers of textile machinery.

While climatic research is but a small segment of this program, Philadelphia is situated close to the Pocono Mountains and the Atlantic Ocean. But it is well to remember that in this phase of the work it has long been the custom of the Quartermaster General to send test teams into the field, such as frost (Camp McCoy, Wis.) and frigid (Fairbanks, Alaska) the Aleutians, etc., a practice that will be continued regardless of where the laboratory is located.

Proponents of the bill have advanced the theory that this laboratory should be located in the Boston area because it would be advantageous to be close to the technological schools located there. I suggest to the committee the proximity to Philadelphia of technological institutions such as the University of Pennsylvania, Temple University, the Philadelphia Textile Institute, Drexel Institute, Lehigh University, Pennsylvania State College, the University of Pittsburgh, and many other scientific and engineering schools. They afford to the research and development division expert technical advice which cannot be equaled in any other section of the Nation.

Furthermore, Philadelphia is the medical center of the world, for it houses such national famous medical schools as Hahnemann College, the Jefferson Medical College, the University of Pennsylvania Medical College, the medical school at Temple University, and others. Johns Hopkins at Baltimore is not too far from Philadelphia to be used to complete advantage. The faculty at these institutions and the constant flow of new students guarantees a never ending reservoir of new ideas and fresh minds as well as technical advice in the study of biology, biological chemistry, physics, colloid chemistry, etc.

The Berkshire Mills, largest in the world, is located at Reading, Pa., and offers unlimited possibilities in research on underwear and knit goods. Another function of the Research and Development Division is research on garments which necessitates a very close relationship to the clothing industry and this industry is largely located in Pennsylvania, New York, and Baltimore.

For generations Philadelphia has been known as the workshop of the world, and it is noted for its hardware and metal trades. Research on such articles is another function of the Quartermaster Laboratory and the location of such manufacturers as Henry Disston & Son Co., North Bros. York Tools, Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co., and several other equally nationally famous companies offer compelling arguments for locating the laboratory in Philadelphia.

I also understand that at the present time much research data is exchanged by the Army with such concerns as General Electric

and Westinghouse. They have plants both at Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. Similar mutual arrangements are in existence with the J. E. Frick Co. at Waynesboro, Pa., and the York Ice Machine Co. at York, Pa., both of which firms are considered the largest manufacturers of refrigeration equipment in the country.

As to aluminum and stainless-steel products, a large number of manufacturers of steam kettles and kitchen equipment have their plants either in Pennsylvania or close by. Nearly 67 percent of all laundry equipment is located within a radius of 150 miles of Philadelphia. Considerable research is conducted by the Quartermaster Corps in this field.

Experiments are also conducted by the Quartermaster Corps on shoes. In 1944 over 37,000,000 pairs of shoes were manufactured in my State. Close to Scranton, Pa. is located the Endicott-Johnson Shoe Co., one of the largest shoe firms in the world.

Plastics is an item in which the Quartermaster Corps conducts extensive research and in this respect Philadelphia is in a most advantageous position with Rhom & Haas in the vicinity and the Du Pont industries at Wilmington, Del. Also, the oil industry at Marcus Hook, Pa., offers an opportunity for research on fuel oil and lubricants that is second to none in the country.

Du Pont paint works is likewise located in Philadelphia and all of its facilities are available to the Government for research in the field of paint and white lead.

I, therefore, strongly appeal to the members of your committee to act unfavorably on H. R. 612 for the very reason that it would appear to be an unnecessary expenditure at this time in view of the fact that the Quartermaster depot at Philadelphia is the finest location in the Nation to carry on the research and development program of the Quartermaster Corps in the future.

Resolution Adopted by Massachusetts House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following resolution adopted by the Massachusetts House of Representatives memorializing the Congress of the United States to place an embargo on all exports of gasoline and oil and products thereof to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PLACE AN EMBARGO ON ALL EXPORTS OF GASOLINE AND OIL AND PRODUCTS THEREOF TO THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Whereas it has already been brought to the public attention by the Congress of the United States that there is a known shortage in this country of gasoline and oil and products thereof, and that gasoline rationing is to be expected in the near future: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby urges the Congress of the United States to impose immediately an embargo on all gasoline and oil, and the products thereof, which are listed for shipment to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted June 19, 1947.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

The Nature of Future War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the nature of future war from the Boston Herald of yesterday, which I think will be of great interest to all Members of the Senate, particularly the members of the Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPHECIES OF DOOM

Two days after Owen J. Roberts predicted an atomic world war in 1948 or 1949, seven eminent scientists headed by Dr. Albert Einstein warned that the same thing might come in 1955. One year or eight to doom?

Nor is there much comfort in their separate preventives. Former Supreme Court Justice Roberts put his confidence in universal military training, and he so told the House Armed Services Committee. The scientists declared that only a supranational government can save the world from disaster.

But whatever arguments there may be for universal military training, the prevention of atomic warfare cannot be one. Whether we have a million or fifteen million men instructed in the science of modern warfare can hardly deter a nation with 20,000,000 potential fighters and a store of A-bombs, if war there is to be. General Eisenhower's complaint that we are a poor second to Russia's Army is well taken, but men's bodies are but feeble barriers to nuclear fission.

Then there is the scientists' cry for a supranational government. As if the Soviet, which has stubbornly clung to all sovereignty, except some inconsequential shreds, in atomic control, could now be persuaded to enter a world federated union in all matters of international relations.

More effective than either of these is the grim fact of our increasing store of bombs and our constant improvement of the Hiroshima model. We have delved deeply into the Soviet Russian mind since she first became an ally, and there is no evidence that it can be moved by anything but a singularly narrow and immediate self-interest.

If we have our bomb reserves, well scattered in strategic world locations, but give guarantees that we shall never use them unless we ourselves are attacked by A-bombs, we shall make peace desirable and war undesirable. This is strong medicine and may not be necessary. But it may be the only alternative to the war our prophets of doom predict. For the nature of our own security measures can only be shaped by the cooperation or lack of cooperation evidenced by the potential enemy.

John C. Crockett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate had the pleasure of congratulating its very able, fine, devoted, and efficient Chief Clerk, Hon. John Crockett, on his 40 years of service to the Senate. Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, of Alabama, has written a tribute to Mr. Crockett, and I ask unanimous consent that the tribute may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. In doing so I join Mr. Carlisle in his tribute to our good friend, our very devoted and able public servant, Mr. John Crockett.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN C. CROCKETT

John C. Crockett, in the Senate,
Has been serving forty years,
In continuous succession,
Although he, in truth, appears
To be not much over forty
Years of age today, yet he,
Without caring to conceal it,
Tells us that he's eighty-three.

Everybody knows John Crockett
As the Senate Reading Clerk—
When he calls the roll, he does it
In a way resembling work,
In a tone, strong and sonorous,
Like Niag'ra's rumbling roar—
Every Member has to hear him,
If he's on the Senate floor.

Everybody likes John Crockett,
For he's everybody's friend—
Every Member of the Senate
Knows on him he can depend—
Strong today, in mind and body,
With a smile that always cheers,
May God, in His mercy, spare him
Many more most useful years.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

The Future of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I had intended to make a short address on agricultural conditions, and particularly on the appropriation bill dealing with the Department of Agriculture. Inasmuch as I feel that at the present time it will not be possible to make the speech, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I am deeply concerned for the future of our great agricultural industry. This effort which is being made to destroy, under the guise of economy, the

great forward strides which the American farmer has made with Government help in solving his marketing problems and preserving the future productive capacity of our most vital resources, the topsoil, is nothing short of alarming.

The farm program which has been in effect during the past decade and which is now well established has provided for the first time in American history the means whereby the actual dirt farmer himself could have a real voice in the formulation of programs and policies which affect his income and his welfare. Not only that, but he has, in fact, the job of administering these programs himself through farmer committeemen whom he elects in his own county and community. Surely any action which undermines, weakens, or destroys the right and privilege of farmers to work together to solve their local and national problems threatens to remove from our society the democracy we are trying so hard to preserve.

The complexity of our economy and the tremendous increase in monopolistic corporation mergers has disadvantaged the farmer. As an individual he is but 1 of 6,000,000 individuals engaged in free enterprise. Little can he do alone to safeguard his interests. His problems are no longer his alone. He sells to giant corporations and he buys at the prices other giant corporations dictate. Only by national action and even international action can his welfare be safeguarded.

Let us see what is taking place in his markets. I quote from the March 7, 1947, report of the Federal Trade Commission on the present trend of corporate mergers and acquisitions. Let us see from this what the farmer's chances would be of surviving if he tried to operate alone in some of our so-called free markets.

"A new wave of mergers is under way in the dairy industry bearing striking resemblance to that of the late twenties, which witnessed the emergence of giant corporations and the elimination of hundreds of small dairy companies. Since 1940 the Borden Co., the second largest firm in the industry, has acquired 14 different concerns. In fact, most of the recent acquisitions in this field have been made by Nation-wide firms, which not only purchased other concerns in the dairy industry, such as creameries and icecream plants, but also expanded into such unrelated fields as fisheries, sardine canneries, and breweries.

"In meat packing, acquisitions consisted of the purchase by large packers of small, strategically located meat-packing houses, as well as the absorption of firms in such divergent lines as poultry and eggs, creamery products, coffee, macaroni, and canned goods.

"Another important influence in the food field was the acquisition by large grocery chains of meat-packing plants and small organizations producing food specialties. This type of expansion by the grocery chains was under way long before the war and has embraced many phases of food processing, as well as warehousing and wholesaling functions.

"Other features of the merger movement in the food industry were the acquisition of nine companies by the General Foods Co., including two sea food firms, a flour mill, a cereal company; the acquisition by the Burry Biscuit Co. of six firms; and the absorption by Pillsbury Mills and Quaker Oats of three companies each."

In the past 6 years 1,800 formerly competitive manufacturing and mining firms in the United States have been swallowed up in furtherance of monopolistic practices in the United States.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, that the 25,000,000 people on our farms can look forward to a decreasing standard of living and, in some areas, even poverty, unless they have legislation which will provide them means of effective action in the market place. Reduce their purchasing power and you pull down the whole economy with them.

Our programs for farm research and education and the dissemination of information to farmers are necessary and valuable services. So, too, are the farm organizations and cooperatives. However, these lack the means of providing positive action in the market place, particularly when action is needed quickly to forestall disastrous marketing conditions. Only under adequate legislative authority can farmers work together locally or nationally to provide orderly marketing and assure themselves and the consumer of fair treatment.

It is not strange that powerful business interests are behind the moves which would weaken and destroy the elected farmer committee system under which the farmer has been able to cooperate with the Government in protecting the welfare of little men in a world of giant corporations.

Now I want to deal specifically with the conservation of our soil and protection of our productive capacity so greatly needed for the ever-increasing population of this country and to meet our food commitments to foreign countries.

It has been proposed that the agricultural conservation program be cut in half in 1947 and eliminated in 1948. This is supposed to be a great act of economy, an alleged step in the direction of so-called free enterprise for the farmer; done in the interest of the public welfare.

I submit that the destruction of the agricultural conservation program will have none of these happy results.

It is false economy to permit an increase in the destruction of our soil. We shall pay heavily for this in the future many times what we save now. It is not enhancing free enterprise when the farmer is forced by economic pressure to deplete and destroy our resources; it is not in the interest of the general public to allow our soil to wash away or the soil minerals to be depleted to the point where the nutritional value of our food is deficient and undermines the health of the consumer.

The sooner we act adequately on the crying need for conservation, the cheaper it will be.

Let me illustrate by citing the case of my own State, West Virginia.

In common with many other States, the largest type of farming is the dairy industry, followed by poultry and eggs, fruit, and forest products, in that order.

One of the most urgent soil-conservation needs in my State is the use of liming materials. Lime to correct soil acidity; lime to enable farmers to grow soil-building legumes such as clover and alfalfa, and thick pasture swards. These legumes and pastures are the very foundation of soil productivity in my State.

Now let us see what has happened concerning the use of lime in my State.

In 1934, before the agricultural-conservation program began, only 16,000 tons of lime were used. In 1936, the first year of the program, farmers doubled their use of lime. In 1940 they used 363,000 tons, 23 times the preprogram use. In 1946 they used 450,000 tons, 28 times the preprogram use. But the most startling fact is that the actual need for lime on West Virginia farms each year is 1,300,000 tons, 81 times the use in 1934, and nearly 3 times the use in 1946. This same amazing progress, and this same difference between the use of lime and the actual annual need for lime exists in every State east of the Mississippi and in certain humid areas west of it.

In total the United States needs about 52,000,000 tons of lime applied each year as compared to somewhat less than half that amount now being used. Before the program only 3,000,000 tons were used annually.

The same applies to even greater degree in other soil-building practices.

Use of superphosphate for soil-building purposes in my State has increased from 3,000 tons to 40,0000 tons annually in the past 10 years with assistance of the agricultural conservation program, but the total annual need is 237,000 tons.

Are we to stop this progress now? To do so is only to postpone the job, increase the costs, magnify our soil and fertility losses, decrease our food supply, increase the consumer's food bill, and lessen our exports to feed hungry people in other lands.

Now, it is charged that the farmer ought to finance this himself—and I want to point out that he is paying half the cost now—or that, given research, education, and information, he will be able to do it himself without the agricultural-conservation program.

There are several reasons why we cannot expect the farmer to do this conservation job alone. First, although he was lectured, educated, informed, and urged for two or three decades prior to the agricultural conservation program that it was in his own interest to carry out soil- and water-conserving practices, the number of farmers who responded was negligible, as shown by the figures I gave you for my State in 1934, before the agricultural conservation program was established.

Second, the large number of tenant farmers precludes conservation on their farms because of their short-term tenancy and lack of incentive for capital improvements. Thirty-two and three-tenths percent of United States farms are operated by tenants.

Third, the cumulative losses of fertility and soil destruction over generations of exploitive farming are greater than it is reasonable to expect contemporary farmers to pay for, even in the comparatively prosperous agriculture of today.

Fourth, many farmers, particularly dairymen, have not received any substantial increase in net income, nor can they view the future without apprehension as to their financial position. The costs of production have equaled or exceeded any price increase in the market place.

It is conservatively estimated that if this program is eliminated, the use of lime and fertilizer will drop from one-half to one-third of the amount now used under the program. This means that on thousands of farms no soil-building or soil-conserving practices will be used at all, particularly in those types of farming less favored by price increases and on the smaller family-type farms where every bit of net income is needed for a minimum standard of living, and on most of the 2,000,000 tenant farms where the operator naturally serves only his short-term interest.

For example, we ought to terrace about 5,000,000 acres every year to get the job done in the next 20 years. But in 1945, with program assistance, farmers terraced 900,000 acres, and if the program is eliminated even this annual rate would be reduced 75 percent. Vast soil losses could not be recovered if the job is postponed and extended over many decades.

Drainage ditches would be reduced from an annual removal of 52,000,000 cubic yards to 14,000,000 cubic yards if the program is discontinued. Yet we should be constructing drainage at the rate of 90,000,000 cubic yards annually to get the job done in the next 20 years.

The land is a resource vital to all the people. The farmer is, in a sense, merely the custodian of this productive plant which serves us all, now and in the future. All of the people should share with the farmer the responsibility of safeguarding our agriculture.

When thousands of farmers of their own accord cannot take the measures necessary to safeguard the future of this country by maintaining the soil productivity, it certainly is short-sighted to eliminate the agricultural-conservation program which for 10 years has demonstrated so well that the farmer will match the rest of the people, dollar for dollar, to do the job he cannot do alone.

Everything considered, I am sure that it is only in the best interests of agriculture and

our entire population that the Government continue to share with the farmer the cost of maintaining the productivity of our agriculture, restoring fertility used up by past generations and exported during the war and postwar.

It is only fair and just that the Congress provide the $300,000,000 program which was promised the farmers by the Seventy-ninth Congress and that there be no curtailment or postponement of the conservation of our agricultural resources in 1948. This is an investment in the future of America, a constructive partnership between the farmer and Government to protect our food supply, meet our export commitments, and guarantee the future for coming generations.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to place in the record some tables which prove conclusively the value of the soil-conservation program.

Mr. President, I also wish to comment briefly on the action taken by the House of Representatives with respect to the FHA appropriations. I regret to say the House drastically cut the President's request for funds for the Farmer's Home Administration for the fiscal year 1948, thus eliminating direct loans for farm purchases.

This action was taken in the face of pyramiding applications for farm ownership loans from veterans and tenants. There were 34,206 more applications for such loans on file with FHA on December 31, 1946, than on the same date in 1945—92,100 against 57,894.

On July 1, 1946, there were over 51,000 applications on file, and during the first 10 months of this fiscal year nearly 58,000 additional applications were received—a demand more than 16 times as heavy as available funds could satisfy.

Where 15,000 applications from veterans were on file April 30 of 1946, more than 41,000 were on hand the same date this year, and to attack this demand farm ownership loans to nonveterans had been suspended in 26 States.

In eliminating farm ownership loans, House Members declared an intention to assist the President in his efforts to combat inflation of farm-land prices. But in a letter to Representative COOLEY dated May 27, 1947, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson declared that the President is strongly opposed to a curtailment of the farm-tenant program to any point lower than the figure carried in his budget. He said further that the recent conference on the farm real estate situation was not intended to destroy the farm tenant purchase program.

House action in eliminating farm-purchase loans, in fact, eliminates an effective weapon in combatting rising land prices. Each loan made under the program is based on careful appraisal of the long time earning capacity of the farm being considered. This determination is made by a qualified appraiser and a well informed county committee composed of local farmers. Loans are not made unless the appraisal indicates they can be repaid from farm earnings. Furthermore, the act authorizing the farm ownership program limits loans to the average value of efficient family type farm management units, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, in the locality where the farm is situated.

Because of the insistence of Federal appraisers and county committees that loans be made only on the basis of the normal earning capacity of the unit, there have been many instances of substantial reductions in the asking prices of farms, especially in the case of veteran applicants.

Mr. President, elimination of the farm-ownership program would stall one of the main efforts to preserve family-type farms in America. By denying to many veterans and tenants the opportunity to buy farms at reasonable prices, it would further concentrate ownership of land in the hands of big operators and speculators. Veterans' benefits extended by the GI bill of rights would be removed and the specific authorization of loans to veterans for improvements on project properties, contained in Public Law 563, would be nullified.

Elimination of the farm ownership program would be particularly inopportune at this time, because current farm commodity prices are highly favorable. This circumstance is vitally important to veterans and farm tenants who, under the farm ownership program, would be given an opportunity to make sound and reasonable farm purchases and could repay their loans in a period of good commodity prices.

Besides cutting out the direct lending program for farm purchases, the House bill puts the insured mortgage program, implemented for the first time, on a token, experimental basis, by reducing that appropriation to $1,000,000.

Like the demand for farm purchase loans, the demand for operating loans made by the Farmers Home Administration is increasing rapidly. During the first 7 months of this fiscal year over 144,000 applications were received by FHA, an increase of 27 percent over the 113,209 applications received during the same period in the last fiscal year. Applications from veterans show an even greater percentage rise. In the fiscal year 1945 only 5,210 for adjustment operating loans were received from veterans, while 32,897 such applications were received during the first 7 months of this fiscal year—a jump of 531 percent.

From September 1944 through January 1947, 35,244 veterans had received adjustment loans totaling $53,844,576.

While the demand for operating loans increased, the House reduced the FHA operating-loan fund from the President's request of $90,000,000 to $60,000,000. Present borrowers will need most of the $60,000,000 during the 1948 fiscal year, and will have to be taken care of first, in order to protect the Government's investment. It is estimated that after these needs are met, there will be funds for an average of about two new loans per county.

The fiscal year 1947, during which $94,000,000 was available for FHA for making operating loans, saw 36 States exhaust their funds for making initial adjustment loans by January 31, 1947. The fiscal year 1948, with only $60,000,000 available, is expected to see funds for all new loans used up before the beginning of the peak lending season.

Along with House action cutting FHA lending funds went a provision reducing salaries and expenses from the $30,000,000 requested by the President to $18,000,000—a cut of 40 percent.

With this reduction, 575 county offices—29 percent of the total—would be closed. Fifteen State offices would be closed, leaving only 25 in the country. The number of FHA employees would be reduced from 8,219 to 4,800. With this reduced staff the agency would attempt to service 1,200,000 borrowers with outstanding accounts totaling $700,000,000, and to give the on-the-farm assistance which had been the core of FHA's credit program.

Mr. President, I repeat, in order to meet the cut the FHA is preparing to close 575 county offices, and it has given dismissal notices to more than 3,400 employees. In my own State the number of employees will be reduced from 111 to 44—or a 67-percent reduction. I am informed by FHA officials that the cuts will be made as follows: The State office will be reduced from 17 employees to 9; the field office will be reduced from 5 to 1, and the county office personnel will be reduced from 89 to 34.

In West Virginia the Farmers Home Administration made 1,133 loans, totaling $652,641, during the first 10 months of the present fiscal year. Forty-six percent of the funds went to veterans. As of April 30, 742 applications for loans were on file, 332 of them from veterans.

Direct loans, totaling $2,338,355, for the purchase of 470 farms have been made in West Virginia under the program which has been eliminated by House action. Applications on file from veterans alone total 300.

Operating loans, totaling $11,634,459, have been made in West Virginia and 79 applications are on file. The bill passed by the House reduces funds for this type of loan to the point that an average of only two new loans per county can be made during the next fiscal year. Almost all of the proposed funds will be needed to meet the credit requirements of present borrowers.

Mr. President, nationally the reduced staff will service more than 1,200,000 borrowers, whose obligations to the Government total $700,000,000. In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that part of the Government's security for these loans has come from the assistance in farm and home planning and in the on-the-farm guidance toward improved farm practices given borrowers by the Farmers' Home Administration. These services will be eliminated under the guise of economy.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will take a much more objective view of the important work performed by the FHA and restore the cuts made by the House of Representatives.

I ask that tables bearing on agricultural conditions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

West Virginia—Soil-rebuilding and soil-conserving practices under the agricultural conservation program

SUPERPHOSPHATE—BASIS 20 PERCENT P_2O_5 (PHOSPHORUS PENTOXIDE)

Program year	Tons			Credit	
	Used from Government contracts and purchase orders	Used where purchased for cash	Total use under program	Credit value of tons used	Percentage portion of State funds
1936		2,896	2,896		
1937		12,543	12,543		
1938	17,333	13,618	30,951		
1939	37,093	4,115	41,208		
1940	30,718	1,645	32,363		
1941	37,941	740	38,681		
1942	23,739	1,411	25,150		
1943	51,868	1,218	53,086		
1944	12,373	4,497	16,870	$355,360	14.39
1945	22,140	10,463	32,603	600,452	29.73
1946	37,431	[1] 2,569	[1] 40,000	[1] 760,000	
1947	[2] 40,000	[2] 10,000	[2] 50,000	[2] 900,000	

LIMING MATERIALS—GROUND LIMESTONE OR EQUIVALENT

1936		54,515	54,515		
1937		152,883	152,883		
1938	1,120	224,362	225,842		
1939	46,284	225,546	271,830		
1940	137,717	206,569	344,286		
1941	179,916	181,304	361,220		
1942	314,737	126,969	441,706		
1943	447,484	112,328	559,812		
1944	512,929	7,385	520,314	$2,088,326	84.60
1945	334,668	74,703	409,371	1,365,437	67.62
1946	432,608	[1] 17,392	[1] 450,000	[1] 1,746,000	
1947	[2] 450,000	[2] 50,000	[2] 500,000	[2] 1,698,000	

OTHER PRACTICES

1944					1.01
1945					2.65

[1] Latest estimate for 1946, pending completion of final data.

[2] Projected estimate for 1947, assuming adequate quantities of materials and funds originally expected.

NOTE.—Recent survey indicates that the annual need for superphosphate, basis 20 percent P_2O_5, for maintenance in soil-conserving practices is from 5 to 10 times the amount now being used. This estimate is subject to further study.

Estimate of the needs for liming materials, ground limestone or equivalent, made in October 1944 indicates an annual requirement of 1,513,750 tons.

Liming materials—Analysis of consumption: Tonnage used through the agricultural conservation program in relation to total tonnage used

[Tonnages are shown in terms of ground limestone or equivalent]

State and region	1935: Total use, prior to the agricultural conservation program	1936		1940			1945			1946 (estimated)		1947 (estimated):
		Total use	Used under the agricultural conservation program	Total use	Used under the agricultural conservation program	Agricultural conservation program contract purchases	Total use	Used under the agricultural conservation program	Agricultural conservation program contract and purchase-order purchases	Used under the agricultural conservation program	Agricultural conservation program contract and purchase-order purchases	Agricultural conservation program, use with same funds as in 1946 [1]
Maine	7,131	24,998	14,244	58,210	56,810	37,583	92,542	83,409	78,953	89,500	85,274	90,500
New Hampshire	2,220	5,800	4,297	27,200	25,588	22,523	34,130	32,086	32,117	55,000	54,832	45,000
Vermont	5,716	14,659	12,078	53,929	53,929	33,057	107,468	99,487	99,487	85,500	82,294	65,000
Massachusetts	25,220	34,612	7,513	53,550	42,715	25,300	73,604	73,604	68,985	77,000	74,103	77,000
Rhode Island	1,936	2,829	591	7,969	5,618	3,495	11,556	8,873	8,773	9,000	8,894	10,000
Connecticut	24,061	30,975	15,217	60,044	49,204	36,656	71,955	60,328	52,232	85,000	80,171	65,000
New York	131,372	233,274	141,941	544,374	510,245	277,343	866,085	866,085	761,467	867,000	755,743	875,000
New Jersey	60,209	73,938	14,682	108,781	91,378	0	208,713	208,713	100,607	180,000	56,079	180,000
Pennsylvania	245,084	307,760	164,878	814,374	814,374	121,959	1,389,103	1,154,985	841,008	1,160,000	834,663	1,160,000
Northeast	502,948	728,845	375,341	1,728,431	1,649,861	557,916	2,855,156	2,587,570	2,043,629	2,608,000	2,032,143	2,567,500
Illinois	523,256	1,022,916	511,712	2,749,576	2,012,905	187,197	4,200,000	3,689,159	841,757	3,350,000	680,000	4,000,000
Indiana	277,511	463,837	236,537	949,428	677,275	229,549	2,101,000	1,585,862	831,962	2,325,000	1,125,000	2,500,000
Iowa	224,016	902,689	310,249	1,018,410	1,018,410	121,035	2,385,638	2,385,638	761,533	2,750,000	675,000	2,900,000
Michigan	135,000	215,000	195,760	325,000	294,132	0	599,410	599,410	510,576	850,000	800,000	1,000,000
Minnesota	13,000	40,169	34,918	64,762	41,919	0	325,000	244,502	221,454	310,000	286,100	350,000
Missouri	122,519	406,533	186,619	1,382,974	1,131,541	538,163	1,299,993	1,299,993	851,139	2,300,000	1,750,000	2,500,000
Ohio	176,168	318,959	220,679	813,875	636,257	193,661	1,350,975	1,202,373	498,647	1,700,000	625,000	1,850,000
Wisconsin	764,963	682,837	414,454	771,029	692,942	76,740	1,834,193	1,834,193	1,240,040	2,200,000	1,300,000	2,400,000
North Central	2,236,433	4,052,940	2,110,928	8,075,054	6,505,381	1,346,345	14,096,209	12,841,130	5,757,108	15,785,000	7,241,100	17,500,000
Delaware	12,450	17,652	2,971	36,554	36,554	1,495	64,856	64,856	11,197	75,000	30,000	75,000
Maryland	59,721	85,304	62,892	191,499	191,499	11,982	295,598	289,048	76,879	300,000	113,000	300,000
Virginia	110,636	196,140	165,981	867,552	567,552	241,961	839,090	824,904	522,272	800,000	460,000	1,000,000
West Virginia	15,260	67,248	54,515	345,194	344,286	137,717	409,371	409,371	334,668	500,000	440,000	460,000
North Carolina	75,861	94,254	27,292	307,889	300,312	230,015	393,851	393,851	267,519	500,000	420,000	1,000,000
Kentucky	261,717	831,439	622,967	1,368,930	1,193,212	87,980	887,629	812,041	450,000	900,000	325,000	1,300,000
Tennessee	70,000	276,000	166,040	900,000	759,435	340,327	1,500,000	1,180,244	423,740	1,100,000	625,000	1,250,000
East Central	605,645	1,568,037	1,102,658	4,017,618	3,392,850	1,051,477	4,390,395	3,974,315	2,086,275	4,175,000	2,413,000	5,385,000
Alabama	19,042	19,749	4,461	129,266	71,981	62,437	132,925	59,722	39,952	90,000	79,050	500,000
Arkansas	0	6,543	3,340	57,443	57,443	9,620	115,000	84,491	60,565	90,000	79,428	250,000
Florida	35,041	42,748	4,460	79,804	55,816	17,024	67,135	66,712	5,665	60,000	4,692	75,000
Georgia	14,020	16,714	3,187	116,096	83,700	66,841	91,813	91,813	56,150	200,000	100,802	600,000
Louisiana	0	685	685	5,981	1,216	0	54,641	47,164	39,709	100,000	92,114	300,000
Mississippi	4,075	5,337	5,337	11,855	3,584	1,003	326,680	326,680	261,215	210,000	188,535	300,000
Oklahoma	2,200	7,000	526	12,414	5,592	462	288,277	252,640	235,971	400,000	391,717	500,000
South Carolina	42,266	48,166	1,139	147,961	117,574	93,272	192,426	151,790	73,417	80,000	69,678	200,000
Texas	0	0	0	3,439	10	0	60,947	60,947	57,934	104,000	92,988	150,000
Southern	116,644	146,942	23,135	564,259	396,916	250,659	1,329,844	1,141,959	830,578	1,334,000	1,099,004	2,875,000
California	16,089	24,050	0	9,515	0	0	48,314	27,742	0	21,000	0	32,000
Kansas	13,373	27,762	7,888	46,059	31,013	10,288	715,374	715,374	715,000	910,000	800,000	1,000,000
Oregon	5,213	10,020	1,634	27,500	18,585	0	30,626	30,626	15,139	40,000	17,000	90,000
Washington	8,250	8,750	0	12,425	6,426	0	22,360	17,460	10,612	33,000	13,000	33,000
Western	42,925	70,582	9,522	95,499	56,024	10,288	816,674	791,202	740,751	1,004,000	830,000	1,155,000
Grand total	3,504,595	6,567,346	3,621,584	14,480,861	12,001,632	3,216,685	23,488,278	21,336,176	11,458,341	24,906,000	13,615,247	29,482,500

Percentages—	Northeast			North Central			East Central			Southern			Western			Total		
	1936	1940	1945	1936	1940	1945	1936	1940	1945	1936	1940	1945	1936	1940	1945	1936	1940	1945
Use under the agricultural conservation program was of total use	51.5	95.5	90.6	52.1	80.6	91.1	70.3	84.4	90.5	15.7	70.3	85.9	13.5	58.7	96.9	55.1	82.9	90.8
Agricultural conservation program contract and purchase order purchases were of agricultural conservation program use	------	33.8	79.0	------	20.7	44.8	------	31.0	52.5	------	63.2	72.7	------	18.4	93.6	------	26.8	53.7
Agricultural conservation program contract and purchase order purchases were of total use	------	32.3	71.6	------	16.7	40.8	------	26.2	47.5	------	44.4	62.5	------	10.8	90.7	------	22.2	48.8

[1] Assuming unlimited supplies of materials.

Source: Conservation Materials and Services Section, Office of the Director, Field Service Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture. Prepared Jan. 24, 1947.

Limestone requirements for cropland and pasture land by counties—West Virginia [1]

County	Cropland (acres) [2]	Plowable pasture (acres) [2]	Acres in need of lime		Annual lime need (tons)		
			Cropland	Pasture land	Cropland [3]	Pasture [4]	Total
Barbour	39,501	53,595	39,501	53,595	27,651	8,039	35,690
Berkeley	69,148	28,610	62,233	14,305	31,116	2,146	33,262
Boone	10,384	6,297	10,384	6,297	7,269	945	8,214
Braxton	47,723	62,326	47,723	56,093	33,406	8,414	41,820
Brooke	12,479	8,271	11,855	7,030	8,298	1,054	9,352
Cabell	30,765	25,535	30,765	25,535	21,536	3,830	25,366
Calhoun	32,548	12,332	32,548	12,332	22,784	1,850	24,634
Clay	18,677	20,782	18,677	20,782	13,074	3,117	16,191
Doddridge	23,058	68,081	23,058	68,081	16,141	10,212	26,353

Footnotes at end of table.

Limestone requirements for cropland and pasture land by counties—West Virginia [1]*—Continued*

County	Cropland (acres)[2]	Plowable pasture (acres)[2]	Acres in need of lime		Annual lime need (tons)		
			Cropland	Pasture land	Cropland [3]	Pasture [4]	Total
Fayette	30,014	18,651	30,014	18,651	21,010	2,798	23,808
Gilmer	33,478	60,870	33,478	60,870	23,435	9,130	32,565
Grant	24,801	16,793	23,561	12,595	16,493	1,889	18,382
Greenbrier	55,619	48,617	52,838	43,755	31,703	6,563	38,266
Hampshire	44,563	66,880	42,335	53,504	29,634	8,026	37,660
Hancock	9,417	4,376	9,417	4,157	6,592	624	7,216
Hardy	29,656	33,550	28,173	25,162	16,904	3,774	20,678
Harrison	46,104	92,204	46,104	87,594	32,273	13,139	45,412
Jackson	53,331	82,120	53,331	78,014	37,332	11,702	49,034
Jefferson	65,889	32,161	52,711	16,080	26,356	2,412	28,768
Kanawha	36,048	34,289	36,048	34,289	25,234	5,143	30,377
Lewis	34,573	49,852	34,573	49,852	24,201	7,478	31,679
Lincoln	41,908	24,970	41,908	24,970	29,336	3,746	33,082
Logan	10,202	5,429	10,202	5,429	7,141	814	7,955
McDowell	14,585	4,689	14,585	4,689	10,210	703	10,913
Marion	39,455	53,686	39,455	51,002	27,618	7,650	35,268
Marshall	41,535	68,010	41,535	51,209	29,074	9,181	38,255
Mason	53,048	69,136	53,048	65,679	37,134	9,852	46,986
Mercer	42,247	56,209	42,247	56,209	29,573	8,431	38,004
Mineral	24,301	20,774	24,301	19,735	17,011	2,960	19,971
Mingo	13,195	4,671	13,195	4,671	9,236	701	9,937
Monongalia	34,374	51,457	34,374	48,884	24,062	7,333	31,395
Monroe	41,696	48,690	39,611	43,821	27,728	6,573	34,301
Morgan	25,484	23,961	25,484	22,763	17,839	3,414	21,253
Nicholas	33,074	26,420	33,074	26,420	23,152	3,963	27,115
Ohio	17,341	14,353	17,341	12,918	12,139	1,938	14,077
Pendleton	35,739	39,532	33,952	35,579	23,766	5,337	29,103
Pleasants	11,868	13,830	11,868	12,447	8,308	1,867	10,175
Pocahontas	29,815	22,168	29,815	21,060	20,870	3,159	24,029
Preston	65,019	42,036	65,019	42,036	45,513	6,305	51,818
Putnam	38,538	35,418	38,538	33,647	26,977	5,047	32,024
Raleigh	35,074	23,774	35,074	23,774	24,552	3,566	28,118
Randolph	41,014	31,274	41,014	29,710	28,710	4,456	33,166
Ritchie	38,882	66,783	38,882	66,783	27,217	10,017	37,234
Roane	49,827	94,792	49,827	94,792	34,879	14,219	49,098
Summers	32,551	17,677	32,551	17,677	22,786	2,652	25,438
Taylor	19,173	35,824	19,173	35,824	13,421	5,374	18,795
Tucker	14,917	11,255	14,917	11,255	10,442	1,688	12,130
Tyler	30,462	42,526	30,462	42,526	21,323	6,379	27,702
Upshur	31,269	54,331	31,269	54,331	21,888	8,150	30,038
Wayne	38,368	51,209	38,368	51,209	26,858	7,681	34,539
Webster	17,029	18,540	17,029	18,540	11,920	2,781	14,701
Wetzel	35,928	43,312	35,928	43,312	25,150	6,497	31,647
Wirt	20,161	42,252	20,161	42,252	14,113	6,338	20,451
Wood	43,323	32,290	43,323	30,675	30,326	4,601	34,927
Wyoming	18,577	15,829	18,577	15,829	13,004	2,374	15,378
Total	1,827,755	2,033,299	1,795,434	1,920,230	1,225,718	288,032	1,513,750

[1] Acreages needing lime and the rates of application are those recommended by the department of agronomy, West Virginia State College of Agriculture.
[2] From 1940 Census.
[3] The annual lime need indicated is one-fifth of the total.
[4] The annual lime need indicated is one-tenth of the total.

Limestone requirements for cropland and pasture land by States

State and region	Cropland (acres)[1]	Plowable pasture (acres)[1]	Acres in need of lime		Annual lime need (tons)		
			Cropland	Pasture land	Cropland	Pasture	Total
Maine	*1,269,670	*319,687	1,000,000	200,000	160,062	40,000	200,062
New Hampshire	*417,302	*173,073	333,841	134,709	50,076	13,472	63,548
Vermont	*1,077,176	*400,890	481,509	382,418	196,301	38,242	234,543
Massachusetts	*557,790	*229,925	557,790	297,778	83,670	67,000	150,670
Rhode Island	*61,513	[2] 56,000	46,048	54,606	11,513	13,652	25,165
Connecticut	*426,475	*215,595	366,010	153,000	109,803	30,600	140,403
New York	*7,456,838	*2,779,977	4,151,085	869,865	1,840,171	347,945	2,188,116
New Jersey	*958,114	*198,538	893,746	198,538	228,570	19,856	248,426
Pennsylvania	*7,611,539	*2,798,081	5,472,018	2,179,850	1,584,799	963,137	2,547,936
Northeast	19,836,422	7,172,666	13,802,047	4,470,764	4,264,905	1,533,904	5,798,809
Delaware	*485,470	*84,113	85,993	11,626	64,495	8,720	73,215
Maryland	*1,982,486	*600,490	1,305,716	433,157	282,281	71,543	353,824
Virginia	*4,765,323	[3] 4,327,914	4,765,323	4,327,914	1,461,357	721,025	2,182,382
West Virginia	*1,827,755	*2,033,299	1,795,434	1,920,230	1,225,718	288,032	1,513,750
North Carolina	*7,192,104	*1,230,171	7,457,658	1,376,455	1,491,511	275,291	1,766,802
Kentucky	*6,509,293	*6,703,335	4,027,648	3,781,398	805,530	756,283	1,561,813
Tennessee	*7,611,856	*3,547,298	5,092,830	2,403,346	1,273,206	600,838	1,874,044
East Central	30,374,287	18,526,620	24,530,602	14,254,126	6,604,098	2,721,732	9,325,830
Alabama	*8,223,542	*2,173,731	8,223,542	2,173,731	2,337,058	641,504	2,978,562
Arkansas [3]	*7,648,498	*2,541,909	1,912,124	254,190	382,425	50,838	433,263
Florida [3]	*2,213,511	*643,060	1,106,755	321,060	110,676	32,106	142,782
Georgia	*10,177,312	*1,512,913	7,673,262	1,309,517	1,117,657	445,198	1,562,855
Louisiana	*4,357,075	*1,679,968	1,575,565	1,073,073	393,890	536,539	930,429
Mississippi	*8,000,543	*2,702,190	5,195,845	2,033,725	649,443	263,541	912,984
Oklahoma	*13,620,572	*3,513,136	4,494,038	732,766	990,882	188,608	1,179,490
South Carolina	*4,925,483	604,350	3,988,519	467,629	1,468,933	176,364	1,645,297
Texas	*5,131,522	*3,787,846	747,923	2,018,367	208,911	531,458	740,369
Southern	64,298,058	19,159,103	34,917,573	10,384,058	7,659,875	2,866,156	10,526,031

Footnotes at end of table.

Limestone requirements for cropland and pasture land by States—Continued

State and region	Cropland (acres)[1]	Plowable pasture (acres)[1]	Acres in need of lime		Annual lime need (tons)		
			Cropland	Pasture land	Cropland	Pasture	Total
Illinois	*20,197,783	*4,935,691	20,206,007	4,936,712	3,710,693	1,273,417	4,984,110
Indiana	*10,948,437	*3,701,562	7,191,786	2,399,139	1,752,378	596,908	2,349,286
Iowa	26,174,000	3,906,106	18,197,000	2,470,000	4,970,193	747,556	5,717,749
Michigan	*9,023,066	*2,875,696	4,121,606	1,358,487	808,060	275,566	1,083,626
Minnesota	*20,133,203	*2,840,821	2,875,257	603,240	716,614	154,928	871,542
Missouri	*13,765,849	*9,240,731	13,063,934	8,838,130	2,296,962	1,951,338	4,248,300
Ohio	12,359,503	4,390,654	9,041,247	3,834,472	2,506,221	892,645	3,398,866
Wisconsin	*10,280,526	*5,240,470	6,522,339	3,459,524	1,630,594	864,881	2,495,475
North Central	122,882,367	37,131,731	81,219,176	27,899,704	18,391,715	6,757,239	25,148,954
California	*2,083,706	*1,605,801	465,300	133,000	88,700	28,500	117,200
Kansas	*10,632,919	*2,649,404	4,175,000	360,000	1,039,000	72,000	1,111,000
Oregon	*1,326,488	*414,860	694,697	246,400	131,931	48,289	180,220
Washington[3]	*584,488	*281,771	204,571	98,620	40,914	19,724	60,638
Western	14,627,601	4,951,836	5,539,568	838,020	1,300,545	168,513	1,469,058
Total, United States	252,018,735	86,941,956	160,008,966	57,846,672	38,221,138	14,047,544	52,268,682

*From 1940 census.
[1] Included in these columns are only the acreages in the counties in which there is a need for lime.
[2] Includes all pasture.
[3] Subject to revision—not approved by State agronomists. Tables approved by State agronomists, showing annual lime needs by counties, are available for all States except Arkansas, Florida, and Washington.

Electric Utilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in this afternoon's Washington Daily News captioned "Don't let utilities backslide," and also an article published in this afternoon's Washington Daily News by Thomas L. Stokes captioned "Floods and consciences." The editorial and article by Mr. Stokes deal with the legislation now pending in the Congress to remove from the electric-utility industry certain regulations now imposed by the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of July 2, 1947]

DON'T LET UTILITIES BACKSLIDE

The electric-utility industry, sobered up, a respected member of the community, its shady past almost forgotten, shows signs of a relapse. It would do well to jerk itself up fast, recall the 1920's, and take the pledge all over again.

Twenty years ago the public was just waking up to the fact that utility stocks were of questionable value because utility accounts were so full of water and write-ups; because holding companies were draining so much from operating utilities in charges for this, that, and the other; and because the utilities had found a way to operate in no man's land between State and Federal regulation where it was impossible to check on what they were doing.

After a 10-year battle this situation was corrected. Changes in the Federal Power Act brought about regulation in the field beyond the power of the States to reach. The water was wrung out of company accounts—$1,250,000,000 worth of water. And when it was out financial pages began bragging about the soundness of the whole procedure and the strong fundamental position of the utilities.

Another act gave the SEC power to break up great holding company pyramids, and the companies that wept most bitterly over their fate in 1936 are more prosperous today than ever before.

Government-developed power furnished a yardstick for rates and showed companies the way to larger profits through wider markets. Again, what the companies thought was ruin turned out to be rosy prosperity.

But memories are short and greed is eternal.

The utilities are backing half a dozen bills in Congress designed to put them back where they were in the twenties. They aren't suggesting repeal of the Water Power Act—just amendments. But the amendments, innocent-sounding, cut away all that's important in the act. They once more would leave things up to the States, and the States once again would find themselves groping in an interstate no-man's-land, confused and impotent.

Other proposed bills are planned to force an end to cheap power rates, an end to demonstrations that the cost of a project eventually can be written off and cease to be a charge to the consumer, an end to the use of power sales as a means of developing the West.

Hearings are being held quietly and in unseemly haste. It's time for the country to take a long, penetrating look at the whole business.

The great tears being shed by the power men, their pleas that they seek only a chance to survive, would be more impressive if they hadn't said it all before—and if it were not for daily stock-market quotations. Taking the cure made the utilities sleek and prosperous and was good for the national economy. Congress will be foolish and reckless if it doesn't keep them that way.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of July 2, 1947]

FLOODS AND CONSCIENCES

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The rampaging Missouri and Mississippi and their tributaries not only are sweeping over the levees in their path but are slopping over in little rivulets that figuratively are sweeping into the consciousness of this Capital.

What is happening in the Middle West shows the need to do the job, once and for all. It would be done through the comprehensive, all-purpose plan for flood control, power development, irrigation, and navigation that is embodied in the proposed Missouri Valley Authority, as it was done for another large area of our country through TVA.

Such an all-purpose program, which was envisioned many years ago by President Theodore Roosevelt for the Missouri as well as other watersheds, was submitted to Congress 3 years ago in the MVA plan by another Roosevelt—Franklin D. There it slumbers.

The Missouri River is lapping at the levees of neglect and indifference erected here by selfish private interests which include among others, utility interests. As well as resisting MVA, the utility interests are trying to build another levee against property development of our river resources in still another sector here, the House Interstate Commerce Committee. This is related to the general problem involved not only in the Missouri but in other rivers which need proper development to prevent floods and for other beneficial purposes, including cheap power.

It seems timely to reemphasize the threat revealed here previously to integrated development of water resources that is contained in two bills sponsored by Representative WILLIAM MILLER, of Connecticut, Republican, which the utilities are trying to slip through Congress in a hurry. These measures would well-nigh destroy the regulatory authority of the long-established Federal Power Commission.

The danger to integrated water-resource development is in the bill that would withdraw many rivers from FPC supervision by a new and narrow definition of navigability. The other bill would affect the consumer in his electricity rate by removing many companies from FPC supervision by a new definition of interstate commerce, including supervision of accounting that already has squeezed so much water out of utility companies and opened the way for rate reductions.

On the general problem of integrated water resource development, Chairman Nelson Lee Smith of FPC said:

"There are many areas of Government lands and many streams subject to the jurisdiction of Congress which would be opened by this bill to private power development without Federal supervision or control. In proposing removal of Federal supervision, the bill represents a distinct

departure from previous congressional policy both as to land use and water power development, completely destroying the wide public benefits to be obtained from planned comprehensive use of these natural resources."

He said the present law, which the bill radically would revise, was "designed to insure that water resources will be developed to make the best possible use of water resources for navigation, flood control, irrigation, municipal water supply, recreation, and other public benefits. If these uses are to be considered in the broad public interest, they should be considered whenever a power development is proposed at a site subject to Federal jurisdiction, regardless of the use to be made of the electric energy after it is generated.

"The limitation of the licensing requirements to projects within a narrow public utility class as proposed would practically nullify any effective control over stream development for conservation purposes."

The private utility type of thinking revealed in these two bills affects all of us adversely—whether it be in water for irrigation of a farm, protection from floods, or cheap electricity to light homes and operate household facilities and to run industries, small and large.

A Ray of Light on the Alleged Bipartisan Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 16, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, a recent George Sokolsky column, These Days, sheds a ray of light on the alleged bipartisan foreign policy since 1941.

It will be interesting to watch the reaction of the American people as the truth comes out. When the people understand that their savings are being used to finance socialism abroad, and that this action is rushing us toward socialism at home, their indignation may be considerable.

Bipartisan collaboration that bleeds our taxpayers to sweeten a European transition to socialism is a questionable practice, to put it mildly.

Mr. Sokolsky's editorial follows:

THESE DAYS
(By George E. Sokolsky)

From the 1944 Presidential campaign until now, this country has witnessed a united political front with regard to its foreign policy. The Republican and Democratic Parties have functioned together as one in foreign affairs. The active opposition centered in left-wing groups headed by Henry Wallace and CLAUDE PEPPER.

The father of the bipartisan policy was Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York.

During the 1944 campaign an appeal was made to him by General Marshall not to impair the war effort by a general debate during the campaign.

That was followed by negotiations between John Foster Dulles, representing Governor Dewey, and Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, representing President Roosevelt. As a result of these conferences, the two parties agreed not to make the conduct of the war an issue.

Many Republicans at the time regarded this as an error of tactics and as not being in the best interest of the country. They felt that the Presidential campaign was precisely the time to air the relations between the United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia.

Many of them still believe that Governor Dewey lost the election because of this policy.

Dewey, on the other hand, felt that he could not endanger our armies in the field or the prospects of victory or permit the campaign to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Subsequently, Senator VANDENBERG and John Foster Dulles, representing the Republican Party, attended a number of international conferences.

Senator Warren Austin, a Republican, was appointed the United States delegate to the United Nations.

John Foster Dulles, on a number of occasions, provided the formula and text which became American policy and Senator VANDENBERG held the Republicans in line behind the President on major issues, including the Greco-Turkish aid, the wisdom of which many Republicans doubted, and the confirmation of the Italian and Hungarian treaties, which many Republicans really opposed.

Even more, no major investigation of the State Department has been instituted, although many feel that that is essential in view of their suspicion that Communists have won high places where they ought not to be.

Undoubtedly, as a result of this bipartisan policy, Herbert Hoover, the most effective personality among Republicans, has served the President on several missions of the greatest importance.

This policy appears to have outlived its usefulness. In the first place, it is impossible to make a clear demarcation between the foreign and domestic policies of this country.

For instance, when the administration commits itself to export $5,000,000,000 to $7,000,000,000 a year to Europe and Asia for a prolonged number of years, it stipulates the nature of taxes, wages, and prices in this country.

The Republicans cannot support dollar exports abroad and seek lower taxes at home, because the two are really one.

The same is true in many other matters, as, for instance, support of a socialistic government in England while we imperial our own cotton and wool markets.

The breach, then, in the bipartisan policy is being made by domestic issues. The President's veto of the tax bill, and the activities of his agents among Representatives and Senators to prevent overriding the veto, engendered a bitterness which will be felt in every quarter.

The fact that the State Department is pressing the Export-Import Bank and the World Bank to make political loans, which cannot be repaid and are therefore illegal, has reached congressional ears and gives the impression of roundabout double-crossing that annoys no end.

Furthermore, the Marshall plan is viewed with considerable suspicion because it gives the impression of encouraging the debtors to bring pressures upon this country which it may be as embarrassing to reject as it will be impossible to fulfill.

In a word, the honeymoon is turning into a Hollywood marriage—one of those things that are wonderful while they last but which must split on the rock of divergent interests.

The split is here, although the divorce papers have not been filed.

Once it is all in the open it will be clear that the principal issue in the 1948 campaign will be foreign affairs, and the argument will revert to Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. It will not be nice going.

Illinois Activities of Federal Home Loan Bank Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have received a letter from John H. Fahey, Commissioner of the National Housing Agency, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, giving a detailed report of the activities of that organization in the State of Illinois. It is a very illuminating and interesting report on what the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has done in my State, and I ask that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOME LOAN
BANK ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1947.

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: On February 28, 1945, I wrote you giving you some current facts concerning the progress of liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, particularly the record of its accomplishment in your State. The figures which I gave you then were as of the close of business September 30, 1944. Since that time even greater progress has been made and I now present to you figures as of March 31, 1947, which reflect the progress made up to this time.

Out of a total of nearly two million applications filed throughout the United States and its possessions during the period from June 13, 1933 through June 12, 1936, 1,017,821 loans were closed having a dollar value including subsequent advances, chiefly for taxes, repairs and other necessary expenses, of nearly $3,500,000,000.

Since June 12, 1936, at which time the Corporation's lending activities ceased, it has been engaged in a rapid yet orderly liquidation of its assets. As of March 31, 1946, a total of $2,695,784,648 had been liquidated, or 77.2 percent. As of March 31, 1947, 1 year later, a total of $2,896,279,856 or over 82.9 percent had been liquidated. In other words, during the 12-month period from March 31, 1946, to March 31, 1947, the Corporation liquidated a total of $200,495,208. Out of a cumulative total of 198,191 properties which the Corporation was forced to acquire, there remained on hand as of March 31, 1947, a total of but 78 properties throughout the entire country.

Out of the total number of loans made, 69,985 were closed in the State of Illinois, representing an aggregate amount of $304,997,764. This amount includes subsequent advances, chiefly for taxes and insurance, made for the account of the borrower. In this connection you will be interested in knowing that according to the 1940 Housing Census 44.6 percent of all owner-occupied, nonfarm dwelling units in the State of Illinois were under mortgage, and 22.3 percent of these mortgages were refinanced by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

As of March 31, 1946, the total amount of outstanding loans of the Corporation in Illinois, together with the value of the properties acquired, had been reduced through collections and the sale of its properties to

a balance of $68,481,445, a liquidation equivalent to 77.5 percent. As of March 31, 1947, 1 year later, the amount of the outstanding loans and the value of the properties acquired had been reduced to a balance of $50,035,417, a liquidation equivalent to 83.6 percent, or a liquidation of $18,446,028 during the 12-month period.

A total of 42,083 borrowers have paid their accounts in full as of March 31, 1947. This represents an increase of 6,520 over the number who had paid their accounts in full a year ago. A substantial number of borrowers in the State of Illinois are making monthly payments in excess of the amount required under their contracts.

The Corporation was obliged to take over through foreclosure in the State of Illinois a cumulative total of 9,197 properties. As of March 31, 1947, 9,193 have been sold, representing a liquidation of acquired properties in your State equivalent to 99.9 percent.

According to the present trends of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation's income and expense and the projection of these into the future, if the present loan balances are liquidated in accordance with amortization schedules, the Corporation should not only be able to cover all future expenses but also be able to wipe out its present deficit and thus make possible the return to the Federal Government of the entire original $200,000,000 capital of the Corporation advanced in 1933 by the Secretary of the Treasury.

We believe that the Corporation's record will be a source of pride to you and to the Congress which passed the original Home Owners' Loan Corporation legislation which has proven to be one of the most advanced measures ever undertaken in any country for the encouragement and maintenance of home ownership.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FAHEY,
Commissioner.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

After some 27 years of intermittent debate, Congress seems at last to be on the road to voting statehood for the Hawaiian Islands. The House yesterday passed by a vote of 196 to 133 the bill introduced by Delegate FARRINGTON, of Honolulu, which has been unanimously approved by the House Public Lands Committee, and which is supported by President Truman and Secretary of the Interior Krug. Although a Senate vote at this session appears unlikely, we believe the weight of evidence is in favor of prompt and affirmative action by Congress.

The Hawaiian Islands have been under the American flag since 1898 and a Territory since 1900. Their population of more than 500,000 persons is larger than that of any other Territory when it was admitted to statehood with the exception of Oklahoma. The islands pay more taxes to the Federal Government than 14 present States and are admittedly more advanced in education and public services than many others. Speed of transportation now makes its isolation from the mainland a factor of little importance.

The principal argument against granting statehood—that its polyglot population, (which was 32.5 percent Japanese in 1945) would make it unassimilable—is not, we believe, a valid one. During the war the varied races of the Hawaiian Islands proved that they were good and loyal Americans. There is little evidence that any racial group has ever indulged in bloc voting in Territorial elections. If Congress believes in the American principles that all men are born equal and that there should be no taxation without representation, then its Members should vote to make Hawaii the forty-ninth State. Hawaii's estimated 519,000 people have, we believe, proved their right to that estate.

Fourth of July 1947 in America—and Elsewhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert as part of my remarks the following speech I am making on the Fourth of July in my home community before the American Legion of Chagrin Falls, Ohio:

I am happier than I can say to be here with you on this Fourth of July, 1947. The surroundings of this beautiful valley, the sight of all these friends and neighbors give all of us a feeling of contentment and peace. Ours is the only country in all the world where this sense of security prevails today. Ours is the only country in all the world where freedom is more than a pleasant word.

Instead of taking our liberty for granted, every Fourth of July and every other day of the year, we should thank God for having blessed us with this land. In America freedom, liberty, justice under law have become platitudes. We talk about them as if they were the simplest items of everyday commerce. We almost forget that they were purchased with the blood of hundreds of thousands of men and women who came to this continent looking for a better life for themselves and their children.

In almost every other country on this globe, freedom is a remote dream utterly unknown in practice. Stand up on a soapbox anywhere in nine-tenths of the earth and chances are very good indeed that you will shortly find yourself in the local hoosegow. If you attempted to read the Declaration of Independence on most of the European or Asiatic Continents, or even the famous French Declaration of the Rights of Man, you would be listed as an "enemy of the State" in jig time.

You know, after the First World War, most of the republics that were set up by the Peace Conference at Versailles adopted constitutions patterned after our own.

They put in long, rhetorical phrases about the Bill of Rights and guaranteed every man, woman, and child the precious freedoms we enjoy in America. These things sounded all right and looked very handsome in printer's ink. But they were meaningless. They blew right out of print with the first wind of adversity. As soon as economic distress struck the words were forgotten. Old hatreds were revived. Old political rivalries were reborn. The traditional Old World solution to every internal problem—a declaration of war on somebody—was pulled out of Pandora's box, and the people of Europe were right back where they had started—at each other's throats. Freedom is more than a word. It is not something you can export in a book. It must be earned—and fought for—and guarded.

There are some modern historians who preach the doctrine that all the patterns of history are purely economic in their origins. To these people America's great success in building this great land of ours is due exclusively to the vast natural resources we have inherited. But look around the world. There are great natural gifts of iron ore and flowing oil and gold and coal in China and Russia and South Africa and dozens of other areas of the world's surface. Yet in none of them has there been anything comparable to the development of these great resources in our own soil. Nowhere have these wonderful gifts of a beneficient God been used for the enrichment of human life as they have here.

We have our troubles in America, to be sure. But behind them all we have built a solid base of principles guiding and sustaining us in every trial. Those principles are preserved in our fundamental law.

So long as we retain the determination to listen to the arguments of the other fellow, no matter how distasteful they may be, we stand a fairly good chance of arriving at a workable solution of our problems. We blow off our indignation in the public press freely. We organize protest meetings. We buy time on the radio to argue our views. These are the rights we regard as inalienable. Elsewhere they are nonexistent.

To those who urge us to abandon our way of life as outmoded, let us say this. All that is new is not necessarily better than what is old.

Sometimes the excitement and glamor of the new idea blinds us to the merits of those things that have been long established. In our own country today there are some people who preach the socialism and communism of Europe. They talk loud and long about the theory of these movements. They talk very little and very quietly about life and human happiness where they are in practice. Everyone who has watched the operation of these systems has come back to our shores blessing America. Every observer, whether he liked or disliked the Soviet Union, has reported that the rights of free speech, free press, free thought, the right to worship our God, the right to build for the future—the very things that have made America great—do not exist across the ocean.

Materially and spiritually we have built in our country a model and a challenge to the nations and the peoples of the earth. When we grow fearful of the future, when we become faint-hearted, let us remember the struggles of our history. It is trite and old fashioned to recall the determination and courage which carved an empire out of the wilderness of this continent.

Today we have a highly complex industrial civilization. We have major social problems. All of us can recite them. There is not enough decent housing in our country. But there is more here than anywhere else in the world. There is too much emphasis upon the machine and not enough upon human personality in our industrial economy. But we are more deeply conscious of this difficulty than any other nation anywhere else. There is too little human tolerance and understanding in many parts of our country. But we are striving everywhere to remind ourselves that no matter what may be our color, creed, or place of origin, we are all children of one God and brothers under the skin. There is too little provision for the education of our youth and their training for the responsibilities of the atomic age. But we are rapidly moving forward in our fight to offer equal educational opportunities to every child in America. There are too many works and too little faith. But we realize our shortcomings and the beginning of wisdom is knowledge of our weaknesses.

Yes; we have still a long way to go before we realize the American dream. We have a hard path to travel before we achieve here a Nation in which all men are free to develop to their maximum usefulness to themselves and to the world. But we have come a longer distance toward that goal in the years since July 4, 1776, than any other people in human history.

There are dangers and pitfalls ahead. If labor and management decide to enter upon suicidal combat, they may destroy the economic pattern of free enterprise. If prejudice and intolerance gain the foothold here that they have achieved in the Old World, they may lead us into the fratricide of civil war and shatter our hopes. If unwise statesmanship determines our foreign policies, we may be surrounded by a circle of potential enemies who raged our wealth with envy and malice. These are real perils. Anyone who minimizes either the domestic or the foreign issues facing us today is deceiving himself. But we in America are the world's great optimists.

We could not have built our magnificent civilization without confidence in what lies ahead. Our great problems today are man-made. They arise largely from the fact that our scientific advances in technology have outstripped our ability to absorb them. We have not been able to translate the steam engine into terms of human society, and today we are confronted with the fact of atomic energy. We must make the difficult effort to catch up in our thinking. World-wide organizations have functioned across national lines in trade and commerce. American engineeers have built railroads and turbines on every continent. The boundary lines drawn on maps are artificial devices. We must learn to think across those lines if we are to have world-wide, enduring peace.

I am confident as we face the future. Here in America we have given men and women the chance to exercise their brains, their muscles, their ingenuity to build a New World. On this Fourth of July 1947, the blessings of this brave New World are everywhere apparent. Let us determine that come what may, we shall labor together with the peoples of the earth to spread the blessings of this world of ours everywhere and preserve them for those who come after us to enjoy in peace and happiness.

The Founders of the American Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Capt. Dudley W. Knox of the United States Navy:

THE FOUNDERS OF THE AMERICAN NAVY

(By Capt. Dudley W. Knox, U. S. Navy)

Although there is no precise definition of the term "founder of a Navy," the many men who were conspicuously associated with the origins of our Navy might be regarded as its "founders."

The first naval forces under Continental pay and control were those established in the spring and summer of 1775 by Generals Arnold and Schuyler on Lake Champlain, and by General Washington near Boston. The Lake force saw no important service for nearly a year when under General Arnold it was defeated by a greatly superior British squadron, although the Americans had gained a vital strategic victory by delaying an invading British Army.

The so-called Washington Fleet, however, was effectively employed at an early date. When General Washington took command of the Army before Boston in July 1775, the extreme shortage of powder and arms persuaded him to commission several vessels in advance of congressional approval to prey on the sea communications of the British Army in Boston, in the hope of capturing munitions. The first of these vessels was the schooner *Hannah* which sailed on September 5, 1775, under Capt. Nicholson Broughton and brought in a prize within 2 days. Commodore John Manly commanded the little fleet of seven vessels that during several subsequent months were very active off Boston and made other valuable prizes of British ships carrying munitions.

Meantime, under the leadership of John Adams, Congress resolved on October 13, 1775 that two Continental ships be fitted out. This was the legislative birth of the permanent Continental Navy. A Congressional Naval Committee was appointed, consisting of Silas Deane, John Langdon, Christopher Gadsden, Stephen Hopkins, Joseph Hewes, R. H. Lee, and John Adams. This committee laid the foundation of the Continental Navy. It directed the purchasing, outfitting, manning, and operations of the earlier ships, prepared the legislation organizing the new naval service, and drafted admirable rules and regulations to govern its conduct and internal administration. The latter was principally the work of John Adams.

Esek Hopkins was appointed commander in chief of the fleet and had general charge of its preparation at Philadelphia under the supervision of the congressional committee. The work of structural alterations needed to transform the purchased merchant ships into men-of-war was placed under the naval architect, Joshua Humphreys. The rerigging and outfitting of the ships were under Capt. John Barry. The matter of obtaining crews was given the special attention of the commander in chief, Hopkins, who was necessarily so much occupied with the affairs of the fleet as a whole that the preparation of his flagship, the *Alfred*, fell largely to the lot of Lt. John Paul Jones, the second in command on board the flagship.

The captain of each of the other ships attended to various wants of his own ship more particularly. These captains, in the order of rank, were Dudley Saltonstall, Nicholas Biddle, Abraham Whipple, John B. Hopkins, John Hazard, William Hallock, William Stone, and Hoysted Hacker.

The first Continental Fleet put to sea under these officers in February 1776. It proceeded to New Providence (Bahamas) and there landed and captured a large stock of munitions which was taken to New London, Conn., for the army. Captain Barry was not in this fleet but remained in Philadelphia and soon was put in command of the *Lexington*, which did splendid service in guarding the Delaware River and its sea approaches.

Following these initial operations, which virtually "launched" the American Navy, other ships were put in active service on the home coast and overseas. There were frequent combats in which the "fighting edge" of the Americans was proven to be the highest. Among the more conspicuous who might be said to have fathered the fighting spirit of our Navy in this way were Capts. Lambert Wickes, Nicholas Biddle, John Paul Jones, John Barry, Gustavus Conyngham, James Nicholson, and Joshua Barney.

After the Revolutionary War the Navy went out of existence completely. It was not reestablished until 1794, when Congress provided for the construction of six new frigates, and appointed six captains to supervise the work and to command the vessels when completed. These men were John Barry (who was the senior in rank), Samuel Nicholson, Silas Talbot, Richard Dale, Thomas Truxtun, and James Sever, of whom four, Barry, Nicholson, Dale, and Sever, were former officers of the Continental Navy.

In 1798 we went to war against the French at sea, hastily buying more ships and appointing more officers. In the subsequent 3 years of quasi war, Capt. Thomas Truxtun especially distinguished himself in two successful and severe actions in the *Constellation* against French frigates. Lts. John Shaw and Charles Stewart also fought brilliant engagements in smaller ships. Among the squadron commanders were Capts. John Barry, Alexander Murray, Silas Talbot, Thomas Truxtun, Thomas Tingey, Stephen Decatur, Sr., and Richard Dale.

Closely following the quasi war with France came our Barbary Wars in which the most distinguished high-ranking officer was Capt. Edward Preble. He established an enviable fighting tradition in several hard-fought attacks on Tripoli by a squadron of 14 vessels under his command, with the frigate *Constitution* as flagship. Under Preble's leadership the loosely knit Navy of that day became a unified fighting force for the first time, and this unification has lasted until the present time.

All of the persons named in the foregoing, from Washington to Preble, may be said to have had an important part in the founding of the Navy. There were also others who might be included in a group designated as the founders of the American Navy. For example, Benjamin Franklin, when acting as our diplomatic representative in France, was largely instrumental in creating a squadron of American ships for operations in Europe, and there was a period late in the Revolutionary War when the Continental Navy would have disintegrated but for the financial and political aid of Robert Morris.

Word "Trusteeship" Waves Red Flag on Korean Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

WORD "TRUSTEESHIP" WAVES RED FLAG ON KOREAN PEACE

(Article 28)

We not only have the Russians to contend with in Korea; there is also the word "trusteeship," a word which causes Koreans to see red, deprives them of the power of reason, and arouses stubborn and implacable opposition.

That word came out of the Moscow Conference, held in December 1945. This conference made the following decrees regarding Korea:

That a provisional Korean democratic government should be formed with a view to the reestablishment of Korea as an independent state.

In forming this provisional government, a joint commission, consisting of representatives of the United States command in southern Korea and representatives of the Soviet command in northern Korea, should

consult with the Korean democratic parties and social organizations. Recommendations of this joint commission should be submitted for consideration by the Governments of Russia, China, Britain, and the United States before being put into effect.

Then the joint commission, with the participation of the provisional Korean Government and of Korean democratic organizations, should prepare various recommendations to assist Korea, including an agreement concerning a four-power trusteeship of Korea, for a period of up to 5 years.

JAP AGGRESSION RECALLED

Right then and there a beautiful friendship between Koreans and the United States came to an end. It was over that word trusteeship. The Koreans had heard it before. In 1905 Japan had established a trusteeship for Korea. This was followed in 1910 by outright annexation. The Koreans were convinced that the proposed trusteeship would follow the same course and bring to an end their dreams of independence.

We tried to explain to them that, as far as we were concerned, trusteeship means friendly aid. We reminded them of the fulfillment of our promises to give Cuba and the Philippines their independence, as evidences of our good faith.

But none of these arguments has had any effect. The Koreans are convinced that trusteeship will means permanent occupation as a colony or protectorate. Their minds are made up, and that's all there is to it.

COMMUNISTS SWITCH STAND

There was one exception, however. The Communists favor trusteeship, although there was a time when they were on the verge of coming out against it. Immediately after the Moscow Conference, the Communists planned to stage a big demonstration and parade in southern Korea to protest the establishment of a trusteeship. This was scheduled for January 3, 1946. But on January 2 their respresentatives called on Lt. Gen. John R. Hodge, commander of the United States Army forces in Korea, and told him that their demonstration would be in favor of trusteeship. Apparently the word from Moscow regarding the party line had been slow in reaching them.

Further complications arose when it came time for the joint commission of American and Russian representatives to consult with Korean democratic parties and social organizations regarding the formation of a provisional Korean Government.

OPPOSITION FROZEN OUT

The Russians took the position that they would not consult with anyone who had opposed the Moscow agreement or who was opposed to trusteeship. The Russians argued that the Moscow decision had been made by democratic powers and therefore that anyone who opposed it was not democratic.

Since everyone in southern Korea was opposed to the trusteeship provision of the Moscow agreement, except the Communists, this meant that the Russians would consult only with Korean Communists in preparing recommendations for the establishment of a provisional government in Korea.

General Hodge quite naturally refused to limit the consultation to Communists. He said that to deny other Koreans an opportunity to participate would be a violation of the right of free speech.

HODGE COMPROMISE FAILS

The Russians refused to budge from their position. The deadlock continued for several months. Finally General Hodge reopened negotiations and persuaded the Russians to accept a compromise under which they agreed to consult with various Korean parties and organizations provided they subscribed to a declaration that from then on they would uphold the Moscow decision in its entirety, including the trusteeship provision, and would not agitate against it.

The Koreans emitted loud yells of protest. One of the most vigorous was a manifesto by the Antitrusteeship Independence Council, an organization composed of 50 political parties and patriotic societies, of which Dr. Syngman Rhee is listed as supreme adviser.

ANNEXATION IS FEARED

"This (agreement) will only result in trusteeship being forced upon us," the manifesto asserted in part. "Only recently, in discussions over the exercise of American trusteeship over certain Pacific areas, the Soviet spokesman naively admitted that trusteeship is annexation. We cannot forget this. Remember what we underwent under the iron heels of the Japanese oppressors for the past 40 years.

"In short, trusteeship means erasing our national spirit and culture, fostered through 50 long centuries, suppression of our sovereignty and finally reducing us 30,000,000 to perpetual serfdom."

These and other blasts from southern Koreans made it impossible to carry out even the first step of the Moscow agreement, which was the formation of a provisional government for all of Korea.

So the Russians retired to their side of the border, while General Hodge flew to Washington in an effort to find some solution of the problem on a higher diplomatic level. Meanwhile, the gulf between northern and southern Korea widens.

National Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a great chorus of voices of individuals, social, civic, fraternal, religious, and other organizations have been raised in the last few weeks demanding action in the catastrophic national housing shortage by getting the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, introduced by me in the House, H. R. 2523, up for hearings by the Banking and Currency Committee and on to the floor for action. Among those from whom I have heard are some of the most substantial organizations in the United States. I submit as typical, an eloquent set of resolutions of the American Home Economics Association adopted at its recent convention at St. Louis, Mo.:

AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1947.

Hon. JACOB JAVITS,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: The American Home Economics Association assembled from all States, 2,500 strong, at St. Louis, unanimously passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the housing problem both for families of veterans and for the families of nonveterans is one of the most critical domestic issues facing the Nation today; and

"Whereas housing facilities in the United States are still inadequate and beyond the purchasing power of the average citizen; and

"Whereas too few houses have been made available for rent; and

"Whereas home ownership is denied to a large percentage of those who desire to buy or build their own homes; and

"Whereas decent housing is a problem of national concern which needs the concerted efforts of National, State, and local Governments, as well as the active interest of those directly connected with building and financial agencies: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Home Economics Association urge the passage of the housing bills, S. 866 and H. R. 2523, before the end of the first session of the Eightieth Congress."

Sincerely yours,
KATHARINE M. ALDERMAN,
President.

Foreign Oil and Steel Shipments Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the board of one of the large oil companies wrote me the other day to explain that there has been a 40-percent increase in demand for heating oils and heavy gasoline demands from the foreign areas. In spite of the fact that they are producing 13 percent more gasoline than last summer, they are forced to limit sales to 1946 levels. This means that there will not be sufficient oil and gasoline to supply the requirements of the people of the Central West. It may be that we shall have to resort to gas and oil rationing again. In the face of this possibility, the State Department has seen fit to continue export policies which are responsible largely for the gasoline and fuel oil shortage. We must curtail foreign shipments of oil and steel to other countries and stop such shipments if necessary, in order to take care of our own requirements. There are some who wish to minimize the importance of foreign shipments of oil and steel, and indicate that our shortage is due entirely to the new uses we have found for oil in this country.

Instead of building up our reserves of oil and gasoline in this country, we permitted the exportation of 191,000,000 barrels of gasoline and petroleum products since January 1, 1946. In 1947, between January 1 and May 1, 600,000 barrels of gasoline and oil were shipped to Russia alone from the California coast. We must support the proposal of the gentleman from Ohio, Representative WEICHEL, to conserve our petroleum and petroleum products in this country against exportation to foreign countries.

Mr. Walter S. Hallanan, chairman of the National Petroleum Council, speaking at a meeting of the marketing committee of the American petroleum committee, in Minneapolis the other day, had this to say:

Here is one example of what the exportation of tubular goods in the first 3 months

of the present year means to the consumers of oil products in the great Middle West—

Hallanan said—

in those 3 months we sent abroad 82,250 tons of such goods.

That same amount of steel manufactured into pipe would be sufficient to construct a 12-inch line from west Texas, where additional crude supplies are available, to the refining and marketing area in the Chicago district. That alone would solve all of the existing and threatened shortages of the Middle West.

In the first quarter of 1947 our total exports of seamless and welded casing and oil-line pipe were 411 percent greater than in the prewar period. In 1946 our exports of those materials to Communist Russia were 670 percent greater than in the 1935–39 period. In the first quarter of the present year they were continuing at a rate of 430 percent greater than before the war.

As you can see, we are not only exporting our oil and gasoline, but we are also exporting the materials which should be used in the distribution of oil and gasoline in this country. The president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey states that the difficulties in connection with obtaining sufficient oil and gasoline in the Central West is due to lack of transportation and distribution facilities.

By all means we should protect our own interests in these important regards. This is particularly true in view of the fact they are so important to our national defense. We must build up our own oil and gasoline reserves and stop shipments of oil and steel products to foreign countries until this is done.

The Future of the Navajo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article of Mr. Jerry McLain which was published in the Arizona Republic on June 11, 1947:

WINDOW ROCK, June 11.—The future of the Navajo—grim today in the face of drought that has parched the ranges, ignorance that has retarded economic advancement, and rising living costs that are bringing poverty—now lies off his 25,000-square-mile reservation.

That is the frank opinion of James M. Stewart, superintendent of the mighty Navajo Nation, as expressed to RICHARD F. HARLESS, Arizona's junior Congressman, who came from Washington to investigate reports of possible starvation among the Indians by the time the next snow falls.

Already, says Superintendent Stewart, Government social workers have reported cases of malnutrition among the Navajo.

"Things look bad," he says. "What we're going to do I really don't know."

With Government education and health programs pitifully inadequate, with the limited relief funds exhausted more than a month ago, Stewart can only look with foreboding toward the future.

In Washington the Congress has recommended a $10,000,000 cut in requests of the Indian Office. A spokesman of that office already has said such a slash will work particular injury in the Navajo Reservation.

But even if Uncle Sam took cognizance of the red man's plight and poured into the reservation the millions which would be required for long-planned improvements, the fact remains that only 35,000 of the Navajo's estimated 60,000 population could hope to subsist in their homeland.

Fifteen thousand, says Stewart, already have seen "the handwriting on the wall." They have moved off the reservation.

The Navajos are believed to have come to the Southwest 10 to 12 centuries ago. They were warlike until 79 years ago they laid down their arms and signed a peace treaty with the United States Government after Kit Carson had led Army forces into the wild frontier to end their depredations.

Navajos, who had been exiled to the New Mexico military garrison at Fort Sumner, were assigned, as a reservation, a huge area in which they had waged their losing battle against the white soldiers.

For more than three-quarters of a century this reservation has been their home; a harsh but fantastically beautiful land where yesterdays linger and time is unimportant.

It blankets the northeastern corner of Arizona and spreads into Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico. It is larger in area than Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire.

The grass in the sixties and seventies was knee high, and areas now barren then were well wooded. Women and children tended the flocks, and the families followed in their wanderings the sheep following the grass. Many thought these people were to become "the vanishing Americans."

But the tribe's population grew. The original 7,000 or 8,000 doubled, trebled, and then quadrupled in number. Superintendent Stewart says there was no true picture of the tribe's size until wartime sugar rationing registration revealed a population of more than 53,000. Today the tribal growth is estimated at 1,000 or more persons per year.

But through the years heavy grazing denuded much of the range. Storms brought rushing water to erode the lands. Wind whipped the loose sand into dunes. Drought dried up the water holes.

So the Government stepped in more than a decade ago with a plan to reduce the flocks in the hope of conserving the land and improving quality of the sheep. The reservation was divided into 18 districts and, depending upon the quality of the range, residents in each area were told the maximum number of sheep they could graze.

Though still free to roam to any part of the reservation, they were required to keep their sheep or other stock in their particular grazing area. Families were not permitted to increase the number of sheep once the "ceiling" was placed on the flocks. When the children grew up to marry and have families of their own, the only way in which they could obtain sheep was for the father to divide his original allotment.

Though the tribe was increasing in numbers, the Government ruled sufficient sheep, cattle, or horses must be sold or slaughtered each year so that grazing would not be on the increase. It was a telling blow to the Navajos, and many still resist the Government's orders.

In 1946 the rainfall for the first 6 months was less than 2½ inches, while 10 to 15 inches is considered normal. The ground is exceedingly fertile, but without water nothing will grow.

So in some areas as much as 50 to 250 acres is required to pasture one sheep, and for even the simplest type of living a family of five or six must have 150 to 200 sheep. Thus the nomadic Navajo cannot live in communities, but rather in isolated units of one or two hogans.

They are scattered at the rate of 2.1 to the square mile.

Life has been, of necessity, reduced to its simplest terms. Fuel is scarce and water even more difficult to obtain. During very dry seasons the Navajo families travel in wagons and pick-ups as much as 15 to 20 miles from their hogan homes to obtain water for drinking and cooking purposes.

Superintendent Stewart told Congressman HARLESS that for anything more than mere subsistence—that is, for a decent living—the average Navajo family should have 350 sheep units. He explained that one cow or one horse represents five sheep units.

But in 5 of the reservation's 18 districts the Government limits the Navajo to 104 or less sheep units. In one district the maximum for a family is 61, in another only 72 to the family. Sixty-one sheep hardly would support more than one person.

Stewart says that right now the reservation's grazing potentiality can support only about 1,500 families, or some 7,500 Navajo. Talk of the reservation supporting 7,000 families, or 35,000 Navajos, involves full development of reservation potentialities, he declares.

So the Navajo, ill-equipped from an educational standpoint to seek a living off the reservation, faces a momentous decision:

Shall he stick to the reservation and battle an economic future where the cards appear stacked against him, or should he pull up stakes and try for a new start elsewhere?

As a ward of the Government, he rarely has had to think for himself. But now, if he is to survive, it appears he must do so.

Yes, Superintendent Stewart told Congressman HARLESS, Washington is aware of the serious situation confronting the Navajo.

Of the Indian Bureau, he says: "I believe they were shocked when we developed these facts."

But Washington isn't doing anything about it.

Two Worlds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Washington Post of July 3, 1947, entitled "Two Worlds":

TWO WORLDS

When Mr. Molotov left Paris, he buried the last hope that we are living in one world and we must now get used to the idea that there are two worlds. The realization will have a grave impact upon the national policy of all countries. Thanks to Secretary Marshall's initiative, there can be no more pretense, and our daily object from now on should be to knit together all nations who are likeminded with us. We may yet find recruits behind the iron curtain, for the Muscovite rejection of mutual aid in Europe is bound to be resented bitterly by, for example, many Czechs and many Poles.

It is a relief to know that France has decided to drop off the fence and join the West. Italy will doubtless follow suit. But both of them are in for a time of trouble (as, indeed, we all are), though it is by no means certain exactly what their Communists will do. One thing only is sure. that is that deviously or openly they will seek to accomplish the aim set out starkly

and crudely by Mr. Molotov. This is to keep Europe divided and prostrate. It should now be obvious to the meanest intelligence that the West must gird itself to retrieve and then protect its civilization.

Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal of June 28 and 30, 1947:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal of June 28, 1947]

PORTLAND'S LABOR PLAN

Portland may set a pattern for the Nation in the handling of its labor relations.

Top Portland industrialists and labor leaders have announced there will be no rock throwing in this city over the Taft-Hartley bill. The industrialists and labor leaders, members of the Portland Labor-Management Committee, sat down around the table this week, as they have done countless times before, and looked the new situation in the face.

They took a common-sense attitude. They talked without heat, and agreed that regardless of any laws that are passed they can continue on a basis of cooperation to keep production humming. They agreed that so-called protest strikes by labor accomplish nothing but confusion and they agreed that any employer or union group who attempts to use provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill to cause disruption and ill feeling in Portland labor relations should be exposed to the public.

Said L. R. Hussa, president of Albina Engine & Machine Works: "There is no legislation that can alter friendship. If labor and management want to be fair no one will be hurt."

Portland is indeed fortunate in having such a level-headed group of industrialists and labor leaders, who realize that continuous strikes, lock-outs, and heated bickering hurt everyone.

The labor-management committee is no Pollyanna group talking pretty words. It is composed of hard-headed businessmen and labor leaders who have some very definite ideas of what they are entitled to for their ability, investments, and labor. Everything is not all sweetness and light when they meet to tackle a problem on which they disagree. Some of their talk is brutally frank.

But the important thing is they all realize that only by sitting down around the table and threshing out differences between management and labor can there be prosperity and decent sort of living for all. Cooperation is the key.

We can use more of that kind of common sense.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal of June 30, 1947]

ABOUT LABOR RELATIONS

(A recent American Legion magazine article about labor relations, by Dave Beck, of Seattle, vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, has caused considerable comment. Some paragraphs of the article are printed below, followed by a letter to the American Legion editor written by E. C. Sammons, president of the United States National Bank and one of the founders of the Legion.)

"Industrial peace, like all much-wanted things, is easier to destroy than to create. It is always easier to talk about wrong ideas, wrong methods, and wrong policies than it is accurately to suggest right ideas, right methods, and right policies.

"If those who cry loudest for laws to curb labor were sincerely desirous of industrial peace they would explore the tried and proven ways. They would tackle the problem by the use of the only successful formula: Better, closer relationships, confidence, and mutual understanding between those who speak for labor and capital.

"Labor has its responsibilities. It must not retard but encourage the introduction of labor-saving machinery and processes. Labor must not interfere with the mechanization of industry and must encourage greater production and resultant lower consumer costs.

"Capital and labor must cease placing the public in the middle. The way to do this is plainly at the conference table. And leave the professional labor haters out as advisers to the employers. This will cut down to a minimum the possibilities of a strike. This will increase the possibilities of arbitration and conciliation."

Sammons letter to the Legion magazine editor:

"Having just finished reading the article by Dave Beck in the May issue of the Legion magazine, I wish to compliment you on it. My compliment arises out of three premises: (1) As one of the founders of the American Legion in Paris in 1918; (2) as a citizen interested in the welfare of our country; (3) as a member of the labor-management committee, successfully functioning in the Portland area.

"During World War II, we saw a notable example of what Kipling called the 'everlastin' teamwork of every bloomin' soul'—government, labor, management, working shoulder to shoulder to win the war. We must, it seems to me, revive that teamwork in order to win the peace.

"As Dave Beck says in his article, labor unions are here to stay, and both labor and management must cooperate for the public good. That great statesman, Barney Baruch, in talking before the legislature in South Carolina recently, said there is nothing wrong with our business situation in America that adequate production cannot cure. We need more things for more people at lower cost, and high production can achieve that goal.

"To get that production we need a cooperative spirit mentioned by Mr. Beck in his article, and such as has been evidenced in the Portland area in consequence of an intelligent approach through the efforts of the labor-management cooperation. More articles of that type, I believe, will be helpful to the cause of stability in this country."

European WPB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of July 1, 1947:

EUROPEAN WPB

An economic concert of Europe including Russia seems impossible to achieve as the result of the Russo-British-French talks in Paris. Mr. Molotov's objections bar agreement. The secrecy governing the parley makes it difficult to determine the sequence of these objections. It seems that in response to the Bevin-Bidault proposal to set up an agency or agencies for the integration of national economies in Europe, Mr. Molotov countered with the request that the whole matter should be referred to UN's European Commission, which will meet again at Geneva on July 5. When the British and the French declined, he seems to have asked that more information be requested on what our Congress will do for Europe. That, of course, is putting the cart before the horse. Secretary Marshall invited Europe to find out what Europe, after an inventory of resources, could do for itself in reconstructiong the Continent as a "working economy." The administration declared it would seek congressional help only after such a plan had been prepared. Mr. Molotov did not rest content with this effort to return the ball to America. He appears to have justified the Bevin-Bidault declination to remit the Marshall proposal to the Economic Commission for Europe by turning his back on any exploration of a scheme for the integration of national economies in Europe. Any discussion in the Economic Commission would amount to precisely nothing within the terms of reference set by Secretary Marshall.

It is to be hoped that any disappointment that Mr. Bevin may feel will not be expressed in a Bevinesque explosion. That would worsen the diplomatic atmosphere. And it would make the position of the French the more difficult as they confront the dilemma of having to make up their minds whether to continue limited negotiations with the view of bringing as much of Europe as possible within a scheme. The Communists in France are bound to take the tip from Mr. Molotov's diplomacy. They may be expected to throw every ounce of effort into restraining the Ramadier government from making a further try to link the coordinate France's reconstruction with Britain's. But if the Ramadier government stands firm, the Communists might be outbluffed. The Marshall initiative, judging from the comment in France as well as Britain, has appealed to the silent men in both countries. They see action in conformity with it as their only salvation. If they remain steadfast, and the French Government sees a mandate in such a manifestation, the Communists may be outwitted. An initiative on the part of Paris and London is, furthermore, encouraged by the avid interest expressed in the capitals, notably in Brussels and Bern. Secretary Marshall would be content, judging from his Harvard speech, with a partial European plan.

Accordingly, the best course to pursue, it seems to us, is to resume, after a respectable pause, the British-French conversations under Mr. Monnet's aegis. They have continued at the instance of former Premier Blum since last August. Little progress seems to have been made, but an impetus is now forthcoming from Secretary Marshall. It may be that this spur will yet bring action, as some of the European newspapers hope, in formulating a super-Monnet plan.

The Monnet plan, certainly, is the nucleus for basic reconstruction. It provides for action in key industries, the modernization of the out-of-date plant in these industries, and a system of priorities for investment money and of allocations for raw material and new equipment. To stretch its provisions to include Britain would be to start the scheme that Secretary Marshall has in mind. The result, if the neighboring countries should see any seriousness of purpose in London and Paris, might conceivably be the blueprinting of a sort of continental WPB.

Somewhere on the way the capitals in Europe might pluck up courage to issue what the London Observer calls a declaration of

interdependence more or less like the Articles of Confederation which were the prelude to the American Union. At least such a declaration has become the aim of the growing army of unionists in Europe. That is probably too much to expect in view of Moscow's frown. However, such a declaration would be implicit in supranational agencies engaged in allocating new equipment available at home or from abroad to jobs that are most urgently needed to speed the revival of Europe. It would be better to underline in some ringing statement the meaning of this kind of activity.

But, even if this is impossible, the significance of functional agencies similar to those we had in our WPB could not be lost on Congress. Russia, we are convinced, would not allow the task of integration to go very far before trying in some way to participate in it. For one thing, Czechoslovakia and Poland would get progressively more restive as this activity went on, and Moscow cannot altogether ignore her satellites, especially when a question of living standards is involved. If Russia can impose a veto on European recovery and the prospect of American investment in it, then the hope of restoring the circulatory system of Europe will go under a cloud, and the future of Europe cannot be foreseen. The struggle to save Europe that Russia is avowedly blocking will be watched with deep concern in America.

Congress Ponders Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Mankato Free Press, Mankato, Minn., on June 30, 1947:

CONGRESS PONDERS FOREIGN AID

There is one point concerning the so-called Marshall plan for aiding Europe that troubles Congress.

Lawmakers in Washington are asking themselves, "Are we following the same course and making the same mistakes that we made after World War I?"

Then vast sums were loaned to Europe, loaned and not given to prostrate nations as is now proposed. On the strength of these advances the heavy industries of this country were kept going, manufacturing goods to be marketed abroad, paid for with the money that was borrowed here. In other words, we were virtually keeping wartime production going by lifting ourselves by our own bootstraps—we were maintaining a false prosperity on loans that were never paid back.

As a result, when we ceased to loan abroad, the depression here was relatively more severe than in the rest of the world because we had supported a false prosperity longer and the problems of recovery were accordingly greater. Members of Congress are asking how different the Marshall plan is, from this program which we followed a quarter century ago.

The difference rests with Europe. If the peoples of Europe have the will power and the desire to make that difference. We propose to advance aid to those nations only long enough to get them on their feet, to insure their economic rehabilitation, after which it is argued they will be able to proceed to sound recovery on their own. That is the argument but the question is how decisively we will act in cutting off aid when we consider enough has been advanced, and also, how much integrity European leaders and peoples will manifest in trying to proceed on their own, after the initial assistance we have given has been exhausted.

Russia is betting that such a program will exhaust us and leave our allies virtually as prostrate as they are now. That is why she is playing a delaying and waiting game. She sees communism triumphing eventually over greatly weakened democratic powers—particularly us, as the leader of the democracies.

That is why we read that Congress is cool to the Marshall plan. It is not that we do not want to aid Europe—it is that we do not want to waste that aid or to so weaken ourselves that we cannot meet any future crisis which may develop. Certainly our postwar experience warrants reasonable caution in proceeding with a program of foreign loans or grants. We loaned England nearly $4,000,000,000—that was to completely rehabilitate her economy and establish her on the road to stability and prosperity.

Now the four billions is virtually exhausted, Britain needs additional funds and her economy is weaker than it was 2 years ago. France has had a smaller grant and our experience with her has been similar to that with Britain. That is why an increasing number of lawmakers and thinking citizens are strongly supporting the so-called Vandenberg-Hoover plan.

That is a program to measure our own economic strength, to assay our wealth and then to decide the amount of aid we may be able to contribue to support of the Truman doctrine, without seriously weakening our own economy. The Truman-Marshall plan proposes to extend such aid abroad as may be needed to halt the spread of communism; the Vandenberg-Hoover plan proposes to extend such aid as we are able but at no dangerous sacrifice of our economic strength and resources.

At the present moment it appears that both Congress and the general public will support some form of the latter plan, in preference to the all-out aid proposed under the Truman doctrine. Certainly if our position is seriously weakened more damage can be done to the cause of world-wide democracy than by any other development. Democracy will live and expand only if the United States remains strong.

St. Paul's Women's Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, no less a personage than William Shakespeare is authority for the saying, "Frailty, thy name is woman." But when so speaking I am sure that Mr. Shakespeare was not thinking of the women of the city of St. Paul, Minn.

For a more accurate description of the women of St. Paul we must needs turn to the writings of the venerable Oliver Wendell Holmes, who in his The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table said, "Nature is in earnest when she makes a woman." No group of women have done more for their community than the women of St. Paul have done for their home city in the way of civic betterment and community promotion. They have, through hard work, reawakened the civic spirit of St. Paul until today it is one of the fastest growing and most prosperous cities in the land. The activities of the St. Paul's Women's Institute were written up in the current issue of Parade magazine and distributed throughout the Nation this past week. I know the Members of the House will be interested in reading of the splendid activities of these women, so I asked permission to include the article in my extension of remarks. The article follows:

ST. PAUL'S WOMEN'S INSTITUTE

Many a merchant knows that local prosperity inevitably follows in the wake of aroused community pride. "But exactly how," he's likely to ask, "do you go about arousing civic zeal?"

More than 12,000 members of the Women's Institute of St. Paul, Minn., think they've found the answer. So do the Twin City merchants.

In 1937 St. Paul's retail stores were operating in the red; $15,000,000 worth of business was going across the river to Minneapolis. An economic survey showed that incomes were high—but that business was poor. Bernard Ridder, publisher of the St. Paul Dispatch-Pioneer Press was convinced that something could be done. But what?

Agnes Kennedy had an idea. Miss Kennedy, who was later to become Mrs. Bernard Ridder, argued that 85 percent of the Nation's spending is done by women. So, she reasoned, if a program of good, low-cost entertainment could be devised to keep St. Paul women at home, they would probably shop at home, too. The Women's Institute was born.

Fifty speakers were sent out to women's organizations to explain the objects of the institute. Within 3 weeks the membership limit was reached.

The first institute program, a sell-out, was attended by out-of-town guests from 496 cities in 24 States and Canada. Today, 8 years later, only the size of the municipal auditorium, St. Paul's largest hall, keeps the membership from expanding beyond its present 12,500 mark.

Membership costs a Minnesota housewife $2.40 a year. It admits her to 12 programs, presented on six institute days. For 17 cents—the ultimate cost per program—she can hear such outstanding lecturers and entertainers as Eleanor Roosevelt, Gracie Fields, Oscar Levant, Eve Curie, Andre Kostelanetz, Tito Guizar, Sigmund Romberg, and Gladys Swarthout.

As one member puts it: 'It's the biggest bargain in the State. Imagine, Oscar Levant for 17 cents."

A bargain to the women, the institute is also a boon to businessmen. Last year St. Paul ranked first in the Northwest, third in the Nation, in increased volume of retail sales. More than one Twin City businessman gives the credit to the Women's Institute.

Prosperity didn't come to St. Paul merchants while they sat and waited. The Women's Institute asked for, and received their cooperation. It sent committees to each store and questionaires to each member.

What did the shoppers want? The Institute found out, and carried the message to the eager storekeepers. The result was a new deal for shoppers, and for merchants, too.

In 18 months, the effects were apparent. Bank deposits rose. Statistics showed that local business was on the upswing.

Having demonstrated its worth—business indexes proved it—the Institute turned to more ambitious projects. St. Paul's shopping district is having its face lifted. More than 350 unsightly hanging signs have been

removed from one street alone at the Institute's request. By dividing the shopping district into blocks, and appointing three women committees for each block, the Institute has cleaned up the area outside and in.

Eighty-five women personally interviewed 263 merchants and building owners to suggest improvements in the appearance of their premises. And 190 of the later have since spent a total of over $16,000,000 on renovations.

Committees from the Women's Institute meet regularly with the chamber of commerce, the St. Paul Retail Board, the Central Business Development Committee, the city council and the mayor to discuss civic affairs.

This year, the Institute's beautification committee is broadening its scope to include the entire city. Its goal is 12,000 new gardens this summer. Based on past performance it will come as no surprise to St. Paul folk if they get the gardens. The Women's Institute wants them.

The Late Honorable John Tolan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep personal sadness that I learned of the death of my good friend and former colleague, the Honorable John Tolan.

When I first came to Congress I served on the Judiciary Committee with Mr. Tolan. The fact that he had been born at St. Peter, Minn., in my district, and that relatives and friends of his still lived in my district, was a common bond which ripened into lasting friendship. Often he discussed with me his boyhood days in Minnesota and his early experiences were a part of the history of that part of the State.

He was a dear friend and associate and I recall the feeling of sadness which came to me when he told me that he intended to retire from Congress. He was devoted to his family and looked forward to spending his remaining days in the enjoyment of the love and affection which he had for them. It is understood that his death resulted from the shock he received when one of his beloved grandchildren became lost. It is to be regretted that he did not live long enough to know the joy that she was found.

I never knew John Tolan to say an unkind or critical thing of anyone either in committee, on the floor, or in private conversation, and I never knew him to have an enemy during the years I knew him.

He not only represented his district and his people diligently and well, but his service in Congress was able and distinguished.

Since his retirement from Congress I have missed his companionship and kindly philosophy and humor. It was his custom to take the same place in the Chamber where he held a benign court where his friends on both sides of the aisle gathered and visited and discussed matters which were closest to their hearts. In memory he will always be sitting there.

My heartfelt sympathy goes to his devoted and beloved wife and the members of his family, whom he loved and who loved him.

May his fine and lovable soul rest in peace.

Address of Col. Melvin J. Maas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given at the twenty-ninth annual convention of the Army Reserve Officers Association at Miami, Fla., on June 18, 1947, by Col. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR, president, Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association:

The world is already choosing up sides for the third world war, and there are only two sides. A third world war will involve everyone in the world as active participants and will be fought to the extinction of one side or the other, if not both. When it is over, the victor will have suffered more damage than any previously defeated nation has ever suffered in all history.

Contrary to the popular conception that it will be confined to push-button warfare and will be over in 48 hours, it will be the longest, the most totally devastating, the bloodiest, and the most costly in all history. Before it finally burns out, over half the population of the world will be dead, and three-fourths to nine-tenths of the property and wealth of the world will be destroyed.

The only way it can be a short war is if the American people surrender in 48 hours.

Only Russia and the United States are capable of waging modern warfare. Therefore, in our time, a major war can be started only between Russia and the United States. If there is to be a third world war, it will be because we are attacked by Russia. We know we won't start it. If Russia starts it, she won't quit in 48 hours because she will have done ghastly damage to us the first few hours and will believe that she will certainly win.

We would surrender at the start only if we were craven and depraved. We aren't, so we would dig in and fight back. Such a war, if it comes, will involve the greatest military mobilization in all history and might very well last several generations—until there is just nobody left to fight. Every known weapon of mass destruction will be employed and new ones, yet undreamed of, will be developed.

It looks as if civilization is determined to commit suicide.

The great problem that faces us is not the imminent danger of such a war breaking out this year or next. Russia is not capable of fighting us right now. But what we do in this country this year and next will, in all probability, determine whether or not there will be a third world war. The Second World War didn't start in 1939. It started in 1933, when the political and financial backers of nazism supported Hitler and his sinister plans. It started, too, when the war lords and industrialists of Japan got behind Tojo. In both cases, it was possible only because these supporters of Hitler and Tojo were convinced that we in America had neither the will nor the ability to fight back. It was because of our disarmament after the First World War, and our failure to even maintain such pitifully small defenses as were provided in the Disarmament Treaty of 1922. Had we remained strong, no one of power or influence would have wasted time or money on Hitler or Tojo.

You can be very sure that the potential Hitlers and Tojos and their backers in Russia are watching most intently to see what we do now.

If we show a determination to avoid our mistakes after World War I, to remain strong this time; if we demonstrate the national will to punish any transgression against the peace of the world, the potential backers of a future Hitler-Tojo will become discouraged and such a movement will never get started. But let us show any signs of weakening, of following our path after 1918, and a revolution for world conquest will be upon us unexpectedly, sooner than we think, and with such sudden fury that it will literally shake the world.

There is no group of citizens in the world upon whom such a great responsibility rests in this matter as we United States Reserve Officers. America must provide the leadership, the power and the influence to prevent such a war. Therefore, you and I have an almost terrifying responsibility. We civilians who have worn our country's uniform and especially those of us who still remain subject to military call have a great and solemn obligation. We did not win a victory. We won only the military battle that gave us an opportunity to work for victory—continuing peace. For us the real job started when we took off our uniforms and returned to civil life. Yes, we won the war, but unless we can keep it won, we shall yet lose the victory for which we fought.

You and I, because of our military service, know the military needs of the Nation and, being civilians, we can translate those needs to the public and the Congress as the professional cannot. He is forbidden, by law, regulation, and public opinion, from openly campaigning for military appropriations.

The Regulars know the grim seriousness of the situation, but may not plead its cause. The statesmen know the realities, but custom, tradition and caution dictate their silence.

You and I, fellow Reserve officers, are under no such restrictions and prohibitions. The regular, were he to plead in peacetime for more appropriations, would be suspected of self-interest.

The Reserve officer in peacetime must be as much a liaison between the military and the public as he is in training to be a part of the fighting forces when and if war comes. The general public will listen to us. For us to remain silent to the needs of our national security is for us to fail in our obligation. Is it any wonder that the public becomes complacent if we remain inarticulate?

To be an effective force in creating proper and enlightened public opinion on our military security needs we must have the full and complete confidence of the public. To merit that confidence we as Reserve officers must play an actual and substantial part in the military policies of the Nation.

When we speak on military matters the public has a right to expect that we speak with the knowledge of participants in the making of military policies. They are right. Reserve officers not only have a right but we have a duty to actually take part in peacetime in the making of military and naval policies. The civilian components comprise 95 percent of the Army and Navy in wartime.

We bear the overwhelming burden in numbers of the fighting when war comes. We have a right to have some say about the policies and practices which are to so vitally affect us in peace as well as in war.

For instance, a reorganization of the Military Establishments is of as much concern to the Reserves as it is to Regulars. We have a vast and valuable contribution that we in the aggregate can make to their problems, in peace as well as in war.

Most military progress is made during a war. Much of the wartime innovations and new developments come from the civilians in uniform, even to tactics, if not strategy.

Frankly, the Regular services are not taking advantage of the opportunity to obtain very substantial aid and assistance on all of their problems that Reserves could contribute. Too often, in fact it is practically a rule, our advice is not welcomed because we are "only Reserves." Much of this is our own fault. We have been timid, awed by brass, and too often petty ourselves in our dealings with Regulars.

We have grown up, and the time has come, gentlemen, for a genuine partnership between Regulars and Reserves. The time has passed when we can afford the luxury of having Regulars treat us as if we were little boys who like to play soldier. Too many Regulars in the past have had the attitude of good-natured indulgence toward the Reserves as long as we didn't bother them, but became quickly resentful if we, too, wanted to play with their toys—congressional appropriations.

In wartime we are praised to the skies and assured that without us they couldn't have "won the war." From now on, however, words won't be enough. They will have to come through with a concrete demonstration of their change in heart by taking us seriously and treating us as officers and not as high-school cadets. They need us far more than we need them. There should not, and there must not, be any class feeling nor any antagonism between Regulars and Reserves.

If the Regulars will accept the Reserves as partners, there are benefits to be gained by them that they have never dreamed of.

For instance, the case of the pending merger bill, or unification as they prefer to call it. They have been running into all kinds of trouble in Congress on this matter. But never once were we, who are so directly concerned with how our military forces are organized, even consulted in the matter. Among the ranks of Reserve officers there are men and women who have a vast knowledge in their own fields of the very problems involved in unifying the services. These problems involve administration, procurement, transportation, medical service, hospitals, construction, finance, and kindred subjects. There are Reserve officers in each of these fields who have had far greater experience in such fields than any Regular ever gets a chance to have.

Yet Reserves were not called in on these problems. We have been ignored in this whole unification endeavor. Reserves should have assisted from the beginning both in fact finding and in the drafting of the bill.

If the bill doesn't become a law at this session of Congress, a commission of Reserve officers of all services, should be convened to make an independent study and report on reorganization of the armed services. If the bill is passed, such a commission should be created to advise the President and the Congress on the detailed steps necessary to implement the law in accomplishing the actual unification and integration of the armed services.

Certainly the public's apprehensions about universal military training are partly due, at least to a traditional suspicion of the military in peacetime, and a fear that they seek militarization of the country.

Most, if not all, of these fears would disappear if the citizen soldiers had a real and prominent part in the military departmental policies. Reserve officers are civilians, they are neighbors, they are the communities' school teachers, lawyers, doctors, businessmen, merchants and members of the local churches and clubs. They are leaders in the veterans' organizations, they are boy-scout troop masters. They are home folks. The people see them every day and know them. The public is not afraid of them. If the public knew that they had a responsible and substantial part in determining military policy matters, and some hand in guiding the administrative policies of the military departments, they would feel far better about the situation. They would know that there was no danger of militarism ever gaining control of their boys. Universal military training has a value far beyond just the military training that the boys themselves will get. It will provide a real training for Reserve officers, also. This value alone may exceed the direct benefit, because our greatest need upon mobilization is for an adequate corps of properly trained officers who are leaders and immediately available.

But there is yet an even greater value.

A sufficiently large Reserve—officers and men—will provide a real deterrent to a potential aggressor. It must be a trained Reserve, for a Reserve no matter how large, if not properly trained, will be worse than no Reserve at all. Because an untrained Reserve will give the country a false sense of security. Such a Reserve, while impressive on paper, just won't exist as a protection at all. The enemy, however, will know the true condition.

A real Reserve, trained and ready, will do more to prevent a war than any other single factor.

For there is only one way to stop an aggressor before he ever starts. That is, to make the situation clear in advance that if he starts it, he will receive more damage himself than he can inflict upon you. He must be made to know that he will be destroyed, in fact, if he breaks the peace.

Two things are essential for this. One is the capacity to destroy him and the other is the will of the people to take such action. The world knows of our capacity. The question is of our will to punish an aggressor.

Nothing will so convince Russia or anyone else of our determination and national will, as the citizenry at large maintaining their youth and their leaders in a constant state of readiness through citizen-soldier training. This is not militarism, this is self-preservation. It is notice to the world that America has the will, not only to defend itself, but to carry out its world obligation to maintain the peace, or to wreak terrible punishment upon any violator.

In this connection, it must become axiomatic, that whenever the Congress determines that the national economy requires a reduction of the regular forces, the reserve components must be correspondingly increased so that the over-all mobilization plan shall not be impaired.

Gentlemen, whether we are to witness the destruction of civilization, or we are to participate in resuming the upward march of civilization to new heights of attainment, depends more upon you than any other group alive.

The rest of the nations of the world are seeking security. They are more concerned with that than with ideologies. They will turn to the side they believe the strongest and best able to protect them.

You and I are not in the war-making business. Our job is to prevent wars. The only way we Americans can be absolutely sure of winning a Third World War is to prevent its ever happening.

It is up to you.

Why Present Meat Prices?

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in regard to the present meat prices. I noted in the press that the Agricultural Department is at a loss for an explanation. This is the first acknowledgment that it has not had all the answers as to the future prices and all past, present, and future of American agriculture. The press quotes the Agricultural Department as saying that the exports are not responsible for short supply and meat prices. This is not altogether in keeping with the facts.

There are many reasons why meat is in short supply. Among the reasons are:

First. The basic reason that meat in the United States is in a continuing short supply is because as a nation for years we have not fostered the livestock industry in comparison to other lines of agriculture. We cannot expect meat at the market place if sheep are reduced one-third, hogs by 40 percent, and cattle by four to five million head.

(a) For the last 15 years the New Deal administration has invited more and more livestock imports and subsidized and promoted other phases of American agriculture, especially corn, cotton, and wheat. At the present time the $6 per bushel floor price on flax surely does not tend to increase the production of livestock or livestock product. We raise about one-third more tobacco and then talk about a food shortage. Most of us voted for these appropriations to furnish this food for the hungry of the world. That, however, does not alter the fact that the export of meat has contributed to the shortage and accounted for a part of the advance in meat prices.

(b) See what has happened to the sheep business during the past 5 years. During the past 5 years the sheep of the United States have been reduced over one-third, and there is grave danger about the future of the remaining two-thirds of the United States sheep. The 15,000,000 sheep that have been liquidated in the past 5 years would now produce lamb and mutton for the American consumer. They have been killed and consumed. The political wool bill was only one angle. The same group that complains about the meat prices and meat shortages is the same group that votes to kill off the meat supply of the country, like the sheep industry. This group evidently wants more to complain about, otherwise why would they vote to erase the mutton producers of America at the very hour they complain about meat prices and meat shortages?

(c) Another reason for a short supply is that the administration in 1943 and 1944 did not fulfill the commitments made by the Congress when it passed

the Steagall support legislation so far as livestock products were concerned. Pork was allowed to sell for 50 to 60 percent of parity when the law stated that the support price was to be "not less than 90 percent" of parity. The administration's support price on dairy products like dehydrated milk even in 1947 was not on the basis of not less than 90 percent of parity nor on a comparable-price basis. When livestock products have been subjected to such discriminations, is it surprising that cattle numbers, hog numbers, and sheep numbers on American farms have decreased? Milk prices have been reduced, but do you see any result when you purchase dairy products?

(d) The duties on livestock and livestock products have been reduced time after time, thus inviting imports, while embargoes have been put in effect on wheat and cotton imports. The duty on hogs imported, for example, was cut in two but the duty on corn remains the same. A bushel of corn can be imported in the form of pork for one-half of what the same bushel of corn can be imported as corn.

(e) Beef has been on an import basis ever since 1913 except during the World War I and World War II periods.

(f) Government official records show that in the fiscal year of 1944–45 only 12,000,000 pounds of beef were exported. In the fiscal year of 1945–46 we exported 440,000,000 pounds of beef, or over 30 times as much as in 1945. Did the Agricultural Department state that exports did not influence the amount of meat in the market place and the price of meat? In the fiscal year July 1, 1946, up to May 1, 1947, we exported a total of 491,000,000 pounds of meat, of which 96,470,000 was beef and veal, for the 10-month period, or at a rate of over 500,000,000 pounds for the whole fiscal year. Can anyone say that meat exports have not been partly responsible for the inability of the American consumer to get the good beef?

(g) The Agricultural Department has advocated a reduction in livestock numbers.

Second. There is another angle to this beef-supply situation. The exports have been largely of meat from the choice or top cattle. Do not let anyone deceive you about this fact. The choicest steers were purchased for export purposes. Since only 10 percent of the beef of the country is the top and choice cattle, and since such a large part of the exports are these choice cattle, is it surprising that the lovers of good choice United States beef find it next to impossible to find it on the meat counters of America?

To secure an unneeded supply of beef for consumption in the United States from July 1, 1940—fiscal year of 1940—to July 1, 1945—fiscal year of 1945—we imported an average of 103,852,000 pounds of beef each year. In the fiscal year of 1941 we imported 157,000,000 pounds and exported only 31,000,000; in the fiscal year of 1944 we exported only 12,000,000 pounds and imported 122,000,000 pounds. Then in the fiscal years of 1945 and 1946 we reversed this import-and-export situation, and all at once changed from a beef importing nation in an attempt to become a beef-exporting nation. Instead of importing four to six times as much beef as normally exported, we changed around and exported over 30 times as much beef as we imported. There were over 4,000,000 less cattle on the farms of the United States on January 1, 1947, than there were on January 1, 1944.

Third. Is it surprising that good beef is difficult to obtain? Is it surprising that when the United States loaned money to others to buy our products the prices advanced? Most of us voted for foreign food relief. The American people paid twice. First in taxes to furnish the money, and second they paid again in advancing prices.

Fourth. The United States from 1909 and including the 1920's had been a large exporter of pork, but the exports dwindled in the 1930's to 63,000,000 pounds in 1937 when the imports of pork were 74,000,000 and exceeded the exports. However, beginning in 1942 the United States exports of pork increased rapidly, and instead of having imports that averaged over half the exports as they did from 1936 to 1939, we find that the exports of pork from 1940 to 1947 were hundreds of times more than the imports. For example, in the 2-year period of 1944 and 1945, we exported 2,200,000,000 pounds and imported only 7,000,000 pounds. This is a rather quick about face in the pork trade. While these amounts may not look large when compared to domestic production they are a factor in the price set-up and they are a factor in the available supply at the market place.

In numbers, there has been from 50,000,000 hogs on the United States farms from 1910 to 1934 when the number declined to 39,000,000. These numbers increased until January 1, 1943, when there were 83,000,000. Due to the lack of proper support under the Steagall amendment this number decreased to 56,000,000 on January 1, 1947. Another cause of short meat supply and another cause of price advances in pork. The imports of pork as well as beef have declined rapidly of late and so have the exports.

Fifth. From 1934 to 1937 when United States cattle were being shot and buried, from 74,000,000 to 94,000,000 pounds of beef were imported—the very time the Agriculture Department was destroying our own cattle and paying the United States farmer less than one-third the value of their cattle.

Sixth. The reduction in lard prices had its effect on pork meat prices. If a packer pays 25 cents per pound for live hogs, dresses them out and sells the lard for 19 cents per pound, it is evident the meat must carry the load.

Seventh. Another reason for the apparent short supply is that the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico has prevented normal imports of 500,000 head from that country, and Argentine beef imported into the United States has been diverted to other markets to a great extent.

Eighth. The apparent shortage of choice meat then is due to the large exports of this class of meat.

The apparent shortage of all beef is due to the policy of the United States Department of Agriculture to discriminate against the livestock farmer all during the New Deal.

The weather conditions and crop prospects for 1947 with advancing grain and feed prices can be expected to be reflected in the market place so far as prices are concerned.

Ninth. The OPA cannot in peacetime do anything but add confusion to the economic beef picture. The OPA can divert the available beef to black markets or to men with the price. There is not much use complaining about meat shortages, meat prices and meat quality so long as the New Deal discriminates against the livestock farmer. The New Deal liquidates the sheep business; it refused to support the pork prices in accordance to the law; it discriminated against the cattle business these many years so that there has been a marked reduction in United States cattle numbers. This procedure has been advocated by the New Deal. Yet the New Dealers who vote to liquidate the livestock industry are the same ones that complain about meat shortages and meat prices, and try to blame the meat problem on to the Seventy-ninth Congress that was dominated by the New Deal itself.

Summing up the meat-supply situation, it appears that the supply of meat or lack of supply is due to:

First. The legislative and administrative attitude taken by the present administration in regard to the livestock industry.

Second. The liquidation of the seed stock when hog numbers on farms dropped over 40 percent, cattle numbers decreased by over 4,000,000, and sheep were reduced by one-third by the administration.

Third. An effort to be an exporter of beef.

Fourth. The elimination of Mexico as a source of beef supply due to the foot-and-mouth disease.

Fifth. The diversion of Argentine beef to other markets.

The prices of meat and the advance in price is in general due to the same factors that made automobiles and most everything else sell for more than before the war. Some livestock products have been selling, and are today selling, below the OPA prices.

The old adage "you cannot have your cake and eat it" applies to the meat situation. You cannot have your meat if you liquidate the livestock industry. Meat may be available temporarily, of course.

The population of the United States is increasing by 1,500,000 per year. We do not want to be misled by statements of United States production when compared to drought years, and we must realize that the domestic demands as a result of population increase are not always given consideration by the propaganda peddlers. We must consider the fact that our agricultural exports have been less

and less ever since 1925, and that our agricultural imports have increased very materially since 1933. Since 1925 we have not been self-sufficient agriculturally, meaning that we have imported more agricultural products than we have exported.

House Resolution 27

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am once again renewing my demand to the Rules Committee that it give prompt consideration to my bill, House Resolution 27, to create a select committee to make an investigation and study of the operation of the Army court-martial system, with special reference to the Litchfield trials.

I do so at this time because of the fact that Col. James A. Kilian, whose most noteworthy achievement was the reign of brutality toward enlisted men at the Litchfield Reinforcement Depot, has now sued the President of the United States to get on the regular promotion list of the Army. As we know, his name has once been withdrawn from the promotion list because of Presidential, congressional, and public disapproval.

In view of the testimony brought out in the Litchfield trials, which showed conclusively the inhuman treatment accorded enlisted men suffering from battle fatigue, I feel this matter should be gone into thoroughly with the purpose of seeing that no future actions of this kind are ever undertaken again. I thoroughly disapprove of the methods used at Litchfield, and I am shocked at the severe penalties given to the enlisted men tried at that time especially in view of the extremely light punishment given to the officers and especially Colonel Kilian, in command of the Litchfield Depot. It is hard to believe that any court would be so callous as to give the man directly responsible for the reign of terror at Litchfield a punishment of only a $500 fine and a reprimand while the enlisted men under him who were tried for carrying out orders received, in addition, prison sentences and dishonorable discharges.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that the whole Litchfield administration and trial should be reviewed, that justice be rendered where deserved, and that punishment be accorded to those directly responsible for the outrages perpetrated.

I feel also that in reviewing the Litchfield trials we should also investigate the whole court-martial system so that in the future justice can be dispensed with a more even hand and the constitutional rights of all Americans—regardless of rank—be protected.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a news story in the Washington Daily News of July 2, 1947, and a column from the New York Post of July 1, 1947, entitled "Washington Memo":

[From the Washington Daily News of July 2, 1947]

KILIAN OF INFAMOUS LICHFIELD PRISON SUES TO GET ON PROMOTION LIST

Col. James A. Kilian, whose reign of brutality at the Lichfield (England) Reinforcement Depot helped spark the clean-up of the United States military court system, is suing President Truman for keeping him off the Army promotion list.

Colonel Kilian, now on duty at Walter Reed Hospital here, filed the suit in district court yesterday. The Army was going to promote him last March but the President blocked it.

Colonel Kilian is now serving on the retirement board at Walter Reed Hospital. He passes on all discharges from the hospital.

JUST 6 MONTHS

The recommendation for promotion was made just 6 months after Colonel Kilian had been convicted of brutality to enlisted men at the Lichfield Army Reinforcement Depot, fined $500 and reprimanded.

The trial was carried on in England and Germany for 9 months and resulted in the conviction of 13 of the 16 men on trial.

BRUTALITY

Testimony brought out cases of almost inhuman treatment of soldiers, some of whom were suffering from wounds or battle fatigue and others whose offenses were relatively minor.

One of the prosecutors quit because he said the trials were so rigged that enlisted men guards would take the rap instead of the responsible officers who gave the orders.

At one point in the proceedings General Eisenhower requested that the trial be speeded up to get it out of the newspapers. The way things were going was bad for the Army's recruiting campaign.

As a direct result of Lichfield, Congress is now considering a bill which will permit enlisted men to sit with officers on courts martial.

Bob Considine, writing of Lichfield in the July issue of True magazine, says, "Fortuitously, the sum total of the terror period promises to have as much effect on the often heartless and inefficient United States military court system as the case of Capt. Alfred Dreyfus had on French justice."

ONE DIED

Wounded combat men were beaten insensible, according to testimony at the trial. One Purple Heart man died of massive cerebral hemorrhage after having his head beaten against a wall by guards.

And public indignation mounted despite the statement by Under Secretary of War Kenneth C. Royall that there was no reason for a lot of fuss because the Lichfield trials were just a lot of hollering by lawyers.

[From the New York Post of July 1, 1947]

WASHINGTON MEMO

(Editor, Charles Van Devander; associates, Oliver Pilat, James A. Wechsler, and William O. Player, Jr.)

WHAT'S WRONG WITH UNITED STATES COURTS MARTIAL? AN "IRRELEVANT AND IMMATERIAL" MEMO

WASHINGTON, July 1.—New and sensational evidence dramatizing the need for a sweeping congressional investigation of military justice has just been obtained by Washington Memo.

Demands for a full-fledged probe of the court-martial system have been intermittently voiced in both Houses of Congress since VJ-day. But the services have skillfully resisted such moves by conducting "whitewash" inquiries of their own.

Now a secret Army document unearthed from the files of the United States occupation army in Germany and transmitted to this column throws sudden and shocking light on the brass-hat conception of justice being practiced in courts martial of both American civilians and soldiers who fall into the hands of the military police.

In amazingly blunt language this document warns Army officers concerned with courts martial that acquittals of certain prisoners who obtained outside legal help would make their lawyers "semipermanent thorns in the sides of this command and theater."

THIS IS THE BACKGROUND

Earl J. Carroll was an officer identified with the prosecution of Col. James A. Kilian, commander of the notorious Lichfield horror camp. He quit when it became apparent to him that the Army was determined to let Kilian get off lightly. Aroused by the inequities of the courts-martial system, Carroll and another ex-officer named Thomas Foley, decided to devote their time to defense of GIs and civilians facing Army trials.

Five prisoners in an Army guardhouse at Frankfurt were the first to obtain their services. The charges against them ranged from murder to counterfeiting. Four were civilians—ex-GIs who had agreed to remain in Germany to serve in the occupation—and the fifth was a private first class. Carroll and Foley set out for Germany last autumn to handle these cases.

It was a fairly unprecedented move. Normally Army prisoners must rely on counsel chosen for them; the rate of convictions has always been phenomenally high. The intrusion of Carroll and Foley plainly threatened to alter that picture. If they won acquittals other prisoners in similar circumstances might get subversive ideas.

In the face of that peril this column now learns that Brig. Gen. C. E. Ryan sent a historic memorandum to members of the Headquarters Command at Frankfurt. We are able to quote these salient passages from his memo:

"Messrs. Earl J. Carroll and Thomas Lester Foley, California attorneys, are expected to arrive in this theater sometime next week to act as special defense counsel for five prisoners now awaiting trial by general court martial in the post guardhouse.

"Mr. Carroll, formerly an Air Corps captain on duty in this theater, has secured widespread newspaper publicity by violent attacks on the system of military justice, the Army generally, commands with whose activities he has concerned himself, and particular officers of those commands.

"It is probable, in view of their past conduct, that Carroll and Foley will again use every device known to clever civilians to prolong trials unnecessarily and to introduce large masses of evidence which are irrelevant to the issues in the trials and seriously damaging to this command and the Army.

"It should be borne in mind that if Carroll and Foley succeed in securing acquittals in all or some of these cases, it is probable that their services will be requested by other accused and that they will seek to remain in the theater indefinitely, practicing law.

"This would give Carroll and Foley a considerable advantage over other American lawyers who are not permitted to come here to practice law and would make them semipermanent thorns in the sides of this command and theater.

"In order that the interests of the Government and the Army may be adequately protected along the lines above indicated it is considered essential that the general court martial which tries cases defended by Carroll and Foley be staffed by alert and thoroughly competent lawyers as law members and staff judge advocates. This command

does not now have available officers who are qualified for these assignments. Request that qualified officers be made available."

SEQUEL

Last week, we are informed on unimpeachable authority, an attempt was made to introduce this document as palpable evidence of prejudice during the trial of one of the accused—John M. Logsdon. The authenticity of the letter was not questioned. The Army's presiding officer ruled, however, that the document was "irrelevant and immaterial."

Communism Confuses and Condemns Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the disappointing although not altogether unexpected break-down of the Paris Conference of Prime Ministers, it seems to me the following analytical commentary by George E. Reedy, of the Mutual Broadcasting System, might prove interesting reading for the Congress and the country. I take this means of calling it to the attention of those making it a policy to keep abreast of developments in the field of foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the collapse of the Paris Conference also high lights another important matter. It is this. Who is going to interpret for the millions of people of Europe the basic reasons why the Conference failed? Who will explain to Europe's homeless and starving people why their hopes for economic and political rehabilitation are being frustrated? Who will describe the motives behind our offers to help and the motives behind those who sabotaged our plans of assistance?

Either the Communists of Europe and their Moscow overlords will tell the Europeans about this conference, its purpose and its results, Mr. Speaker, or they will be told the truth by American sources. The Voice of Moscow, unfortunately, is beamed into all parts of Europe and is booming along with full overtones and growing strength. Contrarywise, the Voice of America is being silenced in many parts of the world, its strength is being decreased and the frequency of its periods on the air is diminishing. All because misguided concepts of economy are motivating Congress to limit the authority and reduce the activity of our American foreign information service at the very period of our history when we should be expanding it emphatically.

There is still time to turn back from this folly, Mr. Speaker, and I hope before this Congress recesses for the summer we can pass authorizing legislation for a full-scale foreign information service and then support it with appropriations adequate to equip it to tell the truth about America at a time when it so badly needs to be told today.

Mr. Reedy's broadcast follows:

The Soviet Union stands indicted today as the major threat to the most important plan for reconstructing war-torn Europe. It is an indictment that will be clear to the entire world, one that cannot be escaped by any fast pleas.

The situation came to a head yesterday when Russian Foreign Minister Molotov walked out of the three-power conference in Paris. He had just finished rejecting the only possible compromise to put into effect the reconstruction program of the United States.

The conference, attended by England, France, and the Soviet Union, had been called to draw up a plan for European economic recovery. It was based entirely on the offer of Secretary of State Marshall to hold out a helping hand to the entire continent.

Britain and France had proposed a program to organize all of the Old World nations for mutual self-help. It was, of course, completely dependent upon financial aid from our country, something which few want to turn down these days.

No one was particularly surprised when Molotov, in the name of the Soviet Union, turned down the plan. It has been no secret that American aid for the reconstruction of Europe was unpopular with the Communists at the time it was announced.

The Soviets proposed what amounted to a blank check signed by Uncle Sam. They wanted the money turned over to foreign nations with no strings whatsoever. In short, they set up impossible conditions in the deliberate knowledge they were unacceptable.

Molotov, after walking out of the Conference, claimed that the whole thing represented an attempt for United States domination of Europe. He said that small nations would be unable to maintain their independence under the British-French program.

The sudden Soviet desire for freedom for small nations will impress no one, least of all the small nations themselves. That is a line that could hardly be sold to the most confirmed party-line addict, let alone a person with freedom of judgment.

The rather obvious fact is that the Soviet Union cannot permit the United States to aid in the reconstruction of Europe. It would be a shattering blow to the prestige of communism to have a capitalist democracy save the world from its own folly.

In addition, there would naturally be strings attached to any American aid. The strings would, no doubt, include guaranties of press freedom, and truly free elections in the satellite nations surrounding the Soviet Union.

These are requirements which the Communists cannot face. They cannot permit press freedom, and they cannot allow free elections. They would be completely incapable of standing the blows that would be dealt them under such circumstances.

Of course the Russians are skating on perilously thin ice. Every competent observer who has been in Europe recently reports that the American reconstruction plan was received with real enthusiasm. No small nation will thank the Soviets for their stand.

The program is not completely dead. France and Great Britain have indicated they will attempt to follow through and come to an agreement between themselves. If they do, Europe may be divided into two worlds—eastern and western—each isolated from the other.

Under these conditions, the cold and hungry Soviet satellites may find themselves peering over the iron wall at countries that are pulling themselves together again. And that might just give the shove that upsets the Communist applecart.

The Minimum Wage Should Be Raised to 65 Cents Per Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938, the 40-cent-per-hour minimum wage seemed to be reasonably adequate for the general well-being of the workers. But today it falls far short of minimum requirements, and in terms of real wages, it is far away from the goal envisioned by Congress when the original law was passed.

The bill which I have introduced today would raise the minimum to 65 cents per hour.

In 1942 the index of consumers' prices for moderate-income families was 116. In the first 3 months of 1947 this index was 153 and by now it is probably somewhat higher. At approximately a 50-percent increase in the cost of living, the 40-cent minimum rate applicable in 1942 would now have to be raised approximately to 65 cents to have the equivalent purchasing power. There cannot be a justifiable rise in the cost of consumers' commodities without a corresponding raise in wage rates; in other words, a corresponding increase in purchasing power.

The increase in the cost of living and the generally improved employment situation during and since the war have been recognized in American industry in adopting de facto a minimum wage in practically all industries which is higher than the legal minimum. The War Labor Board designated as substandard anything less than 50 cents per hour as far back as November 1943, and they raised this to 55 cents per hour in February 1945. The War Labor Board is not now in existence, but its experience shows that in practice as far back as the beginning of 1945, 55 cents per hour was the practical working minimum in interstate commerce.

The economic and social validity of the minimum wage is more widely accepted than ever before. If a minimum wage is adopted which is not much higher than the prevailing minimum wage actually being paid by the bulk of the employers in industry, its effect is to lessen competition at the expense of the workers, that is, by paying lower wages by less efficient or profiteering employers. It gives the employers who pay decent wages a better break.

In the light of all the foregoing, it is clear that the additional burden upon industry of a 65-cent minimum will be even less than the burden when the 40-cent minimum was originally imposed. Moreover, while the number of workers in trade unions is much greater now than in 1940 and the number of union contracts very much greater, large numbers of workers receiving minimum wages are

not covered by union contracts. Some of them are in areas and pockets of industry which have been bypassed by the general labor-management settlements of recent years. Many of these have had no increases or very small increases, while the prices they pay have gone up as much as prices paid by workers and other consumers who have had wage increases.

The principle of the minimum wage is to take an amount of wages representing absolutely basic human need out of competition by making this a cost and an overhead of all competing business. No part of our population needs the money more or can make better use of it, but, unfortunately, also, no group is less able to help themselves than those working in unskilled trades and industries who receive the minimum wage. As in the past, industry will be aided rather than hurt by the adoption of a minimum wage which lifts standards to those prevailing in the more efficient establishments and which affords a weekly income for minimum needs. A 65-cent rate would barely meet these requirements on the basis of conditions in 1947.

Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress should give legal effect to a 65-cent minimum-wage rate before this session ends.

Development of the Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I introduced, on June 25, H. R. 3969. It calls for a comprehensive arrangement between the Federal Government and the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming for the proper development of the Columbia River.

In this regard, I am pleased to include an editorial from the Spokane Spokesman-Review:

HORAN BASIN PLAN WORTH HEARINGS

There is a great deal of merit to the plan proposed by Congressman WALT HORAN for the establishment by the Federal Government of a Columbia Interstate Commission.

Such a unit would be a new departure in regional autonomy, so far as federally sponsored economic developments are concerned. For the Horan proposal visualizes a commission, made up of representatives from each of the four Pacific Northwestern States, plus one member at large, who would be given complete control over the planning, promotion and operation of Federal projects within the entire Columbia River Basin.

This, of course, is an alternate plan to the generally discredited idea of a Columbia Valley Authority, the best features of which would provide a coordinated development of the river basin, and the worst features of which would endanger individual enterprise and lead toward total socialization of factories, farms and all other types of private business in the area.

Mr. HORAN claims his proposal, being submitted in the form of a bill before Congress, is not to create a valley authority. He says the Commission would act as an independent corporation and would be required to reimburse the United States Treasury for every loan or appropriation made to it by the Federal Government.

Anyone familiar with the activities of the many governmental units concerned with the economic development of the Pacific Northwest knows how badly we lack effective machinery for proper coordination among the Federal, State and private units now engaged in hydroelectric power, reclamation, inland navigation, fish, wildlife and other such activities subject to Federal jurisdiction.

A Columbia interstate commission may be one way by which this region might attain maximum utilization of our natural resources and encourage their development by private enterprise through minimum Federal "interference."

The Horan suggestion merits close study and wide public discussion, which would be possible through congressional committee hearings, not only in Washington, D. C., but also in various localities throughout the Pacific Northwest.

Victory for Silence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., dated June 16, 1947. This editorial contains the only story covering the final ends of the Japanese balloon story and as such should be of interest to the membership of the House. It follows:

VICTORY FOR SILENCE

About 2 years ago a Japanese war balloon fell on Waterworks Hill on the edge of Missoula. Another had landed near Kalispell a year earlier. Still another fell near Whitehall, east of Butte. Others were reported in this part of the State. Yet no newspaper said a word about these balloons, each of which was fitted with devices to promote fires, save for the first one in the Flathead region, about which the War Department made a statement. Yet the Japs had launched more than 9,000 such balloons and at least a thousand crossed the Pacific on the prevailing winds and fell on western America. The weapon was not so futile as most of us think. It did some damage here and there and would have done more had the Japs not become discouraged to the point of abandoning this campaign. And the reason they were discouraged was the silence of America as to the arrival of the bomb-laden balloons. The newspapers and other communications services went along with the authorities in their effort to keep the foe from learning what effect his long-range aerial campaign was having.

It was a well-kept secret. Americans did better only as to the immense preparations needed to produce the atom bomb. That great thing was kept so secret that most Americans were as much surprised as were the Japs when Hiroshima and Nagasaki were blasted. That secrecy paid dividends; so did the keeping quiet as to the war balloons.

Brig. Gen. William H. Wilbur, of Chicago, tells an interesting story concerning this. As chief of staff of the Western Defense Command at the time of the balloon attacks in 1944 and 1945, General Wilbur lowered the curtain of secrecy as to their success or failure. Recently, on a visit to Japan, he got the Jap side of the story from Major General Kusaba, who directed the campaign from Nippon. Kusaba admitted that not hearing from the United States as to the landing of the balloons—and they had figured Americans could not refrain from mentioning them—had caused the curtailing of the attack by air and its eventual abandonment. General Kusaba still is bitter about it all, says General Wilbur, still believes the campaign might have caused considerable trouble to Americans had it been continued. And perhaps he is right. Silence paid off. Millions of Americans—and a great many Canadians, for many balloons fell in the Dominion—may pat themselves on the back, even if somewhat belatedly.

Will Independent Unions Now Get a New—and Fair—Deal From the Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, one of the minority groups of this Nation about which we in Congress hear very little consists of the members of the independent unions in the United States.

A great deal is said on the floor of the House, and sometimes properly so, about the plight of this or that minority. There is talk of antidiscrimination legislation galore, particularly around election time, but for some reason or another, the minority—consisting of the members of the independent unions—is ignored.

As we all realize well, one of the supposed New Deal planks through the years has been that of working against discrimination. Yet, those of us who really know the New Deal and its perennial policy of double talk, realize that the executive branch of this Government never has done anything to prevent discrimination among people of this country. As a matter of cold fact, as I shall prove before I am through, the New Deal itself has made possible new forms of discrimination against workingmen who did not cooperate with the bureaucrats in building up either the Congress of Industrial Organizations or the American Federation of Labor.

It is a matter of history that the National Labor Relations Board, which now is being reorganized under mandate from the Congress because of the passage of the so-called Taft-Hartley Act, for many years has discriminated against the independent unions in favor of the AFL and the CIO.

Frank Rising, a noted student of labor relations and formerly labor editor of Business Week, writing in the July 5, 1947, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, points to the evidences of favoritism and biasedness in Government as among labor-union organizations. Let me read a portion of his excellent editorial from

the Saturday Evening Post. Regarding discrimination, he states:

The Department of Labor goes further.

I might insert this thought, Mr. Speaker, that under the Taft-Hartley act, the Department of Labor rightly has had its wings clipped.

It promotes the cause of unionism vigorously and thoroughly with its series of publications and its Labor Education Service, which assists unions, universities, and other institutions in their educational programs.

Its Women's Bureau—to quote the Department's official guide—cooperates with unions in developing women's participation in unions. One of its publications, Women's Stake in Unions, is reckoned by many labor-relations people as one of the most one-sided promotional propaganda pieces ever printed by the Government.

In action, Government administrators have followed a sort of rating system covering all parties to labor disputes. The rating is well known to all who work in the field; it goes like this:

(a) Between employers and unions, favor the unions.

(b) Between unions and nonunion workers, favor the unions.

(c) Between CIO and AFL, favor CIO.

(d) Between either CIO or AFL, and an independent union, favor CIO or AFL.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. Rising's conclusions in regard to labor law administration. He said, and I quote him again:

The Government can recapture the respect and confidence of "all the people" only by being above petty favoritism. If the question of union membership and collective bargaining is really to be left to the individual's free choice, Government propaganda to influence his choice is wrong. The unions would be far better off, if they had not sought Government favors.

In the long run, the union movement will be far stronger, far more respectable, and respected, when it learns to stand on its own feet.

I want to reemphasize the fact that this independent labor observer, and many others of his caliber, have observed the methods by which Government bureaus consistently have discriminated against independent unions. Neither I, nor leaders of independent unions, desire special privileges from our Government. But every citizen, whether he is a member of a CIO union, an AFL union, an independent union, or no union at all, deserves to have his rights respected and to have nonpartisan and fair administration by men whom he has employed, in effect, to administer his Government, namely, the bureaucrats.

Not long ago, I received a letter from David L. Knox, system secretary and treasurer of the Pullman Car Employees Association of the Repair Shops, an independent union with headquarters in St. Louis, Mo. His letter was so appropriate and gave such specific examples of discriminations practiced by Government boards and agencies against independent unions that I want to read it to the House of Representatives:

The independent unions of the country are looking forward with a great deal of hope that some action will be taken in Congress that will insure fair and impartial treatment of independent unions by governmental boards.

Let me interpolate this thought. We in Congress feel that we have done our duty, at least for the time being, by passing the Taft-Hartley labor act. If this act is not administered properly, or is administered with the same kind of prejudice and bias that characterized the administration of the so-called Wagner Act, the only thing left for the independent unions and all other Americans is to vote to put a Republican in the office of President. Congress passes the law, but Congressmen cannot administer the law. We have done our duty. It is up to the administration in power in the executive branch now to do its duty.

But I continue with a reading of this interesting letter from Mr. Knox:

However, it seems that the National Labor Relations Board and its dealings are being exposed to a much greater degree than the National Mediation Board. This conduct may be due to the far greater number of cases that come before the NLRB.

We who are members and officers of independent unions feel that when Congress passed the amended Railway Labor Act it intended that we have a choice in our form of representation. This choice, by a majority of those involved, has been denied us through administration and tricky interpretations of the act by the National Mediation Board. These interpretations have been tailored to fit each individual case, and almost without exception to the disadvantage of the independent unions. This condition is due to independent unions not being represented on the National Mediation Board.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, let me add that neither the AFL nor the CIO represents a majority of the union members of this Nation. Millions of Americans who are union members belong neither to the organization headed so grandiosely by Philip Murray nor the one led so negatively by William Green. The independent unions deserve representation wherever the AFL or the CIO have such representation in Government, but they heretofore never have achieved that representation.

Continuing, Mr. Knox says:

This charge can be substantiated by looking into the National Mediation Board Case No. R1625. In this case, the Board, after holding hearings in which the Pullman Car Employees Association, the Independent Pullman Workers Federation, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, and the United Transport Service Employees Association, and the CIO all intervened trying to persuade the Board that our interest would not be served best by a craft election. Only the Railway Employees Department of the A. F. of L. desired a craft election. The Board ruled the election would be held on a craft basis and this was done.

We based our opposition to the craft election on the difference in the work performed by workers involved, location, and the number of hours worked and so forth. It was shown that in the repair shops, we perform heavy general repairs to cars, while in the yards only minor running repairs are made. Also the shops are located in Chicago, Ill.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Richmond, Calif.; Atlanta, Ga.; Wilmington, Del.; and St. Louis, Mo., while the yard employees are scattered throughout the United States. For many years the shops' employees have had a 40-hour workweek contract, time and one-half being paid for any work in excess of 8 hours per day or Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.

The yard employees have preferred a 48-hour workweek contract, irrespective of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. We tried to make it clear to the Board that we had a chartered organization covering the employees of the six repair shops, and this arrangement had proved satisfactory to a majority for 13 years and there were no expressed or implied desires to be grouped with the yard employees. Likewise, the representative of the yards' employees clearly indicated their desire to remain separated from the shops' employees.

The employees of these two groups (shops and yards), who were the only employees involved, had done everything within their power to conform to the provisions of the amended Railway Labor Act, felt confident that we could expect a fair deal from the Board, only to be sadly awakened to the fact that the Board had and exercised arbitrary powers, and in too many cases used this power to wreck independent unions.

To arrive at this decision, the Board found it necessary to reverse its former position, since previously they had refused to give its blessings to the unnecessary grouping into classes and crafts for the purpose of an election, where a group of employees had organized in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, and this representation had been satisfactory to a majority of the employees involved.

As a result of this election, two groups of our members have been denied the right to bargain through a representative of their own choice, but must negotiate through representatives designated by the National Mediation Board.

While we have no quarrel with the Railway Labor Act, as amended, we do feel that we have been forced to deal with a board which has used tricky interpretations to wreck independent unions at every opportunity and we believe this to be contrary to the wishes of Congress.

We have no legislative program and we are not critical of this piece of legislation. However, the administration of this Board and the interpretations of the act surely are not what Congress contemplated when the act was passed. We are not asking for legislative changes, but we are hoping that something can be done within the framework of the existing act to give us a fair and impartial National Mediation Board whose actions will be to promote harmony, instead of making every effort to create discord among workers who are unfortunate enough to come before them and not see eye to eye with them.

The consideration given this appeal will go further than the few thousands involved directly; it will serve as a stimulant to a large group of independent unions' members who have been oppressed by the Board, or some other board, when they rightfully should have been protected.

I know, Mr. Speaker, as you know, that a majority of this Congress for many years has had ideas similar to those expressed so well by Mr. Knox. We have tried to legislate fairly, but the officials in the executive departments have discriminated against nonunion men and members of independent unions at every turn. It is apparent why this has been done—in an effort to curry political favor and to control the huge blocs of votes represented in the CIO and the AFL.

Let us hope, and have confidence in our hoping, that the day will come soon when we can restore nonpartisan, unbiased administration into every branch, every board, every bureau of our Government. If we Republicans can help hasten that day and can live to see our aims brought to pass, future generations of American citizens will rise up and bless us for our endeavors.

Cultural and Information Program of the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate and House committees have agreed upon appropriations which will implement the cultural and information program of the State Department.

I believe that that program should express, to a very maximum, our truly free and individualistic America and, therefore, should be based upon contractual use of free enterprise as far as possible.

My amendment to the Mundt bill calling for this policy was accepted. At this time I feel that other expressions on this policy are worthy of consideration.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 20, 1947]

VOICE OF FREEDOM

The Voice of America is seldom heard as a solo. Usually it is a chorus, in which everyone is free to join. That is the democratic (if sometimes cacophonous) way.

The public has been hearing of the invaluable work done by the Voice of America, the State Department's short-wave, foreign-language broadcasts to the world. But it needs to remember the possibilities of private broadcasting in this field also. The splendid achievements of Boston's WRUL (at present the only private company in the field) have been amply attested by the flood of grateful responses from other countries.

Independent short-wave broadcasting can help to swell the chorus of freedom along with the official Voice of America. Though there is clearest need for the State Department program, even on an increased scale, we are opposed to any attempt of the Government to monopolize or control the whole field. For that reason we find unacceptable the proposal of Assistant Secretary of State Benton for a trustee-controlled Government corporation to control all short-wave programing.

There is plenty of room on the international air for the best that the United States can give through both public and private means.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

WORLD RADIO UNIVERSITY AIRS PLANS TO RAISE $2,000,000

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 21.—Plans for raising an additional fund of $2,000,000 for the rapid expansion of the World Radio University of the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation were announced today by Dr. Harlow Shapley, director of the Harvard Observatory and chairman of the foundation's board of trustees. The foundation, a nonprofit, noncommercial organization, operates short-wave Station WRUL over which it now radiocasts cultural programs in nine languages to Europe, Central America, and parts of Africa.

With the cooperation of faculty members of Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Brown, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the curriculum of the World Radio University includes programs on the natural sciences, geography, history, economics, and current events, together with language courses, especially basic English instruction for listeners abroad.

AID TO STATE DEPARTMENT

"Our board of trustees believes that these broadcasts over an independent, nonpolitical station are of direct assistance to the State Department's cultural program," Dr. Shapley said. "In any programs touching foreign policy, close cooperation with the State Department is maintained," he added.

The current WRUL schedule includes a series of talks on world geography of the air age under the auspices of Harvard University; a weekly series on nutrition, sanitation, and related problems of war-devastated areas arranged by Yale University; a group of programs on housing problems and rehabilitation prepared by MIT, and a series on the constructive, peacetime uses of atomic energy arranged in cooperation with the Federation of American Scientists. The nine languages now radiocast to Europe include Russian and Greek as well as French, Dutch, and Norwegian.

Half-hour daily news reports on the United Nations sessions are radiocast direct from Lake Success in English at slow dictation speed; listeners who know English only slightly are thus able to write down these reports for subsequent translation into their own language.

APPEAL FOR FUNDS

American business and industrial organizations as well as individuals who share the foundation's belief that world democratic cooperation and peace can best be created through widespread education and understanding, will be invited to contribute to this project. Donations from listeners abroad who, before the war, sent in thousands of small contributions from England, Holland, and other countries are of course not expected at present.

The $2,000,000 fund will permit WRUL to widen the scope of its radiocasts; to increase its staff for additional languages in order to serve all the peoples of Europe, the Middle East, and Latin America; to provide supplementary reading material for listeners to the radio university lectures; to increase its time on the air; and to arrange for reradiocasts in the Mediterranean and Near East areas.

Efforts to build up the fund, estimated to be able to carry the work ahead for 2 or 3 years, will be made through committees in New York, Boston, and other communities.

[From the Washington Post of May 20, 1947]

A NEW ENTERPRISE

Advocacy by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., in the accompanying editorial, of an effective world economic policy is not a mere verbal exercise. In the faith that we as a nation shall develop such a policy, this company, following a trail blazed by leaders in American industry and finance, is expanding its operations overseas.

A newly created McGraw-Hill International Corp. will push forward the frontiers of our technical magazine and book publishing business throughout the world. The new corporation comprises:

Eight international magazines—the McGraw-Hill Digest, the American Automobile and El Automovil Americano, Pharmacy Internacional and El Farmaceutico, Ingenieria Internacional Construccion, Ingenieria Internacional Industria, the Machinist.

A news-gathering agency, McGraw-Hill World News, specializing in industrial and engineering coverage with correspondents in 36 world centers.

McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Ltd. (London), serving the special needs of Britain and western Europe and publishing the Machinist (London).

Five buyers' guides—Automotive Equipment (in English and Spanish), Construction Equipment, Industrial Machinery, and Pharmaceuticals (all in Spanish).

In addition, the McGraw-Hill Book Co. has an overseas network for the distribution of its books.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 21, 1947]

PRIVATE CAPITAL FOR INVESTING ABROAD URGED

LONDON.—W. Randolph Burgess, vice chairman of the board of the National City Bank of New York, declared here that investment of American private capital abroad can speed world recovery and questioned the value of direct Government loans.

"The experience of the twenties and thirties demonstrated that direct investment by business abroad is far sounder than loans of money," he told the American Chamber of Commerce in London.

"In the search for principles to govern our lending," Mr. Burgess said, "I suggest we turn to England's own experience. In the half century before World War I * * * she was by all odds the greatest source of liquid capital."

Mr. Burgess said that in the past "direct investments ran into some trouble—took some losses—but much less than the very sizable losses on loans."

"Business, like banks," he declared, "is now equipped for foreign operations. They know problems; they have trained people. They will avoid some old mistakes.

"They have learned, for example, that you burn your fingers when you play politics in a foreign country."

Mr. Burgess sought to quiet concern, often expressed in Britain, of another American depression.

He forecast a decline in prices and income in the United States but added, "our readjustment—our recession—is likely to be brief and mild."

"Unfilled demands for goods are so great—available funds so ample—that, if we can get over the hurdle of readjustment quickly, we ought to have a long period of prosperity ahead," he said.

Citing "British experience as at least an illustration of principles of lending money wisely and courageously," Mr. Burgess noted the following five "secrets" of British success in international financing:

Her men went with the money to see that it was used wisely and profitably.

British banking and insurance serviced British business.

The Government stood behind British traders.

Goods, money, and men moved freely about the world. There were few Government controls, quota restrictions, or other trade barriers.

Ventures were profitable.

Recalling that the United States "lent not wisely but too well" after the First World War and took an "awful shellacking," Mr. Burgess warned against repeating those losses.

"Overlending," he declared, "usually fails to strengthen and may actually weaken the borrower if it means he postpones the painful process of overhauling his own economic machine."

Muddy Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, this very timely and sane editorial appeared in the Washington Post of this morning,

July 3, 1947. It is my feeling that the Weichel resolution should have been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce instead of to the House Merchant Marine Committee. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has had jurisdiction over all legislation pertaining to oil for many years, and they are best qualified by the background of many years of experience to give to the people of the Nation a sound and unbiased report on the oil situation.

It would take a Rube Goldberg's invention to prove that Russia is to blame for our present oil shortage. May I suggest to the "hate Russia" propagandists that they cool down a little. Their nightmarish thinking is silly and ridiculous.

The editorial in the Washington Post follows:

MUDDY OIL

Oil shortage or not, there is no shortage of efforts to make Russia appear the villain in the temporary domestic inconvenience we are suffering. From some of the charges emanating from the fanatics one would think that we were at war and that the Soviet has been buying oil as a dastardly trick to weaken us. This sort of irresponsible scapegoating, we submit, is exactly the kind of evidence to which Pravda points to sustain its complaints against warmongering in the United States. The truth is that oil shipments to Russia have had little if anything to do with the temporary reduced supplies of oil and gasoline in the Middle West.

Last year we shipped to Russia approximately 2,500,000 barrels of oil. So far this year the amount has been proportionately less. This compares with American oil consumption in 1946 of 1,773,000,000 barrels. In other words, we sent to Russia only a little more than one thousandth of the amount we used at home. Even though we have shipped more petroleum to other countries, the total is dwarfed by our own use. Nor could we lop off these exports suddenly without drastic effects elsewhere. We are, for instance, the principal source of the oil used by our good friend, Canada. What is causing the pinch is the shortage of steel in increasing the facilities wherewith to meet a demand at home which has grown till it is as much as the world's total prewar consumption.

An impartial investigation to disclose the truth about the oil situation could be helpful. But the demagogic campaign unleashed by Chairman WEICHEL of the House Merchant Marine Committee, with its reported browbeating of witnesses and its extravagant charges, only brings discredit upon Congress and increases the difficulty of our relations with Russia. We need facts, not headline hunting.

Diplomatic Staff Mushroomed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussion on the floor a few moments ago the following news item is very timely. The administration supporters were pleading for more money for the State Department. It is difficult to justify the enormous pay roll now supported by the Department. The item follows:

PARIS EMBASSY EMPLOYS 1,200; HAD 118 IN 1940—MANY NEW SECTIONS EXPAND STAFF

(By Henry Wales)

PARIS, July 1.—In the refined but intriguing and adventurous atmosphere of postwar Paris society, the American State Department's establishment here has swollen from 118 members in 1940 to 1,200 today.

The diplomatic staff mushroomed from the prewar installation in four apartments in the Rue de Chaillot to the pretentious four-story mansion in the Place de la Concorde with the overflow lodged in adjacent buildings on the Rue d'Aguesseau and around the Etoile.

The Embassy has more departments than a State Street store, with everything from uniformed guards to wine tasters and its own commissary, restaurant, and soft-drink service.

PLENTY OF ROOM FOR MORE

Although only a few more than 100 persons occupied the vast, high-ceilinged, modernized building during the hectic days before Pearl Harbor, there are now more than 500 occupants in the combined Embassy-consular service. But there is plenty of space in the big, roomy offices to install more personnel if necessary.

The Office of Information and Culture, which carries on a dreary and airy propaganda service over the radio and by handouts, numbers 100, with most of the staff concentrated in the building recently acquired from the French Navy in the Rue d'Aguesseau. It maintains field detachments in Marseille, Lyon, Toulouse, and Bordeaux.

The Office for Liquidation of Foreign Claims—which investigates, classifies, and pays off damages to French civilians, numbers 500, including 3 naval officers, 100 Army officers, 72 enlisted men, 144 American civilians, and 166 French clerks.

SECTION FOR WAR BRIDES

The passport and visa sections of the consular staff employ 75, chiefly engaged in examining the applications of French war brides and fiancées, or digging up old records to issue new credentials to expatriate Yanks who remained in France under cover throughout German occupation.

About half of the staff is American, the rest being French. The glamorous, glittering secretaries, stenographers, and typists have long scarlet fingernails, wear nylon hose, and smoke American cigarettes, which thus far escape French custom duty.

Bankers Torpedo Veterans' RFC Home Loans—Government Loans to GI's Prove Veteran Good Risk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have here an article that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Tuesday, July 1, showing that business loans to veterans have proved to be good risks. Only one-third of 1 percent of these loans have turned out bad. The soundness of this loaning program has been more than justified.

The bankers of the Nation and their friends solemnly shook their heads and prophesied that 50 percent of the GI loans would result in business failures. I wish that every one of those prophets of doom could read this statement. The finest thing that the Democratic administration has done to preserve democracy and to extend opportunities to all the people of the Nation has been in the field of extending Government credit to home owners, farmers, and veterans. Business has flourished, the national income has increased, and the economic condition of millions of Americans has been bettered. The money changers in the temple who had controlled and stifled credit and brought about our depressions and panics naturally hate the Democrats for having trespassed upon their secred ground—the private control of credit.

However, under the Republican administration in Congress the bankers' gang is getting back in the saddle. They have just dealt a terrific blow to the veterans when the recent bill was passed extending the life of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the authority to buy veterans loans on housing was taken from the RFC. This leaves the ex-GI's completely at the mercy of the bankers. The RFC no longer can guarantee veterans loans 100 percent. The banks never did like these loans, because the interest rate was too low for them. The RFC began to purchase these veterans' loans last October after the bankers had boycotted these loans and refused to purchase them. The RFC became the only outlet available for the sale of these loans. Of recent weeks the RFC has been purchasing these loans at the rate of $1,500,000 per day. These veterans' loans carry an interest rate of 4 percent. The FHA loans carry a total interest rate of 5 percent, so now the avaracious bankers have succeeded in wrecking the whole veterans' loan program, and the veteran will be compelled to qualify under FHA and pay 5 percent interest rate instead of 4 percent, and will only get about 80 percent mortgage loan instead of 100 percent mortgage loan, as he was getting under the veterans' loan program. The veterans organizations and the builders of homes for veterans were caught sound asleep, because the press gagged all news on this most important legislation. This week I have received numerous calls and telegrams and inquiries from veterans and home builders, as they are just beginning to find out what happened. Under the Democratic legislation that had been in effect up to this time veterans that had a couple of hundred dollars could buy a home. Now they must have a down payment of at least $1,500 to $2,000 in order to qualify. How many veterans can scrape up that much money for a down payment?

I am advised that 80 percent of the veterans will be pushed out of the market, at a time when millions of ex-GI's are homeless and are struggling to establish their family life. I think that this banker maneuver is mean and inhuman. I am sure that the protests from the veterans will be so voluminous that

Congress will be compelled to restore the original Democrat-sponsored GI home loan provisions to the RFC Act.

The article in the Christian Science Monitor follows:

GOVERNMENT LOANS TO GI'S PROVE VETERAN GOOD RISK

WASHINGTON.—The Government is finding the war veteran a good business risk.

The ex-GI's who got loans from the Veterans' Administration to set up small businesses are generally doing very well, although the truck and tavern operators have had some tough sledding.

A. G. Deane, chief of the agency's Business Loans Division, said the Government has had to pay only $799,000 in claims on veterans' loans it has guaranteed. This represents 1,196 claims out of a total of 70,000 business loans with a face value of $201,000,000.

In addition to the outright failures, 1,079 other veteran borrowers have defaulted. Mr. Deane said, however, that some of the defaults may be "cured" or partially satisfied.

Under the GI bill, the Veterans' Administration began guaranteeing partial repayment of loans to veterans in September 1944.

"The volume of defaults on loans has been small," said Mr. Deane. "The showing to date has been very creditable. The veteran businessman has turned out to be a surprisingly good investment."

TRUCK BUSINESS RISKY

Highest rate of failures has been among veterans who became single operators of trucks. Mr. Deane believes this is partly because the men lacked administrative experience and partly because of faulty equipment.

Some veterans' groups have charged that ex-GI truckers have been "taken for a ride" by second-hand car dealers disposing of machines that were fit only for the junk pile.

Trucking failures, said Mr. Deane, have been most numerous in the Western States, where long distances and mountainous terrain add to the difficulties. The first 6 months usually are the crucial ones.

Second highest business casualty rate was among operators of taverns, restaurants, and night clubs.

"With such enterprises," Mr. Deane remarked, "it seems to be feast or famine."

The Veterans' Administration also has reported that defaults on home loans now number 2,821 out of 723,000 that have been guaranteed.

The Veterans' Administration said that "business loans accounted for about half of all defaults to date, although they comprised only 8.1 percent of all loans approved. The business-loan default rate in March reached 3.9 percent of all business loans closed, while defaults on home loans amounted to only 0.3 percent of home loans closed."

INCREASE IN DISCONTINUANCES

The Department of Commerce recently reported a considerable increase in small business failures, and estimated that a large number of them involved veterans.

Small business "discontinuances"—about half of which were failures, in a broad sense, the others being the result of retirements, illnesses, and the like—averaged 30,000 to 40,000 a quarter during 1944 and 1945.

During the last quarter of 1945 they increased to 37,400, then to 42,600 in the first quarter of 1946 and to 54,200 in the last quarter of that year. Of the firms going out of business, 98 percent employed less than 20 persons each.

Meanwhile, new businesses, many of them operated by war veterans, continue to make their appearance. The Commerce Department said 272,800 new business establishments were organized in 1944; 411,800 in 1945, and 187,000 in the first quarter of 1946. Thereafter the number declined slightly, to 103,500 in the last quarter of 1946.

Civil Rights Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the subject of preservation of civil rights is probably one of the most important subjects before the people of our democracy. It is the primary and fundamental principle of difference between a free people and a slave people.

Marquis Childs in today's Washington Post presents a worth-while treatment of a phase of this problem, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS DILEMMA
(By Marquis Childs)

When Attorney General Tom C. Clark appeared before the President's Civil Rights Commission in closed session not long ago, he came in for something of a grilling. Members of the Commission wanted to know whether the Truman administration did not itself threaten civil rights through the Executive order on loyalty among Government workers.

Most persistent questioning on this line came from Bishop Francis J. Haas, of Grand Rapids, Mich., and from Boris Shishkin of the AFL. They pressed down hard on Clark, demanding to know what right of appeal individual employees would have from the arbitrary action of department and agency heads.

Clark replied, as he has to all such queries, that he intends to be sure that the broad powers under the loyalty order are not abused. Bishop Haas, one of the most liberal and courageous churchmen in America, suggested that the order had already contributed something very much like a witch-hunt in the Government.

Emphatically Clark denied any intention of witch-hunting. He repeated that every effort would be made to safeguard the rights of those suspected of disloyalty. Shishkin pointed to the danger of the precedent which others might misuse.

Here, once again, is the dilemma of our time. At the root of it is the perverted loyalty of the Communist and the fellow-traveling stooge. Their loyalty is to an ideology opposed to our form of society and our Government. Serving that ideology with blind allegiance, they will go to any length to do the bidding of the bosses of communism.

Now no one, except the members of the House Un-American Activities Committee who tremble at shadows, believes that many individuals of questionable loyalty have infiltrated into our Government. But no one can doubt that there have been some. Their very presence, even though they may have done a minimum of harm to national security, has raised a cloud of suspicion.

The other day, the State Department announced dismissal of 10 employees whose loyalty was in question. They were summarily dismissed under the McCarran rider to the State Department appropriation bill. Under the terms of that rider, they have no right of appeal.

Here is the danger and it is a serious one. By this procedure the individual is prejudged and found guilty without appeal.

In at least two recent instances, it has been proposed in the Senate that the FBI be given the right to pass on all new employees of a particular bureau. That would in effect be giving to a police agency the supreme power of Government. It would be a long step in the direction of the police state.

The deeply troubling thought in the minds of many men is that, in scourging the few who are disloyal, we may endanger the whole structure of liberty on which our free society depends. In this there is a terrible irony. In combating communism we can get the very kind of totalitarian controls on which communism inevitably rests.

The President's Civil Rights Commission has made a well intentioned move to point up the dangers in this troubled time and the need for further safeguards in law. Public hearings were held. A digest of the hearings was used in an effective Nation-wide broadcast.

Various subcommittees are now studying special phases of the civil rights problems. A wealth of data is being compiled on discrimination in employment with the end of the war. This will be helpful in giving a push to the new Fair Employment Practices bill recently introduced in Congress under the sponsorship of both Republicans and Democrats.

Shortly the commission will begin putting together the over-all report. A lively discussion is certain on whether it should include a warning on the approach of the Truman administration to the loyalty investigation. It is, of course, a Presidential commission and the final form of the report will be determined by the White House.

The effectiveness of turning over a major problem to a commission of public-spirited citizens is open to question. The members of the Civil Rights Commission all have compelling outside interests, which means that they can give, at most, only part time to the inquiry. The chairman is Charles E. Wilson of General Electric.

With Congress in the midst of a chaotic rush to get out, no new legislation is likely. We may wake up one day to discover that civil liberties are not just a spare-time preoccupation.

Treasury Department Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 2, 1947:

SILLY BUSINESS

Those economy-minded Republican Congressmen have begun to act like people who would spend $20 to save one. That is what President Truman implied when he signed the Treasury Department appropriation measure under protest.

This bill cuts Internal Revenue Bureau funds $20,000,000. Mr. Truman says more than 4,000 employees will have to be fired, although they were working on 30,000 leads to tax evasion cases which could have put money in the Treasury. The President estimates the probable loss of revenue at $400,000,000 a year—or 20 times the saving.

Other budgets have been butchered on the same silly basis. The Republicans sliced funds and slowed work on half-finished Federal power projects which have to be completed before they can begin to pay off their cost.

Less tangible but more dangerous blows were dealt elsewhere. The GOP Congressmen whittled money for the National Labor Relations Board, although it is smothered under 5,500 cases now and faces new burdens for industrial peace under the Taft-Hartley law. They chopped into budgets for defense, for overseas information broadcasts and other items essential to a vigorous foreign policy.

What the Republicans need to do is to sit down together and read up on third-grade arithmetic. They are so wedded to the idea of subtraction that they cannot see how some of their economies add up to a total loss. It is all very well to try to shine up a platform, but how is it that the party which preaches good business practices monkey business?

Branch Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by W. J. Bryan, vice president of the Third National Bank of Nashville, Tenn., before the Independent Bankers Association, on the vicious practice which exists at least in some States, of branch banking, in a little pamphlet entitled "The Bank and Insurance Stock Guide," published by Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, New York, N. Y.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANK NOTES

In an address before the Independent Bankers Association, W. J. Bryan, vice president of the Third National Bank of Nashville, Tenn., called chain banking a menace to our economy, deplored its growth and urged restrictive legislation.

"I realize," Mr. Bryan said, "that there are banks that technically fall into the above classification which are rendering a good service, and are run on a high plane. Yet no one who is aware of the facts can deny that unrestricted multiple banking—branch, chain, group, or holding company—leads ultimately to either complete monopolization of banking or the complete failure of chain banks. It is usually the former because, after the cancerous growth has become entrenched, the Government cannot permit them to fail, and therefore must step in and underwrite them."

He cited countries as Australia, China, Denmark, Italy, Germany, and England which had to rescue their big branch banks prior to World War II. "The United States, which started as a branch-banking country, originally followed the policy of letting them fail. So, of the hundreds of branch banks that were organized between 1701 and the Civil War, only one remained in 1865. We continued this policy until 1932."

"When the failure," he said, "of so many chain banks brought that name into disrepute, they began to call themselves group banks. When they were confronted with laws prohibiting or restricting branch banking, they formed holding companies to circumvent these laws. Then, when the banks owned by the holdings companies were about to fail, they used that fact as an argument for permitting them to convert into branch banks.

"By 1932 the branch bankers had already perfected the technique through the holding company, a device for evading the law of our States and Federal Government. They not only make possible the evasion of laws respecting branch banking, but all the basic laws designed to protect the depositors' funds. Where banks are prohibited from investing or lending, the holding company can. Controlled banks must lend to controlled companies and must refuse loans to competitors of the cntrolled companies. * * *

"One would think that the sorry record of branch banks and holdings companies (on the whole) would have removed them as a threat. But cancer continuously threatens the person once affected, and likewise multiple banking. It is true that of 97 bank holding companies operating December 31, 1931, only 42 remained 5 years later. But new ones have started. Admittedly, some of those operate in a manner above reproach, and these have nothing to fear from the legislation we seek."

Mr. Bryan closed with remarks of indebtedness to Senator C. W. TOBEY, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, "for introducing and setting hearings on a bill looking toward our objective. I believe he could render no greater service to his country than to secure a law that will help insure the continuation of free banks, without which there can be no free enterprise for long, or freemen eventually."

Neglect of Negro Education Creates Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Neglect of Negro Education Creates Problem," by Ralph W. Page, which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on Saturday, April 19, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PICAYUNE—NEGLECT OF NEGRO EDUCATION CREATES PROBLEM

(By Ralph W. Page)

WASHINGTON, April 19.—One of the most tiresome and fallacious current cliches is the Negro problem.

There is no Negro problem. There is an American problem. This is how to put into practice the fundamental tenet of our society. It is the essence of the American creed that each one be given the same freedom of choice and the same opportunities and the same consideration in the development of his body, mind, and spirit.

The so-called problem is due to apostasy—forsaking our birthright and denying our sacrament to vast numbers of citizens.

This denial of participation in personal human development is most flagrant in the case of the Negro population. In particular, we deny them the main source from which men build their characters, acquire knowledge, utilize their talents, and realize their abilities—this is education.

This was forcibly brought home Wednesday evening by Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University, in Washington. Jacob Billikopt, chairman of the executive committee, gave a dinner there for a considerable company of distinguished administrators to hear the dramatic story of this great Negro institution.

This dream of General Howard is supported by Federal appropriations. Starting from scratch, it has developed an undergraduate college of liberal arts with an enrollment of 3,000 students, 2,000 of whom are war veterans. It has accredited graduate schools of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, physics and chemistry, law and music, and an established school of architecture and engineering that fails being accredited only by lack of equipment. All told, there are 6,000 scholars. And the graduates are the leaven of the whole Negro population and a credit to our population. As a story of success and accomplishment against great odds, this is a splendid tribute to the race.

But this isn't what impressed and depressed the audience.

It was the trifling a- picayune share of educational opportunity this incredibly rich country gives these individual citizens.

A large proportion of the colored brethren live in the segregated States of the South and the District of Columbia. This whole region, in 1939, devoted $137,000,000 to higher education. Of this sum just $10,500,000 went to Negro institutions—$2,500,000 in Federal funds to Howard itself.

Consequence: Today there are only 3,000 Negro physicians in the country. And only about 132 graduate from medical schools each year. Just 12 of these are from so-called open schools in the North. Howard and a little school in Tennessee provide the rest. There existed no place where a Negro can learn to be an architect or an engineer until this Howard Engineering School was recently started.

Well, 6,000 students is a good start.

Sure it is. But observe—this invaluable oasis of Negro opportunity, supported by the United States Government, has these 6,000 in quarters, and in classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and such things designed to hold no more than half that number, and handicapped in quality in almost every particular.

The president seemed to be most grateful to a beneficent Congress for not cutting down his inadequate budget, and for granting money to make plans for 30 percent of absolutely essential buildings.

He may be grateful, but as a citizen I am outraged. What kind of pinchpenny, peanut, miserly policy is it that requires national servants to operate a national school like an orphan asylum, with half enough plant, half enough teachers, half enough equipment? This same kind of philosophy and economy would dedicate a chicken coop as a memorial to Abraham Lincoln and arm our marines with bows and arrows. If we won't invest in education, we will invest in a problem. And it serves us right.

Keep Your Shirt On, Fellow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent letter written by a young veteran named Garrett Mattingly. The letter appears under the heading "Keep your shirt on, fellow," in the June 1947 issue of Woman's Day.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP YOUR SHIRT ON, FELLOW

(This letter was written by Garrett Mattingly to a young veteran sorely disturbed about today's volcanic world. It contains the author's well-considered advice on the problems facing us all.)

DEAR BOB: I am guessing, the same as you would be guessing, but I say there isn't going to be any war with Russia. Not soon anyway. You've started to take that degree, and a college degree can be a pretty important thing in your life. Stick with it.

What you say about quitting college for a job, and getting into the money while you have the chance, sounds confused to me. You admit that you'd feel a little ashamed to drop out now. You say you wouldn't think of doing so, if you could feel sure that a new war wouldn't come along to make nonsense of your plans. And you ask my advice. All right. I say, keep your shirt on, fellow, and buckle down to finish what you've started. No, you can't be absolutely sure there won't be another war. Certainly is more than you have a right to ask for. You just have to figure the odds and we had better, for the sake of peace, try to keep as calm as we can.

With the kind of stories the newspapers keep printing, and the kind of books that get published almost every week, keeping calm isn't always easy, I know. Just from the way the news is angled, anybody would say that we are a lot nearer to war with Russia right now than we were with Germany in 1939. And a good many people appear to be more enthusiastic about the idea than they were 8 years ago. Some newspapers seem to take a good deal more trouble to dig up nasty stories about the Communists, than they ever did in the past to print what the Nazis were doing.

Not that there isn't a lot of truth, I expect, in most of the anti-Russian stories. And I don't mean to say that the situation isn't serious. When two big countries get to snarling at each other, it's always serious. I certainly don't mean, either, that we ought to back down and get out of the Russians' way. That not only wouldn't be the decent thing to do, it simply wouldn't get us anywhere. We'd just find ourselves in the same kind of spot, somewhere else, nearer home, and you can't keep backing down forever. No, we've got to settle this thing with Russia, and we might as well settle it now, but I feel pretty sure we can settle it without fighting.

You've asked me, so I'll tell you why I feel that way, but, understand, I don't have any inside dope and I won't be telling you anything that everybody doesn't know or couldn't find out. In the first place, I don't see how any Russian in his right mind could want another war in this generation, atom bomb or no atom bomb. Suppose the Germans had invaded the United States in 1941. Suppose they had got as far west as Chicago in one drive, and as far west as St. Louis in another, laying everything flat as they passed. Suppose, before we finally drove the Germans back into the sea, we'd had as many soldiers killed and wounded as our whole Army amounted to in 1943, so that we finished the war with formations filled up with grandfathers and high-school boys. And suppose that, besides combat casualties, practically half the population of New York and the New England States, men, women, and children, had died of hunger and disease, or been killed by the enemy. Would that make us feel like starting another war? Well, that's about what happened to the Russians. However much they throw their weight around, the Russians know that what they need most is about 25 years of peace to put their country back on its feet.

That's the main reason I think there will be no war with Russia for some time to come. There are other reasons, simple ones that are easy to forget. The size of the U. S. S. R., for instance. The Russians aren't cramped and crowded in as the Germans were, or the Japanese. They have lebensraum. And their undeveloped resources are enormous. The Russians are probably about as well off in that respect, and as near to being self-sufficient, as we are. Countries that well off do not, as a rule, start major wars of conquest. They may do a little casual grabbing, if there's territory lying around loose that they happen to want. We've done that, ourselves. But they don't go all out for world rule or downfall.

Then, too, it looks as if Russia, in the west anyway, were coming to its natural limit of expansion. You sometimes hear that the U. S. S. R. has no natural limits, because with their nationalities policy of letting each people have what looks like a pretty independent set-up, and actually running the show through the Communist Party, they can take over any country where the party can get control. On paper, that's logical. Inside the present boundaries of the U. S. S. R. it's probably practical. It seems to work all right in the Byelorussian, and Azerbaijan, Kazak, and the Turkmenian Republics. But none of those countries is what you and I would call a nation. They are just districts where the people have a local language or dialect, and local customs of their own. Now, expanding westward, the Russians have come into an area where there are some old, tough nations. The Czechs and the Hungarians, the Poles, and the Finns have been separate peoples for a long time, and taker some hard knocks, and stayed in business. For more than a hundred years the old Czarist empire tried to absorb Poland, and the most they got out of it was a lot of police work, and one headache after another. Poland is still a nation, and there's no people on earth who like the Russians less than the Poles do. The party seems to be running things in Poland now, but I doubt very much whether they can go on doing so long after the army gets out, and you still can't sit comfortably on bayonets. You will have noticed that although the countries I've mentioned are all inside what's called the Russian zone of influence, and although two of them used to be parts of the old Russian empire, the U. S. S. R. hasn't tried to include any of them in its federal union. Maybe the Russians know that they are approaching a limit.

So far I haven't said anything about systems of ideas, about "ideologies," because I'm not sure how much such things really matter in Moscow. But the people who keep warning us against Russia say that ideologies do matter, so notice this. It's true that the U. S. S. R. is what we call a "totalitarian" state. In fact, the Italians and the Germans copied the one-party system from the Bolsheviks. And it's true that Communist propaganda, like Nazi propaganda, talks about "tomorrow the world." But there's a big difference. The Communists don't have any master-race theory. Their hope of expansion depends on Communist revolutions, on revolutions made in each country mainly, at least, by the people inside it. (Revolutionists always think their brand of revolution is going to spread all over the world. Lots of Americans thought ours would after 1776; most of the French thought theirs would after 1789). If the Communist theory proves to be wrong—if the people of the rest of the world choose not to be Communists, then that's another limit to Russian expansion.

The final limit, of course, is our threat of force: The atom bomb and all the deadly gadgets that go with it. I think we are entitle to assume that the Russian people, as a whole, don't want to commit suicide any more than we do. You remember Mr. Ridgely, our CIC officer? The morning after we got the news about Hiroshima, he said: "I knew if we let those scientists fool around with this war they'd end up by making it dangerous. I want out of here, and I think we'd better call this whole thing off." That's still the most sensible remark I've heard anybody make about the atom bomb. And I expect a good many Russians can figure out how dangerous war would be now, whether or not they had the bomb themselves.

Well, you say, if the Russians don't want another war, why do they act the way they do? That's one to stump the experts. But I can give you some common-sense answers, partial answers, that don't depend on any deep dark Russian plot to conquer the world. In the first place, remember they've just won a tough war; a big war, and that's enough to make any people a little chesty. It's more stimulating to the Russians because it's the first big war they've won since Napoleon's time, over 130 years ago. In between, the French and British whipped them in the Crimea, the Japs whipped them in Manchuria, and the Germans licked the tar out of them in 1916-17. Even when they did win a little war, against Turkey, back in the 1870's, they were not allowed to cash in on it. Now, when they have been on the winning side, and think they have contributed more to the victory than anybody else, it is not surprising that they think they ought to collect some of the things Russia has been wanting for a long time.

They want to collect reparations and booty, for instance, and they don't much care how. That's one of our most frequent complaints against them. There's a lot of truth in it. But when you read about Russian demands for reparations, and the stripping of food and machinery from areas that can barely struggle along as it is, remember that the Russians have, at least, the excuse of the desperately poor. If the richest part of your country has been turned into a desert, if, over hundreds of square miles, there are no tools left to work with, and no farm animals, and you own people are hungry and in rags, it's hard to remember, when you see a pig or a pair of pants, that your former enemies must live too.

We also complain about Russian expansionism, about their grabbing territory. So they do, but their expansion is somewhat less alarming when you remember that the U. S. S. R. right now isn't so big as the old Russian empire was in 1905, and that except for a little corner on the Baltic, and a little corner against the Carpathians, everything the Soviets have annexed in the last 8 years was Czarist territory not so very long ago. Even their main unsatisfied claims are just old Czarist claims revived. The British practically gave the Czar northern Persia in 1907, and promised him Constantinople and the Straits in 1915, and didn't seem to feel then that the balance of power would be upset if the Russians moved in permanently in both areas.

What's really alarming is the way the Russians seem to be muscling in on countries like Poland and Hungary and Yugoslavia, and taking over the government through local party stooges. As I've said, I'm not sure that's going to last. But right now the backwash of the war has left all that area, and a good deal of the rest of Europe besides, a political and economic vacuum. There just hasn't been any stable government, or any stable economy. Into such a vacuum the nearest big power is likely to be sucked, like it or not. Our critics would say that we and the British have let ourselves get sucked into Greece and Italy with no better

excuse. In the long run, the problem in those borderlands of eastern and central Europe is the same as the problem all over the world. If the things we believe in, democratic government, and personal liberty and private enterprise are going to win out, then the economy that supports those things has got to be made to yield a decent living, and a fair amount of security, and a reasonable hope for the great mass of the people. Misery and insecurity, gross injustice and oppression, hatred between rich and poor, are all so many invitations to communism to step in. If we can help the people of Europe make some kind of democratic economy work, we don't need to be afraid of communism there, any more than we need to be afraid of it over here if we can keep our own economy working.

The toughest problem is the difficulty of working with the Russians—their isolationism. They are suspicious of us and our motives, and they guard their national sovereignty. Some of the reasons for their acting that way are pretty complicated, but the biggest and simplest is fear. They are afraid of us—more afraid of us than we are of them.

They feel as sure that we want to overrun their government and force them to accept a capitalist system as any of us do that they are out to undermine the American way of life. In the past, we've both given each other reasons for being afraid of each other, but we'd better both get over it. There's nothing more dangerous than that kind of fear. We've got to make up our minds to live together in spite of our differences, if we want to live at all. I think we can. It will take time, but, as I've said, I don't think the Russians want to fight now. We shall have the time, if we know how to use it. Maybe 25 years from now it will seem absurd that anybody should ever have thought we'd have to fight the Russians. Maybe, given time, the UN will grow up to be big enough to step between any two nations that grow angry or afraid. Maybe, 25 years from now, it will seem absurd to think of fighting wars at all. It is, of course.

Anyway, fellow, if I were you, that's the way I'd play it. I think I know how you feel. Part of your uneasiness is rational enough. There could be another war which would bust up all your plans, and make all this effort you are putting in just so much waste. That's a chance you have to take. But part of what you feel is just the restlessness and depression that catches up with all of us when we look ahead and see nothing but a long stretch of hard work, and decisions to make, and chances of failure, and less money and less fun than we'd like to have. It isn't just what you thought life would be like when you got out of the service, is it? Just getting along on what Uncle Sam allows you, and what he'll stand for your earning on the side is tough going with prices the way they are, and I suppose it's tougher still to see some of the boys who got out when you did earning more in a week than you can scrape together in a month. I'm not going to argue with you about that part of it. You know all the reasons in favor of an education as well as I do. We went over them together on more than one night watch. If you've changed your mind now, well, it's your life, and you must decide for yourself. Only decide on your own terms. Don't let the headlines and the commentators get you all mixed up.

Let me remind you, though, of one of the things we talked about. We agreed then that there might be another war, but that there didn't need to be. If enough people had really understood what was going on, we said, there need not have been World War II. To avoid another one, we said we needed, most of all, better informed people, people who knew more about the world they lived in. And we agreed that it was every man's duty to learn as much as he could and to help influence his neighbors, and not to give up hoping and working for a peaceful world. That used to be a part of your plan, a part of your reason for going to college. I don't think anything that has happened so far need make us lose hope. That was the trouble last time, you remember; too many people lost hope too soon. Too many people, especially here in America, forgot about the world, and scrambled for their own profit and their own safety. At the end, too many people, especially in Europe, acted as if they were paralyzed with fear, because they were certain that the worst was bound to happen. Indifference and despair and panic—those are the surest ways to invite catastrophe. You've got to have some faith in life if you're going to go on living at all. And if you want a better and safer world to live in, maybe it's up to you to lend a hand. That might be a reason you've forgotten for finishing that degree.

One last word, Bob. You don't have to wait until you are out of college to start lending a hand. Take those past-midnight discussions you tell me about. Get into them with both feet. Talk up the UN. Point out how bitter words between nations may be a hopeful sign rather than a discouraging one. If the fur flies over international conference tables, that may mean that the cards are face up on those tables, as they should be. The hotter the discussion, the more it establishes the principle that words and not wars, open discussion rather than guile and trickery, are the best ways to settle differences between nations. If you can influence, even slightly, only a dozen of the boys you know, you may be influencing a dozen families, and in the end a dozen communities. That's the way public opinion is formed in this country, and, when it is formed, the Government in Washington does what the people expect it to do. That's how democracy works.

Yours,

GARRETT MATTINGLY.

New Labor Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, most of the editorials we read today about the new labor bill are intemperate and excessive in their descriptions of it. Those which are against it make use of the words such as, "Fascist, slave labor, moderate murder," and other extreme descriptions, while avid proponents describe it as "Utopian decree, panacea, and cure-all." It is therefore a distinct pleasure to read an editorial which describes the Taft-Hartley bill in what I think is reasonable, sane, and sensible language and which points out its obvious weaknesses while at the same time recognizes its many good provisions. Such an editorial is this one from the Miami Beach Sun Tropics which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD for the edification of all the Members of the Congress.

NEW LABOR ERA

Nearly every alert citizen and medium of information will comment on the Senate's action yesterday in over-riding the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill, as they did after the House action a few days earlier.

"Smart politics" or "such a bill had to come" or "President Truman was right" or some other theme will be taken. Through it all what is the situation, how will it affect labor and capital-management, what good or harm will the measure do in our national economy?

President Truman, in vetoing the bill, said it "would reverse the basic direction of our national labor policy," that is would cause more strikes, not fewer. He painted a gloomy picture.

On the other hand proponents of the labor-control or labor union-control bill insist that it means the revamping of a labor program that had run its course, that labor leaders had caused the public's stampede for strike-ending, for disturbance in industry that retarded production, etc, etc.

Labor is still here; there will be work for all; the unions will not be destroyed; plants and shops will continue operation; wages will be paid. Such conditions must and will persist. Plainly, the labor bill was evolved, was passed by the House and the Senate because the general public got tired of labor-management turmoil. Leaders of great masses of loyal and dependable, patriotic, and true Americans who make labor paramount outran their privilege. That would seem to be a blunt way of finding a basis for the bill.

Henceforth the country hopes for peace. High pressure, filibustering tactics, lobbying against the bill had no effect. The Senators and the Representatives felt that the public wanted surcease from labor-management trouble, and so voted.

Labor, so essential to winning a great war, is still as loyal to the country as before. The leadership only must trim its sails to meet the new era in labor relations. One might say it is a change that came about from the ill-fated, ill-timed, and ill-conceived sit-down strikes of a decade ago.

The bill protects the national welfare, outlaws the closed shop, secondary boycotts, and jurisdictional disputes. Labor, no more than management, needs to bury itself in gloom, not in this land dedicated to free enterprise where the laboring man like his associate citizens enjoys the greatest of democratic blessings.

Doing Nothing No Way To Solve a Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to include an excellent editorial from the Miami Herald which discusses the failure of this Congress to do anything about the drastic housing problem. I hope all the Members of Congress will read it.

DOING NOTHING NO WAY TO SOLVE A PROBLEM

A concerted effort is being made this week to win Congressional enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

Representatives of more than 20 national organizations endorsing the measure have scheduled a meeting with its sponsors in Washington today.

One of the organizations, the United States Conference of Mayors, has published an illustrated brochure stressing the bill's provisions for slum clearance and low-rent public housing. "America Cannot Afford Slums" is the title of the booklet.

Among its telling points is a chart headed "Slums drain off far more than their share

of city revenue." The example is Atlanta, where only 5½ percent of 1941 real property tax revenues came from slum areas which accounted for 53 percent of the city's costs for police, fire, health and other services.

Virtues of low-rent housing in wiping out slums' high cost of law enforcement, health, and welfare services have been demonstrated in Miami by the projects completed in 1939–40. They provided more than 1,000 dwelling units for families which had lived in slums.

Crime, disease, fires, and juvenile delinquency are virtually nonexistent among the inhabitants of these low-rent units.

More were planned, but the program was halted when all available funds were dedicated to war emergency housing.

One of the war developments administered by the Miami Housing Authority is Victory Trailer park. Its 500 trailers are filled to capacity by veterans' families—a total of 1,870 men, women, and children who would qualify for low-rent housing if such projects could be built.

The bill also provides the means for eliminating by reconstruction of whole blighted areas such as Miami's central Negro district.

But low-rent housing—meaning projects subsidized by the Federal Government—would not solve the whole housing shortage.

As the chart shows, more than 14,000 dwelling units were built in Miami in the 6 years that followed the creation of the Federal Housing Authority in 1934. The FHA program succeeded in combining sound financing with private enterprise to provide good homes at prices many families could afford. It also encouraged some apartment building, although this phase of the FHA work is not well known.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill could scarcely be expected to produce the same results as FHA, now that construction costs have soared above the reach of most people. The measure will relieve the housing shortage for families of low income, and its long-range potentialities for slum clearance are outstanding.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards has denounced the bill as "dangerous" and "communistic." The National Association of Home Builders has called it "the most serious threat" to the private construction industry, and suggested a division into several bills to be acted upon separately.

Just saying the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is bad won't cure the housing shortage. Opponents should wake up to the fact that doing nothing is no way to solve a problem.

Independence Day in the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio address which I delivered on the Fourth of July over Wisconsin radio stations. The subject of this address was The Meaning of America's Birthday in Our Times.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, Independence Day is the birthday of Uncle Sam, but it is also every American's birthday. On Independence Day, every American, so to speak, is reborn. Every American celebrates the birth of his personal freedom and that of his fellow countrymen. It is not a mere formal occasion, lacking meaning except historically; rather it is a living reality to every adult and child of our land.

On the one hundred and seventy-first birthday of our beloved America, there is a feeling of pride in every American breast, a feeling of gratitude for all the blessings that we enjoy, and a feeling of hope for the future.

Every day, we might say, is Independence Day for our land. Yet it is fitting that one particular day should be set aside for consecration and commemoration of the valiant deed of July 4, 1776, when the mightiest declaration of human freedom was proclaimed to all mankind.

I am grateful to this station for the opportunity to speak to you at this time. I hope that I may express the thoughts which many of our citizens feel and, particularly, which many of us in the Congress in Washington feel. Speaking to you at this time in your homes and elsewhere gives me a feeling of being home again in our own State.

CONGRESS ON INDEPENDENCE DAY

Right now, as you know, Congress is proceeding toward what is expected to be the end of its first session at the close of this month. We have met great challenges during the 5 months since we convened, and there are still mighty challenges up ahead on the domestic and the foreign scene.

But I believe that we will be adequate to them, that we will fulfill the trust which the men of 1776 placed in us.

OUR SUBJECT NOW

We are considering now the subject of Independence Day in the atomic age. Of course, in any age there is a certain lasting meaning of independence, a certain enduring set of qualities and characteristics which withstand the changes of time. Yet we know that when the first atomic bomb was released at Hiroshima, the world entered a new era of miraculous discoveries. Many of our concepts underwent a tremendous change. And we have still but touched the hem of the garment, so to speak, of this new era.

HISTORY OF CELEBRATION

But first let us go back to that eventful day 171 years ago when a group of men sat in a plain red-brick building in Philadelphia in the State House there. Half a hundred delegates had come to affix their signatures to a document. It was a bold document, defying one of the mightiest powers of that time. It was a document—the Declaration of Independence—which was to become one of the great landmarks in the history of man's fight for freedom.

The delegates that day in July 1776 were humble men. There was a farmer named Thomas Jefferson, a printer named Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams, Robert Livingston, and John Hancock and others.

By around 2 o'clock that day the great document—the Declaration of Independence—had been signed. A little boy ran from the doorway into the street with uplifted arms and gave the tidings of the birth of the new nation to the crowd that had assembled outside. The little boy gave the word to the men who were waiting to ring the great Liberty Bell.

On that bell there was this message: "Proclaim liberty to the land; unto all the inhabitants thereof."

The message on this bell was first spoken to Moses on Mount Sinai by God: "Proclaim liberty throughout the land; unto all the inhabitants thereof."

The bell pealed forth the news of liberty. That message went not only to the people of the infant Thirteen Colonies, but the message encircled the globe.

Thus American liberty took as its keynote the spiritual message from on high. It was America's destiny to realize that message, to proclaim and maintain liberty for our own people and to inspire all other people by our example.

Freedom really rang out to challenge all peoples. Our job is to keep ringing the Liberty Bell.

LESSONS OF INDEPENDENCE DAY

There are lessons which we all might learn from Independence Day, and perhaps we should review a few of them now.

I. LESSON OF CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS

The most obvious lesson is the power of constructive ideas. Radio and the newspapers tell us each day of the power of physical force in various countries of the world—the power of arms, of violence. They tell us also, however, of the influence of creative ideas.

The Fourth of July confirms that fact. To be sure, the Declaration of Independence was sealed in the blood of the martyrs of the American Revolution. It was reinforced by the sacrifices of Bunker Hill and Valley Forge when the ragged Continentals of George Washington bled for freedom.

But it was ideas which inspired those Continentals, which inspired the Thirteen Colonies to fight the mightiest power of that time. Yes, as Victor Hugo told us, "there is nothing more powerful in this world than an idea whose time has come."

The truth of those words are attested by the Declaration of Independence itself, by its dynamic ideas which burst upon the world like an atomic bomb. But whereas the atomic bomb was destructive the Declaration of Independence was constructive. It nourished the seeds of liberty throughout the world. It inspired men, uplifted them, enlarged their human horizons.

Today all the world looks to the American idea, to the American concept of checks and balances. All the world hungers for our freedom. In this globe of over 2,000,000,000 souls not more than 200,000,000 of them, at the most, enjoy the blessings that we enjoy.

Other peoples have but to recognize, however, that they can realize the heaven-on-earth which we have realized if they will but take hold of the idea which we freely extend to them—the idea of freedom and of liberty.

Thoughts in declaration

What are some of the atomic thoughts of freedom in the Declaration of Independence? I quote:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

How meaningful are those words today when dictatorship still prevails in many corners of the world.

What a challenge we are presented with by those words—the challenge of passing on vital and unimpaired the liberties which we enjoy—economic, political, social, religious—to the generations which will come after us.

As the poet said:

"The glory of our present
Is to make our future free;
We love our land for what she is
And what she is to be."

The lesson of constructive ideas must never be forgotten by us. Emerson said, "Beware of a thinker, he may turn the flank of history." Creative thoughts can turn the flank of dictatorship and oppression, of war and strife, of envy and misunderstanding.

II. LESSON OF COOPERATION

There is another lesson to be learned from the Fourth of July—and it is the lesson of cooperation. Our independence could never have been gained if men of different views

had not been able to reconcile whatever differences they had in favor of common agreement.

Unity, a willing desire to submerge minor disagreements, so as to protect the common good is an objective we must all bear in mind.

But cooperation does not only apply domestically to our homes, our work places; it obviously applies to the international scene as well.

Foreign cooperation

Cooperation is the supplement of national independence in the world picture. Our conception of world cooperation has changed since the days when George Washington warned us against any foreign entanglements and urged us "not to quit our own." To be sure, we still prize as dearly as ever our freedom of speech, of conscience, of the press, of assembly, of worship. We still treasure our self-determination and our ability to forge our own destiny by our own hands and minds.

Yet, we realize that in this atomic age time and space exist no more. Man's ingenuity and inventions have contracted the world. Atomic energy, rocket power, and other discoveries have put every nation in every other nation's back yard. The implications of this are clear.

Our national destiny is interwoven with the destinies of foreign peoples, whether we like it or not. Economic and political storms from across the sea bring storms in our own country and vice versa. We still believe nonetheless, that our foreign policy must be an American foreign policy, designed for our enlightened self-interest. At the same time, we are seeking to make the United Nations Organization, which is just 2 years old, a living, vital organism for peace. One hundred and forty million Americans have demonstrated the will, intent, and purpose for peace, and we expect the rest of the world to do likewise.

THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

We know that we are living in one world geographically, but we are living in two worlds spiritually, economically, and politically. The Stars and Stripes floats over our land, but it confronts the Red flag of the hammer and sickle, already floating over one-sixth of the earth.

The United States and the Soviet Union appear to be contesting, whether we admit it or not, not only for the independence of governments throughout the world and for the control of resources, but for the minds of men.

I am satisfied, however, that with strength and courage, we can, under God, achieve a basis of understanding with Russia, and I hope we can achieve a just and lasting peace.

Our independence, then, in foreign policy is an independence of freemen, who are willing and eager to cooperate with their foreign cousins but who fiercely prize their own self-determination of policy.

CONCLUSION

My fellow citizens, you and I have briefly contemplated the history of Independence Day. We have seen some of the lessons of this occasion. We have felt the need for reconsecration of ourselves to the principles of July 4, 1776. We say now, as the youngster said, in effect, that summer day 171 years ago outside the Philadelphia State House: "Let freedom ring, let freedom ring."

We say: "Let the Liberty Bell peal forth the message, 'Proclaim liberty throughout all the earth and unto all the inhabitants thereof.'"

And we say in our hearts the words of a poet:

"Let independence be our boast,
Ever mindful what it cost;
Ever grateful for the prize,
Let its altar reach the skies!"

American Relations With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Clergyman Wants United States To Get Tough With Russia," containing excerpts from a sermon delivered yesterday by Dr. Walter Rowe Courtenay, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Nashville, Tenn. He stated, among other things, that trying to appease Russia is like tossing fire into straw and expecting the straw not to burn. This is good reading, and I commend it to everyone.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLERGYMAN WANTS UNITED STATES TO GET TOUGH WITH RUSSIA

Dr. Walter Rowe Courtenay, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, stood in his pulpit yesterday morning and got some things off his chest.

"Trying to appease Russia is like tossing fire into straw and expecting the straw not to burn," he said, and added:

"It's time, right now, for the United States State Department to drop its talk, treaties, and bungling efforts to placate Stalin.

"The thing to do is get tough, quick—before it's too late.

"When the Russians get the atom bomb, we should be wise enough to know, from bitter experience, that then it will be too late."

Dr. Courtenay spoke before approximately 850 people in the church auditorium. His address was also broadcast by radio station WSM.

"Trying to feed and clothe the world, while we 'yes' the Russians, will never solve the problem," the minister said.

"At present," continued Dr. Courtenay, "the Russians have 93 heavily armed, well-trained divisions in Europe, while the United States has 3 divisions of hastily trained, unhappy, and dissatisfied young men, trying unsuccessfully to police a small part of the area in which this country fought to the death just a little more than 2 years ago."

LITTLE MORE THAN MYTH

"From what I can learn, through consulting the best-informed sources, United States military air power now is little more than a myth.

"Two years ago, it was, without question, the greatest in the world. Now, the recent report of the Compton Commission describes it as a hollow shell, so obviously, the question arises: How long will it be before we are hopelessly outclassed—and how can we prevent this alarming state of affairs?

"I understand that at present the United States has less than 3,000 modern fighting planes available. Russia has more than 14,000 modern combat planes—ready to take the air.

"This comparison alone is frightening."

Dr. Courtenay told his listeners he disliked very much the risk he was taking in being considered an alarmist, but he added that he felt it was his duty to "try to arouse the people of the United States to the obvious danger of the present situation."

He said he did not approve, entirely, of President Truman's current plan for universal military training, but he thought this country needed a mobile striking force of more than a million men, capable of operating in the tropics, in the Arctic and throughout the world—and he added:

"Such a force does not exist at present—nor is it in prospect."

COMMUNISTS A DANGER

"Communists in the United States are an ever-present danger," said the pastor. "We were shocked, sometime ago, when the Canadian Government discovered Russian spies calmly working in government offices close to the sources of vital military information.

"Now we find, much to our consternation, that the same situation exists in Washington. I read last week, to my surprise, that the State Department had discharged several Communists—and that several other suspects disappeared mysteriously.

"How did these people get their jobs in the first place? That's what I'd like to know. That's what citizens of the United States are entitled to know, but I doubt very much if they will find out."

Dr. Courtenay pointed out that in the two most recent previous wars in which the United States had been involved it had been possible, from an industrial standpoint, to expand with the emergency.

"Then," said the speaker, "we had months—even years when we needed them. But in the future the time limit may be weeks—even days, or possibly it will not exist.

"Don't discount the Red menace," urged the clergyman. "It can be the red of blood and doom—or it can be the red of the sunrise heralding the dawn of a new day.

"It's strictly up to us."

Appropriation for Internal Revenue Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the present false economy drive of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress is the acme of extravagance as proved by a letter which I received from an honest hard-working employee of the Internal Revenue Department, sixth California collection district.

Appended to the letter is an analysis of the money recovered by the 95 men whose services are to be terminated July 15, 1947. It shows that these 95 men recovered during the calendar year 1946 $3,623,832 from taxpayers of 1943, money which would have been lost if their returns had not been personally audited by the field collectors. The letter also indicates that the internal revenue agents are 3 years behind in their auditing due to present lack of personnel.

The letter follows:

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Congressman, Nineteenth California District, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHET: This is an open letter to the Congress of the United States regarding what I think is a stroke at the foundation of our democracy. That is, the elimination of several thousand Government employees from the most vital department of the

Government, the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

In the sixth California collection district 95 field deputy collectors are to be terminated as of July 31, 1947. This is over 19 percent of the total field division. Most of these men are from the lower salaried brackets, that is, grades five, six, and seven. I happened to be in this group, therefore, I am also personally interested.

This district is already understaffed to the extent that all 1943 income-tax returns were not audited for additional tax due before they were outlawed by statute. We are just now starting on 1944, 1945, and 1946 returns for the three biggest profit years, therefore where the most chiseling was done. This district has grown so rapidly we have been unable to keep up with the tremendous case load.

I enclose self-explanatory figures showing production results of the 95 deputy collectors being let out as of July 15, 1947, showing the comparative class of the collectors. Most of these are nonveterans as well as myself.

Almost everybody, it seems, is out to beat Uncle Sam and during the last filing period, I personally saved losses in revenue of approximately $20,000 by challenging and disallowing fictitious dependents claimed, and this is only scratching the surface.

In addition to the regular work to be done it takes 2 or 3 years to train a field deputy for this kind of work, and more if they have had no business experience, as have most of the men who were terminated. While it is true we have drones who should be weeded out, for the next 18 months our personnel should have increased instead of decreased.

This past month of June my individual production was over $6,000 of which $3,600 was collected from a local chiseling second-car dealer and $1,097 additional tax was collected from a trucking company. This is the additional revenue Uncle Sam never gets unless discovered by audit in the field. I am sure the poorest deputy collectors pay for themselves 10 times or more in this work.

Many thousands of dollars in taxes will be lost to the Government merely by the taxpayer being aware that the enforcement department of the Bureau of Internal Revenue has been decreased and figuring that his chances of not paying his just taxes has been materially increased in his favor.

I could add many other reasons why this reduction of personnel is a mistake, but I know that you will do everything possible to right this wrong. Many fine deputies are being let out at a time when they are most needed.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

(Name deleted.)

Sixth District of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

During calendar year 1946:

Total deputies	478
Total productive cases	130,985
Total money production	$22,982,613

Ninety-five men (to be terminated July 30, 1947) equals 19.8 percent of total. These 95 men (19.8 percent) produced 30,693 cases (23.4 percent of total); $3,623,832 money (15.8 percent of total).

The top 50 men (of the 95 mentioned above) equals 10.4 percent of total. These top 50 men (10.4 percent) produced 22,082 cases (16.8 percent of total); $2,772,196 money (12 percent of total).

The top 44 men (of the 95 mentioned above) equals 9.2 percent of total. These top 44 men (9.2 percent) produced 20,123 cases (15.3 percent of total); $2,585,578 money (11.2 percent of total).

The top 28 men (of the 95 mentioned above) equals 5.8 percent of total. These top 28 men (5.8 percent) produced 14,219 cases (10.8 percent of total); $2,032,301 money (8.8 percent of total).

Community Property Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 1947, I introduced H. R. 3989 to amend section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code to equalize Federal income taxes upon married persons. A comparison of tax payable on specified net incomes by a husband and wife residing in a noncommunity and in a community property State indicates the necessity for such legislation.

I am inserting a table which presents the picture of discrimination as between noncommunity and community property States:

Net income before personal exemption (combined income of husband and wife)	Non-community-property State [1] (total tax on a joint return)	Community-property State [2] (total tax of husband and wife filing separate returns)	Tax advantage in community-property States
$1,000			
$1,200	$38.00	$38.00	
$1,500	95.00	95.00	
$1,800	152.00	152.00	
$2,000	190.00	190.00	
$2,500	285.00	285.00	
$3,000	380.00	380.00	
$4,000	589.00	570.00	$19.00
$5,000	798.00	760.00	38.00
$6,000	1,045.00	969.00	76.00
$7,000	1,292.00	1,178.00	114.00
$8,000	1,577.00	1,387.00	190.00
$9,000	1,862.00	1,596.00	266.00
$10,000	2,185.00	1,843.00	342.00
$11,000	2,508.00	2,090.00	418.00
$12,000	2,869.00	2,337.00	532.00
$13,000	3,230.00	2,584.00	646.00
$14,000	3,638.50	2,869.00	769.50
$15,000	4,047.00	3,154.00	893.00
$20,000	6,393.50	4,693.00	1,700.50
$25,000	9,082.00	6,460.00	2,622.00
$30,000	11,970.00	8,540.50	3,429.50
$40,000	18,097.50	13,290.50	4,807.00
$50,000	24,795.00	18,724.50	6,070.50
$60,000	31,891.50	24,529.00	7,362.50
$70,000	39,273.00	30,561.50	8,711.50
$80,000	46,939.50	36,850.50	10,089.00
$90,000	54,891.00	43,434.00	11,457.00
$100,000	63,127.50	50,274.00	12,853.50
$150,000	105,383.50	86,953.50	18,430.00
$200,000	148,124.00	127,081.50	21,042.50
$250,000	191,339.50	169,337.50	22,002.00
$300,000	234,564.50	211,612.50	22,952.00
$400,000	321,014.50	297,103.00	23,911.50
$500,000	407,464.50	383,543.50	23,921.00
$750,000	623,589.50	599,668.50	23,921.00
$1,000,000	839,714.50	815,793.50	23,921.00
$2,000,000	1,704,214.50	1,680,293.50	23,921.00
$5,000,000	4,275,000.00	4,273,793.50	1,206.50

[1] Entire income reported by husband on joint return.
[2] Income divided equally between husband and wife.

Koreans Lack Training, Unready For Self-Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

KOREANS LACK TRAINING, UNREADY FOR SELF-RULE

(Article 29)

While the Koreans believe they are competent to govern themselves, and on that theory are demanding immediate independence, the evidence is all to the contrary.

There is in Korea a small intellectual class, part of which is the product of 50 centuries of Korean culture and tradition and part of which is due to the activities of American missionary societies. Many Koreans have been educated in the United States and, as a consequence, they are familiar with the terminology of democracy and its philosophy.

But there is scarcely anyone in Korea who, prior to the defeat of Japan, had had any training in the administration of any kind of government. Most Koreans have no conception of the meaning of democracy and freedom.

During the 40 years that Japan was in complete control of Korea, the Japanese made a practice of excluding the Koreans from all positions of responsibility in government and business. At the time of the initial occupation, there were only 70,000 Koreans in the civil service, and these were permitted to hold only minor positions and to perform menial tasks. On the other hand, 130,000 Japanese held positions in the government.

WAR DISRUPTS ECONOMY

Moreover, the end of the war found the Korean economy completely disrupted. For years the wealth of Korea had been drained for the benefit of the Japanese interests. However, during the 40 years of Japanese domination, the economy of Korea had become integrated with that of Manchuria and Japan. Although Japanese exploitation kept the Koreans poor, the interchange of products among Korea, Japan, and Manchuria resulted in Korea being virtually self-sustaining.

Now, however, Japan and Manchuria have both been cut off from Korea, and Korea itself is divided with an iron curtain at the thirty-eighth parallel. There is no exchange of goods or products between the northern zone, occupied by the Russians, where most of the mineral wealth and industry of Korea are located, and the southern zone, occupied by the Americans, which is largely agricultural.

Consequently, southern Korea is poverty stricken. It does not produce enough food to sustain the population, nor does it have a surplus of manufactured products which can be exchanged for food. The food deficiency in the American zone must be supplied by the United States in order to prevent starvation.

We are just beginning to realize that when we assumed the obligation to occupy southern Korea, remove the Japanese, and help prepare the Koreans for self-government we also acquired, in effect, 19,000,000 relief clients. And these people, who are dependent on us for aid, and who have no experience in the practical application of democracy or in running a government, now insist that they be allowed to govern themselves.

Even if we wanted to give Korea its independence immediately we would be handcuffed by the Moscow agreement under which Korea is divided into two zones. Under this agreement independence cannot be granted until after a period of trusteeship, for a period of up to 5 years. But the trusteeship cannot be worked out until after a provisional Korean Government has been established. And we cannot agree with the Russians as to who in Korea is to be consulted regarding the organization of a provisional Korean Government.

It is clear that Russia will not consent to the organization of any provisional government unless it is dominated by Communists. The United States will not consent to such domination. We want a Government that is

democratic, according to the American definition of democracy as modified to meet the oriental needs.

The fundamental principles of such a democracy, according to Maj. Gen. Archer L. Lerch, the military governor of Korea, the right of everyone to take part in the Government and acceptance of the wishes of the majority, once everyone has participated and spoken.

The Russians, on the other hand, want a government which is democratic according to their standards, which means domination by the Communists, since they regard all other parties as being undemocratic.

We might abandon southern Korea, but if we did the Russians would move in from the north and all of Korea would become communistic. This would be a serious threat to the democratic reforms we are attempting to establish in Japan.

If the United States and Russia were to agree to withdraw from Korea simultaneously the result would be the same. First, there would be civil war between north and south Korea in which the Communist-trained army of north Korea would have a decided advantage. Moreover, such a war eventually might involve the major powers.

So what we are trying to do is to plant the seeds of democracy in southern Korea so that they will grow and flourish, and to train Koreans in the administration of government.

We have established a provisional legislative assembly in southern Korea, consisting of 90 members, of which half were elected by the people and half appointed by General Hodge. Another assembly is to be chosen soon, with all the members to be elected. This will be done as soon as the election laws are revised to permit universal suffrage, replacing the system under which only the head man in each family casts a vote.

We have also appointed Korean administrators in every top government position, who work with the American authorities. Our policy is to train them, so that American military supervision can be withdrawn at the earliest possible moment.

It will be of interest to Ohioans that General Hodge's Korean adviser is Dr. Myo-Mook Lee, who was graduated from Mount Union College at Alliance in 1925 and who also attended Syracuse, Boston, and Harvard Universities.

We have also encouraged Koreans to organize political parties. There are more than 200 such parties. The chairman of the Social Democratic Party and president of Min Bo Sha, The Voice of the People, a newspaper published in Seoul, is Woon Hong Lyuh, who was graduated from the College of Wooster in 1918. Incidentally, he is a brother of Woon Hyung Lyuh, former organizer of a Communist-front party.

The future of Korea is far from clear. But this much is certain: Democracy's only toehold on the continent of Asia is in southern Korea. We cannot pull out and allow this oasis of democracy to be engulfed by communism without losing face throughout the Far East and imperiling the success of our efforts to democratize Japan and to establish profitable trade relations with the Orient.

Two Hundred and Seventy Billion Dollars Income by 1975?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, most of us realize that wars and depression are caused by greed, avarice, and lust for power. Cartels have dominated much of our international trade.

It is refreshing to learn that many firms realize that a "dog-eat-dog" philosophy of business must be fought, not by Government control and bureaucracy but by voluntary cooperation of the trade associations of the Nation.

I hope that this campaign takes hold of the imagination of those who must lead America in the future, because, after all, it is the idealism of the few which, throughout history, has lighted the way for the millions.

Just recently I received a letter from the Homestead Valve Manufacturing Co., of Coraopolis, Pa., in which F. E. Schuchman, the secretary-treasurer, had the following to say:

Attached is the first of a series of institutional advertisements which our company has seen fit to sponsor.

Our aim is so simple that its import may not be realized at first, but some consideration will reveal, we believe, that somewhere along the route between our boyhood days and man's estate we have mislaid an important ingredient to happy though spirited living. I am referring, of course, to teamwork in business.

Even in our most simple childhood games we played within a prescribed limit—a code—and so do we in the field of business, except that for some obscure reason we seem to shy away from setting down the code of business behavior so that all may be sure that they understand and act within the limits that will permit each of us to be always at our best in business relations.

The price paid for this blind spot is, of course, "booms and busts." With this conclusion you will, no doubt, agree, since it is not monopoly or any similar bugaboo but rather lack of economic balance that has been and is our source of weakness in business relations.

Following are the contents of the advertisement above mentioned:

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY BILLION DOLLARS INCOME BY 1975?

An economist of high standing has said, "My studies show that by 1975 our national income should be $270,000,000,000 if we behave ourselves economically speaking."

Our 140,000,000 people want high, steady, national income, naturally, since it means high, steady, individual income. But to get it we must learn how to behave ourselves economically speaking. Under the guidance of the men who have the know-how—the wisest men of business and experienced economists—we must learn how to exchange to everyone's advantage our goods, our labor, our services.

Therefore it is proposed that men chosen by recognized national groups meet and draw up a code for the guidance of consumers, employees, and employers.

This would not mean a planned economy. It would be simply a blueprint for mutual understanding and cooperation which, if followed, would lead us to the behavior that assures full, steady, profitable employment.

Team action is needed if a code is to be developed and used. We grant the use of all or any part of this advertisement without permission or acknowledgment.

AMERICA'S GREATEST NEED

A code for the fair exchange of goods and services, freely arrived at, freely used.

Urge your national business groups to join in this search for economic order. These groups include all Nation-wide associations of commerce, banking, manufacturing, labor, farming, and marketing.

The Late Maj. R. R. Wright, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. McGARVEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, today in Philadelphia the funeral of a distinguished citizen is being held. Maj. R. R. Wright, Sr., who started his life as a slave in Dalton, Ga., rose from this humble beginning to become a renowned educator and one of the foremost leaders of his people in the United States.

He was 94 when he died on July 2, and the span of life encompassed by those 94 years tells the story of a fine American and a distinguished gentleman. Major Wright was educated in the schools of Georgia and graduated from the University of Atlanta in 1876. He also attended Wilberforce University, the University of Chicago, Harvard University, and the University of Pennsylvania. He was the recipient of master of arts and doctor of laws degrees.

He was the principal of the first Negro high school in Georgia and for 30 years was the president of Georgia State College. His educational activities were interrupted by the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, in which his appointment as special paymaster with the rank of major was approved by the United States Senate.

In 1921, after 50 years of honorable service in the field of education, he came to Philadelphia and founded the Citizens & Southern Bank & Trust Co., which today is the largest Negro-owned and operated bank in the North. As head of the bank, he organized the National Association of Negro Banks, and served as its president for 16 years.

Major Wright was unflagging in his efforts to obtain the recognition due his people. It was through his efforts that a memorial stamp honoring the late Booker T. Washington was issued. He was the founder of National Freedom Day, which celebrates the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution. National Freedom Day is proclaimed annually in Philadelphia and Pennsylvania. It has yet to be recognized nationally, although a bill has been introduced in both the Senate and the House for this purpose. The ideals of National Freedom Day were very dear to the heart of Major Wright, and the formal recognition of this day would be an appropriate honor to an outstanding citizen who contributed so much to this race and to his country.

It was with overwhelming sorrow that I learned of the death of Major Wright. I am honored by the brief acquaintance that I had with him. His life story tells the true tale of America in its recounting. His early serfdom and his struggles against hardships, his eventual defeat of the obstacles which stood in his way and the prominent place which he occupied in national affairs and in the hearts of his people at the time of his death, are a tribute to the country which he loved so well. My heart goes out in sympathy to

the family of Major Wright as they mourn the passing of a fine man, a distinguished leader, and a truly great American.

The Federal Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, recently I took occasion to state my favorable attitude regarding several bills designed to improve the quality of the administration of justice through the operation of the jury system in the Federal courts.

Certainly nothing is more important than the proper functioning of our judiciary and, as an integral part of that branch of our Government, the jury system which has characterized Anglo-Saxon justice over the span of time.

In order to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate the sound reasons for the enactment of these bills, I respectfully call their attention to an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of yesterday, Sunday, July 6.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "For the Federal Courts."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR THE FEDERAL COURTS

Before it adjourns, Congress has several opportunities substantially to assist the better Federal administration of justice. One deals specifically with the southern district of New York, the other affects the entire country.

The local measure arises from the peculiar circumstance that when the late Judge John M. Woolsey retired that judicial office automatically terminated. At a time when the Federal courts in this district are more crowded than ever before there is thus one less judge to handle the work of the court. For example, the admiralty calendar is almost 2 years behind; in other branches conditions are almost as bad. The House has passed a bill authorizing the appointment of another judge for this district. The Senate should pass the bill and relieve the burden of the overworked judges who are carrying a bigger load than ever, and bigger than that of judges in other districts throughout the country. We urge the Senators from New York to exert every effort to obtain a favorable action on the bill to re-create this judicial position.

The other matter deals with the improvement of the Federal jury system. Our system of justice is built on the foundation stone of trial by jury. Few realize that great differences exist throughout the various United States districts as to who is eligible for and exempt from jury duty as well as in other equally important respects. Several years ago the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges of the United States appointed a committee of district judges, under the chairmanship of Judge Knox, the senior judge of the southern district of New York, to make an investigation of the operation of the jury system. They rendered a voluminous report which received the unanimous approval of the Judicial Council. Three bills to carry out the recommended improvements and establish uniformity were formulated and introduced into Congress.

Hearings have been held before appropriate congressional committees. The bills have the support of the attorney general, New York State, city and county bar associations, and many of our most distinguished and experienced Federal judges. Congress should enact these bills and help to strengthen and improve this bulwark of our democracy.

What of the Future of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "What of the Future of America?" delivered by me on July 5, 1947, as part of a national broadcast from Washington.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What shall be the future of the world's greatest Nation, born 171 years ago yesterday? This is a question with which the whole world is deeply concerned, for in the keeping of America, as world events have shaped themselves, is the destiny of the liberty-loving peoples of the earth.

FATE OF WORLD IN OUR HANDS

Whether we wish it or not, the fate of the world is in our hands. It is an unparalleled responsibility, and yet at the same time a great and glorious opportunity.

From my earliest infancy I have been taught that the land of America is a land choice above all other lands; that it was kept from the knowledge of the rest of the world for many centuries, to be revealed in God's own time for the establishment of a great Nation by inspired men—a Nation that would have the responsibilities and opportunities sometime in its history that are America's today.

GREAT NATIONS DESTROYED

There have been many powerful nations in the past, which had opportunities for enduring greatness, but one by one they have gone down to destruction because of moral decay. They forgot God and His commandments.

Yes, the America of today has possibilities of greatness yet undreamed of. She may be the savior of the liberties of mankind and lead nations into an era of peace and good will, or, she may, through the gigantic forces she, in her productive might has discovered and learned to use so destructively, send herself and other nations of the earth to the oblivion from which the nations of the past have never returned.

WHAT SHALL BE AMERICA'S DESTINY?

Whether America's rendezvous with destiny will be one of glory or destruction lies in her own hands.

To make it one of glory she must remember her beginning, her pilgrim fathers and others who came to this land that they might worship God and keep His commandments.

She has but to remember that at the founding of the Republic she adopted the great principle that "All men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

AMERICA'S GREATNESS DIVINE GIFT

She has but to remember that in the sacred document adopted 171 years ago the patriots under God, "Mutually pledged their sacred honor to maintain those principles of human liberty."

She has but to remember that her greatness and her power today came as gifts from God and because she tried to live as a Christian Nation even though she stumbled and faltered at times in her well doing.

In short, she has but to repent in sackcloth and ashes of her drunkenness, her licentiousness, her selfishness and hatreds and all those un-Christian vices that drag her down, and once more become active in spirit and in deed in living the Gospel of the Christ.

Having done this, she will, under God, keep her rendezvous with glory.

Of this I testify. Of this I am sure.

The Townsend Pension Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses:

ADDRESS WELCOMING THE DELEGATES AND VISITORS TO THE SEVENTH NATIONAL TOWNSEND CONVENTION, DELIVERED BY CONGRESSMAN GEORGE P. MILLER, SIXTH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, AT THE ULINE ARENA, WASHINGTON, D. C., ON JUNE 26, 1947

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Townsend, Captain Townsend, distinguished guests, delegates to the Seventh National Townsend Convention, ladies and gentlemen, it seems to me that it is eminently fitting that a California Congressman should have been selected to welcome Dr. Francis E. Townsend and his loyal followers to the District of Columbia, and the Capital of the United States—your Capital and mine.

We, of the Golden West, are very proud of the fact that this great pension movement originated in California. But, the Townsend movement no longer belongs to California—we have gladly given the good doctor to the United States of America. He has broken down State boundaries and bound the senior citizens of the many States together in a militant demand for justice for themselves—and for the liberation of abundance for the use of all, who render useful service in the common life of our democracy.

Out of the suffering of the great depression came this dynamic humanitarian crusade, and, because it is so truly American, and democratic, genuine Americans everywhere have responded, so that in the year 1947 it stands forth as the one great pension movement on a truly national scale.

A NATIONAL ORGANIZATION

There are, of course, isolated State movements, here and there, but the Townsend movement is the only organization with a Nation-wide strength sufficient to command the interest and attention of the Congress of the United States.

A UNIQUE CRUSADE

It appears too, fellow Americans, that the Townsend crusade is unique among the great peoples' movements of history.

For the first time in history, the old folks (senior citizens) are organized, militant, and demanding; demanding not only justice for

themselves, but also, the full use of our mass-production machinery for mass prosperity.

A UNIQUE CAREER

Again, the history of Dr. Francis E. Townsend is, itself, unique. I do not know of any other man leaping from obscurity to national fame at the age of 67, to continue in active leadership of an ever-growing Nation-wide organization, to a healthy 80.

A UNIQUE POLITICAL POWER

Never before have citizens from 45 to 80 years of age, become as a group, a potent political factor in the life of the Nation, holding the balance of power in many States and congressional districts.

A UNIQUE SURVIVAL

Ordinarily during a war period, organizations concentrating on domestic problems pass out of the picture. The Townsend crusade has not only held its own throughout World War II; it is today ready for a great expansion.

I therefore welcome you to Washington. You have every right to be here, as citizens of our great democracy. I know of no organization that comes more directly from the grass roots, speaking in the home-spun language of our farmers, our workers, our shopkeepers, and seeking in our own way to apply the principles of primitive Americanism to the problems and needs of this day in which we live.

Tomorrow we will welcome you on the steps of the National Capitol and in the offices of the congressional office buildings, and hope with you that enough Members of Congress will join with you and with your congressional steering committee to adopt H. R. 16, for we believe most sincerely that the adoption of the Townsend plan will make a very definite contribution toward warding off the threatened great depression, and revitalizing the American free-enterprise system.

May God guide your earnest deliberations.

RESPONSE BY H. N. FILES, FINANCIAL SECRETARY, NATIONAL TOWNSEND PLAN, TO THE ADDRESS OF WELCOME DELIVERED BY CONGRESSMAN GEORGE P. MILLER

Mr. Miller, Dr. Townsend, Robert Townsend, headquarter's, staff and delegates to this Seventh Townsend National Convention, sincerely thank you and the city of Washington for the hearty reception and the warmth of hospitality with which you have greetcd us. We shall remember and cherish all the days of our lives your graciousness and cordiality.

We represent the grass roots of the great cross section of America known as the common people, of whom the immortal Lincoln once said: "God must have loved the common people for he made so many of them."

We are profoundly interested in the Eightieth Congress giving us a hearing on Townsend plan legislation. H. R. 16 was introduced January 3, 1947, by Representative ANGELL, Republican, of Oregon, and is sponsored by 50 other Congressmen, both Democrats and Republicans.

A short time later, on March 10, 1947, J. HARDIN PETERSON, Florida Democrat, introduced H. R. 2476 an exact replica of H. R. 16 so we now have twin Townsend plan bills in the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, also introduced in the Senate S. 57, identical with the twin House bills.

We feel that this legislation should be made a fundamental part of the domestic policy of the United States. It is not partisan legislation, but is supported by Members of both parties in Congress.

In May 1937, the late Secretary of Commerce, Harry Hopkins, at that time Federal Works Administrator, delivered an address before a conference on unemployment and education. As reported by the Associated Press, Mr. Hopkins in referring to Dr. Townsend said "I don't care what you think of Townsend, but you have got to admit he did some job—he dramatized the situation of the aged."

Each and every one of us will take home happy memories of this occasion with a yearning desire to return again to the fair city of Washington.

Thank you.

Postal Rate on Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, it is obvious to every well-informed person that the most desirable method for the dissemination of information is the widespread use of books. No greater facility exists for the acquisition of knowledge than through books; and I submit that it would be a short-sighted policy on the part of our Government to restrict unnecessarily the use of books by our citizens.

A threat to the increased use of books is before us in the form of recommendations for substantial increases in postage rates. If these increases are made they will discourage the circulation and sale of books and will have an adverse effect upon the efforts of educators and librarians to improve the intellectual standards of our people.

A challenging statement on this all-important question has just been written by Mr. Marquis Childs, and appears in today's edition of the Washington Post. I request unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the article by Mr. Childs entitled "Postal Rate on Books."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING—POSTAL RATE ON BOOKS

(By Marquis Childs)

It's an old political axiom that the squeaky wheel gets the grease. That is to say, the pressure group making the biggest noise gets the biggest favors.

Likewise, the meek and the modest, who may some day inherit the earth, receive little attention from the powers that be in Congress. Looking for ways to economize, the Republicans are also scurrying about to find new and preferably painless methods of raising revenue.

One proposal now before Congress is to raise the postal rate on books. To those who deal in global sums and global crises, this will seem a mere flea bite on the body politic. It would bring in only two to three millions in additional money.

But small as this is, it can do a serious injustice with consequences far out of proportion. For many years, magazines have been given preferential treatment on the theory that they helped to educate the public.

This has meant, in effect, a generous subsidy to the magazine industry.

Books, however, have never received such preferential treatment, although they have not fully paid their way in the postal system. Now, Chairman EDWARD H. REES, of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee proposes to increase the rate from 4 cents to 8 cents on the pound, and from 3 to 4 cents for each additional pound.

If you can make a case for magazines spreading light and learning, you can make an even better case for books on the same score. In fact, in the field of book publishing today there is a wider range of expression and a more free play of ideas than anywhere else. Books coming off the press these days radiate ideas.

In the nonfiction field they are a vital source of information, contributing to an understanding of the complicated world in which we are trying to find a peaceful way. Take that whale of a book, Inside U. S. A., by John Gunther, which must weigh at least 5 pounds. It is a remarkable synthesis of knowledge about this broad land and the strange and wonderful things that happen in it.

At the height of the controversy over the Truman program for Greece and Turkey, there appeared a book called The Greek Dilemma, by William McNeill, based on exhaustive first-hand knowledge. It is useful not merely to the ordinary reader, but for Americans going on the mission to Greece it is a valuable handbook.

Prof. Arnold Toynbee's recently published A Study of History gives us the rise and fall of empires through the centuries. We see in the perspective of this sweep what our own role is likely to be at the present moment of history. Anyone who reads Carlo Levi's Christ Stopped at Eboli will have a better understanding of the politics of desperation in Italy.

The list of current examples could be extended almost indefinitely, and there is a long and impressive record out of the past of books that have cut through the dark of ignorance and superstition. In the continuing struggle for freedom, they are powerful weapons.

While there are large publishing firms and the book clubs are in a sense big business, the opportunity for the newcomer seems greater in this field than in almost any other. Several new firms have come into being since the war ended.

On the retail side, too, the book business is one of the few in which the individual can make a start with a modest investment. A recent development is the 25-cent pocket book, distributed in large numbers. Pocket books include not merely thrillers, but fiction and nonfiction titles representing the best in literature.

Undoubtedly, the postal rates need a thorough overhauling. Like our archaic tax structure, they have "just growed." Some interests are favored, others are penalized. A careful study is needed to make sense out of the tangle.

But meanwhile it is unfair to put a further penalty on the publishing business least capable of defending itself. Books, however they may sometimes be debased in the quest for mass readership, are part of the honorable record of man's long struggle up from the primeval ooze.

Alcohol Tax Unit in First District of New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I have received together with a statement of facts pertaining to duties and accomplish-

ments of the alcohol tax unit in the first district of New England:

BOSTON, MASS., *July 3, 1947.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For your information, there is enclosed a statement of facts pertaining to duties and accomplishments of the Alcohol Tax Unit in the first district of New England with regard to law enforcement, crime prevention, taxes collected, and evasions prevented, in addition to the regular duties of the Unit in enforcing the internal-revenue laws with respect to distilled spirits, wine, and malt beverages.

You, as a Representative of New England, are known to be interested in any program which tends to benefit the civic and economic welfare of its citizens; therefore, in conjunction with the enclosed statement of facts, it might well be pointed out that, under the reduction in force which has come into effect, the Alcohol Tax Unit in the first district will be seriously undermanned, with the probability that a great deal of the progress which has been made in control of crime and tax frauds will be nullified.

The first district has been undermanned for some time, due to the fact that replacement of personnel has not been made to cover deaths, separations, and retirements within the Unit. The reduction in force, which has just been put into effect, takes a further cut of 10 trained investigators who have had an individual minimum of 12½ years' service in the Unit under civil service and efficiency ratings of very good and excellent. In the year 1936 there were 79 investigators of the Alcohol Tax Unit in the first district; in June 1947 there were 38 investigators in the first district, and these 38 have been reduced to 28 as of July 15, 1947.

This communication and enclosed facts are presented for your consideration and any action you may deem advisable to take for the protection of the revenue of the United States and the prevention of crime and tax frauds in the first district.

The cost in salaries to retain these 10 trained investigators for a year is just under $42,000 which includes six step rate increases due, with a far greater potential return to the Government through the actual taxes collected by the prevention and uncovering of crimes and frauds, which will not be uncovered by the reduced force.

The Greater Boston area, under this reduction, will be policed by seven investigators, one of whom is permanently assigned to the raw-materials program, two of whom are assigned to the program necessitated by the National Firearms Act; leaving but four men for the prevention and detection of bootlegging and other duties imposed by law and regulations upon the alcohol-tax unit. Other metropolitan areas of New England will be manned in a similar manner.

Very truly yours,

A COMMITTEE FOR FAIR PLAY,
By RAYMOND E. SOLKA.
FRED W. WICKENS.
JOHN J. COLLINS.
LYMAN G. JUDD.
WILLIAM A. O'DEA.

The enclosed statistical report does not reflect all of the duties imposed upon Alcohol Tax Unit investigation personnel by Executive order and the statutes. The following is a concise report of the accomplishments of the investigators of New England in the above duties.

FLOOR STOCKS TAX, 1942 AND 1943

The plan of operation for the investigation of floor stocks tax cases originated in the New England district and was accepted for the entire country. Investigations in New England resulted in the additional collection of taxes, penalties, and interest in the amount of $300,000, and the seizure of distilled spirits valued at $300,000, which liquor was eventually returned to the individuals from whom it was seized by the Department of Justice upon the payment of a compromise to settle criminal and civil liabilities. The exact amount of these compromises is unknown to this unit, but it is a very substantial amount.

BLACK-MARKET LIQUORS

Investigations of the black-market activities resulted in the preparation of 29 reports, of which 24 cases were submitted to the district attorney for prosecution, containing recommendations for action against 100 individuals. Seventeen of these individuals were indicted and 58 informations were filed; 30 individuals were convicted, 4 liquor permits were revoked, and treble-damage actions resulted in the collection of $36,000.

The ramifications of the black market in liquor make it impossible for the above figures to reflect all of the investigations made by the investigative personnel in New England for other sections of the country. However, as a result of one of these investigations, a man was sentenced to serve 6 years out of a total sentence of 48 years and sentenced to pay fines totaling $480,000 and to pay $2,750,000 in taxes and penalties. The value of the investigations made for other districts cannot be fully determined, but the above-cited case is only one of numerous large violations uncovered and prosecuted.

TIE-IN SALES PROGRAM

This program was initiated as a result of protests by consumers that they were being compelled to purchase other types of distilled spirits, including poor grade rums and gins, in order to obtain scotch and rye of popular label. Investigations to the number of 4,000 were made and 2,200 statements were obtained from retail liquor dealers involving 64 wholesalers in tie-in sales to the retailors. This Department issued citations against the 64 wholesalers involved and these wholesalers entered into stipulations with this Department that this practice would be discontinued. The results of these investigations and stipulations were of great value to the general public and the liquor trade.

ATU-SRA PROGRAM

This Unit has controlled sugar since 1934 under its Raw Materials Program. At the start of the war, sugar rationing was inaugurated and the enforcement was turned over to the SRA. While this Unit no longer maintained the full control to which the trade was accustomed, it did assist the OPA by making 434 investigations and reporting 207 violations, all of which were of a major nature, to the OPA for their consideration and disposition. Complete figures as to the results of the findings of the OPA are not available. However, it is known that many of the dealers involved were suspended and others prosecuted.

The above results were accomplished without the surrender of the complete raw materials program of this Unit, which is still maintained as an integral part of its activities.

NATIONAL AND FEDERAL FIREARMS ACTS

Investigative personnel attached to the New England district of the Alcohol Tax Unit, as a result of the large importation of war trophies, carried on a program of education in order that all persons who have such trophies in their possession would comply with the statute.

This program was carried out by personnel making 1,740 public relations contacts with banks, public-utilities companies, and radio stations. These contacts resulted in the obtaining of a tremendous amount of free advertising for this program. Under this program, 3,337 investigations were made, which resulted in the registration of 422 trophies, of which 418 were rendered inoperative, 12 cases being reported to the district attorney's office, and 11 guns being returned to the armed forces. Six persons were arrested, and five were convicted, in addition to the seizure of two boats valued at $3,600.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT ACCIDENT CASES

Recently this unit was assigned the duty of investigating all types of accident cases involving any of the Treasury Department personnel in which suits might be filed against the Government under the Tort Claims Act. To date, nine such cases have been investigated, and no suits have been instituted against the United States or the Treasury personnel. The activities of this Department have undoubtedly resulted in a great saving to the Government.

OTHER INFORMATION

During the war as many as 11 investigators attached to this office were assigned to the Intelligence Unit of the Treasury Department for the purpose of making personnel investigations of war-service employees, for periods varying from 6 months to over 5 years; during the same time personnel was assigned to assist the Narcotic Bureau, these assignments covering 5 weeks to 3 months. In addition, three men were loaned for a period of 60 days to the Intelligence Unit, on several number-pool cases, the latter involving income-tax frauds.

In 1936, 90 investigative employees were assigned to New England, and this number was reduced until, in 1945, 1946, only 47 regular and 3 war-service employees were assigned. The reduction in force covers 10 regular and 3 war-service employees; only 1 of the war-service employees has veteran status. This reduction will leave only 37 regular employees to cover a district which cannot be adequately policed with such a small personnel to perform the many duties which this Department must perform and which it has so capably performed during the past few years with an undermanned force of 50.

One of the most unfair phases of this particular reduction in force in this old-line agency in New England is the fact that in several other districts throughout the country there are at the present time being retained in service, men holding war-service appointments or permanent appointees having fewer retention points than the career men who are being separated in the New England district.

Although the statutes requires that the workweek of all Federal employees shall consist of 40 hours of labor with all work over 40 hours performed in 1 week to be paid for at overtime rates, the investigative personnel of the Alcohol Tax Unit have performed duties far in excess of the weekly 40 hours, for which they draw their salaries without any of them ever having received 1 cent as overtime pay as required by said statute. If such overtime were paid, it would be impossible for any supervisory official to remain within his assigned budget and operate efficiently.

The following investigators have been affected by this reduction in force:

Name	Service		
	Years	Months	Days
Joseph Irzyk, New Hampshire	13	3	14
Fred. W. Wickens, Massachusetts	15	2	3
Lyman G. Judd, Massachusetts	13	1	15
Raymond E. Salka, Connecticut	14	8	9
John Redway, Connecticut	12	7	4
John J. Collins, New Hampshire	13	7	6
Michail J. Daly, Massachusetts	13	5	0
William O'Dea, Rhode Island	13	4	7
William Gouin, New Hampshire	13	1	5
Daniel T. Rourke, Connecticut	13	1	3
James J. Davern, Massachusetts	(1)	(1)	(1)
Joseph Rosenberg, Massachusetts	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] War service.

A Good Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Good Formula," published in the July 1, 1947, issue of the Newark Star-Ledger.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GOOD FORMULA

"Do not expect something for nothing. Do not expect to start where your parents are now. Hold on to some fundamental convictions by which to steer your lives. Hold before yourselves the modern trinity of faith, courage, and grit. Have a magnificent obsession. Be quick to give encouragement. And believe that the law of life is give and live."

That was the advice Dr. Frank Glenn Lankard of Drew University gave graduates of Upsala College. We especially like that part about not expecting to start where one's parents are now. It is not only good counsel to the graduates, but good advice also to overindulgent parents anxious to start their sons off in life with a vice presidency.

Who Is Responsible for the High Cost of Living, the Housing Shortage, and the Weakening of Rent Control?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which I delivered over radio station WMAQ at Chicago, Ill., on Sunday, July 6, 1947:

ANNOUNCER. Here is Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH, of the Fifth Congressional District of Illinois, dean of the Congress, who has been asked to give his views on legislation considered by the Congress during the past week. I take pleasure in introducing Congressman SABATH.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Announcer and radio listeners, the high cost of living, the housing shortage, and rent control are closely related. I shall try to explain briefly why the repeal of OPA and the failure of Congress to enact needed legislation are responsible for the continuous increases in the high cost of living.

The most recent betrayal of the American people by this Congress is the misnamed rent-control bill which will still further increase the cost of living. I deplore its passage as much as the President deplored the compulsion under which he signed the bill into law.

Let me quote just a few sentences from the President's message on the Rent Control Act. He said:

"I have today signed the Housing and Rent Act despite the fact that its rent-control provisions are plainly inadequate and its housing provisions actually repeal parts of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act which have been most helpful in meeting the housing needs of veterans.

"Had I withheld my signature, national rent control would die tonight. It is clear that, insofar as the Congress is concerned, it is this bill or no rent control at all. I have chosen the lesser of two evils.

"We are still suffering from a critical housing shortage. Many families are desperately seeking homes. In their desperation, they would have to submit to demands for exhorbitant rent.

* * * * *

"It is evident that the present high cost of living should not be increased further by an increase in rents. We must get prices down, not devise means of getting the price up."

The President continued by pointing out that the new bill removes the remaining controls on materials, and that as a result construction of homes will be delayed and additional costs may even be added.

Rent control is continued to March 31, 1948; but there is a provision that landlords and tenants may enter into what the bill calls voluntary agreements for a 15-percent increase.

I opposed this bill because it will not do what it pretends to do. I was especially opposed to this 15-percent increase provision because I felt that landlords will, in most instances, take advantage of tenants and force them to agree to the increase so they would have a roof over their heads for at least 18 months and thereby, as I stated, increase their already high cost of living.

I realized that the small property owners needed some relief and, consequently, I have favored the provision in the original law that would permit them, in hardship cases, to obtain an increase in their rents in order for them to make both ends meet. Actually, to date, over a million of the small property owners have obtained an increase in rentals.

The pressure for the removal of rent control did not come from the small owners but came from the vicious lobby financed by the landlords of the large apartment buildings which they bought in foreclosure actions during the depression at 12 cents, 15 cents and 20 cents on the dollar.

Just a year ago, with support from some reactionary Democrats, the Republicans sent a price-control bill to the President, which he promptly vetoed. They responded by passing a still worse bill, which he had to accept to have any price control, just as he had to accept this rent-control bill.

You remember all those pledges and assurances from big business and from the Republicans that ending price control would not bring any increase in the cost of living—in fact, they claimed it would reduce prices.

You know those promises have not been kept and you know what has happened.

Food costs have doubled in the last 9 months.

Almost every cost-of-living item has gone up sharply.

I introduced House Resolution 133 more than 3 months ago, calling for a thorough investigation of the high cost of meat, butter, eggs, cheese, milk, and other items, and to fix the blame where it belongs. I introduced the resolution in the hope of bringing about a reduction in the outrageously high prices, but, unfortunately, have been unable to force the Republicans to act.

You remember that the people were unable to obtain any meats, even at high prices, the reason being that last fall the packers struck against the American people. They refused to slaughter and refused to ship meat from their warehouses until the controls on the prices of meats were removed, while they ran full-page ads telling the American housewife that without price control there would be plenty of meat at little or no added cost, and that the black market would be abolished.

The black market was abolished, all right, because legal prices soon became even higher than black-market prices.

Only last week meats jumped again 10 to 20 cents a pound. The packers have tried to justify these increases by feeding the people with more untruths—yes; with falsehoods—but not with good meats at reasonable prices.

For the last few years the Congress has been subjected to the greatest pressure from industrial and business lobbies in the history of our country demanding higher and higher prices and to kill OPA and rent control.

Of the many vicious lobbies, one that stands out is the real-estate operators and building-construction lobby.

Time after time I have assailed this selfish group, and in his veto message on the rent control bill the President also lashed out at them.

The big landlords, the speculators, the builders, manufacturers, and the materials dealers, under the leadership of the National Association of Manufacturers, fought every control of prices and of materials. They have hampered every effort of our Government to build homes for our returning servicemen.

They hobbled the veterans' emergency housing program, and eventually caused it to bog down. They blocked enactment of the Wagner housing bill in the last Congress and have prevented it from obtaining even adequate committee hearings in this Congress. That bill, if it had been law, would have aided in the construction of thousands of new homes at reasonable prices.

These lobbyists who have infested Washington for many years past have won a great victory, but at what cost to our servicemen and the consuming public.

It is regrettable that the Republican majority in Congress has permitted itself to be the willing tool of these conscienceless profiteers. Oh, I concede that some reactionary Democrats cooperated with them, but the Republicans unfortunately have sufficient votes in this Congress to put over this special-privilege legislation. It is aid to the already wealthy at the expense and to the detriment of the wage earners, yes, to the people of low income and to the public in general.

I am not opposed to industries and corporations making profits; in fact, I favor their making fair profits. But when 228 corporations and combines who continuously clamor for free enterprise increase their earnings by 305 percent in the last 3 months, as shown by official reports, it borders on plain robbery.

Under the pretext of reducing taxes, the Republicans passed a tax bill which, they said, would cut taxes 30 percent. The President properly vetoed the bill, and I voted to sustain the President. This Wall Street financiers' tax bill would have reduced the taxes of the man earning $2,500 a year by 56 cents a week, while the man with an income of $250,000 would save $1,118 a week, or $58,175 a year.

This was in addition to the $6,000,000,000 tax gift given to big companies and profiteers and racketeers last year when the excess-profits tax was repealed.

As the crowning injury, the Republicans have passed the Hartley-Taft antilabor bill, which destroys most of the union progress of the last 100 years and even forbids union workers to criticize the Congress.

The Republican Party controls both Houses of Congress, and they cannot evade responsibility, no matter how hard they try, for all this legislation against the best interests of the people, which I fear may affect our present high employment and prosperity.

The Republicans gained control of both Houses of Congress on the false promises they made in the last election campaign that with the repeal of OPA and other price controls the shortages of meats and other foods would be removed and that prices would be

lowered. Unfortunately, the people were hoodwinked and misled by these false representations and statements. But they know now who is responsible for the ever-increasing rise in prices and, while they regret what happened in the last election, I am satisfied they cannot and will not be fooled again.

Europe's Testing Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a sane and constructive article, entitled "Europe's Testing Time," appeared in the Washington Post for last Saturday, from the pen of the able and informed Barnet Nover. In the article he points out that the conference called by Great Britain and France for July 12 to consider the Marshall program, may well be one of the most fateful in the history of Europe.

There is much reason to believe that the proposal of the Secretary of State of a program of self-help for Europe, with the cooperation of the United States, may be the key that will finally open the door to world peace. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Nover's article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHOOSING SIDES—EUROPE'S TESTING TIME
(By Barnet Nover)

The most fateful plebiscite Europe has ever witnessed is now under way.

This time it is not peoples but governments that are being polled. The question is whether or not to take part in the conference which Great Britain and France have called to meet on July 12.

At that conference—the meeting place, significantly, is Paris, where Russia scornfully rejected the Marshall proposal—plans are to be drawn up for carrying out the program of European mutual aid and cooperative reconstruction with the assistance of the United States.

There would not be the slightest doubt as to the outcome of the plebiscite were the peoples of Europe allowed a truly free, uninhibited choice.

The overwhelming majority of them, those living in the Soviet sphere of influence as well as those living west of the iron curtain, would enthusiastically support the Marshall program as developed by Great Britain and France.

They live in a battered, broken, and bleeding continent. They are desperately eager to get back on their feet. They want something more than an existence on the barest subsistence level.

It was because of such feelings that Russia found it necessary to participate in the Paris conference. To that extent, at least, she responded to the demands of her satellites, particularly Poland and Czechoslovakia.

It is now abundantly clear, what was fairly evident at the time of Russia's acceptance of the Anglo-French bid, that the Soviet Government did not have the slightest intention of helping to carry out the Marshall program.

Instead, Molotov tried to twist that program into a mockery of itself. He got nowhere. Then, as a last resort, he resorted to threats. Great Britain and France were warned of the evil consequences of following their intended course.

Such tactics were aimed to drive a wedge between Great Britain, which has no Communist movement to speak of, and is not subject to fifth column pressures, and France, which has a powerful Communist movement capable of doing great injury to that nation's domestic peace.

Molotov must have known better than to believe that he would get away with such threats. But he was under strict instructions from the Politburo to make no concessions to European unity. The result has been the most serious defeat suffered by Soviet diplomacy in a long time.

No sooner was the three-power conference over, than Great Britain and France sent out invitations to 22 nations to join them at Paris on the 12th.

We can take it for granted that not all of the 22 will accept.

In view of Russia's bitter opposition to the Marshall program, such Russian satellites as Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Hungary, and Yugoslavia can be counted on to refuse the invitation. Poland and Czechoslovakia, eager to join in the benefits of the Marshall program though they are, will be governed by Moscow's decision.

They and other satellite states may get a dispensation from the Kremlin to take part in the Paris parley. That remains to be seen.

On the other hand, there is every reason to believe that the countries of western Europe, including Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, will attend the Paris meeting.

In deciding whether to respond favorably or unfavorably to the Anglo-French invitation, every nation will also be deciding to which camp it belongs.

Russia's action at Paris transformed into a grim reality what many have hitherto regarded as merely a temporary phase of the postwar situation in Europe, namely, the division of Europe into opposing blocs.

The responsibility for that development rests entirely on Russia herself.

At Paris she had the chance to reverse the evil trend that she herself had set into motion when her armies swept into eastern Europe. She did not do so.

Molotov's complaint that in going ahead with the Marshall program Great Britain and France are dividing the Continent comes with particularly poor grace from him.

His tactics are the tactics of a burglar who, caught red-handed with stolen goods, turns on his accuser and shouts, "Stop, thief!"

The fraud is too transparent.

Modernize Our Presidential Election—I. A Comparison of the Present and Proposed Methods of Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 30, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the greatest demonstration of popular government in our time is when 50,000,000 American citizens, untrammeled, with freedom of thought and action, go to the polls and determine who shall be the next President of the United States.

No patriotic citizen will question the contention that an election, which in such an important way registers the will of the people of our country, should be conducted under rules which will definitely result in the election of one of the candidates; that all votes will be counted as cast; and counted by a method that under all circumstances will accurately and justly reflect the will of the American people.

We do not now have such a system. Ever since 1824, when a deadlock threw the election into the House of Representatives, all students of Government have recognized that our system of electing the President has serious defects, some of which are glaring. At best it clearly fails to meet even these elementary requirements of a proper method of electing the President. Under all circumstances it is inherently incapable of accurately reflecting the will of the American people.

About 200 years ago Blackstone, the great pioneer exponent of our system of Anglo-Saxon law, set forth the simple basic formula for the consideration of every legislative problem. In substance, he said, "There are three fundamental questions as to every proposed problem of legislation. The first is, "What is the present law?" The second, "What are the defects or evils of that law?" The third question is, "What is the remedy?"

I am going to attempt to present to you, as I see it, the background of our system of electing the President, its defects and evils that may accompany its operation, and then the remedy as proposed in House Joint Resolution 124, introduced by me and similar resolutions introduced by Mr. GOSSETT, of Texas; Mr. CELLER, of New York; Mr. KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; and Mr. GEARHART, of California.

Nearly 20 years ago I introduced a resolution like those now under consideration. Twice a committee of this House favorably reported such a resolution without dissenting votes. The years that have since passed have increased my conviction of the need of the amendment of the Constitution as proposed in these resolutions.

It is my conviction that the defects and evils of the present system which we propose to remove, serve no useful purpose. Their elimination would be all for the good side of the ledger.

Our constitutional system of electing a President was designed under a clear misconception that we were to have an independent, nonpartisan government; that a small group of electors, an intermediate agency, rather than the people themselves, should select the President.

That was a theory discarded by practical experience within 12 years after the adoption of the Constitution. For 147 years, restricted by inappropriate provisions of the Constitution intended for what has long been a discarded theory of our Government, we have failed to remove the most obvious of those defects. We have failed to modernize and adopt our way of electing a President to the needs of our time.

Now I want to epitomize the substantial factors of the present system of electing the President; summarize the proposals we advocate; and later I hope in more detail to contrast the antiquated

system by which we now elect a President with the modernized method we propose.

MAIN FEATURES OF PRESENT SYSTEM

The main factors for consideration in our present system of electing the President are as follows:

First. With limited exceptions, each State fixes the qualifications of its own voters; in other words, each State determines who of its own citizens may vote for Federal officers.

Second. Under the Constitution, each State is given a definite assurance as to the extent of its right to participate in the operations of the Federal Government and in the election of its President. This assurance not only secures the individual State its rights, but protects it by provisions defining the rights of every State.

Each State has the right to participate in the proceedings of Congress by assuring it two Senators and a number of Representatives in the House of Representatives in proportion to its population.

Each State has two electoral votes corresponding to the number of its Senators; and electoral votes corresponding to the number of its Representatives in the House.

Third. The President is elected by the votes of the Presidential electors, and not by the popular votes of the people. The electoral votes of the State can be cast only by Presidential electors. Those electors are chosen for that purpose by each State in such manner as the legislature thereof determines.

In practice, these electors in each State are now chosen by a plurality vote of its voters at the general election in November.

Fourth. In computing the electoral votes to determine who is elected, no credit is given for popular votes cast for any elector who received less than a plurality of the popular vote in the State election.

Thus, all minority votes cast in a State election for President are disregarded in computing the final result. The plurality candidate receives the total electoral vote of each State, notwithstanding the fact that a majority of its voters may have voted for two or more other candidates. This is known as the unit voting system.

The unit voting plan was introduced into our system of electing the President several years after our Government was established. That was done by and for the purpose of entrenching the power of the dominant political organization in each State by giving it control of the whole vote of the States; and for the avowed purpose of preventing minority candidates from getting any credit for the popular votes cast in their favor.

The Constitution fails to give any assurance to minority voters within the State that their votes will even be counted for the candidate for whom they were cast.

The electoral votes of the State, represented by the minority voters, are in fact not only not counted as cast, but, in the ultimate result, are computed as if cast the exact opposite of the way voted.

Of all the millions of votes for minority candidates within the last hundred years, not one has ever been counted in computing the aggregate vote of the Nation, which determines who is elected.

Fifth. A majority vote of all the electors appointed by all the States is necessary to elect a President.

Sixth. If no candidate secures a majority vote of the presidential electors, the election is thrown into the House of Representatives, where the election is limited to one of the three highest candidates unless one of them has died in the meantime.

A MAJORITY IS NECESSARY TO ELECT

In such an election each State has but one vote, which is cast by the majority vote of its Representatives voting. That means a total of 48 votes; 25 necessary to elect if all States vote. If there is a tie vote among the Representatives of a State, then no candidate receives its vote. Each State is equal to every other State in such an election. The smallest State is the equal of the greatest State.

Seventh. If the House fails to elect, then a vacancy exists when the new term begins, which, under the twentieth amendment, is to be filled in such manner as Congress shall provide.

Eighth. In case a vice-presidential candidate is not elected in the electoral college, then the Senate, by a majority vote, may select. In case there is no such election in the Senate and the President dies, the vacancy would be filled in such manner as Congress provides.

MAIN FEATURES OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Substantial factors for consideration under the system of electing the President we propose are as follows:

First. It leaves with the State the right to decide who of its citizens shall be its voters, as under the existing law.

Second. It leaves in the Constitution as at present, the assurance to each State of its relative right to participate in the Federal Government through representation in Congress and in the election of the President.

Third. The State is awarded electoral votes in the same number and on the same basis as at present.

Fourth. Presidential electors would be done away with. There would be no Presidential electors. The people would vote directly for the candidates for President.

Fifth. Each candidate would receive exactly the same proportion of the electoral votes of the State as he received of its popular vote. In this way the State electoral votes would be divided between the candidates according to their popular votes. There would be no unit State vote as now; unless one candidate received the whole popular vote of the State.

Sixth. In the ultimate computation of the aggregate votes of the Nation to determine who was elected President, every candidate would be credited with the electoral votes he received in each and all of the States.

The plurality candidate, instead of being credited with the whole electoral vote of the State as at present, would receive only such proportion of its electoral vote as he received of its popular vote.

The unit vote under which a plurality candidate receives the whole vote of the State would be abolished. Each candidate would receive his proper share of the votes given him in all the States where he was a candidate.

Seventh. The candidate receiving the highest aggregate number of electoral votes would be elected.

Eighth. Under the method of computing the final result proposed in these resolutions, there can be no deadlock in elections. Therefore, under this amendment there would be no necessity of an election in the House of Representatives. In this way we would remove the possibility of an election in the House of Representatives in which each State, regardless of population, would be the equal of every other State in electing a President.

Ninth. The Vice President would be elected in the same manner as the President.

The Present Liquor Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Present Liquor Situation," by Mrs. D. Leigh Colvin, president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the July 8, 1947, issue of Signs of the Times]

THE PRESENT LIQUOR SITUATION

(By Mrs. D. Leigh Colvin, president, National Woman's Christian Temperance Union)

A man who was, until recently, in the brewery business strikingly describes how much of a curse alcohol is in America today:

"The cocktail lounges of today are far worse than the old-time man's saloon. * * * From the pretentious to the dives they are purposely named cocktail lounges and cold-bloodedly designed with soft stools at bars, upholstered booths, subdued lighting to encourage lounging and thereby excessive drinking and flagrant familiarities getting worse all the time to the extent of well-known seduction as evidenced by the employment of dapper young bartenders, which even the old saloons did not have, with blatant, raucous so-called entertainment blasting out into the streets, an evident decoy to youth and women."

"In fact," he says, "they are actually seduction parlors far worse than the old red-light districts because so widespread and in residential sections.

"Women would not go into old-time saloons but are enticed by the chromium and leather-trimmed chairs and tables, the soft lights, the music, and the seeming respectability of the cocktail lounge."

The consumption of liquor under prohibition was but a small fraction of what it was before, and because of the inaccessibility of liquor many millions lost their drinking

habits. Even during the first year of repeal and notwithstanding the tremendous advertising and hullabaloo over liquor, the per capita consumption was only about half what it had been in the preprohibition wet period.

Since repeal there has been a steady rise in liquor consumption, which increased from 10.53 gallons in 1934 to 20.25 gallons per capita in 1945.

During the war years the consumption went up from 15.47 gallons in 1941 to 20.25 gallons in 1945, an increase in the four war years of 4.78 gallons for every man, woman, and child in America.

SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES

The increase in the number of crimes committed by young people is a matter of serious concern. The average age of criminals is being lowered.

Boys and girls of high-school age are learning to drink and frequent drinking places, where morals are impaired and the criminal and dissolute congregate. Young girls as well as young men are being brought into our courts.

Miss Jessie Binford, reporting for the Chicago Juvenile Protective Association, lists seven challenging situations which adults must face if the youngsters of today are to be given a chance to grow normally. "Alcohol is a major item on the list. This problem," says Miss Binford, "in its economic, social, and personal aspects stands out as one of the greatest we face today in relation to children and youth. There is today an alarming increase in the drinking of young people."

In a large proportion of the major crimes reported within the past few months, alcohol has been a contributing factor. The 17-year-old, self-confessed kidnaper and triple murderer in Chicago had been drinking before the crimes were committed.

The Chicago Daily News, during the last week of May 1946, carried a series of articles based on an extensive survey by that paper of the reasons for the boom in the number of divorces. There is one divorce for every three marriages in Cook County, Ill. Sociologists estimate that by 1965 more than half of all marriages will end in divorce.

In the list of ten reasons for divorce as shown in the Daily News survey, alcoholism was placed second on the list. One judge said that of three hundred divorces granted in his court, 72 percent of the causes of marital difficulties were directly or indirectly attributable to liquor.

Another Cook County judge said that 78 percent of the divorce cases in his court resulted from alcohol.

ALCOHOLISM

Alcoholism, which has assumed gigantic proportions in the last few years, has multiplied so fast since repeal that Assistant Surgeon General Kolb of the United States Public Health Service has called it a "very serious health problem" and "fourth in the list of conditions that bring people to the hospital for mental diseases."

Dr. Winfred Overholser of St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D. C., writes: "With tuberculosis, cancer, syphilis, mental disease, and infantile paralysis receiving competent and intelligent medical attention, we now have alcoholism as the greatest public-health problem of the present time which is not being systematically attacked."

No other disease so disrupts the family life, brings discord into family relationships, causes neglect, poverty, and unhealthy living conditions, is such a drain upon the country through inefficiency in industry, causes accidents upon the highway, is such a drain upon the taxpayer for care of the drinker's family, or causes loss of profits on the part of legitimate trade. No other disease costs the sufferer, his family, or the public so much as alcoholism, and yet we continue to legalize a traffic, the net result of which costs so much in human, social, and financial values.

Even recognizing that personality make-up and psychological factors play a part in the effect of alcohol upon the individual, we also know that without alcohol that individual could live an ordinary safe, healthful, and useful life.

In dealing with the cure and prevention of disease, the most scientific approach from the standpoint of public health is prevention.

In attacking the problem of alcoholism, we have a known factor—alcohol. We also know that it is not an infection, or germ disease, that can be transmitted from one person to another. We know, moreover, that with no alcohol there is no alcoholism, and that the only means of arresting the disease is to stop absolutely the use of any beverage alcohol. It is also known and acknowledged that anyone having become an alcoholic can never safely taste any amount of alcohol again without the possibility of a return of the disease.

Trying to cure the alcoholic without trying to prevent the recruiting of new drinkers is like trying to cure a few typhoid cases but leaving the polluted well or typhoid carriers free to spread the disease.

AWAKENING SENTIMENT

There are signs of an awakening upon the part of the churches to their responsibility in dealing with the traffic in intoxicating liquors. The bishops of the Methodist Church, with a constituency of 8,000,000 people, issued a ringing call to prayer on June 2, 1946, and it was "to be an initial step in an intensive program of education and commitment to be carried on in the months ahead." This call read:

"The Council o. Bishops of the Methodist Church, in session at Atlantic City, N. J., on February 22, 1946, after serious consideration of the state of the church and the Nation, has been led to set apart June 2, 1946, the Sunday before Pentecost, as a day of prayer to Almighty God for the curtailment of alcohol-beverage traffic in America. We call upon our ministers and officials of our 40,000 churches—and upon others who will join us—to give prayerful consideration upon this June Sunday to this present-day menace. We seek divine guidance for ourselves and for the moral and political leaders of America in saving this Nation from moral and spiritual degeneration."

In spite of all the efforts of the public relations and advertising departments of those engaged in manufacturing and selling alcoholic liquors, numerous local option elections in States where such elections are permissible show a decided increase in prohibition sentiment. Three-fourths of 15,000 local option elections since repeal have resulted in dry victories.

One-fifth of the population of the United States now lives in areas that are dry, or that outlaw hard liquor. More than 20,000,000 people are members of organizations committed to national prohibition, a ban on alcoholic beverages by local option, or to total abstinence.

Recent Gallup polls show that one-third of the country's voters would, at the present time, vote for the return of national prohibition if given the opportunity.

The WCTU Research Bureau shows that there are more than 4,200 bone-dry areas in 29 States, including counties, cities, towns, townships, wards, and precincts.

In addition, three States and 1,560 lesser areas ban hard liquor. Attempts to repeal dry laws were defeated in 2,200 local option elections. In dripping wet Chicago there are 133 dry precincts, while the suburban cities of Evanston, Oak Park, and Zion City are totally dry.

In the repeal election of 1933, only 14,000,000 people voted for repeal out of a possible 60,000,000 voters. However, only twenty million even went to the polls to vote. Of these, fourteen million voted for repeal after the most stupendous wet repeal campaign backed by immense sums of money and with the aid and connivance of the political machines in the Republican, Democratic, and Socialist Parties.

A recent Gallup poll indicates that many more people now favor national prohibition and are willing to vote for it again than voted against the the eighteenth amendment when it was repealed, this notwithstanding the tremendous wet propaganda and the absence of any great campaign waged by the moral forces to influence public opinion.

The 33 percent of the total voters today who would vote for national prohibition totals more than 25,000,000 votes, as compared with 14,000,000 votes cast for repeal 13 years ago. Repeal was put across by the votes of only 24 percent of the qualified voters of the country while 33 percent of the now larger population and voting strength would vote for its return.

The WCTU educational program is one of prevention rather than cure and includes both the destruction of the liquor business and the avoidance of any alcoholic indulgence, as safe and effective methods of dealing with this problem.

Its educational program consists not only in education regarding the physical and mental effects of alcohol upon the individual, but upon society as well, and also includes education as to the citizen's responsibility toward the traffic in alcohol, and the knowledge of the tremendous power exerted by that traffic in the social and governmental life of America today.

Trusting in our heavenly Father for guidance and knowing that in any battle victory comes often following the darkest hour, we shall press on and never falter in the holy crusade to rid our homes and our country of the devastating power of the liquor traffic.

And victory will surely come.

American Forum of the Air—Theodore Granik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the close of this session of the Eightieth Congress, I think it is fitting and proper that I pause to pay tribute to a great institution which has aided me and many other Members of this Congress in informing the American people of our work, the decisions we make, and the issues that face us.

I refer to the American Forum of the Air and to its founder and moderator, Theodore Granik. This weekly radio-discussion program is a unique institution in our Nation's Capital. The proceedings of the American Forum of the Air as they are broadcast every Tuesday night through the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System to every corner of our land stimulate our people to think clearly on the vital problems of the day.

We Members of Congress who are forced by the press of our duties in Washington to remain away from our home districts for various periods of time realize only too well the value of informing the people back home about our work.

The American Forum of the Air founded on the principle of free and open discussion of all sides of all issues is one of the best examples of democracy at work that we have in this Nation.

This radio program, which is the oldest public service discussion program, recently celebrated its nineteenth anniversary. For 19 years it has presented discussions of vital issues with outstanding authorities. The name American Forum of the Air has been established in the minds of America's radio listeners as the program from which they can get both sides of an issue.

Many of my colleagues join me in thinking of the program as practically a quasi-congressional activity. The scores of Members of the House and distinguished Senators from the upper branch of this Congress attest to the fairness, impartiality and importance of the American Forum.

The President of the United States during the period he served as Vice President paid tribute to the American Forum in the following manner:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, February 26, 1945.

We know that we speak the sentiments of most of our colleagues in congratulating Theodore Granik on the seventeenth anniversary of his radio program, the American Forum of the Air. Mr. Granik's program, the oldest forum on the air, has been outstanding in its field; week in and week out it has presented to the American people discussions of vital concern to them in the finest American tradition of freedom of speech.

For his splendid public service in conducting these programs without compensation for 17 years, the American people and the many Members of Congress who have participated on the forum owe Mr. Granik a debt of gratitude. The radio industry can be proud of this pioneer in the field of public service programs.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I take a personal pride in paying tribute to the American Forum of the Air and to Theodore Granik. I have known Mr. Granik since his boyhood and I am proud to count him as my friend. I watched him go through law school and start his radio activities in the public service when still a comparative youngster.

I am extremely proud of the fact that almost 20 years ago I appeared on Mr. Granik's first program which at that time established a new method for radio discussion programs. The subject for discussion on that occasion, as I well recall, was repeal of the prohibition law. The great national debates of that day brought about the present format of the American Forum which calls for proponents on both sides of an issue to appear on the same program and debate the issues face to face. In radio's early days, this was an innovation. Ad lib., spontaneous programs were viewed with alarm. Split-second radio timing required everything to be in script form. The American Forum pioneered the new type of discussion program which became an immediate success.

The early program was called Law for Laymen and was broadcast over the facilities of radio station WOR in the city of New York. When Theodore Granik came to Washington as counsel for the United States Housing Authority, he brought his radio program with him which was broadcast through the facilities of WOL here in Washington as well as WOR, New York. The program grew and developed with the Mutual Broadcasting System into the present American Forum of the Air. Theodore Granik as an individual is a great champion of free speech in America. Upon the occasion of receiving an honorary degree of doctor of laws from St. John's University School of Law the accompanying citation recited that Mr. Granik had been an "outstanding student at St. John's University School of Law from 1926 to 1929; while still a student, organized the forum; served from 1934 to 1937 as assistant district attorney of New York; counsel for the United States Housing Authority from 1937 to 1941; helped write the law creating the much-needed Smaller War Plants Corporation; the first alumnus of the school of law to win a place in the current edition of Who's Who in America. The Board of Trustees of St. John's University," the citation concluded, "taking cognizance of the remarkable achievements of a loyal son, devoted father, and distinguished public servant, is happy to confer the honorary degree of doctor of laws."

As moderator of the American Forum, Mr. Granik has become such an unbiased adviser on legislative and policy problems that he has been called upon for advice by various war agencies and committees of the Senate and the House. For example, as a result of a discussion on the forum, Mr. Granik was appointed special counsel to the Subcommittee on Banking and Currency of the Senate to devise legislation for the conversion of small business enterprise to war production. The result was the establishment of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. He also served as a special adviser to Mr. Donald Nelson, of the War Production Board. He served as civilian aid to Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, National Director of the Selective Service.

In 19 years of radio the forum has presented practically every prominent American and hundreds of foreign spokesmen on issues of the day. During one session of Congress alone, 75 percent of the Members of Congress have been guests; labor leaders, spokesmen for industry, authors, doctors, engineers, and authorities of every type have spoken to the people through the forum microphones.

The weekly pamphlet, which consists of a stenotypist's report of the debate, is now distributed to libraries and schools throughout the country. Research organizations follow the proceedings consistently. The American Forum is recognized as an institution and has won the George Foster Peabody award and many other outstanding radio awards for public service.

I know that I voice the feelings and thoughts of most of my colleagues in paying this tribute to Theodore Granik, the individual whose concept of free speech through the medium of radio has advanced the cause of understanding between the people and their Government.

As every institution develops and matures, personalities and staff play an important part in its growth. Mr. Granik has found an able assistant in Irvin P. Sulds, the producer of the forum, whose work these past 3 years in connection with the weekly program is known and appreciated by many Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point an article from the New York Times, one from the New York Herald Tribune, and a copy of a letter to Mr. Granik by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], together with a list of subjects covered by the American Forum of the Air.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times]

WHERE FREE SPEECH PREVAILS

(By R. W. Stewart)

Congress has an unofficial battleground. Opposing factions of the Senate and the House rally to the American Forum of the Air Sunday nights to continue arguments on current issues before a coast-to-coast audience. Under the direction of Theodore Granik, a benevolent rather than an arbitrary moderator, free speech prevails as the listeners are treated to the inside of congressional debate complete with arguments, rebuttals, and just plain wrangling.

Mr. Granik is a combination of liberalism and altruism. He is a liberal because he sees no reason why the layman should not have the opportunity to personally question Congressmen on pertinent current affairs. He is an altruist because he provides the layman with this opportunity at no personal gain or compensation and on his own time as originator and director of this forum on the air in New York through WOR.

THE MODERATOR'S BACKGROUND

Mr. Granik is not a visionary or an idealist; he is a hard-headed lawyer who attained the position of deputy district attorney of New York County and who was appointed special counsel to the United States Housing Authority. He sees in his forum the embodiment of his principles and calls it a practical example of free speech, which he believes to be America's most important right. He likes to consider the panel discussions as his contribution to education and pursues them as a hobby.

The forum is of a quasi official nature. Although it naturally has no connection with the Senate or House of Representatives, a verbatim account, including station announcements, of each 60-minute broadcast during the past year has been read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This practice was begun, according to Mr. Granik, by interested legislators who wanted their speeches put into the RECORD as broadcast.

Another purpose of the procedure, he continued, is that through the introduction of the scripts further discussion on the radio topics is carried to the floor of the Houses, and the broadcast record serves as the basis for rebuttal. "It is like an extension of the broadcast," he explained.

Mr. Granik's stand on free speech is not a pose. He carries his principles right into the forum discussion in Washington's Hotel Willard. So long as order is maintained, freedom of expression is the rule, and everyone is given an equal chance. This opportunity also is extended to the speakers—sometimes they need it.

TWO FACTIONS ARE REPRESENTED

Since all the topics are controversial, the forum opens with both sides stating their stand from prepared speeches. This is limited to 30 minutes. Then the panel discussion begins. Rebuttals are made, and it is then that Mr. John Citizen has his opportunity to stand up to the honorable speakers

and state his difference of opinion or to ask a question. And Mr. Granik does not permit the legislators to evade the issue. So long as the layman has an argument he is permitted to hold the traveling microphone in the audience until he is reasonably satisfied.

This generous practice often leads to round-robin arguments. For instance, it is not rare for a member of the audience to stand up and take issue with another member for the latter's opinion as expressed to one of the speakers. Members of the listening audience unable to attend the broadcast also are permitted to quiz the speakers by telegraphing questions. These are answered over the air by the speaker involved. "It's like open house," Mr. Granik laughed.

He calls this part of the forum his answer to the people who sent in letters stating that they wanted to hear their Congressmen in action; that they wanted to speak to and question them.

HOW TOPICS ARE CHOSEN

In line with his policy of equal opportunity, Mr. Granik points out that regardless of personal politics he always invites an equal number of Democrats and Republicans to each broadcast. The only deviation from this policy is made when the question under discussion breaks party lines, he explained. As examples of these topics he mentioned the isolationist question, aid to the allies, and conscription.

Although people from all walks of life have appeared in the forum, Congressmen have made up the greater part of the guest list, mainly because their opinions were of greater importance on the topics selected.

"In booking programs for the forum I try to get those topics which are 'hot' in the news," Mr. Granik continued. "I watch the congressional debates and if a timely subject comes up on the floor of either the Senate or the House I immediately contact the proponents and opponents of the particular legislation and offer them the facilities to broadcast their views."

That is the format of Mr. Granik's forum. He is no green hand at the game. He has been conducting open discussions on the air for 12 years.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

FORUM REFEREE AT WASHINGTON HAS TRYING JOB—GRANIK NEEDS HIS 15 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE TO KEEP SPEAKERS UNDER CONTROL

Every Sunday evening at 8 o'clock Theodore Granik, director of WOR's American Forum of the Air, steps to the microphone to referee one of the most controversial battles on the air. Mr. Granik has had 15 years of experience in radio-discussion programs. His American Forum is a continuation of the WOR Forum, which he produced before the present program went on a national hook-up. It is produced jointly by WOR and WOL, from Washington, over Mutual.

The forum topics and speakers are announced only a few days before broadcast time. Listeners and editors frequently comment on his talent for keeping on top of the news. On occasion he has changed the topic and line-up of the forum on Saturday night because of some sudden and important development on the Capital news front.

Mr. Granik keeps in constant touch with the chairman and ranking members of important House and Senate committees, many of whom let him know in advance what bills are up for consideration in their committees and when they may be expected to reach the floor. He says his aim is to keep his radio debate simultaneous with the congressional battles or, if possible, even a bit in advance, so that on Sunday the forum is frequently a preview of the biggest congressional debate of the following week. The proceedings of the forums are noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every week.

The most embarrassing incident Mr. Granik can recall in this regard was when a team of a Senator and two newspapermen debated a similar group of three. Just before going on the air, Senator A won one of the opposing journalists over to his point of view. As a result, Senator B found himself being asked embarrassing questions by the reporter who was supposed to be with him on the issue. "I had weeks of explaining to do to that Senator," Mr. Granik says ruefully.

When the forum was moved from New York City to Washington with expansion of the Mutual network in 1937, and the title of the program was changed, Mr. Granik found that most Congressmen and Government officials had not yet become adept at broadcasting. They were of the William Jennings Bryan school of stentorian tones and oratorical flourishes. Many of them had to learn the informal, personalized approach the radio demands.

Getting some Capital luminaries to cut their prepared messages to allow ample extemporaneous discussion time on the second half of the program is occasionally a problem. Most Congressmen and Government officials, however, have learned to conform to this requirement. Congressmen scheduled for a forum, frequently call on Mr. Granik for advice during the week. Sometimes a Senator will telephone him in the middle of the night to read his prepared talk and get his reactions.

Mr. Granik started in the broadcasting business in 1925 as an assistant director of a now defunct New York City station. He presided over a series called Law for the Layman, which he brought over to WOR in the late twenties. In 1929 the law broadcasts became the WOR forum, when it was found that debate made for a livelier program. He was an assistant New York district attorney for several years, and at present is a special counsel to the new Federal Housing Authority, as well as advisor to the National Selective Administration.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
February 18, 1941.

Mr. THEODORE GRANIK,
Director of the American Forum,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRANIK: Confirming our recent verbal conversation, I would like for you to know that as a direct result of the debate conducted by the American Forum of the Air over the Mutual Network on Sunday, January 19, 1941, I received approximately 18,000 letters.

You may recall that during the debate in which Senator Gerald P. Nye and myself opposed passage of the so-called lease-lend bill, while Congressman Andrew J. May, chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, and former Senator Ernest W. Gibson advocated passage of the measure, I repeatedly asked the following question:

"What will this so-called lease-lend bill do to aid Engand, short of war, that we are not doing now?"

Seventy-five percent of the letters received as a result of this broadcast quoted this question almost verbatim, and the following sidelight might be interesting to you:

I attended a meeting of the Passaic (N. J.) Marine Corps League, where I was presented with a medal for outstanding achievement by an ex-marine during the preceding year. During the evening seven ex-marines spoke to me about the debate which they had heard over the air. All of them interrogated me as to whether or not I had received an answer to my question. I asked each one if he remembered the question, and each one repeated the question to me practically verbatim.

I know of nothing in my public life that has aroused the interest and enthusiasm so much as the above-mentioned debate.

I want to take this opportunity of again expressing to you my appreciation for the opportunity of appearing on your program.

With every kind personal regard, I am,

Yours sincerely,

C. WAYLAND BROOKS.

AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR, 1946

January 1—What we face in 1946: Bill Slater, Mutual, New York; Al Warner, Washington; William Hillman, Washington; Cedric Foster, Boston; Paul Schubert, New York; Frazier Hunt, New York; Cecil Brown, New York; Arthur Mann, London.

January 8—Should the USES be turned over to the States immediately? John J. Corson, former director, USES, director of research, Washington Post; Ted F. Silvey, chairman, CIO reconversion committee; Claude A. Williams, past president, Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies; Stanley Rector, chairman, legislative committee, Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies; guest chairman, Arthur J. Altmeyer, Chairman, Social Security Board.

January 15—Should we merge the Army and Navy? Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle; Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Ferdinand Eberstadt, financial authority; Representative Harry R. Sheppard, of California.

January 22—What's holding up housing? Douglas Whitlock, chairman, advisory board, Producers' Council; Joseph Meyerhoff, treasurer, National Association of Home Builders; Boris Shishkin, economist, A. F. of L., secretary, A. F. of L. housing committee; Norton E. Long, Assistant OPA Administrator; Gilbert Convers, American Veterans' Committee; Louis B. Schwartz, American Veterans' Committee.

January 29—Should Congress establish a 65-cent minimum hourly wage for American industry? Senator Claude Pepper, of Florida; Leon Henderson, chief economist, Research Institute of America; Dr. Claudius T. Murchison, president, Cotton Textile Institute; Representative Gerald W. Landis, of Indiana.

February 5—Do we want more TVA's? Ralph L. Carr, former Governor of Colorado; Lachlan Macleay, president, Mississippi Valley Association; Representative Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Judson King, director, National Popular Government League.

February 12—Does Atomic Warfare Make Universal Military Training Obsolete? Prof. Harold C. Urey, metallurgical laboratory, University of Chicago; William B. Ziff, author and publisher; Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, National Director, Selective Service System; Dr. Edward C. Elliott, president emeritus, Purdue University.

February 19—How Can We Achieve Industrial Peace? Representative Roger C. Slaughter, of Missouri; Representative Francis Case, of South Dakota; Representative Hugh De Lacy, of Washington; Representative Luther Patrick, of Alabama.

February 26—What Should We Do About the British Loan? William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State; Senator Claude Pepper, of Florida; Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Representative Dewey Short, of Missouri.

March 5—How Far Should Our Social Security Program Be Expanded? John J. Corson, Director of Research, Washington Post; Paul Sifton, National Farmers Union; Dr. Emerson P. Schmidt, Director of Economic Research Department, United States Chamber of Commerce; Representative Carl T. Curtis, of Nebraska.

March 12—Should the War Powers Act Be Continued? Representative Emanuel Celler, of New York; Representative Chet Holifield, of California; Representative John M. Vorys, of Ohio; Representative A. L. Miller, of Nebraska.

March 19—Should Congress Adopt the Wyatt Housing Plan? Senator Homer E.

Capehart, of Indiana; Representative Jessie Sumner, of Illinois; Douglas Whitlock, Chairman, Advisory Board, Producers' Council; Representative A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Representative George Outland, of California; Chat Paterson, National Legislative Representative, American Veterans Committee.

March 26—The Atomic Bomb—Civilian or Military Control? Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Senator Thomas C. Hart, of Connecticut; Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Dr. Joyce C. Stearns, dean of the faculty, Washington University, St. Louis.

April 2—Should We Continue the OPA? Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; Representative Fred L. Crawford, of Michigan; Senator Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho; Richard V. Gilbert, former Economic Adviser to the OPA Administrator.

April 9—Should We Continue the Draft? Norman Thomas, Post War World Council; Brig. Gen. H. C. Holdridge, United States Army, retired; chairman, legislative committee, Veterans League of America; Joseph M. Stack, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Maj. Gen. Edward P. Curtis, Army of the United States, retired, chief of staff to General Spaatz in Europe; vice president, Eastman Kodak Co.

April 16—Should Congress adopt the President's health insurance plan? Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor, American Medical Association Journal; Dr. R. L. Sensenich, chairman, board of trustees, American Medical Association; Dr. Michael M. Davis, chairman, committee on research, medical economics; chairman, executive board, committee for the Nation's health; Representative John D. Dingell, of Michigan.

April 23—How can we bring peace to Palestine? Dr. Carl Hermann Voss, codirector, American Christian Palestine committee; Mrs. Moses P. Epstein, national president of Hadassah; Mrs. Bedia Afnan, the Arab office; Anwar Nashashibi, the Arab office.

April 30—Can America's armies of occupation secure the peace? Senator James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Representative H. H. Buffett, of Nebraska; Representative John J. Sparkman, of Alabama; Kermit Eby, director, education and research, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

May 7—What should we do about the OPA? Senator Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska; Representative Frederick C. Smith, of Ohio; Senator Hugh B. Mitchell, of Washington; Representative Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania.

May 14—What position should we take on the Spanish question? Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, well-known student of Spanish history and culture; Dr. Jack R. McMichael, executive secretary, Methodist Federation for Social Service; Frank Gervasi, Washington editor of Collier's.

May 21—Are communism and democracy mutually antagonistic? Representative Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut; William Henry Chamberlain, noted writer and lecturer; William Z. Foster, chairman, Communist Party, United States of America; Dr. Harry F. Ward, professor emeritus of Christian ethics, Union Theological Seminary.

May 28—Is new labor legislation necessary? Senator Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho; Frank Fenton, director of organization, A. F. of L.; Representative Francis Case, of South Dakota; Representative Harris Ellsworth, of Oregon.

June 4—Should we return to food rationing? Edgar Ansel Mowrer, noted writer and lecturer; Representative Emily Taft Douglas, of Illinois; Representative A. L. Miller, of Nebraska; Walter F. Straub, director, emergency food program.

June 11—Should we draft the 18-19 year olds? Representative John J. Sparkman, of Alabama; Representative Chet Holifield, of California; Representative Dewey Short, of Missouri; Representative John E. Sheridan, of Pennsylvania.

June 18—Should OPA be modified along the lines of congressional action? Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; Charles Holman, secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation; Robert R. Nathan, economist; James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union.

June 25—Should we merge the Army and Navy? Senator Thomas C. Hart, of Connecticut; Representative F. Edward Hébert, of Louisiana; Representative Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia; Representative Frank B. Keefe, of Wisconsin.

July 2—What should we do about Spain? Johannes Steel, radio commentator; Alexander H. Uhl, foreign editor of PM; John Vincent Hinkel, director of publicity, University of Notre Dame; Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, nationally known educator, author, and lecturer.

July 9—Do we still need wartime Government controls in our economy? Leon Henderson, chief economist, Research Institute of America; Edward Prichard, former counsel, Office of War Mobilization; Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, economist and author; Henry Hazlitt, editorial writer, New York Times.

July 16—Is the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill essential to veterans' housing needs? Wilson W. Wyatt, National Housing Administrator and Housing Expediter; Representative Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president, National Association of Real Estate Boards; Arthur W. Binns, president, National Home and Property Owners Foundation; Guest Chairman: Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, National Director, Selective Service System.

July 23—What part should the CIO-PAC play in politics? Thomas F. Burns, assistant chairman, CIO-PAC; Dr. Palmer Weber, director of research, CIO-PAC; Representative Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan; Representative O. C. Fisher, of Texas.

July 30—How should we evaluate the Seventy-ninth Congress? Representative Andrew J. Biemiller, of Wisconsin; Representative Clair Engle, of California; Representative Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Representative Harris Ellsworth, of Oregon.

August 6—What is the best solution to the Palestine problem? Dr. Carl Hermann Voss, executive secretary, Christian Council on Palestine; Dr. Ruth Gruber, foreign correspondent, New York Post; Mrs. Bedia Afnan, the Arab Office; Cecil Hourani, secretary, the Arab Office.

August 13—What Should Our Russian Policy Be? Richard E. Lauterbach, correspondent, Life Magazine; Prof. Frederick Schuman, political science, Williams College; Lawrence Spivak, editor, American Mercury; Louis Nizer, attorney and author.

August 20—What Should We Do About China? Marrison Forman, author and explorer; Dr. J. Spencer Kennard, former missionary in China; Freda Utley, author; Alfred Kohlberg, American-China Policy Association; guest chairman: Dr. Joseph M. Ray, head of the department of government and politics, University of Maryland.

August 27—How Much Government Control Is Required To Maintain Our Economy? Prof. Maynard C. Krueger, professor of economics, University of Chicago; Prof. Mabel Newcomer, professor of economics, Vassar College; Dr. Emerson P. Schmidt, director, economic research department, United States Chamber of Commerce; Prof. George L. Bach, professor of economics, Carnegie Institute of Technology.

September 3—Is a Guaranteed Annual Wage Practical for Industry? James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, CIO; Kermit Eby, director, education and research, CIO; Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, economist and author; James L. Wick, author and lecturer.

September 10—Atomic Energy — Who Should Control It? Harold E. Stassen, ex-Governor of Minnesota; Dr. Irving Langmuir, associate director of research, General Electric Co.; Representative Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut; Representative J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey.

September 17—Who Should get Trieste? Dr. Stoyan Gavrilovic, Yugoslavian representative to the United Nations; Dr. Vaso Trivanovitch, economist and author; Dr. Diego De Castro, member of the Italian delegation on Venezia Giulia at the Paris Peace Conference; Prof. Max Salvadori, political science, Bennington College.

September 24—How Can Soviet Russia and the United States Keep the Peace? Earl Browder, former chairman, Communist Party, United States of America; George E. Sokolsky, columnist and lecturer.

October 1—What Are the Campaign Issues? Representative A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Representative John J. Sparkman, of Alabama; Representative Clarence J. Brown, of Ohio; John Danaher, former Senator of Connecticut.

October 8—Is a National Political Change Necessary? Senator Owen Brewster, of Maine; Representative John J. Sparkman, of Alabama.

October 15—Is the PAC a Threat or a Contribution to America? Jack Kroll, director, CIO-PAC; Dr. Frank Kingdon, chairman NC-PAC; Senator Joseph H. Ball, of Minnesota; Louis Waldman, labor attorney.

October 22—Which political party can serve the Nation best? Senator Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; Senator Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; Representative Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Representative A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma.

October 29—No broadcast, Herald Tribune conference.

November 5—No broadcast, election returns.

November 12—Is the British Government career system better than the American? Sir James Grigg, Secretary of State for War for the Coalition Cabinet under Churchill; Prof Herman Finer, political science department, University of Chicago; H. Struve Hensel, former Assistant Secretary of the Navy; Donald C. Stone, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget.

November 19—What can we expect from the new Congress? Representative Clarence J. Brown, of Ohio; Representative Howard H. Buffett, of Nebraska; Representative Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Representative Herman P. Eberharter, of Pennsylvania.

November 26—Are closed-shop agreements desirable? James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, CIO; Boris Shishkin, economist, AFL; Henry J. Taylor, economist and radio commentator; Representative A. L. Miller, of Nebraska.

December 3—Can our national economy stand a general wage increase? Robert R. Nathan, economist; Richard V. Gilbert, former economist, OPA; Dr. Jules Backman, professor of economics, New York University; Lawrence Fertig, economist and financial writer.

December 10—Should the Federal Government provide medical care? (Annual student's program): Lee Reiff, Newton, Kans.; Gordon Parks, Jennings, Mo.; Robert Carson, Lansing, Mich.; George Cabell, Norfolk, Va.; guest moderator, Dr. Richard B. Kennan, National Education Association.

December 17—Should we nationalize the coal mines? Norman Thomas, Socialist leader; McAlister Coleman, author and lecturer; William W. Bayfield, executive secretary, American Coal Sales Association; John D. Battle, executive secretary, national Coal Association.

December 24—No broadcast, Christmas Eve.

AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR, 1947

January 7—What Is the Outlook for the Eightieth Congress? Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut; Representative Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Senator Owen Brewster,

of Maine; Representative Bertrand W. Gearhart, of California; guest chairman, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, National Director, Selective Service System.

January 14—Would New Labor Legislation Help Our Economy? Representative Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan; Representative O. C. Fisher, of Texas; James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, CIO; Lewis G. Hines, legislative representative, A. F. of L.

January 21—Should There Be Compulsory Arbitration in Public Service Industries? Senator Harry P. Cain, of Washington; M. H. Hedges, director of research, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L.; Representative Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts; Representative Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey.

January 28—Should Congress Act on the Portal-to-Portal Pay Issue? Senator Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; Representative Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan; Eugene Cotton, associate general counsel, CIO; Charles Margiotti, former attorney general of Pennsylvania.

February 4—Will Raising of Rent Ceilings Solve the Housing Problem? Senator Albert W. Hawkes, of New Jersey; George M. Englar, president, National Apartment Owners Association; Ray Sawyer, national commander, AMVETS; David Ginsburg, former general counsel, OPA.

February 11—Should We Further Restrict Immigration? Representative Emanuel Celler, of New York; Earl Harrison, former Commissioner of Immigration; Representative Ed Gossett, of Texas; Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

February 18—Should Poland Retain Germany's Eastern Territory? James P. Warburg, banker and author; J. K. Galbraith, board of directors, Fortune magazine; Arthur Gaeth, MBS commentator and author; Jean Pajus, author and economist.

February 25—How Far Should a Regulated Industry Be Subject to Antitrust Laws? Senator Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire; Judge Thurman Arnold, former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division; Senator Clyde M. Reed, of Kansas; A. W. Vogtle, general chairman, Southeast Shippers Conference.

March 4 (nineteenth anniversary)—Should We Continue Reciprocal Trade Agreements? Senator Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah; Representative A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Representative Carl Hinshaw, of California; Dr. John Lee Coulter, former member, United States Tariff Commission.

March 11—Should we establish a system of universal military training? Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Prof. Alonzo F. Myers, New York University; Lt. Gen. Raymond S. McLain, liaison officer, War Department Special Staff; Francis X. Burke, chairman, national security committee, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

March 18—What is the solution to the problem in Greece? Andre Michalopoulos, former Greek Government official, author and lecturer; Solon G. Vlasto, publisher, Atlantis, national daily Greek newspaper; Representative J. K. Javits, of New York; Representative John M. Vorys, of Ohio; Senator Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho; Albert L. Warner, MBS commentator.

March 25—Should we reduce income taxes now? Representative Noah M. Mason, of Illinois; Representative Robert W. Kean, of New Jersey; Representative Herman P. Eberharter, of Pennsylvania; Representative Aime J. Forand, of Rhode Island.

April 1—How can we solve the teacher problem? Dr. John K. Norton, Columbia University, Glaude L. Kulp, superintendent of schools, Ithaca, N. Y.; Irvin R. Kuenzli, executive secretary, American Federation of Teachers, A. F. of L.; Selma Borchardt, Federal and international representative, American Federation of Teachers, A. F. of L.

April 8—Where is our present financial policy leading? Leon Henderson, chairman, executive committee, Americans for Democratic Action; Robert R. Nathan, economist; Henry J. Taylor, economist and radio commentator; James L. Wick, economist and author.

April 15—Reciprocal trade agreements—are they benefiting us? Prof. Seymour E. Harris, Harvard University; Representative John D. Dingell, of Michigan; Walter W. Cenerazzo, president, American Watch Workers' Union; Representative Carl T. Curtis, of Nebraska.

April 22—Should Congress adopt new labor laws? Representative Charles J. Kersten, of Wisconsin; Representative Richard M. Nixon, of California; Lewis G. Hines, legislative representative, A. F. of L.; Ted F. Silvey, reconversion officer, CIO.

April 29—Should Congress outlaw the Communist Party? Milton Howard, associate editor, Daily Worker; Dr. Jack R. McMichael, executive secretary, Methodist Federation for Social Action; Representative Harry R. Sheppard, of California; Representative A. L. Miller, of Nebraska.

May 6—Should all co-ops pay Federal income taxes? Senator George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Karl D. Loos, chairman, legal and tax committee, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; Ben C. McCabe, president, National Tax Equality Association; Representative Robert A. Grant, of Indiana.

May 13—What Should the United Nations Do About Palestine? Frank Gervasi, author and lecturer; Dr. Carl Hermann Voss, extension secretary, the Church Peace Union; Prof. Walter T. Stace, Princeton University; Gordon Waterfield, chief correspondent for the Kemsley Newspapers, Ltd., of London.

May 20—Should Congress Adopt the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill? Senator A. J. Ellender, of Louisiana; Chat Paterson, National legislative representative, American Veterans Committee; Edward R. Carr, president, National Association of Home Builders; Charles Stewart, director of public relations, National Association of Real Estate Boards.

May 27—How Can We Get Along With Russia? Jerome Davis, author, lecturer and correspondent; Corliss Lamont, author and lecturer; Representative John M. Vorys, of Ohio; Representative Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota.

June 3—What Should Congress do About Health Insurance? Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; Dr. H. H. Shoulders, president, American Medical Association; Senator J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island; Dr. Michael M. Davis, chairman, executive committee, Committee for the Nation's Health.

June 10—Do We Need Changes in Our Antitrust Laws? Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Representative Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Milton A. Smith, assistant general counsel, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Gilbert H. Montague, attorney, guest moderator; Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, Under Secretary of the Interior.

June 17—Do We Need Universal Military Training? Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, national director, Selective Service System; Representative F. Edward Hébert, of Louisiana; Dr. Ralph McDonald, executive secretary, Department of Higher Education, NEA; Representative Dewey Short, of Missouri.

June 24—Should the United States Admit 400,000 of Europe's Displaced Persons? Edward Mark O'Connor, executive assistant, War Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Representative Emanuel Celler, of New York; Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Representative O. C. Fisher, of Texas.

July 1—How Should We Deal With the High Cost of Living? Leon H. Keyserling, vice chairman, President's Council of Economic Advisers; Senator John J. Sparkman, of Alabama; Representative Howard H. Buffett, of Nebraska; George Terborgh, research director, Machinery and Allied Products Institute.

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two brief but excellent compilations of facts bearing on the need for national health insurance. Each of these facts is documented. Together they convey a most impressive set of reasons for the prompt enactment of the National Health Insurance and Public Health Act of 1947.

There being no objection, the compilations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH INSURANCE FACT SHEET [1]

1. On an average two persons out of every three need help to meet the cost of serious illness.[1]

2. About 97,000,000 people in the United States need help to meet the cost of serious illness.[1]

3. In the course of a year there are approximately 22,000,000 disabling illnesses, lasting a week or longer, in the United States.[2]

4. At least 7,000,000 people in the United States are disabled by sickness or other disability in any 24-hour period, half of them for 6 months or more.[3]

(a) One person out of every 20 is disabled by sickness or disability in any 24-hour period.

5. The total hidden costs of sickness and disability, wage loss to workers and costs to business, totaled in 1943 not less than $15,000,000,000.[4]

6. The estimated annual cost of sickness and accidents, in medical costs and loss of earnings due to sickness and premature death, is $8,000,000,000.[4]

7. It is estimated that only about $20,000,000 a year is being spent for research to find causes and new treatments of diseases.[5]

[1] Families with incomes under $3,000 need help in meeting the cost of serious illness. (Factual Data on Medical Economics, pamphlet issued in 1939 by the Bureau of Medical Economics of the American Medical Association.) Sixty-nine percent of the United States population lived in such families in 1945. (National Survey of Liquid Assets Holdings, Spending and Saving, Part II: Relation of Savings and Holdings to Income. July, 1946. Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.)

[2] Public Affairs pamphlet, Who Can Afford Health? by Beulah Amidon, 1944, p. 9.

[3] Senate Subcommittee Report No. 5 (Health Insurance), July 1946, p. 1.

[4] Federal Security Agency fact sheet, The Health of the Nation, June 1, 1946, p. 2.

[5] See following:

American private foundations, 1940	$4,700,000
National Cancer Institute (U. S. Government) 1946–47	1,772,000
National Institute of Health (U. S. Government) 1946–47	5,966,948
Veterans' Administration—National Research Council (approximate)	1,000,000
American Cancer Society, 1946	2,500,000
National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, 1946	1,858,826
Medical schools and teaching hospitals (estimated)	2,500,000
Total	20,297,774

8. In contrast with this, the Department of Commerce reported in 1943 that approximately $275,000,000 is being spent each year for industrial research.[6]

9. In 1947 Congress appropriated $29,866,200 for the Department of Agriculture alone for research in the control and cure of plant and animal diseases.[7]

10. After about 14 years only about 21,755,766 people, about 16 percent of the population of the United States, were covered by hospitalization plans as of July 1, 1946.[8]

11. Only about 3,500,000 Americans (2½ percent of the population) were covered by comprehensive medical care plans in 1945.[9]

12. In 1941 there was, on the average, approximately 1 active physician for every 1,400 to 1,500 people in the United States.[10]

(a) In 1944, 553 counties in the United States (18 percent of the total of 3,070 counties) had less than 1 active physician per 3,000 population (the "danger line"), and 81 counties (over 2½ percent) had no active doctor at all.[3]

13. More than 10 percent of the people in the United States live where there is no approved general hospital.[3]

(a) Forty-one percent of the counties in the United States (approximately 1,258 counties) with an aggregate population of 15,000,000, have no approved general hospital.[3]

(b) Forty-eight percent of the counties in the United States (1,473 counties) have under the standard of 4.5 beds per 1,000 population; and only 11 percent (337) of the counties meet the standard.[11]

HEALTH INSURANCE FACT SHEET II

I. How many people in the United States need help to meet the cost of serious illness?

1. Two people out of every three who live in the United States, about 97,000,000 Americans, need help to meet the cost of serious illness.[12]

(a) This statement is based on an estimate made in 1939 in a publication of the American Medical Association, that families with incomes under $3,000 need help to meet the cost of serious illness.[12]

(b) However, by 1945 the cost-of-living index had increased by 29 percent over 1939; and in April 1947 the index was 50 percent higher than in 1939.[13]

(c) Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that many people with incomes over $3,000 now need help to meet the cost of serious illness.

II. What is the annual loss to the United States because of sickness, disability, and premature death?

A. In terms of people, the United States lost:

1. In 1945, excluding those who died in the armed forces overseas, 1,401,719 Americans through death. Of these: [14]

(a) 11 percent, or 162,006, were under 20 years of age.

(b) 8 percent, or 112,442, were aged from 20 to 39.

(c) 19 percent, or 274,448, were under 40 years of age.

(d) 23 percent, or 321,921, were aged from 40 to 59.

(e) This means that 42 percent, or 596,369, of the Americans who died in this country in 1945 were under 60 years old.

2. About 1,000,000,000 days of disability each year from chronic illnesses.[15]

(a) There are approximately 22,000,000 disabling illnesses every year in the country as a whole.[2]

(1) Each of these illnesses lasts, on the average, about 57 days.[2]

(b) Over 40 percent of the Nation's selectees were found unfit for military duty.[16]

(1) At least 17 percent of those found unfit had defects which were remediable; many more had preventable defects.[16]

B. In terms of production, the United States lost:

1. About 600,000,000 man-days annually.[16]

(a) Illness and accidents cause the average industrial worker to lose about 12 days from production each year.[16]

(b) More than 75 percent of the 25,000,000 chronic-disease cases in the United States are among people in the productive years from 15 to 64; half of these people are less than 45 years old; 16 percent of them are under 25.[17]

C. In terms of money, the United States lost:

1. An estimated $8,000,000,000 annually, half in medical costs and half in loss of earnings due to sickness and premature death.[16]

(a) It is estimated that American workers lost $560,000,000 in wages in strikes during the first 6 months of peace; at this rate, the annual wage loss would be $1,120,000,000, in contrast with the $8,000,000,000 lost through sickness and premature death.[18]

2. It is estimated that the total hidden costs of sickness and disability, wage loss to workers and costs to business, totaled in 1943 not less than $15,000,000,000.[4]

III. What do we spend on health, compared with what we spend on other things?

1. In 1942 the American people spent only about 3 percent of the total national income on medical care.[19]

(a) It has been estimated that the people of the United States will spend $5,499,963,211 in 1947 for medical care, including supplies and insurance.[20]

(1) This is less than 3½ percent of the national income in 1945 (latest figure available).[21]

2. In contrast with this, the people of the United States, to protect our lives against a possible enemy, will spend 50 percent more for armed defense this year than for all types of medical service, to protect ourselves against disabilities and deaths of our people.

(a) Proposed expenditures for national defense in 1947–48:

Army and Air Force	[22] $5,240,900,000
Navy	[23] 3,469,761,000

Or a total of $8,710,661,000 for national defense, as against $5,499,963,211 for medical care, supplies, and insurance.

3. In contrast with the estimated amount of $5,499,963,211 which the people of the United States will spend in 1947 for medical services, supplies, and insurance, the same people in 1946 spent $8,700,000,000 for alcoholic beverages. This is an average of $89 a year for liquor for each person over 18 years old.[24]

(a) Fifty percent more is spent on liquor than on all health services in a year.

IV. How many doctors are there in the United States? How much do they earn?

1. In 1942 there were 180,496 registered physicians in the United States, including all types of specialists.[25]

(a) In 1943 the number of "effective physicians" was estimated at 135,932.[26]

2. Taking a standard of 1 active physician for every 1,000 patients: [27]

(a) In 1941 there was approximately 1 active physician for every 1,400 to 1,500 people in the United States (if doctors had been evenly divided throughout the country).[27]

(b) However, in 1944, 553 counties in the United States (18 percent of the total of 3,070 counties) had less than 1 active physician per 3,000 population (the "danger line"), and 81 counties (over 2½ percent) had no active doctor.[28]

3. The national net average income of American doctors in 1941 was $5,047; but this figure was overweighted by top-bracket specialists.[29]

(a) About 25 percent had net incomes of less than $2,000.[29]

(b) About 16 percent had net incomes of less than $1,000.[29]

(c) About 12½ percent had net incomes of $10,000 or more.[29]

V. How many hospitals are there in the United States?

1. In 1945 there were 1,738,944 hospital beds in 6,511 hospitals in the United States.[30]

(a) However, approximately 15,000,000 Americans, living in 40 percent of the Nation's counties, have no recognized general hospital.[16]

---

[2] Public Affairs pamphlet, Who Can Afford Health? by Beulah Amidon, 1944, p. 9.

[3] Federal Security Agency fact sheet, The Health of the Nation, June 1, 1946, p. 2.

[4] U. S. Bureau of Vital Statistics.

[6] George St. J. Perrott, U. S. Public Health Service: The Problem of Psychosomatic Disease, article in Psychosomatic Medicine, January 1945.

[8] Senate Subcommittee Report No. 5, 79th Cong. (Health Insurance) July 1946, p. 1.

[7] George St. J. Perrott, U. S. Public Health Service: The Problem of Chronic Disease, article in Psychosomatic Medicine, January 1945.

[8] United States News, March 1, 1946.

[9] Spent for medical care in 1942, $3,710,000,000 ("America's Needs and Resources," published by Twentieth Century Fund, 1947); national income, 1942, $122,232,000,000 (World Almanac, 1947.)

[20] The Medical Market, Forecasts for 1947, (Modern Medicine).

[6] Senate Subcommittee Report No. 5 (Health Insurance), July 1946, p. 1.

[6] Report of survey released by Department of Commerce in 1943.

[7] Budget of the United States, fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

[8] World Almanac 1947, p. 772. Total Blue Cross coverage, 23,132,508; Canada, 1,376,742; United States, 21,755,766.)

[9] Senate Subcommittee Report No. 5 (Health Insurance), July 1946, p. 6.

[10] Senate Committee Print No. 5 (Medical Care Insurance), July 8, 1946, p. 35. Standard: 1 physician to every 1,000 people. (Same, p. 35)

[11] Senate Committee Print No. 3 (National Health Act of 1945), March 1946, p. 52.

[12] Families with incomes under $3,000 need help to meet the cost of serious illness. (Factual Data on Medical Economics, pamphlet issued in 1939 by the Bureau of Medical Economics of the American Medical Association.) Sixty-nine percent of the United States population live in such families. (National Survey of Liquid Asset Holdings, Spending, and Saving: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, July 1946.)

[13] Bureau of Labor Statistics: 1939 yearly average, 99.4; 1945 yearly average, 128.4; April 1947 (monthly average) 156.1. (1935–39 equals 100.)

[16] Senate Subcommittee Report No. 5, 79th Cong. (Health Insurance) July 1946, p. 1.

[21] National income, 1945, $160,952,000,000. (World Almanac, 1947, p. 395.)

[22] Amount recommended by Appropriations Committee as of June 3, 1947. (New York Times.)

[23] Amount passed by House as of June 3, 1947. (New York Times.)

[24] Department of Commerce, April 30, 1947. Associated Press dispatch, Washington (New York Times.)

[25] AMA Directory, 1942, p. 8 (latest issue).

[26] AMA Journal, vol. 121, p. 1163 (1943): Total registered physicians, 1943: 179,039; difference represents those not practicing because of advanced age, physical disabilities, and other reasons.

[27] Senate Committee Print No. 5, 79th Cong. July 8, 1946, p. 35.

[28] Senate Subcommittee Report No. 5, 79th Cong. July 1946, p. 1.

[29] Senate Committee Print No. 4, 79th Cong. March 1946, p. 17. Figures from Survey of Current Business, vol. 23, No. 10. October 1943.)

[30] World Almanac, 1947, p. 773.

(b) Taking 4.5 beds per 1,000 population as the standard for hospitals: [31]

(1) Only 11 percent of the counties of the United States meet this standard.[32]

(2) Forty-eight percent of the counties in the United States have under this standard.[33]

(3) Forty-one percent of the counties in the United States have no approved general hospital.[32]

(c) Sixteen million two hundred and fifty-seven thousand four hundred and two patients were admitted to hospitals in 1945, or an average of about one out of every eight people in the United States.[30]

2. Of 15,800,000 patients admitted to registered hospitals in 1944: [33] 95.1 percent, or 15,000,000, were admitted to general hospitals having 54 percent of total beds; 2.9 percent, or 500,000, were admitted to special hospitals having 3 percent of total beds; [34] 1.4 percent, or 200,000, were admitted to nervous and mental hospitals having 38 percent of total beds; 0.6 percent, or 100,000, were admitted to tuberculosis hospitals having 5 percent of total beds.

VI. How much do we spend for research for new treatments and cures to save our people from death or disability?

1. It is estimated that only about $20,000,000 a year is being spent for research to find cures and new treatments of diseases.[35]

(a) In contrast with this, the Department of Commerce reported in 1943 that approximately $275,000,000 is being spent each year for industrial research.[36]

(b) In 1947, Congress appropriated $29,866,200 for the Department of Agriculture alone, for research in the control and cure of plant and animal diseases.[7]

(c) In contrast with the 1947 total appropriation of $104,088,516 for the United States Public Health Service, Congress made a total appropriation of $744,489,692 in 1947 for the Department of Agriculture.[7]

VII. How much more would a national health insurance program cost the people of the United States than they spend under the present system?

1. It is estimated that about $5,499,963,211 will be spent by the people of the United States for medical care in 1947, including medical services, medicines and supplies, and health and accident insurance.[37]

2. In a study made in 1941, it was found that money spent by sample family groups for medical care was distributed as follows: [38]

	Health and accident insurance	Medicines and supplies	Medical services	Tota
Groups with incomes between $500 and $1,000	$2.13	$9.16	$15.14	$25.12
Groups with incomes between $1,000 and $1,500	4.48	16.28	37.15	57.91
Groups with incomes between $2,500 and $3,000	7.83	18.06	63.99	89.88
Groups with incomes between $3,000 and $5,000	11.39	33.99	107.69	153.07

3. Family expenditures for medical care under the proposed National Health Insurance bill,[39] for people in comparable income groups, would be as follows: [40]

Annual earnings:	*Insurance premiums at 3 percent*
$750	$22.50
$1,250	37.50
$2,500	75.00
$3,600 and over	108.00

4. The above two tables show that the total average family expenditures for medical care under the National Health Insurance bill [39] would be lower than they were in 1941 under the present system.

---

[7] Budget of the United States, fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

[30] World Almanac, 1947, p. 773.

[31] Public Health Bulletin No. 292, Health Service Areas. Issued by U. S. Public Health Service, 1945, p. 5. (Estimate does not include beds for patients suffering from tuberculosis or mental disorders.)

[32] Senate Committee Print No. 3, 79th Cong. (National Health Act of 1945, and hospital survey and construction bill). March 1946, p. 52.

[33] Senate Committee Print No. 4, 79th Cong. (National Health Act of 1945), March 1946, p. 20.

[34] Includes maternity, industrial, eye, ear, nose, and throat, children's orthopedic, isolation, convalescent and rest, etc.

[35] See following:

American private foundations, 1940 (latest estimate)	$4,700,000
National Cancer Institute (U. S. Government), 1946–47	1,772,000
National Institute of Health (U. S. Government), 1946–47	5,966,948
Veterans' Administration—National Research Council (approximate)	1,000,000
American Cancer Society, 1946	2,500,000
National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, 1946	1,858,826
Medical schools and teaching hospitals (estimated)	2,500,000
Total	20,279,774

[36] Report of survey released by Department of Commerce in 1943.

[37] The Medical Market—Forecasts for 1937—(Modern Medicine).

[38] Study of Family Spending and Saving in Wartime, 1941 and the first quarter of 1942. August 1942. U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and Bureau of Home Economics.

[39] Introduced in May 1947, by Senators WAGNER, MURRAY, CHAVEZ, PEPPER, TAYLOR, and MCGRATH.

[40] Senate Committee Print No. 5, 79th Cong. July 8, 1946, p. 158.

World Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of President Truman's address at Monticello, home of Thomas Jefferson:

Governor Tuck, Mr. Houston, distinguished guests and fellow-countrymen, I certainly appreciate that warm welcome extended to me by the Governor of Virginia most highly, and I appreciate the courtesies which have been extended to me since I have been here. Virginia is always courteous to her guests.

It is fitting that we should come to Monticello to celebrate the anniversary of our independence. Here lived Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence. Here Thomas Jefferson died on July 4, 1826, 50 years from the day the Declaration was adopted by the Continental Congress and proclaimed to the world.

The Declaration of Independence was an expression of democratic philosophy that sustained American patriots during the Revolution and has ever since inspired men to fight to the death for their "unalienable rights."

The standard phrase used by writers of Jefferson's day to describe man's essential rights was "life, liberty, and property." But to Jefferson human rights were more important than property rights, and the phrase, as he wrote it in the Declaration of Independence, became "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The laws and the traditions of the colonies in 1776 were designed to support a monarchial system rather than a democratic society. To Thomas Jefferson, the American Revolution was far more than a struggle for independence. It was a struggle for democracy.

Within a few weeks after independence had been proclaimed at Philadelphia, Jefferson resigned his seat in the Continental Congress and returned to his place in the Virginia Legislature. There he began his monumental work of laying the foundation of an independent democracy.

Within a few years, the Virginia Legislature, under Jefferson's leadership, instituted full religious freedom, abolished the laws which had permitted great estates to pass undivided from generation to generation, prohibited the importation of slaves, revised the civil and criminal code of laws, and established a general system of public education. These acts, according to Jefferson, eradicated every fiber of the ancient and future aristocracy. These acts formed the basis for a truly democratic government.

RECALLS UN CHARTER SIGNING

Jefferson knew that it was necessary to provide in law the requisites for the survival of an independent democracy. He knew that it was not enough merely to set forth a Declaration of Independence.

Two years ago the United States and 50 other nations joined in signing a great declaration of interdependence known as the Charter of the United Nations. We did so because we had learned, at staggering cost, that the nations of the world cannot live in peace and prosperity if, at the same time, they try to live in isolation. We have learned that nations are interdependent, and that recognition of our dependence upon one another is essential to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness of all mankind.

It is now the duty of all nations to converge their policies toward common goals of peace. Of course, we cannot expect all nations with different histories, institutions, and economic conditions, to agree at once upon common ideals and policies. But it is not too much to expect that all nations should create, each within its own borders, the requisites for the growth of world-wide harmony.

The first requisite of peace among nations is common adherence to the principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. There must be genuine effort to translate that principle into reality.

The respective constitutions of virtually all the members of the United Nations subscribe to the proposition that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. In many countries, however, progress toward that goal is extremely slow. In other countries, progress in that direction is nonexistent. And in still others, the course of government is in the opposite direction.

It is necessary, if we are to have peace, that the peoples of the earth know each other, that they trade with each other, and trust each other, and that they move toward common ideals. And yet, when governments do not derive their powers from the consent of the governed, these requirements are usually denied, and the peoples are kept in isolation.

The stronger the voice of a people in the formulation of national policies, the less the danger of aggression. When all governments

derive their just powers from the consent of the governed there will be enduring peace.

A second requisite of peace among nations is common respect for basic human rights. Jefferson knew the relationship between respect for these rights and peaceful democracy. We see today with equal clarity the relationship between respect for human rights and the maintenance of world peace. So long as the basic rights of men are denied in any substantial portion of the earth, men everywhere must live in fear of their own rights and their own security.

We have learned much in the last 15 years from Germany, Italy, and Japan about the intimate relationship of dictatorship, aggression, and the loss of human rights. The problem of protecting human rights has been recognized in the Charter of the United Nations, and a commission is studying the subject at this time.

No country has yet reached the absolute in protecting human rights. In all countries, certainly including our own, there is much to be accomplished. The maintenance of peace will depend to an important degree upon the progress that is made within nations and by the United Nations in protecting human rights.

The third requisite of peace is the free and full exchange of knowledge, ideas, and information among the peoples of the earth, and maximum freedom in international travel and communication.

PURPOSE OF UNESCO STRESSED

Jefferson well understood this principle. On one occasion he said, "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of peace, it expects what never was and never will be." Today we can paraphrase those words in international terms as follows: "If the nations of the world expect to live in ignorance and suspicion of each other in a state of peace, they expect what never was and never will be."

Many members of the United Nations have jointly created and now support the United Nations Educational and Cultural Organization for the purpose of promoting the free exchange of ideas and information among the peoples of the earth. In the preamble to the constitution of this organization the member nations have declared that "the wide diffusion of culture and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace * * * constitute a sacred duty which all nations must fulfill."

The United States has taken a leading role in furthering this ideal. We believe that it is essential to a peaceful and prosperous world. We believe that common knowledge and understanding among men can be greatly expanded in the years to come. We have the mechanical facilities—the radio, television, airplanes—for the creation of a world-wide culture. We have only to set them to work for international good.

Unfortunately, a number of countries maintain barriers against the flow of information and ideas into, or out of, their territories. Many of them restrict international travel. Some of them, behind barriers of their own creation, present to their citizens carefully selected or distorted versions of the facts about other countries. They teach and broadcast distrust and scorn of their neighbors.

These activities of organized mistrust lead the people away from peace and unity. They are a far cry from contributing to the full and free exchange of knowledge and ideas which we need if we are to have a peaceful world.

The first step to end ignorance and suspicion would be to stop propaganda attacks upon other nations. The second step would be to let down the barriers to information, ideas, and travel. The final step would be to cooperate with other nations who are so earnestly endeavoring to increase friendly understanding among men.

Here at the home of Thomas Jefferson, who dedicated his life to liberty, education, and intellectual freedom, I appeal to all nations and to all peoples to break down the artificial barriers which separate them. I appeal for tolerance and restraint in the mutual relations of nations and peoples. And I appeal for a free flow of knowledge and ideas that alone can lead to a harmonious world.

The fourth requisite of peace is that nations shall devise their economic and financial policies to support a world economy rather than separate nationalistic economies.

It is important to recognize that the United States has heavy responsibilities here. The United States is the greatest industrial nation of the world, the leading exporter of agricultural products, and the greatest creditor nation. Europe and Asia, on the other hand, have been devastated by war, and with insufficient funds and materials are struggling desperately with mountainous problems of reconstruction. In this situation the economic and financial policies maintained by the United States are of crucial importance.

We have contributed nearly $20,000,000,000 since the war to world relief, reconstruction, and stabilization. We have taken the lead in establishing the World Bank and the World Stabilization Fund. We have cooperated fully in the work of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. We have authorized aid to Greece and Turkey. We have made generous loans through our Export-Import Bank, and we have suggested to European nations that further requests for American aid should be on the basis of a sound plan for European reconstruction.

TRADE EFFORTS OUTLINED

Our representatives are in Geneva negotiating a series of tariff-reducing trade agreements. They are seeking agreement with other nations on the charter of an international trade organization designed to bring fairness and a spirit of cooperation into the trade relations of nations.

I believe that the United States is living up to its responsibilities for creating the economic conditions of the peace. We must realize that these responsibilities are continuous. Even the emergency aspects of the job are not yet behind us.

It is not enough, however, for one nation to live up to its responsibilities for aiding reconstruction and for cooperating in the production and the exchange of goods. The cooperation of all nations is necessary if the job is to be done. To the extent that any nation falls behind, to that extent will urgent needs for food, clothing, and shelter remain unfilled.

Yet, certain nations today are withholding their support of reconstruction plans on the ground that this would mean interferenee by some nations in the internal affairs of others. This is as fallacious as the refusal of a man to enter a profitable business partnership on the ground that it would involve interference in his private affairs.

Surely after two World Wars, nations should have learned the folly of a nationalism so extreme as to block cooperative economic planning among nations for peaceful reconstruction.

The life of Thomas Jefferson demonstrates, to a remarkable degree, the strength and power of truth.

He believed, with deep conviction, that in this young Nation the survival of freedom depended upon the survival of truth.

So it is with the world.

As the spirit of freedom and the spirit of truth spread throughout the world, so shall there be understanding and justice among men.

This is the foundation for peace—a peace which is not merely the absence of war, but a deep lasting peace built upon mutual respect and tolerance.

Our goal must be—not peace in our time—but peace for all time.

Analysis of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the Congress that passed the Taft-Hartley Labor Act overwhelmingly supports the right of workers to organize and to bargain collectively. It overwhelmingly approves of the trade-union movement. The Taft-Hartley Act is just such an act as anyone would expect of a Congress that wishes to preserve our system of free collective bargaining and that wishes to strengthen the union movement and see it grow and develop on a sound basis.

In recent years both collective bargaining and the trade-union movement have been in danger. This has been due partly to mistakes of the Government in setting up labor policies and in administering them, and partly to persons within the labor movement who have followed short-sighted purposes and policies of their own, regardless of effect upon the labor movement as a whole, or, indeed, upon the welfare of our country.

Had Congress not dealt with these problems now, had it not corrected Government policies that are wrong, and had it not protected the labor movement against those within the movement whose abuses undermine the movement in the eyes of the public, there is no doubt that a later Congress, responding to overwhelming public demand, would be forced to enact laws which would really be severe and drastic compared with the fairness and equal justice of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Immediately upon convening this year, the appropriate committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives started investigating problems that have arisen in the troubled field of labor relations. They sat long hours for more than 6 weeks, heard the testimony of hundreds of witnesses from all walks of life, of all shades of opinion and from all parts of our country. Both union leaders and union members asked for changes in our laws. Only the top officials of the great federations opposed all change, insisting that Congress refrain from dealing even with those evils that they admit to exist.

After all these weeks of hearings, the two committees prepared their bills, and the Senate and the House of Representatives debated the bills at length. The Hartley bill passed the House of Representatives by a majority of more than 3 to 1. The Taft bill passed the Senate by a vote of nearly 3 to 1.

The two bills went to conference. There emerged a compromise measure known as the Taft-Hartley bill. It was less comprehensive than the Hartley bill, was less far reaching in its effects, and left for future study by Congress the problems which created the greatest controversy, like industry-wide bargaining,

injunctions in ordinary strikes, and regulation of the internal affairs of unions.

The House passed the Taft-Hartley Act by a vote of more than 4 to 1. The Senate passed it by a vote of more than 3 to 1. The majority of the members of each of the two parties in Congress voted for the act.

Then President Truman vetoed the act. Arguments made against it in his veto message to Congress were considered and found to be unreasonable. The House voted to override the veto, 331 to 83, only one vote short of a 4-to-1 proportion. The Senate voted 68 to 25, to override the President's veto, and the measure became law of the land, objection of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The great majorities by which Congress passed the act and passed it again over the President's veto included Congressmen who are themselves union members and leaders of labor and who have the interests of unions and of labor at heart. Of the men and women who came to Congress last year and who certainly know what their constituents want, the overwhelming majority in both the House and the Senate supported the act.

Clearly, the act was not one passed by labor baiters and union haters, but was one that our people as a whole, and the rank and file of labor, demanded and still demand.

THE NEED FOR NEW LAWS

The Wagner Act was an experiment. When Congress passed it, there had been no law like it in our country or in any other. Experiment though it was, and notwithstanding that it created many obvious injustices, the act remained unchanged in all these years.

Now, what was the purpose of the Wagner Act? It states its purpose clearly in its preamble. The purpose was to increase the output of goods that move in the stream of interstate commerce and thus make available to all of our people, and at low cost, the things that we need and that raise our standard of living.

The Wagner Act undertook to increase output by encouraging collective bargaining and by attempting to remove some of the causes of strikes and other forms of industrial strife. It proposed to do this by protecting employees in their right to organize, by requiring employers to recognize and bargain collectively with unions of their employees and by setting up the National Labor Relations Board to carry out its terms.

Before Congress passed the Wagner Act, unions had enjoyed rapid growth. Under the act they continued to grow. That was one thing that Congress had intended, and was on the credit side. But other things happened that Congress did not foresee and did not intend.

For one thing, strikes, instead of growing less, increased. In each of the 10 years after Congress passed the act there were, on the average, about three times as many strikes as in each of the 10 years before the act. Even during the war, in 1944 and 1945, there were more strikes than ever before, and in 1946 a new record was set in number of strikes, in man-days idle because of strikes and in output lost as a result of strikes. Some of these strikes brought our country to the brink of disaster. Many of them cost workers losses in wages far greater than any gains that resulted from them.

The act had other results that Congress had not foreseen. It gave to unions great power—power not only in dealing with employers, but power under the law to fix the wages, hours, and working conditions not merely of their members but of all employees for whom they acted as exclusive bargaining agents under the act; and power often to discipline their members and drive from their jobs men who did not conform. This power was so great that competing unions went to all lengths to acquire it, and this often resulted in bitter rivalry between them, in jurisdictional strife, boycotts, violence, and other acts of which no responsible person approved. The Congress of Industrial Organizations came into being after Congress passed the act, and rivalry between it and the American Federation of Labor added to jurisdictional strife. Employers, employees, and the public alike were innocent victims of contests between the great federations.

Turning from their proper purpose to improve the wages, hours, and working conditions of working people, some unions undertook to use their power politically, even to the extent of attempting to dictate how their members should vote and of using member's dues to further political objectives opposed by many of the members.

As time went on, the need for bringing our labor laws up to date became more and more apparent. Demand for a change came from people in all walks of life—the public, workers and employers. In the election of 1946, public opinion polls showed labor legislation to be uppermost in the public mind, and they showed also that the majority of the workers and even the majority of union members themselves favored important reforms. In that election, many candidates who favored changing the Wagner Act won; many congressmen who, masquerading as friends of labor yet consistently exploiting the workingman for political purposes, met defeat.

Obviously, something was wrong with the Wagner Act and the worker knew it, and, in the last election, millions of workers voted to correct what is wrong.

WHAT THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT DOES

It is obvious that many who attack the Taft-Hartley Act have not read the act or else they deliberately seek to misrepresent it. The act, generally, is fair, sound, and long overdue. Many who oppose it, unable by quotation to make it appear unfair, use extreme, extravagant, and irresponsible adjectives in attacking it, or torture and distort the language of the act in an effort to make it seem to say what it does not say.

For example, they assert that by guaranteeing to workers the right to refrain from engaging in collective activities, just as it guarantees their right to engage in such activities when that is their wish, the act revives the hated yellow-dog contracts by which employers formerly required workers to agree not to join unions. The fact is that the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the very act that outlaws such unfair contracts, contains language almost identical with that which appears in the Taft-Hartley Act; and the Norris-LaGuardia Act, passed during a Republican administration and signed by a Republican President, has been one of the greatest bulwarks of labor for more than 15 years. No, one cannot blindly depend upon what some opponents of the Taft-Hartley Act say it means; one must read the bill itself to see that it is fair.

Take the commonest argument of those who oppose the act: That it oppresses labor. Obviously, the act does not oppress, or affect in any other way, the 45,000,000 people who work but who are not in unions. Nor does it, by a word or a line, compel any worker to render service to anyone for a single hour or part of an hour against his will. Nor does it outlaw any strike for improved wages, hours, or working conditions, except temporarily when the safety or welfare of the entire Nation is threatened.

A really oppressive labor bill Congress considered was the drastic proposal of President Truman last year, that the Government draft strikers and compel them to work. It was a Republican, Senator TAFT, who led in defeating that proposal; and it is he whom labor leaders are now trying to accuse of writing an oppressive bill.

Take another favorite argument of those who oppose the Taft-Hartley Act: That is will "destroy" unions. Those who say this necessarily imply that, in order to survive, unions must be free to coerce workers, to compel them to join unions; that they must be free to violate their contracts, to strike to compel employers to break the law and to engage in other lawlessness, unhampered by even a few of the laws that govern other adult citizens.

The Congress that passed the Taft-Hartley Act does not believe this. Many unions have grown great by rendering service to workers, not by coercing them: by conducting their affairs democratically, by acting responsibly.

The act preserves, in almost identical language, all the rights that employees and unions have had under the Wagner Act to organize and to bargain collectively and prohibits all the same unfair labor practices on the part of employers. Far from destroying the employees' rights, it strengthens them and assures to workers even greater freedom than they had before to exercise those rights. It guarantees to workers every right that they have had in the past to strike for legitimate objects. Saying that the act "destroys unions" is sheerest nonsense.

MAJOR CLAUSES OF THE ACT

Two things became clear as hearings before the committees of Congress proceeded. One was that, although the Wagner Act had given to unions great power over employers and workers, it had not imposed upon unions corresponding responsibilities. The result was that unions sometimes misused their power to the detriment not only of employers but also to the detriment of the public, and even of employees. The power of the

union was so great that workers rarely could protect themselves even when the union abused them or led them into disastrous and unnecessary strikes or used them for purposes of the union's leaders.

Another thing that became clear was that the National Labor Relations Board, which administers the act, had been following policies of its own instead of the policies that Congress had laid down in the act. Instead of attempting to correct abuses under the act, the Board permitted them, and even encouraged them.

To deal with these two problems, Congress did two things in the Taft-Hartley Act. It laid down fair rules for unions to follow in their dealings with employers and in their dealings with employees. And it revised the composition and procedures of the Labor Board so as to require it to render impartial decisions and not to favor unions against employers, employers against employees, or one union against another union.

UNION RESPONSIBILITY

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, unions may not restrain or coerce employees. Unions can organize workers in the usual way, but they cannot threaten them or beat them up to make them join one union or to keep them from joining another.

The act forbids unions and employers, by agreement, to compel employees to join a union unless the majority of the employees, by secret ballot, authorize the agreement; and it forbids unions and employers to deprive workers of their livelihood upon arbitrary or false grounds as long as the workers are willing, by paying fees and dues, to share the cost of maintaining the union.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act unions have the same duty to bargain collectively that employers always have had under the Wagner Act. Any union that in fact exists for a legitimate purpose can have no reasonable objection to this clause.

The act outlaws jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. The President himself asked Congress to enact such provisions of law as these and never made it clear what type of secondary boycott or jurisdictional strike could be a "good" strike.

If, but only if, an employer and a union agree on a union-shop contract, the Taft-Hartley Act says that the union's initiation fees must be reasonable.

The act forbids the kind of extortion by which a few unions have compelled employers to pay them for work that no one did.

These provisions are not extreme, they are not unreasonable. On the contrary, they are fair and moderate. But even if a union violates one of these clauses, what happens? The Labor Board can order the union to cease and desist, and if the union complies with the order there is no penalty. If the union persists and unfairly causes a man to be discharged, the Board can order the union to pay him back pay. In cases of unfair labor practices by employers, the Board has followed similar procedure for years, and the unions have seen nothing wrong with that. This same kind of procedure has been followed with respect to persons other than unions, under many laws, for many years.

Under other clauses of the act, members of unions are entitled to know how officers and representatives of the union are chosen and how much money they receive, what the requirements for admission to the union are, on what grounds a man may be expelled, how much money the union has, and what it does with money it collects from its members. The members also have the right to know that the union's officers are not Communists. If the union violates these clauses, no one can punish it. It merely loses its right to use the Labor Board, and be officially certified.

The act makes unions, as well as employers, suable in the Federal courts when they violate their contracts or engage in certain other unlawful conduct. Public opinion polls show that members of unions agree that both parties to a contract should live up to its terms, and that this clause is fair. If collective bargaining is to mean anything, and if it is to promote industrial peace, then certainly contracts must be binding on both sides.

Another clause enables the President to enjoin, for a limited time, the rare strikes that imperil the public health and safety. The President followed a like procedure in the coal strike last year. While the injunction lasts, collective bargaining, with the help of Government agencies, proceeds. But even in these cases, no one can compel any individual employee to work if he does not wish to work.

Another clause requires employers and unions, when they set up funds supposedly for the welfare of workers, to make arrangements to insure that the money will be used for the welfare of workers, and not for other purposes.

The Taft-Hartley Act exempts from the operation of the Wagner Act foremen, less than two percent of whom have shown any interest in collective bargaining and who, as bosses, ought not to mix themselves in the labor movement of their men.

Collective bargaining, like any other kind of bargaining, calls for two sides—management on one side, and the men on the other. Foremen are part of management, and management cannot operate unless its representatives are wholly loyal and have no divided allegiance.

The new act forbids unions to use members' dues for political purposes but leaves workers themselves free to engage in any kind of political activities they wish. Committees like the PAC collecting its funds frankly for political purposes are entirely legal. In exactly the same way, the Act forbids corporations to use stockholders' money for political purposes.

Other clauses of the Taft-Hartley Act simply say what the Labor Board and the courts already have said the Wagner Act means, and do not change the law. Still others are like clauses that most unions voluntarily include in contracts with employers.

Thus, a fair analysis of the act shows that it is not antiunion or oppressive. It will improve labor-management relations. It will not abolish strikes, and under it we will have strikes. We cannot forbid strikes and have free collective bargaining or free enterprise at all. But strikes will grow fewer in number, and they will be more for the benefit of the man at work than they have been in the past.

Unable to point to anything in the act that supports their outlandish assertions, opponents of the act try to claim that it can be construed to do more than, on its face, it sets out to do. If the Labor Board were prejudiced enough to apply the amended Wagner Act against unions as it has applied the original act against employers in the past, there might be some ground for the labor leaders' alleged fears. But this is not the case, and many provisions of the new law prevent any such application.

LABOR BOARD'S PROCEDURES

Far more than half the changes the Taft-Hartley Act makes in the Wagner Act do not relate to unions at all, but relate to the Labor Board, its organization, rulings, and procedures. The Board is required to render fair decisions. The act increases the number of Board members from three to five, and enables the Senate through the power of confirmation to see to it that the new members are fair-minded men. It provides that the chief administrative officer who passes on all prosecutions shall be independent of the Board, and enables the Senate to see to it that he, too, is a fair-minded man.

It thus abolishes the un-American system of having a single Board as complainant, prosecutor, judge, and jury.

The act requires the Board to decide cases before it according to legal evidence, and according to the weight of the evidence.

It forbids the Board to use against a union or an employer any statement that does not itself violate the Labor Act. It thus guarantees to all concerned the constitutional right of free speech.

And finally, if in any case the Board is unfair or makes a mistake, the act enables the courts to correct the Board's decision.

All these clauses safeguard the rights unions enjoyed under the old Wagner Act and will continue to enjoy under the amended act, and they will eliminate the unfairness that made decisions of the Board in the past a national scandal.

CONCLUSION

Changes that the Taft-Hartley Act make in our laws are for the benefit of collective bargaining, and under them unions will enjoy healthy growth. The changes are in response to the insistent demand of the overwhelming majority of our citizens.

Many clauses of the act appear in State and Federal laws under which unions have thrived for years. As long ago as 1940 Mr. William Green, president of the A. F. of L., approved many provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act when they appeared in a bill that the House of Representatives, when the Democrats controlled it, passed by a vote of more than 2 to 1. Other clauses appeared in

other bills that Congress passed when Democrats were in control.

Congress has considered these clauses and all other clauses of the bill carefully, many of them more than once. Assertions that Congress has acted hastily are not true.

The President of the United States proposed some of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, as well as others that were far more drastic than any that the Taft-Hartley Act contains.

This act, reflecting the considered judgment of the majority of both parties in both Houses of Congress, is designed in the interest of all our people, and particularly in the interest of working men and women, to further the purpose of the Wagner Act to increase output and to strengthen the protection the Wagner Act gives to workers in their organizing and collective-bargaining activities.

The act forbids interference from any source with the workers' rights. It equalizes collective bargaining and gives meaning and effect to agreements that result from collective bargaining, in the interest of stability and peace. And it curbs those within the labor movement whose excesses, deliberate or otherwise, bring discredit upon legitimate labor unions and threaten to wreck them.

Admission of Hawaii to Union Urged by Boston Globe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the July 2 issue of the Boston Globe, of Boston, Mass., as follows:

THE FORTY-NINTH STATE

The way apparently has been cleared to statehood for Hawaii. Although delay is forecast in the Senate and the Senate's Public Lands Committee may visit the islands before recommending action one way or the other, the House of Representatives' vote of 196 to 133 in favor of statehood is the high mark of Hawaii's 50-year campaign for such recognition.

So many years have passed since the forty-eighth star was added to the American flag (for Arizona, in 1912), that most people have forgotten the old tests for responsible statehood. Whatever they were, it is likely that Hawaii satisfies them fully. Its area is larger than that of Rhode Island or Delaware or Connecticut. Its population of more than a half million is greater than that of any State, except one, on the date of its admission to the Union. In those public affairs which the citizens, through their Territorial legislature, have been free to conduct for themselves, its record has been good—in education, it has been excellent.

Everyone knows Hawaii's vast resources. Its sugar crop is valued at $65,000,000 annually. Its second most important product, the pineapple, brings the islands a yearly return of more than $55,000,000 and represents a remarkable 30-year program of supplying a market for canned fruit and juice which simply did not exist a generation ago; Hawaii had to create the demand. Other sources, including a lively tourist business, swell the islands' income; and so completely has the feudalism of the kingdom of 50 years ago been stamped out that 46 percent of Hawaii's residents share these returns sufficiently to pay Federal income taxes.

They have a case for statehood based on taxation alone. In 35 years Hawaiians have contributed to the National Treasury $200,000,000 more than they have received in appropriations. They have, in fact, suffered badly as a result of a blind spot in the eye of the Government to which they were paying enormous sums. Once, in 1934, Congress passed a law which all but wiped out the islands' sugar-refining industry in favor of that on the mainland. Again, at various times, the Territory has been omitted—either by oversight or purposely—from Federal highway-aid legislation and from benefits that would have promoted its training of agriculturists. Moreover, Congress has turned down 27 times bills similar to that which the House of Representatives has now approved.

It is probable that the advance of air transportation, lessening the distance between the continental United States and the islands, is one of the factors in changing Washington's point of view. If there is also a disposition in the Congress to reward Hawaiian wartime patriotism, it is no more than just. Not only did Hawaiians of all strains fight creditably on every front, but the history of the island's AJA's—Americans of Japanese ancestry—was especially notable. People will not soon forget the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion of Japanese-Americans, the most decorated unit that ever served in the United States Army.

Less well known is the war activity of older Japanese. Their sympathies uncertain after Pearl Harbor, the farmers among them were treated as this Territory has always treated each segment of its mixed population—on terms of equality with other groups. To a remarkable degree they responded with increased production of food for the wartime visitors and the ships which took on provisions there. It was an excellent tribute to the effectiveness of an enlightened policy.

If the Senate Public Lands Committee sits in Honolulu it will have a new opportunity to judge the strength of sentiment for statehood. A 1940 plebiscite on the question was 2 to 1 in favor; observers say that the percentage now is much higher and that there is no longer an organized opposition to the change. This being true, there would seem to be no further valid objection to denying to the island people a status they evidently deserve.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Colorado-Big Thompson Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the following address was made by Attorney at Law Hatfield Chilson, of Loveland, Colo., who has been actively connected with the project since its beginning. In his address he analyzes the benefits that may be expected from this great project, which will provide 315,000 acre-feet of water for supplementary use. Mr. Chilson tells us that there have been few years since irrigation was started during the 1880's that there have been ample supplies of irrigation water.

We are tonight completing the ceremonies dedicating the Adams tunnel. This is one of the key features in the Colorado-Big Thompson project, which will tap the headwaters of the Colorado River, and by means of this tunnel will make these waters available to northeastern Colorado for two purposes—irrigation and power.

I have neither the knowledge nor experience to speak with authority on the power features of the project. However, as a citizen, I am aware of the tremendous shortage of power in Colorado and in the entire United States. Also, I know that as the use of power increases, so increases the productivity of mankind. The production of power from this water will undoubtedly be of great benefit, not only to northeastern Colorado, but also to the State of Colorado and to the Rocky Mountain region as a whole.

As a resident of this area, I can speak with some authority of the benefits which will be derived within the conservancy district from this supplemental supply of water to be applied to irrigation, domestic and municipal uses. However, it is somewhat presumptuous for me to attempt to tell you people who are also residents of this area what these benefits are. All of you are as competent to speak of these benefits as I am.

For instance, why should I attempt to tell farmer Smith that if this water had been available last year for the irrigation of his barley, that his yield per acre would have been 60 bushels rather than 30 bushels? He is more aware of this fact than I am, and it is probably somewhat painful to be reminded of it. Similarly, why should I tell farmer Smith's implement dealer that the reason farmer Smith didn't buy the new tractor last fall is because the barley crop wasn't so good? He, too, is well aware of that fact.

I will assume, therefore, that I talk to you tonight not so much for your information as for the benefit of the record. The conservancy district in which the water will be used is composed of parts of seven counties; namely, Boulder, Larimer, Weld, Morgan, Logan, Washington, and Sedgwick.

In 80 years this area of northeastern Colorado has grown from its virgin state of grass and sagebrush to a highly developed and well-settled area.

Within the district are more than 600,000 acres of irrigated lands; it has a present estimated population of 130,000 persons. Of these persons, approximately 50,000 are rural residents and some 80,000 are residents of such towns and cities as Greeley, Fort Collins, Longmont, Loveland, Fort Morgan, Brush, Sterling, Julesburg, Berthoud, Johnstown, Windsor, and many others. It reaches from the foothills easterly to the State line.

It is a prosperous and progressive area. Its agriculture is diversified, ranging from fruits and vegetables to sugar beets, grains, and forage crops. Crop rotation, livestock feeding, fertilization, and other soil-conserving and progressive farming practices are generally followed. Its livestock industry is widely and favorably known.

Its towns and cities are prosperous and progressive and are growing rapidly. New industries have been established and old ones have been expanded.

I have been informed that, based on the crop yields for the period from 1929 to 1938, and applying the price average from 1923 to 1942, that the value of the average annual production from crops, livestock, and agricultural processing is in excess of $50,000,000 per year.

A stranger might well ask, "If this area is so highly developed and prosperous, what is there in this particular project which can

be of any great benefit?" To us who reside in the area the answer is obvious, "More water." At the risk of being trite, I repeat that time-worn phrase, "Water is the life-blood of the West," and truer words were never spoken. Growing towns and expanding industry need water; farm lands, with increased diversification of crops, need more water. In spite of our highly developed agriculture, there have been few years in which an entirely ample supply of irrigation water has been available when needed. I emphasize the words, "when needed." A heavy flood of water in June does not help the farmer in August unless those waters can be stored and made available when needed. It is this storage of water contemplated by this project which makes this water so very valuable. It is available when it is needed.

The estimates are that the cash value of crop losses in this district due to water shortages has run as high as $13,000,000 in a single year, and over a period of years has averaged $7,000,000 annually.

You can imagine for yourselves what benefits there may be to a community of 130,000 people to have an additional $7,000,000 per year added to community income.

The raising of additional crops will tend to an increase in the livestock, dairy, and poultry industries; an increase in crops and livestock will cause an expansion of processing industries in connection with agriculture and livestock.

Such an increase and expansion must add to the prosperity of the farmer, and as the farmer prospers so prospers his merchant, his doctor, his lawyer, his newspaper, and his neighbors.

When Farmer Smith knows at the beginning of his crop year that there is a certain amount of water stored in a reservoir for his use when needed, Farmer Smith can plan his irrigation. He may still be hailed out; he may still lose his crop by grasshoppers, by freeze or by disease, but at least one, and I may say the principal, cause of crop loss, lack of water, will be eliminated.

Are the residents of this area aware of the benefits of this project? The record will speak for itself.

In the first place, at the time of the formation of the conservancy district, the residents of the district voted to tax all property in the district, whether farm land, business property, industries or homes, to help pay for the project. In the second place, the farmers and municipalities have agreed to pay the district $1.50 per acre foot for this water, and after transit losses and expenses their cost will be between two and three dollars per acre foot.

The pipe-line project for the temporary diversion of water through the Adams tunnel, which enabled this celebration to be held at this time, is perhaps a good indication of what the water users think of the benefits to be obtained. Five ditch companies in the Big Thompson Valley, together with the city of Loveland, invested approximately $115,000 in the construction of this pipe line, which runs from the east portal of the Adams tunnel to the Big Thompson River. By means of this pipe line a supplemental supply of water will be obtained from the headwaters of the Colorado River for use in the Big Thompson Valley, until the permanent project is completed. I might say for the benefit of those who may not know, that our ditch companies and cities do not pay out that kind of money without the expectation of substantial returns.

I could, if time permitted, go into some detail as to the benefits of this project to the State of Colorado as a whole and to the Nation. I could, for instance, point out that economists say that $1 of newly created wealth creates $6 of wealth to the Nation's economy. I could show how an assured water supply could aid in the general farm economy of the Nation by making greater diversification of crops possible in this area to avoid growing crops of which there may be a surplus elsewhere. I could point out the recreational possibilities afforded by the reservoirs to be constructed as a part of this project. Time does not permit, and I will conclude with this thought. Famine and war are two diseases which have ravaged the world from time immemorial. We have just finished a devastating war, and famine now rules in a great portion of the world; but no country has ever lost a war and no peoples have ever starved because that country and its peoples produced too much.

Letter to Drew Pearson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, since there has been so much misinformation in regard to the attitude of the people of California in their claims for the ownership of oil under the marginal sea adjacent to that State, I take pleasure in inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Long Beach Independent which sets forth clearly the position of the people of California in this so-called tidelands affair:

LETTER TO DREW PEARSON

On several occasions we have printed your column in which you refer to the Federal seizure of submerged lands as taking away the lands from oil companies. Your usually well informed sources have certainly misled you on this issue. The great loss is to the State, county, and municipal governments of California. It is doubtful that the oil companies will lose anything. But the loss to the people of California will run into hundreds of millions of dollars. The court decision as worded will protect the oil companies.

Each of the oil wells drilled on these submerged lands is controlled by a lease between an oil company and the State government. Or if the State had vested title of the lands in a county or municipal government, the lease was made between the oil company and the respective governmental bodies. The oil companies pay royalties to these branches of government at rates considerably higher than any percentage received by the Federal Government where it has leased land to oil companies. For this reason it is unlikely that the Federal Government will change the lease held by the oil company. It will simply mean the royalty will be paid to the Federal Government rather than a branch of California government.

For example, Mr. Pearson, the submerged lands from which the city of Long Beach has taken oil or hoped to take oil are probably the richest lands on the coast. It is estimated the total production would reach over 300,000,000 barrels. The money received from these wells to date has gone into development of our harbor which played so vital a part during the war. We had hoped to greatly improve the harbor and use the balance of income for civic improvements over the next 20 to 50 years.

After costs of drilling and producing the oil were paid, the city has received 85.5 percent of the income from the wells in the harbor. The oil company gets a total of 14.5 percent for its supervision, profit on original investment, and gamble. That was a lease made by the city in 1939. The city has just completed another lease with the Richfield Oil Co., wherein the city gets 94.1 percent of all income after costs of production and the oil company gets 5.9 percent. The average net to the city has been over 60 percent of all oil produced. The other 40 percent has paid costs and left the company a maximum of 14.5 percent as shown above.

Now, Mr. Pearson, to our knowledge, the Federal Government has never received royalties half as great from an oil company. It is not likely to take anything away from an oil company where such leases are in force. It can only take away the royalties that have gone to the people—not individuals, Mr. Pearson, but the people.

Another point is that every foot of these seized lands has a Federal mineral claim filed upon it. These are filed by individuals who hope to profit by this seizure. These are of record in Washington. Now that the Federal Government claims to own the lands, these mineral claims may have priority. It is well known that great pressure has been brought by these individuals to bring about this seizure. Without it their claims are valueless. If there is to be a scandal, it will probably come out of these claims that are even filed on our breakwater.

Your columns are read in every State. Your influence is great. We feel you have done an injustice to California by the impression you have created. Will you not check these facts and give your readers a true picture of the situation? This is not a Teapot Dome or Elk Hills scandal. It is an example of the people developing oil lands with the greatest protection to the people ever shown in the oil business. It is a correction and cause worthy of your consideration.—L. A. C.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the following resolutions by the Church Federation of Indianapolis, Inc., and the Indiana State Pastors' Conference opposing the adoption of universal military training:

STATEMENT ON UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING OF THE CHURCH FEDERATION OF INDIANAPOLIS, INC.

The executive committee of the Church Federation of Indianapolis at its regular meeting on April 7, 1947, expressed its opposition to any type of universal military training in peacetime and requested the Committee on International Justice and Goodwill to present these sentiments to persons charged with responsibility for determining governmental policy on this issue.

In keeping with the instruction of the executive committee the Committee on International Justice and Goodwill affirms that the opposition of the Church Federation of Indianapolis, Inc. to universal military training rests upon the following premises:

1. The adoption of universal military training in the United States would belie our commitment to cooperative action in the United Nations and would undermine confidence in the evolving international

machinery which alone holds forth hope of bringing to realization mankind's universal aspiration for peace.

2. At the present stage of scientific development mass armies recruited through a universal draft are unrealistic and foster a dangerous sense of false security.

3. The development of more enlightened policies on the part of the Army, the provision of greater vocational opportunities and better pay for volunteers would secure the forces necessary for a modern, mobile, and technically trained Army without drafting teen-age youth.

4. It is un-American and unwise to risk the character and morality of millions of our young men in an experiment which elsewhere has proved demoralizing and destructive of the very democratic principles which we seek to conserve.

5. The experience of nations utilizing universal military training does not indicate that even under past conditions of warfare this system either prevents attacks or insures victory.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE INDIANA STATE PASTORS' CONFERENCE, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

I. A RESOLUTION CONCERNING UNIVERSAL PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING

The annual State pastor's conference in regular session at the Third Christian Church at Indianapolis, Ind., January 27 to 29, 1947, is concerned to make known its strong opposition to the proposals for permanent peacetime military training.

We believe that permanent peacetime military training to be an unwise public policy. Many of our stanchest citizens came to this country seeking liberty and freedom from the permanent militarization of society in Europe. It have been the cherished tradition in America for 150 years that such militarization should not be imposed upon our people in peacetime. Military conscription is no guarantee of peace and freedom from attack as evidenced by the experience of Russia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, and France. Security can come only through good will and confidence leading toward an organized and cooperative world.

II. RESOLUTION ON THE UNIVERSAL ABOLITION OF PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION

Be it resolved, That the annual State pastors' conference, in regular session at Indianapolis, Ind., January 27-29, go on record as supporting Congressman GERALD W. LANDIS, of Linton, Ind., in his proposals, asking that the United States delegate, Warren R. Austin, of the United Nations Organization, be instructed to work for an immediate international agreement, eliminating compulsory military training from the policies and practices of all nations.

We also request the officers of this meeting to convey this message to President Truman, Secretary of State Marshall, and the Senators and Representatives in the Indiana delegation of Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., and the Chief Delegate of the United States to the United Nations Organization.

III. RESOLUTION ON AMNESTY FOR CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Whereas the President of the United States has established an Amnesty Board to consider the treatment of conscientious objectors to war still in prison, and others who though released suffer from civil disabilities arising from their adherence to the dictates of their conscience: Be it

Resolved, That the Indiana Pastors' Conference commend the action of the President of the United States and calls upon the Presidential board to recommend a general amnesty as the only practicable means to release conscientious objectors still in prison and to restore the civil rights of men imprisoned for the sake of conscience.

We Are Being Beaten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the following column from the typewriter of Peter Edson appeared in a recent issue of the Sripps-Howard newspaper of Washington, D. C., the Daily News. It is a thought-provoking commentary. Its implications are factual and frightening. It describes eventualities which we in Congress have the power and the duty to avert. It merits our thoughtful reading. It is my hope Congress will take early action to correct the consequences which it describes:

WE'RE BEING BEATEN
(By Peter Edson)

The House has now passed South Dakota Republican KARL E. MUNDT'S bill authorizing the State Department to conduct the Voice of America broadcasts and other cultural relations programs to spread democracy in foreign countries. The bill will probably get through the Senate with some amending.

But even when signed by the President and made a law, the Mundt bill will be a good bit like a pardon to save the Voice's life in order to starve it to death later on. House and Senate Appropriations Committees have hacked Assistant Secretary of State William Benton's Office of Information budget so heavily it has no chance to be effective, whether it ever was before or not.

What started out to be a $31,000,000 program was cut to $10,000,000, then eliminated altogether by the House. The Senate Appropriations Committee has now indicated it will raise the figure to $13,000,000. But $1,500,000 of that is to half-liquidate the outfit and bring back home from overseas all the experienced foreign-service people who will have to be fired.

In all this monkeying around, one basic fact seems to have been ignored. It is that in recent months the United States has been taking a terrible beating in the business of waging ideological warfare.

The shooting ended 2 years ago and the end of hostilities was officially declared last New Year's eve. But the war isn't over by a long shot. Only the weapons and the enemies have changed.

The Nazis were licked with guns and bombs. The only way to lick communism would seem to be with a counterattack of ideas—the ideas of democracy. They're what have to be taken out and sold—spread by printed word and word of mouth in foreign countries.

The throwing around of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of relief and loans and military weapons is fine, but it apparently isn't enough. The reason it isn't enough is that the Communists go around spreading lies about all the good deeds.

It isn't necessary to go out and tell lies about the Communists—to fight dirty just because they fight dirty—though that has been suggested. But it is necessary to counterattack with truth.

Cuts which the Senate Appropriations subcommittee under Senator JOE BALL, Republican, Minnesota, has just put in the State Department's "counter-intelligence" program make its task almost hopeless.

On an $11,500,000 net basis for next year, $8,000,000 will have to be spent in the United States. Broadcasting the Voice of America programs will take $6,000,000 of that.

The reduced appropriation will make it necessary to close half the offices now being operated in 77 foreign countries. It will close half the American libraries. It will practically end the making and showing of American documentary movies.

It will reduce the "army" of 2,600 trained specialists now fighting United States propaganda warfare to a mere 600. That number is a bit reminiscent of the old fifth reader poem about the gallant 600 in the Charge of the Light Brigade.

They were licked before they started.

Colorado-Big Thompson Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to attend the celebration and the ceremonies dedicating the Adams Tunnel, which is part of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. This tunnel pierces the backbone of the Continental Divide through the Rocky Mountains. This tunnel brings the water from the western slope of the Rocky Mountains over into the South Platte Valley on the eastern side. The tunnel is 13.2 miles in length and approximately 9 feet square. It will bring supplementary water to provide for shortages during dry years for more than 600,000 acres of irrigated land. All this land is now in cultivation and this extra water will be used when necessary to insure full production.

Mr. J. M. Dille, who made the following address, is secretary-manager of the northern Colorado water conservancy district and has been connected with the project since its inception:

In speaking on behalf of President Hansen and the directors of the conservancy district, about all I can say is to try to express our gratification at the passing of one more milestone in the history of the project.

While other goals have been reached during the 14 years since the program was definitely initiated by the people of northeastern Colorado, the water now flowing toward us, through the tunnel we dedicate today, constitutes the first concrete result of all the years of dreaming, planning, and working.

In spite of present evidence to the contrary, in the prospect of the best local water supply we have ever had, the history of irrigation in northern Colorado is largely a record of short and variable water supplies.

We have the soil, the climate, and the people, but the full agricultural, economic, and social possibilities of this region can only be attained by "firming up" the water supply which is the base of the entire structure that is built upon it.

Following the first mass meeting of public-spirited men in 1933, many problems required solution to get the project in motion. First Mr. R. J. Tipton, consulting engineer, of Denver, made a preliminary report which showed that such a diversion project was feasible.

On the strength of this report, the Bureau of Reclamation was allotted $150,000 to make a complete survey. Their report, released in April 1937, proposed a combined irrigation and power development.

During this period contracts were made with leading irrigation men on the western slope and, as a result of numerous conferences, satisfactory solutions of conflicting interests were worked out, and best of all, friendly relations in the interests of the State and all parties concerned were firmly established.

When, in 1936, it became evident that the Bureau would develop a feasible project, it was realized that some special form of organization was necessary to contract with the United States, guarantee repayment of construction costs, and to do all the things necessary to properly distribute the benefits and costs of the project over such a large, self-developed, and complicated area.

After many months of study by our attorneys and others, a bill for a Conservancy District Act was written and enacted into law by the State legislature in May 1937.

Governor Knous, then a justice of the Supreme Court of Colorado, later wrote the opinion of that court upholding the constitutionality of this act.

Perhaps outstanding among many special provisions of the act is the power given to the directors to levy a tax on all real and personal property in the district. This tax is limited to one-half mill during the construction period and to 1 mill thereafter.

This tax really represents a small reflection of the indirect benefits of the project to the general public and also acts to reduce the cost of water to the farmers.

On petition of property owners, as the act provides, the district was organized in September 1937 by Judge Claude C. Coffin, of our district court.

The 11 directors of the district are also appointed and reappointed by Judge Coffin.

The next important step was the negotiation of a contract with the United States for construction of the project. As most other reclamation projects had been built for the development of new lands, the problems involved in organizing a project to furnish a supplemental water supply to such an old developed area as northern Colorado were new and complex.

A contract was required that would leave all the power features of the project with the United States but which would provide definite terms on which the district would repay the part of project costs allocated to irrigation use.

The reclamation law required such a contract and it was also necessary that the district have the exact terms and conditions as the basis for presenting the proposal to the property owners and water users of the district. During this period many conferences and public meetings were held throughout the district to explain the program and to get the sentiment and advice of the people.

Bureau officials in Denver and Washington cooperated with the district in working out a plan that would assure the United States of repayment and also permit the district to distribute and allocate the water on terms and conditions that the users would accept.

Present water supplies vary widely throughout the district and it was necessary to have a flexible plan that would permit the directors to distribute the water to fit individual and local conditions. In fact, the framing of the district act and the writing of the repayment contract were coordinated in a plan designed to meet the requirements of the reclamation law and also satisfy, as far as possible, all the special needs and conditions of the district.

For instance, when it became known that the part of the cost of the project allocated to the district would require a charge of $2 per acre-foot annually for the water, further meetings were held throughout the district to determine whether this charge would be acceptable as the basis of contract repayment.

When it was finally determined that this was more than the water users were able to pay, the plan for a general property tax was developed to carry part of the load and permit a water charge that the users would accept.

It was finally agreed that if about 50 cents of the annual water charge could be borne by the general taxpayers and the water assessment reduced to $1.50 per acre-foot annually, a repayment contract could be approved by the electors.

The district act and the repayment contract were finally completed to conform to such a plan.

The contract negotiated by representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation and the district directors was approved at an election of taxpayers of the district at which nearly 8,000 electors voted.

In furtherance of the plan the district has already, by recorded contracts, allotted over two-thirds of the 310,000 acre-feet of water on the basis of $1.50 per acre foot, which, together with the mill tax on all property in the district, will fully meet the obligations of the repayment contract.

Most of this water has been allotted to individual farms to fill their particular needs for additional water.

Limited appropriations, the war needs, and many other obstacles have prevented the Bureau of Reclamation from pushing the construction of the project as was expected 10 or 12 years ago.

However, the Bureau is now well underway on an expedited program that should complete most of the irrigation features in the next 3 or 4 years.

In the meantime they have cooperated in making possible the use of the Alva B. Adams Tunnel in bringing water to that part of the conservancy district in the Big Thompson Valley.

The people in this valley are paying for the water and for the temporary pipe line which makes possible this early use and dedication of the tunnel.

During the construction of the project, in addition to developing our own organization and plans, the district has cooperated with the Bureau in such matters as securing rights-of-way, adjudication of water rights, details of water distribution facilities, and, of course, in securing appropriations from the Congress for the project.

I may add that the district has paid most of the $100,000 to Grand County in compensation for reduced tax income.

Mr. R. J. Tipton has been consulting engineer for the district since he made the first report, and his advice and judgment have been invaluable.

Mr. William R. Kelly, present attorney for the district, and others have taken good care of legal matters.

In addition to Senator Alva B. Adams, in whose memory we dedicate this tunnel today, we owe a debt of gratitude to Senator JOHNSON, Senator MILLIKIN, and Congressman HILL of this district, who have kept closely in touch with project problems and given their solution first place on their busy Washington schedules.

Particularly, I think, we owe a debt we can never pay to Clifford H. Stone, director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board. The freely given time and help and the sound advice of Judge Stone have been a pillar of strength to the District ever since he took up the direction of the water board in the same year the district was organized.

Of course, the district is waiting anxiously for the day when the full project can be put into operation. Only then will we know whether the plans that have been worked out to superimpose a supplemental water project over such an area, allot and deliver the water, collect the taxes and assessments and keep to the letter our obligation to the United States, will be fully successful.

Perhaps, 3 years from now—if Congress cooperates, and we think they will—the power plants in Estes Park and the rest of the irrigation features will be completed and we can have another gathering to dedicate the entire project, with both irrigation and power benefits to a better, fuller life to thousands both within and without the district.

Waste and Wanton Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, while Europe starves and the Congress continues to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars under administration pressure for relief all over the world, the administration goes its merry way continuing, almost without number, acts of waste and wanton destruction and displaying a degree of frustration, confusion and incompetence, never before witnessed in this country.

In the Pathfinder of July 2 we are informed that the battle of the potatoes had boiled down into a verbal spud-slinging contest between Secretary of Agriculture Anderson and Representative ANDRESEN.

Congressional resentment had smoldered since last year when the Agriculture Department paid farmers $80,000,000 in price-support checks for 87,000,000 bushels of potatoes, then destroyed 22,000,000.

It flared last month when Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Republican, of Minnesota, charged Agriculture Secretary Clinton Anderson with making a mess of the potato price support program. It grew hotter when Anderson angrily replied: "The fault lies not with me but with Congress, who wrote the law."

By last week our colleague [Mr. ANDRESEN] was ahead on points. His special subcommittee relentlessly cross-examined Secretary Anderson's top officials, tripped them on two facts that did not make sense:

First. Early this year the Department dumped thirteen and one-tenths million bushels of good Maine spuds it had bought from farmers at $1.50 to $2.20 a hundredweight.

Second. The Agriculture Department did not have enough surplus left to fill this spring's export orders.

In January Spain contracted for 60,000 tons of surplus Maine potatoes. But when 18 Spanish ships called at Searsport, Maine, to take them aboard, they had to sail home with only 20,000 tons. Similarly, Mr. Anderson short-changed the War Department by 33,500 tons on a seed-potato order for German relief.

Across the Nation, Representative ANDRESEN stormed, there had been wanton waste. In Virginia the Government paid farmers $2.25 a hundredweight to destroy potatoes, creating such a shortage that Canadian spuds now sell wholesale in Richmond for $4.50.

They present a picture showing mountains of potatoes in Alabama to be dumped and burned by Government agents. This sort of operation is beyond human understanding.

Dollar Economy and Soil Erosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marquis Childs from the Washington Post:

DOLLAR ECONOMY AND SOIL EROSION
(By Marquis Childs)

The Mississippi River at flood crest is rolling down to the sea and carrying with it the stuff of life itself. It is carrying millions of tons of topsoil that can never be replaced.

We read headlines about the damage in dollars done by the floods in the Middle West.

One expert estimate puts the cost of soil erosion thus far in Iowa alone at $107,000,000.

Dollars are such a feeble measurement of the loss, since the soil that goes washing down the river is literally priceless. While we measure with the dollar sign, the true values slip away and are ignored.

* * * * *

Behind the dollar sign is the threat to the well-being, yes, to the very existence of the Nation. There are those with expert knowledge who believe that the great bread basket of America in the Middle West is rapidly approaching the stage of erosion that existed in the South 20 years ago.

Without an immediate large-scale advance to check the rate of erosion, our best farming country will go on washing down into the great sewer of the Gulf of Mexico. That means widening gullies. It means barren subsurface clay and rock. It means eventually drought, dust storms, and desert.

In fact of all this, with every river in the Mississippi system boiling brown with precious soil, it is hard to understand a Congress that hacks away at the funds for the Soil Conservation Service. It is hard to understand until you remember that economy to most Members of the Eightieth Congress means dollars. Such economy completely and tragically overlooks the loss of the wealth that is our bone and sinew, our staff and our strength.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended an appropriation of $48,120,000 for the Soil Conservation Service. That was a little less than $2,000,000 over last year's budget. The House cut this to $40.273,000, and the Senate has thus far shown little disposition to restore even a part of the cut.

Arbitrarily the House cut the amount available for research from $1,423,000 to $673,000. That somehow points up the folly of this dollar economy, for if one thing is important it is to work on new ways to stop the real loss in the good earth that feeds and clothes us.

One of the important functions of the Federal Government in these matters is to provide know-how and guidance for the States and local districts that are setting up soil-conservation projects. There are now more than 1,800 such districts covering about three-fourths of all the farms in the United States.

But in spite of what has been done so far, the losses are still terrifyingly large. H. H. Bennett, chief of the Soil Conservation Service, estimates we are losing around 500,000 acres of farmland through erosion every year. Measured by the dollar sign, this is at least $1,000,000,000 a year.

Soil conservation, through terracing, contour plowing, and numerous other techniques, is directly related to floods. The more water that can be kept in the soil, the lower the level of the flooded rivers. Bennett believes it is possible to cut down flood crests as much as 20 percent through work now being undertaken.

From one river system you hear no reports of floods. This is the Tennessee Valley. Thanks to TVA, the Tennessee system is today the best controlled river system in the world.

Heavy rainfall in the Tennessee Valley in 1945 and 1946 would almost certainly have brought major flood damage at such vulnerable points as Chattanooga if it had not been for TVA's dams and conservation system. Here is an example of constructive effort that stands out in startling contrast to the disaster in the Mississippi Valley—a disaster that will cost at least $100,000,000 quite apart from the soil loss. We can do these things if only we will have faith in our own powers.

Half a Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, no cause in the history of humanity has been more important than the current efforts to make this a permanent peace. It is sincerely to be hoped, therefore, that before this Congress adjourns it will reenforce rather than reduce the mechanics available to the United States in persuading the people of the world to embrace forms of behavior which will enable peace to endure.

The House of Representatives by its overwhelming vote in approval of H. R. 3342 did its part in helping to equip our State Department with the weapons it needs to advance the struggle for peace. It is now up to the other body to schedule H. R. 3342 for action to the end that a comprehensive and carefully controlled program of United States information abroad can be put into operation while there is yet time to avert the development of conditions which make wars inevitable.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the House in voting its approval of a program of information and educational exchanges to dispel distrusts abroad and to develop the wide areas of mutual respect and understanding which are so essential to permanent peace has won widespread acclaim among the outstanding newspapers of America. Innumerable editorials have been written praising the House action and urging similar action by the other body of Congress. At this point in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to a brief but significant editorial which is typical of many others which might have been selected to illustrate the newspaper support being accorded to H. R. 3342 from every section of this country.

The following editorial is from the Washington Post for the morning of July 2, 1947:

HALF A VOICE

If any further emphasis is needed, Secretary of State Marshall's appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this morning to urge passage of the Mundt bill should demonstrate the importance he attaches to the foreign information program. This is the fourth time Mr. Marshall has gone to Congress to plead for this arm of our foreign policy which the Senate has severely weakened. The temporary funds contained in the rider approved Monday at the behest of the Appropriations Committee are better than nothing, but they are pitifully inadequate for the work expected. The Senate's parsimony is strange at a time when we have invested so much in trying to stabilize our kind of world. Among other effects of the cut, nearly half our information officers overseas must be recalled, nearly half our libraries must be closed, our broadcasts must be curtailed, our film audiences decimated. Activities must cease entirely in 11 countries. We hope that the Foreign Relations Committee will see the damage of this sort of economy to our national interest. The Mundt bill in itself would not assure more funds, but it would dignify the information program by placing it on a permanent basis. If the committee makes an all-out drive for enactment of the bill in the Senate, it then will be in a position to return and ask for the money necessary to do a thorough job in telling the truth about America.

Senseless Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, another ironical story of the senseless policies of this administration was impressed upon us by a news item a few days ago. During the war and since, we have supplied the world with merchandise and machinery of every description. It comes to mind that during the war American farm machinery was available to almost anyone in the world except the American farmer. Now we find ourselves without sufficient farm machinery for the harvest and are dependent upon our neighbors. A recent Associated Press dispatch says approximately 500 combines from Saskatchewan are assisting with the United States midwestern harvest and approximately 100 more are on the way according to M. E. Hartnett, a Saskatchewan agriculture department official.

He also said that most of the combines now en route probably would be sent to Kansas, where the harvesting is reported delayed by a shortage of equipment. Because Saskatchewan had agreed to send farm workers to eastern Canada for harvesting, it was doubtful if any more men or equipment could be sent to the United States.

It is reasonable to believe that these combines are from American factories and delivered to Canada in preference to our own people. This is just another administration operation very difficult to explain and understand.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of July 5, 1947:

THE INSISTENT MR. KNUTSON

The Ways and Means Committee has reported out a new version of the tax reduction bill recently vetoed by the President, and the Republicans are reported to be counting upon the House and Senate to act on the legislation in time to send it to the White House by the end of next week. If this timetable is adhered to, they point out, the possibility of pocket veto will be avoided, since adjournment is not scheduled before July 26. They apparently feel that they might muster a sufficient number of votes to pass the bill over a regular veto.

Events conceivably may justify this belief. It is possible that the President's veto of the labor bill, coming, as it did, on the heels of similar action on the earlier tax bill, cost him enough strength to make possible repassage of the proposed measure over a second veto. But this hardly seems likely. When a case is reopened in a court of law it is usually on the basis of new evidence calculated to strengthen it. But the only change in the new version of the tax reduction bill is that it puts the effective date off 6 months, or until January 1 of next year. To many this will seem to make the issue more or less academic.

The President vetoed the original bill because, he said, it was "the wrong kind of tax reduction at the wrong time." To be consistent he would have to take the same course with respect to the successor bill. If the first was wrong in "kind," then the second, since it is identical in character, would face the same objection. As to its timing, Mr. Truman could certainly argue with a good deal of force that it was too early now to say with any certainty what the budget and business position would look like in January 1948. There is no doubt that such an argument would be respectfully received, since it was employed repeatedly by those conservative Members of Congress who warned against too precipitate action in the case of the original measure.

The tax-reduction bill would mean a decline in revenue over a year of $4,000,000,000 but the loss in the second half of fiscal 1948 is placed at only about $1,500,000,000. Estimates of Colin Stam, the congressional staff expert, point to a surplus for fiscal 1948 of $3,900,000,000, even with no reduction in the Truman budget. That would allow for the tax reduction of $1,500,000,000, it is pointed out, in addition to a reduction of $2,400,000,000 in the Federal debt.

Doubtless these estimates are as scientific as could be expected of any such forecasts. But the public may perhaps be forgiven if events over the past several months have given rise to a certain amount of healthy skepticism about fiscal predictions generally. Among other things, it has seen the 1947 budget underestimated by upward of $10,000,000,000 on both the revenue and the spending side. It has seen estimate of a deficit for the year just ended give way to predictions of a surplus of as much as $3,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000—predictions which, in turn, gave way before reality in the form of an actual surplus of about $75,000,000. And it has seen confident statements by the Republicans that they could cut down the Truman 1948 budget by from $4,500,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 proven to be largely illusory. Against such a sobering background it seems doubtful if Representative KNUTSON can expect to arouse an inordinate amount of enthusiasm either in or out of Congress at this juncture with his warmed-over legislation.

Are Levees the Answer to Floods?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the Prairie du Rocher (Ill.) Sun on Friday, July 4, 1947, on the very important subject of flood control in the Mississippi Valley.

This article was written by the editor and publisher of the Sun, the Honorable A. A. Brands, a member of the House in the Illinois General Assembly.

The article fo"ows:

ARE LEVEES THE ANSWER TO FLOODS?

After the 1943 flood, the writer in conversation with the United States engineers gave as his practical opinion, that the Government should dredge the channel of the Mississippi, taking out all the barriers they have been erecting for many years past, to slow up the flow of water, as an aid to navigation, so that the water would have a chance to get away faster. The engineers could not see it our way, stating that the stream should be confined by levees.

Thinking that they knew what they were saying, we became an advocate of levees. The flood of 1943 and this one have demonstrated very clearly that the engineers were wrong, as some mighty fine levees north of here were topped and in most instances broken, with a large amount of damage, due to the release of a large amount of water in a small space.

To prove our theory, the river came up in April and has fallen very little since, and when the flood waters from the upper Mississippi and Missouri arrived, the April floods were still here. Had there been no fences, which have built islands in the river, the April water would have been in the Gulf of Mexico, and there would have been plenty of space for the recent flood, and it would have had a quick get-away, so that it would not have piled up against the Stringtown and Harrisonville levees as it did, thus there would have been no flood.

To prove the point, when highway engineers bring water down a hillside, and want to keep it from washing deep ditches, they build hurdles, to slow down the water, and this is what the Government has been doing for years, building hurdles in the Mississippi, thus slowing the water, with the result that farmers living along the river have sustained losses over the past years, of many millions of dollars, due to the Government's desire to protect navigation. Let the owners of river barges place more powerful boats in service, so they can buck a swift current, and stop this threat to the world food supply.

A copy of this paper will be sent to the Congressman and two United States Senators from Illinois and it might not be a bad thing if every interested citizen would write to these gentlemen, for we have tried the theory of the engineers and it has failed, so we have nothing to lose trying another.

A New Bill for Railroad Safety and Public Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I introduced on May 13 House Resolution 210 to authorize an immediate investigation by this House of the causes and feasible methods of preventing accidents of all kinds occurring in the operation of carriers by railroad. I stated at that time, in view of the large number of train wrecks during the last several years resulting in the killing and maiming of thousands of passengers and employees, it is imperative that something be done, and quickly, to prevent the continued slaughter of approximately 5,000 railroad employees and the traveling public annually.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 210 was referred to the Committee on Rules, but that body has taken no action. Probably House Resolution 210 is slated for a painless death, a fate not suffered by the thousands of passengers and employees who went to their deaths because of rundown roadbeds, equipment and other defective facilities and installations which have caused the accident holocaust of the past several years. At the time of the introduction of House Resolution 210, I dwelt somewhat on the unsafe, unsanitary, and unhealthful condition of express cars and equipment and this situation is so widespread and deplorable that I am now introducing a bill "to promote the safety and health of employees engaged in baggage, mail, or express train service in interstate commerce by requiring common carriers by railroad and any express company to install and maintain all such cars and equipment used or furnished by them for such purposes in safe and suitable conditions for use in the service for which they are put."

Mr. Speaker, a grave injustice is being continued, an unparalleled condition of willful neglect and indifference is forcing express messengers, helpers, and guards to carry on their work under conditions not fit for dumb beasts to contend with.

I am advised by Mr. George M. Harrison, grand president of the Brotherhood

of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees that as a result of a questionnaire addressed to every express messenger in the United States, it was found that replies were received covering the period of July 15 to August 5, 1946, concerning the condition of 3,517 cars in express service. Only 1,738 of these cars were equipped with toilets or not quite 50 percent of the total number of the cars surveyed and that only 422 of these toilets were enclosed and only 133 were flush toilets. The number of cars with clean toilets were 488 and 1,227 had dirty toilets.

Another shameful condition met with was that of water supplied to these cars. Out of a total of 3,476 cars it was found only 1,713 were equipped with water containers and 1,763 were not so equipped, or above 50 percent of the cars examined. As to the condition of the containers, 1,663 were examined for any structural defects of which 1,094 were found in good condition and 569 in need of repair. A total of 3,129 cars were examined as to their heating equipment. Of this total, 2,285 were found to have good heating equipment and 844 were found to have defective equipment, such as broken pipes, insufficient radiation, and other defects. The general cleanliness of the cars was also found to be quite bad. Of 3,489 cars examined as to cleanliness, only 784 cars were found in good condition, 1,689 in fair condition, and 1,016 in bad condition. It was also developed that 3,434 of these cars were held in terminals sufficiently long for cleaning before being taken out on trips. The fact that almost three-fourths of the cars originated at points where they were boarded by messengers provides clear evidence that the bulk of the cars could have been properly cleaned before being dispatched and leaves no tenable justification for the fact that more than three-fourths of the cars were in an unclean state.

Mr. Speaker, the attention of this House is directed to the fact that leaky toilets and water containers, defective heating equipment and uncleanliness of these cars is not only a menace to the health of these express employees, but also endangers the public health as perishable foodstuffs transported in these cars is in danger of contamination, not only due to dirt accumulation from ordinary use, but also from the leavings of animals and the rot and slime from decayed fish, vegetables, and other foodstuffs.

The attention of the railroads and the express company has been directed to these conditions, but very little has been done about it. Grand President Harrison appealed to the Interstate Commerce Commission by filing an informal petition but the Commission notified him under date of June 5, 1947, that it did not possess the authority under the Interstate Commerce Act to make an investigation of these conditions. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it will be necessary to enact legislation empowering the Commission to make an investigation and to be further empowered to take the necessary corrective steps to eliminate these abuses. The bill introduced by me today is designed to accomplish these objectives.

Atlanta Constitution Urges Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the July 2 issue of the Atlanta Constitution, as follows:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Perhaps no event since the war so well illustrates the demise of the old theory of isolation, as well as a certain degree of smugness, as the overwhelming vote in the House of Representatives in favor of admitting Hawaii as the forty-ninth State. The vote, yet to be concurred in by the Senate, is nothing more than the fulfillment of a pledge to the people of Hawaii when it became a Territory in 1900.

If the Senate concurs, and we believe it will see the wisdom of so doing, Hawaii will become the first State outside the continental limits of North America. The action will serve as a precedent and give hope to the people of Alaska and Puerto Rico, who also would like the privileges of statehood.

The population of Hawaii is approximately 519,000, considerably greater than the populations of Arizona and New Mexico when they were admitted into the Union in 1912. Hawaii is rich; it has a fine school system and its citizens made notable contributions, often at considerable sacrifice, to Allied victory in World War II.

Before reporting favorably on the statehood bill, the House Committee on Public Lands took considerable testimony and asked opinions from the War and Navy Departments as well as the Department of Interior. While the War Department, evidently regarding the matter as outside its sphere, declined to render an opinion, the Navy Department went to considerable lengths to laud the Hawaiians for their cooperation during the war. Even though a large percentage of the population is of Japanese ancestry, not a single act of sabotage was committed by a person of foreign extraction, the Navy said. Fleet Admiral Chester Nimitz, testifying as a private citizen, admitted that prior to the war he had doubts as to the loyalty of American citizens of Japanese ancestry. But the war dispelled his doubts and Admiral Nimitz now favors statehood.

The Army's Maj. Gen. Charles D. Heron, retired, a former commander of the Hawaii Department, told the committee:

"What I found of the people there was good. Civil leadership was thoroughly patriotic, and cooperation with the Army and Navy was the rule, though often expensive and highly inconvenient to the islanders."

The Interior Department said the ability of the islanders to govern themselves as a State "has already been amply evidenced by, for example, the mass of progressive and intelligent laws on the statute books of the territory, its advanced school system, and the wise management of its fiscal affairs."

It seems to us that statehood for Hawaii would lend substance to our affirmed policy of extending democracy and granting the right of self-determination to all peoples everywhere. Thus, we cannot agree with Georgia's First District Representative PRINCE H. PRESTON, Jr., who told the House that admitting Hawaii would give Russia a chance to accuse the United States of imperialism. We would like to ask Mr. PRESTON if it be imperialistic to accept, finally, on an equal basis a people who for 47 years have not been considered good enough for equality?

We believe statehood should be granted and further, that the Senate should find time to act at this session rather than postponing any longer a matter that should have been attended to many years ago.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many articles have been written upon the proposed tax-reduction bill, and much speculation has been indulged with respect to that measure, but I am constrained to believe that the article which has been written by David Lawrence sets forth some very cogent reasons for the passage of that measure. The fact is, the people are demanding a tax reduction, and it is the legislative function of the Congress to grant that needed decrease; since this can and should be done, I am constrained to believe that this present tax-reduction bill will be passed by both Houses of the Congress, and it is my hope that the President will coincide with the view of the Congress, and approve it. This legislation if and when passed will do much to aid in the rehabilitation of all kinds and types of business in our country, and it will materially increase the purchasing power of all of the people, who would otherwise have lost that power of purchase. The article to which reference is made contains a splendid analysis upon this subject.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the very enlightening article by Mr. David Lawrence, which follows:

FIVE BILLION LEBT CUT HELD POSSIBLE IF NEW TAX BILL BECOMES LAW

(By David Lawrence)

More than $5,000,000,000 can be cut from the national debt while a reduction in taxes amounting to $1,500,000,000 can be made simultaneously if the new Republican-Democratic tax bill becomes law.

Colin Stam, staff expert for the joint congressional committee of internal revenue and perhaps the best-posted man in America on what the yield will be on tax rates, devotes his whole time to the needs of Congress on tax figures. He is authority for the estimate just given.

Mr. Stam points out that the reduction in tax revenues will affect only a half of the fiscal year which began July 1, 1947, and extends to June 30, 1948. Thus the full effect of the tax rates would not be felt in the fiscal year 1948, which is the one in which expenses are expected to be much higher than in the fiscal year 1949.

FIGURES TO CARRY WEIGHT

There are some experts who figure that, with favorable business conditions, the estimated loss of revenue due to tax-rate revision will not be as large as predicted, because when tax rates are reduced there is usually a stimulus to business and the total volume

of transactions increases. Mr. Stam, however, is making his estimates in the customary way and there is no allowance for a marked improvement in business conditions which could conceivably increase the gross receipts of the Government not merely from individual taxes but from corporations and from customs duties and excise taxes on beverages and various luxury articles.

The figures offered by Mr. Stam will carry a good deal of weight in Congress, because some Members who voted to sustain the recent veto of the tax bill did so because of a fear that the amount to be reduced would be at least $3,000,000,000 during the fiscal year that ends June 30, 1948.

So if Congress passes the new tax bill over an expected Presidential veto, the two Houses will, in effect, be adopting a compromise—half of the $3,000,000,000 instead of the full amount.

The plan to apply $5,000,000,000 to debt reduction presupposes that the tax receipts expected will exceed by that amount the Government expenses planned for the fiscal year 1948. This means that the drive for economy must be continued throughout this year and next. It means that Government appropriations must be pruned by the administration so that everything authorized will not be spent. Each year there is a balance of unexpended appropriations. In fact, there are huge sums now available for European relief which can be handled out of funds already authorized and made available from the grants of preceding years.

MARSHALL PLAN STUDIED

The prospect that America will be called on to furnish many billions to Europe is apparently not interfering with the plans to hold down the 1948 budget. This is because there are big sums available through the World Bank and through the Export-Import Bank and through unspent relief funds—all of which, if pooled, could help the European economy through the purchase by our Government of needed American goods for resale through loans to European countries.

Congressional committees have been studying the scope and possible cost of the Marshall plan. The sentiment on Capitol Hill is that whatever aid is given Europe will be of such an amount as the American Government can take in its stride without upsetting the plan to make some reduction in the national debt.

If it comes to a matter of ignoring reduction of individual taxes altogether or ignoring for a year a further cut in the national debt in order to help Europe, it may be taken for granted that Congress will feel that the debt can wait a year to help out Europe and that tax reduction will help maintain favorable business conditions in the United States and bolster the national economy.

Bishop Henry Althoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an editorial from the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat, written by Hon. Robert L. Kern, editor and publisher, on the death of the Rt. Rev. Henry Althoff, D. D., bishop of Belleville.

Bishop Althoff died late on the afternoon of July 3 in Belleville at the age of 73. He was the spiritual leader of 81,000 Catholics in southern Illinois for 33 years.

The editorial follows:

BISHOP HENRY ALTHOFF

Seldom in our times has a death brought such a sense of sincere sorrow as has the passing of Bishop Henry Althoff, whose attributes of fine character endeared him to thousands of families throughout all southern Illinois.

Here was a man with vision and foresight, an aggressive champion of morality and goodness, a scholarly and wise leader, a community builder, who devoted his entire lifetime to emulation of the highest principles of human endeavor.

The spiritual mentor of more than 81,000 Catholics, his sphere of influence extended far beyond his own church, for his exemplary conduct provided inspiration to untold thousands more, regardless of faith and creed. Bishop Althoff was always looked up to, revered and respected, honored and loved. And that was as it should have been.

The outstanding qualities which characterized Henry Althoff were manifest early in his career. To their everlasting credit, his peers took cognizance of these when they selected him 34 years ago to succeed the late Bishop John Janssen as the second bishop of the Belleville diocese. The passage of time has conclusively proved the innate wisdom of their appointment.

Bishop Althoff always tempered his outlook with solid conservatism, but never to the point that it detracted from his breadth of vision. He understood fully that if his people were to achieve spiritual development, then they must also enjoy the benefits which grow out of a healthy, well-balanced, cultural, and social program, and he was ever guided thus.

Attesting his progressiveness and foresight are the many beautiful church edifices, excellent hospitals, and splendid schools and colleges throughout this diocese which his excellency caused to be built and which stand as perpetual monuments to his greatness.

Though as a mortal individual he has passed from our midst, the fine works of Bishop Althoff shall live on and continue to be felt and enjoyed. The memory of a good man, as Henry Althoff was, never dies.

Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD the following statement of President Truman when he signed the Treasury-Post Office bill, on July 1, 1947:

I have today approved H. R. 2436, providing appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, because it provides for continuing in part the essential activities of these departments. However, I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to bring to the attention of the Congress and the people the gross inadequacy of the funds made available for the collection of our revenue.

The administration of the taxing statutes should never be influenced by political considerations. People of all political faiths are called upon to support their Government through the payment of taxes and are entitled to adequate administrative controls to insure that the dishonest do not shift their share to the honest.

The employees who have been trained in the technical work of tax administration and who have done and are now doing an excellent job are civil-service employees. The training of this personnel has been paid for by the Government at great cost and this investment should not now be dissipated. Once these people are released it is not reasonable to suppose that they will be available for reemployment should additional funds be provided later. It will take years to restore the damage done by the failure of the Congress to support the current efforts of our tax-collecting agency.

I am advised by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that the reduction of $20,000,000 in the appropriation for the Bureau of Internal Revenue will mean a reduction in personnel of 4,000 to 5,000 employees and will result in a direct loss of revenue of not less than $400,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948. There is at the present time with present personnel a backlog of 30,000 "leads" on tax evasions awaiting investigation.

The vast majority of our taxpayers are scrupulously honest in tax matters. Taxpayer morale is now generally high, but it will remain so only if the odds remain strong that the would-be tax evader will be detected and punished.

It is a fallacy to assume that the reduction can be absorbed without weakening the enforcement activities of the Bureau, because it is not possible to decrease materially the now inadequate number of employees necessary for the routine tasks of tax collection. Tax returns must be recorded and funds deposited, even though the returns are never investigated.

It is another fallacy that the work load of the Bureau of Internal Revenue has decreased since the close of hostilities. From a tax collection standpoint the present period resembles in many respects immediately following World War I. At that time the Congress appreciated the needs of the Bureau in the matter of meeting its accumulated load of wartime tax cases and provided increased funds commensurate with such burden. This policy was followed for almost 6 years after that war in order that the Bureau might be able to dispose adequately of such cases.

The action which the Congress has just taken fails to recognize the much greater task of tax collection resulting from World War II.

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Providence, R. I., urging prompt and favorable action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill:

Whereas it is evident that one of the most pressing problems confronting the Nation is the lack of adequate housing to shelter our people; and

Whereas veterans of World War II and millions of other American citizens are finding

it virtually impossible to find decent housing for themselves and their families; and

Whereas there exist in this city, State, and Nation blighted areas which constitute social and economic liabilities and require redevelopment in the interest of the health, safety, and welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill to encourage construction of 15,000,000 city and rural dwellings in the next 10 years; and

Whereas the announced goal of the measure is "decent homes and a suitable living environment for every American family"; and

Whereas under the terms of the bill private enterprise in the construction industry would be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total housing need as possible; and

Whereas the bill provides Federal funds to clear slums and provide public low-rent housing to areas where needs cannot be fully met through reliance on private enterprise or local and State revenues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the City Council of the City of Providence, realizing that there is a great need to provide decent and adequate housing for citizens of our city, State, and of the Nation, and believing that the proposed Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill can do much to alleviate the housing shortage, do hereby respectfully request the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their good offices to secure prompt passage of said Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, so-called; and the city clerk is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, and to the Honorable Senators ROBERT A. TAFT, ROBERT F. WAGNER, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, to the Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to the Honorable JESSE P. WOLCOTT, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Matter of Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me by the House, I include herein the following editorial entitled "Matter of Principle" published in the Washington Post of Sunday, July 6, 1947:

MATTER OF PRINCIPLE

Since the Labor Department's Conciliation Service is soon to be terminated, the Senate victory over the House in respect of its appropriation may seem academic. We, think, on the contrary, that it constituted a victory of essential principle. The House, at the instance of Representative FRANK KEEFE, had placed in its appropriation bill for the Labor Department a clause forbidding the payment of salaries to the director of the Conciliation Service, Edward Warren, and 100 other top officials. The Senate refused to accept this vindicative provision. Senator KNOWLAND in particular deserves credit for his insistence in conference on the Senate position that this provision was improper and inequitable. It would have amounted, indeed, as we have previously asserted, to a species of legislative blackmail and an invasion of the executive power to hire and fire.

Now that the House has yielded, agreeing to the appropriation of funds for the Conciliation Service until its transfer with no strings attached, Mr. Warren has submitted his resignation. The resolution of this House-Senate conflict constitutes complete vindication for him—a vindication which his personal integrity and the fidelity of his service to the Labor Department thoroughly warranted. He headed the Conciliation Service in a period when labor relations were peculiarly trying and contributed much to their amelioration.

Postwar Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting as a part of my remarks in the RECORD an article by Hon. S. Wallace Dempsey, a former very distinguished Member of the House of Representatives of the United States.

I assume that because my former colleague from New York had an active part in all postwar legislation following World War I, he sees the danger of pouring unearmarked billions of dollars of our taxpayers' money into the hands of irresponsible foreign governments, as in the postwar period following World War I, without the slightest prospect of its repayment. Those who lived through the postwar period of World War I are now witnessing a repetition of the same foreign propaganda and the same reaction to it on the part of those American citizens who feel no responsibility for the solvency of our own Government. I am sure that my former colleague presents his plan as a precautionary measure to prevent the waste of the billions of dollars which the Truman administration plans to pour into Europe and Asia.

The article follows:

A WAY TO SPEND OUR LOANS OR GIFTS TO FOREIGN NATIONS WHICH WILL BE MOST HELPFUL TO THEM AND PROMISES A RETURN TO US

To the Congress and to the Secretary of State:

(1) Our purpose in making these large foreign gifts or loans is surely not to support the beneficiaries, but to put them in the way to support themselves and need no aid from us.

(2) The only way the beneficiaries can be made self-supporting is by their producing in a modern and efficient way, so that they can market their products in the competition they will meet.

(3) Take England as an example: We are told that its principal industry is coal mining, but that an English miner uses such antiquated methods that he produces only one-sixth of the daily output of an American miner. This, of course, could be remedied by the installation of modern equipment and the use of present-day methods, and the result would be of enormous benefit to England.

What is true of mining is no doubt true of other English industries, although probably not in the same degree, although to a degree to make competition by England with other countries difficult, if not impossible.

England's production of wheat is surprisingly large, 33 bushels to the acre, and, while her food shortage is one of her most acute needs, as well as that of the west part of continental Europe, and it may be impossible to increase the amount produced very materially, the manpower needed may be reduced greatly by mechanizing the work, as we have west of the Mississippi, and releasing the workers to increase the production in industry. We have in a few years, largely through mechanizing, increased our growth of wheat from 800,000,000 bushels to 1,400,000,000 bushels, over 60 percent, with an important reduction in manpower per unit, a highly valuable result from both aspects. So, farming should be mechanized abroad where it would be really beneficial, as it has proved here.

Our country should learn of each country which asks financial aid what it really needs to put it on a basis where it can compete with other countries in producing and selling, and so become self-sustaining. Our country should then call in the representatives of the leading corporations in these various lines of production and ask them to undertake the modernizing of these foreign businesses in a purely business way, advising what is necessary in the way of new and different equipment, and methods as well, undertake each business just as if it were the business of our corporations and in the same way that our corporations have undertaken foreign business.

This would insure far greater efficiency than could be secured through the various governments. It would follow exactly what our corporations do abroad on their own account. We of this country believe in private and not Government operation of business: we believe that private operation is far more efficient, profitable, and far better for all who are interested. Why then should we disburse these monies through foreign countries instead of through their businesses as aided by our corporations? Why should we not follow entirely private improvement in equipment and procedure and under the direction of successful men in our corporations? In other words, why should we not follow practically the methods which have been followed by our great corporations in establishing and conducting their own businesses abroad?

While the Goverment would furnish the money, just how it should be secured is a question of some thought and study. Whether it should have a lien on the corporation assets or have stock in the corporation is a matter to be determined, probably in each case, and largely on the advice of our corporations which undertake the work, and they should, of course, be secured for what they do, probably by stock in the corporations.

Our Government would not wish, much less seek, to make a profit for itself out of these businesses, but the corporations which handle the matter should be given a reasonable but small profit for what they do.

There would arise the question of control during the reconversion period, but there should be no trouble over that, as our representatives would want only to reconvert and make profitable businesses badly in need of reconversion, both as to equipment and as to operation.

Just how the relations between our corporations which would undertake this work of improving the efficiency and lowering the cost of production should be made would be the subject of study in each individual case, but the general object would be for us to share the risks of the business and share also the profits when the business is put on a profitable basis.

There is nothing unusual in the method suggested. Numbers of our businesses have

carried on profitable businesses abroad, and there is no reason why they should not be able to make businesses which are to remain those of the foreign countries just as profitable as they have made their own business, and probably more so, because of local sympathy and cooperation with their own industries, lacking, of course, for branches of our corporations.

(4) The question involved is the method to be pursued in extending relief to these foreign countries. It has been by sending the money to the foreign country itself, and the intention is to continue this method, which it is submitted, is inefficient and unbusinesslike.

(5) The principal and supporting businesses of each country is well known, and the fact that their methods are antiquated, inefficient, and unprofitable is also well known, and it is that condition which is to be remedied. Instead of having the matter of relief won by our country sending money to the countries to be relieved, it is suggested that our Government call in leaders in our industries, of the kinds to be modernized in the foreign countries, and have them send representatives to the foreign countries to learn what is needed, and that when this is ascertained, our corporations be asked to do the work of modernizing the foreign corporations on terms acceptable to the foreign corporations and to our Government—such terms to be worked out according to the circumstances in each case, but preferably having our corporations undertake the work at their own expense—our Government loaning the necessary money and being secured by the corporations for which it is expended, and our domestic corporations taking security also for what they put into the ventures.

There is nothing novel in this procedure: almost all of our great corporations have branches abroad which are profitable, or they would not have them, and there is not only every reason to expect a like result with these foreign corporations, but a much better result than our corporations have attained, for the very good reason that the locality has no interest in or sympathy for our corporations and they would own and have the keenest sympathy with and desire for the success of these corporations of their own.

(6) The method suggested is simply the substituting of private for Government management of the monies to be spent abroad in the effort to help foreign nations. It is a suggestion that the relief of these countries is a matter of putting their business into modern, profitable, productive operation, and the suggestion is that this be done by business and not by Government—by the agency trained and qualified to do the work effectively and profitably.

Our country is not the most profitable one in the world simply because it has great natural resources, but because these resources have been converted into a manufactured product in a highly efficient way—because our manufacturers and our factory workers have used a high degree of intelligence in their work. And this, which has made us successful, is proposed to be used abroad in the expenditure of all monies sent there in the hope and belief that the industries there may be made so efficient that their people will be redeemed from need and made self-supporting on a proper standard of living. It is believed that this can be far more certain of accomplishment through the methods suggested than by expenditure of these funds by the foreign governments.

Ambassador Douglas expressed the opinion in his recent London speech that "Europe's problem is fundamentally one of increasing production," as urged throughout this article.

An editorial in the New Bedford Standard-Times, with the insight and foresight of that great newspaper and its constant and invaluable arguments for a correct determination of public questions, directed by its extremely able, active, and fearless Mr. Basil Brewer and his associates, forms a fitting conclusion to this article. We quote:

"If the United States, with Europe's help, can raise the issue of economic recovery above the level of politics, it will be a humane action which not only should strengthen Europe but also increase American prestige and advance the cause of peace and freedom."

S. WALLACE DEMPSEY.

JUNE 28, 1947.

Garrett Whiteside

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Arkansas lost one of her finest sons when Garrett Whiteside left us last Wednesday. He was a kind, sympathetic, understanding man, a devoted friend, a public-spirited citizen who worshiped his family.

My first contact with him came about while he was secretary to the late Senator Thad Caraway, of Arkansas. I had written a letter to Senator Caraway in behalf of a friend. It happened that the Senator was in Europe, as I remember, and Mr. Whiteside told me so in his reply to me, but said he felt sure the Senator would want him to comply with my request, therefore the job would be done even if he had to roost on the Treasury Department steps until it was done. A few days later the small claim for a refund came through to my friend. From that time on he and I were Garrett Whiteside fans.

In the years since then I never hesitated to call for him when I needed him and he never failed me. He was happiest when helping others. He also had the very unusual quality of being able to project himself into the position of his chief, whether as secretary to a Member of the House or as secretary to a Senator. When he wrote a letter for his boss to a constituent he put his heart into that letter, a warm, friendly piece of mail which went straight to the constituent's need and made friends for his chief.

In that happy Valhalla of public servants there is rejoicing today because Garrett Whiteside has come into his well-earned rest. I am satisfied that he is joshing some of the old leaders of the past right now, and is having the time of his life doing it.

Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of July 2, 1947:

TURNCOAT MVA CRUSADERS

Where, you might ask, are the MVA enthusiasts who made such an appeal for flood control and river development 2 years ago?

Answer: They are sulking in their tents, giving no aid to flood-control appropriations. They are denouncing the Pick-Sloan plan and trying to blame it for the floods when they know as well as anyone else that Pick-Sloan is a postwar program that is barely started and can't go ahead without appropriations. By their actions or inaction they are aiding the private power companies' efforts to block those appropriations and all river development. And they used to scream loudest about power companies. The story is in the reasons for such an amazing turn-about.

The story starts immediately after the war which Congress had a choice of two plans to control major floods. It was just a question of which plan it would take, Pick-Sloan or the Missouri Valley Authority.

The Pick-Sloan plan was put together from years of study by the Army and Reclamation Bureau engineers. It dared propose projects on a scale to handle the biggest flood of record.

The competing plan, the Missouri Valley Authority, claimed the same objectives. But it asked 2 years to let an MVA board make its own engineering proposals.

As far as anyone knows, an MVA board would have set up an engineering plan similar to Pick-Sloan, if not almost identical with it. Either one was a national commitment to the most sweeping flood-control and water-resources program in American history.

The only known difference between these two plans was administration. The Pick-Sloan plan was set up to work democratically through established governments and agencies. The MVA plan called for a three-man board with final authority over everything related to water resources in the whole Missouri Basin.

Today the Pick-Sloan plan is under way. Everyone knows the MVA could not possibly be revived and started for many years. So, probably for a decade, the Pick-Sloan plan is the one hope in sight.

Yet, the MVA crowd that was fanatical in its demands for vast river control under an MVA is sabotaging river control under the Pick-Sloan label.

For an explanation you have nowhere to look except the one point of difference—administration. Plainly this makes such a whale of difference to the MVA supporters that they would rather have no river control than river control under a democratic system.

For all their damage, at least the floods have succeeded in washing the innocent mantle off the MVA movement. Its whole interest was in spreading a new form of government by boards to replace government by the people.

This charge was made 2 years ago. The Star opposed the MVA plan because of the inherent danger of putting one board over the fundamental resources of nine States. But it believed that charges against MVA intentions were exaggerated.

Today, by their own actions, the MVA supporters verify the most extreme charges. Nothing short of a terrific, undisclosed intention could justify this amazing turn-about. If the MVA supporters had any real interest in stopping floods and preserving Missouri Valley resources they would at least support the Pick-Sloan plan until they could see a chance for their own.

Their message to the people of the Missouri Valley is this: Until you accept our plan to put an appointed board over your fundamental resources we will do all we can to keep you wallowing in your floods. We will try to block everything else.

This isn't just a wild charge of the power companies that are now working along with

the MVA people to block river appropriations. By their actions the message is delivered straight from the MVA supporters themselves.

The Nation That Invented the Steamship Must Now Use It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the following statement of John Green, president of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, CIO, with regard to the present situation of our merchant marine. This statement covers a subject in which I am and have long been vitally interested. I am at a loss to understand why our American shipbuilding program is at a virtual standstill while the shipyards of the other countries of the world are busier than they have ever been. This timely and convincing statement follows:

THE NATION THAT INVENTED THE STEAMSHIP MUST NOW USE IT—FINE WORDS, DEEP HOPES, CANNOT BRING US PROSPERITY OR SECURITY WITHOUT MODERN AMERICAN SHIPS ON THE HIGH SEAS

Right now, the American people have a choice of building merchant ships or not building them. Do you know what it will mean if we don't build them?

1. EVERYBODY BUT US

Every shipyard in the world today, except those in America, is now booked solidly for the next 4 years building modern merchant ships.

Within 10 years, America may be the only major nation in the world with an "old" merchant fleet—with old, slow, uneconomical ships unable to stand up, in world trade, with the modern ships now being built everywhere else in the world.

Will this make for world peace, for world prosperity, for world security?

Will this make for American prosperity and America's peace?

History says: No. No. No.

Yet the American shipbuilding program is virtually stopped right now.

2. BUT WHY BUILD NEW SHIPS NOW?

Why do we need new ships now after all the ships we built to win the war?

The answer is very simple.

Our wartime merchant ships were designed for war, not for peace.

These ships were obsolete the day they were built.

The vast majority of these ships are slow; are very uneconomical in their facilities for handling cargo; and are wholly unbalanced for our practical needs in postwar trade.

It would cost us more to use these ships today than to dispose of them.

We Americans don't think of using old railroad engines, old airplanes, old automobiles, old factories as the best way to make money.

What's different about old ships?

And the simple fact remains that—even with all these ships—our merchant fleet today is missing specific types of ships we badly need and haven't got today: passenger vessels, refrigerator ships, fast special-design cargo ships.

We didn't build passenger ships by the thousands during the war. So we must build a handful of them now.

We didn't build fast cargo vessels during the war. So we must build a handful of them now.

3. ONLY 59 NEW SHIPS NOW WILL KEEP OUR SHIPPING STRONG

We don't need thousands of new ships for peace.

We need only 59 new merchant ships started this year to balance our postwar fleet; to meet the demands of postwar trade; to keep American shipping strong and profitable.

We can build these ships now, and have them paid for out of profits, in 2 or 3 years of operation. American shipping is enormously profitable today, and is certain of profits for the next years to come.

And, by building these ships now, we prevent the ghastly mistake we made after World War I, when we let the American shipbuilding industry evaporate.

The emergency shipbuilding program of World War II cost us billions of extra dollars and thousands of American lives (waiting for the emergency yards and ships to get built). How many times do we have to make the same mistake?

Is America so rich that we can afford to see our shipbuilding industry evaporate again?

Our national prosperity and security depend on keeping all our major skills in use.

Shipbuilding is such a major skill. It takes skilled craftsmen to build ships and manage shipyards; men with years of training and highly developed, specific technical skills.

If there is any further delay in American shipbuilding, the small core of trained men we still have left, in both management and labor, will disappear into other industries.

And with them goes our shipping industry.

4. A STEADY PACE SAVES MONEY

Moreover, our feast-and-famine shipbuilding in the past has made our ships terribly expensive in peace as well as war.

A minimum steady pace of shipbuilding would make many economies possible.

Shipyard costs are greatly increased by the lack of continuous production; investment is curtailed; skilled management and labor drift off; technological improvements are blocked.

So, we desperately need a minimum adequate shipbuilding program continued in America.

Fifty-nine new ships started now will do it.

A normal replacement program of 60 to 80 ships a year will keep it going indefinitely in the future. This will require only 250,000 shipbuilding workers. (We had 1,700,000 of them during the war.)

And this means more jobs and dollars for all Americans.

Each shipyard worker keeps six and a half other Americans at work in other industries supplying material for the ships: material from 46 of our States—not only steel but other metals, electrical equipment, paint, lumber, etc.

And then the ship itself multiplies jobs and dollars, again and again, through the cargoes it carries—the exports and imports on which our prosperity and the world's prosperity depend.

5. MORE FOR POTATOES THAN SHIPS

Some people raise the question about the partial Government subsidies that are necessary for American shipbuilding.

Do you know how much you get for how little in these subsidies?

The subsidies required for American ships—for the ships that will make possible an American world trade of twelve to fifteen billion dollars a year—are a good deal less than one-third of 1 percent of the trade these ships help create; a good deal less than $50,000,000 a year.

The Federal subsidies for paved roads in America are over $180,000,000 a year.

And last year the Federal Government paid a subsidy of $80,000,000 for potatoes alone.

And ship subsidy money comes back. As much as $7,000,000 has been returned in a month. Since VJ-day American shipping hasn't cost the taxpayers one cent. Subsidies are returned after profits are earned by operators. And shipping is profitable.

The question of subsidies for ships might never have come up if shipping were just an industry and no more.

But shipping is a vital link in our Nation's network of transportation, an instrument of national policy, a servant of our commerce, indispensable to our future prosperity, indispensable to our security.

No American subsidy can buy so much for so little as the money invested in ships.

6. ARE OCEANS LESS THAN THE AIR?

We wouldn't think of keeping American planes out of the air, using foreign planes today.

Why should we think, then, of turning the oceans of the world over to foreign domination?

But the fact is this:

Before the war 75 percent of America's exports and imports were carried by foreign ships.

What should it be now?

More and more, the other nations of the world are becoming controlled economies.

This means their ships will be used increasingly as instruments of foreign national policies, not as neutral carriers of American goods.

We cannot hope to get the kind of world trade, and the amount of world trade we need—and the world needs—from controlled foreign shipping.

If we want to see the patterns of world trade follow those of free enterprise, we need American ships to do it with.

We need American ships to carry at least 50 percent of America's exports and imports.

Not all of it, just half of it.

No foreign nation will be hurt by this.

Quite the contrary. American ships on the high seas will help all the world because American energy and ingenuity. American production and demand, can create more trade for the entire world than any other nation can.

We cannot count on foreign shipping domination to do this for us, today.

7. AMERICA MUST DECIDE NOW

The question of what to do with our merchant marine is now up before the American people.

They must decide now whether, in 10 years, America will be the only major nation in the world with an old fleet—depending on foreign shipping for American prosperity and security.

They must decide now whether the world will really have a chance at security and prosperity or not. American shipping is the indispensable tool of such security and prosperity.

Fine words, deep hopes, and dollars alone cannot bring us either prosperity or security without modern American ships on the high seas and active American shipyards, keeping the American merchant marine young and flexible and strong.

JOHN GREEN,
President, Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilders Workers of America, CIO.
CAMDEN, N. J.

Speech by Congressman Thomas J. Lane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a speech which I delivered at the twelfth annual State convention, Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., on Sunday, June 29, 1947, at the Lynn State Armory, Lynn, Mass.:

Fellow veterans and friends, at the outset I want to congratulate you on the steady progress which your organization has made. A few men, blessed with an idea and the will to carry it out, are needed to bring men together in a society. In your case, it is pleasing to note that most of the original group of organizers came from New England. The size and enthusiasm of this State convention banquet of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States is not only a tribute to their success but is proof that veterans want to continue and develop the associations formed in service to their country. In the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, they have found such a vehicle of expression, and to it they are giving their loyal support. As the veterans of World War II become fully adjusted to civilian life, I predict that your membership will show a steady and gratifying increase.

In such communities as Boston, Lynn, Revere, and Lawrence, where those of Italian descent are making such important contributions to the pattern and pulse of American life, there is a fertile field for your endeavors. Truly yours is an organization with a promising future.

A young man came into my office the other day. At first I had difficulty in understanding him because of some impediment in his speech. But, as I oriented myself to his broken voice, I learned that he had been one of the first to fight in those early days when we had so little to fight with and the war was going against us. He was one of the thin line of men who tried to hold the Philippines against the seasoned army of the invaders. On Bataan, he had been shot in the throat and taken prisoner. And then, in the prison camp, weakened from starvation, he had been unable to move quickly enough in response to a command. The brutal guard swung his rifle butt down on the unfortunate prisoner's head. As he told his story to me, he took off his hat. There, across his balding head, I saw the ugly scar.

All this the veteran endured uncomplainingly. But when he came back to the States and felt himself a stranger among the people he had once known, that hurt more than the wounds he had suffered or the miseries of a prison camp.

"It's hard to explain," he said, staring out of the window, "but those people out there on the street forget so soon because they never knew what it was like out there. I feel that there's a gulf between myself and them which can never be bridged."

That in essence is the difference between a veteran and a nonveteran. The inequality of sacrifice can never be remedied until the folks who stayed at home exert themselves as unselfishly to win the battles of peace as the veteran fought and gave, to help his buddy, in the bloody challenge of war. The veteran learned the meaning of comradeship, and he knows how desperately it is needed to solve the problems of peace. And he will not be satisfied until the stay-at-homes measure up to the high standards of citizenship which he learned the hard way. The unity which you knew in time of war, and which you preserve and perpetuate through your veterans' organizations, is part of that greater unity which we the people of the United States must work for in order that we may go forward in peace and progress and happiness.

The veterans do not forget. It is to their everlasting credit that they work untiringly to bring comfort and joy to their disabled comrades in the hospitals who once helped them. There is no other group in the United States which can compare with the veterans in loyalty and helpfulness to its members. It is a lesson in humanity, which others would do well to learn.

But those veterans who are not in hospitals have certain problems of their own which must be met. It is for these purposes, also, that organization among veterans is necessary to formulate and support a legislative program. Veterans were paid a mere pittance during their service, while the folks back home were getting high pay and furthering their careers. The fact that years of service seriously interrupted the normal lives of veterans, put them at a disadvantage when they returned to the job-competition of peacetime life. Although the general interests of the veterans cannot be separated from those of the community, there are certain special problems which arise out of their service in the armed forces, which must be remedied through legislation.

It is plain, for all to see, that the American Government is not only aware of its debt of gratitude to the veterans, but is determined to implement this with a practical program of assistance. The GI bill of rights is the most generous plan to help returning service men and women ever put into operation anywhere by any government.

But the task is huge, involving millions of veterans, and a complex variety of problems. It is for this reason that continuing legislation is necessary to amend the original bill to iron out inequities and provide for situations which could not be anticipated.

Veterans' organizations know veterans' problems better than any other group can possibly know them. It is their responsibility, therefore, to study these problems with a view to corrective action, to advise their friends in Congress, and to give us every support at the hearings of committees which consider the bills which we present.

In the field of compensation and pension, the present law provides that a veteran must appeal from an adverse ruling of the Veterans' Administration concerning the adjudication of his claim within 1 year of rejection. Too often, however, competent medical evidence is not always available within 1 year in order to indicate the chance of success on appeal. Oftentimes, the condition which the veteran claims to exist does not become evident until the lapse of a longer period. To remedy this situation, a bill has been filed in Congress providing that the time for filing appeals shall be extended from 1 to 3 years.

The children of those veterans who are attending this convention will benefit by the education and the training which the Nation provides for you. Because these opportunities will increase your earning capacity, many of you in later years will be able to take care of the education of your children. Unfortunately, the children of those veterans who gave their lives for the Nation not only lose the material support and affection of a father, but will have little chance to secure an education. The meagre pensions paid to their mothers will not suffice to give them the type of education they might receive had their fathers survived the war.

All of us should be alert to support the legislation which recognizes that the eldest child of any man who died in the line of duty shall be entitled to receive by proxy the education or training beyond the high-school level which the father would have received if he were here with us, his living comrades.

Another piece of legislation which deserves your support is the bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944. As it now stands, any member of the armed forces who did not serve overseas and who was discharged at his own request because he was over-age and could best serve the war effort in essential employment, has been denied mustering-out pay.

This act was designed to give the veteran a nest egg upon discharge, with which to buy suitable civilian clothes, furniture, tools, etc., in order to reestablish himself in civilian life. The man who was discharged because he was over age needed this money the same as any other veteran. But he did not get it. Clearly this provision discriminates against the older veterans and violates the basic purposes of the Mustering-Out Act. It must be amended so that all veterans who served honorably get a square deal.

I also believe that veterans should work for the extension and amendment of the Nationality Act of 1940. To all intents and purposes this expired on December 31, 1946. Hence many veterans who were aliens were never informed of their right to become naturalized immediately because of their honorable service in the armed forces, and lost out on the benefits of this act. These men measured up to the highest obligations of citizenship and earned it thereby. They should not be forced to go through the red tape and delay required of those who never did anything for our country but who are now clamoring to get in. The alien veteran should be taken care of first.

A final goal in legislation concerns social security. This act must be amended to provided that every veteran of World War II shall be considered to have paid the maximum social security tax for each month he served in the armed forces. The present act was put into operation as of January 1937. Since 40 quarter years are required for an individual to obtain the full benefits for his dependents, it is plain to see that millions of veterans who would have been fully qualified by January 1947 have been held back by the time spent in service, which was not credited to their accounts. It will be possible to make up for this deficiency without raising the tax rate or substantially increasing the public debt, because of the ample reserves in the social security fund.

You, the Italian-American world war veterans of the United States, now wear your uniforms only on such festive occasions as this, but you are still fighters in the cause of our developing democracy.

Starting with Gunnery Sergeant John Basilone, the Marine of Guadalcanal, who gave his life at Iwo Jima, the list of those Americans of Italian descent who were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, which is the highest award our nation can give, is long and illustrious.

Certain it is that Italians take to the American way of life more readily than other people, because it is consistent with their love of freedom, their natural happiness, and their urge to expression. In turn, with a generous spirit of loyalty and sacrifice, they have served our Nation valiantly in its hour of need. It is no exaggeration to predict that when these United States reach their cultural maturity they will owe much to the vitality and variety which the sons and daughters of Italy contribute to the life-stream of this our beloved country.

You are proud, as you have every reason to be, of the services which you have given. You have formed this organization to perpetuate those ideals for which you fought and to become the living voice for those who did not return.

In this connection I am happy to report that the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, is considering H. R. 1442, the bill to incorporate the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States under a Federal Charter. I am giving my active support to this, and I can assure you that the day is not far distant when you will be fully recognized.

Before I close, I would like to speak of that true school of democracy where you and I and all who ever wore a uniform of the United States learned to know and respect and help one another. There we learned the meaning of that comradeship which brings us together tonight.

It is the true Americanism which enabled us to defeat those who would enslave us. It is the priceless asset upon which we must depend to build a happier and more prosperous Nation in a world at peace.

I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before you and I want to congratulate the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States for the strength and enterprise of your Massachusetts Department. In reunions to come, we shall renew the pledge of fellowship which unites us in common service to that nation which is the hope of the world.

The memory of our departed buddies is close to us tonight. I am confident that it will inspire us with the faith and courage to win through to our objectives. For we are the bridge builders moving from the past toward the shore of the future. With the torch of comradeship held high and lighting the way we clearly see the job that must be done.

The future of America is in the hands of her veterans, who must, and will, lead her forward.

The Tragic Truth About Our Jury System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an article by Judge Julius H. Miner, of Chicago, which appeared in the July 1947 issue of Coronet magazine. I feel that this article should have widespread circulation and, as there are so many Members of the legal profession serving in both Houses of Congress, I am sure they will find this of unusual interest:

THE TRAGIC TRUTH ABOUT OUR JURY SYSTEM—A JUDGE DEPLORES ITS ABUSES AND OFFERS A FIVE-POINT PROGRAM FOR ITS REFORM

(By Judge Julius H. Miner, of Chicago)

Some day you may face a jury, perhaps accused of a crime you did not commit. Or you may be serving as a juror, sworn to pass on the innocence or guilt of one of your fellow citizens.

In the first case, could you expect a fair and impartial trial? In the second case, would you know how to administer that same fair and impartial justice to the accused?

As a judge of several years' experience in the Chicago Circuit Court of Appeals, my reluctant but honest answer to both these questions is "No!"

For instance, it is on record that a citizen of Bangor, Maine, sat on a jury for days before it was discovered that he was stone deaf. And the judge of an Arkansas municipal court reports that one jury foreman in his court read a verdict thusly: "We, the jury, find our client, the defendant, not guilty."

In an important eastern case, the jury voted six for conviction and six for acquittal. Rather than debate the issue for two or three days, the jurors decided to draw a number between 1 and 100. The juror whose age came closest to that number would make the decision for all.

Recently I presided over a murder trial in which both prosecution and defense refused to call the only eyewitness to the crime. Both lawyers feared that he might unduly influence the jury. In other words, both sides were unwilling to trust the jury with the truth.

Daniel Webster said: "Justice is the great interest of man on earth." And in pursuing his great interest, man has established the jury system as a special safeguard against injustice. Yet, today, trial by jury is a farce * * * a mockery of justice * * * a thing frequently of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

Why has trial by jury fallen so low? Part of the answer lies in the low caliber of the jurors themselves. The men and women chosen to listen and weigh and consider are generally unqualified for the task. In fact, many prospective jurors would be rejected for ordinary duties by private employers. Why foist them on a court and expect intelligent results?

National and State laws specifically exempt many citizens ideally suited for this work. Doctors, government officials, clergymen, lawyers, school teachers, newspapermen, and many others are exempt from jury duty. Further, our indispensable men who don't relish a few dollars a day for jury service usually present perfectly legitimate reasons for being excused.

Getting an eligible man excused on some pretext has become an invaluable asset of small-time politicians. Judge Robert Stewart Sutliffe, famed jurist of New York City, wrote: "Jurors are a lot of men picked from poll lists who have not enough political pull to get off, or who are out of a job and want to pick up a few dollars a day."

If by chance an intelligent group of men and women are stuck with jury duty, even then justice and truth are elusive. Is it reasonable to expect 12 untutored, legally naive jurors, straight from the kitchen, shop, or office, to deal wisely with involved principles and technicalities of the law? It would be just as foolish to summon a judge or lawyer to an airplane factory to decide a problem in aerodynamics.

In one case, after 5 days of trial of a desperate gunman, the jurors passed a note to my bailiff: "What does the judge mean when he says 'sustained' and 'overruled'?" Unfortunately, this amazing ignorance of the basic vocabulary of a law court is common.

One judge instructing a jury said: "If you find the defendant did, with malice aforethought, project, propel, and/or otherwise with force or violence, insinuate the aforesaid bullet in, on, against, and within the body of the corpus delicti, then you must bring in a verdict of guilty."

In reply, one of the baffled jurors blurted: "Okay, Judge, but what if we just find that the guy sitting over there shot and killed the other guy who ain't here?"

It is downright scandalous to expose 12 well-meaning but naive citizens to sharp, high-powered, battle-scarred lawyers who are masters at the art of appealing to human sympathies and prejudices. Under "solemn obligation" to their clients, these shrewd barristers in a criminal case will hammer away at such things as "reasonable doubt," "moral certainty" and "presumption of innocence" until there is unconditional mental surrender by even the hardiest juror.

Not long ago a jury awarded $10,000 to the plaintiff, but the decision was such an obvious miscarriage of justice that the judge set the verdict aside and admonished the jury. When asked how they arrived at such a patently ridiculous decision, one juror replied frankly:

"We couldn't make head or tail of the case, or follow all the messing around the lawyers did. None of us believed the witnesses on either side, anyway, so we just made up our minds to disregard the evidence on both sides and decide the case on its merits."

Court-wise defense lawyers follow a pattern aimed at confusing the inept jurors by beclouding the real issues. They assail the police as vicious and corrupt; they ridicule the state's attorney as an ambitious tyrant trying to make a record of convictions for political advantage; they imply that if the defendant is found guilty the judge, an unmitigated sadist, will give the poor, wronged angel the maximum allowable punishment.

Continually I am amazed at how this "underdog" technique works, even if the defendant is guilty beyond all doubt. Finally the attorneys wind up waving the flag, crying that to do otherwise than return this man to his wife and children would be to negate the American guarantee of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

A wife, a child, or an aged parent is always an asset to a man charged with anything from picking pockets to murder. Pretty faces, shapely figures, hospital cots, and crutches are flaunted.

One lawyer asked the jury to look at the defendant's white-haired mother, sitting up front in the courtroom. This angelic little lady won the day for her son, for no jury would ever believe that she could possibly have given birth to a murderer. "Mother" was later discovered to be a waitress in an underworld night club.

Defense attorneys prefer their clients to be tried during the Christmas season, when the quality of mercy is particularly unstrained. Jurors have a way of passing out Christmas gifts of freedom or light sentences to criminals who at other times would be sent up for years. And if one of the jurors has a birthday during the trial, his fellow jurors help him to celebrate by going easy on the defendant.

In one trial, an expectant father succeeded in getting a fast acquittal for an obviously guilty man because the other jurors agreed that "it wasn't fair" to keep the anxious father-to-be waiting around while they tried to reach a verdict.

One of my colleagues tells of a jury composed of many nationalities, a most sentimental jury which in an entire term of listening to cases hadn't returned a single verdict of guilty. Finally an Italian appeared before them for trial, accused of grand larceny, and the evidence against him was so conclusive that the jury voted 11 to 1 to send him up.

The lone hold-out was a fellow Italian who spoke up bitterly: "You have been acquitting Irishmen, Germans, and Jews right along. Now an Italian comes along and you want to send him away. No." The 11 abashed jurors hastily rectified their "injustice."

The law that all 12 jurors must reach unanimous decision has produced a bookful of "unusual" pronouncements from all

parts of the United States. In Easton, Pa., an impatient judge who had been waiting for a verdict warned the jury that if they took much longer he would lock them up overnight. The jurors quickly reached the verdict, but it developed later that two of them, unable to make up their minds, had decided the issue by tossing a coin.

Some lawyers and even judges contend that the answer to the abuses of jury trial is to eliminate juries altogether. That is out of the question. The system is too deep-rooted in our American philosophy of life and law. It is the greatest guaranty for a fair trail yet conceived, and no one who truly believes in a free society should advocate its abolition or the diminution of its power.

Yet there are certain common-sense changes in the system that would alleviate most of the abuses I have pointed out. Here is a list of minor reforms that I believe would reimplement the jury as an instrument of justice:

1. Abandon the requirement for unanimous agreement of 12 jurors to reach a verdict. A majority of one in our electoral college elects a President—the majority principle determines the outcome of all elections. And yet it requires a unanimous verdict of 12 to convict or acquit a moron or vicious gunman. This rule of unanimity is nothing less than legalized coercion. It condemns an honest difference of opinion; it makes jury service disagreeable; it is an incentive to corrupting jurors.

2. Judges should be empowered to strip courtroom procedure of its confusing side issues, keep the language understandable, and restrict lawyers in their befuddling techniques.

3. Judges should further be empowered to assist in and accelerate the selection of jurors, while the practice of lawyers to resolve on the least intelligent, instead of the most intelligent, jurors should be curtailed.

4. Jury duty should be broadened to include many classes of citizens now excused from serving. Furthermore, the ease with which men escape jury duty should be stopped. Jury service is a sober civic responsibility, and every American citizen should be required to take his turn.

5. Lastly, and most important, all jurors should be required to undergo a short, intensive course in legal terminology, procedure, obligations, and duties. This school should be administered by neutral representatives of the bar association, law schools, or the courts, and should cover points which have relevancy to a trial. In fact, a brief course in jury service could easily be conducted in our public schools. After all, we train dispensers of liquor behind the bar. Why shouldn't we also train dispensers of justice before the bar?

Chief Justice John Marshall once wrote: "The judicial department comes home in its effects to every man's fireside; it passes on his property, his reputation his life, his all." The jury is an indispensable part of that judicial department. But unless it functions efficiently, our liberty is insecure and the administration of justice a mockery.

If justice is not to be found in the courts, then the American way of life is in jeopardy. A few minor reforms in our jury system will speedily remove much of the danger, and perform for our citizenry a good that is far in excess of the slight energy required to effect the changes that experience and common sense dictate.

In order that you may have some information relative to the background of the author, I wish to include the following brief statement:

Judge Julius H. Miner, the originator and director of the annual Constitution Day Observance, is currently assigned to the criminal branch of the Circuit Court of Cook County, in Chicago. He is a graduate of the Kent College of Law, has a master's degree from Northwestern University Law School, and for 10 years has been on the faculty of John Marshall Law School. Admitted to the bar in 1917, he served as master in chancery of the circuit court for 16 years, ascending the bench in 1940. As judge and lawyer he has had ample opportunity to study the appalling defects of the American jury system. In this outspoken article he tells what those defects are and how they can be overcome to make the jury system a true instrument of justice.

Independence Day Address of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower at Vicksburg, Miss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, 1863, the valiant defenders of the city of Vicksburg were forced to surrender to Gen. U. S. Grant of the Union Army.

On July 4, 1947, the city of Vicksburg surrendered again to another Yankee general. But this time it surrendered its heart to the boyish smile of General of the Armies Dwight D. Eisenhower as it celebrated Independence Day for the second time since the fall of that historic city.

Eisenhower took the city without firing a shot, and received the greatest ovation ever given a Union general south of the Mason and Dixon's line.

In 1863, Vicksburg ate mule meal. In 1947 the menu was hot dogs and mustard, pink lemonade, and fried chicken. It was quite an improvement after all. Vicksburg had quit mourning its Civil War losses in 1945 when World War II turned right for the Allies under the leadership of General Eisenhower, and her memorable celebration of Independence Day, 1947, is but an indication of the South's intense desire for the continuation of American democracy

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith the brilliant address of General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, at the Carnival of the Confederacy, Vicksburg, Miss., on July 4, 1947:

I am signally honored by your invitation to meet with you of Vicksburg on the anniversary of the American Declaration of Independence and on a day of such significance in the history of your State and city.

On July 4, 1863, the sun of the Confederacy passed its zenith. That day, the gallant hosts of Lee started wearily back to Virginia, their ordeal at Gettysburg behind them, and only their courage to sustain them through almost 2 years more of bitter fighting before they came at last to Appomattox. On that same day the epic of Vicksburg reached its end, but not until there had been given to the world, on the ground on which we stand, imperishable proof of Americans' subborn will to sacrifice and endure and to die for the right, as they see the right.

For all who fought under the Stars and Bars, the eighty-seventh anniversary of the Declaration of Independence was a dark and bitter day. But their bitterness would have been lessened, their gloom would have been lightened, could they have looked forward through the years to the sequel of their struggle as clearly as we can now look back. Scarcely could any of them have hoped that the sons and daughters of a reunited Nation would gather at the places immortalized by their valor, to commemorate the sacrifices they so freely made for the cause in which they believed.

Few could have foreseen that America's fighting men of a later day would be sustained in battles against tyranny by the memory of men, in the Gray as in the Blue, who counted not the cost when all by which they lived was at stake. And still fewer could have realized that the very conflict they waged would—by removing forever from our national life problems that appeared unsolvable—result eventually in a firmer Union, one against which the hordes of the Kaiser, the Mikado, and the Fuehrer would later dash themselves and their false ambitions to destruction.

United ourselves, we now seek to unite a world lately released from the agony of global war and still divided by economic, social, and ideological differences. We see that unless the United States helps plan and build a world structure for peace humanity may suffer the Golgotha of a third world war. The problems ahead are many; their solution obscure. But because the human future is a projection of the past and present, we can profit from the study of the accomplishments, the failures, the lives of our forefathers.

For us who live more than 80 years later, the Confederacy's fall and its causes reveal a truth that is valid today. The southern cause was sinewed by potent elements of victory—courage to win, a stubborn endurance that steeled even the youngest child and the feeblest elder, magnificent armies whose superb leadership and heroic performance have never been surpassed. But though the South had all these, it was blockaded, isolated, cut off from intercourse with the rest of the world by an ironclad net around its coast. Wealth of spirit and the skill and stamina of its armies were outweighed by a fact that must—and especially by us today—be accepted as an axiom of world relations. It is:

A nation's success in war and in peace demands participation in the community of nations. Commerce and communication with others, the exchange of goods and of knowledge, the play and interplay of human activity—such international partnership is required for national vitality and strength. Just as the Confederacy could not stand alone, there is today no people so rich in resources, so stout in action, that they can live alone and by themselves achieve richness of human life. More than this, no nation can in the absolute sense attain by itself even physical security.

Present facts, however, and the possibility of insane attack on those who work for peace cannot be ignored. We do not dare, now, to neglect the relative security that resides in strength—military, moral, and economic strength. Until all others are ready, with us, to substitute the council table for the battlefield we must parallel and support our efforts toward world stability with a unified purpose to guard ourselves well and to maintain an effective strength that compels respect for our peaceful intent.

But this cannot be our final goal. Fear of war and its consequences impedes spiritual and material progress and, at the least, compels vast diversions of our toil and sweat to

unproductive processes. Though a people, accepting barren existence, should devote all their substance to maintenance of arms, they would finally reach, in their fearful and sullen isolation, a point in deterioration where bankruptcy within or attack from without would mean collapse.

Either the nations work together for the common good or one by one they will perish; slowly in withering decay; or quickly under the impact of total war, as is more likely the way of the future. Industrial development and atomic science have left no limits to global conflict, either in scope or destructive result. Many, nevertheless, disparage world unity as visionary and impractical because national loyalties tend to stifle international action. But in the reunion of our States that had been divided by internal conflict, deepened by a bloody civil war, a problem comparable in intensity and kind was surmounted.

In the generations following that decisive struggle, service to the Nation demanded no lessening of loyalty to the State. The Mississippian of today is just as proud of his heritage, is rightly as devoted to the welfare of his State, as any of the men who defended the redoubts of Vicksburg. It is clear to him today that the well-being and full security of the State can be achieved only within the larger concept of national interest which comprehends at the same time the welfare of all of the States and all of their citizens.

In an interdependent world, the ultimate good of any part can be attained only with full regard to its relationship with the whole. Americans we proudly are—never will we turn by a hair's breadth from our devotion and duty to country—but we must realize that self-interest and our country's good demand that our words and deeds reflect the understanding there can be no prosperous America in a starving world—there can be no real safety if others are ready, in savage envy and hatred, to pounce upon us at the first propitious opportunity.

We must admit that international machinery with the strength and status required to adjudicate dispute and back up decision is still in the future. But even if distant, effective world cooperation is still the logical goal ahead. It is the only goal that will permit men to live side by side and prosper on this earth once more. Security and justice for all nations, with each given the opportunity for a reasonable livelihood, is an aim dictated by common decency. It is dictated also by valid concern for our own peace. Conflict between nations in the world of today quickly overflows borders to every nook and cranny of the world and involves hapless millions who know nothing of the war's causes.

Leadership toward the goal of international cooperation is partly a matter of convincing others that their self-interest points in that direction. Tangible proofs are being offered to the world of the sincerity of our own convictions. After fighting a war, with stupendous cost in lives and treasure, we are still extending ourselves to feed, clothe, and minister to the wants of many peoples. We are moved by charity and by the knowledge that starvation and misery are sterile ground for the seeds of cooperation. However, this can be emergency action only—no country can permanently carry others on its back. Millions are still in want and will not reach full sufficiency until they are able, with such help as can be given, to solve their own great problems. Basic to that solution is their freedom from fear of domination.

Another element in our leadership for peace is our successful demonstration of the cooperative method. If we believe that the American system, extended to world-wide practice, would be the salvation of us all, then it is incumbent upon us all to make the system work at home. Cooperation means to work for the good of all. If we—if each of us is concerned with promoting cooperation in the world, then we will measure every contemplated action in terms of the national well-being, rather than by narrow and selfish interest. Industrially, economically, socially, and politically we must cooperate for the good of America.

In striving for world action, we cannot blueprint the future just as we cannot predict the factors it will introduce. Even a plan for the present will rise or fall on the willingness of the nations involved to make it work. Our own heavy responsibility lies in our position as the most powerful and prosperous of those nations that with us uphold the dignity of the individual and the freedom of men in the exercise of fundamental rights.

Our course through these critical years must embrace wisdom and charity. A prosperous peace, which fosters the development of human betterment, is the only wise peace. Wisdom in the face of opposition requires fairness, patience, and a visible competence to defend ourselves. And regardless of the drains upon our patience, the irritations aroused by accusations directed at our honesty of purpose—even at our acts of charity—we will never falter if we recall the alternative to world order. We must abide by the words of one whose spiritual greatness is the common heritage of North and South—"With charity toward all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Thus guided ourselves, we shall more surely lead others to a better future. From war's havoc, death, and destruction, some permanent good to humanity shall be reaped. Just as Vicksburg was a crucible where differences were fired and joined into a strong and inseparable national unity, so the last war, which ended with an inferno of destruction, can be the start of a world union for peace.

As a soldier I salute the memory of all who fell, during our years of internal conflict, battling for what they believed to be right. Whatever their uniform, they contributed to the America whose strength and unity gives hope to the world. Even for Pemberton's army the siege of Vicksburg was a failure only in fleeting sense. Long since it has become a symbol of American endurance, a bright chapter in a volume of glorious traditions. More than this, in terms of history it was a memorable part of a great transformation that has brought America to a destiny of opportunity and responsibility that involves all—everywhere—who seek to live in peace, respectful of their neighbors' rights as they are jealous of their own.

Reds Have an Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent indication by Dr. Townsend, when he addressed his followers at the Uline Arena here in Washington, that he was going to join up with other left-wing elements and support Henry Wallace in a third-party movement, an article appearing in one of the Washington newspapers a day or two ago entitled "Reds Have an Idea," I think, will be of interest to Americans. I am inserting the article herewith, as follows:

REDS HAVE AN IDEA—THEY ADD LABOR ACT TO FOREIGN POLICY AND GET THIRD PARTY

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

American Communists pulled a new one today in their nonstop effort to sabotage United States foreign policy.

It is an attempt to hitch opposition to the Taft-Hartley Labor Control Act to Soviet foreign policy. The party line now is that labor cannot expect to change the act until it has changed United States foreign policy.

Joseph Starobin hit that theme in the Worker, New York Communist organ.

"Because Truman broke from the path of FDR in foreign affairs," Starobin wrote, "the Taft-Hartley bill could not be defeated by last-minute pleas in the Senate.

"And if American labor learns anything from the experience, it will have to learn the domestic fight for democracy can't be won until it becomes a fight for a progressive foreign policy."

From Starobin's standpoint a progressive foreign policy is one which goes parallel with the Soviet foreign policy.

William Z. Foster, Communist Party national chairman, carried on the argument.

"It is an attempt," Foster wrote, "to weaken the people's opposition to big capital's program of world imperialism and warmongering."

Between them these two Communist spokesmen charged their own country with imperialism abroad and fascism at home and called on labor to force changes in our domestic and foreign policy.

For the more naive they tossed in some third party bait. Milton Howard, another Communist writer, carried the third party torch. His heroes are Senator CLAUDE PEPPER (Democrat, Florida), and Henry A. Wallace.

"On all sides," wrote Howard, "both from trade-union leaders and from such Democrats as Senator PEPPER, for example, as well as from Henry Wallace, the talk is boldly and vigorously in the direction of a third party."

The Communists are shooting for 1952 or later. They link American foreign policy and the Taft-Hartley bill, the GOP tax bill and related measures to a bi-partisan development. Their theory is plain.

It is that party lines—Democratic and Republican—are on the way out. They foresee a realignment which would break the solid South tie to the Democratic Party. There would emerge conservative and radical parties here, and the Communists hope to ride the radical party's driver's seat.

Don't Let Utilities Backslide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial published in the Washington News of Wednesday, July 2, 1947, entitled "Don't Let Utilities Backslide":

DON'T LET UTILITIES BACKSLIDE

The electric utility industry, sobered up, a respected member of the community, its shady past almost forgotten, shows signs of a relapse. It would do well to jerk itself up fast, recall the 1920's, and take the pledge all over again.

Twenty years ago the public was just waking up to the fact that utility stocks were of questionable value because utility accounts were so full of water and write ups; because holding companies were draining so much from operating utilities in charges for this, that, and the other; and because the utilities had found a way to operate in a no man's land between State and Federal regulation where it was impossible to check on what they were doing.

After a 10-year battle, this situation was corrected. Changes in the Federal Power Act brought about regulation in the field beyond the power of the States to reach. The water was wrung out of company accounts—$1,250,000 worth of water. And when it was out, financial pages began bragging about the soundness of the whole procedure and the strong fundamental position of the utilities.

Another act gave the SEC power to break up great holding company pyramids, and the companies that wept most bitterly over their fate in 1936 are more prosperous today than ever before.

Government-developed power furnished a yardstick for rates and showed companies the way to larger profits through wider markets. Again, what the companies thought was ruin turned out to be rosy prosperity.

But memories are short and greed is eternal.

The utilities are backing half a dozen bills in Congress designed to put them back where they were in the twenties. They aren't suggesting repeal of the Water Power Act—just amendments. But the amendments, innocent-sounding, cut away all that's important in the act. They once more would leave things up to the States, and the States once again would find themselves groping in an interstate no-man's-land, confused and impotent.

Other proposed bills are planned to force an end to cheap power rates, and end to demonstrations that the cost of a project eventually can be written off and cease to be a charge to the consumer, an end to the use of power sales as a means of developing the West.

Hearings are being held quietly and in unseemly haste. It's time for the country to take a long, penetrating look at the whole business.

The great tears being shed by the power men, their pleas that they seek only a chance to survive, would be more impressive if they hadn't said it all before—and if it were not for daily stock-market quotations. Taking the cure made the utilities sleek and prosperous and was good for the national economy. Congress will be foolish and reckless if it doesn't keep them that way.

Independence Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein the following speech delivered by me over radio station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Thursday evening, July 3, 1947:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, this is the night before the Fourth.

It is a time of celebration—of fireworks and roman candles and bonfires.

It is a night which belongs to the youth of America, for the spirit of the young is of the essence of independence.

The joy of this festival reflects the happiness of our forefathers when they declared their independence of foreign rule and set out to build, starting from scratch, the strongest and most prosperous nation on earth.

The American people accomplished this miracle without sacrificing the freedom of the individual.

In fact, ours is the one last nation on earth where liberty is a reality and not a memory.

The shrine which marks the beginning of these United States is called Independence Hall and it is located, fittingly enough, in Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love.

Its cornerstone was laid in the year George Washington was born.

Until the Revolution it served as Pennsylvania's colonial capitol.

It was the meeting place of the Second Continental Congress, which, in the year 1775, made Washington Commander in Chief.

In 1776 it gave birth to the Declaration of Independence—one of the most inspiring documents ever written by man—and the charter of our material and spiritual greatness.

Eleven years later, with Washington presiding, the Constitutional Convention gathered in this hall and made the United States a nation.

Since that time the building has been regarded with reverence by all Americans.

The Liberty Bell which hung in the old tower has become the symbol of our independence.

Day in and day out, tourists visit the hall.

In the quiet they can almost hear the voices of the past, calling upon the best in every man and woman for the building of a society in which there shall be no ruling class but the people themselves.

And they leave this temple of Democracy with the feeling that we must try to equalize the opportunities and responsibilities of individuals, so that the family which we call the United States may develop in peace and prosperity and happiness.

Visitors from other countries who travel across the great distances of the United States see a world in miniature.

From the industrial east, across the fertile prairies, over the vast natural resources of the Mountain States to the lush climate of the Pacific coast, they meet variety.

And they are amazed that in this diversification we have found a basic unity which has enabled us to solve every crisis in our history.

Repeatedly, they misunderstand us.

From the competitive clamor and activity of American life, which we report and debate without censorship, they assume that we are forever on the verge of breaking up.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

Because America is young and strong, it thrives on doing things.

Sometimes our vigor, needing a safety valve, escapes in sharp and hasty words which other nations misinterpret as signs of an unbridgeable split among us.

But the divisions which they expect never happen.

Our heated disagreements on public issues, are evidence of abundant energy.

We give and take, but we go forward.

Each man and woman in the United States is at once a challenge to and a controlling influence over his fellow-American.

Our efforts are guided by compromise.

They are never dulled by regimentation.

The wide and tragic gap between "haves" and "have nots" which has torn apart the social fabric of many nations will never happen here.

To a lesser extent than other nations we have such a problem, and we do not blind ourselves to it.

There is no hardening of the political arteries in America, separating us into stubborn and inreconcilable camps.

Opposing groups strive to win their special objectives, but, in the long run, it is public opinion whch decides the issue.

There is no room in our Nation for government by any one group, one party, or one man.

I have mentioned the unity which we achieve in time of war.

Apart from the civil conflict of the 1860's, our country has enjoyed domestic unity through all the years of its development—that is, until today, when we face new problems for which there is no precedent to guide us.

In this age of mass production, where a few men control vast areas of our economy, more and more people are dependent for their livelihood upon decisions made by men whom they have never seen and over whom they have no control.

Behind the restlessness of our age and the intense search for security many people feel that they have lost their independence.

There are even a few, a despairing few, who would surrender all freedom of mind and spirit and opportunity in exchange for the promise of material security.

This is a strange and disturbing trend which is foreign to our American traditions.

On this night before the Fourth, as we prepare to celebrate that independence which our forefathers fought so hard to win, it is well for us to ask, what are we doing to promote the greatest development of individual liberty, consistent with the public welfare?

The men of 1776 lived in a society that was largely agricultural.

The men and women of today live in one that is industrial and complex.

We have just come through a war to protect our independence as a Nation from foreign aggression.

But here at home, we are faced with problems and tensions which unless we solve them in the American way, might result in the loss of independence through our own mistakes and excesses.

Much as the background of 1947 differs from 1776, the need for positive citizenship is the same.

Vision and courage and the pioneering spirit are demanded of each and every one of us to maintain our basic liberties, as we adjust our society to meet the requirements of a new age.

In previous broadcasts, I have spoken to you about various public issues, such as the reorganization of Congress.

I have advocated the establishment of a Merrimack Valley Authority in order to develop its potential energy for the benefit of the people.

I have recommended the extension of the social security to provide coverage for more of our elderly citizens.

I have brought you information on the problems of monopoly, communism, and housing.

In Colonial times ours was a Nation of 4,000,000 people.

Today it has more than 135,000,000 members.

In the old days we heard much about State rights.

Lines were arbitrarily drawn across a map, theoretically separating some people from others.

In recent times, however, we have come to see that a river, for instance, does not begin or stop at a State line.

It drains and erodes and sometimes floods vast areas beyond its visible banks.

To meet the problems of rivers, and to utilize them more completely in the public

interest, the States are seeing the wisdom of joining up in regional compacts with Federal assistance, and in doing so have made remarkable economic progress.

The point is there are new groupings of power in the making within our country.

New rights and obligations are appearing on the scene.

In this shifting pattern, our task is to work out a system of checks and balances among these forces, preserving the vitality of each, without allowing any one to become all-powerful.

One of the most important groups in the Nation today includes all those who have served in our Armed Forces.

They are the ones who gave up some of the most precious years of their lives to save our independence from those who would crush it.

Ours was a global Army, Navy, and Air Force, taking our young men and women to all corners of the earth.

They saw and endured much.

They had a chance to compare the lot of other people with that of the folks back home.

It was a stern and realistic education for the youth of America, which made them do some hard thinking.

All the cobwebs of illusion and complacency were brushed away.

When they came back they were still young in years but quiet in a mature and serious way.

The veterans of the United States appreciate independence because they have seen the misery of those who lost it.

Sometimes they wonder if we take these blessings for granted.

They know that freedom must be fought for here at home during peace as well as war.

Democracy does not stand still.

It is dynamic, and there is always the danger that the liberties which our forefathers won, and succeeding generations have fought to preserve, may slip away if we sit back and fail to participate in the making of our Government.

Realizing the great sacrifices which the veterans were called upon to make, while the rest of the population was called upon to give so little, the Congress has tried to narrow the inequality by generously providing educational, job training, and many other benefits for our ex-service men and women.

It wants them to catch up in terms of normal living with the years they have lost.

In the haste to help our veterans, on a scale never before attempted, certain obstacles were bound to arise.

One of these concerned the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946.

This bill provided for payment to veterans for furlough time coming to them, at the rate of 2½ days for each month of service, which many veterans, particularly those overseas, did not have a chance to enjoy in actual time taken off from their military duties.

Officers were paid for unused leave, so this bill corrected a long-standing discrimination.

Rather than pay the men off in cash, which would result in a huge outlay which the veterans might spend immediately, thus contributing to inflationary pressures, a compromise was worked out.

Veterans were paid in cash up to the first $50 of the amount due.

For the remainder, they were issued terminal leave bonds bearing 2½ percent interest and maturing 5 years from date of issuance.

Except when used as premium payments in connection with the conversion of their service life insurance, these bonds could not be put to use for any practical purposes.

This worked a hardship on many veterans who needed the money and not a promise to pay.

As of June 16, 1947, the Treasury had issued more than $1,830,000,000 worth of these bonds.

This is a part of the national debt.

Cashing them now, will reduce the debt that much.

Furthermore, the Government would save a considerable amount in interest.

The President has stated that there will be sufficient income during the fiscal year just ended, to apply to a reduction of the public debt.

I know of no better way to accomplish this purpose than to pay off this obligation to the veterans.

And so I am pleased, at this broadcast, to bring good news to our ex-service men and women.

Your terminal-leave bonds are going to be paid off in cash.

The sentiment in Congress is in favor of such enabling legislation and it will become fact within a matter of days.

On this night before the fourth, when this young Nation of ours with youthful enthusiasm celebrates the independence which has since inspired our great progress, it is well for us to pay tribute not only to the founding fathers, but to the sons of their spirit, the veterans of today, who have preserved our freedom.

In peace as in war they will protect the Nation from the tyranny of power in any form.

As Franklin D. Roosevelt said, and I quote: "Democracy can thrive only when it enlists the devotion of those whom Lincoln called the common people. Democracy can hold that devotion only when it adequately respects their dignity by so ordering society as to assure to the masses of men and women reasonable security and hope for themselves and for their children."

Our veterans know the devotion of those who work together for a common cause.

The patriots of 1776 won for us the Bill of Rights.

The veterans of 1947 will lead in the struggle to win economic justice.

The neighborliness that unites individual men of good will must extend to the groups within our Nation and unite them in understanding and cooperation.

This is the goal which all freemen are working for.

With God's help we shall reach it.

Truman Chose Lesser of Two Evils in Approving the Rent Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me earlier today, I include the following editorial published in the Brooklyn Eagle on Tuesday, July 1, 1947, with regard to the rent decontrol bill which this Republican Congress has legislated and which today is causing pandemonium throughout the country:

TRUMAN CHOSE LESSER OF TWO EVILS IN APPROVING THE RENT BILL

President Truman had no alternative to approval of the rent-control-extension bill which became law yesterday. Existing restraints ended at midnight. The President was accordingly placed in the position of choosing the lesser of two evils.

In these circumstances, a weak law is better than none at all. President Truman will not, and, of course, should not, be held responsible for what happens to tenants throughout the country in consequence of the provisions of this new law. In the words of Senator HATCH, the law has placed a club in the hands of landlords. It will be strange, indeed, if they do not use it.

Surely, there is nothing in the record of the housing tragedy up to date to suggest that some of the real-estate interests will display restraint and consideration in exercising the new power at their command. They have been a factor in obstructing adoption of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill. Their influence has been thrown to the effort to break down rent controls.

Use of the term "voluntary" in connection with the 15-percent rent raise permitted under certain circumstances injects a humorous touch into an extremely grim situation. The landlord is enabled quite effectively to whip the tenant into line, as the President indicates in his characterization of the arrangement as "voluntary only so far as the landlord is concerned." Over the head of the tenant hangs the threat of eviction within 30 days, not 6 months, as provided by the law.

This law is unjust and unnecessary.

Los Angeles, the Incomparable—It's Stupendous, It's Colossal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in Los Angeles and have seen it grow from a population of 750,000 to 1,800,000 in a few short years know what a great city it is and what a great future it has.

We saw the great surge of people from all over the United States and from all parts of the world who came to Los Angeles, the City of the Angels, following World War I. So many thousands came that we could not build enough homes, schools, highways, and other facilities to take proper care of them.

When along came World War II, many more thousands came to build aircraft and ships, to refine petroleum, to make synthetic rubber and rubber tires, to refine aluminum, to make steel, and to produce foodstuffs of all kinds to help win the war.

Thousands of servicemen came to Los Angeles to train for service in all branches of the Army, the Navy, and the marines. True, many other cities have had similar experiences, but none have had so many come and stay to make their homes as has Los Angeles.

The city of Los Angeles, with an area of 450 square miles, has the largest area of any city in the world, and is situated in Los Angeles County with an area of 4,450 square miles blessed with fertile soil and an all-year outdoor climate suitable for recreation, industry, and diversified agricultural production. Its future growth is assured, and it is freely predicted it will become one of the greatest metropolitan areas in the world.

Here is an Associated Press story written by Hal Boyle about present-day Los Angeles:

This is a big tomboy town still able to laugh at itself.

What other world city can? London is too sedate, Tokio—or what is left of it—is too serious. So is Moscow. Paris has circles under her eyes. New York is getting them—a flip femme with a middle-aged wisecrack.

San Francisco, St. Louis, and New Orleans—they are full blown ladies who like their fun, but don't go in for kidding. Chicago is a prosperous beef salesman bellowing self-confidently on the country's windy crossroads.

But Los Angeles, well, she's just a big sprawling gal beginning to get her curves—an adolescent with the promise of a clear-skinned beauty showing through her pimples. And, of course, some of the older women—the other cities—think she's putting on the lipstick too soon. They know she's competition.

She has grown so fast she doesn't quite know what to do with herself. She's all arms and legs and no direction, and where she'll stretch next is anybody's guess. She wears smaller diamond and rhinestone communities like a gawky schoolgirl with a charm bracelet.

She is capricious, lusty, and immature, and no other civic youngster in our time has held out such gargantuan promise for good or bad.

The sun shines vitamins and languor on her all year round, and she is Mediterranean in her extremes—bone poor and Croesus rich. She is the tomb of at least three civilizations, and the womb for every creed and political belief that men put faith in.

Los Angeles is a new battleground between people who think this is the best of all possible worlds, and other people who concede the world may be round—but are sure that it is never square to them.

Los Angeles is one of the last American frontiers—urban rather than rural—for the latter-day Daniel Boones who travel in search of greener pastures in jalopies instead of afoot.

Los Angeles is a mixing bowl for many races—that show no signs of melting until the temperature cools.

Los Angeles is a place where the horse is more of a sign of affluence than the motor car. A beggar needs a car here to get from his room to the place where he holds out his hand for a living.

Los Angeles is the world film capital, spinning artistic cotton candy 29 days out of the month and on the thirtieth a web of Shakespearean grandeur.

Los Angeles is the one city left on the globe where every fool, crackpot, zany, and zealot can have a hearing and find a following. The hospitable slogan: "We've got 'em all."

Los Angeles is the vaudeville heaven where 42d and Broadway went to when it died. Out here they renamed it "Hollywood and Vine."

Los Angeles imports people and water and exports canned entertainment and airplanes.

Los Angeles changes so fast that a man going up life's escalator here can shake hands with himself going down.

Los Angeles is where old settlers have a hard time keeping up a conversation with newcomers who park an astrology magazine in their library next to a first edition of Milton.

Los Angeles is so full of outlanders that when you meet a native son you lift your eyebrows. It's like New York—you never think of anybody ever really being born here.

She's a sort of municipal Texas—Los Angeles is—girdled by mountain, desert, and sea. She's America's last civic tomboy, and about all you can be sure about her is—she's here to stay. And she expects the world to be her beau.

Jews in American Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an excellent review on the book Jews in American Wars, by Leon Dick, editor of the Uptown Observer, a community newspaper in my district.

JEWS IN AMERICAN WARS, A HIGHLY INFORMATIVE BOOK

(By J. George Friedman and Louis A. Falk, 149 pp. New Jersey: The Terminal Press)

As a documentary and statistical account of the part the Jews have played in the making of and fighting for the United States of America, this book serves to contradict adverse propaganda. It is enlightening to realize how deep are the roots of his forefathers.

The detailed account of Jewish-Americanism from the time of the landing of the Pilgrims to the present is a testimonial of great faith and the authors apply themselves to this task, but with a thorough understanding.

While the authors' approach is and must, of its nature, be factual, it possesses an intrigue which carries the reader from one absorbing chapter to the next.

Messrs. Friedman and Falk have divided their book into nine logical chapters; from the time of the American Colonies, which they so aptly titled "A New Nation Is Born," to chapter nine, "The Generals and the Admirals."

Each chapter, in itself, embraces a definite period of American history in progression and gives a thorough report of the contributions by Jews in behalf of Americanism.

For example, it is an exciting revelation to know that there was a Jew who sat at the signing of the Declaration of Independence; one, Dr. Benjamin Rush, of Philadelphia.

The part played by Jews in the following three decades is fully explained in chapter 2, The Star-Spangled Banner.

During this period, the young Nation underwent great changes. Agriculture, trade, and industry developed and prospered, and American merchant ships made their bid for world commerce.

When Tripolitanian pirates tried to enforce levies on American commerce, an American expedition into Tripoli harbor was planned and executed. One of the 10 seamen volunteering for the suicidal task aboard the American frigates *Nautilus* and *Constitution* was Midshipman Joseph Isreal.

In the War of 1812, Haym M. Salomon, son of the renowned Haym Salomon, was captain of the Tenth Brigade, One Hundred and Fifteenth Regiment.

The roll call of Jews in the service of our country at even so early a period in our history numbers in the thousands. From Commodore Uriah P. Levy, one of the most spectacular figures in American naval history, to the late Maj. Gen. Maurice Rose, of World War II, an outstanding field commander, the list of military men of Jewish faith is both enlightening and a source of inspiration.

The remarkable similarity of the history of the United States as compared with this documentary is amazing. It proves conclusively and without a doubt that the Jew has dedicated himself to the service of his country since the first colonial forces were established.

There are a number of interesting letters, poetry, and summations in this volume: Among them a letter from the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt to the Jewish War Veterans of the United States; The Fighting Jew, a poem by the late Damon Runyon; and summations of both World War statistical records.

Address of Hon. James H. Fay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include therein an address made by my friend and our former colleague, James H. Fay, who served in the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-eighth Congresses.

Congressman Fay addressed a joint communion breakfast of the General Duffy Post, American Legion, which he founded, and the Denis Metcalfe Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on Sunday, May 25 last.

These two posts are located in the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress.

Jim Fay served with honor in the Fighting Irish Sixty-ninth Regiment in World War I. He bears the wounds of battle sustained in the Argonne Forest and has always been a great champion of veterans and their families.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, Reverend Father Larsen, commanders of the General Duffy Post, American Legion, and the Denis Metcalfe Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, fellow Comrades, ladies and gentlemen.

Once again we meet at our annual communion breakfast to pay our respects to our dead comrades in arms who gave their lives that our Nation might survive, not for one creed or race, but for Americans all.

Today, as last year, we are joined by our comrades of World War II, all in a common bond and a solemn resolution that war shall never come to our shores again.

We must not forget the men who suffer the pains of war for they are a living example of the ravages of war. It was with this thought in mind that I introduced a bill in Congress early in 1943 for the construction of a $5,000,000 hospital and outpatient department immediately adjacent to Bellevue Hospital. I then pointed out that skilled surgeons and physicians of Bellevue give their services free to our residents and they certainly would do the same for our wounded and sick comrades. I am sorry that they did not act upon my bill then, because now there would be erected this great institution. However, I have been informed that the Veterans' Administration on their own program have acquired the property on First Avenue and Twenty-fourth Street and very shortly work will be commenced for a veterans' hospital.

It was in the same year 1943 that Commander Naftalison did all the research work for me in the introduction of a bill for the creation of a Cabinet post for veterans. Up to the present, no action has been taken

but in my opinion, and it is shared by many, the problems of the veterans will never be properly handled until one agency takes over the 10 or more that are administering to the postwar affairs of the men and women who served.

Today, both our posts are looking forward to the new development which will bring over 12,000 families into our neighborhood. From all reports, veterans and their families are being given first consideration. When that time comes, the grand ballroom of the largest hotel will find it hard to accommodate us for our communion breakfast.

While our World War II boys were away fighting it out all over the world, fighting in the bloodiest battles history recalls, we, of World War I were doing our civic duty on the home front. It can be said of Metcalfe and Duffy Posts that when air-raid wardens were wanted, when war-loan drives were opened, we at home were doing our share in our small way, always mindful of the sacrifices you young men and women were making for us.

Permit me to thank you for this opportunity of addressing you this morning as I have for many years past. May we meet again next year when I hope and pray the destinies of world affairs will be settled.

Proposed Tax for the Support of Liquor Clinics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, July 7), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt of a statement by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, of Washington, D. C., before the Senate District of Columbia Committee.

The subject matter mentioned in this excerpt has to do with a proposal to tax liquor advertising for the support of liquor clinics.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Clinton N. Howard, general superintendent of the International Reform Federation, incorporated 1895, and editor of its official publication, Progress, with headquarters in Washington.

Our federation wishes to go on record as favoring the establishment of clinics for the rehabilitation of alcoholic addicts. In support of S. 757 we wish to propose an amendment to provide funds for the maintenance of said clinics.

The bill as drawn proposed a gallonage tax to be paid by the consumers. There is another and in our judgment a better source of income than from the sale of liquor, that runs into the millions, which is entirely untaxed, and that is the income of the newspapers from liquor advertisements.

The amount spent for advertising by the distillers of the larger producing capacity is $75,000,000 annually, and by beer of the larger breweries $25,000,000, besides their income from retail stores, night clubs, cocktail lounges, and restaurants operating bars, perhaps a total, including beer and wine broadcasts, of $150,000,000. These figures were definitely brought out in the hearing on the Capper bill, S. 265, on Tuesday, May 13, 1947.

IT PAYS TO ADVERTISE

The purpose of all advertising is to increase the sale of the commodity, and the liquor trade recognizes this stupendous sum paid to the newspapers as a good investment. It would be preposterous to affirm that $100,000,000 spent in advertising any commodity did not increase its sale, particularly in a commodity which creates a morbid appetite upon what it feeds. Millions in excess profits, and countless fortunes have been made in advertising from chewing gum to beer and rum.

That the daily papers in Washington get their share is evidenced by the scrap books of liquor ads which we have on file at our headquarters. Let me give you a few recent examples. The Washington Post in a single issue had 31 columns of liquor advertising, and in a pre-Christmas issue it had 51 columns of liquor ads, more than all the department stores put together.

By contrast the New York Times in an edition double in size had only 14 columns on the same date, while the papers published by the Gannett string of 21 daily papers with a total circulation of nearly 1,000,000 do not publish any liquor advertisements and never have.

There are today 8 magazines with 1,000,000 or more circulation, 4 with between 500,000 and 1,000,000 circulation each, 24 with more than 100,000 and less than 500,000, and 44 smaller magazines that accept no alcoholic-beverage advertising. The total circulation of these magazines is more than 43,765,000. The Reader's Digest, with 10,000,000 circulation, accepts no liquor advertisements.

Then there are the Curtis publications: Country Gentleman, Ladies' Home Journal, Saturday Evening Post, and Holiday, with 10,800,000 guaranteed circulation and no alcoholic-beverage advertising. The Reader's Digest, with 10,000,000 circulation and no liquor advertising, leads the list.

There are 90 leading farm papers, 2 with 1,000,000 circulation each and 18 with more than 100,000 circulation, ranging up to 980,000 circulation, that take no alcoholic-beverage advertising, exclusive of the Country Gentleman, with 2,200,000 circulation, listed among the Curtis publications.

HONORABLE MENTION

The following metropolitan dailies accept no alcoholic-beverage advertising:

	Guaranteed circulation (1947)
Chicago Daily News	491,046
Christian Science Monitor (Massachusetts)	155,302
Deseret News, the (Salt Lake City)	41,597
Des Moines Register and Tribune (morning, evening, and Sunday combined)	838,143
Harrisburg News and Patriot (combined)	84,083
Kansas City (Mo.) Times and Star (morning, evening, and Sunday combined)	1,076,238
Minneapolis Tribune, Star, and Times (morning, evening, and Sunday combined)	779,112
South Bend Tribune (evening and Sunday combined)	171,062
Topeka Capital (daily and Sunday)	116,337
The Gannett chain of 26 daily and Sunday papers in 19 cities of New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Illinois	888,531

HORACE GREELEY HOWARD

In addition there are at least 180 daily newspapers and approximately 4,000 weekly newspapers that refused all alcoholic beverage advertising, including 4 papers published by my youngest son, Horace Greeley Howard, in New York State, continuing the policy established by Horace Greeley, founder of the New York Tribune, of never accepting an advertisement to promote the sale and consumption of intoxicating liquors, beer, wine, or spirits.

"MAKE BOYS BEER CONSCIOUS"

On the contrary is the damnable example set by a Philadelphia daily in its issue of May 29 and since with a full page beer ad, to carry out the policy announced at the National Brewers' Convention at Chicago to "make boys beer conscious." The full-page ad is addressed in bold type "To the 10,000,000 young men who have never tasted a great glass of beer." Philadelphia, once known as the cradle of American liberty has become the cradle of journalistic degeneracy.

We believe that the newspapers of the country who are accepting millions of dollars from the brewers and distillers, said to approximate a hundred million dollars, in creating the habit of drinking intoxicants by the boys and girls of America, and increasing their consumption among those who have already formed the habit, from two billion to eight billion dollars in less than 10 years, should pay the cost of the clinics to rehabilitate the addicts.

In his testimony on the Capper bill to eliminate liquor advertising from interstate commerce, Frank Gannett testified that he estimated his annual loss at $1,000,000. It does not seem unreasonable therefore, to suggest that the papers of Washington which have an income of millions annually from promoting the sale of liquor should bear a part, if not the entire cost, of maintaining the clinics for rehabilitating the drunkards they helped to make.

MOUNTING CONSUMPTION

As a result, despite the falling off in the population due to the return of soldiers to civil life and the dismissal of Federal employees, the consumption of alcoholic liquors continues to increase. At the hearing before this committee May 15, it was testified by Guy W. Pearson, the district tax collector, that his office had sold stamps for 4,650,000 gallons of whisky, rum, gin, and brandy in the first 10 months of the current fiscal year which exceeded the total for the fiscal year 1946 by 183,000 gallons.

THE PRICE SOCIETY PAYS

This is further confirmed by the increase in arrests for drunken driving, more than 100 percent since the 1st of January, and most startling of all is the number of deaths from drinking poison alcohol. Up to May 14, the morgue reports 25 deaths in the District since January 1. We feel that these staggering results are due to the high-pressure liquor advertising on the part of the Washington press, and we suggest an amendment to this bill which will require that at least 10 percent of the gross amount received by the newspapers from liquor advertisements shall be contributed to maintain the cost of clinics for the rehabilitation of the liquor addicts they helped to make. Why impose the cost upon the consumers only who reap no financial profit, but suffer physical, mental, and financial loss?

SUGGESTS TWO AMENDMENTS

Such an amendment to the pending bill will more quickly, easily, and cheaply accomplish the same result, and, at the same time, cut off or reduce the supply of drunks that is making Washington a hissing and a byword from ocean to ocean.

BANISH THE WINDOW DISPLAY

As a further method of reducing the number of liquor addicts, as well as to reduce the number of new recruits from the generation that must take the place of the addicts who are cured by these clinics, we suggest an amendment that will prohibit the pernicious and alluring display of bottle intoxicants in the 500 liquor stores of Washington, which

never was permitted anywhere in this country in the old saloon days that brought about prohibition. Window displays are an important factor in increasing sales, as the crowds ogling these whisky windows indicate.

HOOCH ITS OWN HANGMAN

If prohibition comes back, as is now indicated by the vast increase in dry territory all over the country, including Kentucky, where, despite its 70 distilleries and 6 breweries, 93 of its 120 counties have voted out the sale of whisky, wine, and beer, with the rest soon to follow, and if prohibition comes back, the liquor men will have only themselves to blame.

Thirty years ago I campaigned in nearby every county in the Blue Grass State with Col. George W. Bain, of Lexington, known as the silver-tongued orator of Kentucky. We began the campaign at Paris, the capital of Bourbon County, the home of that famous brand of whisky. Night after night Colonel Bain won his audience with the slogan, "Kentucky, Kentucky, the State where I was born; where the corn is full of kernels and the colonels full of corn."

Should Colonel Bain return to Kentucky now, he would add to that slogan an amendment:

"Where the distillery on the hillside now is still,
And the men they take their tipple from the ripple of the rill,
And the boys they come home sober, and the mothers do not cry.
Glory, hallelujah, Kentucky's going dry!"

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Townsend Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, July 7), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Townsend National Convention in Washington, D. C., June 28, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPE AND SECURITY FOR AMERICA'S AGED

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, you will notice that I am speaking to you from a manuscript. I am not like the minister who, when he rose to speak, said:

"Friends, I regret that I left the copy of my sermon at home. So, today, I will have to use the words that God puts in my mouth, but next time, I hope to do better."

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to you folks today, including so many friends from my own State of Wisconsin. This assembly reminds me of a previous occasion when I addressed a Townsend group in Buffalo, N. Y.

You have assembled here today in an hour of history when we should all pause and take stock of our blessings and should evaluate our challenges of the future.

I am sure that you men and women have come from many distant places in order that you might, in this beautiful Capital City, "charge your souls anew" with the love of country and the love of principles which have made her great. I know that each one of you who has performed a lifetime of work in this blessed land is grateful for the blessing of being an American. At the same time, you recognize that we have many problems, which we must meet head-on with adequacy, and one of those problems is, of course, security for America's old folks in these inflationary times.

OLD FOLKS' RESPONSIBILITY

You and I know that the elderly folks of America, who have seen America's wonderful growth during their lifetimes, are guardians of our precious freedom. The flag that floats so near us all today reminds us that we but recently celebrated Flag Day. I remember that many years ago one of my youngsters taught me a lesson on the meaning of the flag. She came home one day from school and said, and her words made me bless her teacher, "Mommy and daddy, this flag is you and me and grandpa and grandma and all of us."

OUR FLAG

I was deeply thrilled by the wonderful lesson which this child had learned. So, too, this flag here is you and I—and all the elderly folks of America and young folks of America, and the generations yet unborn. It is what you and I choose to make it now and what they will make it in the future.

Several weeks ago it was my pleasure to deliver a flag-day address to the citizens of Wisconsin on the meaning of the flag in this atomic age. I stressed the fact that we here on this continent are more blessed than anywhere else on earth, that the bomb released at Hiroshima has ushered in a new age—the atomic age. I pointed out that we had been raised to leadership of all nations of earth, and with the leadership, has come responsibilities to our own citizens and to the citizens of the world. I pointed out that ours was the function of a good samaritan to help the war-weary, the war-ravaged, the hungry, and the diseased abroad, so that they could become competent to help themselves again.

OUR DOMESTIC RESPONSIBILITY

But you and I remember the fact that, as St. Paul said:

"If any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel."

That means that we must be adequate to the needs of our own citizens, too, and, in particular, to the needs of our old folks—those living on inadequate pensions and annuities, while the cost of living is rising.

WORLD OUTLOOK

Yes, as we look abroad for a moment before returning to our domestic issues of today, the world has indeed been contracted in this technological age. Jet planes, guided missiles, and atomic weapons have made the earth very small. As one scientist said to me not long ago, however, "We are still only touching the hem of a new world of amazing discoveries which are to be ours."

As we scan the globe today, we realize that war has not brought peace, but has brought only new and difficult problems. We are in a position today where we must be adequate to our international challenges. There are tremendous differences between ourselves and the other leading power on earth today—the Soviet Union—political, economic, social, racial, spiritual, historical differences, making for a vast gulf between our way of thinking and Russia's way.

But I say that in spite of these differences I have faith that we can make the United Nations succeed. I have faith that if we can live the lives that we should in this land, we will be holding up a standard "to which the wise and the honest may repair." But we must be ever vigilant. We must remember that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." We cannot fall asleep to the foreign realities as they exist. We must exercise keen judgment in conduct between ourselves and foreign nations, but we must have that faith that "moves mountains," that the differences between us can be resolved peacefully. It is my prayer that reason and judgment will be born anew so that these differences to which I have referred will be ironed out. You ladies and gentlemen have seen many wars in your lifetime. You want no war in the future for yourselves or your children.

THE YOUNG FOLKS HERE

I am happy to speak to you many young folks. You and I know that it is not the gray of the hair that makes for age. It is the condition of the heart; or, as the poet puts it:

"Age is a quality of mind;
If you have left your dreams behind,
If hope is cold,
If you no longer look ahead,
If your ambitions' fires are dead—
Then you are old.

"But if from life you take the best,
And if in life you keep the jest,
If love you hold;
No matter how the years go by,
No matter how the birthdays fly—
You are not old."

Yes; age does not depend upon years. Some folks never grow old. As I look around me, I am sure that you have learned the art of growing old gracefully and happily. You know it has been said that no one grows old who can keep "the heart of a child," and perhaps you recall that the ladies of Greece counted their age from the date of their marriage rather than from the date of their birth.

SPIRIT OF MAN

The spirit of man, in contrast to the body of man, is eternal. The spirit of man knows none of the limitations which mortal thinking is prone to talk so much about. So long as you and I keep active in thought, so long as we are always ready to adopt new ideas, to get rid of synthetic thinking, of foggy thoughts, so long as we are dissatisfied with the wrong and content only with the right, so long as we enjoy the art of realizing the best that is around us and within us, just so long will we advance to ever new horizons and be forever young.

OUR PROBLEM HERE TODAY

My friends, I have touched on the foreign situation and on the spiritual side of our problem because I know these matters are close to your hearts. Now, let us turn to the direct problems of our old folks.

I want to address you very briefly on this matter which has had my serious consideration ever since I came to Congress. It relates to compensation for lives well spent. Yes, it is the subject of security for those citizens who have lived their lives in a constructive fashion for the Republic, and have contributed to its maintenance and building up. I am speaking of you elderly folks who have worked for America and have faith in the future of America, in its free political system, its private economic system. I am speaking of those who want their children and their children's children to continue to live in the home of the free and the land of the brave.

MY PREVIOUS EFFORTS FOR OLD-AGE SECURITY

Almost 8 years ago, in 1939, with regard to the Townsend bill, I stated in the Senate, "I would like to see Congress pass Senate Joint Resolution 145, which provides for an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress the 'certain' right to levy taxes for old-age pensions. There are those who claim Congress has that right. There are those who say Congress has not that right. If this joint resolution, amending the Constitution, were submitted to the people, it would enable the people to decide whether they

wanted the Congress to have that certain right. The problem of old age is one of the serious problems confronting the Republic."

Since that day in July 1939, when I stated these thoughts, the situation of our old folks has changed, in many cases, but not for the better. War came, and many old folks joined the war factories and made an invaluable contribution to our military effort. But, with the end of the war and competition much keener in the labor market, many elderly folks have found it impossible to compete with younger workers and with increasing mechanization.

One of the problems which the postwar era has brought us is the problem of inflation brought about by underproduction and underconsumption.

MY JOINT COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Just 8 months ago, in the United States Senate, I reintroduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, which provides for a 14-member Joint Committee on Social Security.

I had previously introduced this resolution in 1943, but, unfortunately, it had not been acted upon then. I am hoping and working so that the Eightieth Congress will take action on it.

If it does take action, then the Townsend legislation in the Congress, introduced by Representative ANGELL and many other Congressmen, and all other social-security legislation, would go to the new joint committee for its evaluation. This committee would have a deep and abiding interest in the social-security problems of our elderly people.

NEED FOR CAREFUL STUDY OF SECURITY BILLS

As you know, H. R. 16 is now pending before a House Ways and Means 5-member social-security subcommittee. I believe, however, that the Townsend bill and other legislation should be reassigned to a special Joint Social Security Committee, consisting of 13 or so men of both Houses.

I believe that both Chambers should assign men with the keenest interest and the most expert background on the subject of social security to this proposed new committee, in order that we might assure justice for the Nation's old folks.

The members of the Joint Social Security Committee, which I propose, should be men who are aware of the vast ramifications of the social-security problem. They should consider the matter of health of elderly folks, of adequate hospital care. They should consider, too, such realities as the national indebtedness of our Nation, now standing at some $260,000,000,000. They should be men who understand that a particular piece of legislation may often involve, upon close inspection, vast areas of other legislation which must be carefully borne in mind in these changing times.

H. R. 16

You and I know that the legislation of your own organization has changed somewhat throughout the years in order that it might be adequate to the changing scene.

Representative ANGELL'S bill entitled "The Business Employment and Security Insurance Act," affects our Nation's production, distribution, and employment in as wide and extensive a manner as any single piece of legislation in the Congress today. That is why it deserves the most detailed consideration of the Congress.

Since I am not a member of the Senate Finance Committee, this bill could not presently come up within my own jurisdiction, but naturally I am keenly interested in it and in all other pending legislation on this subject. H. R. 16 would, as you know, provide every adult citizen of the United States with equal basic Federal insurance and would permit retirement with benefits at the age of 60, in addition to covering total disability from whatever cause for certain citizens under 60.

CONGRESS AND THIS LEGISLATION

There may be honest differences of opinion on this bill and related legislation.

We have in the United States Congress 435 Representatives and 96 Senators. Every one of those men and women is an individual, different from one another in background, be it economic, educational, social, political, religious, or geographical background.

The congressional process is a lengthy and detailed one in which bills can be amended to meet the requirements of particular legislators.

These facts should be borne in mind as you consider the future for your own legislation.

Men may differ on legislation, as I have said, but they cannot differ on the obvious facts and realities of the old folks' difficult conditions today.

INADEQUACY OF PRESENT SECURITY SET-UP

I would like to quote briefly from my Senate address of April 2 on the problems of our old folks.

"It is obvious that in these years, when prices have gotten far out of line and the purchasing power of the dollar has declined, that our present system of old age compensation, of unemployment insurance, of aid to widows and orphans, of aid to the blind, must be reevaluated. * * * Surely, if there is any single issue on which any party can gain the unyielding admiration of the American people, it is on the issues of promoting the security of our citizens in an insecure world, the issue, of course, of not making loafers of any Americans but productive workers who can look forward to enjoying reasonable security. My recommendation (for a joint committee) is but the first small step. Let that step be taken.

"The effects of that step in helping to ease the worry, the anxiety, the care of countless folks throughout the Nation may be incalculable. At least, they will know that the Congress is on its toes eager to explore the whole subject of social security with adequate, integrated resources—with an open mind, with a sympathetic heart."

Just this month I introduced another bill, S. 1403. The purpose of this bill is to permit retired workers, widows, and dependent children, receiving old-age and survivors' insurance, to increase their outside earnings without losing their pensions. This bill obviously affects only one small phase of social-security legislation and yet, I believe it would make for justice for our old folks.

FAITH OF OLD FOLKS

We recall the words of Robert Browning:

"Grow old along with me!
The best is yet to be,
The last of life, for which the first was made."

We recall the words of Walt Whitman in his Song at Sunset when he spoke of "The grandeur and exquisiteness of old age."

But the best has not been for countless men and women of advanced years. Even in our blessed America, they have suffered the torments of insecurity, the woes of poor housing, lack of adequate nourishment, lack of adequate medical care for their ailments, because the few dollars that they receive in social-security aid has virtually lost their meaning in these inflationary times.

But, looking upon you today, I know that you men and women are not discouraged and that millions of other folks of advanced years are not depressed. You know that justice will be done for you. You have faith which, as St. Paul stated, is the "substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things not seen." What you are hoping for is security for old folks. That is the thing which you do not "see" now except in your mind's eye, but which assuredly will come to pass.

It is as if I can almost hear you saying the words in the Book of Psalms, "Now when I am old and gray-headed, O God, forsake me not." You will not be forsaken. The Congress of the United States is not unmindful of the problems of the insecurity of old age.

As you know, there is a vast amount of legislation pending before the Senate and the House of Representatives. Much of it cannot be considered prior to the adjournment of this first session sometime late next month, but I am hoping that if it is not taken up now, this problem will certainly be taken up within the second session of the Eightieth Congress, and will be adequately handled.

CONCLUSION

My fellow Americans, I have been grateful indeed to be with you here today. It has been a pleasant experience which I will long remember.

We have briefly reviewed the foreign situation. We have touched upon the spiritual nature of man. We have considered the problem of our old folks and the legislation which your own organization is sponsoring, in addition to some of my own measures along this line.

I know that you will carry back to your communities fond recollections of your stay in Washington. I know that you will indeed have been filled with "light" on this problem, and that you will have been charged anew with love of our blessed land.

You will know, more so perhaps than ever before, that the "best is indeed yet to be."

Labor-Management Relations Act—Questions and Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, July 7), 1947

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a list of questions and answers which I have prepared, relating to the effect of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS RELATING TO THE EFFECT OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947

(By Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT, chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare)

RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES

Question. Is it true that the act removes large groups of employees previously covered by the National Labor Relations Act from the protection of that statute?

Answer. No. The new act only exempts supervisors, employees of Federal Reserve banks, and of charitable hospitals. As a matter of fact, the Labor Board has never held that hospitals were engaged in interstate commerce, or that Federal Reserve banks were covered by the existing exemption with respect to public employment, so this amendment was largely for clarification.

Question. Does this apply to supervisors?

Answer. Under the new act foremen, to the extent that they are given general managerial authority by their employers, will not be deemed employees. This was the holding of the National Labor Relations Board for

several years, and the sponsors of the legislation believe that it was the intent of Congress at the time the Wagner Act was passed. They believe that the minority opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas in the Packard case, with which three of his Supreme Court colleagues concurred, correctly stated the law. The new act defines the term "supervisors" precisely, drawing the line clearly between bona fide representatives of management, and the group having negligible supervisory duties like straw bosses and set-up men, who are left subject to the act.

Question. Are professional persons excluded?

Answer. Professional persons employed by firms whose operations affect interstate commerce are still given all the rights which other employees enjoy under the Wagner Act. They are protected from being outvoted by employees in industrial units or clerical units by a provision which gives professional employees a right to have a voting unit of their own. They are still free to select as a bargaining representative, however, either a union whose membership is confined to professionals or a general trade union.

Question. Do plant guards still enjoy the rights of employees?

Answer. Yes. They were not exempted from the coverage of the Wagner Act. The only restriction upon plant guards is that the organization which the Board may certify as their representative shall not include persons other than guards.

Question. What rights does an employee have, if his employer discharges him for belonging to a labor union?

Answer. The same as today. Either he or his union may file unfair labor practice charges under title I and obtain an order of reinstatement with or without back pay in the discretion of the Board.

Question. But if an employer told a dismissed employee he was being discharged for breaking one of the plant rules does he have any remedy under the new act?

Answer. It makes no difference what an employer tells a dismissed employee. Just as under the present law, the employee can file an unfair labor practice charge, and the Board decides the real reason of his dismissal. The new act does make it clear, however, that if he was really discharged for cause, the mere fact that he is a union man and that his employer may not happen to like unions does not make him immune from all discipline or from discharge. The Board as today has to determine the real reason for his discharge.

Question. Does an employee have any rights if he is discharged for not joining a union?

Answer. He would have the same rights (unless there is a valid union-shop contract in effect) that the union man would have in the converse of the situation. The new act, like the Wagner Act, prohibits discrimination both to encourage or discourage membership in a labor organization.

Question. Does the new act give an employee any additional rights?

Answer. Yes. He is protected from coercion by labor unions and their agents. He is protected from losing his job even if there is a union-shop contract if he is willing to pay union dues. He is given a definite right to insist on nondiscriminatory treatment from any welfare fund established. He is protected from personal legal liability for the illegal acts of labor organizations. Other protection is given against both employers and union leaders.

Question. Against what kind of coercive conduct by unions is an employee protected?

Answer. He is protected both against physical and economic coercion. For example, in the absence of a valid compulsory union-membership contract if a union compelled a man to join it or to sign an application card by threatening him with loss of his job, this would be economic coercion. Both threats of violence and threats of this kind are prohibited.

Question. Does this cover mass picketing?

Answer. Yes. It will cover intimidating conduct or physical force used by union agents on a picketing line to prevent a man from going to work.

Question. What is an employee's remedy under those circumstances?

Answer. The employee could file an unfair-labor-practice charge and obtain a cease-and-desist order from the National Labor Relations Board. This could be made a matter of a court injunction if necessary.

Question. Suppose a union forces an employee out of a job.

Answer. Unless the union has obtained a union contract requiring membership in that union as a condition of employment, the union is prohibited from causing or attempting to cause an employer to discharge an employee whom the union does not like.

Question. But suppose although the employer is reluctant to fire him, the union nevertheless procures his discharge by strikes or threats to strike.

Answer. Such an employee is still entitled to reinstatement in a complaint case before the Labor Relations Board. Moreover, the Board, since the union was the moving force, can order the union to compensate him for the loss of wages.

Question. Are any contracts under the new act legal which require an employee to be a union member?

Answer. Generally speaking, what is known as the closed-shop contract, that is, one which permits the union rather than the company to choose the employee, is no longer lawful, unless it is negotiated and executed before August 22 and then only for 1 year. What is known as the union-shop contract, namely, one requiring employees to become members of the union after 30 days, is still lawful even though negotiated after that date, provided a majority of the employees to be covered by such contract have given the union a right to ask for such a clause in a secret ballot conducted by the Labor Board. A maintenance of membership agreement is also lawful if preceded by such an election.

Question. May employees who are now covered by the closed shop, union shop, or maintenance of membership contracts drop out of the union if they see fit?

Answer. Not if these contracts were in effect on June 23. Such contracts can be enforced until their expiration date. New contracts of this character made prior to August 22 may also be enforced for a period of a year. Also new contracts for union shop made under the act may be hereafter enforced.

Question. Does the new act give individual workers more voice in the running of their unions?

Answer. The new act does not police the internal affairs of unions, but it does require the union to give full information regarding its methods of election, methods of operation and financial transactions. A knowledge of these facts will give individual workers more opportunity to express their opinion. They are more free to express their opinion and urge policies contrary to the wishes of the union leaders because, although the union may expel them, they would still be entitled to hold their jobs even in case of a union-shop contract.

Question. Is this true even with regard to union-shop contracts made after August 22?

Answer. Yes; because the law simply requires a worker covered by such a contract to tender his dues and initiation fees. If the union refuses to admit him or expels him for some reason other than failure to pay such dues or initiation fees, the union cannot compel his discharge.

Question. Suppose an employer makes a contract with a union after August 22 which requires all the employees to become members within 30 days, but at the end of that 30-day period the union refuses to accept an employee's application either because of some racial rule or because the union's quota is filled?

Answer. The contract then becomes inapplicable to such an employee; and if the union tries to get him fired, it engages in an unfair labor practice.

Question. Can unions still impose political assessments on their members under threat of making them lose their jobs?

Answer. No; because even though a union makes the payment of such an assessment a condition of membership, an employee can still hold his job by paying his regular dues.

Question. Could a union get around this by raising its dues with the purpose of using the increased revenue for political purposes?

Answer. If a union used funds collected as dues for political contributions or expenditures, it would violate an amendment which the law has made in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and the officers responsible for the diversion of such funds would be committing a crime.

Question. Suppose a union, in order to limit employment to present members, raises its initiation fees by several hundred dollars, thus making it too expensive for nonunion employees in shops where that union has a union-shop contract to join.

Answer. The new law makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to charge excessive initiation fees if it has a union-shop contract. It does not expressly state what is excessive, but leaves this to the Board. Obviously, if the purpose was discriminatory and out of line with the practices and customs of that industry, the Board would be compelled to hold the union guilty of an unfair labor practice unless it reduced the initiation fees.

Question. If there is nothing about compulsory membership in the union agreement, does the individual employee have any more voice in his union affairs?

Answer. The law does not give him any direct rights under those circumstances, but since it requires unions to file financial reports and copies of their constitution and by-laws, and to supply copies to their members, the membership would become aware of improper conduct by union leadership and could take appropriate steps within the union constitution to bring about appropriate reforms.

Question. If a union which was using its funds improperly concealed this from the membership by making misleading quarterly reports to the Government in its statements, has the Labor Board or any other public agency the right to check on such irregularities?

Answer. The Labor Board does not have any such authority, but the filing of a statement, which contained fraudulent representations or concealed material facts, is a violation of section 35 (a) of the United States Criminal Code. For violations of this section the Federal courts can impose fines as high as $10,000 and prison sentences for as long as 10 years.

Question. Suppose an individual member knew that the union treasurer's report was false, how would he bring this to the attention of the proper authorities?

Answer. Since the Criminal Code is enforced by the Department of Justice, such an employee could take up the matter with the United States Attorney for his district or to the FBI.

Question. What protection are union members given against seizure or control of unions by racketeers?

Answer. Only the same as today. If the majority of the members of a union really want to get rid of a leader, I believe they can do so and that the courts will protect their right to a fair election. Of course, if these so-called racketeers engage in racketeering, they would be subject to prosecution for misappropriating union funds. Also, they might

be guilty of extortion under title III of the new act, or they might be guilty of coercion against employees.

Question. Can union racketeers compel proprietors of small shops who have no employees to join their unions?

Answer. Not if they apply any economic force to such independent proprietors, such as refusing to transport goods to their shops or interfering with their suppliers.

Question. What redress does a small businessman have against such practices?

Answer. He can bring an action for damages against the persons or organizations responsible and can also file a charge with the Labor Board. If the regional office of the Labor Board finds the charge has merit, it is authorized to obtain an injunction to prevent continuation of such practices until the case is ultimately decided.

Question. After a union contract expires may a union still bargain for higher wages or shorter workweek and compel the employer to bargain with it?

Answer. Yes. An employer is compelled to bargain with the union which represents the majority of his employees.

Question. Is there anything in the law which would prevent an employer from saying no to such demands?

Answer. The law provides that an employer's duty to bargain does not necessarily mean that he has to make any concessions.

Question. If he refuses to make any concessions, is the union precluded from striking?

Answer. No. The law does not prohibit the right to strike after the expiration of the contract, provided 60 days notice of the contract termination or the requested change is given to the employer.

Question. Does this apply to union demands for welfare funds?

Answer. A union can still ask an employer for a welfare fund, but an employer is still free to say no. If the employer agrees to such a fund, however, the contract must make him jointly responsible for the administration of the fund, and the plan under which the fund is created must contain provisions which make it a genuine trust fund.

Question. How does the law affect the check-off?

Answer. The check-off is still legal, but under new contracts written authorization must be given by each individual employee, as is usually customary today.

Question. If an employee refuses to give an employer such an authorization can he be compelled to do so if the contract provides for a union shop or maintenance of membership?

Answer. No; neither the employer nor the union can compel him to give such an authorization. If he refuses to pay his dues directly to the union, however, and the union expels him, he can then be discharged, provided he is one of the employees covered by the contract.

Question. Over what period of time does the law contemplate that unions already having contracts containing compulsory membership provisions shall establish their right to continue such contracts?

Answer. Existing contracts are valid until the end of the contract period. Any contracts which come up for renewal or extension after August 22, 1947, will have to be preceded by a Labor Board election if they are to contain compulsory membership provisions.

Question. How will these elections be handled by the Labor Board, in view of the fact that it is estimated that there are some 50,000 union locals which have, or desire to have, such clauses in their contracts?

Answer. It will be the duty of Congress to see that the Labor Board is given sufficient appropriations to enable the various regional offices to handle these requests for elections. under the law, no hearing is necessary, so the Board should be able to handle them as expeditiously as it handled the strike elections under the Smith-Connally Act; that is, within a 30-day period after the notice or petition has been received.

Of course, these 50,000 contracts will not all expire in the same month, so that in the average month the Labor Board would probably not have to conduct more than 4,000 of these elections. During the wave of strikes last year the Board handled almost this number of elections under the Smith-Connally Act.

Question. Is it true generally that State laws take precedence over the provisions of the new Federal labor act?

Answer. Only where purely intrastate industries are affected. In interstate matters, except for the provisions with respect to compulsory membership agreements, the new act takes precedence over State acts which are in conflict with it.

Question. Is it necessary for a union to have a strike ballot before employees can be called away from their jobs?

Answer. This is not required except in a national emergency strike situation. If such a dispute has not been settled 60 days after the injunction is issued, the Labor Board is then directed to poll the employees with regard to the last offer of the employer. In less important strikes, the Mediation Service may also employ this technique, but it is not mandatory.

Question. Will enactment of State legislation be necessary in any cases to amplify or strengthen provisions in the bill?

Answer. No. State legislation will not be necessary unless the State desires to have legislation applying to purely intrastate industries. States may also pass laws completely prohibiting union shops if they desire to do so.

Question. Does this apply to State mediation boards?

Answer. No. There is nothing in the section of the new law dealing with mediation which would be in conflict with the functions of State mediation agencies. Moreover, the new act encourages State mediation by requiring the parties engaged in a dispute over the prospective termination of a contract to notify both the Federal and the State mediation conciliation services of the existence of the controversy.

Question. Are there any provisions in the act which curb a union's right to strike where such a strike is not a breach of contract?

Answer. In general, the act does not restrict a union's right to strike for wages, hours, and working conditions when the contract has expired. If a union fails to give notice 60 days before the end of the contract of its desire to modify the contract, there may be no strike until 60 days has been allowed for collective bargaining. Also, strikes in the nature of a secondary boycott, and jurisdictional strikes, are outlawed. In the case of strikes of an entire industry, or a substantial part thereof, which endanger the national health and safety, the President may obtain an injunction against a strike for 60 days and until an election can be held.

Question. Does this mean that a strike on an industry-wide basis is illegal?

Answer. No. The strike would not become illegal until the court enjoined it after finding that it affected the national safety or health. In such a case violation of the injunction would be illegal.

Question. May unions strike for recognition?

Answer. Yes. Unions may strike for recognition unless another union has been certified by the labor board as the bargaining representative. An employer, however, does have the right if he receives a demand for recognition to petition the labor board for an election and certification.

Question. May an employer refuse to recognize a union if it is Communist dominated?

Answer. In order to use the machinery of the Labor Board either for the purpose of becoming certified or filing a charge, a union must submit affidavits signed by each of its local and national officers to the effect that such officers are not members of the Communist party. If such affidavits are submitted employers must treat that union like any other union.

Question. What would happen if the employer refused to bargain on the ground that the affidavits submitted by union officers were false?

Answer. The duty to bargain would still exist if the Board decides that the union was the majority representative, but the officers filing the false affidavits would expose themselves to prosecution under section 35A of the criminal code.

Question. If the union officers refused to file affidavits what remedy would an employer have?

Answer. He then could refuse to recognize the union and be immune from proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board because the Board is instructed not to entertain a charge by a labor organization unless its officers comply with these legal requirements.

Question. May an employer discharge a Communist employee?

Answer. Yes; if that is the real reason for discharging him.

Question. Can a group of nonunion employees secure an election after a union has obtained a contract?

Answer. Any contract negotiated with a union having a majority at that time will continue to be valid until its expiration date as the election rules provided by the act do not interfere with contract rights.

Question. If an employer is operating a nonunion plant, may a union man in another factory refuse to handle the non-union-made products?

Answer. The new act makes it an unfair labor practice to refuse to process goods made in another plant in order to force the employer in that plant to recognize a union.

Question. What remedy does the nonunion employer have under such circumstances?

Answer. He can sue the union for damages or he can appeal to the National Labor Relations Board for an order against the boycott.

Question. Suppose the union, instead of refusing to handle his goods in other plants which that union has organized, urges the general public not to buy products of nonunion manufacturers?

Answer. This is not forbidden by the act, since it is merely persuasion.

Question. If a craft union strikes because certain work which it claims should be given to it by its employer is being performed by another craft, has the employer any protection?

Answer. Yes; for, generally speaking, jurisdictional strikes are declared to be unfair labor practices by the new act unless the employer is refusing to comply with a decision of the National Labor Relations Board.

Question. Will this prevent jurisdictional strikes in the construction industry?

Answer. The construction industry ordinarily would be intrastate commerce and would not be affected by the act. Of course, there are instances where it is interstate commerce, and in such cases the employer can obtain a decision from the National Labor Relations Board settling the jurisdictional dispute.

Question. Suppose the employer does not discharge a Communist employee in a plant where there is a union-shop agreement, does the union have to permit him to obtain or retain membership?

Answer. No. The act does not impair in any way the right of the union to make whatever rules it sees fit with regard to the acquisition or retention of union membership.

Question. Does the new act do anything with respect to a common complaint of em-

ployers, namely that they have been denied free speech under the Wagner Act?

Answer. The new act is written so that it insures freedom of speech both to employers, employees and labor organizations. It permits the expression of any views, arguments or opinions which do not contain threats or promises of benefit.

Question. Do you think there is any basis for a complaint by employers to the affect that under the Wagner Act the courts have merely rubber stamped the decisions of the Labor Board thereby preventing them from having any real appeal to the courts?

Answer. Yes. Almost every circuit court of appeals in the country have said as much since under the Wagner Act the court could not reverse the Board if its findings were supported by any evidence.

Question. Does the new law remedy this situation?

Answer. Yes. Congress took two steps to correct this in the passage of the new act. It is required that the hearings be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence prevailing in the Federal courts to the extent that this is practicable. In judicial review the Board's findings are no longer conclusive unless supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole.

Question. Do you think there is any basis for the President's assertion that the division of functions between the Board and the new general counsel created by the act will make it very difficult for the law to be administered efficiently?

Answer. This should not impair the administration of the act in the slightest degree for it merely relieves the Board members of duties which now interfere with their judicial functions. By transferring the responsibility for issuing complaints and prosecuting them to the general counsel the Board should be able to keep abreast of their judicial docket.

Question. But does not this place a tremendous amount of power in the hands of one man?

Answer. The General Counsel is merely responsible for initiating prosecutions. The power of making ultimate decisions still resides in the Board. It should be noted that the prosecuting power given the General Counsel is far less than that possessed by the Attorney General since the Attorney General can initiate criminal as well as civil actions, and against any person or corporation in the United States.

Question. Does the new act abolish the present Board?

Answer. No. It merely enlarges it from a board of three to a board of five. The present members of the Board may still retain their offices.

Question. How does the new act affect Government employees?

Answer. Government employees were never accorded any rights under the Wagner Act and the new law makes no change in this respect. It does contain a provision, however, forbidding strikes by Government employees.

Question. If Government employees are not covered by the Labor Board how is this provision to be enforced?

Answer. A Government employee engaging in a strike becomes subject to discharge and becomes ineligible for employment for a period of 3 years.

Question. Do you think the new law will be effectively enforced?

Answer. Yes. I have every confidence that the men appointed and confirmed by the Senate together with the present Board members will effectively enforce the law.

Question. Can Congress do anything to see that these men perform their duties effectively?

Answer. They are subject to Senate confirmation. Moreover, the act provides for the creation of a joint committee of Congress to study the labor problems not covered by the act. It is expected that this committee will scrutinize carefully the operation of the new law not only to see that it is effectively enforced but also to remedy any defects which are disclosed in its active operation.

World Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the thoughts set out in the July 3, 1947, editorial by H. B. Snyder of the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind., reveals that our duty is first to avert another war if possible, and protect the next generation, regardless of the present cost. Had we followed through our world obligations after World War I, we might not today have the burdensome debt and the aftermath of the World War II confronting us.

The editorial follows:

WE CAN PAY ANY PRICE FOR WORLD RECOVERY

While we have no more desire to give away American goods than others, we see little good in the talk about estimating what we have to give away before we make any offers to help world recovery. If we were to get into a war tomorrow no one would even think of making an estimate of what we could afford to spend.

Yet the purpose of giving American dollars and goods to the devastated countries in order to make world recovery possible is about as important as winning a war. For our participation is not being considered merely because of our wish to help, but chiefly because world recovery means continued prosperity here rather than possible deep depression.

By now we should have learned that we do not live alone and that our economy does not operate in a vacuum. While the volume of our exports is only a small percentage, not over 10 percent, of our total production, yet a much larger percentage of production in some industries enters export channels.

Some of these industries would lose a large part of their sales if our foreign business is cut off and would be forced to lay off large numbers of employees with a resulting serious effect on all employment. Large scale unemployment in this country could not be prevented if world trade breaks down.

Yet this is precisely what Communists are playing for, because out of this paralysis of production would come their opportunity for advancing their interests everywhere. For communism is a product of economic misery.

This is the reason the Russians could agree to no plan at Paris which the western nations could accept. They could only accept a plan which would give them something they want as long as it does not make for recovery elsewhere. Their policy of all take and no give is basic and there is no present reason to expect a change.

Therefore it is apparent that our first need is to win the recovery the Soviet leaders don't want us to have. Recovery means world peace and the recession of communism, for with a return of normal living Europe disarmament will become much less of a problem than it is today. Communism is a world specter only in a world that has lost its way.

And so it is not a question of whether we can stand the cost, but of whether recovery can be attained by any means. Even if we do not know that we can secure recovery by costly methods, we still can hardly hold back from the experiment.

Ever since the end of the war we have been fumbling around trying to find our way out of the maze in which our lack of vision has led us, and yet many still do not want to make an all-out effort to escape.

This is not a choice between war and peace or between freedom and totalitarianism, because no one knows that we have a choice. However, it probably is the only way left by which the world can try to win back the normal processes of living.

It is a decision we have to make, and all the talk about estimating cost is strictly beside the point. We can pay any price for peace and freedom.

Antilynching Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following report of the Gallup poll on the antilynching bill which was published in the July 2, 1947, issue of the Washington Post:

THE GALLUP POLL—ANTILYNCHING LAW FAVORED BY MAJORITY IN SOUTH, NATION

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., July 1.—In the wake of the Greenville, S. C., lynching trial, public sentiment throughout the country endorses the idea of a Federal antilynching law, judging by the results of an institute poll.

A majority of the voters polled in the 13 Southern States say they would approve having the Federal Government step in and take action if local authorities fail to deal justly with a lynching.

To measure the general public attitude toward the principle of Federal action, the institute questioned a true cross section of voters in all the 48 States on the following:

At present, State governments deal with most crimes committed in their own State. In the case of a lynching, do you think the United States Government should have the right to step in and deal with the crime if the State government doesn't deal with it justly?

The vote:

	Percent
Yes	69
No	20
No opinion	11

Voters polled in the South showed a smaller vote in favor, as follows:

Southern voters

	Percent
Yes	56
No	35
No opinion	9

The majority of voters feel that a Federal antilynch statute would serve to discourage lynchings and thus reduce their number. This belief is shown in response to a second question:

Do you think this would reduce the number of lynchings in the United States or would it make little difference?

	Percent
Would reduce	60
Little difference	24
No opinion	16

In the South, however, opinion is more closely divided about the effectiveness of a Federal law in reducing lynching.

Southern voters

	Percent
Would reduce	48
Little difference	37
No opinion	15

In a companion poll, the institute sounded the reactions of all sections, including the South, to the recent Greenville lynch case, in which a group of 31 defendants accused of lynching a Negro were acquitted.

It was found that three out of every four voters had heard or read of the Greenville affair. When asked their opinion of the outcome of the case, voters in South and in the rest of the country expressed disapproval of the acquittal verdict.

	All voters	South only
	Percent	Percent
Disapprove of verdict	70	62
Indifferent	3	2
Approve of verdict	12	21
No opinion	15	15

Robot Machine Forecasts Possibilities of Weather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of July 1, 1947:

ROBOT MACHINE FORECASTS POSSIBILITIES OF WEATHER

WASHINGTON.—A robot is a leading character in a new Weather Bureau service. It gives businessmen a map showing the possibilities on the weather.

The new service is called applied climatology. It was developed during the war, when generals demanded knowledge of weather conditions far in advance.

It has been discovered that weather conditions follow a pattern. This pattern may be found if weather statistics for a number of years are studied carefully.

It also has been found this pattern may be projected far into the future—not in the form of a positive forecast, but in terms of the mathematical possibilities that certain weather conditions will prevail.

A circus may plan to visit Illinois. It has a choice of two towns for the first week of September. A study of the weather pattern shows the chances are 50–50 it will rain in Quincy, Ill., say the first week in September. In Decatur the chances are 90 to 10 it won't.

The odds are based on statistics gathered throughout the Northern Hemisphere since 1899. Some regional statistics are more than 100 years old.

DATA ASSEMBLED

To obtain the weather pattern for any locality, a team of meteorologists assembles the data concerning that locality on punched cards.

The cards may contain such information as extremes of temperature, ranges of humidity, winds, solar energy, dust content of the air, rainfall, depth of snow, or combinations of wind, ice, and snow.

Statistics for one locality, gathered for 60 years, might fill a freight car, but the weathermen punch only those that relate to the particular problem they are trying to solve.

When the punched cards are completed, the robot takes the spotlight. He is similar to many of the business machines used in offices. The punched cards are fed to him. He digests the statistics, adds, subtracts, divides, and multiplies. Then he turns out his map.

It may contain the names of 50 or more towns in a certain region. Beside each town the robot has printed a numeral. The number beside one city may be "50." This means the chances are 50 to 1 the weather will be suitable for the business project that is being studied.

VITAL NEED

The method in some instances has been found 90 percent accurate. Its possibilities for farmers, businessmen, and industrialists seem virtually unlimited.

More than 1,000,000,000 items of information are available from the weather records of the Northern Hemisphere.

Weathermen long ago recognized their value in estimating future-weather patterns, but it was an almost impossible task to use them on a wide scale when pen and pencil or adding machine methods alone were available. A complicated problem might have taken months when weeks counted.

Now it will be possible to carry on studies on a wholesale basis. The service is being developed slowly, however, and it will be a long time before it can be widely expanded.

The chief of this new section, Dr. Woodrow C. Jacobs, was the chief civilian meteorologist for the Army weather service during the war.

Military leaders who wanted to save men in beach landings and win air battles demanded to know far in advance what the weather risks would be.

The Allied High Command wanted to know, as early as 1942, where and when the best weather conditions would prevail for an invasion of the Continent.

EISENHOWER HELPED

Dr. Jacobs says the climatologists, armed with European weather records, were able to tell Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower the odds were 24 to 1 against "ideal" conditions for a Normandy landing in May 13 to 1 in June, and 50 to 1 in July.

By the time the Allied armies were ready for the invasion in 1944, the generals had had their weather information for months. They waited until the last day in the "favorable-weather" period designated by the climatologists, June 6. Dr. Jacobs says the weather behaved in just the way the weathermen had predicted.

This freshly developed skill also greatly increased airmen's chances of good weather over targets. The weathermen were quick to realize it also could help businessmen and farmers in peacetime.

Dr. Jacobs emphasizes that this new climatological service has nothing to do with another department the Weather Bureau has set up. The job of this other department is long-range forecasting. It forecasts the weather days in advance.

The climatological service doesn't pretend to be able to say, weeks ahead, that it will or will not rain on a given day. It simply states the chances.

Only one of the machines now is at work, at New Orleans, La. Eventually it is planned to have at least seven major climatological centers, with climatologists assigned to all large cities. It may take 10 years to expand to that size.

Because this service isn't of benefit to the whole public, the businessmen or the group of farmers or industrialists who want it have to pay the cost.

Address Before Marine Corps League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Marine Corps League, Gardner, Mass., on July 6, 1947:

It is not only a great honor but a high privilege and a genuine pleasure for me to be with you this evening as your remarkable convention draws to a close. I was also honored to participate in the parade on the Fourth of July and wish to state here publicly that it was most impressive and most fitting, coming as it did on one of our great national holidays. Let me congratulate all your officers and members upon a most successful convention in this beautiful, progressive community. Let me also congratulate the many citizens of Gardner, its public officials and its patriotic and civic organizations as well as all the people of the city itself who helped to make your historic annual gathering so agreeable, so pleasurable, and so constructive.

I yield to no one in the high regard that I have for members of the Marine Corps and the Marine Corps League but frankly I think that this high regard is shared by all the American people. And why not? Since its inception early in the history of our country the Marine Corps has been one of the great and powerful arms of our fighting forces. Its history is replete and rich with deeds of gallantry and heroism. In my humble opinion there is no aggregation of fighting men in the entire world which has made a better record, which has served and sacrificed more nobly, which has made more substantial contributions to the cause of American liberty and human freedom than the Marine Corps.

I will not recount here the glorious story of the exploits of the Marines, their unsurpassed loyalty and devotion, their supreme efforts and accomplishments, in behalf of democracy because these matters have been amply discussed and elaborated during the course of this convention by many able speakers. But I do wish to emphasize, as strongly as I can emphasize, the superlative record of achievement in war and peace of the fighting men of the Marines. As a Nation we would be derelict in our duty not to express the profound gratitude which every true American feels for the untiring energy, militant loyalty, superb gallantry and the bitter sacrifices crowned by innumerable glorious victories which the Marine Corps throughout the years has unselfishly rendered to perpetuation of American institutions and the destiny of free men and women.

I have noted with satisfaction the fine purposes of this great organization. They are American purposes. They are purposes of freemen. They are designed to serve the welfare and interests of the country in time of peace just as unselfishly and gloriously as the Marines have served the country in time of war. To preserve the traditions and to promote the interests of the United States Marine Corps is a lofty aim and I know

you will never be swerved from it by the blandishments of supermilitarists who have been covertly planning either the absorption or the severe limitation of this gallant corps. It may well be that in this atomic world of streamlining and modernized military equipment and weapons of terrifying strength and power that it will be necessary for us to revise and readapt the organization and composition of our armed services. We may well have to unify and integrate and bring into closer coordination the activities of various branches of the armed forces though I am proud to say that the American team we put on the field during the recent great war composed of the Marines, the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, and all other components, the team that conquered the enemy in Africa, Italy, France, Germany, and the far reaches of the Pacific from Guadalcanal to Okinawa and beyond gave a very good account of itself. Every branch of the service must be credited for conspicuous valor and accomplishment. If modern war demands additional streamlining, additional consolidation, additional coordination of combat units on land, sea, and air, let us make sure in the first place that no such plan of unification, no such plan of merger of the armed services, shall be permitted to liquidate or limit the Marine Corps. That is a very real and worthy service we can render to the dauntless men and women of the corps to whom the Nation owes so much for its present security and peace.

Your service in war has been glorious and magnificent. But there are other tasks just as urgent and compelling remaining before you. As an organization, it is not only appropriate but meritorious that you should band together with those who served with you to promote the ideals of American freedom and democracy, to build more responsive citizenship, to preserve the sacred history and memory of those of your fellows who have given their lives to the Nation, to foster love for the principles and objectives they fought for, to uphold the American institutions which they died for and to perpetuate the luster of the name United States Marines. I am sure you are also conscious of the equally vital obligations which we all owe to your gallant comrades who fell or were wounded in battle and to their families and dependents. Keeping their sacred memories alive, let us not fail to do our part in enforcing the Government's debt to all our veterans, to provide proper hospital and medical care, proper compensation, housing, education, and broad decent opportunities to get ahead in their chosen professions and lines of endeavor. That is a most important duty which devolves upon all of us and which must be performed in the name of justice and peace as well as to insure effective civilian leadership for the future.

Secondly, inspired by the great marine motto, "Semper Fidelis," let us be ever vigilant in the protection of American institutions. Let us remember that free democratic government and free unfettered American initiative combining together have forged this mighty Nation of democratic-minded peoples. Many years of struggle and bitter sacrifice by countless American generations were required before we were able to achieve the fruits of democracy and free enterprise. Let us vow that we will not stand idly by and watch any group or groups, acting in defiance of the most precious American ideals, move to attack, undermine and destroy the patterns of freedom and the traditional methods of democracy which Americans cherish. We have overwhelmed and defeated the tyrants of wartime. Now we must overwhelm and defeat the tyrants of peacetime—who are working feverishly to accomplish destruction of our free government and establish communism or some other equally undesirable form of totalitarian rule. I know that this organization will never cease to challege the subversive elements which are presently threatening the very existence of free government here and in many other lands.

There is one more subject I would like to bring to your attention and that is the question of world peace, as it relates to our present position as a nation and the very disturbing conditions that currently exist throughout the world. It is not pleasant for Americans to see all our war aims of peace, democracy, self-determination, freedom, and world security being flouted and subverted by a certain world power and her associated puppet governments. In fact, it is a source of great disillusionment, not only to our own people but to peace-loving peoples everywhere.

The time has come for us to make it very clear to every great nation and every great power that we do not propose to see our peace and security threatened, that we do not propose to see communism spread over the whole world and aim its poisonous venom at our own country. As you well know, war is a horror that should be banished from the earth. It has no place in civilized life or in a civilized world where men of reason and judgment should settle their problems around the conference table rather than by resort to armed force. No thinking citizen and certainly no thoughtful representative of the people would ever consciously advocate or support policies that would lead the Nation into another war. Let us seek peace as zealously as we sought victory in the war, however discouraged by current happenings in Europe and the Orient. Let us strive with every ounce of our energy to bring about a peaceful world. There are many weapons short of force available to us. This great powerful Republic with its great resources and unmatched production and vital economic strength has means, I am convinced, if we would but employ them intelligently and forcefully, to exert not only moral suasion but the full power of that economic strength against those who threaten the peace by constant agitation for communism and armed aggression. Let us mobilize the decent-thinking peace and freedom-loving peoples of the world on our side without being deterred by veto powers or diplomatic stalling. Let us take a firm decisive stand now and throw our influence on the side of peace, law and order, and justice, and democracy as against every evil force which threatens the perpetuity of the sacred ideals in whose name and for whose perpetuation you boys fought and so many of your comrades died.

I deplore the existence of huge military establishments for many reasons. But unfortunately if they are necessary in this disordered world until some semblance of order comes out of the chaos of the present, we must maintain them and they must be strong, well-organized, and all-embracing. Until conditions change we must maintain the national defense in all branches and departments, including by all means, our immortal Marine Corps, so that we may be fully prepared not only to defend ourselves, but to fulfill our international commitments and our destiny as a great democracy. Until conditions change, let us be sure that at all times we have unquestionably strong, powerful armed forces ready to spring into action at a moment's notice—striking forces capable of guarding our Nation and commanding the respect of all our potential enemies whoever or whatever they may be.

I have no doubt whatever that this great organization, inspired by the sacrifices of the past as well as the hopes of the future, will continue as a sustaining force of the integrity of our Nation in peace as in war and will protect, defend, and preserve the American institutions under which its members lived, fought, and died so gloriously for God and country.

Making Air Travel Safer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Josephine Ripley from the Christian Science Monitor of July 2, 1947:

MAKING AIR TRAVEL SAFER

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—The urgent need for prompt development and installation of air-safety aids to keep pace with the rapid growth of air travel is clearly indicated in the early reports of investigators into the recent series of disastrous plane crashes.

New take-off regulations for the big four-motored ships have been recommended by President Truman's emergency Air Safety Board.

If the proposed regulations had been in effect before the United Airlines plane crashed and burned at La Guardia Field, no take-off attempt would have been made and the accident avoided, according to authorities. Findings of the Board indicated that the big plane was not only overloaded but attempting to take off from a comparatively short runway.

As a result, the President's Board has recommended that loads be reduced, either by taking on less gasoline or fewer passengers, and that four-motored planes hereafter be restricted to 4,000-foot runways.

In the crash of the Capital Airlines C–54 on the last hump of the Blue Ridge, findings of investigators indicate that the pilot had apparently underestimated headwinds which had slowed him down and believed himself to be over the Potomac Valley when he was still over the mountains.

Aeronautics officials recently flew over the same course in a plane equipped with the new Hughes air-line radar warning device to see if that type of equipment would furnish the answer to the hazards of blind flying over mountainous territory.

These officials expressed themselves "intensely interested" in the device, but apparently were not quite ready to accept it without further investigation as the complete solution to the problem.

Another test at Wright Field recently had a direct bearing on the problems of maintaining sufficient altitude over high obstacles.

It showed that 100 experienced fliers required 7 seconds to read a regulation altimeter and that the pilots tested made errors in 15 percent of the readings, some as much as 1,000 feet.

This test was cited as an indication of the need for a revision and simplification of air instruments.

It has been estimated that about one-half of all plane crashes are due to personal error, mainly by pilots. This fact has resulted in considerable pressure for an improvement in personnel training.

One of the reasons why such training has been delayed in some cases is the tremendous upsurge in air travel during recent months. More and more planes have been pressed into service. During the first 5 months of the year, the average number of airplanes employed monthly on the lines rose from 463 to 666.

The development and installation of air-safety aids meanwhile has not been able to keep pace with the tremendous increase in equipment.

There was little for the investigators to go on in the crash of the Eastern Airliner in Maryland, but the finding of a defective bolt from the tail assembly of the plane led to a preliminary verdict of structural failure due to improper maintenance.

The success with which Army Air Forces in the Azores threw its ground control approach radar equipment into action recently and safely brought in 12 storm-tossed planes illustrates one type of aid which can cut down some of these bad weather hazards.

This equipment picks up approaching aircraft on a radar screen and plots its approach as operators in the control tower talk back and forth with the pilot and guide him into a landing.

The Civil Aeronautics Authority has favored the VHF (very high frequency) radio beam and the instrument landing system over the Army method, and there seems to be a dispute among aeronautics authorities as to which is the more efficient.

This undoubtedly is one of the problems which needs to be ironed out in the necessary revamping and development of air-safety codes, practices, and equipment.

Much will depend, also, upon the generosity of Congress in making funds available for these improvements, the economy drive already having cut air-safety funds rather drastically.

Meanwhile, however, all of the various investigations are bringing the obvious needs into focus and paving the way for proper action.

Free Speech for Government Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when more Members of Congress should come to the defense of the right of free speech. It seems ludicrous that so basic an American right should have to be defended. But let us consider the matter a moment. The action of some members of congressional committees indicates that they do not want Government employees to have original or independent thoughts; that they do not want any employee to express an opinion at variance with their ideas.

In the Appropriations Committee considering the legislative appropriation bill aspersions were cast on the character and loyalty of several trusted employees of one of the most valuable services available to Members of the House, the Legislative Reference Service. I do not know in detail about the charges hurled at all of the persons involved but from the analysis made by Jerry Kluttz in the Washington Post of July 6 they were all without foundation. But none of the charges could have been more thoughtless or unjustified than the attack on Dr. Jack Levin, a Government researcher with a long and honorable public service record. Dr. Levin's value to the Legislative Reference Service is presumed to have been compromised because he was associated with me in the study I made on the reorganization of Congress. There are many men in both the House and in the Senate who believe in some or all of the proposals advanced in my book entitled "Twentieth Century Congress."

It is true, as I so notified Dr. Ernest Griffith, head of the Legislative Reference Service, and also Mr. JOHNSON, the chairman of the subcommittee, that Dr. Levin did not participate in the policy statements that went into this volume. They were my own. Furthermore, the research work he did for me in connection with this book was all done before he was employed by the Library of Congress. He was not connected with the Federal Government in any way during the time he helped me with this study. But even if he had participated in the policy statements in the volume I see no reason why that should impair his work in the Legislative Reference Service. To the contrary, when any of us seek data from Dr. Griffith's unit concerning the functions of Congress I think we should be happy that there are employees there who have an interest in this vital issue and who have read widely in that field and know where to lay their hands on the material Congressmen may request.

The same type of innuendo—that something is wrong because an able citizen and a capable public servant does not think our present organization on Capitol Hill is perfect—was hurled at another brilliant student of Government, Dr. George Galloway. Dr. Galloway was also extremely helpful to me in the preparation of Twentieth Century Congress. He is a deep student and authority on congressional procedures and organization.

If we continue pursuing our present course, an editor or newspaperman who has ever criticized Congress, even though his criticism was justified, will be ineligible for Government service. If our Government service is not to be reduced to a mass of unthinking, spineless robots, let us have an end to these senseless inquisitions that besmirch the names of honest citizens. It should be noted also that these capable Government workers have no redress when charges are made against them in congressional committees. It is true that we are in an ideological conflict with communism but we cannot afford to work ourselves into a hysteria over the Communist menace. The impact of the police states such as the Soviet Union on our democracy must be met with intelligence and firmness but not by the adoption of the same kind of police methods used to keep 170,000,000 peoples of the U. S. S. R. in complete mental and physical subjection.

In our Government service, and this is especially true in the Legislative Reference Service, we need substantial citizens and real scholars. The type of inquisition that has been carried on by some members of a few congressional committees is driving good men away from Government service and is making it unacceptable to many whom we need during these difficult days. My experience has been that Dr. Evans and Dr. Griffith have secured capable scholars in the Library of Congress who are rendering splendid assistance to Members of Congress. Their exercise of freedom of speech and individual thinking should be encouraged and not made the basis for grueling inquisitions.

Export of Steel for Ship Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, in the year 1946 the United States exported to the principal shipbuilding countries of Europe nearly 800,000 tons of iron and steel mill products suitable for use in ship construction. At the same time these same countries of Europe were carrying on the construction of 122 ships which in tonnage and speed compared very closely with similar vessels now in long supply in the Maritime Commission-owned fleet. In other words, during this time of great steel scarcity, coal scarcity, and labor scarcity in Europe we have exported steel from the United States to construct ships of a type of which we have a surplus. It seems to me that one of the problems, perhaps not a major problem but nonetheless an important problem on which the nations of Europe should focus their attention immediately, is whether or not this use of steel does not constitute a terrible economic waste which could well be avoided. It is a problem which should command the attention immediately not only of our Government but of each European government concerned.

In connection with the above, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Chairman of the Maritime Commission addressed to me on this subject, together with two tables which were attached to his letter:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, July 1, 1947.

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HERTER: In response to your telephone request for information regarding shipbuilding abroad and United States steel exports, there are transmitted herewith two tabulations: one showing construction abroad as of March 31, 1947, of vessels comparable on the basis of gross tons, deadweight tons, and speed with those vessels in long supply in the Maritime Commission owned fleet together with approximate amounts of invoice steel going into the construction of these latter vessels; the other showing United States exports of iron and steel mill products which might be used in ship construction exported in the calendar year 1946 to important shipbuilding nations in Europe.

The Technical Department of this Commission which provided the information on the amount of invoice steel going into the construction of Maritime Commission design type ships advised that their figures were based upon practices which obtained during the World War II but that it was believed under normal competitive conditions steel requirements for various types of vessels in the United States would be somewhat less because the scrap would be less. Moreover, the Technical Department pointed out that since the degree to which welding is used varies considerably between this country and some European countries the weight of steel going into vessels built in countries not using welding to any great extent would be increased about 15 to 17 percent.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. SMITH, *Chairman.*

United States exports of selected iron and steel mill products suitable for use in ship construction to important shipbuilding nations in Europe, calendar year 1946

[Tons of 2,240 pounds]

Census Class No.	Commodity	United Kingdom	Eire	Sweden	Denmark	Netherlands	Belgium	France	Italy	Total
600700	Pig iron		100	21,502	1,000			12,500	15,050	50,152
601605	Steel ingots	46,490				66				46,556
601606, 601706	Steel billets, blooms, and slabs	169,778		3,846		594	2,731	60,338	20,921	258,208
602000, 602300	Steel bars	9,390	11	17,195	670	8,130	932	51,254	3,403	90,985
603000	Boiler plate			3,826	1,140	4,377	192	7,749	11,284	28,568
603110	Other plate	230	25	84,396	11,311	50,329	243	52,289	10,392	209,215
604500, 604600	Iron and steel structural shapes	47	49	18,203	3,549	21,137	671	50,586	15,681	109,923
Total		225,935	185	148,968	17,670	84,633	4,769	234,716	76,731	793,607

Source: Foreign Trade Statistics, Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce.

Merchant vessels reported under construction abroad, as of Mar. 31, 1947, which on the basis of gross tonnage, dead weight, and speed compare with USMC design vessels in long supply

Name and type	Number of vessels	Gross	Dead-weight tons	Speed	Propulsion	Design	Corresponding USMC design types				Invoiced steel, tons (2,000 pounds)
							Gross	Dead-weight tons	Speed	Propulsion	
United Kingdom:											
Cargo:											
Silverbriar		7,500	10,700	15½	Turbine	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	Turbine	4,800
Silverplane		7,500	10,700	15½	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Silverholly		7,000	10,700	15½	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Silveryew		7,000	10,700	15½	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Soestdyk		7,000	10,500	16	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Schiedyk		7,000	10,500	16	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
City of Oxford		7,500	10,800	15	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
City of Birmingham		7,500	10,800	15	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Not available		7,500	10,800	15	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		7,500	10,800	15	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		7,500	10,800	15	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		7,500	10,800	15	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		7,500	10,800	15	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		7,500	10,800	15	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		7,500	10,800	15	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		7,500	10,800	15	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Tabaristan		7,000	10,000	11	Reciprocating	EC2-S-C1	7,176	10,800	11.0	Reciprocating	3,500
Not available		7,000	10,000	11	do	EC2-S-C1	7,176	10,800	11.0	do	3,500
Tankers:											
Not available		10,500	15,000	13½	Diesel	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	Turboelectric	5,200
Do		10,000	15,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	15,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	15,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	15,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		1,200	1,500	12		T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	Diesel	700
Do		1,200	1,500	12		T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	do	700
Do		1,200	1,500	12		T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	do	700
Do		1,200	1,500	12		T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	do	700
Do		1,000	1,534	12	Diesel	T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	do	700
Do		1,000	1,534	12	do	T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	do	700
Do		1,000	1,534	12	do	T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	do	700
Do		1,000	1,534	12	do	T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	do	700
Do		1,000	1,534	12	do	T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	do	700
Do		1,000	1,534	12	do	T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	do	700
Do		1,000	1,534	12	do	T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	do	700
Do		1,000	1,534	12	do	T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	do	700
Empire Teslin		1,000	2,000	11	Turbine	T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	do	700
Empire Tesdale		1,000	2,000	11	do	T1-M-A1	1,185	1,483	10.0	do	700
Subtotal	37										119,600
Denmark:											
Cargo:											
Not available		5,800	8,700	15½	Motor	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	15½	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	15½	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	15½	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	15½	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	15½	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Tankers:											
Not available		10,000	15,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	Turboelectric	5,200
Do		10,000	15,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	15,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	16,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	16,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	16,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Subtotal	12										52,800
France:											
Cargo:											
Not available		6,000	9,000	15½	Motor	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	Diesel	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	15½	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	15½	Reciprocating	C1-B	6,711	9,104	14.0	Turbine	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	15½	do	C1-B	6,711	9,104	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,200	15½	Motor	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	Diesel	3,600
Do		6,000	9,200	15½	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		7,334	11,000	15½	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	Turbine	4,800
Do		7,334	11,000	15½	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		7,334	11,000	15½	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		8,020	11,000	15½	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		8,020	11,000	15½	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		8,020	11,000	15½	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		8,020	11,000	15½	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		8,020	11,000	15½	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Do		8,020	11,000	15½	do	VC2-S-AP2	7,607	10,850	15.3	do	4,800
Washington		8,650	11,000	17	do	VC2-S-AP3	7,607	10,850	17.0	do	4,800

Merchant vessels reported under construction abroad, as of Mar. 31, 1947, which on the basis of gross tonnage, dead weight, and speed compare with USMC design vessels in long supply—Continued

Name and type	Number of vessels	Gross	Dead-weight tons	Speed	Propulsion	Design	Corresponding USMC design types				Invoiced steel, tons (2,000 pounds)
							Gross	Dead-weight tons	Speed	Propulsion	
France—Continued											
Tankers:											
Not available		11,800	16,500	14	Motor	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	Turboelectric	5,200
Do		11,800	16,500	14	do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		11,800	16,500	14	do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Subtotal	19										85,200
Italy:											
Cargo:											
Not available		6,000	9,000		Motor	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	Diesel	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000		do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Subtotal	2										7,200
Netherlands:											
Cargo:											
Not available		6,000	9,000	16	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,500	16	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Aagtekerk		6,500	9,500	16	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Almkerk		6,500	9,500	16	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Leersum		6,500	9,500	16	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Not available		7,200	10,800		Reciprocating	EC2-S-C1	7,176	10,800	11.0	Reciprocating	3,500
Subtotal	6										21,500
Norway:											
Cargo:											
Francisville		6,180	9,000	16	Motor	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	Diesel	3,600
Bataan		6,900	9,000		do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Not available		6,900	9,000		do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	16	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	16	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,100		do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		7,500	11,000	16½	do	VC2-S-AP3	7,607	10,850	17.0	Turbine	4,800
Do		7,500	11,000	16½	do	VC2-S-AP3	7,607	10,850	17.0	do	4,800
Subtotal	8										31,200
Sweden:											
Cargo:											
Not available		6,000	9,000	16	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	16	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	16	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	16	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	15½	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000	15½	do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,000	9,000		do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		6,100	9,200		do	C1-B	6,751	8,932	14.0	do	3,600
Do		7,000	9,200	16	do	C1-B	6,711	9,104	14.0	Turbine	3,600
Do		7,000	9,200	16	do	C1-B	6,711	9,104	14.0	do	3,600
Do		7,000	9,200	16	do	C1-B	6,711	9,104	14.0	do	3,600
Do		7,000	9,200	16	do	C1-B	6,711	9,104	14.0	do	3,600
Do		7,000	9,200	16	do	C1-B	6,711	9,104	14.0	do	3,600
Tankers:											
Not available		10,000	15,700		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	Turboelectric	5,200
Do		10,000	15,400		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,300	16,400		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,867	16,300		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Havbor		10,000	15,650	14	do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Not available		10,000	15,650			T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	15,650		Motor	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	15,500		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	15,900		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	15,900	14½	do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,600	15,900	14½	do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	15,900		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	15,900		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,667	16,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	15,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	15,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,000	15,700		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,200	15,900	14½	do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,667	16,000		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		10,867	16,300		do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		11,000	17,200	14½	do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		11,000	17,200	14½	do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		11,000	17,200	14½	do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		11,000	17,200	14½	do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Do		11,000	17,200	14½	do	T2-SE-A1	10,195	16,765	14.5	do	5,200
Subtotal	38										176,800
Grand total	122										494,300

Far East's Brightest Hope Arises in Philippine Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

FAR EAST'S BRIGHTEST HOPE ARISES IN PHILIPPINE REPUBLIC

The new Republic of the Philippines, which came into being last July 4, is a shining star of hope and inspiration in the Far Eastern firmament. It is the one place on the western frontier of democracy where a representative government, elected by the people and dedicated to individual liberty and the maintenance of free enterprise, is operating under its own power.

The United States can take a bow if this venture proves to be successful over a period of time for we have been tutoring the Filipinos and helping them to prepare for independence for more than 40 years, and their government and philosophy are patterned after ours.

If the Filipinos are successful in governing themselves and in achieving a comfortable standard of living, they will provide an example and an inspiration to their neighbors in the Far East, and the Philippines will become a solid barrier against the spread of communism.

But if the venture should fail, the cause of democracy and free enterprise would suffer a mortal blow in that part of the world and American prestige would decline. Consequently, we still have a vital stake in the outcome of the venture as well as a moral obligation to help the infant republic.

NEED FOR AID RECOGNIZED

The Filipinos are aware that they will need considerable help from the United States in the next few years, but it is pleasant to report that the Philippine Government is proceeding vigorously with plans which will enable it to stand on its own feet at the earliest possible moment.

This is largely due to the outstanding ability and vision of President Manuel Roxas. The impression he made on our group of visiting editors and publishers was one of complete sincerity, a thorough knowledge of the problems facing him and a willingness to discuss them with engaging frankness.

The Philippine Republic has its share of economic problems, political turmoil and social maladjustments, as what nation has not, but Roxas has charted a course for the future which, he is confident, will result in prosperity and security.

PROGRAM SEEKS PROGRESS

Among his objectives are an expansion of Philippine industry and agriculture, the development of natural resources, the establishment of the Philippines as a center of trade in the Far East, a continuation of friendly cooperation with the United States and a balanced budget by 1951.

On the latter subject, Roxas delivered a special message to the Philippine Congress on February 11, which is worth quoting, in part, because it contains language which has not been heard in the American Congress for many a year.

"I have set a goal of a balanced budget for 1951," he said. "When I say 'balanced budget,' I mean exactly that. I mean that by 1951 we must be able to pay all costs of government, ordinary, extraordinary and special, with our current revenues. We must be able to service the public debt and to make the necessary payments on loans which we have contracted and will contract."

BALANCED BUDGET SOUGHT

"This is one necessity which we must frankly meet without evasion. We must get our financial house in order and operate the government on a pay-as-you-go basis. Thus even in the years immediately ahead of us when we face an inevitable deficit, I must insist that we restrain our expenditures to the sum total of our revenues, plus loans which we can logically expect to contract and which, in all good conscience, we can expect to repay," Roxas continued.

"The fact that we shall be functioning in part on borrowed money must constitute a constant spur to reduce expenditures, to eliminate those which are not absolutely vital and to make every conceivable effort to increase our revenues. We should not expect to live in luxury on borrowed money. The wise man considers borrowed money as money which is untouchable except for the essential purposes of existence.

"Every centavo spent must answer the questions: Will this expenditure increase our ability to obtain greater revenues in the future? Will this expenditure improve the vital conditions essential to the expansion of our economic facilities? Will this expenditure aid directly in the rehabilitation of the vital instruments of national endeavor?"

FRILLS OUT OF QUESTION

"We dare not make provisions for extravagant conveniences or comforts. We dare not provide services that would be helpful but are not essential. We dare not even increase Government salaries and wages even though such increase might be justified.

"We must seek to obtain in Government revenue every possible peso without interfering with the productive expansion of the nation. We must encourage new capital to enter the Philippines. We must give every stimulus to local capital to invest in productive enterprise. We must discourage the dissipation of capital in luxurious living. We must do all these within the framework of our system of free enterprise founded on freedom and democracy."

Roxas has been largely instrumental in discouraging the growth of an anti-American sentiment which developed in the early days of independence, partly from exuberance over that event and partly as a result of unavoidable friction between American soldiers and Filipinos in crowded Manila.

ARMY CHIEF COOPERATES

In this he has had the cooperation and wise counsel of Maj. Gen. George F. Moore, who commanded the garrison on Corregidor at the time of its fall and who has since returned to the islands as commanding general of the Philippine-Ruyukus command.

Under an agreement recently concluded, the United States is to have 15 permanent land, naval, and air bases in the Philippines, but these are to be located outside the large cities, in order to minimize friction between members of the American forces and the Filipinos. These bases are to enable us to carry out our responsibility for the defense of the Philippines and also to support our other outposts in the Pacific.

COMMERCIAL INTERESTS CLASH

However, there are bound to be clashes of interest between the Philippine Republic and the United States. Here is one example. The Philippines could produce and sell in the United States large quantities of coconut oil, which is badly needed for the manufacture of soap. But dairy interests in the United States will not agree to the importation of coconut oil for fear it would compete with American dairy products.

President Roxas sought to obtain a clause in the American-Filipino trade agreement to permit the export to the United States of denatured coconut oil, which is not fit for human or animal consumption, but which could be used to make soap. But Congressmen from the dairy States "wouldn't even listen to me," Roxas said.

However, the trade agreement permits the unlimited importation of copra, from which coconut oil is made. But copra takes up more shipping space and the cost of processing it in the United States is greater than in the Philippines. Consequently, it is probable that American soap manufacturers will expand their business in the Philippines, instead of enlarging their American plants.

The Italian Debt to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I made in the House on January 15, 1926:

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it was rather amusing to hear the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Tilson], the Republican leader, in his speech a few moments ago, refer to this Italian debt settlement proposition as a nonpartisan question, and in the same breath mildly admonish the membership on the Republican side of the House to stay on the reservation. A nonpartisan measure seems to be a strong Republican proposition that is put through by a combination of reactionary Republicans and misguided Democrats. [Laughter.] It reminds me of the Negro preacher who explained to his congregation that, while the Bible did say that the lamb and the lion lay down together, it never gave any account of the lamb ever getting up. [Laughter.]

We are asked here to support this "nonpartisan" measure which will amount to a cancellation of more than $2,000,000,000 of the Italian debt to the United States. Some of you may deny that it amounts to an absolute cancellation; but I want to call your attention to the fact that it extends the payment of the part not canceled for a period of 62 years, and that in all the history of civilized governments no international debt has ever been paid that was extended beyond the life of one generation. No man in this House can deny that statement, or point to a single instance in history in which a debt owed by one nation to another, and extended beyond the life of one generation, has ever been paid. You are simply canceling the entire debt. You are giving to Italy more than $2,000,000,000 which they owe us, and for which we have outstanding bonds which the American people must pay.

But even the advocates of this measure, putting it in the most favorable light, admit that the passage of this bill means the cancellation, in effect, of more than $1,500,000,000. Or, as has been said by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Hull] in his able argument on yesterday it means the cancellation or giving back to Italy an amount equal to about $7,000,000 to every congressional district in the United States. When you vote for this measure you are passing back to your people a bond issue amounting to $7,000,000 to each congressional district, or more than $40,000,000 to the average State, to be paid by your people, their children, and

their children's children throughout the years to come.

Some men in the course of this debate have asked what would have happened to the United States had it not been for Italy during the World War. I ask you what would have happened to Italy if it had not been for the United States? [Applause.]

They told us that we were fighting the war to make the world safe for democracy. That was the international slogan. It was an inspiring phrase that originated with the President of the United States and echoed throughout the world, even down to the front-line trenches. It even went beyond our lines and found a responsive sentiment among the soldiers of the enemy that finally burst forth in the German revolution that hastened the close of the war. But today, instead of the world being safe for democracy, Italy is in the grip of the Fascisti and is absolutely ruled and controlled by Mussolini, one of the most consummate dictators of modern times. He even sneers at democracy. He is quoted in an Italian paper as saying:

"We must never give the enemy a moment's rest; we must smash and tear down all the dizzy nonsense of our opponents * * *. We have shown the impotence of the old parties, and they have no right or reason to exist any longer. * * * We must forever give battle to democracy."

In an editorial in the New York Evening World on January 8, 1926, we find this striking statement contrasting the American attitude with that of Mussolini:

"We stand for free speech, and Mussolini does not; for a free press, and Mussolini does not; for constitutional government, and he does not; for representative government, and he does not; for the subordination of the military to the civil authority in times of peace, and he does not. We are a democracy, and he has established a tyrannical autocracy."

He has attempted to destroy every institution that he could not control, and has especially directed his vengeance at organized labor and the Masonic fraternity. If we were in Italy under the Mussolini regime, more than 300 Members of this House and about 60 Members of the Senate would not only be debarred from holding office, but you would not even be permitted to vote, merely because you happen to be members of the Masonic fraternity.

The Brooklyn Daily Eagle of January 4, 1926, speaking of the protest of American Masons against the outrages of Mussolini, says:

"So far as we know, this is something without precedent in the annals of Masonry or the annals of diplomacy. Members of the order have been beaten, have been murdered under Mussolini. Lodge rooms have been raided and wrecked by Fascist mobs. Masons have been disfranchised by the dictatorship, which, of course, means giving a free hand to the mobsters."

One instance is given in which 18 Masons were killed by the Fascisti mob at one time. I wonder if it ever occurred to those Members who have been appealing for the passage of this measure, and emphasizing Italy's sacrifices in the war, I wonder if it ever occurred to them that those very men who fought so valiantly in that conflict are being outlawed and murdered and their sacred institutions destroyed by the bayonets of the Fascisti mobs.

But Members tell us that we should not consider the question of humanity in this transaction. They say we have nothing to do with their internal affairs. But the American people have never hesitated to protest in behalf of persecuted humanity. It seems to me that when we appeal to other nations to put a stop to the commission of outrages against any people or any class, we manifest a higher degree of magnanimity than we do when we confine our policies within the circumference of a silver dollar. [Applause.]

What is the object of this measure? It is to enable Mussolini to borrow money in New York with which to perpetuate his regime. We are doing this to strengthen the hands of Mussolini after all our struggles to make the world safe for democracy.

The Fascisti, you understand, consists of only a small band of Italians of which Mussolini is the head. It is a closed corporation. They do not want any more members, and they will not admit any more. So those who are on the outside of this select ring must suffer whatever indignities the Fascisti desires to impose.

But Members tell us that we should not refer to these things in connection with the passage of this measure. That we have no right to discuss the internal affairs of other nations. But, Mr. Chairman, this is not a settlement with the Italian people. The chances are that it will not redound to their benefit. Instead of thus helping Mussolini at the expense of the American taxpayers to continue his dictatorship and carry out his boasted plans to restore the glory of ancient Rome, I believe we should follow the policy advocated by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Hull] to grant a moratorium for a limited number of years until the people of Italy can restore their Government and their country to their former conditions of peace and confidence, in order that whatever settlement we may make with the Italian people may not be rushed through by some financial power at home or abroad, but that it may be based upon a common desire to promote the best interest of both nations and to contribute to the progress and happiness of mankind. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the need for additional housing is being felt throughout the Nation. There is pending before this Congress the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, enactment of which would be a long step forward to relieving the situation.

I offer as a part of my remarks the following telegram addressed to the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency by Miss Elizabeth M. Smith, acting administrator of the department of social welfare of my home State of Rhode Island, which sets forth two examples which prove the need for additional housing:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *June 24, 1947.*

Representative JESSE WOLCOTT,
Chairman, House Committee on Banking and Currency,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Consideration of Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill essential. Failure to provide sufficient dwellings causes deplorable conditions in our State. Examples: Families living in unventilated cellars, 4 families of 17 persons living in 4 rooms, disturbed veterans completely without privacy and a single room to call their own.

ELIZABETH M. SMITH,
Acting Administrator.

The Future of the Navajo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two articles of Mr. Jerry McLain which appeared in the Arizona Republic, June 12 and 13, 1947:

[From the Arizona Republic of June 12, 1947]

ORAIBI, June 12.—The economic future for the Hopi, who live on a reservation within a reservation, appears as dismal today as that of the Navajo surrounding them, says 34-year-old Karl Johnson, postmaster and village governor of New Oraibi.

A lessening demand for the products of their weavers, Government-ordered stock reductions, and drought which haunts their farms in the barren western section of the big Navajo reservation are combining to play havoc with the Hopi livelihood.

Like many Navajo leaders, Johnson blames the Government's failure to educate the Hopi young for some of his peoples' present difficulties. But he also claims that encroachment of the Navajo on Hopi lands, "without challenge from the Interior Department," has handicapped the tribe.

The Hopi by Executive order in 1882, he says, were given approximately 2,500,000 acres as a grant. But in recent years, Johnson declares, that area has been cut until about one-quarter of the original acreage is being used exclusively by the Hopi today.

"Economically," says Johnson, "we are at a standstill. Hopi farmers are trying to make a living on sandhills, with their future at the whim and caprice of the weather, for they must depend entirely on rain. Even if there is rain, a summer wind whipping up a sandstorm can damage their crops."

He told of visiting Washington last March to present facts on the Hopi plight to the House Public Lands Committee. Smiling, Johnson declared he invited "some of those armchair strategists who decide our future to come out and live awhile with us on these sand piles and rock piles."

He claims that when the Hopi were forced to reduce their stock to the carrying capacity of their small range, the Indian Service provided nothing to replace the income source lost to them.

Many families subsequently found it necessary to sell their diminishing stock in order to survive in lean prewar days.

Temporary relief came in wartime employment off the reservation and increased demand for their weaving.

But the situation is different now, with war jobs a thing of the past and off-reservation employment dwindling. And war workers and Hopi veterans are "coming back to nothing," he insists.

Fifty-five sheep units are the most any person can possess in the third mesa area, which encompasses the villages of Hotevilla and Oraibi. Since a horse or cow represents five sheep units, a family could own only nine head of cattle and two horses in lieu of sheep.

Many of the Hopi now are engaged in farming, but Johnson declares the Government has done little to increase crop production. He points out that the average Hopi family is large (Johnson has six children and also provides for his mother and two brothers-in-law) and the need today is great for agricultural education and training in land conservation and management.

He estimates Hopi schools can accommodate about 90 percent of the eligible children—a far higher percentage than on the Navajo reservation. But Johnson claims educational standards are low. Hopi young people, he avers, are willing and eager to learn if only they can be taught things useful to them.

The Hopi weaving art has suffered, he believes, with the younger generation taking less interest because of the dwindling market. He says also that old-timers, proficient as weavers, have found the new type wool from improved sheep herds more difficult to spin and cord, which he sees as another detriment to the growth and expansion of Hopi artistry with the looms.

Johnson, who was educated in mission schools in New Mexico and at Ganado, is village governor of New Oraibi, which is clustered at the foot of a mesa on which stands Old Oraibi, oldest of the Hopi villages and largest continuously inhabited community in North America.

[From the Arizona Republic of June 13, 1947]

KEAMS CANYON, June 13.—Increased instead of decreased Government assistance, or the end of severe drought conditions, are the only factors which can save the Navajo and the Hopi in the Keams Canyon area, say the McGee brothers, who as trading-post operators have done business with the red men for 18 years.

Under present circumstances they see no way in the world for 80 percent of the Indians in their vicinity to exist through farming and stock raising.

On the other side of the plateau, at Jeddito, some 6 miles to the east, Wilmer C. Roberts, a trader 29 years, views the plight of the Indians as serious because "they do not even have the modest existence that kept them going in prewar days."

Roberts believes the time is coming when the Federal Government will turn the care and supervision of Indians over to the States in which they reside. He would welcome that in Arizona, and believes the Navajo here would progress under State rule.

But he doesn't believe the Indians successfully can be taken off their reservation.

Concerned by the congressional proposal to slash Indian Bureau budget requests by about one-third, W. E. McGee, Keams Canyon, declares "If the Government continues to cut its services to the Navajo and Hopi, it soon will have a bunch of hungry Indians to feed, and that will cost just as much anyway. Seems to me the Government might better go ahead and help them now."

Best evidence to McGee that off-reservation jobs are rapidly diminishing is that several weeks ago two truckloads of Navajo men were sent to work on the Santa Fe railroad. About 60 percent soon were back home because they found no jobs.

McGee, who with his brothers, Cliff F. and Ellis D. McGee, operates the Keams Canyon store, says Indians now bring in a small saddle blanket for which they are paid $4, and they take as long to trade out that $4 as they used to require in spending $40 because they realize they must buy only necessities.

The McGees say the Indian always will survive because he can get by on little or nothing. Many wouldn't ask for help if they were hungry. But the traders believe unless jobs and new income are provided the reservation will see hard times and possibly trouble, with the Government being required to step in.

Any further decreases in schools they view as a blow to an educational program on which the Government has been working 30 years. Money spent on the reservation schools would be lost, and a successful effort to show the Indians the value of an education would have been in vain.

Instead of decreases, they contend educational facilities should be increased, pointing out that present buildings will accommodate only about one-third of those in this area who desire to attend. The Keams Canyon and Pinon schools turned down a number of pupils this past year.

Hospital facilities also are nowhere near large enough to take care of the area they must serve, say the McGees. Consequently, some Indians in need of hospitalization must be sent back to distant homes after being treated. Field doctors and nurses are needed to travel to isolated villages generally reached only by missionaries and traders.

Roberts, the veteran Jeddito trader, scoffs at the idea of the Navajo leaving their reservation.

"Take the Indians off the reservation? Impossible. Put them where? The white people don't want them. Their cities already are overcrowded. Even if such a plan was feasible, you couldn't induce the older people to leave. They're perfectly happy on this reservation as long as they can make a living with their primitive farming and grazing."

He sees two sides to the question of what has happened to the Navajo. He doesn't blame the Government for reducing the herds, which he says was necessary. Recalling when grass was high enough to be cut with a scythe, he declares not only overgrazing but the added factor of drought has depleted the ranges.

When war came the Navajo still was existing, though his herds of sheep or cattle were shrunken. Then he forgot the stock, selling or slaughtering it for meat, as the allotment checks began to arrive from the boys in uniform, and there were high-paying jobs in war industries which were crying for any kind of manpower.

"Now there is virtually nothing for the Indian to come back to," says Roberts. "Not even the modest existence of prewar days. The herds are run down, or gone. Drought still stalks the farmer, along with the grubworms and pack rats, and the wind which brings sand.

"Some of your white farmers should see how these Navajo and Hopi crop growers get down on hands and knees in the fields to battle worms and rodents in order to raise a little corn."

Roberts believes increased Government assistance will be a necessity, but insists it should not be a dole. He says many Navajo who held war jobs must be educated to the fact the "honeymoon is over." They were happy before the war to work for $1.25 per day on the reservation, he points out, but now prefer to loaf unless they can get salaries commensurate with high pay showered upon them in war days.

Education is a great need, but education of a type the Navajo can find useful in his own land rather than having to compete with white people in semiskilled or skilled trades. He says, too, that education shouldn't be forced on the Indians; they should be shown its value.

Roberts points out that the Navajo and Hopi are peaceful and law abiding. He says they have their little squabbles and fights, occasionally even a murder—"but turn loose 50,000 whites in this vast area with as little policing as we have, and see how many murders occur."

State rather than Federal control of the Navajo would be advantageous to the Indians, he believes, though he agrees it would create new problems, including the right of Indians to vote and to decide for themselves the prohibition question.

He believes if the question came up for vote today, the Indians would call for prohibition. And he says he fears for the tribe's survival if ever liquor is permitted on the reservation, declaring many a young Navajo employed outside the reservation squanders on liquor—always seemingly available while his funds last—the money with which he should be helping his family at home.

Chinese Feel United States Deserts Them, Does Not Understand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

CHINESE FEEL UNITED STATES DESERTS THEM, DOESN'T UNDERSTAND

A 2-day trip to China affords an opportunity only for a series of fleeting and kaleidoscopic impressions. For example—long before our party of touring publishers and editors reached the coast line of China on the 4-hour flight from Seoul, Korea, to Nanking, we had a glimpse of one of the basic causes of China's troubles, a cause which antedates the era of recorded history.

Our route was over the Yellow Sea, and it actually is yellow and muddy looking, even in the bright sunlight, in contrast with the deep blue and greenish hues of the Pacific Ocean and the Sea of Japan. That yellow pigment represents a large portion of the lost wealth of China—its eroded topsoil.

A quick drive through Nanking's muddy streets brought us to the American Embassy, where we had a talk with Ambassador J. Leighton Stuart followed by another drive to the residence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

Members of our party were ushered into a comfortable living room. The leather chairs and divans were covered with tiger skins, while on the floor in front of the blazing fireplace there was a giant panda skin rug. We were instructed to take seats, but to leave two chairs in opposite corners of the room vacant.

CHIANG APPEARS MILD

In a few moments a military aide announced "Generalissimo and Mme. Chiang Kai-shek." We all stood. When the introductions were completed the generalissimo took one of the chairs that had been reserved and Mme. Chiang took the other.

Chiang does not look like a ferocious war lord, as he has sometimes been depicted. He seemed to be mild-mannered and unobtrusive, more like a poet or scholar, an appearance which was difficult to reconcile with a report in Nanking that day that he had just ordered the execution of two of his generals for not being on their toes in recent clashes with the Communists.

But what Chiang seemed to lack in personality was more than provided by Mme. Chiang, whose beauty, charm, and graciousness are known throughout the world.

The interview with Chiang, conducted through an interpreter who at times had the assistance of Mme. Chiang, was off the record. But, to tell the truth, the generalissimo said nothing that was startling or sensational. Practically everything he said has since been reported in Chinese newspapers, either officially or unofficially.

ALL ADMIRE MARSHALL

The Chinese have great admiration for Gen. George C. Marshall, who spent a year in a fruitless effort to mediate a peace agreement between the Nationalist Government and the Communists, but they feel they have been let down by the United States. They fear that Americans do not realize their predicament, that, after 8 years of war with Japan, VJ-day did not bring peace to China but, on the contrary, was the signal for the

renewal of civil war between the Nationalists and the Communists.

There is no doubt that the collapse of the peace negotiations was due to the Communists' refusal to accept the liberal concessions offered them by Chiang Kai-shek.

The Nationalist regime is not a democracy, under any American interpretation of the word. But it has been moving toward representative government. The Kuomintang is still the predominant political group, but other parties and groups have been given a voice in the government.

NEW CONSTITUTION READY

On December 25 a new Constitution will go into effect under which the people, including those outside the areas controlled by the Nationalist government, will be given an opportunity to elect representatives to the various governing bodies, or Yuans.

Observers believe Chiang Kai-shek is sincere in his desire to bring about unity in China and to establish a form of government which not only will meet the current needs of the Chinese people but which will last beyond his time and will not depend solely on his personality for its strength and survival.

Failure to attain this goal could lead only to chaos, which would give the Communists an opportunity to move in and take over.

An interview with Dr. T. V. Soong, then Prime Minister, and dinner at the residence of Wang Shih-Chieh, China's Foreign Minister, concluded our stay in Nanking. We took the night train to Shanghai.

SHANGHAI APPEARS FANTASTIC

Shanghai is a city that has to be seen to be believed. Driving from the railroad station to the Broadway Mansions, at the junction of Suchow Creek and the Whangpoo River, it seemed as though our jeep could not avoid killing at least 10,000 women and children. The narrow streets were full of pedestrians, darting this way and that, and vehicles of all kinds ranging from hand-pulled carts and rickshaws to 1947 Studebakers. Over all was a constant bedlam.

There is a feverish hustle and bustle about Shanghai today, but it does not create the impression of being a healthy business activity. On the contrary, there is a feeling of tenseness and impending doom, a fear that money will be worthless tomorrow, a rush to buy something—anything—as a hedge against inflation, a fierce struggle just to survive, to live through the day, with no thought of tomorrow until tomorrow comes.

The day we were in Shanghai the price of newspapers went up from $500 in Chinese currency to $1,000. The black-market rate of exchange, which a few days before had soared to $19,000 in Chinese currency for $1 in American money, had dropped back to a rate of 12,000 to 1, a figure which has since been made official.

Tax-Reduction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to vote for the new tax bill, H. R. 3950, which the House is considering today. We are now far enough along with the appropriation bills for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, to have a fairly clear picture of the fiscal outlook of the country. The present picture is that with payment of more than $2,000,000,000 on the national debt a tax reduction can still be made and the budget kept in balance. I would prefer to have a smaller and more equitable tax reduction, with more emphasis placed on tax exemptions, but this bill appears to be the last and final opportunity Congress at this session will have to enact any tax-reduction measure. An important consideration is that this measure goes into effect next year, and not this year, as was provided in the previous bills. Furthermore, when I voted against the original tax-reduction bill I understood the administration would propose in this Congress a measure to take effect next year. No such proposal has been forthcoming, and we now have no assurance that it will be.

The determinative reason I feel that some tax reduction is in the public interest for next year is the necessity of supplying risk capital for new and enlarging businesses. During the war and up until recently small business organizations could secure operating capital or capital for plant expansion from various governmental agencies. Units of the Army and Navy made capital available, the Defense Plants Corporation did financing for war purposes, the RFC, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and other agencies furnished capital to new or expanding enterprises where it could not otherwise be secured. Most of these agencies have now been abolished. Lately the RFC Mortgage Company and the Smaller War Plants Corporation have ceased to exist. Small business cannot now secure RFC participation loans. Recently I have had several substantial small businessmen complain about the inability to secure capital to carry on their business or to put through an expansion program. They say that Government financing is not available and that they cannot secure the necessary funds from private sources. It is my opinion that some tax reduction will make more risk capital available for these small businesses and to sustain our economy it is highly important that they be able to secure the financing they need.

American Veterans' Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, July 7), 1947

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the annual report of Charles G. Bolte, retiring national chairman of the American Veterans' Committee (AVC), given at the organization's second annual convention in Milwaukee, Wis., on June 20, 1947.

The American Veterans' Committee (AVC) has excited considerable comment, so I believe that this report which gives in detail the record of the organization in the past year and the policies it has followed should be of interest.

The report indicates that AVC is prepared for continued expansion in the coming year. I am glad to note that Mr. Bolte said:

We oppose the methods and objectives of the American Communist Party. We are determined to maintain the independence of AVC. We are entitled to expect this forthright statement of independence at every level of leadership in AVC, as we are entitled to expect an active leadership which believes passionately in freedom and uses it to build an ever-improved life for all. For the rest we can do nothing more but go on to prove by our actions the fundamentally American nature of our program and its independence from anybody's party line.

I may say that Mr. Charles G. Bolte is a resident of my own State of Connecticut.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[American Veterans Committee, national chairman's report, second national convention, Milwaukee, June 20, 1947]

This second national convention is another milestone in the history of AVC. More importantly, it is a springboard into the future. We have already shown our concentration upon that future by our activities yesterday in the AVC workshops. I should like now to report briefly on the activities of the past year, and suggest something of our future as I see it.

AVC has grown substantially in the past year. The growth of a new organization such as ours has to be measured in terms of character, activity, and direction rather than in terms of membership and dollars. But even in membership and dollars, AVC has grown importantly. Membership has more than doubled, from just 50,000 to more than 100,000. The number of chapters has grown from 515 to 943, State councils from 3 to 18, area councils from 10 to 23. More than 50 women's auxiliaries have been founded, and the rate is increasing rapidly.

This growth has been accomplished because of the forthrightness of AVC's program, and because of the vigor with which AVC members around the world have forwarded that program. It has been accomplished despite a severe retrenchment in our national staff, from its high of 86 last June to its present 36. Of that 36, 25 are in the national office; 6 are in Veterans' Administration service offices; 3 are in the Washington legislative and public relations office; and 2 are in field organization.

Financial limitations made this drastic cut-back in staff essential. In the face of this situation, your national officers have carried forward an aggressive campaign to further our program and expand our membership. Nationally directed field organization has been limited to the west central region, in which your national planning committee established an experimental field office which has developed new organizing techniques. Many of these techniques have been written down and distributed to chapters throughout the Nation; nearly one and a half million pieces of literature have been mailed from the national office in the past year, designed to help chapters with program and recruiting.

As for our growth in dollars, we are considerably better off than we were a year ago. We have more cash in the bank. Our system of accounting is more conservative. Our budgeting is sound. Our budget control, in fact, has reached that point of careful balancing where we have not only kept within the budget estimate for the past 6 months, but have actually spent less on many items.

Last summer's stringent economy measures have produced results which are shown

in the two financial statements before you—one for the year 1946, the other for the period ending May 31, 1947. In this latter 5-month period, we have accumulated an operating surplus of more than $20,000. Our current assets are approximately sufficient to meet our current liabilities. To state it simply: AVC, after an extraordinarily difficult year, is a solvent and going concern.

A word of explanation is needed as to the largest deficit item in the financial statement, that for prepaid dues. This appears as a deficit under our accrual system of accounting. Under this system, the dues of each member are divided into 12 parts, 1 part to be spent for each month of the year. While the accrual system makes the deficit appear large, it has the advantage of projecting our financial status clearly into the future. And, most important of all, this is money we owe to ourselves; we are not spending anyone else's money but our own.

Two further financial items are of interest for the year ahead.

First, the successful conclusion of a special fund-raising campaign finds us with outstanding pledges totaling $50,000.

Second, a general mail appeal to the membership has now gone out, at the direction of your NPC, asking for contributions so that the new administration will have a war chest large enough to begin the new year with full confidence. I hope the delegates here will go back to their chapters and push this drive. AVC is 100,000 of us. If AVC has meaning for us, we will provide the means with which to expand it. A test mailing suggests that this appeal may bring in $25,000.

These two items taken together—pledges and the mail appeal—will enable the national office to render maximum service to each and every chapter. I cannot overemphasize the importance of this. Too frequently, in the past year, our projected and current activities have been hamstrung by the report from the business office: "We just don't have the money." If we can maintain the present renewal rate of more than 75 percent, if we can expand the rate of new memberships, we will have the money we need in the coming year. Faced as we are with vast problems of organization and program, we cannot afford to be without it.

Our sacrifices in other departments this year did enable us to expand into a new field: that of direct veterans' service. Accreditation by the Veterans Administration last fall opened the door to this vital endeavor. We now have two full-time and two part-time service offices in operation. We must bend every effort in the year ahead to opening more of these offices, so that they can give the aid they need to all veterans, nonmembers as well as members.

This service to veterans has occupied an increasing portion of our time and energies in the past year, as it surely will continue to do in the year to come. Our program, guided by the mandates of our first convention platform and by the decisions of your NPC, has been designed to make it possible for all veterans to become citizens once again. Since housing has remained the veterans' No. 1 problem, it has remained in our No. 1 campaign. With the national office coordinating local activities, we have campaigned vigorously for passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, for the maintenance of rent controls, for the expanded production of prefabricated housing units, for the development of community techniques to meet the crisis, and for the elimination of the black market in housing materials.

On other fronts affecting the veterans peculiarly, we drafted the compromise settlement which produced terminal leave pay for enlisted men, and the revision of national service life insurance. Our campus chapters across the country have led the drive to increase subsistence pay for veterans attending college, and to raise the ceilings in the on-the-job training program. Finally, the national office has now produced a pamphlet setting forth in detail AVC's recommendations for immediate overhauling of the Federal Government's program for veterans, designed to achieve "better administration and more equitable allowance of the benefits which presently exist for veterans of World War II." All of this work has been done within the general framework of our motto, "Citizens first, veterans second."

In the broader field of national affairs which affect veterans as citizens, who campaigned valiantly, though fruitlessly, for the maintenance of price controls. We made thoroughgoing recommendations for overhauling the antiquated methods of military justice, and opposed the imposition of universal military training in peacetime as a step which is certainly not yet essential for our national security. We urged Federal aid to education, and a comprehensive national health insurance plan, as two steps which quite certainly are essential for our national security. And we continued the unceasing struggle to guarantee the basic rights of our democracy by working for a national Fair Employment Practices Act and Federal anti-poll tax and anti-lynching laws, by working against the viciously restrictive Taft-Hartley labor bill, and by working for David Lilienthal's appointment as head of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The world situation deteriorated sharply during this year, and we as veterans of what we prayed was the last war felt ourselves deeply concerned. Our basic policy set forth a year ago in Des Moines, remained steadfast. We worked for a policy of peace, not war, through strengthening the United Nations. Your NPC met the recurrent crises of the year forthrightly. We called for a meeting between President Truman and Premier Stalin to resolve the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union. We spelled out those changes required to give the United Nations the power of law effective to enforce disarmament and prevent war. We urged our Government to use our resources abroad in the restoration of war-ravaged economies and the strengthening of democratic forces—objectives, we declared, which could only be realized by offering a positive and hopeful alternative to totalitarianism of both the left and right.

I have summarized AVC's national activities of the past year. But the vital story of AVC is untold: The story of the chapters, the area councils, the State councils. For this year of growth and progress has been above all the members' year. We have learned that the community is the center of our lives and efforts. We are still forming the character of our organization. While that process continues, as it will for a while longer, we cannot expect miraculous growth or overwhelming influence. What we can expect is that, with our character already formed in its major outlines, we should give tangible expression to it. That expression will take place increasingly in the communities of our Nation.

The experience of the past year shows that there are three main channels through which we may most fruitfully express the character of AVC: service to veterans, community projects, and social activities.

Service to veterans is essential to AVC's future. We have contributed greatly, I believe, to the national thinking by our insistence on our motto, "Citizens first, veterans second." We have never let this motto blind us to the fact that there are still many veterans who are displaced persons, who need houses, who need decent jobs, who need a thousand different things. We of AVC are peculiarly qualified to help these needs, as a fellowship of veterans who know the problems of our fellow-veterans. Here is a continuing responsibility we cannot shirk.

The carrying out of worth-while community projects is equally fundamental to us. AVC is strongest today in the communities where chapters have demonstrated in action their continuing concern for the welfare of all the community. Our strong chapters do not merely pass resolutions denouncing racial intolerance and the housing shortage. They work positively to eliminate discrimination in housing projects they themselves have helped to start. By such work we demonstrate our conviction that we are members of the community, not a group standing outside of it.

This integration with the community is aided when we make social centers of our chapters. One of the best chapters I visited last winter had a clubhouse, where the members gathered in friendly comradeship, where they planned a drive to increase the pay of the school teachers of the town, and where the bulletin board gave details of the national letter-writing campaign on maintaining rent controls. I may add that the members seemed not less passionate in their work for housing because beer was served on the premises.

Through these three means—veterans' service, community projects, social activities—we meet the veterans where they live. We demonstrate our survival value through the chapters which are building for the future by working in the present. From this will grow the strong, independent organization which will command attention when it speaks up for constructive national and international measures designed to assure that more hopeful future for which we fought. The very practicality of our activities will broaden the base of our membership, attracting to our ranks the hundreds of thousands of new veterans who share our hopeful vision of the future but who are not yet converted to a sharply defined body of political, economic, and social beliefs.

This road will not be an easy one, in the year just ahead. The direction we would choose for America runs in frank opposition to the direction now being taken by the dominant forces in our national life. We can console ourselves that this dominant direction—which is as much a drift chosen by default, as it is a deliberately selected course—is only temporary, the aftermath of war, the natural desire to forego greatness and retreat into isolated privacy. We in AVC have deliberately chosen greatness. We have set ourselves firmly against the tide of apathy, fear, and uncertainty. We know that this tide swirls downward, unless checked, into depression and war. We know that inaction, even more than reaction, ends finally in these fatalities.

The very existence of AVC is a challenge to the forces which are propelling our world toward its destruction. With vigor and determination, AVC can become a great instrument for moving our world toward survival. For this one reason if for no other, we may be attacked in the coming year. These attacks may come from some leaders of the old-line veterans' organizations, who see in us a threat to their monopoly of veterans' affairs. They may come from spokesmen of the extreme right, who see in us a threat to their campaign of returning this Nation to the nineteenth century. They may come from some of the uninformed and apathetic, who see in us a threat to the realization of their slothful dream of a "normalcy" which never existed outside of their dreams. These groups will attack us precisely because our promise is their downfall: to further the never-completed mission of democracy. For demanding peace, jobs, and freedom in the coming year, we shall likely be denounced as Reds.

Nothing we do or say will silence all the denunciations; for it is a leading trait of neurotic immaturity to single out a scapegoat on which to blame one's own misfortunes and failures.

We do have a simple answer; we oppose the methods and objectives of the American Communist Party, we are determined to maintain the independence of AVC. We are entitled to expect this forthright statement of independence at every level of leadership in AVC, as we are entitled to expect an active leadership that believes passionately in freedom and uses it to build an ever-improved life for all. For the rest, we can do nothing more but go on to prove by our actions the fundamentally American nature of our program, and its independence from anybody's party line.

I would not deceive you by underestimating the tremendous scope of the job which lies ahead of us. We must think, plan, and organize well, both in our deliberations here and in all our actions of the coming year. Our job is to build our organization, so that we may exercise decisive influence in achieving property and place. We know that our country has the power to do both. We in America have vast means available for the planning of full employment and full production, for the achievement of full democracy, for the reversal of the suicidal drift toward war with the Soviet Union, for the development of the United Nations into a federation capable of enforcing world law. Our present difficulty is that we as a nation lack the will and the plans for using these means to these great ends. Our task in AVC is to help draw the plans and provide the will. Our immediate task is to build the organization which will give weight to our decisions.

Now I come to the end. I take my leave with a full heart. I know you will guard this work well, and build strongly for the future. I know you will move forward in the spirit of one of our members, a great American who died last month after expending himself in the service of democracy and his country. In words, which are as true today as when they were written a year ago, Evans Carlson said:

"As events are shaping up today I believe we will have to assume an increasingly strong progressive position if we are to continue to serve the interests of the broad mass of the people, which are identical with the interests of our membership. The disposition to dominate, to dictate, and to exploit is equally as vicious and as impervious to reason as the disposition to conquer. Neither can be stopped except by creating conditions which make it physically impossible to continue. In other words, democracy as a practical political, social, and economic philosophy can be preserved and made to work only by the united will of a solid majority of the people to make it work and to resist every effort to impose tyranny on the people. It would be most unrealistic to stick our heads in the sand and refuse to recognize the imminence and importance of the struggle between those who would govern by force and domination and those who believe in government by the people in the interest of all the people. * * * AVC is already committed to the latter course. We can fulfill our destiny only by continuing to champion the cause of all the people."

I know you will plan carefully for building AVC in the spirit of these words. I know you will draft a challenging platform designed "to achieve a more democratic and prosperous America and a more stable world." I know you will elect officers who are vigorous, forward-looking, responsible men, united in their devotion to no loyalty outside the principles of AVC. I hope they will be men experienced in chapter affairs, capable of building AVC in all the thousands of our communities.

I will not say good-by. We shall always be together, united in the faith of AVC, wherever our private lives take us. I am happy in the thought that we will be together, working in that faith, however separate our endeavors seem. I thank you for the priceless gift you have given me: renewed belief in our generation, renewed hope for the future. It is an honor to have served you.

Missouri River Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, July 7), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Sun on the Missouri River floods.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Once more, floodwaters have been destroying lives and wealth throughout the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys. Once more, outraged citizens and alarmed Congressmen have been saying that something must be done.

When the roof leaks, everybody is in favor of patching it. But when the sun shines and the floods recede, the sense of urgency evaporates.

On the Missouri and its tributaries, destructive floods come along with depressing regularity every 4 or 5 years. June is the peak month for melting snow from the Rocky Mountains to reach the Great Plains through the Missouri system. When torrential rains downstream coincide with the crest of the mountain flood, rivers burst out of their banks, the rich top soil is filched from the plain, bridges, homes, barns and towns undergo disastrous inundation.

Every time this happens, the desperate survivors cry out angrily for help. As they shovel the stinking silt from their homes and set about the repair of the soil, they resolve that before the next flood hits, they must be ready.

FIASCO OF FLOOD CONTROL

Consider what has happened in the Republican Valley, a tributary of the Missouri system which runs through southern Nebraska and northern Kansas. Twelve years ago this stream and all its feeders rampaged through the valley. More than 100 persons died and millions of dollars' worth of property was destroyed.

The people of the valley demanded Federal aid in flood control. A plan was developed and many chambers of commerce heard interesting speeches on hydrography. But after 12 years the Republican River is still untamed, and last week its waters again took lives.

During the interim, a jurisdictional dispute had developed over river control. The Reclamation Bureau of the Interior Department wanted to harness the Missouri system in its way, for irrigation and power as well as flood control. The Army engineers wanted to harness it their way, for navigation as well as other purposes.

Each bureau had its own congressional claque, its own powerful lobby. Each was implacably opposed to the few voices raised in behalf of river development by a single regional agency.

In the end the two bureaus, frightened by the possibility of a Missouri Valley Authority, got together and divided up the river. By this arrangement, reclamation is to build upstream dams, the Army is to build downstream dams and levees, and the country is to pray that the system will work.

WHAT EACH DELUGE PROVES

But you do not break a horse by committee, and every new flood proves that MVA is basically the most logical, the most simple, and in the long run the most economical technique. MVA would unify the control of the river and insure the beneficial use of its waters for all purposes.

MVA would start on the hills and slopes where the first rain falls, in the mountains where the first snow accumulates. It would follow the streams down through the basin, damming them here, diverting there, building levees elsewhere, coordinating locks and power plants and canals. It would impose the will of man with single unyielding pressure on the wild force of the waters, and substitute for the annual June terror an ordered use of a great natural resource.

The Missouri Valley will come to an MVA in time. Every year of delay before that inevitable decision only increases the social cost of an untamed river system.

World Peace Is Not an Economic Problem; It Is a Question of Moral Integrity—Russia as Usual Does Not Agree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the frantic search for peace throughout the world is on the wrong track. Those to whom we have delegated the task of establishing the peace seem to think that peace can be obtained by applied economics, by the use of money and material things, by giving away dollars, and agreeing to new boundary lines for new states.

They seem to have forgotten that peace is not and never was settled by economic means; that peace is a moral problem of the highest order and calls for the highest degree of moral integrity. All attempts to seek peace by the use of material things to settle differences between nations will and have failed.

Russia has consistently demanded more and more of the material things, and insisted more and more that world peace can be established on an economic basis. She seems to have convinced some of our representatives and those of other countries of the world that that is the one and only way to bring about peace, while she grows strong at the expense of other nations and they become weak under the spell of her false theories.

Why is there no peace in the world today?

Is it not because of Russia's negative and arbitrary attitude toward the rest of the nations of the world?

Name any other nation that has asked for—yes, even taken more without asking than Russia and her satellites. She wants more gasoline, more oil, more tin, more steel, more rubber, more land.

Where and when has she ever shown good grace and displayed high moral integrity in her dealings with the other nations of the world in the search for peace?

Russia's attitude at Paris in opposing the Marshall plan for rehabilitating Europe is apparently her last stand against world peace. She has taken about all she thinks she can get. She has been preparing for this day, when she could threaten the rest of the world, safe in her own selfish but false belief that the world would shudder at her threats.

She is wrong. Russia is now the world isolationist which she charged against others when they did not rush to her aid when she was weak. She is weaker today than she realizes. The greater value of moral forces, moral integrity, and intellectual honesty as compared to the use of material things and applied economics in establishing world peace is shown in the following Associated Press release by the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace:

FREE SOCIETY VERSUS POLICE STATE HELD NO. 1 ISSUE

NEW YORK, July 1.—The Commission on a Just and Durable Peace, headed by John Foster Dulles, Republic foreign-affairs adviser to Secretary of State Marshall, said today that the supreme issue of our time is that of free society versus the police state.

* * * * *

"The fundamental issue is not the economic issue of communism versus capitalism or state socialism versus free enterprise," the statement said. "It is that of the free society versus the police state."

* * * * *

"A casual observer of American conduct might conclude," the statement said, "that our national affairs are operated on the assumption that war is so probable that it is not worth while to take a chance on the possibility of peace."

The statement said the American people should make clear that "they do not put primary reliance upon military defense," but that "our chief reliance is a moral offensive."

* * * * *

The amount of aid should be measured "not alone by dollars," but also "by production and delivery of needed goods," the statement said.

* * * * *

Regarding moral force, the statement said that "our people need to do much more than they are doing to demonstrate their conviction that the greatest forces in the world are moral forces and not material forces, and that with God all things are possible, even peace.

"We utterly reject the idea of inevitability of war and we oppose all national policies which have that presupposition."

A United Freedom Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is regrettable that we cannot discover some formula by which we can measure men in public life as to whether they are right or left. It is perfectly characteristic of many of our would-be liberal orators to announce to the world that the United States is following an imperialistic policy, or perchance that they stand in the very vestibule of financial collapse.

Times without number these days we hear our leftist friends make the statement that the capitalistic system under which America operates has failed. Let us look at it for a moment. Has it really failed? Is it not the envy of all the other nations of the world? And is it not true that they come to America in countless numbers almost daily for help?

We can never deny that by virtue of our system, which includes the capitalistic system, ours is today the leading nation of the world. Yes; we are even the envy of Russia, and we outdistance them by great accomplishments.

Our orators of the leftist variety are constantly making references to the common man. No one is being fooled by this innuendo. We all know there are vastly more common men in the world than uncommon, and the reference to these common men is always in a spirit of solicitation in a desire to help them gain a loftier place. No one quarrels with that philosophy, and I for one should like to see all common men enjoy a better position in life, and I subscribe, Mr. Speaker, to attain this goal. It can only be attained through the assistance of uncommon men. The United States will furnish the leadership of the world today with uncommon men, and at the same time will enhance the sphere of the common man throughout the world.

I like to think of an individual who by his own ingenuity, his ability, and industry, has made a success of his own private endeavors. And then having made that success he has been called in to play a great role in the general welfare of the country in a public service, if you please. And I think of no one who more completely symbolizes that particular individual than Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America. Mr. Johnston recently while traveling in Europe gave a great address to the Belgium-American Society at Brussels, Belgium. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith this address given by this distinguished American citizen:

A UNITED FREEDOM FRONT

Europe recently had a distinguished visitor from the United States, Mr. Henry Agard Wallace. He left you with some very bad misconceptions about my country. He gave you some very bad advice about the United States and its role in the affairs of the world today.

It is not my intention to attack Mr. Wallace or his motives. But I am going to attack some of the things he has said. I do so in the interests of world understanding and world peace. It would be tragic if Europe and the rest of the world were to be misled by the false preachings that America is going to misuse its political and economic power in the world today.

Mr. Wallace has given the world three great misconceptions about the United States:

That the foreign political and economic policy of the United States today is imperialistic.

That the United States today is the world center of reaction.

That the United States is heading into a cataclysmic depression, economic chaos, and financial collapse.

Let's look at misconception No. 1—this charge that the United States is embarking on a program of imperialism.

That's a phony. The spirit of imperialism simply does not exist in my country. There are strong reasons—good, practical reasons—why it doesn't exist. We covet nothing. We don't want anybody's territory.

If we're imperialistic, we're going about it in a most peculiar way. Does an imperialistic nation cut appropriations for its armed forces? We did it.

Does an imperialistic nation allow its wartime conscription laws to lapse? We did.

Does an imperialistic nation voluntarily grant independence to one of its possessions? We did. We have just saluted the flag of the new Philippine Republic.

I never heard of an imperialistic nation giving away territory or cutting down its armaments. I never heard of an imperialistic nation being so magnanimous as we have been to distressed people all over the world.

The sublime absurdity of the charge of imperialism lies in the fact that we are simultaneously accused of isolationism and indifference to the fate of the rest of the world.

Sometimes it seems to us that on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays the United States is accused of being an aggressive, swaggering, blustering, imperialistic nation, busily grinding its swords to hack the world in half, and that on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays we are charged with isolation and indifference to what happens anywhere outside of our own borders. On the seventh day of the week all is confusion.

Actually, there is nothing mysterious or sinister about the foreign policy of the United States. It is simply a policy of self-help.

My country has been inescapably placed in a position of world leadership. She has adopted a bipartisan foreign political and economic policy of helping free nations and free people to remain free—to rebuild their economies and restore stability in their affairs.

There is no precedent in all history for this American policy. We have poured out billions in food, dollars, and materials to help a stricken and prostrate world get back on its feet.

Our policy is the exact contradiction of policies pursued down the ages by imperialistic nations. Imperialism taxes, enslaves, plunders, and exploits. It takes; it drains the substance of the less powerful; it feeds on whatever misery it can find or create.

We are taking nothing. We are putting in instead of taking out. We are taxing ourselves to aid others. It is not wholly altruistic because we know there can be no peace or prosperity for the United States unless there is a peaceful and prosperous world.

Today, our policy of self-help happens to collide with what we feel is the expansionist policy of Soviet Russia. Russia to us in the United States looks like a huge glacier, moving steadily from East to West, smothering and pulverizing whatever may lie in its path.

We in the United States ask this question: "Is this another ice age on the way, and this time made by man instead of by nature?"

If Mr. Wallace had looked East instead of West when he was in Europe, he might have found some cause to worry about imperialism in the world today.

Now let's look at misconception No. 2—that the United States is the world center of reaction.

Mr. Wallace would have you believe that the United States today is a hard, ruthless enemy of the common man's welfare everywhere.

How can you call reactionary a nation which, in a single generation, has fought two wars it neither sought nor inspired for the right of man to live a free life in a free society?

How can you call reactionary a nation in which ownership is so widely diversified and where all the people have such a big stake

and status in the system under which they live?

Let me document that for you.

Thirty million people in the United States are the owners of American industry. They own the stocks and bonds of American industrial and business concerns.

Fifty million Americans are putting capital to work. They have savings accounts in our banks.

One hundred and fifty million life-insurance policies are in force in my country. Those policies are building security for millions of our people.

Those millions who own stocks and bonds, who have savings accounts, and who hold life-insurance policies are owners as well as workers. They share in capitalism; they benefit from capitalism. In short, they are capitalists.

I'm proud to be a believer in the American kind of capitalism. Our kind of capitalism is flexible, and can correct its faults. Under a total state system the individual has no alternative but to adapt himself to the system. Under our kind of capitalism the system can be shaped and adapted to meet the needs of the individual.

I am proud to call myself a capitalist because ours is a participating capitalism which enriches the lives of the many instead of making just a few men rich. Our kind of capitalism is making the common man in the United States uncommonly happy and uncommonly prosperous.

Do I sound like a salesman for American capitalism? Let me assure you I'm not. It needs no selling. The United States is a success.

If Mr. Wallace can find any place on earth where the common man has more of the good things of life than in the United States, then Mr. Wallace is right and I am wrong.

How can you call reactionary a nation so fanatical in its devotion to the ideal of individual liberties? One of the first American flags in our Revolutionary War was the emblem of a rattlesnake and a motto: "Don't tread on me."

For ourselves, we insist on freedom of choice for the individual and we can't imagine taking away the freedom of action of anybody else. We don't want anybody to tread on us, and we hate to see anybody, anywhere, tread on anybody else.

Human life is precious in my country. It is cloaked with great dignity and great protections. In America, men are more important than machines. Human rights take precedence over property rights whenever they come in conflict.

If Mr. Wallace can find any place on earth where the common man has more personal liberties and more individual freedoms than in his own United States, then Mr. Wallace is right, and I am wrong.

Let me take one final pot shot at this charge that the United States is reactionary.

I am afraid Mr. Wallace may have forgotten to remind you that his privilege to attack his own country even outside its own borders is one of the civil liberties and personal freedoms which belongs to Mr. Wallace and to me and to all Americans. Certain countries which Mr. Wallace considers progressive deny this freedom of expression. If Mr. Wallace had been a citizen of one of them he could not have returned safely after his attack on his own land. He would have had to become an ex-Vice President in exile.

Now let's examine misconception No. 3—that the United States is headed for an economic collapse.

Mr. Wallace gave you a doleful picture of America's future, but how reliable an economic prophet has Mr. Wallace been proved to be?

When he was Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Wallace predicted there would be 8,000,000 unemployed in the United States immediately after the war.

What happened was quite the contrary. Instead of having 8,000,000 unemployed, we had a manpower shortage, and employment in my country has moved steadily forward since the war to an all-time high.

I would be less than candid, however, if I didn't concede that so long as we have a dynamic, free competitive, capitalistic system, we are always going to have some ups and downs. Adjustments are normal in a free economy. They are natural in a dynamic economy.

But this you should know, and I doubt if Mr. Wallace mentioned it: Industry in the United States, management, and labor, and agriculture, the men who make the economic decisions, are economically conscious as never before.

We learned something from our economic depressions of the 1930's. We have made certain definite moves by legislation to bolster our economy in slack times.

We have adopted what we call a Full Employment Act, and when we did that, the United States abandoned the policy of complete laissez faire. In so doing, we combined private initiative with cooperative action. It marked the opening of a new chapter in our economic life.

Under the act, we have established a national council of economic advisors which keeps its fingers consistently on the pulse of the Nation's business, checking every symptom and reporting its state of health to government and to the people. A comparable group has been established in the Congress of the United States to study and watch the Nation's economic health and to recommend positive actions to make sure that ups and downs do not become booms and busts.

And by other actions, we have prepared more cushions against a sharp fall in business activity. We have adopted a program of liberal unemployment compensation; we have guaranteed bank deposits. We have adopted a social security system under which old age benefits are paid, and there is no doubt in my mind that the base of the system will be presently broadened to take in more and more people.

We have minimum wage legislation, and we have stabilized ourselves against a collapse in agriculture by putting floors under the prices of farm products.

I am wondering if Europeans knew we had taken all these steps to avoid severe periodic depressions. I wonder if they knew how seriously we are tackling the problem of boom and bust. Mr. Wallace didn't tell you these things. But I want you to know them, because I want you to know the facts about my country.

Briefly, the truth about the United States is this:

The United States has embarked on a foreign policy based on partnership and reciprocity. It wants to help free and independent nations help themselves. That is not the road to imperialism.

The United States is progressive, liberal and democratic; it has twice poured out its blood and its treasure for the ideal of individual liberties and freedoms. That is not the road to reaction.

The United States is building the greatest system of participating capitalism the world has ever seen. That is not the road to economic collapse.

I have tried to dispel the great misconceptions which Mr. Wallace has planted steadily in the course of his grand tours because those misconceptions damage the moral standing of America in the world and hurt the cause of peace and recovery.

American businessmen are eager to help the businessmen of Europe. Our great, dynamic labor unions—one of the great strengths of our kind of capitalism—are conscious of their fellow workers' problems in Europe; our great agricultural organizations feel kinship to the farmers of the older world.

We are conscious that when men are hungry and cold, when life is a constant struggle for bare existence, bread takes precedence over freedom. We are conscious that the immediate job is to provide bread so that men will not be forced to trade away their freedom.

Free men and free nations are our ultimate goal. It is the goal we must everlastingly seek with all our ingenuity, with all our resources, with all our might. Even the fact that our economic systems differ is no barrier to building a united freedom front.

Don't let anybody tell you that the only great issue today is capitalism versus communism. That's important, but it's not the whole story.

The supreme issue of the hour is the secret ballot versus the secret police; free men versus enslaved men; freedom of actien versus a return to something worse than feudalism.

One of the great instruments for building a united freedom front around the world is the motion picture. Its power to enlighten, to bring people closer together, has been demonstrated. It is a powerful link between the United States and Europe; one of the strongest ties that freedom has. It can be an increasingly powerful link to widen freedom. I want to see the screen used for psychological welfare and never for psychological warfare.

Ever since my association with the industry I have advocated, and will continue to advocate, a greater, freer interchange of films among the nations. You may say it is easy for me to advocate that policy because our American film industry is the biggest in the world. But we have no guaranty that our predominance will last forever. Hollywood has no immunity from competition and should have none. But we do want the channels kept open for the best pictures of the world, no matter where they are made.

This magnificent film festival in Brussels is proof to me that the motion picture is steadily gaining in artistry, popularity, and importance with people everywhere.

I hope there can be one single, great world motion-picture festival every year from now on. I would like to see them planned for many years ahead of time, so that all the world film capitals would have their turns as hosts. I believe the greatest good would result from an annual international festival. It would bring together the best in motion pictures from all over the world. It would strengthen the ties of friendship and understanding among us.

I have wanted only to tell you the truths about my country. I have wanted to dispel some of your doubts and fears and uncertainties. I have wanted to bring you a message of promise, encouragement, hope, and faith.

These are desolate, foreboding times, and it is easy for men everywhere to be depressed and discouraged. But the world has had dark times before. The lamp of freedom has been dimmed before only to blaze brighter than ever later on. Fields have been scorched and burned before, and men have been cold and hungry. Disappointment, despair, and the sense of defeat have plagued the world before.

All those things have come to pass—and in their time have passed away. We in my country are determined that the days of relief from hunger and respite from fear and recovery from economic disaster shall come faster than in times gone by. We are determined to do what we can to speed the rebirth of the world; to build on the wreckage of the past a better, healthy, wholesome, peaceful world society.

Reduction of Taxes and Government Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement with regard to the position of this the Eightieth Congress in its effort to keep the promise of cutting Government spending and reducing taxes. A part of this was included in a circular sent out by the Thompson-Hayward Chemical Co., of Kansas City, Mo., under the heading "Let's practice what we preach." It would be well for each and every citizen of these United States to take note of his own responsibility in this postwar period, to see wherein he might contribute to the stability and peace of the world, as unselfishly as he did to the war effort.

LET'S PRACTICE WHAT WE PREACH

There is almost a universal demand for a decrease in National Government expenditure.

The same demand exists for decreased taxes by business and individuals.

Yet Congress is besieged by pleas from various sources urging that certain appropriations be not cut.

Why? Why? Why?

Because—

Farmers don't want subsidies and crop guaranties discontinued.

States want hand-outs for road construction.

Cities want donations to expand airport facilities.

Veterans want expenditures which are growing by leaps and bounds.

Localities want Federal aid for school lunches.

Federal agencies refuse to reduce their specialized activities, and enlist favored blocs to scream at the prospect of being cut.

We could continue, but you get the point.

What further do we see?

Every State, every city engaged in a mad competitive rush to expand.

Citizens all demanding more services, which cost money to create and more taxes to maintain.

Never were so many bond issues being proposed by every metropolitan city for new projects at a time when money will buy less tangible results.

Educational agencies all out raising funds to expand for an emergency condition again with highest costs for accomplishment.

So it goes.

How can taxes be reduced unless we exercise some self-restraint, self-denial, and self-discipline.

A. As citizens, we must resolve—

1. To vote against additional bonds in our own communities when it is not sound to do so.

2. To be willing to forego many improvements.

3. To be hardy enough to stand some inconveniences and discomforts if our pocket books are not able to pay the price of the bill to eliminate them.

B. As communities—

1. To stop looking to Federal aids for donations and help.

2. To only undertake projects the community can properly pay for.

3. To be willing to expand on a realistic and orderly basis.

4. To stop starry-eyed competition with other communities and be content with doing the best we can with what we have.

C. As States—

1. To eliminate duplication of Federal programs such as veterans' bonuses, and paternalistic programs.

2. To restore to their local communities their local responsibilities.

We can't have our pie and eat it too. The New Dealers have proved this to us in our debt load.

Lower taxes can only come with less expenditures.

Let's practice what we preach.

America: The Envy of the World—California: The Envy of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, everybody in Europe wants to come to the United States. Everybody in the United States wants to go to California. Everybody in California wants to come to southern California and Los Angeles County, and that by logical deduction, or rather by accumulation, puts Los Angeles County and southern California right on the spot.

At the rate of increase of population in southern California, of which Los Angeles County is the metropolitan center, most of these people are on their way; many have already arrived.

Those of us who have the responsibility of representing this area are worried about these people finding suitable and profitable employment to take care of themselves and their families and keeping them employed. We fully realize the drastic and serious results of an employment recession.

The following is part of a recent report by a member of the board of editors of the United States News on the situation in southern California:

Migration into southern California is continuing, but at a slower pace. New factories are rising, but in smaller numbers than in 1946. Construction continues to boom, but there are signs of a slow-down. Industries are pouring out goods, yet there are signs of trouble in motion pictures, aircraft, shipbuilding, clothing.

Employment remains high, 60 percent above the prewar level, but down a little from the peak. Unemployment is noticeable here and there. Old houses are selling much more slowly and at an average price 5 to 10 percent below the high point. Retailers in this part of the country, as elsewhere, are buying with caution. Money is not being thrown around wtih the same abandon as a year ago. Population growth continues to confound the experts. War workers who poured into this region during the war have not left on any large scale. Some who did leave have come back. Other people keep coming in to seek new opportunities or just a better place to live. Automobile counts at the State border indicate that only 10 to 14 percent fewer people, counting tourists as well as migrants, are arriving now than a year ago. It is estimated that Southern California alone has a population of about 5,350,000, or well over 1,000,000 more than in 1940.

A flow of new people into California usually has preceded by a year or two an expanding industrial growth. New residents have found jobs in the trades and services until industrial jobs became available. It appears that somewhat the same pattern will apply this time.

Tourist business, which helps to sustain industry, agriculture, and trade, is to be smaller this year than last, when nearly 3,000,000 visitors spent a record $500,000,000 in southern California. Tourists, however, will bring much money into the region this year, to be spent for living quarters, food, gasoline, clothing, and recreation.

Branch plants of eastern and middle western manufacturers were coming in on a big scale last year, but investment in these plants and in other new factories has slowed one-third. Investment of this kind totaled $15,000,000 in the first quarter of 1947, compared with $45,000,000 in the same period a year ago. New-plant investment, however, still is eight times as large in dollar amount as the 1940 outlay.

Revival of the boom in branch plants, if there is a revival, is likely to wait until prices for building and plant sites come down. Good sites near Los Angeles are commanding prices ranging from $5,000 to $30,000 an acre.

Motion pictures also are having their troubles. Movie producers, who have an element of stability in good and bad times are feeling the pinch of shrinking box-office revenue in film theaters throughout the country. Revenue from abroad is hit by political discontent, inflation, and nationalistic restrictions in other nations. Retrenchments now being made in the industry, however, are not expected to be too painful.

Women's clothing, one of California's largest new industries, apparently is heading into less of a slump in the southern California area than in the rest of the country. This is because much of the output is high-grade sportswear, which is less affected than other lines by consumer resistance to high prices.

Outside the field of sports clothes, makers of coats, suits, and dresses are running into some trouble. Falling sales have prompted a rush of redesigning of clothes with a view to recapturing some of these sales. Most coat and suit factories are shut down for the present, and the majority of their 4,000 employees will be laid off until mid-June, when production of autumn models begins.

Retail outlets have caught up with the growth in population, and no longer are multiplying. In Los Angeles County retail stores increased in number from 75,000 to 105,000 between 1939 and 1946. Now the trend is probably the other way. Sales at retail are holding up better than in some other parts of the country, but department stores have slashed their orders for goods as much as 50 percent from a year ago.

In the heavy-goods field contradictory situations exist. Aircraft production and shipbuilding, large employers of labor during wartime, are down to a fraction of their previous size. Employment in Los Angeles and San Diego airplane plants has dropped to 86,000 from a high 250,000, and further layoffs threaten to reduce the number to 35,000 next year. Steel production, on the other hand, is being expanded from high wartime capacity. Nearly all producers are enlarging their facilities to meet increasing demands for steel.

Tire making, which is another big business in southern California, appears to be heading into a slump. Signs of a buyers' market are showing up, although plants are producing twice as many tires as before the war and are operating at near capacity.

That is the situation so far as industry is concerned. In the field of agriculture, a big

source of income in southern California, prospects are for a prosperous year.

Farmers and growers may pocket $1,000,000,000 in cash income in 1947—as much as they took in last year—even if an expected price drop occurs. In 1939, their income was only one-third of that amount. As a result, farmers are spending liberally, reducing indebtedness, and building up cash reserves. There is little of the reckless mortgaging of farms to buy more land at inflated prices that occurred after the First World War.

In the face of this prosperity, farmers, too, are in for some readjustments. Specialty crops such as fruits and nuts are sensitive to price declines, and are not among the crops that the Government is required to support. Orange growers, for example, are likely to find this year's incomes considerably lower than they had expected because of the competition between bumper crops here and in Florida. A recent drop in price reflected that situation.

Construction is being slowed down by high prices, although a turn in the price situation is developing.

Home building is heading into a buyers' market, though later and less abruptly than in some other parts of the country. Builders are finding resistance to new houses that are priced at double prewar figures. Prices are falling slightly, but not enough to increase sales perceptibly. Nevertheless, many new homes are going up. Total sales of all real estate in Los Angeles County are off a third from a year ago, but still are 75 percent above the prewar rate.

Industrial building is held back by high costs. A typical case is that of an oil company which deferred building a new plant when estimates jumped from $15,000,000 to $30,000,000. Most concerns with plants for expansion are delaying construction.

Labor supply is easing, though the situation is spotty. More workers are competing for jobs in industry, yet skilled workmen, qualified office workers, and domestic servants are scarce. Maids are being paid at a rate of $175 a month in Los Angeles, and some families are paying as high as $250 or $300 a month for cooks. Factory employment dropped from 252,000 to 242,000 in Los Angeles County between December and the end of April, but unemployment has not yet become a problem.

All in all, this region seems able to absorb without too much shock whatever setback is immediately ahead, and can look forward expectantly to a reasonably prosperous year.

Terminal Leave Cash Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been an ardent supporter of this legislation since it was first proposed. In addition, I have actively participated in efforts to bring it before the House for passage. Yesterday when the measure was pending in the House, I was unavoidably detained while en route to the Capital from Massachusetts and therefore regret that I was not in a position formally to vote for the bill when the roll was called.

However, there was never any question concerning the passage of this meritorious measure. The unanimous vote of the House not only indicated that there was no controversy at that stage of the bill, but manifested the recognition by every Member of this distinguished body that the enactment of the measure, long and unwarrantably delayed, had, as it should have had, the unqualified and undivided support of the House.

There can be no possible objection to this measure. It was unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member. It enjoyed the support of all our service organizations. It was endorsed by many civic, industrial, business, and patriotic groups. It undoubtedly had the almost unanimous approval of the American people. On its merits and in principle and logic, it should have been adopted long ago. It merely seeks to adjust an inequitable situation affecting the enlisted personnel of the armed forces, to equalize their position with that of officers of all ranks. Thus the bill is the fulfillment of ordinary justice by the Congress to our gallant boys and girls of enlisted rank in all our armed services who so loyally and unselfishly served the Nation in time of peril.

The bill as written and enacted actually saves the Government money in interest charges on the bonds heretofore issued under the provisions of previous legislation authorizing payment of terminal leave pay in bonds. It is estimated that about half of the eligible personnel will avail themselves of the provisions of this measure and cash their bonds. This sum of money will not materially affect current inflationary trends; in fact, it will help many of our finest young veterans to solve pressing personal financial problems. My regret is that this bill was so long delayed, though I am very glad that the leadership of the House brought it to the floor before the adjournment of Congress. There are other bills affecting veterans presently pending in committee which ought to be considered and passed before Congress adjourns and I propose to bring some of these vital matters to the attention of the House, I hope, in the near future.

Though the vote on the bill was unanimous, I am nevertheless sorry that it was not possible for me to have been present to vote in its favor at the time of the formal vote. By that act I could have given final expression to my many efforts and strong support of this proposal.

Speech of Ivan Allen on Anniversary of Foundation of Warm Springs Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Ivan Allen, chairman, Franklin D. Roosevelt Warm Spring Memorial Commission, on the twentieth anniversary of the founding of War Springs Foundation, and Little White House dedication ceremonies, June 25, 1947, WSB, on the air:

Welcome.

The great Roosevelt, before he was Governor of the State of New York, before he was President of the United States four terms, came here to these simple, rural, rustic surroundings in pursuit of health, and here also found happiness and friends. In solitude and tranquillity, here he had humanitarian dreams, and planned a Government with a soul. Afterward these dreams and plans were enacted into laws. Through the years these laws have not been materially changed.

There is being dedicated here today a national, yes, an international shrine, a sanctuary of glory, an altar of liberty. It shall light the pathways of the generations to come.

On this 3,000-acre reservation is a mountain called Dowdell's Knob. Mr. Roosevelt bought this mountain and built a private road to the top. It was his favorite picnic grounds, and here he entertained his visitors and neighbors. Here he could look over the countryside for 50 miles in all directions. Shall we, his followers, build there on this eminence the Franklin D. Roosevelt Peace Tower, higher than the Washington Monument, more elaborate and more beautiful in design, modernized with radio, television, chimes, elevators, equipped to broadcast messages of inspiration to the world? Shall it be built with funds from all 48 States? Yes, and from all the other nations of liberty-loving people. In the very words of the great Roosevelt: "This generation has a rendezvous with destiny." God give us heart and will to take this mission forward to a new, more daring future, a new world of peace.

Monopoly on the March Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there is pending, in the Senate, S. 1461, which seeks to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act. Thereunder there would be continued the present method of controls over export and import of fats and oils, including soap and soap powders.

This plays right into the hands of the three largest soap manufacturers, Lever Bros., Colgate-Palmolive-Peet, and Procter & Gamble. These three entities manufacture practically 90 percent of all soap products in this country. They spend vast sums of money for advertising their brand and have made the housewife brand conscious to such a degree that the small soap manufacturer has little chance to sell his wares. The only opportunity that the small manufacturer has to sell his products, is to sell abroad. There is very little he can do in the domestic market and unless he can get an outlet for his goods through exports abroad, he will find it difficult to maintain himself. He will be squeezed between the upper and nether stones, the three big companies which practically

monopolize the soap business in this country and the passage of S. 1461, which would shut off the opportunity to sell abroad.

These controls play into the hands of the same big three. Quotas allotted to them for export are determined upon the so-called base period before the war. The small soap manufacturers are given little or no quotas.

There is specific authority in S. 1461 to control the export of fats and oil, including soap and soap powder, oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and butter, for the purposes of exercising import control and of establishing priority in production and delivery for export.

It is declared that the policy of controls should be the protection of domestic economy. It can hardly be said our domestic economy is protected if the small soap manufacturers are pushed around like pawns on a chess board. It can hardly be called the protection of domestic economy if the control of export of soap and soap powders strengthens the already existing monopoly of the three soap companies. These three companies want to continue their monopoly over export. S. 1461 provides for the lifting of these controls June 30, 1948. This is only a facade. The monopolists want to continue their export monopoly far beyond 1948.

What I say concerning soap and soap powder has no application to other products mentioned in the bill, to wit, tin and tin products, manila, antimony, and others of which we are in short supply. The words "soap and soap powder" should be stricken from the bill.

It is rather anomalous that many articles which are made with fats and oils in part are not included in the restrictive provisions. I refer to rubber balls, rubber toys, candles, crayons, synthetic tires, and hundreds of other articles which are manufactured out of fatty acids. As a matter of fact, I am informed that a hundred million pounds are used in the manufacture of synthetic tires. Why are these articles omitted and only soap and soap powder included? Is it because the manufacturers of rubber toys, tires, and so forth, do not have the power of the large soap manufacturers—do not have as strong a lobby?

I herewith submit a very interesting and illuminating letter sent to me by the Kamen Soap Products Co., Inc., with a plant at Barberton, Ohio, and general offices at the Woolworth Building in New York City. It indicates the difficulties under which small soap manufacturers now labor, which difficulties will be magnified if the provision covering soap and soap powder is not stricken from S. 1461.

There is sufficient supply of fats and oils to supply the domestic and foreign demands. Any restrictions to the free flow of trade in soap and soap powder engender uncertainty and instability, encourage abnormal market fluctuations, smother production, and tend to build up monopoly. To adhere to the controls of soap and soap powder for another year or beyond will create naught but maladjustment and greater and greater difficulties for the small soap manufacturers.

KAMEN SOAP PRODUCTS CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., July 7, 1947.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: May I call your attention to bill S. 1461 extending import-export controls to June 30, 1948.

A. This bill would tend to continue the present method of controls over export and import of fats and oils including soap and soap powders.

B. Just why soap and soap powders are included in this bill is very obvious. The very few large soap manufacturers, who control over 90 percent of the soap business in the United States and who spend approximately $30,000,000 annually to advertise their brands, prefer controls on export because that would tend to kill the competition they have with about 1,100 small soapers who divide less than 10 percent of the soap sales in this country. The large soaper has no trouble in selling his soap today at a high price because of the extensive advertising he does, whereas, the small soaper has to depend on government contracts which are very small at present or other highly competitive business that can only be obtained through bidding and maintaining low prices.

C. If exports on soap were free, the small soaper could maintain his operations by exporting to other countries and maintain employment in many small establishments now located throughout the country.

D. If soap and soap powders are included in the restriction of fats and oils, why not include rubber balls, rubber toys, candles, crayons, and a hundred other items manufactured out of fatty acids which come from fats and oils. The reason is that the other industries do not have a strong lobby as do the large soap manufacturers to protect them against domestic competition.

E. Since fats and oils have been reduced in price to about 33⅓ percent of what they were 2 months ago, many small soapers have reduced their prices by that proportion, whereas large soapers, because of their extensive advertising, are still maintaining high prices in this country and have no trouble keeping their plants running to full capacity while the small soaper must shut down his plant, first, because of his inability to sell in this country against the advertised brands, and second, because of the restrictions put on by our Government against export.

F. Daily, our company and many other soapers receive large demands and inquiries for quotations for export. Europe as well as South and Central American countries including the Philippines are in terrible need of soap. Soap is next important to food and should definitely not be restricted. Many soap companies could manufacture soap for export with as little as 10 to 25 percent fats and oils, but with restrictions under S. 1461, they would be prohibited. Cleanliness to humanity in other countries should be considered and no restrictions on soap for export should be permitted.

G. We repeat. Here, three manufacturers controlling 90 percent of the soap business should not be able to kill the complete industry by putting them out of business for lack of orders, and at the same time, overcharging our own citizens because of the monopolistic advantages they have. This is your opportunity to help the small businesses who are singled out because of the ability of a few.

H. An investigation will show that there is more soap manufactured today in this country than is needed, but the only ones who benefit from this industry are three manufacturers, whereas, approximately 1,100 small soapers are in terrible condition for lack of business.

We trust you will vote against these controls.

Very truly yours,
KAMEN SOAP PRODUCTS CO., INC.
A. L. KAMEN, *President.*

Labor and Collectivism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edna Lonigan, published in Human Events, Washington, D. C.:

LABOR AND COLLECTIVISM
(By Edna Lonigan)

The fight over the Taft-Hartley Act has left a bitterness which, unless exorcised, will rise to plague us later. A campaign of brilliant and reckless misrepresentation has persuaded many workers that their fellow citizens have deserted them. Ambitious demagogs are taking advantage of everything that will widen the cleavage.

It is not enough to have made this bill into law over the President's veto. For those who care about American unity, it is important to find the common ground on which all reasonable people can unite to give this law their full support.

For years workers have been led to believe that the Wagner Act was a charter of liberties. Powerful Government and party propaganda has said that it was good. But good for whom? What exactly were the effects of the Wagner Act, and how have they helped labor?

The Wagner Act, as the New Deal administered it, in effect transformed American labor unions from simple associations of the traditional type to a form resembling the more complex structure of continental unionism.

In origin, American unions, like nearly all American joint activities, were free associations. Free associations are joint activities which are private and voluntary, with no fixed status or place. They get no help or hindrance from the state but are wholly dependent on their participants for their strength.

Free associations represent the power of citizens, not governments, and obey the will of citizens, not that of officials.

Under the New Deal free American unions became rigid associations, held tightly together in a hierarchical cartel, in which the membership was powerless, and in which power was exercised by the few.

If we read the Taft-Hartley Act with care we see that, despite a few weak spots, its purpose is to help American labor unions regain their rights as free associations responsible only to their members.

This is not an issue in which the interests of labor are on one side, and those of the general public on the other. It is an issue in which union members will decide—for all of us—whether we take the road to freedom or the gradual descent to collectivism.

II

The Wagner Act began as a promise. It promised to workers the same civil rights—of free speech and free association—in dealing with their employers that they enjoyed in dealing with Government.

That promise was broken. It was lost when an executive agency was set up to supervise civil rights. Civil rights are superior to the executive power. No Government bureau supervises freedom of speech or of religion. The protection of the courts is enough. By setting up the National Labor Relations Board, proponents of the bill abandoned the American idea that civil rights inhere in the individual, and are inalienable, for the European idea that rights are state bestowed.

The right to vote for union representatives is comparable with the right to vote for Representatives in Congress, but in the climate of the thirties the administration was called in to supervise. A Federal bureau made the rules for union elections. It decided the bargaining unit, which is the voting constituency. We would not let a President rewrite election laws, nor gerrymander congressional districts, but in effect we gave him just that power over labor elections.

The union approved by the NLRB was the sole bargaining agent for all members—but it could not ever be unseated by the members. The defeated side lost all minority rights. It lost all funds, all means of expression, all power to call meetings. Its adherents could not even talk to their employers. The case was one of winner take all.

By ruling in favor of industrial unions, and union-wide bargaining, the NLRB greatly increased the size of the disfranchised minority. By ruling that workers could be represented by the union hierarchy at headquarters, instead of by their local union or national union, the Administration concentrated the power over unions at a few key points. So the unions came to be controlled by political, not labor leaders.

Labor has been bitterly criticized for its excessive power. Its spokesmen insist that it has not received any such power. They are right. It is not union power that waxed so strong.

The Administration early began to put its key men in the powerful but invisible second-line positions, especially in the CIO. Old line union leaders stayed on in front positions but they were dependent on favors they received from the White House. Political favors, however, must always be repaid. The city vote was the pay-off.

John L. Lewis challenged administration dominance in 1940, but after the election the permanent secretariat of the CIO removed him from office. Individuals were helpless. Those who protested against political use of union funds were soon out of a job.

This is not collective bargaining but collectivism, for which labor did not bargain. All that saved the workers of the United States from total absorption in one centrally-controlled mass organization was the split between the cartelized CIO and the still decentralized A. F. of L.

III

The Taft-Hartley Act dismantles this monolithic pyramid, and requires unions to operate again as free associations.

The right to work is restored as an individual right, which no organization can take away. Workers regain the right not to join a union. It is as contrary to free association to compel a man to join the CIO as it would be to compel him to join the Mormon Church.

Unions can no longer control nonunion men through the closed shop. When unions were tiny oases in a vast area of nonunion firms the closed shop was a natural defense. The right of the dissenter to work was then protected by the unorganized firms. When unions cover a whole industry or locality the closed shop means that the worker is subordinated to a collective power.

Closed shops have permitted union officials to punish a member for dissent by depriving him of his job. That is as severe a punishment as the courts impose on some convicted criminals. The forcible collection of dues from all workers is also now ended.

Without the power to compel outsiders to join, to tax all workers, or to punish dissent in the union, labor officials again become answerable to unionists. Unscrupulous leaders can no longer build a union hierarchy and turn it into political power. Nor can officials now launch class warfare strikes to which their membership is opposed.

Officials are also compelled to report what they do with joint funds. It would have been better if the new law had required financial reports to union members only, for the insistence upon reports to Government is a survival of the Wagner Act philosophy. It is none of Government's business what unions do with their money, within the law.

Shorn of its absolute powers, no union hierarchy can so readily dominate local and national unions. Communist opposition to the new act is naturally intense, because the Communists are the chief losers. Lacking the powers given them by the Wagner Act, the demonstrated Communist ability to exploit American unions has been sharply reduced.

Even in the clause requiring union officials to sign a statement that they are not Communists, the Taft-Hartley Act keeps strictly to the principle of free association. Our objection to the Communists is not because of their opinions. It is because they use force and fraud to promote their opinions. No union is penalized by this requirement for a sworn statement. But it does facilitate the penalty of perjury for Communist leaders who pretend not to be Communist.

IV

For Congress to have untangled much of the spider web of Government control over unions and to have restored the lost freedom of the worker, is a great achievement in constructive political action. But the Taft-Hartley Act does not settle the underlying question. American unions must still choose whether they wish to be free associations or wards of the State. It must be realized that whenever unions are dependent on Government, police powers will be used by Government to prohibit strikes, secure injunctions, and impose compulsory labor.

Labor under the New Deal made as little lasting gain as the German workers under the Weimar Republic. The vitality was then sucked out of German unions by government benefits. Union leaders had nothing to give the workers. The unions lost inner strength. It was not Hitler but Weimar that turned German labor into a pillar of stone. When Hitler came in, he had only, as Stolper said, to throw a switch.

The crisis of our time turns on whether individuals can remain free of state power, keeping their own voluntary, citizen-managed associations, or whether these tools of freedom can be captured by the state, leaving the individual powerless. Obviously free associations do not function perfectly. But our real hope is to strengthen free organizations, and increase the power of the participants in each.

The ascent to freedom was hard but the descent is easy. Once free associations in labor, in industry, in medicine, in education, are bound to Government, resistance to the executive power quickly becomes hopeless, and the road is open to totalitarianism.

The storm center of this millennial crisis is in the labor unions. Workers gained the most from the shift to free association, and they will lose most from a shift to State control. But they are still tempted by the siren song of the welfare state.

If American workers want freedom they will not let their unions be recaptured by the state. And if they win the fight for freedom for themselves they may well have won the decisive battle for the rest of us.

Taft-Hartley Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, the Vineland Times Journal has recently printed an excellent editorial on the Taft-Hartley labor bill, which I am inserting in the RECORD as a matter of interest to the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

TAFT-HARTLEY LABOR LAW

The Senate adoption of the Taft-Hartley labor law, over the determined effort of President Truman to kill the bill via the veto, showed both Houses of Congress at wide variance with the Chief Executive.

The most disturbing aspect of this new law, which revises the Wagner Act, is that it must be enforced by an executive department which has stated over and over again its hostility to every part of it, which has claimed that it is unworkable and that it will cause harm to the country at a critical time.

President Truman took the same line as the national labor leaders in offering no help whatever in the deliberations in congressional committee or in floor debate—the line being that no change should be made in the Wagner Act. The national labor leaders asserted the Taft-Hartley bill is a "slave labor bill," which, of course, it is not. It is evident that this line did more than anything else to defeat the veto, and even the personal effort of President Truman in talking to the country over the head of Congress and calling in a group of legislators just prior to the Senate vote, failed of its purpose.

The evidence points to the conclusion that Truman's course was as much politically inspired as it was a sincere effort at national leadership. A majority of Democrats in both Houses were in disagreement with him on the bill. His own actions in the railroad and mine strikes were proof enough that he believed some changes in the basic labor laws were necessary, yet he completely reversed himself in the present instance.

The first test for Truman will come when he appoints two new members to the National Labor Relations Board and a General Counsel for the NLRB. It will not do the country any good if the appointees are hostile to the law, which largely removes the administrative authority of the NLRB, gives it a status of a legal court through the appointment of a General Counsel, increases the membership from three to five, and ups the salaries of members from $10,000 to $12,000 a year.

The Taft-Hartley law, officially labeled the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, provides for outlawing the closed shop, regulation of the union shop, suspends rights of unions with Communist officers, requires registration of pertinent data such as financial statements and denies recognition of foremen's unions under the law, although it does not bar such unions.

The law replaces the Federal Conciliation Service with a new Federal Mediation Service within the Department of Labor; sets up emergency machinery for handling strikes which paralyze the Nation's health or safety; regulates welfare funds and the check-off system, bars strikes by Government employees, and sets up a joint congressional committee to observe the workings of the new law.

Opponents of the Taft-Hartley law contended that it would not serve to bring about more peaceful labor-management relations, and in fact would only cause greater dissension. More conservative elements were of the opinion that it would result in greater confusion, as recourse to the courts would be more frequent to test the law's provisions. More radical elements denounced the law as striking at the heart of organized labor, as the first step toward destruction of labor unions, and as a step toward fascism and reaction.

That Congress is itself not certain of the workings of the law is demonstrated in the provision for a joint congressional committee whose task it will be to observe the actual workings of the law and to recommend changes to the Congress as time goes on.

The law starts on its course very inauspiciously, and will be handicapped by the fact that in its making there was no meeting of minds between Members of Congress on the one hand and the executive department and national labor leaders on the other.

MAX LEUCHTER.

Assistance Needed for Our Aged Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, day after day we are appropriating and sending American taxpayers' money to help people of Europe, some of whom not many months ago were killing our American boys and girls. Yet, when we ask for a more adequate program to take care of our own aged people—a group of loyal Americans—we find that our program is seemingly blocked. I certainly would like to know why and I think the American people want to know why.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of our Federal Government to help attain security for our people, and immediate action should be taken to definitely establish this program.

Does This Situation Make for Fair Competition Between the Railroads and the Air Lines?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently the following news dispatch by the Associated Press appeared in newspapers throughout the Nation:

SAFETY DEVICES FOR RAIL LINES—ICC ORDERS PLACING OF AUTOMATIC SIGNALS ON FAST RUNS

WASHINGTON.—The Interstate Commerce Commission Wednesday ordered railroads to install automatic safety devices on 45,000 miles of track over which trains are run beyond certain speed limits.

The order resulted from an investigation instituted by the ICC into train accidents and their relation to scheduled speed of passenger and freight trains.

The Commission said the devices should be installed on trackage where freight trains are operated at 50 miles an hour or more or passenger trains at speeds of 60 miles an hour or more.

The order provides for the installation of automatic train-stop or train-control or automatic cab signals on 27,156 miles of track and the installation of manual or automatic block systems on 18,586 miles of track.

While the above news article was being widely circulated the necessity for air safety was becoming more acute due to air-line accidents that aroused the American people.

According to an article by Albert Douglas in the Wall Street Journal of June 19, there is quite a squabble now in progress between the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the air lines and the armed forces on the subject of air-safety equipment. All agree something must be done in the way of providing new and better safety devices, but what suits one group does not fit with the ideas of the other.

And—it says here—there is another, perhaps greater problem—who will foot the bills?

The CAA complains it cannot get from Congress the millions of dollars needed for ground installations alone. To date the CAA has built 10 very high-frequency omnidirectional ranges—which, coupled with air-borne radar, tells a pilot where he is—and hopes to build 500 of them by the end of 1948 if Congress provides the money. Nobody, so the story goes, has an answer to how costs shall be divided between taxpayer and air line. However, if past performance is a criteria, the answer to that one is obvious. The taxpayer will pay.

At a meeting of airport users held in Washington May 19 and 20, under the auspices of the National Aeronautic Association, Robert Fenton Craig, head of the department of commercial aviation, University of Southern California, said that the national airways and airport program from 1920 to date represented in Federal expenditures approximately $1,160,000,000. The taxpayers, he said, had paid the bill, and the States, counties, and municipalities had shouldered their share of the costs of airport installations as their contribution to the growth of this fine new industry. Mr. Craig said that total expenditures for airports from 1925 to 1944 were estimated loosely at $1,027,159,416, of which Federal funds accounted for $740,705,000, State sources provided $10,155,000, municipalities $192,950,000, and commercial and private capital $83,349,000.

At the same gathering, Theodore P. Wright, Civil Aeronautics Administrator, told the airport users present that the airport-building program for 1948 was uncertain because of budget conditions; adding that 2,550 new ports at a cost of $378,900,000 in sponsored and Federal funds would be required to make airport programs meet aeronautical needs. Under the Federal Airport Act passed in 1946, said Mr. Wright, funds had been allocated to more than 800 cities and towns for construction or improvement of airports at a cost of approximately $40,000,000 in Federal funds. A total of 4,431 airports at a total estimated cost of $985,800,000 must be improved or added to the airport system to meet anticipated future needs of air commerce, he said.

In contrast to this national air-transportation policy, let us take a look at our national railroad transportation policy.

As a step toward improving the excellent safety record of the Nation's railroads, the Interstate Commerce Commission this month isued an order requiring the roads to install additional signaling devices on approximately 45,742 miles of track. And they were given until December 31, 1952, to complete the job.

Unlike the CAA, the ICC did not complain that they could not get money from Congress to do the job. There is no question of who will pay. As in the past, it will be the railroads themselves who foot the bill. The taxpayers can relax on that one.

Railroads were ordered by the Commission to install automatic or manual block-signal systems on lines over which any passenger train is operated at a speed of 60 miles per hour or more or any freight train is operated at a speed of 50 miles per hour or more, and automatic train-stop or train-control systems or automatic cab signal systems on lines over which any train is operated at a speed of 80 miles per hour or more. The Commission's report stated that the block-signaling phase of the order will affect 18,586.5 miles of passenger track and a relatively small additional mileage over which passenger trains are not operated at speeds of 60 miles per hour or more but freight trains are operated at 50 miles per hour or more; the requirement with respect to train-control or cab signals will affect 27,156.3 miles of track.

The Commission itself recognized that the cost of such installations would not be insignificant. Averages of estimates before that body indicated that automatic block signals cost approximately $6,000 per mile of road for single-track lines and $4,000 per mile of track for multiple-track lines. The cost of intermittent inductive train-control was put at $400 to $700 per mile of track in addition to the cost of the block signals, plus $2,000 to $2,300 per locomotive. The only estimate on cab signals was that of the Pennsylvania, which put the cost, in addition to the cost of automatic block signals, at $5,000 per mile of track for single-track lines and $4,000 per mile of track for multiple-track lines, plus $2,260 per locomotive.

It is impossible to say just how much this order will cost the railroads by the time it has been complied with. However, a little simple multiplication of miles of track, times the cost per mile, plus additional costs for locomotive installations will give you a figure that is in the proximity of $300,000,000. The railroads, whose net income for the entire year 1946 was $288,534,467, will have to dig up that $300,000,000.

Does this situation make for fair competition? If not so intended, will it then strengthen our great national transportation system? Could it be that

our need for an over-all national transportation policy based on equality is greater today than ever before?

What is the import of past safety records that bring us to this disparity of treatment toward so-called private enterprise?

According to figures of the ICC and the Civil Aeronautics Board, the passenger fatality rate on railroads, even including persons killed in getting on and off trains, or falling from trains, as well as those killed in collisions, derailments and other train accidents, was 0.16 for each 100,000,000 miles traveled in 1945. The fatality rate on scheduled domestic air lines in the same year was 2.17, or more than 13 times as high. In the 3-year period 1943–45, the average annual number of passenger fatalities on the railroads was 0.25 per 100,000,000 miles traveled and on the air lines 1.97, or 8 times as many. In the year 1946, the latest for which figures are available, the rate of passenger fatalities on air lines was 7 times as high as on railroads.

This is not the whole story. Railroads work at this safety business every day in the year, with every dollar they can muster. They are buying all the new rail that can be produced today. It is more than four times as resistant to breakage in service as was the rail of two decades ago. And every year, as a double check, electric or magnetic detector cars inspect approximately 200,000 miles of track, locating and marking hidden defects which might later cause breaks. And even now, automatic signal systems are being installed and extended with such speed that manufacturers of the signal equipment cannot begin to keep up with the railroad's demands. The automatic features of these signal systems already installed represent the most up-to-date traffic control in the world of transportation. And every part is installed, paid for, maintained, and operated by the railroads.

If there is any logical connection between the past performance of the railroads, their present improvement programs, their future plans, and the inequitable treatment they are receiving in matters of transportation policy—it would appear that there is a great penalty placed on progress.

The statement in the Interstate Commerce Act of the national policy with respect to transportation cannot be misinterpreted. Its essential point is that all forms of transportation shall be given a fair and equal chance to do that part of the transportation task which it can do best—in other words, equal treatment and equal opportunity.

Experience in two world wars has further bolstered the old American premise that essential transportation service is best performed by privately financed, privately operated companies engaged in the transportation business on a self-supporting, tax-paying basis. The railroads were built on this basis and are so operated today. If they are to continue to provide adequate service in peace and war, there must be established soon a public policy with respect to transportation based on the principles of equality set forth by Congress under the Interstate Commerce Act. Such a policy will enable each carrier to accomplish its mission of furnishing this Nation with the most adequate and economical transportation it has ever possessed.

Fascism in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I favor the passage of House Resolution 83, which will make Fascism in Action a House document. In view of the recent action we took when we approved an appropriation to publish Communism in Action, I think the public is entitled to a comprehensive review on both of these important subjects. The people in the United States do not agree with either of these extreme forms of government or philosophies. We should acquaint the public with the dangers of both communism and fascism. There is no place in the United States for either. We are a republic as declared in our Constitution. We believe in the dignity of the individual. We believe he was created with certain inalienable rights, and our form of government here in the United States is designed to protect and preserve these rights.

Our citizens should be fully informed of the dangers of the totalitarianism of communism and fascism, and their philosophies of subordinating man to the state, and denying his individual rights. The House should adopt this resolution, and if it does not completely and comprehensively cover the subject it should be revised from time to time. It should be given the widest circulation in the same manner as we circulated Communism in Action.

I urge the House to approve House Resolution 83.

In Commemoration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Tragic Commencement and Triumphal Conclusion of the War With Spain—A Speech by Mr. Tony Siminoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it was with pleasure and gratitude that I learned that my good friend, Mr. Tony Siminoff, a widely and favorably known veteran of the Spanish-American War and an outstanding citizen and publicist of Washington and Los Angeles, had in a forceful speech which he delivered to a gathering of veterans of all wars vigorously endorsed the measures which I recently introduced to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the tragic commencement and triumphal conclusion of the War with Spain, one, H. R. 3396, to authorize the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp, and, the other, H. R. 3397, to direct the minting of a souvenir 50-cent piece of appropriate design.

As Mr. Siminoff's remarks contain much not only of passing interest but of historical importance, I am constrained to offer the text of his address for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for, indeed, he should have a wider audience than the one that gathered about him on the occasion to which I have made reference.

Mr. Speaker, the address of Mr. Tony Siminoff to which I have alluded, is the following:

SOME OF THE HIGH LIGHTS OF OUR WAR WITH SPAIN IN 1898 THAT NOW BELONG TO HISTORY

My fellow citizens, it is well that the people of America know some of the high lights of our war with Spain in 1898. As a prelude to discussing its decisive character, permit me to briefly review the various wars in which this Nation has been engaged in order that the far-reaching consequences of the war with Spain may be properly evaluated.

Our first war was the War of the Revolution, which was fought by the Colonial farmers and the British troops, aided by Hessian mercenaries. Despite this bitter opposition the Colonists succeeded in accomplishing their objectives, successfully setting up our present form of Government. For this they have the undying gratitude of the American people.

The next war was fought in 1812. That war was fought largely upon the high seas and in the South. Following this great struggle came the purchase of the Louisiana Territory, which, when added to the territories of our young Republic, almost doubled its landed holdings. That was purely a continental affair since its effects were not felt outside this hemisphere for years to come.

The next war was that of 1847 known as the Mexican War. That, too was a continental affair, a military task which was quickly and most effectively accomplished to the greater glory of our fastly growing country. The Mexican War did not last long. In its larger aspects, it can be said that it resulted in the acquisition of California and a number of other Southwestern States, adding new stars to our glorious constellation.

The next war was the War Between the States, better known as the Civil War, fought during the years of 1861 and 1865. All of its major battles, as well as its skirmishes, were fought east of the Rocky Mountains, and that, too, was of but hemispheric effect, for the time being at least.

After a long struggle of nearly 4 years the war came to a close as a consequence of negotiations between the commanding generals of the two greatest armies ever assembled up to that time, Gen. U. S. Grant for the Union Army and Gen. Robert E. Lee for the Confederate Army. Though this great struggle resulted in a decisive military victory for the Northern States, the people of our country remained divided, to curse and revile each other, until our war with Spain, fought 122 years after our present form of government had been established, reunited the people of the North and the South in a common cause, healing for the first time the ever-festering wounds of the conflicts of 1861–65 and of the tragic decade which followed.

This short but brilliantly fought war smashed many old and established many new international precedents that the preceding wars did not do. I will endeavor to point to a few. It was the first time in all

history that a war was fought in such widely separated parts of the world. It was fought in the Atlantic Ocean, in the Caribbean Sea, and in the Pacific, in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. It was the first time in our country's history that a western power had ever sent a battle fleet into the heart of Asian waters to give battle to the foe.

On the morning of May 1, 1898, under the command of the then Commodore George Dewey, later Admiral Dewey, the American Fleet sailed into the harbor of Manila and not only gave battle to the Spanish Fleet, but there completely annihilated the sea power of Spain. From that day to this, the battle flags of the ships of Spain have remained furled, never to be seen again upon the high seas, so complete was the American triumph over its ships of war, once considered a constant threat against the commerce of all nations whose ships plied the seven seas.

In the late part of April 1898, the battleship *Oregon* picked up anchor at San Francisco Bay and proceeded to sea From the California coast, she made her way in record time around Cape Horn to join the Atlantic Fleet, then readying itself for battle. On her way, she was met by Spanish ships and she not only gave them battle and subdued them, but brought rich prizes of war into port, won in battle line. That was a stellar role our Navy played in that war.

The major land battle in the Philippines was fought on August 13, 1898. Along in the afternoon on that day, the occupation of Manila took place, followed by the surrender of the Spanish Army to the American forces. A new chapter was written in history. The American Army, gracious in victory, extended to the defeated hosts every consideration, supplying, among other things, food to our vanquished foe. On that same afternoon a guard was placed on the streets of Manila to protect the civilian population against the looting and other atrocities that generally follow in the wake of war. The organization that did the guarding of that city was the First Battalion of Eighteenth United States Infantry, an organization with long years of experience in the ways of peace as well as of war, thus demonstrating to the world that the American Army did not come as a conqueror but as a liberator, to free all the people in the islands from bigotry, tyranny and intolerance.

On the afternoon of December 15, 1898, a German battleship known as the *Helena* sailed into the harbor of Manila. The German boat passed our fleet without rendering the international courtesies or deigning to take notice of its presence, which was contrary to the established customs of the sea. When they had proceeded to a position opposite the cruiser *Olympia*, which was the flagship of our fleet, one of the guns opened fire. The German ship was immediately placed under arrest and held under durance until it was finally released following diplomatic negotiations. All of which demonstrated before an awed world that our Navy was capable of maintaining the honor and dignity of this young Republic of the west in the face of a challenge of any European power however great.

When the war with Spain was over, a conflict which spread over 4 years, if the Philippine Insurrection and the Chinese Relief Expedition are to be considered a part of it, many events of international repercussion followed in quick succession. The then President of the United States proclaimed that the commercial interests of the United States, now extended to all parts of the world, would require the shortening of the ancient sea routes. And plans for the construction of a trans-ocean canal across the Isthmus of Panama were announced. Congress approving, the construction of the Panama Canal was soon under way under the dynamic leadership of the very great President of that day, then familiarly known to the American people who idolized him as Colonel Teddy Roosevelt, colorful leader of the famous Rough Riders of the war of 1898. The great American who actually built the canal was Maj. Gen. George Goethals, an engineering officer of the war of 1898. The great American who freed the Caribbean from the ancient scourges of typhoid, malaria, and yellow fever was none other than Maj. Walter Reed of the Medical Corps of that same war, the war of 1898. Their grand service to their country was matched only by the heroic hospital men, numbering into thousands, who cheerfully offered themselves as guinea pigs to help in the scientific fight against these terrible tropical diseases which all but compelled the abandonment of the project.

The events which precipitated the war with Spain were in a nutshell these: On February 15, 1898, there lay in the harbor of Habana, Cuba, the U. S. S. battleship *Maine*, there on a special mission by the order of the President of the United States. On that particular night an explosion took place in which 266 brave American officers and enlisted men of our Navy went down to an untimely grave in the waters of the harbor of Habana. A shocked and enraged Nation arose as a single man to demand vengeance and vindication of that valiant crew that had died so gloriously in the service of the Republic. The people were so completely united and feeling was running so high that a purely volunteer fighting force was raised almost overnight. This is the only instance on record where a war was fought from beginning to end between two great powers in which every man engaged, soldier, sailor, and marine was a volunteer. This is the highest tribute that can be said to the men who took part in that war, to those now living or to our honored dead. For every man accepted ten or more were rejected. The aroused spirit of America vowed that this type of atrocity must not happen again. A determined America demanded that our ships in time of peace must be safe in any harbor the world over, respected wherever they might be.

It is also well to note that these volunteers who fought a war without the aid of draftees received little or no pay for their services from their government, in defense of which they offered their all. The pay in those days was only $13 a month for a private. The Congress later increased it 20 percent, which brought it to $15.60. Out of this meager stipend these heroic fighting men of the Regular Establishment, our Regular Army, donated 12½ cents each month towards the maintenance of the National Soldiers' Home, located in Washington, D. C. The Government made no provisions for any special hospitalization for these veterans after the war, gave no bonuses, provided no educational program. Though war was declared April 21, 1898, the first recognition of their valiant service to their country in its time of peril that these veterans received was on June 20, 1920, when, 22 years after the successful conclusion of the war, a pension of $12 per month for the ordinary soldier and seaman and a $30 allowance for the totally disabled were provided. Many of the veterans of the war with Spain did not avail themselves of this opportunity, but instead waited for many years before making applications for the $12 pension which they had so richly earned. That is why we style ourselves as veterans of a war of most unusual character, this because of the manner in which the war with Spain was fought, the vast territories acquired and the many other incidents so unusual and unprecedented.

Nineteen years later we were called upon to fight another war, the war of 1917 and 1918. In that war there were 100 divisions engaged. It is most interesting to note that each of these divisions was commanded by a major general, and each major general was a veteran of the war of 1898, including the commanding general of all American armies, Gen. John J. Pershing, who served as a cavalry officer in Cuba and the Philippines.

These great men made ready this Nation for greater things to come. America is greater today because of them.

At the present time, there are two bills before Congress, one known as H. R. 3396 and the other as H. R. 3397. The first calls for the issuance of a postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of our War with Spain, and, the second one, the coinage of a 50-cent piece to commerate the same event. These meritorious proposals are sponsored by Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART of the Ninth District of California, a veteran of World War I who is, incidentally, an honorary life member of General Jacob H. Smith Camp of the United Spanish War Veterans of Fresno, Calif. His introduction of these most timely measures compliments every veteran of the War with Spain. His bills should be promptly passed.

It is also well to remember that today there is in the Far East, situated in the Southwest Pacific, a new and vigorous young Republic of the Philippines, a Republic of Free Men modeled after our own Republic of the United States of America, a monument to the courage and sacrifice of the intrepid veterans of 1898. The infant Republic in the Philippines, the only Christian race in the Orient, is the direct consequence of the hard fighting which was dedicated and consecrated by the letting of the blood of American soldiers and their native Filipino comrades in arms.

The great credit for the establishment of this young Republic belongs to these veterans. Let us all hope that some day this fine camaraderie of these two great Republics will be an effective contributing factor in reestablishing peace and good will to all of the people of this sorely distracted world. That it will, I am confident.

Most Rev. John J. Wright, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the complete text of the sermon preached by Rev. Gerald Groveland Walsh, S. J., editor of Thought, and former instructor of Bishop Wright when he was a student at the Gregorian University in Rome, at the elevation ceremonies of His Excellency, Most Rev. John J. Wright, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Boston.

"To me the least of all the saints is given this grace to preach among the gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ. And to enlighten all men that they may see * * * that the manifold wisdom of God may be made known * * * through the church." (Ephesians 3: 8–10.)

In the solemn moments of this splendid liturgy memories are being made that we shall take with us to the grave—memories that will remain with us even in the blessedness of our immortal life.

In the first place, we shall never forget that the day chosen for his consecration by Bishop Wright was the day chosen by the church for the commemoration of St. Paul, the vessel of election, the teacher of the nation, the doctor of grace, the passionate lover of our Lord, the "least of all the saints" (as he called himself) to whom was given the grace to preach "the unsearchable riches of Christ."

Whenever we repeat the new bishop's magnificent motto, Resonare Christum, to make the name of Christ resound around the world, it will be impossible for us not to link in our minds this motto with the parallel motto of St. Paul, Investigabiles divitias Christi praedicare.

This link with St. Paul will be but the first of many memories. Who of us, for example, will ever forget that hushed moment, already sculptured indelibly in our memory, when Archbishop Cushing and his assistant bishops placed their hands on the head of the bishop-elect and uttered the sacramental words, Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, receive the holy spirit? For in that moment we realized that God's spirit of light and love came into Boston Cathedral as truly as He came into the upper room, in the form of parted tongues as it were of fire, on the first Pentecost Sunday. We realized, in that moment, that a flame of sacerdotal grace broke into a very blaze of supernatural light, into the fullness of the priestly character which makes a new successor of the Apostles—an authoritative teacher of the nations.

There is another moment still to come that will remain no less indelibly in our memries—the moment when we shall watch the mitre being placed on the new bishop's brow. We shall never forget that scene; and still less shall we forget the symbolism of that scene. For, in a sense, the mitre is a symbol of a Doctorate in Divinity conferred by Christ Himself, the very Light of the World. The Church's prayer will remind us of the miracle that made the face of Moses, after he had spoken with God, brighten with a double flame of clarity and truth. For of that double flame the pointed peaks of the bishop's mitre are a symbol. From now on, it will be impossible for us ever to see the new bishop in his mitre without remembering that he too, like another Moses, has become, by the grace of God, awesome to all enemies of truth—terribilis adversariis veritatis.

And yet I think that, more than all else, we shall remember the exultant moment when our beloved archbishop intones the Te Deum. Today, more than ever before, we shall realize that the Te Deum is the noblest song that man has ever sung since David set his harp aside. We shall never forget our heartfelt share in the singing of that song. "We praise Thee, O God; we hail Thee as our Lord; all earth and heaven, the seraphim and cherubim, with unending song cry out: Holy, holy, holy * * * Thou, O Christ, art king of glory * * * Save Thy people, Lord * * * In Thee, O Lord, is my hope; never, never shall I be confounded."

There is not one of us who will not join in filling this great cathedral with loud echoes from the very depths of our souls. We shall want to make the Bishop's motto come to life—Resonare Christum, to sing with all our hearts the name of Christ, to make the name of Christ re-echo in our hearts and minds and souls.

The hearts even of those of us in this great throng who count ourselves among the last and the least of the Bishop's friends will fill to overflowing in that moment of thanksgiving and of prayer. And then there are those older friends who have known John Wright from childhood. There are those who sat with him in the same high school, college, and seminary classrooms, in Boston and in Rome—those who can recall the brilliant mind and golden tongue of the scholar and debater who was, even then, terrible to the enemies of truth, who was already marked out as an apostle of clarity and truth. And what of those who were his teachers and are here today—those who may humbly claim some little share in the shaping of his conscience, intelligence and taste, in the fashioning of his faith, in the fostering—under God—of his priestly vocation?

And then there are, thank God, those two dear souls whose hearts will ring forever with the echoes of today's Te Deum—that strong father and sweet mother who gave, and still give, their greatest gift to God, who poured out with the reckless generosity of St. Mary of Bethany, from the vase of their single parental heart, this precious perfume to cool the burning feet of Jesus Christ. Their tears of joy will tell us more than words the meaning of the motto, Resonare Christum—to sing the name of Christ with all one's heart and soul.

Leading us all in that exultant song will be the dear father and friend, counselor and consecrator, who is to intone the opening words Te Deum laudamus. Our beloved Archbishop Cushing, whose single and undiluted passion it has ever been that all the world may know Thee—ut cognoscant Te—Thee, the one true God and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent—how shall He not rejoice that today another mitered apostle of divine clarity and truth has been given to help him in the task of teaching man's muddled and troubled world God's way and truth and life?

And yet in no heart here will the great song of Thanksgiving and petition echo quite so deeply as in the heart of Bishop Wright himself. More than to all others God will give him the grace to sing the "inexhaustible riches of Christ"—resonare Christum. The Te Deum that he will sing will fill his apostolic soul, his scholar's mind, his human—and no less humanistic—heart, with a flood of prayer and thought and joy and resolution.

And thereby hangs a tale—a tale that must be told however briefly. It is the tale that links the bishop's motto, "Resonare Christum," with the author of the Te Deum as we shall hear it sung today. It is the story of St. Paulinus of Nola and Nicetas of Remesiana.

Paulinus and Nicetas lived in the fourth century, in the Golden Age of Christian humanism, in the age of Basil and Augustine, of Ambrose and John Chrysostom, of Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzen, and of a score of other bishops and doctors of the church who managed somewhow, by the gifts and grace of God, to pray like mystics and toil like saints, to think like philosophers and write like scholars, to dream like poets and yet to make decisions with the energy of statesmen. God gave lavishly of His supernatural graces to the bishops of that age; but there was something magnificent too, in the way these saints, merely as men, nurtured their human nature. They paved the way, as it were, for the supernatural inspirations of the Holy Spirit by a Roman and stoic discipline of their wills. They flung every door wide open to the supernatural illuminations of the word of God by turning the keys in the last recesses of their minds. They adorned what was to be the supernatural temple of the Blessed Trinity by the human carpets and tapestries of feeling and of fancy. They kept their whole beings alive and alert by the minstrelsy of song.

In a word, Paulinus and Nicetas were bishops who believed that it is good and pleasing to God to be not only saints but likewise poets, scholars, friends. Paulinus lived in Nola in Campania, not far from Naples on the Via Latina, one of the great high roads of Roman culture and civilization. Nicetas, his friend, was a hard-working, apostolic bishop living amid the snowclad mountains of what is now the wild and troubled land of Yugoslavia, sacred in our consciousness today as the scene of the persecution of the heoric Archbishop Stepinac. Periodically he came to Rome to visit the tomb of St. Peter. There with Paulinus he would kneel and pray; and afterward the two friends would rest and jest, as only saints and Christian humanists know how, under the shadow of the basilica that Paulinus had built in Nola. It was during these hours of holy yet human friendship that Nicetas would hum the melody of a new hymn, the Te Deum. And when at last he came to leave; to face once more the hard task of bending the wild wills of barbarians to the sweet yoke of Christ's ways and truth and life, Paulinus would send along a farewell song written in the lovely Sapphic meter of a Latin ode.

One of these farewell songs remains; and from this song Bishop Wright has taken his splendid motto, resonare Christum. "Go if you must," Paulinus pleads, "but leave your heart behind you." I memor nostri remaneque vadens. It is a line in which you can feel the careful felicity and playful humanity of Horace himself. The poet bishop pictures the long and dangerous voyage of his friends; he prays that our Lord may clear the skies and calm the sea; he imagines that the rough sailors of the Aegean, listening to Nicetas singing the Te Deum, will want to abandon their own rollicking songs of the sea; then he turns to the epic greatness of the apostle working among barbarians whose heads and hearts are harder than the ice on their mountain tops. Nevertheless, he sings, it is these barbarians who will learn to sing with all their hearts the name of Jesus Christ, Barbari discunt resonare Christum.

That is the lovely line from which Bishop Wright has taken his episcopal motto. Like that other familiar motto, ut cognoscant Te, it is the motto of a bishop in love with clarity and truth. It is the motto of a man who, like Moses, has talked with God and has come away from meditation with his heart and head aflame. It is the motto of a bishop who understood the symbolic meaning of his mitre. It is the motto of a bishop who has not only received but has been filled with the Holy Spirit, who has heard in his heart a sound from heaven, as of a mighty wind coming, who has felt in his soul a parted tongue as it were of fire, who will want to speak, as the Apostles on the first Pentecost spoke, in such wise that all can hear, each in his own tongue, in a language each can understand, the wonderful works of God.

It is, I think, this last pentecostal and pauline grace that Bishop Wright has particularly prayed for—the grace to speak a language that each can understand, that the modern world with its babel of tongue can understand. Like St. Paul and like St. Paulinus he wants so to sing the name of Christ that the song will find an echo in the hearts and minds even of our non-Catholic contemporaries.

In taking a motto that has in its very sound an overtone of the spacious spirit of the age of Paulinus, he is reminding us that the Catholic apostolate for Christ particularly in this capital of American culture, must remain faithful to the tradition of Catholic humanism, in which sanctity and song, supernatural life and human learning walk hand in hand. It is, in St. Paul's phrase, the "manifold wisdom of God" that He wants to "be made known * * * through the church." He prays today, and he asks us all to pray, that to him will be "given the grace to preach among the gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." That, I feel, is the meaning and the motive of his motto, Resonare Christum.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following letter printed in the Washington Times-Herald July 8, 1947, written by Marvin Klemme:

I have just seen the moving picture, Passport to Nowhere. In fact, I was so interested in it that I went back to see it the second time.

I want to say that, in my opinion, this is the biggest piece of propaganda from the screen since Mission to Moscow.

I have just returned from Germany myself after spending over 2 years with UNRRA looking after these very same displaced persons. At least 80 percent of this film is misrepresentation in that it will lead an uninformed person to believe something that is not true.

These people are not wandering around over the country as this picture shows. They are living in large camps mostly, but some are living in requisitioned Germans' hotels, resorts, and private homes.

Their living standard is considerably above that of the Germans because, in addition to receiving the German ration scale, they also received additional food, clothing and amenity supplies through UNRRA and other agencies.

If they do not keep clean it is their own fault. I will say though that in the majority of the camps they do keep clean and that this picture is a misrepresentation.

The children shown digging in garbage dumps are more likely to be German or Italian children for there is absolutely no excuse for DP children to be doing this.

In order to get Congress to pass the Stratton immigration bill a lot of phony information is going out. This movie, as well as miscellaneous printed propaganda, would lead the American public to believe that the 850,000 DP's in Germany were all victims of Nazi slave labor and concentration camps.

This is simply not true.

The statement that about 80 percent of these people were in Germany when the war ended is very misleading. The 175,000 Balts (Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians) are almost entirely refugees from Soviet Russia, although they did arrive in Germany before the war ended. This is largely true of the Ukrainians and the more educated classes of the Poles.

The Yugoslavs are known as King Peter Yugoslavs and are afraid to go home as long as Tito has control of their country.

So far as the almost 200,000 Jews are concerned, probably less than 30,000 of them were in Germany at the time the war ended. One of the UNRRA officials at Belsen, where there are about 11,000 Jews, told me that they had been unable to find more than 100 who were there when the war ended.

The great majority of these people came in from Poland, Russia, and other of the central and southeastern European countries. They were all on their way, or so they thought, to Palestine, and with the help of Russia.

It may interest our Congress to know that large sums of nice new German paper money, apparently run off by the Russians with those plates that we loaned them, were found in the possession of these people.

The British blockade of this "second exodus to Palestine" left most of them stranded in the United States zone. Our military people want to get rid of them, and they don't care particularly where they go.

Checks indicate that well over 90 percent of them want to go to Palestine. The United States is second or third choice with them and if they are permitted to come over here they will still want to go to Palestine.

If I were a Member of the United States Congress I would certainly vote against the Stratton bill as it is now drawn up. I would probably vote for it if it were amended somewhat as follows:

1. To take a reasonable number of orphans or unaccompanied children.

Actually the number available will be small because children over there are in demand and most of those countries are competing with each other to prove claim to them.

2. Blood relatives—fathers, mothers, sons, daughters, brothers, and sisters of people who are now citizens of the United States.

3. A reasonable number of agricultural and forestry workers to take the place of so many of our young people who are flocking to the cities because farm life is too monotonous for them.

It appears to me that if this concession could be made and considering the fact that we have already taken a couple of hundred thousand of these people in one form or another, as well as furnishing large sums for relief, that we will have done more than our share.

There is a limit to what any country can do.

MARVIN KLEMME,
Formerly Forestry and Agriculturist Adviser with UNRRA in Germany.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on July 5, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities, and my congressional district, another brilliant week-end is at hand with several important speaking engagements in our patriotic area to be met.

The Fourth of July always presents an opportunity to emphasize Americanism. This year we must be ready not only to stress Americanism but to champion it. All we have to do is to look at those who hate our representative form of government and we realize how serious the challenge to us is becoming.

You will find that those who are against America are against just about everything that is worthwhile in this life. They are likewise against religion; they do not believe in any god. They are against progress; they do not want to see industrial or domestic peace. They are against a decent standard of living for the American people. Lastly, they are against tolerance and freedom of the individual.

These enemies much prefer to see chaos and disorder, poverty and unhappiness, misery and want. They would rather gloat over an American shambles than to yield one degree of their hatred.

They would pull down the temple on their own heads if, by so doing, they could destroy our liberty and justice.

Our duty, of course, is to fight back. We must resist to the limit all suggestions of discrimination of race or religion. We must blot out intolerance, regardless of where it raises its murderous head.

All we have to do here in America is to abide by the Golden Rule, which says, "Do unto others as you would like them to do unto you." That is the true essence of Americanism, and that is why our kind of living will triumph over all the rest.

There has been a great to-do recently in Binghamton about the elimination of certain candidates for public office because of their apparent failure to present adequate and proper designating petitions. The technicalities of the various laws on this subject of filing petitions are many and enough to baffle even persons most familiar with them.

Personally, I believe our laws governing such technicalities ought to be revised so everybody can understand them. After all, no one should be deprived of seeking public office, at least if he or she is a citizen in good standing.

In the past few years, I have read of much agitation on the part of civic groups and community leaders everywhere calling for better people to aspire to public office. The only way you will obtain better candidates is to get more candidates to seek election.

The solution, then, is to encourage, rather than discourage, those who are energetic enough to aspire to office. If they are to be barred by laws which act as a hindrance rather than an incentive to letting people run for office, then something is wrong. I say, make the American election system work by simplifying the procedure a candidate must go through to get his name on the ballot. That is the fair, impartial way and should be carried out. It is not the case of anybody being at fault. The law is merely a little complicated.

To you veterans who responded so overwhelmingly when I asked your views about terminal-leave bonds, I extend thanks. Your letters are a tower of strength to me.

Of course, I knew all along what you were thinking. I realize that 99 percent of you want those bonds paid off in cash. But I wanted to show the wiseacres that you aren't kidding.

Few will argue that the enlisted men of World War II received the worst deal of their military service when they were denied cash for the terminal leave in the first place. Everybody knows that what policy is fair for officers is fair for buck privates.

The officers got their terminal leave in cash. Why shouldn't the GI?

But there are some, unfortunately, who look down upon the common soldier. They think he is dirt under their feet. That is, until a war comes.

Then the sky's the limit. Nothing is too good for him. We'll pay him double time and give him the GI bill of rights and a bonus besides, they cry. All this, they promise while the war lasts.

But as soon as peace comes, they settle down, put tongue in cheek and hand in pocket and forget about any promise they ever made.

I suppose the same kind of people existed in Kipling's day for you will recall the lines he wrote about the British soldier:

For it's Tommy this an' Tommy that, an' "Chuck 'im out, the brute!"
But it's "Savior of 'is country" when the guns begin to shoot.
An' it's Tommy this an' Tommy that, an' anything you please.
But Tommy ain't a bloomin' fool. You can bet that Tommy sees.

Thank you.

Facing a Practical Problem on FBI Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, more and more thinking people are coming to realize that we are faced with a practical problem in dealing with one of our great

arms of national defense—the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

A few days ago the House passed a bill, H. R. 2826 and S. 715, previously approved by the Senate, which would meet this situation, but discomforting reports are afloat as to the fate of the bill at the White House. This bill has to do with improved retirement security.

Last evening the Washington Evening Star commented:

It is hard to credit reports that President Truman may veto the bill to liberalize retirement benefits for special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Pointing to the heavy loss being suffered by the FBI whose agents are turning to private industry, the Star editorial says:

The FBI so far has had no difficulty in securing replacements, but the new men must be trained at great length and they lack the fund of information which the departing men carry with them.

It is my pleasure to introduce this measure in the House and the authors of the bill in the Senate were Senators STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota.

This morning, Mr. George E. Reedy, popular commentator for radio station WOL discussed this problem at length, and under unanimous consent, I submit for the consideration of my colleagues his statement on this important subject.

It follows:

A disquieting rumor has been floating through the halls of Congress for several days. It is, that President Truman may veto the recently approved bill to set up special retirement benefits, for agents of the FBI.

It is difficult to see how a veto of this bill, could be justified. For it is not a measure designed just to afford a better living, for a group of Government workers. It is a bill, to help us maintain intact, one of our most vital, defense agencies.

The legislation has been urged by both Attorney General Tom Clark, and Chief G-man, J. Edgar Hoover. They are both, frankly worried, at the high rate at which FBI men are leaving the service, to enter private industry.

A better retirement system, they believe, may be one method of slowing down this rate. Their arguments were sufficiently convincing to induce Congress, to pass the bill without a dissenting vote. No opposition could be drummed up against it.

It is not hard to find the reason that the agents leave the service in such large numbers. Their work is difficult and dangerous, and many find themselves unable to carry on, past a certain point. They are simply burned out, while still relatively young.

Coupled with that, is the fact that the FBI demands the very highest qualifications of its recruits. They must have a law degree, or be certified public accountants. Either requirement, is something that a man can meet, only at considerable expense to himself.

Inside the agency, they receive training that makes them highly valuable, to private industry. It makes them so valuable, that they are often presented with a job, paying three or four times as much, as the highest salary the FBI can offer.

Many of the agents who have left the service, say they would have turned down these offers, if they could have been guaranteed security. The money was attractive, because it offered a surety, that their families would be cared for, after they were past working age.

Up to this point, the FBI has had no difficulty securing replacements. However, each man that goes, means the loss of valuable experience. It takes several years to train the man who will take his place—several years, and at least $6,000.

The bill now on the President's desk would make it possible for special agents to retire at 50. Actually, most of them would stay in service beyond that point. The compelling inducement is that the security is there if they become unable to work.

In view of the tremendous performance turned in by the G-men, during the last war, improved security benefits is a cheap price to pay for a stable staff. We already know they are vital to the defense of our country.

Only one argument has been advanced against the bill. It is that other agencies such as the Narcotics Division or the Secret Service are entitled to similar benefits. It is said that this legislation would be discriminatory.

The argument that the other services are entitled to similar benefits, may have some merit. That is something that could be determined only by a thorough investigation. However, it is difficult to see what this has to do with the FBI bill.

The legislation is now before the President, and it is too late to amend it. Whatever happens, nothing further could be done at this session of Congress. Meanwhile, we are faced with the practical problem of maintaining the agency as a going concern.

Gratitude alone should be a sufficient reason for enacting the bill into law. There are, however, compelling arguments for those looking for practical motives for legislation. The simple truth is that we need the kind of FBI we have built up in this country.

We need an agency of efficient, highly trained men, who realize that in a democracy they must do their job without becoming a Gestapo. We have that kind of an organization now. Any legislation that will continue it, deserves the approval of all Americans.

Government Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Subcommittee on Government Corporations of the Senate Appropriations Committee:

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to give testimony to the committee on the subject of H. R. 3756, a House appropriation bill covering the fiscal year 1948, containing section 308, an amendment to the Government Corporation Act of 1945. This section brings under the Control Act certain mixed Government corporations. One of these is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to which I address myself in particular, Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that the directors of that Corporation have passed out certain statements in an effort to lobby against this action on the part of the House of Representatives.

In one such statement which was handed to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, and subsequently handed to me for reply, the FDIC attempted eight arguments. I shall take these arguments as they were listed, quote them, and express my opinion on each for whatever benefit it may give in assisting this committee to approve the House action.

1. Argument of FDIC: "The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation cannot estimate expenditures required to pay deposit insurance claims in closed insured banks. Mortality tables for banks cannot be established."

I agree that the FDIC cannot estimate expenditures required to pay deposit insurance claims in closed insured banks. The FDIC is an insurance company which insures banks' deposits. In a broader sense, it has virtually assumed the insurance of the assets of these banks. Being an insurance company, claims cost should not, and as far as our committee is concerned, would not be considered administrative expense. Claims cost should and would comprise two principal items: pure loss and claims expense. I cannot help but believe that any competent insurance company administrator would concur with this statement. The statement on the part of the directors of FDIC that mortality tables for banks cannot be established, would have no effect upon the good judgment of the Congress in appropriating for administrative expenses of the Insurance Corporation.

2. Argument of FDIC: "If deposit insurance expenditures could be estimated, they should not be made public as such action would, in effect, be predicting bank failures and thus would undermine confidence in banks."

To asume that the Congress intends to make public contemplated losses and thereby imperil the banking system of this Nation is to impute an unworthy motive to the Congress and a degree of carelessness which, in my experience, I have never witnessed. This argument is closely related to the first and I think properly answered—in the only sense that it is an argument—by my first statement.

3. Argument of FDIC: "To impose annual limitations on the Corporation's expenditures would, from the public's viewpoint, place deposit insurance on a year-to-year basis and would destroy its permanent character and impair public confidence in deposit insurance."

It is not in any sense true that congressional appropriation placing limitations on corporation expenditures for 1 year in any way or fashion imperils the permanency of the corporation's character, or would it in any degree impair public confidence in insurance. Some have assumed that this insurance corporation is a mutual. Search of the statute does not reveal any definition of mutuality, but does very clearly reveal that the liability of the Federal Government is greatly beyond that of its original capital of $150,000,000. The liability of the insured banks is limited to an annual assessment of one-twelfth of 1 percent of the average difference between total deposit liability and the total uncollected items included in such deposits. Reference is made to United States Code VII, title 12, section 264, paragraph (o) (1), (2), and paragraph (h) (1). It is somewhat difficult to define legally the limits of the liability of the Federal Government as expressed in this particular paragraph of the statute. There may be some doubt as to what the legal limit of liability is, but it may be assumed from these paragraphs that the liability is limited legally to somewhat in excess of a billion dollars. From a practical standpoint, however, there is little doubt that liability is unlimited since the public believes that the Government stands 100 percent behind these deposits. In view of this circumstance, it is very doubtful whether there should ever be a time when the Federal Government relinquishes its capital stock interest or its annual review.

To assume that an annual budget, which surely these directors made for themselves, is a year-to-year estimation of life, is to say that the Army or the Navy or the Treasury or the Interior Department has only a 1-year life; therefore, the confidence of the public

in these departments of the Federal Government is imperiled. This argument is of a somewhat careless nature. As a matter of fact, the great confidence in the FDIC by the public is due to the assumption on the part of the public that the Federal Government at least morally guarantees the Insurance Corporation's obligations. Yet the directors of the Corporation would have its status be one of governmental moral obligation and lack of fiscal review on the part of the responsible legislative branch.

4. Argument of FDIC: "Fixing budgetary limitations solely on administrative expenses would not work because the administrative expenses of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are inseparably tied to direct insurance expenses."

Their fourth argument as stated was answered in my reply to their first argument.

5. Argument of FDIC: "If blanket authority should be given in an annual appropriation, there would be no point in submitting a budget."

This assumes that the Congress, if it made a blanket appropriation, would do so without reviewing the budget. This Corporation, operating free and independent of congressional review, apparently is not aware of the obligation which has been assumed by and between the appropriating authority of the Congress and various Government departments to keep faith as nearly as possible with their budget justifications.

6. Argument of FDIC: "The Corporation's expenditures do not come out of the Treasury. They are paid out of the permanent insurance fund for insuring deposits established by law into which insured banks pay assessments. None of the Government capital invested in the Corporation has ever been used. There is pending a bill to authorize repayment of Government capital to the Treasury. When the Government capital is repaid, there will be even less basis for these restrictions and controls."

The argument that the Corporation's expenditures do not come out of the Treasury, of course, is an argument which might be applied to Government corporations in the main; and if such argument was assumed good and conclusive, there would be no reason whatever for the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945, which, in turn, of course, is the sole reason for H. R. 3756—an appropriation bill. The statement has been made that none of the Government capital invested in the Government Corporation has ever been used. I do not know what is meant by this statement. If there is no need for this corporation structure, then good management on the part of the Director would have recommended its return to the Treasury. I certainly am not assuming that there is no such need. If and when the time arrives when the subscribing banks repay the Government capital invested in the Corporation and the FDIC becomes an entity owned wholly outside the Government, it would not come under the Government Corporation Control Act and should not, in my opinion. But concurrent with such a time, both legal and moral obligations of the Federal Government should clearly be defined. If either are to exist, then it becomes congressional responsibility to review fiscal control. I believe that congressional responsibility exists today and it has been the unanimous opinion of the House subcommittee; the unanimous opinion of the House Appropriations Committee; and the unanimous opinion of the House by vote in the passage of H. R. 3756.

7. Argument of FDIC: "It would take away the broad powers of the Corporation and would impair the ability of the Corporation to take prompt action in an emergency."

This statement is without foundation and is an argument drawn from the imagination entirely.

8. Argument of FDIC: "The banks have paid assessments into the fund for more than 12 years in reliance on the broad powers given to the Corporation and its ability to perform effectively the functions for which it was established. To now place it on a year-to-year basis would be a breach of confidence with the insured banks and the 90,000,000 depositors who were led to believe that the Corporation would always be in a position to pay insured deposits without restriction or delay."

The broad powers of the Corporation in its function and integrity as an insuror are not, in any fashion, imperiled by this legislation. The opposite is quite true. The confidence between the insured depositors and the Federal Government, in my opinion, would be greatly strengthened—not weakened—by this action. There have been some banks which have used the arguments handed out in the lobbying activities of the Directors of the FDIC, yet I think their fears have been stirred only by the activity of FDIC which has left obviously a false impression in some places. The public has every right to have continued confidence in the FDIC with an increased degree in its feeling of security because of the annual review by the Congress. The activity of the Directors of the FDIC need not cause any question in the mind of any depositor. It is the common custom in Government in Washington for various bureaus, departments, or even Government corporation managers to assume that they are without error. No one has the right to assume that the Directors of any Government corporation are immunized against all nature of mistake which we find so human in the rest of us.

The capital stock owned by the Federal Reserve System does not carry any voting rights in the FDIC. The capital stock owned by the Federal Government does not carry any voting rights. The three-man directorate is appointed by the President of the United States and they assume full authority without review for the operation of the Corporation under the law. The statute provides many privileges which go beyond the mere issuing of insurance and could have a controlling effect upon the very banking system of the Nation. This power is granted to three appointees of the President and these appointees say that the representatives of the people who are responsible through their tax revenues for the full liability of the insurance corporation should not review that for which they are liable. It should be stated that section 307 in H. R. 3756 does not impair the corporate contractual or loan authority of any of the Government corporations. The same is true of those corporations included in section 308.

This case is parallel to another insurance corporation and principally owned by the Federal Government which is under the control of the Government Corporation Control Act, and that is the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. It is, furthermore, similar in its insurance aspects to the Federal Housing Administration, which is a mutual insurance corporation owned by the Federal Government. Has public confidence in either of these been breached by congressional fiscal control? And I dare say they both bear reputations equal to that of the FDIC.

The status of other Government corporations as effected by section 308 is explained by repeating what I had to say on the House floor on June 11.

Mr. Chairman, in certain provisions of this bill, part of title III, the committee, of course, recommended and sought to accomplish extension of the same congressional controls over certain mixed Government corporations as has been extended over wholly owned Government corporations, the purpose being that there is really no difference in interest. The majority stock of these corporations is owned by the Federal Government, in one case the overwhelming majority; as much as 99 percent is owned by the Federal Government; so the same rule of congressional appropriation guidance and control should apply to these corporations as would apply to one that is 100 percent owned by the Government.

In order that the RECORD might be more informative, under the same privilege to extend my remarks, I am going to include at this point in the RECORD a chart of the comparative ownership percentages of Government and other enterprises in these mixed corporations:

Ownership of capital stock in mixed-ownership Government corporations

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

U. S. Government (Treasury Department)	$150,000,000.00
12 Federal Reserve banks	139,299,566.99

NOTE.—This represents the original subscriptions and paid-in stock of FDIC as of January 1, 1934. There has been no change and the figures are still correct today.

CENTRAL BANKS FOR COOPERATIVES

June 30, 1946:	
U. S. Government	$76,500,000
Borrowers (cooperatives, etc.)	1,197,000
Total	77,697,000
Apr. 30, 1947:	
U. S. Government	76,500,000
Borrowers (cooperatives, etc.)	787,300
Total	77,287,300

DISTRICT BANKS FOR COOPERATIVES

June 30, 1946:	
U. S. Government	$102,000,000
Borrowers	5,285,000
Total	107,285,000
Apr. 30, 1947:	
U. S. Government	102,000,000
Borrowers	[1] 7,585,600
Total	109,585,600

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS

June 30, 1946:	
U. S. Government (RFC)	$123,651,200
Member institutions	79,559,450
Total	203,210,650
May 31, 1947:	
U. S. Government (RFC)	122,672,200
Member institutions	94,935,200
Total	217,607,400

[1] Plus $70,800 paid into guaranty fund.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does deal with vast appropriated sums. Other supply bills seem to dwarf this by their amounts. But this bill is most significant in that it deals with functions of Government which influence or control the credit structure of the Nation's economy.

Total assets of all wholly owned Government corporations—including Commodity Credit Corporation, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—as of June 30, 1947, are estimated to be approximately $11,800,000,000. The total unobligated borrowing authority of these corporations as of March 31, 1947, was approximately $18,600,000,000. The value of all assets and unobligated borrowing authority at present is approximately $30,400,000,000. This figure $30,400,000,000, can be said to represent the total amount of money, including assets valued in terms of money, which wholly owned Government corporations have under their control at the present time.

Could any bill be more significant in its effect upon the economy? Because of the national and international impact of this vast credit operation it is imperative that the Congress take and hold authority of both

expenses and assets of these corporations. In the past it has become a lost responsibility. When this bill becomes law it will properly be a current responsibility. These assets—and what is equally important—the liabilities of the corporations are the assets and liabilities of the people through their Government. The only board of directors in this Government which directly represents the people is the Congress. It is our duty and we must, in my opinion, and the opinion of this committee, carefully assume the performance of such duty.

Robert Kirkland Henry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ROBERT KIRKLAND HENRY, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, which was set aside for memorial services for our departed Members, I was privileged to say a few words to express my admiration and respect for my predecessor in this House from the Second District of Wisconsin, the Honorable ROBERT K. HENRY.

Today, I would like to add to the RECORD the words of a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the Wisconsin State Republican convention at Madison on June 21, 1947. Mr. Speaker, the people of Wisconsin will not forget the fine record of public service of this great, good man.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin in convention assembled, does hereby pause in recollection of the late ROBERT K. HENRY, deceased Congressman from the Second Wisconsin District, and in memory of his service to the Nation, to our State, and to the Republican Party; and

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the chairman of the Republican Party of Wisconsin to Mrs. Henry.

John Paul Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, July 6, 1947, by Henry Gillen, on John Paul Jones:

JOHN PAUL JONES
(By Henry Gillen)

John Paul Jones was the raging easter, John Paul Jones was the knuckled pine, high on the hill by the endless ocean, America's sinew and bone and spine, brashly brave with a brave man's caution and ingenuity of the wise, and over it all the contemplation of lone men under the lonesome skies.

John Paul Jones was the landsman's laughter; give him the sea and he found his place, the silencing sea with the long horizon, fenceless and free for those who pace, bright and brimming and skyward sweeping, rolling or rough with tips of chalk, prairie-wide for the full-sail gallop, yet narrow enough for a ship to stalk.

They will dance today in the highland heather, the pipes will sing on the bonny road, as men with medals and kilt and bonnet, parade to honor the wee abode, the stonehouse known as the "Gardener's Cottage," where Jonathan Jones first came to earth, twenty decades ago this dawning, sweet by the side of Solway Firth.

It's an humble place in the land of castles, a Scotch log cabin and yet the home, of the rival of Drake and even Nelson, the nest of the fledgling raised to roam the continents and the many oceans, through thirty-odd summers and thirty-odd springs, mariner bold and the mighty captain, the lance of freedom and bane of kings.

He was only 12 when he left the lintel and only 12 when he sailed away, apprentice-boy in the stout craft *Friendship*, and nobody now to recall the day, whether he wept at the bitter parting, or whether his eye was on a star, and he thrilled alive to the long sea going and the land that beckoned, America.

There are years between when he rode the slavers, cabin boy, able and mate at last; there are years between when he watched and brooded, on men in shackles before the mast; and years between that are dark with flogging, mutiny, murder, and decks run red, and years between when he called on courage and those who tested it soon were dead.

He was no muscled or shouldered stalwart, but 5 foot 6 and wiry thin, plain of face in a manner homely, yet the eyes could tell of the blaze within, the glowing fire and sparkling daring, the swift resolve and the temper taut, the spur of the lash of always winning, and never quitting which foes forgot.

Beached on the shore of a little township, jobless, jackless and hand-to-mouth, living it out on the generous pockets, of lovable friends in our kindly South, who would have dreamed that a highland stranger, plucked by destiny, named by fate, would raise our flag to the Ranger's masthead, in the middle of freedom's great debate?

As many a good man then and after, he found himself in the knock-down league, where petty carpers and politicians, would tear him down with their grim intrigue; but Jones was a man who cleared all hurdles, in one or another way so smart, he swept beyond them and left them gnashing with angered looks and an envious heart.

Fathomless, how could they hope to fathom genius, courage and fearless gall? Poetical, how could they probe a poet who fought with a sword so lyrical? Philosopher, how could they find his measure, who charmed a Franklin, Adams and all? Troubadour, how could they match the singing, the Bonhomme Richard sang one fall?

Under the moonlight, golden moonlight, etched in that moonlight with scarfs of cloud, how could the skipper of the *Serapis*, know of a head that was never bowed, know of a man who would not surrender, when any old ship would have run in fright, know of a man who wrecked and shattered, shouted, "I haven't begun to fight!"

But the people knew in the little Nation, seeking freedom and unafraid; John Paul Jones was their heartlight burning, John Paul Jones was their accolade; John Paul Jones was the bonfire blazing, John Paul Jones was the speaking gun, lifting a starlit, blood-born banner, high to the skies of a foreign sun.

Raise him aloft for the world to see him; hold him on high to the morning light; here is a sailor who was a nation, salt of the earth in freedom's flight; here is a man who is now an epic, history shrine him and bless his bones; unto our children now we give him—gallantry—greatness—John Paul Jones.

The Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the housing shortage in this country is becoming more critical daily. I believe that before this House adjourns, we must enact a strong housing bill—the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

BOSTON, MASS., *July 1, 1947.*
Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Now that Congress and the President have made the rent-control bill a law, and my landlord is not willing to offer me a lease, even at a 15-percent increase, I would greatly appreciate any suggestion you may care to make as to where I can find a place for my wife and children to live after next February.

Yours very truly,
WESTON W. ADAMS,
USNR, 1942–46.

BOSTON, MASS.
The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: We unanimously endorse the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill (S. 866) and urge its immediate passage.

FOURTH METHODIST CHURCH.

Strong Medicine for UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jack Ramey from the Cincinnati Enquirer of June 15, 1947:

STRONG MEDICINE FOR UN
(By Jack Ramey)

The most constructive proposals yet advanced for eliminating the weaknesses hamstringing UN may be found in the quota force plan devised by American Legion, Post 218, Middletown, Ohio, and now being promoted by the American Legion as a whole.

Most critics rant against UN with good reason. But, after they cry out against the veto, after they insist upon organization of a genuine world police force, after they list Security Council failures, the critics crawl back into their holes, curl up and go to sleep. Nothing constructive is proposed to save UN, prevent the atomic war.

The Middletown Post's quota-force plan, endorsed by the Ohio State House of Representatives, is constructive throughout. Once in effect, it would prevent the land-grabbing and government-grabbing technique being practiced by Russia.

Should the program be promoted full-heartedly, as it should be, by every American Legion post, it is not difficult to conceive it becoming a United States plan, then a plan accepted by other nations, and then emerging as the plan to reform UN into the organization it should be.

Quota force would reorganize the United Nations Security Council and the World Court. It would place 10 members, 2 each from the United States, Britain, and Russia, 1 each from France and China, and 2 selected by the remaining member states, on the Security Council.

It would abolish the veto right of major states in cases of aggression or preparation for aggression. In cases involving aggression, Security Council decision would be made by a majority of 6 out of 10. In matters other than aggression, the five major powers would retain their right to veto.

It would define aggression and preparation for aggression. Aggression would be an attack with weapons of violence by the government of a sovereign state, or by its citizens with its acquiescence, against the territory of citizens of another sovoreign state. Preparation for aggression would be production of scientific weapons beyond agreed quotas, or refusal to submit to authorized inspection, or the massing of troops at another nation's border.

The World Court would be revised with power to interpret the revised UN Charter and to determine when preparation for aggression existed. Its composition would be similar to the Security Council except that its members would serve long terms, perhaps life terms. Its decisions, by majority vote, would be binding upon governments, corporations, and individuals.

The Security Council would be empowered to suppress aggression and to control heavy and scientific weapons, including the atomic bomb, with the World Court to interpret the powers.

An Atomic Development Authority would be responsible for control of atomic weapons along the lines of the Baruch proposal. The Authority would be responsible, too, for prevention of biological or chemical warfare.

The Security Council would be empowered to limit the total quantity of warplanes, warships, rockets, and heavy artillery produced in the world each year and to allot to each of the five major powers an individual production quota, and to allot to the remaining member states a collective production quota to be produced by a nonprofit armament authority operated by the Security Council.

Suggested armament production quotas: United States, Britain, and Russia, 20 percent each; France and China, 10 percent each; the smaller member states, a collective quota of 20 percent.

The Security Council would maintain staffs of inspectors and establish branches of the Atomic Development Authority throughout the world.

Refusal by a member state to submit to the inspection or to recognize the authority of the Security Council and World Court would constitute an act of preparation for aggression.

A strong world police force would be organized and equipped to support impartially the powers of the Security Council.

The world police force would be comprised of an active international contingent and five national contingents ready to operate as reserves whenever needed.

The Security Council would establish and maintain under its direct control the active international contingent, composed of volunteers from the small member states only. The volunteers would be recruited in national units, to constitute a professional Army, highly paid, highly trained, and highly disciplined. The Army would owe allegiance to the Security Council only, and would be equipped with the collective heavy weapons produced by the Armament Authority in the smaller member states. The Army's heavy weapons would be 20 percent of the five major powers' production, or equal to that assigned to the United States, Britain or Russia, respectively.

The Security Council could cause the International Contingent to move against any state found guilty by the World Court of preparation for aggression. In event of actual aggression, the International Contingent should move immediately to resist the aggressor. The International Contingent could be stationed temporarily in German or any other occupied enemy territory as troops of occupation.

The national contingents would consist of the national armed forces of the five major powers, and would be equipped with the heavy weapons allotted to them in their respective quotas. The national contingents would help and reenforce the international contingent whenever needed, and the need would be determined by majority vote of the Security Council.

Should the national contingents not be sufficiently strong to repel an aggressor, other national contingents would be called out, with the consent of their respective governments.

The quota force plan, approved by the national executive committee of the American Legion, is being promoted from Washington by the national legislative committee of the Legion.

Its strong medicine could vitalize the spindly and weak-kneed United Nations.

Modernize Our Presidential Election—II. The Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, our electoral college is similar to a system of election established in the State of Maryland before our Constitution was adopted. The State of Maryland, by provision in its constitution of 1776, provided for the election of a body of men similar to our electoral college for the purpose of selecting State senators for Maryland. It provided that these delegates to select senators should be elected every 5 years; six of the senators should be from the east shore and nine from the west shore. The selecting body was to meet at Annapolis and choose the senators. That provision declared it was the duty of the delegates to choose men of the "most wisdom, experience, and virtue," who had at least £1,000 of property.

Under the Articles of Confederation which preceded the Constitution there was no Senate or President. Each State had not less than two or more than seven Representatives. Each State had only one vote in the Congress, and that vote was determined by the majority vote of the Representatives from that State. Where there was a tie vote in the delegation, the State had no vote.

When the adoption of the Constitution was under consideration, there was a bitter fight between the small and the large States as to the relative strength, or part, each should have in participating in the control of the Federal Government. The little States demanded equality with the big States, regardless of population. The big States demanded representation in proportion to population.

The compromise finally agreed upon made the Constitution possible. It provided for equal representation of the States in the Senate regardless of population. It gave to each State, as represented in the Senate, authority equal to that it had exercised in the House of Representatives under the Confederation.

The little States surrendered their equal representation in the House of Representatives. It was agreed that each State should have a number of Representatives in proportion to its part of the total population of the States, no State to have less than one Representative.

Each State was granted electoral votes equal to the number of its Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Under the system adopted the people of the United States have no constitutional right to vote for President. The legislatures of the States are given the privilege of appointing Presidential electors in whatever method they may direct. A very striking illustration of this authority of the legislature was exhibited in the election of 1812. The State of New Jersey had a law giving the people a right to vote for Presidential electors. The dominant political party in New Jersey feared that its vote was going contrary to its desires. So the Legislature of New Jersey, 3 days before election, for political reasons, changed the law, denied the people of their State the right to vote for President, and selected the electors representing that State in the election of 1812.

This plan of the Constitution makes the electoral vote a common unit of the States for the expression of the Nation's will in the election of a President. With the recurring census every 10 years, the relative strength of each State is readjusted to correspond to changes in its population in proportion to the whole population of the country.

Alexander Hamilton was a great exponent of the Constitution. Writing in the Federalist, he made this classical statement:

> It is not contended that the number of people in each State ought not to be the standard for regulating the proportion of those who are to represent the people of each State.
>
> It is a fundamental principle of the proposed Constitution that as the aggregate number of representatives allotted to the several States is to be determined by a Federal rule, founded on the aggregate number of inhabitants; so the right of choosing this allotted number in each State is to be exercised by such part of the inhabitants as the State itself may designate.
>
> The qualifications on which the right of suffrage depend are not, perhaps, the same in any two States. In some of the States, the difference is very material. In every State, a certain proportion of inhabitants are deprived of this right by the constitution of the State, who will be included in the census by which the Federal Constitution apportions the representatives.

The method adopted for the appointment of these electors reflected the purposes of those who wrote the Constitution. The electors were to be free as possible from the influence of all other

States. So it was provided all should meet on the same day; that they should meet not in a general assembly here at Washington, as does Congress, but in separate assemblies in their own State capitols, to be free from the influence of the rest of the country.

It was provided that they should vote by ballot, so that each man was given the opportunity of voting by secret ballot for the man he thought best fitted for President. The electors were chosen for this one purpose, with no other duties to perform. They were to be independent like a juror that is called into court to decide that one case; as free from obligation and prejudice as is possible. He renders that one service to his country, and then his function is complete; he is discharged.

It was provided that these electors should vote separately for President and Vice President. The Constitution provided they should vote by distinct ballots for the two offices. And then, to relieve the President of any obligation to members of the electoral college, it was provided that no officer of the United States should be a Presidential elector.

Then, finally, there was no unit vote in the electoral college as designed by those who wrote the Constitution. Instead of contemplating a unit vote of the electors, it was distinctly designed that every man should have his own vote, let his own discretion, his conscience, experience, and intelligence be his guide.

After the election of 1800 the exercise of the discretion by an elector disappeared from our electoral system. This change resulted from the fact that the people of the country, very naturally and properly, concluded that they should exercise their own discretion in selecting a President rather than leave that discretion to a limited group of intermediate agencies. This change was accomplished by party selection of electors pledged in advance to vote for their party candidates.

Thereafter it was still necessary to elect Presidential electors as required by the Constitution, in order to elect a President. The substantial reason for the existence of the Presidential elector had ceased to exist. The Presidential elector continued as a Constitutional necessity. There was little need for the perfunctory service he performed in casting a pledged vote without exercising his own discretion as originally intended.

As time went on after the adoption of the Constitution the right of the people to vote for electors was gradually recognized. In fact by 1832 it became almost the universal practice of the country to to select electors by direct vote of the people.

Up to and including the election of 1824, 80 legislatures had chosen Presidential electors for their States, without a vote of the people. In the following 52 years electors were selected by 11 legislatures, and none since then.

Within the State the individual voter is a common unit of expression of popular will. There the general rule is to accept election of candidates by plurality votes.

The constitutional provision of two electoral votes to each State regardless of population, as well as the disparity of voting population between the States, and within the States as between different elections, prevents a popular vote from being a common unit of expression on a Nation-wide scale.

The election of a President for the whole country, requires some constitutional common unit, by which the right of each State to participate in the election is defined and by which standard we measure the relative strength of each State as to every other State in such election.

There were two main reasons for the electoral college. The first was that the Presidential electors, at their own discretion had the duty of selecting the President of the Nation.

When the electors were deprived of this discretion, the purpose for which they were selected no longer existed, but it was still necessary that the President should be elected by votes cast by them. They served as figure-heads to cast their pledged votes in order to meet the constitutional requirement that the President should be elected by Presidential electors.

The other important purpose was that the electoral votes allotted to each State and cast by the electors carried out the constitutional standard by which the extent of participation of each State in the election of President was determined.

The electoral vote constitutes the constitutional common unit by which the right of each State to participate in the election is defined and by which the relative strength of each State in such election is determined. That constitutional standard provides two electoral votes for each State regardless of population and an additional number of votes to correspond to the number of its Representatives in Congress. It means, in substance, that each State has two electoral votes regardless of population and additional votes in proportion to its population.

This standard carries out the purpose of the Constitution so far as allotment of electoral votes to the State is concerned. The weakness of the Constitution in this respect is that it has no provision that provides for the allotment of electoral votes as between the candidates for President in the individual State. This defect makes possible the unit vote and lack of any logical system of computing the final results of the election under our present system of election.

House Joint Resolution 124, and other Resolutions pending before the Judiciary Committee of the House, propose to provide a constitutional method by which the electoral votes allotted to each State shall be apportioned among the candidates according to their respective popular votes within the State. Then, in the final count to determine the result, each candidate would be given credit according to the total number of his electoral votes in the Nation, without eliminating any minority votes from the count and without giving any candidate credit for votes he did not receive.

No practical or just system can be established which does not assure minority voters in each State that their votes as cast under State laws, shall be so computed as cast in determining the ultimate result of the election. The present provisions of the Constitution fail to do this. For that reason we have the indefensible unit vote. Under that plan, in an ordinary Presidential election, one third or more of the votes of the Nation are not credited to the candidate for whom voted. In effect they are computed as if cast for the opponent of the candidate for whom cast.

Eulogy at Funeral of Rev. James M. Kelly, O. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following eulogy delivered by the Reverend George S. Walker, O. S. A., pastor of St. Laurence's Church, Lawrence, Mass., at the funeral of Rev. James M. Kelly, O. S. A., Wednesday morning, July 2, 1947:

TRIBUTE TO FATHER KELLY

"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord. From henceforth now, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours. For their works follow them." Apocalypse xiv: 13.

Dearly beloved in Christ: St. Laurence's Parish, the city of Lawrence, the Augustinian fathers and the Catholic priesthood have suffered an irreparable loss in the passing of our good Father Kelly. Seldom has any priest during life succeeded in obtaining and holding so large a part in the affections of the people. All this we already knew and if any doubt lingered in our minds this assembly of priests and people by their presence and their tears should forever remove it.

I could this morning on this sad occasion talk to you who knew him so intimately and loved him so well after the usual manner about the universal law of death from which there is no escape. Speak of death that strikes down king and peasant, young and old, priest and people. But why should we, with death itself in all its stark reality before us?

Once more we are taught the lesson so easy to learn—so hard to remember, that we too whether priest or people must one day die, must give an account of our years, be they few or many, of our deeds done in the flesh. "For it is appointed unto men once to die and after that the judgment." "We have not here a lasting city but we seek one that is to come." "Who is the man who shall live and shall not see death."

Death is no respecter of persons or times. It comes in infancy ere the regenerating waters of baptism are hardly dry on the brow of innocence. It comes in youth, in the springtime of life, with its eager outlook to the golden future. It comes in the floodtide of manhood and womanhood when we are about to do, what many fondly think, our best work for God and neighbor. It may tarry, delay until the fire of life has burned down to gray ashes, but come it will.

But what of Father Kelly? Have we forgotten to speak of him on this his golden jubilee celebrated beyond the everlasting hills—not the golden jubilee of years but without a doubt the golden jubilee of good works.

Father Kelly was called by God, not after a long and lingering illness of wasting and

disease, but suddenly, in a flash—a gasp, a sign, the closed eyes, no last word, no goodby, just tired, just a little weary of this poor old world, just a longing for eternity.

Deep affection chokes back this morning much that could and perhaps should be said of our dear dead though he would desire no word of praise.

I knew Father Kelly intimately. I was master of novices and guided his ways into our order and province. This was the year 1917. His studies made at Villanova were all but completed when he decided to become a priest and religious. In 1919 he was ordained a priest. I preached on that joyous occasion of his first solemn high mass in his birthplace—Gardner, Mass. I go back on memory's wing this morning and fondly recall that great event and the honors bestowed upon him in the old home town that day.

Time marches on. Need I tell you, who know it so well, of his humble, tireless, patient sacrificing work among the people of St. Mary's; of his indefatigable zeal in the parish of St. Nicholas at Atlantic City? And then his return to Lawrence and St. Laurence's. Should I tell you, the people of this parish and this city, of his work in season and out of season; of the counsel and guidance so unselfishly and unstintingly given to everybody? There is an old Latin axiom that runs as follows: "De mortuis nil nisi bonum." "Of the dead nothing but good." And then his silver jubilee in 1944 and the wonderful demonstration on the part of all classes, races, and creeds. Again it was my great honor to preach the sermon on the occasion of his silver jubilee. Of the dead nothing but good. Of Father Kelly we can recall nothing but good, and so without apology we eulogize this day.

And now in 1947 again I speak over Father Kelly the final word. And what is it: "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord." And this is a joyous occasion even in sorrow, for we confidently believe—and with every reason for this belief—that he is at rest. We know that his works follow him. Would you know what he has done? Ask the sick, the troubled, the discouraged. Go into the homes and the hospitals of this city and other cities today and let those who knew him and his kindly priestly ministrations tell the story.

To Father Kelly's family and friends our deepest sympathy and prayers go out today. Their loss is indeed great and no words of ours can describe it or render it less poignant, but our blessed Lord says: "Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted" and "My grace is sufficient for thee."

It is a little hard to take to heart the lesson which this closing chapter in a priest's earthly life teaches us. But let no one reject it, for it is a mighty universal truth. From every priestly form from which death lets the panting spirit free, a thousand virtues rise, in shapes of mercy, charity, and love, to walk this weary, storm-tossed chaotic old world and bless it with their light. Of every tear that sorrowing mortals shed beside the open grave of priests, some good is born, some gentler nature comes. In the destroyer's steps there spring up bright creations that defy his power and his dark path becomes a way of light to our eternal home. "O death, where is thy sting, O grave, where is thy victory?"

And so we follow the body of our beloved Father Kelly and lay it to rest in Mother Earth and to him I would say:

"Green be the turf above thee
Friend of my better days
None knew thee but to love thee
Nor named thee but to praise."

We pray for the repose of his soul as Holy Mother Church would have us do for all of her children and we shall continue to make of our prayers one "Sweet sacrifice and lift his soul to God."

Father Kelly—"May the angels lead thee into Paradise, may the martyrs receive thee at thy coming and take thee to Jerusalem the Holy City, may the choirs of the angels receive thee and mayst thou with once poor Lazarus have rest everlasting."

An Address by George E. Allen Before the Mississippi State Bar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit an address made by the Honorable George E. Allen, a member of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, an outstanding Mississippian, and an adviser and friend to two Presidents.

The address was delivered by this distinguished Mississippian at a banquet attended by some 500 members of the Mississippi State Bar Association at its annual meeting at Biloxi, Miss., on June 27 last. The address was an able one by an able man. It deserved the splendid reception which it received. Mr. Allen's address on that memorable occasion follows:

It is indeed a pleasure to be back home in Mississippi for this occasion. It was exactly 30 years ago this year that I last attended a meeting of this organization. At that time your president was an illustrious lawyer from my home town of Okalona, Mr. A. T. Stovall, father of the equally distinguished son who is now your president. I was then making a most unpromising start in the law in Okalona and I remember drawing some inspiration from an association meeting at Greenville.

To say that the inspiration wore off and that I have strayed from the law in these intervening years is understatement. I have strayed so far, in fact, that I find it most embarrassing to address a group still learned in the law. I fully realize that my subject should be one of concern to the profession. But I also have respect for the rule that any speaker should know more about his subject than his audience. If I am to address this audience on any subject in which I have superior knowledge, that subject must be far removed from the theory and practice of our profession.

Since receiving your invitation, I have been looking, somewhat desperately, for a subject I would know more about than a group of Mississippi lawyers. I confess in all humility that I haven't found one. However, I have found the next best thing—a subject nobody knows and therefore one that I can claim to know better than you. You have probably guessed by now that my subject will be economics. None of you will be in a position to deny, with certainty, anything that I may have to say about the economic prospects of the United States of America in this troubled postwar period. You may dispute what I say but you won't be able to deny it.

As you, of course, know, economics have become a great, though relatively new profession—a sort of fifth estate in American life. Economists are everywhere, particularly in Washington. They assure us periodically in the deep, measured resonances of doom that our economic system is heading us for perdition or, at very least, that a dismal depression is just around the corner, where Mr. Hoover's prosperity used to hide. It is quite true that no two of them agree about the precise reasons for the impending collapse. But they do agree, whether disciples of Henry George or Maynard Keynes, that the outlook is dim and constantly fading.

I don't want you to get the idea from this that I am against economists as such. They are, no doubt, very useful citizens whose understanding of economic forces is growing and whose profession is gradually developing the disciplines which will make it, eventually, a great lighthouse to guide both Government and private business away from the shoals which were once called panics, later depressions, and more recently recessions. President Truman's Board of Economic Advisers, under the leadership of Dr. Nourse, already has become an enormously valuable adjunct of the executive branch of Government. It is the self-appointed, irresponsible saviors of our economic system—the Jeremiahs who keep making themselves seen in headlines and heard on the air—of whom I am, to say the very least, skeptical. The trouble is that the fraternity of economists has still found no way of disbarring these noisy false prophets.

I recently came upon a magazine article, printed back in 1939, containing a parable that may illustrate what I am getting at:

"There was a man who lived by the side of the road and sold hot dogs. He was hard of hearing so he had no radio. He had trouble with his eyes so he read no newspapers. But he sold good hot dogs. He was a firm believer in advertising so he put up signs along the highway advertising the merits of his hot dogs and he stood by the side of the road and cried, 'Buy a hot dog, mister.' (And people bought.)

"He increased his meat and bun order. He bought a bigger stove to take care of his trade. Finally business became so good that he brought his son home from the city to help him. Then something happened. His son said: 'Father, haven't you been listening to the radio? Haven't you been reading the newspapers? There is a big depression on. The European situation is terrible. The domestic situation is worse. Everything is going to pot.'

"Whereupon the father thought: 'Well, my son has been to college. He has lived in the city with big businessmen. He reads the papers and listens to the radio. He ought to know.' So the father cut down on his meat and bun orders, curtailed his advertising, and no longer bothered to stand by the highway and call out his wares. His sales fell off almost overnight. He said to his boy: 'You were right, son; we certainly are in the middle of a great depression.' "

Recently the New York stock market, which, so far as I have been able to make out, follows no rule of heaven or earth, started selling down security prices. As usual when this happens, falling stock prices were widely heralded as the precursor of the postwar recession. President Truman, at a recent press conference, expressed the opinion that the country faced a bright future. His words made somewhat less impression, I should say, than the stock quotations. The doomsday boys were loud as ever. To judge who may be right about the future, the President, whose sources of economic information are good and whose judgment in these matters must be respected, or the know-it-alls who try to rationalize stock-market reactions, it may be useful to go back to something that happened 2 years ago.

The war was still on then but the home front crawled with alleged economists who cheerfully predicted that the bottom would drop out of economic life in this country the moment the guns were silenced abroad. Specifically, these prophets insisted that as soon as the war would end America must

suffer heavy unemployment. After all, there were about 11,000,000 men and women in the armed services and, when demobilized, they surely would flood our labor market. This was the prevailing view, shared by labor leaders and various Government officials as well as professional economic experts, many of them highly respected in their field.

Let me cite a few outstanding examples of the pessimism of 1945. This is presented not in a critical spirit, but merely to reveal the thinking of that period. Among the labor leaders, a prominent CIO official, the PAC president, boldly predicted on August 14, 1945, that there would be no less than 10,000,000 unemployed within 6 to 8 weeks. The following day an important Government agency officially informed the President that:

"It is expected that there will be 5,000,000 or more unemployed in 3 months. By spring unemployment may reach about 8,000,000."

By October 1945, the president of the CIO warned the Congress relative to the full employment bill that unemployment could be expected to reach 8,000,000 by winter. In November 1945, the Administrator of the Office for Emergency Management predicted a peak of four to five million unemployed by the spring of 1946. Even Dr. Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, and a noted authority in his field, flatly predicted in December 1945 that six to nine million would be jobless by the spring of 1946.

The top prize for pessimism, however, should go to a well-known economist of the A. F. of L., who came out in 1944 with a prediction that our postwar unemployment would soon reach a record total of 20,000,000.

Against this array of economic predictions, let us check the views of Harry S. Truman at that time. On April 7, 1945—just 5 days before the death of President Roosevelt—Vice President Truman made a speech in Buffalo, N. Y., in which he sought to prove that the current fear of heavy unemployment immediately after the war was groundless. In his own words, he declared:

"Fear has been expressed that when our fighting forces return, these new workers might flood the labor market and threaten us with heavy unemployment. In the first place, of the 11,000,000 in the armed services, about 5,000,000 will not be in the market for jobs immediately upon discharge from service."

He then stressed the fact that over half of the people in service were under 26 years of age. Therefore, about 2,000,000 should return to schools, colleges, or seek vocational training. (Actually by April 1947, the number of GI students totaled 2,100,000.) Another 2,000,000 veterans also would probably enter business or become self-employed, such as lawyers, doctors, farmers, etc. An additional million veterans would have special positions awaiting them, such as policemen, firemen, teachers, and necessary government workers. Therefore, according to Vice President Truman, these 5,000,000 veterans would not be "thrown on the labor market" as hostilities ended. To quote Vice President Truman again:

"Of the remaining 6,000,000 servicemen, approximately 2,000,000 may remain in service as a career, or be replaced by others, to man our new mighty fleets and outposts guarding America. This leaves only about 4,000,000 veterans available for civilian positions soon after hostilities cease."

(Actually by June 1946, there were still over 2,000,000 in the armed services.)

Mr. Truman then went on to cite an official survey by the Labor Department indicating that about one-fifth of our 18,000,000 women employees planned to return to their homes after the war. This alone should leave about three and a half million positions to be filled. (Latest Labor Department information indicates that between three and four million women have returned to their homes from wartime jobs.)

Furthermore, Mr. Truman pointed out that there were another half a million persons over 65 who were entitled to retire on pensions, and continued to work only to help the war effort. In addition, about two million boys, between 14 and 17 years of age, were permitted to work during the war, but should be sent back to school at the end of hostilities. To summarize this in his own words:

"In brief, about 6,000,000 people may be expected to leave the Nation's labor force when victory comes, while there are only about 4,000,000 veterans ready to step into their places. Modern scientific discoveries should give rise to new important industries. Therefore, if our high production is maintained, or increased to meet the demands of peace, America may actually experience manpower shortages for some time in certain localities."

Subsequent events proved this view to be the correct one.

The latest official Census Bureau estimate of gainful employment in America reached an all-time high of 58,330,000 in May 1947. When we add the 1,470,000 men and women with the armed forces, we had 59,800,000 Americans holding paying jobs last month—only 200,000 short of Henry Wallace's visionary 60,000,000. Surely our economic democracy seems to be on a solid and sound foundation of full employment. Fortunately, the fears of the pessimists, like the hopes of the Communists, are not being realized. When we consider his past performance, we might do well not to take President Truman's present predictions too lightly.

Employment is, of course, only one measure of our national well-being. But any other measure will show the same result. We are producing more goods, our merchants are selling more goods, our people are buying more goods at this moment than ever before in the history of this or any other country. Our free economy is functioning as never before. Of what, then are we so afraid? Why are we listening so intently to those who tell us that this happy state of affairs is illusion that will fade before our eyes day after tomorrow, giving way to another debacle like 1929? There are, to be sure, several valid reasons for some degree of uncertainty about the future. First, we know from bitter experience that the business cycle is a fact of American life; second, we must recognize that our own prosperity is based in part on foreign outlets for our surplus goods; and third, we know that there are isolationist forces in the country—forces which are growing stronger in Congress—which would withdraw this Nation from contact with the rest of the world and cut off this Nation's merchants from the world's market places.

Without reference to the niceties of the economic theorists, I simply refuse to believe that we shall allow any of these admitted hazards to interfere seriously with our prospects. It is certainly true that prices are now too high and that they must be shaken down in some lines—a process which will be painful to some but which need not be disruptive if we refuse to panic. I feel confident that labor-management relations are going to improve—that both sides have learned much in recent years of conflict about the give and take of collective bargaining and that both want a period of peaceful cooperation. I believe that prices will find their natural level gradually and without benefit of panic, depression, or even recession.

As for the foreign situation, nobody knows better than you leaders of the Cotton States how necessary it is for us, as Americans, to concern ourselves with the recovery and prosperity of the rest of the world. Enlightened self-interest demands that we help Europe to its feet. The recently enunciated Marshall policy, calling upon European nations to take the initiative in formulating a cooperative recovery program as a condition to financial assistance from this country, gives promise of accomplishing this. If it succeeds, our foreign markets will be assured for years to come. We can expect Soviet Russia, I believe, to play a disruptive game as it has ever since the end of the Second World War. But I also believe that we can organize the world without Russia, if worst comes to worst, and that, eventually, the men of the Kremlin will realize that they have more to gain from cooperation than from obstruction.

In closing, I remain confident that ultimately all peoples of the world must see the wisdom and necessity of working together to assure a just peace and economic prosperity in the atomic age of the future.

Futile Soviet Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 7), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Futile Soviet Agreements," which appeared in today's Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUTILE SOVIET AGREEMENTS

The United States Senate recently ratified peace treaties with Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria in the hope that this would hasten withdrawal of Russian occupation troops and restoration of normal conditions in eastern Europe.

But the Kremlin has contrary plans. The Supreme Soviet in Moscow has adjourned until September without acting on the treaties. The plain intent is to keep Red army troops in Hungary until that country is communized.

The next Hungarian general election will be in September. With Russian soldiers controlling the polls, a Communist victory seems certain, even though not more than 10 percent of the Hungarians are affiliated with that party. The present ruthless suppression of opposition elements indicates the Soviets will tolerate no interference.

Hungary, nominally under control of an Allied commission, actually is powerless in the Red army's grip. American and British protests against Communist terrorism are shrugged aside by the Soviet military. Developments in Rumania and Bulgaria follow much the same pattern, with wholesale arrests and persecutions. The peace treaties with these countries will have become so much waste paper by the time Russia signs them, for the parties of the second part will have been absorbed into the Soviet Union.

The Russians' strategy in the Balkans shows why it has become impossible for us to do business with them. They enter negotiations with us only to gain time for their political police and fifth columnists to accomplish their real objectives, after which signed agreements are scrapped. That happened in Poland and Yugoslavia. That is happening in Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. And there is much evidence that Austria may be the next victim.

We shall only kid ourselves if we assume that the Soviets will accept in good faith any German settlement that gives them anything less than a free hand in all of Germany. We will make a colossal blunder if we permit them to obtain any kind of foothold in Japan in the peace settlement there. At this time we control western Germany and all of Japan. Russia Shall Not Enter signs should be hung up in both places.

Refusal To Accept Government Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 7), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there is almost nothing as rare these days as a private citizen refusing money from the Government. Yet an instance has been brought to my attention by Mr. J. M. Baker, in which a prominent company has turned down a Government subsidy. In view of the fact that it would have worked at capacity with or without the subsidy, I ask that Mr. Baker's letter and a column on this subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and a column on this subject be printed in RECORD, as follows:

MILCOR STEEL CO.,
Washington, D. C., July 8, 1947.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On June 14 I wrote you a letter and enclosed an editorial which appeared in Lahey's syndicated column some weeks ago relative to Inland Steel Co.'s refusing to accept subsidies for the production of pig iron. I thought you might be interested in this, because Milcor Steel Co. is a subsidiary of this company and is located in your State.

You will note that Inland passed up $160,000 per month; also note that the pig iron subsidy program was around $9,500,000 at the time the program was to have expired on June 30. Such figures as this should go a long way toward helping to pay off our national debt instead of increasing the same.

A press release by the Office of Housing Expediter, dated June 27, 1947, states that "Government premium payments to pig iron producers who exceed their shipment quotas will be continued through December 31, 1947."

Sincerely yours,
MILCOR STEEL CO.,
JOE M. BAKER,
District Fireproof Sales Manager.

LAHEY SAYS: ONE STEEL FIRM SPURNS SUBSIDY FOR TURNING OUT PIG IRON
(By Edwin A. Lahey)

LOS ANGELES.—The Inland Steel Co. is a most peculiar corporation.

Its officers, Chairman Edward L. Ryerson, President Wilfred Sykes, and Vice President Clarence B. Randall, have such a stubborn belief in free enterprise that they won't accept a Government subsidy for making pig iron in their blast furnaces.

The Government, as I have perhaps stated too often in these dispatches, started paying subsidies last summer for "above quota" production of critical building materials.

The reason for the subsidies, of course, was to encourage production under price control. But when prices were decontrolled by President Truman early last November, the Office of Housing Expediter kept the subsidies going. The Government is still paying production bonuses on merchant pig iron and cast-iron soil pipe, on top of the price increases since last November.

While browsing around the swamps of Washington recently I found the names of two subsidiaries of United States Steel, seven plants of Republic Steel, two plants of Bethlehem Steel, four plants of the Interlake Iron Co., one plant of Youngstown Sheet and Tube, a plant of the Wisconsin Steel Co., and the names of a number of smaller companies on the list of those "participating" in the pig-iron subsidy program.

Inland Steel was notable for its absence from the list prepared by the housing expediter.

The reason is found in the recently published annual report of the company for 1946, wherein the officers declare:

"The company has elected not to apply for the premium payments offered with respect to merchant pig iron, for it is our belief that in the normal operation of our business in a free market we need not be paid a subsidy by the Government.

"This decision will have no adverse effect on the quantity of pig iron which will be produced for the housing program."

Inquiry reveals that Inland is producing 20,000 tons of pig iron a month at East Chicago for which it could claim a subsidy of $8 a ton if the officers were so inclined. This would amount to $160,000 a month.

The total cost of the pig-iron subsidy program will be about $9,500,000 when the program expires on June 30, according to Housing Expediter Frank R. Creedon. The cast-iron soil pipe program, which expires on the same date, will cost about $4,000,000.

The Housing Expediter will make public the names of the companies participating in these programs, and the total amount of the subsidies, but will not reveal the amount paid by the Government to any single company.

In reply to a letter asking whether this decision were governed by any law, Acting Housing Expediter A. H. Zwerner informed me that it was an administration decision, and that specific information would not be made public unless the case had some bearing on the exercise of the Housing Expediter's "administrative discretion."

Individual Income Tax Reduction Act of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the time has arrived for tax relief. That relief is long overdue. During the war years, many bills were enacted into law which raised Federal income taxes to astronomical heights. I strongly supported these bills. These tax increases at that time were essential and necessary to meet the demands of a nation at war. Today the American taxpayer looks to this Congress to remove some of the burdensome load which he has carried so long.

To enact a tax-reduction bill at this time would be a tremendous stimulant to the business interests of America. Private enterprise cannot long survive under a system of prohibitive tax rates. The psychological effect on business and on the individual tax-paying citizen would inspire confidence and augment the initiative of our people.

Tax reduction and economy in government should go hand in hand. This Congress has made rapid strides in eliminating governmental waste and reducing duplications. To accomplish this, many thousands on Government pay rolls have been dismissed.

When H. R. 1 was before the House a few weeks ago, I supported it at that time. When the President's veto message on the measure was read to this body, I voted to override the veto. I believed then, and I believe now, that it is essential to cut the tax rates. We have reached a situation in which our citizens are losing hope. They cannot feel that it is worth the price to press forward and increase their profits. The attitude of so many of them is that it is needless to climb the uppermost rungs of the ladder as little would be left in earnings after meeting exorbitant taxes. A big volume of business is needed for the Nation's prosperity and employment, and the Nation's businessmen must be allowed a net profit which will make it worth while to them to create this necessary volume.

In this bill there should be included provisions for universal community-property-tax law. The States without such a tax law are at an obvious disadvantage, particularly if they border on States which have such a law in existence. We in Arkansas are acutely aware of this; we are bordered by Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana—all of which have the community-property-tax law. All of the States of the Union are entitled to have the benefits of the community-property-tax law. I hope that such a provision will be written into this bill before it reaches the President's desk.

Individual Income Tax Reduction Act of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, a great many of us were keenly disappointed and mystified because President Truman saw fit to veto H. R. 1, the income-tax-reduction program for 1947.

It is generally admitted that the best way to stimulate employment is to encourage individuals and business concerns to put money for expansion back into their own businesses. If this is done it naturally follows that we will have full employment with adequate wages for the worker. To sustain this statement all we have to do is to look back to the period after the last war

when in 1920 the Congress decreased the taxes and, much to the surprise of everybody, the budget was balanced in 1921. Then they reduced taxes again. The reduction in 1921 was for 1922 and 1923. Then another bill came along reducing taxes in 1924. Of course, they were not paying taxes currently then, and they reduced the taxes by 25 percent, applicable to 1923. Still the revenues increased. It became possible to pay a billion dollars on the national debt as a result of increased revenue from lowering the taxes, not only a billion dollars one year but to keep it up every year over a period of 10 years. That was not all. Industry increased, labor's wages increased, farmers who had been bankrupt came to Washington to thank the President of the United States for what he had done for the farmers. That was also true of several governors. They were not worried about tax reduction, not at all; they were getting all the benefits of tax reduction. The tax was reduced again in 1926 and in 1928—four times in all. Still the revenue increased. And every year from 1921, of course, the budget was balanced and there was a surplus for debt reduction.

In my opinion this legislation is just a year late in going into effect. I also feel that the reduction could and should be greater for those income taxpayers in the smaller brackets. I do think it is a step in the right direction and if it is enacted it will accomplish three things: First, lift the burden on 49,000,000 individual taxpayers; second, permit business to prosper; and, third, increase the gross revenue to the Federal Government.

Why Finance a European Transition to Socialism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, when American resources were poured out to Japan before Pearl Harbor, many people protested that foreign policy. Their protests were ignored.

Today, the administration follows a similar policy, with even more ruinous consequences indicated.

Truman and Marshall claim to be opposing Russian socialism in Greece and elsewhere, yet, at the same time, they are sending to England and France billions of our resources. This American wealth is being used in those countries to facilitate and sweeten a relatively peaceful transition to a Socialist economy.

Why? Should America finance socialism simply because it is approached by seduction, yet frantically oppose it if it comes about by physical assault?

The eventual terminus on either road is tyranny and oppression for the people—in other words, the police state.

Mr. Speaker, the savings of the American people should no longer be used to underwrite socialism—the forerunner of tyranny—in Europe. Disguising that policy by the claim that more outpourings are to resist Russian socialism is humbug, or worse.

I have discussed this subject in my weekly column of July 9, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By HOWARD BUFFETT, Congressman, Second Nebraska District)

Recently a spending project for Greece and Turkey passed Congress. This outlay, declared Mr. Truman, was intended to aggressively oppose the spread of communism. The first installment amounts to $400,000,000.

Some skeptics declare the Greek-Turko aid scheme is simply global WPA boondoggling, created to prolong inflationary spending in America—because the President wants the war boom to last until the 1948 election is held.

Another observer declares that our handouts in Europe are not to resist communism at all. He says our billions are actually being used "to sweeten and subsidize the changeover of Europe from the free enterprise system to socialism, and that socialism and communism are the same thing." Is this true? Let's look at the facts.

For the facts on communism, the congressional document, "Communism in Action," should be authoritative. Its opening sentences read as follows:

"When the Bolsheviks seized power on November 7, 1917, they took over plants and industries as the first step in the establishment of the basis of socialism or communism. Throughout 1918 an increasing number of industries and activities were nationalized, including banking and foreign trade."

Since VJ-day we have loaned both England and France some billions of dollars. During this same period in France the privately owned Bank of France and branch banking institutions, the coal fields, the electric and gas companies, and 54 large insurance companies have all been socialized. Other French industries have been partially socialized, the Library of Congress reports to me.

In England since VJ-day, the privately owned Bank of England, civil air service, the coal industry, telecommunications, all transport, including railroads and trucking (effective January 1948), bulk cotton purchases, etc., have been socialized. And so part of your tax dollars and war-bond purchases is handed to foreign politicians to socialize their countries—while another part goes to other lands for an alleged attempt to oppose socialism. And at home this export of our wealth causes inflation—which plows the ground for socialism in America. It's a fine kettle of fish, friend, any way you figure it.

This Country Still Needs the Railroads in Its Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article This Afternoon appearing in the Birmingham Post, July 7, 1947, by John Temple Graves. This also appeared in 24 other southern newspapers.

This article deals with S. 110 and H. R. 221, known as the Reed-Bulwinkle bills. This article is worth reading. It follows:

THIS AFTERNOON

(By John Temple Graves)

"Across the parchment of the land
I write with hissing pen
The autograph of industry,
The manuscript of men."

"The railroads of this country," well says the Spartanburg Herald, "are under Government control. If they seek to avoid some of the threat of the antitrust laws in working out their problems, it is not an unreasonable request."

But it is unreasonable to expect politicians to give up an issue on which it is so easy to win friends and influence people. There was a time when fighting the railroads was brave business. Today, with the roads in trouble, with competition cutting in everywhere, with public regulation established and increasing, it's easy.

An indication that our American people understand how time has altered things with the railroads, however, is the huge majorities Congress gave the Reed-Bulwinkle bill exempting roads from antitrust laws on the grounds that railroading has natural monopoly aspects and is regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The majorities were too big to be just "vested interests." The vote was an expression of the common sense which tells our people the railroads are too important and troubled now either to be left alone or to be interfered with destructively.

The Reed-Bulwinkle bill is no invention of selfish interests. It is the proposal of the Interstate Commerce Commission itself, made annually for several years now.

"It is difficult," says the New York Times, "to recall any piece of legislation in recent years dealing with transportation on which informed opinion is so near unanimity."

It is true that the bill was opposed by the Justice Department, which seems to be unable or unwilling to distinguish between the economic position of a private industry on the one hand, and on the other, an industry which is subject to such complete regulation that it cannot change its rates or fares without permission of the Government; cannot sell securities until the Government has decided whether the price asked is the proper price, and cannot even go out of business by abandoning unremunerative mileage without official Government permission.

"In short, the Department's position seems to be that the railroads are entitled to enjoy all the disadvantages of private enterprise and none of its advantages."

How is it that politicians who are so hellbent on having railroads subject to both a regulatory commission and the antitrust laws should be asleep to proposed legislation eliminating Federal regulation of another natural monopoly—the electric utility industry? Pending amendments to the Federal Water Power Act would do away with much of the Federal control in that industry, yet no loud outcries are heard.

That there will be outcries eventually is sure, for this country is deeply persuaded that natural monopolies, especially utilities, must be subject always to adequate regulation, and one wonders at foolish advice which has led utility leaders to ask these amendments just as their industry is recovering the public favor it lost a few years back.

But how does it happen that there is so little present noise against relieving electric utilities of regulation and so much against relieving railroads of an antitrust law liability which exists in addition to regulation?

Nobody is proposing to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission which regulates railroads, as it is proposed to abolish regulatory control of electric utilities. It is proposed only that the railroads be subject to single control, rather than double, one conception rather than contradictory two.

Nothing in sight says that the Nation's basic carrier isn't going to go on being basic. America's railroads face many changes, much new competition, and probably even more regulating—but this country still needs them in its business. The hissing pen still writes industry's autograph and the most continued story of passenger travel. What the railroads meant and did in the last war measures what they would mean and do in another. It measures, too, their peacetime worth. Before the war, they were in trouble financially. They may be coming to trouble again. That is a matter of concern to everyone. The day has passed when a Vanderbilt can say for the railroads, "The public be damned," but the day has passed, too, when we the people can say, "the railroads be damned."

It is as silly to make it out that railroads are villains of our American piece as to say they are whiter than snow. If the demagogs and special pleaders would stand aside and let a practical point of view prevail we could go about the vital business of seeing that our railroad system is preserved now as the ever more perfect instrument of our national economy it needs to be.

And the practical point of view is (1) that the American railroad system is a natural monopoly in so many indispensable respects that laws against monopoly cannot possibly apply satisfactorily to it and (2) that since it does indeed have a monopoly nature, public regulation under the Interstate Commerce Commission must never flag in science, courage, or keeping up to date.

There are enough flourishing, unregulated, unnatural monopolies in this country to be opposed without picking on a crippled natural one already subject to regulation.

The Hungarian Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to have printed a memorandum of the American Hungarian Federation to the Secretary of State, concerning the recent developments in the unfortunate country of Hungary.

No nation has enjoyed a more glorious or more tragic history than has the Hungarian nation. Western Christian civilization will ever be the debtor of the Hungarians, for it was in Hungary and at the capital city of Budapest that an earlier invasion of the west by a power of the east was stopped when the penetration of Islam was halted at that great city.

It was also in Hungary that the eastward thrust of bolshevism was halted after World War I, when the Hungarian people overthrew the cruel dictatorship of Béla Kun and established a representative government.

After being freed from the Nazi yoke, they were in the process of forming a truly democratic government of farmers, small businessmen, and small landholders, when once again their efforts were halted by a superior force of a hostile government.

I am sure that this domination and repression of a free people is doomed to failure, just as were those of the Hapsburgs, of Béla Kun, and of Hitler. I believe that the fire of democracy and the love of homeland still burns in the hearts of millions of true Hungarian patriots.

It is unjust for us or for the other free nations to hold the Hungarian people responsible for the acts of an alien dictatorship which has imposed its rule by force, and which does not represent the will of the Hungarian people any more than did Hitler and his cohorts when they dominated this unfortunate land.

I also desire to have included herein, under leave to extend my remarks, an article from the June 30 issue of Time magazine, which lends credence to my theory.

The matter referred to follows:

MEMORANDUM OF THE AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE CONCERNING THE HUNGARIAN PROBLEM

Soviet Russia's continued aggression in Hungary culminated on May 30, 1947, with the seizure of power in Budapest and the definite subjugation of all Hungary to Communist hegemony.

This act of Russian totalitarian aggression was denounced by President Truman as an outrage and by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG as an apparent treacherous conquest.

For the second time in one decade the Hungarian people have been beaten into submission by a ruthless, overwhelmingly strong neighbor whose totalitarian domination they tried in vain to resist. As a consequence of the Munich Pact, southeastern Europe, including Hungary, was first handed over to the evil rule of Hitler from whose brutal clutch no country could extricate itself until the Nazi power was crushed. Today as a result of the Yalta and Potsdam pacts the same process is being repeated in that area.

When the first tragedy took place in Hungary, on January 7, 1941, after Hungary was compelled to sign the Axis Pact, we publicly declared that:

"It is our conviction that by the signing of this pact the Hungarian Government lost its power of independent action, that the people of Hungary are no longer free to express their will and that this pact is a direct threat to the ancient independence of Hungary, the country of our origin."

We also stated that "we considered it our duty to convey the thoughts and desires of the silenced people of Hungary."

Now, under similar circumstances we again declare, that as Americans of Hngarian descent, united in the American Hungarian Federation, we will voice the true feelings of the silenced Hungarian people, we will keep alive the vital interests of our land of origin which are: Independence, national unity, and true democracy.

In carrying out this freely assumed obligation, we wish to serve faithfully the basic American ideals and principles of equal justice and freedom for all, as set forth in President Roosevelt's declaration on the four freedoms and in the Atlantic Charter. We will also continue to refuse collaboration with all totalitarian ideologies, whether labeled National Socialist or Communist. We firmly upheld this point of view during the last war and we shall not deviate from it.

Hungary's thousand-year-old western and Christian civilization cannot be subjected to Communist exploitation without serious harm to American interests. This brutal violation by Soviet Russia of its international commitments, including the peace treaty with Hungary, will have a lasting effect on future world peace and certainly means much more than careless contempt on Russia's part for her western allies. Hungary's production and entire economy will be drained from now on in order to assist in building up the war potential of the Soviet world revolution. In all walks of international life, the voice of puppet Hungary will support Soviet imperialism aimed at the domination of all remaining free nations of the world.

Hungarian-language propaganda will spread Communist falsehoods and provocations, Communist-trained Hungarian agents will collaborate in wrecking democratic world order and in sabotaging reconstruction. The flower of the Hungarian Nation, its youth, will be forced into the Red army to serve as cannon fodder, or into labor camps to slave for the evil aims of a would-be world conqueror. And when, finally, the inevitable hour of reckoning arrives, official Hungary will stand again on the wrong side.

Must the Hungarian people generally be blamed again for all these crimes? Must they as a nation again be treated contemptuously and given undeservedly the rawest of all deals, as has been the case during the Second World War and at the recent peace conference? We wish to raise the question now, Did the Hungarian people choose to join the Soviet system, or have they been forced to do so against their will?

The answer to this question must be given now.

We wish to restate the undeniable fact that Hungary has wholeheartedly complied with the onerous terms of the Armistice Treaty and that she has faithfully carried out the conditions of the Yalta Agreement which entitle her to assistance in restoring her national independence, her democratic institutions, and her wrecked economy. In spite of the abuses of the Russian occupation force and of the foreseen cruel reprisals, the Hungarian people voted overwhelmingly at the November 1945 elections for true democracy and for continued adherence to their western ideals. They also have achieved remarkable recovery in spite of the wholesale looting, infiltration, and moral degradation inflicted upon them by the Soviets. They have accomplished, within a very short time, fundamental democratic reforms and have completed the distribution of land to the landless. If left alone, the Hungarian people certainly would contribute, as a peaceful and democratic member of the family of peace-loving nations. In view of these undeniable facts, our attitude toward the present unbearable oppression of the Hungarian people is that:

(a) The so-called government of Hungary is not a free agent. It is not representative of the Hungarian people and we do not accept it as the legal government of Hungary. It is an instrument of Soviet policy imposed upon the Hungarian people against their expressed will and completely against their interests.

(b) The Hungarian people have no responsibility whatsoever to bear for the seizure of power by the present Soviet puppet regime, nor for its acts, and its future conduct of Hungarian affairs. From May 30, 1947, on, all responsibility rests exclusively with the Soviet Government which, by infiltration, terrorism, and corruption, has destroyed the independence of Hungary.

In view of these basic facts, we believe it is the duty of our Government to make clear to the world that it absolves the Hungarian people from responsibility for the acts of the illegal and usurping regime now installed in Hungary.

Further, we ask our Government to withhold formal diplomatic recognition from this totalitarian regime.

We urge that immediate action be taken by our State Department to implement its proposal that a three-power commission examine this situation as a matter of great urgency.

Should any delay occur for any cause in the formation of this commission, we urge that our Government immediately refer the

problem to the United Nations, and that it press for prompt action.

[From Time magazine of June 30, 1947]

"MUNKÁSOK EGYESÜLJETEK!"

What does it mean when an orator says "in Russia's sphere of influence the civil liberties of non-Communists are suppressed?" Last week Time Correspondent Robert Low was in Szeged, a south Hungarian town famous for paprika and embroidered slippers, when Communist suppression became a dramatic reality. Low cabled:

"A gusty wind, sweeping up from the Banat plain across the Yugoslav frontier, seemed to heighten the nervous tension in the town. It snapped at the shawls and embroidered blouses of the peasants, sent newspapers and political handbills scurrying around the huge square in clouds of dust. Slowly the crowd gathered around the old-fashioned, three-storied, brown-stone hotel at the corner of the square. From windows the loud speakers monotonously blared out the announcement: 'At 6 o'clock a meeting of the Freedom Party.'

"At a marble-topped table, in an unswept, musty cafe, I sat discussing the meeting with the three anti-Communist members of Parliament who were scheduled to speak that evening. One of them, tall, hawk-nosed Vince Nagy, former Minister of Interior in the Károlyi government after World War I (no kin to exiled Premier Ferenc Nagy), said: 'A few days ago when [Dezsö] Sulyok, head of our party, said in Parliament there was no freedom of speech in Hungary today, the Communists called him a liar. Now we'll see.'

"Fifteen minutes later he had his answer."

SURPLUS FOOD

"Seven hundred people—peasants, workmen, other townspeople—jammed the hotel's auditorium to capacity. On the stage, the speaker's table was covered with the green, white, and red of the Hungarian national colors picked out in wild flowers. Everything looked peaceful enough. But the local secretary of the Freedom Party was worried. As he took me into the box overlooking the auditorium he said: 'Yesterday the Communists sent down a truckload of agitators from Budapest to organize things for this meeting.' He pointed out a group of 150 men bunched together, halfway down the side aisle. They looked tough all right.

"'We've asked the police to maintain order,' he said, 'but they say they'll only intervene if there is trouble. And if we organized the guards, they would accuse us of using Fascist methods. The guards are a political luxury that only the Communists and left-bloc parties can afford.'

"When the three M. P.'s walked on to the stage, they got a rousing welcome. But as Nagy stepped up to the microphone and started to speak, his first words were drowned out by shouts from leather-lunged Communists: 'Long live Stalin; long live Rakosi.'

"Immediately came the crowd's response: 'Long live the Hungarian Republic. Long live freedom.'

"Unruffled, Nagy began again: 'I appeal to the Communists who came here to break up this meeting. * * *.'" He was answered with a shower of eggs from the Communists.

"It takes a good man to find the mot juste at a moment like that, but Nagy was up to it. He cracked: 'I am pleased to see that the Communists find the food situation in Hungary good enough to use fresh eggs for political activities.'

"Suddenly the public-address system went dead, the lights went out. The main power switch for the district had been pulled. And that seemed to be a prearranged signal. Like a well-trained football formation, the Communists began pressing toward the speaker's stand, shouting: 'Munkások egyesüljetek!' (Workers unite!). It had the cadence of: 'We want a touchdown.'

"Out came blackjacks and brass knuckles. Two Freedom Party men went down under the onslaught. A roar went up from the crowd; in a moment hundreds of people were bearing down on the Communists brandishing chairs over their heads. One man went crashing through the glass to the ground, two floors below. Fury flamed up, then died out like a flash of powder. A couple of dozen casualties lay on the floor.

"But the Communists were forced out of the hall. A cheer went up from the crowd; the unbroken chairs were put back into place. The meeting would go on.

"YOU CAN'T WIN

"The Freedom Party secretary came dashing into my box. His eye was cut and his mouth was bleeding, but he shouted triumphantly, 'We've taught the —— a lesson—we've won.'

"But he spoke too soon. The Communists were back, and with them the gray-uniformed police, rifles at the ready. One Freedom Party man who attempted to defend himself from a renewed attack by a blackjack-wielding Communist was promptly arrested.

"Onto the platform stepped a fat colonel of police: 'In the interests of public order this meeting is closed.'

"While the injured were being carried out, the police calmly proceeded to arrest the disturbers of peace pointed out to them by the Communists.

"When Nagy and two other deputies appeared in the window of the hotel overlooking the square, a tremendous cheer went up from the crowd that had gathered there. But this was a short-lived victory, too. The police colonel spoke again, 'I warn you, if you appear anywhere in public, I'll arrest you for attempting to incite a riot.'

"Soon a hundred police were in the square dispersing the crowd of 8,000. They first drove a wedge down the center, then divided halves into quarters, until each group was small enough to deal with individually.

"Finally someone said, 'No free speech—but a lesson in tactics.'"

World Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission given me, I am inserting an editorial from the Washington Post of July 7 entitled "Open Conspiracy" and another article from the same issue entitled "The Politburo's Choice." Both of these articles are timely discussions of the present world situation. They follow:

OPEN CONSPIRACY

President Truman's Independence Day speech, unlike Mr. Bevin's, was nicely calculated to encourage all Europe outside Russia to engage in what H. G. Wells would have called the great open conspiracy to unite Europe. The invitations are now out. It may be that delegates will be forthcoming beyond the iron curtain, though the Muscovites will doubtless strain every nerve to keep the willing Poles and Czechs away. The hardening brusqueness of the Kremlin makes one wonder whether the NKVD (which has always been insulationist) hasn't taken charge of affairs. This, we imagine, is how the situation will look to the satellites, for their surprise appears to be as marked as their present unhappiness over the denouement. Just as western Europe needs eastern Europe, so eastern Europe needs western Europe. In default of membership in the proposed economic concert eastern Europe would find itself progressively tied to the impoverished Russian economy. That would lower its living standards as well as western Europe's and incidentally would call for more aid from us for western Europe than otherwise would be needed. For both reasons the President was wise to bespeak the most comprehensive mutual aid association in Europe.

Molotov's refusal to commit Russia to the effort in Paris to develop a common plan for European reconstruction is the finest tribute we know to the Truman doctrine and to its first application in Greece. Mr. Truman was criticized for bypassing the United Nations. The critics parroted Mr. Gromyko's denunciation of our plan for Greece as "unilateral," though, if they had given the subject a moment's thought, they would have realized that an affirmative answer to a plea for help makes agreement bilateral. It was precisely on a par with the pacts that the Russians themselves had concluded over the head of the United Nations. During the last 2 years the Soviet Government has signed three treaties—with Poland, with Czechoslovakia, and with Yugoslavia—pledging the assistance of these countries in loans, arms, and military and civilian instructors.

Where Mr. Truman erred, as we said at the time, was in refraining from communicating his aid program to the United Nations at the same time as he sent it to Congress. But that was only an error in procedure, or, better put, tactics. If he had referred the harassed Greeks and Turks to the United Nations, it is now plain that the request would have been talked to death, as the Ethridge report pointing the finger at Russia's satellites for the responsibility for the border warfare in Greece looks as if it will be talked to death. Britain's Sir Alexander Cadogan is so disquieted by Russian procrastination on this latter matter that on Thursday he warned that failure to take action on the basis of the Ethridge report would be equivalent to tearing up the Charter and that the delegates might as well pack up and go home. Greece and Turkey knew that their request would be similarly treated, otherwise they would have applied for help to the United Nations. Now the world, as a result of the experience in Paris, shares that knowledge.

Just as clear as the President's wisdom in the matter of aid to Greece and Turkey is the British-French wisdom in keeping the mutual-aid program out of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe sitting in Geneva. It is said that this was Mr. Molotov's initial proposal. Experience has shown that the United Nations is being used as a graveyard for the strivings of mankind for betterment and unity across national frontiers. A bear hug was awaiting the Marshall initiative at Geneva, but the British and the French, with needs that have become urgent, avoided this smothering embrace. At Geneva they had seen the Russians engaged in killing the few functional agencies left for reconstruction in Europe. They had seen the Russians insisting on decisions by a two-thirds vote so as to provide a Slavic veto power. We must now help the British and French go it alone—that is to say, in company, and ever closer company, with other like-minded nations. And not for the purpose of ganging up against Russia—for any grouping should be kept open—but for economic reconstruction and the preservation and improvement of our common civilization.

At Paris, Mr. Molotov proved the statement uttered as his valedictory by former Under Secretary Dean Acheson that Soviet Russia is "diametrically opposed to the new premises of international accord and recovery." It is the worm in the United Nations

which is eating it away. We must now prove in all our actions that we intend to meet negation with affirmation, and so mobilize our resources that the slump for which the Muscovites seem to be waiting, so as to pick up all Europe at what would then be a fire sale, will never happen. It is a very sober undertaking upon which the Russians have compelled us to embark, and President Truman, in his backing of the Marshall initiative and his emphasis on nonexclusiveness, struck exactly the right note. We must try to match our quest for interdependence with Russia's quest for independence and domination. Our success in achieving it will eventually wear down Russian insulation, and persuade the Russians that hermit states are unprofitable and intolerable in this shrunken and atomic world.

THE POLITBURO'S CHOICE

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

Intelligence reports, so detailed that they can no longer be disregarded, have reached Washington to the effect that an international brigade, under Comintern auspices, is being organized to fight in Greece. Observers here recognize the preponderant long-term importance of the European reception of the Marshall plan. But they believe that for the short term the northern Greek border area is easily the most important and explosive friction point in the world today.

In Greece, the Soviets are faced with the same hard choice, on a much larger scale, as confronted them in northern Iran last autumn. In view of the immense risks of any other course, the politburo strategists can decide to cut losses and pull out, as they did in Iran. Or they can intensify the effort to capture Greece, using the now forming international brigade as their chief instrument. It would be difficult to exaggerate the gravity of the consequences if the politburo makes the second choice.

The key figure in the organization of the international brigade is the Greek Communist and guerilla leader, Nicholas Zachariades. Zachariades went to Moscow in the twenties, and there took the long hard Comintern schooling until 1935, when he returned to Greece. In the Soviet Union he knew and became friendly with such other Comintern graduates as France's Jacques Duclos, Italy's Palmira Togliatti, and Yugoslavia's Josef Broz, now Marshal Tito. These old school friendships are now standing Zachariades in good stead.

According to reports, Duclos is sponsoring the clandestine training of the international brigade which includes a sprinkling of veterans of the old international brigade which fought in Spain. Training is being carried on in the south of France—largely in the recreational centers of the Communist-run general confederation of labor. When preliminary training is completed, old school friend Duclos hands over to old school friend Togliatti. In small batches the men are shipped to northern Italy, usually Genoa, where Togliatti's organization takes over. They are quietly conducted across northern Italy to the Adriatic, where they are shipped to Yugoslav ports. Then it is the turn of old school friend Tito, who has at his disposal ample facilities for completing the men's training. A portion of the brigade is known to have arrived in Yugoslavia, but none of them has yet crossed the Greek frontier. That is awaiting the final decision of the politburo.

The trend of the politburo's thinking was perhaps reflected in a recent Communist strategy meeting held in Strasbourg, France, after Secretary Marshall made his historic proposal. Zachariades, who crosses borders without difficulty, was secretly present at this meeting. However, he allowed an aide, Porfyrogennis, to speak for him. Porfyrogennis announced that it might be necessary to establish a "free Greek Government" in a "free Macedonia" to counter the reactionary government in Athens. This pronouncement of an obscure Greek Communist is regarded in Washington with the utmost gravity. If carried through, it will mean that Gov. Dwight Griswold, the chief of the American mission to Greece, will face on his arrival, or shortly thereafter, an all-out civil war, backed more or less openly by the Soviets, through the employment of the Cominternorganized international brigade.

Zachariades is believed to have sponsored the formation of the brigade simply because there have recently been increasing signs of disaffection and loss of morale in the guerrilla ranks. The brigade would be designed to provide the necessary stiffening and leadership. If the politburo decides in the end to take the desperate gamble of throwing the brigade into action, the United States will then be faced with a crucial decision. Either this country can rely on the ineffective Greek Army to protect the American political investment in Greece, or the United States can itself take whatever measures may be necessary to protect that investment. That might well mean the sending of American troops to Greece. And it is all too easy to see where such a step might lead.

Yet competent observers here are fairly hopeful that this terrible choice may still be avoided. They lend the utmost significance to the Soviet reaction to the proposal of the United Nations Balkan Commission. Except for the Soviet and Polish members, this commission unanimously recommended that a United Nations border commission be established to guarantee the Greek frontiers. If the Soviets abstain from voting when the proposal comes up before the Security Council, this will be taken to mean that the Soviet leaders have decided, as they decided last autumn on Iran, that at least temporarily it is the better part of wisdom to abandon the drive on Greece. If the Soviets veto, this will be taken to mean that the drive is to be intensified and the international brigade is to be thrown into action.

The British delegate to the United Nations recently remarked that if the Balkan Commission proposals were set aside, the United Nations "might as well pack up." A Soviet veto of the proposals may have an even more ominous significance.

Better Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 7), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Better Government," appearing in today's Washington News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER GOVERNMENT

President Truman has signed into law a measure which may—and we hope will—prove one of the most valuable achievements of the present Congress.

It is the Lodge-Brown resolution, sponsored by a Republican Senator from Massachusetts and a Republican Representative from Ohio, but passed with unanimous support of both parties in both branches of Congress.

This resolution authorizes a bipartisan Commission to study the organization of the Federal Government and to propose ways and means of bringing it up to date. The job is big and tough, but it urgently needs doing.

The Government has become too complex for the people to understand, for the President to supervise, or for Congress to control. Scores of different bureaus and agencies have a hand in each of its major functions. Its almost incredible duplications of effort and divisions of authority are baffling barriers to wise economy.

Congress, itself, never has made even a good start toward reorganizing the Government. On many occasions it has voted Presidents authority to draw up plans—and then rejected most, or all, of the changes proposed. The Lodge-Brown resolution is a new approach. Under it, Congress and the President will share the duty of seeing that a plan is prepared. That fact justifies hope that it will produce real and valuable results.

The Commission will have 12 members. President Truman will name 4 of them—2 from within the Government and 2 from private life. The Presiding Officer of the Senate will name 4—2 Members of the Senate and 2 from private life. And the Speaker of the House will name 4—2 Representatives and 2 private citizens. The resolution's intent is that the 6 private citizens shall be recognized authorities in the field of business management.

Everything will depend on the caliber and ability of the Commission's membership. Its task will be long. It will have to explore all the musty, cobwebbed corners of Government; analyze the operations of more than a thousand departments, commissions, bureaus, and other agencies; determine the opportunities for saving money and increasing efficiency. In January 1949 it will submit its report for action by Congress.

It is asking a great deal to expect a dozen able men to give this job most of their time for a year and a half. But if their work is thorough, if the plan they propose is a convincing answer to the problem, they will do the country a great service.

Chief of Engineers on Randall Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a hearing held by the War Department Civil Functions Appropriation Subcommittee on July 8, 1947:

Mr. STEFAN. Now, in reply to my questions on the floor you indicated there is nothing in that bill that would delay the work at the Fort Randall Dam. There was nothing in the form of an amendment in the bill to change the Army engineers' program on Fort Randall?

Mr. ENGEL. No.

Mr. STEFAN. Not at all. There is something in the report requesting them to make some studies.

Mr. ENGEL. To make a study; yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to ask the General this question: Will that interfere with your regular program there? Will that delay work on Fort Randall?

General WHEELER. It is our view that the study that has been requested in the hearings before the House Appropriations Committee will be completed before the construction period on Fort Randall will arrive, so the answer to the question is that the study that we are making, as requested in the House committee report, will not interfere with the construction of the present Randall Dam.

Mr. ENGEL. Here is the difficulty we have. You have two dams, Randall and Garrison, which will cost approximately—if you figure a channel for navigation—$320,000,000; $133,000,000 for Randall and $28,000,000 for the channel and $158,000,000 for Garrison. Now, that will require a 6-year period, and the first of that 6-year period will require $15,000,000 apiece, or $30,000,000.

General CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL. The second, third, fourth, and fifth year following will require $60,000,000 a year, which is approximately one-third of what the President allowed for the entire general flood-control program this year, before cuts. It will take another $30,000,000 for the sixth year.

The difficulty that we have, Mr. STEFAN, is trying to give you what you want and not take one-third of the total flood-control money allowed by the President for two dams.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand that very well. We have gone over that.

Mr. ENGEL. We have been very sympathetic.

Mr. STEFAN. All I want of General Wheeler and General Pick is the assurance that the study recommended by our colleague, Mr. CASE, for Fort Randall will not result in delay.

Mr. CASE. Supplementing that, is it not also true that the construction program contemplated for this year in the form of building access roads and railroads and completing the camp sites, the workers' settlement, will be needed in either event, whether you build a low dam or a high dam?

General WHEELER. Yes. I looked into that in detail in order to be able to answer that question. I can officially tell you that the study will be completed before any work will be needed on a different Randall Dam.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, you have stated that this hearing is executive. I think in justice to these men from Nebraska I should ask permission that this latter part of the testimony, starting at the point where Mr. STEFAN asks questions, be made available to the members of the committee so that these Nebraska people here can give that answer to their people.

Mr. ENGEL. I think so.

Mr. STEFAN. The reason for that is that our people are very much worried. I thank Mr. CASE for that. After all, they feel that the Army engineers are the best experts to decide whether they should have a high dam or a low dam, and they have a program going on there. They have the impression now that something has been done in Congress to delay this program at Fort Randall, and definitely nothing has been done to delay the program except the study, and General Wheeler assures us that there will be no delay, because the study is going right along, and if there is a change that will have to be made, that will have to be decided by the Army engineers, anyhow.

Mr. CASE. The work contemplated this year will be needed in either event, whether a high dam or a low dam.

Mr. BUFFETT. The study of the feasibility of the two types of dams will be finished by the time the committee meets again to appropriate money for the next year, which is the first appropriation that would go for construction; is that right?

General WHEELER. That is when we are hoping to get it finished, before the next appropriation can be made.

Mr. BUFFETT. You are reasonably sure that that can be done?

General WHEELER. Yes; we are.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you.

Long Fight Brings Success to Terminal-Leave Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including herein an article written by Hon. John D. Pennekamp, associate editor of the Miami Herald, Miami, Fla., in which he discusses the subject Cash for Terminal Leave Bonds May Result From Long Effort. I am particularly pleased to place this article in the RECORD for the reason that it was from a former article written by John Pennekamp that called my attention to the discrimination and inequality that was practiced between commissioned officers and the enlisted men, ordinarily referred to as the GI Joe's, in the granting of terminal leave pay for unused terminal leave time. The officers received full pay for unused terminal leave upon receiving their discharge or separation from the service, whereas, the GI Joe's got only a good handshake as they returned to civil life. Upon reading the article heretofore written by John Pennekamp, I resolved that if humanly possible I would correct this unjust treatment and this discrimination by the introduction and passage in Congress of legislation that would give equal treatment to both officers and enlisted men and women. I was inspired by this editorial to do this job and I am glad to say now that this legislation is on its way to a successful termination and I predict that before this session closes the terminal leave bond payment in cash will be upon the statute books and that the boys will get cash for the bonds now held by them beginning September 1, 1947.

CASH FOR TERMINAL LEAVE BONDS MAY RESULT FROM LONG EFFORT

(By John Pennekamp)

Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS' long fight to end the discrimination by which officers received terminal leave pay upon discharge while enlisted men did not, seems likely to bear early fruit.

More than 30 bills now are pending in committee, designed to do what the Fort Lauderdale Congressman, then a freshman, tried as far back as September 13, 1945. He then introduced a bill which would have paid to the enlisted men a lump sum for the leaves they lost during the war because of their assignments.

Such adjustments were made for the officers when they were discharged.

His bill, after some delays and circuitous routing, came to the floor of the House and was passed unanimously, the vote being 379 to 0. Approximately $2,700,000,000 of such pay is due the enlisted men.

However, when it reached the Senate the bill ran into so solid an obstruction that, in order to get any kind of a bill passed at all, ROGERS and the House had to accept an amendment providing for the issuance, instead of cash, of 5-year bonds bearing interest at 2½ percent annually. The bonds are nonnegotiable and cannot be transferred "by sale, exchange, assignment, pledge, hypothecation, or otherwise."

ROGERS, as soon as the present session began, introduced another bill which would have made the bonds redeemable in cash, a serious need of many veterans in this period of rising costs. It was bill No. 3 of the current session.

That, however, ran into additional obstructions. It became stalled in the Armed Services Committee, and objections developed on the grounds that it might disturb the cash position of the Treasury, prevent the balancing of the budget, and give a new lift to the inflationary trends.

Thereupon ROGERS introduced another bill, which removes these objections. It provides that the veterans may sell their bonds to private investors at not less than face value, plus interest.

This meets the objections of the economy block, because it calls for no Government expenditure until the bonds mature, which already had been anticipated; it does nothing to upset the budget balancing and it does not further involve the national debt.

The move, it is contended, will not be inflationary since it does not put additional money into circulation, but transfers it from one source to the other, just as it transfers the bond ownership.

In some instances, it is pointed out, it may mean a modest profit to the veterans, since the 2½ percent bonds are gilt-edge securities, and Government bonds, paying only 2 percent, have been selling above par.

Giving the enlisted men the 5-year bonds, ROGERS has pointed out repeatedly in his steadfast fight to restore the purpose intended in his original bill, "is like giving a soldier a gun without ammunition, or an old rusty musket whose trigger will not work.

"This prohibition against the use of the bonds for a period of 5 years is a distinct and flagrant discrimination against the veteran holding terminal leave pay bonds for the reason that there is no other bond issued by the Government that the owner cannot obtain cash on within 60 days to 6 months.

"I can see no valid reason why the terminal leave pay bonds cannot be used by the holder thereof. The withholding of the cash on these bonds from the veteran is a continuation of that discrimination which made the original act necessary."

Massachusetts Disabled American Veterans Favor H. R. 2661

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I have received from the department commander of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Massachusetts, in which they unanimously support H. R. 2661, a bill to name the Veterans' Administration facility at West Roxbury, Mass., the William P. Connery, Jr., Memorial Veterans' Hospital:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, Mass., July 7, 1947.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At the regular meeting of the executive committee of the Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, held Saturday, June 14, 1947,

it was unanimously resolved to support the enclosed bill.

The record of Comrade William P. Connery, Jr., is too well known to be repeated. But in view of his record and the precedents already established in naming the Edward Hines Hospital at Hines, Ill.; the Royal C. Johnson Veterans' Memorial Hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; the Murphy General Hospital at Waltham, Mass.; and the Cushing General Hospital at Framingham, Mass., our members of the Disabled American Veterans believe that we are not asking too much when we seek to enlist your enthusiastic support of H. R. 2661, which was introduced by the Honorable THOMAS J. LANE.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP V. LORY,
Department Commander.

Struggle for Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sumner Welles:

STRUGGLE FOR ITALY—JOB FOR VOICE OF AMERICA

(By Sumner Welles)

At this crucial moment when a two-world order looms before us, nothing could have been more tonic than Secretary Marshall's address of July 1.

For the first time the man who is directing American foreign policy has told the European peoples in concrete and simple terms exactly what the United States has done to help them since the end of the war. And for the first time, in language which can neither be distorted nor misinterpreted, he has pointed out the fundamental difference between the records of the Soviet Union and of the United States in their dealings with the independent peoples of Europe. It was high time that this contrast should have been drawn.

These facts must be brought home to the masses of the people.

As I have previously written in this column, the crisis which will decide whether Italy will adhere to the principles of individual liberty or become a Soviet-dominated police state will probably reach its climax during the coming months. There is no country in western Europe where American propaganda has been more hopelessly deficient. Notwithstanding all of the advantages which it has possessed, this Government has fallen down lamentably in getting across to the Italian people the nature of American policy and the extent of the help which this country has given them.

At the present moment less than one-third of Italy's 45,000,000 inhabitants support communism. Yet because of the ruthless fanaticism and ability of its leaders, because of its far superior organization and, above all else, because of the unlimited funds at its disposal, the Italian Communist Party is beginning to shape the thinking of a large majority of the Italian people.

The United States has time on the Italian radio networks. It has information centers in a few of the larger Italian cities. But desirable as this may be, the effects of such activities have so far been negligible in comparison to the impact on Italian public opinion of the six Communist dailies and of the 100 Communist weeklies now being circulated in Italy, of the propaganda being carried on by Soviet emissaries, and of the fact that the 6,000,000-member General Labor Federation is Communist controlled.

Communist agents have been maneuvered into key administrative positions in every branch of the Italian Government. In the earlier days when American supplies were being shipped to Italy in vast quantities, the local distribution of relief was frequently in the hands of these agents. They have led innumerable Italians to believe that the assistance coming from America was actually help rendered by the Soviet Union.

The State Department's information service has been inefficient. The qualifications of its administrators have been justly open to serious question, but at a time when it is more than ever essential that the truth with regard to this country be made available to other peoples, and particularly to those in Europe, it would surely have been the part of wisdom for the Congress to insist upon a radical overhauling of the propaganda machinery in the State Department rather than to reduce the appropriations for that service.

What is needed is that the masses of the people in Europe be given the opportunity of digesting the kind of information contained in Secretary Marshall's speech.

As a brilliant Italian statesman—a true democrat of the younger generation—said to me a few days ago, the great bulk of the Italian people have as yet had few chances to know such facts. They do not realize, for example, that the United States favored a just peace with Italy and that it was the Soviet Union that insisted on the present harsh and unfair terms, and demanded the severance from Italy of Trieste. They have not been told that many thousands of the Italians taken prisoner by the Russians were slaughtered in cold blood.

Only a few have learned of the humane and friendly treatment given Italian prisoners of war in the United States. Only a small percentage have ever heard of the contraband organization which the Communists set up along the frontier between Italy and Yugoslavia through which a large part of the wheat sent from the United States to feed the starving Italians was filtered into the Balkans to further the Soviet Union's policies in that area.

For lack of resources and for lack of a sufficient medium of information the democratic parties in Italy have been able to do little to make these facts known. As was recently demonstrated in Venice, when Prime Minister de Gasperi's efforts to speak at a great public demonstration were halted by Communist riot squads, the Communists will make every effort to prevent the democratic leaders from enlightening the people. For that reason statements such as that made by Secretary Marshall will be especially helpful if they can be made known to the people as a whole. Every facility available to the State Department should be used so that the facts contained in them may reach the European peoples this summer.

If the truth can be told to the man in the street, to the worker in the factory and to the peasant on the farm, the effects of Communist coercion and the Communist propaganda can be far more readily combatted.

Marketing of Hydroelectric Power Generated at Federally Owned Projects on Navigable Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Public Works Committee of the House:

Mr. Chairman and fellow members of the Committee on Public Works, I have heard all of the testimony presented to our committee on H. R. 3036 and, in my judgment, a case has not been made justifying the enactment of this bill into law and changing the existing policy of marketing hydroelectric power generated at federally owned projects on navigable waters. The two fundamental provisions of the bill are:

First, to shift the authority for the sale of electric power generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of War; and

Second, the requirement that all such power, with minor exceptions, shall be sold at the generating plant or bus-bar. This change, I believe, is of more importance.

Testimony clearly shows that by transferring the authority to sell the power from the Secretary of the Interior to the War Department duplication of controls will not be eliminated and efficiency and effectiveness in control will not be accomplished by reason of the fact that by making this shift there will be several agencies of the Government in the field of marketing power, whereas, at the present time, in the main, there is only one.

The provision to require power to be sold at the bus-bar would throw this great public industry back into the hands of private monopoly and would make it possible for one big holding company or utility to monopolize all of the power from a generating plant built and owned by the Federal Government, and put the consuming public at the mercy of the monopoly. This is what existed before the present policy of marketing power was established by the Congress. Under existing regulations such monopolies are prohibited and the power is made available to all public bodies such as cities, municipalities, rural electrification districts, and other organzations of a public character. It also provides for the sale to private utilities and does not in any sense deprive them of their property rights and the opportunity to serve the public. In fact, under present controls and privileges, their scope is augmented and in my area, the Columbia River Basin District, the private utilities are marketing Bonneville power and are in full accord, as I understand it, with this program. The Government itself does not retail the power. It merely provides backbone transmission facilities so that the power may reach market centers to be retailed there by private utilities or public bodies.

As a Member from a Western State, I wish to take the opportunity to make a few observations and give the viewpoints of the western sections of our country with respect to H. R. 3036. Initially I want to point out that I appreciate and respect the sincerity and objectives of the sponsors of H. R. 3036, but feel that the language of the bill should be amended so as not to do violence to long-established and accepted congressional policies and western institutions. These policies are understood and respected in the Western States where water resources constitute the foundation of our economy. Water power, developed as a by-product of multipurpose, Federal projects, is Government property under article 4, section 3 of the Federal Constitution. The Supreme Court has so held in all late decisions. Therefore, the public interest in the disposition of this type of property as well as all other types of property should be duly safeguarded. This has been sound Republican policy since President Lincoln enunciated this principle in connection with the first land laws. In his first annual message to the New York Legislature on January 7, 1907, Gov. Charles Evans Hughes restated this principle when he said, in effect, that water

powers are property of great value and "They should be preserved and held for the benefit of all the people and should not be surrendered to private interests." This viewpoint was held in the Supreme Court opinion in the Ashwander case, which was written by Chief Justice Charles E. Hughes.

Theodore Roosevelt restated the Hughes principle in his Rainy River power veto message of 1908. In this veto message he stated in effect that "It is unwise to give away the property of the people in flowing water."

He again restated this principle in the James River veto message of 1909. These two Roosevelt veto messages and the Taft veto message on the Coosa River Dam focused public attention on the outstanding importance of hydroelectric power. Theodore Roosevelt in the James River veto message stated, "I esteem it my duty to use every endeavor to prevent the growing monopoly (monopoly of federally owned power), the most threatening which has ever appeared, from being fastened upon the people of this Nation." These messages led up to the conservation movement which terminated in the Federal Water Power Act of 1920. This act provided in section 201 (f) that the provisions of part II (regulation) are not applicable to the United States, unless specifically provided in other statutes.

NAVIGABLE STREAMS

The Federal authority over navigable streams has long been established both by law and precedent, and stems from the commerce clause (art. 1, sec. 8) and the property clause (art. 4, sec. 3) of the Federal Constitution. In the first Supreme Court case of *Givvons* v. *Ogden*, Chief Justice Marshall laid down the principle that navigation is commerce under article 1, section 8, of the Constitution and that this jurisdiction is vested in Congress alone. The first congressional appropriations came for surveys of the tributaries of the Mississippi, which surveys were authorized by Congress in 1819, and surveys for canals, which were authorized initially in 1824.

In 1866 Congress recognized water rights on navigable streams and authorized acquisition of water rights by individuals for mining, agriculture, manufacturing, and other purposes. This was the first congressional enactment respecting western institutions. In the act of 1870 Congress declared that vested rights in public lands for irrigation canals would be effective against subsequent patentees. In 1891 and by amendment in 1895 Congress required the recording of claims of water rights on public lands. The first enactment that I can find covering water power was in the act of 1896 which authorized the Secretary of the Interior "to permit the use of right-of-way not exceeding 40 acres upon forest reservations, for the purpose of generating, manufacturing, and distributing electric power."

WESTERN INSTITUTIONS

Water is life to the people living west of the ninety-seventh meridian. Accordingly Congress, as members of the rivers and harbors section of this committee will well remember, made provision for protecting reclamation and other western rights when the last Rivers and Harbors Act was passed, that is, the act of March 2, 1945. In this act Congress, as the result of concerted western action, recognized the great importance of this matter and provided for coordination in sections 1, a, b, and c, and the provision affecting McNary and the lower Snake projects in this act.

Also the Pacific Northwest is a fuelless region, with natural compensation in the possession of the highest large-volume class hydropower on this continent. Consequently, western institutions have been built around these two life-giving needs.

Civilization received its start in Egypt when these people first learned and applied the lessons of cooperation in connection with the use of rare water. The West is thoroughly grounded through experience in the fundamentals of cooperation needed to protect their water resources and recognized the benefits resulting therefrom. To claim, as has been done in the testimony on this bill, that such cooperation is socialism is an insult to western institutions and shows unfamiliarity with western background and the advances of civilization.

Nature never standardizes its water courses or its water falls, and to attempt to do so legislatively, as in H. R. 3036, is certain to cause conflicts with the natural order. This is the western approach to such a bill as H. R. 3036. The pioneer instincts of westerners are to protect free enterprise, private initiative, and private investments, but they, in turn, demand that their natural resources also be protected for all the people. Therefore, when I differ sharply with some of the testimony given by witnesses unfamiliar with the West, I want it understood that I am not attacking free enterprise, but am only restating principles applying to western institutions, water and other natural resources, which have had long acceptance by Congress and the courts. Any good lawyer knows that the West operates under established water laws which are different from the common legal concepts of riparian rights which applies in humid regions. The people of the West respect the resource rights of other sections. For example, the people of my district do not expect that Michigan copper or Texas, California, Louisiana, or Arkansas oil be sold in Oregon at the same terms as exist at the source. Therefore, the West expects the same consideration in respect to its own resources.

The Nation needs western resources and western development. It was these resources that provided the tools of victory in the last war. Western resources provide pay roll in other sections, as western basic materials are used in eastern and southern satellite industries.

A great deal of western supplemental irrigation is provided by pumped water. Unless Federal power is accessible to pumps, this type of agriculture cannot be placed on a feasible basis. Bus-bar sales, therefore, will be a major obstacle to western agricultural development. Western farm organizations will strongly oppose bus-bar sales. The preference given to public bodies in lines 7 to 11 of page 2 of the bill is nothing more than an idle gesture and can give no hope to the West under bus-bar sales and is subject to the opinions of the Federal Power Commission. This is policy which should be settled by Congress and not left to the opinion of a body not versed in western traditions.

FLOOD-CONTROL LEGISLATION

This type of legislation is of recent origin. Congress enacted the first flood-control legislation as a part of the act of 1879, creating the Mississippi River Commission. The legislative history shows that the 1879 act clearly established the principle of Federal flood control, but the early Commission interpreted this act as applying only as a part of navigation and not as an independent concept. As a result of this early administrative attitude, flood-control policy developed very slowly. It was not until the act of March 1, 1917, that Congress adopted a flood-control program independent of navigation. Consequently there is not an accumulation of multipurpose flood-control projects as the evidence before this committee would lead us to believe. The impression has been created that the 1944 Flood Control Act took away from the Army engineers power-marketing authority which they formerly held. This is not factual and creates a wrong impression.

As far as I have been able to determine, the previous experience of the Army engineers in the power-marketing field was confined to early power sales at Muscle Shoals and Sault Sainte Marie, both navigation projects. At Muscle Shoals the Alabama Power Co. purchased power at the bus bar at 1.63 mills per kilowatt-hour and sold it to the farmers at the dam abutments for 10 cents per kilowatt, or a profit of over 5,000 percent. It was this bus-bar sale incident that led up to the TVA Act.

There is no finer body of men in the Government service than the Army engineers, but I am convinced that their best interests will be served by staying out of marketing, especially when they blanket the country with construction. Marketing conditions cannot physically be the same in any two areas. It seems to me that the best interests of the Government lies in using the outstanding talents of this splendid corps in engineering, but I agree that these qualifications enable them to report on the factual side of transmission feasibility, which should be included in their usual routine reporting so that Congress can develop over-all power development feasibility on a project basis. If this is done most of the reasons for H. R. 3036 will disappear. The West stands for sound financial policies, full reimbursability on power elements, and nonduplication of facilities. Their long experience with resource development is responsible for this position.

THE PRESIDENT'S KANSAS CITY SPEECH

On Saturday, June 7, 1947, President Truman addressed the Thirty-fifth Division Reunion at Kansas City on Resource and Defense Requirements. This speech was based on the Bonneville Act formula, and is along the lines that I covered in a speech on the floor in May 1940 when I pointed out the national resource needs for a sound defense program. The Bonneville Act, known as the McNary-Mansfield Act, was not a party enactment.

This Presidential speech confirmed my earlier judgment that H. R. 3036 could not be considered as conforming with the program of the President or any betterment program. I have seen no official reports from the Budget Bureau or departmental reports that indicated such conformity. Therefore, it is apparent that the testimony given before this committee is evidently based on a desire to expand the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission rather than a well-considered and approved plan to eliminate duplication of controls.

This approach does not make for good legislation. Fundamental congressional policy changes which would have far-reaching effects, should not be based on such considerations. Such handling makes for inefficiency. Instead of centralizing controls it divides them among several Government agencies.

With the heavy war debt which is on the backs of our people, every change should look toward bettering efficiency. Therefore, in view of the far-reaching effect of such a major change in policy as contained in H. R. 3036, I feel that this committee should have more complete facts bearing on the over-all plan. This committee needs to have more facts before it showing the necessity for such a change and that it would result in greater efficiency. Above all, we should have clear and convincing proof that this drastic change in policy would not return hydroelectric energy generated at these great Federal projects over to private monopolies for exploitation, resulting in higher costs to the consumers of power.

Policy rests with Congress alone, and when an attempt is made to change policy, we must know the effect of such a proposal on every section, every type of activity within the section, and how governmental procedure and efficiency is changed. Power policy needs to be clarified, simplified, made consistent, codified, and reduced to a fair business basis. In addition, there is need for a clear policy line of demarcation between Federal and State constitutional jurisdiction applied to

rates and marketing in order that prudent private investments made under State laws can be protected, and Federal expenditures kept within such limits and prevented from encroaching on private enterprise. H. R. 3036 does not accomplish these purposes, but leads to greater confusion and destroys long-established policies which have contributed to national development, the common welfare and national defense, and the prevention of private monopoly of Federal power. I feel certain that the West desires the betterment of development policies rather than a limitation on existing policies and institutions created under such a policy.

It has been only about 10 years since Congress established power marketing laws. This summer will mark the tenth anniversary of the Bonneville Act, and the experience to date under this act has been highly satisfactory. H. R. 3036 will nullify the beneficial policies which are a part of the Bonneville Act. H. R. 3036 divides management responsibility whereas the Bonneville Act concentrates responsibility, and in addition, places management close to the people affected. H. R. 3036 is a remote control set-up which places a brake on private initiative. It is bureaucracy in its worst form, leading to monopoly in Government. Congress has the constitutional authority to control monopoly in private business but should be extremely cautious in setting up any policy leading up to power monopoly as provided in this bill.

The Bonneville Act provides the answers to bus-bar sales. Under this act zone rates are permitted, but the application must be such as to prevent monopolization by limited groups. Industry, if it elects to locate close to a dam, can do so, but at the same time the channels are always kept open so that benefits can also be spread as widely as possible, particularly to rural consumers. This provision, therefore, gives the Federal Government more than one prospective purchaser, insuring a better pay-out return to the Federal Treasury. H. R. 3036, in specifying bus-bar sales, places the superior authority of the Federal Government at the mercy of one private bidder, and permits such bidder to siphon away benefits that belong to the farmers, irrigators, and small manufacturers. For this reason, H. R. 3036 works to the detriment of agriculture and is inconsistent with the policy governing REA enterprises. All friends of agriculture, if they realized the implications of the bus-bar sales limitation in H. R. 3036, would solidly oppose this proposal.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

This is a quasi-judicial body, and as such, under our constitutional government philosophy, should be strictly kept out of the management field, and in addition, should not have policy matters placed in its hands. What is done in H. R. 3036 is tantamount to transferring activities from the executive to the judicial branch of the Government. If we mix judicial with management functions, as is attempted in H. R. 3036, we could, with the same logic, ask the United States Supreme Court to administer the United States Bureau of Prisons.

As a quasi-judicial organization, the Federal Power Commission should properly exercise rate, allocation, and "return" jurisdiction—all of which are judicial functions—as is provided in the Bonneville Act, but the West would feel happier if there were a more equitable division of membership on the Commission, as western resoruces, laws, customs, and traditions are entirely different from those of the rest of the country. The most recent appointments to the Federal Power Commission indicate that the administration has not given full recognition to the western section of our country.

REIMBURSABILITY

The West has long accepted the doctrine of reimbursability of Federal reclamation and power expenditures, and an examination of the long-time public-works expenditures will demonstrate that the West has paid its way more than any other section of the country. A survey of total Federal expenditures for public works since 1824, indicates that the 17 Western States have received less than one-third of the total Federal Works' expenditures. Excluding river and harbor and road work, all these western public-works appropriations have been on a reimbursable basis. The West offers no complaint on this long-established public-works precedent, but feels that since they are on a pay-out basis they should not be hampered by remote control nor kept in a colonial status by unworkable processes. Total public-works appropriations apply to water control of all kinds since 1824 totals close to $6,000,000,000 for the country as a whole. Of this amount, seven-eighths have been on a nonreimbursable basis, whereas the one-eighth of this total applying to the West has required payout. The total long-time expenditures on water-control projects in the 17 Western States totals about $1,800,000,000, of which eight hundred and fifty-one million have gone into rivers and harbors, flood control, roads, and the like, nonrepayable items. The nearly $1,000,000,000 which have been appropriated for western reclamation and power projects have been on a reimbursable basis, without creating a burden on the general taxpayers. Therefore, policies affecting nonreimbursable projects should not be made to apply to reimbursable items. When an attempt is made to include reimbursable and nonreimbursable projects in the same formula, unworkable results follow.

FURTHER ADVERSE EFFECTS OF H. R. 3036

The bus-bar limitation in H. R. 3036, as written, would tie the Government's hands in securing the best possible sale of governmental power as in most cases only one prospective purchaser has transmission lines in the vicinity of the project, and the bill does not permit building even a limited number of lines to reach other customers.

Most municipalities and rural public bodies have individual loads totaling only a few thousand kilowatts. Under such a circumstance, it is not financially feasible for the smaller public bodies to compete with a large private grid in reaching the power outlets, especially in the West. Most of the good western power sites are located long distances from load centers and most of the privately owned lines do not have capacity to handle such loads to focal points. Therefore, H. R. 3036 will limit rather than expand western markets.

Some of the exhibits shown before the committee created the impression that parallelism constitutes duplication. A garden hose could be placed parallel to a 48-inch water main but the condition of parallelism does not indicate that the garden hose could supply water to a city of 100,000 population. Generally, transmission lines throughout the country of all types of ownership are now overloaded and before any issue of duplication can be successfully raised, we must know the load and capability conditions on existing facilities. The experience of the Northwest has shown that grid operation is beneficial both to the public and private interests as long as the public interest is not subordinated to private gain. If a grid system is properly operated, no destruction of private investments will accrue. Of course, a grid system is not warranted unless generation is high. H. R. 3036 will result in increasing the number of Federal marketing agencies rather than reducing the number. For example, the Bureau of Reclamation has been designated as the marketing agency for the Missouri Basin projects. However, under this bill, we would set up duplicate marketing agencies in the same area. This would leave the door open for private interests to play one Government agency against the other. Congress should not legislate such a faulty set-up.

Repayment of western reclamation is possible because of revenues from the sale of power and returns from other western resources such as earnings from public lands and oil reserves. Western reclamation cannot be accomplished on an individual basis. It requires cooperation in the utilization of all resources, including power.

There is another angle which has not been discussed in connection with the pending bill and that is atomic energy. As is well known, the atomic bombs which fell on Japan were energized by Columbia River power transformed into a new metal called plutonium. It is not in order to discuss publicly the developments which are taking place in this field in the Columbia River Basin, but I can say it is my considered judgment that more of the Columbia River power will be used in the future for atomic conversion than has been used in the past. Therefore, we should be extremely careful in legislating about a subject matter that can hamper national defense. The Columbia River, as demonstrated in the last war, is more than a regional development. From what has taken place in the fields of light metals and atomic energy, the Columbia means more to the Nation than it does to the region. This short reference indicates again that H. R. 3036 should be given a good deal more attention than it has received from the standpoint of national defense.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, for the reasons I have given and, based upon the testimony presented to the committee, I sincerely believe that approval of H. R. 3036 would not be in the public interest, but would return hydropower to private monopoly and rob the consuming public of the opportunity to secure this boon to modern industry, agriculture, and domestic use at a reasonable price.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

We, citizens of Polish extraction, residents of the Black Rock section of the city of Buffalo, having met for the annual observance of Poland's constitution of May 3, 1791, on this 4th day of May 1947, at the Post, No. 1041, American Legion hall, 930 Grant Street, in the city of Buffalo, county of Erie, and the State of New York, resolve the following:

We, as loyal citizens of the United States of America solemnly pledge our allegiance to the United States of America and we pledge our wholehearted support to all of our Nation's decisions with whatever sacrifice is asked of us to realize such decisions, and we pause to honor our sons and daughters who have demonstrated their allegiance to our country with the supreme sacrifice at the altar of the battlefield; and

Whereas our observance and manifestation today has the purpose of honoring the memory of the authors of Poland's constitution of May 3, 1791, which has become a pattern for all freedom-loving nations to model their systems of ruling their free peoples; and

Whereas today Poland, the land of the aforesaid authors, the land of many of our forefathers is ensnarled in the throngs of a

foreign occupation and has a system of life and government foreign to its way of life, history, and desires of the overwhelming majority of its citizenry forcibly wrought upon its populace; and

Whereas the great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, has unequivocally and unambiguously promised for all nations the freedoms enumerated in the Atlantic Charter; and

Whereas we feel that the United States of America resplendent with its high ideals of helping the needy, weak, and oppressed nations, is morally responsible for the present plight of the Polish nation which today is bearing the yoke of Communist oppression and of planned starvation; and

Whereas so many of Poland's most able and courageous citizens are scattered throughout the world under the classification of displaced persons who justly fear return to their native land of Poland because of the threat of ominous death or exile; and

Whereas the country of Poland was the first ally of the last World War and has lost almost one-half of her prewar territory in favor of a supposed ally-neighbor who has, in return, forced upon the remaining territory of Poland a government undesired and disliked by the majority of its peace-loving citizens; and

Whereas at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences the Big Three have guaranteed the Polish nation free and unfettered elections to be conducted in accord with democratic ideals; and

Whereas these great men of the world have realized the wrong afflicted upon Poland, have met at conferences, and have sought a way to soothe the wrong perpetrated upon one of their allies, viz, Poland, gave her a boundary on the west on the Oder and Dnieper Rivers and on the north a greater access to the Baltic Sea; and

Whereas over 4,000,000 Poles have settled on these reacquired, historically old Polish lands, which were forcibly partitioned from Poland by the "Drang Nach Osten"; and

Whereas the Department of State, with George Marshall as the Secretary of State, has joined those who wish to take from Poland these historically old Polish nation lands on the argument that it is necessary to reestablish Germany economically because Germany was the prewar center of economic life of central Europe; and

Whereas we, as citizens of the United States, feel that the lot which has befallen Poland and the treatment afforded her has no parallel with the subtle treatment afforded by our Nation to our defeated enemies; and

Whereas the citizens of our sister republic, Poland, are suffering from untold deprivations, the gore of hunger, and from the fangs of oppression, and that these hungry and privated peoples of Poland and the displaced persons scattered all over the world look forward to us for help in their endless plight and suffering; and

Whereas the American relief for Poland, under the direction of Dean Francis X. Swietlik, is straining its efforts and facilities in bringing to the Polish nation the needed speedy relief:

Be it therefore determined and resolved as follows: That we hereby appeal and send copies of this resolution to our Representative in Congress, WALTER ANDREWS, Senators ROBERT WAGNER and IRVING IVES, Secretary of State George Marshall, and President Harry S. Truman, beseeching their aid and support in—

I. That international politics be set aside when questions of aid to the hungry peoples of Poland arise.

II. That attention be not paid to the communistic tendencies of the present Polish Government for the election that placed that Government in power was not free and unfettered and did not represent the majority opinion of the Polish citizens.

III. That Poland be not therefore classified as a Communist nation.

IV. That our representatives in Congress and in Senate try all reasonable means to hurriedly end debates and pass the bill presented by Congressman STRATTON, of Illinois, which provides for the entry of 100,000 displaced persons annually for a period of 4 years over and above the normal immigration quotas.

V. That loans be made possible and given to the Polish nation for rebuilding of their war-torn country.

VI. That other humanitarian aid be devised to assume the task of relief work heretofore done by the now nonexisting UNRRA.

VII. That instead of partitioning Poland for the fifth time in its history by taking from her the historically old Polish lands of East Prussia and Silesia on the pretense that said territories are necessary to rebuild Germany economically for Germany is the focal point of economic life of Central Europe, that our country together with other great powers rebuild Poland; let Poland be the center of economic life of the nations of Central Europe, for there is no danger of Poland commencing war for the Polish people are basically and traditionally peace-loving peoples; be it further

Resolved, That an appeal be made to all unbiased citizens of United States, to write letters and send resolutions and telegrams to our representatives in Washington, D. C., to create in them a sympathetic attitude and a friendly public opinion so that justice is done in matters pertaining to the prostrated nation of Poland; be it further

Resolved, That a vote of praise and thanks be given to Dean Francis X. Swietlik, chairman of the American Relief for Poland and to the members of his organization for their efforts of bringing humanitarian aid to the needy Polish peoples; be it lastly

Resolved, That an appeal be hereby made to all citizens of the United States of America to do their share in helping the American Relief for Poland by giving their contribution and used clothing. Let us all keep sending packages to our relatives in Poland for they need our help and they cannot expect that help from elsewhere.

Long live the United States of America.

Long live the land of our forefathers, free and independent Poland.

JOSEPH P. KUSZYNSKI,
President Council 92, P. N. A.
Chairman, Resolution Committee.
STANLEY STRZYZ,
President, Circuit No. 2,
Polish Roman Catholic Union.
JACOB KUKLA,
President, Colony No. 2,
Polish Union of America.
STEVEN DOMBROWSKI,
Chairman Program.
JOSEPH A. STAROSCIAK,
Secretary Observance Committee.

Problem of Churches Involved in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star:

HOUSE HEARINGS SHOW PROBLEM OF CHURCHES INVOLVED IN POLITICS

(By David Lawrence)

The action of large church organizations in permitting their names to be used for or against pending legislation has its embarrassing moments. Printed copies of the recent hearings on the reciprocal trade and tariff issues before the House Ways and Means Committee, which have just become available, reveal an interesting colloquy between Charles P. Taft, president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and Representative REED, Republican, of New York.

Mr. Taft in his personal capacity is an expert on trade relations, having recently served very efficiently in the State Department. So far as his political and economic background is concerned he is perhaps as far toward the "left" as his brother, the Senator from Ohio, is to the "right."

Charles Taft testified first in his personal capacity and made an able witness, and this correspondent agrees with him on the views presented, so the point being made here has no reference to the merits of the subject under study by the Ways and Means Committee. It was when Mr. Taft testified as a representative of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, an organization of Protestant churches, that Mr. REED asked some searching questions.

ASKED ABOUT METHODISTS

He wanted to know how many members were in the organization. Mr. Taft said about 27,000,000 but stated he was not speaking for any such number. He was then asked if the Methodists were a part of the group and whether they had a temperance organization and whether, in endorsing the operation of the reciprocal-trade-agreements law, they were really familiar with what had been happening. The witness said he presumed they were not.

Mr. Taft said that the Federal Council, at its Seattle convention, passed a resolution about temperance activities, but he added: "The churches today in the Federal Council at least do not stand officially for prohibition." Thereupon Mr. REED inquired:

"However, did they take an interest in the trade agreements with Canada in 1936 and 1939 by which they lowered the duty on liquor—that is whisky—from $5 per gallon to $2.50?"

Mr. Taft replied that he did not think they took any steps. Mr. REED went on to say:

"Well, you are representing the churches here; I know you must be speaking for them here. Of course, it is a loss of revenue of almost $1,000,000 as a result of lowering these taxes. A very interesting thing to me is—I know the churches must have some interest—the fact that they have on the list, over there in Geneva, to lower still further the tax on whisky, brandy, gin, rum, and other distilled spirits; champagne, vermouth, and other wines, with certain exceptions; beer and ale and malt products. I can't tell to what extent. Of course, they had no particular referendum, with fine church organizations and the like, on this item."

Mr. Taft commented: "Their experience with prohibition has led them, to a very considerable degree, to the position that the promotion of temperance must be an educational process and it cannot be done by law—that is my conviction, sir."

Representative REED then inquired: "They are using this method of letting in more liquor to sort of educate people not to use it, is that the idea?"

SEEN AS "SOURCE OF DOLLARS"

Mr. Taft thought not and that it was merely a "source of dollars to the British" in world-trade exchange. Mr. REED promptly put into the RECORD a long list of figures

showing the recent imports of alcoholic beverages into the United States.

The incident illustrates how distrustful Members of Congress are of statements by committees purporting to represent the views of large church organizations. Thus, for instance, there are Members of Congress who do not believe that the recent statement issued by the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference arguing for Presidential veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill was ever submitted to any large group of Catholics to pass on but represented the view of a handful of "left wingers" who tried to use the name of a large and splendid organization to achieve a political action.

This is the kind of danger encountered when church units insist on dabbling in politics. Congress long ago recognized this trend when it passed a law which authorizes the Bureau of Internal Revenue to withdraw tax exemption from any church organization, religious body, charitable institution, or foundation which becomes active in attempting to influence legislation by propaganda or otherwise.

When a tax-exempt organization insists on the right to engage in political propaganda the fact that moral issues are involved does not immunize the organization from tax difficulties. Those individuals who contribute funds, moreover, run the risk of having deductibility on tax returns denied them because political contributions are not deductible for income-tax purposes.

There is no need to run these risks. For there are plenty of legitimate propaganda opportunities for clergymen, acting in their individual capacity, to take good care of the field of morality as it affects or is affected by Government policy on political and economic questions.

Manila Bears Worst War Scars; Squatters Use Ruins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

MANILA BEARS WORST WAR SCARS; SQUATTERS USE RUINS

Manila, once one of the world's most beautiful cities, still exhibits the ghastly scars of some of the most furious fighting that took place in the Pacific. It was badly damaged by Japanese bombing in the early days of the war, despite the fact that General MacArthur had proclaimed it an open city, but it took a terrific pounding in the fighting which preceded its capture by the American forces.

When the Americans entered Manila the Japs retreated across the Pasig River, blowing up the bridges behind them, and took refuge in the old walled city, the Government buildings and the palatial residences, apartments, and hotels in what was known as the American section of the city facing Manila Bay.

Heavy artillery was used to blast the Japs at point blank range, and few of the buildings in which they were hiding escaped destruction. Those which were not demolished were the scenes of hand to hand fighting, as the Americans went from room to room, smashing doors, hurling grenades and spraying the Japs with machine gun fire.

Only a few of the buildings have been repaired. Some are beyond repair and will have to be torn dawn. Squatters are living in the ruins wherever they can find a little shelter. Dewey and Taft Boulevards are mostly wastelands of rubble and destruction.

MANY BUILDINGS RAZED

It is not uncommon to see a flight of marble steps standing alone in a yard. The building to which they once led is no longer there. Dewey Boulevard has been also stripped of trees and utility poles. The Japs cut them down, so that they could use the roadway as a landing strip for fighter planes.

Piers and warehouses were smashed and the harbor was littered with sunken shipping. The Navy towed scores of sunken Jap ships out beyond the breakwater to get them out of the way and sunk them in a line so that they form an outer sea wall. Their masts, funnels and superstructures are visible.

The old walled city was completely demolished by bombing and point blank artillery fire. Heavy shells blasted huge gaps in the thick walls so that the American soldiers could go in and get at the Japs.

The contrast between what happened in Manila and Tokyo is startling. Tokyo had it worse, but the destruction there is not so apparent, because most of the Japanese buildings were consumed by raging fires and there is nothing left to mark the spot.

CORREGIDOR HIT HARDEST

But for complete destruction there is nothing to equal Corregidor, the turtle shaped island, surmounted by a huge rock, which guards the entrance to Manila Harbor.

Our party made a tour of Corregidor, which was one of the most impressive events of our far eastern tour. Our guide was Maj. Gen. George F. Moore, who commanded the ground forces on Corregidor at the time of the American surrender and who spent 4 years as a prisoner of the Japs.

The barracks, the hospital, and other buildings on Corregidor are mere shells. Jungle vines and trees are growing up around them and in time will hide their ugly scars. The golf course on Topside, the high land of the island, already has been reclaimed by the jungle. Only the old Spanish lighthouse survived the two invasions but it bears the marks of battle.

FAMED TUNNEL BATTERED

The famed Malinta tunnel through the huge rock on Corregidor was badly smashed when the Americans recaptured the island. The roof has started to cave in and it is not safe to walk through it. But General Moore conducted our party through it and pointed out the laterals where General MacArthur had his headquarters and where the late President Quezon of the Philippines lived during the early Japanese bombardment.

Many of the laterals were blown up and others were sealed off and became tombs for the trapped Japanese defenders.

Corregidor will never be fortified again. No attempt has been made to repair any of its facilities. Only a small detachment of troops is stationed there and their principal duties are to conduct parties of visitors around the island. Army FS (fast supply) boats provide transportation to permit soldiers and other sightseers to visit the island. As many as 400 make the trip on Sundays, with from 60 to 100 on weekdays.

MONUMENT IS PROPOSED

Eventually, Corregidor may become a joint American and Philippines battle monument. Every tourist will want to see it. President Manuel Roxas favors such a project.

One day our party was known to Baguio, the summer capital of the Philippines, for a visit with Ambassador Paul McNutt. The city of Baguio and Camp John Hay, an American rest area, were badly smashed in one of the last stands made by the Japanese forces in the Philippines. It was in the American High Commissioner's residence there, now the summer embassy, that the Japanese signed the surrender of the Philippines.

BAGUIO'S BEAUTY UNSURPASSED

Baguio, perched high in the mountains, with peaks all around it, is one of the most beautiful spots in the world and has a delightful climate the year round. It is now only a 50-minute flight from Manila. But when it was first discovered by William Howard Taft, the first High Commissioner to the Philippines, it could be reached only by traversing steep mountain trails on horseback.

The story is told that when Taft, who weighed around 300 pounds, first visited Baguio he sent a glowing cable to the then Secretary of War, Elihu Root, describing the wonderful climate and the marvelous scenery and telling how well he had withstood the gruelling trip on horseback.

"Glad you are fine," Root cabled back, "but how is the horse?"

A Conscientious Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harry Alan Sherman from the Keystone Republican for June 1947:

A CONSCIENTIOUS CONGRESS

(By Harry Alan Sherman)

Under the dynamic leadership of Speaker of the House JOE MARTIN, our Representatives in the lower Chamber of the National Congress have very definitely reassumed their constitutional prerogative as lawmakers.

The Republican majority in Congress has miraculously transformed that body in a few short months from a Chamber of vacant seats to a well-attended, conscientious agency of representative government.

For several lamentable years preceding the election revolt last November, the prestige of Congress had fallen to an unprecedented low in public esteem. Leading newspaper cartoonists habitually caricatured the Nation's Legislature as a weak "yes man" to the White House. Many an appointive administrative committee enjoyed far more legislative authority than did the elected constitutional Congress, under the whip of a powerful and unscrupulous political tyranny. Many a lawyer had long since scrapped his law books and had substituted political "fix" for precedent in adjustment of disputes involving legal interpretations.

The only way in which the former Members of Congress could avoid loss of political prestige or other embarrassment was to stay away from sessions. The busiest Members of either Chamber were the few delegated to drag enough others into session to constitute a quorum for the start of the day's routine rubber-stamping of White House bills. Even these latter stragglers soon found themselves uncomfortably ignorant of the meaning of the mass of "must" documents choked through on the day's calendar, and joined the others as Washington sightseers. So it was that in the Halls of Congress one often found a single Representative addressing hundreds of empty seats on a matter of

profound political interest to only his particular local constituency, for the purpose of having his historically inane remarks printed at public expense in the official RECORD and mailed to the voters back home.

All that is now a nightmarish memory. You cannot believe the writer unless you look in on your present Congress at any time of any day during a session. The transformation will positively amaze and delight you.

Our publisher, S. Percival Keyser, and the writer dropped in on the House and Senate on May 26 for a critical glance at the legislative branch of our Nation's Government at work. We had not the slightest hope of seeing all of the big names of those bodies actually at their desks, with their sleeves rolled up, earning their salaries; but there they were bright and early—all of the great statesmen of our day—teaming up with a polish and air of confidence that should inspire high hope and renewed faith in self-government.

The Republican leaders in both Houses of Congress are fortunate in having the most capable and distinguished assemblage of talented legislators which has graced the capitol in decades.

This Congress will make wonderful history. From its rolls the United States can draw great leaders for many years to come.

As Wilkinsburg's JOHN MCDOWELL pointed out to us the delegations of each of the 48 States we felt for the first time in a generation that our country's destiny was in good hands at last.

Incidentally Mr. MCDOWELL is an excellent example of the refreshing conscientiousness evident in Congress as a whole. Although not yet fully recovered from a slight breakdown from overworking on important assignments which took him across the Nation, and still unable to make a speech, he was in his seat at the drop of the Speaker's gavel. He loves Washington and is devoted to his duties, but, above all, he shares the burning desire of his constituents to regain the respect of the people of America and of the world for representative government.

We cannot too strongly urge a visit to Congress in session as an antidote for the blues.

If we sound enthusiastic, it is because the new Congress has made us feel just that way.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial on the labor bill published in the Millville (N. J.) Republican is herewith included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Members of the House:

The Taft-Hartley labor bill has become law over President Truman's veto. A substantial majority in both Houses of Congress affirmed belief in the new law as necessary for the public good.

Only some of the provisions take effect immediately, others in 60 days and in still other instances current contract requirements are unaffected. Labor unions have opposed the law since its framing. However, a majority of Congress believes it will ultimately result in greater industrial peace and improved employee-employer relations.

Like many laws, the new labor law will work no hardship on either unions or employers whose intentions are honorable and sincere. Although unions are made more responsible and can be held accountable for refusing to negotiate or for violating a contract, this is in the interest of the public welfare.

No relationship between two parties can long endure on a satisfactory basis unless the terms of their association are fair to each party. It is on this basis that the Taft-Hartley labor law is expected to bring about equitable relationship between unions and employers.

From a practical viewpoint there is nothing to prevent a continuation of amicable relations between those unions and industries where cordiality now exists. There are many more instances of harmonious relations between unions and employers than of bickering and fighting. However, it is a natural thing that only those cases of strikes and lockout and protracted negotiations with seemingly unsurmountable difference reach the printed page of newspapers.

The Government has the power to seek an 80-day court injunction against strikes or lockout endangering the national health or safety. If the public welfare is threatened, then there must be some protection for the innocent and majority of people whose lives may be in peril. Some idea of the seriousness of such a strike has been clearly demonstrated at least twice in the past few years in the rail and coal industries.

Under the new law employers are given the right to sue unions for breach of contract. Unions are prohibited from making outright contributions to political campaigns for Federal offices. Federal workers are denied the right to strike.

One of the main objections of unions has been that the labor law prevents the closed shop. On the other hand it does permit the union shop if a majority of the employees so desire it. Under the closed shop a person to be employed must be a member of the union. With a union shop a person employed has a stipulated time during which he must become a member but he does not have to be a union member to be employed originally. This is looked upon by the bill's supporters as provision for protecting the individual worker.

We believe, given a fair trial, the new law will soon reveal its weaknesses which can be corrected. We cannot subscribe to the thought that this is a perfect law. But we can expect that given time it will provide a sensible solution to what may have regarded as an intolerable situation which must be corrected if we hope to have better labor-industry relationships.

Modernize Our Presidential Election—III. The Unit Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the unit vote, as all know, means that whoever receives a plurality vote in the State receives its whole electoral vote. The vote of those who vote for the minority candidate has no effect in the election as the votes are finally computed. The controlling majority is arrived at by counting only the totals of State electoral votes after minority votes in the State are eliminated from consideration.

Mr. J. A. Dougherty, who made a very able study of the method of electing our President, has made this statement:

The only instance of the use of the ballot in the United States in which the vote is shorn of its full significance, as a vote, from the moment of its deposit, or, in other words, becomes subject to some influence that may render it absolutely futile and lead to its elimination from the final count, arises under the Presidential electoral system.

In every State, at every Presidential election, owing to the intervention of the electoral college, the voter for electors unsuccessful in that State has never yet deposited a ballot that had the slightest influence in the ultimate aggregate of the count. This result is not commonly appreciated; certainly not be those who affirm that the electoral system, even if obsolete and archaic, is unimportant.

In the campaign of 1800 the intense question was as to whether Jefferson or an anti-Jefferson man should be elected. One or two of the Federalist States changed from the district to the unit vote system in order to prevent part of their votes going to Jefferson, and to secure the whole vote of their States for Adams.

At that time Madison arose in the Legislature of Virginia—he had always been opposed to a general ticket—and urged that Virginia adopt the general ticket, which was done. He declared Virginia was forced to adopt a general-ticket system, a unit vote, as a matter of defense and also as a just retribution.

In other words, if the opponents of Jefferson in other States are going to disfranchise Jefferson votes, then Virginia, as a matter of defense, is compelled to adopt the same course, the same plan of minority disfranchisement, and offset the Federalist vote. When Madison said that it was just retribution he recognized Virginia had almost twice the population of any other State; when Virginia disfranchised the minority it meant she could give a larger solid block of votes than any other State. She could punish more than she could be punished.

The temptation of dominating groups in various States to control the whole vote of their States to the exclusion of minority representation in the electoral count finally resulted in the acceptance of the general ticket system, the unit vote, all over the Nation.

This, as in Virginia, was a surrender to local political expediency at the expense of the national good. It was induced, however, by a situation for which there was no complete remedy except by amendment to the Constitution.

It is interesting to note why and under what conditions the State unit vote was introduced into our plan of electing a President. It is clear that the system was not introduced for the public good, but to enhance the power of political groups controlling the States where it was first adopted. Part of the definite plan was to prevent minorities from getting representation in the computation of the final vote that determined the election.

Innumerable statistics could be provided to show the incongruity of the unit vote, how it disfranchises minorities and gives the plurality candidate vast numbers of votes which he does not earn in the election. I will submit some typical instances to illustrate now the unit vote works.

In 1924 John W. Davis as candidate for President received 6,000,000 votes that brought him no electoral vote. Six million people went to the polls and cast a vote for Davis that did not mean a single vote in the electoral college.

Davis carried a limited number of States in which he received less than 2,000,000 votes, and for those 2,000,000 votes he received 136 electoral votes. In other words, 6,000,000 votes meant no electoral votes; 2,000,000 votes meant 136 electoral votes. It is apparent there is no mathematical accuracy in the plan.

In a close contest the result is subjected to chance, a turn of fortune. A large percentage of the uncertainty, to a large extent the result in the Nation, depends on whether or not one candidate will receive a larger percentage of the disfranchised votes cast for the minority than his opponent.

In other words we have the curious practice under which the result of the election depends almost as much on how much credit a candidate gets for votes cast against him as from votes cast in his favor.

Another way of indicating the effect of the unit vote is by a comparison of the number of votes represented by one electoral vote as received by different candidates. In 1912, Wilson's electoral votes, each one, represented 14,500 voters; but an electoral vote for Taft represented 435,000 votes—over 31 times as many people represented by 1 electoral vote for Taft as by 1 for Wilson.

In 1928, an electoral vote for Hoover represented 48,180 votes; an electoral vote for Smith represented 172,602 popular votes.

In 1932, an electoral vote for Hoover represented 267,149 votes, and for Roosevelt 48,351. In other words, an electoral vote for Hoover represented more than five times the number of people that an electoral vote for Roosevelt represented.

In the election of 1932 the votes of 39 out of every 100 persons who voted, were discarded and not considered when the vote was computed here in the Capitol. A system of computing election results that discards 39 percent of the votes before the final count begins cannot be said to be either just or accurate. Such a method of computing votes can hardly be creditable to any government, especially to the greatest popular government in the world.

In 1932 Hoover received 2,150,000 votes in States he carried and which gave him 59 electoral votes. In the single State of New York, Hoover received 1,938,000 votes and not a single electoral vote. His votes in that one State almost equaled all of his votes in the States he carried; and yet from those States he received 59 votes, and from New York nothing.

Hoover's vote in New York in the 1932 election equaled his total vote in 23 other States in the Union. Hoover received nearly 15,800,000 votes and over 13,600,000 of those votes brought him no electoral vote whatever. All of his electoral votes came from less than 2,200,000, and none from the 13,600,000.

As the votes were counted President Hoover's name was not mentioned in connection with the electoral votes represented by over 13,600,000 persons who voted for him.

Mr. Hoover received only the electoral votes brought to him by the votes of 5.3 percent of the voters of the Nation, who voted in the States he carried. He received no electoral votes from 34.2 percent of the voters of the Nation who voted for him in the States he did not carry. In other words, 34.2 percent of the votes of the Nation gave him no electoral votes and 5.3 percent gave him 59 votes.

In 1936 Roosevelt received 60 percent of the popular vote and 98 percent of the electoral vote. In 1940 he received 54 percent of the popular vote and 84 percent of the electoral vote.

Here was a discrepancy between the popular and electoral votes of 38 percent one year and 30 percent 4 years later.

In 1892 Cleveland received 46.2 percent of the popular vote and Harrison received 45.1 percent. Weaver, the Populist candidate, received 8.5 percent.

Cleveland, with 46.2 percent of the popular vote, received 277 of the 444 electoral votes in the Nation; Harrison received 145 electoral votes; and Weaver, 22.

On 1.1 percent of popular advantage in the vote, Cleveland received a majority of 132 electoral votes.

In 1876 Tilden had a national plurality of 250,807 and 50.9 percent of the popular vote. Hayes had 47.9 percent of the popular vote. Tilden lost the election by one electoral vote.

In 1888 Cleveland, with a popular plurality of 95,713, was defeated by Harrison by an electoral majority of 65.

In 1916 Wilson, with a national plurality of 591,000, gained the one electoral vote necessary to election by carrying the 13 electoral votes of California by a plurality of 3,806.

The statistics above cited will indicate conclusively how impossible it is for the unit-voting system to reflect accurately the popular vote of the country. It follows almost as a mathematical certainty that now and then at future times, if continued, it will in all probability inflict great injustice upon the country.

I call this means of taking votes from a minority as a disfranchisement. I realize that technically that term may mean to deprive a voter of his right to vote. In my mind, however, there is little distinction between taking away the right to vote and refusing to count a vote after it is cast.

It is a serious offense against any practical conception of a popular form of government to deny the voter the right to have his ballot counted for the candidate for whom cast.

It is doubly offensive when the vote is so manipulated as to be counted exactly contrary to the will of the voter; to take the vote away from the candidate for whom cast and add it to his opponent's vote.

Under the plan we propose every vote cast for President in the Nation, even by its humblest citizen, will be counted and credit given where it belongs.

When in the Course of Human Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item for July 4, 1947:

WHEN IN THE COURSE OF HUMAN EVENTS

He's only Joe Doakes from around the corner, celebrating a great day with the missus and the youngsters after whatever fashion best pleases him. He doesn't have to ask anyone's permission or follow any set ritual. So maybe the Doakeses are going to the beach, the ballpark or to a fish fry along some bayou. Maybe they're having a wienie roast on the back lawn, where everything's homey and handy. Maybe they're just taking the old jaloppy out for an airing. Maybe they'll go hear some politician sound off about the day we celebrate.

And maybe his name isn't Doakes. Maybe it's Kindelburger or Brewster or Papapoulikos or Boudereaux or McMahon or Gomez or Adriatti or Cohen or Campbell or Svenson or Cabot. Instead of working at the filling station he might have a job at the supermarket. Maybe he's foreman of a ship repair crew, a college professor, a bank teller, a truck gardener, a civil service employee, a telephone lineman, an X-ray technician.

But whatever his name is in the city directory, whatever his job, and whatever he's doing to celebrate the glorious Fourth, he's also a lot of other people doing a lot of other things. He's young Tom Jefferson, slouched in an armchair in his second-floor-back at Williamsburg, dreaming up the Virginia statute of religious liberty. He's General Goethals driving a canal from ocean to ocean. He's Kit Carson, wading the icy Shoshone creeks to set his beaver traps. He's Horace Bixby piloting a gaudy steamboat down the Mississippi River. He's laying a railroad track across the continent, he's a soldier among the scarlet poppies of Chateau Thierry's fields, he's Ben Franklin establishing the first retail coffee store in his Philadelphia printshop, he's a Baratarian driving his pirogue across Coquille to join Jackson at Chalmette, he's Elias Howe perfecting a sewing machine.

He has preached a sermon, celebrated a mass, or read from the Torah, whichever he pleased. When monarchs, dictators, the bosses of political machines, or other would-be authoritarians suggested they might push him around some, he had a ready answer. When his name was Charles Pinckney he said to Talleyrand: "Millions for defense, sir, but not one cent for tribute!" And when he was just a guy named Joe he probably phrased it: "Oh yeah? You and who?" The wording didn't really matter. It all came to the same thing.

He's also Henry Ford tinkering with a horseless carriage, he drove a covered wagon across the wilderness, he helped dig New York's subway and raise Chicago's skyscrapers. He is young Tom Edison ticking away on a telegraph key, he drove a bulldozer ashore from an LST at Bougainville, he fished for cod off the Gloucester banks, he rode beside Custer at the Little Big Horn, he studied at Harvard in colonial Massachusetts or was graduated from a State university last week.

And he was the Wright brothers tinkering in a bicycle shop at Dayton, he was John

Howard Payne writing Home Sweet Home, he stormed the Halls of Montezuma and caroused in New Orleans with Winfield Scott, he built a cyclotron, he was Benjamin West at his easel, he designed Boulder Dam, he was Walter Reed liberating mankind from yellow fever, he was a Tinpan Alley tunesmith, he planted a Kansas field to wheat, wrote the deathless story of Huck Finn, and ran the length of the field to score a touchdown in a Sugar Bowl game.

He sat around a cracker barrel in a crossroads store cussing the Government, and he debated international issues in the United States Senate. He found gold at Sutter's Mill, signed the Atlantic Charter aboard a battleship, built a better mousetrap, taught the three R's in a one-room country school, explored the Antarctic, played the lead in a Hollywood movie, delivered an address at Gettysburg.

And he signed a certain declaration at Philadelphia 171 years ago today.

He did and was all those things because, whether his forebears landed at Jamestown or Ellis Island, all those things had a share in what he is and does today. They are part of the heritage men died to pass on to him; the same heritage which, if need be, he will give his life to pass on to those who come after him, the children of his children's children. In token thereof, this is the day we celebrate.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

UNITED STATES "VOICE" REDUCED TO A MERE WHISPER

WASHINGTON.—The House has passed South Dakota Republican KARL E. MUNDT'S bill authorizing the State Department to conduct the Voice of America broadcasts and other cultural relations programs to spread democracy in foreign countries. The bill will probably get through the Senate with some amending.

But even when signed by the President and made a law, the Mundt bill will be a good bit like a pardon to save the Voice's life in order to starve it to death later on. For House and Senate Appropriations Committees have hacked Assistant Secretary of State William Benton's Office of Information budget so heavily it has no chance to be effective, whether it ever was before or not.

What started out to be a $31,000,000 program was cut to $10,000,000, then eliminated altogether by the House. The Senate Appropriations Committee has now indicated it will raise the figure to thirteen million. But $1,500,000 of that is to half liquidate the outfit and bring back home from overseas all the experienced Foreign Service people who will have to be fired.

In all this monkeying around, one basic fact seems to have been ignored: In recent months the United States has been taking a terrible beating in the business of waging ideological warfare.

The throwing around of hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of relief and loans and military weapons is one, but it apparently isn't enough. The reason it isn't enough is that the Communists go around spreading lies about all the good deeds.

It isn't necessary to go out and tell lies about the Communists, to fight dirty just because they fight dirty, though that has been suggested. But it is necessary to counterattack with truth, just to keep the record straight.

That's why the congressional cuts of State Department information and cultural affairs budgets are suicidal. They are like refusing to pass ammunition in the Battle of the Bulge.

They take away the only weapons which the Government has to combat communism overseas, whether inexpertly used or not.

The reduced appropriation will make it necessary to close half the offic s now being operated in 77 foreign countries, the army of 2,600 trained specialists now fighting United States counterpropaganda warfare to a mere 600.

Editor, Pathfinder Magazine Urges Favorable Action on Mundt Bill To Establish United States Information Service Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, reports drifting over from the other side of the Capitol indicate that the other body of Congress through its appropriate Committee on Foreign Relations is about to take up consideration of the House approved H. R. 3342 to establish a United States Information Service Abroad. This is indeed gratifying information in as much as the need for exporting the truth about America has never been greater or more urgent in the entire history of this Republic.

Under permission granted me by the House, Mr. Speaker, I would now like to call to the attention of the Congress the following editorial from the pen of Wheeler McMillen, the editor of Pathfinder magazine published here in Washington. This editorial carries a persuasive and pertinent endorsement of the House action in voting in favor of H. R. 3342:

ALONG THE AMERICAN WAY—TRUTH CAN DEFEND UNITED STATES

(By Wheeler McMillen)

The way to get rid of a bad law, it has been said, is to enforce it. Likewise one way to endanger a good idea is to make a mess of its execution.

International ignorance about the United States, we have belatedly realized, is phenomenal. Worse than that, falsehoods about our country are industriously circulated. That something ought to be done has been pretty generally agreed.

The President assigned funds to the State Department, which seemed the logical agency to do something, and William Benton, a successful former advertising man, now an Assistant Secretary of State, was told to do it. Perhaps some of his work was well done. Nevertheless, the radio Voice of America has received sharp criticism. The traveling art exhibit, made up of such stupid pictures as one of a circus fat lady, provoked ridicule. Certainly it did not tell foreigners what America really is like. Congress has come near to cutting off all funds for the purpose because a good idea was badly carried out.

Americans dare not forget that the United States is now the only rich and free spot in a perilous totalitarian world. Nor that exceedingly few people elsewhere have any true conception of freedom. They do not know how good it is. They do not know that America's productiveness is the result of freedom.

Russia, whose acts can only be understood to aim at world conquest by ideas or force, or both, persists in telling outrageous lies about the United States. Russian propaganda misrepresents facts, distorts motives, and challenges any inclination to believe in the good faith of this country. We are reported to be imperialists bent on enslaving and exploiting the rest of the world.

A friend lately back from Europe told of seeing canned goods with Russian labels being passed to hungry Italians as bounty from Russia. But on the bottoms in the tin were the initials "USA." This was UNRRA or other food from America on which the Russians had managed to lay hands before it reached those who needed it.

General Eisenhower told a House committee that Russian Army officers bragged about the quality and performance of their Russian-made jeeps. Their Government has not let them know that these were lend-lease jeeps from America.

The chances for a war against the United States are greater when people overseas believe only evil or error about this country.

Correct information about America can defend our peace on one of the front lines. Plenty of foreigners display great eagerness to know more about the United States. Observers report that wherever the American libraries have been opened people wait in line for a chance to enter and read.

The true story of the United States cannot be told abroad without telling some of the story of freedom. The facts about freedom supply a powerful antidote to the promises of communism.

Freedom has proved its case. Free people can produce enough to eat, wear, and enjoy. We know that.

Communism has not yet proved that it can do more than to distribute poverty.

Why should not freedom be "sold" to people everywhere just as aggressively as communism, a much inferior product, is being sold?

Objection has been made that if our Government promotes an educational program abroad it will engage in propaganda. So what? If propaganda is a weapon for self-defense, let's use it. Our propaganda needs to be only the truth.

It now looks as though the Senate may approve the Mundt bill or other steps to enable the truth about the United States to be spread overseas.

When the world-wide issues are freedom versus tyranny, productivity versus conquest, plenty versus poverty—when our own freedom and our own plenty are at stake—common sense demands that America tell its story in every practicable form. Could we afford not to tell it?

Common sense also requires that when money is so spent it be handled efficiently.

Dissolution of RFC Mortgage Company Presents Serious Threat to Veterans' Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a situation which has caused me much concern in the past

week. The legislation recently passed which included the abolition of the RFC Mortgage Company has created a gigantic threat to our veterans housing program. The RFC Mortgage Company performed a great service for our veterans. In my district alone the benefits derived from this agency were tremendous, veterans housing was accelerated, and with the support of the RFC Mortgage Company many low-income veterans were given the opportunity of securing 100 percent financing of GI loans. It is now indicated that within a week's time discharged veterans in my district and throughout the country who are interested in homes up to $8,000 will have no real service available unless they can meet requirements of substantial cash down payments. I have had numerous letters and wires from real estate people, contractors, lending agencies, and veterans organizations in my district. The following letter is typical of the reaction to the elimination of the RFC Mortgage Company:

GENERAL MORTGAGE CO.,
Chattanooga, Tenn., July 7, 1947.

Re Veterans' Administration guaranteed mortgages, GI bill of rights.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ESTES: Following our conversation over the phone, we enclose at this time a list giving the actual names of the individual discharged servicemen and the amount of Veterans' Administration guaranteed loan desired in connection with their wish to purchase individual residences as a home.

You will notice that this list totals $392,700 and represents individual applications in process of approval by the Veterans' Administration for less than a 30-day period.

Since June 30, conservatively we have turned down applications totaling at least a minimum of $75,000.

The list represents loans to be made and closed for 100 percent of the GI appraisal and so far as we know or with the exception of the Prudential Insurance Co., whom we understand has restrictions relative to locations and age, there is no other institution who is in the market for the making of 100-percent GI loans.

From the list you will note that the average amount of the mortgage involved is only $5,610 and therefore without the support of the RFC Mortgage Company the 100-percent GI loans for the discharged veterans of small means for all practical purposes will be no longer available.

There are numbers of builders with whom our office is cooperating who have had the ability to build and are actually marketing new homes at less than $6,000. This type of construction is not attractive as of yet to the institutional investor and therefore the people who are actually making homes available up to $8,000 are also placed in a very difficult and dangerous situation in disposing of the homes they are building or have built.

The GI bill of rights for home ownership for the small family will in reality have been nullified unless the secondary market for GI loans through the RFC Mortgage Company is reinstated. Unless we can get some encouragement of the passage of House bill H. R. 4058, recommended by Congressman REDDEN, in the next few days, there will be nothing for us to do but turn down all pending applications of individual parties each of which involves the purchase of a home.

We assure you of our appreciation of your best efforts toward securing an early passage of the bill in question, which in our opinion is absolutely necessary, and we cannot conceive of how our own good home town can be much different than other localities.

With kindest regards, we are

Very truly yours,

WHITNEY COLBURN, *President.*

H. R. 4058 will do much to prevent the ruination of the veterans' housing program. This measure would amend the RFC Act so as to authorize the RFC to purchase home loans guaranteed or insured under the GI bill and it would provide a much needed and necessary outlet for veterans' loans. It is imperative that every effort be made to secure early passage of this measure if we are to maintain or hope to surpass our present level of producing homes for our veterans.

The Truth About the New Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, the most controversial piece of legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress is without much question the new Labor-Management Relations Act. Never has a pending bill been the subject of more misleading and in some cases deliberately false propaganda.

Among the picturesque labels smeared on it by its opponents were the scab labor bill, the death warrant for labor and the kill-union bill. Some claimed that its adoption was a long step on the road to fascism, others that it would deliver the country into the hands of Communists. It has been charged again and again that the new act denies the right to strike, legalizes the company union and the "yellow dog" contract, brings back the hated government by injunction and sets up a slave-labor system in the United States.

These are serious charges and they must be answered, because if any law injures the fundamental rights of working people as has been charged by opponents of this legislation, then the Congress has done the Nation a great disservice in passing that law. Therefore, without resorting to the name calling and smear tactics of the opponents of the legislation and making no extravagant claims of what the law will accomplish, let us consider the actual provisions of the law, and the reasons for its adoption.

THE NECESSITY FOR LEGISLATION

Why did Congress consider the passage of labor legislation necessary? One of the most commonly repeated charges against the new law is that it was passed solely because a few greedy monopoly capitalists in the National Association of Manufacturers decided that they wanted more money and therefore ordered their yes men in Congress to produce a bill which would allow them to wring the last dollar from the working men in this country.

But what are the facts? When the Congress met in January it looked back upon a period of unprecedented industrial strife. The Nation had lost $6,000,000,000 in its standard of living in the year after VJ-day due to strikes. Jurisdictional disputes, secondary boycotts, and other union abuses had been brought forcibly to the attention of the public. Union members found that they were subject, in some cases, to the irresponsible power of dictatorial leaders who controlled completely their right to make a living. The American people had come to realize how a few irresponsible leaders of labor could paralyze the entire country by ordering a strike by the stroke of a pen.

Consequently, when Congress met in January it was generally conceded that prompt action must be taken to remove some of the causes of industrial strife. During the lengthy hearings on proposed labor legislation witnesses before the Senate and the House Labor Committees offered diametrically opposed solutions. On the one extreme, the leaders of organized labor to a man demanded that no change whatever be made in labor-management legislation. They offered no solution to the labor problem except a continuation of conditions as they were. On the other extreme, some management witnesses demanded the outright repeal of the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act and advocated the abolition of all forms of union security.

The majority of the Members of Congress refused to accept either of these extremes. They adopted instead a middle ground. They felt it was essential to recognize and protect the good which unions did and to curb the bad practices which were harming the union movement itself. They also recognized their responsibility to protect the general public from the excesses of both unions and management. Let us see how the act carries out these objectives.

SOME THINGS THE ACT DOES NOT DO

First of all, it is essential that we recognize what the law does not do. Time and again opponents of the act have made completely false statements as to the effect of the proposed legislation in order to build up sentiment against it. These false charges can be nailed down once and for all by citing the actual provisions of the act itself.

It has been charged that the new law makes most strikes illegal. This is not true. The right to strike over wages, hours, working conditions, and other fundamental issues is recognized and protected in the law.

It has been charged that the new law in effect repeals the Norris-LaGuardia Act and authorizes the use of the injunction by private employers. This is not true. Private employers are still prohibited from using the injunction.

It has been said that the act legalizes the "yellow dog" contract. This is not true. It is an unfair labor practice under the act for an employer to interfere with an employee's right to join a union.

It has been charged that the act recognizes the company union. This is not true. The act specifically prohibits the employer to dominate or interfere with

the formation or administration of any labor organization.

It has been charged that the act destroys all forms of union security and requires the open shop. This is not true. The act specifically provides for the making of union-shop contracts where the majority of the employees in a plant vote for it.

These are typical of the many false charges which have been made. Others could be answered in the same manner if time permitted.

From this brief recital of things which the act does not do, we can see that from a positive standpoint the new law, just as did the Wagner Act, recognizes and protects the fundamental rights of labor—the right to organize, the right to join a union, the right to bargain collectively, and the right to strike.

Let us now consider the major new constructive provisions of the law and see whether they deserve the antilabor labels which have been given them.

NEW MACHINERY FOR ADMINISTERING THE WAGNER ACT

Often overlooked in considering the provisions of the new law is the fact that it sets up much-needed machinery for handling unfair labor-practice cases and union recognition problems. The procedure set up 12 years ago by the Wagner Act has long needed overhauling. The new act enlarges the National Labor Relations Board from three to five members. This should allow for more prompt handling of union recognition problems. In addition, the Board is relieved of its investigating and prosecuting functions which will now be handled by its general counsel. The Board, therefore, will be able to act in a judicial capacity in considering the merits of the cases before it.

Far from being antilabor, these provisions are definitely in the interests of developing and encouraging the growth of free trade-unionism in America.

IMPROVED PROCEDURES FOR SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

It has been charged that the new provisions for settlement of disputes restrict the rights of the working man and will lead to industrial strife. But again what are the facts? The new law accepts the basic premise of the Wagner Act, that collective bargaining will lead to peaceful settlement of disputes. It provides that where there is a contract between the parties 60 days notice must be given before its termination, during which time both the employer and the union have the duty to bargain in good faith before resorting to a lockout or a strike. Neither party, however, can be compelled to enter into a contract or to make any concession during these negotiations.

A separate and strengthened Federal mediation service is provided for to assist the parties in reaching a peaceful settlement of their disputes. Once the parties reach an agreement the act provides that it shall be incorporated into a written contract which will be binding on both parties.

Some criticism of the law has been made because unions are made responsible for their contracts, but the basis for industrial peace in any case is in the final analysis a contract and a contract is not worth the paper it is written on unless both parties to the contract are responsible for their actions under it. This provision of the act will greatly reduce wildcat strikes and other illegal actions which responsible labor leaders have always severely criticized. The law will insure that once a contract is made between a union and an employer neither party will have the right to break that contract without being responsible in the courts to the other party who has abided by its terms. In this connection it will be noted that the act protects individual employees by specifically providing that a judgment for damages against a union can be enforced only against union funds and not against individual members.

Here again a careful study of the provisions of the law reveals nothing to back up the charges of its opponents that the legitimate interests of the workingman will be harmed.

JURISDICTIONAL STRIKES AND SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

Among the provisions which have been severely criticized in some quarters are those which ban the jurisdictional strike and the secondary boycott. However, these provisions are definitely in the interests of union members and of the general public. For example, can there be any justification for men having to go out on strike in order to settle a dispute between two union leaders as to who is to receive the union dues they pay? Jurisdictional disputes can and must be settled without resorting to the strike weapon and the new law provides for the peaceful settlement of such disputes through the National Labor Relations Board.

There is considerable misunderstanding as to what a secondary boycott is. An illustration will best serve to bring this point home. Recently a milk distributor in California had a picket line thrown around his place of business, not because he had any dispute with his own employees, but because the union claimed that he was handling hot milk. It seems that the milk had come from cows which had been fed with hay which had been delivered on trucks driven by nonunion drivers. Certainly the Congress is justified in including provisions in the new law which will curb such practices as that.

These provisions are definitely in the interests of union members, because in effect what they do is to deprive a union leader of the power to compel members to go out on strike when they have no dispute whatever with their own employer but where what is involved is a dispute between two union leaders or between a union and some other employer.

FAIR RULES FOR UNION SECURITY

One of the most difficult and controversial problems considered by the Congress was that of providing for a fair form of union security. A majority of management witnesses objected to both the closed shop in which the employer must go to the union to obtain his employees and the union shop, in which the men the employer hires must join a union within a specified time after they go to work.

The new law bans the closed shop because a majority of the Congress felt the employer should be allowed to decide whom he should employ but it allows the union shop provided a majority of the employees vote by secret ballot for a union shop. This provision is definitely in the interest of the worker, because in effect it will mean that where the members vote against having a union shop that is a definite indication that the union is not properly representing the interests of the members. They should have a right to refuse to set up a union shop in such cases. Here again we find that despite charges to the contrary the act provides for union security and at the same time places primary emphasis upon the wishes and decisions of union members.

PROTECTION FOR UNION MEMBERS

The opponents of the new law generally have failed to point out that many of its provisions are designed to protect the fundamental rights of union members themselves.

For example, where a union shop contract is in effect in a plant, admission to the union must be made available to all employees on the same basis. The union cannot deny membership and thereby a livelihood to a prospective employee by adopting discriminatory rules as to membership or charging excessive initiation fees. In addition a man who works in a union shop cannot be forced out of his job for failure to belong to the union, if the union has expelled him for some reason other than nonpayment of dues. This will protect union members from losing their jobs simply because they have incurred the displeasure of some dictatorial union leader.

The requirement that unions furnish annual financial reports to their members is another one which is definitely in the interests of union members. Certainly members are entitled to know how their union dues are expended. Many unions now provide such financial reports to their members, and this provision will simply have the effect of requiring all unions to follow the good practices which some unions follow today.

Another requirement which union members should welcome is that which provides for proper administration of welfare funds where the employers make contributions to such funds. The law provides that these funds shall be held in trust solely for the employees and their families and that a joint committee of union and company representatives shall have the responsibility of seeing that the fund is properly administered. Welfare funds in some unions run into millions of dollars and certainly union members are entitled to every possible protection in the administration of these funds.

Another provision which is definitely in the interest of preserving free trade unionism in the United States is that which denies recognition to a union if one or more of its officers is a Communist or a follower of the Communist line. The law provides that every officer

must sign an affidavit stating that he is not a Communist before the union will be certified by the National Labor Relations Board.

In this regard there is one point that should be made particularly clear. The great majority of union members in America are anti-Communist. The great majority of union leaders are anti-Communist. But the Communists are making a tremendous effort to infiltrate key unions so that they may use those unions, not in the interests of union members, but for the purpose of following the Communist Party line as dictated from Russia. The Congress, by denying Government recognition to Communist-dominated unions, has struck an effective blow in behalf of the real American trade union leaders who are waging a courageous battle against Communist infiltration into unions. The only union leaders who can object to this provision are the Communist themselves, whose only interest in trade unions is to destroy them.

PROTECTION FOR THE PUBLIC

The most difficult problem which confronted the Congress was how to handle Nation-wide strikes which endanger the public health and interest. The act provides that when the President finds that a strike endangers the public health and safety he can instruct the Attorney General to obtain an injunction against the strike. The injunction remains in effect for approximately 80 days during which every possible step will be taken through fact-finding and mediation to reach a peaceful settlement of the strike. At the end of this period, if a settlement has not been reached, all the employees are given the opportunity to vote by secret ballot on whether they wish to accept the best offer of settlement made by the employer.

In this connection it is essential to recognize that the man who suffers most from strikes is not the employer or the public—but it is the worker himself who is forced to go out on strike. He can least afford to give up his entire wages during the period of the strike. Therefore, certainly he should make the final decision as to whether he wishes to accept the offer made by his employer. That decision should not be made for him by a union dictator who might be more interested in increasing his own power than in protecting the interests of the union members.

Significantly enough the major criticism of this provision of the law made by some of the so-called friends of labor has been that it does not absolutely guarantee that employees will continue to work in essential industries. That criticism points up the real strength of the provision from labor's standpoint. Because, despite public clamor for outright prohibitions on strikes affecting public health and safety the Congress refused to adopt any such drastic proposal as compulsory arbitration or the drafting of men into the armed services, but instead set up a procedure which postpones the strike for a limited time to allow negotiations for settlement. Here again, we see that the act recognizes and protects the right to strike and the basic interests of union members.

WILL THE LAW WORK?

This brief analysis of the major provisions of the Labor Management Act of 1947 has served to point up some fundamental conclusions. First, it must be recognized that the new labor law was passed overwhelmingly by the Senate and the House because there was a need for it and the general public recognized that need. Second, the new law represents a compromise between the two extremes offered by some union leaders and some leaders of management. It does not favor management over labor nor by the same token does it favor labor over management. In the real American tradition it is a law which recognizes the rights and responsibilities of both labor and management. It protects the rights of the public and what is most important, it recognizes and protects the fundamental rights of union members as well as union leaders.

The success of the new law in improving labor-management relationships will depend in great part on the ability and sincerity of those who administer it. The President has a great responsibility to the American people to appoint able men to serve as members of the National Labor Relations Board, as general counsel to the Board, and as head of the mediation service. He can thereby insure fair administration of the act to all parties concerned. The Congress has a continuing responsibility to study the operation of the law and to determine whether amendments are needed to make it effective. It is significant that the law itself sets up a committee made up of members of the Senate and the House to continue a study of labor-management problems, including means of improving the lot of workers throughout the country through the adoption of guaranteed annual wage plans and incentive and profit-sharing systems. If the President assumes his responsibility to administer the law fairly and if the Congress assumes the responsibility of working constantly toward improving the law where necessary, the success of the law in improving labor-management relationships will be assured.

The decision as to the effect of any piece of legislation must be based on fact. The facts definitely show that the new labor law, far from deserving the abuse which has been heaped upon it by some of its opponents, is a fair, equitable piece of legislation which properly administered, will promote the cause of industrial peace in America.

A Capitalist Looks at Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 7), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very scholarly and interesting article entitled "A Capitalist Looks at Labor," by one of the great industrialists of America, Cyrus Eaton.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CAPITALIST LOOKS AT LABOR

(By Cyrus Eaton, Cleveland industrialist and banker with broad interests in the iron-ore, steel, coal, and railroad industries; director of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway and the Sherwin-Williams Co.; trustee of the University of Chicago)

The one real threat to the capitalistic system in America today is the cleavage between capital and labor. Despite the wishful thinking of most of my fellow capitalists, labor alone is not to blame. An equal, if not a larger, share of responsibility rests on the shoulders of the capitalists themselves. Take last fall's coal controversy as a concrete illustration of my point.

All that the coal miners had been asking for was an opportunity to discuss their desire for somewhat shorter hours and other small adjustments in their working conditions. But the Government, fronting for the owners of the mines, declined to consider any changes as long as the mines continued in Federal possession. And the mine operators, hiding behind legal subterfuge and Federal possession prolonged beyond need, disclaimed any obligation to negotiate with the miners.

While publicly pretending a dispassionate aloofness, the mine owners, under cover, were working feverishly, night and day, to keep a torrent of abuse turned on the miners and their leaders, through every channel of publicity, and to urge all three branches of Government—executive, legislative, and judicial—to crack down on labor. Thus led to believe that the miners were out to destroy our economy, public opinion worked itself up into a dangerous state of hysteria.

The Nation was driven from one fit of madness to another by ranting oratory on the radio and by blazing headlines, inflammatory editorials, and brutal cartoons in the press, until civil war would have been inevitable, had it not been for the wisdom and the restraint of the miners' leader. Throughout the entire time, John L. Lewis never uttered a syllable of complaint and never issued a statement criticizing anybody.

The casualness with which we capitalists seem willing—nay, even eager—to invite the collapse of our economic system in almost every industrial dispute for the sole purpose of thwarting labor is utterly incomprehensible. Labor not only produces the goods and consumes a large part of them; labor also has the votes. In a democracy like ours, where the majority rules, therefore, capitalism cannot survive without the support of labor.

WILL LABOR AND THE FARMER UNITE AGAINST CAPITALISM?

The division that has existed in the ranks of labor itself has tempted many of our captains of industry to believe that it is safe to attack one union or group of unions without incurring the ill will of others. Here, again, the coal case is illustrative. Organized labor closed its ranks and expressed unanimous opposition to the short-sighted measures taken against the United Mine Workers last November and December.

There is an active movement under way now to translate that momentary unanimity into permanent solidarity. Whether or not these efforts are crowned with immediate success, eventual unity is practically a foregone conclusion, which cannot be dismissed lightly. The prospect of labor united should be sobering to even the most embittered and embattled capitalist.

I also believe we may ultimately see a strong alliance between labor and the farmer, accompanied by a tremendous expansion of the manufacturing and selling cooperatives. The effecting of such a formidable combination awaits only the magic touch of some dynamic personality. Then if capitalism has not already gone by the board its continued existence will be completely at the mercy of an estranged 95 percent of the electorate.

To avoid extinction, if for no loftier motive, we who are capitalists will have to make immediate and radical changes in our attitude toward labor and our methods of dealing with labor. We will have to begin by muzzling such organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers and by recognizing, and sincerely regretting, that there is bad feeling on both sides. For every corporation officer who characterizes a union official as a crook there is a labor leader willing to label an industrialist a bandit.

Our next step ought to be full and ungrudging acceptance of labor as human beings and as our partners who do the work. American management has exhibited the greatest genius in mass production and mass selling that the world has ever seen, but no automobile manufacturer ever thought of making denunciation of motorists the keynote of a sales campaign. On the other hand, many are the scathing statements that have been issued from the skyscrapers of Detroit against the United Automobile Workers.

IS THE PRESS MENACING ITS OWN FREEDOM?

Those statements and other antilabor propaganda have received far more attention from the press and the radio than news of labor's constructive activities, simply because the proprietors of our agencies of publicity are capitalists, forming a strong community of interest with their industrial brethren. Any labor dispute, however inconsequential, is fair game for a front-page article, with an indignant headline.

There is no greater news value in the minor and natural differences of opinion between employer and employee than there is in the ordinary disagreements within the family, the church, or any other human institution. The press devotes less space to the trifling infelicities of these other institutions perhaps because it is not out to destroy them. I am a firm believer in freedom of the press, but certainly freedom of the press becomes a downright menace to society when misused in this manner.

One of the worst sins committed by our corporations is entrusting the handling of labor relations to lawyers. The lawyer's whole outlook is colored by his constant searching of statutes and his intensive training in the artificialities of courtroom procedure. So far as I know, no appeal to the courts and no amount of flyspecking of statutes for technicalities to prove labor in the wrong ever settled a strike. Labor relations are human relations; they require the human, not the legal, approach.

SHOULD CAPITAL LOOK TO WASHINGTON FOR HELP?

For similar reasons, there can be nothing but criticism for the capitalists who have lately taken to running to Washington like crybabies for help from the politicians and the bureaucrats in suppressing labor. The whole story of governmental interference in business is foreign to free enterprise, and government, whether it be the executive branch, the legislative, or, of course, the judicial, is loaded with lawyers.

Last fall the Nation witnessed the spectacle of a few stubborn men in high places in the administration, puffed up by applause from the press and industry, preventing the settlement of the coal strike. The Secretary of Labor and his entire Department, incidentally, were excluded from any participation in the case, although they are the Government's specialists in the labor field.

The Supreme Court, after weeks of internal wirepulling and manipulation, finally managed, by the barest majority, to reach a decision against the miners that will be productive of untold evil in the whole field of labor relations. With only three of the Justices in accord on all of the issues involved in the coal case, and with the other six Justices embracing five other viewpoints, the Supreme Court has merely served to confound confusion.

It will take the Nation a long time to recover from the effects of official recklessness in dealing with the miners. When election time comes around again, moreover, the administration will feel the lack of the labor vote. Industry need not delude itself that it will often enjoy the support of the politicians. Politicians have to have votes to be returned to office and, as I have already pointed out, labor, not capital, has the votes.

One of our peculiar national traits is a pathetic eagerness to believe that passage of a law will solve any problem we have. Let no businessman be naive enough to believe, however, that restrictive legislation will be any more effective in bringing about industrial harmony than the Volstead Act was in discouraging drinking. Let it be recalled that the elaborate law that was passed to strengthen the transportation industry resulted in the establishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the biggest bureaucracy of them all, which has brought every known woe to the railroads. Bureaucracy in America is a failure; there are so many better opportunities in business and the professions that the regulatory agencies of the Government simply cannot compete for the best brains.

WHY NOT DEAL DIRECTLY WITH LABOR?

The only recourse we capitalists have, if we want to preserve our system, is to deal directly with labor ourselves. The mine owners, for instance, would find John L. Lewis the most constructive man in the coal industry if they would sit down and exchange ideas with him, instead of persistently refusing to let him play a more constructive role lest his influence increase.

Among my warm friends are a number of labor leaders. They are very able and attractive men. In common with the rest of humanity, they have ambition and pride. We capitalists are overlooking a great reservoir of talent by not inviting these men onto the boards of directors of our corporations and the boards of trustees of our universities an other public institutions.

It is true that the leaders of labor have risen from humble beginnings to their present positions of influence by hard work, but so have many of America's most eminent industrial leaders. And while the descendants of the industrial pioneers are disporting themselves at cocktail parties, the horny-handed sons of toil are hard at it to represent their union constituencies with first-class talent of every kind. Their corps of workers and thinkers include experts in law, economics, research, politics, and publicity. Philip Murray, the skilled leader of the CIO, has assembled an organization that compares favorably with the best that business can boast. The AFL and the railroad brotherhoods, likewise, are staffed with earnest and competent men.

This is not to say that labor is perfect, any more than management is. Labor is guilty of many abuses. The one that calls for the strongest criticism is the small production per man in some industries in comparison to the output that could be achieved. It is difficult to berate labor for demanding more pay for less work, however, while many corporation officials who devote half of their time to golf vote themselves enormous incentive bonuses at the expense of their stockholders.

WHAT EXAMPLE SHOULD CAPITAL SET FOR LABOR?

The classical example of managerial folly is found in one especially vain and strutting corporation head who some years ago announced that he would retire from business before he would let his plants be organized. He wasted $20,000,000 of his stockholders' money in a futile fight against a strike for union recognition. Having spearheaded the attack on labor, he expected his fellow industrialists to reward his company with more business, but found that they placed their orders with other concerns whose more dependable labor relations assured better delivery. Needless to say, he failed to keep his promise to retire, and, although business fell off, he and his fellow executives—none an owner of more than a nominal amount of stock—continued to pay themselves fancy salaries while giving the stockholders only a meager return on their investment. The only tangible result of his whole performance has been an occasional word of praise from Westbrook Pegler.

Such extreme cases are the exception, but they do capitalism untold harm. The men at the top may think that they are omniscient, and that their system is omnipotent in that, of itself, it can confer on humanity all of the material blessings. But both capitalism and the men in it have all the weaknesses and limitations that have racked every system, economic, political, and religious, devised by man during his millions of years of martyrdom. What counts in any system is the intelligence, self-control, conscience, and energy of the individual.

I prefer capitalism and democracy to all other economic and political forms. I believe they will only survive as long as their leaders set an example of hard work and restraint toward those who are less well off. It is the job of capital to convince labor of the dignity and glory of the strenuous life. Hard work appeals to me as the only sure way to happiness, health, and good morals, for rich and poor, high and low alike. There is no spiritual reward to equal the one that comes from a good day's work, well done.

Morals of Selling Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 7), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the July 1947 issue of Kiplinger magazine entitled "Morals of Selling Liquor."

I agree wholeheartedly with the article's contention that the liquor industry ducks public responsibility. I am, however, at variance with the writer's comment concerning the antiliquor advertising proposal, S. 265, in that I feel the proposed legislation, which is currently in the hands of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, should be enacted.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORALS OF SELLING LIQUOR, THE INDUSTRY NETS HUGE PROFITS ON HIGH PRICES, BUT DUCKS PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

In most businesses, when a merchant sells a product and rings up the price his responsibilities end. The makers and sellers of distilled liquor differ from other businessmen particularly in the fact that they have new responsibilities after the customer takes the goods away.

These responsibilities they do not want, will not publicly accept and do precious little to meet. The measure of their general sense of public responsibility can be expressed with two specific facts:

The distilling industry—not including wholesalers and retailers—last year cleared more than $200,000,000 net, after taxes.

The industry, during a decade, has privately contributed less than $1,000,000 to scientific research on alcoholism problems, while publicly disclaiming any responsibility for alcoholism. At the same time it has been spending over $100,000,000 every year to advertise the joys of whisky drinking.

Fourteen years after repeal the industry, while cynically keeping prices at staggering heights in order to make these huge profits, has not even made a start at solving problems whose existence may wreck it along with the lives of a few hundred thousand Americans. One of these problems is that alcohol is a constant—some say increasing—factor in juvenile delinquency, divorce, crime, mental disease and traffic casualties.

This makes it inevitable that public groups should look at the $8,800,000,000 liquor industry and ask how it is organized, how well it functions and how much, if any, social decency it shows in making and selling its product.

Professional drys and drinkers are not the only people interested. Other groups—churches, courts, social agencies, editorial writers, State, city and Federal officials—are scrutinizing the liquor industry and trade. What do they see?

They see, first, a good record of industrial efficiency in the manufacturing end, dominated by four big distilling corporations—Schenley, National, Seagram, and Hiram Walker.

Industrial chemistry is turning whisky into a byproduct of the distillery, with the "spent stillage" (residue from fermenting vats) as a growing source of profits. It averages $40 per ton, enough to cover operating costs and yield a profit. The modern distillery is a huge grain-processing plant, turning out livestock feed rich in proteins and vitamins; corn oil, fusel oil, the vitamin B complex, penicillin, and dry ice. As such it is a boon to industry and to many farms.

This high degree of efficiency has been achieved by the Big Four partly through aggressive acquisition of smaller distilleries and buying into other branches of the liquor industry.

As a result, they have often been accused of a trend toward monopoly. The Big Four retort that few industries are as hotly competitive as theirs. The record indicates that the monopoly trends are temporarily, at least, coming to an end. The big firms have slackened off on the buying of smaller distilleries and brand names; some are reported ready to dispose of recently acquired distilleries and tight cooperage firms.

The industry's first delinquency appears in its price policies, through which distillers, wholesalers, and retailers alike have enthusiastically gouged the 50,000,000 Americans who drink.

"I hope we never see another year as good as 1946," said one spokesman. "It's a bad thing for the liquor business to make that much money."

Last year the United States Treasury received more than $2,000,000,000 from the beverage-distilling industry, and State and local treasuries received $464,000,000. Despite this enormous levy, very high profit margins enabled distillers to clear two hundred millions after taxes, of which the Big Four (who hold about 63 percent of all United States whisky stocks) got one hundred and fifty-five million.

Huge earnings are by no means limited to distillers, who say they take only about 10-percent profit. The wholesaler supposedly gets 15 percent, and the retailer 33⅓ percent. But there are usually higher margins in all three groups. And all these profit percentages are figured on gross cost, which includes, for whisky, the Federal tax of $21.60 per case.

In the buyer's eye, the retailer is particularly guilty. He gets his 33⅓-percent cut, which some retailers have jumped as high as 65 percent, merely for selling a bottle. He doesn't even have to worry about waste and spoilage.

But distillers and wholesalers take the customer just as ruthlessly as the retailer does. The last price rises for bottled-in-bond whisky are not seriously defended by anybody in the trade, and the United States price of Scotch has brought yelps of indignation from the Highlands.

One industry spokesman says an efficient United States distiller today can make whisky for about 12 cents per fifth. It is only after taxes, advertising, and other costs have been added that the pile-up of profit margins begins to build the retail price.

The consumer has no protection against high prices except to stop buying. But most drinkers won't do it. The Department of Commerce calculates that every time consumers' incomes rise 10 percent, liquor store sales rise 19 percent. Liquor consumers are not likely to get price relief unless production outruns demand or a recession cuts down buying.

In addition to price-gouging and monopoly practices, the industry has been criticized on two other counts: for maintaining retail outlets which breed crime and anti-social behavior, and for publicity which encourages more drinking.

Federal law forbids suppliers to have any connection with retail outlets. Wholesalers have been challenged to refuse to sell liquor to retailers who do not maintain proper standards. This is sheer twaddle. No industry will reach for such a responsibility, which would require a horde of private police anyway.

Nevertheless, the industry has a cash interest in the decency of outlets: When public indignation arises, local option elections dry up communities. So organizations like the Distilled Spirits Institute in Washington have taken such action as they thought they could. They have gingerly put pressure on State and local officials to enforce liquor laws. In Illinois, which has the laxest regulations of any State, they have asked State officials to sponsor tighter legislation. Elsewhere local officials have been quietly asked to close taverns which attract attention by serving drunks or minors or by other offenses.

But at the same time the industry pours its millions into advertising campaigns to induce more people to drink more liquor—always "moderately" of course.

Whisky is not a product likely to develop muscles, character, or intellect, and any attempts to present it as such would backfire. So the only publicity gambit is to glamorize the drinking by associating it with social prestige, wealth, pleasure and beauty.

The incongruity of a man of distinction hiring out as a model holding a highball doesn't bother the industry. But the cumulative effect of such advertising, constantly reiterated, on marginal drinkers and young people, bothers many observers besides professional drys.

The industry is sensitive to this attention. Before the war it ran a certain amount of advertising ostensibly designed to discourage excess drinking, drunken driving, etc., but it stopped this several years ago. It cannot use the radio (although beer and wine concerns can) and it avoids advertising in Sunday publications. But mass advertising of the big companies in daily newspapers, in magazines, and on billboards impresses the attractions of drinking on millions of people.

One reaction of this advertising splurge is the Capper bill now before Congress, which would ban all Nation-wide liquor advertising in newspapers, magazines, and radio. The Capper bill raises issues of press and business freedom for these and other reasons it probably is not a satisfactory answer. But it carries a threat of repressive legislation which the liquor people find most ominous.

The point where the industry is probably most sensitive to public opinion is chronic alcoholism. Liquor spokesmen disclaim all responsibility on the ground that chronic alcoholism is a psychiatric problem which afflicts only 1 percent of the drinking public. (Best hard estimates are 750,000 "chronic alcoholics"—of whom 13,000 are "alcoholic maniacs" and 3,000,000 "excessive drinkers.")

But it is on this account that individual distillers have given a half million dollars or more to scientific groups which are trying to improve the treatment of drunks.

Recently an industry group, Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., of New York, engaged a sociologist named Dr. William Cherin to make a survey of the whole field of alcoholic research. LBI has chipped in $70,000 over and above the gifts of individual firms, and promises more.

Analysis of the industry's record in regard to monopoly, prices, and alcoholism reveals a not surprising secret: its behavior is an accurate reflection of the amount of pressure brought to bear on it. The Government has long kept suspicious eyes on the distillers, so they have been careful not to let monopoly trends go too far. But the industry has shown no restraint in its price policies. And even under pressure from many sectors of public opinion, it has made only a tiny and reluctant effort to grapple with antisocial conduct caused by its product.

So far these tactics have proved profitable without jeopardizing the industry's markets. But some observers think proposals like the Capper bill are straws in the wind.

A cut in consumer income, continued high prices, and increased antisocial behavior associated with alcohol may expose the industry to repressive legislation and increased State and local tax levies.

Already the prohibitionists, who never rest, have dried up about a quarter of this country. There can hardly be any doubt that the cynicism and excesses of the liquor industry have helped them do it. The industry needs to clean itself up for its own sake, even if it chooses to ignore its moral responsibility.

Venue in Actions Against Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, a very important matter is scheduled to be considered by the House the latter part of this week or early next week. The bill is H. R. 1639 which seeks to change the law with reference to the venue of lawsuits brought against interstate carriers by

railroad. The bill would limit the places where such lawsuits could be brought to only two jurisdictions.

This bill is reported from the House Committee on the Judiciary. The members of that committee are divided on the advisability of such a change.

A substantial number of the members of the committee have drafted and signed a minority report. This report recognizes full well that certain evils exist with reference to the trial of this class of lawsuits, but they feel that the proposals embodied in H. R. 1639 are too drastic and work an unfair discrimination against railroad employees. They also feel that H. R. 1639 will not wipe out the evils against which it is directed. We have proposed an alternative method of striking at the evil without at the same time working an injustice to the railroad worker.

A discussion of the inadequacies of H. R. 1639 to meet the problems presented together with a full discussion of the alternative plan is contained in the minority report, filed as part II of Report 613, which accompanies H. R. 1639. Because the matter involved is somewhat technical, it is thought advisable to make the contents of this report available to all of the Members of the House before the matter comes up for consideration in order that they might have an opportunity to give the contents of the minority report their study and consideration. I, therefore, include the minority report as a part of my remarks. The report follows:

VENUE IN ACTIONS AGAINST INTERSTATE CARRIERS BY RAILROAD ON ACCOUNT OF DEATH OR PERSONAL INJURIES

Mr. DEVITT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following minority report:

We are opposed to the passage of H. R. 1639 for these reasons:

1. The bill, if enacted, would not wipe out the evils against which it is directed.

2. The bill is unfair in that it discriminates against one class of citizens, to wit, the railroad workers.

3. The bill restricts State courts in the administration of justice, deprives them of their prerogatives to require change of venue of lawsuits where necessary, and transcends the provisions of State laws governing the jurisdiction of State courts.

We are in favor of amending the bill so as to require the bringing of all lawsuits by all classes of people under the same venue statute. An amendment to effectuate this objective will be discussed later.

I

It is admitted that certain unethical attorneys solicit cases under the Federal Employers' Liability Act and transport them to far-distant places for trial and that such lawyers employ touts and runners to solicit business for them, all to the detriment of the legal profession, the railroad workers, the railroads, and the general public. The evidence presented at the hearings was clear that the legal business under this act is concentrated in the hands of a relatively small number of practicing attorneys in the United States and that such actions are customarily brought in a restricted number of communities in the country. It is admitted that some action must be taken to correct the situation.

We submit that requiring the bringing of these lawsuits in the district or county of the residence of the plaintiff, or in which the cause of action arose, will not wipe out the evil that exists. Unscrupulous lawyers will still ply their trade to the detriment of all concerned. Limiting the places where action may be brought will only mean that such lawyers will bring their causes of action in a less limited number of jurisdictions. But the racket will continue.

The basic responsibility for policing the legal profession rests with the legal profession itself, and with the courts, of which such lawyers are officers. It is appreciated that the taking of disciplinary action by bar associations and the courts is sometimes slow and cumbersome. But the fact that it is does not justify our enacting legislation which discriminates against a class of our citizens and which disrupts the fabric of our Federal and State laws.

II

In the event that the proposed course of action outlined in H. R. 1639 was not detrimental to any class of persons, it might be well to change the statute in the manner suggested in order to determine, by trial and error, how effective such a course would be, but to enact the proposals contained in this bill would work to the potential detriment of 2,000,000 railroad employees by inadvisedly and unreasonably limiting the places where they, or their legal representatives, could bring their causes for action against railroads. This would be patent discrimination.

We might as well ask ourselves: "Is not the injured railroad employee entitled to bring his cause of action against his employer under exactly the same circumstances as is the passenger who suffers injuries, or as is the owner of goods damaged in transit? Should not the railroad man suing his employer be entitled to the same privileges of venue as is the employee of any other corporation? There is no basis for distinction.

Why, then, are railroad people singled out and discriminated against in this fashion? It is true that in the bill as amended in committee another class of persons is included in the discrimination; thus a nonemployee who is injured at a crossing or while a passenger, is by the amendment, subjected to the same limitation of venue, but this is only a palliative added as an afterthought to the bill in order to make the discrimination less glaring. The discrimination is nonetheless real even though it may include a second class of persons.

The third objection which prompts our opposition to this bill is based on the effect its enactment would have in unnecessarily restricting the venue of lawsuits in both the Federal and State courts.

It must be appreciated that railroads operate their lines over extensive areas. Some railroads maintain their own hospitals where injured railroad employees are hospitalized. It is customary for the southern transcontinental railroads to maintain hospitals on the west coast, in Los Angeles and San Francisco. A railroad brakeman might live and be injured in the State of New Mexico and be hospitalized in San Francisco. Necessary medical witnesses to testify to his physical condition would live in the State of California. It would be a practical impossibility to get them to come to New Mexico to testify. Normally an experienced medical specialist cannot leave his practice. Taking his testimony by deposition is normally a very ineffective substitute. The provisions of H. R. 1639, in a case like this, would work to the prejudice of the injured railroad man. He could not obtain the necessary and all-important medical testimony. Other examples can be cited of cases where necessary witnesses (for instance, a passenger) would not be available either in the district where the plaintiff lived or where the accident took place. Under H. R. 1639 no discretion is vested in the courts to authorize a change of venue for the convenience of witnesses.

Testimony at the hearings was to the effect that in many communities a distinct prejudice exists in favor of railroads and against persons bringing lawsuits against common carriers by rail. Even in cases of this kind it would be necessary, under the present proposal, that the lawsuit be tried in that community regardless of the prejudice.

The venue statutes of most States in the Union normally provide that the lawsuit may be moved from the place where it is instituted to some other jurisdiction—

1. For the convenience of witnesses;
2. In order to serve the ends of justice; or
3. To insure an impartial trial.

This is the law in the State of Minnesota. (See Minnesota Statutes Annotated, sec. 542.11.) Substantially the same provisions are contained in the statutes of most States.

Under the terms of this bill it would not be possible to move a case of this kind to a different county within a State for the convenience of witnesses or for any other person. The bill lays the venue in the county where the cause of action arose or where the plaintiff resides. It permits no deviation. We might well ask the question: "Why should the injured railroad employee or the legal representative of a deceased worker be discriminated against in this fashion?"

The laws of the various States also provide for the places where foreign and domestic corporations, including railroad corporations, may be sued. The statutes vary in the different States. The present bill would change the law in every State of the Union so as to specifically lay the venue in only two counties, to wit: Where the cause of action arose or where the plaintiff lives. This is an undue restriction imposed on the State courts and is of doubtful constitutionality. Under the law as it is today, venue in the State courts is laid in accordance with the State statutes, and lawsuits may be moved around for the convenience of witnesses and for other purposes in accordance with the provisions of the State laws. Here, again, we ask: What is the basis for making the change?

It is admitted that an evil exists in the operation of the present law and that some action should be taken by the Congress to strike at that evil. What should the Congress do? Let us first look at the problem and see how the evil arose, then we should be in a position, without prejudice or bias, to prescribe the proper remedy.

The Federal Employers' Liability Act was first enacted in 1908. This act abolished the common-law defense of assumption of risk. It did away with the defense that an injured employee suffered injury or death as the result of negligence of a fellow servant, and abolished the defense of contributory negligence. Under the law, the negligence of the injured employee is considered only in mitigation of the damages that he or his estate otherwise might be awarded. By amendments to this act in 1910, the present venue provision of the act was enacted. It has remained the same for 37 years.

The trafficking in, and solicitation of, lawsuits under the act became a major problem after 1942. Why did it arise? The answer to this question is furnished us by a witness who testified, not as an opponent but as a proponent of H. R. 1639. The witness was Thomas P. Gay, Richmond, Va., attorney, president of the Virginia State Bar Association, and chairman of the committee on jurisprudence and law reform of the American Bar Association. (See p. 136 of the hearings.) When he appeared before the committee, he testified that traffic in these lawsuits arose after 1942 following the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the *Kepner* (314 U. S. 57) and *Miles* (315 U. S. 698) cases. Those cases held that the doctrine of "forum non conviens" ("the court is not convenient") was not applicable to

cases under the Federal Employers' Liability Act. The doctrine of "forum non conveniens" is an old common-law principle and is customarily invoked by a court in refusing to assume jurisdiction of a lawsuit legally brought in its jurisdiction but where there is no legitimate reason for bringing it there. Thus in the event that a lawsuit is brought in the State of Florida when the cause of action arose in the State of Oregon, the parties and all the witnesses living in the State of Oregon, the court, by invoking the doctrine, may refuse to hear the case and leave the parties to bring it in the proper jurisdiction. The doctrine is sound, well established, and conducive to the proper administration of justice. (See Columbia Law Review, vol. 29, p. 1.)

Prior to the Kepner and Miles decisions this doctrine was applicable to cases brought under the Federal Employers' Liability Act. In the event an action was brought in some far-distant place having no relation to the locale of the cause of action, or the residence of the parties, or the convenience of witnesses, the railroad could apply for an injunction prohibiting the trial of the lawsuit in such far-distant places and require that it be brought in the proper forum. This principle was so well established that it was very seldom that lawsuits were brought in any jurisdiction other than where they properly belonged.

The Supreme Court's decisions in the Kepner and Miles cases, however, were followed by a flood of litigation instituted in far-away places, many times thousands of miles from where the accident occurred or where the railroad operated trains. Unscrupulous attorneys now concentrate the trial of their lawsuits in forums most convenient and advantageous to themselves. Other parties to the lawsuits suffer inconvenience, expense, and delay. The courts are unduly burdened, and the orderly administration of justice is adversely affected.

We can see that the present evil arose as a result of the Supreme Court's interpretation of section 56 of the Federal Employers' Liability Act. In order to rectify the evil, we should amend the law so as to again make the doctrine of "forum non conveniens" applicable to these cases as it was prior to the Supreme Court's decisions. This can be done by the simple device of requiring that these cases be brought under the same venue statute as are all other civil actions. It should be pointed out that actions brought under the general venue statute (sec. 112 of the Judicial Code) are subject to the doctrine of "forum non conveniens." This is now well established, especially in view of the recent United States Supreme Court decision in the Gulf Oil case (*Gulf Oil Company* v. *Gilbert*, October 1946 term, No. 93). A fair amendment to the present law could be worded as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the second paragraph of the act entitled 'An act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroads to their employees in certain cases,' approved April 22, 1908, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 45, sec. 56), is amended to read as follows:

" 'Under this act an action may be brought in a district court of the United States *in accordance with the provisions of the General Venue Statute (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 28, sec. 112, as amended) applicable to other civil suits, except that such actions must be brought in a Federal district where the plaintiff resides or where the interstate common carrier by railroad operates trains.* The jurisdiction of the courts of the United States under this chapter shall be concurrent with that of the courts of the several States, and no cases arising under this chapter and brought in any State court of competent jurisdiction shall be removed to any court of the United States.' "

Under such an amendment all litigants would be treated exactly the same. An injured railroad employee could bring his cause of action in any county where the railroad operated trains; or, in the event he lived in a county other than where the company operated, he could bring it in the county of his residence. The proviso "where the interstate common carrier by railroad operates trains" was included in the proposed amendment in order to curb the bringing of actions at some far-distant point where the railroad did not operate and where there was no reason for bringing it. The "forum non conveniens" doctrine would be applicable as a check against wanton bringing of lawsuits in improper jurisdictions but the ends of justice and the convenience of witnesses could be effectively served where necessary.

One of the additional advantages of bringing these cases within the general venue statute rests in the fact that we would thereby take advantage of the many well-settled judicial precedents decided under the general venue statute and thus prevent the onus of a long series of cases normally necessary in order to settle a new statute.

At the appropriate time it is proposed to offer a formal amendment to effectuate the objective outlined.

In this manner all litigants will be treated the same. No prejudice to any class of people would result. What could be fairer? It is urged that H. R. 1639 as introduced and as amended by the committee be defeated and that the statute be amended in the manner herein suggested.

EDWARD J. DEVITT.
WILLIAM T. BYRNE.
THOMAS J. LANE.
MARTIN GORSKI.
FRANCIS E. WALTER.
EMANUEL CELLER.
CHAUNCEY W. REED.

Walter Chandler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 7), 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most excellent address delivered by the Honorable Walter P. Armstrong, of the Memphis, Tenn., bar at a testimonial dinner at the Peabody Hotel in Memphis, Tenn., on September 30, 1946. This very fine address is printed in the Tennessee Law Review published in February 1947.

The address eulogizes the Honorable Walter Chandler, in whose honor the dinner was given, and is entitled "Walter Chandler: Citizen, Lawyer, Soldier, Public Servant."

Walter Chandler served for several years as a Representative in the United States Congress, and later served as mayor of Memphis. He was a prominent soldier in World War I, and has now retired to private life, and is practicing law in Memphis.

Mr. Chandler is especially well known among the lawyers and legislators for his fine work in the reformation of the bankruptcy laws while he was serving in the House of Representatives, as well as for many other notable laws which he aided in passing.

Mr. President, I commend the reading of the address to everyone. It is especially well delivered. Mr. Walter P. Armstrong, who delivered the address, was at one time president of the American Bar Association and is himself one of the outstanding lawyers of the country. He is a member of the Memphis bar.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALTER CHANDLER: CITIZEN, LAWYER, SOLDIER, PUBLIC SERVANT

(By Walter P. Armstrong, of the Memphis bar)

This is a unique occasion in the history of Memphis as I have known it for the last four decades. In that period at least there has been no such honor accorded one who at the time held no office in church, State, or civic organization.

Mr. Chairman, this is more than an accolade to a worthy citizen. It is a credit to you and your associates who conceived the idea and sponsored and perfected the plan; it is a recognition of their responsibility by the newspapers which have vindicated their best tradition by demonstrating that it is a part of the function of a free press not only fearlessly to criticize but generously to commend when commendation is due. Finally, the people of Memphis, by their unanimous acclaim of your conception and by their overwhelming response to your efforts, have proved that they are mindful of the unliquidated debt they owe to a distinguished public servant.

Mine is a difficult task. What can I tell of Walter Chandler that you have not already read in the open book of his life? True, we have been intimate friends for 36 years. In many places we have spent many hours together and have talked of many things. If we have sometimes soared into the empyrean we have always been quickly brought to earth by the candid comments of two who sat close by and referred to us as "Your Walter" and "My Walter." But that door leads to the intimacies of friendship and it must remain unopened.

Embarrassment sometimes results from the fact that Walter and I are friends and have the same given name. In a weak moment I accepted an invitation to speak before the alumni Phi Beta Kappa chapter at Southwestern. The introducer, who was a Presbyterian minister, launched a laudation, and when he warmed up, pulled all the stops. As I sat, basking in his benignity, to my amazement he concluded: "The gentleman who so richly deserves the praise I have bestowed upon him will now address you—the Honorable Walter Chandler." Naturally I was a bit nonplussed, so I lamely began: "The gentleman who introduced me has known me for more than 40 years. We were at Bell Buckle together, under Sawney Webb. He knows perfectly well that I am not Walter Chandler. The truth is that while he was making all those extravagant statements he suddenly realized that he was risking his veracity in applying them to me. The only way he could salve his Calvinistic conscience was to indicate that it was not I he really had in mind, but Walter Chandler."

As familiar as you are with them, the facts of our guest's life could by a competent biographer be woven into a fascinating American success story. A skillful writer might point up the distinguishing characteristics of our State by picturing them in a typical Tennesseean. A self-reliant native son; his progress through her public schools and the bright years he spent at her university making friends and acquiring in liberal arts and law a sound education which remained unforgotten and which the study and experience of each passing year have broadened. A member at one time or another of each

house of her general assembly; a leader of her bar; a commander of her troops; one of her representatives in Congress; and finally, the mayor of her largest city. Of all the Tennesseans I have known, I can think of none who, by birth, inheritance, and achievements, better symbolizes his State; of none more aware of her traditions; of none more deeply versed in her history; of none who more fitly embodies those qualities we like to think of as hers.

There are many facets to his career and I shall not attempt to light them all. One of the Walter Chandlers I know best is the lawyer. We hear much about the number of lawyers in public life. Some think there are too many. There need be no fear on that score. There may be too many who hold law degrees or have been admitted to the bar, but there are not too many real lawyers. Walter Chandler is a real lawyer. I know. I have had the comfort of his support as an associate and have suffered at his hands as an opponent. He is thorough in preparation, sound in judgment, searching in cross-examination, and forceful and persuasive in advocacy. Yet he always plays fair, always lives by code. Of him it may be said, as was written of a great English barrister of another day—that stout fighter as he was, he always wielded the sword of the warrior and not the dagger of the assassin.

No wonder that his clients had a sense of personal loss when his public duties took him from the practice; no wonder—and in this we all rejoice—that they are now thronging back to him. They could have no safer adviser, no more trustworthy counselor, no more effective advocate.

The lawyer who looks on his profession only as the means of earning a livelihood and acquiring a competency has a low and false conception of his obligations. A part of that obligation is to devote some of his talent, training, time, and experience to the reform of the law and the improvement of the administration of justice. You would be surprised if I should tell you of the number of lawyers who, individually and as members of bar associations, engage in these disinterested undertakings, and of the results they accomplish. Their work is the genesis of most of the forward looking, nonpolitical legislation that eventually finds its way into the statute books.

For years Walter was an indefatigable worker in these ranks. Later, as president of the Bar Association of Tennessee and as a member of the governing body of the American Bar Association, he had a major part in securing the adoption of the reforms which he had helped initiate.

One of the pleasantest sides of the practice of law is the camaraderie of the bar. We "strive mightily but eat and drink as friends." Than Walter Chandler, no member of the bar was ever a better comrade. Chancellor Herron was speaking not only for himself but for hundreds of Tennessee lawyers when, in sending his contribution to the scholarship fund, he expressed his appreciation of the kindly greetings he had received during the many years Walter was secretary of the State association. But this feeling is not confined to Tennesseans. Few men have ever been so popular with members of the American Bar Association. One year, as a representative of the association, I traveled some 60,000 miles—from coast to coast—from border to border—from Bangor, Maine, in winter to Yosemite Valley in summer. Everywhere I went someone hastened to ask me about Walter Chandler. This was pleasant, but finally it became a bit monotonous. Toward the end I spent 2 days in Yankton, S. Dak. The first day went by and not a word about Walter Chandler. On the second day the sun passed the meridian and grateful silence still reigned. In the afternoon, with a sense of relief I boarded the train and lingered on the platform waving goodbye to my hosts. Just as we started there appeared, running at full speed, a dishevelled, red-faced lawyer. With what little breath he had left, he shouted: "Give my regards to my friend, Walter Chandler." I gave up.

The picture will be deceptively incomplete unless we turn for a moment to the old member of the crack Chickasaw Guards who proved that he was no mere summer soldier by taking his place as an enlisted man in World War I. He was in heavy fighting in the Troyon and Toul Sectors, at St. Mihiel, in the Meuse-Argonne Battle, and the Woevre Offensive. Cool, fearless, and efficient under fire, he earned a captaincy, was respected and admired by his men, and trusted implicity by his superior officers. One of his pronounced characteristics is that he has charity for all and malice toward none, not even toward those friendly but obdurate officials who rebuffed his persistent efforts to obtain a combat assignment in World War II.

The qualities of the lawyer-soldier—the experience he had gained and the capacity for leadership he had developed—admirably equipped him for the constructive work he undertook and accomplished in Congress. Many Americans have a misconception of Congress and especially of the House of Representatives. There is so much emphasis on partisan maneuverings and political legislation—so much prominence is given the foolish statements and demagogic appeals of a few of the headline hunters—that occasionally there is a feeling that some communities must send their Representatives to Washington merely to get them out of town. We are inclined to lose sight of the presence of a group of able, devoted, hard-working members who in an unspectacular way, from session to session, prepare, consider, and secure the enactment of a vast amount of significant remedial legislation. Walter Chandler belonged to this group. His standing as a lawyer secured for him a place upon the Judiciary Committee—a committee so important that it is "exclusive" in the sense that its members are not permitted to belong to any other committee. From knowledge I can testify that our Representative was one of the most efficient and probably the hardest-working member.

Chairman Hatton W. Sumners writes me: "During my service on the Judiciary Committee we never had a more useful member." Results speak for themselves. He sponsored and guided through the House that splendid revision of the bankruptcy law which is called after him the Chandler Act. Mr. Justice Douglas of the Supreme Court of the United States, who was Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission at the time, today telegraphs me that this was an outstanding legislative achievement and will long stand as a monument to its author. The first Municipal Bankruptcy Act was held unconstitutional. After being rewritten by the committee it was again presented to the House with a report prepared by Walter Chandler, and reenacted. This time the Supreme Court, in an opinion by Chief Justice Hughes which quoted from Walter's report, upheld the act. It is generally agreed that the most significant law reform of our time is the adoption of rules which modernize civil and criminal procedure in the United States courts. In each instance Walter Chandler was the key man of the committee and wrote its report dealing with the civil rules. At long last Congress passed a sorely needed statute which systematizes and introduces business methods into the administration of the Federal courts. Here again Walter Chandler represented the committee in handling the bill in hearings, on the floor, and in conference. One of the most important functions of the Judiciary Committee is to initiate impeachment proceedings against Federal judges. It is an open secret that the committee, under the chairmanship of Hatton Sumners, instead of waiting for complaints to be laid before it, adopted the practice of actively scrutinizing the work of the judges. A part of the secret is that the committee entrusted the supervision of this work to Walter Chandler. As a result of his efforts the gentleman from Tennessee acquired an enviable national reputation. He spoke before many trade organizations and bar associations in metropolitan cities and in distant States. He received from a leading publisher a tempting offer to write a book expounding the Chandler Act. He was named by the New York Times as one of the four most useful Members of the House.

Because you are all familiar with the way in which Walter has discharged his duties as mayor I shall refrain from details. We are all proud that Memphis has become one of the most progressive, one of the best-planned, best-financed, and best-governed cities in the country. Justifiably we boast that what was once the murder capital of the world is now a community which wins prizes for its safety record, and in which the law is stringently enforced.

These are substantial achievements, and there are many others. For them all much credit is due Walter Chandler. Now it can be told that the contacts Walter had made and the confidence he had gained among high officials in Washington were major factors in obtaining for Memphis the many extensive establishments which during the war the Government located here. I am not sure that all are conscious of the obstacles that had to be overcome to gain these ends. I know of no more difficult position for any public man than being mayor of Memphis, or any other comparable city, especially during the war years. At best it is a complicated task, which requires something of an Admirable Crichton—a financier, a legislator, and an executive. While he is titular head of the city government, when it comes to determining questions of policy he is but one of five coordinate commissioners. Unless he retains the support of his associates his best efforts will be reduced to impotency. Any man under such circumstances must at times adapt his methods and postpone his immediate objectives. Here is one, however, who never compromised his principles and never relinquished his ultimate goals. The physical and nervous strain of such a position is tremendous. A mayor's constituents are not a thousand miles away; they always surround him. His slightest mistake does not go undiscovered, for the spotlight is ever on him. He has little privacy and practically no undisturbed home life; there is always the public function to be attended, the gracious speech to be delivered, and he is a slave to that importunate master, the telephone. His compensation is far less than he would receive from his vocation, and the demands of his position such that he must encroach on any estate he has accumulated. For any man to leave such an office after 6 years and 8 months not only with a formidable record of accomplishment but with the good will of all of his associates and with the gratitude of the people he sought to serve, with his health unbroken and his good nature unimpaired, is, indeed, a rare achievement.

Acknowledgment and appreciation of Walter Chandler's capacity and work as mayor extended far beyond Memphis. He was vice president of the United States Conference of Mayors, and, except for his resignation, would unquestionably have been the next president of the conference. Col. Paul V. Betters, executive director, writes me that since the establishment of the conference there were few municipal officials who rendered a greater service to municipal government throughout the Nation than did Walter Chandler. Mayor W. Cooper Green, of Birmingham, adds: "In my nearly 7 years of holding the same job in Birmingham, Ala., that he has in your city, I have come to know Walter as one of the South's outstanding conscientious mayors of all times."

I have often pondered the reasons for this success. Character? Yes; this is the first essential. Genius? No; except that genius which consists in the capacity for taking infinite pains and engaging in unremitting labor. Uncommon common sense. Constant study of the science of government. The power of cogent and persuasive statement orally and in writing. A sunny disposition which attracts friends and will cause him to be written down as one who loved his fellow men. Unflagging devotion to duty. The gift of initiative which makes him a natural leader. Poise which leaves him unawed by opinion, unseduced by flattery, and undismayed by disaster.

These characteristics you have all observed. You may not, however, know the recognition he has received as a writer upon historical and biographical subjects. In one way or another this has frequently come to my attention. Recently, I wrote to the librarian of the Supreme Court of the United States for a bibliography of the biographies of the Justices. When it came I found that the library had included in its collection a sketch of one written by Walter Chandler.

One thing that has interested me has been the way in which Walter has grown with the responsibilities that he has assumed and the demands that have been made upon him. This is perfectly indexed by the increasing power of his informed, reasoned, dignified, and convincing utterance. I confess that I did not know the extent of this until I received certain information from an unimpeachable source. At a meeting of a poultry growers' association Walter was descanting in his usual appropriate and persuasive way upon the virtue of fecundity in hens. A fine specimen was on the table before him as exhibit A. As he swung into his peroration she was unable to restrain herself and laid an egg. Such is the power of oratory. William Jennings Bryan, seeking to demonstrate the superiority of Demosthenes to Cicero as an orator, declared: "When Cicero spoke the Romans said 'What a great orator is Cicero.' When Demosthenes spoke the Athenians said 'Let us go against Philip.'" To me it seems a more brillian exploit to persuade a hen to lay an egg than it does to convince the Athenians that they should go against Philip.

Of course, Walter has had some luck. Nearly all successful men do. Part of his good fortune was the inheritance and training he received from his devoted mother, whose presence here tonight must be a supreme satisfaction both to him and to her. One of his luckiest days was the one when he induced Dorothy to share his fortunes. Fate destined her to be the wife of a public man. Birth, temperament, education, environment bestowed upon her every qualification. I have been with her in Washington and elsewhere, among those whose names make news; I have seen her with those whom the newspapers notice only twice. Always she is the same gracious, interested, and unaffected person. As well as I know her, she has one secret that I have never been able to fathom—the source of her effervescing and inexhaustible energy.

Although Walter Chandler has, after performing as long a tour of public duty as could be expected of him, relinquished office, we shall not be deprived of his counsel nor lose the benefit of his efforts. As a private citizen his independent and disinterested views on public questions will be eagerly sought and will inevitably exert measurable influence. He will, of course, resume his place in the civic and religious organizations—many of them represented here tonight—of which so long he was an effective member. Indeed, one of the finest things about him is that in whatever work he enlists he is as enthusiastic and cheerful in the ranks as he is at the head of the column. Here I find in part the significance of his life. If our democracy is to function according to its design, each intelligent person must devote some study to the perplexing social questions and the intricate problems of government that are posed by modern life. Each must give some of his time to the attempt to ameliorate conditions not only by participating in the activities of private associations but by unselfishly performing the duties of citizenship. Without a sensitive civic conscience we may as well abandon hope.

There is other significance—perhaps more obvious. We hear much about the difficulty of attracting desirable men to public office. We need not be surprised. Many men feel a deep responsibility to their dependents; the pay is inconsiderable when contrasted with the prizes offered by business and the professions. There is much bitter, little constructive criticism and frequent ridicule. Someone has said that the first requirement for success in politics is a thick skin. Too frequently the merits of one who has done a fine job are unrecognized and he is summarily retired to private life. No wonder not a few top-flight men feel that the post of honor is a private station. There are, however, heartening signs. Compensation is being increased and retirement provisions being made. Even here we make a modest beginning in our attempt to appreciate a notable career. Everywhere the people are eager for wise, vigorous, and unselfish leadership.

While this is a memorable meeting there is about it no tinge of sadness—no sense of farewell—not even to an admired public official. We confidently predict that, after a well-earned respite, Walter Chandler will return to our service in a yet more exalted station. We believe this is merely a milestone in a useful life which has not yet reached its zenith.

Walter, it is to symbolize our thoughts which I have voiced that we have all participated in having fashioned for you, in spotless and enduring silver, these tokens. [Indicating a silver service which was being placed on the table.] I now present them to you, adding only that the words we have caused to be engraved upon them express the feeling that is in the heart of each of us: "Presented to the Honorable Walter Chandler by the people of Memphis, in grateful appreciation of his services as citizen, soldier, and public servant."

Circular Letter of A. F. Whitney, President of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, during the past month Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, sent a special circular to the delegates of the twenty-eighth convention of that organization, and with that circular sent ballots which were to be filled in and forwarded to President Whitney by Monday, July 21, 1947. A check-up of those who are registered as lobbyists under the act discloses the fact that Mr. Whitney and other persons, named in the circular as having participated in lobbying work, are not registered under the act. It clearly appears from a reading of the circular that Mr. Whitney is maintaining a lobby on Capitol Hill. In view of the fact that the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen registered six persons by virtue of the provisions of that section of the Reorganization Act which requires registration with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States, Mr. Whitney knows that he should register all persons whom he employs for such purpose. He also knows that it is necessary to give much additional information regarding the scope of the activities of such lobbyists. Therefore, because I feel that those responsible for the proper functioning of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 would be interested in reading the circular sent out by Mr. Whitney, I am setting forth the language of that document in full. It reads as follows:

SPECIAL CIRCULAR NO. W-161
GRAND LODGE, BROTHERHOOD
OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Cleveland, Ohio, June 16, 1947.

Delegates, Twenty-eighth Convention, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

DEAR SIRS AND BROTHERS: In my opening address at the Brotherhood's twenty-eighth convention I called your attention to the need for an effective public-relations program, stating that the lack of such a program had adversely affected our wage-rules movement and had been partly responsible for our failure to successfully conclude that movement during the strike of May 1946. I also outlined how we had enlightened the public after the strike was over by running an advertisement in key newspapers throughout the country with heartening results.

I called your attention to the fact that, in order to be really effective, this program should be greatly expanded and with your approval a special public relations committee was appointed to study the matter and submit its recommendations. This committee submitted a detailed report outlining the need for a progressive and comprehensive public-relations program and presented a number of specific recommendations for such a program which, after thorough discussion, were adopted by the convention. In its report the committee said, in part:

"We are sure that accurate and timely information, given out in an intelligent and professional manner, will help mold public opinion in our favor and counteract the unfriendly public opinion created by the propaganda of our enemies.

"The vicious and unfair treatment labor is receiving from the daily press and from the radio is proof enough that broad action to promote understanding of our problems and good public relations must be taken promptly."

Anticipating that the Fascist interests in the United States would make an effort to bring about enactment of laws to retard the progress of labor, the committee said later in its report:

"This committee feels that labor's destiny is at the cross-roads. If we sit supinely by and let the newspapers, radio, demagogs, and labor-baiters fill the public ear without raising our voice in reply, we are leaving the door wide open for the destruction of our free trade unions."

Later on it said:

"As we look at it the problem is twofold. We must formulate new and effective means of keeping our large membership well informed and we must develop a coordinated system for releasing information to the public

to counteract adverse publicity and promote good public relations."

It then presented a number of specific recommendations including the following: That an information service be set up for the express purpose of promoting good public relations; that all up-to-date methods be used for getting our story across and defeating the propaganda of our enemies; that a weekly newspaper be published by the brotherhood, etc., and in its report recommended:

"That the proposed information service and all parts of its subsidiary activities, such as the proposed newspaper, be responsible to and operate under the supervision of the president's department of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen."

In addition to this the committee on joint relations and jurisdictional matters submitted a report containing certain recommendations which tie in with our public relations program. In its report it outlined proposals which it had received in part, as follows: That the brotherhood exert every effort to obtain labor representation in the United Nations Organization; that the brotherhood cooperate with the National Citizens Political Action Committee on a national, State, and community basis. In connection with these proposals the committee recommended:

"That the president and grand lodge officers determine the proper time when the best interests of our membership can be served by giving consideration to the above proposals."

That recommendation and the following were adopted by the convention:

"That the President be authorized to cooperate with all bona fide labor organizations on matters of mutual interest when, in his opinion, the interests of our membership can best be served."

In addition, the convention reenacted general rules 27 and 36, making it "the duty of the president of the brotherhood to collect statistics * * *" that will be of benefit to our legislative boards in framing laws, "also upon any other matters that would be of benefit" to the United States and Canadian legislative departments.

We returned from the convention and took steps to carry out the program in compliance with its most plain and obvious meaning. The publication of the Trainman News was accomplished about February 1, 1947. Communications were written to lodges and members urging local action to assist the program, with gratifying response. Our information service made contacts with press and radio resulting in many opportunities to present our story to the public. Analyses of the various rules sought in the rules movement and written for the purpose of putting our side of the story across to the general public are now being published. Many other steps have been taken to implement this program.

Shortly after the November 1946 election it became readily apparent that the present reactionary Congress was determined to press down upon the brow of labor "a crown of thorns"; to destroy all of the gains made during the Roosevelt administration.

In January 1947, several Senators among our staunchest friends in the Senate, informed me that they were badly in need of assistance. They stated that when the Democrats were in the majority they were able to obtain help, but that privilege had been removed since the Republicans were now dominating the congressional committees.

Realizing the seriousness of the situation I spent several days in Washington during January and, with the National Legislative Representative, conferred with many Members of Congress and found them very friendly to the railroad brotherhoods, especially the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. In the course of these meetings we concluded that it would be difficult to defeat the drastic proposed labor legislation in the House of Representatives and decided that our efforts should be largely centered in the Senate.

At that time we estimated that there were about 20 Democrats and 5 Republican Members of the Senate that labor could depend upon. This small but valiant band was exercising every effort to block the reactionary forces in the Senate, but was faced with the prospect of attempting to work on a wide range of issues without adequate assistance.

The Reorganization Act and the Republican upset in November deprived the progressive Democratic Senators of chairmanships of important committees and access to the expert services of committee staffs and other experts on loan from the executive agencies. Such expert assistance has always been available to the reactionary forces in the Congress. When they were in the minority such expert service was provided by the research staffs of big business and industrial organizations. Now that they are in the majority they practically monopolize the research facilities of the committees and our stanch friends in the minority find it exceedingly difficult to prepare material to be used in fighting the reactionary forces that are attempting to crucify labor.

I discussed with leaders of the brotherhood and of certain other labor organizations the advisability of establishing a research bureau in Washington, D. C., to be headed by a competent economist that would enable the brotherhood, working independently or jointly with other groups, to carry on a comprehensive research work to assist our national legislative staff and me as well as our friends in Congress. Research is an absolute necessity if an effective public-relations program is to be carried out.

Plans for this bureau, to be known as the Public Affairs Research Institute, envisioned that it would be set up as an independent, nonprofit organization financed by donations from a group of founders, including labor organizations and other liberal-minded citizens. Its objectives would be to provide essential data on matters about which public policy is to be made and to highlight the real policy issues and alternatives involved in the maze of political jockeying, by (1) servicing friendly Members of Congress, participating labor unions, progressive religious and other groups with basic background memoranda on pending legislation affecting labor; (2) sponsoring policy conferences on major issues in Washington and elsewhere between lawmakers, experts and public citizens, thus providing a "close to the firing line" forum for balanced discussion; (3) undertaking basic action research, incorporating the efforts of specialists throughout the country on vital international and domestic problems confronting the Government; (4) providing the raw materials for a public information drive through existing media of communications, field organizations, regional conferences, etc. to educate the general public on the real basic issues underlying the problems confronting labor.

This program was laid before the general secretary and treasurer and board of trustees, and I requested authority to spend up to $100,000 from the national legislative revolving fund to promote the program which also included expenses involved in contacting Members of the Congress, and contributions to one or two groups cooperating with us. At the time it was considered by the trustees, Brother B. J. Baumberger was absent. However, Trustees G. J. Giguere and E. C. Bassett approved my request, as did the general secretary and treasurer, and I continued to take steps to implement the plan.

Discussions were held with our general counsel, trusteeship papers were drawn up and a trustee tentatively appointed. I conferred with Mr. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, at Pittsburgh, Pa., February 6, 1947, who stated that he approved the program and that he believed that his board of directors would concur.

With President Murray's tentative assurance of cooperation, plans for the institute progressed to the point where it was determined that a budget of $40,000 would be sufficient to meet the expenses of the institute in 1947, and I arranged for the brotherhood to deposit $10,000 in a Washington, D. C., bank to get the institute started. In the meantime, due to the delay in getting it started, the national legislative representative and I agreed that it would be necessary to employ additional help to fill the immediate need for research and the preparation of materials necessary to offset the terrific pressure for passage of the Taft and Hartley slave labor bills. Dr. Dewey Anderson, an economist of exceptional ability, honored by the highest rating the United States Government could give, had been chosen by the sponsors of the institute to act as director when it was set up, and on February 17 I employed Dr. Anderson to work for the brotherhood in a similar capacity on a temporary basis at a salary of $1,000 a month, with the understanding that any salary and expense payments made to him would be deducted from the brotherhood's contribution to the institute when it was finally set up. I also authorized him to employ a stenographic assistant.

On February 25 I arrived in Washington with a check for $10,000 in my pocket, prepared to carry forward the arrangements which had been made and which had to that moment been approved. However, on the morning of that date I received a telegram from Trustee Bassett withdrawing his support of the $100,000 appropriation and later during the day I received a letter from him confirming his telegram. On the following day Trustee Baumberger wrote me in the same vein, advising that he concurred in the action taken by Trustee Bassett. This left the Brotherhood and its president in a very embarrassing position as I was forced to withdraw the Brotherhood's offer of support of the Research Institute after having agreed that it was necessary if our friends in the Congress were to have any help in their efforts to save even a part of the gains made by labor during the Roosevelt Administration.

Upon our withdrawal as a sponsor of the Research Institute the project collapsed. The $10,000 check was returned to the General Secretary and Treasurer, and I took steps to make such emergency arrangements as appeared to be necessary to tide the situation over and to enable the Brotherhood to throw its influence and weight against the vicious bills pending in the Congress.

Mr. Walter J. Munro, public relations expert, and a former top conciliator, United States Department of Labor, was employed on March 1, 1947, to represent the Brotherhood in the capacity of public relations expert in Washington.

On February 25, 1947, I testified before the House Committee on Education and Labor, and on March 13 I testified before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I also spent considerable time in Washington, contacting Members of the Congress.

On March 12 the Brotherhood gave a dinner to about 41 Republican Members of the Congress at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, and on the following evening another dinner was given to approximately 35 Democratic Members of the Congress at the same hotel. Most of our guests were serving their first term in the Congress and they were delighted to have an opportunity to be informed upon the Brotherhood's program, and its attitude toward the labor bills pending in Congress.

These dinners were held with the able assistance of the national legislative representative, his assistant, and our Washington staff.

This action was a forward step of great value in our public-relations program.

After the unwarranted and tragic action of two members of the brotherhood's board of trustees was taken which, in my opinion,

gave indirect if not direct support to big business, which supported the infamous slave-labor legislation, I held a number of conferences with brotherhood people in authority, and on April 8 a conference was held with Brothers W. P. Kennedy, G. S. & T., William A. Endle, general counsel, and other members of our staff in Cleveland, and it was agreed that the mandate of the brotherhood's twenty-eighth convention had been violated by the action of Trustees Baumberger and Bassett, and that immediate steps should be taken to bridge this difficulty by progressing the aims and objects of the brotherhood's twenty-eighth convention as outlined in the report of the public-relations committee.

Accordingly I instructed Brother Byrl A. Whitney, a member of the grand lodge staff, to proceed to Washington and confer with the national legislative representative, his assistant, Brother G. W. Nelson, Dr. Dewey Anderson, our economist and research expert, Mr. Walter Munro, public-relations representative, and friendly Members of the Congress and ascertain the immediate needs of our Washington staff and friends in Congress in an effort to help them to defeat the unfriendly labor measure.

It was the unanimous opinion that a temporary research bureau should be set up in Washington by the brotherhood following the lines first outlined. Pursuant to this suggestion, I called the national legislative representative on April 21 regarding the employment of additional help to assist Dr. Anderson who had been attempting, with limited facilities, to undertake the necessary research and provide material to defeat at least some, if not all, of the vicious antilabor bills. Two additional expert economists and two stenographer-clerks were employed to complete the staff.

Our efforts, even though hampered by the action of Trustees Bassett and Baumberger, have defeated some of the most obnoxious provisions embodied in the Taft-Hartley bill. The prohibition of industry-wide bargaining and the closed shop and the more vicious sections providing for unlimited use of injunctive proceedings to prevent strikes were defeated. The small group of Senators responsible for the defeat of these provisions of the bill have relied on research and material supplied by our Washington staff. Every resource at our command was made available to them and the success of their efforts to weaken the bill in the Senate was largely attributable to the help given them by the brotherhood.

Our efforts continued while the bill was in the conference committee of the two Houses of Congress and now that the conference bill has been adopted and gone to the President our efforts are centered on defeating passage in the Senate over a possible Presidential veto. On June 9 the brotherhood ran a full-page advertisement in two Washington newspapers urging the President to veto the bill, and quoting excerpts from his veto message on the infamous but less drastic Case bill of last year.

Our temporary research staff will be continued until adjournment of the present session of Congress. It is, however, only a stop gap to fill our urgent and immediate needs. The proposed research institute would be more comprehensive in coverage on pertinent subject matters and would provide a year-round source of material for the brotherhood in its effort to better the lot of its membership, and in the long run less expensive, as our contribution would cover the entire expense to the brotherhood. It is expected that after its inception, our contributions will be substantially reduced as other labor organizations and liberal-minded citizens join in supporting it. The budget would run about $40,000 a year, or about 20 cents for each member of the brotherhood in the United States, even though no financial help is received from other organizations. In other words, the cost will not exceed the price of a package of cigarettes.

Trustee Bassett also objected to payments made to Mr. Charles Kramer, whom I retained for a 3-month period. Kramer was highly recommended by Senators HARLEY M. KILGORE, Democrat, West Virginia, and CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, Florida, and I was advised through other sources that he was a capable writer and research specialist. He was temporarily retained because of the fact that there was a delay in setting up the research laboratory. His services were terminated on February 28, 1947, due to Trustee Bassett's vehement protests. He prepared some very fine statements for the brotherhood, which I used to great advantage. Trustee Bassett's objection to Kramer's employment is an attempt to usurp the managerial prerogatives of the president of the brotherhood.

Another objection raised by Trustee Bassett was against a contribution of $1,000 to the Progressive Citizens of America. This organization is an amalgamation of the former National Citizens Political Action Committee and several other progressive organizations. The general secretary and treasurer and I had agreed that a donation of $1,000 would assist this organization in its efforts to help preserve the gains made by labor during the Roosevelt administration, thus implementing our own efforts.

Trustees Bassett and Baumberger also objected to reimbursing Mr. Walter Munro, our public-relations representative in Washington, for the cost of dining Members of Congress, press representatives and other influential persons connected with labor legislation. As early as January 6, 1947, I recognized that we would have to spend some money for this purpose in order to get our story across, and the board of trustees agreed that such expenditures are a necessary part of our public-relations program and authorized refund of moneys spent for this purpose by the president, national legislative representative and his assistant. Since the time of the national legislative representative was largely consumed at his office, he delegated Mr. Munro to make contacts for him, and under every rule of reason and decency Munro should be reimbursed for moneys spent in dining these Representatives.

Following is a table showing details of expense incurred at Washington and Cleveland in connection with our public-relations program, up to June 1, 1947:

Statement of expense, legislative and public relations program, Washington, D. C.

Dewey Anderson, economist: Service effective Feb. 18, 1947, at rate of $1,000 per month; salary paid Feb. 18–May 31, 1947		$3,451.50
Herman Edelsberg, assistant: Service effective Apr. 21, 1947, at rate $666 per month; salary paid Apr. 21–May 31, 1947		902.00
John Shott, assistant: Service effective Apr. 21, 1947, at rate $666 per month; salary paid Apr. 21–May 31, 1947		902.00
Carol M. Fuller, secretary: Service effective Mar. 6, 1947, at rate $316 per month; salary paid Mar. 6–May 31, 1947		902.85
Dorothy C. Mast, secretary-clerk: Service effective May 6, 1947, at rate $316 per month; salary paid May 6–31, 1947		270.86
L. M. Loebach, stenographer: Service effective May 23, 1947, at rate $300 per month; salary paid May 23–31, 1947		85.71
Total paid for above services Feb. 18–May 31, 1947		6,514.92
Walter J. Munro, public relations representative, B. of R. T.:		
Mar. 1–31, 1947:		
Salary	$672.20	
Per diem	342.20	
Rail fare	35.33	
Typewriting	13.40	
Telephone	5.07	
		$1,068.20
Apr. 1–30, 1947:		
Salary	672.20	
Per diem	354.00	
Typewriting	13.00	
Business cards	10.20	
		1,049.40
May 1–31, 1947:		
Salary	672.20	
Per diem	365.80	
Typewriting	13.25	
Telephone	1.25	
		1,052.50
Paid, salary and expenses Mar. 1–May 31, 1947		3,170.10
Charles Kramer, research writer: Services at $750 per month; December 1946 and January and February 1947		2,250.00
Dworkin and Day, attorneys: Services at $50 per day; consultation regarding testimony on proposed labor legislation		150.00
Miller & Hornbeck, Attorneys:		
Services, Jan. 14–Feb. 27, 1947:		
Services	$690.00	
Travel expense	298.59	
Phone calls	18.72	
		1,007.31
(Has reference to contacts made by Mr. Hornbeck with influential Republicans in the Congress urging them to proceed cautiously on the matter of adverse labor legislation. On Jan. 20, 21, and 22, Mr. Hornbeck was in Washington with me, and we called upon a number of Senators and Congressmen.)		
Entertainment, dinners, Mayflower Hotel:		
Feb. 26, business luncheon	11.15	
Mar. 12, dinner—Republican Members of Congress	246.50	
Mar. 13, dinner—Democratic Members of Congress	199.70	
May 21, press conference, rules movement	231.05	
		688.40
Harry See, national legislative representative:		
Expense incurred entertaining Congressmen and others at luncheons—Feb. 8–May 28, 1947:		
February	2.50	
March	3.00	
April	20.10	
May	3.95	
		29.55
Miscellaneous expense:		
Photographs distributed—Pictures taken at dinners Mar. 12 and 13		62.00

Miscellaneous expense—Con.	
B. of R. T. pencils given to Congressmen and others attending dinners	$17.00
Printing—Testimony of President Whitney before House Committee on Education and Labor	319.30
Printing—Testimony of President Whitney before U. S. Senate Committee on Labor Relations Program	417.15
Progressive Citizens of America—Donation	1,000.00
Total expenditures—Jan. 1–June 1, 1947	15,625.73

In addition to the items of expense listed above amounting to $15,625.73 and paid from grand lodge funds during period January 1, 1947–June 1, 1947, the following bills are outstanding, which, when paid, will increase the total expenditure since January 1, 1947, to $17,921.68.

Newspaper advertisement, Washington, D. C., June 9, 1947:	
The Washington Post	$1,049.20
The Washington Evening Star	1,108.80
Total	2,158.00

Bills not received to date (June 13). Payment not made.

Expense incurred by W. J. Munro entertaining Congressmen and others at luncheon and dinners, which Trustees Bassett and Baumberger refused to approve for payment:	
March expense	$45.90
April expense	35.55
May expense	56.50
Total	137.95

Payment not made.

When request was made for authority to spend up to $100,000 I did not know to what extent we would have to go insofar as the spending of money was concerned, but I did have the conviction that we should not "scotch" our funds and play into the hands of the NAM, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the Association of American Railroads. I know that these associations, with the support of certain Fascist-minded individuals and corporations, are spending vast sums of money in the hope of destroying labor.

I also felt that it was the intention of the convention to have carried forward the public-relations program, for on the seventeenth day of the convention, while considering the report of the Public Relations Committee, an amendment to limit the expenditure of funds for this purpose to $125,000 annually was voted down. The fact that I requested authority to expend up to $100,000 did not necessarily mean that the entire amount would be spent.

Last year following the strike, I requested and received from the G. S. & T. and board of trustees, authority to expend up to $100,000 for public relations and we ran one advertisement in key newspapers throughout the country around the theme that strikes can be prevented. We spent $21,447.98 and the results were very beneficial.

On September 22, 1946, authority was granted the W. B. Doner Co. to proceed with preparation of radio spot announcements and newspaper advertising of educational political nature with total cost not to exceed estimated $30,000.

The cost covering radio preparation and announcements amounted to $24,622.02, and cost to Grand Lodge covering preparation of newspaper ads amounted to $2,514.11, making a total cost paid from Grand Lodge funds to the W. B. Doner Co.—$27,136.13. This amount was charged equally to protective fund and national legislative fund.

(NOTE.—In addition to the $27,136.13 paid from Grand Lodge funds, a cost of $9,746.49 for newspaper advertising was paid from various State legislative advance funds, making a total of $36,882.62 paid to the W. B. Doner Co.)

Our delegates to the twenty-eighth convention recognized the fact that reactionary forces throughout the jurisdiction of the brotherhood were girding themselves to cripple organized labor, and in their wisdom authorized the appointment of the joint relations and public relations committees, whose reports were timely and represented the sentiment of our membership. These reports were unanimously adopted by our twenty-eighth convention, and that action directed the president of the brotherhood and his staff of officers to execute it in the most practical and effective way.

This principle has been carried forward to the best of my ability, notwithstanding the lack of cooperation by Trustees Baumberger and Bassett. Since I have not had their support it was necessary for me, as the leader of 218,000 members, to find ways and means to see that the brotherhood was protected, and to that end I have worked.

I am laying the foregoing facts before you because you and the membership are entitled to know them. In other words, I do not want this brotherhood to lose its progressive and militant record because of the action of any officer or member, and if I have erred in my interpretation of the authority that you gave me at the twenty-eighth convention, you should frankly say so. If you approve of my action you should be equally as frank.

You now have the story, as well as the cost involved in carrying out our public-relations program as outlined above. The results accomplished by this program to date far outweigh the amount of money spent. I believe that I have carried out the mandate of the convention, and inasmuch as I have not received the cooperation of Trustees Baumberger and Bassett I have deemed it proper to place the facts before you. Your action in this matter will direct my future course.

You are therefore requested to fill in the enclosed ballot and forward it to the president of the brotherhood in the enclosed stamped addressed envelope, to reach my office not later than Monday, July 21, 1947.

Fraternally yours,

A. F. WHITNEY,
President.

Mr. Speaker, it is undoubtedly the duty of those responsible for the proper enforcement of the Reorganization Act to investigate promptly the question as to whether or not Mr. Whitney and certain of his employees named in the circular, who have participated in lobbying activities, other than two who are registered, are guilty of a violation of the law. While this is being done it might also be well for the committee to examine into the background of those same persons as some very interesting facts would undoubtedly be disclosed.

It is apparent from the reading of the circular sent out by Mr. Whitney that Trustees Baumberger and Bassett are to be congratulated upon the manner in which they have sought to protect the members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and also to prevent a possible violation of the law. It is equally apparent that Mr. Whitney, as president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, is attempting to use his position for the purpose of charging those trustees with lack of cooperation, when in truth and fact they are protecting the interests of the members of the brotherhood which Mr. Whitney was chosen to represent. It might be well for that organization to examine into his stewardship in view of the activities which he has admitted in his effort to obtain repayment of funds which appear to have been spent without proper authorization. It might also be interesting to see the complete break-down of the expenditures in question. Mr. Whitney should also explain why a sum of $25,000 or more should be expended in lobbying against legislation which specifically excludes any and all persons who are subject to the Railway Labor Act.

Favors Provisional Settlement With Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 9, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing the following letter to the editor printed in the June 1947 issue of Peace Action:

FAVORS PROVISIONAL SETTLEMENT WITH GERMANY

To the EDITOR OF PEACE ACTION:

You have asked for comment on Herbert Hoover's proposal that we make a settlement with Germany without waiting for Russia, in case the foreign ministers' conference next November fails to produce concrete results. There has been some criticism of Mr. Hoover's proposal on the ground that it would permanently cut Europe and Germany in two at the Elbe River and would deprive the Germans in the eastern zone of all hope of eventual liberation from Soviet totalitarianism.

I venture to think that what Mr. Hoover has in mind is not a definitive and final peace treaty but a provisional arrangement, a modus vivendi, that would permit the rapid rehabilitation of the western zones, free from the deadweight of Yalta, Potsdam, and the level-of-industry agreement, but without locking the door against the later unification of all Europe.

Such a settlement could and should accomplish the following ends:

1. Put an end to the legal state of war between Germany and the western Allies, and all its restrictive consequences.

2. Establish immediately a provisional government of the three western zones working under a provisional charter, but avoiding the drafting of a final constitution.

3. Immediate cessation of all the destructive aspects of the Potsdam policy, notably denazification, deindustrialization, and excessive decentralization.

4. Stopping all reparation shipments, subject to reconsideration when normal levels of industry in Germany have been attained.

5. Immediate reestablishment of normal conditions of unrestricted travel, trade, and communication; abolition of all censorship.

6. Immediate abolition of military government and the handing over of governmental functions to the provisional German Government of the western zones. Continuation of the occupation for purely police purposes, but with an Anglo-American-French control council to supervise the provisional

German Government in certain specific fields such as demilitarization.

7. Immediate reestablishment in Germany of full civil rights, especially immunity from arrest without warrant.

8. The claim to a unified Germany, including the Soviet and Polish occupied areas, should be maintained and constantly reaffirmed—it being clearly understood, however, that reconstruction in the West cannot wait until unification has been achieved.

It seems to me that this plan would make possible many of the measures now so urgently necessary for German and European reconstruction without handing the Soviets the potent propaganda weapon that they are the only champions of European and German unity.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER BOEKER.

The Oil Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of Mr. H. J. Porter, president of the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association, before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, during hearings on the Anglo-American oil treaty. The particular point of the statement which I should like to call to the attention of Senators is Mr. Porter's suggestion relative to the oil shortage, on which so much comment has appeared recently in the press.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is H. J. Porter. I am an independent oil producer and reside in Houston, Tex. I am president of the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association. I am also a member of the executive committee of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, a director of the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, a member of the American Petroleum Institute, and a member of the National Petroleum Council.

I am also one of the uninformed with an ax to grind to whom Mr. Davies referred in his testimony, Wednesday morning, June 3. Having never held a position with any of the executive departments of the Government, I have not had an opportunity to become a great man, imbued with unusual wisdom and sagacity. I have never become sufficiently informed that I wanted to change the Constitution and the Bill of Rights of this the greatest of all nations. I hope that my son and my grandchildren never become so well informed that they will want to change the fundamental law of this land and substitute nationalization of industry for private enterprise. The protection of my business and our system of private enterprise is my private ax to grind in this controversy.

I offer for the record a resolution passed by the executive committee of our association last October and another resolution passed by the association membership on April 7, in Dallas, Tex., endorsing the action of the executive committee in opposing the ratification of this treaty.

I also wish to offer for the record resolutions opposing the ratification of the treaty by the following organizations: (1) Texas State Teachers Association; (2) Texas Association of School Administrators; (3) Texas County Judges and County Commissioners Association; (4) board of regents, State teachers colleges; (5) board of regents, University of Texas; (6) Texas State Board of Education; (7) Democratic State convention held in San Antonio last September.

In connection with the resolution of the Texas State Teachers Association, Mr. Davies seemed to think that this treaty was no concern of our school teachers. A large part of their salaries comes from taxes on oil and its products. Thanks to Mr. Davies and his ilk who were running the oil business during the war and until last August, those teachers have been underpaid. That regime of Federal regulations cost the State of Texas over $65,000,000 in taxes. As American citizens, I think the school teachers have just as much right to be concerned with the import of this treaty as Mr. Davies and his colleagues.

I am not an attorney but to my layman's mind it appears that there are two schools of thought supporting this treaty. First, I believe the support of most of the large companies that own foreign reserves of petroleum stems from their desire to escape the vigilance of the antitrust laws in their world-wide operations. Second, I am firmly convinced that the State and Interior Departments want the treaty for the sole and only purpose of obtaining Federal regulation and control of the production of oil and gas in the United States. As you have previously been told, the Interior Department, under Secretary Ickes, carried on a campaign to obtain Federal control and regulation of the domestic industry from shortly after he went into office until President Truman saw fit to dispense with his services.

This committee has been trying to find out during this hearing if there is some means of arriving at reservations or interpretations of the treaty which would meet the approval of the entire industry. In my opinion that goal cannot be reached. I believe that the entire industry, with a few exceptions, could be cemented in a bond in opposition to the treaty if the Congress would pass a simple act exempting the American companies that are engaged in international oil deals from the antitrust laws insofar as their foreign operations are concerned. I do not mean to recommend such a course. In fact it is my opinion that if the Congress saw fit to pursue such an undertaking that within 15 to 20 years the British would be over here asking for a large loan with which to repurchase their properties from the American companies so exempted.

It makes little difference whether the International Commission that would be set up under this treaty is advisory or has authority. Their prestige and influence will be built up to the point to where their advice will become orders. They would be in contact continuously with the companies operating foreign concessions and you may be certain they would be dominated by those companies. We have had experience before with agencies and commissions that were set up with and without authority and in each instance they have continually expanded their authority. The most recent example being the Federal Power Commission which has so flagrantly exceeded the original authority given them by the Congress that bills are now pending in both the Senate and the House to curb that authority. Any treaty, no matter how it is written, will be just an entering wedge to obtain monopolized international regulation of the oil industry and direct Federal control and regulation of the domestic industry. If our State Department and the entire executive branch of the Government will back up our nationals in foreign operations and announce to the world that this Government expects and demands fair treatment of its nationals by other governments then we do not need any treaty for oil or any other commodity. It is sad but true that that has not been the policy of our Government. The British became the world's greatest international traders because they pursued that policy. For generations the most potent and effective instrument of foreign policy the world has ever known was the British Navy.

It is utterly absurd to talk about orderly development of petroleum resources and the marketing thereof on a world-wide scale and at the same time say that it will not affect the domestic production of oil and gas and the domestic marketing of the products thereof. It is utterly impossible to control the development and marketing of crude oil and its products on a world-wide basis and at the same time ignore, the market which consumes approximately 65 percent of the world's production and the nation which produces approximately 64 percent of the world's crude oil at the present time. During this hearing we have heard considerable about world-wide distribution of petroleum products to both the "have" and "have not" nations and that this treaty will facilitate the proper and equitable distribution of petroleum and its products on a world-wide basis. The quesion arises in my mind as to who will finance the purchase by the "have-not" nations of these products.

If I had been a member of the board of directors of the American Petroleum Institute and had voted for the ratification of this treaty with the so-called API reservations or interpretations, I would have been deeply chagrined at the testimony of Secretary Acheson. He made it very clear that he recommended ratification of the treaty without reservations. Apparently he would not have mentioned the API reservations or interpretations if it had not been for some expert dental work on the part of a member of this committee in pulling it out of him that such reservations had been proposed and accepted by the State Department. To my mind the attitude of Secretary Acheson and Mr. Charles Rayner of the State Department during the testimony showed conclusively that they do not seriously consider the API reservations or interpretations and would utterly ignore them in the event the treaty was ratified.

During the questioning of Mr. Rayner as to whom he had consulted concerning the treaty, he made the statement that he had consulted with the American Petroleum Institute and that, in his opinion, this was the most representative group within the industry. For the information of this committee, I wish to state that there are several companies who contribute more than $100,000 per year to the American Petroleum Institute. I contribute $12.50 per year to them. I am willing to leave it to the judgment of this committee as to who determines the policies of the American Petroleum Institute, the large contributors or the several hundred small contributors from among the ranks of the independents like myself. Mr. Rayner stated he had also consulted a number of independent producers regarding the treaty. Mr. Rayner was truthful. He consulted the membership of the Independent Petroleum Association of America in annual convention at Fort Worth last October and after their consultation with him and due consideration of the presently called API reservations or interpretations, they promptly voted their opposition to the treaty with or without reservations.

My friend and neighbor, Mr. George A. Hill, of Houston, was asked when he appeared before this committee about the Independent Petroleum Association of America having approved this treaty in 1945 and then reversing

itself and voting opposition to the treaty in 1946. Mr. Hill and Mr. Ralph Zook, both members of the advisory committee, in the negotiation of the treaty, went to the Tulsa convention of that association in the fall of 1945 and told them that Secretary Ickes was determined to have a treaty but that the industry members of the advisory committee had out-traded Mr. Ickes and given him a treaty that was meaningless. They told them that Secretary Ickes was not only determined to have a treaty but would get a treaty. At that time copies of the treaty had not been generally distributed. I think Mr. Hill sincerely believed what he told them. Mr. Zook supported the first treaty and was for any kind of a treaty. After copies of the treaty became available generally to the oil industry more and more oil men began to question Mr. Hill's interpretation and then came the broadcast. After that Mr. Hill realized that there was a question as to who had outtraded whom. He then came up with the reservations which bear the label of the API. At the Fort Worth convention of that association in October 1946, these reservations were discussed in committee and on the floor of the convention for 3 days. After hearing the discussion and after having heard Mr. Rayner explain the broadcast and explain the treaty, that convention promptly voted by a big majority a resolution against the treaty with or without reservations. Some of those who voted for Mr. Hill's resolution and the treaty told me afterwards that they did it on account of personal friendship for George Hill.

It has been stated that one purpose of the treaty is to protect the titles of American and British nationals to foreign concessions. Undoubtedly they were talking about concessions in the Middle East. Who is going to enforce the protection of those titles. The British or the Americans? The British have notified the world that they are getting out of the Mediterranean area and movin; to South Africa. It may be that the British will protect Kuwait. Although it has an estimated reserve of 9,000,000,000 barrels, one-third of the estimated reserves for the entire Middle East, I understand that the British did not include this protectorate in the list of British possessions that would come within the scope of the treaty. I understand that Burma was also excluded. Is it possible that the British wish to engage in some private enterprise outside the jurisdiction of the treaty?

There has been a great deal said about the conservation of our oil and gas for national defense. The only sensible and practical way to make this country self-sufficient in oil and gas in time of peace or war is by the continued expansion and development of our domestic oil industry, supplemented by a synthetic petroleum products industry. That program has been recommended by the O'Mahoney committee. Until the synthetic industry can be developed, we should have an import policy.

At this time I wish to offer an import policy recommended by our association:

"The domestic oil industry for many years has furnished the American consuming public with an ample supply of continuously improved petroleum products at reasonable prices. The public is entitled to this service and the industry is obligated to render it. The only way this can be accomplished is through an aggressive, healthy, and dynamic domestic oil industry, operating in a free economy. Importation of foreign produced crude oil into this country should be limited to amounts sufficient to supplement the domestic production to the extent that domestic production is not available in sufficient quantities to supply the American consumptive demand for petroleum products at reasonable prices. Such imports, if required under the statement above, should continue only so long as they are supplementary and do not produce a harmful effect upon the domestic oil industry. This policy should be observed voluntarily and should be free of any Government regulation or implementation. If one or more refiners or marketers should commence importing foreign produced crude oil or petroleum products in excess of the amounts stipulated above, then their activities should be restricted by the imposition of sufficient import duties."

There are several things we can do to increase petroleum and natural gas reserve in this country:

First, increase the supply of tubular goods to the independent producers. This can be done by reducing exports of steel products for the development of foreign reserves.

Second, the Government should sell at a series of sales, to the highest bidders, every foot of the some 15,000,000 acres of land it has acquired by various means in the last 15 years, reserving only the lands necessary for the use of the Army and Navy and other essential governmental activities. The minerals should go with the sale of the land as the record shows that the average American citizen is more competent to handle minerals than the Department of the Interior or any other executive department of the Government. I believe there will not be a better market in the foreseeable future for these lands than there is now. The Government can take in a lot of cash and reduce the public pay roll some.

If you should wish to further increase reserves, the Interior Department should be required to offer for lease for oil exploration any of the public domain upon the request of any citizen, same to be sold to the highest bidder within a reasonable length of time after the request. There should be reasonable restrictions as to the size of the block or area to be leased so that independent producers, as well as major companies, will be able to purchase the leases. The rate of discovery on the public domain is little better if any than the rate of discovery in nations in which the State owns the minerals.

If the Senate will reject this treaty and make it plain to the State and Interior Departments that the Congress does not intend to permit executive branches of the Government to obtain control and regulation of this great and vital industry, they will enable oil men to devote their energies to finding new reserves and to an expansion of this great industry. Oil is where you find it. A diligent search for new reserves means millions of dollars in lease bonuses and rentals to the landowners of this Nation, as well as royalty payments to the landowners under whose land oil is found. Lease bonuses and rentals did more to carry the people of Texas through the depression than any other kind of business.

I received a copy of the letter dated May 30, 1947, which Mr. Ickes sent to each Member of the Congress. In the letter, after practically taking individual credit for winning the war, he criticizes everybody, advocates Federal control and regulation of the oil business, and winds up by endorsing this treaty. Mr. Ickes evidently thinks he will be back in the Government eventually as Secretary of the Interior or else he would not have advocated Federal regulation and control of the oil industry for I am confident that the great man does not consider anyone but himself as competent to run such a vast undertaking.

In conclusion, I wish to say to this committee that it is my firm conviction that the people of Texas do not want regimentation of the oil industry or any other industry and they are opposed to this treaty and anything else that carries the brand of Harold L. Ickes. I do not believe that the American people want an industry regimented that from year to year has furnished them a continuously improved product at lower prices. Gasoline today is selling for less than it did in 1920, even though a good part of the present price is in taxes. This achievement was only possible because of our system of private enterprise and ever-present fierce competition within the industry.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore Sun, one from the Washington Star, and one from the Philadelphia Inquirer, relating to statehood for Hawaii.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of July 1, 1947]

SHOULD HAWAII BECOME OUR FORTY-NINTH STATE?

Congress has begun debate on the question of admitting Hawaii as the forty-ninth state of the United States. The same proposal has been introduced repeatedly since 1920, but this time the Republican leaders predict that the bill will pass in short order. Any congressional action at this time will be bound to be influenced by political considerations, because speedy enactment of the legislation will give Hawaii, with a population of more than 500,000, a chance to vote in next year's presidential election. Hawaii voted Republican in its last territorial election.

Hawaii has been a territory of this country since 1900. As such, the eight islands in the Hawaiian group have been represented in Congress by a popularly elected delegate who may take part in debates and introduce legislation, but may not vote, the Governor of Hawaii, together with the Territorial Secretary and judiciary, are appointed by the President of the United States. But Hawaii has its own Senate and House of Representatives for the enactment of Territorial legislation, and the Governor's veto of any legislation may be overruled by a two-thirds vote of each house.

Unlike the inhabitants of Guam and Samoa, Hawaiians already enjoy American citizenship. Statehood would give them the right to elect their own governor, to vote for President and to have voting members of the United States Senate and House. At present, the islanders pay taxes to this country without having a vote in the manner in which those taxes are levied or spent. A congressional subcommittee held hearings in Hawaii last year and unanimously agreed that the islands were ready for statehood. The issue was placed before the Hawaiians themselves in 1940, and 67 per cent of the voters were in favor of statehood.

Opposition to the proposal is expected to arise principally on the fundamental policy of granting Statehood to a group of islands approximately 2,500 miles offshore. It is one thing to grant independence to a Territory, as was done in the case of the Philippines, and quite another thing to try to incorporate a distant group of citizens as an integral part of the national legislative system. We must weigh the primary question of whether or not it is actually feasible to bring a remote territory into our complicated system of interstate regulations. And if Hawaii is given statehood, the issue immediately

will arise as to future status of Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Samoa.

Therefore, Congress should not push the Hawaiian question for purely political reasons. But if a precedent is needed to add weight to the Hawaiians demand for Statehood, the recent action of France along these same lines is worthy of note. France has recently given the status of "departments" (roughly analogous to our States) to Guadeloupe, Martinique, Réunion, and French Guiana. The move is the first step toward the complete assimilation of France's oldest overseas territories. So it might be argued in the case of Hawaii that France has already established a trend toward the admittance of territories as full-fledged member states of a nation. On the other hand, it is conceivable that 50,000,000 Frenchmen can be wrong.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 2, 1947]

CALL FOR SENATE ACTION

The House of Representatives having voted to admit Hawaii to the Union, it is to be hoped that the Senate will find time and opportunity to welcome the forty-ninth State before adjournment. No reason now exists why this action should be postponed. Statehood was promised to the Hawaiian people half a century ago; they have qualified for it in the greatest war in history; simple justice dictates that the pledge should be kept to a people abundantly deserving of the full privileges and obligations of citizenship.

The notion that the Hawaiian Islands are overly distant from the mainland no longer is tenable. In terms of hours of travel they are nearer to Washington today than Maine and Florida were when they were granted admission. Similarly, it is useless to argue that because of their polyracial character the people of Hawaii should be kept in a dependent status. Their loyalty, their patriotism, their capacity for working together have been demonstrated under conditions of the most exacting nature.

But admission to the Union will not be a one-sided affair. The Nation as a whole will be advantaged by the closer adherence of Hawaii. Both in the eyes of the world at large and in the islands the fulfillment of the promise of 1898 will be regarded as a proof of good faith.

Senate consideration of the bill which has been approved by the House depends upon the leadership of Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, as chairman of the Public Lands Committee. If he will call that body together promptly, the necessary action may be taken without further delay. No extensive hearings are required. Admission of Hawaii to the Union has been endorsed by the Interior Department, is accepted by the War and the Navy Departments, has been urged by President Truman, is advocated by both the Republican and the Democratic Parties, is recommended by 93 percent of the press of the country and by 60 percent of the voters consulted in recent national polls. It was requested by the people of the islands in a plebiscite taken in 1940.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 2, 1947]

FOR HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

The House vote to make Hawaii the forty-ninth State was well taken, even though, granting favorable Senate action, it will be 12 or 18 months before the new State can enter the Union.

Congress has been perhaps too hesitant in making this step. As the Hawaiian Delegate, JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, pointed out, the people of the islands have been seeking statehood since 1900. That is a long time.

But originally there seemed reason to move slowly. Hawaii, like Alaska, is so far from the rest of the Union as to have seemed isolated before the recent great advances in aviation. Its population is preponderantly oriental, with a very large proportion of Japanese.

Opponents of the measure have held that these are factors which would make the move a precedent for world imperialism and the conquest of all manner of alien peoples. The truth is, of course, that distance has lost the importance it once had; the Hawaiians have clearly expressed their desire to join the Union; and the Japanese groups among them have proved their loyalty to all, except hopeless victims of race prejudice.

Other objections seem as poorly founded. One is that we ought not to admit as a State an area supposedly held in iron control by the so-called Big Five sugar factors, the idea being that its representatives in Congress would be merely agents of the big companies. The opposite extreme is that it would send two CIO Senators to Congress.

In short, objections to the measure are flimsy. National security demands the move, and there is every reason of justice to the Hawaiians to give them statehood.

Reenact Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following timely editorial suggesting tax relief to the suffering taxpayers of America by Dudlay A. White, publisher of Sandusky Newspapers, Inc.:

REENACT TAX RELIEF

Whether or not you realize it you, as an average citizen, are working 14 weeks a year to support government.

This fact clearly shows that there is no quicker way for the Truman administration to reduce the cost of living than by reducing the cost of government.

Besides lowering the cost of living for every American family, the substantial reduction of Government expenses, together with a reasonable cut in taxes, would strengthen the national economy.

Excessive taxation is a bloodsucker of the kind of trade activity and business development that produces more and better jobs; a bloodsucker of financing for new enterprises, better tools, and new employment opportunities.

Congress, therefore, should not permit Mr. Truman's resistance, highlighted by his recent veto of the tax-relief bill, to prevent them from making another effort to cut taxes in the present session.

Truman has opposed congressional measures to eliminate waste and extravagance. Nevertheless, much has been accomplished in this direction. Meanwhile, administration leaders miserably understimated 1947 revenue available for Government expenses and debt reduction. The fact that the responsibility for these policies rests squarely in the lap of the President, is no reason why the Republican Congress should forego further efforts to overcome his opposition and attempt to enact a new tax-relief measure at the earliest possible moment.

John Paul Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address by Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, delivered at the Cavalcade of Freedom Celebration, Monument Grounds, Washington, D. C., on July 4, 1947:

It is particularly appropriate that today we celebrate not only the one hundred seventy-first anniversary of our Nation's independence, but also the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of a man who contributed so much to making possible that independence—John Paul Jones.

Born in southwestern Scotland on July 6, 1747, of poor parents, John Paul as he was then called, had none of the advantages associated with wealth and position. At the age of 12 he became an apprentice in the service of a shipowner engaged in the American trade. His first voyage was to Fredericksburg, Va., where his elder brother was established as a tailor.

From this time until the outbreak of the American Revolution John Paul made many voyages to this country. By unremitting energy and study he improved his status in the maritime profession, and by 1772, when he was 25 years of age, he was sailing as master of the *Betsy* of London. It was during the period just before the Revolution that he added the surname Jones, the reason for which seems lost in obscurity.

At the outbreak of the Revolution he was one of the first to offer his services in the newly organized Continental Navy and in December 1775 he was accepted for service. His commission as lieutenant bore the date December 7, a date that was to have great significance to the United States Navy many years later.

From that time on his career is known to every schoolboy and needs no repetition here. His courage and determination is exemplified in his famous reply to Captain Pearson of the *Serapis*: "I have not yet begun to fight," when asked if the *Bon Homme Richard* had struck her colors.

The memory of John Paul Jones has always been an inspiration to the men of the United States Navy. His ringing words and heroic deeds have evoked a Navy spirit which has never accepted defeat and has always produced a will which has assured victory. On this Independence Day which falls so closely to the bicentennial of his birth, the Navy is proud to join the Nation in homage to this hero.

Behind his daring spirit and mastery seamanship was a strong and sincere patriotism. It was not a mere patriotism of geography, but a genuine passion for the freedom and justice for which our young Republic stood.

During the Revolutionary War, Jones told the King of France, "* * * I drew my sword in support of the violated dignity and rights of human nature." Here he expressed the spirit of the American fighting man. Here, also, is an expression of real American democracy. We are always opposed to those who would place lesser value upon the dignity of the individual and infringe upon his personal freedom.

John Paul Jones' belief in the dignity of the individual man was the philosophy of

our founding fathers and remains the guiding light for all who would keep America the "land of the free."

There is, and always should be, room in our Republic for men who hold conflicting ideas of politics, economics, and religion. We have no sympathy, however, for those who would place themselves, or their theories, above the individual liberties of all the people. Our war with the Fascist bullies of Hitler arose basically from their lack of respect for the dignity of man. This same principle caused our forefathers to do battle with the mercenaries of King George.

No one can say with assurance what the great figures of our history might do if they were alive today. There have been too many changes in every external phase of life to make just comparisons possible. Yet the basic ideals by which we Americans live remain fundamentally unchanged. And I believe that John Paul Jones would eternally maintain his firm belief in the intrinsic liberties of the individual. It is conceivable that he would caution us against anyone, regardless of political label, who would ask the people to surrender their basic liberties for the sake of a promised but dubious Utopia.

That is why I feel the story of Jones' spirited life has a special significance for all Americans today. Though he lived two centuries ago, his message is still most pertinent. Through the retelling of his story we can find encouragement and renewed vigor in our search for the solutions to today's pressing problems.

It has been said that he honored the generation in which he lived. Our generation, and those of the future, can best return that honor by living up to his bold example of action and justice.

The Last Hope of Human Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me to 250,000 persons attending America's Cavalcade of Freedom program on the Monument Grounds in the Nation's Capital on July 4, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAST HOPE OF HUMAN LIBERTY

Fellow Americans, I am happy to participate in this patriotic demonstration as you celebrate the one hundred and seventy-first anniversary of the independence of our great Republic. For the historic Declaration adopted on that summer's day long ago is truly the nucleus upon which was founded the United States of America. It is, naturally, an occasion for an impressive observance such as this to remind us of its significance—attested daily by our personal freedom, the equal of which is unknown throughout the rest of the world.

On this birthday of our Nation, it is proper that the National Capital should stage the largest celebration throughout the land. For almost a century and a half, this city has been the seat of our Federal Government. Here, this towering shaft has been erected to the memory of the Father of our Country, who devoted a lifetime to the service of his countrymen. Nearby are many memorials and statues commemorating the loyalty and the heroism of others who dedicated their lives to making possible enjoyment of the heritage of freedom by future generations. Thousands of patriotic Americans, in peace and war, have given their fullest measure of devotion to the preservation of constitutional government.

On July 4, 1776, when the Declaration of Independence was adopted by the Continental Congress in Philadelphia, a theretofore-unheard-of concept of government was inaugurated by stalwart men who were bold in thinking and bold in action. What was this concept of government, termed by European statesmen of those days as absolute proof of the mental aberration of American revolutionaries? Why, Americans had been guaranteed life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We Americans today consider this guaranty the fundamental basis of our Government, but in 1776 it was the rankest heresy. Ever since, this concept has remained the inspiration and the objective of all peoples who would be free.

Frequently, in the history of this Republic, constitutional government has been jeopardized. Whenever a foreign enemy has assailed the Republic, our Nation has been blessed with victory. It is noteworthy that in time of war our citizens submerge their personal fortunes to promote the national welfare. War, with its spectacular appeals, has inspired men to fight and die in defense of human rights.

In the United States our Constitution recognizes that the people are supreme—the source of all political and economic authority. Notwithstanding the terrific burdens of waging war, we have always maintained our system of free enterprise. Constitutional guaranties have been preserved.

Americans are justly proud of their rich heritage, although too frequently some citizens overlook the fact that governments endure only so long as people make sacrifices to sustain them. Washington and Jefferson gave us our freedom; Lincoln preserved our Union; patriotic Americans of other generations have responded in many ways to keep America the exemplar of constitutional government.

Our Nation honors the men and women in uniform who achieved victory over the Axis Powers. But we have not yet reestablished peace, and many difficult problems remain to be resolved before peace treaties are consummated.

In wartime our Nation was united; in peacetime it is disunited. The solidarity and unity which characterized our wartime activity have been supplanted by bickering and disagreements in almost every field of human endeavor. It is not essential to eliminate all friction and controversy, but it is imperative for all Americans to recognize that they cannot relax their constant vigilance over the Nation's welfare.

Too many people have the obsession that the President, the Congress, and other public officials can solve their problems. Pressure groups are extremely active in seeking special privileges or gratuities from their Government. Instead of contributing something to the national welfare, many groups and organizations make unreasonable demands because they erroneously believe that paternalism is the rightful function of government. The people are sovereign and must accept their responsibility in helping to chart our national destiny.

It is fallacious to believe that the people need only to look to Washington for bigger gratuities and subsidies, and that the Government can maintain itself. The badge of an American does not entitle a person to "ride on a free ticket." It merely accords him the inalienable right to support to the best of his ability an ideology which imposes obligations as well as provides personal advantages and safeguards.

Throughout the world today, free government is in jeopardy. Dictators seek to thwart self-determination and to make the power of the state superior to the right of the individual. Millions of men, women, and children are the victims of tyranny and oppression. In Europe today human beings are still being interned in concentration camps. Starvation and disease menace their welfare; despair mortgages their future. These tragic conditions clearly show the distinction between the old-world and the new-world concept of government. Dictators can neither bribe nor coerce people to surrender their rights without the inevitable destruction of their security.

The United States is endeavoring to relieve distress and to restore order in countries devastated by war. Billions of our national wealth have been provided freely to bulwark Europe's economic strength and thus prevent political collapse. Notwithstanding false insinuations by those who would obstruct Europe's recovery, Americans are actuated solely by the desire to stabilize conditions so that peace may become a reality.

The history of mankind reflects almost constant travail and frustration in every generation. In colonial days liberty was more highly evaluated because its denial by the British crown obstructed the attainment of those rights which had inspired the migration of God-fearing, liberty-loving people to this continent. Yorktown did not bring security after the Revolutionary War. Hazards and dangers continued within the new Nation, as well as threats from imperialistic rulers abroad. Thirty-five years after he had written the immortal Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson declared: "The last hope of human liberty in this world rests on us. We ought, for so dear a stake, to sacrifice every attachment and every enmity."

Throughout this land are millions of Americans who recognize that "the last hope of human liberty in this world rests on us" today as in past generations. It is our responsibility to prove that representative government can function as effectually in meeting postwar challenges as in helping to win military victories over totalitarian powers. Our Nation is facing many crucial tests, and success is contingent upon an inspired citizenry. We cannot be strong so long as dissension and strife are rampant.

Jefferson and his associates in the Continental Congress were fully aware of the portent of their actions in absolving all allegiance to the British Crown. They were defying the world's most powerful maritime nation, and they knew that reprisals could be expected. Yet they mutually pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

They were willing to sacrifice everything for their country's welfare. Will Americans of our age emulate this patriotic devotion? Their course will decide the destiny of our Republic.

Explanation of the Proposed Bill on Alien War-Service Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, section 325 of the Nationality Act of 1940 provides that persons with 5 years' service in the American merchant marine shall be eligible for naturalization and waives the normal residence requirements.

The proposed bill amends this section to provide that 3 years of "maritime wartime service" shall be accepted in lieu of 5 years of peacetime service. "Maritime wartime service" is strictly defined to include only service after Pearl Harbor and before March 2, 1946, only service aboard ships under the direct control of the Army Transportation Corps or the War Shipping Administration, and only service in waters subject to enemy activity as defined by the Maritime War Emergency Board. As a result of these stringent requirements only the few hundred alien war-service seamen who made the most outstanding contribution to our war effort will benefit.

The proposed bill also provides for the granting of a certificate of arrival to any person with 1 year of "maritime wartime service."

United States Human Mission to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to offer the dispatch by my friend, D. F. Karaka, correspondent of the Bombay Chronicle, and former war correspondent. He has some very illuminating things to state regarding the exchange of students between India and the United States.

The dispatch follows:

UNITED STATES HUMAN MISSION TO INDIA

(By D. F. Karaka)

Due to arrive here in the third week of June is the first United States Ambassador to India, Mr. Henry F. Grady. Carefully chosen for the delicate job of representing the United States in this country, which is in the midst of great political and constitutional changes, Mr. Grady has an impressive background both in his own country and in the east. In 1941 he was President Roosevelt's personal representative and made an economic survey of those far eastern countries which supplied strategic defense materials. In the following year Mr. Grady came to India as head of the American Technical Commission. During 1945 and 1946 he served as the national chairman of the board of directors of American relief for India.

Sixty-five years of age, the United States Ambassador is a family man with a wife and four grown-up children. He is distinguished looking, tall and heavily set with grey hair and blue eyes. He is described as "a man who has no outstanding hobbies, but spends his spare time in scholarly pursuits—he wears glasses."

From the official standpoint and from the diplomatic, Mr. Grady satisfies all the requirements of an ambassador and of a man whose job is to promote goodwill, better understanding and friendship between the country he represents and that to which he is sent as Ambassador.

It seems to me that it is not enough to achieve these objects that a liaison between the two peoples should be effected only at high levels. I have no doubt that in time Mr. Grady will be on the most friendly and easy terms with our representatives and leaders in the capital city of New Delhi. I have no doubt also that he will even understand the intricate political situation which now faces us and that he will be able to grasp the complexities of the Indian national or the binational character. The chances are, however, that the Indian and the American people will still remain as far apart as ever.

LIAISON BETWEEN COMMON PEOPLE

I maintain that liaison among the people of two countries must take place at lower levels than that of ambassadors. The common people of one country must send their own representatives to the common people of another country, unhampered by diplomatic conventions and protocols and all such encumbrances.

There is today a definite world trend which encourages this idea. The creations of the UNESCO is entitled to foster this end. The preamble of the constitution drafted at the London conference of UNESCO expressed high purposes and basic principles. The governments of the states who were parties to this constitution solemnly declared:

"That ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through their differences have all too often broken into war";

"That the great and terrible war which has now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality, and mutual respect of men, and by the propagation, in their place, through ignorance and prejudice, of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races."

The object which UNESCO has in mind is to promote a free flow of ideas and information on the popular as well as the scholarly level through the media of the radio, motion pictures, and the printed page. UNESCO will further encourage the exchange of students and the reciprocal visits of such individuals as scientists, teachers, and artists. It will encourage the association across national boundaries of creative writers, artists, and musicians.

It is my belief that these objects and ideals can right now be achieved by sending to this country a half dozen representative young Americans, picked from the complex pattern of American democracy and charged with no other idea than that they should come here to India, look around for themselves, and take back whatever impressions they gather. A similar team which from the British universities before the war on a talking tour of India was, I remember, a tremendous success.

MISSIONARIES OF ONE WORLD

What would be a representative cross section of such Americans, culled from the colleges of the United States and including today many veterans of World War II who have seen the broad canvas of the world in the theaters of war in which they have operated and who have fought for that one world of which the late Mr. Wendell Willkie spoke? As I see it from this distance, I would pick the men somewhat as follows:

1. I would take a boy from an up-State New York village, who is studying business administration at Cornell or Syracuse and probably was a fighter pilot during the war.

2. I would take a Harvard law student from an old back-bay Boston family.

3. I would take a Negro student of medicine from the Howard University, probably a veteran of the Ledo Road and the CBI theater, whose home is in the deep South.

4. I would take an ex-major now studying journalism in the University of Columbia, who speaks with a broad Brooklyn accent and whose name could be Goldstein.

5. I would take a young man studying agriculture and learning to become a farmer in the University of Iowa.

6. I would take a political-science student from Stanford University, a Californian who has served with the OSS in Burma.

These are six young men haphazardly chosen who satisfy two requirements. First they must be typical Americans, secondly they must, if it is possible at the same time, be also citizens of the world.

If these young men could come out here to India this cold weather, they would, I am sure, create the sort of good will which we want created between the United States and India, and they would, I am also sure, take back with them a picture of this country different from that distorted picture of casts, communal strife, poverty, and squalor, which is so often painted of us in the United States.

If the Government of the United States and the State Department cannot act on this until the Munn bill passes Congress, it would be a glorious idea for some of the individual organizations to sponsor.

Groups like the American Friends of India, the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations, the larger universities who are interested in international relations, such as Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and Syracuse; business firms like the International Business Machines; and a great many philanthropic individuals, could sponsor this idea of a human mission to India.

Military Conscription Is Contrary to the Spirit and Practice of the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony by Josephus Daniels, editor of the News and Observer, of Raleigh, N. C., who was Secretary of the Navy from 1913 to 1921:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as an American citizen who believes in preparedness and who directed the forces of the Navy during World War I, I wish to give expression to my sincere conviction that the proposed conscription of all American youths over 18 is a dangerous departure from the sound and settled policy of America from its foundation. Except in times of war, conscription violates fundamental Americanism, and confers upon the military the duties of the home and the school. If half of the cost of the proposed universal conscription was appropriated to the public schools the youth would be far better trained than in any system conducted with the chief emphasis upon training for war. More than that, from civilian institutions there would come as volunteers all the men needed for making the most efficient Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and the strengthening of civilian objectives in making government more responsive to the noblest needs of the country.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the propaganda for compulsory military service for American youth is based upon three false premises:

First. Fear, and I hold with Franklin Roosevelt that "fear is the only thing to fear." As I read or listen to the pleas to Hitlerize America, and see how the advocates of compulsion tremble, I am reminded of the old nursery rhyme: "Run, little fear, or big fear will get you."

Second. Cynicism, the disbelief in the ability of our civilization to rise out of savagery and so order the affairs of a civilized age as to make war an anachronism. The unbelief is based on the silly credo: "There have

always been wars and there always will be wars."

Third. Imperialism, the desire that Uncle Sam shall abandon democracy, the right of all men to govern themselves, and follow the example of the Israelites of old who, tired of God's guidance, wished a king so they would be like neighbor nations that lived by the sword. It was this jealousy of John Bull's exploitation of weak peoples that caused us to go into the colonial business when we obtained rule of the Philippines by conquest and purchase, and held onto them under the pious profession of benevolent assimilation. Happily, we have come to ourselves and redeemed the solemn pledge to return sovereignty to the Filipinos.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, let me hasten to avow that I belong to the school of thought which holds with Washington, "In time of peace prepare for war." I also am a Wilsonian and Rooseveltian who believes equally in the maxim, "In time of war prepare for peace." One is the corollary of the other. As long as there are men and nations that live by the sword there is the certainty that nations lacking the means of defense will die by the sword. As long as there are robbers and marauders, cities must maintain a vigilant and adequate police force to protect life and property, the size being regulated by the danger of being despoiled. I believe everything in the Bible "from kivver to kivver" except "The meek shall inherit the earth." That makes me a heretic unless this prophecy was intended for some far off century. Up to our day the meek have not only not inherited the earth but have been the victims of the strong and greedy whose creed is that the earth belongs to those who have the power and are able to go up and take it.

Our country for decades was so favorably situated between the two great oceans, it had little fear of invasion. That was in the days when communication and transportation were so slow that Andrew Jackson could be winning the Battle of New Orleans days after the treaty of peace had been signed between the two fighting nations at Ghent. That protection was lessened when submarines could stealthily enter our harbors before their presence was discovered and hurl deadly torpedoes to destroy our cities. It was lost when bombers in a few hours could fly from Tokio and work havoc on the American fleet anchored in Pearl Harbor, or the "airy navies of the central blue" were capable of taking off before breakfast from Berlin and blasting Boston before the setting sun. Protected by the narrow channel separating it from the continent, the tight little island of England was safe from invasion in all former wars, but was dangerously near destruction when flying robots wiped out thickly populated sections of London and made life a nightmare to millions. Only the supremacy in air, aided by sea and land forces, prevented its annihilation.

The whole military strategy was changed when the atomic bombs blasted Hiroshima. Infantry in the years to come will give way to scientific weapons, and the suggestion of universal drilling is to fail to appreciate the lessons taught by the new warfare in World War II. Indeed, the day may not be far distant when the foot soldiers will follow the Cavalry into innocuous desuetude.

The outstanding lesson taught by World War II is that the nation which commands the air is the nation that can rule the world. This is not to say that wars can be fought and enemy countries brought under subjection and punished alone by this new weapon sending its bombs hurtling on crowded cities, industrial plants, and railway stations. No complete victory can be won and garnered, as this war proves, except by aerial warfare, with hand-to-hand fighting to follow the devastation from the air. It is too soon to assess the relative value of the forces of land, sea, and air, or to plan for wise preparedness in a world that is still bleeding from the wounds of war. There must be time for the adoption of the best plan after all the lessons have been made known.

The first sound that fell upon my infant ears was from the shelling by Federal gunboats of a small southern town in which I was born. I have lived through three major wars, having been privileged to direct naval operations of the United States in World War I. Study and experience have convinced me that until we can replace war with effective international agreement as a safe substitute our country must be well prepared against attack. In 1914, when the European war broke out and there was danger the contagion might reach us, the Wilson administration made plans, and in 1915 secured authorization for the creation of the most powerful Navy in the world. I am testifying today from my experience of 8 years as Secretary of the Navy, covering the period of World War I, and from my strong belief in efficient modern preparedness. No man believes more in having a gun well primed than I do. But I put emphasis on the sort of preparedness this war has taught will win victories, and not on the discredited broken stick of universal compulsory conscription.

That is archaic in an era that has pushed foot soldiers to third or fourth place in modern warfare. It is scientists, electricians, engineers, men with new ideas trained in making and using atomic and other bombs and new weapons, who are the main dependence of any country threatened by war.

Before we entered the war in 1917 naval statesmen did not foresee that the enemy would employ the U-boat as its chief offensive. We did not provide adequately for such warfare. We had placed chief emphasis on dreadnaughts while the craft most needed were destroyers, submarines, chasers, and Eagle boats. There was better preparedness against the submarine in this war, but military experts here and abroad had not foreseen that Nazi victories over Europe and the expulsion of the British from the Continent would come from superiority in the air and mechanized weapons on the land. The tide of war did not turn until allied air superiority blasted Nazi cities and fortresses and factories and railroads and war materials. The imperative preparedness of tomorrow is that which will give conquest of the skies. Without that mastery all the mighty leviathans and the thundering artillery and the serried ranks of infantry will be compelled in any future war to say, "One thing thou lackest yet"—and the first and most potent offensive weapon.

We were forehanded in antiquated cavalry in 1940, we were strong in powerful dreadnaughts which may soon be outmoded, we had efficient drill masters and artillerymen, but in 1940 all our belated preparedness lacked the most important essential for modern warfare—modern aircraft carriers and ships in the upper air that could drop down their deadly missiles and destroy whatever they elected to annihilate.

When the time comes to prepare for preparedness, the first step will be to unlearn the methods of the past and discard the archaic drilling, put all cavalry horses to plowing, shut down munition plants making out-of-date weapons, discard the ancient tactics and strategy long taught in military schools, and look mainly toward the perfection of weapons of the skies. The "airy navies of the central blue" will win the first battles of the future. The chief ship of the surface navy will be the aircraft carriers, and the chief function of the land forces to follow up, mop up, and occupy. And Uncle Sam will be astounded at the number of young men who will volunteer—more than needed—to see the sky darkened by the dreadnaught planes raining down their ghastly dew.

My first introduction to compulsory service, and my revulsion from it, came in 1914, a few months before the outbreak of World War I. A very good friend, General Estoppinall, Member of Congress from Louisiana and member of the Naval Affairs Committee, called to see me on his return from France, where he had been on a visit to his sister. "I am glad to get back," he said, "to a free country where youth are not conscripted for military service and where we do not live daily in fear of war. When I arrived in France I found my sister in deep distress because her sons must leave home and school and be called to military service (the law required service up to 45 years of age). She hated the separation—her boys being taken from her and from school to march and drill and drill and march and march, for which they had no taste." General Estoppinall said the French hated the system but tolerated it because of the fear that Germany would again try to possess their country. That fear was well founded, for in less than 6 months after that conversation German soldiers rushed through Belgium and threatened France. It was not till America threw its might into the struggle that the Germans were driven back. The French fought bravely against great odds, not because of the compulsory military service but in spite of it. By 1918 they were war-weary and could not have carried on without the help of British and American soldiers, who, lacking the nightmare of compulsory service, fought with at least as high efficiency as their allies whose sons had been conscripted to serve in the army since 1872.

The draft under French law provided for a 27-year period of military service. The proportion of the youth drafted varied from 65 to 85 percent. In World War I and World War II our American soldiers, who had never in time of peace been conscripted, went overseas with only a few months wartime training and, fighting side by side with the French, demonstrated that long, compulsory training did not make better soldiers. This is particularly true in mechanized warfare, where familiarity with automobiles, tractors, and like machinery makes it comparatively easy to go from peactime to war without a long period of goose-stepping.

The example of France, which in 1939 boasted the greatest and best-trained regular army, with long training under a compulsory law, certainly offers no good argument to adopt a system which did not save that army from rout and defeat in this war. French soldiers, without the blight of compulsion, would have given a better account of themselves. The draft system was tried and found wanting.

The advocates of a compulsory law point to the early victories of the Nazis as an example America should follow. The first thing Hitler did when he became dictator of Germany was to tighten up and enforce military conscription. All German males between 18 and 45 were drafted and forced into active duty for a period of 10 years. The system called for the training of the entire youth of the nation. There was basic preinduction service, discipline and hardening of young boys in the schools. They were indoctrinated into the fake of being the superior race. Germany was made one vast military camp and all life was based on preparedness for war. This by order of the Fuehrer. The Nazis became brutally efficient and for a time ran roughshod over most of Europe. They believed their military caste and universal military service would make Germany the master of the world. It would be futile to deny that the German military force won important victories and imposed their will from the Atlantic Ocean and the British Channel to the steppes of Russia. Their victories were made possible more by early supremacy in the air and the utilization of mechanized implements of war more than by compulsory goose-stepping. And

the time came when the drafted Nazi soldiers, with long years of compulsory military service, came up against mighty armies from countries which had practiced no peacetime compulsion. The result is history. The citizen soldiers, quickly mastering the lessons of war in combat, came off victors over those who believed no soldier could fight unless from boyhood he had been compelled to make militarism the grind of his daily life.

The claim has often been made that Switzerland was not invaded, because she had universal military training. Is it historically correct to maintain that a small Swiss Army trained with rifles and other small weapons presented an important military threat to the highly mechanized Germany?

There were important reasons like the following which kept Switzerland from being invaded by other nations in the past world war:

First. Swiss topography: The report of the President's Commission on Universal Training speaks of "the limited access to armies through mountain passes and the high cost in time, men, and equipment of waging war across the rugged Swiss terrain" as militating "against invasions of that country."

Second. Economic reasons: Swiss trade with other countries, both Allied and Axis, was quite profitable to the Axis powers as well as to Switzerlnad. This trade would have been cut off if Switzerland had gone to war.

Third. A third reason is mentioned in the report of the President's Commission on Universal Training: "The St. Gothard and the Simplon tunnels, through which four-fifths of the traffic between Germany and Italy passed, were mined." The Germans and Italians knew that an invasion of Swiss territory would injure and perhaps permanently prevent the indispensable traffic between Germany and Italy.

If universal military training kept Switzerland out of war, why did it fail to save France, Belgium, Holland, and Poland?

Certainly an examination of the results of compulsory service in France and Germany give no sufficient reason why the United States should abandon its century-old Americanism and adopt European imperialism, which now in its rout finds none so poor to render it obeisance. Weighed in the balance—in the acid test of war—that much-vaunted system was found wanting. Its epitaph—this is true of Italy, too, and will be of Japan: Mene mene, tekel upharsin.

Up to date nobody advocating spending billions and billions of dollars for compulsory military services has even guessed at how much money will be required to put that juggernaut in motion and keep it going, and in what sort of war these draftees will be trained to fight to get best results.

The only guess at the immense cost is that the cost in the first year would approach $2,000,000,000. But that would be only a beginning of the immense burden compulsory service would saddle on the backs of the taxpayers.

The only suggestions of training have been land bases, barracks, and tents galore, and the sort of drilling that was in fashion a generation ago. Most of such training is as out of date as the triremes of Romes. It has not been suggested that there is need for drafting men for the Navy. It can obtain all it may need by volunteers who are ambitious to go down to the sea in ships. Aviation will attract more men of their own volition than there are planes in which they can try their wings. There remains, therefore, as the only possible argument for compulsory training the drafting of men to make up the land forces. At the most there will be need only for a small, compact land force. Every man that can be wisely placed can be obtained by volunteer enlistment if there is adequate pay with certain advancement from the ranks to those who show ability in actual service.

Let me illustrate: When I became Secretary of the Navy in March 1913 Congress had authorized an enlistment of 40,000 men. I found that the strenuous effort to attract enough youths to the number authorized lagged. This in the face of propaganda by Navy bands and solicitation to enlistment by the promise, "Join the Navy and see the world." I resolved to find why the response to appeals to enlist did not secure enough seamen. I found it was due to three reasons: 1. The pay was inadequate. 2. The training, except in gunnery and engineering, was lacking. 3. A caste system denied the equality that is synonymous with Americanism—the door to promotion was barred.

A new policy was adopted of a school on every ship, better vocational and elementary instruction, opportunity for advancement and promotion to commissioned officer rank—not enough—and training in navigation by voyages that enabled all sailors to see the world, beginning with a voyage to Rome. What was the result? In piping times of peace the full strength was enlisted and the next Congress authorized all the sailors needed to man the ships in commission and the new ships to be constructed.

What does this history teach? Beyond dispute that if the pay is adequate, the dignity of youth respected, education provided, and the door to promotion opened, there will be no lack of voluntary enlistments. If these American rights and opportunities are made a part of military life, there will be so many American youths volunteering that no branch of military service will need to conscript men.

The call is not compulsory service—as un-American is nazism or fascism—but the practice of that American democracy in the military branches which prevails in civilian life. The first step is promotion of the capable privates to officer rank, and the utter exclusion of that snobbery which sometimes creates a chasm between the officers and enlisted men.

A beginning has been made in introducing enlisted personnel as members of court martials. It should be followed by public hearings and the adoption of more rules and practices which prevail in civilian courts of justice.

We are told that the cure for democracy is more democracy. The cure for lack of full enlistments is to introduce democracy and more democracy.

Not long ago I chanced to be in a company of civilian officials and officers of the Navy and Army when the discussion turned on the subject of compulsory military service. One civilian, who had come to Washington from patriotic motives to serve in an important post, brought up the subject your committee is now considering, and expressed the strong belief that our country should at once enact the legislation which is now under consideration. He said it was the only guaranty of protection. He advanced the view that every youth should be fitted for war by military training in peace. As he proceeded with the old familiar argument first advanced by Bismarck, and later be-praised by Hitler, a wise admiral who had not forgotten his Americanism and who still has his feet on the ground, interrupted by asking: "How much would it cost to give this universal compulsory military training?" As the discussion proceeded, and the advocates brought forth argument after argument for compulsion, they were all confounded when the quiet admiral halted every argument brought forth with the disconcerting question: "How many billion dollars will it cost?" He has had no answer to his question yet because the advocates shy away from that phase of their proposal. One of those present did say: "No matter what the cost, it will be cheaper than the two wars in which we have been engaged." The admiral asked: "Did compulsory military service in France stop Hitler in 1940? And did it guarantee the peace you think that un-American system would insure for us when a war lord is bent on military domination?" That question remains unanswered.

This wise admiral, whose practical devotion to true preparedness is a matter of record, commented: "I have not forgotten the fundamentals of democracy I learned as a boy. Compulsory military service in peacetimes is contrary to those principles. Let us stick to our Americanism and we have nothing to fear."

After the discussion had proceeded for some time, the civilian who was most vocal for compulsion, turned to the officers present and said: "Unless we get it now, we will never get it. The time to strike is when the iron is hot."

You may ask me, "If you do not believe in compulsory military service, what would you propose in lieu of it for preparedness against any possible foe?" That would be a proper question. No one ought to be against a proposed remedy unless prepared to offer a better one. If and until a League of Nations, or a like international organization has demonstrated its ability to prevent war, our country owes it to itself to be prepared against the possibility of attack.

What is the best protection? My answer is the same one I made to the Naval Affairs Committee while Wilson was in Paris negotiating for a world organization of a substitute for war. Unless and until such an agency could work satisfactorily, I urged the most powerful navy in the world. The naval emphasis then was on surface ships. Today I would place the main emphasis upon atomic bombs and like modern weapons by both arms of the military service, a navy that flies, with adequate military strength on land and sea. Aviation has passed its infancy, but has not reached its stride. I would take leave to be strong in the air. If our country dominates the sky, no enemy can land on any part of our terrain.

We should make a study of the lessons taught by war before determining the character or quantity of military strength or how our armed forces are to be recruited.

It would be the height of unwisdom to plunge into the expenditure of billions to set up a mighty system which would invade every home at the behest of militarist or cynic. I have heard no reason or excuse for compulsory military service except from those who doubt the effectiveness of any world peace agency or those who wish Uncle Sam to become a colonial nation holding the weaker people in chains.

The apparent sentiment for departing from American preparedness does not exist in the hinterland of America, among the men who reap and sow, of those who fashion implements and tools and machines in our factories, or in our schools and colleges. Most of it is pumped up. Outside of Washington and official and military circles there is little demand for this radical departure from a system of government that has been our sound foundation in all our history.

We will never dominate in war by dependence upon the draft. All we need to do is to provide the craft and accessories and young Americans will hasten to enlist, and the number of voluntary aviators will exceed the ability to furnish them wings. Certainly, we ought not to put all our eggs in one basket. We now have land and sea and air forces larger than we will ever need. Enough should be retained of all to guarantee national defense until time has demonstrated the size of each force that is necessary for our own protection and thus to contribute our share to an international police force to use against any who would threaten the peace of the world.

It is too soon to determine the character and size of the military strength in men and munitions.

And to these should be added what World War II proved necessary: A joinder of the Army and Navy under one head. War

taught that unity of command of Army and Navy forces was essential to victory. If essential in war, one single direction should govern training and preparedness in time of peace as well as in war.

The plea that military instruction for all youths is better than all-round education in the schools of civilian teachers is an unjust reflection upon the schools and colleges of the country. A military camp or school is the best place to train men to fight, but not the best instruction for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. Compulsory military training elevates the soldier above the citizen. The genius of our Government makes the military the executive of the civilian officials. When we change our system for compulsory military training we are headed to all the costs and imperialism inherent in the rule of the men on horseback, as seen in France in the days of Napoleon and in Germany in the days of the Kaiser and of Hitler.

America Must Readjust to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following significant address of the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., over the National Broadcasting Co. network from Washington, D. C., Wednesday, July 9, 1947:

Fellow Americans, I take this occasion to speak to you concerning tax reduction, because I believe it is one of the most essential things to be done in this first session of the Eightieth Congress.

Two vitally important issues are involved in this tax bill. The first issue is the maintenance and protection of the respective functions of the different branches of the Government. Only once before in the history of this country has a Chief Executive ever attempted to invade the constitutional function and right of Congress to levy taxes. It was not successful then and it should not be successful now. Congress must continue to be the dominating force in the determination of how the American people shall be taxed.

The strength of the House of Representatives and of the whole Congress has always been in its control of the purse strings. It is necessary for the Eightieth Congress to protect this prerogative so the checks and balances in government may be maintained, as they were intended by the founding fathers to be maintained under our Constitution.

The second issue is that the people of this country simply cannot support a Government which is spending as we have spent during the war and since. The people bore their stupendous tax burdens with great fortitude during the war, but any attempt to continue those tax burdens far into the future will be bound to result in disaster. The people cannot carry the tax burdens that are now laid upon them, pay the high prices now prevailing, and in which taxes enter materially, and at the same time save something for a rainy day.

It is, of course, characteristic of governments to grow and expand. Usually, the cause is war. Government tends to remain expanded. Every bureau which comes into existence to meet a temporary need wants always to remain as a permanent part of the Government.

This has proved to be true since the end of hostilities in this Second World War just as it proved true after the end of hostilities in the First World War. You may recall the disclosure a few months ago of a temporary agency which was organized in 1918 to help fight the First World War was still fighting it after June 1946. It was the United States Spruce Production Corporation created to provide material for wood frame airplanes. I believe it was granted something like $13,000 last year to persuade it finally to go out of business.

It simply is not to be expected that governmental bureaus and agencies will voluntarily put themselves out of business. Quite to the contrary, they will struggle so long as they can struggle not only to maintain themselves in power, but to expand their powers, enlarge their controls and their expenditures of the public funds.

Previous to the elections last November, it was clear the country wanted the cost of Government cut down; the size of the Government cut down; the activities of the Government cut down; and the tax rates reduced.

With the assembling of the Eightieth Congress, it was perfectly obvious if we were going to get America readjusted to peace, progress, and prosperity, we would have to reduce drastically the squandering of public funds by a bureaucracy which had become overswollen, arrogant, and wasteful. The bureaucracy of today is no different than any of the bureaucracies of the past. It is inherent in all bureaucracies, the longer they stay in existence, to become more and more arrogant, more and more wasteful. They set up all sorts of alleged or make-believe public services in order to create a popular demand for their continuance when the Appropriations Committees of the Congress start to apply the pruning knife to their expenditures.

We knew when the Eightieth Congress assembled we must achieve a balanced budget, which we have not had for a good many years. We knew we must start paying off the national debt. We knew we must give tax relief to the 49,000,000 people who had so uncomplainingly borne the enormous tax burdens to bring about victory in the war.

The Congress is the people's special instrument of control over their Government and their public administrators. The House of Representatives has always been recognized as being sensitive to the demands of people because of the fact a new list of Representatives is elected or reelected every 2 years.

For the past 14 years there has been a concerted drive to break down the authority of the legislative branch of the Government over the expenditure of public funds.

There has also been a concerted drive during all that time to destroy public confidence in the Congress.

The subversionists and political self-seekers continually strive to drive a wedge between the people of this Nation and their Congress. If that could be accomplished those subversionists could succeed in wresting control of the Government from the people. They would vest it in bureaus strongly entrenched in the executive department of the Government.

Those are the home grounds of the political termites. This danger really exists.

The people have declared they want their Congress to take back to itself the powers which were too freely granted the Chief Executive or to various independent agencies of the Government in years past.

The Eightieth Congress was on notice it would have to move in this direction.

Because of these facts it becomes an event of very great significance when the Chief Executive undertakes to tell a considerable majority of each House of the Congress whether they should or should not pass tax legislation.

It became necessary, because of conditions which arose in the disagreement over the tax bill between the legislative and the executive branches of the Government, for the House of Representatives to reenact its tax bill, setting the date for the reduction in rates forward from July 1, 1947, to January 1, 1948.

This necessity of passing the same legislation a second time was an extraordinary one. The condition of the country is such as to make it wise for the Congress to do this very thing.

We cannot forget there is a very strong and continuous drive in this country as well as in other parts of the world against free government and our American way of life.

Neither dare we forget that the subversionists in this country will, if possible, try to create resentment through heavy taxation and high prices. They would then charge the Government under the Constitution with failing to carry out its duties of protecting the people against heavy taxation and high prices. These subversionists hope by such tactics to stand a chance, in event of a sharp recession in business, or a depression, of overturning our form of government and stepping in with some sort of a dictatorship.

We cannot ignore the facts of history. From the pinnacle of oppressive taxes, many a government has toppled to destruction, and many a monarch has fallen from his throne.

There are three vital facts which I believe we must always keep before us in a situation such as confronts us in the United States today.

The first is: The tendency of all governments, as I pointed out a moment ago, to continue endless expansion of spending until the point of ruin is reached.

The second fact is: All taxes must come from the labor, the sweat, the privations and the thrift of all the people.

The third fact is one which has always affected governments and always will: The people finally become weary of intolerable tax burdens. When this happens business withers away. Production slows down. Individual initiative is discouraged. Frustration replaces confidence and hope. The government finally goes down to destruction before the onslaughts of demagogues who find in chaos their chance for temporary power and loot.

For a hundred years and more, our American way of life has been progressing to the point where its invulnerable stability was taken for granted. We almost forgot vigilance is still the price of liberty. We became indifferent to encroachments upon our form of government. We have been most tolerant people in the world of new ideas, even when those ideas were antagonistic to our own way of government and of life.

New and terrible stresses have been brought to bear upon our American system of government, and our American way of life, by changes which have occurred in other parts of the world.

After the people last November registered in such an emphatic way their demand that governmental costs be cut and the tax burdens lightened, it was determined the Eightieth Congress must respond to the demand forthwith, and the effort is being made.

We have balanced the budget. We have curtailed governmental spending. We shall be able to make a substantial payment on the debt. All now needed to complete this well-coordinated program demanded by the people last November is to give the 49,000,000

American people a break in tax rates. This reduction of taxes is absolutely essential if we are to safeguard our economic prosperity.

The House of Representatives has performed a magnificent job of carrying out the mandate received from the American people last November in cutting out the wasteful, extravagant, don't-count-the-cost practices of bureaucratic spending.

The program which is presented to the Congress and the people is a straightforward, honest, open program. No trick economics and no false promises are to be found in it.

It is poor service to the country or to any political party for anybody to try to confuse the issue of lower tax rates and defeat the bill by substitute proposals. The American people do not want excuses; they want tax reductions.

The Appropriations Committee of the House has done its work well. Reductions of governmental spending have been made on a sound basis, even though against terrific pressures of hostile propaganda, well organized and directed from high places, apparently, in the Government.

The task of the Eightieth Congress is to restore the finances of the United States Government to a sane and sound basis. Our problem is to preserve the solvency of the Government. We must assure the safety of the people's assets in bonds, savings, and insurance policies. These tasks the Congress is succeeding in performing, and performing well. I want to say the House of Representatives merits the gratitude and the support of everyone who loves America and wants to see our way of life perpetuated.

The taxicab driver, the cook, the housemaid, the millions of school teachers, policemen, firemen, factory and office workers, people in the lower-salary brackets everywhere, will rejoice in the extra take-home pay which will be theirs with the passage of the tax bill.

The people cannot be expected to continue in peacetime the lush spending of a wartime struggle. The citizens must not now be required by their Government to support an inflated wartime tax structure. There is not the slightest excuse for refusing to provide our people with this relief from the excessively burdensome wartime taxes.

The measure now pending before the Congress gives the greatest relief to those least able to pay.

The pending bill would save from paying any taxes at all nearly a million of our poorest people—I refer to those over 65 years of age whose individual incomes are under $1,000 a year. The advantage given them under the bill may well mean that margin of food adequate to maintain health and happiness.

I want to say here and now—that I do not agree with the doctrine advanced by some who claim it is unwise for the American people to be given tax reductions because they already have too much money to spend. I believe the more money in the hands of the people, the higher will be the standard of living. The contention is, if the people have money in their pockets, they will bid against each other for goods in the market place until they drive prices skyhigh. That is not true insofar as production is stepped down.

As I have said on many other occasions, the answer to our main problem in the United States of America is production, and more production, and still more production.

There are several ways in which to increase income. Some methods may increase the income of only a segment of the people, such as an increase in wages, or some special increase in the price of farm products. There are two ways—I might say three ways in which the income of every man, woman, and child in the United States can be increased. The first way is in a reduction of prices. The second way is an increase in quality without an increase in prices. The third way is by tax reductions which leave the people a greater share of their own earnings which they themselves may spend for their own needs and desires.

No contented, prosperous people ever revolted against any Government. A contented, prosperous people necessarily must be a free people. The Eightieth Congress is striving to adopt one method of increasing everybody's income by reducing tax rates. A reduction in tax rates will also help to bring about a reduction in prices, because taxes are embraced in prices.

One of the most prolific sources of taxation is the excise rates—which bear directly, absolutely, and completely upon consumers. If the Government spends too much money, then the Government must either go into too much debt, or it must collect too much money from the taxpayers. In either case, it is the people who are hurt. In the end it is the people who will be ruined.

If the Government does not spend too much money, then the Government does not have to go into too much debt, and it does not have to raise too much money by taxation, either through excise taxes, taxes hidden in the prices of goods and services, or taxes levied directly on income, inheritance, and profits.

It is the belief and the hope of most of us in the Congress that we can, through reduction of taxation and reduction of Government spending, point the way to more production. More production will, in turn, bring down prices through the age-old means of competition in the market place, which is the best way in the world for prices to be reduced to a proper level.

I may say to you in passing there is now a newly signed act for a survey of Government functions and operations. You can readily understand the need for such a survey. Whenever and wherever the Federal Government takes over from a State government, from a county or from a municipality, or from some private business or the citizens, functions which are then embraced in the Federal activities, it is obvious a new bureau or commission or department must be created to perform the functions. Such functions do not perform themselves.

Just the minute you get a new bureau or a new commission or a new department put to work performing a new function, you get a new group of administrators bent on two things: Spending the people's money and interfering with the people's business. Therefore, it is of first importance that we survey the vast number of functions the Federal Government has taken to itself in the past 14 or 15 years. We must begin to return to the States, the counties and the cities, and to private business, those functions which can best be performed at those levels. When we are able to do that, the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate can with accuracy reduce appropriations and cut the Government down to peacetime size.

This is going to be a painful process. There will be loud, long, and numerous cries of anguish from the bureaucrats who get cut out of their good salaries and soft jobs. Nevertheless the operation must be performed on the Federal Government for the benefit of the financial health of the American people, and the safety of the economic structure of the United States.

So then we are carrying forward the cause of the people on three fronts. Let me recapitulate:

First. The Eightieth Congress is driving for tax reduction, governmental spending reductions, and a substantial payment on the debt.

Second. The Eightieth Congress is driving for increased production of goods and services and increased qualities thereof without increase in prices.

Third. The Eightieth Congress is driving for a survey of the Federal Government's activities and functions for the express purpose of returning to the States, counties, municipalities, private business, and the individual citizens those functions which they can best perform for themselves but which have been assumed or usurped by the Federal Government at some time in the past 14 or 15 years.

With the tremendous problems confronting our country in the necessity for our aid and leadership in world affairs, it is an imperative necessity to put our American Government, economy, and society on the most stable possible base. These three lines of endeavor are calculated to do just that.

Yesterday afternoon by the emphatic vote of 302 to 112 the House reflected the desires of the American people and reenacted the tax reduction bill. The Senate is soon to act. It is to be hoped the vote in the Senate will be equally decisive.

I hope you will let your Members of Congress on both sides of the Capitol know how you feel about this necessity for putting our domestic affairs on a sound basis. Let them understand we are getting ready for a new level of prosperity in our own beloved country, behind an adequate, modern defense, in a world being persuaded back to peace and sanity by the example and leadership of America.

God grant it to be so.

I thank you.

Fascism in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution, House Resolution 277, introduced by me on yesterday, providing for the printing of 100,000 copies of the booklet entitled "Fascism in Action," was inadvertently labeled a House resolution when it should have been a House concurrent resolution, the reason being that the House cannot provide for an expenditure of the amount of money that is necessary to print the 100,000 additional copies without the consent of the Senate. Therefore, today I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 69, providing for the printing of the 100,000 additional copies.

This resolution is referred to the Committee on House Administration. It is hoped that the committee will very promptly act upon the resolution favorably, in view of the fact that if the extra copies are authorized and are printed at the time of the original printing, there will be a considerable saving of expense.

The Government Printing Office will doubtless soon go to press for the purpose of printing the copies necessary for distribution required under the law relating to all House documents, also for the purpose of printing a supply for sale through the Superintendent of Documents through the Government Printing Office. If the 100,000 additional copies are printed at the same time, instead of later, it will save a substantial amount.

I desire to urge the Committee on House Administration to give this resolution early consideration for that reason. In addition, Members of Congress will be

asked for copies of this booklet. Unless copies are made available for them, it will be necessary for a Member or his constituents to purchase the booklet from the Government Printing Office.

The booklet, Communism in Action, has been made available for free distribution. The booklet, Fascism in Action, should also be made available for free distribution.

NOT AVAILABLE NOW

There were 26 copies of the manuscript Fascism in Action mimeographed. Each member of the Committee on House Administration was furnished a copy and one for my use. These are the only copies in existence. My copy is now with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress being checked carefully before delivery to the Government Printing Office for printing. It will probably be delivered for printing Monday or Tuesday of next week.

When the booklet is put into type the Public Printer will fix the price that will be charged for individual copies.

Czechoslovakia Accepts Invitation to Paris Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy indeed to learn that Czechoslovakia has accepted the invitation of the French and British Governments to attend the Paris Conference for further consideration of American proposals for economic aid in the recovery of Europe. I have often pointed out that, more than any other country in Europe, Czechs are close to Americans in temperament and in economic and political attitudes. The announcement that Czechoslovakia will participate in the Paris discussions brings inevitably to mind two sage admonitions of Thomas Jefferson to America.

In 1786 Jefferson wrote to Dumas the Elder: "Peace and friendship with all mankind is our wisest policy." More than 10 years later, not long before he himself became President, Jefferson wrote to another friend an even stronger statement: "Commerce with all nations, alliance with none, should be our motto," he declared.

CZECH GOVERNMENT PROTESTS MISREPRESENTATIONS

Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to action taken by the National Front of Czechs and Slovaks as factually reported in the official news agency of the Czechoslovakian Republic, "Prague News Letter," dated June 25, 1947. It appears from this report that all factions and parties of the Czechoslovakian Republic have joined in denying vigorously that Czechoslovakia has departed from its domestic form of government or has succumbed in any way to Communist domination.

After the First World War Czechoslovakia was the very first of the liberated countries oppressed by the Austro-Hungary monarchy to establish a free democratic government. Czechoslovakia adopted a constitution based on the American pattern and even strengthening our own great document of fundamental law wherever possible.

Consequently, I am pleased to insert, under leave, this official statement for the benefit of those in this country who make reckless and unfounded charges against Czechoslovakia and libel the fair name of that liberty-loving country:

[Prague News Letter, written by the editorial staff of the Bulletin and the Czechoslovak Weekly. Prague II, Narodni Trida 10, June 25, 1947]

NATIONAL FRONT UNITY MAINTAINED—FOREIGN LIBEL OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA REJECTED

After its last meeting, the National Front of Czechs and Slovaks issued the following statement:

All parties of the National Front of Czechs and Slovaks have discussed various problems which have recently developed, mainly in Slovakia, in all their aspects, and after a friendly and open discussion the following unanimous resolution was passed:

1. All parties are firmly resolved to continue the policy of realistic agreement and democratic cooperation of all fractions of the National Front, and to fulfill by joint effort all the political and economic tasks on which they have previously agreed in the Government program, one of them being to prepare as early as possible an agreement of all the parties on a constitutional solution of Czech-Slovak relations in the spirit of state unity, founded on the brotherly solidarity and equality of the Czech and Slovak nations.

2. Stimulated by this creative effort all parties agree that it is necessary to prosecute by all legal means all reactionary, Fascist, and subversive elements which have remained as a heritage of the separatist movement and which are trying to undermine the reconstruction of Slovakia and of the republic by spreading unrest and irresponsible propaganda at home and abroad. It is therefore necessary to support economically, politically, culturally, and socially all uniting elements and forces so that the people's democratic régime in Czechoslovakia may be made secure for the benefit of the Slovak and Czech people, and in the interest of the international position of the republic.

3. All parties emphatically reject the libelous campaign of certain foreign newspapers which have been trying to create the impression that forcible changes of the present régime in Czechoslovakia have been prepared. Czechoslovak democracy is solving and will go on solving all problems and difficulties in her own Czechoslovak way through the cooperation of the National Front, and will never allow Czechoslovakia to become the arena of international intrigue or disrupting intervention of foreign and hostile circles. The parties of the National Front ask the public not to allow itself to be disturbed by false foreign informations and inventions whose aim it is to cause civil strife.

4. The parties of the National Front have elected a commission in which all of them are represented, which will investigate the problems discussed in today's session, and will make proposals to the Government concerning a thorough national purge which will strengthen national unity, and ensure a happy development of the brotherly relations between Czechs and Slovaks.

NO SLAV FEDERATION FOR CZECHOSLOVAKIA

I am also including several additional paragraphs from the same issue of Prague News Letter because they are very relevant to misstatements and distortions made by some of the supernationalists in this country, and call particular attention to Prime Minister Gottwald's statement that Czechoslovakia is not interested in the rumored Slav Federation:

NO SLAV FEDERATION, SAYS GOTTWALD

During an interview with the Prague correspondent of the Greek paper Risospastis, Prime Minister Gottwald answered the question "What do you think about the rumors of a Slav Federation?" as follows:

"'Czechoslovakia does not need any federation. The Slav nations are satisfied with the present system of alliances against a possible German aggression. The rumors about a Slav federation, which in fact would amount to a limitation of the sovereignty of the Slav countries, are spread by those who, while shouting 'hold the thief,' are themselves trying to limit the independence and state sovereignty of other nations."

WAR LOSSES ENORMOUS

The devastation caused by the Nazi occupation was terrible. The same destruction in the United States, in proportion to our own wealth and population, would have caused the perpetual weepers to believe that the end of the world has come, as shown by this paragraph:

WAR DAMAGES 780,000,000,000 PREWAR CROWNS

The final balance of war damages inflicted on Czechoslovakia surpasses by far the estimates of the Czechoslovak Government during its exile. According to latest statistical data available war losses amount to approximately 429,700,000 crowns. This sum, however, does not include losses of 296,590,000,000 crowns inflicted upon individuals and 57,000,000,000 as a result of the destruction of buildings, etc. The total of losses thus amount to 780,000,000,000 prewar crowns. The national debt of 52,000,000,000 crowns increased during the occupation by nearly 100,000,000,000, and other financial losses amount to 135,470,000,000 crowns. The reorganization of the Czechoslovak finances enforced by the Germans resulted in damages of 64,000,000,000 crowns, the reorganization and exploitation of industries caused a loss of 38,000,000,000, and damages inflicted upon agriculture are estimated at 44,500,000,000 crowns.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY RAPID

In spite of the terrible destruction wrought by the Nazi despoilers, Czechoslovakia, with undaunted courage, is recovering rapidly, as shown by the following official figures on the 2-year economic recovery plan and by the increase in bread allowance and shoe production:

TWO-YEAR PLAN IN MAY

Industrial targets set out for May were fulfilled by 98.8 percent. A review of the figures for the first 5 months of the 2-year plan shows an upward trend in the timber, power, and chemical industries, whereas the metal industry has caused some disappointment by fulfilling the plan only by 90.1 percent. Other figures of the fulfillment of the plan are: Motorcars and motorcycles 41.6 percent, sewing machines 77.1 percent, telephones 82.5 percent, electric bulbs 75.8 percent, artificial silk 98 percent, artificial yarn 119.8 percent, brick production 64.3 percent (slight improvement), and textile goods are 10 and more percent above plan. The figures of the leather industry show that there will be enough shoes to go around. In May, 1,600 tons of butter, 3,000 tons of margarine, and 800,000 hectoliters of beer were produced.

The 2-year plan—the first 5 months

	Total	April	May
Total industrial production	104.9	101.7	98.8
Mining industry	104.9	101.8	100.5
Regenerating plants	97.4	98.8	104.4
Foundries	112.0	108.3	102.6
Iron and metal industries	106.5	97.7	90.1
Chemical industry	78.6	91.1	92.5
Glass industry	93.4	87.1	90.5
Ceramic and stoneworking industry	90.7	85.4	87.1
Paper mills	106.2	116.5	115.8
Timber industry	99.5	102.2	110.5
Textile and clothing industry	106.2	101.7	97.0
Rubber and leatherworking industry	124.0	124.3	106.6

MORE BREAD

The Czechoslovak Minister of Food, Mr. Václav Majer, reported in the last session of the Government that UNRRA had fulfilled its program to Czechoslovakia by 96 percent. The Government also approved the Food Minister's proposals to raise the white-bread ration from 2 kilograms to 4 kilograms as from August 1, 1947.

THREE PAIRS OF FOOTWEAR A YEAR IN 1948

As announced by the Czechoslovak leather industry, more than 36,000,000 pairs of shoes will be produced in 1948 for home consumption alone. Apart from that, the industry will turn out enough export footwear to pay for the import of necessary raw materials.

In 1937, when Czechoslovakia's population was 14,500,000 people, only 34,000,000 pairs of footwear were produced for home consumption, whilst the 36,000,000 pairs to be produced in 1948 will be supplied to the present number of 12,000,000 inhabitants.

TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND PAIRS OF SHOES TO VIENNA

As reported in Prace, trade union daily, Czechoslovakia will send 200,000 pairs of ladies' footwear to Austria in the near future.

To Retain Trained Men in FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the United States newspapers have taken cognizance of the situation which prevails in our Department of Justice where we are losing valuable agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to private industry, and these newspapers are lending their support to legislation which we believe will correct this by improving retirement security for G-men.

An act, which it was my privilege to assist in sponsoring, is now on the President's desk and the unanimous vote by which both Houses of Congress passed the measure is an indication of our determination to keep the FBI the strong and powerful law-enforcing body as it is known at the present time.

While the standards for employment in this division are of the highest nature, yet special additional training is required to qualify these agents for this specialized and technical work. We cannot afford to train them and then lose them to private industry because we do not afford them adequate retirement security.

The Washington Evening Star has capably presented the situation editorially in its issue of July 7, and I feel the comments are worthy of the attention of readers of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

TO RETAIN TRAINED MEN

It is hard to credit reports that President Truman may veto the bill to liberalize retirement benefits for special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This bill passed the House and Senate unanimously after its merits had been fully explored by appropriate committees. Attorney General Clark and FBI Director Hoover consider the measure urgently necessary to stem the exodus of experienced investigators into more lucrative fields of endeavor.

One of the serious problems of the FBI since the war has been the continuing loss of veteran agents to private employers. A number of these agents, upon being interviewed prior to leaving have indicated they would have remained with the Bureau had they been assured of better security for themselves and their families in later years. The life of a special agent is a hard one and the pace often is too much for the older men. The result has been that some of the most valuable men, still in their prime as investigators, have resigned to accept jobs which will enable them to save for the future. The FBI so far has had no difficulty in securing replacements, but the new men must be trained at great length and they lack the fund of information which the departing men carry with them.

Enactment of the FBI retirement bill would have a marked stabilizing effect, officials believe. By making special agents eligible for retirement at 50 an inducement is offered veteran investigators to remain in the service until retirement benefits are realized. All of this was explained to Congress, with persuasive effect. Yet there have been published rumors of an impending veto, presumably on the ground that no provision is contained in the measure for similar benefits for other Federal investigators, including the Secret Service. While there is some merit to the contention that certain other Government agents should be similarly favored, it is too late now to amend the bill. It is to be hoped that the President will sign the FBI bill. He might well, at the same time, suggest that consideration be given to new legislation covering any other Federal agency faced by a situation like that hampering the operations of the FBI.

New Coal Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, coal is our basic industry and is essential to all production. Everything produced in this country depends upon the production of coal. The new contract that was completed and signed this week is a godsend to the miners, the coal operators, and the entire country. Unknown to most people of this great Nation of ours, coal mining was rapidly becoming a sick industry. The number of miners has decreased from 600,000 to 400,000 in the past 10 years. The average miner is above 50 years of age. This came about because the younger men were taken out of the industry during the war years and they are not returning because the industry is too hazardous and working conditions are far below par with other industries. Thus, with the new contract, the coal operators will be able to entice the younger men to return to the mines. Unless this does happen, we will be facing the same situation in a few years that England experienced last winter. The miner of today is not just a pick-and-shovel man, but he must be a skilled specialist able to operate expensive mechanical coal-mining machinery. Thus, mechanization of the mines has labeled the future miner as a skilled employee who will require training, which will result in higher wages and better working conditions. For a complete description of why the great Republican industrialists were eager to sign the recent coal pact, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the Times-Herald on July 9, 1947. The article follows:

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Some months ago, I was discussing the mining situation with friends who are in the steel industry. I had assumed that they would be cursing John L. Lewis and the miners up and down the road. Surprisingly one of the strongest men in steel put the position in these words:

"We cannot get down to where the British are. Their miners are underpaid and work under the most unfavorable conditions. I do not understand why any man would want to work in a British mine.

"The result is that coal is not being mined there and their industry—the whole of British industry—is in a terrible condition. They have adopted socialism because they do not know how to get production except by force and they get none that way."

Then he went on to say:

"The steel industry must have coal. We have to make coal mining attractive if we are to have coal. We have to make it attractive to young men so that they will go into this industry. They won't go into coal mining today and I don't blame them."

I recalled this conversation to this steel man, of the so-called Little Steel group, when the recent settlement for a new agreement was reached with John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers. He was pleased that the new contract called for an increase of double the average for other labor.

The steel group, he told me, had determined in advance that there would be no quarrel with Lewis over wages.

This does not at all mean that another general increase in wages is in sight. The miners are a special case. They were among the most poorly paid workers and the conditions of employment were always most unsatisfactory.

The theory upon which this extremely intelligent management reasoned is that coal mining must be brought up to the level of any other industry. It must not be permitted to remain so unattractive by lagging behind the general standards of heavy industry.

The miners should be in a preferred class because otherwise young men, particularly in periods of labor shortage, will go into other industries. Last winter, when I visited the anthracite coal regions in Pennsylvania, I was astonished to find that young veterans preferred joblessness to mining, particularly as those to whom I spoke came of families in which mining had been a tradition.

It is not too often that management displays this type of intelligence and it is comforting that even in the period of wild propagandistic statements on all sides over the Taft-Hartley bill, this new contract, containing such attractive terms for the miners,

should have been negotiated in so short a time.

No one company and no one man was responsible for this; it was the general consensus in the industry.

What it means is that American production, which has been faltering because of strikes, has been given a strong tonic. If this country can be 1 year without any major strikes in its crucial industries, it will be strong enough to meet any situation that it may be called upon to face.

A coal strike means lessened steel production which means lessened automobile production. This applies to practically all basic industries.

For instance, up here in the Berkshires, we have been waiting for about 5 years for some rural electrification.

We are now told that we shall have to wait longer because the electric-light people lack wire. They lack wire because of coal and steel strikes a year ago. The effects of strikes are not immediate; their worst effects appear very much later in the lag in production.

If, after all the excitement over the Taft-Hartley bill, management and labor could do so well over coal, there is no reason why all problems in this field cannot be settled by peaceful negotiations.

As a matter of fact, one of the immediate effects of the Taft-Hartley bill will surely be that the NLRB will be bypassed and that there will be a restoration of collective bargaining which practically disappeared under the operations of the Wagner Act. Perhaps a better day dawns than we have known these many years.

American Veterans' Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article from the Milwaukee Journal on the second annual convention of the American Veterans' Committee—AVC—at Milwaukee, Wis., from June 19–22. The AVC has been the subject of much discussion among veterans and people generally, and this objective report of its second annual convention is, therefore, of great interest. The organization has had quite a fight on its hands with elements who would use it for party-line purposes. The ability, patriotism, and diligence of these veterans of World War II, who are waging this fight, entitle them to a full opportunity for the growth and development of the organization of their choice.

AVC COULD SPELL OUT ARDENT, VIRILE CITIZENS

(By Frank Sinclair)

Milwaukee never before had a convention like that of the American Veterans Committee and probably never will again—unless the AVC returns some day.

For the AVC is a different kind of an organization. It is virile young manhood—and womanhood, for girls belong, also—that has seen war and the disruption to life at home. And they don't want it to happen again.

But the AVC doesn't dream the hope of permanent peace. It meets, caucuses, argues and then moves to do something about it, not by mere "resolution" but by adopting deeply thought-out platforms and seeking means to carry them into actuality.

More than 1,500 youths have been spending 4 days—and nights, often most of the night—hammering out their ideas of what must be done during this coming year to bring America closer to a more satisfying life and how to make the world find peace.

INDIVIDUAL SEEN AS KEY

Audacious? Yes. But these young people have vision, courage, energy and intense fire. They feel that the world can be improved only if the individual's lot becomes better—and that needs liberal thought, progressive action within the scope of American democracy, and not the present ideology of Moscow.

Stalinites dwell within the AVC. So do fellow travelers. They are in the minority, but they are cleverly active.

Determined to remain free from those intolerances nurtured by traditional disrespect of race, color, or creed, the Negro, the Jew, the Catholic, and the Protestant walk with locked arms in AVC—actually and openly—as one flesh.

There is an intentness to the organization to carry its slogan "citizens first, veterans second," into practical application.

An observer's thoughts generated by watching the AVC for 4 days in Milwaukee last week and at Des Moines, Iowa, last year, bring out these reactions:

The group has a vitality of spirit that makes it unafraid to tackle any problem, digging far into it and detesting superficiality.

NO CHANCE TO "RAILROAD"

The bulk of the delegates are brilliant in debate, smart in perception.

There is exceptional, sharp knowledge of parliamentary procedure that belies any attempt at railroading.

The convention has shown no regard for hours. A job that had to be done had to be finished if it took all night. And it did—until 8 the next morning—in drawing up the domestic-affairs platform.

What noise there has been at the convention has been in the tenseness of debate, not on the street in hilarity. There has been no horseplay. Even when, on Friday night, the Milwaukee convention committee put on a gay nineties party at the auditorium with beer and a real German lunch with alleged comedians and music, delegates listened to the entertainment briefly then gathered into knots to talk about Greece, or aid to starving nations, the veto of the labor bill, opposition to the bonus. They gathered the same way on street corners downtown.

Typical was the fellow from Duluth, Minn., whose Whitefish Bay brother has not had a peek at him although they haven't seen each other in over a year. That AVCer was too busy at the convention to hop a cab to make a visit or grab a phone to say hello. It was nothing to hear of delegates so busy that an hour's sleep a night was sufficient, after which they were at it hammer and tongs once more.

THEY LIKE A GOOD FIGHT

When not putting on fights on committee floors, delegates were putting on dog fights over prospective candidates for high AVC officers. And a lot of them became angry when caucuses interfered with convention sessions. Others were aroused when one caucus session of the AVC's present administration was held in secret and charges of "bossism" were heard.

Drinking? A bit of it. Up to Sunday, however, not a single person was noted under the influence of liquor.

Wide variety of station in life has been shown. There are youths so short of funds they hitchhiked across the country and looked for rooms at 75 cents a night when they got here. There are lads of wealth—one with a suite of three rooms, one who had easy entry for golf at Milwaukee's best clubs, one (disabled) who came with a valet (pardon, a companion) to help him around. Sons of big industrialists are here declaring that in the AVC they see a better way of life for the Nation, discussing issues with fellows from New York's melting pot, or Hollywood's fairyland, or the Middle West's farmlands.

Fifty American States—Why Not?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Great Falls Tribune of July 7, 1947:

FIFTY AMERICAN STATES—WHY NOT?

The first Hawaiian statehood bill was introduced in the Congress more than 25 years ago. The measure is now up again in this year 1947 and has passed the House.

There is no good reason for further delay. The islands helped us in the war. The United States never did believe in the development of a colonial empire. Otherwise we would have been for keeping the Philippines. Now we have clearly taken on the leadership of democratic governments around the world. Congressman MANSFIELD is correct—statehood for Hawaii is one way to drive a last spike into the charge that America is trying to add dependent territory. Hawaii would be the forty-ninth State.

And while we are at it, Alaska would fittingly round out the half hundred count. It would be a good and profitable policy if we right away make Alaska a State and have 50 stars adorn the American flag. There would be immediate resulting advantages to both Canada and the United States.

It has just about been proven in the last year or so that the Alaska Highway is a valuable international asset. There will soon be comfortable automobile and truck transport from Mexico City to Fairbanks. Nearby business relations are increasing between Montana and the Province of Alberta. There are improvements needed across Montana and Alberta needs to build from Edmonton to Dawson Creek.

We are getting along. Montana would like to put on a celebration welcoming Alaska to statehood.

European Reactions to the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of Tuesday, July 8, there appeared the second of two most important articles by the able Barnet Nover, commenting upon European reactions to the Marshall plan.

There is much to sustain the opinion expressed by Mr. Nover that in the consideration of this American program Soviet diplomacy has suffered a serious defeat, and that the future of world

peace now depends upon what the United States and the countries of Western Europe do.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Nover's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT DIVIDE—A TURNING POINT IN HISTORY

(By Barnet Nover)

In a previous column I said that at Paris, early this month, Soviet diplomacy suffered its most serious defeat in a long time.

The fact must be noted that it was a self-inflicted defeat, deliberately self-inflicted. Neither Great Britain nor France sought to bring it about. Neither is happy over it.

The two western powers would greatly prefer to have Russia and her satellites join with them and other nations in planning and carrying out a continent-wide program of European recovery.

Russia said no. She did so with her eyes wide open and with no lack of awareness of the possible consequences.

The men in the Kremlin must have known full well, when they ordered Viacheslav Molotov to break up the Paris Conference, that Great Britain and France were prepared to go ahead without Russia if Russia balked.

They must also have realized that in taking the stand they did on the Marshall plan, Russia left herself open to the charge of being indifferent to European recovery and of splitting Europe in two.

These considerations did not deter them. They preferred to risk a diplomatic defeat rather than, by Russia's cooperation, to help advance Europe's recovery.

Why?

One important reason for the Russian stand at Paris lies in the circumstance that Europe's economic recovery, in the form it would take if the original Anglo-French-American plans were carried out, would, in the eyes of the Kremlin, be injurious to Russia's political interests.

A continent-wide program of mutual aid would inevitably re-create the old and powerful ties that bound eastern Europe to western Europe. That would inevitably mean a lessening of eastern Europe's present and forced dependence on Russia.

An even more powerful motive for Russia's refusal to join with Great Britain and France in carrying out the Marshall plan is to be found in the Russian attitude toward the United States.

The men in the Kremlin are beyond everything power worshipers.

They have only contempt for small and weak nations. They regard Great Britain and France as nations that have passed their zenith, and are now on the down grade.

Russia's only rival, as they see it, is the United States whose power and whose resources they do not and cannot discount. They are firmly convinced, however, that the United States is headed for an economic tailspin.

When that happens, all Europe and a large part of the rest of the world will be wide open to Russian penetration. They are determined to do nothing that would postpone such a development. And they regard the Marshall plan as a frantic move by the United States to avert impending economic disaster by building up the economy of European nations which, in consequence, would then be tied to Uncle Sam's chariot.

What we now have in Europe is a tug of war.

We can be sure that Russia will employ every form of direct political pressure and fifth-column tactics to prevent the Marshall plan from being successfully carried out.

First of all, Russia has set an example of abstention which her satellites are under pressure to imitate, regardless of their economic needs.

Secondly, we can expect that all through western Europe, and particularly France and Italy, the Communist parties will now seek to sabotage the recovery efforts of their respective governments. There is an offsetting possibility that in doing so the Communist parties will be split wide open.

It is significant, in this connection, that Palmiro Togliatti, the Italian Communist leader, has thus far avoided a frontal, all-out attack on the Marshall plan. The Italians are fully aware that while Russia has been milking their country through reparations, aid can only come from the west.

In the third place, Russia can be expected to use its present harvest, believed to be a very good one, to provide its satellites with food.

All these stratagems will not work, however, unless the western powers, and particularly the United States, fall down on their job.

This country has a great opportunity to reverse the tide that has been flowing in Europe, an opportunity not likely to recur again.

Russia's greatest lever of opposition to the Marshall plan is the fear that Congress will not vote the funds necessary to put that plan into effect.

If that proves true, the battle of Europe will be lost to the Russians and the diplomatic defeat she suffered at Paris during the first week of July will be transformed into a decisive political triumph.

If, on the other hand, our actions prove equal to our intentions, we shall have checkmated Russia's ambitions in Europe and put that continent on the road to real recovery and real peace.

This country's responsibilities are tremendous. The opportunities now within our grasp are equally great. We are at a great turning point in history. We can either advance or retreat. There is no standing still.

War Damage Insurance Program of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. John D. Goodloe, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and President of War Damage Corporation, at a dinner of insurance company executives held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on the evening of June 25, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I understand this dinner, attended by executives of insurance companies which participated as fiduciary agents in administering the war-damage insurance program of the United States Government, is designed to serve two purposes, either of which would, in my opinion, warrant a real celebration. First, it is to commemorate the extremely successful war-damage insurance program of the United States Government and the insurance industry's part in it. Second, it is to afford an opportunity to bestow upon Frank A. Christensen an industry-wide testimonial of respect and admiration for the outstanding job he did in the war-damage program. Under his brilliant leadership coupled with his well-known ability and untiring industry, the almost innumerable problems and obstacles we encountered were overcome with a minimum of delay and the program was brought to a conclusion which entitles the insurance industry to great credit for its part in this phase of the war effort.

I deem it a great privilege, therefore, to attend this dinner and to participate with the industry in the fulfillment of both of the dinner's objectives.

Since, with the exception of numerous and indeed almost continuous appearances before various congressional committees during the past 10 weeks, this is my first public appearance since becoming Chairman of the RFC, I cannot resist the temptation to speak briefly about that organization, past, present, and future.

The RFC was originally established in 1932 when we were balanced precariously on the brink of national bankruptcy and many well-informed people thought the complete destruction of our great American economy was inevitable. The RFC quickly became one of the most important of the several forces responsible for pulling the country out of that terrible depression. Acting through the RFC the Government provided billions of dollars to banks, insurance companies, railroads, and other business enterprises. This not only provided for the continued operation of those enterprises but more importantly from the standpoint of public interest involved protected and preserved the investment therein of the millions of depositors, investors, and policyholders. During those grim depression days in the early thirties, as well as during the critical war years period, the RFC and industry were able to work together successfully without any ill effect on our free economy or any substantial diminution of the rights and liberties of the individual citizens. We are proud of that record of cooperation and mutual understanding.

When the clouds of World War II first began to appear on the horizon Congress, in order to expedite our national-defense program, gave the RFC extremely broad powers and tremendous financial resources with which to meet the impending emergency. This demonstrated the great confidence the Congress had in the ability and integrity of the Honorable Jesse H. Jones and the organization he had headed since 1933.

I am sure you are all familiar with the tremendous and important role RFC, under the able and inspiring leadership of Mr. Jones, played in our war effort. Many people think of this as consisting primarily of the purchase of hundreds of critical and strategic materials and the construction and operation of thousands of defense plants for the production of airplanes, tanks, guns, ammunition, etc. The war-damage insurance program, administered through the War Damage Corporation, however, was also an important phase of our wartime activities. The success of this as of most other wartime activities was largely attributable to the degree of cooperation and assistance RFC obtained from private industry. I believe that high degree of cooperation and assistance was due in a large measure to RFC's recognition of the desirability, indeed the necessity, of utilizing the personnel, experience, facilities, and know-how of private industry, as well as the belief of RFC in the willingness of industry to work with the Government on a friendly and fair basis. We are also proud of the wartime record of our relations with industry.

The wartime activities of the RFC are rapidly being liquidated and brought to a final conclusion. Few of them, however, can be concluded as early or as successfully as that of the War Damage Corporation.

As to the future of RFC, that is a matter which must shortly be determined by the Congress. Legislation to extend the life and functions of RFC beyond June 30 has passed both the Senate and House and is now pending in conference. The Senate bill provides for a 1-year extension on the basis of the present law and the House bill provides for a 2-year extension on the basis of a completely new law which is a revision and condensation of the present laws affecting RFC and restricts and more clearly defines its powers. As I have testified before both those committees, I think the RFC should be extended because regardless of whether the recession which some say is imminent comes as predicted, we cannot at this time afford to take the chance that the tools with which to combat another emergency may not be at hand when they are needed most. I also believe, however, that the RFC should not be permitted to retain its present emergency powers. They are too broad and are designed for wartime, not peacetime. Whatever the Congress decides should be the future powers of the RFC, you may be sure it will be the purpose of the RFC, in the field of credit, to continue its policy of assisting and augmenting the credit facilities provided by private credit institutions. It has not in the past and will not in the future compete with private credit institutions. The Congress is expected to continue and strengthen the statement of basic lending policy as originally written into the RFC Act, namely, that no loan should be made by RFC unless the credit is one which cannot be obtained from private sources on reasonable terms and unless the loan is one that will be so secured as to reasonably assure repayment.

With respect to the area within which RFC is to make loans, Congress has long recognized that it is in the public interest for credit to be made available beyond that which private sources can be expected to provide. Indeed, I think it is a fair statement that the loans which RFC makes result in the establishment of new businesses and the preservation of old businesses thus creating, ultimately, a sound market for the services of private financing institutions.

The illiquidity of the banks in the early and middle thirties prevented them from making many loans which in the national interests should have been made. It also forced the liquidation of loans which in the national interest should have been extended. In those circumstances the gap which RFC was intended to fill was relatively large. Today, in contrast, the proportion of deserving borrowers who cannot obtain credit from private sources is smaller and the proper area for RFC operation is correspondingly smaller than in the thirties.

Whether the present period of full employment, high production, and favorable markets and prices will continue indefinitely is not for me to say. So long as we not only can maintain a free competitive economy but also can enjoy conditions which will provide individuals with the maximum opportunity to engage in competition on a fair basis, I am confident we need have no fear for our country's future.

The Government's war-damage insurance program was initiated by a press release issued by the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, then Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the President, on December 13, 1941, just 6 days after Pearl Harbor. That press release initiated the so-called free war-damage insurance program with respect to which the insurance industry's contribution and participation were largely limited to the use of its personnel and facilities for adjusting losses. The premium war-damage insurance program likewise handled by War Damage Corporation came later. By the act of March 27, 1942, Congress authorized RFC to supply War Damage Corporation with funds up to $1,000,000,000 for the purpose of providing through a premium insurance program reasonable protection against loss or damage to property located in the United States, its Territories or possessions, including the Philippine Islands, resulting from enemy attack or from the action of the military, naval, or air forces of the United States in resisting enemy attack.

With the invaluable assistance of many leaders of the insurance industry, and under the active leadership and direction of Frank A. Christensen and his able and personable associate, Vic Herd, the insurance program was launched on July 1, 1942. Under this program, War Damage Corporation has operated through approximately 1,450 established, policy-issuing offices. It has operated smoothly and without major controversies or difficulties of any sort.

The Government's war-damage insurance program was made possible by the cooperation and assistance of some 546 companies and some 150,000 agents and brokers throughout the United States, its Territories, and possessions. The insurance companies had a 10-percent interest in the operating profits or losses subject to a limit of $20,000,000.

The initial program provided only for insurance on certain real estate and tangible personal property, but effective December 21, 1942, the Corporation made available insurance on money and securities through the facilities of 88 casualty and surety insurance companies, likewise acting as fiduciary agents of War Damage Corporation. The participating companies had a similar 10-percent interest in the operating profits or losses, subject to a limit of $5,000,000.

Although the Corporation has issued more than 5,000,000 policies of insurance, the aggregate premiums collected have amounted to nearly $250,000,000. The maximum contingent liability assumed by the Corporation at any one time was about $140,000,000,000. Without the full cooperation and assistance of the insurance industry, the participating companies, and the agents and brokers, it would not, in my opinion, have been possible for the RFC or any other agency of the Government to have handled and administered a program of this size, nature, and complexity. Indeed, if it could have been done at all, it would have involved a substantial delay, a tremendous expense, and a Government staff of literally thousands.

Policies of insurance were continued in effect for a period of 2 years on the basis of annual premiums. Before the end of the second year of the insurance program, announcement was made that all War Damage Corporation insurance in effect on March 31, 1944, would be automatically extended, without additional charge. Such extension was for 12 months, beginning with the date of expiration specified in the policy or renewal certificate. A similar announcement was made a year later, thus extending all insurance that was in effect on March 31, 1944, for two additicnal years without payment of additional premiums.

By the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, War Damage Corporation was relieved of responsibility for war losses in the Philippine Islands. At the same time, Philippine War Damage Commission was created for the purpose of making compensation for such losses, public and private. Such co pensation was authorized to an amount in excess of $500,000,000. Upon passage of this act, War Damage Corporation, through Fire Companies' Adjustment Bureau, Inc., transmitted to Philippine War Damage Commission all claims that had been filed for Philippine losses, together with the report of our adjusters covering such information as was found available in the United States in verification of such losses.

On March 15, 1946 (hostilities having ended and public demand for policies of insurance having ceased), War Damage Corporation ceased to issue, renew, or extend policies of insurance.

On March 31, 1947, all contingent liability of the Corporation under its policies of insurance terminated.

By the terms of its charter, the corporate powe: of War Damage Corporation expired on January 22, 1947, except for purposes of liquidation.

As a result of transfer to Philippine War Damage Commission of responsibility for losses in the only area within United States Territories and possessions in which there was wide-spread devastation, losses paid by War Damage Corporation have aggregated less than $700,000. Substantially all such losses have been adjusted through the facilities and personnel of Fire Companies' Adjustment Bureau, Inc., Western Adjustment & Inspection Co., and Underwriters Adjusting Co.

In addition, Fire Companies' Adjustment Bureau has supplied, from its own organization and otherwise, the personnel for a most able general survey of war damage in the Philippine Islands. The report of that survey, prepared by Mr. F. E. Vincent, Mr. Ralph R. Moe, and Mr. K. H. C. Dunbar, has been widely used and relied upon by governmental representatives and congressional committees in laying the groundwork for Philippine relief.

While an occasion such as this dinner, which is a testimonial of the respect and admiration we all have for Frank Christensen as well as to commemorate the Government's war damage insurance program and the industry's part in it, is a happy one, nevertheless those of us who have known and worked with Frank Christensen, Vic Herd, and many others in the insurance industry, cannot but feel some regret by the termination of those pleasant relationships. Few men who were called upon to give all or part of their time to the Government during the war so quickly commanded the universal respect and indeed affection of the Government officials with whom they worked as did Frank Christensen. His reputation and standing in Government circles are second only to his reputation and standing in the insurance industry, which has been his life work.

On June 2, 1947, the Directors of War Damage Corporation, in anticipation of the termination of that Corporation on June 30, unanimously adopted certain resolutions. An engraved certificate of one of these resolutions will shortly be sent to each insurance company that acted as a fiduciary agent of War Damage Corporation in order to make a permanent record of the patriotic service those companies rendered to the Nation in the war damage insurance program and the appreciation therefor of the Directors of War Damage Corporation. That resolution is as follows:

"The War Damage Corporation, an agency of the United States Government, entered into an agreement with and appointed _____ _____ a fiduciary agent of War Damage Corporation to assist in carrying out the Corporation's program of insurance against loss of or damage to property, real and personal, which may result from enemy attack.

"The members of the Board of Directors desire to express and record their appreciation of the patriotic service rendered to the Nation through the company's activities in connection with this important war work of War Damage Corporation.

"In testimony whereof, the Corporation has caused its official seal hereunto to be affixed and attested by its secretary this 2d day of June 1947."

Another resolution unanimously adopted by the directors of War Damage Corporation on June 2, 1947, is as follows:

"Whereas Frank A Christensen, has served the War Damage Corporation in a consulting and advisory capacity to June 3, 1942, and as Executive Vice President from June 3, 1942; and

"Whereas War Damage Corporation shall not have succession beyond June 30, 1947: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the members of the board of directors express to Mr. Christensen their regret that his pleasant association with them will formally terminate on June 30, 1947, and that they express to him their appreciation of the conspicuous service he has rendered the War Damage Corporation during a period of national emergency. He discharged the important duties entrusted to him with signal ability and fidelity to the public interest, and in a way characteristic of the highest traditions of the public service, which merits the respect of his associates; be it further

"*Resolved*, That these resolutions be spread on the minutes of the Corporation on the 2d day of June 1947, and that an engrossed copy thereof, signed by members of the board, be transmitted by the President, under the corporate seal, to Mr. Christensen, with the best wishes and high esteem of the members of the board of War Damage Corporation and entire staff of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation."

In accordance with the instructions of the directors of War Damage Corporation and in keeping with the spirit of this occasion, it is now my great pleasure to present to Frank Christensen a certified copy of that resolution, appropriately engraved on a scroll, signed by the President and each of the directors of War Damage Corporation, under the seal of said Corporation, and attested by its Secretary.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial, Let's Have Tax Reduction, from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette of July 9, 1947:

LET'S HAVE TAX REDUCTION

The National House of Representatives has passed the bill reducing personal income taxes by a vote of 302 to 112. This is 26 more votes than the two-thirds necessary to override a Presidential veto.

The bill now goes to the Senate where it is certain to receive a majority. If President Truman should veto the measure, the question then is whether the Senate can muster enough votes to override the veto.

The present bill is identical with the one President Truman did veto a short time ago, except that it would take effect January 1, 1948, instead of July 1, 1947.

We supported the first bill and naturally favor this one. We believe that the President should sign it into law.

It would mean a reduction of $4,000,000,000 in which 49,000,000 taxpayers would participate.

We cannot see any justification for a veto. It is the primary function of Congress to write tax legislation and few Presidents have seen fit to interfere with that function.

The taxpayers are entitled to relief after the most expensive war in the Nation's history. There must be a definite start to curb the extravagant governmental habits which were contracted during the war. And there is no time like the present. Public officials have become accustomed to operating on inflated budgets and it is hard for them to break their old habits.

If the money comes in, it is likely to be spent and perhaps not too carefully or too wisely.

Those who oppose tax reduction on January 1 should remember that even with the proposed cut the Treasury will receive copious revenues, for the national income is very high because business is booming and the country is enjoying full employment.

Even with the proposed tax cut a well-managed Government will be able to meet all of its legitimate expenses and still begin the retirement of the Federal debt.

There is another factor which President Truman should take into consideration when the tax measure comes to his desk. He has asked for bipartisan support for his foreign policy and he has been receiving a large measure of cooperation from the Republicans in Congress. If he continues to oppose Congress on a matter in which it has primary responsibility he may break up the present solidarity of foreign policy. Of course, no one should reverse his stand on foreign policy for such a reason. But human nature is human nature and the risk is one which Mr. Truman ought not to take.

Air Crashes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Joseph Leib:

DEBUNKING A HIGHLY TOOTED ALIBI FOR CAUSE OF AIR CRASHES

(By J. H. Leib)

Less than 2 weeks ago Gen. H. H. Arnold, former chief of the Army Air Forces, writing in the Sonoma (California) Index-Tribune, attempted to place full responsibility for the alarming number of recent air crashes upon the shoulders of dead pilots and other personnel. This story was sent throughout the Nation by the United Press, appearing in the Washington Post on June 28, 1947. And last Sunday the Washington Star carried a similar story by-lined by the general and syndicated through the North American Newspaper Alliance.

Here is what the wartime AAF chief had to say, in part:

"Personnel failures rather than faulty C–54's were to blame. * * * If we are going to stop accidents we cannot whitewash personnel who make mistakes just because someone's feelings might be hurt."

Right here it is worthy to note that the C–54's are the same as the DC–4's—manufactured by none other than General Arnold's son's father-in-law.

Furthermore, there is a definite resemblance between the general's present-day assertions and the stand that he took during the war relative to service crashes. Then, as now, there was a deliberate tendency to blame the pilot and other personnel, rather than the plane itself. General Arnold was able to effectively spread this viewpoint before congressional committees and to force the legislators to swallow this bunk without question. Now he appears willing to smear the young men who have died flying our commercial airships. Equally beguiling is his apparent hope of protecting the Douglas interests—the producers of the DC–4's that have figured in many crashes, including the LaGuardia Field crack-up on May 29 and the one that hit the mountainside near Leesburg, Va.

Until we are absolutely positive as to the cause of these and other crashes, I believe that it is only fair that we give the dead pilots the benefit of all doubt. No one knows exactly what took place inside these planes as they crashed. There could be 101 reasons. Any contention given would be based on assumption or circumstantial evidence, and not entirely conclusive. Certainly pilots and other personnel have their faults, but let's give them a break just once in awhile.

Knowing the background of these planes—and the facts that I am about to relate—I believe that every objective person should be on the side of the underdog—who in these cases certainly are the unlucky personnel involved.

We know that anything can go wrong with a plane in flight.

Donald Douglas, the airplane manufacturer, dislikes flying in his own ships.

Glenn L. Martin once said: "I like to fly, but my bankers won't let me."

The same thing is true of the rest of them.

As I have said many times—dead pilots can't talk back—so they get the blame for the many factors that can cause a crash. Again I make reference to defective motors and my statement appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, A3187.

Now I would like to cite some illuminating facts on how General Arnold used his high office to whitewash one of the greatest scandals of the last war—one that ended the careers of thousands of American boys and wasted untold millions of dollars that the citizens of this Nation must now pay back in heavy taxes.

Early in the war this writer brought about an investigation of service air crashes by the Senate Military Affairs Committee under the direction of Senator KILGORE. Months later on October 12, 1942 General Arnold was called before that body to answer my charges that certain corporations were producing defective aircraft for the armed forces.

But the Chief of the AAF emphatically denied the allegations.

Based on his assurance that no such condition existed in the Nations war plants—the Senate Military Affairs Committee issued a public statement whitewashing the entire matter.

Immediately War Department publicity men rushed out with statistical reports and factory-inspired propaganda attempting to prove that the startling number of service crashes were due to human failures—not the airships. In addition yours truly was taken to task for causing such a commotion between the Congress and the War Department. (I shall have more to say about this particular point later.)

Undeterred, I went to members of the Senate War Investigating Committee—then headed by Harry S. Truman—and after further agitation was able to induce that group to look into the situation.

Nine months later—on July 11, 1943—the Senate Truman committee released its sensational report (S. Rept. 10), charging that the Curtiss-Wright Corp. at Lockland, Ohio, was delivering defective airplane engines to the Army and Navy and that this concern was guilty of gross negligence about inspection practices designed for the safety of our airmen.

Following this—on July 26, 1945—2 years after that blast, this same committee—but then headed by Senator Mead—issued Senate Report 110—asserting that both the Curtiss-Wright plant at Buffalo, N. Y., and the Army Air Forces—headed by General Arnold—were responsible for faulty inspection that was causing dangerous and defective aircraft to

reach our boys on the battlefields throughout the world.

Let me repeat that the Senate Military Affairs Committee permitted General Arnold to bulldoze them to ignore and overlook what might be called legalized sabotage, only to have another committee of the Senate force the lid open twice on a war scandal that disgraced the Nation from end to end.

These amazing senatorial reports show what actually took place here on the home front while our boys were dying on foreign soil in behalf of their country.

Shame on General Arnold, who turned his face to protect a number of airplane manufacturers; shame on every public official who permitted such selfish, disloyal, and un-American conditions to exist at a time when this Nation was fighting for its very life and future.

Before I end this story I desire to include the shocking truth that the Douglas Aircraft Co., owned by the father-in-law of General Arnold's son, was making huge profits at the expense of this Nation's security.

The files in the State Department in Washington bulge with photostatic copies of secret letters seized by the United States Government showing how the Douglas Co. had sold experimental DC-3's or C-47's and DC-4's or C-54's to the Japs—after Hitler had invaded Poland—thus plunging the world into another war.

The Japs were at that time fighting China, and preparing for war against the United States.

In fact, on October 30, 1939, Jap General Terauchi and a group of his aircraft technicians visited the Douglas factory at Santa Monica, Calif., at the very time that the company was under contract to produce secret plane equipment for the United States Air Corps.

Cordell Hull was then the Secretary of State and he repeatedly issued requests to all United States plane manufacturers not to sell war implements or technical information to the Japs—a potential enemy—but his pleas were totally ignored and disregarded. It is said that this situation continued up until the day of Pearl Harbor.

When war came our boys had to fight against equipment that was designed and produced by the Douglas factories.

On May 17, 1945, I had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (pp. 4696-4697) an affidavit from a soldier who had spent 29 months in a forward Fifth Air Force command depot who witnessed the disheartening effects of defective aircraft production upon the morale of our fighting men.

Upon receiving a medical discharge, and after a few months of hospitalization, he secured a job at the Douglas aircraft plant at Park Ridge, Ill., basically to diagnose the causes of certain defects that he had found in planes shipped to the front lines.

This boy became an aircraft inspector, final assembly, but in a short time resigned in protest because he could not conscientiously approve defective aircraft that the company was producing.

This in brief is part of the history of the company that produces the DC-4's—now involved in most of the commercial aircraft accidents.

Yes, blame the personnel—not the planes—it is the easiest way out and life is awfully cheap and plentiful here in the good old United States of America.

In conclusion the news story referred to above follows and it certainly speaks for itself:

"[From the Washington Post of June 28, 1947]

"ARNOLD BLAMES PERSONNEL

"SONOMA, CALIF., June 27.—Gen. H. H. (Hap) Arnold, wartime chief of the Army Air Forces, suggested today that personnel failures rather than faulty C-54's were to blame for the recent crash of commercial air-line disasters.

"The general, who retired more than a year ago to his ranch here in the Valley of the Moon, expressed his biting views in an article for the Sonoma Index-Tribune, to which he regularly contributes.

"He referred especially to two recent crashes that took a toll of 93 lives—the crack-up of a United Airlines DC-4 that killed 43 persons as it took off from LaGuardia Field May 29, and the Pennsylvania Central Airliner, also a DC-4, that crumpled against a mountainside near Leesburg, Va., with a toll of 50 killed. The DC-4 is the C-54 used by the Army Air Transport Command during the war.

" 'In both of those cases there must have been personnel error somewhere along the line,' General Arnold said. 'If we are going to stop accidents we cannot whitewash personnel who make mistakes just because some one's feelings might be hurt.' "

Trade Has Long Been a National Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I was honored by an invitation to address a large group of very intelligent men and women at the American University here in Washington, and during the summer the great and progressive university gives special courses for teachers and others taking post-graduate work. As a part of these courses a discussion of important public questions is had on special stated times. On July 8, I spoke to this distinguished and learned group. A part of what I had to say on that occasion I am including in this further extension of my remarks, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much this opportunity to appear before this learned group. I hope that all of us working together can make this an interesting and a profitable hour.

As I understand it, most of you are teachers and are active in the field of education. I can give you this word of encouragement, or sympathy if you think it more appropriate, for I, too, have been a teacher and a high school teacher and have in my work as a legislator been very solcitous for the best interest of the teaching profession and of the schools in general.

While I am now on my twenty-third year as a Congressman, I ofttimes feel that my most worth-while work in my 25 years of legislative work in the State Senate of Ohio and here in Washington was done when I sponsored and put through the State legislature in Ohio a bill that committed the State to a program of giving financial aid to the schools in the poorer sections of the State. This legislation equalized schooling opportunities so that those who lived in what we call the poorer counties were better able to educate their children. I took the position then that education was an obligation of the State and that we should educate the children where we found them and tax wealth where it was located. The State of Ohio has continued the program which was laid down in my bill with a result that Ohio today has a State school system that is, I believe, on a par with any other State of the Union.

As I understand it, our subject for discussion today is reciprocal trade agreements. You will notice that I say "our subject" and not "my subject." By this language I mean that before we close this discussion you will be cordially invited to ask questions and we can thereby discuss this important matter together.

I have brought with me an expert on reciprocal trade agreements and all kindred tariff matters. His name is Mr. Serge Benson. He was employed by the Tariff Commission for years and is now an employee of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

We have had many national issues, both political and economic, that have claimed the attention of our people from the days of the Pilgrim Fathers and the days of the Jamestown settlers. We have had very few public issues that have been with us from the beginning down to now.

For instance, in the early days, we had much trouble with the Indians, and what to do with the Indians was a matter of great public interest and brought this issue sharply before the people. We decided that problem early in our national life. Likewise, the Tories and the Continentals, in the days of the Revolution, made a sharp issue of the measure of loyalty which each owed to the British Government. The War of the Revolution and the War of 1812 put those issues behind us.

Likewise, the Civil War put the issue of slavery behind us.

I do not know of any issue that has been with us from the beginning down to now except one issue of national unity and another issue of national protection for American industries. If you know of any other issues that have been with us from the establishment of the early Colonies, I should like to have your views as we go along.

The desire and the determination of our people from the beginning to set up a free country and to make an issue with any people, force or influence that might tend to work to their disadvantage was so strong and firm that we might consider it a national issue.

They determined to defend and protect themselves against the world. When the Pilgrim fathers came to this land, they came to stay and they did stay. They successfully resisted every effort to deter them from their purpose to set up a new government in a new land. They fought the Indians and they also fought the economic tyrants that sought to tax their every activity.

They evolved a system whereby everybody worked. The recognized the right of property. They realized that religion, morality, and education were necessary to a firm, political, and economic government. As a result of their determination in this respect, they established a church soon after they landed. This church was to be a new institution without any connection or adherence to any other church. In order that the church might be independent they organized a church and called it the Congregational Church.

They also, as proof of their belief in the importance of education, established in Massachusetts the first free public school ever set up in the world, and they maintained the same by public taxation. While the Massachusetts colony was carrying on its program, Capt. John Smith had laid down the rule that "He who would not work should not eat." The determination of these early settlers to build a new nation was so positive that an issue developed immediately when any group or any nation engaged in any practice that would tend to hinder the growth and development of America.

From the determination of these people to establish a free country and from their bravery in maintaining this determination

the new world has been called the land of the free and the home of the brave.

It would be easy to appreciate that these early settlers would soon find themselves without any articles and commodities which they must have in order to endure the hardships of their undertaking. They would need clothes, shoes, tools, shelter, and many other commodities that they could not produce in the new land.

In other words, they were solely dependent on Great Britain for many of the necessities of life. They could produce food, fish, and raw materials—and that was about all. For 100 years after the Pilgrim Fathers landed, it took the time of 90 percent of the people to furnish food for themselves and the other 10 percent. The early settlers realized that if they were to be a prosperous country they must learn to make as many of their needed commodities as possible. They could have remained a pastoral or agricultural colony even to this day if they had been satisfied to send their surplus food and their raw materials to Great Britain in return for the other commodities which they would need. They determined early, however, that they would not be satisfied with this kind of arrangement. They determined to be self-sustaining. From that determination has come the reciprocal trade-agreement laws of today. Let us trace together the growth of this idea from that early day to now.

Gradually artisans and craftsmen began to come to the Colonies in greater number and gradually the Colonies were able to manufacture for themselves many of the commodities which they had theretofore been compelled to import. From that early beginning there were many who opposed the plan of seeking to become self-sustaining and they preferred that the American Colonies should remain as colonies to supply the mother country with raw materials. These groups gradually divided themselves into Tories and into Continentals. The policy over which they disagreed has been the subject of national disagreement ever since.

As the American colonies progressed, even as they progressed in their lines of manufacturing, they were still very dependent upon Great Britain for many commodities. Great Britain, realizing this fact, never missed an opportunity to levy taxes and charges against the colonists. As time went along and as the country developed, the feeling to be self-sustaining grew stronger and stronger. It finally manifested itself in the Boston Tea Party, and in the incidents of Concord and Lexington and Bunker Hill, all of which developed into the great Revolution. The Revolution was not as much a political revolution as it was an economic and social revolution. The Colonist resented maintaining a government in which they had no representation. The principal connections between the colonists and Great Britain at that time were the connections that came about through exchange of goods.

They did not know what to do to get the ultimate advantage from the great victory which they had won with the termination of the war. During the war they were cohesive and coordinate because they were engaged in a common cause. With the determination of this cause, they found themselves completely disorganized. This, to my mind, was the most critical period in the history of our country. The Colonies began to compete with each other in their dealings with Great Britain and had commenced to build up trade privileges among themselves. So keen had become this competition between the Colonies that it was clear that all the advantages gained by the Revolution might be lost unless something could be done to again bind the Colonies closely together. They were already bound under the Articles of the Confederation, but these were only voluntary organizations and had no compelling power.

These trade tariffs and agreements which these Colonies had built up against each other had become so bad that Washington, Hamilton, Franklin, Madison, and many of the other leaders from the various Colonies decided that something must be done to coordinate and bind the Colonies together. They decided to call a convention of delegates from all the Colonies. This convention met and George Washington was elected the chairman. From this convention came the Constitution which is the cornerstone upon which this great country has been built. I have tried to impress upon you the powerful influence that trade has had in the growth and development of our country. I know of no other such powerful influence except the determination of our early forefathers to maintain freedom and liberty at any price.

From the early settlements down to the adoption of the Constitution, there were many who would be glad to see America free herself from Great Britain but were afraid that she could not maintain herself economically.

Washington and his associates knew that it was absolutely imperative that the Colonies should stand together. The framers of the Constitution gave expression to this feeling in language more eloquent and more compelling than any that I could use when they wrote the preamble to the Constitution:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The framers of the Constitution gave much consideration to interstate and international trade. They were determined that no colony should without the consent of Congress have the right to charge a duty on goods passing from one colony to another.

They were also determined that no State should have the right to levy a duty on goods imported from that State to any foreign country. They were also determined that none of the seaports should be given any preference over others in reference to imports or exports.

The framers of the Constitution considered this matter of the movement of commodities of such importance that they devoted three separate paragraphs to this subject. These paragraphs are as follows:

"No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.

"No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another.

"No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any impost or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws; and the net produce of all duties and imposts, laid by any State on imports or exports, shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and control of the Congress."

With the adoption of the Constitution, trade, both domestic and international, increased rapidly. The industrial States were naturally more interested in industrial development than were the agricultural States, but on the other hand the prosperity of the industrial sections guaranteed a measure of prosperity for the agricultural sections. The statesmen of that day early recognized that the best method of financing the new Government was through the levying of duties on imported commodities. The first tariff laws passed were passed for the express purpose of securing revenue with which to operate the Government. At that time they did not know anything about income taxes and excise taxes. They not only levied duties on articles that were in competition with articles manufactured in the Colonies, but they levied such duties on all commodities as they thought the commodities could carry. Tariff for revenue only was the tariff of that day.

From these tariff laws the Government soon had plenty of money. In that respect the statesmen of those days were much smarter than the statesmen of these days.

Because of the heavy duties which the Colonies laid on imported articles, practically all of which came from Great Britain, that country, with her powerful navy, proceeded to compel a reduction in those duties by driving from the sea what little shipping the Colonies controlled. Because of this action Great Britain was soon in a war with the Colonies. The War of 1812 was practically a trade war. Up to that time Great Britain had claimed control over the seas. As a result of the War of 1812 the doctrine of the freedom of the seas was established and made applicable to all the countries of the world. This result amply justified the war.

It is clear, therefore, that for the 200 years from the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers up to the close of the War of 1812 the principal issues that ran through all the activities of the people were the issues that rose naturally from trade and commerce.

The American people immediately appreciated the trade advantages which they had gained by reason of the War of 1812 and they came to realize that the possibilities of the new Nation to become a great manufacturing country were very bright. At this time Alexander Hamilton put out his great work, known as Hamilton's Report on Manufactures. This document did much to establish America on a firm commercial basis. I would recommend to any student of trade and commerce that he read this document above all others relating to American trade and commerce. In this document, Hamilton advocated that America to be great must protect her industries as well as her agriculture. Not long after the issuance of this great document, Congress passed the Tariff Act of 1816. This is one of the great events in the history of the development of the tariff policy of our country. There were many who opposed this legislation for the same reasons which I have heretofore set forth, but the public sentiment was overwhelmingly in favor of a program that would establish industries and manufacturing plants in our country.

The law of 1816 was a great improvement in many ways over any previous action dealing with trade. Under this law, commodities were divided into classes and duties were levied according to classes. Commodities were divided into three groups. First, commodities which could be manufactured in ample quantities in America. Imports of this class of goods carried a high rate of duty. The second class of goods were those which could be partially supplied in America. These carried a lower duty. The third group of commodities were those which were not produced in this country. These carried a very light rate of duty in order to encourage their importation.

This law was the first tariff law that gave any considerable consideration to the setting up of a free list. By this I mean a list of commodities that would be permitted to enter free of any duty. Ever since that time this free list has been gradually increased until today more than 65 percent of all imports come in free of any duty. To those who are clamoring for more free trade under proposed reciprocal trade agreements must not forget that now two-thirds of all imports are already coming free of any duty.

From this legislation that early Congress set a pattern which has been rather closely followed from that day to this.

The act of 1816 was not perfect, but the Congress was ready to correct defects by proper amendments.

The agricultural States complained against the provisions of the act of 1816 because they felt that they were selling their commodities in the buyers' market and buying what they needed in a seller's market.

From that time down to now, this has been a forceful argument which the agricultural States have made. There is no denying that it is a good argument. However, if we had continued in the program that was advocated by the agricultural States, we would not today be the powerful Nation that we are.

From 1816 to the time of the Civil War the tariff question was a very important one. Several tariff laws were passed in that time and with each new law the matter of levying duties became a more scientific task.

In every Presidential election during that time the tariff was a lively issue. During that time two great Americans increased their prominence by reason of their participation in matters in which the tariff was the principal issue. When some of the States were dissatisfied with the tariff laws and threatened nullification and secession. Andrew Jackson came to the front in a way so positive as to have won for him a place among the greatest of great Americans. Henry Clay—the great pacificator—came into prominence at that time because of his great work in the strengthening and in making the tariff policies more general in their application and more general in their acceptation.

This was a great era marked with great progress in the field of domestic and international trade and at the same time marked with some serious national financial depressions.

During the Civil War period a number of agricultural States withdrew from the Union and the industrial states for that reason, and for the further reason that the country was at war, increased the tariff rates greatly in order to secure revenue with which to carry on the war and to operate the Government

But the tenacity of this doctrine that I have tried to trace for you from the foundation of our Government down to the Civil War manifested itself again with the return of the Southern States with even more force than it had ever had before. The advancement of the industrial States as a result of protective tariff proved its efficacy. On the other hand, the persistency of the agricultural States had not diminished.

In 1876 Rutherford B. Hayes was elected to the Presidency. Immediately after his election he began to give the tariff question a complete study. He called to his assistance a young Congressman with whom he had fought in the War Between the States. To this Congressman—William McKinley—he gave the assignment of giving to the tariff problem a thorough study. As a result of his study on this subject this young Congressman advanced in power and influence, and in 1890 he was the author of the McKinley tariff law. This law was the result of much study by McKinley and also by the other statesmen of that time. In that law a new principle was announced. I refer to the principle of reciprocity in trade agreements.

Mr. McKinley's reciprocity formula was that, in tariffs for protection, the duty should be sufficient to balance the difference between the cost of production in the foreign country as against the cost of production in America, plus a reasonable profit. Mr. McKinley also advocated that true reciprocity could be extended only through agreements made with individual nations. For in that way he fixed individual responsibility.

Since that time a new innovation came into the tariff laws of our country. I refer to what is known as the favored-nations clause. This is a plan which has now gotten to be so broad as the world. It is a provision that when a concession is granted to one country it is generalized so that every other country should have the same concessions. Before the war we saw situations where Japan got the benefit of all the concessions that we had given to any other country. There are many who feel this provision should be repealed.

The McKinley tariff law proved to be very popular. By virtue of this law a very large number of commodities were added to the free list. This tended to remove many objections that had theretofore been leveled against tariff rates. It also marked the gradual transition from tariffs for revenue only to tariffs for protection.

By reason of his efforts as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, McKinley was able to do for his country a work which was in my opinion the most important work of his career. It was because of this legislation and his reputation as a statesman that he was elevated to the Presidency.

Since the days of McKinley, the tariff continued to be a great public issue, of varying degrees of intensity. I will not take the time to trace this development in detail.

The next great and important change in the tariff laws was a new provision that was included in the Fordney-McCumber Act, which was passed in 1922. This provision to which I refer was known as the flexible-tariff provision. Under this provision the President was authorized to increase or decrease rates by not more than 50 percent, and to do so only after a thorough investigation by the Tariff Commission of the differences between the cost of production in the foreign country as against the cost of production in the United States.

This law also provided that additional duties could be added and total exclusion might be added in case of unfair competition on the part of any foreign country.

Under this law the President could act only after the facts had been found by the Tariff Commission. And he could act only within the measurement of a yardstick specifically laid down by Congress. Congress did not grant to him any legislative powers.

It must be remembered that under the Constitution all authority to levy duties is given exclusively to the Congress. The President has no authority over the levying of any duties of any kind. But the President has a right under the Constitution to collect duties that have been levied according to laws passed by the Congress. Under the Flexible Tariff Act, to which I have just referred, the Congress laid down a yardstick by which the duties were levied, and gave the President the responsibility of collecting the duties thus levied.

From 1922 to 1930 no drastic changes were made in the tariff laws. In 1930 the Smoot-Hawley tariff law was passed. Many Members of Congress and others have claimed that this law was responsible for many ills against which they complained. It is passing strange, however, when we remember that those who have made most of the complaints against this law, although they have been in power for 15 years, have never attempted to repeal the law.

This brings us now to the so-called reciprocal trade agreements act. This word "reciprocal" was applied to this Tariff Act for the purpose of attempting to tie it in with the McKinley doctrine of reciprocity.

In 1933 President Roosevelt favored and forced the passage of the NIRA. To enforce this law there was set up an organization known as the NRA. This was an attempt to control the business and trade of the Nation. Most of us remember this experiment and most of us know that the Supreme Court declared the whole thing to be unconstitutional.

President Roosevelt in a message which he sent to Congress in 1934 requested that the Congress pass legislation to authorize the Executive to enter into executive commercial agreements with foreign nations. He further stated in that message that his request was an emergency and that he expected early action. Congress acceded to the demands of the President and his State Department and passed a law which was signed by the President on June 12, 1934. This law gave the President the power to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements with foreign countries, and provided that public notice of the intention to negotiate such agreements should be given to interested persons so that they might have an opportuniy to present their views. The law further provided that the President before concluding these agreements should consult with the Tariff Commission and also with the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce.

Much complaint has been lodged by hundreds of business people in the United States against the manner in which this law has been executed. Many aggrieved companies and individuals have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and have complained bitterly against the treatment they have received by the Department before whom they have made their complaints. Their principal complaint was that they were never given any direct explanation as to why their complaints were rejected and that none of them have ever known what persons or group of persons have passed upon their complaints and rejected the same. The unfairness of this procedure has been proven by the fact that in not one single instance has the tariff rates been increased but in every instance the rates have been decreased.

In the administration of this law, great injustices have been brazenly and defiantly done. The law has been so written that no aggrieved person has been able to get into any court in which he might seek redress. By the passage of this law, Congress abdicated the duties and responsibilities placed upon it by the Constitution of the United States. It is a well-recognized proposition of constitutional law that Congress cannot surrender and assign its constitutional duties to be performed by any other department of the Government.

The Republicans have maintained that this reciprocal trade-agreement law is an abdication of constitutional authority and that its administration has been unfair, unreasonable, and unjust.

The New Dealers maintain that the Congress had a right to pass this law by reason of its similarity to the flexible tariff provision of the law passed in 1922.

It is unfortunate that not one of the many aggrieved Americans has been able to test the constitutionality of this law.

Logically, we now come to a discussion of the Geneva Conference, which is now in progress. Immediately after the termination of hostilities in the recent war, the State Department, under its policy of giving America away, started negotiations by which it expected to establish a one-world economy. They realized that much more than half of all of the business of the world done in normal times was done in the United States. Not more than 10 percent of our business is done with foreign countries. They realized that the American markets were the prize markets of the world. And yet they sought to enter into agreements with all the countries of the world by which they gave to these countries the advantages of the American markets. A conference of a large number of the most important nations of the world was called to meet in London in 1945. At this conference it was decided that another conference would be called in April of 1946. This conference was not held until April 1947. The reason assigned was that the Tariff Commission had not been able to make the neces-

sary studies. Immediately following the election of 1946, the State Department hurriedly decided to make an effort to get ready for the conference in April of 1947. This was done regardless of the fact that the Tariff Commission had not been able to make the necessary studies.

In April 1947, Mr. Clayton of the State Department with a retinue of 150 or more assistants, went to Geneva where this conference was to be held. Before going to Geneva Mr. Clayton appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and in substance stated that the purpose of going to Geneva was not so much to enter into trade agreements, as it was to set up a special world-wide organization to control the trade and the business of the whole world and to be known as the International Trade Organization.

The Geneva Conference has now been in session for nearly 3 months. Either because of inefficiency or because of secrecy little is known as to what is going on in Geneva. Recently a short report was put out by the State Department. In that report is a paragraph which reads as follows:

"The present schedule calls for completion of discussions on chapters IV through VII by mid-July. Chapters I, II, and VIII on purposes, membership, and organization are scheduled for later consideration."

From this it is evident that the Geneva Conference is having hard sledding. So far no good has come from it. I am not as much interested in any good that may come from it, for I am afraid of the evil that will come from it.

Every country in the world is anxious to trade with the United States of America upon most any terms that might be granted.

Trade agreements already made have already seriously injured many industries in the United States. I shall cite you a few:

Practically all watches sold in America are foreign made.

The glass industry has been seriously impaired.

Likewise the pottery and china industry is terribly worried.

The same is true as to textiles.

When these great basic industries of the Nation complain they are told that the policy is the policy enunciated by Henry A. Wallace before the Ways and Means Committee a few years ago when he said that any industry that cannot compete with the cheap labor of foreign countries is inefficient and should be permitted to die.

The policy by which the United States grew to be the most powerful Nation of the world from the standpoint of production and commerce is being abandoned for a give away policy and no one knows what the outcome will be.

Foolish To Suppose 100,000 Refugees Would Reduce Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by John W. Love in the Cleveland Press, June 27, 1947:

TODAY'S BUSINESS

(By John W. Love)

FOOLISH TO SUPPOSE 100,000 REFUGEES WOULD REDUCE JOBS

The clubwomen in their national convention this week had the bad luck to be hooked on one of the oldest of economic fallacies. This is the belief there is just so much work to be done at any one time, and that to increase the number of workers deprives some of them of jobs. It is known as the lump-of-work fallacy.

In ordinary conditions the General Federation of Women's Clubs would have been only one of many organizations to pick up the ancient error. This time the circumstances are deeply regrettable.

The federation voted down a resolution to support the Stratton bill to admit 100,000 displaced persons a year for 4 years. It did so after it had heard there were unemployed in this country and that the arrival of this number of people from Europe would deprive our own of jobs.

The supporters of the resolution, and they were numerous, presented all the important arguments for the bill, but if they had had time they might have asked a few questions. They might have inquired whether there ever was a time before the war when we had fewer unemployed in proportion to the size of the country than we have today. Or whether there had ever been a day when there was not some unemployment, with immigration or not. Or whether it was not true that the greatest unemployment we ever had in America occurred after we had cut down our immigration.

If there is a connection between employment and immigration it could just as easily be argued on the favorable side. There's no getting around the fact our great industrial prosperity dates from the arrival of millions of immigrants, or that the collapse, in the 1930's, followed by 6 years the passage of the present legislation.

But the fundamental error in the lump-of-work idea is hundreds of years old, and history and statistics can seldom prevail against it.

In any case the admission of as small a number as 100,000 persons a year, many of them women and children, can have no noticeable unfavorable effect upon employment.

The best of the arguments in favor of the Stratton bill is that by agreeing to accept 400,000 of the homeless, this country would be taking a substantial share of the nearly 1,000,000 for whom no homes can be found in Europe, and that by so doing, we would be in a position to urge other countries to accept the remainder on a quota basis.

There appears to be little doubt that relatives, friends, and institutions in this country would arrange to house these people, most of them Roman Catholics. There is no doubt whatever that those immigrants who were willing to take common labor jobs could find them readily, or that those who were skilled in certain types of work would have no trouble getting employment.

In a country which is maturing as rapidly as ours is, wherein the children of the laborers are going into skilled jobs or to college, and the children of the skilled seem to be trying to get into professions, there is certainly room for people who would be willing to work at anything just to live in America. A mere 400,000 by 1951, however, would go only a small way toward solving the distortions in our labor supply.

There are disturbing phenomena in our changing population, and one of them is the advancing age of the people in it. The numbers of young and vigorous are not increasing as they should be—if the figures didn't show it we would know it from the growing interest in pension plans. We need more providers in this country. The greatest criticism it seems to me can be made of the Stratton bil' is that it would revise the quotas for only 4 years, but by that time the change in the make-up of America will be evident to many more than it now is.

Yet 4 years is about as long as we can be sure the routes will be open for any kind of travel. Unless Europe can be rehabilitated and the prospects of peace made stronger, then the one nation which has everything may find itself without friends, the object of universal envy.

If the Stratton bill were defeated, and if it at the same time the proposal made by some of the Republicans to cut down the shipments of grain to Europe were to carry, then we would indeed be turning our backs upon the misery of the Old World. The effect of decisions of that sort would be profound, but the nation which made them might lack the imagination to prepare for what lay ahead.

A Salute to Wayne Township, N. J., a Friendly Community, on Its One Hundredth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday afternoon the people of Wayne Township, N. J., concluded a 3-day centennial celebration. I was privileged to make a brief address in tribute to this friendly community, speaking as follows:

Historians record that hospitality has ever been a Jerseyman's concern. Wildes, in his entertaining history, "Twin Rivers, the Raritan and Passaic," points out that in 1609 when Hendrick Hudson first entered Newark Bay, the Indian tribesmen lined the shores holding out gifts of corn and beans and squash, calling out "Scheyichbi," the Raritan Indian word for "welcome." Believing that the natives were calling out the name of the land the Dutch sailors called the lands west of the Hudson, now northern New Jersey, "Scheyichbi," or "Welcome."

While that title has disappeared, the tradition is still retained in Wayne Township. When it was known as the "welcome" country it was then, as now, rich and scenic farm land, and it was crisscrossed by Indian trails over which the Indian from west of the Delaware traveled to reach the coast, to which they made an annual pilgrimage for the purpose of gathering and eating oysters and other shellfish, considered even by the early Indians as rare delicacies.

This was then a hospitable area and it so continued to be through George Washington's day for we are all familiar with the stories of the general's visits to Wayne and Preakness and his headquarters at the Dey mansion. Probably in no other camping area was the Continental Army so well supplied with food by the neighboring farmers as it was while in this valley. There had been great changes in many things between 1609 and 1780 but hospitality was still a chief concern as attested by the records of General Washington and his troops.

Undoubtedly visitors 60 years later, in 1847, when Wayne was formed, were given just as hearty a welcome as they are today and as they had been given 238 years previously. There must have been many visitors in that year, for the country was just beginning to develop. Communications were improving. Just a month before, the first postage stamps had been placed on sale by the Federal Government. The telegraph was only 3 years old. The Morris Canal had brought to this section increasing commercial activity in the 15 years it had been open. The Morris and Essex railroad served the area, and plans were being drawn for the Lackawanna and for expanding the Erie through northern

Jersey. Popular and busy stage-coach routes bisected the new township. Paterson, which did not become a city until 4 years later and was then an independent township, was a popular market center for the farmers not only from Passaic County but also from Bergen and Essex. It was then known as the Strawberry City of the World. Although the first factory in Paterson had been opened under the Society for Useful Manufactures in 1794, it was not until 1840 that the silk industry got its first start and by 1847 Paterson's reputation as a silk center was just beginning to spread. Building of locomotives there had started 10 years earlier. Iron mining in 1847 was a major industry in this area.

There was a spirit of progress in the air not only in the commercial world of the day but also in the political and social fields. Passaic County had been an independent unit only 10 years when Wayne Township was brought into being and the present New Jersey Constitution was then only 3 years old. Slavery had not been abolished in New Jersey until 1846 and in that year the first taxes for a public school system were levied against townships. In 1847, as in 1947, the effects of a war unsettled the country; the Mexican War was adding great territories to the United States. There was industrial strife in those days, too, and during the 10 years that preceded the establishment of Wayne Township the State and this section were troubled with a series of great strikes. Workers in Paterson, Newark, Morristown, and New Brunswick, as well as in other communities, struck during the late thirties and early forties for higher wages and a 10-hour day, but it was not until 1851 that the 10-hour day was secured by legislation throughout the State.

This congressional district, when Wayne Township was created, was represented in the House of Representatives, in which Abraham Lincoln was then serving, by a Whig, William Wright, of Newark later a United States Senator and in 1847 an unsuccessful candidate for Governor of New Jersey. Serving New Jersey in the United States Senate in that Thirtieth Congress were Jacob Miller, of Morristown, and William L. Dayton, of Freehold, who 9 years later became the candidate for Vice President of the United States on the first national ticket of the Republican Party.

In those days it took my congressional predecessors at least 4 days, traveling by train, coach, and boat, to reach Washington. There they met in a Capitol much different from the one we know today. Just a quarter of a century earlier the building had been burned by British troops in the War of 1812. The dome had not yet been built, nor the two wings added. James K. Polk was President, and the two issues of paramount national importance were slavery and expansion of the Nation to the Pacific, which were accentuated by the Mexican War. Gen. Zachary Taylor was the hero of the hour. John Tyler had only 2 years before retired as President of the United States, and it was interesting to note just this week in the papers that the last surviving daughter of President Tyler had died at the age of 87 in her home in Virginia. President Tyler was born in 1790, and the lives of him and his daughter have covered the entire span of our country's history from the administrations of President George Washington to the present day.

In the first election in which the people of the newly formed Wayne Township voted for a State Senator from Passaic County, I have been interested to learn that they elected one Silas D. Canfield, who served as president of the State senate in 1851. He was an ancestor of mine.

In those days, without our rapid means of transportation and communication, without modern schools and hospitals, without electric lights and so many of the other conveniences on which we depend today, I believe there was a far greater spirit of friendliness, of hospitality, of neighborliness, locally, nationally, and throughout the world than we find today.

In this respect, Wayne has not retrogressed. It has been found one of the friendliest communities in our land. Characterful and patriotic, its citizens have kept faith in peace and in war with the best traditions of America and the ever-inspiring spirit of Wayne's founders.

We speak today of the good-neighbor policy. America cannot be a good neighbor among nations unless it has that attitude and spirit at home. It must be a land whose communities live happily together, exalting good will and casting aside those things that tend to feed the germs of hatred and intolerance.

In this turbulent world in which day after day we read in the press and hear recounted over the air the failures of statesmen to effect a meeting of the minds looking to world peace, we cannot afford to "toss up the sponge" and say it cannot be done. American morale is the most important element of the hour. It can be sustained in thousands of communities by the spirit of Wayne.

I remember how my distinguished predecessor, the late Mr. Seger, liked to visit among your people. "Wayne is so friendly" he used to say.

And I recall several years back an incident emphasing this spirit. I was scheduled to make an address before your Republican Club at Donohues. With Wayne hospitality and good will, several Democratic friends attended. One learned the following morning his name had been called at a bank night in a neighboring town theater and his absence had cost him some $300. While he took his loss with a smile, he never did tell me my speech compensated him.

Today, as I salute Wayne on its centennial anniversary, I can picture one of the early settlers philosophically referring to other difficult days with the expression, "they say the first 100 years are the hardest." May this be so of Wayne, the friendly community, where the open door, the helping hand, and the smiling face, are not lost in "times that try men's souls."

New Glory for Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD, a sermon delivered on Sunday, June 29, by Dr. Peter Marshall, pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church of Washington, and Chaplain of the Senate. I have read this sermon several times and, in my opinion, it is a work of deep religious significance—a message of guidance not only for those of us who have the great honor to serve in the United States Senate, but, also for all the people of this great land. The Nation as well as the Senate should indeed be proud of Dr. Peter Marshall.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW GLORY FOR OLD GLORY

Text: Acts 22: 28: "And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was free born."

The proud boast of the captain who held Paul prisoner, that he had paid for his political freedom with big money, reflects the ancient and mistaken idea that freedom can be bought or sold, conferred or withdrawn.

Paul's confident reply that he was free born, that his freedom was a matter of birthright, shows an understanding that rests on much higher principles.

In a few days, all over this country, there will be celebrated the one hundred and seventy-first anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. The celebration will be marked as usual with holidays, special sports events, picnics, orations, and fireworks. And yet I wonder how many of those who celebrate the Fourth of July will understand the meaning of what they celebrate.

Perhaps in the noise, in the explosion of fireworks, in the music of the bands, and the shouting of the people, whispers from the past will be totally unheard.

There will be voices from Valley Forge whispering, "With a great sum obtained I this freedom."

There will be whispers from Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill, from Trenton and Princeton, aye, and from Mount Vernon and Monticello, "We paid a great price for this freedom."

Perhaps these whispers will never be heard. If they were, it would be amazing how many voices would join in and from what widely scattered parts of the country and from what distant lands the message would come.

One thing is clear—the freedom that was purchased 171 years ago was not paid for in one down payment. Installments have been kept up for more than two lifetimes, for this is one possession that exacts a perpetual price.

There is a danger then in your sitting back smugly applauding when the flag is thrown upon the movie screen, puffing yourself up with pride, as you boast of America. For you were free born.

Unless you have lived in other lands, unless you have known hunger and persecution, unless you have come as an immigrant to this good land, you have absolutely no idea how good it is. You cannot fully appreciate its blessings. Nor can you truly be grateful, since you have no conception of what it means to be without all the things you take for granted.

You have never known anything else. It is because they who went before you were willing to stake their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, that you have what you now enjoy.

But you forget how bitterly it was won. You forget how great a price was paid. This is, indeed, a land of plenty. But that does not mean that we have a right to waste our resources.

The story of the waste of this country's riches is a sad story of greed and selfishness. It has been estimated that there were not less than 75,000,000 head of buffalo roaming this continent at the time the white man was making the first colonies. Today there are only about 4,000 left.

The wildlife of this Nation has long been exploited to satisfy the greed and the so-called sporting instincts of free Americans.

Many species of native American wildlife have been exterminated, such as the great auk, the Pallas cormorant, the Labrador duck, the passenger pigeon, the heath hen, the Eskimo curlew, and the Carolina paroquet.

Of the mammals, the giant mink has gone. The grizzly bear has been nearly exterminated. The trumpeter swan, the canvas back duck, the redhead, the upland plover, the whooping crane, and the ivory-billed woodpecker may in a few years be completely wiped out, all because some people said, "This is a free country. I have a right to hunt, shoot, and kill."

So the patriot enjoyed himself killing birds, killing more than he could give away, so that the next year there were fewer birds, and at last there were none at all.

The same kind of greed and selfishness was shown in our treatment of the land. It was good land, but we were greedy. We wanted money crops, and the slogan was "Plow and plant, plow and plant."

Well, we plowed. For 50 years we chopped cotton and moved West when the land gave out. For 50 years we plowed for corn, and moved on when the land gave out.

Corn and wheat; wheat and cotton—we planted and plowed with no regard for the future. And 400,000,000 tons of our most valuable natural resources have been washed into the Gulf of Mexico every year. Three hundred thousand acres of good topsoil dumped into the ocean.

Our reckless stripping away of the vegetable cover of the soil has driven out the animals and invited the forces of erosion, which are now exacting the terrific toll of 300,000 acres of land every year. This is equivalent to dumping into the ocean each year 1,875 farms of 160 acres each.

It has made red clay gullies in the Southland, it has made dust bowl storms in the Middle West, it has made prairies and deserts, and more than half of our total land surface has been damaged by erosion.

When the white colonists first came to this continent this kind of erosion was unknown. It can be traced directly to the wholesale removal of the original vegetable cover, to the destruction of forests, and the plowing of prairies and plains.

Surely freedom does not mean that people can do as they like with the country's resources.

The same wanton waste and disregard for the future is to be seen in the almost criminal waste of oil, thousands of barrels of oil wasted every month; in the deforestation of our country, when the slogan seemed to be "Cut and sell, cut and sell," with never a thought of planting young trees, never a thought of preserving the timberland, as if there were a supply that would never be exhausted.

The natural resources of America are the heritage of the whole Nation, and should be conserved and utilized for the benefit of all our people.

There is, however, a higher concept of freedom, higher than something that can be conferred or withdrawn, higher than something that is an accident of birth, and that is that freedom is an endowment of every human soul.

This was the great idea that nurtured the young Republic struggling to be born in 1776.

It seems to be forgotten or ignored today, but history proves that the inspiration of this fundamental idea of our democratic faith came from the deep spiritual reservoirs of our religious heritage.

The source of democracy is Christianity, and liberty comes from God. This teaching is as old as the Bible. The word of God declares that if a nation is to live it must depend on God; and if it refuses, it will die.

Our Pilgrim forefathers believed this truth, for the first thing they did in America was to dedicate their venture to God. The Mayflower Compact, the first civil document drawn up on our shores, acknowledges God in these words:

"In the name of God, amen.

"We, having undertaken, for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith, do by these presents solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic."

Later, we find the compacts and charters of all the early colonies giving a very definite place to God. No better statement of the relationship of God to government is found anywhere than in the Great Law of Pennsylvania, which was passed December 7, 1682. This document said:

"Whereas the glory of Almighty God, and the good of mankind, is the reason and end of government, and, therefore, government in itself is a venerable ordinance of God."

Notice these two ideals: Government is for God's glory and is ordained by Him. Is it not true that we as a nation have largely forgotten these ideals today? We have government "of the people, by the people, for the people." But we lack a government of the people of God by God.

Many examples might be cited from colonial history to show the close relationship which existed between God and the Government of that day.

In the Declaration of Independence, the framers of that noble document three times emphasized God's part in their struggle for independence. The Declaration closed, "With a firm reliance upon the protection of Divine Providence."

This was a statement of the firm conviction that prevailed in the minds and hearts of the founding fathers.

It is strange, and I believe tragic, that the Constitution makes no reference to God. It was not a perfect document, as all the amendments prove.

It took 19 years to insert the first 10 amendments, which are known as the Bill of Rights. Public criticism and the grumbling of the men who had fought for freedom finally forced the Congress to make constitutional provision for the rights of men, but no amendment has yet acknowledged the rights of God.

Many efforts have been made at different times to introduce such an amendment, but there has been opposition and indifference, so to this good day the Constitution of our country ignores the principles upon which our country was founded.

Forty-three of our States have already written into their constitutions vague religious acknowledgments. All make some reference to a higher power, but not one State honors Jesus Christ.

Christ said: "He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent Him." Christ said again: "All authority has been given unto Me in heaven and earth."

God can be honored only through His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. All pious, vague affirmations about God as the Supreme Being, etc., are vain unless supreme honor is specifically given to Jesus Christ.

The classic lines of J. G. Holland were never more challenging than now:

"God give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And scorn his treacherous flattering without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking."

Yes, we need men like this, but our greatest need is for men who know and believe God's Word; men who will rule in the fear of God.

The first question about all candidates for public office should be: "Do these men know their God, and will they rule in the fear of God?"

Christian rulers need to know their Bible better than any other book. Large portions of the Bible are filled with instructions for nations and rulers; what they are to do, and how they are to serve.

For the most part, this instruction is discarded by statesmen of the world today. It is time we put the Bible back into our Government; time that our statesmen began to make their decisions on all moral questions on the basis of the authority of God's Holy Word.

In his book, The Christ of the American Road, Dr. E. Stanley Jones speaks of the fading of Christianity from our national life. He tells of a cartoon in which Uncle Sam, standing on the ship of state, turns and says to the representatives of the Christian faith, "It is your business to keep off from the ship of state the barnacles of greed, selfishness, and dishonesty."

"And that was supposed to be a compliment to religion," says Jones. "It was to keep off the barnacles, but was to have nothing to say about the directing of the ship."

This is the common attitude today in America toward Christ and the civil government. Christ is useful to help keep barnacles off the ship of state, but it would never do to let Him take over the helm.

But, of course, Christ cannot direct the ship of state until He is permitted to direct the lives of the people. Were He permitted to do that, great changes would come about in our national life.

All religious practices, all church services and pious observances mean nothing at all unless they result in the willingness of individuals like you and me to surrender their lives to Christ, to let Him guide them in decisions, to let Him lead them in action, and to look to Him for the power to do His will.

There is a shoe manufacturer named Johnson who has no trouble whatsoever in his factory. His relations with labor are excellent. Strikes are unheard of.

And why? Because he determined in his business to do what was right and to treat his employees as Christ directed.

That spirit in his business is a model and an example to the Nation.

The same thing could happen in a coal mine if the owner thoroughly surrendered to Christ, began to run his coal mine according to Christ's guidance; if the owner determined that in his mine every invention and device of modern science would make the mine as safe as is humanly possible; if he determined that for the comfort of the miners bathing facilities would be provided on the premises; if he made up his mind that the miners' homes would be equipped with all modern conveniences, and that the commissary would be stocked with goods at the price levels existing elsewhere; if he felt a concern for the welfare of his men and their families, in seeing that hospitals and schools were available.

I am not suggesting that the whole responsibility for labor unrest lies upon employers, but I do say without fear of contradiction that where employers are God-guided men, where they are filled with the spirit of Christ, and where they are willing to run their businesses as Christ runs them, then I say that labor troubles would vanish.

But it has been proved that where labor union leaders come face to face with such a spirit, their own spirit of rebellion and hostility and suspicion, their unreasonable attitudes and the hatred in their hearts are melted and broken down.

"It is a beautiful theory," you may say, "and it would be fine if that were so. But it isn't so; human nature being what it is."

But I am here to say that human nature can be changed and human nature must be changed if this Nation is to survive, and if she is to become what the founding fathers intended her to become.

But I know perfectly well that there can never be a new spirit in America until it begins with you and me—in our homes, in our business, in our friendships, and in our relations with other people.

And so I would focus my plea first to myself and then to you who are listening to me now: "Is Christ the head of your home?" "Does He guide your decisions?" "Do you consult Him about your problems?" "Are you honestly trying every day to do what Christ wants you to do?" You must answer those questions for yourself.

But not until your answer is yes is there much hope that this Nation can become God's own country.

It is only by God-guided lives, it is only by applying Christ's solutions to the problems that plague us, it is only by living under His blessing and guidance that we can ever hope to add any new glory to Old Glory.

The Challenge to Christian Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under authorization to extend my remarks, I call the attention of the membership of the House of Representatives to the commencement address of Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick, president of Mount Mary College. This speech, although addressed to the 1947 graduating class of Mount Mary College, is worthy of earnest consideration by all of us.

THE CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION

(Mount Mary College commencement speech 1947 by Edward A. Fitzpatrick, president, Mount Mary College)

(To the school sisters of Notre Dame on the centenary of the American Foundation, 1847-1947)

THE CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION

I. The main problem and challenge.
II. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and communism.
III. The world of the machine of force and of propaganda.
IV. The schism of man's soul and social life.
V. The betrayal of the intellectuals.
VI. The decentralization of government.
VII. The problem of statism.
VIII. The universality of the moral law.
IX. Spiritual renewal and renovation.

I

The socially conscious Catholic graduate must be concerned with the major intellectual and moral problems of the age or its major intellectual and moral challenge. In a commencement address some description and evaluation of that problem is necessary and some method of meeting it must be suggested. In the confused and contrary currents of contemporary life the main problem is communism and the main challenge is Russia, the self-styled "center of world revolution." Communism is not necessarily associated with Russia but in the present world situation it is. Russia is, as the Third Communist International says, the "international driving force of the proletarian revolution that impels the proletariat of all countries to seize power." What seems on the surface to be involved is merely an economic revolution or even a social or political revolution, but what is really involved is a moral, spiritual, and religious revolution—a new world—the one world of communism.

II

In a free world the interchange and exchange of ideas, even revolutionary ideas, in all fields would not be of such tragic concern to men unless there were in back of these ideas not reason but brute force—the force of the most ruthless and powerful nation in the world at the present time, ready by every subterfuge, device, and technique to use legal and illegal means in every country to make over the world in its evil design, but the preliminary and decisive skirmishes or battles must be won in the area of ideology—and that is the opportunity of the educated man. The nation we call Russia should be more properly referred to as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It is a great Eurasian empire covering almost 9,000,000 square miles, called in geopolitics the heartland, with over 200,000,000 people primarily Slavs with almost inexhaustible resources in the tundra, in the forests, and in the steppes. These people are an amazingly gifted people in art, in literature, in music, in science, and even in technology, and fundamentally a religious people.

A free Russia would be a good neighbor and contribute much to the well-being and welfare of the world, but unfortunately the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is at the moment the embodiment of every evil force loose in the world—atheism, imperialism, materialism, and exaggerated nationalism, in spite of its international program to include world wide political and economic revolution.

We saw in Germany how uncertain and how unstable is political power, particularly in a highly centralized government. We saw what could be done by a technique of refined usurpation by a group of gangsters like Hitler, Goering, and Goebbels in misdirecting the energies of the people. This is very much the situation in Russia today. It is dominated by a group of doctrinaire Communists who have control of the political organs of the state. The dominant ideology of this ruling group is destructive of all human values and of democratic processes. This politically immature nation passing from an agrarianism to a forced industrialization in a short period of time is the victim of what we saw in Germany—the four horsemen of the apocalypse getting ready to put out the lights of reason and good will on the highways of the world in order to let its plundering bands loose in the interest of a predatory imperialism seeking world dominion. Its agents are now operating both openly and subversively in the victim nations, i. e., the rest of the world. That the Soviet leadership is more subtle, more practical, more cunning, and less impatient in promoting its program of expropriation and dominion, makes it even more dangerous than the Hitler regime.

We have seen on the world stage in the meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Great Powers, the effrontery, the insolence, the contumacy of the Soviet's representatives in their stalling maneuvers, with their self-contradiction, their false accusations, and their delaying counterproposals. They are willing, as General Marshall says, to let the patient—Europe or Germany, the world or Christian civilization, as you choose to put it—die while the doctors consult. The Russian delay tactics are, as Generalissimo Stalin says, merely reconnaissance expeditions as a basis of compromise, or the tactics of exhaustion and attrition hoping for concessions out of hopelessness. But meanwhile the world drifts more and more into confusion, uncertainty, starvation, conflict—which is the seedbed of world revolution. It is the Soviet's gain either way.

III

Things are in the saddle, said Emerson, and the progressive deterioration of our society before our very eyes is the evolving result. It has been going on for four centuries but with greater momentum in the last century.

The machine has extended its range, its cunning and it automatism and has produced the amazing comforts and conveniences which we know and enjoy, and praise highly for what they are not—intellectual, moral, or spiritual gains. The sociologists were deceived and so were the educators. The sociologists rationalized these gains of industrialism into the now bankrupt theory of inevitable progress. It remains a casualty of man's reason as a part of the sociological mythology of the later nineteenth and earlier twentieth century. Our science has gone forward with leaps and bounds in its discoveries of the innermost forces and energies of matter of the universe revealing on the one hand God's amazing designs, and on the other, man's incapacity—to use these discovered forces and energies for benevolence rather than for destruction, for civilization rather than for barbarism, for life rather than for death, for peace among the nations of the world rather than as a means of world destruction.

In a free world, freedom of speech and freedom of thought are possible and desirable—they help make a free world, a necessary condition of a dynamic civilization aiming at a fuller, richer life. But in the world in which we live we have the loaded dice of perverted propaganda and organization, and the manipulators cry loudly for freedom in order to destroy the very freedom they invoke. It is pleasant to quote and to be elevated in spirit as we hear such lines as Bryant's quoted:

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again;
Th' eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes in pain
And dies among his worshippers."

Admirable as is the sentiment such statements are likely to be narcotic. In World War II we came too dangerously near seeing every genuinely human value of our civilization lost in the barbarism of what was probably the most schooled nation of the world. In the infamy of barbarism and the perversion of government there will have been no blacker crime against civilization than Oscewin, Buchenwald, Dachau, and Lidice.

In every country Communists with the loaded dice of infiltration and propaganda are destroying the very things they claim they aspire to achieve by their use as shibboleth of the great moving terms of modern life, humanity, liberty, freedom, and democracy, by their amazingly efficient techniques as well as by their cunning and ruthlessness. Only as things happen and are thus past correction will the dupes know that they have been duped and will there stand revealed the duplicity of their leaders and guides now convulsed in mocking laughter at the success of their deceit and their hypocrisy. How carefully planned, how adroitly managed, how simple the first steps of the process of betrayal are is spelt out in all the planned cunning of the Soviet spy ring in Ottawa, Canada, so well documented through the heroism and intelligence of the code-clerk Ignor Gouzenko. It is no wonder that governments in self-protection are outlawing Communist parties and forbidding the employment of Communists as public employees, though as political typhoid Marys they are loose in the community.

IV

The fundamental difficulty has come about in modern society in a major degree by the central place which economics, including technology, has taken in our thinking and in our lives. The older agricultural economy with its dispersed population, its individualism, its relatively simple life, laissez faire and a state aiming principally at order was adequate. An overall moral and spiritual order was accepted or acquiesced in and was central in the social order—sometimes unconsciously using the spiritual capital of the past.

With the political revolutions of the late eighteenth century and the industrial revolution, the relation of a moral and spiritual order and the economic and social order began to change and a sharp line of separation—even of divorce—resulted. This was the accentuation of forces that had been gathering momentum for four centuries. It was further intensified by the World Wars

in the twentieth century. Now they have reached the period of explosive confusion and disintegration. Depressions, strikes, and wars were the unexpected fulfillment of rosy dreams of the days of liberalism. The whole problem of civilization has to be faced, no mere patchwork will do to meet the fragmentations of man's life and, what has been aptly called, by Toynbee, an internal schism of the soul.

The menace of atheistic communism engineered by the cunning plotting of the Third International as the agent of the new Soviet Russia with its enormous world prestige and extraordinary military power is great. This is so, not because of the wisdom or insight of their ideology, nor because of their pretense of service to humanity, nor because of their program for the dictatorship of the proletariat as the most decisive and revolutionary form of the class struggle. It is because of the confusion of the economic order, the creation of the bogies of capitalism, as well as the admitted evils of an exploiting capitalism, the promotion of the class struggle as against cooperation, that the contemporary situation is such a fertile seed ground for the diabolic designs of the communistic leadership.

Social change or economic change in itself is not an evil, it may be the necessary release from old oppressions, exploitations, or limitations. We the beneficiaries of the American Revolution cannot regard revolution as an evil or taboo, particularly as we assert in the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

We need the reassertion of the universality of the moral law—the law of God—over all the affairs of men, particularly the economic affairs. We need to unify man's outlook on life—individual life, social life, and the life of nations.

We need today a revolution in our values, our purposes, and our meanings. We need a reassertion of the spiritual nature of man, the achievements of new personality, a fresh view of life. We need moral and spiritual revolution renouncing our materialism, our racialisms, and man's inhumanity to man. We need spiritual renewal and spiritual renovation.

V

One of the strange things that develops in a crisis is what has been called the betrayal of the intellectuals—la trahison des clercs. The manifesto of the German intellectuals in World War I is an illustration of this. How readily the body of professors of the great German universities—with notable exceptions—succumbed to the blandishments—and ultimately terror—of the Nazis is another illustration. Still another illustration is the success of the Communists among university teachers, as shown notably in the Canadian spy ring, and too frequently on our college campuses. These are all illustrations of what is meant by the betrayal of the intellectuals. This is the group from whom we should expect the most ready perception of the errors and wiles, deceits and hypocrisies, of the pseudo science, pseudo history, ersatz philosophy and religion of those who would undermine civilization, but instead we find as a matter of fact they are the most gullible promoters. The intellectual minute men of our social destiny fail us. It is, therefore, of special interest that college people properly trained should play their part in the defense and development of their country and their civilization. Reason is not enough, without discipline, without responsibility, without character.

VI

There are some things in the present situation that we might very well look to the college graduate who has been properly trained to defend. There is one very obvious tendency in government that furnishes a ready means for betrayal and usurpation and a dubious paternalism. It is the increasing power of its central government, its widening scope, its remoteness from effective popular control, its intoxication of power, and its means of control through subsidization, and the development of the executive branch at the expense of the legislative.

It would seem the part of wisdom in a democratic government that the situs of political power should be as near to people as possible—the more remote it is the more easily possible it is of manipulation and the more complete is the control once subversive agencies take over. The simple wisdom of the maximum, do not put all your eggs in one basket, is good political practice. This is still the basis of our educational organization. It has been the pride of America that its education was primarily a State function, but a State function largely delegated to local government. It is the economic factor here that is the basis of the dangerous tendencies to increase centralization of power and of control. If we would stop turning inevitably to government to solve all our social problems and to find in ourselves the capacity for organization outside of government as well as in such movements as the cooperative agricultural movement with its one-man-one-vote policy, we could keep the problem of government within its proper sphere, and make popular control possible. This is typical of some of the practical measures that the college graduate could take if he has been prepared for his social responsibilities even on the merely social level.

VII

However, the college graduate's interest must go deeper. He must understand the very nature of government itself and particularly of the social instrument of government called the state. The propaganda of the Communist is definitely to make the state central in life. There is a whole lot of diffused opinion which, whatever its philosophy, has the practical result of doing the same thing. The state is conceived of as an end—not a means. The state develops a paternalistic attitude and presumably takes care of all the troubles of the individual citizen. The citizen gets into the habit of turning to the state in his economic and social difficulties. The officials of the state whom we were wont to call public servants discard such a word as "servants" and develop into the familiar bureaucracies that we know not only in Europe but in this country as well. There is a legitimate field for the operation of the state—the common welfare of the citizens. It must have every support of the good citizen when it operates in its legitimate field. The danger comes when there is conceived or assumed an attitude of omnipotence and the state is expected to take the place of Providence of God and religion in the life of the people. The educated man must always keep in mind that the state is a means to an end. The end is the welfare of the individual citizen. It should operate with the consent of the governed. Its ultimate justification is what happens in the quality of the life of the individual citizen. The building of great public structures of any kind—dams, bridges, highways, theaters, social centers—the establishment of great public policies or principles of law, have significance only in their effect on the actual life of the individual citizen. The state is not, as some think, a mystic entity calling for a religious fanaticism of its own. It is merely a piece of practical political machinery that may be changed whenever the will of the people wish it and is expressed through the regular channels for decision.

VIII

The problem of the State raises a more fundamental issue: the need for an assertion of the universality of the moral law over all individuals and over all nations and over every sphere of life. One of the commonest dangers of the modern state is its disavowal of moral responsibility. Its acts are, presumably, its own justification and a philosophy called "stateism," has been elaborated which justifies this conception of the state. The great need in connection with the theory of the state is, to put it most simply, the effective assertion that politics is subordinate to ethics. In the actual operation of the economic, political, and social activities there is need for a binding acceptance by the actors of their responsibility to the moral law and to spiritual values. It is part of the technique for the advancement of science to make the fields of economics, politics, and sociology self-contained and complete within themselves. But this is true only for the purposes of study and only as an instrument for the intellectual advancement of the science. The moment a science is to be translated into the practical fields of human life the intellectual organization needs reinstatement into experience or else its limited vision may be dangerous to human welfare. To talk about the "economic man" in the study of economics is all right so long as you keep your assumptions clear, but the moment you get into the field of human life there is no such thing as an "economic man." Man may be, as Aristotle said, a political animal but he is not merely a political animal in his life as a citizen. The conception of the totality or completeness of human life needs to replace the divisive and partial views which the blinders of science reveal regarding man. He is essentially and primarily a moral being—a son of God. He is concerned with the meaning of life, its values, its purpose. These are the things that must be central in his actual living as well as in his practical thinking about his relations to himself, to his neighbor, to his God.

You will be tested. Think not that the temptations of Christ in the desert are not your temptations. They will be part of your life in the world every day. And the old Satan will offer in its most enticing form for you all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them if falling down you will worship him. The avarice and the pride and the concupiscence of men are falling for the satanic temptations, but you must remember the great principle of life—the Lord thy God shalt thou adore and Him only shalt thou worship.

It is your part in the active participation of the life of the community—as well as in every phase of your individual life to assert that the life is more than the meat and the body more than the raiment. The supremacy and universality of the moral law must be affirmed in the economic and political life and we must denounce betrayal of trust, in the political life or greed or exploitation in the economic life of Catholics as we would anyone else. We must not remain neutral, or silent on moral issues. The great need is for spiritual renewal, for a new affirmation of spiritual values, for meaning and significance in life. The test of your education in all its aspects, intellectual, moral, and religious, will be the revelation in your life of this educational insight: If you would understand the doctrine you must live the life.

How you live is the test of whether you were taught in these hallowed halls how to live. I wish you Godspeed as you go forth to the test.

Do the Russian People Share the Beliefs of Their Leaders?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, John Knight, the owner and editor of the Miami Herald and other newspapers, writes every Sunday excellent editorials dealing with the problems of the day insofar as the Nation and the world are concerned. While I do not agree with all of them, they are, nevertheless, pertinent and provocative and do a lot of good down in our section of the country.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to introduce his editorial for Sunday, July 6, which is entitled "Do the Russian People Share the Beliefs of Their Leaders?" To my way of thinking this is an excellent editorial on the relationship—present and future—between Russia and the United States. I am confident that a consideration of it will help clear up the thought of many of us on the problem of what our present international situation is and what we might expect:

DO THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE SHARE THE BELIEFS OF THEIR LEADERS?

One wonders what line the Russia Firsters in this country will adopt following the tragic collapse of the European Big Three conference at Paris.

For a time Henry Wallace and Senator CLAUDE PEPPER had a good many people believing that it was all our fault whenever Russia refused to cooperate with other world powers.

Foreign Minister Molotov's sharp refusal to participate in the Marshall plan for European reconstruction must be disillusioning indeed to followers of the Wallace-Pepper appeasement school.

Ever since the end of the war, the Russian record has been one of noncooperation, obstruction, evasion, and defiance.

Yet we have tried every possible approach to the Russians and made every concession in an earnest endeavor to find the basis upon which the United States, Great Britain, France, and Russia could work together to guarantee a lasting peace and assure the economic recovery of a stricken Europe.

Now Mr. Molotov tells us that our proposals for rebuilding Europe "have nothing in common with the real interest of the peoples of Europe."

In Mr. Molotov's mind, their real interest would lie in the direction of a communized Europe and bringing the peoples of that unhappy continent under Soviet domination.

For the first time, Russia has been forced by Secretary of State Marshall to show her true colors. Even before any definite proposals for European rehabilitation were submitted, which probably would have been attacked as American imperialism, Russia had declared herself out.

That should end the farcical play acting at cooperating with Russia.

You can't cooperate with a bear who wants to crush the breath from your body.

So we enter a new and terribly important phase of our foreign policy. The so-called "white war" is on. This will determine whether the United States, Great Britain and France can build a western Europe bloc of nations in opposition to Russian domination of the continent.

The stakes are high but, sooner or later, years of diplomatic bluffing had to come to a showdown.

William McGaffin of the Chicago Daily News foreign service cites two pressing questions which the future must answer:

1. On whose side is time? Molotov, obviously, believes it's on Russia's side. The more Russia can delay and hamper the recovery of western Europe, the better are the chances that communism will sprout out of the mess.

Others are not so sure. They say: "If the Marshall program succeeds, there will be, as time goes on, less need for American intervention and less opportunity for Russian intervention."

2. Will Congress appropriate the huge sums required by the Marshall program? The suggested sum of $6,000,000,000 a year is equivalent to the cost of World War II, for 1 month.

Writing from London, Mr. McGaffin says the British observers believe Secretary Marshall would never have submitted his program without first having sounded out enough key figures in Congress to make sure the program had a reasonable chance of approval.

Still, our British friends may be surprised at the amount of opposition that develops to the Marshall plan in Congress although, ironically enough, the program's chances of success have been materially improved by Molotov's actions at Paris.

The Miami Herald has consistently opposed the theory communism can be stopped with dollars alone. Simply pouring out dollars buys off Communists only so long as the dollars last. The United States must continue to furnish substantial aid to western Europe but what Europe needs most of all is the will and the desire to help itself.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch suggests a number of interesting commercial possibilities if enterprise and imagination are not entirely dead in Europe. Among them are revival of the Ruhr, development of the mineral and agricultural resources of the British, French, and Dutch colonies, basic steel from Australia and India, low-cost pig iron from New South Wales, nickel from Canada and New Caledonia, bauxite from British Guiana, Surinam, South Africa and Malaya and gold to prime the pump from South Africa, Canada, and New Guinea.

Europe can find herself only if the will exists to rebuild and reshape her destinies. Simply absorbing American loans without any permanent accomplishments to show for them is a slow form of economic death.

Congress is finally on the verge of making this discovery.

The thought must have occurred to many Americans as it has to me. What of the Russian people? Do they share their leaders' beliefs? How much do they know?

The current issue of Time carries a remarkably good article on the Russian people by their correspondent, Samuel Welles.

"When you write about Russia," a woman interpreter told Welles, "you will have your own opinions but write with the heart. We don't want any more war. We had enough. Remember the terrible destruction we suffered and the pale faces of our children. Write with the heart."

Welles says that to consider Russia "with the heart" means to sense two stories—the story of her great warm people, and the story of the cold bureaucracy of lies and murder which grips the people's lives.

Welles' article leaves the impression of a friendly, docile people living a drab, rather listless existence under the thumb of political bureaucracy and the secret police.

They are told what the government believes they should hear and their lives are regulated by government edict.

Things haven't changed a great deal in Russia since Lenin said: "One would like to caress the people, but one cannot; they bite."

We hear a great deal of uninformed twaddle in this country about the capitalistic system being on trial.

On trial for what? For making possible the best living standards in the world? For guaranteeing civil liberties and free speech? For preserving individual opportunity?

Can the communistic system provide something more attractive? Are people happier living the regimented life required of all Russian citizens?

High as prices are in the United States of America, a suit of clothes in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics costs a Russian 7 weeks' pay as against 1 week's pay for a worker in the United States.

A pair of shoes costs a Russian about 3 weeks' pay, while an American worker can buy six or eight pairs of shoes with 1 week's pay.

All foodstuffs show an even greater disparity. According to the United States News, workers in Russia are about half as well off as they were in prewar days, while United States workers are better off than before the war.

What, then, is communism's appeal in this country, especially to the young?

One can conclude only that, excluding the doctrinaires and those stimulated by the intellectual excitement of the cause, it offers a form of leadership to a confused and somewhat bewildered portion of our population who no longer want to think for themselves.

The Communists know exactly what they want, whereas democratic action is neither sustained nor consistent.

Of course, Hitler offered the same kind of absolute leadership. It exists today in some of our most powerful labor unions.

The tip-off on communism's relationship to individual freedom is contained in Lenin's remark: "One would like to caress the people, but one cannot; they bite."

And so they do, and will again, in Russia.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Control of Pollution of the Waters of the New England States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I introduced a bill, H. R. 3875, granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the control of pollution of the waters of the New England States.

I have been informed that the authorized officials of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut have executed the compact and that the Governors of these States are prepared to make their appointments to the interstate commission established by these compacts as soon as Congress sees fit to grant its consent to this compact.

I believe it would be a wise policy for this Congress to encourage the States to handle problems of this type rather than

seek a solution through Federal authority. The Council of State Governments has long urged the States to set up proper agencies, whether they be on a regional basis or otherwise, to handle problems of this type. As a result, in recent years we have seen the creation by interstate compact or reciprocal legislation of the Potomac River Compact Commission, the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River, and the Interstate Sanitation Commission in the New York area.

The New England interstate water-pollution compact has been approved by representatives of all the New England States and has been endorsed by New York State insofar as that State would be affected.

The interstate commission will classify interstate streams in accordance with the present and proposed highest use of their waters and will establish reasonable physical, chemical, and bacteriological standards of water quality deemed satisfactory for each classification of use. Interstate agreement on these matters will permit each State to require that municipal sewage and industrial wastes originating within its boundaries be treated to the degree necessary for the protection of the neighboring State without putting any of its municipalities or industries to the expense of providing a higher degree of treatment than is necessary.

It is my hope that speedy and favorable action will be taken on this bill, H R. 3875.

Hoover Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a communication on the subject of the Hoover Dam from Mr. Northcutt Ely to the editor of the Washington Post, which appeared in that newspaper on June 9, 1947.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOVER DAM
A COMMUNICATION

Mr. Ickes (communication published May 19) attacked your fine editorial of May 4 commending the restoration of the name of Hoover Dam. His letter concedes that "no one could properly dispute the legal power of the Congress to change the name of Boulder Dam. * * *" But when, in 1933, Secretary Ickes changed the name of Hoover Dam he apparently felt otherwise, because there were at that time five acts of Congress on the books so designating it. See the statement of Chairman-elect TAYLOR of the House Appropriations Committee, December 12, 1930 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 74, p. 646):

"So that the dam is now officially named by both the Secretary of the Interior and by Congress."

The last four of these acts were enacted when the Democrats controlled Congress. All five are recited on the face of the act of April 30, 1947, restoring the name to that used in those statutes.

Mr. Ickes' defense is that a bill by Senator Smoot, introduced prior to enactment of these five laws, did not pass. The fact is that Secretary Wilbur on January 13, 1930, reported to the committee: "I believe that action on the bill might well be deferred until construction has commenced, or at least until an appropriation has been provided by Congress."

Accordingly the bill was never brought up for hearings in committee, being overtaken and superseded by the act of February 14, 1931, the first appropriation act to name Hoover Dam.

Attorney General Cummings reminded Mr. Ickes of these statutes on January 21, 1935, when, in reply to Mr. Ickes' protest against the use of the name "Hoover Dam" in the pleadings in *United States* v. *Arizona* (295 U. S. 174), he wrote:

"The difficulty in this particular instance seems to grow out of the fact that, while the term 'Boulder Dam' is used as often as possible and scattered somewhat promiscuously in strategic places in the bill of complaint, nevertheless the draftsmen of that document seemed to feel it necessary in describing the dam to use the title employed by the Congress in the acts appropriating money for its construction. I believe these acts refer to the dam as 'Hoover Dam.'"

Mr. Ickes' letter says that Commissioner of Reclamation Elwood Mead reported "that there was great confusion as to the name of the dam," and asked him "to determine which name should be official." It does not profit Mr. Ickes to cast the responsibility on Dr. Mead. Actually, Commissioner Mead, on January 10, 1930, had advised Secretary Wilbur: "President Hoover's influence in shaping the Boulder Dam project makes it fitting that the dam should have his name, and the public would approve the change."

In April 1933 Commissioner Mead sent Secretary Ickes a pamphlet describing the dam for the Century of Progress Exposition, calling it Hoover Dam. Mr. Ickes sent it back with a note May 8, 1933, saying: "I would be glad if you will refer to the dam as 'Boulder Dam' in this pamphlet, as well as in correspondence and other references to the dam you may have occasion to make in the future."

Signing this memorandum was apparently all that Mr. Ickes did about the name. Although his letter to the Post says: "I decided upon 'Boulder'," and "I gave orders with reference to the name," on May 17, 1935, he wrote Congressman Treadway: "There was no Executive or administrative order issued. Therefore, I cannot supply you with one."

Mr. Ickes says that the Colorado River compact was a "mere futile and as yet unaccomplished attempt to peddle waters as between claimant States."

This compact did not peddle waters.

On December 15, 1922, Delph E. Carpenter, Colorado's commissioner, reported to the Colorado Legislature: "It (the Colorado River compact) protects our development from adverse claims on account of any great reservoir or other construction on the lower river. It removes all excuses for embargoes upon our future development and leaves us free to develop our territory in the manner and at the times our necessities may require.

The compact thus made it possible to build Hoover Dam, in the lower basin, without foreclosing the upper basin's right to put water to use decades later.

The compact designedly left to the States of each basin the internal allocation of that basin's share. The Boulder Canyon Project Act directed the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a comprehensive scheme of river development, as the basis for these local subcompacts. Mr. Ickes was Secretary of the Interior for over 12 years.

In December 1946 the State of Colorado, formally commenting on the plan prepared under Mr. Ickes' administration (released under Mr. Krug's), said:

"It (the Interior Department plan) ignores the allocations of water made by the Colorado River compact, the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the California Self-Limitation Act, and contemplates increased uses of water by existing projects and additional uses of water by projects yet to be constructed, contrary to the provisions of the compact and the above-mentioned statutes."

These two official comments from Colorado, coupled with Mr. Ickes' notion that the compact was supposed to peddle waters as between claimant States, tell their own story.

As to Mr. Ickes' general discontent, the House committee report (No. 87, 80th Cong.) on the Hoover Dam resolution, March 4, 1947, answers him:

"Herbert Hoover, while Secretary of Commerce, in 1922 presided as the representative of the Federal Government over two score meetings of the Representatives of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, for the formulation of the Colorado River compact. He had a major part in bringing the States into agreement.

"This compact, signed November 24, 1922, made construction of the dam possible by allocating the waters of the river system, between the upper and lower Colorado River basins, settling a 25-year-old controversy. The Boulder Canyon Project Act, enacted December 21, 1928, when Mr. Hoover was President-elect, ratified the compact and authorized construction of a dam in Black Canyon or Boulder Canyon, leaving to the Secretary of the Interior the choice of sites. It also laid upon him and the Secretary of the Interior extraordinary responsibilities.

"As President, Herbert Hoover took an active part in settling the engineering problems and location of the dam in Black Canyon; was required by the project act to obtain power and water contracts adequate to assure some $200,000,000 of revenues before construction was begun; settled the difficult and controversial questions involved in the allocation of the power, and make the revenue contracts which Congress required; and proclaimed the Boulder Canyon Project Act to be in effect on June 25, 1929.

"This act ratified the Colorado River compact, which Mr. Hoover had signed 7 years before, and subjected all operations of the Boulder Canyon project to that compact. He subsequently reported to Congress, through Secretary Wilbur, compliance with its mandate that this project be built on a self-liquidating basis; Congress made the necessary appropriations (in acts which five times named the dam in his honor); the construction contracts were signed under his administration, and when he left office construction had been pushed to a point where it was more than a year ahead of schedule."

Let the record say whether Mr. Ickes, on the one hand, or the American Congress and President Truman on the other, have been right in their appraisal of Mr. Hoover's services.

NORTHCUTT ELY.

WASHINGTON.

Pensions for Postmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's New York Times:

PENSIONS FOR POSTMEN

Caught in the log-jam that always piles up in Congress toward the end of a session, the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson postal retirement bill is still help up on the calendars of both Houses. As a matter of simple justice it should be voted into law.

Here in New York City some 700 retired letter carriers are eagerly hoping it will pass. It would prove a godsend to a group of forgotten men who have given Uncle Sam the best years of their lives in faithful service. If it fails, they and their families may somehow continue to exist on $23 a week, though none of them can figure how. If it passes, their annuity will be raised to $1,500 a year.

Nobody seems to have any objection to the bill. It has been favorably reported by both committees. For the first time it provides some benefits for widows and survivors. It should encourage the retirement of many superannuated postal employees who simply can't afford to quit now. It won't cost the Government anything since the working postmen themselves will pay for it with an additional 1 percent deduction from their pay checks. Civil service actuaries figure that this will more than take care of the slight pension increase. If Congress greases its wheels a little the bill will pass at this session.

Citizenship for Alien Seamen With War Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

CELLER PROPOSES CITIZENSHIP FOR ALIEN SEAMEN WITH WAR SERVICE

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York, introduced a bill today providing citizenship for aliens with 3 years of war service in the American merchant marine. Representative CELLER said the bill would enable our Nation to honor its wartime promises and pay its debts to a small but heroic group of men who bring vitally needed skills to our economy.

Aliens who served in the armed forces became eligible for naturalization after 3 months of service. Up to the present no reduction has been made in the 5-year period required for naturalization of an alien seaman, despite the fact that service under wartime conditions was extremely hazardous.

The Celler bill proposes that 3 years of maritime wartime service shall be accepted in lieu of 5 years of peacetime service. Maritime wartime service is strictly defined so that only a few hundred alien war-service seamen who saw continued service in the war theaters will be eligible for naturalization.

"It is doubtful if our rapidly expanding merchant fleet could have been manned without the skilled alien seamen recruited for service in our merchant marine," Representative CELLER said. "In addition to demonstrating great heroism and great devotion to our cause in manning vessels, many of them in the early days of the war unarmed, these skilled alien seamen helped to train and carried the additional burden of the thousands of unskilled men poured into the merchant marine during the war.

"The aliens which this bill will aid in most cases made application for immigration visas which were denied solely on the grounds that their services were needed in the United States merchant marine and that once granted they could come ashore and work. The official letters from the State Department answering these applications promised consideration after the war. However, with the cessation of hostilities quotas were immediately filled with first- and second-preference applicants and the priority given alien war-service seamen in the nonpreference group is but a pretense at honoring our wartime pledge.

"The group which my bill would aid is very small in number but its contribution to our victory was great. It is a group which will bring valuable skills to our economy. It is a proven, trustworthy group."

God Guide America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me, at this time, to bring to the notice of the House of Representatives, the prayer, God Guide America.

This prayer was the high-point of the ceremonial exercises held on the eve of Independence Day under the auspices of the United Freeport Observance, at Freeport, Long Island.

On this occasion, all segments of the people of Freeport—religious, veterans, civic, and business—joined in an unusual observance of our birth of freedom.

God Guide America is a prayer of great inspiration, of rededication of America to the moral, religious, and spiritual concepts upon which our Nation was founded.

You, Mr. Speaker, together with the President of the United States and the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, have also received this prayer, and of course it will become a part of the records of the United States House of Representatives. For all of us here, it is a reminder that as a Nation and a people we must continue to turn to God for guidance and wisdom in setting our country's course and in taking our responsible part to achieve lasting peace.

The prayer, God Guide America, and the program of ceremonies mentioned follow:

TOWARD LASTING PEACE AT HOME, ABROAD, AND IN OUR HEARTS

(Program, hymns, and prayer, united Freeport observance of Independence Day, Municipal Building, Thursday evening, July 3, 8 p. m.)

THE POWER OF PRAYER

Nobody knows the power of prayer,
But Somebody must be listening there
With a friendly ear for the heart that calls;
Someone who knows when a sparrow falls.

Miracles lie in the power of prayer;
Faith that can banish the soul's despair!
Hope that can shine like a holy light
And brighten the spirit's darkest night!

When earthly help is of no avail
There is one Friend who will never fail;
Just lift your eyes—the answer is there—
For nobody knows the power of prayer!

—*Nick Kenny.*

THE VOICES OF THE PAST SPEAK TO US TODAY, LISTEN

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.

"Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes.

"And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." (Declaration of Independence.)

"How has it happened, sir (to Washington), that we have not once hitherto thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illuminate our understandings * * * the longer I live the more convincing proof I see of this truth; God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?" (Bejamin Franklin at the Constitutional Convention.)

"It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." (Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.)

PROGRAM

Star-Spangled Banner.
Invocation---------- Rev. R. G. Harris
President, Inter-Faith Clergy Council; pastor Second Baptist Church
Program opening------ Mayor Cyril C. Ryan
The conception and purpose of the program.
Horace E. DeLisser
Chairman, United Freeport Observance Committee
Excerpts from the Delaration of Independence---------- Lester H. Baumann
American Legion, William Clinton Story Post
Historical interpretation of the Declaration of Independence--------- C. Oliver Moore
God Bless America--- Young People's Choir
Holy Reedeemer Church and assemblage
God Guide America... Martin M. Mansperger
Organizing president, Long Island Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution
Freeport's gift to the Nation----------
Rev. Wesley Haines
President, Freeport Community Council presents the prayer God Guide America to President Truman
American the Beautiful----------
Young People's Choir and assemblage
Benediction---------- Rev. John F. Drab

Thoughts to remember as we rededicate ourselves to the fundamental, moral, spiritual, and religious concepts upon which our Nation was founded, and because of which it grew great:

"I think the greatest discovery will be along spiritual lines * * * some day people will learn that material things do not bring happiness and are of little use in making men and women creative and powerful." (Charles Steinmetz.)

"I expect to pass through life but once. If therefore there be any kindness I can show, or any good thing I can do to any fellow being, let me do it now, and not defer or neglect it, for I shall not pass this way again." (William Penn.)

GOD BLESS AMERICA

God bless America, land that I love,
Stand beside her and guide her
Through the night with the light from above.

From the mountains, to the prairies,
To the ocean white with foam;
God bless America, my home sweet home.
God bless America, my home sweet home.

—*Irving Berlin.*

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL

O beautiful for spacious skies, for amber waves of grain,
For purple mountains majesties above the fruited plain!
America! America! God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood, from sea to shining sea.

O beautiful for pilgrim feet whose stern impassioned stress,
A thoroughfare for freedom beat, across the wilderness.
America! America! God mend thine ev'ry flaw,
Confirm thy soul in self-control, thy liberty in law.

O beautiful for patriot dream that sees beyond the years,
Thine alabaster cities gleam undimmed by human tears;
America! America! God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea.

—*Catherine Lee Bates, Samuel A. Ward.*

UNITED FREEPORT OBSERVANCE COMMITTEE

Inter-Faith Clergy Council: Rev. John F. Drab, Rev. R. G. Harris, Rev. Charles Hogle, Rev. Pournelle Pitts, Rabbi Simon Noveck.

The Community Council: Rev. Wesley N. Haines, Mrs. H. W. Battin.

The Board of Education: Clifton B. Smith, Harold E. Pearson.

The Village Board: Martin W. Weyrauch.

The American Legion: William H. McCloskey, Austin Montross.

Veterans of Foreign Wars: Dominic Pellicio, Theodore Allegra, Edward Gregg.

Chamber of Commerce: Horace E. DeLisser, Mrs. William J. Martin, Walter Green, Mr. William J. Martin, Harry Carman.

The committee wishes to express its appreciation to all whose interest and cooperation made this program possible.

For ourselves, the great joy, the closer friendships have already amply repaid us for anything which we might have done in producing what we hope and pray may become a pattern for future observances of our greatest of national holidays.

FREEPORT'S GIFT TO THE NATION: A PRAYER FOR LASTING PEACE

God guide America

Almighty God, from Whom cometh all human understanding, in this hour of national confusion and international disquietude, open wide, we pray Thee, the hearts and minds of all Thy people. Let not our human frailties and material longings hinder the fruits of peace. Let not our age-old lusts and cravings raise again their ugly heads above the true greatness of the Divine Spirit that is in all men. Drive out from the thoughts of each of us every last vestige of intolerance toward our fellow men, no matter what their color or creed.

Let the heart of everyone of us be filled with the realization that peace is more than just a relationship of nations; that peace is a condition of mind brought about by a serenity of soul; that lasting peace can come only to peaceful people.

Awaken all men to the desire for this inner peace, the peace that passeth all understanding; the peace that comes to all who truly turn to Thee and love Thee and to all who seek to serve their fellow men even as they serve themselves.

Reveal to us, we pray Thee, that we are all a part and an important part of this mystic universe which Thou hast created and into which Thou hast caused us to be born. Make clear to us that no man is here because Thou didst not have good reason for his being; that no man would be rich were it not for the willingness of less able men to work for him; that no laborer would find his hire were it not for the enterprise of his employer; that each of us has been equipped to serve one another according to our needs and according to our respective abilities and understanding.

Finally, dear Father, as the statesmen of the world seek the solutions of our problems in the councils of the United Nations; as we in this blessed country of ours struggle with our difficulties and our differences; as the minds and hearts and souls of mankind everywhere cry out for peace, lasting peace, teach us, we pray Thee, to seek and discern those things in which we all agree and to forego and forget those things in which we do not agree. Amen.

Re Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, today I voted against H. R. 3950, the Knutson bill, for the following reasons:

First, as was stated by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK]:

If politics were stricken from this bill, there would be nothing left in it but the enacting clause.

Second, yesterday we voted to cash the terminal-leave pay bonds of enlisted men. That will cost the Government $2,000,000,000. Today the House of Representatives has passed this tax bill and thereby reduced Government revenue by another $5,000,000,000. In 2 days time $7,000,000,000 has been taken from the Federal Treasury. Yet we still do not know what the budget figures for 1948 are, nor do we know how much revenue will be forthcoming in 1948. We do not know what our domestic or foreign commitments are. We have been asked to pass a universal military training bill, and it is estimated that will cost the Government $2,000,000,000 annually. We will be called upon to pass, and we know that we will pass, a bill to subsidize our merchant marine in order to keep it on the high seas. That will cost the Government many more millions of dollars. We are asked to subsidize various farm programs, all of which will cost many millions of dollars. We have a war debt of $258,000,000,000, and no plan has been presented whereby it will be paid off or whereby a start will be made to pay it off.

Therefore, I voted against this bill because to have voted for it would have been, in my opinion, unsound business practice and would have jeopardized our Federal economy. Of course, it would have been easy to vote for it. It is always easy and popular to vote for every appropriation and against all taxes.

Third, the bill is admittedly a hastily drawn measure, designed to give temporary tax relief until such time as our entire tax structure can be worked over and its inequities and obsolete provisions changed. This bill does not become effective until January 1, 1948, over 5 months from today. It does not make good sense to me to pass, and thereby freeze into our tax structure, an allegedly temporary measure, which is basically unfair and inequitable in that it gives great tax relief to those in high income brackets and practically no tax relief to those in low income brackets. It puts the scale of taxation for those in high income brackets back to the 1939 level but does not restore the 1939 levels for those in low-income brackets. We all admit that Federal taxes insofar as they pertain to community property States and non-community property States should be equalized. It is admitted by all the tax experts here in the Congress that the present tax system insofar as estate, gift, and corporation taxes are concerned should be changed. All agree that dependency exemptions should be raised. Yet none of this has been done in this bill H. R. 3950.

Therefore, because we have 5 months remaining between now and January 1, 1948, I think it would be wise for this Congress to stay in session and devote its energies for the next 5 months toward reworking the entire tax structure so that as of January 1, 1948, we could embark upon an intelligent, fair, and workable tax system, having some better idea of what our commitments and responsibilities are going to be. I, for one, am in favor of staying on and doing that job.

Federal Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting highly informative testimony on Federal taxation presented to the Ways and Means Committee by Mr. Don G. Mitchell, chairman, taxation committee, National Association of Manufacturers:

PROGRAM FOR FEDERAL TAX REVISION

My name is Don G. Mitchell. I am president of Sylvania Electric Products, Inc. I am also chairman of the taxation committee of the National Association of Manufacturers. This statement is made in exposition of the association's program for Federal tax revision.

My remarks will be divided in two parts. First, I will present an economic analysis of the Nation's requirements for capital formation in the immediate and the long-range future. Then, I will present the specific recommendations for tax revision to implement the findings of the preceding economic analysis. These recommendations were developed by the taxation and tax administration committees of NAM and adopted by the board of directors on June 24, 1947. A more extensive exposition and supporting statistical data in support of these recommendations are included in the full brief filed with the committee yesterday.

Four major purposes are emphasized in my statement. They are:

I. Adjustment of tax rates and tax burdens to permit needed capital formation: Our economic analysis demonstrates that the maintenance of a healthy, vigorous economy with full employment and full production requires an amount of funds for venture capital formation materially beyond

what is now possible under existing tax rates. This necessary supply of capital funds cannot be forthcoming without a thorough revision of the income-tax rates upon all individual incomes, large and small.

II. Tax relief for those with small and moderate incomes: In addition to making sure that the material basis of a strong and vigorous economy be provided by making possible a larger volume of saving and investment, it is necessary to sustain and improve the morale and the incentives of workers, investors, and managers. This can be most effectively accomplished by increasing the proportion of every income, small or large, over which the recipient has control for spending and saving. The most deadening effect upon the willingness to work, or to save and invest, is to have left, as a reward for economic effort, a trifling and inadequate reward. The present tax burdens compel everyone, regardless of the amount of income, to work a disproportionate amount of each year for the Government. A fair and reasonable program of tax reduction is one which will leave with all taxpayers a larger share of the income which they receive for their economic effort, whatever its character may be.

III. Various technical adjustments in the tax laws: The general objective of such technical adjustments as NAM would emphasize is that of securing greater recognition, in the tax law and in its administration, for the results of business accounting and for the decisions of business management. Illustrations are the treatment, for tax purposes, of depreciation, obsolescence, and some other classes of deductions from gross income, and the decisions of management with respect to the amount of earnings to be retained.

IV. Equitable adjustments in the tax laws: Illustrations of the kind of adjustment referred to here are the double taxation of dividends and the disparity of tax burden between married taxpayers in community and noncommunity property States. These and similar matters are important but in the NAM program they are relegated to a minor position by comparison with the subjects which are regarded as of primary importance. Eventually, with budget stabilization at a much lower level than at present, and with a larger need for venture capital funds, these and related topics must receive serious consideration. For the present, the relief to all taxpayers through a revision of the income tax rate scale should be the primary subject of tax revision by the Congress.

For the present, the need for additional capital formation and the promotion of individual incentives will be adequately served by a revision of the individual income tax rate scale to a rate of 12 percent on the first bracket of taxable income $0–$2,000, and a rate of 50 percent applicable at the taxable income level of $100,000 and above, together with additional deductions for insurance premiums and medical expense. Eventually, in order to assure availability of larger sums for capital formation and to provide still greater stimulus to economic motives and incentives, the rates of tax on individual incomes should be reduced below the rates proposed above.

At the time we began preparation for this appearance, there seemed no likelihood of tax legislation in 1947. Now that there is greater prospect of such an outcome, as indicated by the action on H. R. 3950, it should be pointed out that this bill, if enacted into law, would provide for those with low and moderate incomes, a substantial proportion of the tax relief which is advocated in our brief. It would not, however, go as far as we consider it necessary to go in releasing income for saving and capital formation throughout the individual income scale. The correct view to take with regard to H. R. 3950, in our opinion, is to accept it as a step in the proper direction, but to recognize that it is only a transition phase in the movement toward a more thorough revision and readjustment of individual income tax burdens such as we recommend in the accompanying tax program.

CAPITAL FORMATION AND TAXES

It is customary to approach the problem of taxes from the point of view of how much the government proposes to spend and, then, when this is determined, devise ways and means to collect the needed amount from the taxpayers of the Nation.

When the amount is small—either in dollars or as a percent of the national income—such an approach to the tax problem is economically sound. In these circumstances, the total amount collected in taxes is not enough to disrupt the economic system, and consequently the primary consideration is simply that of distributing the tax burden equitably.

But today the potential demand for funds on the part of the government has become so great and the tax burden in this nation has become so heavy, that it no longer is safe from the point of view of the future welfare of our nation and our people to think only in terms of the distribution of the tax burden.

Today the first and primary consideration must be, not how to collect so many billions of dollars, but how many billions can we afford to collect in taxes if the country is to continue to progress; if we are to continue to have full employment and full production; if our people are to continue to enjoy a steadily higher standard of living.

The tax problem of this country, we submit, therefore becomes one now of substantial relief for all the people from the crushing burden of wartime taxes, plus the maximum of assurance that this relief will be so planned as to promote the continuation of industrial and agricultural growth, prosperity for all, security for the individual, and the national strength which will mean so much to world peace in the years to come. That is why we are here proposing both a new approach to the tax problem and specific measures to implement this approach—all to the end of providing: The maximum of tax relief now to all citizens; and, the maximum of protection for all citizens against unemployment, distress and national weakness in the years immediately ahead.

To answer the question of how much this country can afford to pay in taxes, it is necessary to keep one fact constantly in mind: When government collects taxes from the people it does not reduce the total volume of buying power in the country. What happens when government takes away part of the people's income is simply that government, instead of individuals or private organizations, spends the money. In other words, taxation is, in its immediate impact, a problem, not of how much buying power there is in the economic system, but of who is to use this buying power and in what ways.

In view of this irrefutable fact is there any possible answer to the question of how much taxation our Nation can stand and still prosper?

If we are to answer the question of how much taxation we can afford, we must find some way to distinguish between that taxation which represents merely the transfer of an inescapable burden and that taxation which undermines the economic progress of the Nation. We must find some bench mark without which the Nation and our people cannot continue to progress. This bench mark must be one which would remain the same regardless of whether the Federal Government proposes to spend twenty, thirty, or forty billion dollars, and regardless of whether our national income is one hundred fifty, one hundred seventy-five, or two hundred billions dollars. In others words, we must have a bench mark which is definitive in the sense that we can say with positiveness that unless such and such is done the Nation cannot continue to grow and prosper, regardless of what else may be done.

Fortunately, there is such a bench mark. It is the amount, on the average, of each dollar of goods and services produced which, instead of being consumed, is saved and through investment is used for further production. In technical terms, this is known as "capital formation." It includes, not only machines and factories, but everything used in the productive process.

We have data on the amount of such capital formation from 1869 to the present. The data from 1869 through 1939 were compiled by the National Bureau of Economic Research. From 1909 through 1946 similar data have been compiled by the United States Department of Commerce. These two organizations have used somewhat different definitions in their studies, but when allowance is made for the differences, the results are so nearly identical as to remove any doubt as to their fundamental accuracy.

Specifically, as the following table shows, just about one-fifth of the Nation's total production must be devoted to capital formation.

Percent of gross national product devoted to capital formation

Period:	
1869–78	18.9
1874–83	18.9
1879–88	19.3
1884–93	20.8
1889–98	21.3
1894–1903	21.1
1899–1908	20.1
1904–13	19.7
1909–18	20.7
1914–23	21.7
1919–28	20.8

Source: National Bureau of Economic Research.

This capital formation has been accompanied by growth in production as shown by the following figures:

Gross national product

[In billions of dollars of 1929 purchasing power]

Period:	
1869–78	10.3
1874–83	14.8
1879–88	19.5
1884–93	23.1
1889–98	26.7
1894–1903	32.9
1899–1908	41.2
1904–13	49.8
1909–18	56.5
1914–23	64.5
1919–28	77.8

Source: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Not only has total output increased, but the product per man-hour of labor has also grown phenomenally.

This increase in productivity is a direct result of the worker being given more and better machinery and tools with which to work; that is, of capital formation.

The record of the product per man-hour in manufacturing industries since 1899 is shown in the following table:

Product per man-hour in manufacturing

[1899=100]

1899	100
1909	118
1914	137
1919	135
1921	164
1923	179
1925	200
1927	213
1929	238

Source: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Because of the increase of productivity resulting from capital formation, real wages have risen in this manner:

Real hourly earnings in manufacturing, 1869–1929

	Cents
1869	21.9
1870	23.2
1871	24.0
1872	24.1
1873	24.6
1874	24.0
1875	24.5
1876	24.8
1877	23.9
1878	23.5
1879	23.4
1880	23.5
1881	23.3
1882	22.9
1883	24.6
1884	25.9
1885	26.6
1886	26.3
1887	27.6
1888	26.9
1889	27.2
1890	27.6
1891	28.9
1892	28.5
1893	29.6
1894	29.7
1895	29.7
1896	30.0
1897	29.2
1898	29.4
1899	29.4
1900	29.2
1901	29.0
1902	29.3
1903	29.1
1904	29.4
1905	29.8
1906	29.9
1907	29.3
1908	29.7
1909	30.0
1910	29.7
1911	30.0
1912	29.5
1913	31.3
1914	31.1
1915	35.7
1916	37.1
1917	35.8
1918	37.6
1919	38.5
1920	38.9
1921	40.0
1922	40.4
1923	42.8
1924	44.8
1925	43.6
1926	43.4
1927	44.4
1928	45.8
1929	46.2

Source: Based on data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and Paul H. Douglas' Real Wages in the United States, 1890–1926.

During this 60-year period, 1869–1929, the Nation, by devoting approximately one-fifth of its output to capital formation, has been able to increase its production at an average rate of 3.8 percent per year. This is a record of achievement without equal in the history of any other nation in the world.

The record of the decade, 1929 through 1938, is equally impressive—in reverse. This was the first 10-year period in our history when the Nation did not reach a new high level of production. This also was the first 10-year period since the Civil War when capital formation fell substantially below the historical percentage previously noted.

Specifically, the record of capital formation from 1929 through 1938, as compared to what would have been necessary if the Nation had progressed at its historic rate, was as follows:

Capital deficiency: 1930 through 1938

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Private gross capital formation		Deficiency in private gross capital formation
	Actual	Required	
1929	17.6	16.9	(1)
1930	12.1	15.0	2.9
1931	6.4	12.2	5.8
1932	2.2	9.4	7.2
1933	3.3	9.3	6.0
1934	5.3	10.9	5.6
1935	6.7	12.0	5.3
1936	10.0	13.9	3.9
1937	11.6	14.9	3.3
1938	7.7	13.7	6.0

[1] Required less than actual capital formation.

Source: Computed from data of U. S. Department of Commerce.

Such a record does not mean that it was the absence of capital formation which caused the depression of the 1930's. But this record, in combination with that of the preceding 60 years, does prove beyond reasonable doubt that when there is a deficiency of capital formation the Nation neither progresses nor prospers. Or to put this conclusion in positive terms: Unless we have an adequate volume of capital formation, neither the Nation nor its people can progress and prosper; moreover, if the rate of progress is to be that enjoyed for the 60 years from 1869 through 1928, the rate of capital formation must be a certain ascertainable proportion of the gross national product.

This means that we have an excellent tool with which to approach the problem of taxation, both from the point of view of the amount which the Nation can afford, and equally the extent to which various types of taxes may safely be levied, because, as will be explained later, different types of taxes have widely different effects upon capital formation.

The first step in such an approach is to determine the amount—in dollars—of the capital formation necessary to keep the Nation moving forward at its traditional rate. In other words, how much capital formation is necessary to enable our Nation to resume its forward progress of 3.8 percent a year?

Two elements are involved in arriving at an answer to this question.

Our economic system today is not in good working order. At numerous places, in some cases because of inadequate capital replacement in past years and in other cases because of shortages and intensive operation during the war, our productive organization is in need of extensive rehabilitation. If we are to have an accurate idea of the amount of capital formation needed from here on, allowance must be made for this rehabilitation.

This is not an easy problem. The best that anyone can do is to make an intelligent estimate. And the best means for doing this is to start with the fact that, according to Department of Commerce figures, the capital formation deficiency during the past 10 years has amounted, in the aggregate, to $125,000,000,000. This $125,000,000,000 in other words, is the additional amount which would have had to be devoted to capital uses if the Nation had progressed during these years at the predepression rate.

It is not to be expected that this entire deficiency will be made up. And neither is it necessary. The mere passage of time means that, had such capital been created during the 10-year period, much of it—machines, for example—would already be worn out or obsolete. Therefore, to be on the conservative side, from the point of view of future capital needs, let us assume this passage of time eliminates the need for restoring half of the accumulated deficiency, reducing the total to some $62,500,000,000.

But making up even this amount of deficiency will take time, and again this will reduce the amount necessary. So, to allow for this, let us again be conservative and once more cut the total in about half, or to $30,000,000,000.

This, then, gives us a fair and reasonable over-all rehabilitation figure. But it leaves the question of how rapidly the capital formation for this purpose can, or will, take place.

From the point of view of the American public, the more quickly this rehabilitation is completed, the better it will be because it will mean that the Nation and our standard of living will get back on the up-trend just that much sooner. But it takes more than mere wishing to bring about such a result. It involves the whole problem of the adequacy and character of savings, the availability of supplies and the general outlook for investment. So, once again, let us be conservative and assume that this necessary rehabilitation process is extended over a 5-year period at the rate of $6,000,000,000 a year.

In making this assumption it is imperative to keep in mind that it is conservative—that it probably should be considered as the absolute minimum, and that the American people would be served well if steps could be taken to speed up this rehabilitation process.

What of the other aspect of the need for capital—the amount, aside from that for rehabilitation, which is necessary if the Nation is to resume its upward trend? This is relatively simple to determine.

As explained before, the record shows that this must be a definite percentage of the gross national product. Applying this percentage as developed by the Department of Commerce—in order to have up-to-date figures on an annual basis—we find that for this purpose we would need $36,000,000,000. This, added to the conservatively estimated need of $6,000,000,000 for rehabilitation, means that, at the minimum, it is necessary to have $42,000,000,000 of capital formation in 1947 if the Nation is to move forward at its historic rate of progress.

We can assume that in 1948 the need for rehabilitation will remain the same; which also will be true for the following 3 years. But granting we resume our forward march at the rate of 3.8 percent per year, so will the need for capital formation increase at this rate. This would mean that, while $42,000,000,000 is the minimum necessary for 1947, we must have a minimum of $43,400,000,000 in 1948. And year by year thereafter the amount will increase. Specifically, with allowance made for the completion of the rehabilitation process in 5 years, the need for capital formation over the next 10 years will be as follows:

[In billions of dollars]

1947	[1] 42
1948	[1] 43.4
1949	[1] 44.8
1950	[1] 46.3
1951	[1] 47.8
1952	43.4
1953	45.0
1954	46.7
1955	48.5
1956	50.3

[1] Years of rehabilitation.

The next step is to examine the possibility of our actually getting such a volume of capital formation. For this purpose we need to analyze four segments of the economy—because there are only four sources from which capital formation can come.

The first of these four sources is business reserves. Every year, of necessity, business

sets aside from its revenues large sums to provide for the wearing out of its productive facilities. According to the data compiled by the Department of Commerce, business thus set aside $9,600,000,000 in 1946. This provides a basis for estimating how much in the way of funds for capital formation will be provided from business reserves in future years.

Were it not for one complicating factor, we would be justified in assuming that this will be the amount of capital formation provided from this source from now on (with proper allowance, of course, for the 3.8 percent annual increase). This complicating factor is that, because of the rise of prices as compared with prewar, the machines which are bought today cost substantially more than did the machines which they replace. In estimating the future of capital formation from this source, therefore, it is imperative to make allowance for this price change—for the fact that it may cost $75,000 to replace a machine which originally cost $50,000.

Since business reserves are computed by amortizing original cost rather than replacement cost, they will be greater in future years as present assets are replaced by more expensive ones. What the difference will amount to in terms of dollars depends upon both the amount of the price increase and the speed with which replacements take place. On the basis of available data, it appears that, on the average, it is reasonable to assume a 50-percent increase for this type of item. If we allow 5 years for this increase to be fully worked into the cost of capital replacements, then we can estimate that the capital formation derived from business reserves will be as follows:

[In billions of dollars]

1947	10.8
1948	12.1
1949	13.3
1950	14.6
1951	15.9
1952	16.5
1953	17.1
1954	17.7
1955	18.4
1956	19.1

The second source of capital formation is Government. This occurs when tax collections exceed the current expenditures of Government for goods and services. The process may be viewed as one by which Government takes away from the disposable income of individuals an amount which the Government itself does not spend. As such, these excess tax collections of Government become available as a source of capital formation, and, as the data are compiled by the Department of Commerce, must be so considered.

What such excess tax collections will amount to in future years will depend, first, upon how much Government pays out in such items as financial aid to farmers or business, and, second, upon how rapidly the public debt is retired. In 1946 it appears from the national budget figures of the Department of Commerce that Government, largely through subsidies and loans, made a contribution to capital formation of $2,400,000,000.

Because of commitments already on the statute books, it would take considerable time to eliminate this source of capital formation, even should improved conditions throughout the economy convince Congress that elimination of direct Government aid is wise public policy. In view of this, it appears reasonable to assume that for a period of 5 years, Government will continue to be a source of capital formation through such activities at a gradually declining rate. If we add to this another $2,500,000,000 for annual debt retirement—compounded annually for the assumed growth of production—then government would provide the following capital formation:

[In billions of dollars]

1947	4.5
1948	4.1
1949	3.7
1950	3.3
1951	2.9
1952	3.0
1953	3.1
1954	3.2
1955	3.3
1956	3.4

If the above assumptions in regard to government as a source of savings for capital formation are to be realized, the Government must not only pursue a salutary tax policy; it must also live within the revenue provided by that tax system.

The third source of funds for capital formation is the retained earnings of corporations. To arrive at an estimate on this item, it is necessary to make assumptions on the amount of corporation profits, the volume of taxes which corporations will pay, and the amount which corporations will pay out as dividends.

The easiest of these assumptions is that on taxes. Since the purpose of this analysis is to determine how much, and what type of taxes the Nation can afford to pay, we must start with the assumption that corporation taxes will remain at present levels. Only by doing this can we carry through the analysis in such a way as to have a sound basis upon which to say what changes should be made in taxes.

The assumption on the volume of corporation profits is more tenuous, but not exceptionally so. In 1946, total corporate profits before taxes were $21,100,000,000. This was distributed: $8,600,000,000 for taxes, $6,900,000,000 for retained earnings, and $5,600,000,000 for dividends.

But in at least two particulars this $21,000,000,000 figure must be modified in thinking of the future. In the first place, according to official estimates, some $4,500,000,000 of these profits were the result of inventory appreciation, leaving only $2,500,000,000 for capital formation out of the $6,900,000,000 of retained earnings. Granting the price level remains steady from here on (as we are assuming throughout this analysis), there will not be a recurrence of such inventory appreciation profits.

The other modification which must be made in this $21,000,000,000 figure, in thinking of the future, is to allow for the increased charges for capital replacement, as noted before in the discussion on business reserves. It may be said that this is merely a matter of corporation accounting; a question of which pocket the money is put into—and that is correct. But obviously it cannot be put in both pockets. Consequently since this increase was allowed for as a source of capital formation under business reserves, it cannot also be included in corporate profits.

It is thus possible to assume (and it probably is as optimistic an estimate as anyone would care to make) that corporate profits will continue at the 1946 rate, less the two factors just mentioned, plus the accretion which would occur from the projected increase of 3.8 percent a year in production.

The final assumption, which must be made in determining what contribution to capital formation will be possible from the retained earning of corporations, is the amount of earnings which corporations may be expected to pay out in dividends. In 1946, as stated above, dividend payments amounted to $5,600,000,000. In view of the level of profits in that year it might appear reasonable to conclude that this sum, with allowance for the projected growth of production, is a generous estimate to make for the years ahead. Actually, this is far from the case.

The reason such an assumption would be quite unrealistic is that the 1946 volume of of dividends was exceptionally low, both as a percentage of the total earnings of corporations and as a share of the national income. To be specific, corporations in 1946 paid out in dividends only 42.5 percent of their earnings as against a customary average of about 80 percent during the 1920's.

The relation of dividends to national income is even more significant. During the decade of the 1920's, and again during the depressed decade of the 1930's, dividends amounted to 6 percent of the national income. In 1946 they amounted to only 3.4 percent of the national income.

Dividends are a source of income, and a payment for a contribution to the productive process, just as truly as are the wages of labor or the income of farmers. It is not reasonable, therefore, to expect the millions of stockholders in this country to settle for half of their traditional proportion of the national income any more than it is reasonable to assume that labor or farmers would settle for half of their historic share of the national income.

Instead it is only fair to assume that, in time, dividends will be restored to the prewar proportion of the national income; that, if this is not done, there will simply be a drying up of investment on the part of stockholders. Obviously such a restoration does not have to be made immediately, but unless some progress is made along this path it is probable that stockholders will become more and more wary of equity investments. So again let us be moderate and assume that, although as stated above, corporation profits stay high, the total of dividend payments will be gradually restored over a five-year period to their historic proportion of the national income.

Such, then, are what appear to us to be the reasonable assumptions to make in connection with the retained earnings of corporations as a source of capital formation.

Put together—the elimination of inventory profits, the assumed increase in dividends, and the continuation of the present corporate tax rate—these conclusions would lead to a drastic shrinkage in corporate retained earnings as indicated below:

[In billions of dollars]

1947	2.9
1948	2.0
1949	2.1
1950	.2
1951	−.6
1952	−.7
1953	−.7
1954	−.7
1955	−.7
1956	−.7

It should be repeated (since we are attempting to determine what should be done in connection with taxes) that in these estimates we have assumed that corporation taxes continue to take the same proportion of corporate income as in 1946. Should corporation taxes continue at the present rate, dividends could not be restored to their historic relation to the national income.

The final source of capital formation is individual savings. In 1946 individual savings amounted to $19,000,000,000. This amount bore approximately the same relationship to the disposable income of individuals—disposable income being total income less taxes—that the prewar record indicates is customary. As the shortages of consumer goods are eliminated it is probable that the public at large may draw somewhat more heavily upon its income and thus reduce the percent saved. On the other hand, if dividends are increased to their prewar relation to the national income, as we have assumed, this will increase the volume of savings.

It would appear reasonable to assume, therefore, that these two tendencies may pretty generally offset each other and thereby result in savings amounting to their tradi-

tional proportion of the disposable incomes of individuals. This would give us individual savings as a source of capital in the following amounts:

[In billions of dollars]

1947	19.3
1948	20.1
1949	20.6
1950	21.6
1951	22.3
1952	23.0
1953	23.8
1954	24.9
1955	25.9
1956	26.8

We are now in a position to make a direct comparison between the need for capital formation over the next several years with the sources from which such capital formation may be derived, granting present tax rates are maintained. By adding together the potential sources of capital formation—business reserves, excess tax collections by government, retained earnings of corporations, and individual savings—we get the total capital formation which would be possible under existing tax laws. By comparing this with the amount of capital formation necessary for the continued progress and prosperity of the Nation, we have a basis for saying how much additional capital formation must be provided by changes in the tax laws. This over-all comparison is as follows (in billions of dollars):

	Capital formation necessary	Amount in sight	Deficiency
1947	42.0	37.5	−4.5
1948	43.4	38.3	−5.1
1949	44.8	39.7	−5.1
1950	46.3	39.7	−6.6
1951	47.8	40.5	−7.3
1952	43.4	41.8	−1.6
1953	45.0	43.3	−1.7
1954	46.7	45.1	−1.6
1955	48.5	46.9	−1.6
1956	50.3	48.6	−1.7

At first glance this table would appear to indicate that, even without tax reform, the inadequacy of savings with which to provide our needed capital formation is a question of only the next few years. But the problem of savings in relation to capital formation is not only a matter of whether there is a sufficient volume of saving, but equally whether the savings are of the proper character to meet the particular type of capital formation needed. The above table, therefore, is only half of the story. We must now look at the character of savings in relation to the needed capital formation.

This is a problem of the distribution of those savings which their owners are willing to put only in what may be termed risk-free investments, and those savings which their owners are willing to put in more venturesome types of investment. The risk-free investments include government bonds, deposits in savings banks, insurance, and so forth, and it will be convenient to refer to the savings which are used for these purposes as nonventure savings. The other type of savings includes those put in corporate securities and unincorporated business undertakings. We shall designate these as venture savings, and our immediate task is to determine what the volume of such venture savings will be in the coming years in relation to the need for this type of capital formation.

First, let us examine the need for venture savings. At an earlier point in this analysis, we indicated what the aggregate need for capital formation will be in the coming years. We followed that with estimates of what might be obtained, under existing tax laws, from business reserves, from the excess tax collections of government, from retained earnings of corporations, and from individual savings. From the point of view of taxes in relation to the volume of venture savings the first two of these need cause no concern. The volume of business reserves is not controlled by tax rates. The amount we have assigned to excess tax collections represents a mere shift from individuals to government, and then back again, and, granting we are going to maintain a balanced budget and make a moderate regular payment on the public debt, we may assume the amounts we have given are reasonably minimum.

If we deduct these two items from the total of required capital formation, as stated earlier, we get the following amounts:

[In billions of dollars]

1947	26.7
1948	27.2
1949	27.8
1950	28.4
1951	29.0
1952	23.9
1953	24.8
1954	25.8
1955	26.8
1956	27.8

The question which we must answer is, to repeat, how much of this needed capital formation can be provided out of venture savings, and will there be enough venture savings and for this purpose?

Offhand, it might appear that the proper way to answer this question is to classify all the needed capital formation according to whether it requires venture or nonventure savings, and then to match this classification with the savings of the Nation. But a moment's thought will make it obvious that the question cannot be answered in this way. The economic system does not divide itself into such neat categories insofar as capital formation is concerned.

From the point of view of the managers of business every dollar invested in business is a "venture" and involves risk. The only difference between one dollar and another is the priority of loss, should the venture prove unsuccessful. Thus, the dollar put in through common stock is less "safe," at least theoretically, than the dollar represented by preferred stock, and so forth, through the whole gamut of possible corporation securities. In other words, the problem of analyzing the need for capital formation in terms of the adequacy of venture savings is purely a question of determining whether the needed capital formation can be converted into instruments which appeal to the holders of savings as suitable for nonventure savings or as suitable only for venture savings. The problem of matching the need for capital formation against the adequacy of venture and nonventure savings, therefore, is not a question of the use to which funds are put; it is a question of the means by which savings find their way into capital formation. When so conceived the problem which confronts us becomes comparatively simple and we have ample statistics upon which to base conclusions.

We may well start with the item of the volume of savings converted into capital formation through institutional investments—savings banks, insurance companies, and so forth. In 1946, about $5,000,000,000 of individual savings were converted into capital formation in this manner. We may assume that this rate will continue, with allowance for the projected increase of production and the national income.

Second, in 1946, individuals made a further contribution of about $4,000,000,000 to capital formation out of their savings by accepting the additional deposits created by bank loans extended to business. We may also assume that this process will be continued with the normal rate of growth.

In both these instances, although the funds received may have been used in most venturesome ways, the funds were attracted by means of instruments which are suitable for nonventure savings. Since we assume this volume of funds will continue to be attracted in this way from nonventure savings, we may properly subtract these amounts from the total of capital formation which must be related to venture savings. This reduces the totals to the following:

[In billions of dollars]

1947	17.3
1948	17.5
1949	17.7
1950	18.0
1951	18.2
1952	12.7
1953	13.2
1954	13.8
1955	14.3
1956	14.9

It is now necessary to bring in another factor. During the war business organizations piled up an enormous volume of liquid assets. With the end of hostilities, and an increasing supply of materials for private capital uses, business began to draw down these liquid assets and convert them to capital purposes. In 1946, this process was carried on to the extent of about $9,000,000,000. This again was a case of business being able to attract private savings for capital purposes through offering the holders of such savings various instruments—Government bonds, for example—which were suitable for nonventure savings.

How long can this process continue? Only for a relatively short time. Because of the rise in the price level and the increased dollar volume of sales, it may be assumed that business will find it necessary to hold twice the volume of liquid assets that it did before the war. This means that, as of the first of 1947, business only had about $30,000,000,000 of such liquid assets that it can safely dispose of. At the rate of $9,000,000,000 a year (the 1946 figure), it follows that this method of attracting nonventure savings would exhaust these liquid assets in less than 4 years. After that business will have to replace this source of funds by attracting direct investments, i. e., by venture savings of individuals or by retained earnings of corporations.

When allowance is made for the amounts of capital formation which will be provided out of nonventure savings through this reduction of liquid assets, we reduce our totals to the following—and this is the amount of capital formation which in the years ahead must be provided from venture savings and retained earnings of corporations:

[In billions of dollars]

1947	8.3
1948	8.5
1949	8.7
1950	18.0
1951	18.2
1952	12.7
1953	13.2
1954	13.8
1955	14.3
1956	14.9

With these totals established, the next question we need to face is whether there will be, under existing tax laws, enough venture savings to meet this need. This, again, is a relatively simple problem.

From two studies made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (one for 1941 and the other for 1944) on the spending and saving habits of American families, it is evident that, by and large, venture savings come only from those with incomes of $10,000 and above. Individuals with incomes less than this have savings—in the aggregate, comparatively large savings—but they are of the nonventure type.

This means that if we are to have the venture savings necessary to meet the required capital formation they must come, insofar as individual savings are concerned, largely from the savings of those with

incomes of $10,000 or more and from the retained earnings of corporations. The volume of such savings will be as follows:

[In billions of dollars]

1947	4.2
1948	4.4
1949	4.5
1950	4.8
1951	4.9
1952	5.0
1953	5.2
1954	5.4
1955	5.6
1956	5.8

All retained earnings of corporations are, by their nature, venture savings. At an earlier point we already have estimated what these retained earnings will be, if present taxes are continued. Adding these to the venture savings of individuals as just given results in the following as the total of venture savings which the Nation would have under existing tax laws:

[In billions of dollars]

1947	7.1
1948	6.4
1949	6.6
1950	5.0
1951	4.3
1952	4.3
1953	4.5
1954	4.7
1955	4.9
1956	5.1

By comparing these totals with the volume of capital formation which must be financed out of venture savings, we arrive at a conclusion on the magnitude of the problem which confronts the Nation from the point of view of assuring an adequacy of venture savings. This comparison is as follows:

[In billions of dollars]

	Capital formation to be financed from venture savings	Venture savings under present taxes	Deficiency
1947	8.3	7.1	1.2
1948	8.5	6.4	2.1
1949	8.7	6.6	2.1
1950	18.0	5.0	13.0
1951	18.2	4.3	13.9
1952	12.7	4.3	8.4
1953	13.2	4.5	8.7
1954	13.8	4.7	9.1
1955	14.3	4.9	9.4
1956	14.9	5.1	9.8

This completes the second half of the problem of capital formation and savings. The first half, it will be recalled, was a comparison of the necessary capital formation with overall savings. This second half has carried the analysis to the point of determining whether, regardless of the total, we would have enough venture savings to provide for the continued growth of the Nation and assure "a better tomorrow for everybody."

Putting these two halves together gives the following as the deficiency, first in total savings, and second in venture savings, which would confront the Nation if no changes were made in present tax laws:

[In billions of dollars]

	Deficiency in total savings	Deficiency in venture savings
1947	4.5	1.2
1948	5.1	2.1
1949	5.1	2.1
1950	6.6	13.0
1951	7.3	13.9
1952	1.6	8.4
1953	1.7	8.7
1954	1.6	9.1
1955	1.6	9.4
1956	1.7	9.8

To summarize this table in words, the tax problem, as it relates to savings and capital formation, is for the next 3 years primarily a question of making possible an adequate over-all volume of savings. After 3 years, or starting in 1950, the major problem will be one of making possible an adequate volume of venture savings.

One final point needs to be analyzed for the completion of this approach to the tax problem. This is to appraise the effects of various types of taxes on savings and capital formation.

It will be sufficient for the present purpose to consider three general types of taxes: (1) Individual income taxes; (2) excise taxes; (3) corporation income taxes. In each case the question we must answer is how much of such a tax comes out of money which otherwise would have been spent for consumption and how much comes out of what otherwise would have been saved? or, to state the question another way: If each of these taxes were reduced by, say, $1,000,000,000, how much of the billion will be spent for consumption and how much will be saved, and hence available for capital formation?

First, individual income taxes: Our conclusion here is based upon the two studies, which we previously mentioned, made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the spending and saving habits of American families of various income groups. These statistics are much less complete than one might wish, and a substantial amount of interpolation is necessary to convert them to the present purpose. Nonetheless, on the basis of these studies, it is our judgment that—

On incomes below $5,000 the personal income-tax dollar represents 80 cents that would otherwise be spent on consumption and 20 cents that would otherwise be saved;

On incomes from $5,000 to $10,000 the tax dollar represents 40 cents of consumption and 60 cents of savings; and

On incomes above $10,000 the tax dollar represents 20 cents of consumption and 80 cents of savings.

In drawing such conclusions it is not our contention that these percentages apply to every person within the indicated income bracket. These are merely general averages for the various groups which, on the basis of the Bureau of Labor Statistics studies, are reasonably accurate and hence provide a basis for appraising the effect upon capital formation of any proposed changes in the individual income tax.

Excise taxes are a different type of problem. Excise taxes are levied on each unit of the taxed item. Thus, in general, they have the effect of increasing the price of the article by the amount of the tax. In order to estimate the effects of excise taxes on spending and saving it is necessary to arrive at a conclusion as to the amount of the taxed articles bought by different income groups. We must then determine what this amounts to on the basis of the distribution of incomes within these groups as between spending and saving.

To make a thorough analysis of this kind would be an enormous statistical undertaking, and we have not attempted it. Rather, we have drawn a conclusion on the basis of various established generalities. This conclusion is that excise taxes as a whole come 75 percent from funds that otherwise would be spent and 25 percent from funds that otherwise would be saved.

Corporation income taxes offer still a third type of complexity. This is because of the question as to what degree, if any, such taxes are passed on to consumers in the form of higher prices.

Looked at from a purely theoretical point of view one would say that no part of such corporation taxes are passed on to consumers. The reasoning leading to this conclusion is that since the price of an article is fixed by the cost of production of the marginal producer, and since the marginal producer does not pay a corporation income tax for the simple reason that he has no income, then clearly the price is no higher than it would be if the more efficient producers did not have to pay a tax on their profits.

That is the theoretical view. It has the support of probably the majority of experts in this field. But it is proper to note that not all competent students of this problem accept this view. Some go to the opposite extreme and maintain that corporation income taxes are virtually all shifted to consumers. They say that if corporation income taxes were removed it would be only a matter of time until the aggregate price of the products of corporations would be reduced by the amount of the tax reduction.

Since this problem does not lend itself to statistical determination, we will not attempt to resolve this controversy. Rather, it seems to us that, for the present purpose, the wise course is to accept the argument that such taxes are, in the final analysis, a burden on corporation profits, rather than assume that they are a hidden tax which is paid by consumers. Such a conclusion necessitates the minimum of tax reduction to provide a given volume of capital formation. In other words, by assuming that corporation income taxes are in reality a burden on corporation profits, we need reduce such taxes only $1,000,000,000 to provide $1,000,000,000 of capital formation (granting the corporation retains the billion rather than paying it out in dividends). By comparison, were we to assume that 50 percent of such corporation income taxes are shifted to consumers, we would have to reduce these taxes by $2,000,000,000 in order to realize $1,000,000,000 of capital formation.

By relating these conclusions to what we have explained earlier as to the source of venture savings, we get the following conclusions:

	From spending	From saving	
		Nonventure	Venture
Tax on individual income of below $5,000	80	20	0
$5,000 to $10,000	40	60	0
$10,000 and above	20	0	80
Excise taxes	75	22	3
Corporation income taxes	0	0	100

To interpret this table in terms of savings and capital formation, if taxes were reduced by $1,000,000,000 it would have the following effect upon the volume of nonventure and venture savings:

[In billions of dollars]

	Increase from $1,000,000,000 tax reduction on saving	
	Nonventure	Venture
Tax on individual income of—		
Below $5,000	200,000	0
$5,000 to $10,000	600,000	0
$10,000 and above	0	800,000
Excise taxes	220,000	30,000
Corporation income taxes	0	1,000,000

There is one final point which we feel it is important to emphasize. This is that, although we have been quite specific in giving figures, we do not claim definitive accuracy for our estimates. In such an analysis as this, dealing exclusively with future developments, the best that anyone can do is to use the authoritative data which are available and, on the basis of this, make what appear to be the most reasonable estimates as to the future.

That has been the procedure we have followed throughout this study, and at every point we have attempted to explain fully the assumptions we have made and the reasons for making them. Because of this we are convinced that the conclusions we have drawn are as accurate as are possible today.

We are further convinced that only by such an approach as we have made in this study is it possible to have a sound basis upon which to make those changes in the tax structure which are imperative for the continued prosperity and growing welfare of the people of this Nation. In spite of the obvious risks involved in attempting to make such predictions as we have given, therefore, we urge that Congress carefully weight the conclusions we have presented, in order that we truly may have a better tomorrow for everybody.

NAM PROGRAM FOR SPECIFIC FEDERAL TAX REVISION

The National Association of Manufacturers has approached the problem of specific changes in the Federal tax law from the viewpoint that there are two major objectives to be served by such revision. One is the introduction of tax changes which will be of greatest significance for the smooth operation of the economy at high levels of employment, production, and income in the years to come as set forth in the prepared statement before you and as I have just explained by means of the key charts you have seen. The other is the maintenance of budgetary balance, to be established at as low a level as can be achieved through the practice of rigorous economy in the operation of the Federal services.

With respect to our first major objective, NAM recognizes that tax rates and tax burdens are too heavy throughout the Federal tax system. These rates represent the extreme exactions from the people that were necessary during the peak of the war effort. It would be invigorating if sweeping reductions could be made throughout the entire area of Federal taxation. The budgetary requirements are such, however, as to preclude widespread tax reduction at the present time.

Consistent with the second of these objectives—the maintenance of a budgetary balance—NAM recommends that there should be a diversified, flexible, Federal tax system. It is essential that the present extreme emphasis upon the net income taxes, individual and corporate, be modified in favor of a broader tax base, including a substantial contribution from excise or other taxes based upon consumption, for the reason that the sharp shrinkage of the yield from net income taxes under recession or depression conditions would tend to make renewed deficit financing necessary otherwise. NAM favors a regular and consistent policy of debt reduction, but there is little to be gained from a general fiscal policy so badly designed and so badly managed as to lead to the loss, during a depression, of all the ground gained in debt reduction during prosperous years.

In formulating recommendations for early consideration by your committee, it was necessary, therefore, to make a choice among the various major fields of Federal taxation. Our decision is that the individual income tax should be given first priority, for the following reasons.

First, the individual income tax affects more income recipients than any other Federal tax, and it affects them directly and inexorably, insofar as they have taxable income. They are permitted no choice, such as is available under the excise taxes, as to whether or not they will pay the tax.

Second, the individual income tax diminishes directly and, at present rates, severely, the income which the people can take home after their economic effort as workers, or managers, or investors. Hence it has a direct and serious effect upon economic motives and incentives which constitute the driving force in our economy. It is our judgment that there will be a greater release of productive energy by reducing the individual income tax than can be developed by the reduction of any other Federal tax.

As the representatives of American industry, we are convinced that the present corporation tax rate is too high, and that it should eventually be brought down. We hold a similar view with regard to many of the excise taxes. But we recognize that neither the corporation tax nor the excise taxes impinge as directly or as forcibly upon the economic attitudes of the citizens—their willingness to work, to save and invest, to take risks—as does the individual income tax. Therefore we are proposing first priority for this tax in the coming revision, because of a conviction that the general good will be most effectively promoted by such action.

Third, because of its serious effect upon the individual economic motives and incentives, a lightening of the individual income-tax burden will accomplish most for the smooth operation of the economy at high levels of employment, production, and income.

We emphasize, therefore, that the tax burden must be adequately reduced throughout the income range in order to achieve the best results both for capital formation and for private rather than public consumption. The tax load is too heavy upon the small income; it is also too heavy upon the large income.

The specific program which has been developed by the taxation committee and the tax administration committee of NAM has been designed, according to our best judgment, to recognize these facts. The major provisions of this program are the following:

1. The tax-rate scale (normal tax and surtax combined) should be revised throughout so as to establish, for the present, a maximum rate of 50 percent, and a minimum rate of 12 percent, the latter being the rate applicable to the first bracket ($0–$2,000) of taxable income. Also, for the present, the maximum rate of 50 percent should apply at the taxable-income level of $100,000 and above. Eventually, with a further reduction of the Federal budget to a reasonable postwar level, it will become necessary to reduce this scale of rates still more if we are to obtain out of individual incomes the amount of savings that will be required to assure adequate capital formation.

The logic of this recommendation is that the economic incentive to gain income through any form of economic effort is definitely impaired by the fact that more than half of any portion of income must be paid in taxes. To argue that taxation in excess of 50 percent does not involve such impairment leads to the conclusion that at some point the tax rate could be 100 percent without diminishing the effort that individuals would make to push their income beyond that point.

2. The present exemptions should be retained. The reason for this position is that any increase in the exemptions, even as moderate an increase as $100, exempts large numbers of persons entirely from income-tax liability, and excludes large amounts of income from the taxable-income base. Although we have criticized the present extreme reliance that is placed upon the income taxes, it is clear that they will continue to be a significant element in the Federal tax system. Under such conditions it is important that the base of the individual income tax remain broad. The amount of tax burden placed upon the lower and moderate incomes should be reduced, and this is provided for by our proposal that the first bracket rate be lowered to 12 percent. In our opinion, however, there should not be such extensive, complete exemption from tax as there would be if the personal exemptions were increased.

3. As a further relief provision, beneficial mainly to persons with small and moderate incomes, we recommend two aditional deductions from adjusted gross income. These are:

(a) An allowance for life-insurance premiums actually paid during the taxable year by the taxpayer on his own life, to a maximum of $500;

(b) An allowance for medical expenses actually paid during the taxable year for the taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent, to a maximum of $1,250 for a single person and $2,500 for a married person, without regard to the relation of such expense to net income.

These deductions would benefit those who incur such expenses. They would constitute recognition of the voluntary effort which many make to provide for their own, or their family's future, and for their health. The proposed restrictions upon the amounts deductible would assure that the major benefit derived therefrom would inure to persons with small and moderate incomes. At a time when there is strong pressure to extend compulsory old-age insurance and compulsory health insurance, we deem it fitting and proper that this degree of recognition be given to those who are carrying their own load of insurance and health care.

Our estimates of the amount of tax reduction that would be provided under the foregoing plan are as follows, by comparison with the estimated tax liability at 1945 rates. These calculations have been made on an assumed national income of $166,000,000,000.

Distribution by net income classes of the tax reduction provided by a 12–50 percent rate scale below the estimated tax liability at 1945 rates

[In billions of dollars]

Net income classes	Tax liability at—		Tax savings at 12–50 rates
	1945 rates	12–50 rates	
0 to $5,000	9.44	5.97	3.47
$5,000 to $10,000	1.32	.86	.46
Over $10,000	6.25	3.91	2.34
Total	17.01	10.94	6.27

Tax liability at 1945 rates is estimated by the Treasury in hearings before the Senate Finance Committee on H. R. 1, page 30.

No data are available whereby a distribution might be made of the additional tax savings resulting from the proposed deductions for insurance premiums and medical expenses. We estimate the total of such savings at $645,000,000, the bulk of which would inure to persons with small and moderate incomes.

In formulating this portion of our recommendations, we have aimed at an objective treatment designed to promote the general good rather than the special good of any group or section. We do not seek to favor either the rich or the poor, as such. Our concern is to lessen the repressive effects of heavy taxation throughout the income range, and to make it possible for everyone, regardless of his income, to have the control over a larger portion of it for his own purposes, whatever they may be. We would emphasize, however, that no permanent advantage can be established for the persons with small incomes by concentrating all tax relief at the lower end of the income scale and allowing little or none at the upper end of this scale.

Insofar as severe taxation does affect incentives—and of this there can be no doubt—the effects extend far beyond the persons who must pay the taxes. Actually, the jobs and the incomes of thousands who get only small incomes are jeopardized. The great bulk of the workers cannot create their own job opportunities. These are dependent upon decisions made and actions taken by others. When the tax load becomes so heavy as to

interfere with the decisions and actions upon which jobs depend, the burden will fall upon thousands, even millions, of persons with small incomes. It would be a short-sighted policy, affording only a short-lived advantage, to neglect the effects of heavy taxation throughout the income range.

4. The NAM program recognizes certain other matters which are important from the standpoint of equity as among individual taxpayers. One of these matters is the double taxation of dividend income, another is the situation of married taxpayers in the community-property States and the noncommunity-property States. Both of these situations should be corrected. In the program which we now place before you, they have been given a secondary place, however, for the reason that neither is a comprehensive method of tax relief which is applicable to all taxpayers. This does not diminish such inequity as may be present in the existing practices. In our view it does, however, warrant placing them lower in the priority scale than the changes which we have just outlined.

Nothing can transcend in importance the obligation to provide adequate tax relief to all taxpayers. There is no way of doing this except by a thorough revision of the tax rate scale. Therefore, while we approve, in principle, of steps which would correct such inequities as may result from the present treatment of dividend income and from the operation of the community property rule in certain States, we conclude that these matters should be deferred until further reduction of the budget will permit the additional loss of revenue that would be involved.

We estimate that, at the proposed rate scale of 12 percent to 50 percent, the division of incomes would cost $500,000,000, and a credit for the tax on dividends at the first bracket rate would cost $764,000,000, or a total of $1,264,000,000. Since this relief would go principally to persons with the larger incomes, we are unable to justify the additional revenue loss for the present in view of the amount of tax saving that it is now possible to accord to those with small and moderate incomes.

5. The NAM tax program also deals with certain matters of corporation income taxation. The subject of most concern to business men, namely the rate of tax is not pressed for the present, but emphasis is laid on the obvious proposition that as the Federal budget is brought down, this rate should be reduced. We do recommend the elimination of tax on any part of intercorporate dividends, and the removal of the 2-percent-penalty tax on consolidated returns. Neither of these changes would affect the total revenues materially.

Our recommendation of greatest significance in the corporation area of Federal taxation is a change of policy with respect to the interpretation and application of section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code. We share the view that has been expressed by other groups to the effect that, except for the closely-held companies, family corporations, and the like, the decisions of management should be accorded greater recognition and weight as to the amount of earnings to be retained. We do not agree that in the case of the corporations with widely distributed stock ownership, there is any general disposition on the part of management to withhold earnings with a view to shielding stockholders from surtax. We recognize the need of retaining the authority which the Bureau now has to investigate suspicious cases, but we hold that there should be a definite burden on the Bureau to establish an improper motive.

We recommend that some plan be devised whereby the notch provision for the taxation of corporate incomes between $25,000 and $50,000 be smoothed out so as to remove the barrier of the 53 percent rate. The present arrangement is mathematically correct, but it is definitely not convincing to a business manager who must face the hurdle of the 53 percent rate as the income of his company rises from $25,000 toward $50,000.

We have also recommended that steps be taken to restore the stock options as a useful means of enlisting and retaining competent managerial personnel.

Finally, we have proposed that where a nonprofit corporation such as a foundation or a research laboratory goes beyond the purposes which originally justified exemption from Federal tax and engages in the actual operation or management of a business enterprise which results in a profit, the exemption would not apply to the income so obtained.

There are also, in the NAM program, certain recommendations affecting both corporate and individual income taxpayers. One of these is that greater recognition be given to the results of business accounting in the determination of business net income. The difficulties which many taxpayers have had over differences of procedure with respect to depreciation, obsolescence, promotional expenditures, salary and pension determination are thoroughly familiar to the members of your committee. We believe that much could be accomplished in establishing better relations between the Government and the taxpayers by greater acceptance of the results of some standard, generally accepted accounting practice in these matters.

A second matter of general concern to all taxpayers is the treatment of business net losses. We recommend a 6 year carry-forward of net losses in lieu of the present rule. Our reason is that carry-backs involve refunds, which may be embarrassing from a budgetary standpoint, and are very likely to be troublesome in other ways for both the Treasury and the taxpayer.

We recommend that the existing tax treatment of capital gains and losses be continued, but with a substantially lower rate on long-term capital gains. Such an adjustment would be logical if our recommendation for a first bracket rate of 12 percent be adopted, for the only basis by which to determine what would be a proper rate of tax on such gains is by reference to the tax rate scale applicable to income in general. If the present rate of 25 percent is reasonable when the first bracket rate has ranged from 20 percent to 23 percent, then at a 12 percent rate there is a case for reduction.

With respect to the excise taxes, our general position is that there should be a substantial degree of reliance upon such taxes in order to assure greater stability for the Federal revenues, particularly in those periods in which the net income taxes tend to disintegrate. The existing system of excise rates is a product of the strain of war financing, and there is general recognition of the disparities that were unavoidable during the emergency. We recommend that there should be some adjustment of excise rates in order to diminish these inequalities and discriminations, and further, that if a broadening of the excise system should become necessary in order to sustain the Federal revenues and protect the budget, care should be taken to assure reasonable equality of treatment among producers of competing products and among the consumers of different products. Minor classes of taxable objects, yielding only a negligible revenue, would be eliminated except where police control or regulation warrants retention of the tax.

Our principal recommendation with respect to the estate and gift taxes is that eventually the Federal Government retire from this field of taxation, leaving it to the States. This tax was developed by the States, and for some of them it is an important source of revenue. Federal relinquishment would be a step toward solution of the Federal-State problem of duplicate and overlapping taxation. In the meantime, the rates of tax should be eased and exemptions increased, in order to diminish the emphasis which the present rates unavoidably give to the nonfiscal, social purpose of equalizing wealth in this tax.

The NAM program concludes with a brief recommendation regarding the procedure to be followed in drafting and promulgating interpretative regulations. Again our concern is with the promotion of better feeling and better relations between the Government and the taxpayers. It is well known that in the past, regulations have been drafted and enforced which, in the opinion of many taxpayers, constitute an interpretation of the tax law not intended by the Congress. We believe that a review of such regulations, before promulgation, by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, would assure more faithful interpretation of the tax laws and make for better relations all around in the administration of our complicated tax system.

A Program for Federal Tax Revision

(Adopted on June 24, 1947, by the board of directors, National Association of Manufacturers, on joint recommendation of the association's committees on taxation and tax administration)

I. General principles of tax policy

1. Unified fiscal policy: Both Federal taxes and Federal expenditures should be directly related to the needs of a healthy national economy. Tax planning must occur within the budget framework. This requires close congressional control of a unified fiscal policy as provided in the Legislation Reorganization Act of 1946.

2. Scope and flexibility of tax system: The Federal tax system should be broad in scope and flexible in application. Breadth means the use of various taxes, without undue reliance upon any one tax, both to assure revenue stability under different economic conditions and to avoid the necessity of excessive rates of tax at any point. Flexibility means capacity and readiness to shift the revenue emphasis from one tax to another as economic conditions vary.

3. Economic guides: In reducing the tax burden, primary attention should be directed to those changes which will be of greatest significance for the smooth operation of the economy at high levels of employment, production, and income. This means tax changes that will:

(a) Enable adequate capital facilities to be provided out of current income whereby employment, production, and income can be sustained at high levels;

(b) Encourage the investment of savings in capital facilities rather than being held in idleness.

4. Priority in tax revision: Reduction of the burden of individual income taxes should be a matter of first priority in Federal tax revision.

II. Detailed recommendations on tax revision

1. The individual income tax: (a) The tax burden on individual incomes should be reduced by a thorough revision of the scale of tax rates in order to:

(1) Enable all taxpayers to save more out of their incomes and thus contribute more to the fund for capital formation;

(2) Permit all taxpayers to keep and spend a greater share of their respective incomes.

(b) Tax rate revision and reduction of tax burdens must depend upon firm congressional control of the public expenditures. Assuming a conservative national income estimate of $166,000,000,000 a net Federal budget (exclusive of transfers and refunds) of $30,000,000,000, and the revenue effects of other parts of this program, it would be possible to make the following changes in the individual income tax:

(1) Reduction of the maximum tax rate (normal tax and surtax combined) to 50

percent, applicable at the taxable income level of $100,000 and above;

(2) Revision of the entire tax rate scale downward from the 50 percent maximum rate to a rate of 12 percent on the first bracket ($0–$2,000) of taxable income, and allowance of the following additional deductions from adjusted gross income:

(A) A deduction for life insurance premiums paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year on his own life to a maximum of $500;

(B) A deduction for medical expenses actually paid by the taxpayer for himself, his spouse, or a dependent, during the taxable year, up to $1,250 for a single person and $2,500 for a married person, without regard to the relation of such expense to net income.

(c) With future progress in the further reduction and stabilization of the Federal budget at a level materially less than $30,000,000,000, consideration should be given to a reduction of the individual income-tax scale below the rates proposed in paragraph b. Such reduction will become increasingly important with time in order to make available in the future a larger volume of funds for venture capital formation out of individual incomes as the present sources of business capital formation, largely liquid assets, are exhausted.

(d) No consideration should be given at this time to an increase of personal exemptions as a means of providing tax relief to individuals. The individual income tax must be levied upon a broad base because at the present and prospective level of Government expenditures it must remain an important element in the Federal fiscal system. Increased exemptions would defeat this necessity, for even at the most moderate increases over the present allowances, large numbers of persons would be exempt from tax liability and large amounts of taxable income would be excluded from the Federal income-tax base. An increase of exemptions would concentrate virtually all of the tax reduction in the lower and moderate incomes, and thus compel the retention of such high tax rates upon the remaining taxable income as to largely prevent additional saving for capital formation.

(e) Further important revisions: The following equitable adjustments also should be made as soon as budget levels permit:

(1) Dividend income: A credit against tax on dividend income at the rate paid by the corporation, such credit being subject to the limitation that it shall not reduce the individual's tax below that which would be payable on his taxable income exclusive of dividends. In the event that this provision cannot be immediately fitted into the budget framework, consideration should be given to a step in that direction by initially allowing the credit at the first bracket rate of the individual income tax (normal tax and surtax combined).

(2) Division of income: Authorization for general use of a division of income between husband and wife for reporting income and computing individual income tax.

2. The corporation income tax—(a) Nonprofit corporations: In the case of corporations not organized for profit and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, the Federal income-tax exemption privilege should be eliminated with respect to that part of their net income which is derived from the actual operation or management of business enterprise.

(b) Rate revision: As the Federal budget is brought down to a stable postwar level, the corporation tax rate should be reduced.

(c) Rates on smaller corporate income: A differential between the taxation of corporate net incomes under and over $50,000 should be continued, but the present arrangement for the adjustment of rates on incomes under $50,000, whereby a rate of 53 percent is applicable to the net income between $25,000 and $50,000, should be changed to provide a smoother transition between the lowest rate and the standard corporation rate (now 21 percent and 38 percent respectively).

(d) Intercorporate dividends: The credit for dividends received from corporations subject to the Federal income tax should be increased from 85 percent to 100 percent.

(e) Consolidated returns: The additional tax of 2 percent on the net income reported in consolidated returns should be eliminated.

(f) Undistributed earnings (sec. 102): The policy with respect to retained earnings should be changed so as to accept the decisions of management regarding the proportion of earnings to be retained. In any event, the burden should be upon the Government to establish an improper motive as to the specific amounts retained.

(g) Stock options: The usefulness of stock options as a means of securing and retaining executive personnel having been nullified by court decision and Treasury rulings, explicit statutory provisions should be adopted to cover the following points:

(1) An employee realizes no income from the purchase of stock from his employer, provided the purchase is effected or the option is granted at prices not appreciably less than the fair market value of the stock, and in no event until the stock or option is sold.

(2) An employer is not entitled to deduction for compensation paid, on account of his employee's purchase of stock under a stock purchase or stock option plan.

(3) The tax basis of the stock purchased by an employee is its actual cost to him.

3. Reforms affecting all income taxpayers.—(a) Business net income: Greater recognition should be given to the results of business accounting in determination of business net income. Examples of the areas in which managerial policy should be accorded greater weight than at present are:

(1) Depreciation and obsolescence.
(2) Expenditures for intangibles.
(3) Salary determination.
(4) Pension determination.

(b) Business net losses: Business net losses should be carried forward over a 6-year period instead of a 2-year carry-back and a 2-year carry-forward.

(c) Capital gains and losses: The tax treatment of capital gains and losses, as now provided in section 117, Internal Revenue Code, should be continued, but the rates on long-term capital gains should be substantially reduced.

4. The excises.—(a) Rate adjustment: There should be some adjustment of excise rates in order to diminish the discrimination and inequities of tax among different classes of goods. Any broadening of the system should be carefully worked out so as to establish equity between producers of competing products and as between consumers of different classes of products.

(b) Minor excises: Classes of taxable objects which produce only small receipts should be eliminated.

5. Estate and gift taxes.—(a) The ultimate goal: Estate and gift taxes ultimately should be returned to the jurisdiction of the States in order to support State revenues and as a step in the solution of the Federal-State tax problem.

(b) Interim revisions: For the present, exemptions under Federal Law should be increased, rates of tax reduced, and taxation on transfers between spouses eliminated.

(c) Survivor annuities under pension plans: The following rules with respect to survivors' annuities under pension plans should be adopted:

(1) The value of pension benefits and any death benefits paid to a survivor-beneficiary through exercise of a joint and survivor annuity option should not be subject to estate tax.

(2) There should be no gift tax by reason of the employee exercising his right under a plan to choose a joint and survivor option.

III. THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE TAX LAWS

Positive steps should be taken to insure that the Treasury interpretative regulations accord with congressional purpose and intent. Such regulations should be submitted, before promulgation, to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for comment and criticism, in order to prevent regulations widely at variance with the spirit and purpose of the law, to give them greater weight in court, and to encourage readier acceptance of them by the taxpayers.

Cooperation on Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, the terrible devastation and destruction caused by the raging floodwaters of untamed rivers throughout the Nation—and especially the Missouri and Mississippi in the Midwest—demands the immediate attention of the Congress and a high order of cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. Year after year we permit the waste of flood damage to continue without action to prevent it; year after year we bury the dead, take inventory of the losses in livestock, crops, property and industry, and give relief to those who have been made destitute by floodwaters.

This year's disastrous experience with floods makes it imperative that we immediately reexamine the entire problem of river development and control and proceed to appropriate funds sufficient to permit orderly and speedy progress toward completion of plans already authorized by the Congress.

I trust that every Member of the House will read an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Star on July 9, 1947, which is as follows:

PARTY FLOOD RESPONSIBILITY

The one clear flood control need right now is appropriations from this Congress. To get these appropriations President Truman's personal hand should be extremely important.

The President has demanded an over-all flood-control program. Since he called General Pick to Washington for a conference it shouldn't take long to put together into one program the existing but separate plans for the Missouri and Mississippi Basins.

The big thing is to get Congress to appropriate the money for the Missouri Basin program that is ready to go full speed ahead.

As the leader of the Democratic Party the President should be able to bring the MVA Senators and Congressmen to the support of adequate appropriations—now. Most of the MVA Members of Congress are Democrats and they make up one of the two main groups that are doing everything possible to obstruct flood-control appropriations.

Given the money the Army engineers can build the whole vast system of dams, flood walls, and levees within the next 7 years. Then we can laugh at the floods. On an appeal from the President the MVA advocates should be willing to support flood-control appropriations now and take a chance on

getting their form of MVA administration later. The Missouri and all its tributaries can be completely protected before anyone could reasonably hope to get an MVA bill through Congress and turn the first shovel of dirt under a new authority.

The active participation of the President should also aid the Republican Congressmen who want all-out flood control. From the Republican side the main opposition is among the Senators and Representatives who serve the private power interests. It also happens that many Congressmen who are remote from the Missouri Valley are little interested in our floods.

The Republican leadership is just as deeply involved with the party responsible as the President. It is in great regional problems of this kind that party responsibility counts.

If this part of the country is literally sold down the river it is going to find out which Members of Congress do the selling.

Most issues can be argued honestly from both sides. This one can't. The only public attempt to justify these wickedly low appropriations is the argument of economy. To see the absurdity of trying to economize with floods you need only read the report of damage made by the Midwest Research Institute.

Its survey of damage was taken over river valleys that in some places showed nothing but water for a width of 10 miles. Highways and railroads were under water so deep that the observers could see nothing but the crossbars of the telegraph poles. Rich croplands were doomed to inundation for so long that there is no hope of a late crop this year. Houses, barns, villages, and towns were under water.

Out of this survey the institute produced a conservative estimate of $127,000,000 damage in the Missouri Basin. Because it had access to existing detail maps of all these valleys it was able to measure the lost crops almost to the acre. It leaned over backward to be conservative, estimating the corn loss at 55 bushels an acre on land that, year in and year out, has averaged 75 bushels to the acre. It took no account of related losses that will be felt for the next 2 or 3 years.

Yet on this conservative basis the loss in 1 year stands at $127,000,000—enough money to have gone a long way toward permanent flood protection. Congress can stop these floods and there is no argument about it.

Purchase by RFC of Veterans' Mortgage Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 2, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, in extending the life of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation recently, the Congress failed to grant it the authority to continue the purchase of veterans' mortgage paper. As a result of this fact, the RFC no longer buys mortgage paper on veterans' homes from local banks and other financial institutions, and in turn the repercussions of this action is being felt throughout the country.

I have been informed by long-distance telephone from my own State that the financing of veterans' homes has almost reached a standstill. I am satisfied that a great blow has been dealt the program of veterans' housing as a result of this action.

To make matters even more inexplicable, this action by Congress was taken in the face of the recommendation of General Bradley, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration; urging the continuation of RFC authority to purchase veterans' mortgage paper. It was taken in the face of the recommendation of the American Legion and other great patriotic organizations which realize the vital importance of RFC in all veterans' housing programs and the need for this continuation. In fact, to show the vigor of the position of veterans' organizations, I desire to read at this point a letter written by the national housing committee chairman of the American Legion, the Honorable Richard C. Cadwallader, written to me on June 29, regarding this very matter.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *June 29, 1947.*
Representative OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR OVERTON: Gen. Omar Bradley, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, has urged that the powers of the RFC to purchase veterans' mortgage paper be continued; however, the House Committee on Banking and Currency has refused to continue this power, despite General Bradley's plea.

American Legion posts all over the country report that this will seriously endanger the chances of thousands of veterans to get a decent place to live, since no other market for the purchase of such paper seems to exist.

We will appreciate your support and advocacy of immediate extension of the RFC's power to purchase such mortgages, at least until some other Government agency can be vested with such power.

Very truly yours,
RICHARD C. CADWALLADER,
Chairman, National Housing Committee, The American Legion.

Mr. Speaker, when the bill extending the life of the RFC was before the House, I voted for a motion which would have continued the authority to purchase veterans' mortgage paper. Unfortunately, this motion was defeated by a rather heavy vote and, in doing so, the Congress dealt the veterans' housing program a very heavy blow. I hope before this Congress is adjourned action may be taken looking toward rectifying this situation and granting the power which General Bradley says is needed badly now.

Appeal for the Displaced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the hearings on the Stratton bill, H. R. 2910, I made a statement to the committee which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave granted me, together with an editorial from the Chicago Sun of recent date on the same subject.

My own statement was made, of course, before the President made his persuasive and well-timed appeal for favorable consideration of the bill; while the editorial followed the President's message.

I am indeed pleased that President Truman has again urged favorable action, and I hope that the Congress will heed his humanitarian message and complete favorable action on the bill before adjournment.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE A. J. SABATH, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM ILLINOIS, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. Chairman, as you are aware, I am, myself, the author of H. R. 464, a bill to provide for the admission of certain displaced persons to the United States for permanent residence, which I introduced on January 6, 1947.

My bill provides that a number of displaced persons equal to the total number of unused immigration quotas for all nationalities for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1947 and June 30, 1948, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence at any time prior to December 31, 1948.

The effect of this bill would be, of course, to open quotas for two current years to the tragic victims of Nazi aggression and horror in Europe and speed the task of mankind to help these frightened, starving people to build new lives.

Since my main interest is, however, in supporting any practicable and acceptable means of aiding the victims of Hitler, without regard to race, religion, or nationality, I wish to express my full support of the Stratton bill, H. R. 2910, and to urge its favorable report.

At the same time, recognizing that much of the opposition to the Stratton bill is based upon the fact that under its provision the quota is more or less set aside for the benefit of 400,000 displaced persons, I should like to point out that my bill might well prove an acceptable substitute, since it would provide only for the use of unused quotas for the 2 years in the immediate future

Let me recall that for 24 years of my 41 years in Congress I was a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of this House. Most of the present immigration laws were adopted during my service on that committee.

My attitude has been consistent. I have recognized the necessity in the modern complex world of providing some restrictions on the free flow of human migration. I have believed that criminals, the insane, public charges, and other categories of definitely undesirable immigrants should be screened out.

But I have also insisted and urged and pleaded that restrictions apply equally to all people without any discrimination based upon national or racial derivation, and that the restrictions be the minimum required for national security and international comity.

Because the entire world was the intended victim of the madman Hitler, and because the helpless, defenseless people of Germany and the European areas conquered by the Hitler armies and the Hitler ideologies were sacrificed to the benefit of the rest of the world, it is now a world responsibility to do everything within human capacity to help restore these tragic victims to useful and productive lives.

The record of these hearings has been filled with statistics, so I shall not burden you with further recapitulations of facts already known to you.

I address myself rather to the humanitarian aspects of the problem.

Traditionally, the Western Hemisphere has been the refuge of all people fleeing from religious persecution, political repression, or economic desperation. Every nation in the world, every religious cult, every racial stock, has contributed to the greatness of the United States and its sister nations in North and South America.

Immigrants have developed and made great this land. It has been the common task and the common glory of mankind. We are not crowded in this country. There are still frontiers—frontiers of land, frontiers of the mind. We can absorb easily those human beings who dream of coming to this free land from the oppression and misery they have known in Europe.

These helpless people, deprived of every opportunity of rebuilding their lives, originated in practically every one of the war-torn nations of Europe. In religious faith they are predominantly Roman Catholic; some are Greek Orthodox; some are Russian Orthodox; some are Mohammedan; between one-fifth and one-sixth are Jews. Slavic and Teutonic people predominate overwhelmingly.

Many of the refugees are women and children. I should like to remind you of the Christian invitation, "Suffer little children to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

The women and children and elderly men will, of course, go to the homes of relatives, or friends, or to the residence halls of welfare agencies which have sponsored and guaranteed their maintenance. They cannot conceivably affect the housing shortage, nor can they "threaten the employment" of American workingmen. Let me remind the committee that the stupendous total of 58,000,000 persons are gainfully employed in the United States today, and that there is no indication of a slowing up of demand for many years to come. We actually need the labor and industrial experience of the relatively few able-bodied men who would be able to come over here. The children will be received with open arms and fully supported by blood or foster relatives.

Mr. Chairman, there is a pathetic malady to which human flesh is heir. It is commonly called xenophobia. It means an irrational fear of what is strange or unknown. I suppose there is no real cure for xenophobia; but it is possible to expose to the reasonable and informed members of this committee some of the curious misconceptions of the xenophobes.

There have appeared before you in the course of these hearings some gentlemen who have been long known to me and perhaps to you. Their morbid dread of the new and the unknown is so obvious it scarcely needs my pointing up. However, I must point out to you that this dread has given rise to the most amazing misstatements or distortions of facts. This is nothing new. As far back as 1790, when the population of the United States was only three to four million souls, there was strong agitation to bar all further immigration lest those here first should be crowded out and foreign ideas brought in.

I can recollect reading, many years ago, the report of the Commission on Restriction of Immigration appointed in 1790, and reconstituted in 1810, and can, I think, recall the exact words with which the report began: "We look with apprehension on the great influx of undesirables who are filling our poorhouses and our penal institutions, overcrowding our cities, and overflowing our maritime borders."

We realize now that the findings of that commission and its fears were unjustified. The country was never harmed by immigration. On the other hand, it is conceded by every authority that immigration developed our resources, enriched our history, added vastly to our wealth, and contributed to our culture.' In every war, and especially the two World Wars, immigrants and the sons of immigrants proved their loyalty and devotion to the last full measure.

You have had before you John B. Trevor, a perennial witness before congressional committees, who has been chewing this soiled rag of xenophobia and anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism for some 40 years. You have heard the badly-mixed-up Merwyn K. Hart, who fears all things foreign except the Spanish despot, Franco, and Mussolini's corporate state. You have heard a few others of the same ilk who deal in reckless and unfounded misstatements and exaggerations to which no credence should be given by the thoughtful and unprejudiced members of your committee.

You have, from the other side, heard in support of the bill such distinguished Americans as Gen. John H. Hilldring; Justice Owen Roberts of the United States Supreme Court; William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor; the Reverend Samuel McCrea Cavert of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, speaking for the united voice of most Protestant Churches; Bishop William T. Mulloy for the Roman Catholic Church in America; my friend, Charles Rozmarek of the Polish Congress; and the Honorable Ugo Carusi, Commissioner of Immigration and spokesman for the national administration. Ten Members of Congress, including myself, have formally urged favorable consideration.

Against the statements of this great weight of authority and enlightenment, I do not believe the committee can or will give serious consideration to the narrow selfishness of the opponents.

There are no new arguments to be advanced on this subject. The question must be and will be decided on the basis of selfishness and self-defeat, or it will be decided in the beneficent light of progress and selflessness which, in the brief span of 170 years, has made this Nation the greatest power on earth.

I hope sincerely that this committee will be swayed by noble humanitarianism, supported by the facts of history.

The Stratton bill has been endorsed and recommended and urged by scores of outstanding American leaders and organizations; it is opposed only by the misguided and professional opponents of immigration, still reciting the same misstatements of a century ago. I am confident, and I hope that the committee will favorably report this bill, or an acceptable substitute which will be directed toward the same end.

I include as part of my remarks the following splendid editorial from the Chicago Sun, which speaks for itself:

APPEAL FOR THE DISPLACED

President Truman in a special message on Monday asked Congress to authorize the admission of a substantial number of Europe's displaced persons into this country. These are the 850,000 people now huddled in concentration camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy.

They are homeless without prospect of homes; they are the helpless without prospect of help. They are people, as the President said, who "because of their burning faith in the principles of freedom and democracy have suffered untold privation and hardship." They are people who for 6 years were subjected to the inhumanity of the Nazis and who never will be able to return home for fear of persecution in areas now dominated by the Communists. Their present plight suggests that they would be firmly opposed to dictatorships both of the right and of the left. Of their number 80 percent are Christians and 20 percent are Jews. More than 50 percent are women and children of whom 170,000 are below the age of 17. There are many workers in this group to fill our manpower shortages on the farm and in the factory.

At present the International Refugee Organization is assuming responsibility for these victims of the war in Europe. Our share of IRO's first-year budget of $160,000,000 has been fixed at $75,000,000. This is a stiff price to pay for the temporary expedient of maintaining refugees in internment camps. We cannot continue indefinitely on such a futile basis. It would be far cheaper for the American taxpayer if the problem were solved once and for all by resettlement of the displaced persons in new homes. This is the only possible enduring solution.

A bill now pending before Congress, introduced by WILLIAM G. STRATTON, Congressman at Large from Illinois, would accomplish this much-needed assimilation. The bill provides that refugees should be admitted at the rate of 100,000 a year for the next 4 years. The bill does not propose any fundamental change in our immigration policy. It merely proposes to make use of existing quotas which were not used during the war years.

There are now 1,000,000 unused visas which accumulated during that period. The Stratton bill asks that only 400,000 immigrants—less than one-half of this million—be permitted to enter. In most cases they would be coming to the homes of friends and relatives.

Perhaps Americans really don't care at all about the tired, the poor, and the huddled masses that the Statue of Liberty beckons. But let us remember that this country was founded and built by immigrants. Let us also remember that we are all immigrants or descendants of immigrants. And let us finally remember that only recently an immigrant by the name of Lise Meitner, who fled from Adolf Hitler, brought to these shores a vital secret of atomic fission which is capable of making refugees of all of us.

A Congress which remembers these things will act on the President's appeal before the present session ends.

Lincoln as He Was

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, of this year, the Chicago Daily Tribune reprinted its editorial dated May 23, 1860, 5 days after Lincoln's nomination. This editorial gives a true description of the living Abraham Lincoln, destined to become immortal—the greatest of all American statesmen. I am sure no one can read this editorial without increased respect for the living, human Lincoln.

Since 1860 a great deal of water has gone under the bridge. Our Nation, since then, has become the greatest and most powerful of all nations. Since then, we underwrote, entered and won two European wars. Our entry made them world wars. Whether for better or for worse no one knows.

Let us hope, in spite of doubts, that the vision of World War III on the distant horizon can yet be avoided. Let us hope, in spite of doubts, that there will arise among our own leaders, a true statesman of the integrity, the courage, and the vision of Abraham Lincoln. A

statesman who will get us out of the foreign entanglements that now threaten to engulf us.

It is with sincere appreciation and pleasure that I here include among my remarks the reprint of the Chicago Daily Tribune's editorial:

LINCOLN AS HE IS

(The editorial which follows is taken from the Tribune of May 23, 1860, 5 days after Lincoln's nomination. Joseph Medill, the editor, and his associates had striven for this result with unflagging energy for many months. The Tribune's profile of the candidate was widely reprinted at the time, for it was recognized as the work of a man who knew Lincoln as only an intimate and devoted friend could know him.)

Ten thousand inquiries will be made as to the looks, the habits, tastes, and other characteristics of Honest Old Abe. We anticipate a few of them.

Mr. Lincoln stands 6 feet and 4 inches high in his stockings. His frame is not muscular, but gaunt and wiry; his arms are long, but not unreasonably so for a person of his height; his lower limbs are not disproportionate to his body. In walking, his gait though firm is never brisk. He steps slowly and deliberately, almost always with his head inclined forward and his hands clasped behind his back. In matters of dress he is by no means precise. Always clean, he is never fashionable; he is careless but not slovenly.

In manner he is remarkably cordial and, at the same time, simple. His politeness is always sincere but never elaborate and oppressive. A warm shake of the hand and a warmer smile of recognition are his methods of greeting his friends. At rest his features, though those of a man of mark, are not such as belong to a handsome man; but when his fine dark gray eyes are lighted up by any emotion, and his features begin their play, he would be chosen from among a crowd as one who had in him not only the kindly sentiments which women love, but the heavier metal of which full grown men and Presidents are made.

His hair is black, and though thin is wiry. His head sits well on his shoulders, but beyond that it defies description. It nearer resembles that of Clay than that of Webster; but is unlike either. It is very large and phrenologically, well proportioned, betokening power in all its developments. A slightly Roman nose, a wide-cut mouth, and a dark complexion, with the appearance of having been weatherbeaten, complete the description.

In his personal habits Mr. Lincoln is as simple as a child. He loves a good dinner and eats with the appetite which goes with a great brain; but his food is plain and nutritious. He never drinks intoxicating liquors of any sort, not even a glass of wine. He is not addicted to tobacco in any of its shapes. He never was accused of a licentious act in all his life. He never uses profane language. A friend says that once, when in a towering rage in consequence of the efforts of certain parties to perpetrate a fraud on the State, he was heard to say, "They shan't do it, d——n 'em!" but beyond an expression of that kind, his bitterest feelings never carry him. He never gambles; we doubt if he ever indulges in any game of chance.

He is particulary cautious about incurring pecuniary obligations for any purpose whatever, and in debt he is never content until the score is discharged. We presume he owes no man a dollar. He never speculates. The rage for the sudden acquisition of wealth never took hold of him. His gains from his profession have been moderate, but sufficient for his purposes. While others have dreamed of gold, he has been in pursuit of knowledge.

In all his dealings he has the reputation of being generous but exact and, above all, religiously honest. He would be a bold man who would say that Abraham Lincoln ever wronged any one out of a cent or ever spent a dollar that he had not honestly earned. His struggles in early life have made him careful of money; but his generosity with his own is proverbial. He is a regular attendant upon religious worship, and tho not a communicant, is a pewholder and liberal supporter of the Presbyterian church in Springfield to which Mrs. Lincoln belongs.

He is a scrupulous teller of the truth—too exact in his notions to suit the atmosphere of Washington as it now is. His enemies may say that he tells black Republican lies; but no man ever charged that, in a professional capacity or as a citizen dealing with his neighbors, he would depart from the scriptural command. At home he lives like a gentleman of modest means and simple tastes. A good-sized house of wood, simply but tastefully furnished, surrounded by trees and flowers, is his own, and there he lives, at peace with himself, the idol of his family, and for his honesty, ability, and patriotism, the admiration of his countrymen.

If Mr. Lincoln is elected President he will carry but little that is ornamental to the White House. The country must accept his sincerity, his ability, and his honesty in the mold in which they are cast. He will not be able to make as polite a bow as Frank Pierce, but he will not commence anew the agitation of the slavery question by recommending to Congress any Kansas-Nebraska bills. He may not preside at the Presidential dinners with the ease and grace which distinguish the venerable public functionary, Mr. Buchanan; but he will not create the necessity for a Covode committee and the disgraceful revelations of Cornelius Wendell. He will take to the Presidential chair just the qualities which the country now demands to save it from impending destruction—ability that no man can question, firmness that nothing can overbear, honesty that never has been impeached, and patriotism that never despairs.

Coequal Status of Services Under Single Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION IN ANNUAL CONVENTION, JUNE 18–21, 1947, MIAMI, FLA., URGE UNIFICATION AT THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS

COEQUAL STATUS OF SERVICES UNDER SINGLE DEPARTMENT

Whereas the President of the United States has heretofore recommended to Congress integration of the Armed Forces of the United States to include Army, Navy, and Air Forces under a single department of national defense; and

Whereas the various departments have not been able to agree on a plan implementing such recommendation; and

Whereas it is the unanimous recommendation of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States that such a single department will effect unity of command, simplify personnel requirements, facilitate combined operations, economize supply procurement, and realize the maximum employment of all potentials to insure national security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States in convention assembled at Miami, Fla., June 18–21, 1947, urge the Eightieth General Congress to enact legislation carrying out the recommendation of the President of the United States for the unification of the Armed Forces of the United States with coequal status of our Army, Navy, and Air Corps under a single department of national defense.

New Coal Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD today the remarks made on Station WOL yesterday morning by my old friend, George E. Reedy. George Reedy is probably known to more Members of Congress than any other man in the newspaper world. As a newspaper man myself, it is flattering to the profession to hear the remarks made regarding his pin-point accuracies in presenting the news to his great radio audience. His discussion yesterday, although heard by a great number of Congressmen and Senators, should have been heard by all of them; therefore, I have secured a copy from Mr. Reedy and present it herewith:

The always amazing John L. Lewis has presented the southern coal operators with one of the most fantastic choices in American history. Either they must break a law—clearly spelled out by Congress—or they must close down their mines.

He is allowing no ifs, ands, or buts. Halfway measures are not enough for the shaggy-browed boss of the United Mine Workers. Either they capitulate or they go under. And he is indicating that he does not particularly care which course they follow.

The law that he is asking them to violate is the recently enacted Taft-Hartley labor bill. That measure specifically says that State laws banning closed or union shops will take precedence over any Federal statute.

Lewis insists that all the operators sign a contract which includes a closed-shop agreement. The law worries him not in the slightest. To quote one of his lieutenants: "The quicker we get that law into the courts and get it tossed out—the better."

Most of the operators, of course, do not have to worry about this situation. It is in only a few States where anti-closed-shop laws prevail that it is a problem. But there, it is keeping the operators up late at nights trying to figure out an answer.

If they sign—they are in clear violation of a law that has all the sanctity of a two-thirds vote of Congress. If they don't sign—they run the risk of a headlong clash with one of the most strong-willed men of modern times.

Apparently, no compromise is possible. The operators will be compelled to sign the contract and take it into the courts. How they will fare is something that no one can predict. It is not a pleasant prospect under any circumstances.

If this were the only question involved, some solution might be found. Apparently, however, Lewis has already found ways of making the operators break the Taft-Hartley bill. One of the most interesting has already been pointed out by HARTLEY himself.

The New Jersey Republican says that the contract between the United Mine Workers and the coal operators violates one provision of the law without any question. It is the section relating to the check-off of miners' wages for union dues.

The Taft-Hartley Act, he says, permits a check-off for dues and dues only. Yet, the coal contract permits it for assessments and initiation fees. Signing such a contract lays the mine operators open to both fine and imprisonment, he says.

It is a strange situation where men can be forced to sign legal contracts that clearly break the law. It is one which could well make the founding fathers of our Republic rub their eyes in amazement and ask themselves how well they had wrought.

Should we stop at that point, we would actually have said very little. It would be merely a question or belaboring the obvious—of beating a dead horse with a stick. We must go further to find a solution of an extremely serious problem.

It is apparent that the Taft-Hartley Act goes either too far or not far enough. No kinder interpretation can be made. Either it is a law that violates too many basic human concepts to be enforced or it is a law without enough teeth to put in a bite.

HARTLEY himself thinks it does not have enough teeth. He believes that an adequate labor law should completely ban industry-wide bargaining. On the other hand, the unions are banking on the belief that it is too much and cannot be enforced.

At the moment, it does not matter which side is right. The important thing is that the public will receive a stiff jolt in increased steel and coal prices that will be felt all along the line. Obviously, our national labor-management problems have not been solved.

That must be left to the next session of Congress. It will be faced with the problem of determining whether we took a step in the right direction or a step in the wrong direction. In either case, the task of following through is one that nobody can envy.

Nomination of Robert Franklin Jones—Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in this morning's Times-Herald, and also an editorial from the weekly newspaper called Labor, in connection with the nomination of Representative ROBERT FRANKLIN JONES to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIARS AND THEIR SPONSORS

Establishment by a Senate committee that Drew Pearson, a columnist and radio commentator, is a lying scoundrel will hardly come as a surprise. Pearson has been caught in falsehoods before and his victims have proved him a liar. His current conspiracy to blacken the name of Representative JONES of Ohio, whose nomination to the Federal Communications Commission yesterday was unanimously approved by the Senate Commerce Committee, was a particularly vicious one.

Pearson had obvious selfish motives for opposing the nomination, inasmuch as he is a member of a group trying to get control of a valuable radio license in Baltimore which the FCC had the power to give him. He confessed before the Senate committee that he thought JONES would act unfavorably on his application.

Through his column and on the radio he launched a campaign of libel against JONES, asserting that the Ohio Representative had been a member of the Black Legion, a sort of revival of the Ku Klux Klan which flourished in Michigan and Ohio some years ago. As a matter of fact, JONES had fought the Black Legion and as a county prosecutor waged a long and successful fight to extradite one of its leaders on a charge of murder.

When Pearson was required to produce proof of his allegations, he brought three witnesses before the Senate committee. One was a former inmate of an insane asylum, who had been committed there for homicidal tendencies. The second was so senile that he could not remember how he got to Washington the day before he appeared as a witness. He had served a jail term as a perjurer. The third, a CIO official and political opponent of Jones, was a confessed forger.

No court would give the slightest weight to the testimony of any one of the three. No reputable newspaper reporter would think of basing a news story on their authority. Pearson not only hunted them up in Ohio and had them brought to Washington, but also put one of them on his radio program. This witness, the former insane-asylum inmate, couldn't remember what he said on the radio except that he had read a statement given him by Pearson.

Pearson has long been notorious as a member of the smear brigade in Washington. This time he found himself caught, tried to lie out of it, and instead got himself inextricably tangled in his own falsehoods. Jones has announced that he will take action against Pearson. The Senate may also wish to have him prosecuted for perjury and the presentation of perjuring witnesses.

Pearson, however, has involved others than himself and his immediate agents. He has involved all those who have lent newspaper or radio facilities to the dissemination of his lies. These persons can hardly plead that they were caught unawares in this case. The Blue Network and the hat manufacturer who sponsored his program knew that he was a liar when they put him on the air. They apparently were willing to accept that risk in order to profit by his lies.

The same goes for the newspapers that print his column. They cannot escape responsibility for his falsehoods. As their lawyers will advise them, they have a legal responsibility, but they likewise have a moral responsibility.

A newspaper that prints Pearson's lies is just as conscienceless as Pearson.

[From Labor of July 12, 1947]

SOLON DENOUNCES PEARSON CHARGES AS LIES

Congress originates a good many queer stories, but one of the strangest broke out this week. It started when Drew Pearson, Washington columnist and radio broadcaster, and his former partner, Colonel "Bob" Allen, who lost an arm in the war, decided they should have a broadcasting station of their own.

They believed a former member of the commission, Ray C. Wakefield, of California, was favorable to them and, naturally, were pleased when President Truman nominated him for another term.

Wakefield was originally named as a Republican, but it seems he was not satisfactory to GOP leaders and the President was induced to withdraw his name and substitute Congressman ROBERT F. JONES, of Ohio, Republican.

Pearson promptly turned his guns on JONES, in radio broadcasts, in his column, and eventually before the Senate Interstate Commerce Commission, which is considering the appointment.

DECLARES PEARSON IS A LIAR

Pearson charged that JONES' father was a member of the Ku Klux Klan and that JONES himself was a member of the Black Legion, an anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic group, which has been outlawed in Michigan and other States.

Letters from CIO officials, with whom Pearson appears to be on friendly terms, were presented to the committee in support of these charges.

JONES says Pearson is a liar; that he never had anything to do with the organizations named, and that Pearson is prompted by a desire to get his hands on broadcasting rights probably worth $1,000,000.

The committee is also skeptical of Pearson's testimony. Its chairman, Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, Republican, insists that affidavits of Ohioans submitted by Pearson are phony.

It developed that the three who signed the affidavits were an admitted forger, a former inmate of a hospital for the insane, and a convicted perjurer.

Facing the Export Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission granted me at the request of our majority leader, I am including as a part of my remarks the following article from the Washington Post of July 10 entitled "Facing the Export Crisis":

FACING THE EXPORT CRISIS

(By Malvina Lindsay)

TRADE STRIKES HOME

Current whipping boy in American griping is this country's export trade. If a housewife has to pay too much for meat, if her husband can't find a certain kind of screwdriver at a store, it's all because "we're sending all our stuff to foreigners."

How are millions of such families to be set right on this widespread misconception? How are they to understand clearly the great issue this country soon must face in relation to export-import trade balance?

The very words "exports," "imports," "tariffs" cause many Americans to run to the nearest movie or soap opera. Unlike Europeans, they have not been brought up to think of world trade in connection with their bread and butter. But now, within 6 months or a year, they may find their jobs and dollars getting scarcer—not because "stuff is being sent to foreigners" but because it is not.

It may soon be even less easy to blame Europe for what we pay the butcher. For the paltry 2.3 percent of our meat supplies being purchased abroad will be cut much further by foreign countries, especially England, as their dollars dwindle.

Britain has just halted a scheduled purchase of 10,000,000 pounds of beef. Curtailed foreign purchasing leads to dwindling dollars also in the United States, the world's emporium.

The trade facts of life are pushing in on the average American family. Here are some of the stark economic realities it must consider in its future budgeting:

That the United States this year is selling abroad about twice as much as it is buying—$16,000,000,000 worth of exports, as food, machinery, coal, cotton, tools, against $8,000,000,000 (or probably less) worth of imports, as wool, clothing, food products, watches, wines.

That Europe is running out of dollars with which to buy from us the goods she needs, and we want to sell, because she has lagged in her expected recovery from war's devastation (partly because of droughts and extreme cold), and because our inflated prices are exhausting more quickly than was counted on the American dollars available to her.

That Britain will have used up its loan by some time next winter; that France, Italy, and the Netherlands will reach the bottom of their pocketbooks by January 1; that even South American countries are feeling the pinch of dollar exchange.

That this will mean sharply cut buying from abroad and a drop in our exports—followed by a drop in production and employment as ships become idle, seamen are laid off, farmers curtail crops, factories lay off men, purchasing power diminishes, other businesses draw in their horns.

That we are now sending about 10 percent of our production abroad, and that economists say a drop of even 2 to 3 percent in this would markedly affect our production, employment, prosperity. That in the boom 1920's our exports were 10 to 12 percent of total products, in the depression thirties about 6 percent.

That the poorer the rest of the world gets, the less chance we have of getting future customers for our goods; that if we expect to keep our factories, mines, and farms operating at full production we shall have to develop markets abroad—otherwise goods will pile up, we'll have a crash and Russia will say, "I told you so—a boom-and-bust nation."

That there are two ways we can bridge the gap between our exports and imports. One is by increasing our imports, by lowering tariffs and buying more foreign goods we need and don't produce successfully here. The other is by getting our sick customers back on their feet by economic aid so they can produce more, sell more, and thus earn the dollars to pay for the increasing amounts of goods we will want to export.

That good business sense, not altruism, demands that we build up a dollar exchange abroad so we may hold up our own living standards and also prevent a European drift to chaos, totalitarianism, and probably the next war.

The Free State Versus the Police State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in light of the present confused and threatening world situation, it is distinctly helpful for us all to have expressions from public men of prominence helping us to define what we mean when we speak of the present war of ideas.

In a recent commencement address at Northwestern University, delivered by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, at Evanston, Ill., on June 18, 1947, Mr. Dulles points out clearly that the big issue in the world today is the moral issue of the free state as against the police state. He says that this moral issue must be clarified. He states:

That issue is not the issue of economic communism against capitalism or state socialism against free enterprise. It is not an issue of relative national power. Those are not moral issues. The moral issue is the issue of the free state as against the police state.

Mr. President, in view of what I believe to be the importance of this address, I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the RECORD in full.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today's problems are not insoluble; they are only hard to solve. I shall speak of the international problem. The crux of that is the effort of Soviet leaders to impose widely their system of government. There is no reason to believe that that effort will stop of its own accord. If it stops, it will be only because something stops it. That something will be either violent resistance or a moral resistance so solid that to oppose it would evidently be futile. Clearly, Americans must see to it that there is a peaceful stoppage. However, the United States is in an awkward position to organize that, because, at the moment, our motives are suspect. That suspicion is found even among such historic and understanding friends as the British and French.

Soviet propaganda, endorsed by a few Americans, persistently says that we have become an aggressive nation; that we are taking advantage of the weakness of others to impose on them our own particular way of life. That propaganda is plausible because most Americans are truly proud of their country and do not hide that feeling. Our Nation has shown for 160 years, and is still showing, that a society of freedom bears good fruit—spiritual, intellectual, and material. It is America's unique productivity which today fends off death from millions throughout the world.

Because our society is so powerful and because most of us believe in it so completely, it is easy for hostile propaganda to spread fear that we will use our power to coerce others. That weakens our influence. Most of the peoples of the world feel too weak and impoverished to adopt our example, much as they may admire it. I have seen in Moscow, Berlin, Paris, and London the long lines of patient, weary people standing in queues to get the food and clothing which barely suffice to keep life going. That has been going on for about 8 years throughout much of the world. The cumulative result is a great mass of humanity which is sick, nigh unto death. To them, our country seems like a stadium where healthy people play rugged, competitive games. That may be the best way to develop physique and discipline and sharpen the faculties. But the finest athletic contests will not tempt sick people into the arena. They want to be taken care of, and in their present weakened condition they would rather have some measure of state socialism than our system of free enterprise.

Since that is so, a first phase of our quest for peace must be to restore our moral influence. The United States must make it clear, clear beyond a doubt, that it has no thought of using economic or military might to impose on others its particular way of life. Unless we do make that clear, we shall not be able to assume moral leadership in the world. Rather, we shall be shunned and dangerously isolated.

Fortunately, there should be no difficulty in making our position clear. Our society is a society of difference and of experimentation. It encourages individuals to think and believe as their minds, conscience, and circumstances dictate. Many Americans have deep-seated convictions, religious and social. But none of us, whether as private groups or as Government, wants to impose those beliefs by force, intimidation, or other methods of intolerance. It would be a flagrant violation of our most cherished traditions were the United States to try to compel other nations to conform to our way. We can, and I hope we shall, continue to set the example of a good way of life. We shall, I hope, continue to be imbued with a righteous faith and a sense of mission in the world. We shall, I hope, use enlightened judgment in applying our resources and our resourcefulness to help others to help themselves. But whether others adopt our particular economic system is for them freely to decide. Never will our system be extended by force or duress. That is the positive will of the American people and of their Government. On that, all the people of the world can rely utterly.

Once that is clear, we can, without fear of being misunderstood, take leadership in consolidating world-wide opinion. That is the second phase of our quest for peace. It requires that the moral issue be clarified. That issue is not the issue of economic communism against capitalism or state socialism against free enterprise. It is not an issue of relative national power. Those are not moral issues. The moral issue is the issue of the free state as against the police state.

A police state is a state where a few who control the police power proclaim a pattern of political, social, and economic life and then use the police power to perpetuate it, detecting and crushing all who do not conform to their pattern.

A free state is a state where the police power is used to protect the right of individuals to think, believe and persuade in accordance with the dictates of their mind and conscience.

The philosophy back of the police state is materialistic, that men will be more peaceful and secure if, like domesticated animals, they are cared for, herded and driven in accordance with some superior human will.

Back of the free state is belief in a God who endows men with certain inalienable rights which none can justly take away and which none should want to take away because cooperation which admits of diversity produces richness far beyond that of enforced conformity.

The Soviet Union is today a police state. Its rulers believe in that system and they believe that it should prevail generally. They are effectively translating that belief into reality. Their recent action in Hungary adds one more to the number of European countries with police state governments. There are now ten. In other countries, Soviet leaders have great influence through labor unions and political parties and, in several of these countries, they are close to being able to duplicate their Hungarian performance.

The efforts of Soviet leaders to spawn police states throughout the world would, if persisted in, lead to widespread violence, even war. The overwhelming majority of mankind does not want to be subjected, in perpetuity, to the dictation of a small minority. Even the Russian people are not all happy about that, as shown by the generally accepted fact that for every member of the Communist Party in Russia, there are at least two political prisoners. Russian Communist circles discreetly suggest that the time has come for that "withering away" of dictatorship which Marx forecast. In other countries, where freedom has long prevailed, imposition of the police state system would inevitably lead to underground resistance movements and long and bloody struggles.

The future must not unfold in that way. It need not if, while most of the world is still free, the issue is clarified. Then there

will develop a world opinion strong enough to stop a program which otherwise will be stopped by violence. I do not doubt that world opinion can do this. Why should not moral forces be as powerful in peace, to preserve peace, as they are powerful in war, to promote victory? They would be if, during peace, the issues were clear. Actually, the issues are usually kept blurred in the hope that that will keep peace. Thus, it is left for war itself to be the precipitant of international issues. When that happens, the peoples of the world show the power of their moral judgment. President Wilson, after the beginning of World War I, and President Roosevelt, after the beginning of World War II, did much to consolidate and marshal world sentiment to insure Germany's defeat. Thereby, they became great war Presidents. They confirmed Napoleon's statement that "In war, moral considerations make up three-fourths of the game." But if that moral power which won the war could have been used to prevent the war, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Roosevelt would have been great peace Presidents. That is what we want for the future. We cannot afford any more great war Presidents.

If world opinion is brought into being, its quality and quantity must be made evident at a time and place conducive to peace. That is a third phase of our quest for peace. Opinion is not effective merely in the form of inchoate individual aspirations for peace. It must reflect a strong will and a steadfast purpose. There must be willingness to accept discipline and sacrifice. Most of all, world opinion must be focused. In this respect, we should use the United Nations.

The United Nations was never designed mechanistically to keep the peace. It was designed to provide a place where international differences could be aired and where every nation's international acts and purposes could be subjected to the pressure of public opinion. The General Assembly was designed to be a town meeting of the world. It is time to use it in relation to what really matters. There are a number of issues which could impair friendly relations among nations. Most of them involve no great principle and they could be compromised in the interest of peace. There are some issues which involve principles that cannot be compromised. The moral judgment of the world could be relied on to make clear which those principles were and that assault on them would lead only to disaster. The issue of the police state versus a free society cannot, I believe, be compromised. On that, the Assembly would pronounce. Certainly, if we intend to settle that issue by peaceful processes, we should give the Assembly a chance to talk about it. It is, in fact, being discussed everywhere else. It ought to be discussed in the place which was especially designed to make discussion productive of peace.

Lay-Off of Internal Revenue Agents at Jacksonville, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMORY H. PRICE
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently in the Jacksonville, Fla., office 14 internal-revenue agents received notices of temporary lay-off, effective July 15. The amount of the deficiencies in income tax and excess-profit taxes recovered in a 12 months' period ending March 31, 1947, was $1,121,005.30. The combined salaries of the 14 agents involved amount to approximately $56,600.

I do not mean to imply that without the services of these 14 agents the revenue received by the Jacksonville office would have been reduced by $1,121,005.30, but it is true that it would be necessary to accept the returns as made by the taxpayer, which have heretofore been checked by these agents; and the statement I am enclosing will go into detail regarding the subject.

It is safe to say, however, that the salaries of the 14 men, who have received notice of temporary release, would be paid many times over by the increased revenue effected through their activities as agents. Thus, to me, it is penny-wise and pound-foolish to cut off these revenue-producing employees of the Government.

I am heartily in favor of reducing the number of Federal employees where their services are no longer needed, but I cannot understand why agents in the Internal Revenue Department should be released.

The amount of deficiencies in income tax and excess-profits tax set up by Internal Revenue agents, Jacksonville division, who receive notice of temporary layoff effective July 15, 1947. These figures represent a period of 12 months ending March 31, 1947.

CAF–8

1	$99,565.14
2	47,294.50
3	64,610.84
4	167,834.66
5 (less than 12 months)	8,962.33
6 (less than 12 months)	25,625.83
7	156,088.44
	569,981.74

Salary for grade 7: Minimum, $3,397.20; maximum, $4,149.60. Approximate average salary of group is $3,800.

CAF–9

8	$49,751.62
9	102,533.91
10	160,054.27
11	160,354.94
12	90,983.70
13	66,001.69
14	491,325.17
	1,121,005.30

Salary of grade 9: Minimum, $4,149.60; maximum, $4,920; approximate average of group, $4,400.

The above deficiencies include ordinary adjustments and fraud adjustments.

The release of agents will make it necessary to accept returns which have heretofore been checked by agents. The returns which have smaller tax and small adjustments will have to be accepted as filed as it will not be possible to examine the number of returns which are now being examined. These small returns cannot be held until such time as the Department can find time to check them since the law provides that the statute of limitations shall run—toll—3 years after the filing date of the return, or 2 years after the last payment of tax, whichever is the later.

This office has obtained waivers—form 872—which extends the above statute of limitations 1 year on a large number of cases since it was not possible to complete examination of these returns with the number of agents employed before the reduction which is effective July 15, 1947. If the Department cannot complete these returns in the 3 years as set forth by Congress with the number of agents employed prior to the reduction, it is impossible to complete such examinations in the 3-year period or ever get on a current basis with the force of agents reduced and still examine the type and number of returns which have been examined in the past.

Admission of Displaced Persons to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert L. Norton from the Boston Post of July 9, 1947:

ROBERT L. NORTON COMMENTS ON THE DISPLACED PEOPLES

WASHINGTON, July 8.—The message of President Truman favoring the admission of displaced persons to the United States of America has a real human appeal. It should overcome the narrowness and the intolerance of small but powerful groups which up to date have blocked that passage of the Stratton bill, permitting 100,000 of these unfortunate people to enter this country a year, for the period of 4 years.

STATUTES REMAIN

As the President pointed out, an amendment to the present laws does not change the fabric of our immigration statutes. More than 95 percent of these people would be taken care of in the homes of their friends and relatives. They are not Communists, else they would return to the countries dominated by the Soviets, and risk death or slave labor.

Quoting from Prof. William S. Bernard, of Yale, in Survey Graphic, who has made the best study of the situation we have observed: "They come from no single economic group, no one race or religion—Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Yugoslavs, and Estonians, make up the largest single nationality groups, but all told some 15 or 20 different nationalities are included in their numbers. All major religions are represented, with Christians (Roman Catholic, Protestant, Greek Orthodox, and others) comprising 80 percent and Jews about 20 percent. Before the war a majority of them were agricultural workers, but there were also shopkeepers, artisans, skilled workmen, professionals, students, and homemakers.

"This remaining group of displaced persons is the hard core of nonrepatriables. Today the towns, cities, and farms of their homelands are, for all practical purposes, closed to them. They cannot go home because they have grounds in which to fear religious or political persecution; or to fear that if they do return they will lose their liberties, perhaps their lives. In a very real sense they gave up their right to a familiar homeland when they chose the hope of freedom. If they return today, even that hope may be forfeited."

In the course of our history we have received more than 38,000,000 immigrants. Better than a quarter of our population is

still made up of people of foreign birth or mixed parentage. With this heritage we cannot longer ignore our international responsibilities, or our moral obligations.

NINE HUNDRED FOURTEEN THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-TWO QUOTA NUMBERS UNUSED

The facts are that from 1940 through 1946, allowable quotas, if completely filled, would have given us 1,076,733 immigrants—153,774 a year for 1940 through 1943 and 153,879 for 1944-46. We actually received 161,971. Thus 914,762 quota numbers were never used. Even if we set our fair share of displaced persons at 400,000, this would make up less than 50 percent of this wartime loss—would welcome less than half of the number of immigrants Congress and the people of the United States of America had been ready to admit from 1940 through 1946. If we were willing to borrow extensively from the future it would take an average of 15 years to allow 433,500 persons to come in.

"In a very real sense," says Mr. Bernard, "we, the people of America, will decide the fate of those men, women, and children waiting patiently for us to welcome them or to turn our faces from them. Perhaps it does not matter whether our help stems from our own self-interest or from sympathy and understanding. Only the action that we take counts now—and few among us would let that action damn the war's displaced persons to a useless, wasteful life, without homes and without hope. For in our hearts we know too well that there, but for the grace of God, indeed, go we."

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a letter from Mrs. George Mellen, dated June 17, 1947.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator LANGER wrote me you had talked with him. Thanks. But I understand the difficulty of putting over anything like that at this time, with Congress faced with so many overpowering problems. So I shall not really expect it, but would settle for a good blast from the Senator, calling attention to what should have been done—and thereby puncturing the pure and noble picture of themselves presented by the statehooders!

As ammunition for the blast I'll enclose some figures showing the terrible death rate of the Hawaiians—due to the fact that they are so poor and beaten down. Every effort to help them in the past has been opposed by the moneyed-people here. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that when the Wilson administration tried to give them back a little of their land as homesteads, the sugar planters here sent their lawyers to Washington to fight it. Just as they tried to take Papakolea away from them here—saved only by practically my dead body!

Queens Hospital now has an income of $100,000 a year—left by Queen Emma to give "free hospital care to poor and indigent Hawaiians," but in spite of all the fight to get it for them not one penny of that goes to Hawaiians.

Just one more item—these figures I enclose are from a booklet gotten out this year by the chamber of commerce. Note the Caucasian population of 173,000—to cover the Japs at 163,000. More propaganda. All Portuguese are included in that Caucasian list—accounting for more than half of it I think.

I'll enclose a picture of what they call a Caucasian.

And thanks for all you've tried to do. I really don't expect it to be done but I would like to force the true story out into the open, and renew the faith of the Hawaiians that Washington is their friend. They have never blamed Washington for their neglect. In spite of all the injustices to them, they still idolize America and are loyal. Senator O'MAHONEY knows that. They still adore him just because he made statements on what he thought should be done for them and when he came out here they showered him with leis.

Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from a 12-year-old girl in Philadelphia, Pa. She remarks on the fact that she heard her parents talking about the extended speech which I made when the labor bill was under consideration. They were glad that I made the speech, because they were not aware of what was in the bill. It gave them time to look and find out. She writes that she thinks it might be a good idea for the President or Senators, or someone else, to go on the air once in a while and tell the people what is going on in the Congress. I ask that this letter be printed with any misspellings there may be in it, exactly as it came to me.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 27, 1947.*

DEAR SENATOR TAYLOR: My name is Harriet Liebster. I am twelve years old and attend the Jay Cooke Jr. High School. At dinner this eveing the adults were talking about the Taft Hartley bill. I asked some questions about how a bill was passed. I found out that only you senators and the President knew about the bills that were passed and rejected. I think it is about time that the american people knew why some of these bills were rejected. That's what I'm writing to you about. I have a suggestion for President Truman and all presidents after him. They should take an hour each week to read over the radio parts or all of important bills, for endance, the Taft Hartley bill. I know that in the olden days such a thing was imposable because there were no radioes, but nowadays they can do it. Would you please tell the President and the senators about my idia. I would be very gratful to you if you did.

Your sincere friend,
HARRIET LIEBSTER.

P. S.—My aunt said that you tried to delay the vote on the Taft Hartley bill so people would have a chance to find out what the bill contained. I think that was very good of you, and thats where I got my idia.

HARRIET.

Fascism in Action—Printing of 100,000 Additional Copies Asked For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] made a speech concerning the booklet, Fascism in Action, in which he criticized the cost of publication.

In this statement, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 10, 1947, page 8619, the gentleman stated:

Yesterday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] introduced House Resolution 277, dated July 9, to print 100,000 of these documents at public expense.

Some of us opposed this a few days ago on the ground of economy, saying it would run into a lot of money later—and now it is evident that it is going to run into a lot of money.

Although the gentleman probably did not intend to leave the impression from this statement, I am afraid the impression might be left nevertheless that this resolution asking for a hundred thousand copies is somewhat of a surprise; that possibly I had withheld from the Members the information that this number of copies would be asked for.

If anyone should have that impression, I desire to invite their attention to the fact that when the Committee on House Administration held hearings on the resolution to print the document, Fascism in Action, as a House document, I stated before that committee more than once that I expected to ask Congress to authorize the printing of at least 100,000 additional copies.

When the resolution was discussed in the House Tuesday last, in a colloquy between the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MEADE] and myself which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 8, 1947, page 8471, it was stated:

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Will the gentleman tell us how many copies he expects to have made of this document and how much it will cost?

Mr. PATMAN. I expect to ask for a hundred thousand at first. If there is a demand for more we will ask for more. It may not be as popular as the book on communism. There were 500,000 of that booklet printed. But the cost is not the important thing. We have just gone through a war against fascism, which cost us three or four hundred billion dollars, so it would not be too much expense to pay a few dollars more to inform the public.

Therefore, it should be no surprise to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], or any other Member of the House that a resolution has been filed by me asking for the printing of an additional 100,000 copies. The fact is, the Committee on House Administration reported the resolution to the House for consideration with that understanding and knowledge. The further fact is, the House of Representatives by a majority vote passed the resolution with that understanding and knowledge. It occurs

to me that there is some obligation on the part of the members of the House Administration Committee to make a favorable report on the resolution to print a hundred thousand additional copies for the reason the House provided for its printing with that understanding.

UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The United States Chamber of Commerce widely distributed the booklet on Communism in Action. Doubtless this same organization will want many thousands of copies of the booklet, Fascism in Action, for the same purpose of giving it the same wide distribution that it gave the booklet, Communism in Action.

Many other big organizations like the United States Chamber of Commerce distributed the booklet, Communism in Action. It is presumed that these organizations will be just as interested in warning the people that there is a threat to our Government coming up from the right in the form of fascism, which is just as strong as the threat to our Government that is coming up from the left in the form of communism.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Doubtless the veterans' organizations that distributed the booklet, Communism in Action, will also be interested in giving the same wide distribution to this booklet on fascism.

It is my hope that the time is not far distant when everyone in public life, who denounces fascism, will also denounce communism and vice versa.

BOTH SHOULD BE DENOUNCED

It is noticeable that some of our great leaders, when so vigorously opposing either communism or fascism, often confine their denunciations to one and not to both.

Attorney General Tom Clark and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, are examples of outstanding leaders in our country, who invariably denounce both, not one.

Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the High Point (N. C.) Enterprise of July 3, 1947:

VA HOSPITALS

Several years ago the administration of veterans' hospitals was reputedly so poor as to become a national scandal. Then there followed a shake-up from the head of the Veterans' Administration on down. According to reports reaching us, the veterans' hospitals of today should be a source of national pride.

Recently members of the Enterprise staff have had occasion to visit one of these hospitals, located at Roanoke, Va. A member of the staff is a patient there. The reports these visitors brought back—reports of the medical care and personal attention the patients are receiving—were excellent. They were enthusiastic in their praise of the doctors and the staff. Similar reports we have received from veterans who have been to other such hospitals. No doubt there are exceptions to the rule. There usually are. But from all we can learn the average veteran in a Government hospital today is getting the kind of attention he deserves—the best.

Address by Hon. William Langer Before Senator Langer Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Chicago, Ill., on Sunday, May 25, 1947, at a rally under the auspices of the civic committee to welcome Senator LANGER.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman HANS A. FRANKE. It is an honor and privilege for me to introduce to you, ladies and gentlemen, the speaker of the day, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota. I am not going to say very much about the Senator, not because there isn't much to say, but I am going to say two or three words, with your permission.

The Senator has had many outstanding accomplishments which we could take much time to tell you about, in addition to what Dr. Roan already told us. However, I briefly want to say that Senator LANGER was a farmer at one time, a lawyer, and became a member of the State legislature, was a district attorney, he was three times Governor of his State, and now being a Senator, he is a real authority in the United States of America. He is one of the most highly respected men in the Senate. As you will hear, and you may know already, he is a fearless and courageous man. We are proud that he is a man who is of the same parentage as most of us. (Applause.) Senator LANGER's grandfather immigrated to this country from Germany in 1852—that is less than 100 years ago.

There is only one more thing I want to say about the Senator and then, ladies and gentlemen, I will let the Senator come to us. He is one of the men who supported the bill which permits you and me to send 11-pound food packages by mail to the various zones in Europe. (Cheering and applause.) And last of all, among the many other things that we know the Senator will do, he has already introduced a bill to increase the size of these packages to at least 22 pounds (applause), and also make it possible to permit the sending of money to those who need it.

I give you United States Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, your friend and my friend. [Audience rises and applauds.]

Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota. Mr. President * * *

(Senator LANGER's opening remarks were in German.)

And now, my friends, I think we are all agreed that the people of the United States want peace. [Applause.] I think we are all agreed that we do not want any World War III of any kind or character. [Applause.] I think we are all agreed that we do not want any part of Germany to go communistic, now or any time in the future. [Applause.] And just as certainly do I feel that we are all agreed on the fourth point, and that is that we do not want German children, women, or the aged of that country to starve to death. [Applause.]

Now, you know, I am sort of an optimist. I like to look at the bright side of everything, and my friends tell me that I am unusually hopeful and optimistic. It reminds me of a story they tell about an old maid. You know she went to the furniture dealer one day and she said, "I want to trade in that old double bed I have for two single ones." The furniture man said, "Well, I will trade with you, but I don't quite see the sense in your trading." "Well," she said, "it is this way: Every night when I go to bed I look under the bed to see whether or not there is a man under there, and you know if I looked under two beds instead of one I've got just twice as good a chance." [Laughter.]

You know, one time I heard a good story about a school teacher. Mrs. Hoff, of the Germanic Society here, heard it last night. She told me she thought it was the best story that she ever heard. She asked me to repeat it to you because she said it exemplified hope. It is the story of a school teacher that said to her little children: "If you lose the hearing in one ear, don't worry any because you can hear twice as well in the other one; if you lose the sight of an eye, don't worry any because you can see just twice as far on the other eye." There was an old Irish janitor in the back of the building, and he said, "B'Gora, I know that is right because whenever I've seen a man with a short leg I notice that the other leg is longer."

Now, today, I come here with a lot of hope. I come here very, very optimistic because the various departments of our United States Government are cooperating together now, at long last, to do everything they can to better conditions over in Europe. It has taken a long time and we Americans here, whether we stem from Spain, Portugal, or whether we come from Denmark or Norway, whether we come from Ireland or Germany or Austria, or Rumania, are good Americans all, and are interested, first, last, and all the time in the welfare of the United States of America. [Applause.] All of us are agreed that there is no room in America for any hyphenated Americanism of any kind or description, whether you call them Anglophiles, or by any other name. And we are all agreed, too, that we are going to back up our Government in every way we possibly can to better conditions over there in Europe. [Applause.]

You know, I've stood upon the Capitol Grounds at Washington, and I have been proud of the fact that that beautiful Capitol, that beautiful building, together with the building dome, was designed and the work on it was supervised by a man of Germanic extraction, Thomas Walter. And when I glance over to the other side of the grounds and I see that beautiful Congressional Library, American as I am, I am nevertheless proud of the fact that that, too, was designed by a man of Germanic extraction, Paul T. Pelz. And then I am proud, too, of the fact, when I go into the Senate and see there upon the walls in that Capitol those beautiful pictures painted by a man of German origin, Emanuel Leutze, Washington Crossing the Delaware, and over on the other wall that magnificent picture that hangs upon the stairway, Westward the Course of Empire Takes Its Way, and when I enter the Chamber itself, when I walk in there as chairman of the Civil Service Committee of the United States Senate, I am proud of the fact that Carl Schurz once upon a time was in the United States Senate, also chairman of the Civil Service Committee, the same committee I am on today, and when upon

that committee, that man made such a marvelous record that today he is still known as the father of civil service of the United States of America. [Applause.]

Well, now, my friends, I come to you today to talk upon a problem that is of vital interest to every American today. I hold in my hand the report of that great ex-President Herbert Hoover [applause] the report that was made public on the 28th day of February 1947 only a few short weeks ago. I am going to read from that report because, unfortunately, I find that even though it has been published for many weeks, that some of the newspapers are not yet familiar with it. I quote from his introduction: "At the time of her surrender, Germany had exhausted all of her reserves and most of her stocks of consumer goods and raw materials. We now know that, driven back into her own borders, she would have blown up in chaos within a short time without further military action."

Herbert Hoover in this report was backing up everything that was said upon the floor of the Senate by such great patriots as Burton K. Wheeler, of the State of Montana [applause], David Walsh, of Massachusetts, Hendrik Shipstead, of Minnesota, [applause], and many more of us who time and time and time again, plead and plead and plead upon that Senate floor that we might make peace with Germany, that unconditional surrender might be so defying that we could have peace without homes being totally destroyed in Germany and her industry absolutely ruined. We plead because we knew that if her industry was ruined that it would mean a tremendous burden upon the taxpayers of our own country. We knew that if her industry was ruined it would mean starvation on the part of millions and millions of the people over there in Europe, and today here we have the corroboration by ex-President Hoover: "Promptly after the surrender, her liquid resources from which she could have been provided with supplies were seized and divided as reparations. The population thus became largely dependent for its life upon the armies of occupation. The changes which have taken place in population profoundly affect all economic problems. The population of the combined zones in 1939 was about 34,200,000. The Germans expelled from the Russian and Polish annexations together with those from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Austria, have raised the population in the American and British zones to about 41,700,000. It is estimated that an additional 1,000,000 will come into this area by December 1947.

"One consequence of these distortions is that in the age groups between 20 and 40 there are 6 men to 10 women, and in the age group between 40 and 60, about 7 men to 10 women. Thus there are in these groups between six and seven million more women than men. The results upon productive power are bad enough, but the consequences to morals are appalling. The housing situation in the two zones"—listen to this, and when I read it, remember that there were a group of us fighting upon the Senate floor of the United States to stop it—"The housing situation in the two zones is the worst that modern civilization has ever seen. About 25 percent of the urban housing was destroyed by the war. Therefore 25 percent of the urban population must find roofs from among the remaining 75 percent, in addition to all the destitute 'expellees' and other groups brought in. There has been little repair of damaged houses, due to lack of materials and transportation. The result of all this is that multitudes are living in rubble and basements. The average space among tens of millions is equivalent to between three and four people to a 12-by-12 room."

"The shortage of coal is, next to food, the most serious immediate bottleneck to both living and the revival of exports to pay for food. The coal famine all over western Europe and the unprecedented severity of the winter have produced everywhere the most acute suffering. As an example in Germany, no household coal has been issued in Hamburg since October. Other German cities have been but little better off."

In another place in his report President Hoover says: "Over half of the 6,595,000 children and adolescents, especially in the lower-income groups, are in a deplorable condition. Their situation is better in limited localities where school feeding has been undertaken, but outside these limits stunted growth and delayed development is widespread. In some areas, actual starvation is appearing in the children. A study of groups of boys between the ages of 9 and 16 years showed 5.5 pounds under minimum standard weight, with girls 5.1 pounds below such standard. Other groups studied showed even worse conditions."

In another place he talks about fish and where the Germans are not allowed to go fishing in the Baltic and North Seas because, he says: "There are ample supplies of fish in these seas. It seems a pity that, with this food available, British and American taxpayers are called upon to furnish food in substitution for fish the Germans could catch for themselves."

And then, finally, he says in another place: "Our determination is to establish such a regime in Germany as will prevent forever again the rise of militarism and aggression within these people." Now, mark you, what the former President says: "When you meet someone who still is desirous of starving women and children over in Europe or Austria, or any one of the other countries," the former President says, "but those who believe in vengeance and the punishment of a great mass of Germans not concerned in the Nazi conspiracy can now have no misgivings for all of them—in food, warmth, and shelter—have been sunk to the lowest level known in a hundred years of western history. If western civilization is to survive in Europe, it must also survive in Germany. [Applause.] And it must be built into a cooperative member of that civilization. That, indeed, is the hope of any lasting peace. After all," the President concludes in this report on Germany, "after all, our flag flies over these people. That flag means something besides military power." [Applause.]

And if there be some among us in the audience here who are Democrats and not Republicans, if there be some among you who believe that possibly the former Republican President might be biased, I want to read you a paragraph signed by all 18 members of the House of Representatives committee—Republicans and Democrats alike—who a short time ago were over there under the chairmanship of Representative WILLIAM COLMER, of Mississippi. They were over there and made a personal inspection tour of Germany. Here is one paragraph of their unanimous report:

"If a hard peace requires the elimination of eight to ten million Germans, it would be much more humane to eliminate them at once and not wait for elimination due to starvation."

You know, I like this book, this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that I have in my hand here, because some of us saw what was going to happen in Germany over a year ago. A lot of this has taken place, after those in authority have been thoroughly warned. In a speech which I delivered on the Senate floor on March 29, 1946, over a year ago, I quoted Mr. Carl Brandt, the economic adviser to the United States Army, who had been over there and just returned—the man the United States Army relied upon—and here is what he said. This letter was written to Henry C. Taylor, and it was written by Carl Brandt, who is the economic adviser to the United States Army, stationed in Germany. It is entitled "Famine in Germany Over a Year Ago." At that time Mr. Brandt was stationed in Berlin with the Office of Military Government, United States, Food and Agricultural Branch. Henry Taylor said: "The facts in this letter may not be new to you, but to me they are appalling." Here is what Mr. Brandt said. Mind you, this was a year ago last March 26, and I inserted it in the RECORD on March 29, 1946: "The greatest famine catastrophe of recent centuries is upon us in central Europe. Our Government is letting down our military government in the food deliveries it promised. Although Generals Clay, Draper, and Hester have asked for and were promised more, there was the barest minimum for survival of the people. We will be forced to reduce the rations from 1,550 calories to 1,000 calories, or less. The buds of democracy will be burned out in the agony of death of the aged, the women, and the children."

I got up on the floor and I said then: "What has become of those beautiful words we heard from the late President of the United States, when Mr. Roosevelt said, and I quote him, 'The war is not against the German people; the war is against Hitler and his satellites'?" "But," I said, "who is starving in Germany today, Mr. President?" "The economic adviser to our Army in Germany says it is the aged, and the women, and the children, and I have on my desk, if any Senator cares to look at them, pictures showing some results of the starvation now prevalent in Germany, in Austria, and in Poland." Then I kept on reading from Carl Brandt's letter: "The British and we are going on record as the ones who are letting the Germans starve. The Russians will release, at the height of the famine, substantial food stores. They have locked up 300 to 400 tons of sugar and large quantities of potatoes. Aside from the inhumanity involved," Mr. Brandt said, "it is so criminally stupid to give such a performance of incredible fumbling before the eyes of the world. It makes all the many hard-working officers of the Office of Military Government, Food and Agricultural Branch, ashamed." Signed, Carl Brandt.

My friends, that is the record. And you know, it was about that time that a few of us Senators got together and introduced Senate bill 2101, by Senators JAMES EASTLAND and STYLES BRIDGES which permitted the sending of relief packages, not to exceed 11 pounds, from here to private individuals in Germany. It also established mail service. Now, my friends, I am proud of the fact that I was one of the sponsors of that bill. [Applause.] But I am more proud of the United States Senate that passed it. [Applause.] I say, I am more proud of the United States Senate that passed it, in spite of Mr. Morgenthau.

Now, between 7,000,000 and 8,000,000 packages, food packages, have already been sent over there by hundreds and thousands of you people who are here today, but you can't send money, can you? You may have a mother or a brother, or some other relative over there who is starving. You can't send money, You may have some relatives starving over there, and all you can send is this 11 pounds, and that includes all the wrapping, and so for some months our group down there in Washington, headed by my friend, Siegfried Goetze, who is on the platform here today, and who, after World War I, was sent by the relief committee of southern California over to Germany, and who was welcomed over there. That man came before the United States Senate Committee with his credentials, with the credentials signed by every president of the German Republic from the first to the last, testifying to the great work he had done. He brought with him some of the other gentlemen, who are on the platform here today. I don't see one of them. Dr. Claus, I thought he was up here but he isn't. They came to my committee, of which I am chairman, and to the committee that has charge of the

post office, and they said, "We want to increase these packages to 22 pounds, instead of 11." [Applause.] It made me very, very proud indeed that Mr. Goetze and his associates were accompanied by Americans of nearly every extraction under the sun—Irish, British, and Scandinavians, were in there with him backing that committee and to do what it could to get the limit raised from 11 to 22 pounds.

And so my friends, we called a meeting and the Department of War, which has charge of the occupied portion of Germany which the United States controls, and the Department of State, and the Post Office Department, and representatives from these great big Departments of our Government, met jointly with our Civil Service and Post Office Committee and, as a result of these conferences, the Post Office Department decided to send two men who were not members of the Post Office Department, but men whom I could select as chairman of that committee, to attend the Postal Union meeting in Paris, and from there to go to Germany and Austria to meet there with the men in charge, to meet there with post office experts that will be supplied to Dr. Martin W. Roan and to Mr. Anton Rieder, of Los Angeles, Calif., the two men who are going to represent my committee there. Then, face to face, they will work out the problems that I confidently believe will result in the month of June, just a few weeks from now, in permitting the people to send 22-pound packages, instead of 11. [Applause.]

One thing you can be absolutely certain of and that is, after I searched my conscience, under my oath of office, to find two men who would conscientiously and honestly represent the rank and file of the people of America over there. After I looked over the list of all the men I knew in this country, I couldn't think of any two men better qualified, harder working, more honest, than the distinguished gentleman, Dr. Roan, who talked to you a few moments ago, and Mr. Rieder, the president of the Coast Packing Co., of Los Angeles, Calif. [Applause.] Those are men, both of whom have been in Germany many, many times; those are men, both of whom speak the German language; Dr. Roan was in World War I—and World War II—those are men who have been over there time and time again. Mr. Rieder has relatives over there. They are intimately acquainted with conditions, or will be shortly after they arrive. Both of these men are great humanitarians. Both of these men have rendered great service in America, Dr. Roan in the Army. Both of them are men who will not tolerate hate in their hearts, but men who say this war was over 2 years ago. [Applause.]

I hope very much that while those two men are there, they will also, if possible, at first hand get some additional information about slave labor. When they come back they will be able to join ex-President Hoover in his report which tells about that slave labor over there even today. Great Britain still has many she is most reluctant to release. The Russians have between five and six million, but admitting they have 800,000; you are all familiar with the hundreds of thousands over in France; and with the thousands over in Belgium where those Germans are working in the mines. Think of it. In this twentieth century, slave labor, all in violation of international law. [Applause.] I ask you, what would Abraham Lincoln think about it if he were alive today? [Applause.]

So, finally, my friends, in conclusion, I want to thank you for your magnificent welcome to me, for the great kindness shown to me since I have come to the city of Chicago, but in bidding you goodby today, I want to appeal to you and say to you that because food and shelter and public health go hand in hand with the recovery, not only for Germany, but in a greater measure for Europe and the whole world, outside help, your help, must go to the rescue. And it is for this reason that I welcome the creation of the organization, "American Aid to Rebuild Bombed Areas in Germany," a nonprofit, nonpolitical corporation, which has set itself the task to promote and carry on research and aid in a general plan of rehabilitation, rebuilding and developing bombed-out areas in Germany, and to aid and assist the German people through proper channels, to provide the necessary housing facilities for living, and other purposes, and to alleviate suffering from exposure and famine. The Quakers have done an outstanding job up until now [applause] in getting food over to your relatives and to your friends, and to the people of Germany and Austria, but that is only a beginning. If we can get this law changed, this rule or regulation, by the Post Office Department, so that we can send 22-pound packages, and send them not once a week, or once in 2 weeks, but as many as anyone cares to send, because it is costing the American taxpayer nothing. It is being done gladly by the great humanitarian people of America, and which will save a life perhaps, and all that is necessary is to go over to the post office and deposit the package.

And so I say in conclusion, that I don't know of any place in the entire United States of America where I believe the people have come closer to my heart than you people here in Chicago. [Applause.] As I have met you, as I have talked to you, as I have heard the expressions of sympathy for the poor, starving, aged women and children over there in Europe, as I have looked into your eyes, I have gained new faith in America, and I know that God Almighty still reigns supreme.

[The audience arose and there was prolonged applause.]

Rubber Legislation Must Wait Until Next January

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of Armed Services Subcommittee on Organization and Mobilization I take this time to make the following statement:

Legislation for a permanent rubber program will be presented to Congress soon after the 1st of January 1948.

On May 8 of this year the Subcommittee on Organization and Mobilization of the Armed Services Committee held an informal meeting to discuss with industry and the Army and Navy Munitions Board a proposed synthetic rubber program for the Nation. At the conclusion of this meeting the Army and Navy Munitions Board was requested to meet with industry to prepare suggested legislation which would establish this program.

It was anticipated that these proposals would be presented to this subcommittee by the 1st of June. However, the problem proved to be one of such a complicated nature that it was not possible for the Army and Navy Munitions Board to present recommendations until Wednesday, July 9. In studying the recommendations that have been made, it now appears that they do not represent the majority view of industry and the Army and Navy Munitions Board but rather represent a majority view of governmental agencies.

The subcommittee met in executive session today. Because of the vast scope of the problems involved and the short period of time remaining before the congressional recess, members attending the session decided that the possibility of conducting public hearings at this time is precluded. However, the subcommittee will hold hearings during the recess. These hearings will not be conducted with respect to any single proposed bill, but will involve the general problems. During the course of these hearings the subcommittee hopes that the industry will present recommendations representing the majority and minority views of the industry. The subcommittee has been advised by several members of the rubber industry that prior to January 1, 1948, industry can present to the subcommittee an outline of legislation acceptable to the majority of the industry. Thus, with the benefit of the Army and Navy Munitions Board proposals and a report accompanying these proposals, plus any recommendations submitted by the industry and information obtained during hearings, the subcommittee is confident that it can present to Congress, in January 1948, legislation with respect to a long-range rubber program acceptable to industry and Government and fully providing for the national defense.

The subcommittee is primarily interested in national defense and must continuously bear that objective in mind as its primary function. On the other hand, the subcommittee recognizes the fact that any legislation as far reaching as that proposed must be reasonably acceptable to industry since industry must live with this legislation.

Members of the subcommittee know that rubber plays a major part in the economy of the world, and they also know that this Nation can no longer be dependent entirely upon a foreign supply of natural rubber to meet the needs of this country in time of national emergency. Therefore, the subcommittee, working with the Government and industry, will during the recess make a complete study of synthetic rubber. In addition, it will make an on-the-spot study of the manufacture of butadiene, styrene, and all other related topics of the rubber industry.

The subcommittee is fully aware of the importance of this proposed legislation. It recognizes the impact that will be felt in world markets when such legislation is finally passed. However, it will probably report a bill to Congress which will provide for a compulsory consumption of a more or less specific amount of synthetic rubber, which will represent the minimum necessary to maintain a technically advanced and rapidly expandable industry. It hopes to present a bill involving the barest minimum of Government controls. It is confident that a bill encompassing the views of industry and the views of governmental agencies can be passed.

The present controls on rubber cease on March 31, 1948, under Public Law 24, and prior to that time the subcommittee believes that Congress will have enacted into law a far-reaching rubber program that will permit rubber manufacturers and natural rubber producers to plan their future with a reasonable degree of certainty.

While the subcommittee has taken no definite action on the Army and Navy Munitions Board recommendations, nor on any specific provision that will be contained in any bill reported to Congress, nevertheless, it was the opinion of members present at today's executive session that any bill reported to Congress must provide for the consumption of a rather substantial amount of synthetic rubber. It is hoped that the administration of this program can be handled simply without the establishment of a Government bureau. Furthermore, the bill must provide a satisfactory plan for plant disposal. The subcommittee realizes that the problem of plant disposals, plus the possible creation of protected monopolies, creates tremendous problems.

Thus, in brief, the subcommittee will plan to conduct hearings this fall; will anticipate receiving suggested legislation from industry, will observe the rubber industry in its actual operation, and will assuredly present a bill to Congress in January 1948 that will, it is hoped, be reasonably acceptable to all concerned and very definitely will provide for the defense of the Nation.

Pensions for Postmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pensions for Postmen," published in the New York Times of July 10, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENSIONS FOR POSTMEN

Caught in the log jam that always piles up in Congress toward the end of a session, the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson postal retirement bill is still held up on the calendars of both Houses. As a matter of simple justice it should be voted into law.

Here in New York City some 700 retired letter carriers are eagerly hoping it will pass. It would prove a godsend to a group of forgotten men who have given Uncle Sam the best years of their lives in faithful service. If it fails, they and their families may somehow continue to exist on $23 a week, though none of them can figure how. If it passes, their annuity will be raised to $1,500 a year.

Nobody seems to have any objection to the bill. It has been favorably reported by both committees. For the first time it provides some benefits for widows and survivors. It should encourage the retirement of many superannuated postal employees who simply can't afford to quit now. It won't cost the Government anything since the working postmen themselves will pay for it with an additional 1 percent deduction from their pay checks. Civil-service actuaries figure that this will more than take care of the slight pension increase. If Congress greases its wheels a little the bill will pass at this session.

Truman's Foreign Policy Since War's End Has Cost $21,058,424,818—Truman's Domestic Policy Since War's End: Not One Cent of Relief From Oppressive Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the United States has provided in contributions and advances 21,058,424,818 hard-earned American dollars to the other nations of the world since the surrender of Germany and Japan in May 1945 and September 1945, respectively. This is equal to a contribution of $430 from each of our 49,000,000 income taxpayers.

Think of it! Four hundred and thirty dollars of your hard-earned cash has been used in an attempt to bring about peace and the rehabilitation of the world. The contributions have been made as follows:

Contributions:	
UN	$29,289,349
UNRRA	2,700,000,000
World Bank	3,175,000,000
World Fund	2,750,000,000
Lend-lease	2,163,000,000
Other advances:	
Surplus property	1,148,000,000
Loans to Great Britain and Philippines	4,390,000,000
War Department grants	1,771,926,293
Export-Import Bank	2,931,209,176
Total	21,058,424,818

While President Truman's foreign policy has cost us this tremendous sum of hard-earned American dollars, his domestic policy has been to deny to the average American taxpayer the saving and relief he would receive, if he—Truman had not vetoed the income-tax reduction bill.

We undoubtedly have an obligation to help rehabilitate and encourage the establishment of peace in the world, but we of the Congress as well as the President also have the duty and obligation to relieve our people at home of oppressive and confiscatory taxes.

The United States, the victorious Nation, has used its blood, sweat and tears, its money and its resources to help bring the world out of the sad state of affairs it is in today. We have been doing all this while Russia has been waxing fat at the expense and gullibility of the rest of the world by annexing country after country to her sphere of influence, by adding great territorial gains and millions of people by her communistic imperialism.

Perils of the Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, now that the President has announced his intention to veto the tax reduction bill and deny any increase in the take-home pay, not only now but even after January 1, and has taken the unprecedented action of attempting to crack his whip on this issue even before the other body has acted and in the face of the overwhelming vote in this House, he will be confronted with writing another veto message.

At about the same time this bill reaches his desk it is expected that he will also receive a measure to permit enlisted men to convert their terminal-leave pay bonds into cash, already approved unanimously here in the House.

It is hoped that in his message of disapproval of the tax-reduction measure he will frankly concede the obvious error in his earlier message wherein he used as one of the principal arguments against an increase in take-home pay the contention that it would have dangerous inflationary results. He still clung to the basic fallacy of the Government spenders that it is a mistake to let the people have the money to spend, but in some curious way not conducive to the same inflation to make the people pay that same money to the Government so that it can be spent by those in Washington who have become so adept at that pastime through many years of indoctrination and training.

It would be a tragic injustice to the GI's who have already been the victims of discriminatory legislation in the last Congress if the President were to repeat his mistake and again follow the advice of his Treasury Department, which has opposed this measure to permit enlisted men to receive cash for their bonds. True, it will result in payment of some $1,800,000,000 if these veterans should all take advantage of the option afforded them, but every dollar paid to them reduces the Government debt, a legal obligation, by the way, which deserves first consideration. One way out of the dilemma in which the President has placed himself would, of course, be to disapprove the terminal leave pay bill. This compounding of an error, however, would be most unfortunate and unjust. It is preferable for him in the message accompanying his second rebuff, which he has promised to the taxpayers and wage earners of this country, to eliminate from the grounds upon which he seeks to support his case the patently unsound argument based on the inflation threat.

In accordance with leave granted I include an editorial from the New York Times:

PERILS OF THE VETO

The practice of the Presidential veto is fraught with very real political perils for the Executive and his party. This is a lesson that the late President Roosevelt had to learn the hard way; but he did learn it, and in the later years of his administration he rarely employed the veto with respect to measures which came to him with decisive majorities in the two Houses of Congress. The most obvious practical reason for such a course is that an Executive who consistently flouts the will of Congress can hardly expect to rely indefinitely upon the support of that body for his own policies.

But events this week serve as a reminder that the injudicious use of the veto power may boomerang in another way. The Executive may find himself entrapped in the coils of his own veto messages. The House has just voted unanimously in favor of permitting veterans to cash their terminal-leave-pay bonds at any time after next September 1. The 1946 legislation providing remuneration for accrued leave time for the enlisted personnel made it payable in bonds which are nonnegotiable and the principal of which does not become payable until 5 years after date of issue. Whether the Senate will go along with the House in making this back pay available in cash is still to be determined. Should it do so, the issue will then be up to Mr. Truman. The political appeal of the legislation is attested by the fact that it was unopposed in the House. It also can be argued on its behalf that it represents no more than simple justice to the enlisted men, since it is merely extending to them the same treatment accorded officers, who have remained on the service pay rolls on terminal leave after their return to civilian life.

The other side of the argument is that this legislation would represent a potential addition to current purchasing power of some $1,800,000,000. Mr. Truman, in weighing the merits of a veto with respect to this bill, should it pass the Senate, might find it easy to ignore this latter fact were it not that he has already given a hostage to fortune. One of the four major arguments advanced in justification of his veto of the tax-reduction bill was that the economy was already subject to inflationary pressures, and that tax reduction would tend to increase them. If the President should decide to ignore this argument in the case of the terminal-leave measure, this fact will be accepted by many persons as confirmatory evidence that the tax bill veto was essentially a political strategem.

Grapes of Wrath Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 20, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times:

GRAPES OF WRATH AGAIN?

Better organization of this country's vast army of migratory agricultural workers would be of direct benefit to the farmers. It would assure them of sufficient help in the planting and harvesting seasons when time is precious and crops can be saved or lost in a matter of days.

It would protect communities from some of the unwholesome conditions which grow up around the shack settlements in which workers tend to congregate when jobs are hard to find and there is no way of transporting them and their families to areas where their services can be utilized.

These are important considerations in a bill which Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, of California, is sponsoring. Her plan calls for intelligent compilation and dissemination of information relevant to the supply of migratory labor, the availability of work in the different areas. It would also provide for better training of workers, assurance of means of transportation, the furnishing of medical care, and other services that are sadly lacking in some of our most important food- and textile-producing States.

Surely the farmers would appreciate such an effort toward a more efficient organization of their labor force. They are victims of the present haphazard system as much as the workers are. But basic human rights of the workers are an important consideration, too. They and their families deserve greater guaranties of these rights than they now have. Three-fourths of the 550,000 who worked on three or more farms in 1945 had less than 75 days of employment. There can be very little security, very little happiness in such a nomadic existence. And worst of all, their children are subject to undernourishment and disease. Denied access to local schools, many grow up with stunted minds as well as stunted bodies. No better argument for Mrs. DOUGLAS' bill can be made than she makes with these words:

"Let us help the American farmer harvest and market his potatoes, beets, corn, wheat, fruits, and produce without the tears that now stain so much of the clothes we wear and the food we eat."

Temporary National Commission on Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
July 10, 1947.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I have just had called to my attention Senate Joint Resolution 141 introduced on July 2, 1947, by Senator FLANDERS, together with seven other Senators, the title of which is "To Establish a Temporary National Commission on Veterans Benefits."

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 2, on page 8086, appears the statement made on the floor at the time that this resolution was presented to the Senate. This joint resolution would create a temporary national commission on veterans' benefits composed of seven private citizens appointed by the President. The duties of the said commission are then set forth in the statement.

This is very disturbing to me as a national commander of the American Legion, in view of the fact that in many respects it is similar to section 701, title VII, "Provisions Applicable to Veterans," Public Law 212 of the Seventy-second Congress, June 30, 1932, by which there was created a joint congressional committee to carry out practically the same functions as are set forth in this resolution. In particular, "to conduct an investigation of the operation of the laws and regulations relating to the relief of veterans of all wars and persons receiving benefits on account of the service of such veterans and report a national policy with respect to such veterans and their dependents," and "report and recommend such economies as will lessen the cost to the United States Government of the Veterans' Administration." And further, to report "the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable."

This resolution, it seems to me, goes somewhat further, in that the commission is composed of seven private citizens who are in no respect responsible to the people, as are Members of the Senate and the House, to carry out the wishes of their constituents.

The fact of the matter, in my opinion, is that this is a serious reflection upon the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, which has been considering this very subject matter for a period of 25 years, and which is composed of members who are skilled in questions of veterans' legislation; and similarly, in the Senate, the Finance Committee, and now, under the Reorganization Act, also by the Labor and Welfare Committee.

The public law of June 20, 1932, which I have referred to above was followed by the iniquitous Economy Act of March 20, 1933, Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, provisions of which were repealed by Congress over Presidential veto.

Section 701 of Public Law 212 required that the report be submitted not later than the 1st of January 1933. Senate Joint Resolution 141 requires that the report shall be submitted on or before February 1, 1948, again a period of time during which it would be absolutely impossible to make a fair and impartial study of existing laws and those bills presently pending before the Congress calling for new or amendatory legislation.

On a number of occasions bills and resolutions have been introduced which have been the cause of the utmost disturbance, both mentally and physically, to our disabled men, the wards of the Government. Fourteen million World War II veterans and their dependents, in addition to the veterans of World War I, other wars, and the Regular Establishment, and their dependents, would be directly or indirectly affected—nearly 45 percent of the population of the country.

Speaking as national commander of the American Legion, I regret that legislation of this character has been introduced during this session, and I sincerely hope that it will be rejected by the Congress.

Very truly yours,
PAUL H. GRIFFITH,
National Commander.

Crime and Graft Plague New Philippine Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an

article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

CRIME AND GRAFT PLAGUE NEW PHILIPPINE REPUBLIC

Lawlessness and graft are two major problems which President Manuel Roxas of the Philippine Republic is attempting to solve. Lawlessness in particular is an aftermath of the war and the occupation of the Philippines by the Japanese.

Large quantities of arms and ammunition were distributed to Philippine guerrillas, who were encouraged to ambush and kill Japanese soldiers and to steal their supplies. Apparently this pastime became habit forming, as far as some Filipinos are concerned.

Some indication of the number of Filipinos who considered themselves to be guerrilla fighters is shown by the fact that approximately 1,000,000 claims have been filed with American Army authorities for compensation based on guerrilla activities during the war.

All these claims are being investigated. Probably two-thirds will be disallowed because of lack of proof, or because the alleged guerrilla activities were not carried out by regularly organized troops. Those whose claims are proved, however, will be given back pay at the same rate of compensation for members of the Philippine Army.

ARMS COME EASILY

In addition to the weapons of the guerrillas, large quantities of arms and ammunition fell into the hands of other Filipinos. The stuff was lying around and they simply helped themselves. The natural result is a high incidence of crime in Manila and other cities.

In recent speeches and public pronouncements President Roxas has repeatedly stressed the problem of law enforcement. He has insisted that persons not authorized to have arms must surrender them and that graft among minor Filipino officials must be suppressed.

Rigid measures have been taken by the American Army authorities to halt thefts of army property from the huge stocks of surpluses accumulated in the Philippines to support the anticipated invasion of Japan. Although a great deal of this material has been sold or turned over to the Philippine Government, there are still vast stores to be disposed of, quantities of which are rapidly deteriorating, due to the climate.

MANY JEEPS STOLEN

But in spite of great precautions American Army property still disappears and jeeps are still being stolen at the rate of nearly one a day. Since thousands of jeeps were sold to Filipinos and much of the public transportation in Manila is provided by privately operated "jeepneys," it is virtually impossible to detect and recover a stolen army jeep, once a few alterations have been made.

One story going the rounds in Manila is that a couple of American military policemen set a trap for jeep thieves, parking a vehicle equipped with apparatus to sound an alarm if it were tampered with. They watched for 3 hours, but nothing happened. But when they went to get their own jeep, which had been parked a short distance away, it had been stolen.

There is also the case of the gasoline pipe line through which fuel was pumped from Manila Bay to Clark Field, 60 miles north. But only half the gas which went into the pipe line ever reached its destination. So it was decided to discontinue use of the pipe line and transport the gasoline by truck.

EXTENT OF THEFTS REVEALED

One American officer suggested that a large quantity of sugar be pumped into the pipe line, which would gum up the motors in which it was used, and thus punish the thieves who were tapping the pipe line. But security officers vetoed this suggestion, on the ground that it would be necessary to triple the guards around the warehouses in order to prevent thefts of motors and parts to replace those which would be ruined by the sugared gasoline.

Instead of this stratagem, the line was pumped full of water, in order to expel the gasoline and avert the possibility of explosions. On the day this was done, observers reported that more than half of the civilian motor transport in southern Luzon was stalled in midafternoon.

However, many Filipinos have the philosophy that it is perfectly all right to help themselves to government property. This is based on the theory that government property belongs to the people anyhow and they are merely borrowing from themselves.

GRAFT IS OLD CUSTOM

Grafting by public officials has been prevalent in the Far East for thousands of years. So it will take some time before official corruption is regarded with the same disfavor that it is in the United States. Nevertheless, the Roxas administration is doing everything possible to establish high standards of honesty and efficiency in the administrative departments.

In addition to these troubles, the new Republic has an armed rebellion on its hands, the center of which is only 100 miles from Manila. This rebellion is being carried on by the Hukbalahaps, or Huks, a group of people who originally banded together to secure land reforms, but who have been joined since the war by bandits and outlaws.

President Roxas offered the Huks all the land reforms they had demanded. His program, in fact, is more extensive than their original demands, but the Huks refused to end their rebellion. They were more interested in fighting than in reform. So the Philippine constabulary has gone out to hunt them down in their mountain fastnesses.

AMERICAN FREEDOMS PREVAIL

In spite of these troubles of a growing nation, including a recent attempt to assassinate Roxas, Filipinos enjoy the same individual freedoms that Americans have. Freedom of the press, in fact, is sometimes carried to the point of irresponsibility. But no attempt is made to suppress the dissemination of news, no matter how inaccurate or garbled, or how critical of the government it may be.

When all is said and done, it is probable that lawlessness and graft are no more prevalent in the Philippines than they were in the early days of the American Republic.

Moreover, there are more than 7,000 islands in the Philippine Archipelago. Much of the territory is unsettled and some has never even been explored. In many respects, the problems of the new Republic are similar to those of America's wild west frontier days.

Statement of R. N. Buck Made Before the President's Special Board of Inquiry on Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by R. N. Buck made before the President's Special Board of Inquiry on Air Safety:

In 1940 the CAA pointed out, and wisely so, that the true test of the Transport Category would be in the experience gained through its use. As air-line pilots, we feel that enough experience has been gained to enable us to judge the safeness of the Transport Category. Unfortunately this experience has shown that safety has not been accomplished as it could be.

It has always been unfortunate that the pilot, as he flies day in and day out, cannot have each take-off and landing accurately measured so as to be able to present actual figures to engineers and scientific nonflying men who are prone to cast looks of doubt upon the air-line pilots' observations. Or perhaps it is unfortunate that the scientific men and the engineers cannot ride along with the pilots through some of the more harrowing take-offs.

There is not an air-line pilot flying who has not skimmed out over trees or houses or some other obstruction, with a minimum of speed and a sensation that only his wishing and prayer are keeping him above the surrounding hazards. The thought of an engine failing at this critical point gives him a cold chill. And yet this Category we operate under says you can lose an engine and be safe. It is a false belief indeed.

It seems, on close study, that there has been a misinterpretation of the use of the Transport Category as the air-line pilot understands it. It certainly proves out in practice that one of the misinterpretations is temperature! That temperature has not been included as a factor in calculating take-off weight is astounding. We, gentlemen, deal in air. It is our medium; to deal with it properly, we must consider all the things which influence it. The most primary text books tell how air which is hot is less dense than air which is cold. The less dense air is the more difficult it is for an aircraft to lift itself, climb and carry a load. This was very impressively demonstrated recently when it was pointed out that for a C–54 aircraft, each degree of temperature above standard gives the effect of adding 250 pounds of weight. Visualize, then, a pilot taking off with a gross weight of 60,000 pounds, at sea level, with a temperature of 85 degrees. This would give him, in effect, an added load of 6,500 pounds. Or, in a more graphic sense, the airplane might have 50 passengers aboard, but this added temperature would be the same as adding 38 more passengers to the C–54, making a total of 88 passengers. Quite a load for a C–54.

Now the CAA recognizes altitude as a factor; they talk about the sea-level equivalent. This means, simply, that they figure a certain runway on an airport that is above sea level, as being shorter, in effect, because of its altitude, than the actual measured length. So that a runway which actually measures 4,000 feet on a field that is 3,000 feet above sea level, has a shorter effective length than its measured 4,000 feet. This is a step in the right direction. All flying people know that at high altitude an airplane doesn't fly as well as it does down low. In this light, let's look at temperature again. What does warm air do? As everyone knows, it raises the density altitude. So that a sea-level field from which a pilot is about to take off, with the air temperature 85 degrees, isn't really at sea level at all; no, the field has been raised so that it is now at approximately 1,700 feet above sea level. It can be seen that temperature and altitude have the same affect. Therefore, if altitude is considered, temperature must certainly be also. And there are many cases wherein altitude and temperature both affect the flying of an airplane.

Recently, in going through a Constellation and DC–4 manual, it was interesting to note that in all the landing and take-off requirement charts for these airplanes, there never was a mention of temperature as a factor influencing take-off or landing distances. As an aside, but still very important

to the total problem, have you gentlemen studied the charts presented in the pilots' manuals concerning modern aircraft? First of all the charts differ in construction for different type airplanes, and in most cases the explanation of the chart's use is either not made at all or else it is written so poorly that it is most difficult for anyone to understand.

In considering temperature, I have never heard anyone talk about the reported temperature compared with the actual temperature found out on the runway. The temperature reported on the weather report and placed upon the teletype sequences is temperature taken from a thermometer sheltered in the little-white-house-on-stilts-like structure we see at airports. This thermometer is in the shade. Now, what is the actual temperature out on the runway? What is the actual temperature the airplane has to deal with? Well, it is from 10 to 20 degrees more than the reported temperature. Let's not forget that when we talk about runway length, and especially 4,000-foot ones.

Now let us look at wind. If we could constantly count on a steady, known wind, it might be satisfactory to use as a weight-increase factor. But, unfortunately, we can't count on its steadiness, or the accuracy of its velocity.

First, let us consider how wind is measured. Generally, the anemometer cups are on top of the airport administration building. At this level the wind is generally stronger than it is down on the ground. But the airplane is taking off from the ground level. The pilot, however, is interested in the wind on or close to the surface. Any pilot can tell you of experiences wherein he was given a strong wind velocity, then this information led that pilot into believing it was best to use a short runway into the wind. The pilot can further tell you how he almost overshot the runway because when he got close to the ground, ready to land, there wasn't the strong wind, and he landed much faster, in ground speed, than he had anticipated from the wind information. On the same take-off and landing charts mentioned previously and which are found in the DC-4 manual, it actually mentions that the wind, considered in the charts, is measured 6 feet above the surface of the runway; a far distance from the anemometer on top of the administration building.

When you consider that the airplane's load is computed well ahead of the flight from a teletype sequence report of the wind velocity taken from the top of some building, it becomes apparent that the accuracy of wind information, in a practical operational sense, is poor enough not to warrant its use.

To add complication to the use of wind, let us consider the fickleness of its remaining static long enough to compute an airplane's load, load it, start it, get out to the end of the runway, read the check list, run up the engines, and take off. Looking at the official records of the United States Weather Bureau, we find that wind changes in both velocity and direction occur with rapidity. For example, in one case at 1736 hours the wind was south 20—3 minutes later at 1739 it was west-northwest 7. The type recorder the Weather Bureau uses does not get down to the actual moment the shift occurred, but it occurred quickly—somewhere less than 3 minutes, perhaps 10 seconds. Visualize the pilot taking off to the south with a load computed on the basis of a south wind and 20 miles an hour and then actually finding a cross-tail wind of 9 miles an hour. (This was at Washington, D. C., January 7, 1946.) Going through the Weather Bureau records, we find many cases which clearly show that wind is a variable and many times, unpredictable factor. With such a quick and vacillating nature wind should most certainly not be counted upon to allow an increase in airplane weight if we are to be sincere about safety.

In the questions we are considering here, the exception which allows certain factors to be considered in international operation seems strange, indeed. An airplane is not aware of the country it is flying from. Its wings and engines know no difference between foreign air and air of the United States. If a safety rule applies within this country, it should apply anywhere.

Arguments may be brought forth showing the constantness of certain winds. I wish to doubt those arguments. There is nothing in the sea of air that remains static. One might think of the steadiness of trade winds, for example, but they vary in velocity according to the hour of day, and many times they vary in direction. I am reminded of a narrow strip on the island of Cozumel, off the coast of Yucatan. It was my lot to operate from that strip back in 1933. I remember that it was necessary to do all our flying before noon while the wind was down the runway, because during the afternoon the wind shifted and was quite brisk across the runway. Since there was no other runway, flight in the afternoon required a tricky cross-wind landing; that wind was not constant.

I wish to point out the conditions under which tests are made when an aircraft obtains its license. These tests are made after the aircraft has been cleaned up and put in the most perfect operating condition. Factory pilots who have practiced with the airplane are used. The airplane is flown as near its maximum performance as is humanly possible to do so.

In a similar vein, when we talk of runways, I believe most of us visualize a sunny day, dry, well-surfaced runway with a steady and perhaps exhilarating breeze blowing down its length.

Now, let us look at what the pilot may encounter. He is operating out of LaGuardia. He reports to duty an hour before departure. He studies his weather, determines his route altitudes, alternates at his terminating point, and many other items, including the amount of gas needed, and the runway to be used, which will depend on the wind direction and velocity. He advises management of these decisions.

From these decisions, the load is figured for this runway taking into account the gasoline required. The captain does not enter into or have a chance to check these figures as they are computed by ground personnel using the transport category as a basis.

The captain boards his plane and a few seconds before departure he receives his load slip. Due to other duties his only check is to have the first officer call out the load allowable and load abroad. So far he has been at the mercy and accuracy of all the variables that he has been told were accounted for.

At the end of the previously selected runway, let us assume runway 18, he further checks the mechanics of his aircraft, and receives clearance from the tower. What is the wind blowing down the runway? He doesn't know; the only information comes from the tower in a different location. There is no indicator on any runway. Does he have a diminished wind caused by a wind shift? He doesn't know; yet he has been loaded an extra 320 pounds for each 2 miles per hour of wind. Let us assume he has a wind shift so that the wind is zero not to mention a tail wind on some portion of the runway. He would be overloaded at least 3,200 pounds. In case there is a 10-foot gradient that wasn't accounted for, you could figure another 2,500 pounds. If the temperature at the time was 80°, he would have another 5,250 pounds. Assume there was a mistake in figuring the load for that runway in the original computation of another 3,000 pounds.

This all totals up to 13,950 pounds, or the same as placing 131 passengers in a 50-passenger airplane. If he tried to get the same performance that the airplane was designed to meet and found that he couldn't get off this short runway and tried to stop, he would have a minimum of 1,395 feet of runway lacking in which to stop. The pilots are convinced that just such a condition could transpire.

You will note that I have not included many other variables not accounted for in the transport category, namely, rain effect, loss of acceleration due to climbing up hill, engine efficiency due to high service hours, condition of propellers and plane due to nicks, dents, dirt, added passenger weight, as all passengers are figured at 170 regardless of extra wraps and belongings carried into the plane, added drag caused by a cross wind, and other variables too numerous to mention.

Those are things that happen; those are the things the air-line pilot faces. He needs adequate margins to help when all the variables that can cause trouble begin to heap one upon the other during a take-off that was supposed to be routine, but instead turned into a desperate experience. Air-line pilots do not only fly in perfect airplanes, on nice sunny days. They fly in all conditions, with good airplanes, with old airplanes, with badly loaded airplanes. We cannot cut margins close; we must have something to fall back on when things get tough. Only a flying man can appreciate these things.

Considering all factors and remembering that even after the recommendation of you learned gentlemen, temperature is still not considered sufficiently, it is not desirable to change (a) of item 5 in your report to the President. Wind is too variable and unpredictable. Temperature, while not in this particular question, is still a factor which tends to make take-offs marginal. Therefore, on short runways of 4,000 feet or less, figured at the sea-level equivalent, wind component should not be used to increase weight. It is suggested that an addition be made to (a) which would state that full temperature correction be applied to these runways.

2. The exception for international operation be taken out and no exceptions allowed.

3. Part (b) of the interim report should be so worded as to allow the pilot to use his discretion entirely in choosing a runway for landing without any set figures being placed upon any runway.

I am not here to blame any airplane, quite the contrary, these are good airplanes we are speaking of. I am not here to choose sides and argue with anyone. The only adversary here is danger. The pilots believe that one way to attack danger is to use these airplanes wisely. We are not doing this or being conscientious about safety when we attempt to make them fit runways that are too small, with weights that are too large, and against variable factors that are too potent and unstable to count on.

The unfortunate accident at LaGuardia Field on runway 18 demonstrates how the compounding of the factors talked about here can bring about a disaster.

Displaced-Person Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, upon reading the Washington Evening Star of yesterday, July 10, 1947, I found the following letter addressed to the editor by

my good friend and fellow Brooklynite, Mr. Ignatius Nurkiewicz on the subject of the Stratton bill to admit displaced persons into the United States. Under the permission granted me by the House, I include Mr. Nurkiewicz' letter which reads as follows:

SUPPORTS DP LEGISLATION

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Truly democratic people will give the Stratton-MacKinnon bills the active support they deserve, for their opposition only furthers Soviet aggression.

During my recent tour of European DP camps, I learned that these people wished to emigrate to countries in Europe and to South America, but UNRRA sought to coerce them to return to a Soviet-dominated Poland. If permitted to go, some 250,000 to 300,000 Poles might be easily absorbed in Europe and South America, as these countries need them to replace depleted labor ranks and want them.

This eagerness for DP's repudiates the misstatement that the United States is asked to bear the whole burden of responsibility for former slave laborers and soldiers. American resources and opportunities would allow for the admission of 400,000 Polish DP's without disrupting our economy, for more than 200,000 are farmers and the balance trained in trades and professions.

The DP's are victims not only of the war itself but of postwar agreements as well. The war forced them into concentration camps or slave labor. But the peacetime Yalta agreement allowed a Russian sphere of influence in eastern Europe and attempts to oppose the expanding Communist regimes are ruthlessly squashed. The DP's refuse to submit to Communist regimes; they know that slave-labor camps are the fate of those who oppose dictatorial governments.

The homeless Polish DP's were left exposed, it seems to me, in the path of greedy Communist expansion rather than cherished as our democratic allies.

The speedy enactment of the Stratton-MacKinnon bills would legalize the immigration into the United States of some 400,000 Polish displaced persons, including some 20,000 soldiers who fought so valiantly on the side of the Allies and became prisoners of war when Poland was first invaded.

IGNATIUS NURKIEWICZ,
National Vice President of the Polish-American Congress, National Chairman of the Polish Displaced Persons' Committee for the Congress.
BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Radio Address to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I delivered over Station WHBF:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, for many years, I have made it a rule to see that every family in my district which is blessed with the arrival of a new baby receives a book entitled "Infant Care."

This is a publication of the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor. According to well-informed baby doctors at home, I am told it is the finest book of its kind available.

However, the jump in our birth rate in the Thirty-seventh Congressional District is so tremendous since 1939 that my office is continually running short of these books. We find it necessary to beg, borrow, and grab enough to take care of all the new parents.

I can remember when we started in, there was always a sufficient supply from the quota to which each Congressman is entitled, or 125 baby books per month.

Now, however, my secretary informs me the average monthly birth rate of our area has mounted to from four to six hundred infants, and that means we just can't get along on the present allotment. In order to make out, we have to do a lot of trading.

But to you parents who have not received one of these infant-care books, upon the birth of your son or daughter, I urge you to let me know. I will be happy to send you one immediately and I feel sure it will prove most helpful to you in caring for the new child. Success to you in this wonderful venture!

A few days ago, the House brought out another tax-reduction bill, not too different from the other excepting that it does not take effect until 1948.

I told you before I was not satisfied, any more than I am now, with the exemptions in this measure. I think the big boys get too much of a break. I think the little fellow receives too little consideration and relief. I should have liked to see the exemptions far greater than they were in this bill. Small incomes should be spared so that heads of families will not have to shell out their dollars for heavy taxes when they ought to go for food, shelter, and clothes.

But we were compelled to take what they gave us. I had to vote for tax reduction because I promised you folks I would and I believe that campaign pledges ought not to be broken. Maybe some people consider preelection statements just oratory, but I assure you I don't.

So the tax bill has been passed, and taxes will probably be reduced next year ever so slightly. Better luck next time!

Speaking of taxes, I was told by an expert on the subject recently that if we continue the flow of billions out of this country for one reason or another in the future we will soon be saddled with a tax burden of over half our incomes.

"That's quite a figure," I answered. "It's hard to believe! Besides, Congress never would assess each American 50 percent of his or her income."

The expert thereupon told me that whether or not Congress acted upon the question, the economy of the country would.

"Don't think for a minute we can keep on printing up crisp new dollars and get away with it," he continued. "We'll pay the fiddler either by inflation or bankruptcy, or both."

Well, I agree with him to this extent. We can't do what Hitler did in Germany. We can't turn over our printing presses to exploiters and chiselers to print up money for their own amusement and their own uses.

I am for American relief to foreign countries as I have many times stated. I want to see the people of Europe on their feet. But I want to know how they stand toward America.

I'm through voting any more funds or loans to foreign countries until I know for sure whether they're friend or enemy. I want to call them friends if I can. But why hand over the money that ought to be going to the veteran, to the aged, to the unfortunate right here in our own country? Why hand it over to somebody you know is against America?

I want to have plenty of accurate information at hand the next time I'm called upon to vote for a huge foreign loan. I'll be fair but I refuse to sell America down the river to please a few.

Thank you.

Rural Electrification Week in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of the State of Texas has proclaimed next week, July 13–19, as Rural Electrification Week in Texas and has called upon all citizens of the State to observe the splendid progress that has been made in electrifying rural areas in that State since the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration 12 years ago. I think that the people of all America might well give heed to this program that has meant so much for farm people.

The great job of electrifying the rural areas of America is not yet complete, but the farmer-owned REA-financed cooperatives have done far more than the private power companies said was possible. Not only have they proved that rural service is practical and profitable, but they have proved that that service can be just as good as city service and that it can be just as cheap. In most sections of the country the power companies have ceased to fight the efforts of American farmers to provide electric service for rural areas, but they still fight the efforts of these farmers to reduce the price of electrical service. We have, however, gone far enough to make it perfectly clear that wherever we have competition, rate reductions are forthcoming.

If this Congress will but give this program the same support during the next 12 years that it has given it during the past 12 years, I am sure that it will be possible to make electrical service available to every home in America and at reasonable rates.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a proclamation by Hon. Beauford H. Jester, Governor of the State of Texas:

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come:

Whereas the percentage of farm homes in Texas receiving central station electric service has increased from 2.3 percent to 55 percent during the past 12 years through the stimulation of the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) program; and

Whereas more than 160,000 rural families of Texas now enjoy the benefits of electric lights and power through cooperatives which they themselves own and operate; and

Whereas each of the 75 rural electric cooperatives in Texas is a free and independent, tax-paying business enterprise, chartered under the laws of the State of Texas, and owned and controlled by the farmers and ranchers who receive service along its lines; and

Whereas the money to build rural power lines is loaned, not given, to the cooperatives

by the Federal Government, and is being repaid with interest on or ahead of schedule, thus representing no cost to the taxpayers; and

Whereas no electric cooperative in Texas is delinquent in the repayments of its loans to the Government at this time, while more than a million dollars has been repaid in advance of date due; and

Whereas the availability of electricity has brought about a wholesome revolution in farm methods, production and living standards; has lightened the drudgery of farm tasks and increased farm output and profits; has been instrumental in keeping young people on the land, and has promoted the general welfare not only of rural people, but of urban residents as well whose prosperity and well-being depends upon a sound and prosperous agriculture; and

Whereas the rural electric cooperatives of Texas are holding their annual State-wide meeting in Austin on July 18–19, 1947, at which time several hundred cooperative leaders will gather here to make plans for extending electric service at the earliest practicable date to the approximately 180,000 rural homes in Texas which do not yet have such service;

Now, therefore, I, Beauford H. Jester, Governor of Texas, do hereby proclaim the week of July 13 to 19, inclusive, as Rural Electrification Week in Texas, and call upon all citizens of the State to observe during this week the splendid progress that has been made in electrifying rural areas during the past 12 years, and to resolve anew that the program shall continue to expand until every farm family in the State shall enjoy the blessings of electric lights and power.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto signed my name officially and caused the seal of State to be affixed hereto at Austin, this the 7th day of July A. D. 1947.

BEAUFORD H. JESTER,
Governor of Texas.

By the Governor:

PAUL H. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

Every Member of Congress Should Read the Great Globe Itself, by William C. Bullitt, Former United States Ambassador to Russia

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the prophetic advice, the comprehensive views, and the clear understanding of former United States Ambassador W. C. Bullitt of the future plans and foreign policy of Russia should be a guide, a warning, and an indication to the United States and to the rest of the world of the plans, purposes, and designs that Russia had as far back as 1936 on acquiring and annexing to her sphere of influence all of the countries in Europe which she could influence or dominate with her communistic philosophies.

Mr. Bullitt saw the possibility of Russia's invasion of Turkey long before action was taken by the Congress to prevent that invasion. I quote from page 176 of the Great Globe Itself:

For example, Stalin may order his troops to attack Turkey, relying on war weariness to prevent Great Britain from honoring her agreement to go to war in support of Turkey if Turkey should be attacked, and relying on indifference to prevent the United States from giving aid to Turkey and Great Britain. If, however, we should leave no doubt in Stalin's mind that we would not permit further aggressions by the Soviet Union to succeed, there would be no armed attack by the Soviet Union on Turkey or any other of its neighbors. We can prevent aggressions by the Soviet Union during the period in which we have the atomic bomb and the Soviet Union does not have the atomic bomb, by maintaining the superiority of our Air Force, and by warning the Soviet Union in the politest manner—and meaning it—that new Soviet aggressions will be met by American action.

The communistic imperialism of Russia was also envisioned by Mr. Bullitt when he stated the following. I quote from page 184:

No official of the American Government is justified in defending his failure to act in accord with the vital interests of the American people by the excuse that American public opinion is not yet ready to face the fact of Soviet imperialism, unless he has done his utmost to give the facts with regard to the acts and aims of the Soviet Government to his fellow citizens. Those facts have been coming into our Departments of State, War, and Navy for many years, and still come in every day. There is no reason why they cannot be made available by the White House and the Department of State to the representatives of the American press. The facts speak for themselves. Our Government would not have to issue one word of comment on the facts to make the people of the United States understand that the Soviet Union is not a peace-loving democracy but a predatory totalitarian tyranny which is striving to conquer the earth for Communist dictatorship. Given the facts, the American people would recognize instantly that Soviet imperialism threatens not only peace and liberty in Europe and Asia but also their lives in the United States, and would demand action now to protect their vital interests.

Mr. Bullitt also was conscious of the weakness of the United Nations because of the veto power held by Russia in preventing action of which Russia did not approve because of the possibility that such action would mitigate against her determined foreign policy of communistic imperialism. I quote from pages 185, 186, and 188 of his book:

We know well that the UN under its present constitution has no power to stop wars which involve the interests of any one of the permanent members of its Security Council—the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, China, and the United States—or of any state supported by one of these great powers, because each permanent member of the Security Council has an absolute veto on any action by the UN.

The Soviet Government was careful to have articles 5 and 6 of chapter 2 of the Charter of the United Nations so drawn that it cannot be expelled from the UN, as it was expelled from the League of Nations in 1940 for its attack on Finland. And so long as the Soviet Union remains a permanent member of the Security Council of the UN, it will have an absolute veto on any official action by the UN. But the other members of the UN cannot sit by and let the Soviet Union swallow weaker nations without rendering the UN a contemptible corpse.

Another vitally important suggestion was made by Mr. Bullitt which actually is being put into practical operation at the present time by Secretary of State Marshall to organize the countries of central and eastern Europe against the advances of Russian communistic imperialism, and I quote from page 191:

The Soviet Union may continue its advance against Iran, or attack Turkey, or Iraq, or some other state, and may use its veto power to prevent action by the UN. We shall then be obliged to improvise action by the democracies to prevent the Soviet Union from carrying its aggression to a successful conclusion. We are the most powerful of nations, but we have neither enough wisdom nor intelligence nor will to carry by ourselves the entire load of preventing aggressions. We need like-minded associates ready to carry their fair share of the load.

The Soviet Union is on the attack. The democracies are in retreat, not because they are weaker than the Soviet Union—we ourselves are stronger—but because they have not clarified their thinking and unified their forces to oppose Soviet aggressions. The more democracies we can gather together to oppose Soviet aggressions—with force if necessary—the more certain we shall be that the Soviet Government will not dare to start new aggressions. Our Government should, therefore, immediately commence conversations with the other democracies of the world designed to insure their united action to prevent Soviet aggression, which are likely, or aggressions by any other power, which are unlikely.

The failure of the United States under the administration of President Roosevelt to come to some understanding with Russia when her very existence depended on her lend-lease aid is also reviewed by Mr. Bullitt in his book, and I quote from pages 192 and 193:

When the Soviet Union was dependent for its life of lend-lease aid, President Roosevelt, as a quid pro quo for lend-lease aid, could have obtained a written guaranty from Stalin that the western limits of the Soviet Union should be those of August 1939, and that the Soviet government would assent to the creation of a European federation. Prime Minister Churchill had often advocated the creation of a European League or Federation, and the President was repeatedly urged to join the Prime Minister in making a bargain of this sort with Stalin. President Roosevelt refused to take this action, not because he was opposed to the idea of a European federation, but because he was hoodwinked into the belief that it was unnecessary for him to obtain any promises from Stalin with regard to Europe, that Stalin had no desire to incorporate in the Soviet Union portions of Europe, or to control independent European states through Soviet puppet governments, and would cooperate with him fully in creating a world of liberty, democracy, and peace.

Few errors more disastrous have ever been made by a President of the United States, and those citizens of the United States who bamboozled the President into acting as if Stalin were a cross between Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson deserve a high place on an American roll of dishonor.

Our magnanimous gullibility in permitting the Communist Party to function in the United States when it is known to be a foreign arm of Russia to spread the communistic philosophy and the party line in the United States is also stated in the Great Globe Itself—and I quote from page 209:

We permit a branch of the Communist Party to function in the United States. The Soviet government will not permit branches of the Democratic or Republican or Socialist Parties to function in Moscow. We permit the Daily Worker and other Communist publications, whose policies are fixed by the

party line laid down in Moscow, to spread their views in the United States. The Soviet government does not permit any newspapers of any kind in the Soviet Union, except those it controls.

These are but a few of the pertinent paragraphs from The Great Globe Itself, written by W. C. Bullitt, former United States Ambassador to Russia, whose warning and advice has not been followed, or if they were followed, the action we had taken was too late to be of any benefit and as a result we find ourselves in a confused and complex situation insofar as our foreign relations with Russia and the other countries of the world are concerned.

Much of the diplomatic and political losses in world prestige and confusion could have been avoided if we had been as alert to the warning of Mr. Bullitt as we were to the warning of Paul Revere in 1776.

We in the United States must alert ourselves to the future dangers we are facing in order to preserve the liberties, the freedom and the individual dignity which we are guaranteed under our form of constitutional government.

The Labor Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of June 26, 1947:

THE LABOR BOARD

Enforcement of the Taft-Hartley bill is not a pleasant assignment for the present members of the National Labor Relations Board. So far as they have expressed themselves publicly in weeks past, they were opposed to many of its provisions. They shared the President's view that it was undesirable. But as NLRB Chairman Paul Herzog said, the bill was merely proposed legislation one day, and the next day it was the law of the land.

That makes a difference, for the qualified representatives of the American people made it the law, and there is no more to be said. The task now is the fair and full enforcement of the law.

This is what Mr. Herzog and his colleagues propose to do, so long as they continue with the responsibility. Actually, their new assignment does not call for such a reversal of behavior as the ugly talk of some embittered labor leaders would suggest. The trend in the Labor Board for 2 years and more has been toward a more judicious interpretation of the Wagner Act, toward a policy of holding unions more closely to their responsibilities. The Taft-Hartley bill carries this somewhat farther.

It is an essential part of our American way of doing things to accept in good spirit any decision of the Congress, which is the primary source of public policy in the United States, just as it is our tradition to accept cheerfully the results of a popular election. The first reaction of the bulk of organized workers unquestionably is to accept the Taft-Hartley Act as unpalatable, perhaps, but as the considered judgment of Congress.

A few headstrong leaders have counseled defiance, and in a few unions there have been ugly repercussions. But organized workers in the main are just Americans like everybody else. They may turn to such political efforts as are open to them, in the hope of electing a different Congress that will revise the labor laws again. But meantime they will try to conform to the law, because that is what the overwhelming majority of Americans in all walks of life habitually do. The good example set by Mr. Herzog and others of the NLRB ought to help us through a difficult period of readjustment with a minimum of friction.

Bomb Theft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop from the Washington Times-Herald of July 10, 1947:

BOMB THEFT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Don't let anybody kid you. That news the New York Sun broke yesterday about the theft of atom-bomb secrets is a lot bigger than Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER admits.

For your information it originated with the Government, was checked through three high sources in the Government for accuracy, and was worked on by some of the most careful and serious-minded and responsible reporters in Washington before the first word appeared.

Furthermore, the Sun was warned in advance that HICKENLOOPER and the self-appointed master mind of atomic legislation, Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, Democrat, of Connecticut, would do their level best to knock the news down if it ever got out.

The Sun's Washington bureau and editors in New York were under no illusions that they would be congratulated by MCMAHON or HICKENLOOPER for making public what has been known on the inside of the Government for weeks.

All of the foregoing is just to help any interested American judge for himself the character of the performance that will now be put on by the Atomic Energy Commission of the United States, headed by David E. Lilienthal, and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, of which HICKENLOOPER is chairman and MCMAHON former chairman.

And Senator HICKENLOOPER may be interested to know that when the committee next meets there will be present two Members who have said that if they are not satisfied with the way things go they are going to take the floor of Congress and tell the facts as they know them.

For the New York Sun's news story of yesterday had nothing whatever to do with any souvenir-hunting GI's accidentally carrying off atomic information from the Los Alamos, N. Mex., laboratories.

It had to do specifically with Oak Ridge, Tenn., where a supposedly routine file search is now being carried on.

The search is not routine.

It is a desperate attempt to find out just how much has been carried off, when, and by whom.

It concerns something new that has happened in 1947 since David Lilienthal's Atomic Energy Commission took over the Manhattan project from the United States Army while the Communists and the pinks and the fellow travelers cheered.

It also concerns the survival of the United States.

Therefore, by any test the people of this country have a right to the real facts as to how efficiently and faithfully the Atomic Energy Commission and the President who appointed that Commission and the Senate which confirmed it in office, have guarded the Nation's security.

Before the present sessions of the joint congressional committee have ended there may well have started another investigation comparable to the series concerning Pearl Harbor.

It will depend upon how fully people outside Washington get to know the facts.

Here in the Capital politicians of both parties are committed to upholding the operations of the Atomic Energy Commission so fully that few even think about getting tough on their own.

The smear that was laid on Senator K. D. MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, during his opposition to Lilienthal's appointment as chairman of the AEC has not been forgotten.

When you come right down to it, the full development of what has started will really depend on how hard and faithfully the Washington press corps as a whole works to get at the truth and then works to put that truth on the public record of newspapers around the country.

And so just as a reminder to the press corps, maybe here it is appropriate to recall how the Canadian spy ring was broken back in 1945.

That spy ring, which reached into the United States and stole secrets of atomic energy while we were at war with Germany and Japan, worked for Russia.

That spy ring included Russian diplomats, a professor of Cambridge university in England, a member of the Canadian parliament, and assorted United States, British and Canadian Communists and stooges for Communists.

How was the story broken?

By a member of the Russian embassy staff, Igor Gouzenko.

Gouzenko quit his job because he was revolted by the Reds' behavior toward the nations that had saved Russia's neck from Hitler. He took with him unshakable proof of the facts and offered to give it all to a Canadian newspaper.

He had heard how newspapers over on this side of the world were free, independent and aggressively interested in facts.

But—and this is something for American newspapers to think about today—the Canadian paper told Gouzenko to go somewhere else and peddle his idiotic hooey. Too wild to be true. Impossible.

Only it was. And except for merest chance the Russians would have been able to kill Gouzenko off and get back the evidence. The chance was that a Canadian sergeant had sense enough to call a cop off the beat when the Russians raided Gouzenko's apartment.

The new atom story that broke here yesterday is not all told, yet. Nor will it be until the newspapers force it out.

The Trojan Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, last week the Public Lands Committee, of which I am a member, passed out a resolution,

introduced by the chairman of that committee, requesting the Department of the Interior to investigate the economic feasibility and economic justification of diverting surplus waters from other basins to southern California and the Colorado River Basin and the practicability of exchanges of water.

I, as well as other committee members from adjoining States, protested this resolution, House Resolution 244, and I am now publicly disaffirming any connection therewith, and, in fact, I am opposing it.

Yes, we realize that water is very important to southern California, but we definitely want only that water which belongs to us and that water is in the lower Colorado River Basin.

Just why is such a resolution introduced at this time? Whether or not the author, not a resident of southern California, realizes it, it is timed at the very moment when there are two bills, S. 1175 and S. 483, being pushed in Congress, both of which would take more water from the Colorado River Basin than Arizona is entitled to. This would mean that southern California would naturally have to go to other water basins for their dire needs, would have to abandon their established water rights and abandon the works already constructed to utilize such rights.

Now, let us analyze this resolution. It states that the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, is requested, under and by virtue of the authority conferred upon him by the Federal reclamation laws, to make such an investigation. This resolution was not necessary for the Secretary to do this job. He already had this authority. This resolution is for the sole purpose of exciting and arousing the peoples in these other basins threatened by the resolution.

It is true that it is only an investigatory job, but what it would accomplish if we were to sit idly by would be to combine the forces of such States as Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, and Nevada, against this supposedly water-grabbing southern California. These States would rally to the support of Arizona which actually is the State which is definitely and unequivocably attempting through legislation to obtain water far in excess of that which rightfully belongs to her.

At this very moment, the Senators from Arizona are trying to block a resolution requesting the Supreme Court to litigate this problem of water rights in the lower Colorado River Basin.

No, we from southern California are not going to be fooled by this type of psychological red herring. We want you people in the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, and Nevada to know that we do not want your water and on the contrary, we pledge ourselves to help you in defending your rights.

All that we want is the water to which we are rightfully and justly entitled in the lower Colorado River Basin.

For that reason, we protest the purpose of House Resolution 244.

To substantiate that this represents the thinking of the leaders in southern California, I am also entering in the RECORD a copy of telegrams sent to Governor Wallgren of Washington, Governor Snell of Oregon, and Governor Robins of Idaho:

JULY 2, 1947.

GOV. MON C. WALLGREN,
Olympia, Wash.,
GOV. EARL SNELL,
Salem, Oreg.,
GOV. C. A. ROBINS,
Boise, Idaho:

Speaking for water users in southern California we desire most emphatically to assure the people of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho that our people do not endorse or support any proposal looking toward the possibility of importing into southern California water from the Columbia River or from any other source in your three States. Southern California communities do not seek or ask for any water rights on the Columbia River. We have our water rights on the Colorado River and we intend to maintain those rights and we intend to use the Colorado River water for which we have contracts and for which we are paying in full. Columbia River water for California, is a red herring being dragged across the way by interests outside southern California. These interests have the idea that such a red herring will divert the attention of Congress away from California's legitimate rights on the Colorado River. This red herring is being tenderly nurtured by those who seek to grab costly, infeasible Colorado River reclamation projects at the expense of United States taxpayers. Southern California people do not covet or seek the water of your northwest rivers but we do seek the support of your United States Senators and Representatives in opposition to Senate bills 1175 and 483. These bills seek to authorize projects for an unspecified quantity of Colorado River water to Arizona lands at an unspecified cost. We ask that passage of such legislation be deferred pending (1) a determination as to the amount of water which would be diverted from the Colorado River by each of the projects proposed to be authorized by Senate bills 1175 and 483, and whether under existing compacts, contracts, and the Mexican treaty, water for such projects is available, and (2) pending a determination binding upon the States of the lower basin of the Colorado River as to the amount of water from the Colorado River available to each State, and (3) pending a determination as to the possibility of repayment of the cost of the proposed projects to the Federal Treasury.

EVAN T. HEWES,
Chairman, Colorado River Board of California, and Chairman, Board of Directors, Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
PRESTON HOTCHKIS,
President, Colorado River Association, Los Angeles, Calif.

United States Forced To Guard Far East Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

UNITED STATES FORCED TO GUARD FAR EAST AGAINST COMMUNISM

Now that the United States has established the western frontiers of democracy in Japan, in southern Korea, and in the Philippines, we have an obligation to see that those frontiers are protected, not only from armed attack, but also from the invasion of Communist ideologies.

It will be to our advantage to do this, first, so that the people of the Far East will be able to experience the benefits of free enterprise and representative government, as compared with the tyrannies of totalitarianism, and secondly, to protect our own interests in a part of the world which has vast trade possibilities.

Under Gen. Douglas MacArthur we have made amazing progress in the conversion of Japan from a feudal empire, dominated by military dictatorship, into a democratic state which recognizes the rights of individuals and which has adopted a form of government which is subject to the will of the people.

In Korea, we have had only limited success, due to Russian obstructionism, Communist agitation, and the division of the country into Russian and American occupation zones. But the people of southern Korea are being taught how to govern themselves and the seeds of democracy are being planted in fertile ground.

MAC ARTHUR SEES IT THROUGH

The Philippine Republic is a going concern, and it has bright possibilities for the future, all within the framework of the free-enterprise system, based on the development of its natural resources and its growth as a trading center in the Far East.

No one can foretell how long the military occupation of Japan will continue. General MacArthur believes that military occupation is no longer necessary and that the next step in dealing with Japan should be the negotiation of a peace treaty and the withdrawal of our armed forces. He does not plan to return to the United States until that is done.

But it may take a long time to conclude this phase of the occupation. It depends largely on how many obstacles Russia puts in the way of its accomplishment.

LONG GUIDANCE NECESSARY

The Japanese will need guidance in the ways of democracy for a number of years, probably until the generation now attending school grows to adulthood and provides the leadership of the future. That guidance could safely be provided by a civilian occupation, because no force is needed, even now, to compel the Japanese to carry out the reforms we have instituted.

However, if the world situation remains as uncertain as it is today, Japan may need protection from Communist aggression, for she has no army, no navy, no air force, and only 60,000 unarmed policemen to maintain law and order.

The United States has the primary responsibility of providing Japan with whatever protection may be needed, for when we undertook to bring about a political, social, and economic revolution in Japan, so that Japan never again would be a menace to world security, the 78,000,000 people of Japan became wards of the United States.

We have liberated them from the bondage of the war lords; we cannot in good conscience permit them to become the slaves of commissars.

UN PROOF AWAITED

Thus it may be many years before we can safely withdraw our military forces from Japan and dissolve our guardianship over the Japanese people. It would be foolhardy to do so, at least until the United Nations has demonstrated its ability to halt aggression and to protect nations which are defenseless.

But while we are protecting Japan from the invasion of Communist ideologies from the outside, there is a grave danger that these same ideologies will gain a foothold inside Japan, just as they have in the United States, through Communist domination of some labor unions.

Our policies in Japan, as formulated by the Far Eastern Commission, which sits in the United States, give the Japanese Communists a free rein in the politics and the labor movement of the country. They are aggressively taking advantage of this opportunity.

DEMOCRACY WELL STARTED

We have planted the seeds of democracy in Japan and have given the Japanese the tools with which to till the soil. But until they learn how to use them effectively, there is a serious danger that the Communists, with our permission, if you please, will undermine all our efforts.

The policies of the Far Eastern Commission need to be reexamined. Is is senseless to encourage strikes and to open the door to Communist agitation in Japan at a time when we are trying to stimulate production in an effort to make Japan self-supporting.

This policy simply plays into the hands of the Communists. It will prolong the period during which American taxpayers must contribute to the Japanese food bill and lead to agitation for the withdrawal of American support from Japan. If this should come about, the Japanese would be left to the mercy of the Communists, and that is exactly what the Communists want.

ISLAND AIR BASES VITAL

As long as we have commercial and political interests in the Far East we must retain control of whatever islands we need in the Pacific to supply our forces, to facilitate naval operations, and to maintain air communications between the United States and Asia.

Kwajelein and Midway are indispensable as refueling points on the airways between the Hawaiian Islands and Guam and the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippines. Guam is one of our principal naval and air bases in Far Eastern waters. Saipan, Tinian, and Iwo Jima are stepping stones on the air route from Guam to Japan, while Okinawa is a vital link between Japan and our bases in the Philippines.

MILITARY RULE PREFERABLE

There is controversy now as to whether these and other islands in the Pacific which we acquired as a result of the war should be placed under the jurisdiction of the Navy or the Department of the Interior. It seems peculiar that the Interior Department would want to extend its power to regions so far removed from the boundaries of the United States.

As long as these islands are essential to the defense of the United States, they should be placed under the jurisdiction of the defense agencies. We should not forget the experience prior to Pearl Harbor when the installation of radar equipment on the island of Oahu was delayed by a controversy between the Interior Department and the Army over its proposed location.

PACIFIC FLIGHT SCHEDULE

For those who are contemplating a flight to Tokyo—and there are many constantly en route nowadays—a log of our trip between California and Japan may be interesting:

Left Fairfield Air Base, California, 2:35 p. m. Pacific time, Wednesday, January 22. Arrived Hickman Field, Honolulu, 11:55 p. m. elapsed time, 11 hours, 50 minutes. (Two and a half hour time differential.)

Left Hickman Field 5 p. m. Thursday, January 23. Arrived Kwajalein 2:25 a. m. Saturday, January 25. Elapsed time, 10 hours, 55 minutes. (One and a half hour time differential, and 1 day lost crossing international date line.)

Left Kwajalein 4:05 a. m. Saturday, January 25. Arrived Harmon Field, Guam, 9:20 a. m. Elapsed time, 7 hours, 15 minutes. (Two-hour time differential.)

Left Guam 8:15 a. m. Sunday, January 26. Arrived Tokyo 4 p. m. Elapsed time, 8 hours, 45 minutes. (One hour time differential.)

Thus the actual flying time from California to Japan was 38 hours and 45 minutes. The flying time from Washington, D. C., to Fairfield Air Base, Calif., was 15 hours and 55 minutes, with stops at Omaha and Sacramento, making the total flying time from Washington to Tokyo, 54 hours and 40 minutes.

Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JULY 1, 1947.

Hon. JAMES M. LANDIS,
Chairman, Special Board of Inquiry on Air Safety, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to the Board's discussion yesterday on item 3 of the agenda "Approach and Landing."

I definitely share the concern expressed by the other members of the Board on the matter of drastic cuts being made in appropriations for landing aids.

Believing that our recommendations to the President on present needs should stress items whereby we can buy the greatest amount of safety for every dollar appropriated, I would like to reemphasize the remarks made, in regard to the relative importance of the various aids, by Mr. Wood and myself.

We consider the installation of adequate approach and runway lighting the No. 1 item which will make the greatest contribution to safety of all the aids presently available.

We recommend that the 97 ILS systems now installed be completed by putting in approach lights, runway lights, and compass locator stations before we spread our funds too thin for experimental items.

Two direction approaches completely implemented should be the minimum installed in each case. If these installations are completed by winter, many lives will be saved that otherwise must almost inevitably be lost.

We also recommend that every effort be made to secure sufficient funds to reinstate the CAA's original program of installing additional ILS systems complete with approach lights, runway lights, and locator stations.

In short our recommendations, as to the order of priority which will accomplish the greatest and quickest return in air safety, are these:

1. Approach, runway lights, and locator stations to complete all presently installed ILS systems.

2. New ILS installations to be installed at all airline airports not covered in one (1) above. If it is impossible to install ILS at all fields, these fields should at least have approach and runway lights installed. These lights are necessary for normal four-course range approaches and also are part of the ILS system when it is installed and will not require additional funds at that time.

3. Fido—experimental basis.
4. Surveillance radar—experimental basis.
5. CCA—installed at nearby military fields.

Sincerely yours,

H. B. COX,
Pilot Representative.

The United States Marine Corps Is Faced With Possible Extinction if the Merger Bill Is Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the people of Pennsylvania, speaking through the Pennsylvania State Senate and General Assembly, have expressed themselves in no uncertain terms concerning the future of the United States Marine Corps should the so-called merger of the Armed Forces become a reality.

This is another case of the absolute need for careful and serious study before hastily merging the armed forces.

I am calling your attention to the following resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania State Senate and General Assembly, evidencing the wishes of the citizens of Pennsylvania:

Resolution 56

Whereas the United States Marine Corps has been a shining example of faithful and efficient service to our Nation for more than 172 years; and

Whereas the United States Marine Corps has been a source of strength whenever our Nation has been threatened; and

Whereas the United States Marine Corps possessed a vision to develop the science of waging amphibious warfare which knowledge permitted our Nation's offensive might to be carried to enemy shores and which proved to be the key to victory in a global war; and

Whereas 50,872 of the young men of this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have served our Nation during World War II in the United States Marine Corps; and

Whereas the United States Marine Corps is threatened with extinction if the merger bill now pending in the Congress of the United States is passed in its present form; and

Whereas the abolition of the United States Marine Corps would be a disastrous loss to our Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved (*if the senate concurs*), That the existence of the United States Marine Corps be assured by amendment to any merger bill, such amendment specifically providing that the United States Marine Corps shall continue to serve as our Nation's amphibious troops and as a force in instant readiness to protect our Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, and members of the congressional delegation from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolution introduced by the Honorable Messrs. Robert F. Kent and Walter F. Layer in the house of representatives the 9th day

of June 1947 and concurred in by the senate the 10th day of June 1947.

FRANKLIN H. LICHTENWALTER,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
W. E. HABBYSHAW,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.
W. J. RIDGE,
Chief Clerk, Senate.

New Coal Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star of July 10, 1947:

SUBSTANTIAL VICTORY FOR LABOR LAW SEEN IN NEW COAL CONTRACT

(By David Lawrence)

The new coal contract between the miners' unions and the operators represents a substantial victory for the Taft-Hartley law.

Not only is the new statute mentioned by name seven times in the contract, with the specific and avowed purpose to operate within the limits of this law, but there is also a plainly implied obligation in the contract to refrain from concerted work stoppages during the period of the new agreement.

It may be that the days of authorized work stoppages on a large scale in the middle of a contract period are over in America and that a period of real peace in the industrial world has been introduced as a result of the new legislation.

The new coal contract is a conspicuous example of what labor unions mean to do to conform to the new law, despite the murmurings about political reprisals, tests of constitutionality and rumors of plans to evade the provisions by writing contracts purporting to give immunity from the law.

SOME VAGUE PHRASES

The new coal contract contains some vague phrases about the miners working hereafter only when they are able and willing, which merely conforms to the specific statement in the law itself about the right of an individual to quit work. Omission of the no-strike and penalty clauses for illegal suspension of work, which used to be in the contracts between the operators and the miners' unions, has attracted some attention, but it really means that these are not now needed. Two important points in the contract are the key to the whole document. The first point is in the following paragraph:

"The contracting parties agree that as a part of the consideration of this contract, any and all disputes, stoppages, suspensions of work, and any and all claims, demands, or actions growing therefrom or involved therein shall be by the contracting parties settled and determined exclusively by the machinery provided in the settlement of local and district disputes section of this agreement; or, if national in character, by the full use of free collective bargaining as heretofore known and practiced in the industry."

This means that efforts will be made to settle grievances at the local or regional level and by neutral umpires, but if a Nation-wide dispute occurs, the full use of free collective bargaining will be the method employed to arrive at a settlement.

OBLIGATIONS DEFINED

The Taft-Hartley law defines the obligations of collective bargaining and states specifically that anyone who quits work during the life of a contract need not be rehired and also that any concerted work stoppage or slow-down is a violation of the law.

This means that no secret instructions from a union to bring about a so-called spontaneous walk-out can hereafter be issued lawfully and that any interruption by the operators through a lock-out can also be a violation of the law. Hence, there is no further need for no strike clauses in contracts, because the new law forbids a concerted work stoppage during the life of a collective-bargaining contract. Unless there is mutual agreement by both parties to modify such a contract, it cannot be changed until it expires. Even then notice must be given to the Federal Mediation Service and other conditions must be complied with before a strike can really be legal.

The second point of significance in the new coal contract is the clause stating that 30 days' notice can terminate the agreement, but this provision is really nullified by the language that follows immediately:

"The foregoing termination provision shall not be construed to limit or affect in any way the obligation of the parties relating to the termination of contracts under the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947."

SPECIFIC MENTION

It will be noted that the contract mentions specifically the obligations of the law with reference to termination notice. These require 60 days' notice prior to expiration and the maintenance of existing conditions right up to expiration and under certain circumstances for 60 days thereafter.

The Taft-Hartley law has, therefore, accomplished a great deal, as the text of the new coal contract fully demonstrates. It is regrettable that Representative HARTLEY takes the view that one clause in the coal contract, which authorizes the check-off for initiation fees and assessments, is a violation of the new law. The statute uses the word "dues," to be sure, in authorizing a system of check-off, but it certainly could be construed to mean that assessments and initiation fees are part of the dues.

The point is not really an important one, as the principle of deductions is conceded, and Mr. HARTLEY might better have noted how completely the new coal contract conforms to and accepts the obligations of the new law of which he was coauthor.

National Subsidy Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic City (N. J.) Daily World has recently published an editorial referring to the large share of Federal funds received by the so-called poorest States, and the small share received by the contributing States, which is a subject which has concerned me greatly for some time. The editorial follows:

WHY DON'T THEY?

When it comes to national subsidy programs, it pays a State to be poor.

This fact is pointed out in a bulletin of the New Jersey Taxpayers' Association, which says: "The lopsided Federal formula for assessing benefits under national subsidy programs severely penalizes New Jersey, which hands over $4 for every $1 it receives in Federal grants-in-aid."

Chief recipients of Federal funds for education, for example, are the Southern States, supposedly the poorest. Yet from 1940 to 1946, individual incomes in Florida increased 184 percent; Mississippi, 180 percent; Tennessee, 179 percent; and Alabama, 165 percent.

Among the rich industrial States comparative figures are 79 percent for New Jersey and New York.

The 10 poorest Southern States have an aggregate of $306,000,000 in treasury balances. Still the industrial States are heavily taxed to improve their educational standards.

The association believes lobbies have a lot to do with this. It thinks the Southern States can pay a bigger and fairer share of supporting their own schools, and asks the pertinent question, "Why don't they do it?"

Labor-Management Bill Protects Rights of Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent settlement of the coal strike since the Taft-Hartley bill was passed, wherein the coal miners of the Nation have secured the greatest gains they have ever made in wages and working conditions, should prove to everyone how false are all of these charges about the attempt in this act to enslave labor. This satisfactory settlement to the laborers in the coal mines is a dramatic proof of the falsity of the wild and irresponsible charges made against this bill that once it was enacted into law the unions would be busted and powerless to deal with the great corporations. This is the first proof of these false charges on a Nation-wide scale. The charges hurled against this bill by labor leaders and others will continue to be proved false as labor contracts are renegotiated and renewed.

Mr. Speaker, having struggled up from a railroad laborer and later as a newspaper publisher, to the Congress of the United States; because of my close contact with those who work and produce, my keen interest in the welfare of these men and women has remained with me to this day whether they be on the farms, behind the counters, or in the shops and foundries.

We who have recently voted for the labor-management bill are charged by some as voting against the interest of labor, voting to make it more difficult for labor to advance in the future. I brand these charges as false, and I want to take a few minutes today to show that they are false. I propose to mail this analysis of the Taft-Hartley bill to the laboring men of my district. I want them to read it carefully and then decide for

themselves as to the truth or falsity of the charges against this piece of legislation.

There is no finer group of citizens in my entire district than the honest rank and file of labor. If I had believed that this bill, after a close study of it, was unfair to the rank and file of labor, that it would do them a grave injustice, I would not have voted for it. If this bill was vicious and unfair to labor certainly 400 men and women of this Congress would not have voted for it. Remember, only 108 votes were cast against it. May I make this sincere statement: It is my firm belief that 95 percent of the Members of this House are friendly to labor and would not vote to treat labor unjustly.

Mr. Speaker, may I make another statement, and it is this: I predict that when this law has been on the books so that labor may have an opportunity to work under it and to pass judgment on it, that the laboring men of my district and the Nation will say at the expiration of 1 year when it has been tried out, that this law has not taken a necessary, legitimate right away from them, that it has not restricted their opportunity to bargain collectively or to promote their interest through their union activities, and that it has not hurt the laboring man.

We all want labor steadily employed under good working conditions at a high level of wages. I believe that this law will bring about a condition between management and labor that will keep the laboring men more steadily employed on a high-wage basis, that will allow him by reason of keeping steadily employed to earn and take home more money with him at the end of the year than he would have had if this bill had not been enacted into law.

If it proves that I am right, and a year's time will probably tell, then it will prove that the charges hurled against this law as being an attempt to enslave labor, and to do labor an injustice, are false. I ask the laboring men to reserve their judgment and keep an open mind until this matter can be tried out. I do this because I am confident that the results will show that I am right.

Now let us see what worth-while changes this law brings about. It forbids the closed shop. All contracts now existing under the closed-shop agreement remain undisturbed until the end of those contracts. Any closed-shop agreements made within the next 60 days will run to the end of the contract. The union shop is guaranteed. Collective bargaining is guaranteed in this bill. The right to strike is guaranteed. The union shop is permitted when a majority of those employed vote for a union shop.

If the employer refuses a union shop when a majority have voted for it, the men have a right to strike to enforce a union shop. When a union shop is agreed to between the employer and the men in the union, the employer is entitled to hire a nonunion man but within 30 days he must become a member of the union under the union's bylaws. Can there be any objection to this?

Let me remind you that the great railway unions of this Nation work under the open shop and never have worked under the closed shop. These unions have done very well and are most satisfactory to the railway laborers. Of course, every one employed on the railroads are exempted from this act because their labor relations are handled through the Railway Labor Act and a part of this bill follows, so far as mediation and conciliation are concerned, the splendid pattern of the Railway Labor Act which has worked so well for the past number of years.

The check-off can still be maintained if the men working in a union make such a request to their employer. So you see the check-off has not even been banned in this bill. This bill has many provisions in it that give greater democracy and greater protection to the rank and file of the men and women who make up a union. Under this bill any member of a union can rise in the union hall and state his objections and his opposition to any union leader or the way the affairs of the union are being conducted without risking being fired out of the union and an opportunity taken away from him to make a living for his family. Millions of men working in the unions, especially in the big cities, today under the closed-shop agreement have been afraid to voice their opposition to the way their unions have been run for fear they would be thrown out of the union without just cause and the right to work and make a living for his family taken away from him.

This bill provides that a strike cannot be called unless a majority of the men making up the union vote to call such a strike. This is another protection and an extension of democracy to the men and women who make up these unions. Thousands of strikes in the past years have been called by a minority of the votes, and often by the leaders without any sanction by the rank and file. In such cases the rank and file of the union must be out of work with payless pay days, many of them against their will, many of them hoping for the day when the leaders will call off the strike so they can go back to work and have something with which to buy groceries for their families, make payments on their homes or money with which to pay their rent. One of the thousands of illustrations of this abuse, calling men out against their will, was the Allis-Chalmers strike, which lasted nearly a year, in Wisconsin, preventing the farmers from getting new farm machinery. This strike, fomented largely by the Communists, was called off after the Labor Committee went there and made a 4-day investigation, and open hearings, the men on strike voting 15 to 1 to return to work.

Under this bill in the future, when a strike is called, it will be by a majority vote expressing the wish and the will of the men who make up the union. Can there be anything wrong with giving the rank and file in a union who pay their dues to sustain the union the right to control the action of the union? This bill will prevent exorbitant charges for the purpose of joining a union. If the charges are out of reason, the same can be reported to the National Labor Relations Board, which will make an investigation and determine whether the initiation fee to the union is too high. Is there anything wrong with this? This bill will prevent the officers in charge of the union from wasting and giving away as political donations the money in the union treasury that belongs to the rank and file whose dues made the fund possible. This bill compels the officers of a union to make a report to the Government of how much money they have taken in during the year, how much they have left in the treasury, and what they have spent such moneys for as have been expended during the year. And it goes further and provides that a copy of this accounting of expenses be mailed to every man or woman in the union. I know the rank and file who pay the dues will be glad to learn that the officers of all unions must make a just accounting to them, the men and women of the union, as to what they have done with their money.

In the big cities, in the industrial centers, officers of the union have wasted in the past years millions of dollars which the hard-working rank and file have had taken out of their pockets through dues paid by them. In many cases they have grafted and stolen the funds.

Let me cite one instance of waste. In 1941, Abe Goldberg organized a union of produce terminal workers in the freight yard at Philadelphia known as local 929. It has approximately 4,000 dues-paying members. According to the bylaws, 7 members constitute a quorum. Mr. Goldberg and 6 other members picked by him run the union. They have not called an election for new officers since they organized. Working with Mr. Goldberg was Mr. Schlein, who was made president of another union organization known as a Haulers Association, at a salary of $7,800 per year. Goldberg and his gang had the power to organize another union in the produce market known as the Distributors Association. Mr. Schlein was made business manager of that organization, at $7,500 per year. Total, $15,300 for Schlein, and he had another union job paying big fees. Goldberg, Schlein, and his gang have complete control not only of the teamsters and all workers in the produce market there but they have almost complete control of what hours the business or commission men can keep their businesses open and large control over their activities.

To further prove the waste of funds of that union, when Mr. Goldberg went to Florida, spending most of the month of January 1947, their union, controlled by these seven men, voted him $7,000 for the expenses of the trip. Do you need further proof?

Through the manipulations of these unions in the Philadelphia Dock Street Market, when the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor published what was known as a Yearbook of 1946, Goldberg and his crowd collected from the merchants, by putting pressure on them, $100,000 in advertising for this publication. The merchants were not approached by solicitors, but Mr. Goldberg simply billed them for what, in his opinion, would be a proper assessment for the ad. No merchant was asked to approve his ad.

Testimony before the Labor Committee showed that a very close friend of Mr. Goldberg, Mr. Lapenshon, received a kick-back out of these funds of $60,000.

Things got so bad that even a veteran was not permitted to establish himself in business without first contributing to Local 929. Farmers were denied the right to deliver their produce to the market in many instances without joining the union or paying a fee for that privilege.

Naturally, such powerful local union leaders are opposed to their graft and waste of the dues of the members being stopped by a law that would compel them to make a report to the Government and to their members as to how much money they take in and how they spend it. I am sure the rank and file of that local and all union locals will be glad that this protection for them is written into the law.

There are various other provisions written into this act to protect the rank and file of the laboring men of America.

Now, let's see where some of those bad things are that have been talked about in generalities, but have not been pointed out specifically.

Very few, if any, will be pointed out because they do not exist in the bill. This bill seeks to stop some of the abuses which have grown up in labor which are practiced by a very few in labor, but which tend to stir up public sentiment against all labor. May I say that 95 percent or more of labor only want what is fair. Just as you will find in business and in the everyday walk of life there is always a small minority who, through greed and otherwise, carry their activities so far that they must be curbed. That rule holds true with labor the same as it does with business and with the human race in general. If the big labor leaders of the Nation would have stopped these abuses there would have been little reason for writing this law. For years extremely bad abuses have been carried on mostly in the big industrial cities which the labor leaders could have stopped if they would. They did not do it, and because they failed to stop these abuses the people cried out against them to the point where the Congress of the United States tried to reflect the will of the people and at the same time trying to be fair and just to the rank and file of labor saw fit to write this legislation.

With the war over, with the American people and the returning veterans wanting to buy goods of every kind during the year 1946, there were 4,985 strikes involving several million workers, with a total loss of 119,000,000 man-days of work. In the coal industry we were faced with two strikes within a year. In addition to the 119,000,00C man-days of work lost by men who were called out on strike, countless other millions of men were thrown out of work because of the coal and steel strike, automobile strikes, and other strikes. The entire economy of the Nation was seriously threatened and we are still short of steel in the Nation today because of these coal and steel strikes. These strikes punished over 100,000,000 people known as the general public who do not actively belong to either business or labor. This record is a part of the reason why this Congress sought to write a new labor-management bill that would define and protect the rights of the rank and file of labor, that would be fair to business, and that would try to protect over 100,000,000 people who make up the general public.

At a time when the people of the Nation, including millions of veterans who had returned from the defense of their country, wanted to buy clothes, automobiles, trucks, and lumber for houses, I cannot believe the laboring men themselves want to see this country continue in a position where a few groups in nationwide industry can be allowed the high privilege of practically shutting down the business of the Nation, throwing millions of men and women out of work in other craft unions bringing this Nation, if they so desire, to the point of economic chaos. I have more confidence in the good sense and patriotism of the rank and file of labor than to believe that they will insist that a few leaders be allowed to retain such power. I do not believe they want to grant this liberty to any individuals when they understand that a law can be written and enforced, that will protect the men in these big unions in their rights, and at the same time will make it possible for all other union men in the smaller crafts to continue to work at high wages and steady employment.

Mr. Speaker, this law permits industry-wide bargaining, but, at the same time, it tries to prevent the calling and continuing of a strike nationwide, or in any industry so big that it endangers the health and public safety of the Government. This provision is particularly aimed at Nation-wide coal strikes, Nation-wide steel strikes, and could be applied to Nation-wide telephone and telegraph strikes, and probably to some other large unions where a strike might endanger the public health and safety of the Nation. I believe the laboring men generally, as well as everyone else, wants to protect the public health and safety of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, now, in approaching these big strikes or lock-outs here is what the bill provides. First, it provides for an 80-day cooling-off period, which is to give them time for mediation and conciliation to try to bring the employer and the employee together on a fair and amicable basis in settling the dispute and preventing a strike. When a strike or lock-out is threatened the National Labor Relations Board makes an immediate investigation and reports to the President that there is danger in such a strike. The President is empowered to immediately start an investigation to determine the facts, both with regard to the employer and the employee. An impartial board of conciliation steps in at once and sees to it under the law that an honest attempt at collective bargaining is constantly carried forward between the management and the representatives of labor in an attempt to settle the strike. This board of conciliation is working constantly with both sides attempting to find a basis upon which they can agree. The President's board investigates the claims on both sides, gets all the facts ready, and reports them to the President. At the end of 60 days the best offer made by the employer for a settlement is put up to the rank and file of the union, and the rank and file of the union must decide by a majority vote whether they will accept the last best offer made by the management. If they accept by a majority vote, the contract is written on the offer and there is no strike. If they do not accept, and vote to strike, they have a right, after mediation and conciliation have failed, to strike. Is there anything in this procedure that is unfair or attempts to enslave labor? I ask you that question. Now bear in mind that the public health and safety of the Nation is at stake.

Now bear in mind that through this 80 days of negotiation all these men who want to continue to work will be drawing their pay checks regularly and their families will not have to suffer, while in a decent way under the plan of the Government, the Conciliation Board, the Mediation Board, along with labor's representatives will be trying to get together to see if a strike can be prevented. Is not this a fair and better way?

Now, during these 80 days, any or all of the men on their own volition can quit their jobs if they so desire. If during this 80 days the union leaders did call a strike they would violate the law. Many Members wanted to go further and give this Board of Mediation the power to enforce compulsory arbitration. We Members of Congress thought that this step should not be taken. We believed that when the President made an investigation and everything else failed and a strike or lockout was called, that if the President published the facts, and it would show that the fault was on management—that management would be forced by the power of public opinion to agree to the demands of the men. On the other hand, we felt that if it showed that the strike was not justified and that the men should have accepted the last offer of the company, that the rank and file of the men would go back to work under the pressure of public sentiment. I think that Congress showed great patience, great restraint of its power, and great confidence in their belief in the fairness of the laboring men and in management to leave this street with an open end, where a strike could be called as a last resort.

This law requires a 30- and 60-day cooling off period for lesser strikes which should be helpful. It seeks to prevent jurisdictional strikes and boycotts.

Mr. Speaker, the President, in his message to Congress in January, spoke out against jurisdictional strikes and boycotts. William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, testified, as I recall, that he was opposed to jurisdictional strikes and boycotts. Nearly all of the big labor leaders claim there is no justification for jurisdictional strikes and boycotts, that they are bad for labor, but the trouble is that while they had the power to clean up these abuses they have not done it, and unfortunately the big labor leaders of the Nation made no effort to cooperate with the Congress in writing this bill—they simply were against anything, any corrections whatsoever through the writing of a labor

code. Millions of the rank and file of labor want these jurisdictional strikes and boycotts stopped, and they want many other abuses which have brought the good name of labor into disrepute stopped, but nothing has been done. The people of this Nation who do not belong to either business organizations or labor want these abuses corrected, and they want the economy of the Nation to move forward with greater production, which means greater wealth, which means more hours of work with higher wages for the laboring man, and greater production will mean a great reduction in the cost of living to the laboring men and to all the people of the Nation.

The Congress tried to do this in this act and tried to be fair to all these groups in doing it. This law lists as unfair labor practices those acts which constitute secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, wildcat strikes, featherbedding, and the restraint or coercion of the employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the act. An injunction can be used only against jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts, and such an injunction cannot issue until the National Labor Relations Board has made an investigation and has determined that the law is being violated to the extent that an injunction should issue. In other words, a Government body is the only one that can call for an injunction, and the employer is prohibited in these two instances from the use of an injunction against jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts and other unfair labor practices. Those who are guilty of these practices lose the protection of their union and the company is not required to reemploy them unless they see fit to do so. I think you will agree with me that we ought to be able to trust the Government in requesting an injunction and that the other penalties I refer to are very light. Do you see anything in this that tends to enslave the laboring man?

This law provides that if a union violates those unfair practices, thereby damaging the employer, the employer has a right to sue the union. On the other hand, if the management violates the unfair labor practices which are set out against management, the union has a right to sue management and recover.

These penalties were written into the bill in an effort to compel the employer to keep his contract with the union and to compel the union to keep its contract with the employer. If the company gets a judgment the judgment is against the funds in the union treasury and not against the individuals.

This is a two-way street—the company can sue the union and the union can sue the company if either of them fail to keep their contract, and if either of them thereby damage the other. Of course, these damages must be proved in a court of law. Have we reached the place in this country where the employer can fail to keep a contract or where the employee can fail to keep a contract and that nothing can be done about it? The law provides since the establishment of this Nation that when men make contracts they are legally bound to carry them out and are naturally liable for any damages in not carrying out such contracts. This is a good provision. At times it will help the union officers to control some of the more impetuous members of the union. And at times it will put the unions in a position to demand and sue for their just rights when they are violated by the management.

Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to prevent any office in a union from being held by a Communist. Certainly labor will be greatly benefited when it can proudly boast that no union in this country has a Communist official in its union, who preaches the overthrow of this Government by force and violence. The American Federation of Labor, I can say to its credit, is strongly against any Communist even being a member of the union, and certainly they would not have any Communists in an official position in the union if they knew it. Men, high in the American Federation of Labor and men high in the CIO union have charged time and again, and have proven that the CIO has officers in some of their locals who are outright Communists.

Mr. Speaker, these Communists in key positions in unions foment strikes, class hatred, and unrest. They would like to see the country plunged into strikes so continuously that they would wreck the economy of the Nation; in fact, that is the big hope of the parent head of communism in Russia who has predicted time and again the downfall of what he terms our capitalist form of free enterprise. The Kremlin is waiting for this to happen and they realize that the greatest chance for stirring up unrest and destroying the economy of this Nation lies in the infiltration of the Communst ideals into the rank and file of labor. The big labor leaders of the Nation are beginning to be fearful of the damage this group is doing not only to their organizations, but also to the cause of labor and the Nation. The Congress has attempted to help the honest labor leaders of the Nation to curb the power of communism in writing into the law that no Communist can hold an official position in a labor union, and retain for such organization the benefits of the act.

Mr. Speaker, most of the rank and file of labor, in the smaller towns where they only want what is fair, may not understand why it was necessary to pass a labor bill. This bill was passed, in most instances, to stop abuses perpetrated against millions of people both in the public and among the rank and file of labor in the big industrial centers.

An investigation of the union in the Philadelphia produce market brought facts to the Labor Committee that would amaze the honest rank and file of labor which should be corrected. Pages of sworn testimony in the record reveal graft, corruption, coercion of the rank and file of labor who pay the dues, coercion of the produce merchants almost taking over their business, coercion of the farmers delivering produce, all adding to the cost of living to all the people in Philadelphia. This is one instance of hundreds in the big industrial centers.

Mr. Speaker, in the State of Michigan and in other States, men and women who run family stores were boycotted and not allowed to have their produce hauled from the produce centers to their stores unless the owners themselves joined the union. In fact, the names of these small outlying stores who hired no help were posted and the union handlers in the produce centers would not allow meat and produce to be loaded on their trucks when the owners came after it. Some food stores and others were boycotted in the same way unless the man and woman who owned the store and the clerks employed joined the teamsters' union. Think that one over for a minute.

Farmers were not allowed to deliver produce to the markets in New York and other cities unless they paid a fee to the union of about $10 for each load. When they refused their milk and produce were overturned and many of the drivers were beaten up.

In California a big dairy farmer was not allowed to deliver his milk in the city and it was turned over in the streets by the teamsters union because in hauling feed from the city to his farm to feed the dairy cows, he had not hired a union hauler but had hauled the feed himself. In the same state a woman on the farm who raised several hundred turkeys was not permitted to sell them to the dealer until she paid a Union man 30 cents a head.

In northern Illinois and Michigan men who owned and operated small filling stations had their supply of gas and oil stopped at the source because they would not join the teamsters union. Such activities were being committed in many states.

In the great limestone producing quarries in Indiana construction unions in New York boycotted the use of Indiana stone for building purposes if it was polished and cut to meet the architect's requirment and such work done at the stone quarries in Indiana. The unions in New York boycotted the use of this stone unless it was shipped in the rough to New York so that the stone cutters in New York could cut and finish it for the building. Testimony showed that on one building which shipped the stone from Indiana and later cut it in New York, it cost the building contractor over $100,000 more than if the stone had been fabricated in Indiana. Of course, this increases the cost of building. In New Jersey, a jurisdictional strike occurred as to which group of men in the same union would carry the lumber 50 feet from the trucks to a certain spot. This strike went on for weeks stopping $50,000,000 worth of building construction.

In testimony before the Labor Committee it is estimated that the jurisdictional and boycott strikes between the American Federation of Labor and the CIO of Washington and Oregon States with work stoppages of approximately 4 months during 1946, prevented the production of sufficient lumber to build 210,000 homes. Is there any wonder we cannot get housing for the veterans and others? There are pages upon pages of sworn testimony before the Labor Committee given by union men, labor leaders, business men, judges of the court, many men in the rank and file of labor citing hundreds of cases showing abuses that

the ordinary rank and file of labor have no idea exist in this country.

These are some of the reasons why the Congress of the United States felt it was duty bound in the interest of labor and all the people to write this legislation. The Congress, in writing this legislation, sought at all times to protect the rank and file of labor, to give fair protection to business as well, and to protect the interest of all of the people of the Nation.

The labor leaders of the Nation will serve the laboring men and the Nation far better if they will stop their unwarranted and unjustified attacks against this bill and join their efforts in cooperating with the Congress and the people in giving this act a fair trial. If they will, it will prove beneficial to labor and to all the people of the Nation.

Statement of Mr. J. E. Wood on Behalf of Air Line Pilots Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of J. E. Wood, Air Line Pilots Association, made before the President's Special Board of Inquiry on Air Safety:

The subject of runway lengths and the interrelated matter of stalling speeds has long been a subject of vital concern to the air-line pilots.

Our fight for safety on these items extends back over many years, and we feel it will be of interest to the Board if we delve into the background briefly.

We have a rather extensive file of correspondence between the Air Line Pilots Association and the CAA and the CAB which very definitely outlines the pilots' stand at the time these regulations were promulgated. We will just quote pertinent parts from this file, as the presentation of all the material available would be a rather lengthy proceeding. We will start by quoting the greater part of a letter dated March 9, 1940, from David L. Behncke, president of the Air Line Pilots Association, to Mr. Charles F. Dycer, Coordinator, Flight Test and Inspection Unit, Civil Aeronautics Authority, Washington, D. C.:

"In further reference to your letter of February 6 and my answer dated February 10, I would like to advise that the air-line pilots' engineering and airworthiness advisory committee recently held a meeting for the purpose of thoroughly going over the CAA's proposed revisions to CAR 04 for the purpose of making final recommendations thereon.

"In short, their final decisions coincide with the views expressed to you in my letter of February 10. So that the engineering units of the Civil Aeronautics Authority will have an unmistakable understanding as to what are the recommendations of the Air Line Pilots Association relative to the proposed changes in question, I will again outline for your information exactly what their final recommendations are:

"I. The committee is against the 85-mile per-hour stalling speed figure in paragraph (b), page 3, of section 04.7000 in the CAA's proposal. They are strongly of the opinion that the figure of 85 miles per hour should be reduced to 80. Before making this decision a thorough discussion was had and all factors affecting this very important part of the question were carefully weighed and thoroughly considered.

"During these deliberations the committee was not unmindful of all the factors involved and discussed the entire situation with open minds. In the first place, the opinion of the line pilots right from the start was that the part of the CAR having to do with landing speeds should be left as written unless equally definite limitations could be substituted. In reviewing the proposed revisions, the committee reached the conclusion that paragraph (b) of section 04.7000 places a definite limit on landing speeds within a reasonable range providing the figure of 85 miles per hour is changed to 80. When it is considered that a stalling speed of 80 miles per hour permits an increase in the present landing speed of 70 miles per hour by approximately 10 miles faster, the reasonableness of the committee's position on this very important part of the question is amply demonstrated.

"In a problem of this kind, regardless of all the arguments, there are certain unalterable facts that, because of their very nature, cannot be brushed aside. In the final analysis, the pilots must fly the equipment that will be built in accordance with the limitations that will be established in the revised regulations. The committee does not agree with the theory that the day has passed when air liners will land only on improved landing areas. They will continue to make unscheduled landings and, therefore, this part of the problem can likewise not be ignored. And, even if it were possible to always land on properly improved flying fields, the fact still remains that under the requirements of paragraph (b), section 04.7000, aircraft can be built that will land at 85 miles per hour which landing speed is considered too high by the committee. It can be argued that the aircraft built under the requirements of the proposed regulations will not land this fast but again the fact remains that there is nothing definite in the proposed regulations to definitely compel slower landing speeds.

"Another very important fact that has an unmistakably important bearing on this entire problem is that, even if an aircraft does land on approved fields, which is certainly not always possible, operating conditions are not always going to be ideal. For example, an airplane that lands at 80 miles per hour will, with a moderately light coat of ice, land at a speed of 90 miles per hour or faster. Similarly, a craft with an 85-mile-per-hour landing speed, which is possible under the proposed regulations as written, would, under similar conditions, land at 95 miles per hour and if a heavier or possibly a rough coat of ice accumulated on the wings and other surfaces, the actual landing speed would mount to a figure in excess of 100 miles per hour. General field and runway conditions must also be considered. It is not uncommon in air-line operation to encounter landing surfaces glazed with ice and on fields where there are no runways, it is not uncommon to encounter conditions where it is impossible to secure proper braking action because of slippage under the tires. For instance, if a field is frozen all but an inch or two on the surface, and such surface is wet, the slippage is so great that the braking action is practically nil.

"Another common condition that renders brakes ineffectual is when a plane lands and runs through a low place in a field where water has accumulated. We have all had experience with wet automobile brakes and the result is much the same in a plane. To forcefully illustrate this last point, your attention is invited to two recent accidents, one on Penn-Central and one on Braniff, involving aircraft being unable to stop because of tire slippage resulting in sliding off fields on which they had effected a landing and into the bordering fences. In the case of the latter company mentioned, the pilot reported that his brakes were rendered ineffectual for a large part of his landing run because of running through low water-covered parts of the field. In this particular instance the plane was on the ground for more than 1,800 feet and yet was unable to stop because of slick field conditions and wet brakes. It was lucky that obstructions in these instances were only fences. What if they were immovable obstructions? No doubt, a number of other accidents were caused by similar reasons, but the two mentioned are recent.

"It is granted that there are a number of other factors that go to make up safe performing air line equipment but the committee is of the opinion that the designing engineers should be caused to realize, through the means of properly limiting regulations, that the speed at which air liners actually make contact with the ground, especially under adverse conditions, is highly important to air safety.

"Landing gear, retracting mechanism failures, malfunctioning of flap actuating mechanism, the failure of tail wheel or steering devices, plus the ever-present possibility of landing gear structure failure, are also factors that must be continuously reckoned with when landing speed limitations are established.

"A rule that cannot be lightly disregarded is that the kinetic energy to be dissipated in landing or perhaps in sliding, tearing, or crushing, is 61 percent greater at 89 miles per hour and 102 percent greater at 100 miles per hour than it is at 70 miles per hour.

"In view of the foregoing and to insure against the dangers that are akin to high landing speeds, the Air Line Pilots Engineering and Airworthiness Advisory Committee sternly instructed me to convey to the Authority the recommendation that a stalling speed of 80 miles per hour should be the maximum allowed in paragraph (b), section 04.7000, and that they were unalterably against allowing this to stand at the figure of 85 miles per hour. They further took the position that because they were actually flying the equipment of today and will be called upon to fly the equipment of tomorrow, and because of their intimate knowledge of the underlying factors involved, they feel that the Authority, whose interest is in the final analysis the same as theirs, would not want to cause the building of equipment that lands faster than the pilots feel is safe at the present stage of the industry's development.

"II. Paragraph (f), section 04.7000, on page 4 of the proposed new regulations was in part objected to by the committee. They recommend that the fraction 10/7 in the fifth line from the top be changed to read 10/6 and that the figure 70 percent in the third line from the bottom be changed to 60 percent. The committee is of the opinion that this part of the proposed regulations has a definite relationship to landing speeds. As I explained at the Kansas City conference, the pilots are definitely of the opinion that landing and approach speeds should be held to reasonable levels in the interest of safety.

"To bring a plane in at a high rate of speed with the idea of getting the wheels on the ground and then depending on excessive use of brakes to dissipate such high speed is, in the opinion of the committee, the wrong way to go about it. In this particular part of the problem there is again that ever-present necessity of reaching a certain balance between all the factors involved that can best be described by the words 'practical' and 'reasonable,' and last but certainly not least 'safety.' An airplane that uses 70 percent of a given landing area is, in the language of the pilots, 'landing rather hot.' In

the first place, under the proposed regulations, there is no definitely established runway length or allowable width of the usable part of a landing area and here again we will not be troubled in actual operating conditions when a field is sufficiently large, but what we must reckon with is the smallest fields into which a given aircraft will be certificated to operate.

"In all the arguments on this particular part of the question, it was brought out that under the new regulations much dependence was placed on good braking facilities. Again the committee wishes to point out that even if the brakes and their actuating mechanism function perfectly, and tail wheel and steering mechanism likewise function perfectly, there is still a very real and often present danger of slippery, ice-glazed, and other slick field conditions that reduce the grip of tires when brakes are applied. For example, if a plane uses 70 percent of a runway in landing on the smallest field approved for the particular plane used in this illustration, and field conditions are such that the effectiveness of brakes is materially reduced, it isn't going to take very long to use up the remaining 30 percent and have trouble. It was argued at the Kansas City conference that a pilot attempting to make a short or emergency landing would come closer to the obstruction than 50 feet when coming into a landing area. This is possibly true, but the committee is of the opinion that no one would recommend that a pilot fly a heavy air-line transport very much closer than this, especially when a ship is performing under conditions of greatly reduced speed, which naturally reduces its controllability because of sluggish response to the controls.

"Everything considered, 50 feet is not a great amount of distance for clearance and because of this it is not reasonable to assume that much dependence can be placed on cutting corners insofar as clearing obstacles by less than 50 feet is concerned. In the interest of safety, the committee is firmly of the opinion that the above-recommended changes should be made a part of the new regulations.

"Summarizing, the committee wishes me to point out to the representatives of the Authority that they are strongly of the opinion that their recommendations as outlined in this letter are reasonable and entirely necessary in the interest of safety in the current stage of air-line equipment development. They further pointed out that in considering and reaching their conclusions they were not unmindful of the economic factors involved and in this regard feel that they have been entirely fair and at the same time strongly feel that the recommendations they have made are paramount to the maintaining of the proper degree of safety in future air-line aircraft development.

"As one of the committeemen put it, the committee reached its conclusion after conscientious and painstaking study of all factors involved, and in the final analysis their desire and that of the Authority is identical, because both the pilots who must fly the equipment and the Authority who is responsible for its safe operation are one and the same, and that is safety first. The adoption of the committee's recommendations on the proposed new regulations is earnestly solicited by the Air Line Pilots Engineering and Airworthiness Advisory Committee."

This gives an idea of the reaction taken by the air-line pilots to the industry effort to establish a high stall-speed limitation.

On April 10, 1940, Mr. Dycer replied as follows:

"1. It is noted from the contents of your letter that, although the recommendation is that the 85 miles per hour stalling speed with flaps in the approach condition be reduced to 80 miles per hour, the discussion following the formal recommendation appears to be primarily concerned with establishing this 80 miles per hour as a limit upon the landing speed. With this in mind we have proposed to and obtained approval from the remainder of the industry that there be instead an 80 miles per hour limit upon the stalling speed with the flaps in the landing condition. This, we believe, will accomplish the objective toward which your recommendation was aimed, and we are therefore recommending this latter for approval by the Authority."

Considerable additional controversial correspondence ensued regarding various flap settings which should be used in figuring the stall speed, but eventually a regulation was written which, although not completely satisfactory, the pilots felt would give them a reasonable ceiling on this critical problem affecting air safety.

As closing remarks in a letter dated July 22, 1940, to Mr. Behncke giving the many arguments in favor of the method used in arriving at the stall-speed limitation, Mr. Dycer stated:

"For all these reasons we suggest that the amendment as written be allowed to stand until experience with airplanes built under the requirements contained therein indicates the possibility that this limitation should be reduced."

Now let's just sum up the implications at this point.

In the face of the pilots' strong objection at the method used in establishing the 80-mile-an-hour limitation and also in the face of the obvious possibility that even this limitation might have to be reduced in the interest of safety, as experience was gained, the manufacturers proceeded to build airplane after airplane that had no possibility of meeting the regulation if any load was carried.

There perhaps was justification for some compromise with safety during the war years. However, the justification for extending this compromise with safety into airline operation, when this equipment returned from the war, has never been conceded by the pilots.

Instead of changing the airplane design to meet the regulation which had been agreed upon for safe air-line operation, the hue and cry immediately became "change the regulation to fit the airplane."

In a letter dated December 31, 1940, to Mr. Behncke from Mr. Edward Warner of the Civil Aeronautics Board, discussing regulations, Mr. Warner states:

"I think everyone will agree with you that it would be very undesirable if regulations were made to fit aircraft, rather than the reverse."

Yet when the war-weary equipment returned in 1945 and could not meet the requirements for airline operation, the procedure which Mr. Warner stated would be "very undesirable" is exactly the action that was taken.

The regulation was changed to fit the airplane. The doors were thrown open. The stall-speed limitation was removed completely and although there were supposedly checks and balances in the requirements which the engineers said gave the necessary safety factor, the pilots nevertheless noted with foreboding that the stall speeds and landing speeds were way above the limitation which they, in full realization of their grave responsibilities, had protested as being too high.

In the spring of 1945, a proposal was received by the Air Line Pilots Association for comments and suggestions which alerted the pilots to the grave realization that complete elimination of a stall-speed requirement was under way.

The pilots and the ALPA engineering department protested vigorously. We were castigated roundly by engineers and other experts as obstructionists. Brilliantly worded newspaper and magazine articles accused us of blindly overlooking the airport expansion program, which would provide enough runways of adequate length, and the landing aids program which was to provide us with lights and facilities for straight-in approaches from more than one direction.

The net result of this campaign was that, in spite of our fight for air safety, we got the high landing speeds and high stalling speeds at that time, but today we still do not have the improved runways or the landing aids we were promised.

We were accused at that time of stifling rapid progress and of having no vision. We regret to say that practically the only rapid progress we have noted, since we were overruled, has been the exceedingly rapid progress of our airplanes through the fences, ditches, and localizer shacks at the boundaries of our inadequate airports. Our vision has also dimmed somewhat, peering for poorly lighted fields with inadequate or incomplete instrument approach facilities.

In a desperate effort to prevent the elimination of the stall-speed limitation, Mr. Behncke wrote a lengthy letter to Mr. Dycer on August 2, 1945, giving in detail the arguments of the pilots against this action. A copy of this letter went to every member of the CAB.

In the light of what has transpired since that time in operating these airplanes, it might be interesting to quote a few of the predictions and objections contained in this letter:

"Our engineering and air-safety department has informed me that on April 2, 1945, you submitted a proposal to the Air Line Pilots Association for comments and suggestions relating to the elimination of the stalling speed of 80 miles per hour in part 04 of the Civil Air Regulations and, in fact, proposed to eliminate the stalling speed entirely as a definite and fixed design, engineering and performance requirements for air-line aircraft. Headlines in magazines are beginning to appear, of which the following is typical: 'Unlimited stalling speed asked by 9 of 11 big plane builders.' It is all very disquieting. I note from our files that Mr. T. G. Linnert, our aeronautical engineer, has been carrying on considerable correspondence with you regarding this proposal."

This definitely indicates that it was pressure from the manufacturers that initiated this fateful action. Again we quote from the letter of August 2, 1945, from Mr. Behncke to Mr. Dycer:

"On February 6, 1942, when part 04 was adopted finally by the Civil Aeronautics Board, it was the missing yardstick and the signal to the engineers of all the manufacturing companies interested in building postwar air line equipment and all the air line companies to proceed with their postwar plans. The CAB's action on February 6, 1942, in adopting part 04 of the CAR gave them all the green light as it gave them all their postwar air line equipment planning, engineering, and building yardstick. The result was that everyone went to work.

"Now it seems that when the whole proposition is well along and in midstream of completion, you, of all people, who should be its greatest stabilizing force, are suggesting that all concerned change horses right in the middle of the stream and start plodding in a new direction."

This clearly illustrates our previously stated point that after the requirements had been established, by all concerned, the manufacturers proceeded to build aircraft which could not possibly meet the rules and then immediately brought pressure to bear to have the rules changed to fit the airplane.

Another quote from Mr. Behncke's letter to Mr. Dycer:

"Very few people give any thought whatever to what the eliminating of the stalling

speed limitation or the raising of the stalling speed for air-line aircraft in the CAA's engineering requirements for the planning, engineering, and building of such aircraft really means to our national and international airport planning and building program. To get right to the point, this is, in itself, a terrifically important question. It can make a billion dollar national and international scheme of airports practically obsolete overnight. Then where is the second billion dollars going to come from? The fact of the matter is that it isn't going to come. Much more can be said on this point—in fact, volumes could be written about this one point alone, but the stalling speed question of air-line equipment and our airport planning and building program both nationally and internationally are so completely geared together and related that they are one and the same. We had better realize this or there will be much wailing when the investigators begin their inquisitions on the lack of proper postwar and other correlated air-line equipment engineering and airport planning by our Federal regulatory agencies that can easily result in losses of many millions upon many more millions of dollars to the taxpayers."

In commenting on this quote regarding lack of correlation between airport design and airplane landing speeds, it is significant to note that American Airlines reportedly will have to curtail operations in approximately 19 of 20 cities when they inaugurate service with their new Convair 240's in the near future. Unless, of course, previous precedent is followed and the regulations are changed to fit the airplane to the inadequate airports. It will be regrettable if this is done, because airplanes do not seem to understand legislation very well; and they land just as fast after a new rule is passed as they did before.

One more quote from Mr. Behncke's letter of August 2, 1945, to Mr. Dycer:

"The peacetime public is terrifically conscious of the fact that human life is very precious and once lost is lost forever. All who are making grand speeches and gazing starry-eyed and too intently in the crystal ball of tomorrow's air-transportation development, failing to understand and realize what air safety really means, will soon—and, in fact, sooner than they expect—be judged by a highly critical public for their actions and the judgment rendered will not be lenient, particularly in regard to the safety factor in postwar air-line-transportation developments which must depend upon the patronage of John Q. Public to exist and go forward."

We have not quoted these predictions from the past merely to be able to say "we told you so." Rather we feel that it will be of benefit to the Board to have an accurate, if brief, background knowledge of what the pilot's position has been throughout these developments up to the present time, so that perhaps a comparative evaluation of many of our practical recommendations, as determined by experience in the past, can be made.

May I summarize the action taken in the past several years by the air carriers and manufacturers and, you might say, collaborated in by the CAB and CAA. First, you need rules to govern designs for the future aircraft. The aircraft did not meet the rules, so the rules were changed to meet the aircraft. The aircraft would not fit into the airports so the airports should be changed to fit the aircraft. This being impossible it is proposed to fit the aircraft to the airport. The answer is in our opinion very obvious.

I shall close by again quoting from Mr. Behncke's letter to Mr. Dycer:

"The air-line pilots of this Nation have said many times in the past and they shall keep saying it over and over, again and again that the CAB and the entire CAA must stand unalterably in opposition to all moves of this kind as stanchly and immovable as the universe itself. Any other course is intolerable, dangerous, unsound, and thoroughly and unmistakably fraught with every conceivable manner of confusion, frustration, and instability for all the air-line industry in all its branches and can only result in a deadly force against a right and proper degree of air safety in air-line transportation, and will prove to be an unforgivable travesty on the inherent right of the public to have human life protected properly in day-after-day, year-in-and-year-out air-line travel."

This, gentleman, was the stand of the air-line pilots in 1940, and again in 1945 and it is our stand in 1947. We have not altered our position in any respect.

Food Prices and Foreign Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I have naturally become acutely conscious of the inflationary budgets presented to us this year by the administration and their effect upon the national economy. As a fruit rancher, I am also conscious of the publicity and attention given to the rise in food costs which, more than anything else, is attributable to these same inflationary budgets and the purchase of tremendous amounts of foodstuffs for foreign-relief purposes.

In this connection, I think the following editorial from the July 1947 issue of the Washcoegg, publication of the Washington Cooperative Farmers' Association, is worth while as a frank statement of the truth about food prices:

WHO IS SPOOFING WHOM?

Living costs are high as most everyone agrees. But why blame this plight on food producers—the farm families who are now the brunt of an unjust attack by the metropolitan press, periodicals, and other groups?

City folks say food prices are too high. Laboring groups say the same thing—everyone blames the other fellow. And while all of this is going on Government spokesmen on one hand are trying to "talk down" prices, but with the other are carrying out practices which bolster prices.

Why not let's get to the bottom of this business? High living costs as far as foods are concerned are mostly because the Government is purchasing tremendous quantities of foodstuff to help feed the hungry of the world. In effect, this establishes an artificial price structure and throws the law of supply and demand out of kilter. It means the higher costs of food are resulting in continuous demands by labor and other groups for higher wages and salaries to meet these higher living costs. The whole thing is a spiral upwards—and the end result is that every particle of food the farmer manufactures costs him a great deal more to turn out and he must necessarily receive higher prices for it.

Most everyone is humanitarian enough to want to help the less fortunate of the world. If the food we send abroad will alleviate suffering even just a little bit, it is a job well done and will have the support of the general public.

But why not let's have the truth about the whole thing? Why not let's have Government spokesmen come out and say exactly what they're doing—that every time they purchase a lot of food for export it means just that much more competition for remaining supplies at home? And when consumers compete for scarce articles they are bound to bid up prices.

This is not the time to hide the facts under a bushel and let the metropolitan consumer feel that farmers are the big bogies who are taking so much of their pay checks. Instead, it is time for a clear-cut, simple statement by Government spokesmen to tell exactly what is going on. It is time to admit that costs are high—and will remain so until the vast populations throughout the world are able to feed and clothe themselves as they did before the war.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky, from the Washington Times-Herald of July 10, 1947:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Much of history is the record of good intentions ending in astounding errors. The Marshall plan gives the appearance, at this stage, of having been conceived in charity and good will, but inevitably having produced a whopper of an historical error, the correction of which may not be possible.

It started with a speech at Harvard on June 5 in which Secretary of State George Marshall said:

"Any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative.

"Any government that is willing to assist in the task of recovery will find full cooperation, I am sure, on the part of the United States Government. Any government which maneuvers to block the recovery of other countries cannot expect help from us.

"Furthermore, governments, political parties, or groups which seek to perpetuate human misery in order to profit therefrom politically or otherwise will encounter the opposition of the United States."

That is obviously a firm promise. Secretary Marshall is sure, you will note. He does not say how much. He does not describe the nature of the assistance. He merely says that we shall assist a certain type of nation and oppose another type.

So far this is in conformity with the Truman doctrine, although it is a rejection of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, at which the big three made no such fine distinctions.

At that time, we spoke only of "peace-loving" nations, meaning Soviet Russian but not Switzerland.

George Marshall sets up a European modus operandi by saying further:

"* * * It would be neither fitting nor efficacious for this Government to undertake to draw up unilaterally a program designed to place Europe on its feet economically. This is the business of the Europeans. The initiative, I think, must come from Europe.

"The role of this country should consist of friendly aid in the drafting of a European program and of later support of such a program so far as it may be practical for us to do so.

"The program should be a joint one, agreed to by a number, if not all, European nations."

Bevin of England and Bidault of France immediately accepted that as a promise, a guarantee and an invitation to go ahead. They called a conference, and included the Russians. The latter wisely wanted to know precisely what the Americans intended to do, but that no one could say.

The most that the Secretary of State could offer was a proposal to Congress for an appropriation, estimated to be $5,000,000,000 a year, more or less, for a number of years, which Congress might or might not agree to do.

Certainly the present Congress is not likely to make any such appropriation on Mr. Truman's or Mr. Marshall's say-so without further and profound investigation. This the Russians understood and they estimated that it would not go through. The British must grasp at any straw because they are so short of dollars and socialism in that country is inadequately productive.

Now, the good intentions in all this lies in the necessity of aiding Great Britain, France, Italy, and other European countries that are willing to avoid communism at home and subservience to Soviet Russia.

The error lies in the method of doing it.

Instead of determining what this creditor country can and will do and stipulating the terms and conditions of aid, Marshall set up a debtors' conference to gang up on the creditor or to stipulate such conditions as the creditor could not meet which, in the end, will justify their assumption of a promise given and not kept.

Secretary Marshall might have been warned by the history of the relations between this country and Europe since World War I. He chose to assume that he had a device which would work because of Europe's desperation.

Actually, European politicians are never desperate because they can always resort to revolution and communism. Only the United States is desperate because this country wants peace and production.

Europe is prepared to make us pay her price for peace and production—any price we can be got to pay. This lack of understanding of European history got George Marshall into his present trouble.

The New Coal Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan appearing in today's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I have received from my district several severe criticisms of Congress for remaining silent over the demands made by John L. Lewis and the acceptance by the coal operators of the coal contract. These constituents feel that while Congress is busy with a new tax bill, trying desperately to reduce taxes, along comes John L. Lewis, a private citizen, levying a tax on his own on the American people, which amounts to approximately a dollar a ton on coal. Of course this affects our economy right down the line, especially steel products and for every coal consumer.

This is a sad state of affairs. In trying to look at this situation from the operator's standpoint, I imagine it evolved itself to the point of whether we would have a paralyzing strike or the hope of having a long-time period of production. A strike without a doubt, would have eventually ended with the Government again taking over the mines and I, for one, favor the operators running their own show. From past experience the operators know that the Government would have granted Mr. Lewis his every demand. We cannot be too harsh on the operators and after all it is not the function of Congress to interfere with collective bargaining. Personally, I feel that John L. Lewis is at the height of his power and every time the price of coal advances the industry can expect further inroads of other types of fuel for power and heat.

MINE OWNERS' YIELDING TO LEWIS LIKENED TO MUNICH APPEASEMENT—MARK SULLIVAN CITES THEIR HOPES OF PEACE IN THE COAL INDUSTRY FOR A LONG TIME, BUT HE SEES AN OMINOUS STEP ON THE ROAD TO INFLATION

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, July 10.—The contract made by the coal-mine operators with Mr. John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers, by which Mr. Lewis got practically all he demanded, has led to an aftermath which includes criticism of the mine owners for making the contract. Much of this focuses upon the United States Steel Corp., a large owner of coal mines, and upon its president, Mr. Benjamin F. Fairless, who was a spokesman in the negotiations with Mr. Lewis. Criticism of Mr. Lewis is passed over, presumably on the assumption, sustained by experience, that Mr. Lewis is immune; he either has developed an induration, or sees advantage in criticism as a thing that strengthens his position with his union following, whichever way you choose to read Mr. Lewis' extraordinary mind.

What went on among the mine owners as they negotiated with Mr. Lewis—while neither this nor anything else can ameliorate the effects of this contract on the public and the country's economy—reveals the reasons the mine owners took the course they did. Their early discussions with Mr. Lewis might justify the term "negotiation"; there was some argument about minor aspects of Mr. Lewis' demands, such as payments to the miners' welfare fund. But what went on toward the end could hardly be called negotiation; it might be more accurately described as an ultimatum by Mr. Lewis: The mine owners could accept or refuse.

BLOW TO THE ECONOMY

Leaders among them gave thought to the two sets of consequences they were obliged to choose between. Resistance would mean a strike. While the new labor law in some respects enables an employer to resist a strike more effectively than the former one-sided law, nevertheless neither the new law or any other condition could bring a strike to termination in less than some 3 months or so. Meanwhile the strike in coal would bring paralysis of almost the whole of the country's industry and economy. Avoidance of this calamity was mainly the thing for which the mine owners chose to pay the price they did.

Mr. Fairless, in a statement he made as the contract was signed, emphasized the effect on an industrial paralysis on the entire country, and added that it might also have had an adverse effect upon the international situation. What was in the mine owners' minds was that much of Europe is at this time dependent upon America for coal; it is being shipped to Europe in large quantities. Deprivation of American coal, causing distress and paralysis to Italy and other European countries, might strengthen the movement toward communism. Also, interruption of coal to Europe might impair European confidence in the Marshall plan, much cherished by our Government, which rests upon the assumption that we can help Europe recover.

The mine owners apprehended that a coal strike might lead to another seizure of the mines by the Government. Though the wartime law under which past seizures were made ended July 1, there was already talk that in the event of a coal strike, Congress would pass an act authorizing seizure. And seizure, the mine owners felt, would be likely to end, as past seizures have, with a granting by the Government of most of Mr. Lewis' demands. Granting of the demands by the Government some months from now would be no less undesirable than granting by the mine owners now.

AN ADDITIONAL MOTIVE

An additional motive weighing with the mine owners was the wish to get on with certain technological improvements in the industry now well under way, such as "gasification" of coal at the mines, expected to offset higher cost of coal.

The mine owners, as a representative of them said to this writer, had to "choose between the devil and the deep blue sea"—in which figure of speech let us assume that Mr. Lewis is the deep blue sea. The defect of their choice is suggested by a phrase Mr. Fairless used. He hoped the contract would bring "industrial peace in the bituminous coal industry for a long time to come." These words uncomfortably recall the phrase used to justify concession to Hitler at Munich for the sake of "peace in our time."

The decision the mine owners came to—leading to higher prices for coal as a basic commodity and hence to higher prices for all sorts of goods—is a step, and an ominous one, in the upward spiral of the country's price level of goods generally. That, if it should go on to serious inflation, would be a greater calamity than any which the mine owners envisaged as possible consequences of resisting Mr. Lewis.

Dissipation of American Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky, from the Washington Times-Herald:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

For three centuries, work was the creed of Americans. The early settlers had to work or starve. The founders of this Nation had to work, or there could have been no Nation. The honored men were not aristocrats, not those who traced their lineage back to William the Conqueror.

Honor went to those who achieved success in any field by hard work.

And out of all this work, the people of this country piled up huge wealth. They created an industrial structure which stands unparalleled in history. They established means of communication, railroads, high-

ways, telegraph, telephone, and more recently the airplane and radio, in the greatest profusion.

They could afford the luxuries of churches, schools, hospitals, and numerous social institutions and associations. Every small town, as well as the large cities, had newspapers and other vehicles of information and free expression of opinion.

All this was the result of work in a free society where each man followed his judgment and gave a maximum of effort. Those billions that politicians speak of so freely and scatter to the winds is the hoard of generations of Americans, accumulating and increasing from the time of the early colonies until these days of profligacy.

It is this hoard that is now being dissipated. Much of it is being spent in futile politics, to putty the holes of a declining society in Europe and Asia.

As dangerous as such a course is, even more dangerous, more frightening is the damage done by imitation of European ways by those who, having the benefits of this free and rich country, seek utopias in a decaying society.

What is the utopia that Europe offers? At best it is a workless society. For the mark of a gentleman in any aristocratic community was that he did not work. He might govern other men. He might control their minds and even their persons. He might devote himself to fashion or to dilettantism in one of the arts or humanities, but he did not soil himself by productivity.

He did not add to the wealth of his nation or any other. He was an ornament.

That, to many, is utopia. It is the ideal to which men, in this generation, look. That, for instance, is what happened in England. For decades the British socialists have been offering their followers a society with less work, fewer hours, more leisure.

When the Socialist government took over, the British workingman assumed that utopia had arrived and that he could work less and be guaranteed from the cradle to the grave. France went through that period on the verge of World War II and was, because of it, smashed by the Nazi.

Here in this country all sorts of devices are offered to lessen productivity until today we are suffering a scarcity which is the result of decreased work. Every industry suffers from limitations upon the efficiency of the worker who restricts his output to conform to rules set to equalize the more competent with the least competent.

Ceilings have been placed upon human progress by rejecting new devices which increase output and which forbid exhibitions of superior abilities by those who possess them.

The danger is that while we are consuming our savings in wars, relief, and aids, we are not building new hoards of wealth by increased output. As our savings decrease—and the national debt is the best example of the decrease—prices rise, wages grow meaningless because of higher prices, and the tax rate becomes an unbearable impediment to new developments and greater output.

In a word, we are being squeezed between losses in our National Capital hoard and the greater difficulty in individual efforts to produce more and to keep the rewards of production.

That is what the Utopians have brought us. For while those who would put heaven on earth immediately paint roseate pictures of what the outcome of their changes will be, actually they make us all poorer as individuals, and they are impoverishing our collective hoard upon which we all depend for national and individual security. This mischief may not appear in the national balance sheet at the moment, but the warning is already in the figures.

The West Pays Its Debts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include an article printed in the July 7, 1947, issue, of the Wenatchee Daily World, of Wenatchee, Wash., telling of the expected final payment this year on the bonded indebtedness of the Icicle irrigation district, in Washington's Vale of Cashmere.

This article, coming only a few months after the celebration of the pay-off on the Tieton reclamation project in central Washington, is just another proof to the Nation that the West pays its debts. It shows that we of the West are worthy of the investment made in our enterprises by the Federal Government and how this irrigation project, begun in 1923, has added materially to the wealth of the State of Washington and the United States.

The article follows:

ICICLE WATER PAY-OFF

CASHMERE, July 6.—Three hundred and fifty Cashmere Valley fruit growers after harvesting this year's apple crop will pay off the final $60,000 bonds on the life line of their industry—the Icicle irrigation district.

Payment of the bonds will cut their production costs for the growers have been paying $10 extra per acre on retirement of the outstanding bonds. The Icicle, which secures its name from the source of their water supply, Icicle River and Canyon, winds 40 miles at 380 feet elevation above the valley.

Four thousand feet of tunnel, 3.7 miles of pipe lines and the remainder of the irrigation ditch, wood and steel pipe, covers 3,900 acres of orchard land and supplies supplemental water for 3,600 more acres in the Cashmere and Peshastin area.

Claude M. Zediker, secretary of the Icicle district, engineer, fruit grower himself, and the mayor here said today they had spent $1,000,000 since 1923 on reconstruction of the entire system, now 24 years old. He said that the reconstruction involved tearing out flumes, excavation and lining the ditch with 3 inches of concrete—all necessary to secure more water and strengthen the existing system.

The district was organized in 1917 by a private company financed by the Black interests in Seattle. The present nonprofit cooperative took over in 1923 and things started happening. Zediker told of their immediate concern for insuring a continuous supply of water. Because of a gradual reduction in the supply—they went to the source and built three water reservoirs that could be emptied, when needed, into the Icicle Creek. These reservoirs are located at Coldchuck, Eight Mile, and Klonaqua Lakes.

There was another reason for their concern about ample water—overgrazing of sheep within the forests had cut heavily into the soil—erosion led to a sparse watershed and a diminishing supply of water. Government grazing officials doubted this effect on the apple industry; they asked for an inspection and set the date.

"They picked a date when normally sheepmen wouldn't be releasing their sheep to the forests," Zadiker explained, and not around September 1 when they could see the actual results of overgrazing. They must have forgotten to notify sheepmen about the inspection trip or else they didn't cooperate, for when we made the trip, the sheep were there and the damage was plainly visible. Government men then conceded we knew more about the forests and the necessity of protecting the watershed than they did—so we won out in the end and haven't been bothered since."

Eighty-five percent of fruit is water and you don't get fruit tonnage without water—hence the value of the Icicle and similar irrigation districts. Conservatively, Zediker estimated from a study made during the lean years of the thirties that every acre of an average orchard produced at least $500 to other industries of the State before the landowner received a cent from his investment, water charges, or taxes and labor for himself or family.

"By other industries," Zediker continued, "I mean production of boxes, spray material, paper, labor market, warehouse and cold-storage operations, and the railroads. If it was worth $500 in the 1930's think of what it would actually be worth today—I estimate it would run to $1,200 or $9,000,000 alone for this valley—and this doesn't include revenue from the apples themselves."

The annual cleaning job on the Icicle represents quite a chore. Sections sometimes have to be removed and replaced, strainers must be cleaned, and oftentimes the 30 or 40 workmen have to go right into the tunnel pipe themselves to get the debris which has accumulated during the 5-month continuous operations from May 1 to October 1.

Zediker said the pipe and tunnel was in good shape and no further expansion or replacement program was in sight at present. They are not taking on any new customers, but are improving the service to present owners—the growers themselves.

The directors of the corporation, elected annually, with each grower allowed one vote irrespective of land holdings are as follows: Dale Kooken, Dryden; president, Vern Cedergreen, Monitor; and J. Howard Stephen, Leavenworth. C. P. Hartvedt is the manager.

When you talk about Cashmere Valley irrigation, you cannot overlook Peshastin irrigation district—an integral part of the Icicle. They have a 40-percent interest in the Icicle ditch from the intake to the diversion across the Wenatchee River—1 mile east of Leavenworth. In addition, they control 50 percent of the north side diversion to Peshastin Creek.

The history of the Peshastin is equally as interesting and, from a historical viewpoint, the older in inception and water rights. The original stock company—called the Peshastin Ditch Co.—dates back to 1891, and thereby hangs a tale.

In 1942 the 50-year State charter or franchise expired. The stock company was not informed and legal counsel were a bit lax. In effect, they went out of existence as a legal body. So the growers were more than happy; they jumped in with $20,000 and bought up the district that originally spent $60,000 for physical equipment alone. In reality, they bought at receivership, paying what was owed—a rare opportunity for the growers to form their own cooperative, which today is debt free and unencumbered.

There was a time when water rights were sold for loans and taken as security—many a time an orchard purchaser would buy without the water rights appurtenant to the orchard—even legal action ensued which ended up with the water rights coming back to the property. But all that is changed now and the directors have the growers' viewpoint for they are the growers and have seen both the lean and the lush years. They know a man who puts work into an orchard must have water and, like taxes, they remain with the property.

The Peshastin district, a much lower elevation ditch, serves 3,600 acres in the low lying valley lands of Peshastin, Dryden, and

Cashmere. They take their water from three sources, Wenatchee River, Peshastin Creek, and Icicle through 11 miles of pipe and ditch. Water users are assessed only $3 per acre, since they own the district. The ditch is 5 feet across and flumes are constructed at Dryden and Dittman Hill.

There is the story of the Government official who in the early forties had the bright idea of combining the Peshastin ditch and the Icicle in one. It sounded good and seemed practical but these ditches are like family affairs—you must know them to understand them—and oftentimes unknowingly you stir up a beehive when you ask one group of growers to assume the bonds still due from another—and yet today they work closely together and help one another, the water gets on the land, and the apples keep rolling out of the valley.

Admission of Displaced Persons to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ivan H. Peterman from the Philadelphia Inquirer for July 11, 1947:

DP'S NEED SCREENING BEFORE ENTERING UNITED STATES

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

Sweeping generalities have always been a part of White House utterances, but it seems almost time that on the subject of displaced persons, President Truman come down to specific facts and figures.

"America must admit a substantial number," sounds fine for world consumption; but what does it mean? What is a substantial number compared to 140,000,000 Americans already in our midst? Or what is it compared to the 800,000 still homeless DP's.

This corner is for going very cautious on the admission of any more Europeans. Too many of them are outright troublemakers. The DP ranks, with all due respect for their suffering and ample allowance for deprivations, nevertheless contain today some of the toughest, meanest, and most exasperating characters on this earth. They also include some of the finest, most deserving patriots left alive between the upper and nether millstones of Europe's greedy ruling classes.

It would interest the Nation a good deal more, if President Truman set forth a logical plan on these would-be immigrants. They ought to be thoroughly screened; we want no Fascists and we have enough Commies, too. Let us have a few decent people, instead.

Another thing: Why don't we come out and say how many have already come into the United States? How many refugee Germans? How many Italians, how many Jews since 1933—fleeing Hitler and Mussolini? How many came in legally, and what is the score on illegal entries? Let us total up what we already have, and then parcel out—in fair proportion—a certain number of admissions to countries passed by for lack of sponsors.

I would like to see a few of those Poles who finally took Mount Cassino let in. There are 1,700 in the Monastery's cemetery who won't be a problem to anybody. But there are thousands left homeless.

Great Britain offered these Poles sanctuary, but they had few jobs except the coal mines. That's a pretty grim choice: Mount Cassino's cemetery or the depths of a mine that British laborers don't wish to work. Nevertheless, a percentage of the Polish Legion has filtered back, marrying Scottish girls they met during their training days. Do you remember that far back? I do. I saw them training for the tanks and airborne up near Perth—my first war assignment in 1942. The Poles had come out, half-starved and begrudgingly given passage via the Middle East by the Russians, after being engulfed by the Molotov-Ribbentrop deal.

They came to Britain and joined the Empire's forces. They got no easy assignments after that. They parachuted into Sicily and Italy, and when the SS couldn't be dislodged by the Yanks or crack New Zealanders, the Poles went up there at night, hand-to-hand, killed Hitler's chosen and took the Monastery. The Polish armored units did a job all the way across Europe.

So why not sort out the situation, find out how many Balts—Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians—how many refugee White Russians, how many non-Commies from Austria, Germany, Italy, and the Balkan States, including Hungary? There has been too much emotionalism, too much burping over hardships and the past, too much coddling—to put it plainly—and not enough fact finding about the wishes, plane, and possibilities of these people.

One of the first things to know: Are they willing to come as the early pioneers came? Or do they expect a hand-made berth when they arrive? Are they determined to pile up in already crowded cities—and where does President Truman propose housing them if they do? Are they willing, as the Polish Legion members have said they are, to go as settlers to sparsely populated areas? Would they be willing to take up lands and start from scratch somewhere beyond the bright lights of Broadway, or the established manufacturing trade centers of the East? We ought to know. We could find out.

Some of these homeless souls would add a good deal to the American melting pot. Others, from their performances already in well-warmed DP stockades, have shown they'll be chronic pains in the neck. Nothing satisfies them. They got into the habit of complaining and slick dealing in order to survive; they haven't settled down and don't intend to.

Back in the days when you could buy your way out of Europe, come here for a "visit," and forget to return after Hitler veered from persecution to outright conquest, plenty of DP's got into the United States. Some came with bulging pockets, and did all right. Others, notably a gang from Rumania, brought convertible valuables along, waited out the war, intending to rush back as grand-scale carpetbaggers. They would sit around in small foreign soirees, in the St. Regis Hotel region of New York, talking it over. A magazine friend of mine, overhearing one day, promised to expose the lot if they ever tried it. Of course, Uncle Joe Stalin took Rumania over, so carpetbagging there is now on the Soviet plan alone.

These details should be considered when writing new invitations to permanent citizenship in the last Promised Land. Certainly the matter of service and wartime sacrifice—not merely loudly shouted personal tribulations, of which all Europeans had their share—ought to be high on the list of qualifications. Wouldn't you prefer to see a man and his family come down that gangplank, knowing he'd killed a few Nazis and done his bit with the rest? And wouldn't you feel surer about the political inclinations of DP's who are on A. A. Vishinsky's purge list than you would about a clamorous fellow already well hated for his disturbing activities in DP camps?

When President Truman and the DP sponsors come down to such practical matters, the American Congress and American public should be sincerely interested. Until then, however, they should be alert that we don't let in the undeserving, while keeping out those who earned a chance.

Old-Age Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation, conspicuously first in so many fields, was among the last to develop an awareness of the need for social security.

A severe depression shocked us into the realization that we are all members of a society and are dependent upon one another.

All of us who believe in the free-enterprise system know that it cannot stand up under the cycle of boom and bust—of feast and famine. The best way to preserve our way of life is to distribute purchasing power, especially to those who, because of age or other circumstances, cannot compete in the labor market.

What we need, above all, is an adequate insurance in the form of a national old-age pension system; not for humanitarian reasons alone, but because it is necessary to avoid economic anarchy.

The present system of pin-money pensions will never solve the problem, either for the individual or the Nation. Broken down into 48 State compartments, it results in many cruel discriminations. It ignores the realistic fact that you cannot seal off the people of one State from another, treating one as human and the other as subhuman.

This is a national problem and must be dealt with on a national scale, treating all our aged as fellow Americans.

Like many other Members of Congress, I want to see H. R. 781 come out of committee and onto the floor of the House of Representatives for debate and vote. I am confident that when this forum brings the facts to the attention of the American people, public opinion will do the rest. Your cause is their cause. When properly informed as to the problem, the generations behind you will provide for themselves through you by insisting on national legislation for better old-age pensions without delay.

Statement by Hon. Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, on Public Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me on yesterday before a sub-

committee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to take this opportunity to present the reasons which led me, as a Senator from the State of New Mexico and as reflecting the views of the peoples of our great Southwest, to join with the Senators from Montana and New York, from Florida, Rhode Island, and Idaho in sponsoring S. 1320; the reasons why, under my obligations to the Nation and to the people of my State, I must oppose S. 545.

Fortunately, one no longer has to argue over whether or not there is need for Federal action to assure our people of access to modern medical care and of a chance to maintain the good health which that care makes possible. Experts and statisticians have produced volumes of figures proving that our people are not getting the care they should. During the last two sessions of Congress, both the existence of this need and the absolute necessity for Federal action in meeting the need has been recognized by leaders of the Republican Party, as it had been long before by men of my own persuasion. This session has seen the introduction of S. 545 sponsored by Senators TAFT, BALL, SMITH, and DONNELL, and of S. 1320 sponsored by Senators WAGNER, MURRAY, PEPPER, TAYLOR, MCGRATH, and myself. The need and the need for action has been agreed upon.

But the proposals set forth in S. 545 are so unsatisfactory that I am sure its sponsors cannot really have been aware of either the very great extent of the need in the Southwest or of the methods of meeting that need which would be acceptable to the people of the Southwest. It is on these points that I should like to comment. My colleagues will, I am sure, address themselves to the conditions pertinent to those varied sections of our great Nation which they represent.

New Mexico is a most fortunate State in most respects. Our people are rich in their cultural heritage; richly endowed by the climate and character of the land in which we make our homes; rich beyond measure in their deeply satisfying ways of living. But New Mexico is an agricultural State and our people are not rich in the common usage of the word—in dollars. Recent figures indicate that the average effective income for each family in New Mexico in 1941 was only $1,435. That was but 67 percent of the national average of $2,133. In 1944, although the corresponding cash figures had almost doubled, New Mexico still stood at only 70 percent of the national average. If this was the average income for New Mexico, the Senators, knowing that New Mexico has some very wealthy families, will realize that our average family had in fact an appreciably lower income. If even the AMA concedes that a family with $3,000 a year cannot alone and unaided purchase good medical care, it becomes obvious that a bill like S. 545, which at best can aid only 5 to 10 percent of the population, cannot solve our problem. Only a program reaching 80 to 90 percent of our families, as does S. 1320, can do the job.

In October of 1942 there were 45 States with a more satisfactory ratio of people to each practicing physician than in New Mexico. At the same time throughout the country as a whole the distribution of practicing physicians was one for every 1,400 persons. Corresponding figures for New Mexico showed 1 physician for every 2,449 individuals. There were only 2 States with more people per physician, the last State on the list having only 1 for every 2,806 persons. At the other extreme, 1 State showed 885 individuals for each practicing physician. It is unlikely that more recent figures would show much improvement for New Mexico. Nor do such figures begin to tell the whole story because there are areas in New Mexico where the patient-physician ratio is even worse. Physicians here as elsewhere have located for the most part in the more urban communities where they have access to the medical resources necessary for the practice of high-quality medicine. Such a condition means that any bill which pretends to solve the problem but which makes no specific provision for the training and relocating of physicians and which, in addition, requires the State to match Federal funds, is in truth a mockery no matter how well intentioned.

One other factor peculiar to the Southwest must be given consideration. Our people are the proud representatives of three great cultures: The Indian, the Spanish, and the Anglo-American. In terms of Americanism, the claims of these first two groups antedate that of the people of practically any other part of the country. This heritage, together with the fact of citizenship in our United States, means that we in New Mexico are a proud people—rightfully so. It means that we are an independent people—very much so—and it accounts, too, for the extreme patience which characterizes our people. Even in the face of shameful treatment as members of little-known or recognized minority groups, they have exhibited unusual fortitude and forbearance. They, along with millions of others in this Nation of ours, were denied economic and social justice before the last war. Nevertheless, the record of volunteer enlistments from these groups in New Mexico was outstanding during the recent international holocaust dedicated to uprooting fascism. Their performance on every battle front during the war was heroic and many of them gave their lives in the performance of feats of bravery and endurance. Those who returned were fortified in their belief in the ultimate victory of democracy for all the people.

To a people such as this, a measure offering assistance only on condition that they accept the label of indigent—as does S. 545—would be completely unacceptable. Our people would recognize it at once for what it is, namely, a system of emergency relief with a double standard of medical care—one for the low income and another for those of wealth. The people of New Mexico know that there is only one acceptable standard of medical care. We do not want to see separate systems of medical service, one for those who can afford to pay well and another for those who cannot, established in their State or, for that matter, anywhere in our Nation. Such a proposal is archaic, a return to the Elizabethan poor laws of 1604. Those people needing medical care the most would scorn such a policy before bowing to the humiliation of accepting charity. They would rightfully resent the prying of the investigators who would be required to execute S. 545.

To the people of New Mexico S. 545 means degradation, dependence on charity, poor medical care, and a compulsory tax on all the people for the questionable benefit of a few. Such legislation is abhorrent and no solution to a problem affecting over 90 percent of all the families in New Mexico.

The Senate subcommittee reporting on the 1939 Wagner health bill said, among other things: "Poor health leads to unhappiness, poverty, dependency, and even to crime; good health contributes to well-being, production, income, and wealth. The ideals and principles of American democracy call for equality of opportunity. Such equality of opportunity certainly cannot exist unless all groups in the population have access to those health services needed to prevent and cure disease and to promote vitality and well-being." The right of all the people to medical care which S. 545 ignores makes this bill even more intolerable.

In contrast, S. 1320 really recognizes the basic philosophy of making medical care available to all the people. It rests on the right of the individual to health and on the economic need of society for a healthy population—one which is fit and able to produce. S. 1320, as opposed to S. 545 would entitle practically every American family to medical care as a right, when it is needed, in return for contributions made while well. This is an extension of the social-security principle which has already been accepted by the American people to replace the antiquated poor-law system which S. 545 so closely resembles. S. 1320 permits our people, along with those of every other section of the country, to proudly pay the proper percentage of their incomes for their medical care; it assures the man earning a thousand dollars a year or fifteen hundred or two thousand that he is doing just as much to insure the health of his family and of the Nation as is the man earning five or ten thousand; it enables him to seek and to receive medical care on the same rightful basis as any other man.

S. 1320 assumes even greater significance when the administrative aspects of the bill are reviewed. I shall leave a complete review of this phase to my colleagues. However, I should like to indicate in passing that S. 1320 very adequately and properly recognizes the importance of local control. In fact, it provides for the distribution of health services in accordance with local customs and traditions. This, permit me to assure you, is extremely important to New Mexico. It is an amazing incongruity that such provisions are not apparent in S. 545.

S. 1320 further provides that the Federal Government must approve State plans and that there will be standards set for the quality of services rendered. I am not at all afraid, as other Senators seem to be, that such provisions will make the Federal Government dictatorial. Perhaps because we in New Mexico trust our Federal Government and its officials. It also seems odd to me that any legislation involving the expenditure of Federal funds would not contain safeguards guaranteeing their wise expenditure. From this point of view S. 545 virtually gives the medical profession carte blanche. It is no wonder that organized medicine is supporting S. 545. It is nothing more nor less than a subsidy for the voluntary prepayment plans which the medical hierarchy is now advocating but which they so bitterly opposed just a few short years ago.

I particularly approve of the provision in S. 1320 which permits a State to have the Federal Government handle the administration of the program if it so chooses. The densely populated and wealthy States have of necessity developed large departments of welfare and public health which could take the administration of a health program as outlined in S. 1320 in their stride. Other States, finding themselves not so well situated in this respect might well prefer Federal administration. Again, as is true throughout all of S. 1320, there is a democratic adherence to freedom of choice. In contrast, S. 545 not only requires that the State administer the program but it insists that the State health department be the administrative agent. As heartily as I endorse health-department administration of medical care, I still insist that in accordance with our democratic traditions the State should be permitted to choose which agency it feels is best equipped to handle the program. It would appear that those who talk overly much of the principle of "States Rights" are afraid of the decisions which the State might make.

The provisions for rural areas which appear in S. 1320 are of great importance to New Mexico. They mean that, as an inducement to settle and practice in sparsely populated and low income rural communities, physicians may be guaranteed a minimum income; reasonable expenses incurred in travelling to the chosen area may be paid; loans may be made for the purchase of office equipment;

unusually costly travel expenses incurred in the transportation of patients may be paid; funds may be expended to educate the people in the area as to the medical services available and how they may best be utilized; and finally funds are available not only to initially train medical personnel who will settle in rural areas but to permit post-graduate training of any medical personnel located or willing to locate in rural areas. Only in such a manner does a democracy improve the health of the people and fully realize the value of its largest single resource.

In closing I should like to indicate that the problems of medical care which we face in New Mexico are not peculiar to New Mexico. The problems of medical care of the low income, rural and Negro groups are closely interrelated and follow the same pattern. All of these groups receive less medical and hospital service than do the high income, the urban and the white populations and have higher morbidity and mortality rates. Disease and poverty go hand in hand.

The satisfactory solution of the health problems of our Nation cannot of course, be achieved by the medical profession alone. Public health services must also be included in any planning for the protection of the health of the community. It also becomes increasingly important to give a strong voice to the consumer who pays the bill for medical services. This is not only democratic but it is good common sense to have the benefit of the experience and judgment of these groups.

If passed, S. 545 would deter us an unnecessarily long time in reaching a satisfactory solution to these problems. It is an objectionable and un-democratic piece of legislation. In contrast, S. 1320 provides the answer to the health problems of New Mexico and the entire country. It deserves the hearty recommendation of this subcommittee.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD four editorials relative to statehood for Hawaii. One appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle of July, another in the Washington Post of July 6; the third in the Portland Journal of July 2; and the fourth in the Philadelphia Bulletin of July 2.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle of July 1947]

SIMPLE FAIRNESS TO HAWAII

The organic act which created the Territory of Hawaii in 1900 necessarily contemplated eventual statehood. So the United States was long ago committed on that.

Hawaii has now waited 47 years for the fulfillment of that promise. The Territory has an area larger than Connecticut and Rhode Island together. Its population, now 519,000 is larger than that of any other State, except Oklahoma, at the time of admission to the Union.

If there was ever a doubt, based on imperfect knowledge, of the loyalty of some sections of that population, the question was settled in the late war. Admiral Nimitz is on record that the performance of the people of Hawaii during the war erased any prewar doubt he might have had. He has said further that "from a military and naval standpoint, I can see no objection to these islands achieving statehood."

These loyal American citizens who live under our laws and pay Federal taxes have no voice in the enactment of these laws or in the imposition of the taxes; not even the right to choose their own Governors or to vote for President.

The House on Monday voted statehood for Hawaii. It is now up to the Senate. In all fairness, the people of Hawaii are entitled to be freed from their anomalous position. Forty-seven years of tutelage is enough.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of July 6, 1947]

HOPE FOR HAWAII

At last the 50-year struggle of the people of Hawaii to obtain statehood has won congressional recognition. In its 196–134 vote approving preliminary legislation authorizing admission of Hawaii as the forty-ninth State, the House showed proper appreciation of Hawaii's case. These Pacific islands, which voluntarily ceded their sovereignty to the United States half a century ago, meet all the requirements for statehood. Their qualifications have been reaffirmed many times by congressional committee.

As a Territory, Hawaii has a history of financial responsibility and of constructive handling of its own affairs. It is a prosperous community of more than half a million Americans whose education and literacy standards are high, whose participation at the polls is far above the national average and whose loyalty was demonstrated beyond all question during the war. There is no racial problem in Hawaii, for the Territory is a living experiment in racial democracy. The old continental argument against encompassing offshore possessions is diminished by the fact that Honolulu is a mere 10 hours by plane from San Francisco—far closer than most State capitals a century ago. With America's vital interests in the Pacific illustrated only too clearly by the war, the State of Hawaii can well serve as a symbol of our permanent concern with that area.

It is regrettable that the Hawaiian statehood bill must go through exhaustive hearings again in the Senate, and that pressure of other legislation probably will prevent passage during this session. But proponents of statehood have won a signal victory in the House which will hold over until the next session of Congress. Then there will be time to concentrate on the Senate for the long overdue recognition of the just aspirations of this group of citizens to become an integral part of the American Union.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of July 2, 1947]

ALOHA MEANS HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Hawaii calls, but not in vain. To the Senate, perhaps not for action at the present session of the Congress, goes Hawaiian Delegate JOE FARRINGTON'S bill to make the Hawaiian island group a State. The blessing of the House upon the measure was a roll-call vote of 196 to 133.

Between Hawaii and Oregon there is historic mutuality of interest. The first farm animals were brought to Oregon in 1811 from the Sandwich Islands (Hawaii) by the John Jacob Astor fur-trading party. In 1825, Dr. John McLoughlin, Hudson's Bay factor, shipped lumber from his sawmill to Hawaii. Ten years later, Nathaniel Wyeth brought cattle, goats, and hogs from Hawaii and placed them on Wapato (Sauvies) Island on the Columbia. In 1840 missionaries from the Atlantic seaboard reached here by way of Hawaii. More than a century ago, Senator Thomas Hart Benton, of Missouri, foresaw the day when "commerce from the Orient and the islands of the Pacific will pour into the valley of the Mississippi through the channels of Oregon." His colleague, Senator Lewis Fields Linn (Benton and Linn counties are on opposite shores of the Willamette River) introduced in 1838 a bill to establish the Territory of Oregon and to grant land to actual settlers. In doing so, Senator Linn argued that the "occupation of Oregon would secure sources of vast wealth in the fur trade, in the fisheries, in Hawaii and the Orient." Owyhee, name of an eastern Oregon irrigation district, is believed to be an early English spelling of Hawaii.

To the people of Hawaii, aloha, a musical word often set to music, has many shades of meaning from felicitation and farewell to salutation and endearment. Now aloha is also beginning to mean statehood.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin of July 2, 1947]

HAWAII DESERVES STATEHOOD

When the House passed and sent to the Senate a bill that would admit Hawaii to statehood and change the flag for the first time since 1912, opponents raised a variety of arguments which fail to bear up under analysis.

One dealt with the area and population of the islands; yet 3 States are smaller in area, and 10 have smaller populations. Another held that labor union strength among the population would mean two more pro-labor Senators. What validity lies in such an argument no one explained, nor was any more light thrown on the claim that five large business firms control the islands' economy.

Proponents, on the other hand, offered acceptable reasons for creating a forty-ninth State. When Hawaii became a Territory it was with the tacit understanding that it could develop into a State. Furthermore, the world might be particularly impressed at this time with the fact that our democracy is not static, but growing. Similar arguments might be advanced on behalf of other territories when they are ready.

The more than a half million Hawaiians demonstrated their unquestioned loyalty during the war, and in circumstances more trying than confronted most people on the continent. The mixture of populations, objected to by some opponents of statehood, differs only in the origin of its peoples from the older mixture familiar in Eastern States.

No partisanship is evident in this proposal, and no reason appears why the Senate should not follow the House's course. Hawaii deserves statehood.

Will the Taft-Hartley Law Improve Labor Relations in Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH H. BALL
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me on Thursday, July 10, 1947, on the Town Meeting of the Air. It is entitled "Will the Taft-Hartley Law Improve Labor Relations in Industry?"

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW IMPROVE LA RELATIONS IN INDUSTRY?

(Opening statement of Senator JOSEPH BALL, Republican, Minnesota, on T Meeting of the Air, Thursday, July 10, t ing affirmative of question)

(Mr. C. H. Haggerty, executive secretary California State Federation of Labor, speaker on program.)

It is perhaps natural that Mr. Hagg should confuse his power and privileges union leader with the rights of emplo under the new labor law. He denounces provisions outlawing the closed shop and quiring a majority of employees affected approve by secret ballot a union shop grant that these provisions restrict the a trary power of union leaders over employ But by the same token, they actually res to employees their right to get a job w out prior approval of a union and to m their own decisions as to whether they a union.

The law prohibits expenditure of un funds for or against candidates for Cong or President. That means the union c not spend a member's dues to support a c didate he personally is against. Of co that may lessen the political power of un leaders, but isn't it a sound protection of individual's right to his own political c viction?

The Taft-Hartley Act is on the books to because no free people can tolerate any g and powerful group, as labor unions are day, being above and beyond the law. P to June 23, there were Federal laws gove ing employers in labor relations, but tually none governing the conduct of uni The power which this situation gave to leaders of big unions was tremend Small employers and individual workers v at their mercy. They had to go along w patterns set by a few union leaders in ne tiations with a few great corporations.

What does the new law do to improve la relations? First, it sets up some rules unions to follow, along with those the ployer must follow. Let me emphasize t the unfair practices of employers in the Wagner Act, such as domination of a un discrimination between union and nonun employees and discharging an employee union activity, are not changed by so m as a comma. All these rights of emplo are protected and Mr. Haggerty's statem to the contrary is not true.

Congress did add some unfair practices unions. It will be, after August 22 w these amendments become effective, an fair labor practice for a union as well as employer to coerce employees in their choice of a bargaining agent. It will be unfair practice for unions as well as ployers to refuse to bargain collectively closed-shop contract will be illegal. Uni shop contracts must be approved by a jority of all the employees affected, and e then, the union will be guilty of an un practice if it tries to force an employer discharge an employee expelled from union for any reason other than nonpaym of dues and initiation fees.

The law also makes it an unfair prac for unions to engage in secondary boy and jurisdictional strikes. These strikes h always violated the intent of the Wag Act, which guarantees to all employees right to freely choose their own represen tives. In a secondary boycott or juris tional strike, a union attempts to force ployees to join a particular union aga their will by boycotting their employer. effect is always to deprive employees free choice.

Other provisions of the law make un responsible for violations of contracts sign and provide that foremen are par management and not employees under Wagner Act.

Under the closed and union shop a was, union leaders were under little c

lost a distinguished colleague in whose memory we are now assembled.

I have lost a good friend, and it is fitting that I should add my sentiments to the occasion of his passing.

FRED BRADLEY was an intelligent, capable legislator, and a good and jovial companion. It is most startling to bear in mind that shortly before his untimely passing the gentleman from Michigan publicly deplored the State affairs, the dinners, and the social activities which constitute such a drain on the vigor and health of a Congressman.

No monument is needed for this man. His able work, his unselfish devotion to duty, his conscientious and untiring attention to his office stand in the history of the United States as a perpetual memorial to him. There abides in the breast of each of us his unwritten memorial—not material, but spiritual.

Because of his devotion to maritime affairs in his committee work, I am reminded of the epitaph of Robert Louis Stevenson:

Here he lies where he longed to be;
Home is the sailor, home from the sea,
And the hunter home from the hill.

Ralph Waldo Emerson has said:

Not gold, but only men can make
A people great and strong;
Men who for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long.

I know that the life of our distinguished colleague, whose memory we now revere, was dedicated to these words, since his activities were so devoted to its spirit.

May we take renewed spirit in the thought of our devoted brother. Let us here resolve to take up the torch where he, by necessity, dropped it and carry on his principles and his spirit to the lofty place where he intended they should ultimately rest.

The people represented by our late friend have lost a champion. Their grief, I acknowledge, is deep. However, merely because this gentleman led so public a life, it did not preclude his full enjoyment of a happy and contented private life, and I wish to extend my sincere sympathies to Mrs. Bradley who stood by her husband so fearlessly and so faithfully throughout their married life. We of the House have expressed our regrets over the passing of so splendid a Member. We have told what a blow his death has been to us and his people. We must, and we should, be remiss if we do not extend our warmer and deeper sympathies to his widow.

Let us bear in mind these words:

Asleep, awake, by night or day,
The friends I seek are seeking me;
No wind can drive my bark astray,
Nor change the tide of destiny.

What matter if I stand alone?
I wait with joy the coming years.

I trust that Mrs. Bradley may gather some consolation from my remarks and those of my colleagues, and in closing commend to her this imperishable quotation:

This is not a loss, life is a promise;
At the end of the lane and fulfillment, we rise again.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hawaii Nears Its Goal," from the Christian Science Monitor of July 2; an editorial entitled "Hawaii, Forty-ninth State," from the Boston Herald of July 3; an editorial entitled "Statehood for Hawaii," from the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of July 2; and an editorial entitled "Case for Hawaii," from the Dallas News of July 3, all favorable to statehood for Hawaii.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 2, 1947]

HAWAII NEARS ITS GOAL

After 49 years under the United States flag, and something around 28 unsuccessful tries, Hawaii seems nearer statehood than ever before. The House, with little evidence of either partisan or regional division, has passed the enabling bill by a safe majority. The Senate may not act until next session. But with the congressional investigating committee and the administration both behind it, the bill seems likely to get senatorial approval also.

The arguments for Hawaii statehood are many. Here is an instance in which it may be safe to judge by the objections, which appear few.

First is the point of Hawaii's polyglot population (which, by interpretation, means that some fear the high percentage of those of Japanese ancestry). Hawaii's war record in general, the Nisei's war record in particular, plus the notable scarcity of interracial frictions on the islands, would seem to offer adequate answers here.

Two other objections almost cancel each other: First, that Hawaii might come in as a "CIO-dominated State"; second, that Hawaii might come in as a "Sugar Trust-dominated State."

The very nature of these objections suggests that more probably Hawaii might enter the Union during a period in which its "big business" is being challenged by "big labor." This foresees a situation which a number of American States have already had to face and handle—Pennsylvania and Michigan, for instance. Perhaps it would be a situation which Hawaii might handle best on its own, in terms of its own quite unique conditions.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of July 3, 1947]

HAWAII, FORTY-NINTH STATE

As we struggle with the problems of self-government in Massachusetts we sometimes wonder why the Hawaiians, in their island paradise which really has the climate California talks about, are so eager to shoulder statehood. A Territory can legally and morally expect Congress to solve all its problems, and can keep out of trouble by merely doing what the Governor appointed by the President tells it to do. But evidently Hawaii's 500,000 white, brown, and yellow-hued people have become Americans, for they want to take on the hard work of governing themselves. Also, in good Yankee fashion, they object to paying millions of dollars in taxes annually to Washington without having proportionate representation.

Honolulu is an American city. Nobody would have any doubt about that after shopping in its stores or reading its newspapers. Waikiki Beach is a lot like Coney Island, only, thanks be, considerably better looking. In all the villages of Oahu and the other large islands English is spoken and Americanism taught in the schools. About one-third of the population is, to be sure, of Japanese birth, but these people were impressively loyal to the United States during the war and their sons—the Nisei—fought with almost unequalled valor and honor in Italy beside our own troops.

Hawaii has been a part of the United States 49 years. We agree with the House of Representatives, which has just voted 196 to 133 for the statehood bill, that it is high time she was accorded the privileges and the responsibilities of becoming the Union's forty-ninth State.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of July 2, 1947]

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate should follow the lead taken Monday by the House of Representatives and vote its approval of the bill which would admit Hawaii to the Union as the forty-ninth State.

Hawaii has at present more population than most of the territories at the time of their admittance to statehood. Hawaii pays more in taxes to the United States Treasury every year than many of the States now incorporated in the Union. During the war the half a million inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands proved themselves loyal Americans. Hawaii, which has been under American administration for the past 49 years, wants to become a State and to receive voting representation in Congress.

The sum of these factors seems to weigh very heavily in favor of conferring statehood on Hawaii. The only serious argument which has been brought forward in opposition has been that the proportion of Hawaii's population which is of Japanese extraction might prove difficult to assimilate. Such an argument is obviously contrary to our fundamental principles of equality for all and is a weak and somewhat meaningless argument to begin with.

This Nation's great strength has come from the fact of our representation for all Americans in government, the fact of our belief in human rights and liberties and equalities, and the fact that race and color and creed are no barriers to citizenship.

There has never been a more opportune time for this Nation to reaffirm these democratic principles and to demonstrate them for the benefit of those sections of the world which are still incredulous of American freedom.

Admission of the Hawaiian Islands as the forty-ninth State provides an excellent opportunity for such a demonstration.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News of July 3, 1947]

CASE FOR HAWAII

Hawaii's long-cherished ambition of statehood got a big boost from the lower House in its approval Monday. If the Senate of the Eightieth Congress acts favorably, the flag makers can try to solve the difficult problem of placing with geometrical precision 49 stars on the blue field of the corner of Old Glory.

With us, Hawaii should be a case of put up or shut up. Denying all claims to imperial status, we still have retained on territorial

basis a country that merged its independent kingdom voluntarily in the Union 49 years ago. It has suffered for us and fought with us. Simple justice and a sound theory of fair play urge admission now.

The American babyhood of the 20 islands was passed in an era when Americans, flush with the easy victory over Spain's decadent naval power in 1898, spoke of manifest destiny without catching the vision that might have gone along with it. Hawaii furnished a ready example for Pacific hegemony that might have been developed with profit both to ourselves and the thousands of land dots that make up Oceania. Had we viewed Hawaii as a stepping stone to governmental relations with these isolated insular areas, long before this the Pacific might have been developed under the American flag. Japan's hideous dream of expansion by force majeur might never have developed into its costly reality.

Size and population and economic limitations make impractical the maintenance of many thousands of separate political units. On the other hand small islands lend themselves admirably to the development of localized governments resembling municipalities or counties, larger ones like Hawaii to statehood. A benign imperialism might have cultivated the Pacific toward ideal government, guaranteeing the civil rights of its populations and furnishing trade advantageous to all concerned. It is far too late to realize now on that dream. Hawaii, state or territory, is not a gateway but an outpost.

Pertinent Observations Concerning the Cost of President Truman's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam has extended aid to 59 different countries since the fighting ended, handing out a total of $20,000,000,000 in loans, grants, relief, lend-lease, surplus-property credits, and cultural cooperation projects—all to come out of the American taxpayer's pockets. General Marshall, our Secretary of State, now says that it will require at least $6,000,000,000 more per year for the next 3 or 4 years to put European countries back upon their feet, economically and politically. This is a staggering load to place upon the American taxpayer's back. It requires some explaining by those responsible for doing it.

In a partial break-down of the $20,000,000,000 handed out since VJ-day, we learn that Great Britain has received $4,400,000,000, plus 800 fixed war installations we built there at a tremendous cost; France has received $2,000,000,000, plus credit on the purchase of 75 Liberty ships; Italy, $530,000,000, plus her share in the $350,000,000 new European relief fund. From these three items alone we should begin to realize what the rehabilitation of Europe is going to cost us before we are through, because these three countries are already applying for more aid.

When we consider the $50,000,000,000 lend-lease hand-out we made during the war—eleven billion of which went to Russia—the $20,000,000,000 hand-out since VJ-day, and the $24,000,000,000 that General Marshall estimates we must yet hand out to rehabilitate Europe, one can easily see that our American tax burden will be a heavy one for the next 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, a prominent Arab of the Middle East, in discussing prospective aid from the United States with an American representative, said: "All we are interested in is how many dollars we will get and when." This statement expresses the general attitude of Europe, of the Middle East, and of the Far East. If we assume financial and economic responsibility for the rest of the world, what will the program cost? We are already committed to extend further credits to foreign countries of approximately $12,000,000,000. No one knows when these distressed countries will be able to stand upon their own feet and pay their own way. As evidence of this, both England and France are much worse off today than they were a year ago when we provided them with their first postwar loans.

How long can our capitalistic system last under the continuous drain that is being placed upon it? England has gone the way of all Europe; at least she has deserted the capitalistic system and become a hybrid government, half democratic and half totalitarian. She has at the same time gone on relief. Not only has she gone on relief herself, but she has asked us to place her former dependent nations—Greece, Turkey, Iraq, and Iran—on our relief rolls. The idea of placing these impoverished nations on our relief rolls is to keep them from falling into the outstretched totalitarian arms of the U. S. S. R., and thus protect England's Mediterranean life line.

Mr. Speaker, democracy is dying in Europe—dying of war wounds. Democracy as we know it never existed in Asia. Democracy in South America exists in name only, because dictatorship is the order of the day south of the Rio Grande. In view of these facts, it might be wise for us to devote all our efforts to preserving democracy at home. In order to do so we need to keep our financial house in order; we need to keep financially strong and solvent; we should not dissipate our strength nor our resources in trying to revive democracy in other parts of the world. If we weaken ourselves in an effort to revive democracy elsewhere, the last stronghold of democracy will become an easy victim for totalitarianism, the enemy of democracy.

In an address at Springfield, Ill., on January 27, 1837, Lincoln said:

> If danger ever threatens us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher.

Lincoln's words are prophetic. In the light of that warning uttered over 100 years ago, perhaps we should today stop, look, and listen before carrying on the Truman foreign policy to the point where we exhaust ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, we were told that the $400,000,000 lend-lease request for Greece and Turkey is the first step in a 3-year program of world rehabilitation that will cost American taxpayers at least $21,000,000,000. This estimate is made by conservative authorities in the field of world finance. Since we have already extended this peacetime lend-lease aid to Greece and Turkey, we now may be forced to follow through with a complete program of world rehabilitation as a part of our new policy to stop Russia now. In fact, England has already stated that only a generous peacetime lend-lease program can save her from economic disaster.

If we extend this peacetime lend-lease aid, however, we should not lose sight of the fact that the financial burden we are assuming is not the whole burden. The Truman foreign policy, if carried out, means we must continue to export huge quantities of scarce goods—food, clothing, fats and oils, sugar, farm machinery, and so forth—thereby boosting prices of these scarce articles higher and higher. The program will require us to export between thirteen and fourteen billion dollars' worth of good each year for the next 3 or 4 years. This will result in an ever-increasing spiral of price and wage boosts, with their attendant labor frictions and work stoppages. It means adding billions of dollars to the cost of living for American families because of the higher prices that will be charged for their food requirements.

President Truman's new foreign policy, if carried out, will also mean that Uncle Sam accepts the role of world policeman; that from now on he will have to furnish the military might required to stop trouble wherever and whenever it arises in any corner of the world. It will mean we have taken over the responsibilities and obligations that we had hoped a strong United Nations organization would assume and carry. The world now recognizes the fact that the UN is a very weak reed for the world to lean upon, and so Uncle Sam is being called on to feed the world, to finance the world, to police the world, and to support the world, in order to save the world from communism.

We saved the world from Hitlerism at a cost of $300,000,000,000, plus thousands of lives, and blood, sweat, and tears. Now we are asked to save the world from communism at a cost that can neither be estimated nor predicted. Is Uncle Sam strong enough to do all this, even if he should be willing to do it?

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the San Francisco World Peace Conference many Members of Congress urged our United States delegates to that conference to offer the following amendments to the proposed United Nations Peace Charter:

(a) Abolish the veto power in the Security Council.

(b) Require all nations to agree to world-wide inspection of atomic energy development.

(c) Agree upon a world-wide limitation of armaments.

We suggested that if Russia refused to agree to these amendments, or safeguards, and walked out of the Conference, the United States and England, with the other peace-loving nations, constituting at that time at least 70 percent of the world's military power, should go ahead and complete the UN, leaving

Russia on the outside. After the organization was set up and functioning then Russia should be given the opportunity to come in or stay out as she desired. However, if she remained outside and thereafter disturbed the peace of the world—as she has done in the Balkans, in Greece, in Turkey, in China, and elsewhere—the UN could brand her as an aggressor nation and throw the military might of the rest of the world against her. Our recommendations, if they had been adopted, would have forced Russia to join the UN or commit national suicide, if and when she became an aggressor nation. The stalemate at the Moscow Conference and the recent break-up of the Four Power Conference at Paris over the so-called Marshall plan, as a result of Stalin's attitude, causes the same Members of Congress who recommended that action at the San Francisco Conference to wonder if it is too late to act now. Many Members of Congress today believe we should sever diplomatic relations with Russia now; isolate her from the rest of the world, and keep her isolated until she is ready and willing to cooperate to insure the future peace of the world. We believe drastic action on our part is the only way we can prove to Russia that she has gone too far already.

Mr. Speaker, we may as well face the fact that the postwar world of today is composed of two forms of government, two ideologies, that temporarily are living side by side. First, we have the democratic form of government with a President or head selected by the people, as in the United States, England, France, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, and others. Second, we have the totalitarian form of government with a dictator at the head, as in Russia, in Yugoslavia, in Spain, in China, and elsewhere. These forms of government, or ideologies, are diametrically opposed to each other, and therefore find it very difficult, if not impossible, to compose their differences and get along together. This means that from now on we must live in two worlds—not in one world as we have been led to believe—a democratic world revolving around the United States and Christianity, and a totalitarian world revolving around Russia and communism. The democratic or Christian world believes in God, places spiritual things above material things, emphasizes the dignity of the individual, and makes the state subject to the people.

The question we face is, How can a Christian nation deal with or get along with a communistic nation that rejects God and all that the Christian religion stands for? In trying to reconcile the diametrically opposed ideologies, or in trying to find some basis upon which they can live side by side peaceably, the $64 question becomes overnight the $64,000,000,000 question because it will require that astronomical figure before we find an answer; and even then, in my opinion, the result will still be in doubt.

Mr. Speaker, what is our record so far? We advance money to Poland, and free elections in Poland are denied. We advance more money, and freedom is destroyed in Bulgaria and Rumania. We grant millions to Greece and Turkey, and promptly Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Albania disappear behind the iron curtain. We grant billions to England, France, and Italy, and now we see the scourge of communism springing up in each of these nations. In spite of all the billions we have advanced we are further away from our goal than we were at the close of the war. Therefore, judging from the results obtained thus far, the future outlook in Europe is not promising.

And what about our record in Asia? In Asia, with the exception of MacArthur's work in Japan, the outlook is exactly the same. China and the rest of Asia are in worse shape today than on VJ-day. The only progress toward peace, the only bright spot in the world today, is found in Japan as a result of MacArthur's work.

Mr. Speaker, America today is full of fears and doubts. Tension between the American eagle and the Russian bear is growing. The bear is squeezing Greece, Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Egypt, Afghanistan, Korea, and Manchuria. If we decide to wetnurse the world it will take a lot of money, as well as "blood, sweat, and tears." Do we want to pay the price—in dollars; in goods; in continued controls; in continued restrictions, and scarcities; in continued high prices; in furnishing American boys to police the four corners of the world? Before undertaking the task we should ask ourselves: Can Uncle Sam carry the whole world on his back without breaking down under the load? My answer to that question is an emphatic "no." What is your answer?

Business Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "That Recession," published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 14, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAT RECESSION

If you read and listen to economic and industrial predictions you'll recall that a lot of them a few months ago had a recession hitting the United States just about now.

Employment and business were going to be at boom levels through the first half of 1947, but the last half was fated to be anywhere from punk to terrible. Large numbers of economists, statisticians, and industrial fortune tellers had it all figured out, and it couldn't miss.

UNITED STATES BOOM STILL ON

True, most of these prophets of gloom and doom were on the left side politically, but a fair number were conservatives.

So now we are near the middle of July. And how are we doing? The Census Bureau has just reported that we have not only reached the dream goal of 60,000,000 civilian jobs but passed it by 55,000.

This was the count for June. It came on the heels of a United States Employment Service report that likewise made monkeys out of the prophets of a depression in this country. The USES tallied 58,300,000 jobs for May and commented that unemployment had sunk to about the lowest level it can reach in a free labor market.

Employment slacks off a bit in summer, the USES expects new highs in the fall.

WHY THIS PROSPERITY?

Three main reasons are given for this continued prosperity: Manufacturing going on at a high level; consumer demand for goods unabated, despite the inflated prices of many items; and a tremendous export trade.

No early sag along any of these economic fronts is indicated by USES statistics.

We are at this time, in short, practically at the goal demanded by Henry A. Wallace and his fellow leftists when they set up their war whoop a while ago of "60,000,000 jobs."

And we're maintaining this prosperity with fewer and fewer of the wartime Government controls which Chester Bowles and his ilk told us we would abandon at our peril.

A slump may be coming sooner or later; but meanwhile the doom merchants are having a long, weary, and rather pathetic wait.

RUSSIAN RUBLES; AMERICAN DOLLARS

However, a recession does exist somewhere in the world. Unhappily for our leftists, it exists in their spiritual homeland, Soviet Russia. We'll leave it to them to explain why, and content ourselves with passing along some figures from a report on Russia just issued by the energetic United States Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Like the rest of us, Russia has had almost 2 years to get over the shooting part of World War II. Yet, while Soviet living standards were very low before the war, they are much lower now.

The average Russian worker earns 115 rubles a week; the average United States worker, $49.

With his entire week's pay, the Russian can buy 22½ 1-pound loaves of white bread; the American, 394, assuming that anybody wants that many.

The Russian's weekly wage will get him 16.9 pounds of sugar; the American's 503.7 pounds. When it comes to beef, expensive though it is here, the American can buy 81.8 pounds with his weekly $49, while the Russian's 115 rubles will bring home only 8.4 pounds.

In the United States, $49 will buy about 276 quarts of milk; in Russia, 115 rubles pays for 15.2 quarts, if you can find any milk. As for butter, it's about 70.3 pounds for $49 here, 3.8 pounds for 115 rubles in the Soviet paradise.

Getting around to clothes, the average Russian has to work 7 weeks to buy one suit, and a shoddy suit at that. The American worker can buy a good suit for 1 week's pay or less.

The typical Soviet workingman must shell out 2 to 3 weeks' wages for one pair of shoes, while the American can get six to eight pairs for a single week's pay.

Goods are tragically scarce in Russia, whereas the shortages of most consumer goods are disappearing in the United States, now that a reasonable time has passed since we dropped our Russian-style wartime price controls.

DEPRESSIONS WITHOUT END

So, if you're a lover of depresions, as our leftist prophets of disaster seem to be, the best place to look for a big, apparently endless, depression is good old Soviet Russia.

And, while our living standards are going up again after the wartime sag, those in

Russia are on the downgrade. The Kremlin's slaves have nothing to look forward to except a bigger and better depression than the one they now have—which in turn is bigger and better than any we've ever yet had.

The more we learn about communism, the more highly we think of capitalism. At least the latter doesn't have permanent depressions.

Intention to Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD a very illuminating, a very sound, and a very well-reasoned editorial on Why President Truman Should Veto the Tax Bills, published in yesterday's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTENTION TO VETO

President Truman's advance announcement of intention to veto the tax-reduction bill once more was denounced by Senator MILLIKIN, chairman of the Finance Committee, as an "impropriety," particularly so because control of the purse strings "is the heart of the power of Congress under the Constitution." As a general rule we agree that the President should not try to restrain or interfere with the lawmaking process by warning Congress of a coming veto. We believe also that the veto power should be used sparingly, and only for the purpose of preventing hasty and unwise legislation. In the present instance, however, the President is simply stating his intention not to yield to congressional pressure to sign a tax bill differing in only one detail from the measure he has already vetoed. We can see no impropriety in his announcing in advance that a mere 6 months' delay in giving effect to proposed tax reductions does not alter his conviction that the bill is "wrong" both as to timing and content.

Congressional control of the purse strings is not vested solely in Congress, as some of the President's critics imply. Like all other measures passed by Congress, bills for the raising of revenue are subject to veto. The power to veto is a feature of the system of checks and balances set up under the Constitution. Whether the exercise of that power is wise or unwise in any given instance is, of course, another question—one to which the answer depends upon the bias of the individual critic.

That the veto of the tax-reduction bill was wise, is, in our opinion, confirmed by the recent impetus to inflationary pressures resulting from a variety of causes. If consumer purchasing power should be increased by a $4,000,000,000 reduction in taxes, efforts to bring down prices would be further impeded Moreover, tax reductions would almost certainly interfere with appropriation of funds to assist the distressed peoples of the world, since there would be less surplus income available to meet such outlays. It is evident from the comments of some Members of Congress that tax reduction, in their opinion, takes precedence over the Marshall plan We do not doubt that many legislators who express such views would welcome tax reduction not only as a means of lightening the domestic tax burden but also as a defense against voting adequate sums for world reconstruction.

Following repassage of the tax-reduction bill by the House, Speaker MARTIN appealed to the public to let "your Members of Congress on both sides of the Capitol know how you feel about this necessity for putting our domestic affairs on a sound basis." Granted that financial soundness at home is essential if we are to aid others, it seems to us that the way to achieve financial soundness is to defer tax reduction until we are sure that revenue returns will be more than adequate to cover domestic budgetary expenditures and finance a foreign-relief program. The case for postponement is further strengthened by booming business activity, making it unnecessary to resort to tax reduction as a means of stimulating lagging enterprise.

Air Power Role in Unified Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of May 16, 1947:

AIR POWER ROLE IN UNIFIED DEFENSE

(By Col. Harris B. Hull, U. S. Army)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author of this article was a member of the editorial staff of the Post from 1931 to 1936. During the war he served in the European theater as assistant chief of staff to Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker. He is presently on duty in headquarters of the Army Air Forces.)

The fundamentals of the military problem facing America are being clouded, at a critical time, by incidental issues. That these excursions into side-line discussion should obscure the important aspects is unfortunate enough, but that this confusion should come at a time when the organization of the military services is being considered in Congress may well be tragic for America.

No one doubts that the future of the marines is an important subject. But the plain fact is that no one in the War Department is advocating abolition of this historic corps.

No well-informed person will argue that economies could not have been effected by a well-organized joint procurement service during World War II. But we did not have such a service when the Japs struck, we did not have many things, so the services set out to procure the needed items in the shortest possible time. That there was waste is incontrovertible. That is the nature of war.

These subjects essentially are diversionary to the basic military problem before us.

What we face is a critically important issue which essentially can be broken down into two parts: (1) strategic emphasis; (2) command.

There are three realms in which weapons can operate—on land, on the surface, and in the air.

The armored columns or World War II revolutionized overnight all tactical concepts of land warfare. They swept hundreds of miles in a fraction of the time required for the major advances of World War I. Modern and improved weapons facilitated the conquest of land masses—first by the Germans and later by the superior allied forces. But when the tanks came to the beaches they stopped.

Similarly, fast cruisers, long-range submarines, and other improved surface craft made fundamental changes in naval tactics. The American fleets of World War II approached a degree of operational efficiency undreamed of 15 years ago. But when the heavy fleet units came to shallow water they had to halt.

The third sphere is the air. Equipment built for air operations is no respecter of barriers. It operates with complete freedom over land or water, utilizing the shortest air route to move at very high speeds, and carrying large bomb loads. Airplanes operate in the universe, which is to say that they operate universally. They constitute the only universal weapon. They were employed in World War II to deliver independent strategic attacks against German and Japanese industry, to cripple the enemy's ability to wage war, and they were used to give support to ground forces.

It is important to remember that the airplane is not solely a bomber. As an instrument of reconnaissance it has no equal and it can be employed effectively as a troop carrier, for logistic support, for liaison missions, or in the other basic military roles.

Two fundamental air lessons emerged from World War II. The first is that there is no real defense against a superior air force. Its great flexibility and limitless operating area make it difficult enough to detect and to intercept. The German air force mounted a strong defense against the day and night attacks of the AAF and the RAF. This was the same German air force which had been the scourge of Europe, which had swept like lightning through the early campaigns of Poland, the Lowlands, and France. The ashes of Hamburg attest to the ineffectiveness of the GAF defense against General Spaatz's and Air Marshal Harris' bombers.

A second lesson to come from World War II is that if the air battle is lost it follows inevitably that the battle on the ground will be lost, regardless of the size of the forces involved. The campaigns of France, Africa, and Italy, viewed from both the Allied and German sides of the lines, stand in evidence.

A prime consideration of the war planner then becomes a treatment of the air situation.

The problem before us today is whether or not we will give air the prime consideration that it deserves, whether or not in our strategic planning we will recognize that the air is the unguarded frontier through which surprise attack can be launched, that if we are to lose air superiority a war may end before any ground or surface forces can be brought into action.

The airmen who recognize these facts are called zealots by a few remaining critics who still preach in the face of World War II experience, that the airplane and the missiles are another of the great family of weapons which started with the bow and arrow and which came to fruition with the automatic rifle.

This doctrine is fallacious. All other weapons, except the airplane, are built to assist the ground soldier and the sailor to complete his mission. The opportunities of employment of air weapons are unique, are as limitless as the realm in which they operate.

Air weapons alone are capable of independent strategic action. In the war against Germany they were the "decisive" factor according to the President's Civilian Strategic Survey Group. In the Japanese war they hastened the enemy's collapse, making invasion of Honshu unnecessary.

No airman advocates the abolition of ground or surface forces. He only asks a clear recognition of the fact that military science has changed and that the strategic emphasis must be given, if we are to be realistic, to the vital problem of air operations. The

airman points out that the avenues of potential action in the air are infinite. Were he to fail to point this out he would be less than an honest soldier. The same opportunities that are available to us for air action also are open to potential aggressors.

In the face of this paramount importance of air our military organization creaks under a system in which air force, far from being placed in a priority position, is subordinated to the other elements. Our command structure is out of balance and badly in need of consolidation. Today we do not have air in its proper place. We do not have unified control or direction.

We need today a coordinated system of military control which will insure that all our resources are employed with efficiency, and should we ever be attacked, in time.

Who is there that can argue that instantaneous control of our military weapons is not a necessity in a day when a single bomb can wipe out a city? If we do not have a unified system we forfeit automatically a degree of military control—we capriciously disregard the most single important factor of war—time.

We should remember that in World War II we had time on our side. Is there anyone who can come forward and guarantee that we will have the same amount of time at our disposal in any future conflict?

For years the airplane was considered as a fad of over-zealous airmen. Its development was hindered by the unimaginative who tried to tie its operation to the maneuvers of land and sea forces. Today full public understanding of the implications of air power is being diverted and unification is being delayed by arguments which, as vital as they may appear, are extraneous to the basic issue.

Many of the military tenets were revolutionized in World War I, others in World War II, but one that has remained unaltered is the advantage of surprise. A successful surprise attack in itself can be devastating enough, but with full exploitation in which additional forces are hurled on stunned defenses the result may well be conclusive.

The opportunities for surprise vary in proportion to the speed of execution. Air power offers, to any potential aggressor, the ultimate in opportunity to effect complete surprise. It is a certainty that the initial blows in a future conflict will be struck through the air. It is hardly necessary to mention the implications of successful surprise attack in an era of atomic weapons.

America's military problem, divested of all but the fundamentals, is whether or not we will recognize this, put air in an equal status, give it a high degree of strategic emphasis and establish a national defense organization capable of giving immediate direction to all our military resources.

Local and National Elections in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have a letter which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix concerning recent elections in Japan. It comes to me from a former classmate of mine, a captain in Japan, who helped conduct the elections referred to.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURAL RESOURCES SECTION,
GHQ SCAP, APO 500,
San Francisco, June 1, 1947.

The Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: You might be interested in a first-hand account of the recent Japanese local and national elections, insofar as it concerns a sizable and representative section of the Japanese nation, and has some indication of the people's progress toward the attainment of democracy, and rule by the majority of the whole nation.

About the middle of last March, the CO of the Aichi military government team gave me the job of organizing and running the surveillance of the coming April Japanese local and national elections, for Aichi prefecture. This duty was required by General MacArthur and the supreme command allied powers for all of Japan, and it was the job of each military government team to cover its prefecture. There are some 45 prefectures, and 2 metropolitan districts, each the charge of a military government team, and as I have said before, these teams, and the MP's, are the real tangible occupation for the great mass of the Japanese. As for the rest of the occupation personnel, the majority live segregated lives in the little replicas of Washington, Fort Ord, and similar. Over here, it is somewhat like Paris in the twenties for a lot of Americans. You can stay here a long time, do your business, have fun, meet a lot of other Americans and a few westernized Japs (with Oxford or Chicago accents), attend a few saki, sukiyaki, and geisha parties, and learn very little of the people or the country. The great majority of GHQ life is like that, and too many of the accounts of today's Japan come solely from such sources. It is pretty superficial, and I feel that this criticism also goes for much of the overseas press. The latter, from what I have seen, read, and heard of their activities, missed a great chance for a story in these last elections. They mostly wrote of the business, solely from what happened in Tokyo, and let it go at that. This was grossly misleading, as the results in Tokyo and the four great cities were quite at variance with other sections, and told at best only a part of the picture.

The job was this, Aichi prefecture covers some 3,500 square miles, and comprises 9 cities, 213 towns and villages, and some 3,000,000 people. The cities run from Nagoya with 800,000, down to Tshushima with the bare minimum for a city of 30,000. Under the new constitution, the prefecture is run by an elected governor and prefectural assembly, the cities by an elected mayor and assembly, and the towns and villages by elected headmen and local councils. All such offices are to be elected, whereas in the former set-up the governors, mayors, and town chiefs were appointed by the central government, and the assemblies were purely honorary bodies, with litle or no power to oppose the executive's will. For this reason, the people had small interest in voting or electing their assemblies.

In these 1947 elections, things would be much different. Not only would the local executives be directly elected and responsible to the local inhabitants, not only would membership in one of the local assemblies mean a certain amount of power and responsibility, but the people of the numerous prefectural districts would be able to elect and send representatives to a national diet, that would no longer be a mere piece of political scenery and an obedient servant of the ruling powers, but the chief power in the nation. This was the new appeal for the people to really come out and vote. In order to qualify for voting, one had merely to be 20 years old, a 6 months resident, registered by a certain date, not a criminal or insane, and able to legibly write down the name of one's chosen candidate on the ballot. The last, a required that all candidates' names be posted, conspicuously, in the polls. One had merely to be able to read and copy a name.

There was also another important difference between those elections and those previous. Formerly, the business of running the elections was in the hands of the governors, mayors, and police chiefs. They fixed the rules. For these elections, no official would have a word to say. The whole business was under the authority of various local administrative election committees. For the perfecture as a whole, there was a prefectural committee with general supervisory powers, and each city, town, and rural district had its own election committee, whose duties were to supervise the election of its own local officials. These committees were chosen from the ranks of the nonpolitical citizens. Their size ran from a dozen to six or seven members, and they generally comprised a banker, a couple of merchants, a couple of lawyers, a school principal, a publisher, a professor, and very often one woman, and a labor-union leader. They had full responsibility for setting up the election machinery, and for seeing that the elections were properly and honestly run, and that the election laws were observed by all parties concerned. For this, they were given full authority over the police and all officials. It was our job to confer with and advise these election committees, to back them and build up their prestige with the officials, the police, and the mass of the people, and to watch the elections, listen to complaints, and take action if anything serious developed.

Aichi prefecture is both an industrial and an agricultural area. Before the war it contained textile industries, porcelain factories, and numerous other industrial works. However, a large section is an alluvial plain, and it is common to see a factory and its towering smokestacks set in the midst of rice paddies. The district also raises sweetpotatoes, fruit, wheat, and cultivates the silkworm and the mulberry tree. Another section is mountainous, where water power is developed and much lumber is cut. All types of economic life—including fishing along the coast—are carried on in the prefecture. The population is fairly evenly divided between farmers and businessmen and workers. A large vote here would be representative and a cross-section of the nation to a significant extent.

Since there were many and different types of offices to be filled in the elections, and since the people were new to voting and apt to become confused by having to vote for too many offices at once, using long, complicated ballots, it was decided to hold a series of elections. The first elections, on April 5, would be for executives. Each voter would vote for one candidate for the prefectural governor, and one candidate for mayor or chief of the locality in which he resided. Since there were numerous candidates for each office, many running as independents, the chances were that the winner would have a mere plurality. This plurality had to be not less than 37.5 percent of those voting, in the case of executives, and there was a provision for a run-off election on the 15th, for such offices as did not obtain this minimum. The run-off would be confined to the two leading candidates. Following, there would be elections on the 20th for the House of Councillors (the upper house of the Diet), on the 25th for the House of Representatives (the lower house of the Diet), and on the 30th, the representatives of the prefectural and local assemblies would be chosen by the voters.

Since there would be 1,562 polling stations and 266 ballot-counting stations distributed throughout the prefecture, and it would be our job to check, advise, and report on as large a percentage as possible, during the voting and ballot-counting days of each election, this called for considerable organiza-

tion. Since our little team, with many other regular duties to perform, could not possibly furnish the needed personnel and vehicles for a good coverage, we were empowered to call on aid from the tactical troops in the vicinity. The most available were the Twenty-fourth Infantry, stationed in Gifu, some 20 miles distant. They agreed to assign us, for the elections, 37 surveillance teams and 1 officer; each surveillance team would consist of 1 noncommissioned officer (of the top 3 grades), 1 driver, and 1 jeep. In turn, we could furnish 9 teams, giving us a total of 46 for the job of surveillance. The Twenty-fourth Infantry is a Negro regiment, although half the officers are white. The various teams would be distributed throughout the prefecture, on their own, spending the nights in Japanese inns, in many cases in remote villages and districts. There have been many criticisms of the Negro soldier, in this war and the last. He has been represented as lawless, undisciplined, and unsoldierly. The elections were to be a great experiment in teaching democracy. We were the teachers, and the Japs judged democracy by the kind of people it produced. Bad behavior on the part of American troops would give the prestige of democracy a bad set-back. I was skeptical over this use of Negro troops, and thought that the "high brass" were bowing to political pressure from the United States of America. How it turned out, I will tell you further on.

During the 3 weeks of preparation we were very busy. There were many maps to prepare, showing locations of roads, inns, police stations, town halls, polling stations, etc. The prefecture had to be sectioned out into eight regions, with so many teams to each region, to insure the best coverage. Suitable inns had to be selected and advised that we would occupy them. The police had to be advised and requisitioned for sufficient guides and interpreters for each team. Then conferences with the more important election committees had to be arranged. At these conferences—a good 30, covering all districts in the prefecture—we took care to see that not only were the whole committee present, but also the local mayor or chief, the chief of police, the school inspector for the district, and other officials. In some cases there were as many as 200 people present, as many citizens came to listen. Also, there was the press. This was what we wanted, as such meetings stirred up interest in the elections, built up the authority and prestige of the committees, showed the officials and bureaucrats where they both stood and got off, brought out questions and discussions concerning the fundamentals of American democracy, gave great publicity to the importance of everyone voting, and showed the people that they need have no fear of using free speech and voting their own choice, as the occupation, through its military-government team, was keenly interested, and would back up an honest election with all its powers. In addition to this, we gave out releases to the press, stirred up the radio people, and made several addresses to large audiences on elections, American democracy, and such subjects.

In addition to the above, we had to train the surveillance teams. This involved briefing talks and the arranging of mock-up poling booths and counting stations, each one equipped with Japanese actors representing all the necessary watchers and officials, plus voters of various ages, sex, education, etc. With these and acting out various situations, we trained the colored soldiers of the teams how to go about their inspections, what to look for, what the election laws were, and how to take care of most anything that might arise.

Finally everything was ready, and all had been coordinated, so that the teams, interpreters, guides, police knew where they were to go, meet, duties, reports, and all the necessary things. From the start it went very well. For the four main elections, and one run-off election, we average over 50 percent full coverage of all the polling stations. In all the elections there were no major violations, such as intimidation, bribery, interference, and the like, and very few minor ones. The latter were mainly technical mistakes and were quickly corrected, as soon as the poll supervisors' attention was called by the inspecting team. The polls were mainly in schools and temples and were clean, orderly, and well handled. All gave evidence of sincere and intelligent effort on the part of the responsible election committees. They would have done credit to polls in the United States. The percentage of those voting, who were eligible, was remarkable. A large proportion were women. I quote a few figures:

ELECTION FOR LOCAL CHIEF EXECUTIVES, APR. 5, 1947

Number of eligible voters:	
Men	789,931
Women	853,442
Total	1,643,373
Number actually voted:	
Men	611,127
Women	596,691
Total	1,207,818

Percentage eligible, who voted, 73.5 percent.

Number of candidates for governor: Socialist, 1; independents, 5. Elected: Aoyagi, independent.

Number of candidates for mayors of cities: Socialist, 1; Liberal, 1; Democrats, 2; Communists, 3; New Political Club, 1; independents, 18.

Mayors elected for nine cities: Democrats, 2; independents, 7.

Number of candidates for chiefs of towns and villages: Socialists, 4; Democrats, 6; National People's Party, 1; Liberals, 2; Communist, 1; independents, 355.

Chiefs elected: Liberal, 1; Democrats, 3; independents, 199.

Women elected: None.

Violations reported or noted by surveillance teams: 16 minor.

ELECTION FOR HOUSE OF COUNCILORS, APR. 20, 1947

Percent eligible voters, who voted: 70.7 percent.

Number of seats, house of councilors, from Aichi prefecture: 6.

Number of candidates: Democrats 7; Liberals, 5; Socialists, 2; Cooperative, 1; independents, 2.

Candidates elected: Democrat, 1; Liberals, 2; Socialist, 1; independents, 2.

Votes by parties: Liberals, 251,100; Democrats, 232,312; Socialists, 147,035; People's Cooperative, 14,698; independents, 362,175.

NOTE.—Out of 1,137,181 who voted, 128,841 ballots were declared invalid, about 11.3 percent. This was mainly due to confusion from the form of the ballot. In the entire prefecture there were 1,633 preelection campaign meetings, by various parties and independent candidates.

ELECTION FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APR. 25, 1497

Percentage eligible who voted: 77.2 percent.

Number of seats in house of representatives from Aichi prefecture: 19.

Candidates by parties: Democrats, 18; Socialists, 11; Liberals, 11; Communists, 5; Cooperatives, 4; small local parties, 6; independents, 7.

Elected to house of representatives, lower house of National Diet by parties: Democrats, 6; Socialists, 6; Liberals, 4; Cooperatives, 2; Nippon farmers.

Women elected: None.

Independents elected: None.

	Number	Percent
Total vote by parties:		
Democratic	397,162	32.0
Liberal	298,508	24.0
Social Democrat	273,519	22.0
Peoples Cooperative	105,446	8.0
Nippon Farmers	64,505	5.0
Communist	46,595	3.0
Small parties	11,882	1.0
Independents	17,075	1.4
Declared invalid		3.6

Number of preelection campaign meetings, 6,009.

Women elected: None.

Violations: None observed or reported, except a few anonymous communications to MG team, which were later investigated and found groundless.

Principal cause of invalid ballots: Writing in of General MacArthur and other noncandidates' names.

ELECTION FOR LOCAL ASSEMBLIES, APRIL 30, 1947

Percentage eligible who voted: 83.2 percent.

Number of seats in prefectural assembly: 73.

Number of candidates for seats: 267.

Number elected by parties: Democrats, 32; Liberals, 10; Socialists, 10; Cooperatives, 2; Communists, 0; Independents, 19.

Number of seats in nine city assemblies: 332.

Number of candidates: 813.

Number of elected by parties: Democrats, 59; Socialists, 21; Liberals, 19; Cooperatives, 3; Communists, 1; independents, 229.

Number of seats in town and village councils: 4,531.

Number of candidates, 5,501.

Number elected by parties: Independents, 4,531.

Women elected: Prefectural assembly, 1 Democrat; city assemblies, 3 independents; town and village councils, 2 independents.

Number of preelection campaign meetings:	
Democrats	12,884
Liberals	5,830
Socialists	4,918
Communists	1,600
Cooperatives	1,455
Local parties	288
Independents	95,333

Number of invalid ballots: 60,837, 4.8 percent.

Number of violations: 6 minor.

From the above figures it can be seen that in none of the four elections did the actual voting of the eligible voters fall below 70 percent. The least interest was shown in the election for the upper house of the National Diet the Housé of Councillors. For this branch, there were 250 seats chosen, of which 100 were from the nation at large, and 150 represented the various prefectures. Although now a democratically chosen branch, the old aura of the House of Peers still clings to the present House of Councilors, the candidates are apt to be either nationally known scholars, authors, and other noted characters, and they seem more remote to the people, and of less pertainment to their lives. On the other hand, the hottest election was that for the local assemblies. Here it was "my friendo" Wtanabe San running against that no account uncle of Izumi San, and the whole family turns out to vote. As for the Communists, they made a miserable showing, and I think that as long as Japan continues to have free, honest, and secret elections, they will never make first base. One other thing is of significance. The big cities did not make nearly so good a showing as the smaller centers. Here are some figures from election for the local assemblies, broken down by localities:

Percentage of eligible vote cast, by cities and rural districts

	Approximate population	Those voting
Cities:		*Percent*
Nagoya	800,000	67.9
Toyohashi	115,000	88.6
Okazaki		90.9
Ichinomya		90.7
Seto		92.1
Handa	70-30,000	83.5
Kasugai		84.7
Toyokawa		88.2
Tsushima		88.2
Rural communities:		
Aichi-gun	(1)	88.4
Niwakgun	(1)	89.8
Unkata-gun	(1)	95.5
Atsumi-gun	(1)	91.4
Etc	(1)	87-94.0

[1] Less than 30,000.

The good showing in the smaller places, as against big industrial and metropolitan centers like Tokyo, Nagoya, Osaka, seemed due to numerous factors, such as pride in generations of continued residence and feeling of community responsibility, personal acquaintance with candidates, and pressure by various members, including the children, to bring out the entire family vote. The women made as good a showing as the men, even better in some places. They seemed thrilled by the privilege, and flooded the polling places early on the election days.

I have mentioned that 37 of the 2-man surveillance teams were made up of Negro soldiers, from the Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment. They did an excellent, conscientious, and intelligent job of a difficult assignment, and although for days and nights without officer supervision in remote areas, they behaved in a manner that was a credit to the United States Army, and were fine ambassadors for democracy. They were all big, coal-black, fine-looking men, and I enjoyed working with them. They took a keen interest in the job, understood the nature of the work, and all went like clockwork. However, several officers commented on the odd fact that many of these colored boys, who were doing a good job of supervising elections in Japan, would not be allowed near a polling booth, back in their own home town. The Japs would never have understood that.

I have now transferred from my assignment with Military Government, and am on the last few weeks of my terminal leave. I have signed up for one more year over here, as a Scientific Consultant, with the Natural Resources Section of SCAP. My job calls for frequent field trips, in the inspection, study and reporting on the situation, problems and needs of various mines and mineral-producing properties in Japan and Korea. Just now, I have returned from a week's trip to Iwate Prefecture in the north of Honshu, to inspect two large pyrite producers. Next to coal, iron, and copper, pyrites have first priority in the present mineral program, in aid of Japanese national economy. The sulfur contents of the pyrites are badly needed to make sulfuric acid, for the fertilizer plants, and the latter are a prime necessity.

Succession Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, July 13, 1947. It is entitled "Succession bill," and is very timely, in view of the fact that as a people we are considering throughout the United States changing the succession of the Presidency of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUCCESSION BILL

Three chief arguments against the present law governing succession to the Presidency were advanced when the country suddenly found itself without a Vice President more than 2 years ago. The first was that it would be undemocratic to have an appointed official serve as President. The second was that designation of a Cabinet member as "heir apparent" when there is no Vice President, would enable the President to appoint his own potential successor. The third was the confusion of the present law. Certainly a good case was made for some action on the part of Congress to overcome the defects in the present statute, but we do not think that the right answer has been found in enactment of the bill giving the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate priority in the line of succession over members of the Cabinet.

Should there be an outright vacancy in the White House, something would doubtless be gained by having the Speaker fill it. But the idea that the Speaker is likely to reflect the will of the people is largely fallacy. He is elected to Congress by only 1 of 435 congressional districts. His elevation to the Speakership is usually influenced by seniority and politics more than by ability or alertness in serving the national welfare. It is difficult to think of a Speaker in recent years who has had any reasonable chance of being advanced to the White House by the vote of the people. In our opinion the objection to having an appointed official pinch-hit as President should have been overcome by limiting his service and making definite provision for a special election. Instead, the present bill eliminates all possibility of a special election in such a contingency.

Theoretically, there is objection to having a President name his own potential successor. But in practice this objection seems insignificant. The chance of a Secretary of State succeeding to the Presidency is very small. Surely it did not become a major factor in the naming of former Secretary of State Byrnes or Secretary Marshall. Whatever slight danger there may be in leaving this discretion to the President is overshadowed, in our opinion, by the great advantage in having the head of the Cabinet carry on in the event of his Chief's death, resignation, or disability, in the case of temporary disability on the part of the President, only a member of the administration can properly assume this function. How confusing and stultifying it would be, for example, if President Truman, a Democrat, should be incapacitated for 6 months, with Speaker MARTIN, a Republican, taking his place as Acting Chief Executive, only to be displaced again by the President's recovery. To cite this one possibility of chaos is to indicate how utterly inadequate the present bill is.

As to the third argument for the bill, we have previously pointed out that its punch has been lost. The vague implication in the present law that Congress would be called into special session to order an election in case of vacancies in both the Presidency and Vice Presidency is of little significance now that all possibility of holding a Presidential election before 1948 has passed. To our way of thinking the need for special election machinery for use when and if necessary was the strongest argument for enacting an emergency Presidential succession bill, 2 years ago. Now it is no argument at all. Congress would have done much better, as Representative GWYNNE pointed out, to have discarded this makeshift bill and ordered a thorough study of succession to the Presidency as well as our machinery for nominating and electing Presidents. There is still time for such a study to be approved.

United States Largesse Totals Twenty Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Largesse Totals Twenty Billion," by Clarke Beach, of the Associated Press, as published in the Washington Post on Sunday, July 13, 1947.

The humanitarian impulses of the American people are great, and their willingness to make loans which would have no foundation in any business transaction is also great, but from my point of view, the people of the United States must soon begin to consider whether their impulses to "give," and to make unsound loans, are greater than their ability to pay when the pressure to pay their debts is finally upon them.

If we "give" ourselves into national bankruptcy and the destruction of our great American system, then we will not have fulfilled our role of leadership in the interest of the peoples of the world and the people of our own country. Let us stop, look, and listen, and first know that what we are doing is for the good of the world, and, secondly, know, so far as is humanly possible, that in doing these things we are not destroying ourselves to the disadvantage of our own people and the peoples of the world.

Individual freedom and the acceptance of individual responsibility are so interwoven that they cannot be separated for any people on earth or for any group of people within our own borders.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES LARGESSE TOTALS TWENTY BILLION

(By Clarke Beach)

The United States has made grants and pledged loans totaling more than $20,000,000,000 for the relief and rehabilitation of foreign nations in the postwar years.

At the request of the Associated Press, the International Economics Division of the Commerce Department compiled a complete list of American largesse.

Outright gifts to prostrate peoples in Europe, Asia, and Africa amount to $7,215,000,000. Of this, individuals and institutions gave $1,500,000,000 in parcels and money.

(The data on private gifts were obtained from banks and other organizations having a remittance business, from post-office money-order and parcel-post records, and from philanthropic institutions.)

Loans comprise $12,871,000,000 of the total. They have been made, generally, for 20- to 30-year periods. They bear interest of 2 to 3½ percent.

To get an idea of the enormous sums involved in these loans and gifts, recall that the public debt of the United States in 1932 was only $19,487,000,000. All the goods which this country exported between 1932 and 1939 cost somewhat less than $20,000,000,000.

BULK TO EUROPE

Chief recipients of the gifts have been the countries of eastern and southern Europe. Western Europe comes next and Asia third.

Britain has been by far the largest borrower.

Most of the goods exported to the loan countries have been food, fuel, and clothing. Machinery, steel, and other hard goods have been exported mainly through UNRRA in the form of gifts.

Here are some facts cited by a State Department expert:

We exported 29,600,000 tons of coal in the year ended June 30—all but 3,000,000 to Europe and North Africa. In average prewar years we exported only 50,000 tons of coal.

We exported 14,500,000 tons of bread grains, nearly all of it wheat, in the past year. To Italy went 1,276,000 tons, to France 682,000 tons, and to Greece 376,000 tons. In average prewar years we exported only 36,400 tons to all those countries.

All our exports—both consumer items and hard goods—are steadily mounting. In June we were exporting at the rate of $1,400,000,000 worth of goods a month—an all-time record.

CHINA'S PORTION

Here are the gifts made by the people of America through their Government:

UNRRA: $2,700,000,000. This is 72 percent of all UNRRA donations. Largest recipient of UNRRA help was China, with $530,000,000. Two Russian Soviets, the Ukraine and Byelorussia, received large grants.

Post-UNRRA relief: $350,000,000, which this Government will distribute as it sees fit.

International Refugee Organization: $75,000,000. This is 45.75 percent of the IRO budget. It will help care for 1,200,000 homeless and destitute persons.

Philippine grants: $620,000,000. To pay private claims for war damage, $400,000,000 is provided; for public rehabilitation, $220,000,000.

Gravy Train in the Kitchen, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 10), 1947

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial dealing with the tax situation. The editorial is entitled "Gravy in the Kitchen, Too," and is from the Chicago Times of July 11, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAVY IN THE KITCHEN, TOO

Bill Jeffers, the railroad man, tells his friends: "The backbone of America still eats in the kitchen."

If the Republican Party wanted to do something for the backbone of America, it would pass more of the tax-reduction gravy out into the kitchen where so many of the great American family eat. Instead, the Republican tax bill ladles out the gravy to the penthouse trade.

When he vetoed the GOP tax-reduction bill last month, President Truman said it was the wrong kind of bill at the wrong time. The Republicans want now to make the reduction go into effect next January instead of this month. But it's still the wrong kind of bill. It does not give enough tax reduction to those in the lower brackets who are being hit hardest by rising food and other costs.

The average family whose income is $2,500 has been hard hit by current high prices. A big part of its income goes for food. The GOP tax bill would give this family a kickback of $30 in taxes. It would give the $50,000-a-year man a reduction of nearly $5,000.

Some believe that since the $50,000-a-year man is taxed at a rate of 72 percent, he is entitled to the bigger kick-back. Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS (Democrat, Illinois), proposed a more equitable reduction. LUCAS would raise personal exemptions from $500 to $650, thus giving a better break to the average man with a number of children. He would reduce surtax rates by four points. These changes would eliminate taxes for many low-bracket families and still would give the $50,000-a-year man a couple of thousand dollars' reduction.

If the gravy train for the rich does roll through Congress now, there probably will not be a general overhauling of the tax laws for a long time. This is the time to see that more tax relief goes to the people who eat in the kitchen.

Tax-Reduction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, section 138 of the Reorganization Act passed last year directs the Committees on Ways and Means and Appropriations of the House and Finance and Appropriations of the Senate, to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress "and report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year." This section also states "such reports shall be made by February 15." The word is "shall" not "may." It is common knowledge that the members of these committees have failed to comply with this provision of law in that this report has not been made. Naturally, since they are dominated by Republicans, it is a Republican violation of law for which the Democratic members are not responsible.

The newspapers tell us that the House Members proposed a reduction in the President's budget of $6,000,000,000, which the Senate Members thought should be four and one-half billion. We are all well aware that the appropriation bills as passed by the House will not reduce the President's budget nearly as much as even $4,500,000,000. In fact, they will not do so even if such "phony" reductions as the elimination of $800,000,000 from the appropriation for tax refunds, which will, of course, have to be restored in deficiency appropriation bills, are considered as actual reductions, which they naturally are not. We are equally aware that the Senate has already greatly increased many of these appropriation bills, that it will undoubtedly increase numerous others and that the final real reduction in the President's budget will most probably be nearer $1,000,000,000 than four and one-half, to say nothing of six billion. In fact it may be less than one billion.

Not only has this report, which would have informed us what we might expect and which the law required to be made by February 15, not been made, but only one appropriation bill for the fiscal year which commenced 8 days ago has become law. Such a situation has never heretofore existed since I entered Congress.

It is interesting and thought compelling, even though astounding, to refer to the headlines in the July 4 Washington Post from which we first learned of the Republican determination to again pass this tax bill now, while we are still groping in the dark. Just under the front page headline 'House starts tax-cut bill on repeat run," we find: "Army appropriation boosted 600 millions by Senate group." On page 3, where the first referred to article is continued, we find "The House will call up and probably pass on Monday legislation giving veterans the optional right to cash their terminal leave bonds" which will, regardless of how we feel about it, add $2,000,000,000 to the inflationary potential and cost $3,000,000 for administration, which will be added to the public debt by this Republican decision.

Though not germane to the subject of these remarks, the next paragraph quotes Majority Leader HALLECK as planning to also take up the following antisouthern measures; minimum wage, antipoll tax, and possibly antilynching legislation.

On page 2, we find another evidence of Republican wastefulness under the headline "Voice funds cut to bring dismissals." The House has passed by a three-to-one vote legislation permanently authorizing the all-important cultural relations program of the State Department, which favorably impresses a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and will doubtless become law before adjournment. Despite this prospect, this article refers to the reduction of another million in this appropriation which will require very expensive and unnecessary liquidation of an organization which will probably have to be recreated during the fiscal year.

I quote from an editorial, Revised Tax Bill, on page 6:

In the message accompanying his veto of the tax bill, President Truman declared that reductions in income taxes would increase existing inflationary pressures on prices and were not needed now to provide additional funds for business expansion. * * * The purely political gains that the Republicans hoped to achieve from their drive for tax reduction have, in our opinion, already been

chalked up to their credit. We doubt whether those gains are very substantial. * * * We conclude, therefore, that the decision to revive the issue of tax reduction is not only, economically speaking, ill-timed, but a tactically unwise political maneuver.

An editorial, Military Missionaries, follows, which is followed by one on budget surplus from which I quote:

During the 17 intervening years, the Federal debt has risen from approximately $16,000,000,000 to more than $258,000,000,000. * * * Opponents of the tax-reduction bill that encountered a Presidential veto are well aware of the need for tax relief; they merely object to tax cuts at a time when the country is facing new drains on its resources for foreign aid and has not yet succeeded in effecting necessary reductions in outlays.

I particularly call the attention of those who insist that taxes should be reduced now, because this occurred after the last war, to this increase in the national debt from sixteen to two hundred and fifty-eight billion which resulted somewhat from depression but primarily from war. The situations are by no means identical or even similar.

On page 7 of this same issue, we find under the article "Split with Russia" by Mark Sullivan, the following:

At long last, after 2 years of patient endurance of fustration by Russia, we have taken responsibility for the leadership the world hungers for. Britain and France have acted upon our leadership and other countries will. The mere act of decision on our part, the coming to conclusion, will have on other peoples the psychological effect of confusion ended, of men's spirits released, their freedom assured. It will be a psychological tonic as constructive as the material help we give.

Can any conscientious public servant, who pays even lip service to the concepts of good business practice, conscientiously vote for tax reduction 6 months hence after reading such headlines in one paper, which are merely illustrative of those in the press of our Nation today? While we cannot possibly know now, when only one appropriation bill has become law, what our governmental expenses for the fiscal year now commencing will be, we do know that the cashing of some $2,000,000,000 in terminal-leave bonds was authorized yesterday and that the passage of this bill today will decrease our revenue by at least $4,000,000,000. Six billion dollars is a goodly sum for an economy-minded Congress to indirectly add to the public debt and the inflation potential in 2 days, even though Republican dominated and indifferent to business principles. Since it is Republican dominated, it is but natural that the large taxpayer would be the main benefactor of this bill.

Since we do not know what to expect now, nearly 5 months after we should have been tentatively informed by the report of which I spoke and a week after we should have gained positive knowledge by the passage of all appropriation bills, we certainly cannot be expected to know what the situation will be 6 months hence. This is particularly true in view of the approaching Paris Conference looking toward the implementation of the Marshall plan. In January we will have a much better idea of the size of the foreign commitments in which we must indulge, by no means entirely because of our humanitarian attitude, but primarily in self defense, to prevent the world from crumbling in ruins about us and the resulting revolutions and probable war which would be so much more expensive to us, not only in dollars, but in precious lives than whatever foreign commitments are decided upon as necessary.

Why the necessity for acting on tax reduction now, effective January 1? As evidence of the fact that this bill could be passed by January 15, I call your attention to the fact that it will be passed today, only 4 days after the above-referred to headline, which first warned us that it would be here. Since Chairman KNUTSON attempted to pass a tax reduction bill in June, retroactive to January 1, there could certainly be no complaint against such a short retroactive period. Furthermore, it now appears almost inevitable that a special session will occur several months hence. If the Republican leadership does not wish to wait until January, when information which will enable us to act intelligently will be available, why would it not be preferable to enact tax legislation during this special session with the information then available, which would undoubtedly enable us to act far more intelligently than we possibly can today? The fact is, my colleagues, that no truer statement has been made in this debate than the one by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] when he said that if politics were eliminated from this bill only the enacting clause would remain. I hope the number of my democratic colleagues who are willing to join our Republican friends in running the risk of immediately returning to deficit financing will prove to be small.

We all thank the gracious God that the shooting war is over. However, the war will not have really concluded until the signing of the peace treaties and the restoration of world order. In view of the increasing responsibilities of our country, which results from our position of leadership, which we cannot abdicate, I am strongly of the opinion that it behooves us to stop, look, and listen before reducing taxes at a time when business is more active and prosperous and our people are more able to pay than at any other time in our history.

Yes, the line of least resistance is to vote for tax reduction. Perhaps a measure of statesmanship is required to vote against it, particularly when we positively know that it will pass the House and realize the probability of it doing so over the President's veto. Even so, it is in my considered opinion but common, hard-headed business sense to oppose tax reduction in early July, effective in January, under the uncertain conditions I have outlined, during this period of unprecedented prosperity and when the people of our country can enjoy their tax reduction just as much if it be authorized either in a special session or early in January. Should the argument be advanced that business would know better how to plan, I reply by repeating that our people, both individually and as operators of industry, are more prosperous now than at any time in the past. Witness the largest national income in history.

In conclusion if you are unaware that inflation confronts us, inquire of your wives who do the shopping. What effect will this $6,000,000,000 addition to the inflationary spiral have? Are you willing to gamble that it will not be the straw that will break the camel's back, rather than wait and act more intelligently 3 or 6 months hence?

I am strongly in favor of tax reduction at the proper time, but I am not at all sure that even next January will be that time. Such may be the case. I sincerely hope it will. In this event I shall gladly support appropriate tax reduction then, but I cannot too strongly urge you to permit us to take a look around, to see what happens during the next 6 months, and defer action on this all-important matter, at least until any special session, and preferably until early next January. In the meantime, your constituents who wish tax reduction will not gain or lose one single penny by such action on our parts.

There Is No Perfect Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there is altogether too much talk these days about the clashes of ideologies and the consequent interpretation that another world war is inevitable.

We need, in my humble opinion, to restore a sanity in thinking. There is no perfect peace. Those who despair because everything does not come out just as they would like to have it are demanding a perfectionism which history has never offered any age.

That is my opinion, at least, and I was heartened recently because thoughts like these were expressed in a brief but notable speech by the Honorable James F. Byrnes, former Secretary of State, former Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, former Member of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, to mention only a few of the many positions of honor and responsibility he has held.

His remarks were given when he received the annual humanitarian award of the Variety Clubs, International, May 12, 1947. In presenting Mr. Byrnes, Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson recalled that during the war Mr. Byrnes had served his country as Economic Stabilization Director and War Mobilization and Reconversion Director. Then he stepped upon the world stage as an advocate of and worker for peace.

The very first day he became Secretary of State, Justice Vinson recalled, Byrnes said:

There can be no doubt that the peoples of this war-ravaged earth want to live in a free and peaceful world. But the supreme task of statesmanship the world over is to help them understand that they can have peace and freedom only if they tolerate and respect the

rights of others to opinions, feelings, and ways of life which they do not and cannot share.

Mr. Speaker, here in the United States, as well as elsewhere, the "task of statesmanship" is to help our people to understand that they, too, "can have peace and freedom only if they tolerate and respect the rights of others to opinions, feelings, and ways of life which they do not and cannot share."

And supplementing that thought, I wish to place in the RECORD the address of Mr. Byrnes to which I have alluded, for it voices the fear which I have that "both in the Soviet Union and in the United States there is too much talk about war and too little talk about peace." The address follows:

STATEMENT BY JAMES F. BYRNES UPON HIS BEING PRESENTED THE HUMANITARIAN AWARD BY THE VARIETY CLUBS, INTERNATIONAL, MAY 12, 1947

RESPONSIBILITY NOT TO MISREPRESENT

I should be happy to receive this award under any circumstances, but I am particularly happy that it should be presented to me by Chief Justice Vinson, who for many years has been one of my dearest friends. That friendship is responsible for the generosity of his statements.

Throughout this Nation, wherever the Variety Clubs, International, have "pitched a tent," they have won the good will of the people of the community by their good works. These men and women who make their living in the field of entertainment have given not only their money but their time and their talents to improve the lot of others. They have given relief to the needy. They have given financial assistance and intelligent guidance to organizations of boys and girls. They have given assistance and encouragement to the unfortunate who were out of work and out of luck.

Because I have had opportunity to know of their good works, I ask the privilege of giving the honorarium which has been tendered me to the welfare fund of the Washington unit of this organization.

It is understandable that the Variety Clubs, International, should show an interest in our foreign policy because the membership includes so many people engaged in the motion-picture industry. That industry now plays an important part in our foreign relations. The motion picture has become an unofficial ambassador to many countries, interpreting to other people our American way of life.

I am confident that those directing the industry, as well as the writers and artists, realize that with this great opportunity there has come also a great responsibility, the responsibility of seeing to it that without sacrificing the quality of entertainment that makes American pictures welcome everywhere, they do not misrepresent our American life.

Nothing could give me greater happiness than to know that during my recent public service I have made some contribution to the cause of peace.

Two years ago the people of the world were rejoicing because of the end of hostilities in Europe and were praying for the early end of the war in the Pacific. As the people of many nations counted their dead and welcomed home their living, they had but one hope—that out of it all there would come a universal yearning for peace that would make future wars impossible.

Today they are disturbed. They are disturbed because both in the Soviet Union and in the United States there is too much talk about war and too little talk about peace.

CONFLICT IS NOT INEVITABLE

The people of the Soviet Union do not want war. The people of the United States certainly do not want war. The people of other nations still suffering from the terrible cruelties of the recent conflict pray for a lasting peace.

Under the circumstances, if war should come, it will not be because the people want war but because of the incapacity of those who control the governments of the world. I do not believe there exists such bankruptcy of statesmanship. I deny that conflict is inevitable. On the contrary, I believe we can make the peace and we can keep the peace. I realize the difficulties. But we can overcome those difficulties.

We have made it clear to the Soviet Union that it cannot dictate the terms of peace. We must also realize that the United States cannot dictate the terms of peace. There can be such dictation only to a defeated enemy state or a defenseless state. The Allied Powers must realize that in their peace negotiations there is no place for the take-it-or-leave-it attitude. They must negotiate with each other on terms of equality. They are not called upon to sacrifice fundamental principles, but they are called upon to make wise decisions as to what are questions of principle and what are questions of policy.

THERE IS NO PERFECT PEACE

And the people of the United States must not demand perfectionism in our peacemaking. We must recall the words of President Roosevelt in his last message on the State of the Union on January 6, 1945. Then he said:

"Perfectionism, no less than isolationism or imperialism or power politics, may obstruct the paths of international peace. Let us not forget that the retreat to isolationism a quarter of a century ago was not started by a direct attack against international cooperation but against the alleged imperfections of the peace."

The President was right. He foresaw the coming of this day. In this imperfect world there is no perfect peace. But we must follow our policy of patience and firmness and seek thereby to establish a peace as nearly perfect as human beings can devise.

Booklet on Fascism Should Be Printed at Once

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, although the House of Representatives authorized the printing of the booklet on Fascism with the knowledge that at least 100,000 additional copies would be asked for, the resolution providing for the printing of these copies has not as yet received the attention of the Committee on House Administration to which it was referred. I hope the committee will take action as soon as it can conveniently. This session of Congress is expected to end July 26, less than 2 weeks from now. The resolution will not only have to pass the House, but will also have to pass the Senate, so time is of the essence.

In the Washington Post for Sunday, July 13, 1947, there appeared an article written by a prominent reporter, Mary Spargo, on the subject No Leftist Balm in Fascism Exposé—It Tars Them With the Same Brush. This article fully describes the booklet on Fascism in Action.

When the resolution for its publication was first introduced, the charge was made that the booklet was not well prepared and not as well prepared as Communism in Action. This article states that it is "an equally objective and possibly even more scholarly book." This was also the testimony before the Committee on House Administration when hearings were being conducted on the question of whether or not it should be printed as a House document.

Both booklets on communism and fascism should receive wide distribution. I cannot understand why any person should be eager to distribute one and not distribute the other.

The article is as follows:

NO LEFTIST BALM IN FASCISM EXPOSÉ—IT TARS THEM WITH THE SAME BRUSH

(By Mary Spargo)

What is fascism?

How does it start, how does it operate, and what are the danger signs to warn the people of any nation if their government is drifting toward a Fascist state?

The House of Representatives decided last week that Americans should have the answers to these questions. It ordered publication of a book on the subject prepared by some of the Nation's leading experts.

The book, Fascism in Action, will roll off the Government Printing Office presses within a few days.

Fascism in Action is a companion piece to Communism in Action, which the House ordered published last year. Both were prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, a group of experts employed by Congress.

Communism in Action was prepared at the request of Representative DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois. Fascism in Action was prepared at the request of Representative PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas.

The authoritative study on how communism works has had a phenomenal distribution—700,000 copies. It has become a textbook in political science and government at Harvard.

Judging by the brisk advance demand and the amount of free advertising it has received, Fascism in Action, an equally objective and possibly even more scholarly book, should also crowd the best sellers.

STIRRED 2-HOUR DEBATE

The question of whether or not Congress should publish Fascism in Action touched off a heated 2-hour debate on the House floor. It's a toss-up whether that was better advertising than having a book banned in Boston.

One of the reasons for the House wrangle was the fear voiced in some quarters that Fascism in Action would be used by left-wing groups to attack American business. Some of the most urgent requests for the book came from apparently very left-wing sources.

The left wing, however, is going to find little comfort in this book.

At the request of the House Committee on Administration, Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, director of the Legislative Reference Service, a Rhodes scholar and an expert in political science, has written a preface to Fascism in Action pointing to the deadly parallel between communism and fascism.

Even without the preface the careful reader could not fail to see the similarity between the Fascist and Communist state, especially in their foreign policies.

The book is an analysis of how the Fascist system worked in Germany, Italy, Japan, and Spain. Except for a brief mention of the American industrialists tied in with one German cartel, it does not mention this country. It is left to Patman's foreword to

suggest that there are strong symptoms of fascism in the United States.

OLDER THAN PHARAOHS

The writers content themselves with pointing out that fascism is not new but deeply rooted in ancient ideas and institutions. It is a state of mind as well as a political system. In every age and in every government there have been and are latent seeds of fascism.

Of the ancient roots of fascism, the document states: "Politically it has drawn generously upon the theories of absolutism, the supreme right of kings, dictatorship, and tyranny, ideas older than the ancient Pharaohs, Nebuchadnezzar, Alexander the Great, and Caesar."

What is the prime difference between fascism and democracy?

"Fascism builds everything around the purpose of the state and makes the state preponderant, while democracy holds the individual and his freedoms and rights as primary and would build the welfare of society upon his freedom."

As to its insidiousness:

"The transition to fascism from any other form of government is deceptively easy, for it progresses by steps and stages, but the change from fascism to other forms of government to date has been destructive and violent, as is testified by the fate of most fascist countries during the last generation.

"This is not surprising for the fascist doctrine is couched in violence, and its program is one of conflict, of violent and aggressive prejudice openly espoused and approved."

UNIONS WERE USEFUL

There are going to be some surprises even for the usually well-informed in this book.

For example, even some conservative writers think this country veered toward fascism when Congress cracked down on labor. Some of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill do appear to measure up to the fascist yardstick Congress is about to make public, but it is not true that the fascist states destroyed labor unions.

In fact they created new ones, gave them a place in government councils and took them over, lock, stock, and barrel.

Many liberals want this Government to do as much as possible for recreation. But the Fascist states made control of their people's leisure hours an important objective. The dictators wanted to leave no time for people to think or to become discontented.

If this objective study points to anything it points the way toward as small a degree of Government control over the lives of its citizens as possible. That does not mean, however, that the laissez faire philosophy can go so far that monopolies and cartels flourish.

The Fascist states used monopolies, too, and cartels became not only part of their internal economy but also of their foreign policy.

LEGISLATIVE MEMO

When the GPO gets out the first 1,500 copies of Fascism in Action for Members of Congress, some of them may want to take another look at the Bulwinkle bill to exempt railroads from the antitrust act.

The section on German cartels was one over which members of the House Committee on Administration tangled most fiercely. The writers cite the Kilgore committee report concerning the participation of some American firms in I. G. Farben.

"Its cartel agreements numbered over 2,000 and included agreements with such major industrial concerns as Standard Oil (New Jersey), the Aluminum Co. of America, E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Ethyl Export Corp., Imperial Chemical Industries (Britain), Dow Chemical Co., Rohm & Haas, Etablissements Kuhlmann (France), and the Mitsui interests of Japan."

FROM OWN MOUTHS

If the scholars employed by Congress have come up with some surprises, they have also come up with some analyses that are not only new but alarming. That is perhaps particularly true of the chapter on foreign policy, which is said to be the only existing exhaustive analysis of Fascist foreign policy.

Written by Dr. Thorsten Valentine Kalijarvi, European affairs analyst of the Legislative Reference Service and final editor of Fascism in Action, the chapter has been approved by the State Department.

Dr. Kalijarvi has used as the basis for his conclusions about Germany much of the material gathered by the State Department in 1945 and 1946 from interrogations of German leaders.

The dynamic and aggressive character of Fascist foreign policy is stressed. It is alarming to gather the conviction that both Fascist and Communist states depend upon crisis politics in international affairs to maintain their power at home.

The history of Fascist Germany, Italy, and Japan, particularly, as set forth in these pages, shows that no compromise is possible with nations whose foreign policy is set in this aggressive course. Every concession is taken as a sign of weakness in the decadent democracies and sooner or later a head-on collision becomes inevitable.

PERSONAL REFLECTION

Here are Dr. Kalijarvi's conclusions about Fascist foreign policy—and the reader should not forget the deadly parallel between fascism and communism:

"1. The dictator formulates and determines foreign policy, which then reflects his strengths and weaknesses.

"2. Established agencies for the conduct of foreign relations are frequently relegated to the background and made impotent. This results in a conspicuous lack of correlation of foreign policies both in formulation and in execution.

"3. Revolutionary methods as practiced at home are translated into international affairs, resulting in secretiveness, duplicity, and contradictory actions. This is destructive to confidence between states and thus militates against a stable international order.

"4. Many agencies are set up to do the same thing, and the overlapping duties and functions of these agencies cause confusion and frustration in the administration of Fascist foreign policies.

"5. In Germany those who set, controlled, and executed foreign policies were amateurs and dabblers.

"6. Fascist foreign policy lacks continuity and correlation.

"7. It generally lacks informative background for decisions. Therefore, it is inefficient, paradoxical, and self-contradictory, since crucial steps are taken capriciously, intuitively and individually.

"8. Fascist foreign policy tends to become a crisis policy, which gathers momentum as it progresses. In the case of Hitler, he was able to deal only with one point at a time, thus intensifying each crisis in which he was involved.

"9. Fascist foreign policy is world-wide. It is quick to claim threats to the security of the Fascist state no matter where they may appear to arise, and it tends to take aggressive action on the basis of such claims wherever it is possible to do so."

GRANDSTAND SEAT

Dr. Kalijarvi saw the strongest Fascist state in operation. A native of Gardner, Mass., Kalijarvi took his doctor of philosophy degree at the University of Berlin in 1935.

As one reads his careful analysis of Fascist foreign policy, a conviction grows that the sovereignty of small nations and their right to their own internal and foreign policies vanished soon after World War I.

There were 13 authors of Fascism in Action. Part 1, dealing with the political structure of fascism, was prepared by George B. Galloway, Kalijarvi, Raymond E. Manning, Howard S. Piquet, and M. Loretta Standard.

Part II, dealing with the economic structure, was prepared by Julius W. Allen, Ludwig Hamburger, Theodore J. Kreps, and John Kerr Rose.

Part III, dealing with the industrial structure, was prepared by Francis R. Valeo, Hugh L. Elsbree, William H. Gilbert, Jr., and Helen E. Livingston. Dr. I. L. Kandel, author of School and Society, prepared the chapter on education and thought control.

In writing and editing this document, Kalijarvi said, the staff kept constantly in mind how it would read 5 years hence.

A Courageous Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to note that some newspapers maintain a consistent policy between the editorial department and the advertising department. Mr. Mason Dobson, a courageous editor, has clearly stated the reasons why his paper will not accept advertising copy from the Communist Party which recently has undertaken a national advertising campaign. Mr. Dobson says very clearly:

We're trying to say as plainly as we can that we aren't willing in the name of free speech or anything else to subject freedom to the abuse and the lies of Communist propagandists.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend to the Members of the House the editorial which I am including as part of my remarks and which appeared in the Beloit Daily News on Thursday, July 10, 1947.

DOUBLE TALK BY THE NEWSPAPERS

On one page of a Wisconsin newspaper the other day an advertisement of the Communist Party of Wisconsin was published.

On another page of the same newspaper the same day was printed an editorial headed "Double Talk by the Communists." The editorial sought to undo what the advertisement tried to do, and perhaps did do, to a degree.

The juxtaposition of advertisement and editorial provokes us to the writing of an editorial which might be headed "Double talk by the newspapers." This is it:

Many silly things are done in the name of freedom of speech and of the press and one of the silliest of these is to encourage Communists to make use of both in their efforts to destroy the very freedom whose protection they claim.

In its editorial the Wisconsin newspaper to which we refer had this to say about Communists:

"It must be remembered that the American Communist Party and its subsidiary, the Wisconsin Communist Party, is an organization inspired by an alien ideology and having as its goal the conquest of America through internal revolution for the purpose of establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat in a Soviet America. It advocates death to the American system. This Communist Party of Wisconsin is operated solely for the benefit of a foreign nation whose first aim is the liquidation of American capitalism.

"Joseph Stalin himself, addressing American Communist leaders, declared: 'It is necessary that the American Communist Party should be capable of meeting the moment of crisis, fully equipped to take direction of future class wars in the United States. You

must prepare for that, comrades, with all your strength and by every means. You must forge real revolutionary cadres and leaders of the proletariat who will be capable of leading the millions of American workers toward the revolutionary class wars.'

"* * * They seek, not labor's progress under the American system which brought to labor its present standard, but American revolution by bloodshed and eventual control of labor through class wars. * * * Were they to succeed in their plan of class strife and revolution the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights would be the first to die. * * * Resort to political action, of course, is secondary to the Communist cause. First they must get rid of our freedoms and the Constitution."

That is what the newspaper said on one page while printing the same day on another page an advertisement of the Communist Party.

But if the Communist Party is what that newspaper said it is, what reasonable and common sense and patriotic justification is there for printing the party's advertisement?

How far ought American newspapers go in giving Communists a freedom which they would destroy the moment they acquire the power they seek, and whose efforts to acquire that power are abetted by the advertisements they publish?

In the effort of Communists to destroy our economy and our democracy should Communists be allowed to abuse a democratic freedom which they do not tolerate or permit in their own economy?

Must we, in the end, see our democracy destroyed by the abuse of such a freedom?

Freedom of speech is a magnificent thing. It flourishes only in a democracy. Unless democracy is maintained there is no such freedom. If we believe sincerely in such a freedom we have the obligation to preserve the democracy in which it can flourish.

So, somewhere along the line, there comes a time when realistic thinking and honest forthrightness should call a halt to the destructive efforts of democracy's enemies. We think such a time has come.

Communism is the enemy of democracy and Communists are the enemies of this country.

That, it seems to us, is reason enough to step up on the line and be counted among the enemies of communism in this country.

It is reason enough, it seems to us, to say now to Communists that we aren't printing Communist advertising on one page—and apologizing for doing so on another page.

We're trying to say as plainly as we can that we aren't willing—in the name of free speech or anything else—to subject freedom to the abuse and the lies of Communist propagandists.

If some may say this does violence to the principle of free speech, we say only that we do violence to that principle in a good cause—which is to do our bit to defend democracy by opposing communism here by every legitimate means at our command.

We want no part of communism. We'll oppose communism with as much energy and intelligence as we have. We won't permit ourselves to be used by Communists.

We won't be swayed by Communists who bawl "free speech" in this country while they liquidate it in Russia—and would liquidate it here if they could.

We don't believe in double talk by Communists—or by newspapers. The Communists are frankly out to destroy democracy. Newspapers ought to be as frankly and as aggressively and as intelligently busy fighting communism.

And if Communists insist on using brass knuckles there's no sense in relying on soft words to oppose them.

We're trying to make our position clear on this issue. There will be no Communist advertisements in the Daily News. Then there need be no apologies for them on the editorial page.

And if the academicians want to make something of it, let them. What liberties do academicians have in Russia where art, music, literature, drama, and all the works of all the academicians must glorify the Communist state or cease to exist?

Do they want that here?

The Ideals of America—Address by Bishop Sheil, of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago, at the national convention of the American Veterans' Committee, on June 20, 1947, at Milwaukee, Wis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the life of every nation comes a moment when that nation must study once more its basic principles. It must reexamine those basic ideals which are the source of its greatness, and it must examine itself to see whether it is still following those ideals. Such a moment has arrived for the United States. It is a moment crucial in its implications not only for us but for all humanity. In the tragic war which scourged our world and in the social revolution now sweeping the earth there is and there shall remain but one issue: man and the freedom and justice belonging to him. It is imperative, then, that we be neither ignorant nor uncertain of what the American ideal is, for it is an ideal which, in the destiny of this Nation, was meant to be a model and a hope for the people of the world.

The ideal of America is a society of free men enjoying the fruits of justice; men free to think, to speak, to worship; men free to govern themselves without arbitrary domination by self-appointed masters; men free to live their lives without fear or oppression or want; men free from any economic strangulation which would make freedom a hollow catchword. This is the American ideal—an ideal which is the very lifeblood of a genuine and organized democratic society.

Americans have always sought freedom and justice for all men. They have sought freedom and justice, because only in such an atmosphere can the human person flourish in the manner God intended. Freedom and justice are not luxuries which only the rich and privileged can afford. They are not merely an expensive addition to fine living. They are an absolute condition of life. They are God-given rights, not something bestowed by a paternalistic government or a kindly superstate. They belong as of right to all men and to every man individually.

The key to the interpretation of American history is the persistent struggle to keep alive this ideal of freedom and justice; to vindicate it and to expand it against every force, which would seek to destroy or restrict it. That struggle has never ended, and each generation of Americans must not only protect and consolidate the hard-won gains of the past; it must also move forward by making freedom and justice vital realities in every sphere of life for ever-increasing numbers of people.

To us, the possessors of this noble heritage, has fallen the high duty of preserving and expanding this freedom and justice from the growing threat of totalitarianism—the most powerful single danger to the entire concept of democracy. The choice, not of the future, but of the present, is between democracy and totalitarianism; between a social order based upon human freedom and one founded upon the idea of the state as the complete and unquestioned arbiter of human life. The successful conclusion of the war has only intensified the urgency of choosing the social order of the future. I repeat, the choice is between democracy and totalitarianism.

We Americans believe that our democracy, of all the political systems in the world, is the one which now most closely corresponds to the needs and rights of men. It is based squarely upon the deeply religious foundations of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Its roots lie deep in the soil of Christianity, so that it is impossible to understand democracy correctly apart from its religious background. Above all, it derives its strength from the Christian belief in the absolute and unique value of the human soul, which transcends all the power and glory of the world. In our democracy man is the foundation and the end of the state; man is the shaper, the maker, not the tool of the state. Only at our grave peril can we neglect the religious foundations of our American democracy; for without this foundation democracy cannot remain itself. Without this foundation freedom and justice and equality will have only a tenuous hold on the minds and wills of men.

And there are suspicions of a fading concern for freedom and justice within this Nation. Our concern for these things is fading because we are not quite sure what they are. It is strange and sad that we who possess the only decent political form of life hesitate and grope when we should be firm and decisive. For many of us, our glorious tradition is in tattered remnants. In the land of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, in the land of noble avowals of devotion to freedom and justice, shameful compromises abound. There are Americans who have never understood America. And they have consistently acted against the best interests of the country. We cannot, of course, doubt their integrity; but we are justified in questioning their practical wisdom.

A glaring example of this unenlightened action is the Taft-Hartley bill. Without any doubt, this bill is aimed at hamstringing all unionism. The alleged interest in the freedom of the individual worker is an ironic play with words. The bill is out of line with the American tradition because it unduly restricts freedom and interferes with that justice which is every man's due. It is almost entirely punitive in nature, and as such, it will cause more ills than it is designed to cure. The satisfaction of spiteful revenge is not calculated to produce beneficial results for the Nation.

The desire to weaken unions is not shared by everyone; but it is common among powerful groups. And we must remember that it is the unions who delivered the workingmen from their bondage. It is the unions which have given justice to workingmen; for this alone, unions deserve our most fervent and devoted support. Through the unions, the working people have tasted economic justice and have enjoyed the fruits of economic freedom. All the Taft-Hartley bills in the world will not make them forget that freedom and that justice. The memory of such rights, once enjoyed, will never die.

Only in the past years have labor unions come into their own as an acknowledged and responsible social force in the United States. Yet they have, by and large, shown an anxiety for the welfare of the Nation that industry itself might well imitate. In their over-all concern for justice the labor unions have pointed the way to their colleagues. The unions, unquestionably, have done more than any other economic group to bring justice to ordinary men; by and large, they have been more democratic within their

own ranks than have their managerial counterparts. It would be most unfortunate for the United States if any serious harm were done to the cause of unionism now; unfortunate for the very things for which America stands: Liberty, justice, and equality.

There is still much muttering about what the opponents of social progress are pleased to call Government interference. One of the reasons businessmen complain about Government interference is that for generations no government dared question the actions of business. Naturally, therefore, when legitimate and necessary Government intervention began there was weeping and gnashing of teeth. Much of the resentment at Government intervention is in the nature of hurt surprise, like that of an undisciplined child that is suddenly made to do what he should have been doing all along. Let us not, however, carry this analogy too far. For the abuses of our industry have not been the actions of a child. They have often been heinous crimes against society.

There would never have been any Government interference if business had regulated itself, and if business had shown at least as much concern for workingmen as for profits. What they call interference is a result of their own failure to concern themselves with the well-being of the people. Recent social legislation is the result of the full, unreserved recognition that the Government has the fundamental duty to secure citizens in the peaceful enjoyment of their natural rights. This includes the fundamental right of providing for themselves and their dependents a decent livelihood by honest and efficient labor. If private industry is unable or unwilling to afford men the opportunity of honorable employment, government is bound by its very nature to employ all its resources to secure to all citizens this essential right to work. This is not a new truth, and Leo XIII gave it excellent expression when he said: "It is the first duty of every government to make sure that the laws and institutions, the general character and administration of the commonwealth are such as to produce of themselves public well-being and private prosperity. Above all, the public administration must duly and solicitously provide for the welfare and the comfort of the working people." The people who pay the price for economic blunders are not the bland, well-tailored leaders of the business world, but unhappy men and women trembling for their jobs.

Recent rumblings against social advances are unpleasantly reminiscent of the time when the sphere of business was an absolute; even God Himself, it seemed, could not enter. In the past several years I have detected, I fear, a carnival air among certain of the rich, as if the happy hunting days are about to return. There is rejoicing in the camp of the Bourbons; and they charge, with unseemly haste, to push the sweaty people back behind the barricades. The anarchistic, communistic unions are about to be broken. Once more the worker's inalienable right to starve will stand as one of the foremost pillars of free enterprise; once more a total disregard for human dignity will be accepted as an avowed principle of commerce. Once more the almighty dollar will be elevated to the altar, to be worshipped as the one true god. Once more the devout followers of Mammon are in control of the sacred edifice of business, which can no longer be touched by morality or law. After all, business is business; we can hope for no further revelation. I have no quarrel with the rich. I will readily grant that there is nothing more pleasant than the sight of the privileged classes enjoying their privileges; but I must admit, even more readily, that there is nothing more heart rending than the sight of the underprivileged grubbing for the basic decencies of life.

Another example of this state of mind is seen in the tax law sent to the President, and fortunately vetoed by him. With tender concern for those in the upper income brackets, our lawmakers evolved a tax reduction which adds to the average man's income the princely sum of $30 and to the rich man's income anything from $1,000 up. I do not by any means advocate "soaking" the rich; but the President was certainly right when he said this plan gave too much tax relief too soon to the wrong people.

Yet another indication of our failure to live up to our ideals is the languid interest in the Stratton bill. This is the bill which would permit 400,000 displaced persons to enter the United States over a 4-year period. Probably the strongest opposition to this bill comes from our own indifference to the pitiful plight of these people. They hunger not only for food and drink, but for justice and mercy. They do not wish to return to their native lands, for reasons that are perfectly obvious. They look to the United States as to an island of light in a sea of darkness. They are ready and eager to live again, if we will just give them a chance. The opposition comes also from the professional Americans, interested, they allege, in preserving us from alien influences, although the bill expressly provides that undesirable persons will be excluded. Our racially pure patriotic groups have quite forgotten that we are all the descendants of immigrants. To them and to all who think like them, I should like to repeat these lines:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

The greatness of America has come from just such groups. Our welcome to these people would strengthen our position in the world as the leading exponent of liberty for all men.

There is another example of our waning care for justice and freedom. This is the regrettable tendency to find communistic influence in almost every proposal for legitimate social and economic improvement. And those who favor such measures are arbitrarily accused of being Communists. It is a mystery why there must be a Communist plot in these measures. We have been told that if we just let free enterprise alone big business would bring us straight into a modern Garden of Eden. Those who dared to protest were immediately labeled Communists. Even now if anyone points to the evils of modern industrial society, the smear brigade goes into immediate action.

Does a speaker have the temerity to state that anti-Semitism is un-Christian and un-American? He is a Communist. Does he dare take the part of labor? That is sufficient proof to label him a Communist. Was he against scrapping the OPA? Does he mention that the wholesale price of food products has risen 40 percent since OPA was done to death? Does he remind the propagandists of free enterprise that they promised to bring prices down if controls were removed? Does he remind them the profits and prices have spiralled dizzily while wages have not kept pace? If he does, he is labeled a Communist.

Naturally, our good social laws are positively not communistic; they are normal outgrowths of our Constitution. The anguished wails of the opponents of improvement serve only the communistic movement. They arouse a fear of progress which plays directly into the hands of the Communists, who thereupon appear in the public eye as the sole defenders of the common man. If the high tide of national prosperity recedes, many citizens may turn to communism, in the mistaken apprehension that the Communists are the champions of the underprivileged.

At the same time it would be the height of folly to think that there can be any compromise between communism and democracy. Communism is intrinsically wrong, under any form, in any possible combination of circumstances. And we detest its fruits just as we detest the fruits of fascism. Now, I do not believe in hysterical ranting or in witch hunting. But I do believe in intelligent appraisal of realities and of men. Time after time, Communists have proved themselves unworthy of the trust and respect of men of integrity. Time after time, worthy organizations have found themselves dominated by a few persistent and clever men. Time after time, these worthy organizations have lost the support of decent people because of the actions of their few Communist members. Today a growing number of true progressives are realizing that the Communist affiliation is the kiss of death. We can never forget that American Communists are the spiritual cousins and the servile lackeys of totalitarianism. And we instinctively recoil from lackeys, whether in the service of the well-to-do or their totalitarian counterparts.

These and other problems in America can be solved in freedom and justice if we act in unity. When the war ended, the unity that had joined us in wartime was revealed in its true light—a temporary partnership designed to cease when the last shot was fired. Many shortsighted Americans forget that, while war is a hard, dirty business, it is just as difficult to fashion a true peace. They have forgotten that without the complete and unselfish cooperation and guidance of America the world cannot win a real peace. And only a united America can lead the world to peace. Apparently, some of our prominent men have not learned that what happens in Timbuctoo has repercussions in Toledo; that when the life and liberty of a Pole are threatened, the life and liberty of a Philadelphian are in jeopardy.

We can achieve this unity only in a common belief that man is a creature of unique dignity; that his rights are inalienable, for the very reason that they come to him from God. There is no other road to unity. But unity can make us successful in the fight for justice only if we have the right motives. We cannot be motivated by some vague sentimental affection for the common man, or by hatred of the rich. We must be motivated by solid, real concepts, by the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. These are the beginning of all human relations; they are the bed-rock foundation of enduring peace. Only when we realize that human rights are derived from God can we effectively fight unbridled social and economic exploitation. Only then do we have the right motives for granting to others that liberty and justice which we demand for ourselves.

How long do you think our present Congress would fumble, if, united in this way, we demanded immediate action to provide decent housing, with only incidental regard for the hitherto sacred right of plentiful profit? Here we are a Nation of 140,000,000 people, with a demonstrated capacity to produce war material in an unending stream; but we bog down completely in the effort to provide adequate housing for our citizens, the majority of whom are returned veterans. The answer is greed: The greed of a few who seek to profit at the expense of the many. We see the congressional leaders of this Nation which spent billions to develop the destructive energies of atomic power hold up their hands in horror at the prospect of spending even a little money to provide low-cost housing for millions of our people. And how long do you think our cities would be fettered by racial restrictive covenants if we the people spoke in unity to demand that our courts cease to mock the justice they are sworn to uphold? How long do you think we would be forced to watch the disgusting spectacle of some of our representa-

tives dutifully fulfilling their obligations to their campaign backers in voting for legislation that "has been strenuously pressed upon" them?

In the practical order, we must work swiftly to effect the reign of justice and charity. And I know of no group in America today that is better equipped and better situated to accomplish this work than the veterans' groups. You of the American Veterans' Committee possess an enviable opportunity for heroic achievement. The people of America are crying out for leadership; they are sick of selfish groups who think only of their own interests. They are appalled by would-be leaders who go about fomenting dissension and suspicion only to take advantage of the resulting confusion.

Gerald Vann has remarked that "we of the modern West are the only people in the whole history of the world who have refused to find an explanation of the universe in a divine mind and will. * * * And is it not worth wondering whether, perhaps, that refusal is not at the root of the chaos and misery in which we find ourselves? Without a sense of ultimate purpose, without intelligible answer to the ultimate why and whither, what else could we expect?" Because we are without this sense of purpose, we have not yet provided the world leadership which God intended us to have when He so richly endowed us.

The hour is late; but we still have time. Pius XII in a recent address said that we are living in a time of panic and pessimism; and he called for a great upsurge of Christian faith and love which will sweep the world like a "mighty breath of pure air." Only a spiritual rebirth can bring about a genuine solution to our problems. Mere material remedies can never cure the evils of hatred and cynicism and greed, evils that exist only in the souls of men. The Pope calls for a fearless courage, rooted in "a love as ardent and as vast as the world." Such a love would purge our society of the hatreds which plague us and would drive away the fear which, in the words of the Pope: "* * * hides under the appearance of Christian prudence, and under this pretext remains silent when duty should require it to utter a fearless 'non licet' to the rich and powerful."

I have said that the choice for today and for tomorrow is between democracy and totalitarianism. And, if there is a war in the future, it need not be a war of arms. It must be a war of ideas and of competing social systems. The domains of this conflict are no longer located in geographical areas; they are now located in the bodies and souls; in the minds, and hearts, and wills of men. The techniques of this new warfare, then, must be spiritual. The aim is not to reshape the map of the earth; but to reshape the thoughts of the human mind; to create new objects for the aspirations of the human heart; new ideals for the human soul. The aim is to enkindle the flame of quenchless hope in lives that now know only the darkness of despair. The aim of this spiritual warfare is to teach every child of Adam that his destiny is not to grovel in the slime like beasts that perish; but to walk among the stars as the sons of God.

Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an editorial from the New York Times, July 12, 1947, regarding the proposed Missouri Valley Authority.

The editorial follows:

MR. TRUMAN BACKS THE MVA

We have had a costly lesson this year in the necessity for futher control of the upper Mississippi and Missouri Rivers and their tributaries. This investment of at least a quarter of a billion dollars is not recoverable, except as it may stimulate action to prevent such losses in the future. Congress has authorized the expenditure of two billion dollars on a long-range flood-control, power, navigation, and soil-conservation program. It has not, however, appropriated much of the money. This year's budget includes $35,000,000 for flood control, or about one-eighth of the minimum estimate of this year's flood losses. And this niggardliness is in no sense economy.

But the spending of money on rivers for single purposes, such as the control of floods, has been rendered obsolete by the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Multiple-purpose river engineering is the modern thing, and since we cannot safely turn over a whole great river valley to a single private enterprise we are compelled to invoke the powers of the Federal Government. This has been done in the Tennessee Valley with all due respect for local autonomy and for private business. There is no reason why it should not be done in the vaster and more complicated arena of the Missouri Valley. This is the purpose of the Murray bill, creating a Missouri Valley Authority, to which President Truman gave his warm endorsement on Thursday.

The Murray bill, introduced by the senior Senator from Montana, is modeled on the TVA Act. It creates a public corporation, directed by a three-member board, to develop and carry out a plan for the use and control of the river and its tributaries. Flood control, reclamation and irrigation, industrial expansion, power, navigation, recreation, and the protection of wildlife are mentioned in the bill in that order, which is probably the order of their importance. There are two elements of controversy. One is power. The Missouri's undeveloped power, a good deal of it in thinly settled upstream areas, is something more than 2,000,000 kilowatts, or a little less than TVA's present development. It is something in the pocket for future use. The other dispute is intragovernmental. An MVA would take over from the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army, and these agencies—especially the Army—have a human reluctance to surrender their functions.

But it is hard to see how the river can finally be controlled and used if private power companies and several Government agencies each have a vote—and a veto. The lesson of TVA is that private enterprise doesn't suffer from abundant power, flood control and conservation. Indeed, the Tennessee Valley today hums with private enterprise, both big and little. The Missouri Valley may be too big, and in places too arid, to hum. But it can get ahead if it has an MVA to attend to the matter.

The Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me on the occasion of the First Gertrude Dudley Memorial Lecture at Chicago University on June 5, 1947:

The Congress of the United States is the most precious institution of this democracy. It is the living product of the faith of our forefathers in the people.

Each morning as I approach Capitol Hill, I feel the heart of the Nation beating under the Capitol dome. Each day as I watch the men, women, and children of America flow through their Capitol, I feel the strength of the Nation that keeps the heartbeat steady.

What does one find in the Halls of Congress? One finds men and women coming together from the farms and from the cities of America, thousands of miles apart, representing every walk of life and many professions.

Here one finds a cross-section of the country. Here one finds men of many national origins, Catholic, Jew, and Protestant, white and Negro working together.

Here one finds mediocre talents as well as rare ability and judgment and the highest integrity, devoted to service.

But whatever the ability, taken on an average, the Members of Congress are the hardest working group of people I have ever known.

They come early in the morning to their offices. Hurry back and forth all day long from their offices to the committee rooms, from the committee rooms to the floor of the House and the Senate and then back again to their offices. Rarely is an evening completely free of work.

Here the Representatives from 48 States covering a continent discuss everything from the village schoolhouse to the harnessing of the sun's energies.

Here the pressure of ideas beats constantly.

Here new ideas struggle for expression, become plans, and are finally drafted into legislation—legislation which the people then study, weigh, accept, or reject.

This is the institution that has developed out of our forefathers' efforts to give to the people an instrument through which they could manage their governmental affairs. This is the bulwark of our democratic system.

Men want freedom and security. They do not want to barter one for the other. Under democratic government, they can achieve both.

To those of us who have been cradled in democracy, freedom looks easy. Yet an essential safeguard of freedom must be an ever-living appreciation of it.

Every generation is asked to defend the principles which guarantee our freedom not only with life but with the mind and the heart.

We cannot safeguard that which we do not deeply and profoundly appreciate.

Each generation must reevaluate the principles which secure freedom and uphold them in daily living—in conduct with others.

In order to do so each generation must discover for itself, the root and substance of freedom.

We have guaranteed freedom of thought and expression for ourselves by defending that right for others—even though we may despise what they say. We have grown tough minded and fearless on this daring concept.

Democracy is not a leveling or a blind assumption that all men are equally capable. It is a belief in the dignity of the individual and his right to equal opportunity.

This belief is the cornerstone of our democracy. Our Government was set up as the instrument of this belief: to serve the people—all the people—through the voice of the people. The people do not serve the Government. The Government serves the people. Power does not rest in the Government but in the sovereign will of the people.

This—the most revolutionary concept in the world—is the basis of our Government.

Our democracy is the instrument of the people themselves, conceived and built to insure their liberty and to promote their welfare and happiness. It has given the millions of men and women on this continent more liberty and greater security than is found anywhere else in the world.

We have gone further in bettering the lot of the individual with less restraint than any other form of government.

Because we believe that the welfare of people should be the goal of good government, our democracy has brought the millions of men and women on this continent further along in man's historic march toward the building of an enduring peace for all men than any other government in the world.

For we know that our liberty and security today are indivisible with the liberty and security of others.

In the Congress of the United States a Member of the House or of the Senate can no longer represent the best interests of his district and the future of the people he represents if his horizons are limited to the boundaries of his district.

Just as the Federalists, in the interest of their people, moved their horizons from the boundaries of the colonies to the boundaries of this continent, so the Representatives of today must move their horizon from this continent to the rim of the earth.

Today, when the radio carries the voice to a listener in China or India more quickly than Patrick Henry's cry for liberty or death reached his audience in the little Virginia church house, today when we can get to London in as many hours as the days it took Jefferson to get from Monticello to Philadelphia, we can no longer afford to have Congressmen who are "Peoria minded."

We won our political democracy under Jefferson. True, we broadened it under Lincoln and we must further broaden it today by the passage of antilynch and anti-poll-tax legislation, but the basic principle of political democracy was assured a long time ago.

That principle of political democracy has given the people the political power to pass any bill they determine to pass.

We won our political democracy early but have never finished our continuing battle for economic democracy.

Until we win this battle for economic democracy, we are threatened with the loss of our political democracy. If we are to continue to grow, and to be prosperous as a nation with benefits for all our people, we cannot continue to permit the wasteful exploitation for the benefit of the few of our natural resources—forests, mines, lands, water resources—and, above all, we must put a stop to the exploitation of people.

We know that in our highly industrialized civilization staggering concentration of economic power in the hands of a few must be prevented if opportunity for free enterprise is to be something that all can enjoy.

We have learned through years of bitter experience and study that we must use every possible weapon against devastating depressions that leave one-third of our people unemployed, with bread lines stretching across the country, and want, misery, and tears the order of the day.

Now that communications in the world have almost annihilated time and space, we have learned that economic depressions have very far-reaching consequences. It is no longer possible to have a long depression anywhere in the world which to some degree does not affect the whole world.

We now understand that political peace, essential to the survival of men the world over, must be founded upon international economic peace. In other words, the best insurance policy we can take for our children to guarantee that they live out their lives to a ripe old age is to work for economic stability at home and in the world.

In the light of these facts, the last Congress, convinced we could no longer legislate in a vacuum, passed the Employment Act of 1946. The act provided for a Council of Economic Advisors to the President, to appraise programs and activities of the Government and to formulate and recommend national economic policy.

Under this act, the President at the beginning of this legislative session, as every President will in the future, presented to Congress an economic report on the State of the Union.

For the first time in our Nation, we proposed scientifically to evaluate our resources and productive capacity, prospective employment and consumer buying power for the coming year.

In other words, in seeking to balance the budget of our National household, we take an inventory of our national resources and of what we have on our shelves.

The job of Congress is to achieve national stability—to strike a balance between prices, wages, and profits.

The job of Congress is to obtain the same high level of production in peace that we achieved in war.

The job of Congress is to promote human happiness by increasing individual opportunity and deepening individual security for all.

The job of Congress is to enrich the spirit of man by general freedom.

The Republican Party in the last election won a majority of seats in both Houses. The Eightieth Congress, therefore, is under Republican leadership. As a result, the legislative program is the responsibility of the Republican Party. A bill must be given the green light by the leadership before it is considered by committee and brought to the floor of the House.

By studying legislation one can easily and accurately discover what a party considers of first importance to the welfare of the people.

This Congress has utterly failed the people. It has set aside the economic report made to it by the President and turned it over to Dun & Bradstreet. Instead of a program of social legislation, the leadership of this Congress has a three-point program to meet the greatest challenge this country has ever faced.

The program of leadership of the Eightieth Congress is—

1. Cut taxes for the rich.
2. Break the back of labor.
3. Destroy the agencies of Government set up to protect and promote the welfare of the people.

Rising prices, housing, FEPC, health, education, development of natural resources, antipoll tax, scientific research, antilynch, power development are not the concern of this Congress.

No wonder Senator MORSE a few days ago in Washington charged the Eightieth Congress with yielding to selfish economic pressures in a program that is seeking "to make the rich richer and the poor poorer." He warned that "we can't win the peace by the selfishness and isolationist thinking of the Eightieth Congress."

What this Eightieth Congress is up to can be clearly seen in its actions on the tax bill, on the labor bill and on the various departmental appropriation bills. These bills together demonstrate the pattern. The underlying purpose of them all is to give special help to the vested interests of this country.

The tax bill particularly shows this tender consideration for the rich. Of course, everybody likes tax cuts but it doesn't make sense to cut taxes if by doing so we recklessly invite further inflation.

If we really want to save the people's money, we should be grappling with rising prices which have cost the American public $8,000,000,000 since last June, and about which this Congress has done nothing.

Instead, it proposes now to raise rents with a phony rent control bill that will cost the American people at least another billion dollars.

The tax cuts are intended to save $4,200,000,000, but the policies of this Congress are costing the American people more than twice that amount. It is the little fellow who is paying most of the nine billion cost of inflation, and it is the big fellow who gets most of the relief from tax cuts.

Breaking the back of labor is the second point in the program of the Eightieth Congress. The Congress, after piously writing into the labor bill a reaffirmation of their faith that collective bargaining is essential to industrial peace, proceeds to write a bill calculated to disrupt, weaken, and destroy collective bargaining, thus paving the way for more labor strikes—not less.

The Taft-Ball-Hartley bill as it was sent to the President will give great advantages to the minority of nineteenth century employers who still hate collective bargaining and will undermine established union principles and the legislative gains of labor in the past 15 years if this bill becomes law.

The bill would undermine the administration of the Wagner Act, which guarantees the right of workers to self-organization, free of coercion, intimidation, and interference by employers.

We have heard much talk of union abuses, such as jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. A bill to check these abuses, if confined to that purpose, would easily be passed into law; President Truman last January, in fact, requested such legislation.

The Taft-Ball-Hartley bill goes far beyond this purpose; it reproaches and punishes unions for striking last year when the vast majority of strikes had nothing to do with jurisdictional squabbles.

The strikes of last year—just as the strikes of 1919 which followed World War I—were strikes over wages and union security.

Whenever a Government fact-finding board recommended a settlement of a strike, with one exception, the recommendation was accepted by the union involved; it was the corporations—General Motors, Westinghouse Electric, United States Steel Corp—which rejected proposals of Government fact-finders and mediators. That is plain historical fact.

But now a majority of Congress wants to penalize unions for the strikes, while doing nothing about the truly serious growth of monopoly and concentrated economic power among corporations, and doing nothing about the rising cost of living which has made new wage negotiations necessary.

Binding the hands and feet and gagging the mouth of labor doesn't put milk and eggs in the ice box for 50,000,000 people.

The abandonment or curtailment of Government programs which will eventually affect every man, woman, and child in America is the third point on the program of the Eightieth Congress.

Under Republican leadership, Congress labored 2 weeks and turned forward the clock in the District of Columbia 1 hour. Congress labored for 5 months and turned back the clock in Government one decade.

To the farmer who helped feed the Allied armies and who has been guaranteed by legislation that he will be helped in his continuing struggle against soil erosion and the washing away of the topsoil, which if allowed to continue would change this country from the bread basket of the world to a land with large areas of barren waste, for the help he now asks, the answer is: "You have had enough."

To the tenant farmer asking to own a farm of his own so that he too may have a stake in free enterprise, the Congress answers: "No more loans to tenant farmers." Despite the fact that money invested in this program was repaid 176 percent ahead of schedule, the answer is still the same: "You have had enough."

Two and one-half million American mothers still read to their children by flickering coal-oil lamps. Only one out of every two rural homes in America has electric power.

To the millions of American mothers of rural homes who now ask that the lights be turned on, that they may use the power to milk, wash and iron, cook, and read by, the Congress answers, and the answer is a crippling cut in the REA appropriations.

Even though this investment comes back dollar for dollar, plus interest, and is ahead of its payments, setting up a chain reaction for other needed services, making for greater production and employment, the answer of the Congress is still the same: "You have had enough."

For the thousands upon thousands of children asking for a warm, balanced meal, at least once a day, the answer is: "We have to cut somewhere. You have had enough."

To the progressive, forward-looking citizens of the Northwest and the far West who ask for dams, water, and power, the Congress answers, and the answer is: "You have had enough." Despite the fact that irrigation farmers and power users in this great section pay back into the Treasury the capital advanced for construction, dollar for dollar, the answer is still the same: "You have had enough."

To the veteran who spent years in a fox hole, and who now wants to raise his family in decency and dignity, free from in-laws, free from doubling up with strangers, free from trailer camps, free from the orders of move over or move out, and now asks his Government to take steps to make it possible for him to obtain a home, the answer is: "You have had enough."

To 72 percent of all the families in America who have an income of less than $3,500 a year, pleading that they be rescued from the inflation which is eating away their dollars—pleading for workable legislation to hold down rents—the answer is, "You have enough."

To the school teacher who protests that she cannot support herself on her pitiful and paltry pay check and asks for help, she is told, "You have enough."

To the wage earner—a victim of the high cost of living and NAM propaganda, begging that his hard-earned rights not be taken away—the answer is, "No; you have had too much."

To the men and women in poll-tax States asking for help; to the Negro who fought with his white brother, not without honor, and who now asks that he be given equal opportunity to earn his living, and to lynching by mob violence, Congress turns a deaf ear.

This program is a betrayal of democratic life. This program is short-sighted and wasteful. This program puts in jeopardy our ability to win the peace.

Even on foreign affairs the record in the House is not good. I will give but one illustration. There are many more.

We cannot have political peace if we don't achieve economic peace. Nevertheless, a dangerous attack on the entire trade-agreements program has been carried on at all sessions of the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

This attack culminated in the passage of the wool price-support bill, which has a neat little amendment attached to it that does three things:

One, strikes a blow at the trade-agreements program.

Two, throws a monkey wrench into the International Trade Conference now being carried on in Geneva, repudiating the assurances of the United States Government to 17 other nations that tariffs on certain commodities, among them wool, would not be increased before the Conference.

And, three, the amendment indicates a revived fondness for tariffs which is, to say the least, frightening.

This would all be very discouraging if we didn't live in a democracy, but we do—and we must never forget it.

The right to accept or reject any legislative program rests with the people. They have the last word.

In other words, the pencil has an eraser on it. If the people don't like the program that Congress has spelled out in any given 2 years, they can and should erase it at the ballot box.

For every 2 years the sovereign people of this union can change the complete color of the House, and while the Senate can only have its complexion changed in any given 2 years, it is nevertheless very responsive to any change that takes place in the House.

It takes a better Congress to win the peace than it does to win the war.

If we can't afford to have "Peoria minded" Congressmen, it's up to the people to see we don't get them.

And to the degree men and women in the 48 States work through their representatives in Congress for economic democracy, to that degree they are working for enduring peace—the issue of our time.

As we work let us never forget that our United States is the pilot plant for the United Nations—living, working, concrete proof that union of nations is possible.

We can renew our hope and energy if we measure constantly the difficulties and barriers that separated the Thirteen Colonies out of which our Union grew with the difficulties and barriers that separate the nations today, for we find that the job already done on this continent was more challenging, fraught with greater hazards, than the job which confronts us today.

The suspicions, jealousies, and fears that separated men when this Nation was born were no less real than they are today. If it had not been for the revolutionary, far-reaching, abiding faith of men like Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln we would today be living as they are in Europe—separated by border troops, currency, language, customs, plus the age-old fears and jealousies that rot man's mind and heart.

The only way the Colonies could survive was to stand together. They came together of their own free will. But they made very sure that no one Colony should be able to dominate any of the others. That is what we are trying to do in the United Nations—make sure that no one nation shall be able to dominate any of the others.

The safeguards which were developed 170 years ago were far reaching and revolutionary in that the emphasis was placed for the first time not on the state but on the people.

This is the root of the success of the United States. The United Nations Charter breathes the same life—for it is the first international document ever written which places the same emphasis on the people.

If we the people of the United Nations live up to that Charter to the degree that we the people of the United States have lived up to our Constitution, we will not fail.

If we the people of the United States give enlightened leadership here at home, we will be the symbol of hope for all the world.

Corporation Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted at the annual encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of California, at its recent convention held in Santa Cruz, Calif., commencing June 10, 1947.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars reflecting the attitude of those men who have made a maximum service in the defense of their country realize that devotion to country does not cease when they shed their uniforms. They have been quick to protect the interests of the people of this Nation and of their own comrades in arms. That is why they have definitely gone on record against a legislative bill that if adopted would encroach upon the family-type farm—the farm that has been the backbone of a free America.

The resolution follows:

Resolution 28

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars have consistently supported legislation bulwarking the family-type farm and look with admiration and hope at the generous example set by the people of the Columbia Basin, where the Department of the Interior has been empowered to purchase private lands for veterans' settlement on family-size reclamation acreages; and

Whereas in California, on the Central Valley project, the exact opposite process is under way, with the land and produce corporations taking control of ever more lands and driving the family-type farm out of existence, closing off the opportunity of veterans and others to establish themselves as independent farmers; and

Whereas Senate bill 912 (the Downey-Knowland bill to repeal the acreage limitation on service of Central Valley project water) would only further and foster this socially destructive process and is therefore an improper piece of legislation for public-minded men such as these to introduce and support particularly when viewed in comparison with the far-seeing generosity of the Columbia Basin Congressmen: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars call upon Senators Downey and Knowland to abandon their open championship of corporation farming and all its destructive meaning to our California life, and that our national legislative committee be instructed to oppose legislation of this type.

Endorsed: Lieutenant Lansdale Post, No. 67, April 17, 1947.

SAM J. RIPPON,
Senior Adjutant.

Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Thirteenth District, Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars, endorse this resolution.

RUSSELL C. MASON,
Commander.

Taft-Hartley Bill Analyzed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, what is in the Taft-Hartley bill? There seems to be much confusion as to real contents of the measure.

The analysis which follows is perhaps one of the clearest on the subject. It

was prepared by Paul H. Douglas, a member of the faculty of the University of Chicago. It appeared in the Decatur (Ill.) Herald-Review, Sunday, June 22, 1947, and I herewith ask unanimous consent that the Herald-Review's article be inserted in the RECORD.

Paul H. Douglas, who prepared the analysis, not as a member of the university staff, but as an interested citizen, is a noted educator and soldier. Early in World War II he enlisted as a private in the United States Marine Corps. At the time of his discharge after the war's end he was a major and wore the Purple Heart for wounds in action in the Pacific.

The analysis follows:

AN APPRAISAL OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY BILL

(By Paul H. Douglas)

After a close and somewhat prolonged study of the Taft-Hartley labor bill, I have come to the conclusion that while it embodies features which have won wide popular support, it also has concealed within it a number of sleeping or delayed time bombs, of which the general public is ignorant, but which are likely to be fatal not only to unionism, but also to orderly industrial relationships.

The good features of the bill lie on the surface and are obvious to all. It requires unions as well as employers to bargain in good faith and hence makes this obligation reciprocal. It prevents unions outside a plant from trying to alter by sympathetic strikes or boycotts the bargaining representatives which the workers inside have chosen in an authorized and fair election. It prevents unions from charging new members excessive initiation fees. It requires the unions to publish their financial accounts and the salaries of their officials. It outlaws the jurisdictional strikes which have little justification, but which the unions have not effectively prevented. It makes explicit the right of an employer to present his case to the workers in contests over representation.

CONTAINS MANY DUBIOUS CLAUSES

Were those provisions all, few legitimate objections could be raised to the act. But unfortunately they are not all. The bill also contains a series of very serious and dubious clauses. These are so cleverly embedded in the text as scarcely to be noticed by the general reader and are evident only to the experienced. But taken in their entirety, they will make the effective practice of legitimate unionism extremely difficult. Among these provisions are:

1. Because of the fact that (a) elections to decide whether or not the workers wish to be represented and if so, by whom, may be held as frequently as once a year (sec. 9 (e) (3), and (b)) employers may present a request for such a new election on behalf of a person or group claiming to represent the employees (sec. 9 (c) (1) (b)), the way is opened to a continually harassing series of elections which can wear down union strength. Employers are thus put in a position in which they can finally catch union strength at ebb tide and frequently get the union voted out. A provision that elections might be held as frequently as once every 2 years would not only be understandable, but perhaps desirable. But to permit them to occur every year opens the way to incessant electioneering, which is certainly not good for industrial stability.

EMPLOYERS COULD PLANT STOOGES

2. In addition, workers can be denied representation through unions if a union has not "furnished to all of the members" copies of its required financial report. (Section 9 (f) (B) (2)). It would be proper to require a union to make these reports freely accessible to all of its members, but to require the delivery of such reports to all members is unduly onerous. It would be a relatively easy matter, for example, for men to be planted inside a union who would then claim that they had not been furnished or delivered copies of the financial report. This could then be used as a pretext to deny a union the right to represent the workers even though the majority desired it, and to prevent the union from initiating charges of unfair-labor practices against employers.

3. The act outlaws unions if they "restrain or coerce" employees who do not wish to join a union nor to strike (sec. 8b; sec. 7) without giving any definition of what constitutes "restraint" or "coercion." While the general public properly condemns violence or threats of violence in connection with picketing, and does not approve of wholesale mass picketing, courts have erred grievously in the past in declaring peaceful picketing by a moderate number to be acts of restraint and coercion. What this act does is to create a national court for the decision of what have hitherto been largely local police issues and gives this court a blank check by which it may outlaw innocent as well as guilty actions.

4. The act outlaws all forms of sympathetic strikes and boycotts (except those directed by workers against their immediate employers (sec. 8 (b) (4)). Some forms of these activities are undoubtedly antisocial, and as I have indicated, abuses have occurred when unions, beaten in an election, have used these methods to compel an employer to deal with them over the opposition of the majority of the workers inside a plant. But there are other cases, such as where "struck work" is shipped out to other firms to complete, where if the workers in these other firms are compelled to work on the material or to fulfill the contracts, they are in effect being forced to act as strikebreakers. I do not believe that the fair-minded American public wants this to be required.

SOME STOPPAGES ARE PROVOKED

5. While many will approve the provision making unions suable for violations of contracts and for sympathetic strikes and for boycotts (secs. 301, 303), these provisions are in practice susceptible of great abuse. For example, sporadic stoppages of work by sections have been a vexatious feature in the newly organized mass production industries. In some cases the unions have been at fault in not dealing energetically with these stoppages. In other cases, however, the stoppages have been provoked by unduly cumbersome methods on the part of employers in dealing with grievances and by the anti-union attitudes of foremen and minor officials. In such cases it is very difficult for unions, however well-intentioned, to control their members. And yet if they fail to do so, it is possible that they can be held financially liable under this act and perhaps stripped of all their funds. It is indeed quite conceivable that unscrupulous antiunion groups could plant undercover men within the union ranks who would start such stoppages which could then be used as grounds for bankrupting the unions.

Experience in the clothing and steel industries seems to indicate that as unions grow older and as both sides get accustomed to collective bargaining, wildcat strikes gradually disappear. This is one of the evidences of the collective maturity of both parties. But to make such acts a possible ground for suits implies a degree of control by a union over all the acts of its members which voluntary associations rarely possess and could be made the pretext for a campaign to strip them of virtually all their resources. While this whole question is a knotty one, it personally seems best to me to make the penalties for illegal and damaging acts enforceable against the guilty individuals instead of against organizations as such.

COUNSEL WOULD DOMINATE BOARD

6. The act strips the enlarged National Labor Relations Board of virtually all control over its own staff and procedures and confides these instead to a general counsel whose appointment by the President is required to be confirmed by the Senate (sec. 3 (a)). This official is not only to be in charge of all attorneys but also over all officers and employees in the regional offices. He and not the Board is to have the power to investigate charges and issue complaints. He may thus sidetrack certain complaints and expedite others, and in addition, can control the making of settlements. Since the majority of the Senate, because of the overrepresentation of the agricultural States and the exemption of railroad labor from the act, will probably tend to be basically hostile to organized labor, it would seem that the Senate in its present mood would reject the appointment of anyone whose attitudes were markedly different. There is grave danger, therefore, that the activities of the Board will be dominated by an executive who will not proceed in a judicious manner. While I grant that some members of the Board may in the past have been lacking in a judicial frame of mind, it should be remembered that the two chairmen who have largely shaped its policies, namely, Messrs. Madden, and Millis (the latter from our own State of Illinois) have been exemplary public officials and that in practice the Board has been seldom overruled by the courts. While it is true that the prosecuting and judicial functions of regulating commissions should be separated, this had already been effective by the Walters Administration Procedures Act and by the Board's own rules. To inject a general counsel into the situation who becomes in effect the practical dictator of the field procedures is likely not only to produce bad but also biased administration.

7. While the act provides a referendum to decide whether or not a union can ask for the union shop, it is necessary that a majority of all eligible voters must approve this in order for it to carry. (Sec. 8 (a) (3). This may be debatable, but it would seem better merely to require a majority of the votes cast. For the existing phrasing would permit employers to identify the attitude of employees and to put pressure upon them to stay away from the polls.

DISMEMBERS LABOR DEPARTMENT

8. The progressive dismemberment of the Department of Labor is continued by transferring the Conciliation Service from that Department to the status of an independent agency (sec. 2020). The Conciliation Service has been greatly improved during the last year and a half and in this improvement the representatives of management have played an important part. It is sound administration to have the bureaus dealing with labor integrated in one department and not scattered to the winds, as is now being done. Business would resent such tactics being followed in the case of the Department of Commerce as would the farmers in the case of the Department of Agriculture. There is no reason why labor should be singled out for such treatment.

9. The act forbids unions from making not only any "contributions" in connection with national primary or general elections, but also any "expenditures" (sec. 304). Outright contributions by unions for such purposes are doubtless subject to abuse although they can be defended on the ground that they permit the many in the low-income groups to pool their individually small contributions to offset the bulked contributions of the wealthy. But this act goes even further. It would prevent unions from publishing literature to acquaint their members with the voting records of Members of Congress or the public attitudes of candidates

for governor or President. While an apparent attempt is made to make this prohibition mutual by a loosely worded clause which would similarly prevent "any corporation" from making similar expenditures or contribution (and which might stop newspapers from taking polls, etc.), this restraint is not applied to unincorporated employers' associations and hence in all probability would not serve to restrain them. This somewhat one-sided and certainly injudicious prohibition strikes at the fundemental rights of citizens in a democracy.

In addition to the points which I have outlined above, there are other matters of more than dubious fairness in the act, such as the fact that the Government in being given the power to prevent national strikes is not given adequate powers to see that a just settlement is reached. But for reasons of space I shall not go into these issues.

Perhaps there will be some who, while admitting the force of the above contentions, will, nevertheless, favor the bill as it stands because they believe it gives the Federal Government the power to deal with Nation-wide crippling strikes, such as in coal, which threaten the public health or safety. Here it should be pointed out that by section 502 Congress seems to have included an escape clause which would permit a coal strike. For there it is provided that the quitting of labor "because of abnormally dangerous conditions of work" shall not be deemed to be a strike. This would seem to open the way for Mr. Lewis to stage a Nation-wide walk-out at such time as he deems appropriate and to refer to it as a protest against unsafe conditions.

VETO IS JUSTIFIED

It is a pity that the advice of Senators IVES and MORSE in respect to this act was not followed. They begged Congress to divide the measure into several bills. One could have dealt with the generally recognized abuses which do need correction. The others could then have dealt with the more debatable and dubious issues of public policy. But Senator TAFT and Congressman HARTLEY and their followers were adamant in refusing to permit this. They were successful in tying up the doubtful and bad features along with the good. They may have been actuated in this by a desire to put the President in a difficult position. But in so acting they have placed the country in a similar situation. There is good ground for believing that, taken in its entirety, the bill would do more harm than good and that the President would therefore be justified in vetoing it and Congress in upholding any such veto.

The Motion Picture and the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have made the statement before the House that the motion-picture industry is one of the greatest mediums of influence upon the people next to our great educational institutions. It is good to know that one of the great leaders in this industry fully realizes the tremendous influence that motion pictures have upon the public mind and character, and the need of the motion-picture industry carefully scrutinizing and publicizing its own releases to protect the public welfare.

Clean, wholesome motion pictures can do a great deal of good. Inspiring patriotic and historical pictures can be of great benefit in preserving our national traditions and creating better international understanding. The reverse kind of pictures can do a great deal of harm.

Mr. Louis B. Mayer, a leading industrialist of the Nation, head of the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, in Los Angeles County, recently delivered a brilliant address before the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association at their annual convention at San Francisco July 7, 1947, on the subject the Motion Picture and the World Today. His address follows:

Mr. Chairman, guests of honor, members of the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association, to address such a distinguished gathering is indeed a privilege and I am deeply grateful for the honor of your kind invitation.

San Francisco, the birthplace of the United Nation's Charter, the city of hospitality, is always a pleasant place to visit. Last week our attention was again called to the birthplace of our Constitution, Philadelphia. These two great cities will ever recall man's advancement in political science.

We have much in common, your business and mine. There are few enterprises in the country which have as much competition as the motion picture and the newspaper.

Forty years marks my experience in the motion-picture industry in all its branches. I am like the man who adopted the pretty little kitten and found in a few months that he had a full-grown lion on his hands. Motion pictures attracted me first because it was something entirely new, and by hard work would afford a decent living; also, because I knew all the happiness and relaxation it would give to the people of the world.

But those of us who pioneered in the industry never dreamed that the nickelodeon was the pretty little kitten that would grow into the lion.

Grandpa said the automobile would never supplant the horse. He would not have believed that voices would ever circle the world and he certainly never imagined that man would invade the domain of the birds.

Little did I dream as I opened the door of that small theater in Haverhill, Mass., that the motion-picture industry would rise to such dominance in American life and cross international borders to influence the conduct of nations.

Statesmen and scholars have referred to the screen as the greatest educational force in the history of the world.

The expenditure of some $52,000,000 annually in newspapers, places our industry third on the Nation's list of advertisers. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer alone has some 14,000 theater accounts which advertise in local newspapers.

Besides ranking third as an advertiser, Hollywood news is found on many pages of your papers. Every day news services carry stories from Hollywood. There are over 500 newspaper and magazine correspondents in Hollywood representing every language and nation on earth. Hollywood rivals the Nation's Capital in news that attracts the world.

Beginning with the Federalist over a century and a half ago, the press has battled to preserve our American way of life; then came the screen and then the radio—two powerful aids.

In every age serious crises have arisen and conflict of opinion have engaged nations in battle with each other, and even in civil wars.

Today there is an undemocratic state on the march. Its political philosophy is foreign to our traditions.

The crisis we face—and few have ever equaled it. It is not a battle among ourselves; it is not a battle between two countries, but it threatens the way of life upon this planet; it threatens our fundamental concepts of human rights and liberty.

More precious than our lives we hold our liberty—a liberty that means free speech, free press, the right to assemble and remonstrate against real or imaginary wrongs, and the right to worship at any shrine; a liberty that means free enterprises and unlimited opportunity; a liberty which lights the footsteps of the poor boy born in a floorless cabin in Kentucky as brightly as the pathway of the boy born to wealth and social position.

These liberties, won on many battlefields, must be preserved. This serious responsibility we share in common with the newspapers and the radio.

The inventive genius of man has annihilated distance, and two great oceans which in the past have insured our security no longer afford us that protection. If the slightest doubt existed, Pearl Harbor dispelled it.

A silent, white flash and a hundred thousand people died at Hiroshima. Yes; we split the atom. A new undreamed-of force of destruction had been let loose in the world, struck terror in men's hearts, caused military leaders and statesmen to change all their plans of warfare.

A powerful nation challenges and discredits the liberties I have mentioned and seeks to spread its influence to dominate the lives of men and women in smaller nations. No one can dispute the right of any people to select their own form of government * * * but the right to force its own government upon another people is disputed. This has never been the American policy. We are proud of our traditions. Cuba and the Philippines came to us by right of conquest, but we did not destroy them or enslave their people.

Right now we are doing everything possible to help the Philippines recover from the staggering blows of the last war—we not only made the Philippines free and gave them all the rights of an independent nation—but today, our Government is assisting the Philippines in rebuilding her industries, her buildings, her roads, her schools, her churches—and to make that country self-sustaining—that her people may once again enjoy the prosperity attained under our protection.

We encourage trade relations with Cuba; we extended credit to the country; our people purchased Cuban bonds—and the great guns of our Nation protect its independence—that is the American way.

Our system of free enterprise has provided free schools for our children, free parks, security for unemployment and old age, and has supplanted fear in their hearts with happiness. The billions of dollars in savings accounts; the billions invested in Government bonds; the 30,000,000 automobiles; the many thousands who, each day, attend our great national sport, the baseball game, cheering and applauding; the millions who attend the theaters and other amusements; it is all evidence that all groups and all classes enjoy the freedom and prosperity of America.

We play—we work—there is a deep thrill in watching ten, twenty or thirty thousand men and women laughing and joking, swinging their dinner pails, as they enter the great factories of the Nation, or leave after the day's toil.

Motion pictures portraying these actual scenes in American life are welcomed by all liberty-loving countries * * * and frowned upon and denounced wherever liberty is suppressed.

The reason behind the dictators action is readily understood—if his people were to see and learn of the freedom of the working men and women in a free country, it would destroy his power.

The comfortable homes of the working men—the children playing in the parks, or

running to and from school—the whole family riding in their own automobile, or basking in the sun on the beaches, or at the lake—would cause his working people to demand a similar way of life.

Yet, this same Nation welcomes with open arms The Grapes of Wrath, Tobacco Road, and similar films, which portray only a small portion of American life, which is certainly less typical.

Under our system, industrial life has been so organized that in a few months our factories turned from the products of peace to the engines of war and, with a united front, labor and capital together made great sacrifices in a common cause. We won. We preserved liberty, not only for ourselves, but for our allies.

We preserved our way of life, not for one class, but for all classes.

What can the motion-picture industry do in this world encircling conflict? The message of the screen reaches approximately 235,000,000 persons throughout the world, in 86,640 theaters.

There is a heavy responsibility upon the producers of motion pictures. A motion-picture can not only afford entertainment, but be of educational value. In this crisis, it can portray fairly and honestly the American way of life, and can be a powerful influence in the lives of the millions in other countries who are either denied access to our way of life, or who have never had the opportunity of experiencing it.

This is not propaganda, unless one would say that presenting to the world our way of life, our freedom, our opportunities, our defense of liberty, our emphasis on the dignity of the human being is propaganda.

Propaganda, as such, should never masquerade under the cloak of entertainment. Subjects of controversy should be clearly designated.

Our industry has opened wide its gates and welcomed talent from every corner of the earth. There are 125 different arts, crafts, and trades in our industry. There is no discrimination in the selection of talent. In whatever country we find talent we present it to the people of the screen. You can easily recall the names of artists of every nationality: Garbo and Bergman came from Sweden; Garson and Coleman from England; Boyer from France—these are just a few. Some of these artists have won the highest honors our industry can confer.

Our American talent comes not only from great cities but from farms and towns. A little town in Ohio gave us Clark Gable; from the Midwest plains of Montana came a cowboy—Gary Cooper. Another chap waited on tables to pay his way through school, and nearly everyone knows him—Gregory Peck. A little girl with enthusiasm and great ambition found an outlet for her talent on the screen, and millions acclaim Judy Garland.

Our industry is confronted with as keen competition as any of the great enterprises of this country. We welcome competition. Foreign films are exhibited in American theaters on the same basis as our own. There is no quota. There is only a nominal tariff. They flow in as freely as the air. This is not true of American films sent to foreign countries. In most other countries there is a tariff and a tax, which places our films at a disadvantage to the films produced in those countries.

Our films are not confined to depicting American life. The great film Mrs. Miniver portrayed the courageous and heroic resistance of the British during the blitz. That film gave renewed courage to men and women who were engaged in the battle for freedom all over the world. That was no imaginary epic. That was a truthful, pictorial demonstration of the undaunted courage and stanch hearts of the British—fighting for survival.

In all events, we do our utmost to try to show people of the world in the best light possible.

Last year more than 400 feature films were produced in this country. England made more than 100, with more than 300 produced in other parts of the world.

During the war we supplied all of our films—some 43,189 prints of feature films and 33,217 shorts—to the armed forces overseas. This was a contribution to the war effort, and was furnished free of all cost to the Government.

Again the Government has called upon us, and we are now supplying pictures to be exhibited to the peoples of occupied countries. The men and women of Germany, Japan, Austria, and Korea are getting, in many instances for the first time a glimpse of the true America. It is a contribution to world peace—to a better understanding—among all peoples of the earth.

More recently the motion picture invaded another field. It has stimulated the desire of people to purchase new inventions, to adopt new styles, and to desire the machinery they see in the farmers' fields. A new design in a house, a new style in a woman's hat or hair-do, or a new design in a dress—all these are popularized through the motion-picture screen.

I recall a film, It Happened One Night, where Clark Gable pulled off his shirt and there was no undershirt beneath it. Immediately hundreds of American boys stopped wearing undershirts. And we heard emphatically from the manufacturers of undershirts. In another film, however, Clark wore an old turtle-neck sweater. Instantly turtle-neck sweaters became the rage, and manufacturers found an unprecedented demand which they had not had in years.

More and more the world becomes one unit. No nation can sell and not buy. No nation can buy and not sell. Our industry is supporting the Government's program at the World Trade Conference in Geneva. The barbed-wire entanglements erected at the borders of nations must be untangled if the countries are to be prosperous and the people happy.

We have many problems in the motion-picture industry. We have made errors, the same as any other business. We are earnestly striving to improve every picture that is exhibited—to uphold the high moral standards of America. Great historical films have been produced; great films showing the advancement of science and art, and films which stimulate the imagination to reach out into unconquered worlds.

Another field the motion picture has entered is the schoolroom. It has been established that many subjects can be taught more easily and with greater rapidity in the schoolroom through the medium of motion pictures.

Someday the American school will have talking blackboards which will be as common as today's blackboards and chalk. I realize this means redesigning classrooms so that films can be adequately shown. It means training teachers to use films intelligently; research to determine what film content is most acceptable and most important in education

We reach into every community in the Nation and become a part of the community—the motion picture theater is an integral part of community life. Out of every dollar that is taken in by the cashier of the local theater, 65% is paid out for rentals, local advertising, local employees, local taxes and other local expenses.

In common with the newspapers and radio, the screen fights the battle for freedom of speech. Jefferson said "that Government is best which governs least." Intelligent self-disciplined industry is our greatest assurance that the freedoms guaranteed us by our Constitution will not be denied.

By maintaining high standards, by adhering to the truth, we can preserve the right to this freedom.

Yes, the motion picture industry has grown into a mighty institution, reckoned in billions of dollars. Yet, it is still in its infancy. It has hardly begun to use its facilities to entertain, to educate, and to carry its message of good will and happiness to all the people of the world. In my opinion, its possibilities of power and influence are greater than any other single instrumentality.

The responsibility, ladies and gentlemen, is great. We all appreciate that responsibility. It is my deep and solemn conviction that the Maker of the universe intended that men should be free and not slaves; that the peoples of the earth should enjoy the bountiful treasures which Nature has placed under every sky; that men and women should be happy and not depressed, and there should be a song of peace and good will in every heart.

We pray God that we may be worthy of the stewardship entrusted to us, and do our bit to realize these dreams.

A Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am hereby presenting a resolution, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY MATHEWS-CARTER POST, NO. 325, THE AMERICAN LEGION, MANCHESTER, OHIO

Whereas the cost of living has increased to the point where veterans are unable to live upon the pensions and disability allowances now paid by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas, veterans of both World Wars served their country with valor and honor and are entitled to a living compensation for the proper and adequate support of themselves and their dependents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Mathews-Carter Post, No. 325, the American Legion, Manchester, Ohio, That they support and urge the passage of House bill 2716 now pending in Congress of the United States, in order that veterans will be paid an increased allowance from Veterans' Administration based upon their needs in accordance with the number of persons dependent upon them.

Adopted this 23d day of May 1947.

JAMES O. DEATLEY,
Post Commander.

Attest:

JAMES W. LANG, Jr.,
Adjutant.

Problems of Small Business—Statement by C. Wilson Harder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement presented before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report yesterday by

Mr. George J. Burger, director in charge of the Washington office of the National Federation of Small Business, on behalf of C. Wilson Harder, president of the federation. Mr. Harder was unable to be present personally, and a statement was given for him by Mr. Burger.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., a national organization comprised of independent small businessmen throughout the Nation. For the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., which has the largest individual membership of any business organization in the United States whose head office is in San Mateo, Calif., and with district offices in Chicago, Ill., and Washington, D. C., I would like to express to the committee our sincere thanks in granting us the privilege of appearing here to state our views before this important body.

I think, before I go into my complete statement, that we owe a debt of gratitude to the foresight of the Congress in creating the small business committees in the Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, Seventy-ninth, and Eightieth Congresses. During the war years, small business of this Nation had the help of the small business committees in the Congress. It is a safe conclusion in stating that most of the small businesses would have been eased out for the duration of the war without this aid. I think it safe to say that in Great Britain, small business did not have this kind of help during the war years and found itself in a very precarious position and some industries the bulk of them small business people, were eliminated for the duration of the war.

I think, also, at this time it is important and proper to pay tribute to Senator TAFT who was an active member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses, and at the same time, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN who served in a like capacity in the House side on their Small Business Committee. In our opinion, it was these two important committees in the Congress that saved the day for small business of this Nation, and I am glad to have this opportunity to make our position publicly known.

I believe, in opening my remarks, it is important to know that we feel this committee has an important obligation on their hands to save the economy of the Nation—more important, the free-enterprise system on which this Nation was built. The importance of this committee's undertaking is typified in a letter that I recently noted in the New York Times under date of June 21, which I quote:

"PLACE OF SMALL BUSINESS—ITS IMPORTANCE STATED AND PROTECTION AGAINST BIG ENTERPRISES URGED

"To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

"The recommendation in the report of the Committee for Economic Development, for improving the plight of small-business enterprises are encouraging because they have long been needed. It is hoped that means will be found to put them into effect with reasonable dispatch.

"The report points out that 98 percent of all American business qualifies as small business." So long as these little enterprises remain comparatively sound and active, there need be little fear of an over-all business slump.

"Over the years, America developed the strongest industrial economy the world has known through the combined work of her thousands of small, widely scattered enterprises. To further strengthen the place long held by small business, steps should be taken to keep the small enterprise harmless from the encroachment of the large enterprise which, by one means or another, would take over the little fellow or force him out of business. As big business gets larger and more centralized, the balance which has kept American financially strong swings toward economic unstability.

"Some much needed improvement in our patent laws should be considered by the committee so as to protect small enterprises which are pioneering new inventive ideas. It should not be possible for big business to sit quietly on the side lines until by hard work and sacrifice and invention is proved successful and then to throw up legal barriers against its manufacture and sale.

"Regardless of the ability of big business to spend more time and money on research and development, once they get the inventive idea no subsequent advancement made possible by greater facilities and manpower, except in rare cases, should be permitted to deprive the original sponsor of rights vested in him by his patent. Americans are prolific and resourceful inventors and, from the beginning, in most cases, in order to obtain recognition they have been obliged to commercialize their work the hard way. That is how small enterprises are born.

"EDWARD F. CHANDLER.

"NEW YORK, *July 13, 1947.*"

We agree with this and the statement recently released by the Committee for Economic Development in which they state, in part: "We are so fully aware of the fact that small business in most lines has been unusually vigorous and prosperous since the war." Their statement continues, "but the boom times of 1946 and early 1947 will not last forever." It is our opinion that the latter condition is slowly approaching the crisis. It is our opinion that if our Nation had not opened its arsenal in supplying the world since VJ-day, due to increased production facilities, small business of this Nation would find itself in a precarious position. In some industries it appears that that has already come about. The federation, speaking for its members, insists, and demands strong and healthy competitive conditions.

It is my opinion that the purpose of this committee, to a large degree, is to dig into production and competition in the Nation's industry which will, after all, bring about a healthy competitive structure and bring prices more in line so that the consumer will be in a position to purchase his necessary requirements. I do not believe that the trend in our Nation's business structure tends to bring about fair and healthy competition. That is not my belief only. I refer to the reports of the Senate Small Business Committee in the Seventy-ninth Congress, Document No. 206, "Economic Concentration and World War II." Then again, the same committee reports, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, Committee Print No. 16, "Future of Independent Business"; and again, "United States versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly," a staff report to the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress. Then again, appearing in the press, July 1, 1947, was a United Press story stating that in 1947 they list 45 American firms in the "Billion Dollar Club." The total assets of these 45 American firms in 1947 totaled $103,456,016,995. It would be foolish to suppose that this economic concentration in the hands of 45 leading corporations would not have some serious effect preventing a healthy, fair, honest, competitive condition in the Nation's industry. There is a danger—and a serious danger—unless this committee is insistent that small business is given the proper protection to function in fair competition in which the public will be the beneficiary. We may reach a point in our Nation's economy where it will end in socialization of most of the industries, and we for one, speaking for small business, will fight to the very end any such attempt.

This economic concentration situation must be serious when Mr. B. C. Forbes recently stated the following:

"Dinosaurs, too big, became extinct. The Roman Empire, overexpanded, fell. And the far-flung British Empire is shrinking. Is it possible for ambitious American industrial, financial, and other leaders to overdo expansion?

"I have an uneasy feeling that the time has come for the brainy stalwarts administering these massive organizations to give very serious thought to their future policy. Should they reach out unrestrainedly, acquiring vaster and vaster interest, travel farther along the road toward monopoly, dominance? Or should they pause to reflect on what the final consequences of unrestrained growth may be?

"These questions deserve the most serious, long-visioned pondering."

It would appear to us in reports we received from our members, our field staff, and others, that there is a great worry in the minds of small business if they dare to attempt to force competition. As many state, they will end up with price wars or, again, their source of supply no longer available. Having the closest contact with small business of this Nation through our membership, these reports we are receiving every so often, show the fear felt by small producers and small independent retailers, of what will happen if they attempt to bring about real competition in which, indirectly, the public will be the principal beneficiary. Our members believe that production sparks competition and that competition in turn sparks production when both are uninhibited by either business or governmental checks. If this condition comes about our Nation's economy will be in fair and healthy competition and fear of retaliation from suppliers will no longer hinder small business of this Nation.

It is interesting to note that on July 5, 1947, the American Federation of Labor recommended to its Nation-wide membership the setting up of cooperatives. This must all lead to a fact that this economic concentration, in the hands of a few corporations, controls and dictates the price structure throughout the Nation. It is not my intention to state that these leaders in big business get together and plan. But it is my opinion that the power in the hands of a few corporations acts for them as a warning or deterrent so that the great numbers in industry don't step out of line.

The Committee of Economic Development in its recent report confirms what I have just said when they stated, "The growth of big business in the last 50 years undoubtedly has taken place, in part, at the expense of smaller concerns." They further state that, "some large firms undoubtedly have taken unfair advantage of smaller competitors." We might as well look the facts in the face; we are never going to bring about a real competitive condition in the Nation's industry until this economic concentration is broken up for the maintenance and reestablishment of many thousands of small businesses. It is my honest conviction that the public, in this way, will get lower prices and better commodities.

It is not our intention to ask this committee for any protective measure for the inefficient small businessman. We have no interest in the inefficient small business institution; that is, provided his inefficiency is due to his own negligence.

It is possible that the Government itself has been at fault or negligent in its administration and enforcement of the antitrust laws. Possibly big business has been aware of the situation.

Just a few months ago the former Assistant Attorney General, the Honorable Wendell Berge, stated, in substance, before the Senate Civil Service Committee, that for the past 35 or 40 years the administrations have

been giving merely lip service to the enforcement of the Sherman Act. Bear in mind, members of this committee, this is not my statement; this is the statement of the then Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust. Unfortunately, the Nation's press did not carry his complete testimony. I ask, How are you going to bring about real and healthy competition within the Nation's industries in which the public is the present beneficiary unless law enforcement takes place and is done immediately?

It is significant to note that the Federal Trade Commission has been appealing to the Congress for nearly 20 years, requesting an amendment to the Sherman-Clayton Act that would prevent or prohibit corporations in the same line of endeavor to merge. Up to the present time, Congress has not seen fit to pass such legislation; witness the merger upon merger of corporations in the same lines of industry during the past 10 years. The result is that you are adding more to the "billion-dollar club" in our Nation's economic structure, and through this will stifle and prevent healthy competition. It is my opinion that if there is to be a future for small business of this Nation, with the public being the principal beneficiary, the main and foremost action of this committee should be vigorous and immediate antitrust enforcement.

I need not tell you the effects on small producers when they see corporation upon corporation merging in their respective lines of industry. You will know what this must mean to the thinking of a small producer and even more important, to the small retailer. So it is my intention to make as the No. 1 issue the recommendation, before anything else is done, to bring about free competition and the preservation of small business. Antitrust laws must be enforced; not merely lip service, but by a directive of this joint committee to the respective agencies. A glaring example of the depressing effect of alleged antitrust-law enforcement is the action of the Federal court in Sioux City, Iowa, June 24, 1947. I quote:

"TRUST CHARGE DROPPED—PACKERS MAY AGAIN BE INDICTED, HOWEVER, BY MIXED PANEL

"SIOUX CITY, IOWA, June 24.—A 1942 Federal grand-jury indictment charging three major packing firms with conspiracy to violate the Sherman Antitrust Act has been dismissed on motion of the Government. The packing firms * * * has attacked the indictment on the ground there were no women on the panel from which the grand jury was chosen.

"Federal Judge Henry N. Craven dismissed the indictment yesterday on motion of United States District Attorney T. E. Diamond, who said he agreed with the defendants' contention."

While I am talking on the antitrust laws, I must also include the importance of the Robinson-Patman Act, because that ties in with preventing monopoly if the law is vigorously enforced. Some institutions have enjoyed special price consideration from the producer to them because of the alleged mass purchasing power. It may be found that the benefits these mass purchasers receive from certain producers will not always be passed on to the ultimate consumer. What apparently they do, too, with their mass purchasing power is to keep their resale price at a level that prohibits independent retailers to compete. It is not competition but destruction.

A recent case came before the Federal Trade Commission on an alleged Robinson-Patman Act violation in which certain large companies received benefits over all other consumers of that manufacturer; it is true that the Federal Trade Commission issued a cease and desist order shortly before Pearl Harbor, and it is interesting to note the observation of the report of the House Small Business Committee on this particular case. In their press release, dated June 15, 1947, they stated, in part, "During the war the Government virtually took a holiday on enforcing these laws in the interest of maximum production." In a recent case in Danville, Ill., the Federal court found that a mass distributor had consistently operated thousands of retail stores, and these stores were run at a loss. No independent retailer could hope to meet this unfair competitive condition. It was also found that this mass distributor had effected lower prices than those granted to other buyers of the same suppliers—this was circumvented by outright cash contributions. It is significant to note that when this mass distributor received these special concessions from the supplier he demanded that he be protected against any alleged Robinson-Patman law violation. We find in the court record of the same case that when new independent retail stores were to be established this mass distributor put in effect special practices and policies in the reduction of its prices until the new establishment was closed out of business. I have heard it stated that in some other cases mass distributors establish stores in a community that are run for 2 or 3 years without a profit or until they are able to concentrate the business in their hands and the hands of some other few mass distributors supplying in that territory.

Small business is interested in the tax structure, finance, labor, and business management, but I think small business' main and present concern is: What is Congress now going to do with these antitrust laws? Is it going to be just a continuance of lip service by the various governmental agencies? If this takes place, there can be only one alternative—socialization of the Nation's industry.

I ask that this committee recommend:

1. A special appropriation of at least $2,000,000 (the minimum) to the Antitrust Division for the purpose of making an industry-wide antitrust investigation in order to:

a. Get at the problem of concentration.

b. Prosecute vigorously and immediately all cases pending in the Antitrust Division.

It is my understanding that the present Congress has appropriated $2,150,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947. It is my further understanding that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in its original budget requested $3,500,000, but that this request was reduced by someone in the Antitrust Division.

To substantiate our request, we refer to you the finding on pages 6, 16, 48, and 51 in the report, United States Versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly, Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress. Then again, we refer you to the Senate Small Business Committee's report, Future of Independent Business, Senate Committee Print No. 16. You will note that their recommendation for the Eightieth Congress was the increased appropriation for the Antitrust Division.

It is interesting to know that economic concentration is increasing in leaps and bounds when, on June 19 of this year, Senator LANGER offered a resolution which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. He cited the reason for the resolution quoting the Federal Trade Commission as the source of information. Since 1940, 1,800 industrial concerns have been absorbed by other concerns. More than one-third of all mergers since 1940 have been in three industries in which small concerns have predominated: Food, nonelectrical machinery, and textiles. Big companies are most active in mergers of business units since 1940, almost one-third of the absorbed companies being taken over by the largest corporations with assets of $50,000,000 or more. At the end of 1945, the 62 largest manufacturing corporations held $8,400,000,000 in net working capital. About three-fifths of the mergers in the past 6 years have been "horizontal"—firms producing similar products. The purpose of Senator LANGER's resolution boiled down to the recommendation of an investigation into the efficiency, economy, and practices of giant corporations in the United States.

Price discrimination has been the graveyard of most small businesses. In 1936, after a most thorough investigation by the Congress, they approved and put into effect the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, Public Law No. 692, Seventy-fourth Congress. In the act there is a provision which I quote:

"That the Federal Trade Commission may, after due investigation and hearing to all interested parties, fix and establish quantity limits, and revise the same as it finds necessary, as to particular commodities or classes of commodities, where it finds that available purchasers in greater quantities are so few as to render differentials on account thereof unjustly discriminatory or promotive of monopoly in any line of commerce; and the foregoing shall then not be construed to permit differentials based on differences in quantities greater than those so fixed and established."

No such investigation has ever been made by the Federal Trade Commission on the quantity discount provision. It is interesting to note that two very large contracts in a major industry were in effect just at or about the time the Robinson-Patman Act became law. In one of these contracts, the Federal Trade Commission had found a preferential of $41,000,000 accruing to a mass distributor over the independent buyers of the same producer. When the Robinson-Patman Act became law, that producer supplying this mass distributor publicly stated the cancellation of the contract because he could not justify the price under the new law. Some 60 days later, another major producer, with a similar type of contract with another mass distributor, made the same announcement of the cancellation of his contract with a leading national corporation—cancellation of the contract because they could not justify the price under the law. In other words, quantity discount was involved and they, with the best legal authority available, came to the conclusion that they could not justify their prices—hence the cancellation. It is to be regretted that the Federal Trade Commission did not go in immediately and make a Nation-wide investigation, at least with some few principal corporations who were enjoying quantity discounts, and find out whether these quantity discounts were in full keeping with the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The next recommendation:

2. That this committee recommend a special appropriation of not less than $350,000 and that the Federal Trade Commission be instructed to make this investigation which is provided within the law itself on quantity discounts, and report back to this committee and the Congress not later than February 1, 1948, an interim report on their investigation. It apparently has been that the Commission never had the proper appropriations or the necessary competent personnel to go in and do this job properly, and until this is done by the Commission, we say to this committee that insofar as the Robinson-Patman Act is concerned, it is a dead-letter law.

Surely this committee or the Congress should not be fearful of making these measly appropriations to these two important agencies with a direct mandate to those agencies of what they should do with this money. After all, Congress since VJ-day has appropriated to Bretton Woods, British loan, Greece and Turkey, UNRRA, new relief, lend-lease settlement and surplus property, Germany and Japan, Export-Import Bank, a sum totaling $19,500,000,000, and with the Marshall plan now coming up we will be most lucky if this amount is not doubled within the next few years—all out of the taxpayers' pockets. It is more necessary to the future

of our own Nation's economy that a few million dollars be appropriated immediately to the enforcement of these antitrust laws. For refusing to do so, the result can be only one thing—regimented economy.

It is my hope and trust, when I make the plea for the 100,000 or more small businesses for which we speak—and we speak for all with no cliques or groups but all our membership—that this committee take under immediate advisement the recommendations I have set forth and put into effect at once these recommendations. The result will be a healthy and steady competitive condition in our industries, and, most important, the public will get lower costs and improvements in the various commodities.

It was my hope to include recommendations as to the taxing structure affecting small business, the financial situation affecting small business, the long-term capital loan, the labor situation affecting small business, suggested management methods for small business through the Department of Commerce. However, I believe that the subjects I speak on are of more importance for our Nation's economy and future, and I would like to request the privilege of filing with the committee a supplemental statement on the various programs which I have just mentioned and which cannot be included in this prepared statement.

I would like to bring to the committee's attention the result of a questionnaire circulated among our members, through the official publication, the Mandate, bulletin No. 141. The questions were as follows:

1. Are you for or against full-scale investigation of the present lack of enforcement of the Sherman-Clayton Act and the Robinson-Patman Act with adequate authority placed in the hands of the Federal Trade Commission, and full investigation of the Federal Trade Commission to see that all violations are handled promptly and effectively?

2. Are you for or against full investigation of the Antitrust Division for the purpose of making all corrections necessary to bring about prompt and effective prosecution of all monopoly violations now incompleted, also efficient and prompt handling of all future antitrust violations?

3. Are you for or against the House and Senate Small Business Committees giving preference to action on the above-mentioned issues, over activity which pertains to any certain vocation of business?

The answers have been received and tabulated, and the result of the poll was, as follows:

Question No. 1: 97 percent for, 2 percent against, 1 percent no vote.

Question No. 2: 96 percent for, 2 percent against, 2 percent no vote.

Question No. 3: 95 percent for, 3 percent against, 2 percent no vote.

In closing, I say to you, in all sincerity, that unless immediate action is taken through this committee and its recommendation to the Congress of a vigorous and immediate antitrust-law enforcement, with the proper applications, small business of this Nation might as well know the score now as later on—they are through.

Modernization of Railroads—Editorial From the Wyoming Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Wyoming Eagle, on July 4, contained an interesting editorial entitled "Come West, Mr. Young" on the modernization and development of the Union Pacific Railroad. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COME WEST, MR. YOUNG

One man who ought to come west and get an eyeful of real railroad progress is R. R. Young, chairman of the board and reputedly the guiding spirit of the Chesapeake & Ohio lines. The C. & O. is not quite the greatest as American railroads go, but the noise its chairman is making in newspapers and magazines might fool the unsuspecting into believing that his outfit is the biggest and best ever.

One of the large advertisements inserted in metropolitan newspapers recently by Mr. Young's C. & O. is headed, "Why the railroads cannot afford not to modernize." It speaks of the rolling tenements that still pass for sleeping cars and tired, old, creaking day coaches. It says that "if old-line practices continue to be tolerated, then regardless of rate relief, further deficits and bankruptcies are certain."

Apparently Mr. Young has been looking over only certain lines. Certainly, he has not been looking at western railroads. Or if he has, he is unfair in that he does not print the whole truth. By implication he puts over the idea that it is the C. & O. which is progressing while other railroads are decadent and ill managed. What are the facts?

Last year, only last year, mind you, the C. & O. installed its first two streamliners on a short run between Detroit and Grand Rapids. Further orders have been placed for new equipment to replace its rolling tenements and creaking day coaches. Few replacements have been made yet; only orders have been placed. This is all disclosed in the C. & O. advertisements.

Not last year, but 13 years ago, the Union Pacific put into service its first streamliners—on the long run from Chicago to the Pacific coast. The Burlington Zephyrs began running between Chicago and Denver. And during the last 10 years practically every western road installed streamliner service, long before Mr. Young's lines, apparently, heard of air-conditioned, Diesel-powered passenger service.

Nowhere else in the world do communities and states enjoy train service comparable to that provided by the Union Pacific. Here is daily streamliner service (both directions) between Chicago and Los Angeles, and between Chicago and Portland. Here is thrice a week streamliner service between Chicago and San Francisco—the reason this service is not provided daily being that the Southern Pacific, over whose tracks the trains run between Ogden and Oakland, has not as yet consented.

And another thing, western railroads are going in for dieselization in a big way, meaning the fastest freight service in the country. The Union Pacific alone has placed orders aggregating $23,807,000 for Diesel locomotives.

However, this is only a small item in the UP's postwar modernization budget. It was disclosed recently that since VJ-day ultramodern equipment to the value of $88,785,000 has been ordered, much of which already is in service.

If R. R. Young, of the C. & O., knows of any railroads that are too stupid to modernize, he should name them and not imply that all lines but his own are in that category. And before sponsoring any more advertisements he should get acquainted with what lines west of Chicago have done and are doing. Come west, Mr. Young, and see some real railroading.

Statement of George M. Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of George M. Humphrey, chairman, Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I was summoned to appear before this committee to discuss the subject of your general inquiry long before there was a settlement of the recent coal wage contract.

However, in view of all of the questions that have since arisen with respect to that settlement, it would be inappropriate now not to discuss the coal contract and its effect upon the so-called wage-price spiral.

When the mines were turned back by the Government to the operators last month, Mr. Lewis simply said that his men were unemployed, there being no contract in effect, and that if the operators wanted to employ them certain conditions would have to be met or the men would not go to work. Whether that would constitute a strike or not within the meaning of the new labor law was something for the lawyers and courts to decide, but there was no doubt that little, if any, coal would be mined in the meantime.

This was not a theoretical matter—it required a practical decision. There were two immediate courses open, either let the mines stay idle and resort to mediation, litigation, or legislation, or another Government seizure; or on the other hand, work out with the union the best possible terms that could be voluntarily agreed upon.

The first consideration was what would the consequences of each of these alternatives be?

Coal is in great demand both here and abroad, and stocks are relatively low. Without coal production it would only be a short time before transportation would be crippled, steel production curtailed, and all manufacturing dependent upon coal, steel, and transportation would be seriously interrupted, with consequent unemployment and increased shortages of many commodities for use both here and elsewhere throughout the world. While 400,000 miners would face payless pay days voluntarily, there would be many thousands of other workers who would be forced into involuntary idleness and loss of pay. Further shortages would force higher prices and the familiar spiral of increases would continue to go further out of control.

The Taft-Hartley law was new and its application to these particular circumstances involved unsettled questions upon which legal authorities differed.

The Smith-Connally law had expired and talk was current concerning the possibility of new legislation by Congress for seizure by the Government or proposed new remedies, the results of which no one could foresee. All this would be time consuming and nothing was suggested which would start the mines working after the miners' holiday and prevent the serious interruption to the production of coal, with all the vicious consequences on the general economy of the Nation as well as those resulting from further shortages of many much-needed articles of commerce. Furthermore, all our past experience had been that when once the Government intervened in a labor dispute, it finally granted about all that was asked by the union, but only did so after serious

strikes had taken place causing great damage and inconvenience to the public as well as to our customers and ourselves.

On the other hand, what would be the result if an agreement could be reached through collective bargaining? The men would then return to work and production would continue in coal, steel, and many other commodities. There would then be no crisis threatening soon to paralyze a large part of American business. As production rose and finally supplied demand there would be an application of the economic law of supply and demand with a resulting pressure on prices. Clearly the choice of courses to follow was that of reaching an agreement and maintaining production all along the line with all of the benefits to the entire Nation that would result therefrom, unless the price of such an agreement was unreasonable and excessive.

There was so much speculation and misinformation about this contract during its negotiation and before it was actually prepared and available for study that many people have become confused by the inaccurate and misleading stories they have read or heard. Are the terms of the settlement really inflationary or unreasonable? Let us consider just what they are.

The miners' request for six additional paid holidays which was made in this case, as well as in many others recently, was denied and withdrawn. The request for premium pay for Saturdays and Sundays as such was also denied.

Further safety precautions are earnestly desired by both parties, and an additional constructive safety program was agreed upon.

The purposes and general administration of the welfare fund which was the real cause of the last bituminous coal strike and was first established by the Government after its seizure of the mines about a year ago were settled so as to accord with the terms of the Taft-Hartley law. This fund is for an employees' welfare program to be used and administered strictly in accordance with that law.

The issue of the unionization of foremen has caused two recent industry-wide strikes and many local interruptions to production. An agreement was finally reached in this contract which not only complies with the Taft-Hartley law, but may well settle this serious issue for the benefit of all industry. Under the new contract there is reserved to management, free from union control or organizational activities, all necessary management employees, and at the same time the union is protected from the abuse of such exemptions. There is nothing more important to the efficient functioning of our industrial system than the proper settlement of this long-standing controversy regarding foremen.

It has been said that this agreement was purposely designed to avoid the real intent and obligations of the Taft-Hartley law.

It is not practical to try to analyze all the legal obligations of the parties under the contract. Certain points, however, have been raised upon which comment is warranted. The first is the so-called willing-and-able-to-work clause, which was first included in an agreement with this union by the anthracite coal operators about a year ago. That clause is contained in the following sentence:

"It is the intent and purpose of the parties hereto that this agreement will promote and improve industrial and economic relationship in the bituminous coal industry and to set forth herein the basic agreements covering rates of pay, hours of work, and conditions of employment to be observed between the parties, and shall cover the employment of persons employed in the bituminous coal mines covered by this agreement during such time as such persons are able and willing to work."

On this point the Taft-Hartley Act provides in section 502:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this act be construed to make the quitting of his labor by an individual employee an illegal act."

If an employee is unable or unwilling to work and wishes to terminate his employment, he may do so in compliance with the contract and the law which says he shall not be required to render service without his consent. If, on the other hand, he has a grievance, the contract provides that—

"Any and all disputes, stoppages, suspensions of work, and any and all claims, demands, or actions growing therefrom or involved therein shall be by the contracting parties settled and determined exclusively by the machinery provided in the settlement of local and district disputes' section of this agreement, or, if national in character, by the full use of free collective bargaining as heretofore known and practiced in the industry."

It is not unusual to provide for the arbitration machinery to be used as the remedy for disputes under a labor contract, and it does not contravene the policy of the Taft-Hartley Act.

It has been asserted that the check-off provision of the contract does not comply with the requirements of the law. There seems to be some confusion as to whether dues alone may be checked off on the basis of voluntary employee authorization as contrasted with the check-off of initiation fees and assessments. This will probably later be clarified, but regardless of this relative detail, no violation of the law is intended by the contract which in the check-off section provides:

"In order that this section may become effective and operate within the limitations of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, the mine workers hereby agree to furnish, with all reasonable dispatch, to the respective operators, and the operators agree to aid, assist, and cooperate in obtaining written assignments from each employee so employed."

If the law is held to limit check-off to dues only, the law shall be complied with, because it is clear from what I have just read that the intent of the parties was to operate within the limitations of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

The union did demand clauses which, in the operators' opinion, would have contravened the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law but which, in the opinion of the union, were proper. The operators were adamant in refusing to grant such provisions. There is no provision in the contract which was intended or which, if properly construed, weakens in any way the right of government to enforce fully any and all provisions of the law and which is not in full compliance with the law. In fact, it would be impossible for the operators, even if they cared to do so, to make a valid contract which would be contrary to the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

This brings us to the important matter of wages and hours.

Under one of the previous settlements made by the Government after seizure of the mines, a 9-hour portal-to-portal day underground was established by Secretary Ickes as a war measure. When the mines were again seized by the Government about a year ago, an agreement was made by the Government with the miners that the 9-hour day be continued, notwithstanding the fact that the 8-hour day and the 5-day week was then being adopted by most other industries and an increase of 18½ cents per hour was generally being paid to maintain the take-home pay in view of the reduction in hours. By this Government agreement the pay was increased, but the hours were not reduced. This left the coal business in a situation different from most other industry. Wages for the coal industry were increased, but hours of work were not reduced and the preservation of take-home pay had to be faced in the future whenever a new agreement was reached which reduced hours. We could have no objection to the miners' request to eliminate the ninth hour and adopt the 8-hour day underground as standard in coal mines as is customary in other industry. But because it had not been settled in the coal business when it was generally settled in most other businesses, the ninth hour had to be dropped in the new contract without reducing the pay per day. We did not think that in view of present conditions we were justified in demanding a reduction in take-home earnings at this time, and we do not believe we would have been supported in such a demand as the reason for a serious coal strike.

Despite many statements which have been made to the contrary, the only increase in the miners' take-home pay is an increase of 15 cents an hour, or $1.20 for an 8-hour day. This wage increase is identical with the wage increase of 15 cents per hour granted recently in many other industries to meet increases in living costs. It does not set up a new wage pattern, but rather conforms to an already existing wage pattern. Under the new contract a coal miner gets the same pay for an 8-hour day underground as he formerly received for 9 hours underground, plus this wage increase of 15 cents an hour. In the absence of overtime his take-home pay is increased under the new arrangement only to the extent of 15 cents an hour, or $1.20 a day. Under the Government agreement in force last year, a base-rate man working a 5-day week took home $59.25 for his week's work. Under the present agreement, he will take home $65.25, or an increase of $6 per week. If, because of the miners' declared desires and the very high cost of premium pay for the sixth day's work, the industry should stabilize on the basis of the 5-day week, as is common in so many other industries, a base-rate man who previously worked 6 days will have $10 less take-home pay for his 5-day week under the terms of this agreement than he was previously earning, but of course he would be working one less hour each day and one less day in the week.

The hourly wage of the miner is high under the agreement, and it should be. Coal mining differs in many important respects from almost all other industries. It is a hazardous occupation. The economy of the whole country now and for the future depends on the type of men who seek and take employment in coal mines. Since the war the sons of coal miners have not come to the coal industry for employment. The industry must attract high-grade young men if the coal industry in America is to continue to be the most progressive of any country in the world. In our negotiations with the union we strove to arrive at a contract which would produce this result.

A comparison of earnings will demonstrate that they are not out of line with those in other industries considering the nature of this industry and the kind of work required. Certainly there is nothing wildly inflationary or grossly unreasonable in paying such wages to our employees.

The increase in the cost of coal on this basis will vary with different mines in different districts but even if it is to average as much as 75 cents to $1.00 per ton as now estimated, it is entirely possible that as the working forces get adjusted to the shorter hours and more efficient operations result, the tonnage per man, per hour may increase and if so costs and prices gradually be expected to decline. If the cooperation which has been promised by the miners' union is realized and it is much more apt to be so by satisfactory mutual agreement than by strikes and Government controls—increasing production and increasing efficiency will surely mean more coal at less cost.

On the other hand, the effect of shortages on prices is conclusively illustrated by the increase in spot prices for coal which have taken place recently when a strike and shutdown was only threatened and which are right now much more than the actual advance in cost which will result from this contract. It is only reasonable to expect that these higher prices will gradually be adjusted downward when, as a result of this agreement, it becomes apparent that production will continue and a supply of coal will be currently available.

Only continuous production will give other industries and the American public the coal and the other things dependent upon coal in the volume which is required, and not until that volume is attained and demand is more nearly in balance can we hope to gain much-desired economic stability. Strikes causing interruptions to production and resulting further shortages of various articles will be most costly and damaging to the Nation.

It has been said that big steel and big coal made this settlement to the detriment of small coal business. The exact reverse is true. Small coal operators are by far the largest employers of contract miners who work on tonnage rates while the larger mines, which are mechanized, employ almost wholly hourly and day-rate men. Tonnage rates are not increased at all by this agreement and the tonnage man is increased only $1.20 per day, whereas the hourly and day-rate men get the same $1.20 per day increase as well as the maintenance of their old "take-home pay" for 9 hours for now working only the new reduced 8-hour day. The advantage competitively is all in favor of the small mines and against the large operation.

The negotiations which led to this agreement began many weeks ago. The southern operators groups immediately withdrew. The remaining operators negotiating committee continued to meet with the miners' representatives only breaking from time to time when failing to reach agreements on the several issues. The union's demands for reduction in hours and increase in pay were never modified in the slightest degree.

Mr. Fairless and I were called in by the operators' committee after an impasse had been reached, in a last attempt to work out an agreement. When the settlement as finally proposed was submiteed to the northern and captive coal operators for their approval it was unanimously adopted.

By avoiding the strike and all of the resulting damage that would surely follow, this agreement will do more to stabilize the economy and retard inflation than has the settlement of any controversy in the soft coal business during the past several years. Production and only production which creates a balance of supply and demand is the only sure cure for the increasing wage and price spiral.

This new agreement is in full compliance with the spirit of the new Taft-Hartley law which covered several of the most controversial issues and it terminates the trend toward Government dictation of industrial relations and seizure and control of business.

Long-Needed Change in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the American people today have no greater concern than how to get our State Department so organized and staffed as to become as effective and efficient and vigorous in pursuing our national objectives by diplomatic and economic means as our War and Navy Departments were during the war in pursuing our national objective by military and naval means.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a penetrating and stimulating article on this urgent question by John Chamberlain from Life magazine:

MEMO TO ROBERT LOVETT—RE: SOME OF THE PERPLEXING QUESTIONS THAT CONFRONT THE NEW UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE—CAN STATE CLEAN OUT ITS REDS?—HOW CAN WE UNIFY UNITED STATES POLICY?—WHAT SHOULD KENNAN'S STAFF DO?—WHERE DO WE GET GOOD DIPLOMATS?—WHAT WILL REPLACE BRADEN'S JOB?

You, an able and eminent member of the class of Yale 1918, have been designated Under Secretary of State to succeed Dean Acheson, Yale 1915. This Old Blue apostolic succession, this laying-on of hands is a splendid thing for God and for country as well as for Yale. The world knows what a remarkable job you did during the war as Assistant Secretary of War for Air, fighting for the big bomber program that eventually crushed the Axis. You had a firm directive from Commander in Chief Roosevelt—"50,000 planes a year"—and the rubble of the German cities is testimony to the fact that the down-the-line work which you supervised was done with firmness and dispatch. Aside from your war record it is reassuring to know that you rose above the handicap of having a great father, Robert Scott Lovett of the Union Pacific Railroad. Where the average son of a great man is apt to spend his life making a cult of failure, you derived from your childhood a sense of the sweep and courage and productivity of America. Moreover you didn't depend on your marriage to Adele Brown of the Brown Brothers-Harriman banking-house fortune to further your career as a banker; I understand that you rose to the top in the financial world on your own, permitting your in-laws to hire you only after you had proved your capacity to master the intricacies of finance, including international finance. It is also cause for satisfaction to remember that you were a patriot beyond the call of duty in World War I, quitting college to become a pilot in the United States Navy's air arm, in which you helped develop the early theory and practice of night bombing. Everything you have done has been crowned with success—and if you have paid for the expenditure of your highly charged nervous energy by developing a troublesome digestive tract, I am sure that your black Scot pertinacity is equal to strenuous days in State.

In the State Department job, however, you will have to deal with the impalpable elements that make Russian human nature, for instance, different from American or British human nature; you will have to be psychologist as well as technician. When you were in the War Department, Russia was an ally, not a stumbling block standing in the way of world peace. Although the Russians once denied you the use of shuttle bases at an uncomfortable point in the war's history, you have yet to experience the conspiratorial and evangelical aspects of Marxism. Like many men of affairs who have been immersed in practical adventures, you have been sheltered from the ideological storms of the modern world. I know that you are not like some members of the wealthier classes, consumed by a bad conscience and therefore a set-up for any plausible Communist who wants to talk another Park Avenue scion into the glories of fellow traveling. But although your conscience is clear you have never tried to work with Communists in a trade-union; you have never had your character assassinated in a Communist-line publication; you have never had an opportunity to watch the Communists and their peripheral stooges from close-up. Thus you may be gullible, as indeed, your predecessor, Dean Acheson, was gullible until events served to educate him to reality.

You are entering the State Department at a ticklish period of change. For 3 years our foreign policy has been based on fundamental errors. Item 1: The deal behind Chiang Kai-shek's back which gave Soviet Russia imperialist rights to the Chinese port of Dairen. Item 2: The attempt to force the Chinese Communists, their army included, on Chiang in the name of unity, an odd notion for a nation that once refused unity with the government of Jefferson Davis and the armies of Robert E. Lee. Item 3: The Potsdam Agreement, which fragmentized the German economy and kept Europe from solving its productive problems as a unit. Item 4: The supervengeful Morgenthau plan, which has kept us from thinking constructively about European revival for two horrible years of starvation that may end with the incubation of a whole host of new Nazis. Item 5: The appease Stalin mania, which originated in the blithe assurances of the otherwise estimable Harry Hopkins, who had probably never cracked a book on Marxism in his life. Item 6: The constant shifting of our policy in Latin America, with its now forcible, now feeble handling of the Argentine. In order to help formulate sound policies for the future, Robert Lovett, you should meditate deeply upon these sins of our past. They have created many a dilemma that will not lightly yield to thought and action.

But if you inherit the result of these fantastically mistaken policies of the past, you are also entering the State Department in a period of great promise. Your chief, George Catlett Marshall, is a man who hates both failure and slipshod work—and though he was palpably wrong in trying to force unity among Communists and Kuomintang in China (it is nature-faking to believe that Communists will ever cooperate in a coalition except to further their own ultimately disruptive ends), it can at least be said for Marshall that the Chinese policy was not his own. Marshall, as you very well know, will back you up at all turns, but with Molotov and Tito and Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Communists and European redemption all tumbling in and out of his mind he won't have time for handling details. You will have to suggest things to George Marshall, not vice versa.

You will also have to suggest things to certain career men in the foreign service who have become passive through the years. The trouble with our career diplomats is not that they may have a fondness for tea and striped trousers. But the tea-and-striped-pants accusations symbolize a dissatisfaction with the ideal of the career man, which is never to take a chance for fear that it might possibly be construed as a mistake. What we need abroad is a number of Ambassadors who are evangelical about the virtues of democratic capitalism, which has made the United States both productive and free. Let our men speak out for the American essentials which have energized people like yourself. You cannot, of course, fire the passive career man. But you may be able, over the months, to jockey men around, getting the dynamic fellows into key spots on the earth's surface.

Before the advent of Acheson and Marshall the State Department was hardly an administrative mechanism. In the old days it had its own boyars, barons or independent warlords—Sumner Welles ruled over American Republics, Stanley Hornbeck took the Far East for his own, Jimmy Dunn ran Europe. Nobody bothered to explain the State Department to Congress until Dean Acheson, who had quit a job as Under Secretary of the Treasury in 1933 when the Roosevelt gold

policy gagged him, came back into Government service as Assistant Secretary of State in 1941.

Acheson is a splendid advocate and a splendid organizer. His brief for the stock exchange in the Richard Whitney case is remembered to this day as one of the ablest briefs ever written by a canny attorney. As liaison officer for State with Congress, Acheson was a great success. A debonair, tall and aristocratic fellow, Dean Acheson has a distinct Anglo-American flavor, which he comes by honestly as the son of an Englishman who was Episcopal bishop of Connecticut. The Anglo-American flavor has never gone down with prairie Congressmen, but Acheson surmounted his handicap by organizing his material superlatively well. His briefs for his new client had much to do with the success on the Hill of lend-lease extension, Bretton Woods, and UNRRA.

The real Acheson accomplishment, however, is the 9:30 meeting. Not so long ago each area desk in State worked with little reference to what the next geographical division was doing, and nobody knew what the economics department of State was up to or why. The result was a gorgeous confusion of administration—one man might be chasing Fascists in Paraguay, another man might be coddling them in Spain, another might be annoying Communists in Poland, still another might be welcoming them in China or Iran. The Secretary or the Under Secretary of State would get the news of chaos too late to do anything about it, and there was always the worry about what PM or Drew Pearson might say. Acheson brought an abrupt end to this state of affairs by bringing certain department heads together at 9:30 three or more times a week. The 9:30 meeting has been attended by Freeman ("Doc") Matthews, head of the European office; Loy Henderson, head of the Near Eastern and African office; John Carter Vincent, head of the Far Eastern office; Will Clayton and Willard Thorp from the economics division; Charles Fahy, the department's legal adviser; Charles ("Chip") Bohlen, the Russian expert who attended all the big conferences at Yalta and elsewhere; Ben Cohen, counselor of the department, and various other functionaries. Only Spruille Braden, of the division of American republics, remained aloof—no doubt a tribute to his unmalleable personality but a headache for his coworkers.

Ever since the introduction of the 9:30 meeting Freeman Matthews, for instance, has been able to judge just what Loy Henderson's policy in Turkey means when it is stacked up against affairs in Italy or Germany; the various area problems have been tackled in the light of coordinated thinking. And now that Marshall has called Norman Armour, a career foreign-service man, from retirement to serve as Assistant Secretary of State in coordinating all the various area offices, Latin America included, it should serve to make the job of Under Secretary so much easier.

There is a drawback, however, to the Armour appointment, and you, Robert Lovett, should be aware of it. In creating a coordinating assistant secretaryship for Armour, the title of Assistant Secretary of State for American Republic Affairs vanishes with the resignation of Spruille Braden. Latin Americans must inevitably take this as an affront to their dignidad. Moreover, the appointment of Armour is no consolation to Argentineans, for Armour never warmed up to Perón when he served as Ambassador in Buenos Aires. This may cause certain minor difficulties in our program of wooing the Argentineans to sincere support of hemispheric unity. Incidentally, the bad features of Bradenism did not stem from his dislike of Perón's coddling of Fascists in the Argentine; if we had broken with Perón, there would have been much to justify it. The trouble with our Argentine policy was that it was neither fish nor fowl; we kept an Ambassador in Buenos Aires as a token of friendship, yet at the same time we needled the Argentineans from Washington. Thus, we made the worst of two worlds; nor did we consult the wishes of the other Latin-American nations on Argentinean policy.

With Braden gone, you, Robert Lovett, should look into those who have helped conduct our Latin-American affairs under him, for while Braden was undoubtedly anti-Communist as well as anti-Fascist, it is a fact that some shady left-wing characters were among his top advisers for an extended period. The more notorious of these advisers have departed, but the people who hired them and listened to them may still be in a gullible frame of mind.

Even if you have an assistant secretary to keep track of the area desks, you, Robert Lovett, should still sit in on the 9:30 meetings—at least for some time to come. But if you or your assistant should miss an occasional meeting you will find that you can brief yourselves quickly on the discussions, for another recent State Department innovation—that of the secretariat, which was Marshall's own idea brought over from the War Department—sees to it that conversations, cables, and papers are briefed for quick perusal by the Secretary if and when he desires to see them. The secretariat controls all incoming and outgoing messages—which means that relevant material, say, from Chungking or Moscow doesn't languish for critical hours or weeks on an area desk.

You, Robert Lovett, will find both the 9:30 meeting and the secretariat made to your own efficient hand. But even more important than these innovations is the new long-range planning committee headed by George Kennan. Much has been written about our ad hoc, or Saturday-to-Saturday diplomacy. At one time we are hot for the Morgenthau plan for pastoralizing the German economy; at another time we have come to our senses about the Ruhr, whose coal production can hardly be pastoralized without ruining French, Dutch, and Belgian industrial systems. When a Cordell Hull is telling off the Japanese on the eve of Pearl Harbor, he promises unequivocally to back the nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek through hell and high water. But later in the war a new view comes to the fore in the State Department: The corrupt Kuomintang government of Chiang must be leavened by the admixture of the supposedly pure agrarian communism of Yenan. Such weather-vane statesmanship has operated because there has been no long-range planning, no properly evaluated theory of United States political interest. The Kennan group should do much to put the State Department on a firm philosophical base.

George Frost Kennan is one of the real patriots in the State Department. His granduncle, George F. Kennan, once wrote a famous series of exposures of the czar's political prisoner camps in Siberia; and the young namesake nephew, after his graduation from Princeton in 1925, elected to take up where Uncle George left off. Joining the State Department in 1926, the young Kennan was sent to Berlin (he already knew German) to immerse himself in Russian language and history. Summers he worked for Loy Henderson in the Baltic States, and in 1933, when the United States at last decided to recognize the Soviet Union, he went to Moscow with Ambassador William C. Bullitt.

Unlike Ambassador Joseph Davies, unlike that other Russian expert, Chip Bohlen, George Kennan was always suspicious of the ultimate objectives of the Soviet state. Perhaps it is significant that his career languished when Harry Hopkins was telling Franklin Roosevelt that Stalin could be wangled into behaving after the war. During the dark days of his career, Kennan, an introspective, sensitive person, developed stomach ulcers. But toward the end of 1945 Averell Harriman, our Ambassador in Mossow, began to see through Stalin's game, which was to gain a maximum of United States material aid without promising a thing for the future. Harriman let Kennan offer his estimate of the situation in Moscow—and Kennan, in a long dispatch, recalled Washington to the fact that Stalin was a Marxist. True, others had said as much in the course of the years; William Bullitt tried to tell President Roosevelt that Stalin was not the Duke of Norfolk in 1943; Adolf Berle had said the same in 1944. These men had laid their diplomatic careers on the line in the "appease Russia" period and had lost out. But Kennan, who had lived through the "everything for Russia with no return commitments" phase, was listened to in early 1946. What he said, in effect, was that the Soviet believed in the vulnerability of world capitalism and would stall until such time as it could take advantage of world economic depression. But he also said in essence that Russia, the great, fluid state that occupies the plain that stretches from Poland to the Pacific, would give ground if confronted by firmness in the united West. The specifically Marxist theory is to strike when "inner contradictions" paralyze capitalism; the purely Russian theory, derived from the time when the dukes of Muscovy were fighting the Mongols over endless plains, was to retreat in times of weakness to a position that could be held.

Since the only power in the world that could possibly menace the United States at the moment is Russia, the appointment of Kennan to head a long-term planning group has symbolic significance. But it is a significance that is not unfriendly to a Russia that is willing to cease the Marxist game of promoting discord and world revolution. That is the point which you, Robert Lovett, should clearly grasp.

The Kennan staff is in process of being assembled as you take over. For example John Davies, who has been in Moscow, has come home to join it. The appointment of Davies to the Kennan staff may be a good one, but you should be warned that John Davies was once Gen. Joseph Stilwell's political officer—and "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell was until his recall the symbolic head of the anti-Chiang, pro-Chinese-Communist movement that later did its best to unseat Pat Hurley as Ambassador in Chungking. Davies may or may not support what has become known as the John Carter Vincent Chinese policy—which would treat Chinese Communists as simple agrarian democrats and merge them into the government of China without due thought to their containment as a disruptive element. But the point is that personalities in the State Department date from different periods—and they often have a lack of broad consistency. I am not urging you to underwrite the right wing of the Kuomintang in China; it might be sounder policy to encourage the emergence of certain democratic middle groups. But I am urging you to be wary of equating communism and liberalism anywhere.

It is often said that Chinese communism is different. But the Marxism that is followed by Stalin does not regard the world as divisible into different capitalisms; they are all supposedly subject to the same laws that allegedly push democratic capitalism into the phases of imperialism and monopoly. The other side of this Marxist coin should be equally plain; no communisms are different in the final analysis.

Now, in this letter to you, Robert Lovett, I don't want to a Red baiter. I am willing to admit that John Carter Vincent, who is going out into the field this summer when he relinquishes his job as boss of the Far Eastern office of the State Department, is anti-Chiang Kai-shek for honest pro-American reasons. The Kuomintang, no doubt,

has its corrupt aspects, and no doubt any money we send to China should be accompanied by United States advisers to help them spend it for truly productive purposes. But it makes no sense to oppose Russian infiltration in Greece, Turkey, and Iran, and to protest against it in Hungary and Austria, while we actively maneuver to increase Russian penetration of China. Somehow, sometime this must dawn on President Truman—and you, as the top-ranking assistant to Marshall and the voice of consistency in the State Department, might properly argue the case with your superior, George Marshall. He, having been the instrument of Truman's inconsistency for the period of a year in the Far East, is in a psychologically bad position to begin an argument with himself.

If you elect to become a force for unity in our foreign policy, however, you may run into a refractory situation. While Dean Acheson has honestly changed his mind about the nature of Soviet dynamism, it is still a fact that the State Department has never had a house cleaning. If John Carter Vincent is no longer to head the Far Eastern Office certain people who have been in charge of digesting information for him will undoubtedly linger on at the information desks to digest for his successor. The working-level men are in many respects more powerful than their superiors—for they set facts in perspective before the facts are sent up to be acted upon.

Having changed his own mind about Stalin's foreign policy, Dean Acheson did noble work in giving a tip to the Iranian Embassy that resulted in successful firmness at Tehran in the face of Soviet maneuvering to split Iran. But before Dean changed his mind he was spokesman for an appease Russia attitude. He attacked General MacArthur at the precise moment when the Communists were turning their guns on the general because of his efficient methods of instituting the occupation of Japan. MacArthur had never done anything to controvert the fact that Washington not his own conscience, sets broad policy for Japan, yet Acheson chose to make it appear otherwise. Why? Who put him up to it? These questions have never been answered. Acheson also appeared on the same platform at Madison Square Garden with the Red Dean of Canterbury to address a Communist-supported mass meeting.

While Acheson showed great ability to learn from the cables from Europe, he never did anything to disturb the people who had once used him. You, Robert Lovett, are left with these people on your hands. If they, too, have changed their minds under the impact of events, then there is no real case for house cleaning in the State Department. But you should be aware that they once pushed Dean Acheson into doing the work of the appease Stalin school. If you are properly aware of this you will be in a position to gage their present loyalties and practices and to make recommendations to Marshall accordingly.

With a planning board and a secretariat and the 9:30 conference to speed the work and to tune up the thinking of the State Department, the United States is at last in a good technical position to cope with the outer world. But there are still some things to be done. The Kennan planning board might be made more effective if it were to be entrusted with making an audit, an inventory, of United States resources along the lines proposed by Senator VANDENBERG on June 13. If we know what margin of goods and services we have to play with, we will be in a better position to decide just what percentage of the national energy should be devoted annually to world rehabilitation. The Kennan board might also set up a table of priorities in rehabilitation; it might well appear that a little food devoted to strengthening the muscles of Ruhr coal miners would be worth the expenditure of millions of dollars elsewhere. One hopes the Europeans will themselves offer us a plan for rehabilitation on an integrated continental basis. But such a plan will have to reckon with the weakest links in the economic chain. The Kennan group should know just where the weak links are. It should also cut itself free from the incubus of the Morgenthau plan for pastoralizing Germany. This plan, while it is now more or less abandoned, still prevents certain key people from thinking constructively about making the Germans support themselves.

This letter to you, Robert Lovett, is not written out of any assumption that you can make policy. That job belongs to George Marshall and President Truman—and the American people. But even though your position is purely administrative in its functional aspects, no man who holds it should be innocent of certain realities. The Under Secretary must be the eyes and ears of the policymakers—and it is futile to argue that eyes and ears do not affect the decisions of the brain.

So here's wishing you well. I don't know how you are going to find good men to carry out the work of the Department in all spheres—first-rate people just don't want to work for the Government when they can make more money elsewhere. Perhaps we need some system of scholarships for youths who might wish to be State Department career men. That is a good subject for argument in the near future. But even though you will have to make shift with some Old-School-Tie people who have lost the faculty for energetic conduct of their work, even though you may have to get along with ex-fellow travelers in certain spots, I know that you yourself are as capable as they come. May your shadow never grow less—and may it be cast where it will do the most good in bringing the world back to the ways of peaceful production.

Long-Term Planning Essential to Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is the present intention of Congress to adjourn on or about July 26.

Although this Congress has made an excellent good record in passing many bills, there is still a great deal of work left unfinished. Under the Reorganization Act, Congress will not meet again until January 3, 1948.

With world events moving so fast, Congress must be available for immediate call to cope with possible emergencies. There is some likelihood that the acceptance of the Marshall plan will materialize during the summer months. If a substantial number of the European nations decide to cooperate, Congress will have to act quickly on whether or not Marshall's suggestions will be put into action. This will mean weeks of debate on the terms of our participation in the plan and additional weeks of debate on the amount of assistance to be made available for the rehabilitation of the countries of Europe participating in the Marshall plan.

Recent disclosures about the security measures surrounding the atomic energy plants give rise to some apprehension as to how soon other nations will perfect their atomic research projects.

Although it is not a probability, it is not entirely out of the realm of possibility that an unfriendly foreign nation might develop new atomic bombs within the next 3 or 4 years.

An atom bomb dropped on the city of Washington, D. C., would probably completely disorganize our entire Government. No plans as yet have been made for this possible emergency. It is my sincere belief that we should prepare for such an emergency by devising a master plan of government which would, in effect, anticipate the horrible possibilities of atomic war. Some practical method for managing and operating this Nation at a location away from Washington, D. C., should be devised.

I do not wish to be classified as an alarmist. This idea is not a new one and it has been timidly put forth by many outstanding thinkers in national, political, and economic circles. However, I feel that the time has come to press for definite action. Congress should devote some time this summer to setting up a committee to investigate ways and means of carrying on our Government activities in an orderly manner in the event that an atom bomb should fall on Washington and wipe out the majority of our national political leaders in the United States.

I heartily recommend to my colleagues that we give some thought to recessing with the view of coming back into session for a month or 6 weeks late in September or October to consider the proposal of providing for the administration of government in case of a serious disaster befalling our National Capital.

The Preservation of the American Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention the annual report of the National Desertion Bureau, Inc., of New York City. This splendid institution, whose origin dates back 42 years ago, is dedicated to the rebuilding of homes broken by desertion. Though sponsored and supported by Jewish philanthropic agencies, its free service is available to non-Jews. Based upon many years of intimate experience, Mr. Charles Zunser, secretary and executive director, has embodied in this report a number of very constructive recommendations designed to strengthen the family. Copies of the complete report may be secured by addressing National Desertion Bureau, 67 West Forty-seventh Street, New York City 19, N. Y. Portions of this valuable report are here reproduced:

There is strong evidence that the institution of the family, throughout western civilization is going through a crisis. When

divorce statistics show that one out of every three American marriages ends in the divorce court, it is time for everyday folks, let alone our leaders and thinkers to sit up and take notice. Recently Dr. Carle C. Zimmerman, the Harvard sociologist, no alarmist, in an address before the American Social Hygiene Association, said "Evidence indicates that our middle-class family-system has reached its maximum demoralization—or will very soon. If left alone the family system will break up before the end of the century."

Every war tends to shake the marriage institution. That America, which was perhaps less disturbed than other belligerents, should be experiencing a divorce epidemic was not expected and should end our complacency. The National Bureau, as the only agency of its kind in the world, combining the function of a legal aid and social agency in the field of domestic relations, is placed in the peculiarly sensitive position of being a repair shop, a test tube, a hospital ward, a laboratory, or a mechanism where these crises manifest themselves.

As a social agency we witness the lamentable results of family desertion: economic, physical, and mental break-down; truancy, juvenile delinquency, ending in a pattern of adult amorality and crime. As a legal-aid agency we try to cope with this vast plethora of problems with the inadequate weapons the law affords us. We seek to mend broken homes, and in cases where incurable marital gangrene has set in, we perform legal amputations.

What type of cases come to us? Let me illustrate from actual records:

Mrs. A, a recipient of public aid, asked that her husband who had deserted her and their children, be located and compelled to provide support.

Sergeant B, just returned from overseas, found his wife had disappeared with the last allotment check, their child temporarily placed. He asked that she be located.

Mr. C was receiving old age assistance. His son Louis, age 35, had not been heard from in several years. The public assistance agency requested the Bureau's aid in locating the son.

Mrs. D, who was dependent upon relatives for support, had not heard from or about her missing husband for more than 5 years and believed him dead. She had a chance to remarry. She requested aid in securing an Enoch Arden decree. She could not afford to retain an attorney. The Bureau obtained a dissolution for her on payment of the actual disbursements.

Mrs. E, a deserted wife, suffered a mental breakdown and had to be institutionalized. Her child was under care of a child placement agency which asked the Bureau to assist in locating the husband.

Mr. F, deserted his wife and children, turned up in Miami, Fla., where he went for a vacation, and an easy divorce. Through our correspondent there, the suit was successfully contested; support was secured.

Mr. G, chose Reno as his gateway to freedom. The marriage had long since gone on the rocks and was irreparable. He got his divorce but not before he was made to pay a lump sum to enable the wife to get a fresh start, and to send his children a weekly stipend.

Our 1946 intake includes referrals from 116 family, children's and law-enforcement agencies in 23 States and 15 foreign countries. We located missing persons in 2,037 cases and gave legal assistance in 1,584 situations. Some 703 family adjustments were effected without resort to court action.

Is the outlook altogether hopeless? I think not. To begin with, I believe that the present divorce rate is likely to recede considerably after the flood of hasty wartime marriages has subsided. As an institution the family needs no defense. The wealth of the Nation lies in the character of its citizens. It is the home where the child's personality is developed.

What can be done? Here are my recommendations:

1. The creation of a nonsectarian desertion bureau, modeled along lines of this agency, which has functioned so successfully for 42 years. In this connection it is well to note that there is no comparable agency in the nonsectarian field; that from its inception the bureau had accepted isolated non-Jewish cases referred to us by the courts, the law-enforcement and nonsectarian agencies we have often made use of. During the war, the United States War Department designated the bureau as one of 46 legal-aid agencies throughout the country, to handle cases, within our functional area, in behalf of servicemen and their dependents. These were, of course, taken on a nonsectarian basis. After VJ-day the various veterans' agencies have similarly referred cases to us, likewise on a nonsectarian basis, so that a fairly large segment of our intake today consists of non-Jewish cases. An analysis of new and reopened cases for the first 3 months of 1947 shows a total of 781 cases of which 133, or 17 percent, were non-Jewish. The comparative figures for a similar period in 1946 were 23.5 percent. These point to a definite need for the creation of an agency to be built on nonsectarian lines.

2. A Federal marriage and divorce statute, like Britain and Canada, with concurrent uniform legislation by the States, to prevent States from offering competitive divorce bargains and to bring greater security to children of parents who, after divorce, escape their responsibility across State lines.

3. The National Association of Legal Aid Organizations, with which we are affiliated, has sponsored a uniform divorce recognition act which has the approval of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. This proposed legislation has for its purpose the recognition of alimony judgments of sister States and their equitable enforcement. Identical bills will be offered to each of the States.

4. The prevention of hasty and ill-considered marriages by a 5-day waiting period between application and issuance of a license plus a physical and psychiatric clean bill of health. The important point is that all States must adopt similar measures.

5. Maternity vacations and care as recently inaugurated by Sweden alarmed by the declining birth rate, has taken these steps to prevent the dissolution of the family for economic causes.

6. The creation of desertion bureaus, preferably municipal, with case workers to study personality maladjustments within the family group at the inception of domestic discord symptoms, thus preventing the final break-up of the home.

7. Rational and vigorous enforcement of existing desertion laws on the part of prosecutors.

8. A Federal family-desertion act that will make the abandonment of a minor child and the crossing of a State line a Federal offense similar to the national motor-vehicle law. This will give Federal courts, where the deserter is found, jurisdiction to impose support orders without recourse to extradition and will subject offenders to the Federal probation system.

9. Extension of family courts to municipalities and counties where none exist now, with full jurisdiction in all family matters including divorce, annulment, dissolution, etc., with properly organized social service and probation departments working in conjunction with attached psychiatric clinics.

10. Proper ethical and hygienic instruction, both in school and in the home, as to marital and parental duties.

Report to Congress on Fascism Heavily Debated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press staff writer, James Marlow, has written an article, which appeared in the newspapers Sunday, July 13, 1947, on the report to Congress on fascism. This article states that the writer has gone through one of the original copies and that it is worth the time of anyone who wants to understand fascism in action.

There were only 26 copies made—1 for myself and 1 for each member of the Committee on House Administration. My copy has been and is now with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, being carefully checked before being sent to the Government Printing Office for printing.

The article is as follows:

REPORT TO CONGRESS ON FASCISM, HEAVILY DEBATED, NEAR FINISH

(By James Marlow)

Very shortly the Government will publish, for sale to the public, a booklet called Fascism in Action.

This study in dictatorship—how it works and how it gets that way—was prepared by a special staff of the Library of Congress.

Representative PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas asked that it be done. Before it could be printed for the public the House had to approve.

This it finally did after much delay and fiery debate because some Members of Congress said it was a waste of money.

The Government Printing Office will announce the price of it, which won't be much, when it's printed.

This writer has gone through original copies. It is worth the time of any one who wants to understand facism in action.

BASED ON FOREIGN STUDIES

Mr. PATMAN wanted it made public as a companion piece to Communism in Action, another booklet which the House ordered printed last year.

This, too, was prepared by the special Library of Congress staff. So far more than 400,000 copies of it have been sold.

Neither booklet deals with any evidences of communism or fascism which have appeared in this country.

One sticks to communism in Russia. The other concentrates on fascism in Germany, Japan, Italy, and Spain.

The conclusion of the long study on fascism is, roughly, that fascism means these things:

1. A dictator runs a Fascist government. He's supported by a single political party and a special class. The state, for its own so-called good, keeps everyone under its thumb.

2. Freedom, in the democratic sense understood in this country, does not exist. An individual's life means little. It is full of duties and obligations to the state.

LEISURE SUPERVISED

3. Religion is attacked if it suggests obedience to anyone else before the state, or if it emphasizes the importance and dignity of the individual.

4. An individual's leisure time is carefully supervised because the state wants to control his waking thoughts and actions.

5. Education and thinking are controlled to make the masses think and do what the dictator wants.

6. Foreign policies are aggressive, or warlike. Fascism, looking for more living room for its people, seeks to build an empire.

7. To suit its own purposes, the dictatorship directs banking and private investment.

8. The dictatorship controls foreign trade of its people to suit its own ends.

9. Labor is so controlled that free collective bargaining and self-government by labor organizations are abolished. In short: Free unions are smashed.

FARMING INTENSIFIED

10. Farming is developed intensively so the population can be fed with its own products. Its purpose is to be self-sufficient.

11. Transportation, beside carrying goods and passengers, is built up to ease unemployment and as a preparation for war.

12. Fascism goes in for big arms programs. This tends to raise living standards. But no one knows how long that could last since no big Fascist state has lasted long enough to show it.

13. Big business and big industrials are favored and strengthened. Enough private profit is permitted to let the special ruling class get rich.

Tariffs are raised. Huge sums are spent for military purposes. Not only is freedom of the individual disregarded, so are freedom in business dealings and investments, and even freedom in changing jobs.

AMVETS Organize Post in the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every Member of the House will be glad to know that a group of veterans employed in the House of Representatives have organized an AMVET post—affiliating themselves with the largest veterans' organization that has come out of the recent war.

The unit will be known as the House of Representatives Post, No. 19, District of Columbia.

Several months ago the House approved a congressional charter for this great and youthful organization and last week the United States Senate Judiciary Committee placed the measure on the Senate Calendar for final adoption.

Thus AMVETS will be the first and only veterans' organization of World War II to be officially recognized by the Congress.

The post was organized by J. H. Leib, former national legislative director of AMVETS.

The acting commander and cofounder of the post is Lucian O. Hunter, Jr., legislative aid in the Speaker's lobby.

Among the charter post members are:

Karl Standish, clerk of the House Veterans' Committee.

Allan M. Ames, Assistant Doorkeeper.

Richard G. Jefford, Assistant Sergeant at Arms.

Jack W. Watson, clerk to House Administrative Committee.

Howes W. Meade, Member of Congress.

S. A. Morichetti, House gallery doorkeeper.

Richard A. Micheel.

Millard B. Rice.

Wesley H. Wilson, Capitol policeman.

Joseph L. Bowles.

William E. Brady, House gallery doorkeeper.

James C. Hunter, House post office.

An organizational meeting to elect officers will be called this week, and the post charter will remain open for additional members.

A letter welcoming the post into the organization follows:

AMVETS, AMERICAN VETERANS
OF WORLD WAR II,
July 11, 1947.

LUCIAN O. HUNTER, JR.,
Acting Commander, Post No. 19,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR AMVET HUNTER: It is a great honor and pleasure for me, on behalf of the District Department of AMVETS, to welcome you and your members of Post No. 19, House of Representatives, to the department.

We feel very fortunate to have posts in the Senate and House. We know you will be active with us and help AMVETS become the leading organization for the veterans of World War II.

Yours in AMVETS,

REGIS COLE,
Executive Secretary.

An Editorial by W. Harvey Hurt in the Wayne County News, Waynesboro, Miss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith a timely editorial which appeared in the Wayne County News of Wayne County, Miss.

When we think of the possibility of World War III, we are awed almost into insensibility with the implications of what such a holocaust would mean. Certainly, no man or group of men with any degree of love of his fellowman, could, in his right mind, think of bringing another such tragedy upon the world.

Mr. Harvey Hurt, the editor of the Wayne County News, has evidently been giving some serious thought to this question.

Possibly the best assurances that we have that such a thing might not happen is in the gruesomeness of the thought itself.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I recall that shortly after World War II in a conversation with that great British war leader and statesman, Winston Churchill, I raised this question. I asked him what assurances we had that once Russia came into possession of the secrets of the atomic bomb, she would not send a fleet of bombers to unload these deadly instruments upon Britain or America in a sneak attack similar to the Pearl Harbor tragedy. Mr. Churchill replied that the best assurances that he could think of was that the Russians would have no assurances that the next night we would not retaliate by destroying the principal cities of Russia.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we contemplate the possibility of a new world with even more deadly implements of warfare than those used in the last war, we can get some comfort out of Mr. Churchill's philosophy.

The editorial from the Wayne County News follows:

NATIONS SEEK NEW WEAPONS

It is an indication of the state of the world today that every time someone makes a suggestion for world disarmament, it is received respectfully, but with complete pessimism as to the possibility of achieving it. No sane man can help but be appalled by the cost of the world's present military establishments or by their obvious threat to a prolonged peace. But the hope that something tangible can be done to cure this—a hope that was held high at the end of World War I—is almost totally lacking now. The truth is that the world is actively engaged in an armament race which is of an unprecedented character.

In the last war there were only two major new weapons—the atomic bomb and the German guided missiles. All other weapons simply represented developments of lethal instruments which had long been in existence and involved no revolutionary principles. Some basic weapons, such as the rifle, have been essentially unchanged in generations. And even a block buster is simply an evolutionary advance on the small aerial bombs of the First World War.

Today's armament race does not follow the classic pattern of attempting to produce and store more standard weapons than the competing nations. Its emphasis is largely on new weapons. As a consequence, much of the race is being run in the laboratories, rather than in the munitions factories.

This, of course, is particularly true of atomic weapons. Our atomic-bomb plants are still going at full capacity, and the work being done is as completely shrouded in secrecy as in wartime. The Russians are known to have put a number of the leading German nuclear physicists to work on atomic research and to have given it No. 1 priority among their own scientists. No one outside of Russia knows just how much progress has been made.

It would be a grave mistake, however, to let the terrible potentialities of atomic power blind us to other possible innovations in the bloody art of warfare. Our own Army has been carrying on extensive experiments with guided missiles, using the seized German equipment, and other armies are unquestionably following suit. This is one of the most ominous weapons yet devised, and some experts believe that had the European war lasted another year or so, German technicians might have been able to develop it to the point where it would have crushed England. When the latest type of bombs appeared, England established a strict censorship to keep knowledge of the damage done from becoming known to the world. These weapons were particularly terrifying in that their speed was so great they outran their own sound. Thus, the explosion took place before the missile was ever heard.

What kept them from becoming a decisive factor was their inaccuracy. They could be aimed to hit a section of a city—but they could not be controlled with sufficient accuracy to strike a particular target, such as a plant or an arsenal. Present efforts are directed at perfecting the guiding equipment and giving them the accuracy of artillery.

Pilotless aircraft, controlled by extremely advanced radio equipment, is another subject of intensive research. Planes are infinitely cheaper and more abundant than crews—at the end of the last war we were producing aircraft much more rapidly than we could train men to man them. If a truly efficient and reliable pilotless air force could be developed, the deadliness of war in the air would be multiplied manyfold. Enormous fleets could be sent against enemy targets, and the losses would be in material, not in men.

At intervals there is discussion of the possibilities of bacteriological warfare. Even in the first war it was rumored to be impending, though nothing came of it. The problems in the way are enormous—foremost among them being some means of protecting the user's own people from retaliation in kind. Germs do not respect boundaries. Again, means of distributing bacteria may be an unsolved problem. But in these days, when science seems to be on the verge of outdistancing the ability of man to control it, no innovation can be considered impossible. And no one can believe that in a war of extermination any belligerent would let moral scruple stand in the way of the employment of any killer.

A little news has seeped out concerning the United States War Department's plans in the event of another war. The atomic bomb has made it necessary to plan on the widest possible decentralization of authority—if one city or a dozen cities were wiped out, there would have to be a super command post ready to take over elsewhere. There has been much serious discussion of putting certain essential industrial plants underground, either in natural or constructed caves. The cost of this would be incredible—but no one yet seems to have devised any other defense against the A-bomb.

Perhaps the almost inconceivable destructiveness of weapons now being developed will, in the long run, be an assurance of peace—for the simple reason that another war might literally mean the destruction of civilization. General Eisenhower touched on this vividly when he said: "The earth may become a flowering garden or a sterile desert—and we may make the difference."

GI Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy GI home loans approved by the Veterans' Administration was recently discontinued. My amendment to continue this authority in the RFC was defeated in the House by the narrow margin of 12 votes on June 24, 1947. Immediately thereafter I introduced a separate bill to accomplish the same result. This bill is H. R. 3974, introduced on June 25, 1947.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the United States News on July 11, 1947, entitled "Future of Veterans' Loans," and a copy of H. R. 3974:

FUTURE OF VETERANS' LOANS—INCREASED RISK FOR PRIVATE LENDERS, WITH RFC BACKING ELIMINATED

THREAT TO GI HOUSING BOOM WHERE LOCAL BANKS BALK AT BIGGER MORTGAGE LOAD

Private lenders now are put on notice that they will have to assume at least half of the risk when they make home loans to veterans. This may bring a sudden end to the GI housing boom in areas where local capital is running low.

What has happened is this:

Congress has taken away authority of Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy up GI home loans approved by Veterans' Administration. Under the GI bill of rights, VA guarantees 50 percent of real estate loans to veterans up to a maximum guarantee of $4,000. Veterans have borrowed $4,200,000,000 under this program. About one-third of all nonfarm mortgages written in the last year have been GI mortgages. Their value represents one-eighth of the value of all nonfarm residential mortgages outstanding today.

With RFC in the field ready to pay the full face value of loans offered by original lenders, there existed, in effect, a 100 percent guarantee of GI loans by the Government. Congress approved that backing for GI loans last August. It kept the GI homes program moving at high speed.

Actually, RFC's part in this loan business was on a small scale during the 11 months when it could buy GI mortgages. Only $63,000,000 worth of mortgages was in RFC hands on May 31, and the total bought before the June 30 deadline is not expected to exceed $90,000,000.

But builders and lenders knew the agency was there to support the market any time money was needed, or loans began to go sour. Too, as smaller banks in the South and Southwest began to get more requests for real estate financing than they wanted to handle, they started to sell an increasing amount of GI mortgage paper to RFC. A bank that had loaned $10,000 to a veteran, for example, with VA approving the deal, could sell the mortgage on the veteran's house for $10,000, less whatever payments had been made, to RFC. And the RFC would pay the bank one-half of 1 percent for continuing to collect the principal and interest payments from the veterans involved.

With RFC out of the field, however, banks and other lenders must find buyers for their mortgage holdings in the investment public. Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, who led the fight to prohibit this RFC activity, argued that, if the public did not support the GI home-loan market, any additional Government action should come through amendment to the GI bill of rights rather than by "going through the back door of the RFC."

Public interest in buying GI loans appears limited. Here and there premiums of 1 to 1½ percent have been paid for such mortgages, but buying is confined to the safest loans.

Result is that lenders no longer can count on a sure and quick market for GI loan paper. This means that banks and mortgage companies which already have invested heavily in GI loans may balk at putting any more money into such loans.

That, in fact, is just what will happen, as officials see it. T. B. King, Director of VA's Loan Guaranty Service, reports that many builders have been promised operating funds by lenders who themselves had planned to use the RFC purchase market to get their own money back quickly. These builders now may have to abandon or delay construction plans.

A substantial number of banks in small cities and towns say they will not have any more money to lend on GI homes unless they can sell some of the mortgages. Prospect, thus, is that builders will have to find new sources of operating funds.

Trouble now indicated in GI home loans will be the first set-back this program has encountered. The record to date on GI real-estate loans is nearly all good. Out of 736,687 home loans approved by the end of May, only 370 had been defaulted and only 1,923 defaults were pending. About 1,000 home loans have been paid off in full.

But VA does not minimize the potential troubles involved in a program of the size it has undertaken. In the early days of the loan program, excessive appraisals often were approved; loans have been made during a period of peak prices, which already are beginning to weaken down payments, and thus the veterans' equities in the houses under loan, are small. All these weak spots will show up in any widespread economic adjustment, and, in that case, home-loan defaults would go high.

As to the long-term future, there will be at least 16,000,000 veterans of World War II, nearly all of them eligible to get VA guarantees on loans. If half of them take up their home-loan privileges to the limit, VA will have guaranteed, over all, $32,000,000,000 worth of real-estate mortgages. The agency has set up a Property Management Section to take care of foreclosure problems as they may arise.

Business loans to veterans are not affected by RFC's withdrawal. Where a lender will put up the money, veterans still can offer a VA guarantee of one half the loan up to $2,000. But lenders have been cautious. Only about 70,000 business loans are on VA books, with a face value of about $213,000,000. Defaults are recorded on 1,400 and another 1,238 are pending, most occurring through failure of trucking and entertainment enterprises.

H. R. 3974

A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to acquire home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in addition to other powers granted to it by any other act of Congress, shall also be authorized, within the limitations provided in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, to provide for original mortgagees a market for home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by the purchase, administration, and disposition of such loans directly, or through national banks, acting as agents or as trustees.

Why Sell Our Oil Abroad?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD an editorial taken from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of July 7, 1947.

I consider this article most apropos of our present policy of exporting vital commodities, and I believe it should be of interest. The editorial follows:

WHY SELL OUR OIL ABROAD?

A man who knows what he is talking about points to the rapidly dwindling oil reserves of

the United States and definite danger for the future.

The danger is not only that the United States might disastrously drain its oil supplies in peacetime—but that in wartime we wouldn't have enough oil of our own to supply our planes, ships, and plants.

The man is Edwin W. Pauley, one of the best-known oilmen in the United States. He is, in addition to being an expert on oil and a man with large interests in oil, an adviser to the United States Government on certain important phases of foreign relations.

He is the official adviser on reparations to the United States Government and as such he has visited most of the major foreign countries.

In particular, he has been in the Orient and he has had personal experience with the tough and realistic attitude which Soviet Russia is taking toward her nearby neighbors and the rest of the world.

Mr. Pauley, visiting in Honolulu, says that if there should be another World War, the United States would have to tighten its belt on oil consumption far more strictly even than in World War II.

Moreover, the United States would have to get foreign oil to augment its own depleted supplies.

Mr. Pauley did not say so, but the United States might have to pay an exorbitant if not a terrible price for any oil we should get, in wartime from foreign soil.

And at this very time when oilmen view with alarm the steady drainage of our precious reserves, we are selling oil abroad—including notably, Soviet Russia.

Only a few days ago the Star-Bulletin carried the story of lubricating oil, grease and drums or containers being loaded aboard a Russian freighter for shipment to a Soviet port.

Now the irony of this is that Soviet Russia has abundant oil of her own. She has within her own boundaries some of the richest oil fields in the world. She has, in some of her satellite countries, much other oil available. And in case of need, Russia won't hesitate to go right into those satellite countries—with armed force, if necessary—and take what oil she wants.

In the face of these facts the policy of the United States in continuing to allow shipment of oil abroad begins to look like sheer folly.

And it is a grim reminder to Honolulu of the days when Japan was buying scrap iron in the United States—and moving it through this port to her ship plants and munitions factories. Japan was getting ready to turn the deadly might of her war machine on Pearl Harbor, on the Philippines, on Midway, on the Aleutians, and on American soldiers, sailors, and marines dying at Guadalcanal and elsewhere in the Pacific.

But, until only a few months before Pearl Harbor it was "business as usual" for Uncle Sam with Japan.

We "couldn't afford" to take the decisive step of shutting off Japan from our scrap iron.

Stalin's Sucker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop from the Washington Times-Herald of July 15, 1947:

STALIN'S SUCKER

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Rarely does an old-school, career diplomat ever spill the inside story of his trade. So it will pay you by any test to get a copy of the current issue of Life and read the piece by Arthur Bliss Lane, who resigned as United States Ambassador to Poland just to be free to write it.

The sum of it all is that Stalin's favorite chump or sucker during the recent war was the late F. D. Roosevelt, for whose folly Poland is paying now in blood, and the whole world may next find itself paying, too.

The tragedy of Poland is, of course, the central crime and horror of World War II. It is a crime in which the United States has its share of guilt and so do England and France.

England and France, in early 1939, worked a confidence game on the Poles by promising them effective help if they would defy Hitler. The Poles fell for it and in September of that year found themselves invaded by Germany and Germany's ally, Russia, while England and France went into the sitzkrieg.

The Poles were just brave fools. They were sure their friends would not let them down. This writer was talking the other day with a young Polish refugee. Said the Pole:

"We were so sure the English and French were coming that even when the Nazis and the Reds were right on top of us we wouldn't give up hope. I remember one day the wild excitement in our village. We heard the French had cut clear through Germany and their troop trains were spreading over Poland.

"Actually, some firemen from Warsaw were passing through on the train to some other place to show people there how to fight fire bombs. But the sight of those unfamiliar uniforms was all we needed. It took weeks for the truth to sink in."

The truth, in fact, never did sink in with the Poles from 1939 to 1945. They fought the Germans. They fought the Russians. They ran an underground government at home, another government in exile in London, they raised an under-cover Army in Poland and built another Army in exile that fought in the air over England, across the desert in Africa and up Italy.

The Poles believed that in the end their bravery and love of freedom would be justified in history, even though bravery and the love of freedom were costing them their young men and women, and for that matter their old ones, too, at a sacrificial rate beyond any other nation's.

They were willing to stand it, for the Poles believed that Poland would be restored and free when the war ended.

Arthur Bliss Lane, in this Life piece abovementioned, lets you know in detail just how cruelly the Poles were deceived by false friends.

Just to give it to you quick, here is what he tells about his visit with President Roosevelt to get orders before leaving for Warsaw:

"I said that the Soviet view * * * of an independent Poland was quite different from ours. The President replied that he had entire confidence in Stalin's word and felt sure he would not go back on it."

There it is. Arthur Bliss Lane is no schoolboy, nor is he a tattletale. He is a serious-minded professional dealer in relations between nations with 31 years' experience in positions of great trust and importance.

Roosevelt, in 1944, had convinced himself that he had entire confidence in Stalin's word. He thought he had put the Indian sign on Bloody Joe after one easy session of the Roosevelt charm school. Such vanity.

So Lane went on to Poland, and there he found and documented the evidence that Life sums up under the headings:

"How the Communists rigged the Polish elections."

"Why the deputy foreign minister bossed his boss."

"How Poland was sold down the river at Yalta."

"Why the government officials have shifty eyes."

"Who the Kremlin's top agent in Poland is."

"How Poles disappear overnight."

It is all fascinating, as any great and monstrous tragedy is fascinating. It is also a story to make any American ashamed because our Government played such a disgraceful part in deceiving the Poles and helping to deliver them to Stalin.

No need to repeat the details of Lane's piece here, except to say that they include many items you may have read first in the Times-Herald as they were happening.

Such things as the Russian double-cross of the Polish underground army of "General Bor" that led these brave and foolish Poles out where the Germans could wipe them out while a Russian Army sat down 10 miles away to watch.

Also, how the Russians kidnaped the 15 Polish leaders who followed the lead F. D. gave them at Yalta and undertook to negotiate with the Kremlin. All they negotiated was their own destruction.

The above and many other stories of the same kind were first told in the Times-Herald during the war. They were denied and denounced as lies. Now you can read them again, furnished by a man who learned the facts officially.

The value of Lane's report is that it shows us just what kind of a character Stalin is. And whether Lane meant to do so or not, it also adds some more dope on F. D. R., whom history now begins to bill publicly, "Stalin's sucker."

Story With a Moral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George S. Benson:

STORY WITH A MORAL

(By George S. Benson, president, Harding College, Searcy, Ark.)

One time there was a young man, the younger son of a well-to-do farmer. Times were good, prices were high. It was a period of prosperity for everybody. Apparently spending had got to be a habit with most of the folks in that community. At any rate, this son saw that others were having a good time spending money. Since everybody's doing it, he thought, why shouldn't I enjoy myself?

So this fine young man who had all the opportunities one could wish for, and a brilliant future in sight, kept after his father until one day "the old man settled him off" with a good deal of money. This country boy then went to town, and set out to have himself a better time than he had ever had before. He spent more money than he had ever spent before. Friends were numerous. Playboy super de luxe, this young man had swarms of lady friends. But they required money.

HE ACHIEVED WISDOM

Now, you are wondering, if you have read this far, whether this misguided and pampered lad ever quit spending. He did. He quit spending when a depression set in, for that was the time when he found himself unable to obtain any more money. At this

point, our broken-down playboy began to think. Wisdom was forced upon him and he learned the hard way. He found he couldn't even buy a sandwich, and panhandling was out of the question. Rather than starve, he took a farm job feeding pigs.

If this lad had done what some of our so-called statesmen advocate, he would have continued to borrow and spend. But having thought the matter through, he went to work, even though his hunger was scarcely outdone by that of the pigs he was sent to feed. He had spent all, and he was in want. You may read the rest of this story in Luke 15, for it is the story of the prodigal son who finally came to his senses.

NO MONEY MILL

Must we, as a nation, spend all that we have before we come to our senses, like the prodigal son? With signs of depression approaching, we continue to spend and spend, apparently from habit. Doing little or nothing about our monstrous national debt of $260,000,000,000, we continue to look around trying to find things for which to appropriate money. We have come to count off our years as spending years, in terms of the next budget and appropriations bills.

It is easy to justify any and every expenditure. Constituents in each and every community represented by Senator Bloake and Congressman Doake can spout a whole book of reasons why this or that pet project must go through. Folks are inclined to think that the money for the whole thing is a gift, just because they don't see where it comes from. But the founding fathers did not leave at Washington a mill which flows out perpetual dollars.

DAY OF RECKONING

Maybe it's not a nice thought, but you can't keep on spending money without knowing where it's coming from. This was a fact the prodigal son discovered. Neither can you safely manufacture currency to carry through your spending projects. Either course will soon lead to dire results. A day of reckoning will come to a country that spends all it has, just as it did to the prodigal son. Let us have more wisdom than the prodigal, who found that he could repent only when hard times struck him.

Our spending, as opposed to saving, has created a situation that calls for the best brand of intelligent citizenship. It is already time to go to work. We must also impress upon our legislators that if they are to be statesmen, not mere politicians, they must conserve the wealth of the country rather than lavishly spend it. Without being penny-wise and pound-foolish, we ought to adopt fiscal policies that will cut down our growing debt.

Strategists Deplore Our Failure To Support China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Sunday Star of July 13, 1947:

STRATEGISTS DEPLORE OUR FAILURE TO SUPPORT CHINA—ARMY, NAVY EXPERTS HOLD STRONG, FRIENDLY CHINESE NATION IS VITAL TO AMERICA'S LINE OF DEFENSE IN PACIFIC

(By Constantine Brown)

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has ordered total mobilization in China, and this applies not only to China's manpower but to all resources the country still possesses.

The Chinese leader is fighting with his back to the wall. But it is clear to every one in China—and in Washington, too— that unless American support is forthcoming, his battle will be in vain and he will be overwhelmed in the next few months.

The American Government's attitude toward China is considered by those who attempt to read the future as one of the major errors it has committed since the end of the war.

Now, when high-ranking Army and Navy officers and many civilian officials insist that the possibility of war with Russia should not be ruled out, China assumes top strategic importance for America's national defense. In fact, it is considered as America's first line of defense in the Pacific.

EUROPEAN-MINDED

Until a few weeks ago it was not in good form to doubt Moscow's good intentions and raise the possibility of a Soviet aggression against the United States. Many vital reports on Soviet activities in western and northwestern Siberia were salted away without ever seeing the light of day, lest the American people become alarmed about Russia.

Reports that Russian submarines were spying on American naval exercises in the Pacific were designated top secret by responsible American authorities. So were the reports of feverish military activities of the Red armies in the area facing Alaska and Japan. The same was true of news that the Russians were establishing important military airfields in the same area.

There have been no indiscretions in official quarters about the astounding progress of construction of railways and other communications throughout Siberia. But all this information, which exists in the files of responsible Government departments, adds up to but one thing: Such activities on the part of Moscow leaders are inexplicable unless they harbor hostile intentions with respect to Alaska and northwestern Canada.

This possibility—distasteful as it is—should not be hidden from the American public. But the long tradition of excluding the American public from its Government's confidence in matters of foreign affairs still stands today, as it did in pre-Pearl Harbor days.

PROVED LOYALTY

It is admitted in military quarters—although not in the State Department—that a strong China, friendly to the United States, would be an effective deterrent to Russia's plans in the Pacific area. The American people are European-minded right now because the Government, the press, and the radio place great emphasis on that part of the world, rather than on the Far East. Americans are traditionally European-minded and went to war twice to save that continent. The Far East is regarded as hopeless and relatively unimportant.

In its early stages the last war created the fear that American territory could be invaded by the Germans, either from Britain—if it fell—or from North Africa. The blow came, however, from the only other major Pacific power—Japan.

Today the U. S. R. R. is only a stone's throw from Alaska, one of the weakest spots in the American armor. It is admitted in Washington military quarters that little has been done to fortify Alaska and the chances of adding to its defenses right now are limited. Yet it is admitted in the same quarters that if a hostile power were to establish itself in that area, the security of the west coast would be seriously jeopardized.

The attention of the American public is focused on the Balkans, France, Italy, and Germany. We are now considering spending billions of dollars to rehabilitate Europe, in the belief that this will assure our own safety. Yet no one speaks seriously of strengthening our position in the Far East.

REJECTED JAP OFFER

Since the end of 1944 there has been much talk about the corruption of the Chinese Government and the dictatorial powers of General Chiang. From the State Department came inspiration for the charge that China is rotten to the core, as are the leaders of the national government.

It may be true that the top men in China, such as T. V. Soong and the Kung brothers, are no model of honesty. It is equally true that General Chiang is a dictator, less so, however, than Prime Minister Stalin or Marshal Tito and certainly more friendly to America than to any other western power.

But General Chiang and his corrupt government have given ample proofs of loyalty to the United States. The fact is seldom mentioned that General Chiang rejected Premier Tojo's offer of an honorable peace shortly after Pearl Harbor and after the Japanese had conquered Singapore, Malaya, and the Philippines.

According to information only now coming out, the Japanese offered to recognize General Chiang as the supreme leader of China and told him that the two countries would share exclusive domination of Asia, at the expense of the white races. Russia was to be kicked out of Siberia, which was to be taken over by the Japanese, while a Chinese-Japanese campaign would liberate India.

Although that moment was the darkest for the United States, General Chiang turned down what appeared to be a tempting offer and continued to fight with what little he had. If he had accepted the Japanese proposal, Allied victory might have been postponed for many years.

Some State Department officials maintain privately that General Chiang is too shrewd a man not to have realized that victory would finally be on the Allied side. If he is as shrewd as that, he also would have realized that his position would not have been more desperate than it is today if he had gone over to the enemy.

The fact is that General Chiang believed China would recover only with the help of the United States and he had no reason to doubt our sincerity of purpose. It was the American Government which in 1931 started the ball rolling against the Japanese aggression in Manchuria, as it had earlier offered its services when the Russians in 1929 tried to take over a part of Manchuria.

FOUGHT REDS

The American Government did its utmost to supply China with equipment and war materials while it was fighting the Japanese single-handed, and Mr. Hull went on record—just as Mr. Stimson did before him—in opposition to any partition of the young Chinese Republic. It was under the administration of President Hoover that we enunciated the doctrine of nonrecognition of Japanese conquests in Manchuria, and the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was precipitated by our determination not to let Japan expand on the Asiatic mainland.

All these facts were well-known not only to General Chiang but also to his corrupt advisers, who saw no profit in the tremendous bribes offered them after Pearl Harbor by the Japanese. Yet since 1945 we have done much to weaken the position of the only Chinese Government which still enjoys recognition of the world powers.

China has been fighting communism for the last 20 years. After flirting with Russia in the twenties, General Chiang realized the pitfalls of Soviet friendship. He expelled the military mission headed by the Communist leader, Mikhail Borodin, whom Moscow had sent to help General Chiang's regime. General Chiang began fighting the Communists with the smiling approval of Washington. It is true that he made peace on one or two occasions with the Communists who were

cooperating with his divisions, particularly in the defense of Shanghai in 1937. But these were only incidental compromises, as occur in all Chinese civil wars.

PRESSURE ON CHIANG

After VJ-day General Chiang, who was aware that the Communists headed by the Moscow puppet, Mao Tse-tung, would prevent an early recovery of China, wanted to use his American-trained divisions to end the Communist movement. He told some of our representatives, including Ambassador Patrick Hurley, that unless he disposed of the organized rebels while his military power remained, China would become the scene of a bitter civil war.

The United States opposed his plans. The State Department and a part of the press and radio told General Chiang that he must bring the Communists into the government and try to work with them. His argument that the only way to work with Moscow's tools was to surrender to them had little effect on the State Department's officials in China and in Washington.

When General Chiang demurred he was told that American assistance henceforth would be predicated on his ability to unify China by taking the Yenan government into his own. Under this pressure General Chiang agreed.

After the spectacular resignation of Ambassador Hurley General Marshall, who had just given up his position as Chief of Staff, was given the thankless task of mediator between the Chiang government and the irreconcilable Communists. General Marshall went to China and extended de facto recognition to the Yenan group by organizing tripartite teams to bring about a truce in China's civil war.

STRATEGY FAILED

Although the present Secretary of State was given wider powers by President Truman than any other special Ambassador ever had, he took his inspiration from the specialists in the State Department. This group of men was wedded to the idea that the Chinese Communists had nothing to do with Moscow, that they were agrarians and reformers, and that by hook or by crook Mr. Truman's special Ambassador had to ram cooperation with Yenan down General Chiang's throat.

This failed because Mao Tse-tung's representative, Chou En-lai, adopted the Moscow strategy of making promises which he did not intend to keep. General Marshall returned to Washington denouncing both the national government and the Communists for the failure to create a united regime.

Russia stayed on the side lines. She had signed a treaty of amity with General Chiang in August 1945, but when it came to execution of that treaty, she used delaying tactics to enable the Communist armies to infiltrate Manchuria before General Chiang's troops arrived.

All kinds of obstacles were placed in the National Government's way to favor the Yenan puppets. All these were sugar-coated for the good reason that there was still a strong American army in China, which under strong provocation could have acted. Frantic propaganda to get the Americans out of China was begun by the Communists and so-called liberal newspapers and radio commentators.

CHIANG'S PLIGHT

But General Chiang still had American-trained divisions which were no match for the Russian and Japanese-trained Communists. He had obtained the promise of a loan from Washington to bolster his forces. The amount earmarked by the Export-Import Bank was $500,000,000. But he soon discovered that American laws would not permit him to buy military equipment in this country. The money could, however, he thought, be used to alleviate China's acute economic crisis.

This crisis was ascribed by the political philosophers in the State Department to the crookedness of the Chiang administration. In fact, however, it was impossible for the Nanking government to remedy the situation when the country was in the throes of war against the Yenan Communists, who are receiving strong support from Russia.

SOME POSSIBILITIES

The Chinese Government is being told now by Washington that credits would be available if they are to be used for sound rehabilitation projects. How can such projects be planned by a Government which is fighting for its life? This argument is answered by our policy framers: "What about making peace with the Communists?" No such suggestion is being made by Moscow to Mao Tse-tung when he asks for military equipment and support in the persons of Japanese instructors or Korean Red-trained divisions.

The Chinese tragedy can easily affect our own security. According to American observers recently returned from China the Russians aim to place the portion of China between Manchuria and Tibet under Soviet supremacy. The rest of that vast country will be left to its own devices and recovery will be prevented by fomenting civil wars and political and economic chaos with the assistance of ambitious and unscrupulous war lords who are willing to fight for personal profit.

Under these conditions and without even America's moral support, General Chiang is expected to disappear from the Chinese scene within a year or less. The ideologists in the State Department thus will have played unwittingly into Soviet hands.

A strong and friendly China, our military and naval experts maintain, would be a serious threat to whatever aims Russia might harbor in the Western Hemisphere. With a strong Chinese Army on her flanks the Moscow leaders would think twice before deciding on any rash action.

POSITION CHANGES

Our stand in favor of the Chinese National Government since 1931, when the Japanese first entered Manchuria, a stand which brought a head-on clash with Japan in 1941, has now been changed. Policy framers in the State Department have decided that China is no longer democratic and does not deserve our support, which the military considers more important than ever in the past.

China is not a democracy in the American sense of the world. But neither was she a democracy when we came to her assistance 16 years ago. There have been no radical changes in China for ages. But there appear to have been some fundamental changes in the new policy framers in the State Department, changes which we hope will not affect America's security. However, some observers fear that mistaken ideas about foreign countries could prove expensive, indeed, for the American people.

Crisis on the Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Los Angles Times of July 3, 1947, which I consider both timely and of interest to southern California and Arizona, alike.

I should like to point out that there have been resolutions introduced in both the Senate and the House requesting the Attorney General of the United States to start suits such as this editorial recommends.

Furthermore, the House Public Lands Committee has also recommended that the Attorney General institute such action.

This editorial, I believe, clearly presents the issue. It follows:

CRISIS ON THE COLORADO

Slowly, and for the most part behind the scenes, there has been built up on the vital question of ownership of Colorado River water a situation so dangerous that it now demands to be discussed fully and openly. If it is allowed to fester any longer the vicious consequences may impair the entire course of future growth of southern California and Arizona.

The public has been slow to grasp the full gravity of the increasingly serious Colorado River deadlock.

In a series of articles last fall, the Times presented the facts involving the 25-year fight between California and Arizona over apportionment of the river's water. Those articles set in motion some forces which may tend toward an eventual settlement. But meantime the factors adding to the seriousness of the water conflict have been intensified.

For 25 years Arizona and California have not been able to agree even upon a formula to approach an understanding; they cannot now agree; and there is no prospect of an agreement in the future.

Under these circumstances, the Times recently has taken the lead, along with Gov. Earl Warren of California and Gov. Vail N. Pittman of Nevada, in exploring the possibility of a United States Supreme Court ruling on the whole complicated and tangled mass. Admittedly, a Supreme Court ruling is a final resort only after efforts at compact or arbitration have been exhausted. And all such latter efforts never appeared more hopeless than now.

At this moment the practical factors adding to the misunderstanding and ill will are multiplying fast. Arizona's great Central Valley around Phoenix is suffering an acute water shortage, lack of rainfall having left the storage spaces behind Roosevelt and other dams practically empty, and this climaxing a series of dry and terrifying years. Yet California water officials are in Washington bitterly opposing before Congress an Arizona project for diversion of Colorado River water to correct the shortage. In southern California there has been formed the aggressive Colorado River Association with Preston Hotchkis as its president to support the demands of California for Colorado River water.

Yet, in all truth, it must be admitted that the demands of some extremist elements in California are as unfair and unjustified as some similar demands by Arizona extremists.

And, all the while, 6,500,000 acre-feet a year of Colorado River water—almost half of the river's useful flow—is going to waste into the Gulf of California because it is not needed now.

Indeed, the sickening thing about the whole fight is that it is over a situation which may develop 25 or 30 years from now when the full flow of the river is in use. California tries to establish a claim which will stand up years hence. Arizona tries a retaliatory grab. Then both sides cry "Thief!" and "Robber!"

This senseless bickering and name-calling has gone on long enough.

What is needed now, under the direction of the governors of the three States most vitally involved—California, Arizona, and

Nevada—is an agreement to seek participation of the United States in a suit to determine the water rights. Otherwise the jockeying for legal advantage, extending over a period of years, is going to become more and more ridiculous and unproductive of results.

California taxpayers have a $500,000,000 stake in Colorado River water, Hoover Dam, and numerous other works. This must be protected. Yet Arizona deserves a fair deal, too. She is an intimate part of southern California's economy, with the Colorado River in reality only an artificial boundary line.

Every support should be given the present attempt in Congress to get the matter before the Supreme Court; a difficult problem in itself from a legal standpoint because the Court is reluctant to set forth "declaratory rights"—a case in which the issues have not yet jelled. Still, because the United States itself is involved so deeply because of its contract commitments to the States along the Colorado, the Court may be persuaded to take jurisdiction.

It is to be hoped it will. Every citizen of southern California should make himself fully acquainted with the details of this controversy. It involves every drop of water coming out of the tap. It involves, literally, the Southwest's "last water hole."

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Press, St. Marys, Pa., for July 11, 1947:

MILITARY TRAINING

Many organizations and individuals with laudable purposes in mind are opposed to universal military training, believing steps in that direction lead to war.

We would like to know what they propose substituting for an armed nation that faces a constant threat as does America at this time.

The majority of World War I veterans can tell you the price this Nation paid for unpreparedness, and the lesson was repeated, far more costly in World War II for the same pacifist reasons.

A burglar intent on robbing your home will not be scared off by soft words.

A nation that has its eyes on the wealth of America will not be dissuaded from its purpose by pleas for world-wide disarmament.

When World War I was over this Nation in a gesture toward peace towed to sea and sank what then represented the most powerful naval force in the world.

The one man who told United States the next war would be won by superior air power was literally kicked out of the Army, his name besmirched until later facts proved his accurate forecasting.

All this was done in the name of world peace, the seeking for something tangible. We led the way in promoting peace for all nations and all we got from it was the further arming of such nations as Japan and Germany, World War II foes.

No one wants to see universal conscription become a fixed policy in United States, but there remains no alternative at the present time that we can see.

Realists know that in this present unsettled state of affairs America needs to be alert. We only have to recall here the slimy Soviet espionage work in Canada in getting data on the atomic bomb to realize that country does not recognize anything but brute force.

We have seen the United Nations sink lower and lower in public prestige. It has yet to raise its voice in protest over the Russian seizure of Hungary.

When you put all these things together they spell the need for an adequate armed America.

And as far as can be seen the only way to accomplish that is by universal military training by making every boy at 18 liable to 1 year military service.

He may never have to go to war, but if he does he will, at least, be prepared for it, not thrown into conflict with little knowledge of the weapons he must use as was frequently the case in two world wars.

America has paid a tremendous price for the preservation of the freedom it now enjoys.

Would it hurt any 18-year-old lad to spend 12 months of his life in carrying on that freedom?

We agree with what Cy Peterman, war correspondent of the Philadelphia Inquirer, had to say on the subject when he said:

"If it only teaches young men to say 'No, sir' and 'Yes, sir,' it will have accomplished something worth while."

But that would not be our only reason for favoring such a training program. It would mean the future security of America, a guaranty this would remain a Nation of free men and free women long after this generation has answered its last summons.

What we have enjoyed in the way of human liberties should be passed on to succeeding generations so the Statue of Liberty has the same meaning in years to come as it does today.

Universal military training will be an expensive proposition, but only a fragmentary cost of what total war would be.

World Collectivism by Compulsion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, as our State Department representatives are now in Geneva negotiating trade agreements and formulating plans for the International Trade Organization, division of the United Nations, it is encouraging to find an editor now and then who is informed and has the courage to speak out. During extensive hearings on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements this spring by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, it was demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that by and large the agreements had operated to the detriment of American industries and agriculture. Now comes the International Trade Organization which is the subject of an editorial by Mr. Edward Swint, editor of the Point Pleasant (W. Va.) Register. His conclusions are correct.

The International Trade Organization and the International Refugee Organization are organizations set up under the United Nations, and if carried to their ultimate conclusions will permit the free flow of merchandise and people between countries. It is readily observed that the United States will be the sole loser under this arrangement. It is plainly evident that we are on the road to surrendering two basic rights we have held sacred for 150 years—the control of immigration and the control of the importation of merchandise.

The editorial follows:

AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL NOT SUBMIT TO THIS PROPOSAL

While Congress has been wrestling with such domestic problems as new labor legislation, cutting the Budget, and a bill for the reduction of income taxes, some of the global planners of the State Department, led by Will Clayton, have been at Geneva, Switzerland, putting together the framework for the proposed International Trade Organization.

The master plan for this projected set-up is described by Garet Garrett, one of America's most competent economic analysts, as prepared by experts and clothed in language that only experts can understand.

The ITO, if approved, would function as a part of the United Nations. Under the proposed plan, which calls for the establishment of a vast interlocking system of state cartels, directed from the single seat of international authority, we would lose control of our foreign trade, besides surrendering the right to order domestic affairs according to our own liking, in some particulars, at least.

That the American people will sanction such a plan when they come to understand it seems very unlikely. International cooperation on a voluntary basis is one thing; world collectivism by compulsion is something entirely different.

Slaves at $13.05 a Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Stillwater Evening Gazette, Stillwater, Minn., of July 9, 1947:

SLAVES AT $13.05 A DAY

In announcing his new contract with coalmine operators John L. Lewis gleefully boasted that it is the best deal he has ever put over. Well he might boast, too, for under the new contract the miners will get $13.05 a day in addition to all sorts of benefits that make them about the best paid working people in the country.

Mr. Lewis tries to give the impression that he has put over a fast one on the mine owners but he is not fooling anyone. What he means, of course, is that he has put a fast one over on the coal consumers, for they pay the bill. They are paying twice as much for coal as they did a few years ago, due almost entirely to increased pay to the miners.

A puzzling thing about Lewis is that despite his glee over this record-breaking wage contract, he took occasion to lambaste the Taft-Hartley Labor Act which apparently has not hampered him in the least. The new coal-mine wage also must be a little disconcerting to those other labor leaders who have been using the Taft-Hartley law as a wailing wall, dubbing the act the slave-labor law. It will be hard to convince the public there is a slave angle to a law that permits a $13.05 daily wage to coal miners.

Lobbyists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 11, I extended my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with an editorial which apeared on July 8 in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Today I am including in the RECORD an editorial along the same lines from the Atlanta Journal of July 10.

I heartily approve of this editorial because I believe the pendulum is swinging too far against the development of our great waterways for the threefold purpose of navigation, flood control, and production of power, all for the benefit of the people as a whole.

The editorial follows:

LOBBYISTS

One of our most valued Washington services, Congressional Quarterly, edited by Henrietta and Nelson Poynter, informs us that at present 842 lobbyists are registered and plying their trade in and around the Capitol. These 842 legislative agents are seeking things either positive or negative, active or passive, commission or omission by government.

As evidence of the value put upon them by their employers, these lobbyists admit total salaries of $3,727,000 a year. But that is probably only a fraction of their earnings. About one-third of them report no salaries, saying their pay is contingent upon results or that they are operating only part-time at lobbying and cannot allocate the portion of their stipends attributable to that activity.

So you may see that the art of making friends and influencing legislation is a pretty big and growing industry in the precincts of Capitol Hill. The cold, statistical facts, taken from official sources, give especial point to certain recent comments made by Drew Pearson, Thomas L. Stokes, and other uninhibited correspondents. There doubtless are those who suspect Messrs. Pearson and Stokes of nagging some of the big interests, but the evidence in the record supports their charges of powerful organized pressures, especially in behalf of the electric-power industry, the railroads, and the associated real-estate agents.

This newspaper feels a high interest in these activities which concern the Tennessee Valley Authority and public power. We have commented from time to time for more than a year on the Nation-wide propaganda drive whose aim obviously has been to discredit TVA in popular esteem, and in Congress to hobble and handicap it by legislative action.

We are familiar with all the arguments that are brought against TVA, and yet, giving them the full weight due, we believe that TVA is a great success, a national asset, and should be continued in operation in accordance with the congressional act by which it was established.

We are familiar with all the arguments in favor of the private ownership of electric utilities and yet we still believe there should be further utilization of the Nation's rivers and their valleys for the public benefit in the manner of TVA.

It has been disturbing, then, to learn of the operations of the lobbyists for the electric companies in their endeavors to rip TVA and balk any further development of hydroelectric power by the Government. Especially disturbing is the skill of the lobbyists. Fourteen of them are registered and their capability is attested by the fact that they admit to an average salary of $19,170.

The most intense activity of these lobbyists which was obvious to the naked eye was brought against the House Appropriations Committee in its consideration of funds for public power projects in the Interior Department bill. This was carried on by the National Association of Electric Companies, which has 110 member companies operating in every State except Maine, Iowa, and Nevada. Only part of the pressure was applied from Washington. More effective probably were the pressures which were organized in the districts and home communities of the Congressmen.

This form of direct action can bring terror to the heart of a timid representative fearful of a hard race for re-election. To receive letters from bankers, merchants, and captains of industry at home, urging him to oppose socialistic experiments and to stand stalwartly for free enterprise and rugged individualism, give him pause in the manner calculated by the organizers of the propaganda.

As it stands, the lobbyists have done well for their big business clients at Washington since the turn of the calendar. The job has not been completed in the matter of public power, for the Senate is yet to take a whack at the legislation.

But the accomplishments are such as to suggest that a congressional reaction has occurred and it is time for the people to stop, look, and listen.

Skillful propaganda is swinging the pendulum; it may be further than the public is aware.

Worcester Housing Authority Praises Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the July 11, 1947, issue of the Worcester Telegram. This article comments on the testimony of Mr. Raymond P. Harold, chairman of the Worcester Housing Authority, given July 10 before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee at an open hearing on H. R. 3565, a housing bill which I introduced in the House of Representatives:

The article follows:

PRAISES REPRESENTATIVE DONOHUE'S VETS HOUSING BILL

WASHINGTON.—Raymond P. Harold, chairman of the Worcester, Mass., Housing Authority, yesterday told the House Veterans' Affairs Committee that the veterans' housing bill filed by Representative HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Democrat, from Worcester, "seems to offer the most workable and least expensive means of easing the veterans' housing shortage."

"As chairman of our housing authority in Worcester, I have had a close-up view of the desperate plight into which some of our ex-servicemen have been forced," he said.

"From reports, also, I am sure that our problem in Worcester is only a fair sample of that existing in most cities and towns of the United States. Anyone who has actually reviewed the cases of such distress will agree with me that something must be done to relieve them. Also, anyone who has figured the various ways and means under today's excessive building costs realizes that the job cannot be done without some kind of governmental aid.

"The plan DONOHUE proposes," he said, "has the merit of calling for the use of Government credit, with good prospect that the loan will be repaid with interest, instead of requiring a grant or inviting the waste that always accompanies construction by the Government itself.

"Briefly," he continued, "the bill is an amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. It would make funds available to local or State housing authorities, groups of veterans, or others, organized as limited dividend corporations, in proportion to housing needs and veteran population.

"Funds would be advanced," he said, "at the rate of $1,000 a room, or 50 percent of cost, whichever is less, for the construction of up to 200,000 multiple-housing 4- to 6-room rental units. Funds so advanced by the Government would constitute secondary charges on the rental projects, with interest and principal payments deferred until first mortgage obligations were all discharged."

MANY TO PARTICIPATE

"Any qualified public or private agencies may participate in building and financing rental homes for veterans under the bill's provisions," he said. These agencies include any bank, Federal savings and loan, or building and loan association, insurance company, real estate or builders' corporation, veterans' cooperative, and any groups of citizens representing the civic, business, or industrial life of a community.

"It is anticipated," he said, "that most of the applicants for assistance under this plan would be municipalities. To the city or town that has been struggling to keep faith with its veterans and at the same time avoid a ruinous advance in the local tax rate, this solution will come as a godsend."

After careful calculation, our housing authority is convinced that it can build comfortable, healthy units to rent for $35 to $45 a month, depending on size, he continued.

"With the 10-year exemption from city taxes and with most efficient use of the city's various services, we could amortize half of the project cost in not more than 32 years. At that time, the Federal Government would hold the prior lien.

"While no one can say precisely what the value of property will be 32 years hence," Harold said, "experience indicates that buildings that have been well-constructed and given good care retain a very considerable value for beyond a 32-year period."

DWELLING STRUCTURE

"Each dwelling structure contemplated in the Donohue bill would be of not less than four dwelling units," he said, "with a minimum of 12 dwelling units in any one community. Safe, sanitary, and complete living accommodations must be supplied, and each unit must consist of not less than four rooms, of which two shall be bedrooms; nor more than six rooms of which three shall be bedrooms," he said.

"The following construction and financing provisions are specified," he said. "Project plans must have approval of the veterans' administrator. An approved local public agency or corporation sponsoring a project shall agree to complete it in accordance with approved plans. Such agency or corporation shall have a paid-in capital fund of not less than 5 percent of the project cost, with dividends on this capital stock limited to 4 percent per annum. The first mortgage shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 4 percent, and it shall be amortized at the rate of at least 3 percent annually."

Annual net profits, he said, after taxes and amortization of the primary obligation shall be allocated: 1, to payment of any arrears of interest or amortization of the primary obligation; 2, one-half of remaining net profits

to a reserve for contingent losses until this reserve equals 10 percent of the project cost; 3, 10 percent to a reserve for amortization of secured obligations.

INTEREST RATE

"A government loan on a project may be repaid with interest at the rate of 2½ percent per annum," he continued, "at any time after 10 years from the date of project completion if it is established that emergency need of rental homes for veterans no longer exists. Partial repayments of the Government loan may be made at any time. This appears to leave the way open for sale of the project after 10 years, or to retain it and repay the Government on the same basis as applied to amortization of the primary obligation, namely, at least 3 percent principal payment yearly."

The bill specifies exemption from real estate taxes and other local assessments for a period of not less than 10 years. If local or State law does not permit tax exemption, then taxes and assessments shall be paid without cost to the project operation or by reducing first mortgage interest by an annual amount sufficient to pay such taxes and assessments.

To insure fair distribution of Government funds for veterans' rental housing, loans would be distributed between counties on the ration between the number of veterans living in the county and the total county population. The same basis of apportionment would be used between States, Harold maintained.

President Truman Misrepresents the Housing and Rent Act to the Detriment of the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following remarks on the Housing and Rent Act of 1947:

When the President signed the Housing and Rent Act, he attached a long message containing many misrepresentations. These were so glaring and obvious that they reflect either on his intelligence or his integrity—one or the other, or both. For instance, in respect to the 15-percent increase which can be made only by voluntary agreement between landlord and tenant, the President said: "This is voluntary only so far as the landlord is concerned." Actually, the tenant is completely free to negotiate as to any percentage increase as long as it is less than 15 percent. He can negotiate as to the length of the lease—18 months, 2, 3, or 5 years. He can bargain about improvements. If he cannot secure a satisfactory arrangement, then he can tell the landlord flatly that he will stay in until March 1, 1948, avail himself of the protection given him by the present law, and take a chance on perhaps having an additional extension of rent control for a new period.

The President's own appointee, the Housing Expediter who is administering the act, Frank Creedon, issued a statement. Mr. Creedon said: "Both tenants and landlords are afforded protection under the terms of the act * * * Its provisions will prevent unwarranted increases in rents and unlawful evictions." And further: "It is up to the tenant to decide whether he wishes to sign such a lease * * * the new law states that the lease must be entered into voluntarily and made in good faith * * * Control of maximum rents remain just where they were under the old law * * * there is no provision in the new act that changes rents automatically * * * nothing in the new law invalidates a lease now in existence." Mr. Creedon said there were "specific protections" in the statute against evictions. Quoting again: "The tenant who continues to pay the rent to which the landlord is entitled and lives up to the obligations of his tenancy generally, has no more fear of eviction than before." Mr. Creedon issued this analysis only 4 or 5 hours after the President's message was presented to the Congress.

The President protested against the removal of controls of building materials. Yet all the witnesses before our committee, Government, and others, all stated that these materials were in ample supply at present, with one exception. This exception was taken care of in conference before the bill was finally approved.

Of course, Mr. Truman's message was a purely political gesture made for political effect. It does not worry either the Congress or me personally, to receive a verbal spanking from Mr. Truman. If he wants to play politics with these messages, that is his responsibility, as long as it does not create impressions which will hurt the general public. But this has had, and was bound to have, the unfortunate effect of giving landlord and tenant a completely erroneous idea of the new law to the worry and disadvantage of both. This is proven by Mr. Creedon's statement which is in complete accord with the outline given in my radio talk a few weeks ago, and it is further proven by careful reading of the law itself. Those who pay any attention to Mr. Truman's utterances on the subject, if landlords, will find themselves in legal difficulties; if they are tenants, they may make commitments or arrangements thinking they do not have the protection which the law does accord to them. I hope no one in this area, either landlord or tenant, will be led astray by what the President said.

There is no authority in the Constitution for the President to send critical messages along with bills he signs. The net effect is to undermine the law he has approved and which he has taken an oath to support. I feel that statements such as these are entirely improper coming from one who is sworn to administer and execute the law.

The President repeated this process of criticism when he signed the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. All this, despite the fact that the Congress has gone to every length to cooperate with the President, particularly in respect to his foreign program.

While President Truman's vetoes have cause the most comment, the text not only of his veto messages, but also of the messages accompanying laws he has signed, have caused much resentment in the Congress. In vetoing the labor bill, the President attacked every one of its many sections, thereby making it clear that no legislation whatever on this subject could hope to secure his approval. This all-inclusive attack was undoubtedly one reason why his veto was overridden. His criticisms of its "unworkability" give rise to misgivings about his intentions to administer it well. They also encourage disrespect and opposition to the law. This may be good politics but it is bad for the country.

Mr. Speaker, the above analysis is substantially the one presented by me over radio station WHP on July 6, immediately after the message had been delivered.

Export Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, if anything more had been needed to demonstrate the dangers of granting again the unlimited authority to control exports it has been supplied by the Department of Commerce. In response to public and congressional demand that exports of petroleum, especially to Russia, be stopped, the Department restored petroleum to its controlled list just before June 30. Now it has admitted through its Under Secretary William C. Foster, that it went ahead and issued licenses for still further shipments.

The Navy complains of inability to get fuel oil in California. The Department of Commerce licenses shipments of fuel oil to Russia. This is the same Department that was supposed to control shipments of steel abroad but has permitted the pipe needed by our oil and gas industries to go abroad in unprecedented amounts. There is a shortage of that material here and the spot interruptions in supply in the United States is conceded by all to be due to such shortage.

The Congress must decide soon what course is to be followed on controlling exports. I understand authority has been extended until March 1, 1948.

There should be no further extension of full authority to license the export of materials we need, particularly petroleum, and especially to a country whose political and military aggressions we are supposedly trying to stop by exporting our dollars. Those in charge of the export controls have demonstrated a contemptuous disregard of the expressions of Congress. They should not be trusted further.

Better Than No Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread misunderstanding of the labor law passed recently by the Congress, it is refreshing to find an editor now and then who evidently has observed the history of the legislation and presents a sound statement in respect to its enactment.

Cooperation on the part of the opponents would have been tremendously helpful. Unmovable opposition to the correction of any abuses whatsoever made intelligent legislation very difficult.

I submit for your consideration an editorial by Mr. Clyde A. Wellman, editor of the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser.

The editorial follows:

IMPERFECT LAW

The new labor law, which Congress passed over President Truman's head and, as a consequence, stirred a greater emotional storm than it has by any other action in years, is not perfect. None of its supporters at any time claimed it to be perfect.

But it is better than no law at this time to lessen discord in labor-management relations. And it won't destroy the unions and put labor in chains, as its well-organized opposition argued. It won't for the simple reason that there are clear provisions in the Constitution to bar destruction and enslavement.

One reason for the law's imperfections is that the opposition was unmovably opposed. It was irreconcilable to any labor legislation Congress might pass. The law was written with no assistance or advice from the labor leaders invited to appear before the committees responsible for drafting the bill. None of them admitted any unfairness or abuses in union management and practices. Any suggested change was denounced as restrictive. There was much name-calling, but nothing constructive from the labor leaders appearing before the committees. They simply were opposed to any labor law being enacted, and that was that.

Except for this negative attitude, the utter lack of any cooperation from labor's own leadership, Congress no doubt could have produced a better bill than the one the executive branch of the Government now has to enforce.

Capitol Lights and Reflections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to exend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of June 17, 1947:

CAPITOL LIGHTS AND REFLECTIONS

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—One of the pleasant impressions of Washington to a returning stranger is the first glimpse of the Capitol dome at night. Rising white and austere and serene, it seems to symbolize the city's quietness and cleanness.

It is surprising to see how many State capitols resemble it at a distance, particularly Arkansas' in Little Rock. Although the mellowed, settled air of time surrounds it, these old steel engravings show that the Capitol dome was still unfinished when Lincoln took the President's oath. Even so, a lot of American history has seethed around it, as all the vast array of cast-iron equestrians scattered around Washington's 750 parks testify.

It would be interesting to see a census count of the statues that impart their solemn dignity to the Nation's landscape—not counting that Army of stone sentries of Civil War vintage that have been eyeing village traffic as far back as when a discerning sight-seer by the name of Lord Bryce recorded his impressions of the American scene.

At Shiloh, Tenn., where the Interior Department maintains a fine military park, you can hardly see the forest for the monuments different States have erected there to memorialize the valor of their native sons, North and South, who fought there. And on the field of Gettysburg, there are nearly 1,000 commemorative markers.

Uncle Sam must spend a good deal of time just sharpening the lawnmower, what with 30,000 acres of parks to keep up right around Washington. At the moment, the Park Service is dismantling the two unsightly second-story footbridges spanning the Lincoln Memorial reflection pool between the Navy Department and those temporary buildings that housed its Bureau of Supplies and Accounts during the war.

The Federal Communications Commission and the OPA—or the little that's left of it—are moving in. The Government is trying to compress all its activities within Government-owned buildings. When these two agencies move into the former Navy offices, the Government will have reduced its rented office space from 6,000,000 square feet to 4,000,000.

Anyway, the bridges are coming down so that soon the reflection pool will once more mirror the Grecian temple which houses Daniel Chester French's colossal likeness of Lincoln.

What would Louisa May Alcott have said had she lived to gaze up into the great carved face, recalling the day when she gave the boy in Concord a sculptor's tool. It is not hard to imagine—seeing this seated Lincoln and remarking how genius flourished from such a homely beginning as that which first inspired young French to fashion a bullfrog from a turnip.

It was another Concord resident who said something to the effect that if you carve a better likeness than your neighbor, you'd never have to mow your own path. Incidentally, their times touched, for didn't Emerson—stroking his chin approvingly as he surveyed the young sculptor's bust of him—remark, "Yes; that is the face I shave every morning."

The proof is in the Park Service's 1946 statistics. No fewer than 995,957 pilgrims paused before the compassionate gaze that French breathed into this sublime conception of Lincoln.

These figures testify not only to the deep Lincoln appeal but to the wide citizenship of the Capital. A policeman's whistle brought this home the other day. Intercepting two pedestrians in the act of disobeying a traffic light, the policeman had to hear all about "the way we work our traffic signals back home."

You can taxi anywhere in the central zone of the Capital for 30 cents, but it costs $2 to walk across the street against the light—if one of Washington's polite policemen should catch you.

Address at Annual Picnic of Southern Wisconsin Cheese Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me at the annual picnic of the Southeastern Wisconsin Cheese Association at Juneau, Wis., on July 13, 1947:

Down in Kentucky they tell a story of the farmer up in the hills who owned an old plug of a plow horse that he paid $1,000 to enter in the Kentucky Derby. This old plug, of course, had no chance of winning and the farmer's neighbors went around shaking their heads and wondering why anyone would want to pay $1,000 to enter an ordinary old plow horse in the Kentucky Derby. Finally one of the neighbors got up the courage to ask and the answer he got was, "Well, I knew that old Dan didn't have a chance to win, but it was worth that much money to me just to see him in such good company." That is about the way I feel about getting back here to Juneau today—that it is worth a lot to me to be in such good company. We think of people as being "good company" when they are interested in, and think about, and do the same things that we do.

When we mention cheese in Wisconsin, we are talking about something with which we are all familiar, and something which certainly merits our interest and concern.

By traveling a few miles in three different directions from Juneau we can reach the three most important centers of the cheese industry in the United States. Just a few miles east of here, within the boundaries of this county, is Mayville, the center of the foreign-type cheese business in America. To the south is Monroe, the Swiss cheese capital of the Nation, and to the north is Plymouth, the cheese market where the price of American cheese for the entire country is determined. Right here, in this county of Dodge, nearly 90 percent of all of America's brick and Munster cheese is produced. Of cheese of all types produced in 1946, the State of Wisconsin produced 525,000,000 pounds, representing one-half of the Nation's total output, and a 2 percent increase in production over 1945, the highest previous year.

Out of 3,760 cheese manufacturers in this country last year, 1,941, or more than half, were operating in this State. Wisconsin, as anyone who looks at one of our automobile license plates can tell you, is known as America's Dairyland. It is also, in truth, America's Cheeseland.

Cheese is one of the oldest known prepared foods of man. The Old Testament contains numerous references to cheese. I don't suppose that the early Jews or the Romans could have told you that cheese is rich in vitamins, proteins, in fats and in minerals (especially the all-important phosphorus), or that a pound of cheese contains more of these essential components than is contained in a pound of meat. But the Jews and the Romans did know that for some reason or other cheese was a highly beneficial food. It was a part of the regular rations of their armies. The early Greeks provided their wrestlers with cheese to give them endurance.

Up in Pierce County they will tell you that it was Wisconsin cheese and butter that stopped the Germans at Stalingrad, and if Clyde Chapman of Dairyland Co-op is here in the audience this afternoon, I am sure he will verify this story.

All of us here recall the seemingly unstoppable drive of the Germans to the suburbs of Stalingrad. Now, it so happens that at this crucial moment of the war, the first lend-lease shipments of cheese from Plymouth, and butter from up in Pierce County, reached the defending Russian armies. It is a matter of history that the Russians held their ground, and then took the successful offensive which ended only when Germany was beaten. Some people will say that is a mere coincidence, but up around Elmwood they will tell you that there is no question but what there was a direct cause and effect relationship. It is true that battles have been won or lost by lesser things and that I have heard arguments with less factual basis made on the floor of Congress.

From that day in April 1864 when Chester Hazen opened the doors of Wisconsin's first cheese factory at Ladoga, the Badger State quickly forged to the front as a cheese producer. During the last 15 years we have almost doubled our production. Wisconsin's cheese industry fully fell into step with the

demands for greater and greater wartime production. There was no marketing problem—the demand always exceeded the supply. Cheese was used to fill the gap caused by the faltering meat supply. The millions of men and women in the armed forces throughout the world received cheese as part of their rations. Now we are approaching a buyer's market. Government purchases have declined. European countries are going back into cheese production. They are attempting to gain back the American market for Edam, Roquefort, Camembert, Italian, and other foreign type cheeses they enjoyed before the war. They are attempting to use this means to obtain some of the dollars these countries so badly need for their trade balances. In the final analysis, they will succeed only if American cheese producers cannot continue to compete in quality and salesmanship with their foreign competitors.

The American cheese producer continues to be blessed with a firmly expanding domestic cheese market. American per capita consumption of cheese last year was about 7 pounds, the highest in history. This represents a 100-percent increase in the last 50 years. The wartime habit of cheese eating among both civilians and servicemen has continued into the postwar years. This healthy condition deserves greater efforts for greater expansion. It is a job of quality production and salesmanship. The Swiss people have an annual per capita consumption of 16 pounds; the Dutch 14; the Danes 13; the Italians 12. Even the meat-loving Britishers have a per capita cheese consumption of one and one-half times that of Americans.

I remember a few years ago, when I was teaching school at Waupun, I lived in the home of two elderly ladies who kept two covered dishes on the dining-room table at all hours; one contained crackers and the other cheese. To them, and before long to me also, cheese was considered a delicacy far better than nuts, or candy, or fancy fruits.

I am stating nothing new or different when I say that the greatest marketing asset of cheese or any other product is the ability to offer a standardized product of high quality. Wisconsin has long been famed for the grading and branding of cheese. There are still many individual cheese manufacturers who consider cheese making an art and not a science and who find it hard to reconcile themselves to making cheese in accordance with any set procedure. But through continued research and competition with the large-scale marketeers of processed varieties the industry is becoming more and more standardized. Consequently, the purchaser can rely upon one pound of Wisconsin cheese of any particular type being more and more similar in texture and flavor to the previous pound, or the next pound, purchased. This is a necessary development. Too frequently have housewives been passing over the superior natural cheese in favor of the standardized processed cheese which often has a lot of other things besides natural cheese mixed with it but has been made with a fixed process and has been made palatable and attractive looking.

If we agree with the necessity for this standardization, we must, I believe, also agree that pasteurization of milk for cheese is an inevitable development. I don't know whether the time for 100-percent compliance with that development has arrived. I do know that dairy specialists in Wisconsin and Minnesota in recent issues of trade papers have predicted that in the near future all cheese will be made from pasteurized milk. It is well known that bacteria found in raw milk sometimes survive in cheese. Pasteurization can remove that risk in natural, unprocessed cheese. Several States, including New York, New Jersey, California, Illinois, Indiana, and others, now have such requirements.

Perhaps it is presumptuous for me to make these few suggestions to you. Many of you have been connected with this industry for many years, some of you for practically your entire lifetime. It is because I want our State to continue to be known as not only the State that produces the most cheese but also as the State that produces the best cheese, and because I believe it is important to all of us in this State that every pound of cheese be of top quality that I take the liberty of making these suggestions. Quality along with sanitation is the phase of the cheese industry that every individual producer can control.

Now, to diverge from the specific subject of common interest which has brought us together here today, I would like to spend the remainder of my time on a subject that is, I am quite sure, of general interest to all of you. That is a brief summarization of the activities of the Eightieth Congress thus far.

In my opinion, the outstanding contribution of this session of Congress has been to make substantial strides toward taking the Federal Government off the backs of the people. By the time Congress adjourns late this month it will have slashed Federal spending by about $4,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year. It has not been an easy task. Let no one be mistaken about that. The Congress, and particularly the appropriations committee have been hindered, blocked and undermined in their efforts at every turn, by a stubborn and persistent bureaucracy. Let me cite a few examples, with which some of you are already familiar. Last March and April some of you received notices from the Milwaukee Post Office that certain mail was being delayed because of lack of funds for hiring sufficient help. You saw in your Milwaukee newspapers headlines to the effect that some 250 temporary employees had been released. The inference was that economy was interfering with the postal service. What they did not tell you was that the postal department was then operating under appropriations which were made in 1946, and that the present congressional economy efforts, therefore, had no connection with this alleged curtailment. Nor did they tell you that it was not until May of this year that the postal department came before Congress to ask for any appropriation to make up their deficiency. The representative of the postal department at that time repudiated the actions of the local postal authorities.

We have been flooded with mail and criticized in the press because of decrease in appropriation for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Inspired propaganda has attempted to create the impression that the enforcement and investigation of tax collections would be severely crippled. The fact of the matter is that the appropriation for this function was curtailed by less than 4 percent, and this because much of the difficult immediate postwar tax work no longer existed.

You have been told that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has been crippled at a time when business monopoly is growing. This is more than propaganda; it is deliberate falsehood. The appropriation for the Antitrust Division was increased by more than 25 percent. Every Congressman has had letters and received personal calls protesting the elimination of certain Federal jobs. To continue our efforts in behalf of Government economy in the face of this opposition was not easy, but continue we did. It is safe to say that there will be 100,000 less Federal employees by September 1 of this year. Several of my personal friends from Wisconsin, who are in various bureaus and departments in Washington—fellows that I had gone to school with—have told me that only the surface has been scratched; that there is still a lot of fat that needs to be removed. We are pledged to pare the Federal bureaucracy by half a million by the end of 1948.

At the suggestion of Congressman WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon, a very pointed cartoon has appeared in a number of newspapers throughout the country. The first scene shows a delegation of people demanding economy in Government spending. The second scene, a few weeks later, shows the same people back to protest against economy which has stepped on their particular corns, demanding that the "economy wave be started somewhere else." This, I might add, is too typical to be really humorous.

Many times we have heard speeches urging greater appropriations for some particular agency delivered on the floor of the House by Congressmen who have had those speeches prepared for them by the paid press agents (they call them public relations officials) of the particular department or bureau whose appropriation happens to be before the House at that time.

These instances show why I believe that $4,000,000,000 worth of savings to the taxpayers of this country represent an outstanding achievement.

We are attempting to pass some of these savings on to the 1948 taxpayers. Most of you will recall that the previous attempt was defeated by the President's veto. The new attempt simply delays by 6 months the effective date of the tax reduction. The House passed this revised tax measure last week by a vote of 302 to 112. It now is in the hands of the Senate. President Truman has said he will veto this proposal also. He has insisted that the measure gives too much tax relief to the large taxpayer and not enough to the small taxpayer. A comparison of the proposed tax schedule under this bill with the existing tax in 1939, the last year before we went onto a wartime tax schedule, shows that this measure would be proportionately more favorable to the small taxpayer than were the income tax schedules of 1939.

A second major achievement of this Congress has been to restore a measure of equality to the relationship between labor organizations and employers. The Labor-Management Act of 1947, which was passed over the President's veto, removes a great many of the faults which have grown up since the original Wagner Act that was passed in 1935. Many of you have had your milk dumped in the road to run down the gutter while the children of nearby cities went without milk, simply because some milk truck-driver or processing-plant worker refused to join a particular labor organization, or because one of your cooperative dairy plants refused to sign a closed-shop agreement. This legislation strikes at these and similar evils.

No one asserts that the Taft-Hartley law is perfect. That is why a commission of 14 members has been set up under the law to provide for continuing revision as defects in existing legislation are exposed. Surely those who have refused to give a single positive suggestion for the improvement of the Wagner Act should be the last, instead of the first, to criticise every single provision of the Taft-Hartley law.

This Congress has also passed the so-called portal-to-portal law. It prohibits the bringing of suits which, if successful, would wipe out thousands of business establishments in America.

There is now pending before the House of Representatives a bill by Congressman REID MURRAY, of Waupaca, which would compel the Department of Agriculture to support the price of milk on a basis of 90 percent of parity. We have had this support in theory, but the Department of Agriculture has sidestepped its responsibility on several occasions. Congressman MURRAY'S bill has the support of every Wisconsin Congressman. It has been favorably reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and will help to insure a fair price for the most

important single item in the income of our State.

I have not attempted to read the roll of the enactments of this Congress. I have attempted, instead, in the short amount of your time that it has been my intention to take, to mention some of the high lights of what I think will generally be considered one of the most fruitful sessions in many years.

The Congress will, within the next few months, be called upon to decide its gravest question since December 8, 1941. Secretary Marshall and his aides have been holding a series of secret conferences with the leaders of Congress regarding the so-called Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of some 50 countries of the world. It has been suggested that this vast project will drain America of her substance to the extent of more than $20,000,000,000 during the next 5 years. A study is now being made to determine to what extent America can, with safety to our resources and reserves, participate in such a plan.

I do not believe this grave decision will be made this year. I hope not. I want the people of this district and of the entire country to have a chance to think, to read, and to discuss this problem. We need to know the extent of the need, the objectives, and the prospects of such a vast program. I hope it will be debated in every town hall in America before Congress reconvenes in January. Its resolution will require all the thinking and all the information that can be mustered. Every Member of Congress will need the help of the people of his district in making his decision, and, above that, he will need the help and guidance of Him who gave us courage in the grave trial of war, and must now give us wisdom in this grave hour of peace.

No Money for "Down Under"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of July 13, 1947:

NO MONEY FOR "DOWN UNDER"—OUR SILENT SALESMEN ARE GETTING THE GATE

One of America's wartime links with the people of the Southern Hemisphere will be broken this week, by order of the State Department.

Padlocks will be snapped shut Wednesday on the American information libraries in Sydney and Melbourne, Australia. Later this month, similar libraries in Wellington, New Zealand, and Johannesburg and Capetown, South Africa, will close their doors—for lack of funds.

Congress slashed the State Department appropriations so deeply that the department officials decided to abandon the dominion libraries. Each of them cost about $30,000 a year.

MORE THAN BOOKSHELVES

In the scholarly sense of the word they were not libraries at all. They were primarily reference centers and reading rooms, where anyone seeking facts about any phase of American life could find them in books, periodicals, and Government documents.

To make them accessible they were located on downtown streets to help inquirers, and reference assistants were put in charge.

This was something new in American foreign relations, but it worked. Almost from the moment the Office of War Information established the libraries, visitors crowded in at a rate of about 3,000 a month at each of them. In addition, information rippled out to the press, to universities, and to a public that had learned most of what it knew about America from Hollywood.

Henry Seidel Canby, then editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, was in Melbourne the day President Roosevelt died. He described what happened as follows:

"Every newspaper in that part of Australia began to telephone the information library. What was the procedure of installing a new successor? Who would be his successor in case of Mr. Truman's death? What effect constitutionally might this tragedy have upon American policy? What was the relation of the Chief Executive to Congress? Where had Mr. Truman stood in his political activities? What was he like?

"The result was the best and most accurate and most thoroughly informed newspaper coverage of a world-important event in another country that Americans then resident in Australia had ever seen."

SPARED BY CONGRESS

This was not outright propaganda at all, yet Dr. Canby and others described it as propaganda in the best sense of the word. Every American diplomat stationed in the dominions, and the dominion governments themselves, praised the libraries for what they did to make the United States better understood.

Even in Congress there was seldom the slightest criticism of the libraries, although other activities of the OWI and the State Department were attacked without mercy. The Mundt bill, passed by the House by a 3-to-1 majority, authorizes the continuance of information libraries abroad, and the State Department plans to maintain most of them in Europe and Asia.

Why were the dominion libraries the first to go? Congress did not decree it; department officials decided it on their own. Officials are reticent about the reason, but as nearly as can be gathered they did it because the dominions were farthest from Moscow. Since there was not enough money to continue information work everywhere abroad, it will be continued in those places that are more directly in the path of Soviet penetration and propaganda.

By this process of reasoning, it was judged more important to inform Bulgaria than Australia, Egypt than South Africa, Iraq than New Zealand.

A WARTIME NECESSITY

It was not always so. Early in the war when hundreds of thousands of American troops were stationed in Australia, it became apparent that the dominions had been badly and wrongly informed about the United States. One or two mass-circulation newspapers were distorting American attitudes and policies almost as bady as Communist propaganda in Europe distorts it today. In South Africa there was an active pro-Nazi movement which never ceased its sniping at the United States, especially among the Afrikaans-speaking population.

There was no teaching of American history in the dominions, and precious little knowledge of it. There were few American visitors, and little opportunity to get American books, magazines, or newspapers. With widespread ignorance there was also much suspicion and misunderstanding.

New Zealand still has not a single resident newspaper correspondent in the United States; South Africa has just one; both countries, and Australia, still clamor for the kind of material the libraries supplied. Prof. Ralph H. Gabriel, of Yale, who taught for a year at Sydney, said the other day that their loss would be a disaster.

FERDINAND KUHN, Jr.

Do We Want a Wool-Growing Industry in This Country?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the wool industry in the United States is in a very precarious position. It is vitally necessary that this Congress consider carefully and pass the wool bill, which I hope will be before us shortly. If this Congress does not give this needed assistance to this industry, we can expect it to decline still more. This would be disastrous to the country and is something we should not allow. The wool industry is entitled to the protection guaranteed in the bill unanimously reported out by the Agriculture Committee, and I sincerely hope that we will pass this measure before adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a statement of facts concerning the sheep industry as compiled by Mr. Carl O. Hansen, secretary of the Montana Wool Growers Association, and published by many papers in my State of Montana. I recommend its reading to the membership because it states briefly our position and the need for assistance by the wool industry:

FACTS CONCERNING THE SHEEP INDUSTRY

(By Carl O. Hensen, secretary, Montana Wool Growers' Association)

MONTANA SHEEP NUMBERS

Sheep numbers in Montana have been declining steadily from nearly 4,000,000 head in 1942 to less than 2,000,000 head at the present time. This alarming liquidation is based on a number of factors, but lack of profit is the principal reason for sheepmen going out of business. Other factors include the labor shortage and the uncertain future for the industry.

UNITED STATES WOOL PRODUCTION

The United States produces, at the present time, only 300,000,000 pounds of wool annually and our annual consumption for the past several years is approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds. The United States has always depended upon imports to satisfy its demand for wool. In normal times the United States produced approximately two-thirds of its consumption.

WOOL IN TIME OF WAR

Army and Navy officials have testified that a domestic wool industry is absolutely necessary for the proper defense of the country during wartime. They are convinced that something should be done now to assure the United States a strong industry and a suitable reserve of domestic wool. During the war, wool was stock-piled for our security and wool growers were encouraged to stay in the business. To do this the Government purchased all domestic wool at a set price. Now after the war, certain interests not sympathetic with the wool industry are willing to sell the wool grower down the river, since the wartime purpose has been accomplished. Others who are more farsighted realize the need for a healthy domestic wool-growing industry in the event that there might be future wars. Naturally if we are to maintain a wool industry, wool growers will need some type of support, because they have to compete with foreign wool. The British Joint Organization controls the world wool market

and can undersell our domestic wool growers within 24 hours' notice no matter what the wool market is in this country. The reason for this is quite simple. The cost of production in this country has risen tremendously since before the war. In Montana these costs have doubled and labor costs have increased 158 percent. Americans have the highest standards of living of any country in the world, so in any kind of times, it will cost more to produce domestic wool than foreign wool.

ESTIMATED INCOME FROM WOOL AND LAMB IN MONTANA

The estimated 1946 income from wool in Montana was $10,005,000 from 22,234,000 pounds of grease wool. The estimated 1946 income from lamb in Montana was $18,805,000 for 121,950,000 pounds of lamb.

PREPARATION OF FLEECES

Australian wool is considered approximately 10 cents per pound more valuable than domestic wool of the same grade, due to the superior method of preparing the fleeces for market. The Australians "skirt" all fleeces at the shearing pens. This procedure consists of removing the britch, leg wool and offsorts from the fleeces and packing this wool separately from the main body of the fleece. That makes the fleece uniform which is desirable from a selling standpoint. Australian wool is also graded at the shearing pens.

WOOL IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The British Empire has very little to bargain with when it comes to trading with this country with the exception of wool. The Governments of the British Empire appear to have a most selfish motive when trade agreements are discussed as far as wool is concerned. These governments want us to lower our tariff so that they can make this country a dumping ground for that product which is so extensively produced in these countries. They are not satisfied with supplying the United States with the amount of wool which represents the difference between our production and our consumption. However, the wool growers themselves in Australia have made statements supporting our tariffs and want to see our domestic wool growers protected. Our State Department appears willing to lower the tariffs and let the foreign wool come into this country and then subsidize our own domestic industry. There is this point about it. No matter what our domestic market is, the joint organization is going to undersell our wool just enough below our price to obtain the market. As we have said before, the Joint Organization controls the world wool market. They market about 80 percent of the world's apparel wool.

OUR WOOL STOCK PILE

The Government owns over 400,000,000 pounds of grease wool which it has been unable to sell because, according to law, it cannot sell wool at less than parity price. Foreign wool has been selling at a price enough lower to steal the market so the Government has been stock-piling the wool. The Government should be allowed to dispose of this wool at market prices and in an orderly manner so as not to upset the market. This is only fair to our domestic wool growers, because it is not their fault that we have this tremendous stock pile. It is simply an aftermath of war and the industry is a war casualty.

IT BOILS DOWN TO THIS

Do we want a wool-growing industry in this country or not? If we do, the only way we can have one is to give the domestic wool grower enough protection so that he can grow his wool and receive enough for it to pay his operating costs and have a reasonable profit. This can be accomplished by adequate tariff, import quotas or direct Government subsidy. If we do not have a wool-growing industry, it should be remembered that it would weaken the defense of this country and millions of acres of land which are adapted to sheep grazing and sheep grazing alone would be valueless and the source of income from taxes on these lands would be lost.

OPPOSITION TO THE DOMESTIC INDUSTRY

Certain members of the Boston wool trade who have derived substantial profits from handling foreign wool during the war would rather see the domestic wool industry liquidated. Profits to wool handlers on domestic wool since 1943 have been moderate because they were paid on a commission basis. These handlers who have made huge profits prior to the war at the expense of the domestic growers are opposed to a program that would protect the industry.

The wool trade has thousands of dollars to spend lobbying and on publicity that is detrimental to the domestic wool industry. In spite of this opposition, wool-growers' associations were able to convince Congress that their request for protection was based on facts and that the industry does need protection. Even though the wool legislation was turned down by the President, there is still hope of remedial legislation that will protect the industry through 1948.

Postal Retirement Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the so-called Stevenson postal retirement bill, which has now been reported favorably by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, will be approved promptly by the Rules Committee and brought to the floor of the House for action before adjournment. This measure has been redrawn to meet certain objections made by some of the members of the Rules Committee. In some respects, notably regarding the elimination of dependent children under 18 from the benefits of the legislation, I regret that this has been necessary.

The bill, however, certainly substantially improves the lot of a group of Federal employees whose faithfulness, devotion to duty, and quality of performance are unsurpassed either in governmental or private employment. This measure will afford to them, at a very slight cost, according to actuarial estimates, a modest increase in their retirement annuity. No one can doubt that this recognition is needed and, in my judgment, richly deserved.

Expand and Strengthen the ROTC Program in Our State Colleges and Universities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Reserve Officers Training Corps has functioned in the colleges and universities of this Nation for many years and has served to provide trained men for the armed services of our country both in time of peace and war. The ROTC has been a popular and useful arm of service for our Nation's defense and it should be strengthened and expanded. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to include a letter from Dr. C. E. Brehm, president of the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, outlining the need for an expanded ROTC program and urging the passage of pending legislation to provide for the effective operation and expansion of the Reserve Officers Training Corps. I urge the members of this Congress to give thoughtful consideration to the contents of Dr. Brehm's message as his opinions represent the views of one of the outstanding educators of our country. The passage of legislation recommended by Dr. Brehm will greatly stimulate volunteer enrollment in the ROTC and serve to strengthen and build up the defense of our country. Action on this and similar needed legislation should be taken prior to the adjournment of the present session of the Congress. The letter is as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
Knoxville, July 8, 1947.

Hon. JOE EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EVINS: On April 29 there was submitted to the House a bill designated as H. R. 3280 which provides for Army ROTC activities in cooperation with the land-grant colleges. The proposed intent of this bill is to encourage ROTC enrollments in the various colleges of the country in order to provide officers for the Army and at the same time give military training to young men as a part of our whole national defense program.

If this bill is not enacted in this session of Congress, but held over until the next session, it will be rather disastrous for the ROTC program. By that I mean that it will receive a set-back that will require some time to overcome.

The War Department has given the colleges much assurance of the need of the postwar ROTC program and particularly along the lines provided in the ROTC legislation. By virtue of the interest of the War Department in this program and the belief that the proposed legislation would be enacted into law, the colleges have endeavored to encourage in every way young men to participate in the ROTC programs. For example, in cases of students in colleges with ROTC schools pursuing the advance course in military instruction, it is proposed to give each student monetary allowances at a daily rate not exceeding $1, plus the cost of the garrison ration of the Army for the number of days under instruction during the last 2 years of training.

We have a large number of veterans enrolled in the University who would make excellent officers due in large part to their war experience. Many of these students are unwilling to increase their academic load by taking ROTC courses unless some financial assistance is given. Last summer when it was rumored that postwar ROTC legislation would increase the emoluments to about $60 per month, we had a large number of applicants for the advanced courses, but when Congress failed to act, most of these students lost interest in the program.

At the present time we are adding three additional units to our program here, Signal Corps, Transportation Corps, and Ordnance, making a total of six units. We may not be able to secure enough students for all

of these units if the proposed legislation fails to pass before Congress adjourns.

It is our understanding that there is no real objection to the bill in Congress. It is just one of those that lies in a committee without any action unless someone gets behind it. It is for this reason that I am writing you.

We feel that enactment of this legislation will have a profound effect on the interest in the ROTC program in all the colleges where this program is under way, and certainly will have a big influence in building up a reserve of men who have had Army training as a part of our national defense program.

Anything which can be done to expedite action on this bill before Congress adjourns will certainly be a great stimulus to young men enrolled in the ROTC program.

Yours very truly,

C. E. BREHM,
Acting President.

A Free Society or the Police State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a pertinent editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Monday, July 7, 1947. It clearly points out the issue involved in the world today. It is high time that we appreciate this problem:

THE ROOT ISSUE

In its latest statement on American foreign policy, the Federal Council of Churches has gone to the heart of our troubled times in declaring that "the critical and supreme political issue of today is that of the free society versus the police state." The statement—drawn up by a special commission headed by John Foster Dulles—does not offer any easy solutions, but it has the virtue of reminding us that much more than naked material power is involved in current world tensions. At the root of everything is the ideological or spiritual clash between two entirely different ways of life.

If Russia had the same political system as the United States and the other western democracies, if its people had liberty, if they could think, speak, write, assemble, and vote freely, the international situation today would certainly be far brighter than it is. There would be disputes, of course, and rivalries of one kind or another, but fundamentally there would be agreement on the thesis that the state exists for the individual and not the individual for the state—a thesis whose acceptance would enable all nations to move forward together in building a just and enduring peace. What poisons the atmosphere with fear and suspicion is that the Soviet Union, far from being democratic, is a totalitarian dictatorship run by a handful of men who brook no opposition, rigidly control all avenues of information, systematically employ distorting propaganda, and maintain themselves in power with the constant help of a ruthless and omnipresent secret police. Worse still, it is a dictatorship that makes the most of conspiracy, infiltration, and direct and indirect aggression to undermine the independence of other countries and extend its sway wherever it can throughout the world.

The Soviet system thus differs from our own as night from day, and unless and until it makes room for liberty we shall be hard put to get along with it. The Federal Council of Churches, however, is one with those who completely reject the idea of an inevitable war and who oppose national policies based on that idea. It holds that the United States can do much to meet the situation by launching a "moral" drive to impress upon peoples everywhere that we "stand on the principle of a free society as against a police state" and that we are ready to back that principle by word and deed at home and abroad, particularly with aid to nations "intelligently striving to help themselves and to help others."

Freedom attracts men generally. If we uphold it vigorously, we can succeed in rallying so many friends of it in Europe and Asia that the Russians, as a matter of expediency, may feel impelled to stop trying to extend its opposite. All this may be more easily said than done, but the Federal Council of Churches has offered timely counsel in advocating it.

Establishing a European Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of July 12, 1947:

ESTABLISHING A EUROPEAN ORDER

It is arresting to contrast the situation in Europe now and after the Napoleonic wars. Europe lay in chaos after Napoleon had been thrown out of Russia. Alexander I could have stayed at home, shut himself off from the world, and sought to repair the domestic ravages of war. But he refused to take the line of least resistance. This half-lunatic, half-genius of a sovereign was convinced that victory would be of no value for Russia without the reestablishment of a European order. And to him belongs the initiative for leading Europe back to pacification and what Secretary Marshall calls a working economy. Ferrero, the historian, gives the Russian ruler prime credit for saving Europe from suffering the fate of the Roman Empire.

But his successors, members of the Politburo, have different ideas. The veil came off their intentions when Molotov, invited to join in European reconstruction, not only said "No" but warned Europe against engaging on the adventure of reviving the old continent. Nobody, we fancy, will take any notice of the published reasons for Russia's refusal. That the great effort is a device, as Molotov sees it, to split Europe and invade the sovereignty of its members is, of course, utterly fantastic. Just the opposite is true.

It is solely because Europe saw yawning before it the fate of Rome that the nations are essaying this fundamental attempt to restore a continental system. The prospect alarms the men in the Kremlin. Men who prate the Marxist jingle, "From each according to his ability and to each according to his need," don't want to see it applied among nations, even though interdependence is the insurance of life. They want to see Europe kept on its back, divided and weak, so that it will be easier to tie to the Russian chariot. Out of fear the Europeans have hitherto allowed themselves to be bludgeoned by the Kremlin. Secretary Byrnes in his proposal for a 40-year pact and his famous speech at Stuttgart sought unavailingly to assuage the panic. In his time, so soon after Europe's trial by fire, the Europeans could not exert the effort necessary to shed the new toils in which they were being wound and bound. Time and Secretary Marshall have now shown them a way out.

The dazzling diplomatic initiative of Secretary Marshall was the stroke of the moment which bids fair to rescue Europe. The gathering today will comprise only half of Europe. But eastern Europe will be watching the work with the same eagerness that it betrayed before Russia slammed the door on its participation. It is our guess that the Poles and the Czechs will not quickly forget their public humiliation at the hands of their Russian masters. The Czechs in particular had been seeking to demonstrate their independence of Russian dictation. To be sure, they said, the Communists are in control, but they are Czech Communists, and they are wedded to the parliamentary system. There was no disputing the Czech contention—till (it will be said) now. Accordingly the fact that the Russians have cracked the whip is likely to cause a resentment throughout Czechoslovakia that bodes ill for the tightening and expansion of the satellite system. The way to encourage the Czechs to break away is for the men in Paris to show what can be done when men are seized with the urge of reconstruction in the interests of all. One result of Russia's obstructionism already is plain. By their panicky and egregious demonstration against Czechoslovakia the Russians have destroyed the model, the show-window exhibit, of a freely elected Communist organization of a western country which they hoped to sell to far western Europe.

The Paris Conference will not break up into working committees, we hope, before it nails down its unifying purposes in resolution form. The main job, of course, is for the expert committees. Without a doubt the European transport organization, killed by the Russians in United Nation's European Commission, will be revived. Transport is second only to coal in reviving a working economy in Europe. Transport was the one and only truly international system in Europe, a system mainly dependent on the inland waterways and coastal shipping. Coal used to go from Silesia to Vienna—a distance of some 300 miles overland—down the River Oder, all around Europe, through the Dardanelles, and up the Danube. The break-down of this system is an example of the shattering of those invisible ties binding Europe together that inspired the Marshall initiative.

But something more than mere restoration of a working economy is in the minds of the men who are now assembling in Paris. Long delay has made the problem of recovery so urgent that the pooling of resources and the coordination and allocation of capital expenditures and imports are essential. That may be the thin end of the wedge of political as well as economic integration. "One of the greatest mistakes committed by human indolence," says Ferrero, "is the belief that order is best preserved by keeping it as it stands. It can only be preserved by continually reconstructing it." The facts of our diminished planet plainly show the need for modern reconstruction.

The adventure, in short, may be a turning point in history. The present undertaking is a response to an idea born in desperation as much as to a man, but in the immense work that is about to begin men will be needed who have vision as well as courage.

Representative Joseph J. Mansfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 14, 1947

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I would be doing violence to my inner feelings

if I permitted this occasion to go by without adding my tribute of love and respect to the life and character of one of God's noblemen, the late Representative JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD.

When I came to Congress Judge MANSFIELD had been here one term. I served one term on the Rivers and Harbors Committee with him. I knew him intimately and well. In those days he was a man of splendid physique, always well-groomed, attractive, very active and, indeed, agile. I remember well when he was overtaken by sickness in Texas and returned to Washington in a wheel chair, there to remain the rest of his life. It apparently did not discourage Judge MANSFIELD, however. He said to me one time: "Yes, it is inconvenient, but just think of the number of people in the world who are so much worse off." That was the philosophy of the man, and we all came to appreciate it. The day was never dark and dreary when Judge MANSFIELD was around.

Mr. Speaker, in order to be an efficient and a successful Member of Congress one must have intelligence, he must be industrious, he must be honest, he must be tolerant, and, last but not least, he must have the respect and confidence of his colleagues. Judge MANSFIELD was endowed in a marked degree with all of these attributes. He not only had the confidence and respect of his colleagues but he had their affection. This is best evidenced by the sincere eulogies pronounced today. I have been in Congress a long time and I believe this is the longest memorial service I ever attended. There is a reason. A good and a great man has gone and we all join with the family in genuine sympathy.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following editorial which appeared in the Boston Traveler, Monday, July 14, 1947:

THE TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

We have failed to speed housing construction, to build homes at prices people can afford, to give the veteran a place to live. There are not more houses going up. There are fewer. Things are not getting better. They are getting worse.

We have said all this before and we shall say it again. It is America's worst problem today. It is the duty of every American to have a clear-cut knowledge of the crisis, as well as the practical steps proposed to end the crisis.

One of these is the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. This sets up a national housing commission, lets home-loan banks and other federally chartered institutions lend money for homes, gives Federal insurance for those loans, protects the owners against foreclosure, guarantees interest to investors in home construction, gives financial aid to slum clearance projects, subsidizes housing for the needy, and in other ways aims at smashing the economic log jam which has created a dearth of new building amidst the greatest demand of our history.

Much of this may be novel, some of it may be impractical, a little of it may be dangerous. But Americans without homes are novel, a market frustrated by the want of homes to buy is impractical and above all, for veterans and other Americans to go on month after weary month in attics, converted garages, Quonset huts, and trailer camps is dangerous. There could be a tremendous explosion somewhere. It could set off chain explosions all across the country.

Will Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bob Considine:

KING OF THEM ALL—ROGERS TOMB STILL A PRIME TOURIST LURE EACH YEAR

(By Bob Considine)

CLAREMORE, OKLA., July 12.—Today's American humorists are measured by their Hooper ratings and the grosses they attract in their movie house and night club appearances.

They rise and fall not so much on their gifts for provoking laughter as from their astute selections of gagwriters, the gall of their agents, and the acumen of their managers.

Will Rogers, king of them all, died before such modern yardsticks could be applied to him. But he'll be remembered when the rest of them are forgotten. His tomb and its memorial have become a major United States shrine.

Since the rambling place was built in 1938, on a green slope which Rogers bought in 1911 as a site for a home, more than 4,000,000 persons have visited it.

The crowds grow bigger with the years, a remarkable tribute to the gentle memories he stimulates. He was killed in a crack-up with Wiley Post, near Point Barrow, Alaska, August 15, 1935, but there is as much interest in him today as in his prime.

STATUE DOMINATES SITE

The body of Will Rogers lies beneath a simple marble tomb, set in a stately terrace.

With him now are his wife, Betty Blake, who died in 1944, and their fourth child, Fred, who died in 1920 at the age of 2. But one still feels Will Rogers is alive, for the entire memorial is dominated by Jo Davidson's bronze statue of the humorist, head bashfully down, hands deep in the pockets of his crumpled coat and a shy, sly twinkle around the eyes.

A number of dioramas now complete portrayal of Will's life. They are miniature stages which show Rogers from the time he was a child on a nearby ranch to a final graphic portrayal in which an Eskimo calls through cupped hands to the lifeless bodies lying in a half-submerged seaplane.

In another room are his saddles and lariats, and some of his early scripts, including the last one of his "telegrams," as he called them, to his editors. In one case lies his portable typewriter, crushed as if hammered by a sledge hammer. He had it in the plane with him.

A GIFT OF TONGUES

The Rogers legend is perpetuated in many ways. One lands here at the Will Rogers Airport, or comes in on the Will Rogers Special. Claremore has a Will Rogers Library. Oklahoma Military Academy auditorium is named for Will. The Hollywood movie colony once named him mayor of Beverly Hills. In the Colorado Rockies high above the Broadmore Hotel and Colorado Springs another Rogers memorial sounds its chimes. There are Will Rogers theaters in Claremore, Tulsa, and Oklahoma City. Will Rogers had a gift of tongues that made him understood in the most primitive community as he was on the stage and in Congress. The only other bronze struck from Davidson's mold stands in the Capitol in Washington.

At the base of each is written a favorite Rogers expression:

"I never met a man I didn't like."

The Ten Capitals of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address presented before the Germantown Historical Society by Leighton Paxton Stradley, a member of the Philadelphia Bar, a former assistant professor at the University of Pennsylvania, and a director and member of the society:

The New York Times magazine, in a recent article commenting on the selection of New York as the site for the United Nations capital, stated that New York was the first Capital of the United States and is now the first capital of the world. Actually, Philadelphia was the first Capital of the United States and New York was the eighth. In determining the correctness of this, it is necessary to ascertain when the Colonies first became independent and united states.

It is generally conceded by historians and other authorities that, with the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, the Colonies became an independent country and a member of the brotherhood of nations. Our citizens were no longer subjects of the King of England but were citizens of the Republic. This is often referred to as the birth of the Nation. The title and the declaration clause of the Declaration indicate that the action was taken by "the Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled."

It was asserted in the Declaration of Independence that the States had the power to regulate commerce, foreign affairs, and the conduct of the war. Hildreth, in his history of the United States, says that the Continental Congress seized the reins of power and assumed leadership of the insurgent States, that it issued bills of credit, raised armies, declared independence, negotiated foreign treaties, carried the Nation through 8 years of war, and finally wrested from the mother country an acknowledgment of sovereignty.

At the time of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and of the birth of the Nation, Philadelphia was the seat of the government. Consequently, it was the first Capital of the newly formed United States. Three changes of the Capital followed during the course of the war, which is briefly outlined:

The day before the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, Howe landed on Staten Island with a large force of troops, said to be about 9,000 men. During the weeks following the landing, this army was swelled by the arrival of additional troops, and estimates of the final force run as high as 30,000 men.

On August 27, 1776, he launched an attack with 20,000 men against the American forces at Brooklyn Heights. The battle was fiercely fought, but the Americans were decisively beaten.

The American Army at this time was at its lowest ebb. This period, August to December 1776, was known as "the dark days of the war." Washington's army was slowly disintegrating due to the low morale of the troops. It is said by historians that when Washington left the vicinity of New York his army was a ragged, starved, defeated, and demoralized band. Many of them deserted, many were killed, and many, whose enlistments were expiring, returned to their homes. At one point Washington's forces were reduced to less than 1,000 men.

Howe, realizing his advantage, decided that Philadelphia should be taken. It, as the capital of the United States, was the citadel of American authority. Howe thought that if Philadelphia were taken, the revolutionary cause would be broken and the war terminated. He accordingly planned an expedition across New Jersey to attack Philadelphia. Washington, pursued by the British Army, went from New Brunswick to Trenton, and conducted his well-known "retreat across New Jersey" just in advance of the British forces. He succeeded in crossing the Delaware at Trenton and was safely across when the British arrived. Washington had foresight enough to sequester all of the boats and river craft in the vicinity, so that when the British reached the river there were no boats available for crossing. On learning this, Howe and Cornwallis decided not to pursue the campaign further at that time. Leaving outposts at Bordentown, Trenton, Princeton, and New Brunswick, and Elizabethtown, they returned to their comfortable quarters in New York. Cornwallis planned to return to England to report the brilliant successes of the British Army in their campaign after the Battle of Long Island.

British patrols came within 17 miles of Philadelphia and some were reported as close as the Cooper Creek opposite Philadelphia. Members of Congress, hearing of this, were terrified particularly by the reports of the brutality of the Hessian soldiers and by the prospect of their own indictment for treason and the punishment by hanging. Congress accordingly resolved to leave Philadelphia for Baltimore. It did so on December 20, 1776, and thereby established Capital No. 2.

At this time, the British were in control of New Jersey while the Americans controlled the Pennsylvania side of the Delaware River. Washington decided that he would be obliged to make some showing to boost the morale, not alone of the Army, but also of the entire country. He accordingly planned an attack on the British in New Jersey. The famed crossing of the Delaware at McKonkey's Ferry was accomplished by Washington on Christmas night, but two other expeditions were unable to cross. Washington's forces landed 9 miles above Trenton early the following morning and proceeded to Trenton, where his army fell on the Hessians, fought the battle in the streets of Trenton, and defeated the entire Hessian army in Trenton. Washington decided to retire immediately to the Pennsylvania side and recrossed the Delaware at once. However, scouts in Trenton informed him that there were no British soldiery in that locality, so Washington returned to Trenton with his army. When Howe heard of Washington's success at Trenton, he dispatched Cornwallis to retrieve the situation.

Cornwallis appeared in Trenton on the 2d day of January 1777. Washington decided to face Cornwallis and give battle, but before doing so retired to the south of Trenton on the other side of the Assumpink Creek. The British attacked the Americans, but were unable to cross the bridge over the creek and decided to retire and resume the attack the following morning. It has been said that the fate of the Colonies hung in the balance at the second battle of Trenton and that this battle turned the tide of the war in America's favor. Washington's escape with his army intact opened the way to ultimate victory for American arms. Washington again decided to retreat. He accordingly left the campfires burning to deceive the British, bypassed the whole British Army in the night, and proceeded at once toward Princeton, where he defeated the British below the town. He then proceeded north to winter quarters at Morristown. Cornwallis, hearing the guns at Princeton, rushed to the aid of the British forces there, but arrived after the American Army had left. Cornwallis decided not to give open battle to Washington. He accordingly retired to New Brunswick, leaving Washington in command of south Jersey.

The Congress, finding that the British pressure on Philadelphia was removed, returned to Philadelphia on March 5, 1777. This campaign of Washington, particularly his brilliant successes at Trenton and Princeton, established him for the first time as a commander of the highest order. His name and prestige and the morale of the American Army were immensely restored. Volunteers flocked to the American colors and reestablished the American Army.

Washington was waiting to see what move Howe would make. Howe, instead of going to the assistance of Burgoyne, assembled a naval expedition with transports and left New York with 18,000 men with the idea of attacking Philadelphia. When Howe appeared off the Delaware Capes, Washington was assured of the fact that Howe was moving on Philadelphia. He moved his army south, crossed the Delaware River at New Hope, passed on through Philadelphia, Chester, and Wilmington, and brought his army beyond the hills of Wilmington. Howe, meanwhile, was forced to make his landing in the Chesapeake because of obstructions in the Delaware. While waiting at Wilmington, Washington was informed that Howe's march to the north was further west. He accordingly shifted his army to Chadd's Ford on the Brandywine. Issue was joined with Howe on September 11, 1777.

The Americans again suffered defeat and Washington was obliged to retreat leaving Philadelphia undefended. Howe accordingly entered Philadelphia at his leisure, arriving there on the 26th day of September 1777.

Meanwhile, Congress was again alarmed on hearing that the British were at the "fords over the Schuylkill" and left Philadelphia on the approach of Howe and his army. The Liberty Bell was removed from Philadelphia to Easton and Bethlehem and was finally secreted in a church in Allentown for several months. Numerous cities in Pennsylvania were considered as sites for the Capital. Lancaster was finally selected and thus became the third Capital of the United States. Congress arrived there on September 27, 1777, and immediately went into session. It was reported that British patrols were reaching out as far as Lancaster County, and after a 1-day session at the third Capital of the United States, Congress decided to place the Susquehanna River between it and the British Army, and moved to York, Pa., where it went into session on September 30, 1777. York, then became the fourth Capital.

When Howe occupied Philadelphia, he kept only four regiments in the city and posted the bulk of his army at Germantown. In the meantime Washington retired to Pennypacker's Mill at Schwenksville. He succeeded in re-forming his forces, and again prepared for an attack on the British in an endeavor to force them back against the Schuylkill River. Washington moved into an attack on the British at Germantown on October 4, 1777. He was again repulsed owing to a mistake of the American forces in firing into each other in the fog, to the stout resistance of the British under Colonel Musgrave at the Chew Mansion, and to a disastrous delay by General Greene's army on the left. Washington returned to Pennypacker's Mill and then retired to Valley Forge. Valley Forge was selected because it was well situated for defense and Washington desired to be in a position where he could come to the rescue of Congress at York if it should become necessary.

After Burgoyne's defeat, Benjamin Franklin and the other commissioners in France were able to obtain a treaty with France by which our independence was recognized. More importantly, France openly supplied us with funds, sent over a navy, and later sent an army. It was reported that the French Fleet was preparing to bottle up the British in Philadelphia by taking possession of the Delaware Bay and River. The British Ministry, alarmed at this, and also at the prospect of a war with France, Spain, and Holland, decided to concentrate their forces in this country, and accordingly ordered General Clinton, then in command of Philadelphia, to evacuate Philadelphia and return to New York. Clinton left Philadelphia on June 18, 1778.

General Clinton decided to retreat across New Jersey. He accordingly crossed the Delaware, with his army and with a large number of Tories and camp followers. Washington decided to pursue and give battle. He engaged Clinton at Monmouth. The battle went well for the Americans and might have resulted in the surrender of Clinton, except for the treachery of Gen. Charles Lee. The British were repulsed, and Clinton withdrew to New York.

As soon as the British pressure was removed, Congress left York and returned to Philadelphia on July 2, 1778. From the time of the return of Congress from York there seemed to be no question but that Philadelphia would remain the capital of the United States. It was adapted in every way for that honor and distinction. However, in 1783, a most unfortunate occurrence took place.

In the meantime, Cornwallis, following his successes in the South in the taking of Charleston and Savannah and the defeat of Gates at Camden, allowed himself to be bottled up at Yorktown, and was forced to surrender in 1781. This was virtually the end of the war, and a preliminary treaty of peace was made in England. Congress decided that the American Army should be disbanded in order to save the expense of maintaining it, which, at that time, the Federal Treasury could ill afford. Since the definitive treaty had not yet been made, Congress asked the Army to accept furloughs without pay. The members of the service accepting the furloughs were subject to recall if the treaty should not become final. The men, however, objected to being furloughed without pay owing to their extreme needs. They had not been paid for some months because of the depleted state of the Federal Treasury. When they had been paid it was with continental money and other worthless currency. The result was that the men and their families had been reduced to a pitiable condition.

In 1783 a mutiny broke out in Philadelphia over these conditions. A body of disgruntled veterans marched into Philadelphia and made their demands on Congress. It is reported that they posted sentries at the various entrances and surrounded Independence Hall, where the Congress was then sitting. President Elias Boudinot was seized and detained a short time by the mutineers. They

seized the city's arsenals, attempted to seize the bank, and were altogether riotous and unruly. President Boudinot called on the Pennsylvania authorities to restore law and order and to protect the Members of the Congress.

The Pennsylvania authorities, under the Constitution of 1776, consisted of a supreme executive council and its president, often referred to as the President of Pennsylvania, who at that time was John Dickinson. The Pennsylvania authorities declined to take any measures to protect Congress, and Congress accordingly resolved to leave Pennsylvania. On June 24, 1783, they left for residence at Princeton, N. J., which became the fifth capital.

The session at Princeton was comparatively short, from June to November 1783. During this time the first important debates in Congress on the selection of a permanent residence for Congress took place. Here, for the first time, arguments were made for having a separate and independent Federal town, which would have title to the area ceded to it by the States, erect its own buildings, have quarters for its own members, and, more specifically, apply its own law in the district. These ideas were later followed, and became part of the arrangements under which Congress settled at the District of Columbia, where these conditions are presently in effect.

In response to a suggestion by Congress that a permanent residence was contemplated, invitations from many sections of the country poured in calling attention to the advantages which would make the individual cities ideal sites for the permanent seat of the Government.

After a great deal of debate, it was finally decided to set up a Federal city at the Falls of the Delaware or at Georgetown on the Potomac. This was followed by a resolution that until a permanent Federal city was located Congress should meet alternately at Annapolis and Trenton. Congress reluctantly left Princeton and resolved to convene at Annapolis on November 26, 1783. Accordingly, Annapolis became the sixth Capital of the United States. The session at Annapolis was characterized by elaborate ceremonies, at which General Washington surrendered his commission as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army. The treaty of 1783 with England was adopted at this session, thereby terminating the war. Congress adjourned at Annapolis on June 3, 1784, and, in accordance with the resolution adopted at Princeton, convened at Trenton, the seventh Capital, on November 1, 1784. After a session of less than 2 months at Trenton, Congress decided to convene the following January 1785 at New York, the eighth Capital, until such time as a Federal town should be established.

When the Continental Congress convened at New York, its power was waning, and the Congress itself was losing prestige. During the war, the Continental Congress had a function to perform in prosecuting the war. When the war was terminated, however, it was evident that the operations of the Continental Congress under the Articles of Confederation were inadequate for the needs of the country. This situation resulted in the convocation of a convention at Annapolis to consider the possibility of a uniform system of commercial regulation. All the Colonies were invited to send their representatives.

The Annapolis convention convened in 1786, but owing to the fact that only five States were represented and a quorum could not be obtained, no action was taken other than to issue a call for a further convention to be held in Philadelphia.

The convention was held at Philadelphia in 1787, and proposed a constitution which was to become effective when ratified by nine States. The call for the meeting of the First Congress under the present Constitution was issued by the old Continental Congress. It fixed March 4, 1789, and New York, as the time and the place of the meeting.

The Constitution of 1789 in section 8, clause 17, provided that the Congress should select a permanent residence for the seat of government. The Constitution also provided that the seat was to consist of territory ceded to the Federal Government by the States in which the district was located, and specified that the district was to be not more than 10 miles square. Owing to the large amount of territory involved, this ruled out Philadelphia and New York. In the case of Philadelphia, if the 10 square miles were started at the Delaware River, the 10-mile point would reach into Delaware County, and if they were started at League Island the 10-mile point would reach into Germantown. This would have meant a third of the wealth and population of the entire Commonwealth. New York would have been similarly affected, as it would have taken all of Manhattan Island, and more.

The First Congress under the Constitution convened in New York. New York was, therefore, the first capital under the new Constitution. There were three sessions of the First Congress, two in New York and one in Philadelphia. Among the first matters taken up by the First Congress was the selection of a permanent residence. The choice finally narrowed down to a location on the Potomac and three locations in Pennsylvania, one on the Susquehanna, another at the falls of the Delaware, and the third at Germantown. The issue was brought to a head by the passage of a bill in the House of Representatives selecting the Susquehanna site. This would have been the area presently occupied by Wrightsville and Columbia and the nearby territory.

When the bill passed by the House of Representatives reached the Senate, Robert Morris, whose vote against Susquehanna resulted in a tie vote, succeeded in having the Susquehanna location deleted and Germantown inserted in its place. On Morris' motion for Germantown, there was again a tie vote. In order to settle the issue, Morris offered a $100,000 contribution by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to bear the expense of the erection of public buildings. When his authority to commit the State to this large appropriation was questioned, Morris offered personally to guarantee the payment. As he was one of the wealthiest men in the Colonies at the time, despite his later financial difficulties and imprisonment for debt, his personal guarantee was well worth the amount involved. The deciding vote was to be cast by John Adams, President of the Senate, then Vice President of the United States. John Adams was no doubt influenced by the $100,000 contribution and voted in favor of Germantown. The bill was then returned to the House of Representatives for action on the amendment and was approved with the amendment in favor of Germantown. At the last moment, however, James Madison of Virginia, who throughout had been an advocate for the Potomac site, succeeded in putting a rider to the bill, providing that until Congress otherwise indicated, the Pennsylvania law would apply to the Federal district.

This necessitated returning the bill to the Senate for action on the amendment. When the bill reached the Senate, it was near the time for adjournment of the first session, and the bill was not acted on before adjournment.

Between the first and second sessions of the First Congress there was a considerable change of sentiment and a great deal of controversy over Hamilton's financial measures. Hamilton, as Secretary of the Treasury, proposed ways and means to handle the debt incurred by the war. It can now be seen that his plan was sound and practicable, but in the eyes of a great many legislators at the time it was thought inexpedient to saddle the new Government with a large funded debt, although it was clear that there was no money to pay the debt which amounted to $73,000,000.

Agreement was reached in both Houses of Congress on the funding of the foreign debt and the domestic debt. Sentiment was sharply divided, however, over the assumption of the State debts of $21,000,000. The South was violently opposed to the assumption; and the North, particularly New England, was just as strongly in favor. The argument became so acrimonious that the New England States threatened to secede, and they might well have done so. It appeared that Congress, except for the Pennsylvania Representatives, was about equally divided and that the Pennsylvania Representatives themselves were divided. Consequently, Pennsylvania held the balance of power.

Hamilton became disturbed over the state of the Union and the threats of secession, and decided that the matter could be settled only by a compromise. The compromise of trading the capital site for the assumption of the State debts proved to be the proper solution owing to the fact that those two controversies were invariably linked together in all of the debates in Congress. It is not generally known and it does not seem to have been recorded except in Maclay's Journal, that Hamilton first approached the Pennsylvania delegation and offered them the site for the national Capital either at Philadelphia or Germantown if the Pennsylvania delegation would support the assumption bill. There was considerable sentiment in Pennsylvania against the assumption bill, particularly on the part of Senator Maclay and before Pennsylvania accepted or rejected, Hamilton made a similar offer of compromise to Jefferson. Jefferson accepted and entered into a log-rolling agreement that the site was to be located on the Potomac in return for Jefferson's obtaining the concurrence of the southern delegation, particularly Virginia, in voting for assumption. This bill was passed and signed by the President designating the permanent Capital on the Potomac, but subject to the temporary Capital being located in Philadelphia for 10 years from 1790 to 1800.

In 1793, while Philadelphia was the seat of the Congress, the city was visited with a devastating yellow-fever epidemic. Congress was not in session at the time since the epidemic occurred in the summer, but was to reconvene the following December. The members of the Cabinet, however, were forced to leave Philadelphia, and went to Germantown. Washington joined the Cabinet members in Germantown, so that in 1793, Germantown became the ninth capital of the United States for a period of 1 month. Washington secured living quarters at the residence of the Reverend Frederick K. Herman. This house immediately adjoined Germantown Academy on School Lane and is now on the school grounds. He later removed to the Morris residence on Germantown Avenue. Cabinet meetings were held in both of these places, except during a short period when Washington toured a number of towns in an effort to find a location where the Congress might sit.

As the cold weather developed, the yellow fever disappeared, and Congress convened at its regular session at Philadelphia in December.

The yellow fever reoccurred more or less annually until about 1798 and 1799. Owing to the widespread districts that were affected, Congress in 1798 moved to Trenton for a few months. Promptly at the expiration of the 10-year period in November 1800, Congress convened in the District of Columbia where it has remained ever since. Washing-

ton, in the District of Columbia, therefore, became the tenth and last capital of the United States.

Shooting Into the Air or What's in the Sky?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, the friendly and warm-hearted poet of your State, whose verse is cherished in every American household and often read as the family gathers around the hearthstone, once wrote:

I shot an arrow in o the air,
It fell to earth, I knew not where;
For so swiftly it flew, the sight
Could not follow it in its flight.

I breathed a song into the air,
It fell to earth, I knew not where;
For who has sight so keen and strong
That it can follow the flight of song?

Long, long afterward, in an oak
I found the arrow still unbroke;
And the song from beginning to end
I found again in the heart of a friend.

In these days of the war's aftermath, newspapers and the radio report almost hourly that strange objects have been seen in the sky. Some say the objects are pancakes, some say they are disks, some say they are saucers, and some say they are blades shunted from circular saws and plummeting through the sky. Others with a scientific bent contend the things they see are reflections of ice particles having fun with the sun. The imagination of the human mind is left free to speculate on what the strange objects, if any, may be.

Apropos of all this, a delightful fellow in St. Louis recently posed the following question:

I shot a glimpse into the sky,
I saw a disk go flying by.
Some say I saw a saucer,
Some say I saw a saw, sir.
What do you think I saw, sir,
A saucer, or, a saw, sir?

Mr. Speaker, if jitters have overtaken some people, may it not be that the sublime poet of Cambridge, who is so dear to the American household, can through his verse stay the shakiness of nerves? And, has not the genial gentleman in St. Louis performed a service to society in posing his pertinent question? Gentle reader, what do you think? Are the things some see in the sky pancakes, saucers, saws, disks, arrows, or songs? Or are they the dollars that used to be in the long ago when they fetched something in return in the market place? Maybe so.

I have a suggestion to make, Mr. Speaker: Everyone will gain, if everybody will give a fair day's work in return for a fair day's pay. That is a down-to-earth idea and not at all exciting. But he who follows that old prescription may find at the close of day that he can see nothing in the sky except the familiar objects that have been taken for granted with the rising and the setting of the sun.

Minimum Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage law is here to stay. I am certain that it should be increased. Workers are entitled to a fair share of the employer's profit. Our goal is full employment at a wage which will give American workers a decent standard of living.

MINIMUM WAGE EXEMPTIONS

The provisions of minimum wages and maximum hours shall not apply with respect to—

First. Any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, professional, or local retailing capacity, or in the capacity of outside salesman—as such terms are defined and delimited by regulations of the Administrator.

Second. Any employee engaged in any retail or service establishment the greater part of whose selling or servicing is in intrastate commerce.

Third. Any employee employed as a seaman.

Fourth. Any employee of a carrier by air subject to the provisions of title 2 of the Railway Labor Act.

Fifth. Any employee employed in the catching, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life, including the going to and returning from work and including employment in the loading, unloading, or packing of such products for shipment or in propagating, processing, marketing, freezing, canning, curing, storing, or distributing the above products or by-products thereof.

Sixth. Any employee employed in agriculture.

Seventh. Any employee to the extent that such employee is exempted by regulations or orders of the Administrator issued under the section which applies to learners, apprentices, and handicapped workers.

Eighth. Any employee employed in connection with the publication of any weekly or semiweekly newspaper with a circulation of less than 3,000, the major part of which circulation is within the county where printed and published.

Ninth. Any employee of a street, suburban, or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motorbus carrier, not included in other exemptions contained in this section.

Tenth. To any individual employed within the area of production—as defined by the Administrator—engaged in handling, packing, storing, ginning, compressing, pasteurizing, drying, preparing in their raw or natural state, or canning of agricultural or horticultural commodities for market, or in making cheese or butter or other dairy products.

Eleventh. Any switchboard operator employed in a public telephone exchange which has less than 500 stations.

MAXIMUM HOURS

The provisions of the 40-hour week shall not apply with respect to—

First. Any employee with respect to whom the Interstate Commerce Commission has power to establish qualifications and maximum hours of service pursuant to the provisions of section 204 of the Motor Carrier Act, 1935.

Second. Any employee of an employer subject to the provisions of part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

LEARNERS, APPRENTICES, AND HANDICAPPED WORKERS

The Administrator, to the extent necessary in order to prevent curtailment of opportunities for employment, shall by regulations or by orders provide for—

First. The employment of learners, of apprentices, and of messengers employed exclusively in delivering letters and messages, under special certificates issued pursuant to regulations of the Administrator, at such wages lower than the minimum wage applicable under the law and subject to such limitations as to time, number, proportion, and length of service as the Administrator shall prescribe.

Second. The employment of individuals whose earning capacity is impaired by age or physical or mental deficiency or injury, under special certificate issued by the Administrator, at such wages lower than the minimum wage applicable under the law and for such period as shall be fixed in such certificates.

Through the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, Congress took an important step toward a minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers. However, in terms of real wages it now falls far short of the goal envisioned by Congress. It is my belief that the act should be amended to increase the present 40-cent-an-hour minimum to 60 cents an hour. It is clearly justified by the current level of unemployment insurance. Certainly no one would agree to a wage level below the income level established for idleness. Yet, that is the situation created by the existing minimum wage and existing unemployment insurance.

Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by the Washington Times-Herald veterans' editor, Lt.

Comdr. Tyrrell Krum, USNR, retired, which appeared in the Times-Herald of Sunday, July 13, 1947.

The article is written in support and approval of House bill 1888, an act to incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, which appears as Order 452 on the Senate Calendar.

Commander Krum is a disinterested and impartial observer and constructive critic of veteran movements and organizations. His point of view may be helpful to other Senators as they consider House bill 1888.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(By Tyrrell Krum, lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve, retired)

With the presently scheduled date for adjournment of the first session of the Eightieth Congress a brief 2 weeks away, it becomes increasingly clear that the mass of legislation designed to aid veterans of our past wars which is now lying idle in the legislative hopper is going to be passed over until next year.

It is obvious that the bill which would make terminal-leave bonds convertible into cash after September 1 instead of waiting for the original 5-year maturity date will, in all likelihood, be enacted into law before Congress goes home.

But as to passage of the Kearney training-on-the-job subsistence increase measure and the bill to raise the amount of monthly subsistence paid veterans going to schools and colleges under the GI bill of rights—it would appear they are doomed.

Both these measures have been chucked into a pigeonhole by the House Rules Committee with orders that there they are to remain, despite the clear and uncontroverted fact that were they to come to the floor of the House passage would be certain.

However, we hope that the Senate will find time to pass one very meritorious piece of legislation already adopted by the House—the granting of a Government charter to AMVETS—the American Veterans of World War II.

The Senate Judiciary Committee recently reported out the AMVETS' charter bill and ordered it placed on the upper Chamber's consent calendar. The road ahead appears cleared of further road blocks.

And let us get this one point clearly in mind: AMVETS is not to be confused with the AVC, which stands for the American veterans committee.

AMVETS is a first-rate organization composed of high-class veterans of the Second World War; it is Nation-wide in scope and today has some 120,000 members.

On the other hand, AVC is a conglomeration of Commies, Reds, radicals, parlor pinks, fellow travelers, and other extreme leftists—a large segment of whom never served a day in Uncle Sam's armed forces and thereby stands as an impostor when it terms itself a war veterans' group.

PMA Committeemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following preface and a magazine article dealing with Mr. W. Lewis David, a State committeeman of the Production and Marketing Administration and a farmer living in my district near the city of Corsicana, Tex.

The State committeemen of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture have been doing a wonderful job with the soil-conservation program in Texas and have given many hours to the well-being and general welfare of the farmers of the State. These men have given the PMA many helpful suggestions and have done much toward carrying out the programs on marketing and production set up by the PMA, one of the Department of Agriculture's most important units.

One of these committeemen is W. Lewis David, and the following article tells graphically some of the practical work he is doing.

HIS LAND IS GOING TO SEED, AND LEWIS DAVID FINDS THIS NOT ONLY PROVIDES A CASH INCOME, BUT CONSERVES THE SOIL AND SAVES BOTH TIME AND LABOR

The immediate reason why W. Lewis David changed over from growing cotton, corn, and a few other grain crops to seed production on his 1,200-acre farm just south of Corsicana, was the scarcity of labor brought about by the war. But the results of his program have brought about benefits far beyond this immediate need. Because he can offer year-around employment, he has been able to attract and keep the type of men he wanted—men of sufficient ability and skill to operate expensive machinery. His legume planting and rotation has reclaimed depleted soil and been an important factor in a 50-percent increase in crop yields, and he has found an all-year money crop.

Back in 1940, after several years' service as county agent and as agricultural economist in Washington, Mr. David returned to the farm his father had bought at the beginning of the century. Following tradition, he put between 500 and 600 acres in cotton and about 200 acres in corn and other grain crops. He sprayed for cotton insect pests and observed the usual practices of farming, only to find at the year's end that he hadn't done much better than other farmers in the vicinity who did not practice insect control. Probably nothing would have been done at the time, however, if the labor situation hadn't become critical. He considered several changes, even discussing the possibility of drug crops with representatives of Parke & Davis, whose need was great due to the war. He discovered, however, that growing such crops required special technical knowledge and a great deal of practical experience.

His work with soil conservation groups made him aware of the great need for legume seeds whose supply did not meet the growing demand of farmers, and he finally decided to try a plan of growing legumes and other crops for seed, using phosphates as fertilizer. The first field was planted to clover in 1941, but without phosphate. Then in 1942, he experimented with 150 acres, using phosphate on vetch, and made better than ⅔-bale of cotton per acre following this program. Hubam seed was harvested for the first time in 1942. He didn't know too much about it at the time and declares he made many mistakes. But when, in spite of mistakes, he made around 400 pounds of seed to the acre and realized 18 cents per pound for it, he knew if the work were done correctly, it would yield a big income, in addition to the good it was doing the land.

Soon he began to experiment with hybrid corn which he grows exclusively as a seed crop. This year he planted some black medic with seed imported from England, the first time this clover has been tried in this section of the State.

Mr. David's rotation system—until the land is sufficiently rebuilt—calls for clover every other year and has resulted in a 50-percent increase in crop yields. This has been so obvious that the owner of a plot of land directly across the highway from the David farm, whose last corn crop did not warrant further planting, offered Mr. David the seed harvest if he would sow it to legumes to restore its fertility.

In working out a schedule which would provide a good distribution of labor, Mr. David grows hubam as a summer cover crop and vetch for the winter. Hubam, planted about February 15, is harvested in July after the time to pull corn and before the cotton needs attention. Vetch, seeded with rye about October 1, is up and covering the land at the time of the spring rains and is ready for harvesting about the middle of June.

So successful has this program been that the same land which in 1939 required the efforts of nine tenant families and seven tractors is now worked more efficiently with one self-propelled combine for harvesting, three tractors, a seed cleaner, and three laborers—paid by the hour—in addition to Mr. David.

The seed cleaning takes place in a large quonset barn with concrete floor and 24 200-watt lamps to make work possible during dark days and at night. The electric cleaner has a capacity of 1,500 to 2,500 pounds (30–50 bushels per hour) depending on the kind of seed. It is adjusted to different types and sizes by a series of screens. A scarifier, which breaks the hulls, increases germination and results in a more uniform stand. A seed separator, which works on the same principle of gravity as the cream separator, separates seeds of the vetch from those of the Abruzzi or Balboa rye planted as a support crop to hold the legume above ground for combining and with which they become mixed in harvesting.

All seeds are inoculated, a process which adds to them the bacteria necessary for the legumes to take nitrogen from the air instead of from the soil.

When there is time enough, Mr. David does custom cleaning for other farmers in the vicinity, but his equipment is primarily for his own use.

His land is divided into approximately this pattern: 300 acres in rye and vetch; 150 acres in Hubam clover; 80 acres in oats, some of which is certified seed; 165 acres in corn, 100 of which is for seed, and 50 acres in cotton, grown solely as a source of protein feed.

In addition to legumes in a rotation program, his conservation plan includes terracing and contour planting. Before building his terraces, he established his outlets, sodding the lead-off waterways largely to Dallas grass and the permanent pastures onto which the water empties to Bermuda. Prior to sodding, legumes and phosphates were used on the pastures to build up their fertility. Stock tanks have been built and electric fences enclose the pastures where white face cattle graze and are prepared for market.

Milch cows and White Leghorn chickens are kept for family use, and a 40-acre wood lot supplies fuel for the people working on the farm.

Land which until a few years ago knew nothing but cotton and corn and gradual deterioration, is now returning to original fertility, yielding bountiful harvests and contributing to a carefully planned agricultural prosperity.

Escaping Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Rizley bill will increase gas rates from the city of Washington to President Truman's home town of Independence, Mo. In fact, it will increase rates in every State from California to New York.

Why doesn't every Member of the House and Senate develop the same information as to the effect of this bill upon the people of his own congressional district and State as I compiled for my district and presented to the House on July 11, 1947, as shown at page 8708 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Each of these gas pipe-line transmission utilities already considers the Rizley bill passed, and they have arranged their corporate set-up to take advantage of its provisions.

This bill directly affects every person in the United States in that it increases the cost of gas, as well as that of certain manufactured articles, which increased cost is passed on to the purchasing public.

I plead with each Member of the House and Senate to examine this measure carefully and determine for yourselves the effect of this bill upon your own people.

For the information of the House, I am inserting an excerpt from an editorial on this subject which appeared in today's Washington News.

It reads as follows:

ESCAPING GAS

That strong odor comes from the Capitol—where lobbyists and lawmakers are working to help the natural-gas industry escape effective regulation.

With only 2 hours of debate, House Members passed the Rizley bill, which many of them said they didn't understand. It forbids the Federal Power Commission to regulate the cost of producing or gathering natural gas. It directs the Commission to accept, as a rate base, any figure the companies name as the market value of gas entering their pipe lines.

In 9 years the FPC has saved consumers $150,000,000 by regulation under the 1938 Natural Gas Act. The Supreme Court says it has done this legally and properly. The net income of companies under this regulation was 58 percent higher last April than in April 1946. Their book cost totaled $1,292,000,000 last January 1. Since then they have applied to the FPC for certificates for additional facilities estimated to cost $1,222,977,569.

So their business seems to be thriving, and investors seem eager to put in more capital under the law as it stands. Yet these natural-gas companies are driving for higher rates and freedom from regulation.

Two companies—Cities Service and Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line—are now having to return to customers some $48,000,000 which the FPC and the courts found they had collected improperly.

Your gas bill will get bigger if the Rizley-Moore measure becomes law. And it's a symptom of a current trend that could hit your pocketbook hard.

For, in addition to the natural-gas companies, other public utilities of all kinds have seized on this as the time for a determined effort to repeal, indirectly, most of the Federal regulation enacted in the last 20 years. The Rizley bill is only one of a dozen along these lines pending in Congress.

Labor Education Extension Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement explaining H. R. 4078, known as the Labor Education Extension Act, which I introduced in the House of Representatives July 2, 1947:

This bill is a constructive piece of labor legislation. It has the united and wholehearted support of all labor organizations. This is what labor says:

AFL: "Such a service would give workers the material and tools with which to meet their educational needs."

CIO: "All affiliated international unions, councils, and local industrial unions are urged to support this program by resolution, publicity, financial assistance, and communications to their respective Members of Congress, and cooperate with the Committee for the Extension of Labor Education toward this end."

Railroad labor: "Our association endorses the principle and objectives of this proposed legislation."

Through this bill labor is asking for better access to and more training in the use of the modern tools of facts and reason. This will promote orderly collective bargaining and peaceful industrial relations. It will likewise promote wider and wiser exercise of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship in the community, State, and Nation.

HOW THE SERVICE WOULD WORK

The bill would extend to some 42,000,000 wage and salary earners a program similar to that carried on by the Agricultural Extension Service for families of 6,000,000 farm operators.

Instruction would be provided at times and places and in forms convenient for wage and salary earners.

Teachers would be drawn from institutions of higher learning cooperating in the program.

Requests by groups of workers for classes would be worked out with these institutions and presented to State boards for approval.

Approved requests would be incorporated in a State plan and budget to be presented to the Secretary of Labor. Upon approval, he would request the Secretary of the Treasury to release from funds earmarked for the several States, payments to the cooperating institutions.

Sums deemed by Congress to be adequate to meet the demands for this service are to be appropriated and in each instance matched by at least 25 percent from sources within the State.

WHAT IS ASKED FOR BY WORKERS

This list is based on specific requests from workers, reported by universities, unions, and teachers of labor education classes.

Basic courses: Economic problems of American industry; economics of individual industries; labor legislation and law; social security; collective bargaining; history of the labor movement (related to economic and political history); consumers' problems; current national and international events; health and safety; government; community programs; public relations.

Tool subjects: Parliamentary law; public speaking; shop steward training; time and motion studies; grievance procedures; publicity workshop; radio workshop; writing; techniques of workers' education.

Other services: Research projects; exhibits, pictorial material; conferences; library services; moving pictures; occasional speakers.

NEED FOR THE BILL

Typical reports from universities conducting labor extension programs:

Wisconsin: "Winter off campus service is needed. Field staff should be placed immediately in 9 cities to serve 35 cities and towns in those areas. Estimated teaching staff needed is forty-four. Summer and winter institutes on campus are in demand. Training for union leadership requested. Research and preparation of printed material for union use and more audio-visual material are needed immediately."

State College, Pennsylvania, 1946: "Provided a week's summer training on its campus for 400 steelworkers. Is repeating this program for 1947. Textile and hosiery workers and many other unions are planning similar institutes. AFL, CIO, and railway organizations are making inquiries about educational services. At request of steelworkers, extension classes in union halls were undertaken, autumn 1946. More than 75 locals requested classes in contract administration, grievance and adjustment procedures, and related subjects leading to improved industrial relations. Penn State lacks resources to meet more than a fraction of these growing demands."

Chicago: "Because of lack of staff we reached less than 5 percent of the union members who want to attend classes. Requests for case materials have come from 60 leading universities. Five international unions have asked for text materials. None of these requests can be adequately filled unless we have assistance in the form of grants."

Michigan: "Classes held in 300 union halls 21 college or university campuses in 43 cities We believe there is tremendous need for extension of more informal types of educational programs through additional personnel in areas of: (a) community services; (b) socio-economic problems (national and international); (c) local and State government

"More printed and visual materials are needed. The training program for people from other institutions and unions engaged in labor education should be started. Except for the year 1944–45 we have not dared carry on any kind of promotional program because with an inadequate budget we cannot extend our services beyond trying to care for the most pressing requests."

Rhode Island State College: "Classes requested by workers: Trends in labor legislation, mediation and arbitration, methods of handling grievances, railway labor legislation, introduction to principles of stewardship. Requests from local unions and other groups are increasing but cannot be met with present resources.

"At present more than 75 colleges and universities are conducting some type of labor extension service.

"As the above reports show, they cannot begin to meet the need that exists. Many of them are aware of the need of a pooling of experience and information so that improvements in teaching methods and materials worked out in one institution may be immediately available to all."

THE LEGISLATIVE BASIS FOR THE BILL

"A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of July 2, 1862, the act of August 30, 1890, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of these acts and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor

"Be it enacted, etc., That in order to broaden and further develop the cooperative extension system as established by the act of July 2, 1862, the act of August 30, 1890, and acts supplemental thereto, and to aid in diffusing useful and practical information among the wage earners of the United States and increase the resources and facilities available to them, there shall be established in cooperation with colleges receiving the benefits of the aforementioned acts and other colleges, universities, and research agencies as designated in the several States a Labor Extension Service in the Department of Labor, administered by the Secretary of Labor.

"It is declared to be the policy of the Congress that the purposes of this program shall be to enable the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with his duty to promote the welfare of wage earners, through a program for the dissemination of useful knowledge to provide a means by which the Nation may conserve the creative capacities of workers, who, together with farmers, comprise the Nation's basic productive asset."

Depleting Our Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, there have been appearing in recent days, from various New Deal columnists, jibes at me and other Republicans, as well as some old-time Democrats, who have pointed out the illogic of allowing oil to be shipped to Russia while at the same time spending hundreds of millions of dollars to stop Russia, through the Truman plan, the Marshall plan, or some other high-falutin plan.

The truth is, all these so-called plans, to which the name of some Democrat is given in order to enhance both his prestige and the prestige of the plan itself, are nothing in the world but new-fangled ways of depleting our natural resources and causing more inflation in the United States.

In connection with my recital of the illogic of sending oil to Russia, while at the same time this Nation spends money in a moral war with Russia, I pointed out that we made the same fatal mistake in dealing with Japan before we were involved in World War II. The defenders of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt were quick to take up the cudgels in his defense, but the truth cannot be hidden by voluminous words. The sad truth is that our diplomacy under President Roosevelt was filled with errors of judgment that have cost our Nation untold lives and still are costing us dearly in prestige abroad.

It is often said that those who mention these matters are exercising "hindsight," as if to leave the impression that there were no other alternatives for Mr. Roosevelt at the time he made the faulty decisions. But anyone can go back and look at old newspaper files to see that there were alternatives and that this Nation did not have to ship gas and oil and steel and pig-iron and scrap metals to Japan. As a matter of fact, members of the President's own party urged him as late as 1940 to put the economic squeeze on Japan, but he chose to go right ahead, lending money to China and sending what amounted to war materials to Japan.

I have recently read an article by Constantine Brown, the columnist from the Washington Evening Star, which reveals some research on Mr. Brown's part and brings out clearly the fact that those who are now accused of "hindsight" when they indict Roosevelt's judgment actually had foresight too, but that they were scorned at the very time they should have been heeded.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the article by Mr. Brown which appeared in the Washington Star issue of July 11, 1947:

HISTORY IS SEEN REPEATING ITSELF IN UNITED STATES STAND ON OIL SENT RUSSIA

(By Constantine Brown)

Those who heard Acting Secretary of Commerce Foster explain to Chairman WEICHEL, of the House Merchant Marine Committee, last Wednesday why the administration will not yield to congressional pressure to halt oil exports to Russia, felt that history was repeating itself.

In 1940 when the United States was exporting large quantities of gasoline and scrap iron to Japan, Members of Congress made direct representations to Secretary of State Hull to stop consignments. He told them an embargo would invite serious friction with Japan.

When Senator Gillette, of Iowa, called on the Secretary of State with the suggestion to introduce a resolution to prohibit further exportation of war materials, Mr. Hull became disturbed and warned the Iowan: "Senator, I must ask you to refrain from such an action. You will rock the ship of state."

HULL'S WORDS RECALLED

Mr. Hull pointed out that the Japanese would consider as a cause of war any interference with their normal trade with the United States. Our relations with Japan were strained, Mr. Hull told Senator Gillette confidentially, but there was still hope that by careful handling and patience difficulties could be straightened out, if this country did not give the warmongers in Tokyo cause to go on a rampage.

The resolution was never presented. We continued to do normal business with Japan, and our gasoline—converted into high-octane fuel in Japanese plants—and our scrap iron were returned to American soldiers and sailors at Pearl Harbor, Guadalcanal, Iwo Jima, and other battle sites in the Pacific.

Wednesday Mr. Foster said publicly what Mr. Hull had said off the record to Senator Gillette. He stated that an abrupt halt to oil shipments now would create chaos in the economies of friendly powers, and suggested that such an action might have far-reaching diplomatic repercussions.

According to official reports from the USSR, oil production in the Soviet Union has considerably increased in the last 12 months. Russian reports indicate that it even exceeds prewar production. Hence, the export of American oil can make no difference to Soviet industries, which have at their disposal large oil centers inside Russia, to say nothing of the oil fields which the Soviet controls in Rumania, Austria, and Poland.

But what is important is Russia's need to import oil into Siberia, where there are no known petroleum deposits. In that part of the empire Russia is reliably reported to be constructing important military establishments. It was disclosed to a number of Senators, at a secret briefing last month, that information had been received that a number of military air stations are being built in Siberia, while a large number of Soviet submarines are patrolling off the American Pacific coast. The latter would explain the need for oil for Diesel engines.

PURCHASES NEGLIGIBLE

The Soviet has been purchasing a negligible quantity of oil from this country, Mr. Foster maintained. The Acting Secretary of Commerce estimated Russian purchases in the first half of 1947 at 730,000 barrels. This, he added, is not a disproportionate part of the total world consumption.

But the situation justifies a certain amount of concern when one bears in mind that the oil was shipped from the west coast for consumption in Siberia and, in all likelihood, as the Senators were informed, is being used exclusively for military and naval purposes.

The shipment of 730,000 barrels to Russia for her industries would be a drop in the bucket. But the sale of such a quantity for use exclusively in Siberia, could be of real assistance to the Russian armed forces. This might explain Mr. Foster's alarming suggestion that an embargo might create diplomatic friction with Moscow.

In spite of all entreaties Russia has turned down the Marshall plan, which might have given her many times 730,000 barrels of oil. Yet, presumably on advice from the State Department, the Commerce official suggests diplomatic complications.

One Way to Radicalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic City (N. J.) Press has recently printed an editorial entitled "One Way to Radicalism." The philosophy of the editorial is worth thinking about, and I am including it in the RECORD, and inviting the attention of the membership to it. The editorial follows:

ONE WAY TO RADICALISM

A phenomenon of the hour is the protest against rising costs—of everything from biscuits to automobiles. Folks talk sourly against higher rents, higher taxes, and higher everything. If employers, they dislike higher wages and salaries; if employees, the higher prices fixed by those who pay the higher salaries.

And the class affiliation makes no difference. If we live by the sweat of our brow, the rich should pay the higher taxes; if by clipping coupons, the Government tax collectors are scorned just the same, the high prices resented, and a Roosevelt is cussed to high heaven.

Ironical, indeed, if while we talk of Marshall plans and apppropriate billions to stop

the spread of communism abroad, we should be unconsciously sowing the seeds of communistic progress in our own homeland—with price decontrols, tax reductions, OPA elimination, and other steps in encouragement of inflation.

However, let's avoid too much emotional dejection. And remember the old Republican battle cry of the dinner pail era, "When prices and wages are high the country is prosperous."

In this conclusion there may be more than a modicum of truth. Money doesn't last long; no. A man's grand income just flies away in the weekly purchasing; yes. But we do seem to have more things than ever.

Probably not as much happiness. They say that is not purchased with money.

But what the statesmanship guiding our American affairs should be careful of is that the inability to keep money in the pocket does not breed discontent.

Address by Hon. Owen Brewster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following speech by the Honorable OWEN BREWSTER, United States Senator from the State of Maine, delivered on July 5, 1947, at the closing session of the Fiftieth Annual Convention of the Zionist Organization of America. This speech dealt with the problem of Palestine, the satisfactory solution of which may help to relax materially international tensions which threaten the peace of the world.

In view of the fact that even now the problem of Palestine is being investigated by the United Nations special committee, a fact which underscores the international import of the subject, I think it is fitting that this powerful speech should be included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Silver, distinguished guests, and friends, it is surely an inspiration to stand before an audience such as this. You can understand why I was most happy to yield my time to the gentleman who immediately preceded me in your entertainment, to listen a little longer to those golden notes that have demonstrated the unity of our ideas.

I am also happy to be on the same platform with my colleague in the Senate. Senators sometimes seem to be some distance apart, not only geographically, but ideologically. [Laughter.] Here is a subject on which we are in full accord. [Applause.]

As Senator MURRAY has so appropriately pointed out, the overwhelming sentiment of Congressmen and Senators in both parties has been in favor of the Palestine resolution. Yet in spite of the practically unanimous endorsement of the Palestine resolution which we read, we still find ourselves suffering from the frustration of a State Department that refuses to go forward with what is so evidently the overwhelming sentiment of the American people. [Applause.]

It is appropriate, as Senator MURRAY pointed out, that strongly as we condemn the action of Great Britain and its foreign office, its colonial office, regarding Palestine, we must hold to account our own administration for failure, in spite of all the favors granted to Britain and others, to achieve this thing which, above all others, contributes, not only to justice to a great race, but also to serving, in my judgment, the interests of the foreign policy of the United States. [Applause.]

If our foreign policy has any sense left to it, it will see to it that Palestine is made into a Jewish commonwealth without delay. [Applause.] I hope that Senator MURRAY may speak with the same eloquence and earnestness to those more immediately concerned in the formulation of this policy in the executive department. I do not challenge the good faith or the good intentions of the President or of the Secretary of State. What I ask simply is that after 24 months of frustration through action and inaction, we shall now expect results worthy of the great cause in which we are engaged. [Applause.]

I am happy to be here tonight fresh from a dinner which I enjoyed on Zion Hill in Dexter, Maine, where I was born. Perhaps that explains my devotion to this cause. [Applause.] I also claim, with Dr. Silver, to be preordained a Zionist by selection of my place of birth on Zion Hill. [Laughter and applause.]

I was delighted when John Gunther in Inside USA selected my devotion to Zionism as one of the outstanding characteristics of my public and private life. [Applause.]

I came under the influence of the silver tongue of your great leader 25 years ago. [Applause.] If there had been any doubt in my mind, he resolved it with the wisdom and the fervor which he revealed. Since then, it has been my pleasure to serve as I might in advancing this great cause. You are highly privileged to have had him as your leader—one who is recognized throughout the world because of his vision and his statesmanship; one to whom all of us in Washington are proud to pay tribute in this zenith of his devotion to the cause. [Applause.] His world-wide leadership approaches the day when the great cause of Zion will come into its own and be ordained by all the nations as a vision that has been converted into a reality.

While we sometimes may seem dismayed and discouraged, while sometimes it seems as though the way is long, while sometimes it seems as though we have been wandering in the wilderness, for more than the 40 years of that long journey from the darkness of Egypt up to the bright hills of Palestine—let us not lose heart.

I come to you fresh from Palestine where 10 weeks ago this very day I was privileged to alight and spend the day there with Mrs. Goldie Meyerson, the great political leader. [Applause.] We traveled about Palestine and visited a colony that was established there 25 years ago. Thus I saw at first hand the fruits of your devoted labor and contributions. I also saw there 50 young children who had been brought from the displaced-persons camps of Germany, whom I had seen 2 years earlier in Germany, and now was privileged to see them brought back to life from the dark ghosts that were stalking there in the shadows of the graves of those they had loved. Here they were in the brightness and light of Palestine, there upon the hills, in a colony that was bringing them back to a realization of the great love.

Yet the joy of that day was overshadowed by the thought of the thousands who remain in the displaced-persons camps.

Only in the past few weeks I filed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report given to me by Col. Julius Klein covering conditions there in Germany in the displaced persons camps, and in the associations of our soldiers with the Nazis, and the extent to which they are being indoctrinated with Nazi ideas and ideologies as a result of the associations that are going on; and warnings of the peril and what must be the reaction of the thousands in the displaced persons camps to see our own soldiers becoming infected with the disease of nazism as a result of that association. I was happy today to read that a distinguished rabbi in Germany and a clergyman of another faith had joined in denunciation of those associations which are bringing about the corruption of our youth. [Applause.]

So I come to you to bring you reassurance as to the progress there in Palestine, in spite of the dismal stories that are told, and to assure you of my continuing profound faith that this great cause is going on in spite of all the opposition which may be generated by men of little minds.

As we wander in these days, as you contemplate the 50 years of your labors in this wilderness of doubt and of despair, you must realize it comes to you primarily as a challenge to your faith, as a test of whether or not you are worthy of all those throughout the hundreds of generations who have handed down this great vision, and whether now, as we come to the very threshold of the promised land, you can maintain your faith and be worthy to see your comrades.

I am reminded of a small boy up in Maine, a barefoot boy, fishing from a bridge over a little brook. A shiny automobile stopped at the bridge. I suppose we could say a cosmopolitan New Yorker was probably inside. He said to the little boy, "Sonny, can you tell me the way to Rumford Falls?"

"No; I can't."

"Can you tell me the way to Westbrook?"

"No; I can't."

"Can you tell me the way to Waterville?"

"No; I can't."

The New Yorker said, "Well, sonny, you don't know very much, do you?"

The little boy answered, "No; but I ain't lost." [Laughter.]

That is what we need to say to our sometimes devious diplomats who seek with siren tongues to deceive the electorate. We have to assure them we still know the objective we have in view and that no words can confuse or bemuse us in the achievement of this goal. Diplomats use words in many ways, as Senator MURRAY pointed out. It is high time we here in America should accumulate some of that shirt-sleeve diplomacy that speaks and says exactly what it means and does not deal other cards under the table. [Applause.]

Words are very funny things. I knew of a young lady up-State who asked to have her genealogy developed. An authority in this field discovered that one of her uncles had perished at Sing Sing under somewhat dubious circumstances. [Laughter.] She did not think that was very desirable, and asked if he could not fix it up a little. So he brought back a report which stated that this particular uncle had occupied the chair of applied electricity at a great American institution. [Laughter.] And had died in harness. [Laughter].

That is the way I feel about some of the utterances of our diplomats. I think it is high time we held them to account. They can discover very serious obstacles in very little things. They can give us a million reasons why a thing cannot be done. They can hide behind shadows that are without substance of any kind.

There was a spinster lady who had a cottage on one of the rivers in Maine. She was disturbed to find boys swimming along the banks in front of her cottage. She asked the chief of police to tell them to go away. Two days later she called up and said, "Chief, it is still very unsatisfactory. Out of my second-story window with a spyglass, I can still see those boys." [Laughter.]

That is the way it seems to me these diplomats are operating. If we have any doubt about it, simply read the words of Bartley Crum—[applause]—a member of the fifty-seventh variety of Anglo-American commissions that we have had to evade this problem. He has written a record of the devious

course of our diplomacy that has never been successfully denied. As long as that record written by Bartley Crum stands unchallenged, our administration must recognize that it faces serious questions as to its capacity to deal with matters of this kind. [Applause.]

Why do I have this faith regarding Palestine in the face of all the discouragements of recent years? If I may paraphrase the words of a very great man, there is no power on earth that can resist an idea whose time has come. In my judgment, that is the story of the great Zionist dream of Palestine. It is about to be realized even though, as always, it is darkest before the dawn.

Secretary Marshall wrote to 30 Congressmen one short month ago that it was premature to formulate an American policy regarding Palestine. What an amazing statement. American policy regarding Palestine was formulated in the Coolidge Anglo-American Treaty of 1924, following out the policies enunciated by Woodrow Wilson and by every one of his successors in the White House, down to the very present day. [Applause.] How can anyone dare to say that there is any necessity of formulating an American policy regarding Palestine. That policy declared in no uncertain terms that Palestine should be developed as a Jewish homeland. [Applause.] The ignorance of General Marshall is understandable in view of his preoccupation with many matters, but it is unpardonable in the utterly inadequate briefing of his devious subordinates. It is only a question of time until they must be repudiated in order to justify the good faith of the administration. [Applause.]

Now I come to what seems to me the significance of this present time. Senator MURRAY has given you a complete and accurate history of the development of this great idea. But now we come to the present and to this very spot where the United Nations are now assembled to deal with the problem of peace throughout the earth. What do we find?

Under the Truman doctrine regarding Greece and Turkey, we find it was necessary to detour the United Nations, perhaps for the reason that the prospect of a Russian veto of the Greek Border Commission seems to doom to frustration any action on their part.

Then we come to the Marshall plan for Europe, and the debacle in Paris this past week, perhaps necessary because of the fear that the Economic Commission of the United Nations might be under the domination of Russia and her satelites and so render nugatory the great objectives he had in view. Yet, here again, in these two great momentous issues concerned with the peace of all the world, it has been necessary to go around the United Nations. If this policy is to continue, then perhaps it will be necessary to erect a pyramid instead of an office building, over here on the banks of the East River, as a melancholy monument to another vision of world peace that passed this way in vain.

But Palestine has been referred to the United Nations, and here is the challenge of the vigor and virility of the United Nations to do justice in this cause. And justice here requires only that the pledge of 54 nations in the mandate given to Great Britain shall now thus belatedly be redeemed. [Applause.]

It will be something far more than the problem of justice to the Jews. That is the problem of whether good faith still continues among the people of this earth. At the very time that Palestine in its meager 10,000 square miles was pledged as a homeland for the Jews, there was also a pledge of more than a million square miles to five Arab nations. That has since been accomplished under the careful midwifery of the United States and Great Britain. They now have the effrontery to challenge their foster parents with war upon our countries if we shall not yield to their demands regarding Palestine. Can anyone conceive of greater effrontery than of a Grand Mufti fresh from his residence in Berlin—that the United Nations shall consider the worthiness of their cause?

Perhaps we can understand Britain's seeking of Arab friendship on the verge of the great war, although, as Senator MURRAY said, Winston Churchill challenged that in words still ringing down the corridors of history when he said that the good faith of Great Britain was a more potent weapon than all the Arabs in the world. He said that the White Paper was a plain breach of a solemn obligation, and that the day would come when Britain would rue that act.

What did they gain for it? Did they gain the aid of a single Arab in the painful struggle through which we have passed? Ibn Saud declared war in April of 1945, 1 month after the collapse of the Hitler regime and 2 months before Hirohito took the air. That was the aid we got from Ibn Saud in return for the White Paper. It seems to me he has been abundantly repaid by the $1,000,000,000 which I read in the paper today he is to receive as a result of the oil concession in Saudi Arabia. It does not seem to me that we need to give him Palestine as well. [Applause.] In his kingdom he will not allow a Jew, and he has never visited Palestine. So it seems to me his views regarding Palestine in the light of the last quarter of a century of achievement do not need serious consideration by the United Nations.

What do we see beyond? My time is running out. I asked Dr. Silver how long I should speak and he said what a great President of Yale said on a sunny May afternoon when the boys had to attend chapel. He said, "You know, no soul is saved after the first 20 minutes." [Laughter.] I rather suspect there are no souls here that are in need of saving. I think you have by your dedication throughout the past 50 years demonstrated your right to consideration in this cause. I think some of you have been at it that long, although I am sure the ladies are a little more recent acquisition. [Laughter.]

My proposition is simply this—that not only justice to the Jew under the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924 dedicates and declares our policy, but that American foreign policy at the present time insistently requires that we shall see to it that Palestine becomes a Jewish commonwealth, as obviously the only way in which the pledge of a Jewish homeland in Palestine can be realized. [Applause.] Let's pray that this will be. Also, it is the only way in which there can be any assurance that we shall continue to have access to these precious and indispensable oil reserves in the Middle East. All through the story of Palestine runs the theme of oil. Let us face it as a fact.

Our action regarding Greece and Turkey can only be justified upon the ground that our vital national interests are immediately involved. In no other way can they justify our action, pouring in hundreds of millions of our money, with a potential promise to back it up with military might—unless our vital national interests are involved. Surely, if Greece and Turkey are vital, Palestine is more important yet, because through Palestine runs the very sacred pipe line which Lebanon and Syria tell us in the very reports today are the means of their rising in the family of nations to a new era of prosperity and progress. Yet those very pipe lines run through Palestine. Rights to them were given by the British mandatory within the past 3 months without regard whatsoever to the rights and interests of the Jews and of the other occupants of that land.

This is why it seems to me it is time for the American people to insist that those in authority in our Executive administration shall take cognizance of these plain and simple facts. If Arabian oil is vital to our people, as we are told within the past week, the 500,000 barrels a month are coming to redeem our shortages upon the Atlantic seaboard, for each month in the remainder of this year.

If they establish this pipe line to Arabian oil, there are two policies which they may follow. One is by insisting that all nations live up to their pledges, without delay and in good faith. That means that the United Nations—practically all of whom were parties to the League of Nations, with the single exception of the United States—consider the mandate as to the future of Palestine. The United States became a party by the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924.

Where do our Arab friends stand? They have given concessions to oil companies on the oil that lies beneath their soil. They are being paid, as they boast in the paper today, more than a billion dollars for those rights. Yet they now demand the right to dictate regarding Palestine. They have not a single vestige of a claim. As Lawrence of Arabia pointed out in a letter to Winston Churchill, he said the pledge regarding Palestine was warranted and just. The leader of the Arabs at that time similarly gave his sanction to the act. Yet, these Arab muftis would now undertake to repudiate their own pledges and would demand that the Jew must be sacrificed, as it was said in the House of Commons, to the imperialistic rather than humanitarian policies.

The time has come to call a halt. That is why I end, as I began, with the declaration that Palestine within our day is going to become a Jewish commonwealth. [Applause.] I say that not only because it is right, not only because it is just, not only because it is a consecration of the loving labors of all the millions here in America who have contributed to this great cause, not only because of the hundreds of millions of dollars poured into redeeming that land to make it blossom, literally, like the rose. I rode about there, first, where the Jewish colonists have redeemed it; then, side by side, the land deserted by the Arabs and denied to Jews by the British who seem to be intent on keeping Palestine always a subordinate among the nations.

It is a curious thing. Palestine is almost the only country in the world that does not ask for aid. The Jews have gone in there. They are self-supporting. They are self-respecting. You and your associates throughout America have made that possible in one of the greatest demonstrations in modern life of the capacity of a people for sacrifice for a high and holy cause. [Applause.]

If they would come to us and tell us that they were perhaps infected with the virus of communism, if they would come and ask us for $4,000,000,000 in a loan, then America would spring into response and our State Department would insist that something be done. But when Palestine comes to us and asks only that they shall be free and independent, that they would be happy to relieve us of more than a million displaced persons in Europe now dependent upon our charity and help, that they will be delighted in the next decade to take them over—and the record of the past 25 years is a sufficient guarantee that they are entirely capable of that pledge [applause]—they cannot understand language of that character. They do not know what it is to have a country offer to help us. So they shy aside.

I suggest that our cartoonists, our satirists, those capable of doing justice to this cause, shall point out not only the futility, but the farce of America refusing one country in this world which offers to help us out. [Applause.]

They are deliberating over in Europe today as to how many billions they shall ask

us for to help them out. We are deliberating as to how many billions we can afford to give them. Yet the one country in the world which asks for nothing but an opportunity to be free, in accordance with the pledge made by all the nations, must stand as a mendicant at our door; and our State Department cannot even do it justice to say they will formulate a policy. [Applause.]

These are some of the reasons for the faith that is in me. I could continue without end, speaking from the inspiration I have gathered in the past week from Zionists, speaking on my visit to Palestine twice in the past 3 years. But assuring you certainly as there is a God in Israel, certainly as the sun rises in the east and sets in the west, Palestine is going to be a free and independent Jewish commonwealth, either under this administration or under the one that will certainly succeed it.

(The assembly arose and applauded.)

Air Reserve Endorses Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, at its first postwar national convention, the Air Reserve Association of the United States placed itself squarely on record in support of unification of the armed services with the unanimous adoption of a resolution which concisely states the case for unification. Because of the concise accuracy of that resolution representing another strong evidence of the American public's support of the proposal of unification, I am inserting it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AIR RESERVE ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES AT MEMPHIS, TENN., NOVEMBER 18–20, 1946

Whereas the strength of national security forces under present unsettled war conditions is of extreme importance; and

Whereas it appears that there is a growing tendency in some quarters to economize at the expense of national safety requirements: Now be it

Resolved, That the Air Reserve Association place itself on record as favoring a strong air force in being, supported by a strong air reserve, maintenance of a research and development program adequate for development of weapons superior to those of any possible enemy, and maintenance of an aircraft industry capable of proper expansion during wartime; and the Air Reserve Association requests that the United States Government take the action necessary to maintain a defense program and a sufficient air force to meet all foreseeable emergencies; and

Whereas unification of the armed forces is a question that should be decided on its own merits; and

Whereas it is unthinkable to attempt adequate national defense under the present uncoordinated command; and

Whereas the effective strategic employment of air power during World War II is justifying its recognition as military power in its own right; and

Whereas an adequate defense set-up demands the establishment of an autonomous air force; and

Whereas the formulation of an adequate air-defense program has been delayed due to the inability of the Air Forces to act independently in their present subordinate position: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Air Reserve Association favors the immediate establishment of an autonomous air force; and

Whereas economy in military organizations is necessary in order to obtain maximum defense per dollar invested; and

Whereas the experience in World War II has shown the necessity for one supreme coordinated command of military services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Air Reserve Association favors a single department of defense with coordinated land, sea, and air components; and furthermore be it

Resolved, That action be taken by Congress at the earliest possible moment in order to eliminate the present delays in the reorganization of the Army Air Forces.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a resolution adopted by an outstanding aviation group, the National Aviation Clinic, and vigorously endorsing unification.

Resolution 4—National Defense

Resolved, That the National Aviation Clinic strongly favors, and again urgently recommends, the immediate establishment of a Secretary of Defense with three Under Secretaries for the Army, Navy, and Air Power.

Rural Life Sunday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Joseph W. Fichter, of Oxford, Ohio, chaplain of the National Grange and master of the Ohio State Grange, delivered during Rural Life Sunday coast-to-coast broadcast under the auspices of the National Grange over the Mutual Broadcasting System, from Hamilton, Ohio, May 11, 1947:

It is fitting that the Sabbath Day be selected as the time for taking stock of rural life. On this day, when our thoughts are turned to God, we reflect on the meaning and purpose of life and ask ourselves whether we are giving proper direction to the great gift of life which has been bequeathed to us.

Furthermore, it is fitting that the Grange cooperate with the Church in observing Rural Life Sunday, for the Grange is interested in spiritual matters as well as in economic, educational, and social questions. The Grange, however, is nonsectarian and scrupulously refrains from interfering with the religious opinions of its members.

The origin of Rural Life Sunday is in the Rogation Days, which were designated by the early church for the purpose of offering special prayers to God for His blessing on the fruits of the soil. Rural Life Sunday, as a world-wide day of prayer, was instituted at a meeting of the International Association of Agricultural Missions in 1929. The fifth Sunday after Easter was selected as the time for the observance, and all groups were urged to endeavor to make the day fulfill its possibilities for the rural life of the world.

Following the suggestion made in 1929, Granges throughout the land have observed Rural Life Sunday. In some places Grange members attend the local church as a group, and participate in the special service appropriate for the occasion. In other places special meetings are held in Grange halls, with a member of the clergy or someone else interested in rural life as a speaker. The theme running through all of these meetings is the responsibility of all—on the farm and in the city—as stewards of God's holy earth.

Today this Nation-wide network broadcast of a typical Rural Life Sunday program marks a milestone in the observance of the day. Assembled here are members of the local Grange and of the local church, who have met to worship together and to consider the relationship of rural life to the Nation and to the world.

Down through the ages prophets, poets, and sages have urged the people to hold fast to the virtues inherent in rural life. But their exhortations have been as a voice crying in the wilderness.

Within recent years, however, we are beginning to realize the folly in our neglect of rural life. We have begun to see that in our search for wealth, power, and temporary pleasures in the city we are losing the security, freedom, and happiness that were once ours on the farm. We have become aware that the soil, which is a vital source of food for people in the city as well as in the country, has been depleted to the danger point.

Today there is a revival of concern for rural life. With the realization that city populations are not reproducing themselves, we are becoming aware that the continuation of the human race depends upon the rural areas.

There is nothing to be gained by stirring up a spirit of antagonism between city and country. The welfare of the city is dependent upon the health, prosperity, education, and spiritual attitude of the countryside; and likewise the well-being of the city is good for the farm community.

It is unfortunate if city people reach conclusions regarding political, economic, and social issues through a process that takes into account only the temporary and easily apparent selfish interest of the city. Also, it is unfortunate if farmers pursue a similar process.

It is much better if all of us, city dwellers and farmers, consider ourselves members of one human family, making our homes or and nurtured by God's holy earth. All of us, in one way or another, are engaged in occupations which contribute to the production of food, raiment, homes, and other elements of civilization.

With such a perspective, we shall realize that one of nature's basic laws is mutual dependence and that no one is exempt from it; that no one person or one group can expect always to be so powerful as to be sufficient unto itself.

If we think of living as members of one human family and if we seek an acquaintanceship with and an understanding of life as manifested in nature, we shall learn to distinguish between the essential and the less essential. We shall learn that the soil is necessary to life everywhere. While realizing that prosperous cities can contribute to the prosperity of farmers, we shall at the same time be aware that in the last analysis life can go on without cities but it cannot continue without the soil and the products thereof. Xenophon, the ancient Greek writer, said, "When agriculture flourishes, all other pursuits are in full vigor; but when the ground is forced to lie barren, other occupations are almost stopped, as well by land as by sea."

Were it not for the food which moves daily from the farms, people in the cities would soon go hungry and no amount of money or sophistication could satisfy their hunger. To

a great extent, the fertility of the soil has been depleted through the furnishing of food for the cities. The cities have been developed in large measure by people who were born and reared on the farms. As boys and girls from the farms have gone to urban communities, they have taken with them a large investment in the cost of their rearing and of their education and in the quality of their integrity and spiritual life, all of which has been furnished by the farm homes and rural communities. Furthermore, as city populations have so far not reproduced themselves, the physical continuance of life in the cities has been dependent upon immigration from the country.

Thus, life, soil fertility, and money have constantly flowed from the country to the city. This one-way stream cannot continue forever. If we expect the cities to continue to exist, the country must be replenished. We must not forget that one of nature's basic laws is mutual dependence.

The cities can do their part in this plan of mutual dependence by sharing with rural communities some of the money that has been transferred through the process which I have mentioned, from the country and concentrated in the cities. As a result of this transfer of people and money to the cities, the people remaining on the farms are no longer financially able to maintain facilities for health, schools, churches, libraries, and recreation as good as those in urban communities. It should be possible for teachers, preachers, physicians, and others in rural areas to have incomes and living conditions as good as those in the cities.

This can be possible either by an increase in the relative share of the farmer's income or by forms of taxation whereby taxes can be collected on the basis of the ability to pay and distributed on the basis of need.

Furthermore, the cost of conserving and restoring of the soil is an obligation which should be shared by the city.

For many years, the average income of the farmers has been less than one-half of that of city residents. Even in 1945, a year of relatively high farm prices, the income of persons on farms averaged only $743 compared with $1,294 for persons not on farms.

The great increase in living costs during the last few months has created the impression that the farmers are receiving the benefit from these high prices. It is true that farm prices are higher now than they were in 1935–39, which is the base period that is so frequently used in making comparisons, but we should remember that farm prices during that period were 16 percent below parity. Although farmers are receiving more for their products now than formerly, a report released by the National Industrial Conference Board last week points out that by December 1946 the latest date for which the board had available figures, "the farmer was paying 94 percent more for all commodities for family maintenance than he did on the average in the 1935–39 period, 63 percent more for all commodities used in production, and 238 percent more for farm labor." The report of the board states that "to maintain prewar living standards, families of moderate income in large cities must now devote about 42 percent of their expenditure to food, as compared with 35 percent in 1935–39."

A study made by the Federal Trade Commission in 1936 revealed that the growers of Texas cabbage received 14.5 cents of the consumer's dollar; the grower of Florida grapefruit 24 cents; the grower of California oranges 33 cents; and the grower of Maine potatoes 46 cents. There is nothing to indicate that the farmer today is receiving a greater share of the consumer's dollar than he received in 1936.

Ways and means of encouraging the family-type farm must receive our attention. The family-type farm and the rural community constitute an ideal environment for better living. The farm home is the best place for normal living, which is the kind of living that all of us should seek to attain.

We cannot afford to accept the assumption there will be fewer and fewer people on the farm in the future. I realize that some economic conditions and some other developments have given us reason to take this assumption for granted. We should not fall into the defeatist attitude of accepting these conditions, but we should attempt to alter them.

Soil conservation and all that it implies—the planting of trees and the building of our depleted soil—should be a major concern of all the people, both in the cities and in the country. Perhaps land heretofore considered as wasteland can be made into fertile soil for the raising of crops and for the building of homes. Swamps can be drained and desert lands can be watered through the use of power machinery. Perhaps these places can be offered to our young people to encourage them to establish themselves on the land. It is encouraging that a million returned veterans have selected farming as their occupation.

The farm is not only the seedbed of the race but it is the place where democracy and wholesome family life are best nurtured. Parents and children do not go their separate ways, but through work and recreation the normal conditions of family life prevail. By sharing in the work of the farm and home, all learn the responsibilities as well as the benefits of democratic living. The virtue of thrift is acquired. Independence of thought is encouraged. Farm life develops integrity. The farmer can be a personality, with enough detachment from the surging mass of humanity and the rush and glitter of artificial life to enable him to think calmly and objectively. He shares in the joys and sorrows of his neighbors. It will be unfortunate for democracy if fewer and fewer people live on the family-type farm.

Modern man, influenced by the materialistic philosophy which says that the main purpose of life is the production and distribution of material goods, has lost much of the human and cultural values of rural life such as simple living, freedom, security, the appreciation of the beauty of nature, the association with lifelong friends, and a strong family life.

Material progress is not bad in itself. It is eliminating drudgery and isolation. But labor-saving devices should be used to provide more leisure time which should be devoted to the advancement of the cultural and spiritual phases of life.

If the business of farming completely absorbs us, we have overlooked the chief attractions of rural life. A way of life should be our main interest. Instead of allowing ourselves to be overcome by the materialism of this machine age, we should capitalize on the opportunities for normal living which surround us on the farm.

Displaced Persons Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the displaced persons is that of the resettlement of a million men, women, and children. At present these people are living in camps in Europe created for them when the Allied armies liberated them from Nazi exploitation and persecution.

Originally there were approximately eight millions of these persons who were made homeless during World War II They had fled from persecution or possible extermination or were taken to Germany, from all of the Nazi-dominated countries of Europe, to help build the war machine. Only one million have survived. Because of political and social conditions, they do not wish to return to their original homes, many of which are now under Communist domination. Of them, 21 percent are children, 13 percent are over the age of 44. Contrary to popular opinion, which has been formed on the basis of the magnitude of the concurrent and connected Palestine question, and the fact that 6,000,000 Jews were exterminated, most of these people do not belong to the Jewish race. About 20 percent are Jews, 65 percent Catholics, and 15 percent Protestants.

The United States is at present caring for about 60 percent of these people, as they are in the United States zone. The cost to the United States in 1947 will be about $130,000,000. As a member of the International Refugee Organization, which will take the place of the separate funds by the countries involved, the United States will pay a share amounting to $73,500,000.

Although membership in the International Refugee Organization will in no way commit the United States Congress to any policy on immigration, the two matters are related because at present the immigration laws of the United States do not permit the settlement here of many of the refugees who would like to come here, who would probably make good United States citizens, and who must go somewhere.

The problem until now has been one which has taxed the imagination, patience, and resourcefulness of soldiers, diplomats, and administrators. In the future, policy with regard to these refugees will have to be determined by the legislators.

There are four possible solutions, only one of which seems humane and sensible, to the question of providing homes for these displaced persons:

First. We could by force repatriate all of those now in the United States zones. Our soldiers with the aid of the German police could, at the point of bayonets, load them into boxcars or trucks and transport them to the countries of eastern Europe, or, likewise by force, collect them in order to have them fetched by the authorities of those countries. Russia has demanded their repatriation. To date the United States has refused. The use of force would be necessary.

Second. As a second possibility we could close the camps for displaced persons and let them struggle for themselves in a land where they have been, and, from definite indications, still would be persecuted. The International Refugee Organization offers a temporary remedy from this, but it will be an annual question.

Third. Another temporary solution would be maintenance of the camps, segregated from the economy and govern-

ment of Germany and paid for by the American taxpayer, either partially or wholly. The effect on the DP's, as they are called, would be to condemn them to a continued life of uncertainty with dissipation of their skills and their energies.

Fourth. The only alternative with any seeming permanence of solution which seems consistent with American principles would be to combine with our efforts—already being made—to resettle as many of the people as possible in Europe and Latin America, an effort to solve justly the Palestine question, and, primarily, a willingness to do our share in resettling some of these people in the United States.

Some of them we already have. But under the existing quota laws it is impossible for the number of these displaced people that are allowed to find refuge here to approximate the number that wish to do so. Moreover, on the basis of specific calculations as to age, ability, and adaptability, the thought is advanced by disinterested investigators that these people would make good, responsible American citizens, many of whom are needed for their special skills.

H. R. 2910 accepts the fourth alternative.

RESETTLEMENT POSSIBILITIES

Resettlement in Europe is expected as a possibility for only a few of the displaced persons. The fact that they fled persecution or annihilation—some of them are the sole survivors of their families—would indicate that they would have small reason to wish to return to their former homelands. The fact that they fled countries which are now chiefly Communist dominated and are still afraid to return to them means that most of eastern Europe is eliminated as a possible home for them. Germany was the country in which many of them were singled out for particularly brutal treatment. They cannot be expected to wish to settle there. England has opened her doors to an unusual number of immigrants as a temporary measure; but there is much uncertainty as to how long England's economy will be able to support any large number of additional persons. The rest of western Europe is also limited in capacity, although it is expected that some thousands will be distributed among the remaining countries.

Latin America is expected to absorb many thousands of displaced persons. It is the attitude, however, of those who are struggling to find a solution to this problem, that the Americans can scarcely hope to promote successfully efforts in this direction unless they themselves are willing to do a fair share.

Settlement of the question of Palestine, which might care for, eventually, some 20 percent of the displaced persons, is a matter involving various countries in a political, social, and economic tangle. The part of the United States in this matter can be pursued much more logically if this country has already made evident its good faith in sharing the larger problem.

THE UNITED STATES VIEWPOINT

The attitude of the United States toward the problem of the displaced persons involves some conflicting thought. Primarily the United States has been considered, at least in the eyes of most of its citizens, and, to some extent, abroad, as humanitarian in its viewpoint. Not only has it been regarded in the past—because of its very foundations and methods of settlement—as a haven of refuge, a land of freedom for the oppressed, a land of opportunity for the independent-minded, but also it has extended a helping hand to the unfortunate and has expected to do so in varying types of disaster. In this case a solution rather than temporary aid—already given—is necessary. These people want the chance to help themselves. They are not only not unwilling, as some have supposed, but anxious for the opportunity to pursue their own trades, to build again for themselves a home and a career and a permanency for their families. Many of them would like to come to the United States. The possibility of their making good citizens is offered as a good one judging from their background of adaptability, of industry, of their desire for independence.

The United States immigration laws are such that at present only certain numbers of persons from each country can come to stay here permanently. Many of those who must resettle somewhere and who wish to settle here can not do so under the present law. The emergency is considered a temporary one and one that is not likely to be repeated. The immediate question facing the United States is whether the legislators will see fit to relax the immigration laws, perhaps temporarily, in order to help to take care of a desperate situation, not only by actual assistance but also by example.

Modernize Our Presidential Election—IV. Count the Votes as Cast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, recently the Nation was shocked on learning that minor election officials out in Kansas City had used their position to make a theft of votes by counting them contrary to the way they were cast. A few hundred votes, or possibly a few thousand, were involved in the election to nominate a candidate for Congress.

In the Presidential election of 1944, 21,384,797 votes, with the approval of the law under which we elect the President, were counted exactly contrary to the way they were cast.

Mr. Dewey carried 12 States, having a total popular vote in that election of 9,894,187. Of these Mr. Dewey received 5,252,834, or 53 percent of the total vote of those 12 States, while the other candidates, principally Mr. Roosevelt, received 47 percent of the popular vote, but no credit for the electoral votes.

In a Nation-wide vote there was a total of 48,025,684. Of this number, Mr. Roosevelt received 25,602,505. In the electoral college Mr. Roosevelt received credit for the total votes of 36 States, with an aggregate vote of 38,131,947, or 12,528,992 more popular votes as represented in the electoral college, than he actually received.

Of the popular votes thus credited to Mr. Roosevelt, 16,743,444 were votes cast for Mr. Dewey and other candidates in the States he did not carry.

The total popular vote of the Nation which, in the ultimate computation, was not represented for the candidates for whom cast, was 21,384,797. Thus, in the election for President in 1944, over 44 percent of all the popular votes cast were not credited for the candidates for whom cast, as they were counted in the electoral votes. Even worse than that, like the Kansas City case, they were computed the opposite of the way they were cast.

The difference, of course, in the two cases is that the Kansas City counting was illegal, and the Presidential counting is legal. The illegitimate effect, however, was the same—taking votes from one candidate and crediting them to another.

Each State is given electoral votes mainly in proportion to its population. Yet the Constitution does not require the allotment of votes within the State to the minority candidates for whom they were cast. That permits this travesty on justice by allowing them, in effect, to be computed exactly the contrary to the way they were cast.

I, with other Members who have proposed similar resolutions, am seeking a system for electing the President by which the vote will be counted as cast. Is it not time that such a crude method of conducting the Presidential election as we now have should be terminated?

The fundamental features of the plan of an election we propose are to do away with the Presidential electors, the State unit vote, and to abolish the practice of disfranchisement of minority votes. We propose to accomplish these purposes by directly abolishing the Electoral College and the Presidential electors. We propose to retain electoral votes as a just means of preserving the States' relative strength among the States in the election of President. In order to do this we propose to let the people vote directly for the President. Each candidate would automatically share in the electoral vote of the State in proportion to his popular vote in the State.

The basis of this plan is the popular vote of each candidate reduced to a percentage of the popular State vote. By multiplying the total electoral vote of the State by the percentage of the popular vote received by the candidate, we give him the exact proportion of the electoral vote of the State to which he is entitled.

In this way we establish the electoral vote as a common unit for each State and a fair method under which every vote for every candidate is taken into consideration in the final count.

Table I, which I present, is intended to illustrate the operation of this plan by showing the popular votes of all candidates of all the States and then the percentage of popular votes to which each candidate would have been entitled based on the election returns for 1944.

TABLE I.—*Popular votes and percentages for candidates, 1944*

States	Popular votes						Total	Percentage of popular votes					
	Roosevelt (Democrat)	Dewey (Republican)	Thomas (Socialist)	Watson (Prohibition)	Teichert (Socialist Labor)	Others		Roosevelt (Democrat)	Dewey (Republican)	Thomas (Socialist)	Watson (Prohibition)	Teichert (Socialist Labor)	Others
Alabama	198,918	44,540	190	1,095			44,743	81.276	18.198	0.077	0.447		
Arizona	80,926	56,287		421			37,634	58.797	40.896		.305		
Arkansas	148,965	63,551	438				212,954	69.951	29.842	.205			
California	1,988,564	1,512,965	3,923	14,770	327	326	3,520,875	56.479	42.971	.111	.419	0.009	0.009
Colorado	234,331	268,731	1,977				505,039	46.398	53.209	.391			
Connecticut	435,146	390,527	5,097		1,220		831,990	52.301	46.938	.612		.146	
Delaware	68,166	56,747	154	294			125,361	54.375	45.266	.124	.234		
Florida	339,377	143,215					482,592	70.323	29.676				
Georgia	268,187	56,506		36		3,382	328,111	81.736	17.221		.010		1.030
Idaho	107,399	100,137	282	503			208,321	51.554	48.068	.135	.241		
Illinois	2,079,479	1,939,314	180	7,411	9,677		4,036,061	51.522	48.049	.004	.183	.239	
Indiana	781,403	875,891	2,223	12,574			1,672,091	46.732	52.382	.132	.751		
Iowa	499,876	547,267	1,511	3,752	193		1,052,599	47.489	51.991	.143	.356	.018	
Kansas	287,458	442,096	1,613	2,609			733,776	39.175	60.294	.219	.355		
Kentucky	472,589	392,448	535	2,023	326		867,921	54.450	45.217	.061	.233	.037	
Louisiana	281,564	67,750				69	349,383	80.588	19.391				.019
Maine	140,631	155,434			335		296,400	47.446	52.440			.113	
Maryland	315,490	292,949					608,439	51.852	48.147				
Massachusetts	1,035,296	921,350		973	2,780	266	1,960,665	52.803	46.991		.048	.141	.049
Michigan	1,106,899	1,084,423	4,598	6,503	1,264	1,530	2,205,217	50.194	49.175	.208	.294	.057	.069
Minnesota	589,864	527,416	5,073		3,176		1,125,529	52.407	46.859	.450		.282	
Mississippi	158,515	3,742				17,823	180,080	88.024	2.077				9.897
Missouri	867,357	761,175	1,750	1,175	221		1,571,678	51.369	48.430	.111	.074		.014
Montana	112,556	93,163	1,296	340			207,355	54.281	44.929	.625	.163		
Nebraska	233,246	329,880					563,126	41.419	58.580				
Nevada	29,623	24,611					54,234	54.620	45.379				
New Hampshire	119,663	109,916	46				229,625	52.112	47.867	.020			
New Jersey	987,874	961,335	3,358	4,255	6,939		1,963,761	50.305	48.953	.170	.216	.353	
New Mexico	81,389	70,688		148			152,225	53.466	46.436		.097		
New York	3,304,238	2,987,647	10,553		14,352		6,316,790	52.308	47.296	.167		.227	
North Carolina	527,399	263,155					790,554	66.712	33.287				
North Dakota	100,144	118,535	543	549			220,171	45.484	53.837	.428	.249		
Ohio	1,570,763	1,582,293					3,153,056	49.817	50.182				
Oklahoma	401,549	319,424		1,663			722,636	55.567	44.202		.230		
Oregon	248,635	225,365	3,785	2,362			480,147	51.783	46.936	.788	.491		
Pennsylvania	1,940,479	1,835,048	11,721	5,750	1,789		3,794,787	51.135	48.357	.308	.151	.047	
Rhode Island	175,356	123,487		433			299,276	58.593	41.261		.144		
South Carolina	90,601	4,547		365		7,862	103,375	87.643	4.398		.353		7.605
South Dakota	96,711	135,365					232,076	41.672	58.327				
Tennessee	308,707	200,311	892	882			510,792	60.436	39.215	.174	.172		
Texas	821,605	191,425	594	1,017		135,689	3,150,330	71.423	16.640	.051	.088		11.795
Utah	150,088	97,891	240				248,319	60.441	39.421				
Vermont	53,820	71,527				14	125,361	42.932	57.056				.011
Virginia	242,276	145,243	417	459	90		388,485	62.364	37.387	.107	.118	.023	
Washington	486,774	361,689	3,824	2,396	1,645		856,328	56.844	42.237	.446	.279	.192	
West Virginia	392,777	322,819					715,596	54.888	45.111				
Wisconsin	650,413	674,532	13,205		1,002		1,339,152	48.569	50.370	.986		.074	
Wyoming	49,419	51,921					101,340	48.765	51.234				
Total	25,602,505	22,006,278	80,518	74,758	45,336	216,289	48,025,684						

COMPARISON OF ELECTION RETURNS UNDER PRESENT AND PROPOSED PLANS AS APPLIED TO THE ELECTION OF 1944

I present table II showing the election returns of 1944, as measured by electoral votes, and what would have been the returns had House Joint Resolution 124 been part of our Constitution.

The first two columns of figures in this table show the result in each State as between the two main candidates at that election. Mr. Roosevelt carried 36 States, with their 432 electoral votes; Mr. Dewey carried 12 States, with their 99 electoral votes.

A glance at the first two columns of figures will show how illogical is our system of counting votes, under which the minority votes in each State contribute nothing to the candidate for whom cast. All minority votes are counted as if cast for the plurality candidate in each State.

Then if we look over to columns 3 and 4, in contrast, we will see what would have been the results, as measured by electoral votes as between these two candidates, had each one of them received a proportion of the electoral votes equal to his proportion of the popular votes.

Under the present plan of computation as shown in column 1, Mr. Roosevelt received 432 electoral votes. Under the proposed plan as shown in column 3 he would have received 300.726.

Then looking at the vote received by Mr. Dewey, we find that his total was 99 under the present plan; under the proposed plan, as indicated in column 4, his electoral vote would have been 223.529.

Under the proposed plan Roosevelt would have received 131.274 electoral votes less than he received under the present plan. Dewey would have received 124.529 electoral votes more than he did receive. The plurality of Roosevelt instead of being 331 would have been 77.197.

Neither candidate received any credit for millions of votes which were cast for him in States where he did not have a plurality. Glancing at the last four columns of figures, we see credit given for a minority candidate in every State where in proportion to his popular vote he received as much as only one one-thousandth of a percent of one electoral vote of the State. The minority candidate is entitled to this credit, and there is no reason why those votes should be computed as if cast for the plurality candidate.

The method of computing these votes is simple. Divide the total popular vote of any candidate in the State by the total vote of the State, and we get the percentage of his popular vote. Multiply the total number of electoral votes of the State by the candidate's percentage of the popular vote and we get the exact vote to which the candidate is entitled.

The computation of fractional numbers is not carried farther than three points beyond the decimal as a matter of convenience. Ordinarily fractional numbers beyond that point are immaterial. As a matter of precaution, however, House Joint Resolution 124 provides that the computation shall be carried further if by so doing it would change the result of the election. In case there should be a tie as between two candidates, then a resort to these minute fractions would break the tie.

As a further protection against the possibility of a tie vote and hence a deadlock in case there is a tie, the candidate receiving the largest number of popular votes shall be elected. These provisions remove the possibility of a deadlock. They forever remove the necessity for the election of a President in the House of Representatives on account of a deadlock in the electoral college.

A striking, if not an appalling, feature in the election of 1944 is the fact that over 21,000,000 votes were never credited to the candidates for whom cast. They were in effect credited to those for whom they were not cast.

Dewey received 222,285 popular votes for each of his electoral votes; Roosevelt received only 59,263 popular votes for each of his electoral votes.

Such discrepancies are characteristic of Presidential elections. These discrepancies demonstrate the fact that electoral votes under the present system do not and cannot accurately reflect public sentiment. The discrepancies result primarily from the fact that minority votes are not counted as cast. Votes credited to the plurality candidate in effect credit him with all votes which were cast for his opponents in every State he carried.

Minority votes are thus disregarded in computing the aggregate result. This, despite the fact that it is perfectly apparent that the aggregate number of minority votes of one of the candidates in the Nation may exceed the plurality votes of another candidate. For instance, one plurality candidate who carries an average plurality of 30,000 in each of 26 States will have a less aggregate vote than a minority candidate who carries 22 States by the average majority of 50,000 each.

TABLE II.—*Allotment of electoral votes, 1944*

	Under present plan		Under proposed plan					
	Roosevelt (Democrat)	Dewey (Republican)	Roosevelt (Democrat)	Dewey (Republican)	Thomas (Socialist)	Watson (Prohibition)	Teichert (Socialist-Labor)	Others
Alabama	11		8.940	2.001	0.008	0.049		
Arizona	4		2.351	1.635		.012		
Arkansas	9		6.295	2.685	.018			
California	25		14.119	10.742	.027	.104	0.002	0.002
Colorado		6	2.783	3.192	.023			
Connecticut	8		4.184	3.755	.048		.011	
Delaware	3		1.631	1.357	.003	.007		
Florida	8		5.625	2.374				
Georgia	12		9.808	2.066		.001		.123
Idaho	4		2.062	1.922	.005	.009		
Illinois	28		14.426	13.453	.001	.051	.066	
Indiana		13	6.075	6.809	.017	.097		
Iowa		10	4.748	5.199	.014	.035	.001	
Kansas		8	3.134	4.819	.017	.028		
Kentucky	11		5.989	4.973	.006	.025	.004	
Louisiana	10		8.058	1.939				.001
Maine		5	2.372	2.622			.005	
Maryland	8		4.148	3.851				
Massachusetts	16		8.448	7.618		.007	.022	.394
Michigan	19		9.536	9.343	.039	.055	.010	.013
Minnesota	11		5.764	5.154	.049		.031	
Mississippi	9		7.922	.186				.890
Missouri	15		7.705	7.264	.016	.011		.002
Montana	4		2.171	1.797	.025	.006		
Nebraska		6	2.485	3.514				
Nevada	3		1.638	1.361				
New Hampshire	4		2.084	1.914				
New Jersey	16		8.048	7.832	.027	.034	.056	
New Mexico	4		2.138	1.857		.003		
New York	47		24.584	22.229				
North Carolina	14		9.339	4.660				
North Dakota		4	1.819	2.153	.017	.009		
Ohio		25	12.454	12.545				
Oklahoma	10		5.556	4.420		.023		
Oregon	6		3.106	2.816	.047	.029		
Pennsylvania	35		17.897	16.924	.107	.052	.016	
Rhode Island	4		2.343	1.650		.005		
South Cerolina	8		7.011	.351		.028		.608
South Dakota		4	1.666	2.333				
Tennessee	12		7.252	4.705	.020	.020		
Texas	23		16.427	3.827	.011	.020		2.712
Utah	4		2.417	1.576				
Vermont		3	1.287	1.711				
Virginia	11		6.860	4.112	.011	.012	.002	
Washington	8		4.547	3.378	.035	.022	.015	
West Virginia	8		4.391	3.608				
Wisconsin		12	5.828	6.044	.118		.008	
Wyoming		3	1.462	1.537				
Total	432	99	300.726	223.529	.709	.754	.249	4.745

Pensions of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated July 7, 1947, addressed by Abraham C. Shapiro, president, Empire Branch 36, National Association of Letter Carriers to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune and published in that newspaper on July 10, 1947. The letter refers to the pensions of postal workers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL PENSIONS—CONGRESS URGED TO ACT NOW FOR RETIRED WORKERS

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

With Congress set to adjourn by July 26, letter carriers and other postal employees are renewing their efforts for passage of the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson retirement bill.

Unless Congress acts favorably on this measure, 700 New York City retired carriers will be compelled to exist on substandard pensions for another year against the high cost of living. With no increase in their meager annuity since 1930, retired employees are forced to seek light employment to augment their earnings during their twilight years.

The Senate has held the Langer-Chavez bill (S. 637) on its calendar since mid-May; the companion measure in the House, the Stevenson bill (H. R. 3872) on its calendar since mid-June.

Retired letter carriers, after faithful service for 30 or more years carrying the heavy mails, look to Congress not to forget them again. This bill provides for:

1. An increase of only $6 in the weekly pension; and

2. Widows' and suvivors' benefits—for the first time.

3. A comparative annuity increase for active carriers who will retire. Present maximum annuity, $1,200, is insufficient to maintain a carrier and his wife, now reaching the age 60 retirement mark; an increase in such pensions by 20 percent will encourage retirements (or else he will work until age 70 limit or death before then), which in turn create vacancies to be filled by substitute carriers, additional substitutes will be appointed to take their places, predominantly veterans. With jobs becoming scarce, it would be wise for Congress to set the pace to retain a high level of employment nationally.

4. A 1-percent increase in pay-roll deductions into the retirement fund—from 5 to 6 percent.

This bill will not cost the Government any additional money. The latest Civil Service Commission actuarial report pegs the cost of this bill at $39,000,000. Based on the 1947 annual Government-employee pay roll of $4,000,000,000, the 1-percent additional deduction would total $40,000,000, which more than covers the cost of the bill.

The demand is very modest; the need is so great and long overdue to deserving employees who never enjoyed a high salary mark to save for that rainy day.

There are at present 100,000 retired Government employees throughout the Nation on the retirement rolls. They would receive a $300 or 25-percent increase, whichever is smaller.

A new formula in determining the annuity for an applicant for retirement is created in

this bill, giving credit for years of service instead of a flat minimum of $1,200.

ABRAHAM C. SHAPIRO,
President, Empire Branch 36, National Association of Letter Carriers.

NEW YORK, *July 7, 1947.*

Safeguards Against Judicial Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Charles M. LaFollette, Chief of Counsel for War Crimes, Nuremberg, Germany, entitled "Safeguards Against Judicial Dictatorship."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, I am honored by your invitation. I hope I shall say one or two things which will be worthy of your intellects and the integrity and high purpose which has motivated our hosts who have called this meeting.

The representatives of the prosecution in opening the case at Nuremberg against the 15 Nazi Ministry of Justice officials and judges, who are the defendants, succinctly stated the issue and the problem, as we saw it, as follows:

"Two facts stand out when we study the crimes charged in this indictment. First, the diabolical novelty presented by the designed use of a nation's system of justice and its machinery by the governing power of a nation, as a weapon of destruction, an instrumentality of murder, kidnapping, slavery, torture, brutality, and larceny. Second, the mass character and therefore the enormity of the crimes committed by these defendants with this new weapon—this headman's axe fashioned from the scales of Justice in a forge, stoked with national greed and racial bigotry and hatred, fanned by blasts of directed propaganda and shaped by the calculated blows of designedly infamous legislation, controlled and dominated courts, and a studied effort to make ineffective or to eliminate completely, the defensive aids customarily enjoyed by defendants in the courts of civilized nations."

I hope you will agree that we have stated the issues accurately.

However, the trial of this case is still going on. The defendants have not yet had the opportunity to present their defense. Therefore a proper regard for the ethics of our profession precludes me from presenting here the detailed evidence which has been produced to support the substantive charges alleged in the indictment. Likewise, it seems to me improper to propound here, before arguing the same before the judges of the tribunal, the theories of law which the prosecution believes have been sustained by its proof. But I do believe it is proper to offer my observations about the existing condition in pre-Hitler German judicial practice, procedures, concepts, and government policy, which I feel made it so easy for the Nazi plotters to fashion the headman's ax which they used.

It is my opinion first, that the traditional power of the pre-Nazi German judge to control the proceedings during the trial was too great as contrasted with the rights of defendant and his counsel to adequately combat any usurpation of that power. And second, that the control exercised by the state or land ministries of justice over the appointment, promotion, and disciplining of the judges was potentially so strong that the domination of the judge, by men with evil purposes, was an ever-present, if not fully realized, danger.

Before specifically discussing these two contributing causes of the perversion of German justice under Hitler, I must, in fairness to myself, make a few preliminary remarks.

First, and above all things, I am not a blind or youthful American who is insistent that the American system of choosing and controlling judges results in a perfect administration of justice. In fact, as you may know, in the United States there is no fixed over-all pattern controlling this matter. The judges of the Federal courts, the courts of the United States, are appointed by the President by and with the consent of the concurring majority vote of the Senate for life during good behavior. They can be removed only by impeachment. The judges of the courts of the several States are elected, but the terms of their office, the manner of their selection and the methods which provide for their removal, follow no set pattern and are so varied that no purpose can be served by elaborating upon them. Indeed, except for the check of Senate approval, which I consider to be of great value, the method of appointing and controlling the members of the Federal judiciary does not differ too materially from that of many European countries.

From this it follows that my subsequent remarks about appointment and control of judges are not made completely outside of the context of United States procedures.

Again I am not dogmatic on the subject of systems of economics. Nor am I blind to the fact that those who have the most to gain or lose under any economic system make it their business to resort to pressure or artifice to protect from loss by changes sought to be effected by the people through democratic methods, that which they possess be it property or power.

Finally, I am not a boy, filled with the fervent ardor for an idea which accompanies his first cerebellic exercise. I am aware that the procedural methods and powers which we, in my country, have afforded to a defendant in a criminal case to insure him, as much as possible, against the whims, preconceptions or errors of the trial judge are expensive in time and money to operate and very often lead to a miscarriage of justice, in that an enemy of society in fact is found in law to be guiltless. I also understand that the orderly existence of a society and its progress toward a better way of living together can be adversely affected by such a result.

However, I am convinced that the safeguards which I have mentioned and under which I have learned to work make it increasingly difficult for any designing group of men in the future to let loose upon the world that which the Hitlerites turned loose and to capture a system of justice to facilitate such an adventure.

Let me return now first to a consideration of the power which the German judge had before Hitler to control the conduct of a criminal trial. He controlled the presentation of evidence, which included the power, if he cared to use it, to call for the production of witnesses. He controlled the examination of witnesses although, as a matter of judicial courtesy or largesse, he could grant to the prosecution or the defense the right to address questions after he had finished exercising his prerogative. Therefore the judicial result rested upon the integrity of the presiding judge. If he was objective and honorable, a proper result was obtained, but if he was not then the holocaust which was let loose upon the world by Hitler was not only negatively countenanced but actively served by a judge who possessed such power.

Hitler and his satellites saw clearly that here was a system made to order for their purposes. The special court, a recognized pre-Hitler device, was re-created and expanded. Then a studied and, believe me, effective program of filling those courts with proven Nazis as judges was followed. The people's court was also created; the same procedure was followed in choosing professional judges as was followed in the case of the special courts, and lay judges were not chosen until or unless either the army, the air force, the SS and the SA branches of the party, or all of them, were consulted and their approval obtained.

There is German documentary proof for every statement I have made.

The system of criminal procedure was there. The Nazis seized it, as the whole world and the German people must have known they would do, if they did not choose to ignore all they had learned from history about the way in which evil, designing men have always acted.

Does this concern us here, Germans and Allies alike? Do we not need to reexamine the basic concepts of a system so easily perverted? Listen to the facts. Did the Nazi government decree that the Jew was subhuman and must be exterminated? If so, then the Nazi judge decided that no witnesses need be called to testify in open court against him—the Gestapo report was enough; that no witness could be called or examined for him—his guilt was self-evidence because the party and national policy decreed it; that he could not be heard to testify for himself—for the party and national policy decreed that he, being a Jew, could not give trustworthy evidence. The Jew was exterminated. Did the party and national policy decide that Poles should be exterminated? Then the Nazi judge, operating the made-to-order German system, followed the same process. The Poles were exterminated. Did the party and national policy decree that under the "Nacht und Nebel" policy French civilians should disappear forever? Then the Nazi judge, operating this made-to-order system, followed the same process. The French civilian disappeared forever. Did the party and national policy decide that Communists, Social Democrats, and other opposing German nationals should be eliminated because they stood in the way of world conquest? The Nazi judge, operating this made-to-order system, followed the same process, and the Communist, Social Democrat, or other opposing German national was eliminated. I agree with you, of course, that these were evil judges, but I will not let you forget that their power to accomplish their purpose, which all thinking mankind now knows was evil, was made possible by the judicial traditions and system which were conveniently ready at hand for their use.

Again, the Nazis, availing themselves of article 48 of the Weimar Constitution, that dangerous anomaly, a dictatorship device in a democratic constitution, which its creators had thought, honestly and hopefully—but oh! how foolishly—they could pick up or lay down at will without endangering the existence of a democratic society, proceeded quickly to eliminate the state ministries of justice so as to concentrate all administration of justice into the hands of the Central Government—the Third Reich. But this act would not have had such disastrous results had it not been true that prior to that time the power of the ministries of justice of the German states to dominate the appointment, promotion, and discipline of the judges within their state jurisdictions had existed as a traditional accepted policy. The only device

used as a protection against complete control of the administration of justice over the whole German Nation by any one group within the Nation had been the device of decentralization into state control. Thus, the Nazis, by decreeing centralization of the administration of justice, were able by that one stroke to acquire dictatorial domination over the whole nation.

Now, let us see what happened after that accomplished fact.

First, the act reforming the civil service was passed. It eliminated Jews and half-Jews from any participation in any and all phases of the administration of justice. It also furnished the club of economic power by which all other judges or prosecutors who refused to obey were beaten into submission or driven from office. Then followed the open and avowed removal of judges whose decisions were not consistent with Nazi ideology and current positions. Finally, the ascendancy of Himmler and the SS and the Gestapo and of Kaltenbrunner and the Reich security main office over the judges, prosecutors, and, indeed, the Ministry of Justice itself, became an accepted fact. All of this is established by German documentary evidence.

Does this concern us here, Germans and Allies alike? Are the means, which I described, which are the naturally resulting ones from the German concept of judicial administration which existed when Hitler seized power, of no concern to you? Then listen to the facts. If Himmler and the SS and Gestapo decided that Russian soldiers should be exterminated in order to insure the thousand years undisturbed existence of the Lebensraum, which was to be gained in the east, then the ministry of justice was ordered not only not to interfere with the Nazi policy, but also to aid affirmatively the success of the policy, by operating drumhead courts in the eastern territories. Shoud Hitler and Himmler decide that French Nacht und Nebel prisoners should be turned over to the tender hands and mercies of the Gestapo after their terms of imprisonment were ended, then the judges and prison officials, with the approval and often at the express order of the Third Reich ministry of justice officials, obeyed. When Hitler, Goebbels, Himmler, and Bormann decided that any German who murdered a downed Allied flyer should not be punished by German judicial process, then Thierack as minister of justice, ordered all indictments or investigations of such cases turned over to him for quashing and the Nazi judges and prosecutors obeyed. If German nationals were found, who had the temerity to question the probability of ultimate German victory, then the Nazi-controlled judge was ready to exterminate them, with a death sentence manufactured out of whole cloth under the prodding of the Nazi ministry of justice.

There is the record as it is written: Those that can hear, let them hear. Those that can see, let them see. Those who can read, let them read.

O man, how much longer must history repeatedly show you that the control of the judiciary has ever been an essential element in the pattern of dictatorship—be it that of a king, a religious hierarchy, a political hierarchy, an emperor, or a police state? How long will it be before you shall learn, O, man, that if you are to have progress, not mere change, then you must devise checks against the executive domination of the judiciary and also practical courtroom procedures which will enable you to control the exercise of autocratic power by the judge in the trials of the facts to which the law shall be applied?

I am not impressed by the argument against such checks of the religious, political, or economic zealot who says:

"Normally, I would agree, but this time it is right for me to destroy the independence of the judiciary because that which I advocate is good for the people, therefore it is necessary to destroy anything which interferes with my purpose and my plan."

That, my friends, has been the cry always through history of the zealot and his equally vicious imitator, the expedient rogue.

Can you so soon forget that that, too, was Hitler's cry?

Surely today, when no spot on earth has escaped the effect and far too many have felt the direct impact of the Hitlerian dictatorship, we will give some thought to leading the peoples of the earth into an understanding of the value to themselves of methods which shall insure progress under law, administered with checks, effectively devised against the capture and perversion of the judicial system which administered that law.

I now frankly admit a glaring personal inconsistency. I hate dogma and the zealot who first evolves and then enslaves himself with his dogma. Yet, I, too, have a dogma, and I, too, am a zealot.

With all my being I am convinced that no lasting progress is ever made by man when wrongful means, which always include force in some form, are used to attain an end. Therefore, I am convinced that mankind must be taught that this is an immutable rule of living. And, because I believe that this is true, I also know that the first step to a peaceful world is an awakened and sustained determination to set up checks against the power of any man or group of men to impose a course of conduct upon other men. Obviously, and logically, these checks must, and therefore should be established before the power is seized. This in turn demands that mankind shall learn, and having learned, accept as true, the fact that freedom from forced acceptance of other men's views is desirable and valuable. And, again, if and when man learns that truth, then he must act, he must establish a system of checks against the power of any man or any group of men to enforce their views upon other men. Then only will the system be effective. Then only will man obtain some increased measure of protection against the zealot and the rogue.

The time for speech making is over. If you believe, then act. If you do not understand, and believe, then prepare to go through all this holocaust again.

The time to act is now. Mankind in most of Europe and America still has a relative degree of free will. He can either learn from history and act and initiate a new civilization, or he can fail to learn from history or learn from history, but fail to act, in either of which events he can prepare to perish or to languish in slavery. Permit me, then, because I feel this thing so fiercely, to borrow an expression from the rough but expressive parlance of the world-flung fraternity of gamblers, "It is time (for mankind) to put up or shut up."

My experience in the trial of the Nazi justice officials has convinced me that my conclusions are sound. Therefore, it is time for us to quit talking about the evil effect of wrongful force in the world and do the constructive work of devising means of protecting ourselves agaisnt the causes of the wrongful use and the conditions which permit it to break out.

If we fail to do that, then let us at least be honest. Let us, who now occupy positions in which we could exercise leadership if we would, step down from the positions which we now occupy and let some other men take over. Men who will have the wisdom and courage to render the plain people of the world the leadership and the service which they so ardently seek and so richly deserve.

Bean Growers in Distress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAYTON E. PHILLIPS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of the Congress the critical situation facing the farmers of Johnson County, Tenn. The Johnson County farmers planned for 800,000 to 900,000 bushels of snap beans—5,000 to 6,000 acres were planted in snap beans. The market has collapsed, and the price per bushel has fallen to 60 and 75 cents. The cost of production is set at $1.35 a bushel, which includes the return on the land, the labor, and the cost of harvesting. The growers are suffering a heavy financial loss. Beans are rotting in the fields. Bean pickers are idle. A Government labor camp, with a considerable investment and the necessary migratory labor to harvest the beans, is located in the county and will be a great loss to the Government if their services are not used. It has been necessary for farmers to plow under probably 500 acres of beans. The production and marketing administration has the machinery set up in Nashville, Tenn., to come to the aid of these farmers under the price-support policy of the Department of Agriculture. It is my understanding that the Commodity Credit Corporation has more than $500,000,000 at its disposal, coupled with the ability to borrow additional money to take care of a situation of this kind and it has also been called to my attention that in the agricultural fund, known as fund 32, there is sufficient authority to help the bean growers. The Department of Agriculture could come to the assistance of the bean producers under the Emergency Appropriation Act of 1948, by virtue of this act the Department could contract to purchase the beans for the world market and pay when the general appropriations bill is approved. I urge that the Department of Agriculture come to the immediate relief of these distressed farmers. We are asking the farmers to virtually feed and clothe the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press-Chronicle of July 13, 1947:

BEAN MARKET COLLAPSE PUTS JOHNSON IN DILEMMA—"CORNER COUNTY" IS PICTURE OF DESOLATION

(By Sue Thomas)

MOUNTAIN CITY, July 12.—Collapse of Johnson County's $1,500,000 bean market has thrown about 2,500 laborers out of work, made a comparative ghost town of Mountain City, sent farmers into their fields to plow under an estimated 500 acres of the tender green vegetables ready for marketing, and left many in a dilemma as to whether to continue planting this season.

Publicized in many newspapers and magazines as the leading bean market in the Nation, many Johnson Countians are beginning to believe that publicity might have been their downfall. Opening of markets

in Ozark, Mo., and points in Ohio probably played havoc with the local market by creating an oversupply—the only conclusion that farmers and buyers have reached for the sudden tumble of prices.

Mountain City's two bean markets presented a dejected picture yesterday. Floors, usually filled with from 15,000 to 25,000 bushels, were empty. A few farmers straggled into town to see what the score was. Buyers twiddled their fingers and scanned the late market prices just arrived in the morning mail.

The hard labor of weeks and months in preparing for the crop is "gone with the wind."

Although disheartened and dissatisfied over the slump from $3 a bushel at the market opening 2 weeks ago to 60 cents this week, most of the farm people are taking it in fine spirit.

AVERAGED $2.25 A BUSHEL LAST YEAR

Last year's crop averaged $2.25 a bushel, which probably spurred growers to increase production several hundred acres. About 6,000 acres were planted.

Growers draw their labor from a Government labor camp of 152 Bahamans and 350 migrant workers, which is augmented by approximately 1,500 native laborers plus the work farm families do themselves.

Halting of work has left the pickers more in a daze. They are unaware that there may be little more work.

At the labor camp, the Bahama Negroes are making a holiday of the shut-down. Congregated in groups they idly sit and gossip with a "crap" game occasionally tossed in to liven things up.

Yesterday, out of the 152 Bahamans located in the camp, only 20 went to the field to work. Growers just didn't check them out.

They have little to worry about though. They are under contract and get $15 a week until September 1 whether they work or not.

On the migratory side of the camp, which draws Negroes largely from Florida and Georgia women took advantage of the let-down to wash. Negro children romped and played, and the men sat lazily looking on.

Laborers were trucked to fields Monday afternoon and Tuesday. Then, work began dropping off with a price drop. When Wednesday's low bid brought growers only 60 cents for which they had paid 45 cents to have picked, work was halted completely.

Brookshire McQueen, owner of about 200 acres, pulled about 100 laborers from the fields the middle of the afternoon Wednesday when word reached him of the price tumble.

Two of the county's largest growers—Don Grindstaff and W. A. Potter—quit picking Thursday. They own about 350 acres of beans, and had planned to plant an additional 150 acres, bringing their total crop to 500 acres.

OTHER CROPS ARE BEING PLANNED

"There's nothing doing now," Grindstaff said as he walked over the empty floor of the market. The heavy loss is pinching, but he managed to smile. Determined not to be outdone, he, like many others, is preparing the land for other crops. He began turning under a 40-acre tract of beans Thursday. "It will go in buckwheat," he said, "if I can get the seed." If he doesn't get the seed, it will be grassed. Others plan planting of wheat.

It was a tragic sight Friday to pass field after field that had been plowed under, and a more tragic sight to view a tractor in a 40-acre plot plowing under the thrifty vines loaded with the tender snap variety, especially when the retail market price has been running about 2 pounds for 25 cents. A bushel basket of beans averages about 30 pounds.

Farmers have two purposes in plowing the beans under. One is to prepare the land for a crop that will probably mean more money, and the other is to rid it of the bean beetle.

The county agent's office is one of the busiest places in the mountain town. County Agent Vernon Sims and his co-workers, George Peters and W. D. Snyder, are putting their heads together with the growers in trying to work out a solution to save the market not only for this year, but in future years.

Sims estimated this year's crop (had it all been harvested) slightly over the 700,000-bushel mark sold last year. He said only about 10 percent had been harvested.

The agricultural group has one aim in view and that is to obtain a sufficient amount for the vegetable so that farmers will make a slight profit above expenses.

"The growers are going to suffer a terrific financial loss until prices are restored," Sims said. "Beans are rotting in the fields," he said.

PRODUCTION COSTS ARE TABULATED

Approximate cost of production is set at $1.35 a bushel, based on the average production of 150 bushels to the acre, or $203 a 150-bushel acre.

Break-down of expenses runs something like this:

Rent of land, $25 an acre; seed (1 bushel), $13.20; fertilizer (700 pounds to the acre), $13.30; preparation, seeding, and cultivation, $15; dust and dusting (100 pounds in three applications), $24; harvesting and marketing (biggest single cost), $112.50.

Assistant County Agents Snyder and Peters are having plenty of worry, chiefly over labor. Snyder is in charge of local labor, and Peters, the migratory labor.

"It seems funny," said Snyder, "the first of the week, we couldn't get sufficient help, now there is plenty."

Some 15 buyers representing brokers and canning companies all over the country are also afflicted with "bean headache"—a disease no amount of aspirin will cure. Some of them were twiddling their fingers, others kept indoors.

One broker paid $2.75 a bushel when the price was up, shipped the products to Cincinnati and got $2.25 a bushel.

Two buyers interviewed—Homer Stalcup and Vernon McEwen—could advance no more reason for the price drop than the growers and Extension Service personnel.

"All we can say is, there is no market for the beans," Stalcup said.

McEwen, who is a broker and a grower combined, went a little farther. He explained the markets were glutted and that Johnson County farmers could not afford to take less than from $1.31 to $1.35 a bushel to break even.

"It costs more to produce beans this year," McEwen continued. "Labor is more expensive, fertilizer is higher, and the cost of dusting to keep down the bean beetle is an expensive item."

R. H. Howard, manager of the Tri-State Market—largest of the two—was found in his office looking out over the deserted floor. One lone basket stood on the auction block.

Auctions were held yesterday afternoon, but it was the same routine cry—no beans and less money.

"Oh, yes," the manager said, "we will continue to have sales. Some growers will sell regardless of price, not because they want to, but because they must get what they can out of their crop."

None of those contacted could give a clear, definite reason for the sudden slump.

Farmers ordinarily are protected under the Production Marketing Administration, which gives them a floor ceiling of $1.15 a bushel. At the present, it is reported the floor ceiling is in effect, but Congress has not appropriated the money for the payment, which means no ceiling.

Where Will Prices Settle Down?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Kiplinger magazine for July 1947:

WHERE WILL PRICES SETTLE DOWN?

There is general agreement that prices are too high, but those who assume that prices will return to the prewar level are in for a surprise.

The chances are that prices will settle down, after a few years of steady decline, to a level substantially higher than the prewar period, though lower than the March 1947 peak. The best bet for the 1950's lies somewhere between 35 and 50 percent above the 1939-40 bench mark.

"Too high," when applied to prices, means different things to different people. Superficially, most people mean that a house which cost $6,000 before the war is selling for $11,000 or $12,000, that bread which sold for 8 cents before the war broke in Europe is now up to 12 cents, or that a pound of butter which cost 40 cents during that lull before the storm costs at least 75 cents and sometimes $1 postwar. Similarly, a Ford car—that old symbol of low prices—which sold for $849 in one city early in 1941 fetches $1,261 6 years and one war later.

"Too high" also may mean to most people that when wholesale prices hit their top in March they were almost exactly twice as high as in August 1939. Farm commodities were three times as high, food two-and-one half times as high. Other commodities had risen 65 percent. The cost of living soared almost 60 percent during the boom.

But such conceptions of too high, based on comparisons with prewar price indices, are far too simple. Reference to them is more nostalgic than revealing. Specific prices are too high only in relation to other prices. Price tags have risen and fallen many times in the country's history, leveling off for a reasonable length of time at stable levels. Some of these levels were higher, some lower, than the preceding level. Thus, from 1923 to 1929 the cost of living index averaged 75 percent more than it had in the years before World War I. Then from 1935 to 1940 it averaged 19 percent less than it had from 1923 to 1929.

Realistically, when we speak of prices as being too high we ought to mean one or more of the following things:

A particular price is too high in comparison with some competing price. For example, in the past 10 years lumber prices have risen 170 percent, although cement is up only 26 percent and brick and tile only 43 percent. Lumber is too high in relation to competing building materials.

The price of a certain commodity may be too high in relation to its cost of production. To illustrate, the price of lumber was so high in 1946 that the number of small saw mills in Oregon multiplied 10 times. So much new production was stimulated by the price that the market was broken locally.

Prices may yield profits too high to keep the economy operating. Excessive profits, if salted away instead of going into plant expansion or inventory, serve no economic function. Money in a corporate bank account employs no workers and moves no goods.

Prices may be too high in relation to consumer income, out of which the buying public takes goods off the market. By early

1947 prices were up so much that the volume of goods being bought was shrinking, and inventories were becoming overloaded. Hence, the President's Council of Economic Advisers recommended in January that a 5- to 7-percent cut in the average of prices was needed to restore a balance between supply and ability to buy.

Balanced prices in the postwar period will not necessarily mean prewar relationships. For instance, cotton-textile wages, after long depression, have risen much more than the wages of auto workers or the makers of electrical equipment. Therefore, cotton cloth will remain more expensive, comparatively, than refrigerators or autos—unless there are violent changes in material costs.

One widely current but evidently erroneous idea about future prices is that they will continue their inflationary trend. This school of thought pays much attention to the size of the national debt and the amount of money in circulation, but neither of these indicators is strong enough to support a conclusion of inflation from now on. The debt is being managed better than skeptics of the thirties thought it could be, and there is just about the right amount of money in circulation for a national income of our present size.

Another popular notion, also unsupported by evidence, is that prices will return to the prewar level because that was the last normal period. But prices did not return after World War I, and are much less likely to do so this time.

The chief reason for an even higher price level after this war is that wages are not so flexible now as then. Wage reductions are made only under very unusual circumstances, and history shows that such cuts are only temporary. Labor's income—that is, the price it receives for its work—is the biggest factor in national income. Including the income of farmers and small proprietors, labor income makes up more than four-fifths of the national income and is the chief determinant of prices.

Another floor under wages is Federal legislation on minimum pay and maximum hours. Though present wage rates are well above the law in nearly all industries, still this legislation, combined with the basic bargaining power of unions, makes a great drop almost impossible.

However, this does not mean that prices will or must stay as high as the modern wage level. The productivity of labor is expected to rise enough to offset much of the effect of fatter pay envelopes. Output per man-hour is already increasing from its wartime position and is at least 5 percent more than last year. New machinery and new production methods developed during the war, plus the drive on management to cut costs, will result in exceptional increases in output for the next few years.

It now appears that the change in productivity will follow the pattern it set after World War I, when productivity rose about 30 percent in the first 4 years. A little arithmetic with the latest wage increases and the expectation that productivity may rise 30 percent by 1950 allows the conclusion that labor costs will rise about 40 percent.

There is always the chance that organized labor will capture the gains in man-hour productivity by winning proportionate wage increases, but that chance is slim because the market for labor will be falling during the same period, somewhat limiting labor's bargaining strength.

A second difference between this time and last is rooted in farm legislation. The Steagall amendment, guaranteeing farm prices of 90 percent of parity this year and next, is not now holding up the price of any important commodity. But it could do so in the recession which is expected before that time runs out.

More important, the mood of Congress is to keep on the books some kind of legislation for supporting farm prices. It might be done by crop loans, for example, under which the Government merely takes over the pledged crop if market prices fall below the set loan price. By the mid-fifties such loans could be a strong element in maintaining high prices, particularly if farm surpluses start rotting in the fields and Congress goes back to restricting production.

A third major difference between the two periods under comparison is that more and more prices have become rigid in their behavior. Economists call them "sticky" prices, without referring to the kind of illegal price-fixing with which the Antitrust Division is concerned. What the economists mean is that more and more goods are falling into the category of "administered prices"—those which a company puts up or down on the basis of its own considerations, rather than on the basis of pure, sensitive competition.

Buttressing this trend toward "sticky" prices is the sweep of State and Federal laws dealing with prices. Retailers cannot cut prices on nationally-advertised brands; manufacturers cannot give discounts to one distributor without giving the same deal to others; and chain stores are curbed in their use of "loss leaders," such as cut-rate cigarettes. If these laws are enforced—and there is much pressure for both enforcement and extension—they would add much rigidity against lower prices.

Of course some prices will come down while others go up. The general level of prices should be thought of as a result of these movements, not as a goal to be attained. No past level should be thought of as sacred, to be set up again by arbitrary action. It is the relationship that counts. For instance, much of the early boom in farm prices, during 1940 and 1941, was a healthy thing for the economy. It brought agriculture into a better balance than that of 1938 and 1939—better for the entire economy, not just the farmers.

The things to fear is that prices will not adjust smoothly. Out-of-line prices too often do not fall until there is a drop in consumption and a drop in production. However, in the one case on record of a major change in price level (after World War I), the change was achieved without much jumping around—without much waste motion in the economy. The index of wholesale prices for all commodities dropped from 167 in May 1920 to 91 in January 1922, then settled at an average of nearly 101 during 1923.

The prospect this time is for an even smoother downward curve and leveling off. After a 10-percent drop in wholesale prices and a 5-percent drop in the cost of living, by the end of this year, prices will probably go on down at that rate for some months, gradually curving off to stability. (During so-called stability prices may be expected to rise very gradually—about 1 percent a year.)

Within the general downward movement of prices, certain specific things are bound to increase in price. Rents, which rose only 5 percent during the war because of strong controls, will go up firmly when controls are lifted. So will freight rates, gas, and electricity.

How much better off we will be when prices settle at 35 to 50 percent above the prewar level depends on many factors other than price statistics. If the adjustments result in full employment, the new level will be known as a prosperous one.

Certainly agriculture will be better off, helping the whole economy; also, the public debt can be paid off more easily with the inflated dollars. On the other hand, people living on fixed income, such as pensions and annuities, will be pinched in the 1950's.

It is too early for a sweeping generalization, but the portent is favorable for a well-balanced economy. Certainly there is nothing unfavorable in the fact, alone, that prices will remain higher than the familiar prewar standard. It is the balance, not the level, of prices that pays off.

Tax Reduction Now Invites Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio speech which I made yesterday evening on the subject Tax Reduction Now Invites Disaster.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX REDUCTION NOW INVITES DISASTER

(Radio broadcast of Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, over the American Broadcasting System, at Washington, D. C., July 15, 1947)

There are three principal reasons why the income-tax reduction bill which the Senate has just passed for the second time should be vetoed by the President and the veto sustained by the Congress. If this bill should become a law it would undermine the whole structure of American policy at home and abroad.

1. It would repudiate the traditional American principle that taxes should be levied in accordance with the capacity to pay.

2. It would cripple the ability of the Government to manage its stupendous public debt at the very moment when, for the first time in 17 years, the Government is out of the red and in a position to begin to reduce that national debt.

3. It would make it extremely difficult if not impossible for the people of the United States to lead the world to economic rehabilitation and permanent peace.

Of these three reasons, the third is the most important, for neither the little people of America, the millions who are at the bottom of the economic scale nor the few hundred thousands who are at the top can reap even the slightest benefit unless the economic structure of the world is restored and the basis of permanent peace firmly laid.

The road to tax reduction is the road to economic chaos and to war, for it threatens our own economic stability and unless the economic stability of the United States is maintained a third world war will be inevitable.

Tax reduction now will make it impossible for the world to disarm. Without economic stability here at home, the United States cannot lead the way to permanent peace and the world will continue to prepare for war. The four billions of tax reductions promised in this bill will be expended over and over again in the maintenance of a military establishment.

There is no future for the people of the world except upon the basis of permanent peace. The supreme duty of the people of America is to concentrate all their efforts on winning the peace.

I shall have more to say on this phase of the subject in a moment, but let me now

show that this bill gives preferential treatment to the very wealthy in violation of our tradition that the ability to pay is the just measure of taxation. I assert that this bill is intended to shift the burden of taxation from the few wealthy to the backs of the poor. It provides a bonanza for those in the high income-tax brackets but only a pittance for the poor, dollars for those in the top brackets and pennies for those at the bottom.

PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT FOR WEALTHY

Prior to the war, the little people of America whose annual net income before personal exemption was $2,500 or less paid no income tax. This was because the Congress allowed personal exemptions upon the theory that it was in the public interest to maintain living standards of those at the bottom of the scale. This policy was changed when we became involved in the great war and personal exemptions were lowered. The new income-tax reduction bill makes no pretense of going back to prewar standards, but increases the spendable income of those who receive $10,000 a year or more in vastly greater proportion than it increases the spendable income of those who receive less than $10,000. The increases of spendable income for the wealthy range from 4½ to 13 percent while the increases of those who receive less than $3,000 a year range from only 1 to 2 percent. Every suggestion to restore the exemptions formerly allowed to those in the low-income brackets was rejected because the determined purpose behind this bill is to relieve the rich at the expense of the poor.

Twenty-six million taxpayers, according to the report of Chairman MILLIKIN, receive less than $2,000 a year. There are only 681,000 who receive $10,000 or more. To the latter high-income group at the top of the scale, this tax reduction bill gives benefits ranging from $45 to $125 per thousand of income as compared with only $9 to $25 per thousand for those at the bottom. The whole point of this bill is to transfer the burden of the cost of government from those individuals who are making huge profits to the backs of those whose incomes now are admittedly too low to enable them to meet the increased cost of living.

THREATENS FINANCIAL STABILITY

So much for the shift of the burden of government from the extremely wealthy to the poor. Now let me discuss the threat which this bill contains to the financial soundness of our country. I undertake to say that this bill, if enacted over the forthcoming veto of President Truman, will endanger the capitalistic system and by that I mean the system of private property.

During the whole period of the depression, with all its "deficit spending," the national debt was never even as much as $50,000,000,000. Now it is two hundred and fifty-eight billions. This debt is the measure of what the Government borrowed to fight the war. It is greater by almost one hundred billion than the total national income. In other words, if the total income of all the people this year were to be paid upon the national debt, it would still not be extinguished, but would be three times as great as the total debt accumulated throughout the depression.

Every year the United Press publishes a list of what it calls the billion-dollar corporations. This list, made public in the Scripps-Howard papers on Friday, July 4—a significant day—includes the great giants like the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., General Motors, United States Steel, American Telephone and Telegraph, Standard Oil, and so forth. There are 45 of these corporations with assets of more than a billion dollars each, running up in some cases to four, five, and even eight billion dollars. If all the assets of all of these giant corporations were added together and applied on the national debt, the Government of the United States would still be in the red to the amount of $158,000,000,000, or more than six times as much as the total debt incurred during the Roosevelt years of Government spending.

Let us not delude ourselves in the belief that tax reduction, according to the pattern of this bill, will be an aid to small business. It will not. It is confined to income-tax reductions for individuals, and the principal beneficiaries, as I have already pointed out, are the few wealthy persons in the upper brackets.

This bill contains no reduction for any corporation. It contains no provision to stimulate new independent enterprise, but serves only to cut the revenues of the Government for the benefit of those who need tax relief least.

On June 30 last, for the first time since the depression struck this country in the middle of the Hoover administration, we had a surplus in the Treasury. It was only $754,000,000. If we intend to reduce the national debt our first policy must be to maintain a surplus. We cannot afford to risk going in the red again. We cannot afford to reduce our receipts until we are sure we can substantially cut the cost of government. President Truman reduced the budget of 1947 $20,000,000,000 below the budget for 1946. In preparing the new budget for the fiscal year 1948 which began on July 1 last, he cut it five billion more. Six months ago at the beginning of this Congress the Republican majority predicted that it would cut the President's budget by some four and one-half to six billion dollars. It has failed. The present Congress has not passed a legislative budget. It has not even passed all the major appropriation bills. Eight of the 12 are still pending in the Senate and it is evident now that the appropriations this year will not be materially less than those estimated by the President. Not having been able materially to cut the cost of Government, we cannot afford to cut the receipts because that will mean going back to deficit spending.

We shall never be able to pay the national debt unless we begin reducing it now while we have 60,000,000 people employed. Unless we begin to reduce the debt while we have money in the pocket, we shall never pay it and if this debt is not paid, the system of private property cannot endure and totalitarianism will take over. I do not hesitate to say that from the point of view of every property owner in America, big or little, this tax-reduction bill is the most reckless and wanton attack upon the American system ever made. America can withstand her open foes, but she cannot sustain an attack by the shortsighted greedy who are willing to reduce the receipts of their Government at a time when every principle of fiscal stability demands that we apply every possible dollar to the reduction of the national debt.

BILL THREATENS INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Let me turn now to the third reason why this bill should be vetoed. The economic stability of the United States is the last surviving hope of mankind. If we risk economic catastrophe here, the whole world will go communistic. Peoples everywhere who cherish the hope of maintaining a democratic society in which the individual controls his own economic and political destiny are looking to this country to lead the way.

The dictators of the Soviets are looking to this country to fail. The whole explanation of Russian policy lies in this fact that Marshal Stalin and his associates are confident that capitalism is too greedy to save itself. They are counting on another depression in America. They have seen socialism advance in England. They have seen communism rise in Italy and in France. They have followed a deliberate policy of repudiating the agreements they made at Yalta and at Potsdam in the hope of preventing economic rehabilitation in Europe because they know that chaos is the stepping stone to communism.

We here in America stand between the misery and starvation which stalk Europe upon the one hand and the atom bomb upon the other. If Europe is not rehabilitated, then let the United States prepare for war. Communism is on the march and there is no defense against it except the humanitarian high-mindedness of democratic peoples.

The summons which Secretary Marshall and President Truman have extended to the peoples of Europe to help themselves has been repudiated by Russia because Russia knows that such a program will be an effective bar to the spread of communism. The Marshall program is the rallying call of democracy and freedom. It cannot be permitted to fail.

This is not a program designed to put Europe on relief and to contribute both our money and our goods to its support; it is a program to restore the productive capacity of Europe. The war destroyed that productive capacity and we played a major part in that destruction. We won the victory, but we cannot abandon the peace.

Your tax dollars fight for peace. They fight for the system of private property and political liberty and unless we put them to work, freedom and peace will be impossible.

Money expended to promote production is an investment. Money expended in war and in preparation for war is waste.

We stand at the crossroads of history. For the second time in this century America has the opportunity to lead the world to peace. It failed after World War I and the result was the appalling and destructive World War II. If we fail now, the experiment in free government which began upon this continent in 1776 will also have failed because mankind cannot withstand World War III.

National Maritime Union Member's Opinion on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House today, I include in my remarks the following article which I found in the July 11, 1947, issue of the Pilot, publication of the National Maritime Union. In this article one Lawrence E. Smith, rank-and-file member of the National Maritime Union, in his own way writes his opinions about communism, which he says gives him indigestion. I am always similarly affected by it. While Smith's writing is not couched in the best of the King's English, it is a forthright statement of a real American member of the National Maritime Union and I commend him for it. It reads as follows:

To the Membership:

As a rank-and-file member of our great union, I'm forced to write my viewpoints on this issue of communism that is leading to the apex that it gives me indigestion, especially at pork-chop time and this issue is one that every true American and alien rank-and-filer of the NMU must give their honest attention and voice. And to start my blast, my opinion of the American Communist is that he is an opportunist with his hands stretched out, his voice full of poison, his head wrack in Ism and one that does not

appreciate the true meaning of rank and file (because how can he say that his patron saint Uncle Joe from across the sea and his communal favors a voice of his rank-and-file national public with their trades unions which to my opinion are only dues-paying unions to their membership and with a mute voice).

God, how lucky we rank and filers are under our own uncle, Uncle Sam, that he gives us the freedom of free speech, religion, with the pursuit of happiness, and a free way to make our livelihood even if some prefer the boxcars to get to them. Our American way of life has been a struggle of hardship, wars and civil war, hard times with drought and depressions; still our standards of living are unequal to none. The isms that make communism whittle down to a point are fascism, anarchy, which the two combined forms a program of jealousy and hatred toward other peaceful nations that are enjoying the progressiveness of their forms of government with their better ways of living. This is unknown to the najority of U. S. S. R. national public by the censorship of its communal by fed propaganda which through this, they are serfs without claims.

So think, think, and think you opportunists, Would you really turn your ship over to Moscow? Your reward, form your own opinion as a traitor (proverb) once a traitor always a traitor. Communism with its idiocy of world revolution to divide the family, abolish religion, and its many other theories to wreck human mankind must be stopped and with a capital S.

And now with respect to space in the Voice of the Membership, our ship voted on the strike referendum; my vote was "YES" with capital letters and the members of this crew voted 100 percent condemning the Taft-Hartley bill by sending a telegram and a letter to President Truman with our signatures to veto this drastic bill against American labor.

LAWRENCE E. SMITH, No. 176454.

Europe Is Worth Saving and Can Be Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. L. Woodward from the New York Times magazine:

EUROPE IS WORTH SAVING AND CAN BE SAVED—AMERICAN AID CAN HELP TO STRENGTHEN AND PRESERVE AN ECONOMY RELATED TO OUR OWN

(By E. L. Woodward)

LONDON.—There is a popular belief—a modern version of the old legend of the Sibylline Books—that the opportunities of history occur twice; in other words, an individual, a nation, or a group of nations may be given a second chance of recovery from a mistake. A third or fourth chance is unlikely.

Although it is dangerous to read events in this way, few European observers can avoid seeing in the present situation some kind of analogy with an American proposal made at a time of European crisis 16 years ago. In the summer of 1931, when financial panic in central Europe seemed to threaten the world's credit system, the American Government suggested a moratorium of a few years on all intergovernmental debts. The immediate effect of this proposal was a sudden revival of confidence of which advantage might have been taken for rapid and drastic action. The British Government—a labor administration under Ramsay MacDonald—at once seized the occasion. The French Government—MM. Laval and Flandin—hesitated, discussed, bargained, and the favorable moment was lost.

Once again an opportunity has come to Europe through a gesture by the United States. The circumstances now are far more difficult than in 1931, the demands upon imagination and will power are greater, and the sacrifices involved are more severe.

It would be out of place for an English observer to speak of the large political adjustments necessary on the American side if this new grand design is to be realized in its fullness. All Europeans, however, should acknowledge that the offer carries with it for the American people restraints and sacrifices of a kind which not every European nation has been willing to bear, even in former days of prosperity. The American Government would not be justified in asking for such sacrifices unless it was not reasonably clear (a) that the American people benefit by European recovery, and (b) that European recovery is conditional upon American help.

It is possible by elaborate statistics of imports and exports and the balance of trade to show how the United States must benefit materially by European recovery and must lose by a permanent European collapse. There is no need to tabulate these figures because a much simpler demonstration can be provided by looking at a map.

This Europe which America is being asked to save is part of a civilized area, the world's most civilized area, which has developed on and from the eastern and western shores of the North Atlantic Ocean. The European regions principally concerned do not form a vast land mass out of reach of direct American approach and capable of economic self-sufficiency. In other words, the peoples to be helped cannot just accept American aid and upon this foundation build up an economy which will be of no benefit and bring no return to those who have provided the means of recovery.

The Europe which faces America across the Atlantic has often been described as a peninsula of peninsulas. From the Baltic port of Koenigsberg to the Black Sea port of Constanza is a diagonal of 800 miles. Every great European capital except Moscow is west of this line. Owing to the long sea lanes stretching inland from the Atlantic, not one of these capitals is more distant from a port open to ocean-going steamers than Pittsburgh is from Atlantic City or Buffalo from New York. Nine European capitals, 10 if Istanbul is included, are within 30 miles of the sea; five are themselves seaports.

The present-day significance of these facts is complicated but not lessened by the introduction of air transport; an even more significant change came centuries ago when improvements in navigation opened the way to new continents, and the Atlantic Ocean came to serve Europe and America as the Mediterranean had served Greece and Rome.

From the date of the first European settlements in America and the arrival of the first cargoes of American produce in European ports, there has been a community of interest between all the nations living around this oceanic region and possessing easy access to it. Specialization of labor in Europe has been determined by the possibility of maritime trade.

In modern times the interrelation of American and European life is such that Europe—the Europe of the peninsulas—would wither and die if any unforeseen calamity weakened American energy and creative power, while the American economy, although it could survive, would be confused and debilitated by a total European collapse. In other words, the interest of the United States in Europe is not as starkly a matter of life or death as is the interest of Europe in the United States, but it is nonetheless of the highest importance.

It is unnecessary to discuss the nature of the present European collapse or to recount in detail the measures of an economic kind which should lead to recovery. The facts are obvious and the public has been told enough about the technical requirements for restoring the "circulatory system"—the exchange of goods and services—proper to a maritime civilization.

If the problem were one for technicians alone, the reconstruction of Europe would be a complicated business, but it would not be outside the range of mathematical calculation. Every politician, however, knows, and, for that matter, every salesman knows, that you cannot express human behavior purely in terms of mathematics—the exact statement of size.

As soon as you leave statistics and enter politics, that is to say, as soon as you try to get things done, you must take account of what are commonly called historic conditions. "Historic" is perhaps a misleading word since it may be taken to imply things past and over, events, tragic or otherwise, of interest to students but without immediate reference to life. The real meaning of the term is very different. In the jargon of today history is "dynamic"; it is the sum of the past acting on the present. Historic conditions are thus hard, knobby facts against which only the foolish and the unwary will bump their heads.

Historic conditions, for example, determine why Wall Street is narrower than Fifth Avenue, and this difference in width is not less real because it is the result of things which happened in New York generations ago. It is no more possible to elude this momentum of history, this action of the past upon the present, then it is possible to stop or turn within a few feet a car going at full speed. Every driver knows that if he fails to take account of momentum he is liable to a fatal skid.

What, then, is the historic momentum of Europe, or to change the metaphor, and to assume that this knowledge of the local situation is to be used by the politicians as the local knowledge of the pilot is used by the captain of a ship, what are the particular rocks or shoals to be avoided if the ship is to be brought safely to harbor?

Nationalism is by the far the most dangerous of these obstacles. In a last analysis this nationalism is the product of European geography—the geography of these highly articulated peninsulas. Within the closely packed areas west of the Koenigsberg-Constanza line there have been bloody battles for every place of strategic or economic importance and for every frontier. The body politic of Europe carries the scars of these past battles. A glance at an atlas will show the number of towns and ruins bearing more than one name.

A similar historical shorthand can be read in old maps of America, but the old names have become antiquarian curiosities. Suppose, however, that millions of Americans still talked of Fort Duquesne and implied by their talk that they were asserting claims of right over a city which millions of others call Pittsburgh. This kind of thing actually happens in Europe.

It is a waste of time to say that it ought not to happen. Nothing can undo past facts of this kind or annihilate the cumulative influence which they have exerted over so many years.

European recovery, therefore, cannot be considered only in mathematical terms, so many calories, such and such a number of units of horsepower, so many tons of coal. If these units of power are in German control, a Frenchman regards them as a threat to French national existence; if they are in

Polish control, a German thinks they will be employed to the detriment of Germany. Hence the politician has to warn the economist of the risk of going too far or too quickly in binding human beings to economic convenience.

It looks easier to impose uniformity than to provide for diversity, but every conjuror who has tried to iron out this European diversity has failed. In the long run economic forces will prove stronger than armies, yet as the old saying goes, the mills of the gods grind slowly. Americans do not find it easy to think in these "historic" terms about Europe. Indeed there is often a subconscious element of forbearance in the American attitude toward Europe; a mixture of imitation and amusement at the conservatism which clings to old and bad ways.

For mutual understanding therefore, it is a good thing on the American side of the Atlantic to remember that Europeans may be equally bewildered at the "historic" conservativism of the United States, as shown, for example, in the difficulty of getting rid of obvious anomalies in the Federal Constitution. An attachment to established political forms and a sentimental preference for a particular way of life are not features limited to Europe.

Again in moods of impatience at the slowness with which long-established societies discard habits and fears and animosities of the past, it is necessary to take account of the demonic consequences of war. After a terrible 6 years Europeans stand one to another much as North and South stood on the American Continent at the end of the Civil War. Indeed, the European position is far worse owing to the bewilderment caused by Hitler. There were in America differences of principle between the two sides; each of the beligerent parties had leaders of unquestioned nobility.

The last European war had no such extenuating circumstances. It was not a conflict between two rights but a direct struggle between right and wrong. There were no figures among the Germans or their Quislings whom posterity will admire. Therefore, forgiveness and compassion are difficult and the restoration of mutual confidence between Germans and non-Germans, between patriots and collaborationists, must take years.

There is also another political factor of a general kind which is hindering European conciliation. East of the Koenigsberg-Constanza line the U. S. R. R. is spread over an area far larger than that of the "peninsula" of Europe. It is tempting—perhaps the temptation is itself dangerous—to draw an analogy from the old Mediterranean civilization and to observe that the potential military threat to the modern oceanic successors of Greece and Rome is at the circumference and not at the center.

The temptation is greater because the Russians are behaving as though they did not want European recovery on the terms—a lessening of social strains and tensions—which alone would make recovery possible. There is no country within range of Soviet interference in which the domestic situation has not been envenomed by Russian policy.

The rasping effects of Communist propaganda, the deliberate confusion of issues by Communist parties everywhere, and the contempt for western standards of public and private liberty must lead one to doubt whether it is really possible to find any basis of collaboration with the U. S. S. R.—unless something more than a merely tactical shift takes place in the Russian attitude.

Such a conclusion is both economically and politically disheartening to the last degree, but the time has passed for more bargaining with Russia. The taxpayers and consumers of America cannot be asked to make sacrifices in the interest of any power which continues to sabotage recovery outside its own borders.

So much, then, in bare outline, for the political zones of which account must be taken in large schemes of European reconstruction.

Nevertheless, if Europe cannot be remolded in a day and if full allowance is made for the unruly wills and affections of human beings, the mathematical expression of European requirements—the truths stated in the "language of size"—are not less real. Europe needs at once certain things which can be weighed and measured, loaded on ships, and valued in terms of money. No one who has seen the visible evidence of dislocation is likely to underrate these quantitative needs.

Furthermore, in many respects, there is no question of riding roughshod over national habits of life which have a deep symbolic meaning. The question is irrelevant because old ways are gone.

Measurable economic aids to Europe are those linked directly to politics. American opinion can rightly go a long way in insisting that the passionate small-scale hatreds of Europeans cannot be allowed to stand in the way of economic reconstruction. Sensible Europeans themselves realize the folly of using the present moment as an occasion for paying off old scores or grabbing slices of territory.

Mr. Molotov is alone among the Ministers of the great powers in supposing that economic cooperation can be hedged around by the ancient walls of exclusive national sovereignty or, for that matter, by notions of security which date back to the military conditions of the age of Louis XIV. Public opinion in the democratic states, large and small, is ready to back much larger plans for coordinating action without respect to frontiers.

The problem for the politician, therefore, is to find "the most that the traffic will bear," that is to say, the maximum of international economic cooperation which can be "put across" without causing political difficulties likely to aggravate the economic confusion. Once more a glance at the map will show that the sharpest controversy may well occur over the restoration of the productive power of Germany, and especially of the Ruhr.

Anyone wishing to keep in view the interlocking of economic and political issues in Europe would be advised to concentrate upon this latter reason. The liquidation of the once powerful Junker element in the eastern agricultural lands of the Reich is now complete. These Prussian figures can hardly recover a predominance which they had already surrendered to Hitler, but there is a danger to peace if the control of the Ruhr falls again into evil hands. In the famous phrase of centuries ago about the Papacy as "the ghost of the Roman Empire sitting crowned upon the grave thereof," a Fourth Reich might well grow up among the ruins of the Third Reich if the productive forces of this part of western Germany were at the disposition of a group of men who, for Marxist or non-Marxist reasons, rejected the principles of domestic liberty.

A satisfactory settlement of the Ruhr question is no easy matter. Indeed, at this point, one might put in a word of sympathy for the politicians (on both sides of the Atlantic) responsible for solving—and solving quickly—these complicated issues. It is inevitable that mistakes should be made. The actual routine business of foreign affairs is much heavier than at any previous time in modern history. The situation is more complicated, there are more facts to be marshaled, assessed, and kept in mind.

In 1913, for instance, the number of telegrams and dispatches received at the British Foreign Office was under 70,000; in 1938, the number was over 223,000. Today it is greater. Consider what this means for a Secretary of State if he is to read and digest only a small fraction of the information supplied to his department.

It is thus not to be wondered at that politicians so often content themselves with rough guesses. They cannot be expected to know the undertones and nuances of every subject which comes before them, and yet they are the targets both of expert criticism and of a dangerous kind of popular grumbling resulting from the oversimplification of issues as they are stated by headline writers and cartoonists.

For these reasons it is most desirable that—within limits of the possible—democratic countries should continue the "bipartisan" approach to matters effecting European restruction. These matters may divide democratic from nondemocratic countries, but within the region of free institutions they cannot properly be the subject of disagreement on ordinary party lines.

The only distinction which really counts in Europe today is that between liberty and totalitarianism; "parliamentary" socialism and "parliamentary" capitalism are much nearer to one another than either is near to communism.

There is another point to be considered. I should not call it final, because the ramifications of this problem of European recovery are endless. The restoration of Europe and the return of balanced health throughout this modern oceanic economy cannot be thought of in terms of the North Atlantic alone. The United States is a Pacific as well as an Atlantic power. Great Britain is a member of a world-wide commonwealth.

Four western powers are responsible for the welfare of territories in Africa larger than North America. The great oil fields of the Middle East are as important to Americans as to Europeans. Political confusion in Indonesia has a direct effect in increasing the security of essential commodities in Europe. Economic and political chaos in India would be hardly less of a handicap to European recovery.

In many of these extra-European regions an inexperienced and oversanguine minority, excited by political nationalism, is faced with administrative problems which hitherto have baffled western skill. It is irrelevant to the crisis of today that the vast populations of the Far and Middle East may move in the long run toward stability. What is wanted is that they should move toward stability here and now, but even the most optimistic observer cannot fail to notice that here and now the movement is mainly in the opposite direction.

This general picture is very somber. There is no use pretending it to be otherwise. And yet if you live in western Europe you do not find despair. A tour of the universities of Europe would convince most doubters that Europe is worth saving and can be saved. The younger generation is neither defeatist nor sentimental. There is much more self-help than self-pity, and the prevailing mood is very far from being one of twilight preceding the dark.

What, then, is the sum of it all? The answer, as so often, can be extracted from the very difficulties of the problem. I venture to suggest that if Europeans were like bees or ants, whose capacities can be assessed just because they fall within narrow limits, most of the present technical obstacles to recovery would disappear. So, also, would most of the chances of recovery.

The hope of the present and of the future lies in the waywardness and unpredictability of human action and especially in the endless powers of adaptation possessed by the heroes of the European past (a pretty rough past, taking all in all).

Not so very long ago in the time-scale of history, a handful of Europeans landed on the American Continent. They were alone. They had few of the instruments and gadgets which we take for granted. They had no idea of the size of the country in which they were trying to establish themselves. A modern expert, complete with graphs and statistical tables, could have demonstrated the certainty of their failure. Nevertheless, they were the founders of American civilization.

All or most of the facts may be against Europe, but if Europeans refuse to accept these facts and decide to remake them as they have remade so much of the world, Americans should be the last to refuse their help in such an impossible enterprise.

The Loyalty Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire briefly to present my views concerning the so-called loyalty bill, H. R. 3813. In the first place I commend and compliment the able committee and its chairman for painstaking, diligent work on this measure. I am very sorry that I find it necessary to disagree with some of their conclusions, and specifically with the bill in its present form.

It is generally agreed by all that it is not only desirable but necessary in these days of impending crisis to secure loyalty, absolute and unqualified, on the part of all Government employees. The threat and reality of organized Communistic infiltration urgently require the most careful scrutiny of those holding Government positions in the present and future. It is imperative that we keep the Government service unpolluted by radical doctrinaires preaching communism, fascism, or other alien un-American political tenets. The Government is duty bound to protect itself against corruption and subversion within its very structure just as it seeks to protect the body politic from contamination by practitioners of poisonous ideologies. To keep these doctrinaires out of the Government is an obligation arising from the necessity for self-preservation of the state. Private persons do not customarily engage employees when they know such employees are planning to burn down their homes, or their factories or lay waste to their farms. By the same token it is fundamental and basic that Congress should move to protect the Government and people against the inroads of cunning, resourceful apostles of Marxism and every brand of totalitarianism. There is undoubtedly unanimous opinion in this House concerning the validity of these principles and aims.

On the other hand, free men and women of a democracy are entitled to their opinions and must be guaranteed not only the right of free speech, free thought, free assembly, free association, but also must be secure against abridgment of or infringement upon their constitutional rights. The language of this bill does not afford these guarantees. To the contrary, it denies individuals who are charged under its provisions the right to appeal from the action of an administrative officer or board, the right to be confronted by witnesses against them, and the privilege of cross-examination which is accorded to a common thief under our ordinary judicial procedure. This bill strips the courts of final jurisdiction over the precious right of an American citizen to earn his livelihood and vests it exclusively in the hands of an entrenched bureaucracy. It encourages star-chamber proceedings, lettres caches, inquisitions, and persecutions of individuals for their opinions by an administrative board which are entirely irreconcilable with customary constitutional safeguards. It gives a powerful bureaucrat or bureau the power of life and death over a man's employment and leaves the individual helpless and defenseless to know the source of character of the evidence against him, the persons rendering it, or the means of combatting it.

The provisions of this bill remind me more of antiquated courts-martial procedure wherein the accused is presumed to be guilty by members of the court before his trial commences. His conviction usually ensues ipso facto without a real trial.

Such procedure is the antithesis of justice. It is an anomaly in our judicial system. In my opinion, it cannot be defended on any grounds. So far as I am concerned, every citizen of the Nation has a definite, concrete, inalterable right to be secure in his constitutional rights. Whether an individual is a Communist or not, there is no justification for denial of his or her constitutional rights. Instead of limiting traditional procedure which zealously protects and safeguards the rights of the accused, the Government should set a high example of conformity with the mandates of the Constitution and the long-established principles and practices which our courts of justice and agencies of Government have followed since time immemorial. Despite what some bureaucrat may think, despite what some entirely well-meaning opponents of communism or fascism may think, an administrative body should be no more exempt from the requirement of recognizing the constitutional rights of the individual than is the Congress or the courts of justice. It is by this type of piecemeal whittling at the fabric of representative government, at the principles of constitutional law, and at the impartial administration of justice that we may encourage and spread radical ideas and sentiments of rebellion against the Government.

I think that this bill should be recommitted for further study and for the express purpose of writing into it adequate safeguards for the liberties and rights of free American citizens who may be employed by the Government. In its present form I am in conscience constrained to vote against the bill. While I agree with its main objectives, I cannot support it so long as it does not provide guaranties for the accused of full constitutional opportunity to defend himself or herself against charges—comprehensive and comprehensible specifications; fair, impartial hearing; right to hear all the evidence presented in any given case; the right to representation by counsel, confrontation of witnesses, and the right of cross-examination; and review by the Federal courts. If enacted in its present form, this bill will strike a body blow at civil liberties in this country at a time when we should be building, not destroying, confidence in and respect for the Constitution and our democratic Government.

The Loyalty Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, certainly no person who is disloyal to the Government of the United States should be permitted to work for it. There can be no question about that. If new legislation is shown to be necessary to permit the Government to get rid of employees who are actually disloyal to the United States, I will certainly support it. If this bill were that kind of legislation, I would be for it. A simple reading of this bill and the committee report reveals, Mr. Speaker, that the true purpose of this bill is something quite different.

This bill would set up in the executive branch of the Government an independent five-man board, with sweeping authority to recommend the dismissal of any Federal employee whose ideas seemed unorthodox or whose views it disagreed with, and woe be to the administrator who failed to follow its recommendations. This is a bill to legalize a wholly irresponsible inquisition into the thoughts and opinions of a million and a half Americans who work for the Federal Government.

Let me back up that statement. The Loyalty Review Board, which this bill would set up, would become the absolute arbiter of the loyalty of Federal employees. It would prefer the charges, hear the evidence, and render the final verdict. In other words, it would be the prosecutor, judge, and jury. The standards against which it is directed to judge employee loyalty under this bill are so broad that they could be made to fit anyone who ever had a progressive idea or who ever advocated a social reform. Let me name one standard which the bill sets up:

> Sympathetic association with any * * * organization, movement, or group * * * designated by the Attorney General as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive.

What constitutes sympathetic association would be entirely up to the Board itself to decide.

Having charged a Government employee with disloyalty under this vague standard, the Board under the terms of this bill would not have to show the employee the evidence against him or tell him specifically what it consisted of. By the language of the bill, the Board is instructed not to reveal the source of its information. Furthermore, it would not have to prove its charges. The burden of proving the charges to be false would remain entirely with the employee. In other words, Mr. Chairman, under this bill the accused would be guilty unless he could prove himself innocent, and do

so without knowing the charge against him.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the sponsors of this bill did not consciously intend to introduce into the administrative procedures of the American Government the principles of justice developed and utilized by the Nazi rulers of Germany before the war. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, if this bill should pass, employees of the United States Government would be subject to dismissal from their jobs and to continuing persecution under virtually the same standards and procedures employed by the Nazi government in dealing with its employees and its citizens.

I take no comfort in the fact, Mr. Speaker, that employees convicted under this bill would be penalized merely by dismissal from their jobs, for a person convicted and dismissed for disloyalty to his Government would find it difficult, indeed, to find any other employment. Discharge under this bill would be virtually an economic death sentence to the employee involved. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to institute a far-reaching and irresponsible witch hunt in our Government service and to drive from public employment every self-respecting person who really believes in the American birthright of freedom of speech, thought, and conscience.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that I am in favor of punishing any Government employee who is really disloyal to the United States. It is only fair to recognize that the first four standards set forth in this bill for judging employee loyalty are perfectly proper ones, and I agree with them. But upon inquiry I discover, Mr. Speaker, that each and every one of these standards prohibit activities which are already specifically prohibited by existing law. We already have laws, Mr. Speaker, against sabotage or espionage. We have laws against treason, sedition or the advocacy thereof. We already have laws against the disclosure of confidential information by Government employees. Riders to current appropriation bills deny Government employment to anyone who advocates the overthrow of the Government by force or violence or who belongs to an organization of such advocacy, and provide criminal penalties for any employee who falsely swears he does not advocate such overthrow of the Government, or belong to such an organization. The fifth standard in this bill requires undivided loyalty to the United States Government. But, Mr. Speaker, so does the oath of office taken by every Federal employee. Dismissal from the service and, I believe, other penalties are already provided for the violation of the oath of office. So, Mr. Speaker, this bill is entirely unnecessary in order to make illegal any real acts of disloyalty on the part of our public servants. The Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Justice at the present time have full authority and responsibility for prosecuting any Government employees who violate the standards I have just mentioned. The only thing this bill adds to existing law, in terms of prohibited activities, is the sweeping and insidious ban against membership or "sympathetic association" with certain groups, organizations, or movements; and the unheard-of grant of authority to the Attorney General of the United States to designate what organizations, groups, or movements are to be proscribed under this act.

Mr. Speaker, this is a frightening piece of legislation because it strikes at the very fundamentals of American liberty. I have not discussed the question, Mr. Speaker, of the wholesale spying and intimidation which would result from the investigation of each of our one and one-half million Government employees which the bill would require. Nor have I discussed the curious extravagance evidenced by the sponsors of this bill in proposing to spend some $30,000,000 on such an investigation in a stringent economy year when no concrete need for such an investigation has been demonstrated. These are important considerations but the preservation of basic American freedoms of thought and conscience, the preservation of political liberty and the American concept of justice are more important.

If it should be passed, its effect would be felt far beyond the Federal service. The designation by the Attorney General of any organization as subversive would certainly go far toward destroying such an organization. Thus the Attorney General is given the final and arbitrary power to so proscribe any American organization, any political movement or group of people without a hearing and with no appeal permitted. I cannot believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will approve any such totalitarian grant of authority to a Government official. And I cannot believe the Members of this House will vote to introduce into Government administrative procedures the odious totalitarian justice which this bill would inaugurate.

Resolution of the City of Newark, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a duly certified copy of a resolution passed on July 2, 1947, by the Board of Commissioners of the city of Newark, N. J., urging the Congress to restore to the appropriation for the Federal Public Housing Authority the amounts recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. It is concrete evidence of some of the harm caused by the penny-wise pound-foolish economy program of the majority party. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the United States House of Representatives has passed the Government corporations appropriation bill (H. R. 3756) with reductions and restrictions in the appropriation for the Federal Public Housing Authority which might destroy the public housing program if enacted; and

Whereas the appropriation in this bill of insufficient funds to pay the amounts due to the Newark Housing Authority under its contract for annual contributions would be repudiation of a Federal obligation to the payment of which the faith of the United States was solemnly pledged; and

Whereas this bill would reduce by two-thirds the payments in lieu of taxes to the city of Newark in spite of the fact that the city has amply fulfilled its obligation to contribute by granting tax exemption to the public housing projects; and

Whereas this bill would require the Newark Housing Authority to expend its reserves for repair and maintenance on the basis of which bonds have been sold to private investors: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, That this board urges the Congress to restore to the appropriation for the Federal Public Housing Authority the amounts recommended by the Bureau of the Budget; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be, and he is hereby, instructed to send copies of this resolution to the United States Senators and Congressmen from New Jersey, with the request that they work to accomplish the purpose of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby instructed to send copies of this resolution to the members of the Appropriations Committees of the United States Senate and of the House of Representatives.

JOHN B. KEENAN,
RALPH A. VILLANI,
JOHN A. BRADY,
M. ELLENSTEIN,
Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J.

Memorial to the Late Honorable Roy H. Williams, of the Supreme Court of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable Roy H. Williams, of the Supreme Court of Ohio, removed one of the outstanding members of the bench and bar of the State of Ohio. He was a most distinguished son of Erie County, a good neighbor with a kindly word, and his friendly encouragement to young members of the bar will be a lasting memory. Along with his host of friends throughout the country, I want to add my humble tribute, and include a memorial to the late Honorable Roy H. Williams, of the Supreme Court of Ohio:

MEMORIAL OF THE LIFE, CHARACTER, AND PUBLIC SERVICES OF ROY H. WILLIAMS

Your committee appointed to prepare a memorial of the life, character, and public services of the Honorable Roy Hughes Williams, a member of this court at the time of his death, submits the following:

Death came suddenly and without warning to Judge Roy H. Williams in Columbus, Ohio, on December 18, 1946, 4 days after the Supreme Court had recessed for the Christmas vacation. While he had been ill a year or so before his death, he had fully recovered and returned to the bench where he had resumed his full share of the work and responsibility of the court throughout the fall term of 1946.

Judge Williams was born in Milan, Ohio, on September 1, 1874, the son of Charles Ronald Williams and Helen Hughes Wil-

liams. The Williams family was of Welsh ancestry, the eighth ancestor, William Williams, having landed at New Salem, Mass., in 1629. Judge Williams' father, a native of Lorain County and a teacher by profession, was killed in an accident when the judge was but 5 years old. Left fatherless, he made his home with his grandparents on a farm and spent his early boyhood days in and around Milan, the birthplace of another great American, Thomas Alva Edison.

Judge Williams attended Milan High School and Western Reserve Normal School. He then matriculated at Oberlin Preparatory School, and while attending that school went to work for the Western Union Telegraph Company, stringing wires, in order to have sufficient funds to obtain a higher education.

He later entered Oberlin College, where he continued his studies until the sophomore year, when he transferred to the University of Michigan, at first majoring in literature and later pursuing the study of law. He graduated from the University of Michigan Law School in 1897. Judge William L. Hart, a present member of this court, was one of his classmates at Michigan Law School.

Upon graduation from Law School, Judge Williams was admitted to the Ohio Bar in 1897, receiving the second highest grade in the State bar examination out of a class of eighty-five. After practicing for three years in Sandusky, he was elected to his first public office, prosecuting attorney of Erie County, in which capacity he served from 1901 to 1907.

His service as prosecuting attorney was marked by his vigorous prosecution and conviction of bridge contractors under the Valentine Antitrust Act. His work in these cases was ever remembered by the voters of Erie County.

In 1914, after eight years in private practice, he was elected Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Erie County, which office he held for 10 years. On that bench he had the distinction of being the first Judge in Ohio to impanel the first jury of twelve women on the very day the 19th Amendment to the United States Constitution became effective.

In 1924 he was elected judge of the court of appeals of the sixth district and served as judge of that court for 10 years. During this period that court rendered more than 1,200 written opinions, of which Judge Williams wrote over 350, many of which are reported in volumes 17 to 49 in Ohio Appellate Reports.

With such an experienced judicial background on both trial and reviewing courts Judge Williams was elevated to the Supreme Court to fill an unexpired term. He was reelected in 1936 to a full 6-year term—the only Republican candidate for any State office elected that year. He was reelected in 1942 for another full 6-year term, which he was serving when he died.

Attesting his popularity before the voters of Ohio, it is to be noted that in all three of his initial elections to the Court of Common Pleas, the court of appeals, and the Supreme Court of Ohio, he ran against and defeated an incumbent judge then serving on the bench.

Had he lived until next month, it would have been half a century since Judge Williams first took the oath of practicing law, of which the last 32 consecutive years of his career were served in a judicial capacity.

This is but a brief outline of his public service, and is purely biographical and statistical. It does not portray the character of Judge Williams, either as a jurist or as a man.

Coming to the supreme court with his long experience on both the trial and reviewing courts, he was unusually well-equipped to handle matters presented to the State's highest tribunal. He was of a deeply conscientious nature and put forth painstaking efforts on every case. He never shirked or avoided any duties imposed upon him. To him every case was important with the sole aim to do justice. He knew that the law springs from reality and so avoided the use of abstractions and epigrams to decide disputes.

Throughout his lengthy judicial career he interpreted the law as a guide for the conduct of society and a guaranty of its fundamental rights. He held the view that the Constitution and the common law were to be liberally interpreted to meet the needs of the time. He understood and respected the sovereignty and the dignity of the common man whom he believed was the ruler of his own life and government. These conceptions were developed because the Judge believed deeply in upholding the rights of his fellow men.

He was not the type of jurist who would make hurried judgments or reach quick decisions, but, on the contrary, arrived at his conclusions only after deliberately analyzing and carefully weighing all arguments presented. His opinions were direct and simple, unadorned with rhetorical flourishes. To him the precedent was a guidepost, but not conclusive one.

Time and again he maintained that justice in an ever changing world could not be achieved if the law was static. This interest led him to a study of the work of great jurists such as Marshall, Taney, Hughes, Holmes, Brandeis, and Cardozo.

His opinions showed great research, and an acute analysis of law and fact. One need but read, for example, the opinions in *City of Cleveland* v. *Ruple* (130 Ohio State, 465); *Matz, Administrator* v. *Curtis Cartage Co.* (132 Ohio State, 271); or his dissent in *Federal Housing Authority* v. *Guckenberger* (143 Ohio State, 251), to understand that he did not take the line of least resistance. His opinions were not "unconfined and vagrant," but were "canalized within the banks" and proper limitations. His reported opinions on the supreme court are found in volumes 129 to 147 of Ohio State Reports.

In recognition of his judicial work and public services, the University of Bowling Green, Ohio, conferred upon him its doctor of laws degree in August 1944.

During the long time he was on the bench, Judge Williams never forgot that he was a lawyer and those who appeared before him were his brothers in a learned profession. Never did he attempt, by remark, question, or innuendo, to criticize or embarrass those who pleaded their causes before the court. All inquiries were put in a courteous, kindly, and direct manner. Harsh or intemperate words or language were unknown to him. His kindly, gentlemanly, and dignified attitude will long be remembered and beloved by the bench and bar of Ohio.

Socially and in conference, Judge Williams showed the same kindness, thoughtfulness, and consideration which he possessed while on the bench. While firm and strong in his convictions, disagreeing, and dissenting when he felt others were wrong, yet he always respected and gave due deference to their opinions.

Judge Williams was a modest and unassuming man, but his gentleness of manner and his kind expression and softness of voice gave confidence to all who met him. He was a man of the deepest integrity and was utterly devoid of religious prejudice and nationalistic hatred. His wants and habits were simple, and even wealth would not have changed his mode or manner of living. He personified simplicity.

His love for humanity led him into many fields of civic endeavor, and he became a leader in many fraternal orders and organizations. He was past lieutenant governor of Ohio Kiwanis; one of the organizers and the first President of the Ohio State safety council; a member of the Scottish Rite, and Knights Templar; a member of the Knights of Pythias, Elks, Maccabees, and Sons of the American Revolution. He took great pride in the charitable undertakings of the Loyal Order of Moose, which organization elected him to national supreme governor in 1938. Judge Williams was a deeply religious man, and he and his wife showed a continued interest in the work of the Presbyterian Church of which they were both members.

During World War I, while serving as judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Erie County, although 44 years of age, he voluntarily enlisted as a private and was sent to Camp Knox for training. While this service was short because of the end of hostilities, he always showed a great interest in the affairs of the American Legion and other veterans' organizations.

Judge Williams was married to Verna Lockwood on December 7, 1898, and until his death 48 years later, she was his constant helpmate and companion and inspiration. They took great pride in their home in Sandusky. They were interested in exceptionally selected furnishings and the home portrayed the characteristics of tranquillity and a well-planned life. Peace and quiet prevailed not only in the physical surroundings but in the habits of the household.

The loss of Judge Williams was a great shock to Mrs. Williams, but the treasury of her memories of their close association and the high esteem with which he was held by his fellow men will ever be far more comforting to her than anything we could say here.

Judge Williams' record is written not only on the pages of the law reports, but is found in the heart and spirit of those who knew him intimately. All who met him were of one accord—there was, there is, no kindlier, gentler man.

The day before his death Judge Williams was engaged in writing an opinion and making plans for the future. It seems appropriate, therefore, to conclude this memorial by quoting from the poem written by Dr. S. Hall Young, a Presbyterian missionary, and sent to Mrs. Williams recently. May the thought expressed serve as an inspiration to all those who travel the same road traveled by Judge Williams.

Let me die working,
Still tackling plans unfinished, tasks undone,
Clean to the end, swift may my race be run,
No lagging steps, no faltering, no shirking,
Let me die working.

Let me die thinking,
Let me fare forth still with an open mind,
Fresh secrets to unfold, new truths to find,
My soul undimmed, alert, no question blinking,
Let me die thinking.

Let me die giving,
The substance of life for life's enriching,
Time, things, and self to heaven converging,
Let me die giving.

Publication of Anti-Semitic Statements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on July 2 Mr. Alfred Schwartz, adjutant of Atlanta Post, No. 112, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, forwarded to me a resolution adopted by that post with reference to House bill H. R. 2848. As a representative of the post, Adjutant Schwartz asked for my cooperation in opposing this bill.

On July 7 I wrote him asking for permission to insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which permission was granted on July 10.

I insert herewith the resolution referred to.

I feel that action of this kind by this post of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States is worthy of more than passing notice. The membership of this post of Jewish War Veterans have, of their own volition, announced that they want no special treatment—are seeking no special favors or consideration that are not granted to or enjoyed by every other American citizen. In this day and time, when it is the rule that most organized groups seek special treatment, special favors, and concessions, it is refreshing and inspiring to see a patriotic organization such as this come up with a forthright declaration that they are seeking no special consideration and will accept none, but on the contrary repudiate any attempt to enact special legislation in their behalf, and demand to be treated simply as American citizens.

I regard this as one of the finest examples of patriotism and Americanism which has been set by any group, and I commend it to the consideration of the House.

The resolution follows:

Whereas there is now pending, in the United States House of Representatives, the Buckley bill (H. R. 2848) purporting to prohibit the publication of anti-Semitic statements; and

Whereas said bill is poorly conceived and poorly drafted, since by singling out anti-Semitic libels for prohibition it invites invalidation by the courts as "special legislation," thus making the constitutionality of said bill highly doubtful; and

Whereas the bill is so vague and ambiguous as to be unenforceable; and

Whereas it is inimical to the best interests of the United States to pass legislation of this nature for the benefit of any special group, religion, race, or creed: It is hereby

Resolved, That Jewish War Veterans Post, No. 112, goes on record as being unalterably opposed to the passage of this bill, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Representative of our District in Congress.

ARTHUR WEISS,
Commander.

Attest:

ALFRED SCHWARTZ,
Adjutant.

Labor Extension Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill to broaden and develop the extension system as established by the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto. This bill will aid in extending useful and practical information among the wage earners of the United States and increase the resources and facilities available to them. It will establish a labor extension service in the Department of Labor, administered by the Secretary of Labor. It will greatly aid the creative capacities of workers who, together with farmers, comprise the Nation's basic productive assets.

I wish to extend for the benefit of the Members, a few questions and answers which will simply and concisely reveal the contents of this legislation.

Question. What is the labor extension service bill?

Answer. A bill to establish for wage and salary earners a publicly supported Labor Extension Service in the United States Department of Labor.

Question. How would the service operate?

Answer. Through a cooperative plan between the Department of Labor, colleges and universities in the States and local groups of wage and salary earners requesting this service.

Question. What kind of services?

Answer. Classes and discussion groups for wage and salary earners who need to know more about their everyday problems in industry and in their communities. Institutes and forums, motion pictures, library services, research projects, help with the conferences and exhibits. Under this plan, workers would be able to secure teachers in labor history, labor economics, collective bargaining, labor journalism, labor-management relations and civic and community programs.

Question. How did the plan start?

Answer. This plan has been discussed by labor organizations and other interested groups for the past 10 years. The National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education was formed a year ago to frame such a bill and organize support for it. On the committee are officers of a number of international labor unions, education and research directors, persons from labor education agencies, and from interested colleges and universities. The committee serves as a clearing house through which all groups concerned may cooperate for this legislation.

LOCAL PLANNING

Question. How can a local union get labor extension service?

Answer. By having an education committee which—

First. Decides what services are needed.

Second. Draws up a request for these services and confers with the nearest college or university which is cooperating with the State labor extension board making sure that the local requests are forwarded to this board.

Question. Will such services benefit organized workers only?

Answer. No. Any group of workers may apply for these services.

STATE BOARDS

Question. Who will be responsible for the labor extension service in each State?

Answer. A State labor extension board, consisting of at least 9 and not more than 15 members, working in cooperation with approved institutions.

Question. Who will appoint this board?

Answer. The Governor of the State will choose the majority from a panel submitted by bona fide labor organizations State-wide in scope. The other members will include the head of the State labor department or industrial commission, representatives of institutions participating in the program, someone whose main work is in adult education, and, where possible, someone from the field of workers' education.

Question. What will be the duties of the State Labor Extension Board?

Answer. The Board will:

First. Receive the local requests.

Second. Approve the services given by cooperating universities and colleges.

Third. Make sure that funds are spent without discrimination of race, color, creed, sex or national origin.

Fourth. Submit plans and reports to the United States Secretary of Labor.

Question. How will the cooperating institutions be selected?

Answer. First. The State boards, following local requests from groups of workers, will determine which institutions will develop and offer services for which these funds may be allocated.

Second. Standards set up by the Department of Labor for these services will have to be met by these institutions.

Third. Through local extension centers conveniently located and through the use of union halls, wage and salary earners in every part of a State may be serviced.

FEDERAL OFFICE

Question. Where and how will the labor-extension service be set up?

Answer. In the United States Department of Labor, under a director of labor extension directly responsible to the Secretary of Labor and appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Question. Will the director have advisers?

Answer. Yes. The bill provides for a National Labor Extension Council of 15 members "to advise the Secretary of Labor and the Director in formulating general policies."

Question. Who will serve on such a council?

Answer. A majority will be chosen by the Secretary of Labor from a panel submitted by bona fide labor organizations national in scope. The other members will be appointed by the Secretary of Labor from cooperating institutions conducting labor-extension services, from workers' education organizations, research agencies operating in the field of social science, and someone whose chief interest is adult education.

FUNDS

Question. How much money is needed for this service?

Answer. The bill provides for an initial sum to be determined by the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee for the first year; doubled the second; tripled the third year and each year afterward.

Question. How will the money be divided?

Answer. Every State meeting the necessary requirements will receive funds based on the number of wage and salary earners in that State compared with the total number in the United States.

Question. Will these services be entirely paid for by Federal funds?

Answer. No; Federal funds will cover three-fourths of the cost; one-fourth will be provided locally.

Question. How will this contribution be raised?

Answer. It may be provided by the State Legislature, by cooperating institutions, by local groups from their own budgets, by moderate fees, or by contributions, such as rent of space, equipment, light, heat, or janitor service.

SERVICES LONG OVERDUE

Question. Is there a precedent in Government for this service?

Answer. The Morrill Act of 1862 and other acts of Congress provide agricultural extension services for families of 6,000,000 farm operators, costing in Federal funds $23,500,000 a year. This is the first bill to provide a labor-extension service for 50,000,000 wage and salary workers.

An Interrupted Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following syndicated article by Mark Sullivan entitled "An Interrupted Dream" which appeared in the newspapers of Monday, July 14, 1947. Mr. Sullivan's article is timely and interesting, as usual, and of especial interest is his quotation from the recent address of our colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

AN INTERRUPTED DREAM
(By Mark Sullivan)
RUSSIA AND THE HOPE OF ONE WORLD

For reasons which are understandable, our heads of Government refrain from speaking about our relations with Russia as starkly as the facts are. This official restraint prevents our people from fully grasping the attitude of the Russian Government, and the breach into two worlds which it harshly emphasized last week. Understanding of the condition is imperative, for it puts our people under the necessity of changing their thinking about one world.

Our Government, acting in the interest of cooperation for world recovery, proposed that the countries of Europe get together for mutual self-help toward economic recovery. We said that after the European countries had done this, we would help—contribute funds, food, machinery, every sort of aid.

The proposal, called the Marshall plan, was hailed by Britain and France, but Russian Foreign Minister Molotov warned them against the plan, tried to intimidate them. They went on, nevertheless, invited 22 European governments to a conference at Paris. Sixteen of the governments accepted and the conference is now in session. Eight governments, with Russia, are not present—the eight that are closest to Russia's borders and are in varying degrees of willingness and duress subject to Russian domination. Their absence, and the reasons for it, tell the story. In the case of two, the reason came out.

In the case of Poland, an official statement of the Polish Embassy in Washington, July 2, said, "We would like to take part in discussions relative to * * * the Marshall plan and eventually to present suggestions of the Polish Government." A few days later the Polish Government declined to participate in the conference.

The case of Czechoslovakia is stark. At first that Government announced that it would participate in the conference, and sent a plane load of technicians to Paris. A few days later the Czech Prime Minister and Foreign Minister flew to Moscow and had an interview with Stalin. From Moscow the Czech Prime Minister telephoned his Government at Prague that it must withdraw its earlier acceptance. In doing this, the Czech government said officially: "Acceptance of the invitation might be construed as an action against the Soviet Union."

Both Czechoslovakia and Poland wished to take part in the conference. Both could have made important contributions to the recovery of Europe, and both desperately needed the help from Europe and the United States that the Marshall plan assured. Both countries were forced by Russia, in the most humiliating way, to refuse.

Why did Russia thus make plain the breach between her and the Western World? An answer that receives much credence in Washington is that Russia could not afford to have the Marshall plan succeed, could not afford to have the world see cooperation between America and western Europe, it would lessen her hold on Communists in every country. Especially she could not let the Marshall plan succeed in helping the countries under her domination. Success would show them the way of escape from their subservience.

While our Government continues its restraint, occasional signs emerge which show that it recognizes the facts. In the magazine Foreign Affairs last week is an article which, while anonymous, is generally supposed to have been written by a high official of the State Department. The article contains a warning: "There can never be on Moscow's side any sincere assumption of a community of aim between the Soviet Union and powers which are regarded as capitalist." The United States "must continue to regard the Soviet Union as a rival, not a partner, in the political arena."

The ominous condition which America must grasp was put in clear words by an able young Congressman, Republican CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey: "No longer can we avoid the conclusion that Russia's purpose is the opposite to our own—to create confusion, perpetuate disaster, and bring chaos everywhere beyond her borders, in the hope that eventually democracy will be destroyed throughout the world. It is time for us to face the fact that we must act, not only without Russia's help, but in the face of her stubborn opposition * * * that our dream of one world, in which peoples of conflicting ideologies will live together in peace, cannot now be realized."

Admission of Displaced Persons to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 15, 1947:

IT'S NOT TIME THAT'S LACKING

Senator VANDENBERG came out of yesterday's bipartisan conference with President Truman with the announcement that it seemed "all but impossible" to adjust the immigration laws at this session to admit displaced persons. If this is true, the Stratton bill and one of similar intent in the Senate will die. Something else will die, too. We have posed as a great humanitarian Nation. In loans and gifts, made and projected, we act in a humanitarian manner, but our kindliness, down to the present moment, seems to be for far-away peoples. We turn chilly at the prospect of admitting, by an adjustment of quotas, within a space of 4 years, the equivalent of one stranger for each 350 of our present population. The strangers would be of several faiths and various national origins. The overwhelming majority of them would be refugees from communism, which most of us don't like, either. What will die if these bills die is the refugees' faith in us.

Congress is in a hurry to get home. The refugees, who have spent two or more years in camps, without homes, are probably in a hurry to get somewhere, too. The proposal to let some of them in by diverting unused quotas has been before the Eightieth Congress since January 6, when President Truman included it in his message on the state of the Nation. The Stratton bill has been in the House since the beginning of April. There has been time enough.

The program of the Stratton bill is a little thing to do for those who stood with us in the late war, and stand with us now. It is much more of a thing to do for ourselves, for these would be carefully selected immigrants, many of them bringing skills we need. Congress can find time for this measure, or for a compromise between this and the Senate bill, if it wants to. If it does want to, it can make many more than 400,000 friends for us; it can increase our own self-respect; it can answer the critics who call us hard-hearted hypocrites.

Europe's Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune:

NOT IMPOSSIBLE

Congressional leaders have told President Truman that "extreme legislative difficulties" make conclusive action now in behalf of Europe's displaced persons "all but impossible." It is our conviction that this issue calls for the impossible. Provision for the human beings displaced by the war was and is a first responsibility of the peace. The war against the Nazis was fought to preserve a civilization in which the dignity of the individual is basic. Yet for 2 years these individual victims, most of them nationals of our allies, have wandered homeless or have been supported by international charity in the vacuum of internment camps. Thousands are in the very concentration camps from which the Allied armies rescued them. Pleas for more time in which to rerescue them have a very hollow sound.

Ira C. Hirschmann, who knows the problem of the displaced through special missions and work with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, points out that of the 850,000 for whom resettlement is the only hopeful solution, 170,000 are children under 17 years of age. Surely there is no part of the peace making more important than to provide these young recruits for

democracy the minimum prospect of a home and useful occupation. Eighty percent of the displaced are Christians. Common humanity requires that this predominantly Christian Nation take the lead in allowing a fair share of them to start a new life here. Twenty percent are Jews, for whom a Palestinian settlement may yet offer opportunity. If it does not, again, common humanity requires that these most tragic of refugees not be left stranded at the scene of unparalleled pogroms and persecution.

The Stratton bill would admit 100,000 of the displaced here every year for 4 years; all would be carefully screened in accordance with established immigration safeguards against admitting criminals or prospective troublemakers, invalids, and paupers. The President last week reiterated in an eloquent special message his request for some such measure. The bill's principle has the support of the State Department, of church, labor, civic and veterans' groups through the country. The chief opposition comes from persons and organizations still overwhelmed by isolationist timidities. Recognition of the measure as an essential part of the Nation's accepted international policy, and as itself dictated by humanity, justice, and love of peace, will far outweigh the opposition. We urge that the leaders of Congress hurdle the difficulties, do the all but impossible and see this measure through.

State Department: Stupid in Public Relations, Kiplinger Magazine July 1947, the Changing Times and Text of Secretary Marshall's Speech to the Conference of Governors at Salt Lake City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From Kiplinger Magazine of July 1, 1947]

STATE DEPARTMENT: STUPID IN PUBLIC RELATIONS

These words are addressed to the man I met on the diner out of Columbus some weeks ago. I didn't get your name, but you are the man who put down the newspaper as I barged into a seat across the table, and you started a conversation about Greece and Turkey, and how they meant nothing to you. You said you were plenty occupied with your own business and you were satisfied to let the State Department take care of foreign affairs without any kibitzing from you. I didn't agree with you on the matter of your indifference, and I'd like to say a few things about what's wrong with the State Department, and why it is your business.

You think the future of your kids is in your hands. Well, that isn't quite true. Whether your kids will have to go through another war depends partly on you, but also on your State Department. That Department directs the arrangements which turn out for either peace or war. It's your peace or your war, and so it ought to be your State Department.

The State Department is going to ask the American people to spend billions of dollars more in foreign countries. They have the plans drawn up. They have reasons why it is a good idea, not only for the foreign countries but for you. They have ideas on why it will be a good investment, for peace and good business later on.

But you haven't heard enough from the State Department on what the whole program will cost or why the price should be paid. You've heard the first few chapters, but you need to know the whole story. You need to know what it will cost, how much taxes it will take, what it means in business planning, how much of your product should be sold in foreign markets, how it will affect the tariffs, whether it means more or fewer depressions, and finally whether it means your children will do business or fight a war.

You're not the only one who hasn't been taken into confidence. Members of Congress who have to decide the final questions haven't been able to get the State Department to talk honestly about what's coming. The program just grinds out, piece by piece, accompanied by the hand wringing of diplomats and the State Department wail that nobody understands.

I want to make it clear that this is not a criticism of the ability of the men in the State Department, and it's not a beef about their policy. Those are different matters. What I'm talking about is an attitude toward the public, and I'm saying that this attitude is stupid.

The standard attitude of many key officials in the State Department has been, and still is, that you and millions like you are too dumb to comprehend what their work is all about. This attitude originated in Old World diplomacy, when diplomats fixed the affairs of nations in high secrecy, then called upon the people to do the paying and the fighting.

Now, in this country your State Department apes the Old World diplomats. Your State Department tells you what it has done, but not what it is cooking up. Policies in the making are hush-hush. You will be told in due course, but you mustn't bother your mind while big policies are cooking. You just take what's cooked and like it.

There's a State Department booklet, an inch thick, to impress on departmental officials and employees the rules of secrecy. Many of the rules are proper, but the effect is also to withhold information which you ought to have. Secrecy is a fetish, and it works against you.

Our foreign policies, whatever they are from time to time, have only as much strength as the public support behind them. Diplomats and other high officials can plan as much as they please, but their plans go for naught if Congress and the public do not back them up. Only through public support do policies get guts.

And yet, in the face of this fact, the State Department officialdom goes around maintaining its secrets, mumbling that the public doesn't understand, and doing very little to make the public understand. The State Department has more "trouble" with Congress than almost any other department. It is always on the defensive, even in its appropriations. The result is that policies arranged by the State Department often do not have support in Congress, or with the public. No wonder you are so indifferent. And no wonder Congress, by State Department standards, is so often "difficult."

The influence of our State Department in the world is now at an all-time high. It has great opportunities for either peace or war. Its opportunities are sometimes undermined, however, by uncertainty about support at home. The State Department officialdom faces outward, toward the world. It should also face inward, toward our people, people like you. If it does not soon reform, and face inward, it will stub its toe and the Nation's toe, and the pain will be yours and your kids'.

W. M. K.

TEXT OF THE ADDRESS BY MARSHALL

I have welcomed the opportunity to meet with you gentlemen again but not the obligation to make a formal public statement. During the war years it was possible for me to talk off the record and also to discuss matters in a rather definite manner.

I always felt that you not only gave me your confidence, but that the Army derived a very definite benefit from the more intimate knowledge of its problems that I felt free to communicate to you.

I express again my appreciation of the support you gave me in those difficult days and the meticulous manner in which you respected my confidence.

I little thought in my last meeting with some of you—I believe at Mackinac Island—that I would return again in a totally different capacity and with problems and responsibilities that are in some respect much more difficult than those that were mine during the war.

It is unnecessary to tell you gentlemen that reestablishing the peace has its difficulties, or that it is necessary that I be very careful in what I say publicly and when I say it.

If it had been practicable for me to talk to you off the record and in great confidence, there is much that I would like to discuss with you. However, I must confine myself to the necessities of the time and the occasion.

PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING ASKED

In accepting my new responsibilities it is probably fortunate, though it did not seem so at the time, that I had little opportunity to go into all of the details concerned with the critical negotiations, discussions, and actions in which I was soon to participate.

Probably if I had had a full realization of the enormity of the task and its requirements, I would have suffered considerably in morale. As it is, I have reason to be really very grateful for the generous support which has been given me and the sympathetic understanding with which my various efforts have been regarded.

I will say right now that the greatest problem I feel we have to deal with is in bringing the American public to a general understanding of the conditions involved at home and abroad which influence all negotiations and therefore all efforts to reestablish the peace and prosperity of the world.

Prejudiced points of view are of course objectionable in all such matters, but it is very hard to avoid a degree of prejudice under real provocation, and particularly when one is remote from the scene of difficulties. Also it is very difficult to reduce the problems to a simplicity of statement that is understandable to our citizens generally.

MOSCOW CONFERENCE CITED

I can judge this I think rather accurately by my own difficulties when I first took up the burdens of preparation for the meetings in Moscow.

That experience, incidentally, has guided my language to a considerable extent in the various public statements I have had to make. State papers and State pronouncements must be couched in diplomatic, at least dignified, phraseology, and unless one is a master of the English language, such as Mr. Churchill, for example, it is very difficult to combine these requirements with the urgent necessity of making impressively clear to the ordinary citizen the matters under discussion.

These gatherings of the executive heads of the States on which our Government is founded are emphatic reminders of the function of the States of our political life. That function has a very special significance today when one considers the present world problems.

Thinking back on the developments of our Federal Union, on the doubts and difficulties which preceded the final union of the Colonies, on the remarkable productive effort which followed on the solution of the early difficulties, and on the high degree to which the States have continued to main-

tain their own individual personality and institutions, Americans should have a keen and sympathetic understanding for the efforts now under way in Europe to overcome the limitations of national barriers in the approach to a solution for common economic problems.

And their understanding will strongly influence, in fact will determine, the decisions which this country will be called upon to take with relation to the outcome of these discussions.

NATION AT TURNING POINT

There is no blinking the fact that this country now stands at a turning point in its relations to its traditional friends among the nations of the Old World. Either it must finish the task of assisting these countries to adjust themselves to the changed demands of a new age, or it must reconcile itself to seeing them move in directions which are consistent neither with their own traditions nor with those of this country.

In this latter case, the United States would be faced with a radical alteration of its own position in the world. I ask you to consider most carefully the implication of such a development for the future prosperity and security of our country.

There are many who are in doubt as to the course which this Nation should now pursue. They feel that the aid granted thus far to the countries of Europe has been piecemeal, and certainly not fully effective. And they wonder whether we are pursuing the right course.

These reactions are understandable. It is true that the efforts to put European countries back on their feet have thus far been largely to meet a series of crises and therefore of a somewhat disjoined character. It is also true that they have been far more beneficial than is generally realized.

The uncertainties of the immediate posthostilities period were such that no one could have predicted accurately the course of developments or devised adequate, coordinated approaches to Europe's problems.

An immense amount has been accomplished by what this country and others have already done to help Europe overcome the effects of this war. However, a great part of the problem of postwar adjustment in Europe still awaits solution. No one clearly foresaw, and no one could have foreseen, the outlines and the magnitude of the problem while the smoke of battle still hung over the scene.

BETTER PLANNING POSSIBLE

It is now possible to calculate more exactly the needs which must be met, and the sources from which they must be met, if this adjustment is to be completed. Furthermore, the urgent need for a carefully coordinated European effort is now widely recognized.

The meeting in Paris called at the initiative of the Foreign Ministers of France and Great Britain constitutes an auspicious beginning to the accomplishment of this task.

The representatives of European countries there assembled deserve to feel that their work will be followed in this country with genuine sympathy and good will. For we are intimately concerned with the solution.

In Washington we are studying with the greatest of care the implications of the various possible solutions from the standpoint of the interests of the United States. But whatever course is adopted will affect the lives and fortunes of people in every State of the Union.

It is imperative that the attitude taken by our Government toward this problem, as in all great questions of foreign affairs, be in intimate accord with the feelings of the Nation at large.

To make up its mind this country will need facts. One of the results of the meeting being held in Paris and of the studies now being made by the Government will be to bring out all the facts. With the facts before them I am confident of the response of the American people.

With your help I feel it will be possible for our Government to find a course of action fully consistent with our own national interests and yet equally considerate of the incalculable stake which this country has in the preservation of European civilization.

Address of Gov. Robert F. Bradford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech made over Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., on July 6, 1947, by the Honorable Robert F. Bradford, Governor of Massachusetts, under the auspices of the Polish-American Congress, Inc., western Massachusetts branch:

Thank you, Dr. Smolczynski. I deeply appreciate your invitation to participate once again on this important program which is designed to bring home to the American public the true condition of Poland and the acute problem confronting those Polish leaders who are seeking justice and freedom for their country. Your organization is to be commended for the intelligent and energetic manner in which it is working for the restoration of a government in Poland under which the people of that nation may enjoy happiness and liberty.

It was only a few weeks ago that the Polish people celebrated a day of great significance in the history of their country—the anniversary of the promulgation of Poland's first liberal constitution in 1791. It was an occasion on which the hearts and minds of thousands of American citizens of Polish ancestry turned naturally to the land of their birth. The sentiments which stirred the hearts of these men and women—the thoughts which filled their minds—doubtless combined sadness with pride. And also, I am sure, confidence and hope and determination—the characteristics of a nation which refuses to accept defeat.

There is little need for me today to speak of the strong bonds which have existed for so many decades—and still exist—between Poland and the United States. The history of the two countries bears ample testimony to this warm friendship. It is a friendship nurtured during long years of peace and tempered in the furnace of war. It is a friendship which has fostered mutual admiration and respect, one which will not be shaken by passing storms.

In recent years, Poland passed through one of the dark periods of her history. An enemy sought to destroy her. But though forced to suffer the deepest agony, she maintained her dignity, her integrity, and her existence. Poland fought with all the force and gallantry at her command, and although overwhelmed, she was never completely conquered. The story of her resistance is one of the bright chapters in the sordid history of war.

Within her borders, despite the presence of the invader, and on the scattered battle fronts of the world as well, indomitable Poles refused to accept defeat. They continued their struggle for justice and freedom wherever a blow could be struck in the cause which they held to be more dear than life itself.

To those who understand the Polish people and their history, this high valor and devotion to principle came as no surprise. The spirit behind this noble struggle was but a natural outgrowth of their deep-seated belief in justice and tolerance and liberty. The meaning of democracy was known and respected in Poland hundreds of years ago. But in those distant days, the shining example which Poland gave to Europe merely aroused the suspicions and hatred of rapacious neighbors who fell upon her repeatedly. In fact, it was only a few years after our own American Colonies had won their liberty that Poland suffered a blow which virtually wiped her off the Continent.

But there was that in the spirit of the Poles which rejected annihilation. The flame of freedom could not be extinguished. Poland could be trampled upon, partitioned, grievously hurt, but she would not be exterminated. So, from the ashes of that terrible defeat, she rose again slowly and painfully to regain the stature of a republic and to take her place among the nations of the world. This was in our own time and the Polish Republic began its stern task of recovery, hopeful that in a world at peace it could grow and prosper.

However, the respite was to prove all too short. The Second World War broke out and it was Poland which first sustained the blow—a blow which fell with terrific force and the speed of lightning. Poland was the target of a vicious man imbued with a cruel idea. In little more than a month, she lay prostrate under the heel of a warlord whose design was not only to crush a weaker neighbor but also to use his victim as a symbol of the bitter destiny which would overcome all who dared oppose him.

But Poland still was not dead. The fury and tenacity which marked her hopeless struggle were not wholly exhausted even when the enemy had completed his invasion. Beneath the surface of apparent defeat there still burned the spirit and the will and the ability to resist and to fight. The magnificent uprising in Warsaw bears eloquent testimony to the indestructible spirit of the Polish people. It did not succeed. But it presented to the world a flaming badge of courage—inspiring evidence that love of liberty is a living force which brute power cannot crush.

This spirit of Poland still animates her people as today they strive to meet the challenge of a world seeking the way of true peace. Devastated by war, terribly injured by an enemy which imposed ruthless punishment on her, Poland is now struggling back to her feet. She is beset not only by her internal difficult problems, but by exterior forces as well—forces of questionable design which make her rehabilitation all the more difficult to achieve.

Because we have a warm affection for Poland, because of her long tradition of democracy, because so many thousands of her sons and daughters have contributed to the greatness of our own land, we are deeply touched by her plight and moved to give her aid. Poland needs our moral support. She needs material help from America. We must stand by her in this troubled hour and insist that she be accorded justice and the full opportunity to live as a free country.

Control of Natural Gas Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from

the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of July 14, 1947:

THE GRISLY BILL

From the consumer's viewpoint, the Rizley bill which the House passed without amendment on Friday might better be known as the grisly bill. Opponents of the legislation have charged that it reduces control of the Federal Power Commission over the natural gas industry, tending to increase profits of the pipe-line companies at the consumer's expense.

The bill would prohibit FPC from exercising any authority over natural gas in the field. It would prohibit FPC from determining the "end use" of gas, an important consideration in Pittsburgh where in time of shortages FPC has been able to insist upon gas deliveries to homes first instead of industries.

Further, the legislation would change the rate-making structure so that hereafter FPC could no longer consider the operator's investment cost as the basis for rates but would have to substitute for this the "prevailing field price" of gas. It would also transfer from FPC to the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over persons engaged in "transportation of natural gas by pipe line solely for others for hire and not engaged in the selling of natural gas."

The net effect of the bill is to increase the power of State utilities commissions at the expense of FPC. And State utilities commissions are not able to exercise the sort of control a Federal agency provides for the public's protection.

The bill now goes to the Senate, where it should be defeated.

As its first session draws to a close it becomes increasingly clear that the Eightieth Congress has seemed more concerned with special-interest legislation than with measures in the public's interest. It could find time for things like the Rizley bill and the wool grab but couldn't get around to vote on such matters as a long-range housing program and national health insurance, to mention only two major items that now have no chance of passage.

World War I Veterans Are Nearing Pension Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when the armistice of 1918 was signed there were 4,757,000 men and women wearing the uniform of our armed forces, with an average age of 25 years. Today there are 3,727,000 veterans of World War I alive, with an average age of 54 years. According to the Veterans' Administration, 137 World War I veterans are dying daily.

From the standpoint of benefits received from the Veterans' Administration, 433,210 veterans of World War I are receiving disability compensation or a pension by reason of being permanently and totally disabled.

Since the average age of World War I veterans is 54 years, it is recognized that before long Congress will have to decide if the traditional policy of granting pensions is to be followed with respect to this group. This Nation has paid pensions to its defenders in the Revolutionary, Mexican, Indian, Civil, and Spanish-American Wars and lesser campaigns and expeditions. These pensions, covering the period from 1818 to the present, have ranged from $6 monthly to over $100 in certain cases requiring the constant need of an attendant.

The basic requirements for these pensions included honorable discharge following service during the active prosecution of the war and a specified number of days for such active service.

Since we are speaking of the earlier conflicts in the history of this Nation, it is interesting to observe the following figures in regard to the number of veterans of past wars in receipt of pensions. The figures are as follows: Civil war, 154; Indian wars, 971; Spanish-American War, 115,072. From the age standpoint, the average age of the Civil War veterans is 100 years, and it is realized that the 154 remaining Civil War veterans will soon answer the last call.

Spanish-American War veterans, who include veterans of the Boxer Rebellion, Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition, number 139,000 living today, with an average age of 71 years, and with a daily death rate of 27.

With further reference to the veterans of World War I, we must recognize that they are the only group reaching or nearing retirement age that have not been recognized through the enactment of pension legislation by the Congress.

It is true that certain World War I veterans are receiving compensation or pension benefits, but it must be clearly understood that compensation is paid for service-connected disabilities and pensions only when a person is totally and permanently disabled and unable to earn a livelihood.

During the Eightieth Congress, now in session, several bills have been introduced to provide pension benefits for aged and disabled veterans of World War I. H. R. 677 provides pension benefits to aged and disabled veterans of World War I on a basis comparable to existing pensions for veterans of the Spanish-American War.

Under the provisions of H. R. 677, a veteran must have served 90 or more days between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, and have received an honorable discharge. He must have a disability that handicaps him in the performance of manual labor to the extent he is rendered wholly or partially unable to support himself. The following monthly rates apply to varying degrees of disability:

10 percent	$24.00
25 percent	30.00
50 percent	42.50
75 percent	60.00
100 percent	75.00

Veterans who are totally disabled and who require regular aid and attendance will be paid $100 monthly.

Under the provisions of H. R. 677, a World War I veteran, when reaching the age of 65, is presumed to be permanently and totally disabled and eligible for a pension of $75 monthly.

It is interesting to learn that, while the average age of the World War I veteran is 54, there are 65,541 World War I veterans who will attain age 65 during the year 1947, 29 years after the war ended.

The following table will show the number of World War I veterans reaching 65 years of age between 1947 and 1962, inclusive:

Year:	*Total number of veterans 65 or over*
1947	65,541
1948	76,324
1949	88,824
1950	104,039
1951	128,492
1952	226,648
1953	342,451
1954	480,557
1955	633,166
1956	795,759
1957	989,149
1958	1,213,656
1959	1,468,867
1960	1,752,502
1961	2,060,158
1962	2,209,002

According to the above table, in 1962, 44 years after the end of World War I, there will be 2,209,002 alive who have attained 65 years of age. In other words, this figure represents about one-half of the total number of veterans who served in World War I.

While it is true that the initial cost of H. R. 677 will amount to about $770,000,000 annually, it must be remembered that this year over 50,000 World War I veterans will die and the number will increase in 1948 and subsequent years as the veteran's average age increases.

From the standpoint of providing the necessary funds to pay pension benefits to World War I veterans, let us remember we have sent millions of dollars to foreign countries with many similar appeals now pending and little question has been raised as to where the money is expected to come from to pay these international hand-outs. If we can assist the people of every foreign nation and organize societies to aid displaced persons in Europe, why not give some attention to the plight of the defenders of American ideals and institutions, who in 1917 followed President Wilson's advice and donned American uniforms "to fight a war to end all wars—and save the world for democracy"?

H. R. 677 should be enacted as an expression of gratitude owed by this Nation to the veterans of World War I.

Administration of Relief to Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by O. R. Hauser, national president, American Relief for Germany, Inc., who toured Germany under OMGUS travel orders to survey the need for and administration of relief to Germany:

On March 14 I took off at LaGuardia Field, N. Y., on an American Overseas Airline four-motor plane. Midnight March 15–16 I landed in Templehof Airport, Berlin, Germany, and forthwith registered with the Office of Military Government, United States. At the outset I wish to pay tribute to the American military government, particularly to the Office of Public Health and Welfare, for having given every assistance to my mission, which, as stated in the travel orders issued by the office of the commanding general, was to "Survey the need for and administration of relief to Germany." My travel orders were received also by the military governments of the British and French zones, who likewise extended every courtesy and cooperation through their divisions of public health and welfare. I also gratefully acknowledge the aid and assistance given me by the Laender and Stadtregierungen, especially the ministries of social welfare.

I went to Germany to get a first-hand picture of the actual living conditions of the German people and to bring this picture back to the United States. Four thousand feet of motion pictures taken by professional photographers will tell the story. After a preview of these pictures in Washington, D. C., before United States Senators, Congressmen, and representatives of the State and War Departments, these pictures will tour the country accompanied by a sound report. It is my hope that they will stimulate greater giving through the agencies licensed to operate relief in Germany.

MOTION PICTURES WILL TELL

I visited the homes, schools, offices, waiting rooms of railroad stations, sleeping quarters for transients, hospital wards, children's homes, orphanages, Altenheime, refugee and displaced-persons camps, camps for returned prisoners of war, also two internment camps for political prisoners—Dachau and Karlsruhe. I made most of these trips alone in order to see what I wanted to see and to enter into the heart of the German people. I actually penetrated into the depth of every need and was able to feel the pulse of the German nation.

The physical destruction of buildings, 60 percent of city housing destroyed, which means 5,500,000 living units, rendering 20,000,000 people homeless, including 4,000,000 children; the demolition of entire blocks and sections of the cities, miles and miles of nothing but ruins of walls and rubble of brick, ashes, and twisted steel and iron, the apathetic, blank look in the eyes of the people moving and living amidst these ruins, the sight of old women with picks and shovels engaged in rubble clearance, large crowds at street intersections trying to get onto streetcars crowded beyond capacity, the steady flow of hungry and tired-looking masses of humanity in the direction to and from the railroad stations, the sight of hundreds of tired wanderers, often entire families, trying to gain entrance into transient sleeping quarters to spend the night on straw sacks, the waiting rooms amid the ruins of railroad stations crowded with desperate people from everywhere going nowhere, the expression of bitterness and hoplessness in their faces when asked whither they were bound—all of this you will see in the pictures which will tell their story more eloquently than the power of speech.

And more also, these pictures will take you to the refugee camps, to the camps of prisoners of war returned from Russia housed in barracks temporarily to receive sufficient nourishment furnished by our help so that they may gain strength enough to return to their homes and families, and into the hospital wards of such camps where I received first-hand the tragic story of treatment at the hands of the Russians from returned prisoners who appeared to be nearer death than life on their hospital cots. You will be taken into the barracks of former prison camps where hundreds and thousands of homeless Germans, Yugoslavs, Sudeten-Germans, refugees and expellees from the Baltic States, East Prussia, Silesia, Posen, Pommern, and Poland have found temporary housing. You will be taken down into the subterranean living quarters in air-raid shelhomeless Germans, Yugoslavs, Sudetenoxygen, families have found refuge who had lost their homes in the terrific bombardments. You will see a so-called bunker (concrete air-raid shelter two stories underground) housing 130 people in Stuttgart, among them 50 children, crowded together, almost every child showing symptoms of tuberculosis. With these pictures I will give you the most heartbreaking story of mothers who with their children are living in the basements under their ruined former homes, the children undernourished and tubercular, the mother a mere shadow, the father still a prisoner of war. In March when I arrived it was still cold and I found such families under the cover of featherbeds and rags, all damp and moldy.

"CREEPING DEATH BY HUNGER"

You say that I must be exaggerating and I admit it is all an unbelievable nightmare which has haunted me and is still haunting me, but this all is not the deepest or most far-reaching distress of the German people. All of these tragedies of life strike a comparatively limited number of the entire population. The great, deep anguish of the German nation is the daily, steady, perpetual hunger of the masses. I have called it "der schleichende Hungertod" (a creeping death by hunger). Suppose 10,000,000 people receive packages from abroad and suppose 15,000,000 have rescued something of substance, as a piece of jewelry or some clothing or some silverware, and can barter with such treasures, giving up one after another rather than to face starvation; there are still 40,000,000 and the 14,000,000 expellees and refugees who have nothing but what they can obtain with the ration coupons and their earnings in marks. I have looked into the faces of these hungry masses as they came to and fro at railroad stations. Some of the people whom I observed at the Dahlem substation of Berlin Ringbahn on the 16th of March, the day of my arrival, I have seen again at the end of 2 months still coming and going but with a still less steady step, feebler and hungrier looking than 2 months earlier. When I arrived in Germany, the daily standard of nutrition was 1,200 calories. When I left it was eight hundred to nine hundred.

TEN DAYS ON GERMAN RATIONS

For 10 days I have forced myself to live on the German rations, staying away from the dining rooms of the military officers' billets and clubs. I have gone into the few reestablished German eating quarters. I beheld the mostly elderly people pulling out their ration coupons, looking at them as if calculating, "Can I afford it and will they reach," and finally tearing off the required number, handing them to the waiter or waitress in order to see placed before them, as an example, four tablespoons of dehydrated potato with one tablespoon of hash placed in the center thereof and a small slice of dark bread made of rye and corn. I testify that after eating this meal my stomach felt as hungry as before I sat down. Indisputable evidence is my loss of 24½ pounds of weight at the end of my first 2 weeks in Germany, although, in fairness, I must admit that some of this loss was due to the chagrin and nerve strain caused by the perpetual, constant sight of tragedy.

THEY ASKED FOR IT

This is the comment you hear again and again. A large part of the American press is hostile to every attempt to help the German people. There is talk of the collective guilt. Are they guilty—the children of Munich, for instance? Out of 55,000 school children, 6 to 14 years old, 15,000 sick, afflicted with tuberculosis, bronchitis, and scabies, 30,000 undernourished and exposed to disease; or even in a less-destroyed city, Wiesbaden, 60 percent of the school children undernourished—that means hungry. Are these children guilty?

COLLECTIVE GUILT

I have found no one in Germany who had a word of condonement for Hitler. To admit the guilt of Hitler is not to admit the guilt of the German people as a whole. "They should have resisted," it is said. In the first place, only 43.9 percent had voted for Hitler March 5, 1933. After he had usurped power there remained a strong movement of resistance. What effect must it have had on the German people to see one foreign government after another accept the Hitler regime officially as fully trustworthy. Sir John Simon and Anthony Eden were received by Hitler March 24, 1935; the American Under Secretary of State, William Philipps, December 1935; September 4, 1936, Lloyd George, victor of the First World War, who refused to help the democratic Germany in its problems of unemployment and economic distress, but saw fit not to refuse Nazi Germany his recognition; and to crown it all, the visit of Foreign Minister Molotov and the conclusion of the German-Soviet Russian pact on August 24, 1939.

If there is to be talk of collective guilt, let all be included who between 1933 and 1939 did not offer defiance to Hitler, and remember that to do so in Germany meant Konzentrationslager and almost certain death. Let the war criminals be punished. Those guilty of overt acts of crime and cruelty should have been dealt with long ago by prompt and exemplary punishment. All the rest who are held behind the barbed wires of internment camps should be released. Among these are the trained talents in all fields of human effort, and these are sorely needed for the rebuilding of the German economy.

CONCLUSIONS

Germany needs a central government, a stabilized currency, raw materials for its civilian production, seed and fertilizer for its agriculture, assurance of protection by the western nations against permanent enslavement by Russia. The menace of the spread of communism is not imaginary. The Russian Sector Radio Station in Berlin is so powerful that it drowns out the programs of the American Rundfunk.

SELF-INTEREST COMMANDS ACTION

It is ultimately in the interest of our own political economy and in the interest of western democracy that we tackle the problem of rehabilitating the German economy. The problem of saving Germany is tied up with the entire European economy. Europe will not live unless its industrial heart is restored and its Korn-Kammer (Pommern and Posen) in effective operation. The people of Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, the Russian-controlled regions of southeastern Europe and of Poland need the productive coal and steel industry of Germany and all of Europe needs a 100-percent rehabilitation of agriculture.

HOOVER'S HORSE-SENSE RECOMMENDATION

Important as our emergency relief action is and will remain for a long time to come, more important is the immediate action of our Government on the recommendation of former President Herbert Hoover to the effect that a large enough one-time appropriation be made by the American and British Governments on the basis of a long-term loan to be amortized on the import-export principle. We are spending over $200,000,000 a year in the American zone of occupation now without improving conditions. Are we going to repeat in Germany the mistake we made domestically during the years of depression when we slowly but steadily spent millions for relief, pauperizing the masses

instead of promptly in businesslike manner tackling the job of reemployment of labor in industry revived through adequate large-scale subsidies? We are not helping Europe by pauperizing Germany. The Germans do not wish to be recipients of alms. If given seed and fertilizer for agriculture and raw materials for civilian production, by the endless circle of export of products made of such raw materials against import of new raw materials the German economy will be rehabilitated and the German, instead of being dependent upon aid charged to the American taxpayer, will support himself by the work of his hands. This is the hope of every German. The German people have no desire for a revival of militarism. The terrible effects of war are round about them. Everywhere you hear expressed the hope that the Americans will not withdraw from Germany until peace is assured.

Perhaps the greatest contribution which I was privileged to make was the strengthening and upbuilding of the morale of the German people by holding out to them the hope that our voluntary agencies will do much more than they have done towards emergency relief and that we will strengthen the hands of our Government by educating public opinion to the facts of living conditions in Europe so that, backed by enlightened public opinion, our statesmen will courageously tackle the job of leading the United Nations in a sane program of European reconstruction and rehabilitation.

May the United States of America assert her economic and moral strength in leading the United Nations in the direction of world peace!

May we, the plain citizenry of this country, ban from our hearts and minds all hatreds and build an American Christian consciousness of moral responsibility for our brothers of all lands and nations. As long as suffering calls for relief let there be no racial nor religious barriers to our charity! Let all good Americans be united for peace on earth, good will to all mankind.

How Free Is Enterprise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Sharon Herald, Sharon, Pa.:

HOW FREE IS ENTERPRISE?

This is the land of free opportunity and private enterprise, sure enough. But our nonlegal guess is that Jimmy Petrillo's threat to set up his American Federation of Musicians in the recording business is a little too free and private even for the economic climate that nurtured the Horatio Alger legend.

What Mr. Petrillo hints at doing would force the present rceord manufacturers out of business by monopolizing the services of all union musicians—which means the services of virtually all professional bands and orchestras and most of the instrumental soloists. It would force the union musicians to work for one recording company if they wanted to make records.

Mr. Petrillo presented this new idea to a congressional subcommittee with some reluctance. He said the AFM would rather remain a labor union. But we believe that, if James Caesar could get court permission, it might be an instructive experience for him if he turned employer.

It is Mr. Petrillo's laudable ambition to give employment to all of the 216,000 members claimed by his union. (We think, though, that he should make it clear sometime that many of those members are part-time musicians who gain their principal livelihood from nonmusical jobs.) But while the AFM president might be able to force the present recording companies out of business and compel his boys to work for him, he couldn't coerce the public into buying all the records they turned out.

Music, as art or business, is highly competitive. Yet many, perhaps most, AFM locals do not require auditions or proficiency tests for membership. The skilled union members rise to the top and the less skilled brothers remain below. There's nothing Mr. Petrillo can do about that.

Thus, mass employmen' in music is hard to achieve, however just and proper it is in theory. Mr. Petrillo can force a theater manager to hire musicians he doesn't need, doesn't want, and won't use. But he can't force the public to listen to music that is full of squeaks, clinkers, and sour notes. So he has to use threats and maneuvers against the employers before he can make general promises to the membership.

If he were boss of the recording field, however, Mr. Petrillo would have nobody to threaten. Instead, he might conceivably run into a little labor trouble. For he would have to set the fees for the performers who make records. Unless he wanted to put money in the members' pockets with one hand and take it out with the other, he would have to set fees which allowed him to at least break even. There would be no more dickering by top orchestra leaders with several recording companies for the best deal they could get.

This is not to say that Mr. Petrillo doesn't have a case for his membership on many points. It is obviously unfair, for instance, that a disc jockey can make a six-figure annual salary by playing records for which the performing musicians received only a single modest fee. But a policy of made work and feather bedding doesn't seem the best cure fo- this condition.

Mr. Petrillo has hurt his men's cause by his defiant, dictatorial attitude and by his own unfairness. In fact, he has hurt the cause of all labor. For his past performances certainly contributed to the public indignation which gave rise to laws restricting the power of unions. If he now goes ahead with his proposal to solve the musicians' problems by creating a record-making monopoly, somebody is pretty sure to throw the book at him even harder.

Saving Public Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD a condensed article from an editorial by John S. Knight which appeared in the Detroit Free Press of May 11, 1947.

I believe every man in business life should realize that the credit of the United States is limited. We can only furnish world leadership if we are a strong, solvent nation. The amount of the public debt should convince anyone that we are no longer a rich nation and, therefore, economy in government must be the first order if we are to survive and preserve our freedom and self-government.

The article follows:

JOHN S. KNIGHT SAYS

Saving public money isn't a very exciting subject for an editorial, but in these days, at least, it has the virtue of being different. It is considered modern to sneer at economy and to brand as reactionary anyone who questions huge appropriations for nonessential functions of government.

To an alarming degree, the metropolitan press smears Members of Congress as visionless, little men when they challenge foreign loans and swollen departmental budgets. Along with the growing concentration of industry and the disappearance of individually owned firms, industrial management has become as careless about government expenditures as it is cautious about its own. The business executive who insists that lead pencils and typewriter ribbons must provide the maximum use sees nothing inconsistent in howling his head off for Federal funds to finance his pet local project. The prevailing delusion is that somewhere, somehow, the money can be found to reduce taxes, balance the budget, curtail the national debt, and bail out distressed nations all over the world. In the United States, which is the sole remaining major citadel of capitalism in the world, the press should encourage, not condemn, reductions in the cost of government. It should discourage States and municipalities from leaning upon the Federal Government for support.

It is high time that we came to a true realization of the financial perils that lie ahead and swung into action against waste in government, whether it be local, State, or National.

Modern Luddite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Post under date of Saturday, July 12, 1947:

MODERN LUDDITE

Mr. James Caesar Petrillo is feeling his oats again. After bowing in unprecedented humility to the Supreme Court decision upholding the Lea Act, he is now busy devising new ways to plague employers and potential employers. It may be necessary, he thinks, for the American Federation of Musicians to counteract unemployment by prohibiting musical broadcasts over radio chains and by refusing to make commercial recordings. It is even possible, he adds, that the AFM may enter the recording business itself. On the basis of his past success Mr. Petrillo, barring legal complications, is just the man to put on the kibosh and make it stick. Congress owes him thanks for his frankness if for nothing else.

It is easy to rail at Petrillo as the personification of an unprincipled labor boss taking out his spite on society. But the case is not so simple. Mr. Petrillo represents in effect the displaced persons of a greatly overstocked profession. He is the modern symbol of resistance to technological change on the part of persons who see their jobs evaporating through greater use of recordings, "canned" broadcasts, movies, and juke boxes. It cannot be challenged that these mass media have

brought more music—and more good music—to millions of Americans. But as the taste for music has been cultivated, the number of live musicians required to cater to it has greatly diminished.

Mr. Petrillo would answer this dilemma by forcing more widespread employment of musicians through restriction of technological advance. Carried to its extreme, that would mean that no new invention could ever be applied when it meant displacing a worker. Such a practice, which is a form of feather bedding, would soon chill incentive. In Mr. Petrillo's own union is to be found part of the solution. The great majority of AFM members are not full-time musicians. They have come to the realization that there is not enough work to go around for the number of qualified professionals and have adjusted their lives accordingly. They know there is no real security or satisfaction in made work. Mr. Petrillo would earn a great deal more sympathy for the plight of displaced musicians if he sought to ease their transition into other fields instead of merely striving to perpetuate a situation which in reality no longer exists. In this respect, moreover, society has an obligation.

New Coal Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials.

The first is from the Staunton (Va.) Evening Leader of July 9, 1947, and the second is from the Staunton (Va.) News-Leader of July 10, 1947:

[From the Staunton (Va.) Evening Leader of July 9, 1947]

WHO'S LOONY NOW?

Without any amplifying statement, John L. Lewis asked that question late yesterday after the most favorable contract he has ever obtained from coal-mine owners had been signed and sealed. The president of the United Mine Workers was in high glee, as he had every right to be. There are some who believe that his union membership now has a working agreement under which it is immune from provisions of the recently enacted Taft-Hartley labor bill. As the contract is being interpreted at this time, if the miners are not able or willing to work, there is no contract, and hence the union cannot be sued for breach of contract.

Who's loony now? It would seem that an affirmative answer would apply to the mine owners themselves for signing such a document. Virtually, they have given Lewis complete immunity from provisions of the labor bill.

Coal is expected to advance from 75 cents to $1 a ton; steel about $1 a ton. The miner will receive the highest pay in the history of the industry, and also work the least number of hours. His welfare fund is raised from 5 to 10 cents per ton. Three hundred thousand northern and midwestern miners have been ordered back to work by Lewis, but representatives of southern mines employing 100,000 did not immediately sign, and hence these fields remained idle today.

No one, this early in the life of the new contract, definitely can predict what may happen, but it is interesting to speculate along such lines as these:

The contract practically ignores the National Labor Relations Board, the Government agency which carries out the law. As an example, it can force an employer to bargain with a union if, among other things, the workers vote for the union to represent them and the union reveals to NLRB, and maybe to the public, its financial set-up. A union and a boss do not have to go to NLRB, if they do not want to. Lewis and the mine owners did not do this, because the owners agreed that Lewis' union represented the miners; therefore, Lewis did not have to get NLRB assistance to prove it. Since he did not, he does not have to tell anyone how much money his union has or who in the union draws how much pay.

As for disputes which may lead to strikes while the contract is in existence, Lewis and the owners agreed to settle that subject themselves. But suppose some hotheaded miners, without approval from Lewis, go out on a wildcat strike. The new law says an employer can sue a union for striking like that while a contract exists. Could a mine owner sue Lewis' union? No; according to at least one lawyer expert on the new law, because the contract says that any time miners are not "able or willing to work" there is no contract. Since the owners signed this, they seemed to give up any right they have under the law to sue for a strike that violates a contract.

The new law says a boss or union who wants to end a contract must give the other side at least 60 days' notice, but the new contract states that if the Lewis union or the owners want to end a contract, the side wanting it must give 30 days' notice. Is that contrary to the new law? We will have to wait and see what happens. If there is a threat of a big coal strike, the Government can try to use the new law to delay it, although it cannot stop it. Under the law the President—if he thinks a big strike will hurt national health or welfare—is supposed to be able to delay it at least 80 days, with the help of court injunctions against a strike. But what could the Government do if, after a contract ended and the courts ordered "no strike," the miners decided they individually were not willing to work and stayed home? It is an old custom for Lewis' miners, without direct orders from him, to stay away from work if a contract ends and no new one is signed.

In the new contract there is also the question of the check-off system. That is where, until now, the mine owner could deduct workers' union dues from their pay check and turn them over to the union. Until now this was done through agreement with union officials because individual union members had no voice in this. The new legislation declares the owner no longer can do this without approval from the individual workers in writing. The new contract says the union will provide the owners with this O. K. in writing from the individual union members. Since Lewis' union is a pretty tight outfit, it is not likely any individual miner will refuse to turn over his written consent to a union official. In addition to this, the new contract asserts the mine owners will check off not only union dues but also initiation fees and assessments. In explaining how an employer now can check off anything from a worker's pay, the new law mentions only dues. It is silent on initiations fees or assessments. So is it all right—since the law does not say anything about initiation fees and assessments—to include them in the check-off?

Who's loony now?

Lawyers may go loony endeavoring to interpret the Taft-Hartley law in relation to the new coal contract. The consumer of coal and steel may go loony trying to pay higher prices. Congress may go loony in a probable attempt to write another labor law, or strengthen the present one. Mine owners may go loony when what they have done begins to be revealed through actual practice.

Lewis? No; he is not loony. By obtaining what he asserts is the best contract under which the miner has ever worked, he has ingratiated himself even more deeply in their affection, won a higher degree of their blind loyalty, and, through surrender by the mine owners, has made the Nation's lawmakers look like a class of elementary school children.

Congress may enact laws, but it is not long before Lewis, by one means or another, finds a way to circumvent most of them.

In obtaining a contract that voids one of the essential provisions of the new labor law, the Richmond News Leader feels that the public should extend its thanks to Mr. Lewis for being frank. That newspaper, in part, puts it this way:

"In the arrogance of his greatest victory over shortsighted opportunists who manage the coal mines * * * Lewis has shown the American people the true nature of his demands. * * * What is behind it? Dictatorship—bold, defiant dictatorship. Lewis intends to place the United Mine Workers above the Statutes at Large of the United States. Other men may be compelled to respect the law of contract. The miners must be exempt. Thank him for presenting that ultimatum clearly."

[From the Staunton (Va.) News-Leader of July 10, 1947]

"WHO'S LOONY NOW?"—LET'S WAIT

By his latest victory over the soft coal industry, John L. Lewis has once more proved himself more powerful than the Government and has so inflated the cost of the Nation's principal fuel that the feared depression may come with a crash comparable to that of 1929.

The man could not be exerting his power for the sake of his miners, hypnotized by one wage increase after another and by the repeated spectacle of tail-twisting staged by their union boss, for each raise is offset by higher living costs. Lewis is evidently drunk with power, as blind as Samson, and willing to topple the whole economic structure to prove that not even the Government can curb him.

The new labor-management relations law may have been circumvented in part by Lewis in dictating a contract clause saying the miners were binding themselves to work only when willing and able. While this clause may free unions from financial liability for strikes during a contract period, it will not free them and their leaders from the criminal penalties of the new law. Nevertheless, the surrender of the mine operators to a demand intended to nullify the law of the land was a craven performance, as was the capitulation in general. The American public has been sold down the river for the sake of maintaining coal and steel production, regardless of cost.

Coal is going up from 67 cents to $1 a ton. The operators and steel manufacturers themselves don't yet know how much, for the calculations run into hundreds of millions of dollars. Every industry and transportation line using coal and steel must raise prices. The other big unions, which got only one-third of what Lewis did when they negotiated or struck for increases early last spring, are certain to seek a further pay hike. And "in the middle" are the poor and the millions on fixed incomes.

How much longer our economy can withstand this inflationary spiral without crashing is anybody's guess. It begins to look like the Florida boom of the early 1920's. It finally became evident that the Florida bubble had to burst, and it did. The arrogant and all-powerful Mr. Lewis may have stuck the pin in the present prosperity balloon, though the rubber may give awhile before the explosion comes. It is too soon to answer his smart crack, "Who's looney now?" made when the northern contract was signed.

For another slant on the mine contract, see Mr. Sokolsky's column in this issue. He has disregarded the dangerous and highly inflationary effect of another increase in the price of coal, the short working hours demanded, and Lewis' defiance of the new Labor Law. He is also in error as to the relative wages of miners and industrial workers.

Independence Day Address of Hon. Clifford P. Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by my colleague, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, at Plainfield, N. J., on July 4, 1947. This is the address referred to by Mark Sullivan in his syndicated article of Monday, July 14, which I have inserted in another extension of my remarks this day.

For the people of New Jersey, and particularly those of the section in which we live, the celebration of Independence Day has always had a peculiar significance. During the Revolution, both the Continental and British armies crossed and recrossed the State and many major engagements were fought on New Jersey soil. While no conclusive battles were fought in our particular locality, there were several engagements of importance, the chief of these, perhaps, being the battle at Springfield. British forces, under a Hessian general, raided and burned that town 167 years ago but failed to advance beyond the American line and were forced to retreat to Staten Island, never again to venture into the State.

Our immediate vicinity was, of course, the scene of important activity during the greater part of the war. It was a most strategic location, equally distant from New York and Trenton and from Newark and Perth Amboy, and on the most likely paths of any British advance. A principal encampment of one of the Revolutionary armies was at Middlebrook, just a few miles to the west. General Washington himself was in command of this army in the early summer of 1777. His headquarters was in the Nathaniel Drake House in what is now the city of Plainfield. His scouts kept watch over the activities of the British and Hessian troops from their lookout at Washington Rock. Our Army held this position off and on for several years and it was at Middlebrook that General Von Steuben, brought to America by Benjamin Franklin, joined the Army in the spring of 1779, after it had kept its quarters there during the preceding winter.

History records at least one significant engagement in this immediate area, the battle of the Blue Hills. Sir William Howe, at New Brunswick with 17,000 men, was anxious to draw General Washington, with fewer than 6,000, into battle. Howe advanced up the Raritan to Millstone, hoping to lure Washington out of his position at Middlebrook. Washington, however, realizing the advantages of his prepared position, preferred to wait for the British to advance. Uncertain of success, Sir William finally commenced to withdraw. At that point, Washington sent General Greene, with three regiments, in pursuit and at Quibbletown, now New Market, he caught up with the enemy and inflicted important losses.

An interesting speculation is the probability that the Stars and Stripes were flown for the first time while Washington was in camp with his troops at Middlebrook. The flag was adopted by the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777, and the Army remained at Middlebrook until the following July 3.

Many incidents of interest are recorded as occurring during the Revolution in the area where we now live and not a few of historical importance. It is entirely right that all of us should, as we do, reflect upon this history with pride and satisfaction.

And we take just pride and satisfaction also in the contribution made to our national history and development in the years which have followed. In all our country's wars, as in its peacetime activities, the residents of New Jersey and of this section have played their full part.

Today we honor those who have made their contribution of service and sacrifice in the war just ended. To those of you who have served and who are now back among us, we make public acknowledgment of our deep sense of appreciation. To the loved ones of those who have fought and who will not return, our hearts go out in gratitude and in sympathy beyond any power of ours to express.

You who have fought in this war and are now back with us, and that smaller but glorious company who have fought but will not return, have done well the task which was set for you to do. It would be pleasant if we could report that the task of laying the foundation for an age of progress, security, and peace had been performed as well. But, though hostilities have ceased, peace is not yet assured. Indeed, the peace has not yet even been made.

A peaceful world will be realized only if we are willing to work for it, to sacrifice for it, to devote to it all our energies, with the same unity of purpose which brought us victory in the fighting war.

Wherever we cast our eyes, the prospect is grim. All Europe lies prostrate. China is deadlocked in civil war. Much of the rest of Asia seethes with unrest. Uneasiness pervades the countries in the great continent to the south of us. Vast areas of the world, especially many of those countries we have thought most highly civilized, are so destitute and despairing that the fantastic promise of communism that it alone can bring order out of chaos has an ever wider appeal. And deep in the mind of everyone is the foreboding thought of the unearthly power of atomic energy and the incredibly horrible developments in the field of germ and chemical warfare.

The United States is the only democratic nation with physical strength and material resources sufficient to have even a chance to restore the world to peace and stability under any system which we would accept as tolerable. And the task has been made vastly more difficult by the policies and practices of Soviet Russia.

Our task will be much more difficult. Still it is not an impossible one.

No one who has ever tasted freedom will voluntarily accept dictatorship. No one who has ever known the material benefits of a free economy will ever turn to a totalitarian economy if there is any chance whatever for him to avoid it.

I have no fear of the choice that the peoples of the world will make if they are given the chance to make a choice. If we will it lies within our power to give them that chance.

Already we have given much in money and in goods to prevent starvation and suffering in foreign lands. Both for reasons of generosity, and because our own interests require it, we will continue such relief measures as are necessary.

Under the program announced by Secretary Marshall the countries of Europe are now engaged in studying how they can most effectively develop and utilize their own resources in cooperation with each other and how we can help them rehabilitate themselves. Russia, as you know, was asked to participate in this and again has given a clear indication of her unwillingness to do so. The rehabilitation of Europe without Russia's help—indeed against her opposition—will be a most difficult task but it must be accomplished. No venture since the close of the war holds more promise of success than this. It has my own complete support and I know that in taking that position I am doing what you want me to do.

The time has come to recognize facts and to speak plainly about them. In the present situation one such fact is that, ever since the surrender of Japan, Russia, with obviously deliberate intent, has done her utmost to block every effort the nations of the world have made, under our leadership, toward the establishment of peace and stability. In the organization of the United Nations and its functional agencies, in the creation of machinery for the control of atomic energy, in the establishment of a United Nations police force, in the rehabilitation of the war-stricken countries of the world, in everything which needed doing, we have been opposed, delayed, held up to ridicule and scorn, and frustrated by Russia and her satellite states. Her apologists have long claimed that fear of aggression on our part was at the basis of Russia's attitude. I cannot accept that explanation. I cannot credit the Soviet leaders with the stupidity to believe the United States has any interest in imperialistic expansion. The only credible explanation is that the Russians believe that their totalitarian form of government and philosophy cannot exist in a world in which democracy also exists and that, therefore, the democracies must be destroyed. No longer can we avoid the conclusion that Russia's purpose is the opposite of our own—to create confusion, to perpetuate disorder, and to bring on chaos everywhere beyond her own borders, in the hope that eventually democracy will be destroyed throughout the world.

It is time for us to face the fact that we must act not only without Russia's help but in the face of her stubborn opposition.

It is time for us to face the fact that our dream of one world in which peoples of conflicting ideologies will live together in peace cannot now be realized. Russia has offered us only the choice between one world dominated by totalitarianism and two worlds, one totalitarian and the other a world in which free peoples may live under whatever system they may freely choose. In these circumstances there can be no doubt what our decision will be.

Much has been said of late about appraising our own resources and limiting our assistance to other lands to that which we can spare. Obviously, there are limits to our food production and, if our own economy is to remain stable, our exports of foodstuffs must be wisely dealt with—much more wisely, indeed, than they have been in the past. But the great need of Europe is for the tools and other things which will enable her again to become productive, and our experience in the war proves clearly that there is practically no limit to the amount of such things which we can produce. The emphasis, therefore, should not be on the limited nature of our resources but upon our willingness to do our utmost. I know it will be sufficient.

With the exception of Germany, the people of Europe have already shown extraordinary powers of recuperation. If we assist them to the limit of our ability I am confident we shall be amazed how soon their rehabilitation becomes an accomplished fact and astonished at the relatively small amount we shall have to expend. With the combination of the American and British zones of Germany, and I hope also the French zone, for economic and administrative purposes,

great improvement, if not completely successful rehabilitation, in that territory will also result.

And from all this will come what we most fervently desire, the orientation of the nations of Europe toward the west and democracy rather than toward the east and totalitarianism. Even such states as Poland and Czechoslovakia will not long be able to resist this attraction.

But, while the peoples of the world are striving desperately to rebuild their shattered homes and factories, to restore their lands to productivity, and to reestablish their institutions, what assurance is there that they will be permitted to do so in peace and free from outside aggression? Eventually, of course, the United Nations, if it is successful, will be the reliance of all nations for the maintenance of a peaceful world. We must continue, as we have done, to support it in all its aspects and to work for its strengthening and development.

But, during the formative years of the United Nations which lie immediately ahead, potentially aggressor nations must be made to understand that they will not be permitted to succeed in using force as an instrument for advancing aggressive ends. Here again we are the only democratic Nation potentially strong enough to check an aggressor. Unfortunately, our military strength has fallen away. Our Army has been disbanded, our sea and air strength is dwindling so rapidly that it cannot long be considered either a shield against possible attack or any check whatever to a powerful aggressor nation.

For a few years our monopoly of the atomic bomb and the availability of millions of veterans of the last war will be some assurance against a direct assault, but that is, at best, a temporary condition. The most qualified witnesses tell us that in from 4 to 10 years our monopoly of the atomic bomb will no longer be a fact. We still have time in which to develop our military strength to the point where we need not fear challenge by any would-be aggressor—but we have no time to waste.

This problem has been studied by many people over the last several years. The results of these studies are available to us. We are now at the time for decision.

One month ago a commission of distinguished Americans, appointed by the President, made the report of their investigation of the measures necessary to be taken to insure the maintenance of our military strength at a point adequate for our protection and for the discharge of our international commitments. They dealt particularly with the question whether, as a part of that program, any form of universal military training should be adopted. The Commission, after the most thorough consideration, unanimously recommended that, as a part—though only a part—of a comprehensive program, a plan for compulsory military training, under a commission with a majority of civilian members, and a civilian head, was essential. This decision was reached notwithstanding the Commission's appreciation of the objections which have been made to such a program, many of them by the most sincere and intelligent citizens, and of its cost in money, and of certain other disadvantages.

The Commission recognizes the disadvantages faced by the United States or any democracy in warfare in the atomic age. It recognizes that we shall never start a war. It recognizes that in any future war the destruction of our industrial potential must be any aggressor's first concern. It recognizes that we shall be struck with lightning speed and devastating force and shall have no period of months or years in which to gather our forces and prepare our counterblows, that wide areas of our land will be laid waste at the outset, and that one of our primary needs is to have throughout the country numbers of men trained to deal with the immediate devastation, sabotage, panic, fire, radioactivity, disruption of utilities, communications, and transportations—and even to meet the onslaught of the enemy's suicide troops. And, in addition, that we must have also reserves of trained men ready for swift counterattack. It concludes that only universal military training will enable us to meet this need.

A careful study of this report and of the other available evidence, both for and against the proposal, has brought me to the conclusion that the Commission's recommendation should be adopted. Unless it is adopted, I am satisfied we shall fail to attain the security which we must have for ourselves, and shall be unable to assure for the other nations the security which they must have, if a world of the kind which seems to us fit to live in is to be reestablished and maintained. I respect the views of those who deeply fear that this and other preparations for our military security will increase the likelihood of war. But I disagree utterly with such views. On the contrary, I am convinced that our recognition of the danger, and our preparation adequately to meet it, offers the best hope—indeed the only hope—that war will not occur.

The speaker on a similar occasion marking the close of World War I had a much simpler and more pleasant task than I. Then the world looked serene and a long period of prosperity and peace, for this country, at least, if not for the world, seemed assured. We know that that is not the prospect today. We know we have only a chance for peace, only a chance, indeed, for the continued existence on this planet of the human race. Yet the people of America have never failed to meet the challenge of any real emergency. In this ultimate emergency I am confident we shall not falter nor fail to meet its inexorable demands.

New England and the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an address by Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson delivered at Dover, N. H., on New England and the Presidency:

Suppose we consider together the subject "New England and the Presidency." Of the 32 different individuals who have taken the oath as President of the United States only 5 of that number were native New Englanders. Those 5 were the 2 Adamses, John and John Quincy, natives of Massachusetts; Franklin Pierce, a native of New Hampshire; and Chester A. Arthur and Calvin Coolidge, both natives of Vermont. I need not remind you that Arthur was a New Yorker when he became President and that Coolidge was a citizen of Massachusetts when he, like Arthur, was suddenly elevated from the office of Vice President to the Presidency on account of the death of his Chief. It will not be pleasing to your pride for me to also remind you that of your 5 native sons who have reached the Presidency only 1 of that number, John Adams, became President as the immediate first choice of the American people. Let us look at the record.

John Adams, who proposed the name of Washington as our leader in the Revolutionary war, served as Vice President during Washington's two terms as President. He had been the voice of the Revolution as Washington had been its sword and Jefferson its pen. He had a just claim to the high office Washington was leaving. But John Adams defeated Jefferson, of Virginia, by only three electoral votes in his first race for the Presidency in 1796 and 4 years later was defeated for reelection as President by Jefferson by a still larger electoral vote. Jefferson was Vice President during the 1797–1801 period.

John Adams, like his son John Quincy, the only son of a President yet to be President, was essentially a patriot and statesman but woefully lacking in the ways and wiles of the successful politician. The father and son born in houses, still standing, near each other, were each Harvard graduates, and each lived for many years in the same Quincy house as an ex-President, and now their bodies rest near each other in the basement of the old church where each one had long reverently worshipped.

John Quincy Adams, a Puritan in conscience and conduct, was always unhappy over the fact that he was a minority President. He was chosen as President in the contest before the House of Representatives in 1825, though Andrew Jackson of Tennessee had received far more popular and electoral votes in the Presidential election of 1824. Though Adams wished to be his own successor in 1828, the odds were against him and he was snowed under by Jackson. John Quincy Adams, after a 2-years rest, went back to Washington where he served as the only ex-President thus far to become a Congressman. He was holding that office when he died in the Capitol in Washington 17 years later. Though no greater scholars or more unselfish leaders have served the Nation than these two great men, father and son, they stand alone as the only native sons of Massachusetts yet to reach the White House office.

Franklin Pierce was one of the eight lesser lights in the White House in the 24-year period between the end of Jackson's 8 years there in 1837 and the eventful election of Abraham Lincoln in 1861. Pierce, a Bowdoin College man and son of a former New Hampshire governor, was handsome and attractive in a social way but ineffective as President. Put forward in a convention deadlock at Baltimore in 1852 as a dark-horse nominee by Virginia slave-holding Democrats, he could never have been a popular President even in his own native New England. Pierce won distinction in the Mexican War and came out of that war a brigadier general, though he had entered it as private soldier. The slavery issue, upon which Ixion wheel so many political careers were broken, was, also, the ruin of Pierce. When he signed the Kansas-Nebraska Act it meant his deathknell as a popular political leader. By a strange turn of fate Pierce had as his opponents in the Presidential campaign of 1852 Winfield Scott, the Whig nominee who had been a general in the United States Army when Pierce was a private soldier, and John P. Hale, the nominee of the Free Soil Party, like Pierce a native of New Hampshire and also an alumnus of Bowdoin College.

It is doubtful that Chester A. Arthur, who was born in a Baptist parsonage in northern Vermont, ever dreamed of being President before the bullet of the mad Guiteau laid low the gallant and handsome Garfield. Arthur had been given the Vice Presidential nomination by a tired and homesick Republican convention in Chicago, after it, weary over the fruitless effort of New York and other State to force Grant again upon the country, had suddenly over his protest made Garfield its Presidential dark horse nominee. Arthur had been removed by President Hayes from the only high political office he ever held before being suddenly nominated for the Vice Presidency as a sop to the Grant faction of which he was a part. Arthur, a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Union College at Schenectady, N. Y.,

was a tall, handsome man, greatly sobered by his high and unexpected duties as President. Like others before him, who became President on account of the death of a President, Arthur was disappointed in not having become his own successor and died an unhappy man on account of it.

Calvin Coolidge, the shrewd and taciturn Vermonter who mounted round by round the ladder of political success until he finally reached the Presidency, was a strange political figure. An Amherst graduate, he located early in life in nearby Northampton, Mass. The swearing in of Coolidge as President in a plain Vermont farmhouse at the hands of his own Justice of Peace father by the light of an oil lamp was one of our most democratic scenes. The sudden death of President Harding out in San Francisco lifted Coolidge into immediate fame and he, like Theodore Roosevelt, was able later to win the Presidency in his own name. Coolidge was aptly called a Puritan in Babylon by an admiring biographer.

Though New England has not furnished the Nation Presidents in proportion to its influence otherwise in our history, the ones it has furnished have all been highly educated gentlemen and great patriots and you may well be proud of their places in American history. May your future human contributions to our national life, like these heroes of yesterday, be blessed in character with the strength of your granite hills and in vision with the wideness of the ocean that beats upon your rock-bound shores.

Legislative Reference Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MITCHELL JENKINS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the last few months there have, from time to time, been rumblings of vague charges made against some of the personnel of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress; while they never have been substantiated, they ought not to pass without some word of refutation.

I rise to call the attention of the House to two of the outstanding men who are working for us in that department, both of whom I have known personally for years, long before I became a Member of this body. So often we do not fully realize the quality and capacity of our staff and when we do realize it, we do not always give it the recognition it deserves.

Many of you know Ernest Griffith as the genial and cooperative director of our Legislative Reference Service. I doubt if many Members know much of his background and qualifications. Since coming to his present position, he has resolutely put aside all considerations of whatever may have been his previous party affiliations or predilections in order to give Congress, as a whole, the most accurate and unbiased information and analysis on public questions of which he and his staff are capable.

As an authority on government he ranks among the very best, being the author of a number of books on that subject. For many years he served as the national chairman of the Research Committee of the American Political Science Association. A man of wide contacts and broad horizons, he is a keen analyst of world affairs. For example, as early as 1942 he foresaw and predicted the present Russian policy and prophesied that Russia would insist upon controlling everything east of a Stettin-Trieste line. As an economist, he has written and lectured widely, and, in addition to his theoretical knowledge, has had the practical experience of the business world and the requirements of meeting a pay roll as manager of a theater for a 5-year period. This was during the time in which he served, also, as head of the University Settlement, Liverpool—incidentally, as the successor to Frederick Marquis, now Lord Woolton.

He is a graduate of Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y., and holds his doctorate from Oxford University.

I know of my own personal knowledge that he is a completely loyal American. In the first World War he volunteered for service in the Naval Air Corps. During the war that has just finished, he played a leading part in successfully organizing and carrying through the War Bond, Blood Donor, War Fund, and Red Cross Campaigns in the Library of Congress.

He is a man of many civic interests; a member of the Citizens' Planning Committee, set up by the District of Columbia Commissioners; for 3 years he has been president of the Council of Social Agencies for Washington. He has served as chairman, locally, of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and, nationally, as treasurer of the Wilderness Society. He is an officer of his church and teaches a Sunday school class of 100 high-school boys—one of the largest, if not the largest, of its kind in the United States.

Incidentally, his favorite hobby is mountain climbing, and in his younger days he held a number of records for speed and endurance. He still climbs vigorously and incidentally plays basket ball or tennis twice a week, although celebrating his fiftieth birthday this past year.

My own experience with the Legislative Reference Service leads me to the conclusion that Ernest Griffith has gathered there, an inspired, a truly remarkable staff—one which is a hundred percent loyal to Congress and willing and anxious to give us their best effort.

Before sitting down I want also to pay special tribute to another member of this staff who is well known to me personally. George B. Galloway is a real American, a man devoted to the public interest, a man who even before becoming staff director of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, had a national reputation as a student of American institutions. After graduating from Wesleyan University, in Connecticut, where I first knew him almost 30 years ago, he became one of the small but distinguished group of scholars trained by the Brookings Institution, in the years in which it conducted a graduate school. He has been a contributor to several of the encyclopedias, is on the research staff of the Twentieth Century Fund, and is the author of many books and articles. His work in connection with the Reorganization Act is well known to all of you. He is now giving most of his time to our House District Committee, working on the problems of Washington. Last, but not least, he was this past month honored by New York University for distinguished public service.

Address of Hon. Edward Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARVE TIBBOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN at the annual State encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Harrisburg, Pa., Tuesday evening, July 15, 1947:

Commander Shroyer, comrades, and my fellow Americans, it is good to foregather here with my own kind of folks, men whose devotion to America has been shaped by wearing its uniform in battle.

I know we share the same concerns, the same fears and the same high aspirations for our country's future. We have the same desire to see her strong and able to take care of herself in this time of uncertainty when the world once more seems to be choosing sides for—we know not what.

It is as true today that these are the times that try men's sculs" as it was in 1776 when Thomas Paine rallied his countrymen to the cause of independence.

In this time of world cleavage between two dominant philosophies, the Nation has a right to call once more upon its veterans—the men who sacrificed the most for their country—for help. I should like to propose to you and to other veterans across the country—to go out and preach America to the faint of heart and to the indifferent.

Teach them that our system stresses the freedom and dignity of the individual. Its foundation is that government is the servant of the people and not their master. Teach them that the controlling philosophy in Europe and Asia makes the state the master and the people its servants.

Preach that our kind of life emphasizes self-reliance while dictatorship emphasizes dependence upon a central, all-powerful government. The continued existence of our kind of world depends upon freedom and self-reliance. A republic such as ours cannot be maintained by weaklings. People who must lean upon a powerful leader will not be strong enough to sustain our kind of government, or to fight for it as each generation of Americans has fought.

In recent years there has been some drifting away from the philosophy which built America. There has been excessive concentration of power and authority in Washington, a centralization which has tended to drain away some of the precious freedoms of our people.

Let us regain these freedoms because they will make us stronger to face the growing world conflict of ideologies.

Preach this lesson first. It is the most important of all.

Another point upon which the Veterans of Foreign Wars and I see eye to eye is the necessity for preparing our men to meet an emergency. I refer, of course, to the universal training of our youth.

I know this is unpopular with many mothers. I know that some are opposed to military training because of religious convictions. I know that it is also unpopular with some of my fellow Members of Congress and with many politicians. The politicians tell me that advocating such a course loses votes. Well, I've been in public life and in politics for many years. But I have yet to see the day when political expediency will turn me away from what I believe is best for my country.

I know that properly trained manpower is the best defense this country can have—today, tomorrow, or at any time in the future. We have been under fire, you and I. We know that an untrained man is far more likely to be killed or wounded than one who has been taught to take care of himself. We know—and this is something you veterans can preach to the mothers—that the properly trained man has a much better chance of coming back alive and whole.

We know also that the stronger we are the less chance there will be of any other nation picking on us. Trained manpower is a potent factor for peace.

Soviet Russia has compulsory military training behind its iron curtain. Today it is drilling and teaching its young men to fight and to defend themselves. It has a much larger standing army than we have.

In view of this, it is not surprising that every Communist in America opposes training—that is, training for the American youth.

Pick up the Daily Worker or any other Communist propaganda sheet and you discover indignant opposition to America's building its strength to defend itself. By word of mouth, this same propaganda is spread to the mothers and fathers. The Communists say that for us to prepare is warmongering. I suppose it would be much nicer to wear rose-colored spectacles and just drift.

Never do you hear a word of complaint from them that Russia is warmongering because Russia has compulsory training. Never, in fact, do they even mention that Russia has such military training.

To me that is very, very queer. I don't mean that all Americans who oppose universal training are quislings or Communists, but I do mean that all quislings and Communists oppose military training.

I hoped that Congress would enact a bill for such training this session. I have been disappointed in this hope. Now we shall have to wait until next year. In fact, we may have to wait for many years unless you veterans go out and preach the need for this kind of preparation

There are some other things I should like our veterans to help educate our population about—the matter of depressions, for instance. The Communists and their friends spread the poison that the Soviet system is better than ours because we have had depressions and they never do. That kind of an argument can make considerable impression upon some people, if the seed is sown when the ground is right.

But there is another side to all this—the way the Russians solve unemployment and prevent depressions. The answer is the slave labor system, men permanently behind barbed wire, working as slaves of the state until they die. There are more permanently enslaved workers in the Soviet Union—and I do not use the term as a mere figure of speech—than there were unemployed in the United States at the very depths of our depression.

Our unemployed had a chance to come back, and did come back. Slave labor in the Soviet has an opportunity only to die, and does die.

Who are these slaves? Some are men who dared to voice criticism of communism. Some are priests, some are intellectuals, some are workers who protested their working conditions and wages.

Their ranks include, for instance, men who criticized the Soviet form of government and the Soviet leaders far, far less than the Communists and their fellow travelers in this country have criticized the American form of government and its leaders.

One system's inalienable right to speak out freely is obviously another system's one-way ticket to a Siberian slave camp. Go out and preach that to your fellow Americans who are indifferent to the blessings we enjoy here.

In this connection it should be mentioned that the Soviet Union has shipped thousands of its soldiers, men who had been Nazi prisoners of war, to the slave camps after Germany hoisted the white flag. These men had surrendered because they had no other course except death.

Just imagine, if you can, this parallel situation. Suppose when we had beaten the Japs and recovered the heroic prisoners of Bataan, we had sent them to slave camps instead of treating them as the gallant men they were. The thought of this shocks you. It shocks me, too.

But it has actually happened in Russia. And why? Well, it seems the Russians felt these men had been contaminated by being exposed to the culture of the western world—to a higher standard of living and greater comfort than the Soviet system was offering.

Our country, with the highest living standards in the world, does not fear that kind of competition from any other country. Go out and preach that to the Nation.

Then there is another matter of vital importance. That is the necessity of keeping our Nation financially sound if we are to remain strong and a beacon of freedom to the peoples of the world. In 1929 the individual's share of the Federal tax was $27 per person. Today it is $286 per person. The cost of Government and our debt have gone up and up.

Even Uncle Sam does not have a bottomless pocket.

We have seen what has happened to Britain, not so many years ago the richest and strongest power on earth. Today the British lion is poor. He is fighting desperately to hold his head above water, and to keep from becoming just another small, bankrupt country.

Certainly no one in Britain dreamed of anything like that as recently as 25 years ago. Very few in America today feel it will come to us. But it did happen on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean and we must prevent it from happening here. If we are careless, it can happen.

That is why I urge you to preach to the country the need for maintaining our financial stability and of reducing the cost of government.

Finally, I have this in mind.

I believe in the potentialities of the United Nations. I believe that, given a fair trial it will work. I believe we should do all we can to assure that opportunity.

But if it does not work, if its path is strewn with booby traps and vetoes so that it cannot succeed, then it will be incumbent upon us to assert our leadership for a peaceful world. It will be our duty to organize the peace-loving nations of the earth into a force so powerful and so strongly united that no aggressor will dare challenge our freedom.

We all hope and pray that America may be spared the horrors of another war. But I say to you that we must never lose sight of our first objective—to be so strong and so well trained that no alien philosophy and no alien force will dare to tangle with us.

Keep our country's muscles strong and its powder dry.

Preach that.

United States Foreign Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune for July 13, 1947:

UNITED STATES FOREIGN RELIEF TOTAL IS TWENTY BILLIONS FOR 2 YEARS—FIGURE COMPRISES GRANTS AND PLEDGED LOANS; $7,215,000,000 IN GIFTS TO THREE CONTINENTS; REPAYMENT DEPENDS ON REHABILITATION

WASHINGTON, July 12.—The United States has made grants and pledged loans totaling more than $20,000,000,000 for the relief and rehabilitation of foreign nations in the two post-war years.

This is what George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, had in mind when he told the Women's National Press Club on July 1 that "historical records clearly show that no people have ever acted more generously and more unselfishly than the American people in tendering assistance to alleviate distress and suffering."

At the request of the Associated Press, the International Economics Division of the Department of Commerce compiled a complete account of the loans and gifts.

SEVEN BILLIONS IN GIFTS

Outright gifts to prostrate peoples in Europe, Asia, and Africa now amount to $7,215,000,000. Of this, individuals and institutions gave $1,500,000,000 worth in parcels and money. (The data on private gifts is obtained from reports of banks and other organizations having a remittance business, from records of postoffice money orders and parcel post and from reports of philanthropic institutions.)

Loans comprise $12,871,000,000 of the total. They have been made generally, for a 20- to 30-year period. They bear interest of 2 to 3½ percent.

One high State Department authority says that whether these loans will ever be repaid depends on the ability of the borrowing nations to get back on their feet economically. He says the future economic health of Europe depends largely on the ability of the Continent to agree on some plan for joint rehabilitation such as Secretary Marshall has proposed.

To get an idea of the enormous sums involved in these loans and gifts, recall that the public debt of the United States in 1932 was only $19,487,000,000.

All the goods which this country exported between 1932 and 1939 cost somewhat less than $20,000,000,000.

Chief recipients of the gifts have been the countries of eastern and southern Europe. Western Europe comes next and Asia third. Great Britain has been by far the largest borrower.

Most of the goods exported to the loan countries have been food, fuel, and clothing. Machinery, steel, and other hard goods have been exported mainly through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in the form of gifts.

TWENTY-NINE MILLION SIX HUNDRED THOUSAND TONS OF COAL

Here are some facts cited by the State Department expert:

This country shipped overseas 29,600,000 tons of coal in the year ended June 30—all

but 3,000,000 tons to Europe and North Africa. In average prewar years the country exported only 50,000 tons of coal annually.

The United States exported 14,500,000 tons of bread grains, nearly all of it wheat, in the last year. To Italy went 1,276,000 tons, to France 682,000 tons, and to Greece 376,000 tons. Average prewar year exports to all those countries totaled only 36,400 tons.

All exports—both consumer items and hard goods—are steadily mounting, both to the loan countries and to the gift countries. In June the United States was exporting at the rate of $1,400,000,000 worth of goods a month—an all-time record.

Here are the gifts made by the people of America through their Government:

UNRRA: $2,700,000,000. This is 72 percent of all UNRRA donations. Largest recipient of UNRRA help was China, with $530,000,000. Two Russian Soviet republics, the Ukraine and Byelo-Russia, received large grants.

Post-UNRRA relief: $350,000,000, which this Government will distribute as it sees fit.

International Refugee Organizations: $75,000,000. This is 45.75 percent of the IRO budget. It will help care for 1,200,000 homeless and destitute persons.

SIX HUNDRED AND TWENTY MILLION DOLLARS TO PHILLIPPINES

Philippine grants: $620,000,000. This comprises three funds, administered by the Philippine War Damage Commission. To pay private claims for war damage, $400,000,000 is provided; for public rehabilitation, two funds totaling $220,000,000.

Civilian supplies distributed by the Army and Navy: $1,200,000,000. These goods were given away chiefly in Germany and Japan. They were basically a military expense, necessary to prevent disease and unrest. It is the intent of this Government to exact payment when the countries can pay.

Italian civilian supplies: $135,000,000. This sum was made available to the Army through lend-lease channels during the occupation period.

Chinese postwar lend-lease: $620,000,000, to enable the Chinese to disarm the 1,000,000 surrendered Japanese soldiers on their soil and reoccupy captured areas.

Scientific and cultural aids to Latin America: $15,000,000. With this we share the expense of sanitation and public health programs and various projects for the development of industry and agriculture and for the exchange of students.

The 11 items the Commerce Department lists on the loan schedule follow:

Export-Import Bank: $2,476,000,000.

International Monetary Fund: $2,750,000,000.

International Bank: $635,000,000. (Available for loans as soon as they can be arranged.)

British loan: $3,750,000,000.

"Pipe line" lend-lease: $1,350,000,000. The United States extended credit in this amount to nations which at the war's end had contracts for lend-lease goods that they wished to have completed and delivered.

Surplus property sales credit: $1,100,000,000.

RFC loan to the Philippines: $75,000,000.

Maritime Commission ship sales credit: $165,000,000.

Greek-Turkish loan: $400,000,000.

Silver commodity loan: $50,000,000. Silver for the minting of coins was transferred to India and some Dutch possessions, to be paid back in kind.

Congressional credit to China: $120,000,000, from a $500,000,000 fund established by Congress in 1942 for Chinese assistance.

Of the $20,000,000,000 which the United States has given, loaned, and committed itself to lend, $15,739,000,000 has been disbursed.

What have been the results of this vast outpouring?

A State Department official who bears much of the responsibility for the administration of the program said in reply to this question: "Unlike other wars, this one was followed by no mass starvation in Europe and no serious epidemics. It is true that many of the nations ravaged by the war still are in dire condition. But if we had allowed them to freeze and starve * * * they would have tended to embrace extreme political philosophies. * * * It is true that our help has not yet averted this danger. But if we had not helped them, where would they be now?"

GIFTS AND LOANS TO FOREIGN NATIONS

WASHINGTON, July 12.—The following table lists United States gifts and loans to foreign nations since the war ended, as compiled for the Associated Press by the Commerce Department. Figures are in millions of dollars. In the first column is the amount to which we have committed ourselves; in the second is the sum actually disbursed:

[000,000 omitted]

	Total	Disbursed
GIFTS		
Personal and institutional remittances	$1,500	$1,500
UNRRA	2,700	2,550
Post UNRRA relief	350	-------
International Refugee Organization	75	-------
Philippine grants	620	45
Civilian supplies distributed by Army and Navy	1,200	1,200
Italian civilian supplies	135	135
Chinese postwar lend-lease	620	620
Aid to Latin America	15	15
Total gifts	7,215	6,065
LOANS		
Export-Import Bank	2,476	1,595
International Monetary Fund	2,750	2,750
International Bank	635	635
British loan	3,750	2,050
"Pipe line" lend-lease	1,350	1,350
Surplus property sales credit	1,100	900
RFC loan to Philippines	75	60
Maritime Commission ship sales credit	165	165
Greek-Turkish loan	400	-------
Silver commodity loan	50	50
Congressional credit to China	120	120
Total loans	12,871	9,674
Total loans and gifts	20,086	15,739

NOTE.—In instances where loans have been partly repaid, only the amount still outstanding is given here.

Our Filipino Veterans—Let Us Give Them What Is Their Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the well-known Filipino journalist, lawyer, and economist, Mr. Vicente Villamin, is quoted as having said that it was the Rescission Act of 1946 which deprived the Filipino veterans of most of their well-earned rights and benefits. The restoration of these rights, to which the Filipinos are entitled, is included in the Missing Persons Act which, on June 16, passed this House unanimously. That was the first step in the direction of justice and it is hoped it will become basic in our law covering benefits for veterans. This bill, to quote Mr. Villamin, "should be a complete omnibus bill." I subscribe fully to these sentiments and expressions. I ask unanimous consent to include a pertinent and forceful editorial captioned "Our Good Faith at Stake," which was gleaned from the Washington Star of July 15, 1947:

OUR GOOD FAITH AT STAKE

A bill is pending in the Senate Armed Services Committee which should be reported out and passed before adjournment as a matter of good faith. So far as known there is no opposition to it. It is in danger, in the closing days of Congress, because it has been given no place on the leadership's legislative priority list.

During the war we followed the practice as a Nation of continuing the pay and allowances of men in the armed services who were, in line of duty, absent from their regular posts—such as prisoners of war. Filipino soldiers were included as Americans in this category. Many of those who stood with our forces on Bataan were captured, sent to prison camps and some of them never came back. The War Department adjudicated and met claims for arrears in pay (the Filipino private on Bataan drew $9 a month) of some 1,400 living Filipinos and about as many who were dead.

But in enacting the law which severed our ties with the Philippine Commonwealth and recognized the independence of the new republic, restrictions were written into the statute barring further claims (with some exceptions) of Filippino veterans. The restrictions were interpreted as applying to the missing persons and that interpretation stopped the work, then in progress, of completing payments under the missing persons law. The House corrected this mistake, for certainly it was a mistake, by passing unanimously and without debate the same bill which is now pending in the Senate Armed Services Committee, under which valid claims, under the missing-persons law, would be paid. But unless action is taken soon, the bill will perish from inaction.

The results would be unfortunate. The members of the Philippine Army were entitled to the same treatment as American soldiers, in respect of pay due them while missing. This was recognized by Congress, approved by the War Department. The present corrective legislation is recommended by the War Department. It is merely to meet a just obligation. The money involved is not nearly so important as the principle and if the principle is repudiated by inaction we shall unnecessarily raise, in the minds of the Filipinos involved, a question of good faith on the part of this country. It would require a minimum of effort by the Senate to dispose of this bit of unfinished business, with credit to ourselves.

Drive for Federal Sales Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Chicago Sun:

[From the Chicago Sun of July 6, 1947]

ABILITY TO PAY UNDER FIRE—BIG BUSINESS GIVES AID TO KNUTSON IN DRIVE FOR FEDERAL SALES TAX

(By Griffing Bancroft)

WASHINGTON.—The growing drive for a Federal sales tax appeared certain today to

become one of the basic issues in the next session of Congress and in the 1948 political campaigns.

Both sides, it was learned, have been laying the ground work carefully for this battle.

1. Chairman KNUTSON, Republican, of Minnesota, of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee, has named a special tax-study committee composed chiefly of big business spokesmen who favor shifting the emphasis in Federal taxes from the ability-to-pay income levy to a sales tax.

2. Some committee Democrats, who were not even consulted on the formation of this group, have declared open war on it. They are letting it be known that they intend to end the last shred of pretense of the long-standing custom of drafting tax bills on a bipartisan basis.

The Knutson committee, said to be the first non-Government group called upon to draft legislation of importance since the writing of the famous Smoot-Hawley tariff during the Hoover administration, already is at work.

It is headed by such men as Roswell Magill and John W. Hanes, of the Tax Foundation, a Wall Street group frankly seeking tax relief for big business, and John Cheever Cowdin, long-time tax spokesman for the National Association of Manufacturers.

These three have repeatedly urged a Federal sales tax, as have a total of 6 members of the 11-man committee. The views of the others on taxes are not publicly known, but it is believed that virtually all will support this form of revenue raising. Two of the group are St. Paul, Minn., industrialist friends of KNUTSON.

No doubt has been left in anyone's mind that the function of this group is to draft the proposed revision of the Federal tax structure which has been promised by both parties for the next session of Congress.

Democrats, however, have mostly refused to cooperate with the present closed sessions of this extragovernmental tax-writing group. Three to date have publicly challenged its authority.

These three are Representatives DINGELL (Michigan), FORAND (Rhode Island), and EBERHARTER (Pennsylvania). The three form the progressive vanguard of the Ways and Means Committee, but every indication is now that most, if not all, of the other Democrats on the committee will go along with them on this issue.

These Democrats, it was learned, already have started the work of drafting their own counterproposal to what they call the expected Knutson-Cowdin tax bill.

Their plans for a revision of the tax structure would call for higher exemptions before which income taxes would be paid and a curtailing, rather than an expansion, of Federal excise or sales taxes.

Their contention is that a sales tax falls with equal force on rich and poor alike and is therefore a retreat from the theory that taxes should be levied on the ability to pay.

They hope to be able to carry their fight directly to the people by declaring that the Republican plan is for the relief of Wall Street and the wealthy, while the Democratic tax plan is for the relief of the average wage earner and the poor.

These Democrats concede that the success or failure of their drive may hinge on one man—Representative DOUGHTON (Democrat of North Carolina), veteran former chairman of Ways and Means and a leader of the more conservative elements of the party.

When the nongovernmental tax-drafting group was set up by KNUTSON, he indicated that it had been approved by DOUGHTON. While the North Carolinian himself is noncommittal on the whole matter to date, his friends report that far from approving the new group, he simply told KNUTSON that since Republicans controlled the committee he, DOUGHTON, did not plan to fight it.

KNUTSON originally had named 10 men to the group. At DOUGHTON'S request he added one more suggested by DOUGHTON—Clarence H. Poe, Raleigh, N. C., editor of the Progressive Farmer.

[From the Chicago Sun of July 7, 1947]

ABILITY TO PAY UNDER FIRE—PROBE OF WALL STREET ROLE IN DRIVE FOR FEDERAL SALES TAX SOUGHT

(By Griffing Bancroft)

WASHINGTON.—Demands for a full-scale public airing of alleged Wall Street influence on tax legislation in the Republican Congress were voiced in Democratic quarters today.

The move followed the single-handed action of Chairman KNUTSON (Republican, Minnesota) of the House Ways and Means Committee in appointing an 11-man group—heavily weighted with industrialists favoring a Federal sales tax as against the present ability-to-pay income levy to draft basic changes in revenue laws.

Led by Representative DINGELL (Democrat, Michigan), Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, are laying plans to challenge its authority and to couple this challenge with public demands for an investigation.

When the new extra-governmental group held its first meeting, KNUTSON promised its members that Congress would reimburse them for travel and other expenses. This would require a congressional authorization and when KNUTSON seeks it, the Democrats plan to make the rafters ring with demands that alleged "Wall Street dictation" be ended.

At the same time these Democrats are demanding that members of the group register as lobbyists, as others who seek to influence legislation do, and make a full accounting of how much money they spend and where it comes from.

Their contention is that such publicity would furnish leads showing that the influence of big business on vital tax legislation is on a huge scale.

They are particularly anxious to "smoke out" the powers behind the Tax Foundation, a group which works for tax relief for the higher echelons of industry and for which two members of the Knutson group are public spokesmen.

A study of the background and affiliations of the 11 members of the Knutson-appointed tax committee shows them to be for the most part ultra conservatives. Six of the 11 are on record publicly favoring a Federal sales tax, 4 have not made their tax views public, and only one is known to oppose a sales tax.

The group is chairmanned by Roswell Magill, member of a New York law firm, professor at Columbia University, and a director of the Tax Foundation.

Magill was an assistant to former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., until he broke with the Roosevelt administration in 1938 over economic policies. He publicly urges a Federal sales tax.

Other members of the new committee studying tax revision are:

John W. Hanes, chairman of the Tax Foundation, a New York investment banker and all-out sales-tax advocate. He, too served in the Roosevelt administration but broke with it at about the same time Magill did. Hanes and Magill were the only two non-Government witnesses called by KNUTSON to testify on the tax bill in the present session. Both favored the Knutson measure to give 20-percent-income-tax cut to all brackets of income-tax payers.

John Cheever Cowdin, chairman of the board of Universal Pictures, a director of a dozen other large corporations, and for a long time the tax spokesman for the National Association of Manufacturers. He also is a sales tax advocate.

Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor and the only nonbusiness spokesman on the group. Woll has publicly urged higher corporate taxes and lower levies in the bottom income-tax brackets.

Frank Carlson, Governor of Kansas and formerly a Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee. During his time in the House he fought for a Federal sales tax.

Clarence H. Poe, of Raleigh, N. C., editor of the Progressive Farmer, whose views on taxation are not known. He was appointed at the request of former Ways and Means Chairman Doughton (Democrat, North Carolina).

Norris K. Carnes, St. Paul livestock dealer, a friend and fellow-stater of Knutson. He has never publicly expressed his views on taxation.

John L. Connolly, St. Paul manufacturer and one of the authors of the Twin Cities Plan on Postwar Taxes. He has urged a sales tax and opposed any increase in exemptions for income-tax payers.

Carlson Samuel Duncan, economist of the Association of American Railroads, one of the most powerful lobbies in Washington.

E. H. Lane, Altavista, Va., manufacturer who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in 1942 to urge a Federal sales tax.

Wright Mathews, Dallas, Tex., attorney whose views on taxation are not known.

[From the Chicago Sun of July 8, 1947]

ABILITY TO PAY UNDER FIRE—GOP PREPARES TWO PLANS IN STRATEGY FOR SALES TAX—PROPOSED FEDERAL LEVY WOULD BE DISGUISED AS EXCISE IMPOST, PAYMENT FOR THE WAR

(By Griffing Bancroft)

WASHINGTON, July 7.—Long-range Republican strategy to enact a Federal sales tax in the next session of Congress now has been formulated. It consists, basically, of two major plans:

1. The proposed levy will not be called a sales tax, but instead will be referred to as "broadening the excise taxes."

2. Attempts will be made to gain popular support by trying to make the new levy appear as a special tax to pay for the war.

Excise taxes are Federal imposts now levied as sales taxes against so-called luxury goods, such as liquor, tobacco, and other commodities. To broaden them by placing them on more commodities would, in effect, be imposing a general sales tax.

This long has been advocated in some GOP circles, but on May 28, at a special meeting of the House Ways and Means Committee, Chairman KNUTSON (Republican), of Minnesota, gave this program his full support and disclosed the forthcoming strategy. According to the official transcript, KNUTSON said:

"It is the hope of the committee to be able to shift much of the burden that is now being carried by the income group over to excises, at least in part.

"Obviously, if we are going to extend the excise field we will have to include a great many items that are not now included. Perhaps the revenue can be set aside into a fund that could be called the war retirement fund."

Democrats for the most part contend that any such shift from the income taxes, which are levied on the basis of ability to pay, to the sales tax, which falls on rich and poor alike, would benefit the wealthy at the expense of the poor.

As previous articles in this series have related, these Democrats already are at work with a counter plan which would lay the emphasis in the new tax structure on income-tax relief for the lower-bracket taxpayers.

Republicans, however, have set up a special non-Government tax committee

headed by Roswell Magill, New York lawyer and sales-tax advocate, to draft their bill, which is expected to seek the bulk of Federal revenue from some form of a sales tax.

Magill and John W. Hanes, chairman of the Tax Foundation, a big business organization seeking tax relief, were the only two non-Government witnesses to testify this session on the Knutson tax bill to give the bulk of income tax relief to higher-bracket taxpayers.

Both favored the bill and both, under questioning by the committee, said they favored broadened excise taxes.

In fact, a transcript of those hearings last March show that Hanes, who also is a member of the Magill tax-writing group, let the cat out of the bag and openly espoused a sales tax.

It was while he was being questioned by Representative GEARHART (Republican, of California), a long-time sales-tax advocate. The transcript at this point reads:

"Mr. GEARHART. As I pointed out in my examination of Mr. Magill, I think that we should take the emphasis off income taxes as the principal source of income just as much as we possibly can, not for the purpose of doing away with revenue, but of recapturing it some place else, through a comprehensive system of excise taxes for instance.

"Have you given any particular thought to a comprehensive manufacturers' excise tax—an excise levy at the manufacturers' level?

"Mr. HANES. I am not prepared to talk about that at the moment, as I am not familiar with it. But in the past I have always felt that there was something to be gained from a general sales tax, if you wish to call it that, because I would rather speak of an excise tax—I would rather speak frankly and call the excise tax what I think it is, a direct sales tax.

"For that reason I have advocated a sales tax because I think we have to get the revenue where the revenue is, and we are going to be pressed very hard for revenue in the next few years.

"Mr. GEARHART. I have carefully avoided the use of the phrase 'sales tax' in discussing manufacturers' excise tax. I think there is a distinction there. The distinction turned on the point where you levy the tax. If it is at the manufacturers' level that is one thing. If it is at the retail level that is another thing."

Occupation of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by George E. Reedy:

The United States is embarking on its most important international venture, with both arms strapped tightly to its side. It is the occupation of Germany, which is supposed to end with that country restored to a respectable position in the world.

The policy for that venture was laid down yesterday in a State Department directive to Gen. Lucius D. Clay. He is the military governor in Germany. Today he must be wondering whether his Government thinks him a magician, or a card sharp.

He has been ordered to bring the German people to an adequate standard of living and to put the nation back on its economic feet. At the same time he has been ordered to resist the imposition of any outside form of government, including our own.

This is a glib phrase which at first blush seems to be the finest fruit of democracy. Carried to its logical conclusion, however, it places the good general in a spot where he must almost help bring another dictatorship to Germany.

Suppose, for example, that we are actually serious, and permit the German people to choose their own form of government. What happens if they demand another Hitler? And a revived Nazi Party? Do we help them out? Do we?

As another alternative, suppose they demand a communistic government, under the rule of the Soviet Union. With the international situation being what it is today, do we just bow to their decision, and tell them to go right ahead? Do we?

Of course, democracy is something that can't be imposed from the outside. To that extent, the State Department's directive is just a waste of words and of paper. No man can be forced to accept democracy. It is something that must come from within himself.

At the same time, however, every effort should be made to convince the German people that democracy is the best way of life. There can be no compromise in this. Two generations of our men had to fight Germany because it was not done before.

On the other side of the ledger is the obvious fact that the Soviet Union is not going to handicap itself in their part of Germany. It is doubtful whether the Communists would even make a pretense of keeping their hands off. They are too realistic for that.

The effort to democratize Germany should be carried on in every way possible. The modern world can no longer permit irresponsible militarists to lead such a powerful nation to its own destruction, and the destruction of the rest of us.

This does not mean that a repressive government must be established. The job can be done by democratic means. But it can only be done if we stand firmly on our rights as an occupying power and refuse to bury our heads in windy phrases of keeping our hands off.

This is no time to close our eyes and imitate blind moles burrowing through the earth. We are engaged in a bitter struggle for the preservation of a form of life we hold dear. Germany is one of the great prizes of that struggle and should be treated as such.

Celebration of First Anniversary of Philippine Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. JASPER BELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an address of Ambassador Joaquin M. Elizalde, delivered at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.; an address by Hon. Carlos P. Romulo, permanent representative of the Philippines to the United Nations, at the Independence Day banquet and ball held by the Filipino community of the city of New York; and an address delivered by Philippine Consul General Melencio, at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C. These addresses were delivered on July 4, 1947, in celebration of the first anniversary of Philippine independence:

ADDRESS OF AMBASSADOR JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE, JULY 4, 1947, SHOREHAM HOTEL

Fellow citizens, ladies and gentlemen, today we have come together to celebrate Independence Day. It is the Independence Day of 18,000,000 Filipinos. It is the Independence Day of 145,000,000 Americans.

I need not tell you that this is more than mere coincidence. It was a design, woven out of our common devotion to the principles and concepts of freedom.

We observe today one of the greatest and most unselfish acts of recorded time—the free grant of sovereignty to a dependent people by a great and powerful nation. America, at the height of her power and authority in the world, gave to the Filipino people the title to their own land, the right to be the masters of their own fate, the right to be an equal at the council table of nations.

That event took place on the Fourth of July a year ago. It was an event which will be marked in the records of mankind as a milestone on the forward road of freedom.

But America did more than grant us independence. Coming, as it did, on the heels of the terrible destruction of our homeland, the grant of independence might have been a mockery, if America had not at the same time stood ready to help us with the essentials of national existence.

A year ago, as the American flag dipped downward in Manila, to be replaced by the proud emblem of the Philippine Republic, we became a free nation.

But we were a free nation with few of the economic means of survival.

Our industries had been destroyed. Our potentialities for export, on which our economy had been based, were only beginning to recover from the zero point to which war reduced us.

The bitter struggles which had raged in our homeland during the 4 years of Pacific war had wiped out our transport, our communications, destroyed our roads, razed our cities, killed and maimed hundreds of thousands of our people, and swept away more than 70 percent of the national wealth.

The war set us back no less than 50 years.

But our people, traditionally courageous and devoted to the nation, neither faltered nor abandoned hope.

New elections were held in the best democratic tradition. Under the magnificent leadership of President Manuel Roxas, the heavy task of reconstruction was begun.

With American help, we repaired our most vital roads, acquired essential transport, reestablished our communications, provided relief to the needy, and met on a score of different circumstances the heavy problems confronting us.

We reestablished our free school system, the bedrock of our democracy. Today 3,000,000 of our young attend the public schools, one-third more than before the war.

We spread far and wide, knowledge and information about current events, through the activities of a free press and radio. Today we have more than a score of daily newspapers, mostly in Manila, and three major radio stations serving the nation.

Air-travel facilities were reestablished and expanded, until today there is more air travel than ever before in the history of the Philippines.

We have begun the mountainous job of rebuilding and repairing our homes and factories and office buildings. We have only made a beginning, but we have begun.

I could enumerate many more of the achievements of the past 12 months, of the progress that we have made in the first year of our independence.

But this is not an occasion requiring the recitation of such a record. I wanted merely to indicate that we have taken joy in our freedom, and new resolve to work, repair, and produce.

That is our national slogan. That is our national preoccupation. In this, as I have said, we have had the generous assistance of our former sovereign, now our friend and ally, the United States.

Yet, while we have been occupied with the stupendous tasks of rehabilitation and reconstruction, we have not been unaware of what was taking place in the rest of the world.

If we had learned one lesson from the war, we had learned that we were a part of the world, that peace was indivisible, and that we had a responsibility for the preservation of that peace.

We have maintained our faith in the principles of the United Nations, and have shown in every way our devotion to the program of cooperation with other peace-loving peoples of the world.

We have seen the sharpening edges of ideological struggle in the world. We have not shrunk from that conflict. We have not hidden our heads in the sand. We have assumed our proper responsibilities to mankind and to our national conscience and principles.

We have stood by the side of the United States on every issue of principle in which America has championed the ideals to which both our nations are devoted.

We have caused our voice to be heard abroad, and it has been heard and respected by our sister nations. The peoples of the Orient, who have watched our emergence into independence, are today our good friends and neighbors. The peoples of those countries pin great hopes upon the leadership of the United States, and find in our independence a good warrant for that leadership.

So this year has not passed its turbulent course unmarked by activity on our part. It has been a fateful year, a critical year in our destiny.

We are proud and happy that we mark our anniversary on the same day that marks the anniversary of the United States.

I may say to our American friends, that in any struggle over the principles to which both our countries subscribe, the Filipino people will be arrayed on the side of America.

On this day our thoughts are naturally turned to the future rather than to the past. We face grave and desperate problems and, as one looks around, one can see nothing but more difficulties and hurdles to overcome.

The record of the past year is one to inspire faith in the ability of our people to succeed despite the great handicaps that are found in the present situation.

The Government of President Roxas, with convincing support from the 18,000,000 Filipino people, has combined good common sense with a spirit of high patriotism.

Our progress, in the midst of the terrible devastation of war, gives us courage. Proudly and confidently we face the future.

THE FIRST MILESTONE

(Address by Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo, permanent representative of the Philippines to the United Nations, at the Independence Day banquet and ball held by the Filipino community of the city of New York in celebration of the first anniversary of Philippine independence, at the Waldorf-Astoria, July 4, 1947)

The anniversary we observe today is a two-fold one: it is, in a manner of speaking, both a birthday and a wedding anniversary. The selfsame hour that witnessed the glorious birth of the Republic of the Philippines witnessed also the solemn ritual of our people's indissoluble union with liberty.

This also is a double anniversary. It sheds its benign light with equal splendor on the American people and the Filipino people. It symbolizes their single victorious purpose in war as well as their resolute common purpose in peace. It holds for both the same joyous memory of fulfillment and the same inescapable challenge to vision and enterprise.

Anniversaries are for looking backward. They are for taking stock of the things we have done as well as of the things we have left undone, and we pause in our endeavors in order that we may measure our achievement by the yardstick of our original purpose.

But anniversaries are also for looking forward. They are for fixing the vision anew on the goal that lies ahead, and we pause in order that we may measure the distance we have yet to travel by the yardstick of our collective will.

I emphasize the sober mood of inventory far more than I do the inebriate sense of simple rejoicing and glory, and for a good reason. This, after all, is for the American people the one hundred and seventy-first anniversary of their independence, while it is only the first anniversary of our own. Americans can look back upon many long years of consistent and fruitful endeavor in freedom, and they can afford to rest, as it were, upon the laurels of wealth and power they have won. We, on the other hand, have many long years of travail ahead of us, and we can ill afford to be distracted from our labors by any emotional excursions empty of content.

In observing this Fourth of July, we Filipinos have this significant advantage: that for our generation independence is much more than a mere memory hallowed by tradition and custom; it is, instead, a precious experience which we have lived and shared, and therefore a powerful source of direct encouragement and inspiration. Not by rote nor by the testimony of historians do we know that this indeed was the hour of our freedom, but rather by the personal knowledge of the vision we have pursued, the sacrifice we have borne, and the suffering we have endured. For us "the rockets' red glare" and "the bombs bursting in air" are matters of first-hand experience denoting Bataan and Corregidor, Leyte and Lingayen; and when we sing of beholding the radiance and feeling the throb of "glorious liberty", we know that the words have reference to something our own eyes have seen and our own hearts have felt. The quickened pulsation of the blood tells us better than any twice-told story of heroism the true meaning of independence.

In the mood of inventory to which I have already referred, I propose now to examine the true meaning which independence should hold for our people. I would say, first of all, that independence has become for the Filipino people an opportunity rather than a privilege, and that it implies moral obligations more than it assures juridical rights. While independence may appear to be a privilege to those who do not possess it, it is an opportunity to those who do. And those who do possess it shall make nothing of it until they realize that independence has positive value not as an end in itself but as a source of imperative moral duty.

In its narrowest sense independence means living by one's own effort. However, in the world as we know it, independence of this sort is neither possible nor desirable. It is not possible for any nation, however rich or powerful, to live by itself alone, nor is it desirable that it should do so even if it could. It is an ancient tenet of religion that all men are brothers; it is an equally self-evident truth of modern science that all nations are neighbors. Yet neither religious tenets nor religious truth has canceled the essential merit of the ideal of independence: that every nation, like every man, must strive for a certain measure of freedom by being self-sufficient in the primary essentials of life, secure in the conditions of peace and order which make life supportable, and rich in the attributes of respect and dignity which make life worth living.

Measured by these tests, our young republic may be said to have made remarkable progress in the brief span of 1 year. Rising from the wreckage of a destructive war, our people have wrestled with the problems of political reorganization, economic reconstruction, and social regeneration with high resolve and enthusiasm. The Government of the Republic is functioning on a sound constitutional basis. The will of the people continues to be expressed in periodic elections as provided by law. The basic civil liberties which are guaranteed to the citizens by the Bill of Rights are meticulously respected by the agencies of the State and by the courts. Freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly remains unimpaired and is in fact upheld by the government under conditions which might have induced a less enlightened leadership to establish restrictive regulations or even punitive measures in the ostensible interest of peace and order. For the first time in nearly two decades there is in the Philippines today a real party of the opposition whose existence is generally recognized to be essential to any genuine form of representative government.

In the field of economic reconstruction, the most encouraging sign is to be found in the upward trend of productive enterprise. An impending rice famine has been averted by increased production of this staple cereal supplemented by imports from Siam and the United States. The production of copra has risen to prewar levels, while the production of abaca, or Manila hemp, is now 60 percent of the prewar output. Crop loans to private producers and government-owned corporations devoted to the encouragement of the production of cereals and of the principal export commodities, including sugar, are certain to bring about a more speedy restoration of the national economy than was at first anticipated.

American financial and material assistance has been assured and is now being extended in accordance with the Philippine Trade Act and the Philippine Rehabilitation Act. This has made possible the initiation of a large-scale program of public works construction, including public buildings, schools and hospitals, railways, roads and bridges, post and telegraph offices, harbors, and air navigation facilities, weather observation and lighthouse service. Furthermore, our government is now ready to resume the program of light industrialization which was rudely interrupted and set back by the war, including the reopening and expansion of cement and textile factories, sugar and oil mills and refineries, lumber mills and fertilizer plants, and the development of water power. The acquisition of surplus property worth half a billion dollars has greatly facilitated the restoration of essential public services. In addition, the discussion of the Japanese reparations program has advanced to such a stage that the Philippines may soon confidently expect the transfer from Japan of a number of important industrial plants and equipment.

The entry of foreign investment capital, especially American capital, and the extension of American technological assistance are also assured under these enactments. At the same time, our government, by establishing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and by assisting other banks and credit institutions, is giving every encouragement to Filipino citizens to apply their skills and talents to the exploitation of the country's natural resources.

The Philippine Government has secured budgetary loans from the United States which were needed to help tide the country over the current period of financial stringency. There are two things worth noting about these loans; first, that the state of utter economic prostration in which the Philippines found itself at the end of the war would have necessitated such loans whether the country were independent or not; and second, that the economic potentialities of the Philippines are such that these loans will be repaid as soon as the productive capacities

of the nation can function normally and the system of tax collection is restored and reorganized. The United States has extended loans and outright gifts to various countries of the world, and I believe that Americans will agree with us when we say, quite candidly, that no country is better entitled to such assistance than the Philippines. At the same time, we also dare to affirm that few among these beneficiary states are in a better position to pay for every cent received than the Philippines. We wish to reassure the American people that these loans are gilt-edged investments guaranteed by collateral of the soundest character. The Filipino people, furthermore, consider them as investments in good will that will be repaid in full, with substantial interest, in kind. It is only necessary to add that the Philippines should be given sufficient time to settle these obligations—an extension of from 3 to 5 years, perhaps, to allow for the rehabilitation of productive enterprise.

The upward trend of the cost of living, which is a postwar economic malady not confined to severely devastated countries like the Philippines, has not only been arrested but shows encouraging signs of leveling down. Increased production will hasten this process. In the meantime, the government has sought to relieve the tense agrarian situation by the enactment of a new tenancy law providing for the unprecedented 70–30 crop-sharing plan; that is, 70 percent for the tenant and 30 percent for the landlord. The government has also launched a new attack on the agrarian problem by purchasing private landed estates for redistribution to the farmers and by reviving the prewar program of establishing agricultural settlements in new areas. In the field of labor-management relations, the government has prevented or cut short several major strikes through mediation and arbitration by the court of industrial relations, while at the same time permitting the growth of a labor movement that is more extensive and more vigorous than any existing in the Philippines before the war.

Despite its difficult financial position, the Philippine Government has accomplished prodigious feats of social regeneration. It has provided schooling for a greater number of Filipino children than before the war. It has distributed relief to the needy from UNRRA supplies and other foreign sources as well as from voluntary domestic contributions. It has reopened hospitals and public dispensaries throughout the country. It has approved a veterans' bill of rights under which a veterans' board has been created to administer pensions, educational benefits, and hospital facilities to veterans, war widows, and orphans. By persistent and effective representations to the American people and Government, the administration has secured appropriate recognition and reward for our valiant guerrilla fighters, and stands an excellent chance of obtaining similar concessions for Filipino veterans of the USAFFE.

In reciting the efforts and achievements of the government of the republic during the first year of its existence, it is not my intention to ignore the shortcomings and difficulties, the entire complex of the multitudinous problems which continue to plague our people and government today. There are serious problems of criminality and gangsterism, of graft and black marketeering, of shortages and inflation, of unemployment and low wages, of disease and deteriorating public health, of agrarian unrest and military operations against armed dissidents, of slow-moving treason trials and of insufficient faith in government. Though I will not attempt to gloss over these matters, I feel bound to declare that most of these criticisms are made in deliberate disregard of the facts which condition the existing situation. Foreign critics, but especially American critics, speak of the situation in the Philippines as if the country was not twice ravaged and laid waste in the space of 4 years, as if the Filipino people were unscathed by the ruthless acts of a brutal occupation, indeed, as if the war that despoiled our country and people had been solely of our own making and responsibility. A sense of proportion would seem to dictate that conditions in the Philippines be viewed in the proper perspective and that the faults of government be considered against the background of the almost total collapse and disorganization of Philippine life as the result of war. Without condoning instances of corruption or incompetence, such an attitude would give praise or blame as the facts require. Judgment would be tempered by sympathetic understanding, and a sick nation, no more than a sick man, would not be required to give performance equal to that of one which is hale and sound.

The inadequacies of Philippine life today are not peculiar to the Philippines. Most countries have them in a greater or lesser degree, including those that suffered no direct physical or moral damage from the war. There is hardly any criticism now being leveled at the Philippines which cannot, with equal justice, be leveled also at the city of Chicago or the States of Mississippi or Missouri or South Carolina, and this latter without the partial justification which exists in the case of the Philippines. Furthermore, our critics would most certainly have a much sounder basis for judging the conditions in the Philippines today if they were to read up on the history of other countries—like the United States, for instance, on July 4, 1777—1 year after their independence. They will find that the picture was nowhere pretty at any time—certainly not of the United States where there also was great insecurity of life and property and where there was a movement supported by respectable people to replace the Republic with a monarchy and make George Washington a king.

It is not my purpose to excuse the faults of our Government by citing the faults of another. My purpose rather is to show that we Filipinos are ourselves sharply aware of these deficiencies, and that our frank recognition of their existence is in itself a beneficient act of conscience, which constitutes the first step in the process of healing. We know these shortcomings to exist, we do not avert our eyes from them, nor do we wish to conceal them from the eyes of others. We are confident that the conscience of the nation, reacting to every evidence of negligence or incompetence, corruption or abuse, will fashion the necessary remedies in accordance with our laws and constitution, and in the interest of a more perfect democracy.

For the things that have been accomplished so far, the credit goes, in the first instance, to the recognized leader of the Filipino people, President Manuel Roxas. A man of solid achievement in Philippine public life, trained almost from young manhood for the responsibilities of leadership, he has sought to put our nation on its feet by methods of self-help supplemented by every available assistance from the United States of America. Faithful to our country and our people, loyal to our constitution and our laws, he has held before his vision, in admiration and as guiding star, the liberal, humane, and democratic institutions of American life.

This faith in America, this admiration for American institutions, account in great part for the strong pro-American orientation of our foreign policy. In a score of public addresses since his induction into office, President Roxas has underscored the fact that the Republic is, in his own words, "committed to the cause and international program of the United States of America," whose friendship is "the greatest ornament of our independence and raises us far above the level of our intrinsic power and prestige." Such sentiments, one might add, come natural to a man who is one of the finest products of the American public-school system in the Philippines, and who has served with courage and distinction under the American flag in defense of American ideals.

This spirit of intimate collaboration and alliance has already been enshrined in, and validated by, a number of treaties and agreements. But over and above such written affirmations of common purpose are the sentiments of mutual faith, affection, and gratitude which have outlived the moment of political separation and which are so deeply rooted in the minds and hearts of both our peoples that there shall be no need whatever of reducing them to the form of a polite diplomatic instrument. The Filipino people know, as the American people should know, that the independence of the Philippines was a historic act of mutual consent and consideration between two peoples, and that its ultimate success or failure will depend equally upon the capacity of the Filipinos and upon the willingness of the Americans to exhibit continuing evidences of their friendship and esteem.

Such evidences of improved relations between the Philippines and the United States have been of a most encouraging character. The relations between the American troops stationed in the Philippines and our civilian population have eased up considerably as a result of the sincere efforts of the authorities on both sides, especially Maj. Gen. George F. Moore, to reduce or remove the causes of friction. Even more heartening are the new proofs of generous consideration which the United States Government has shown in giving heed to the claims and grievances of our Filipino guerrillas and veterans of the USAFFE. The cloud of misunderstanding and resentment arising from the failure to give appropriate satisfaction to these grievances is fast lifting, and we have every hope of resolving all remaining issues in an atmosphere of mutual regard and consideration.

The commitment of our young republic to the cause and international program of the United States of America has a wider implication than is apparent at first glance. That policy commits us with equal force to the cause of the United Nations of which the United States was one of the principal organizers and of which the Philippines is a loyal member in good faith and in good standing. We have, since San Francisco, given to the organization our full and ungrudging allegiance. By express will of our people and government, we are pledged to continue giving of loyal support to the United Nations. We shall do so, not merely because it is our desire to honor our signature on the Charter. We shall do so because in our hearts we know that in the United Nations lies the last great hope of mankind—for peace and justice, for prosperity and survival. More potent, in the end, than any aggregation of troops and armaments or system of fortifications or treaties of military alliance is the establishment of one world which shall stand as the bulwark of the security of all.

The independence of the Philippines has imposed another obligation of supreme importance upon the Filipinos. We were the first country in Asia to break through the wall of colonialism which has been built for centuries around that rich and populous region. We have a duty to lead the way, and to continue leading the way, until that wall is crumbled completely and all the oppressed and exploited nations are free. The President of the Philippines, realizing the historic responsibility of our people in this field, has expressed on various occasions his wholehearted support of such a policy and has given me a special commission, in his official letter of instructions, to give it the most emphatic endorsement. Insofar as I personally

shall have the opportunty and the power to give expression to this desire of our people, and to comply with the President's instructions, I shall endeavor by word and deed, in the councils of the United Nations or elsewhere, to support the legitimate aspirations of all peoples to freedom and independence. For I consider that it would be disgraceful for us Filipinos, having won our freedom, to remain silent or to stand apart in selfish isolation while the angushed voices of our less fortunate brethren in Asia cry out for liberty.

I said, in the beginning, that it was my purpose to speak to you on this occasion in a mood of sober reflection. The nature of the work we have done, as well as of the work we have yet to do, certainly requires an attitude of honest self-examination. The nature and magnitude of the problems that beset our young republic compel us to gather our forces anew for a supreme exertion of heart and mind and muscle. There must be no relaxation of effort. While yet the injuries of a long and blood battle remain, we must face the challenge of another equally arduous and exhausting.

Though our republic is young, our people are old in the endurance of battle and in the experience of suffering. The centuries of our history have taught us lessons in patience, in courage, and in determination to which no exhortation can add one jot of meaning. The future can place no burden upon us more onerous than we have borne in the past. A generation that, like ours, has already borne the crucifixion of the Japanese occupation can bear any responsibilities which the future may bring. We know the measure of our strength as a people, and by this strength we shall measure the remaining tasks that await us in buttressing our independence and in establishing upon a more stable foundation the Republic of the Philippines.

OPENING ADDRESS DELIVERED BY PHILIPPINE CONSUL GENERAL MELENCIO AT THE FOURTH OF JULY CELEBRATION, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY 4, 1947

Your excellencies, esteemed guests, countrymen, the Fourth of July has a double meaning to the Filipino people, the meaning it has to the world at large and its significance to us as the day when our Republic was born.

In relation to world history, this day recalls to mind the outstanding episode in the inspiring record of the American people—the struggle of the Thirteen Colonies, the American Revolution, the adoption of the American Constitution, the emancipation of the slaves, the Spanish-American War to aid weaker peoples in their struggle for freedom, World War I to vitalize the principle of self-determination and to make the world safe for democracy, and World War II to liberate weaker nations from the clutches of totalitarianism.

In relation to the Philippines, the day recalls half a century of Filipino-American association, harmonious, fruitful and mutually beneficial. The consistent policy was one of altruism and helpfulness—that the Philippines was for the Filipinos, not to be exploited, but to be developed under America's benign guidance; that the country was to be prepared for self-government and eventually for independence. That was the course set and it was faithfully adhered to. A year ago today, the political bonds were severed and the American flag was hauled down in glory, amidst tears of joy and of sorrow—sorrow for the separation that was taking place, joy for the freedom that had come at last.

For the past 12 months we have been paddling our little banca through the reefs and shoals of heartrending devastation. Not far away, America's powerful ship of state stands by, cheering us on to our allotted destiny, ready to come to our succor if the winds and storms of uncertain fate should be too strong for our yet feeble arms.

This is true friendship in action, and it is reciprocated by 18,000,000 people to whom the American flag will ever be the symbol of American altruism and generosity.

Thus it is that we may well dedicate this celebration to the most beautiful comradeship in the annals of nations—the comradeship between strong and mighty America and a weak and prostrate Philippine Republic.

But we will not be weak and prostrate long. Amid the wreckage and the desolation that one sees wherever he turns in the Philippines, Filipinos stand uncowed and brave. Under our determined, gifted, and patriotic leader we shall rise again from our prostration—slowly and painfully perhaps, but rise again we will and shall. Even now, with the limited means at our command, we are making considerable headway. We are reconstructing homes that have been wiped out; industries that have been leveled to the ground, roads and bridges and public buildings that have been wantonly demolished. The schools are open again. We are mending economy so we can be self-supporting again as we were before the war. And we are stimulating our nation's productivity so that the balance of trade will again be in our favor as it was in 1941, before the Nippon juggernaut dripping with cruelty and blood rode roughshod from one end of our archipelago to the other and destroyed everything they could lay hands on.

Yes, from the debris of the old, we mean to erect a new and robust nationality characterized by fortitude, industry, prestige, achievements. This is our resolve. We feel a new sense of growth, a quickening of the national energy. We shall fortify our minds and spirit for all the travails of nation building. We shall fashion a strong democracy, a democracy which will surely succeed because its architects are all products of the democratic institutions implanted by America in our land. With the fine qualities and the innate genius of our race, we shall yet make our republic a modest monument to America's guidance and example.

We can do no less than this. It is the mandate from thousands of the flower of our manhood who have been mowed down side by side with Americans beneath the folds of the Stars and Strips. It is the mandate from hundreds of thousands more of Filipinos who were massacred and exterminated in cold blood by the enemy in vengeful retaliation, for no other reason than that we refused to make common cause with them in their misguided defiance of democratic civilization.

In our valiant efforts at reconstruction we shall never forget to be grateful for all the aid we are getting now—for the war-damage payments being processed, for the surplus property being turned over to us, for the funds for public works, for the loans we have been granted, for the military assistance agreement recently concluded.

In return we have given America a part of ourselves as it were—special rights for Americans in our own land, and naval and military bases for the security of our two Republics. We wish we could do more.

It is in this spirit that we celebrate this day of days for us. It is in this spirit that we are gathered here in thankfulness for the freedom that is ours at last. Year after year, wherever they may be, Filipinos will foregather in much the same manner as this, blessing America's name and revering her flag. Year after year, in the hearts of an entire people, will be the prayer: May America be always strong and always mighty.

The Box Score on Naval Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the imminent action of the House of Representatives on the proposal to unify the armed services of the United States, I believe every Member of the House would find information of utmost importance in a communication published today in the Washington Post. It is written by Mr. Stuart B. Barber, a World War II Reserve naval officer, whose military experience qualifies him to speak with authority. Mr. Barber calls attention to factual information brought to light in a voluminous but little read study by the joint Army-Navy assessment committee assigned to assign credit for the destruction of Japanese naval and merchant vessels during the war in the Pacific.

In weighing the merits of the unification proposal as now drafted, there is ample reason to fear that one of the war's most effective services—naval aviation—will be jeopardized. Just how effective that service was, and how essential it is to the maximum power of our national defense, is well outlined in Mr. Barber's statement, which follows:

NAVAL AIR RECORD

A COMMUNICATION

Buried deep in a small article in the Post of July 6 was the briefest mention of the contents of one of the most authoritative and revealing documents on the Pacific war. This was the report of the Joint Army-Navy Assessment Committee assigning credit among the several services for the destruction of all Japanese naval and merchant vessels sunk during the war.

The burial of this news was not the fault of the Post, but was another of the brilliant feats which give rise to the suspicion that Navy public relations men do not have sense enough to come in out of the rain. The committee's report was published by the Navy Department as 180 pages of dull tables, with utterly no explanatory text, and was apparently released to the press without explanation, expansion, or comment on its contents. No newspaperman could be expected to turn into a tabulating machine to figure out what the report said.

One would hardly know from this treatment of a report which shows so conclusively the Navy's wartime achievements that the Navy is engaged in a great struggle with the Air Force over theories, weapons and methods of warfare. Or that the joint committee had spent innumerable months of work to reach its unanimous and proven findings for the principal purpose of shedding light on which weapons and methods were successful. Nor, from the principal emphasis given in the report to submarines, would one be able readily to discover how naval aviation stacked up against the Army Air Forces, which is the heart of the interservice struggle. I have extracted some data on this point from the report, and present it herewith.

The Pacific war was a sea and air war. The major Japanese strategic target was the shipping on which the Empire depended for its industrial life. It is highly relevant,

therefore, to a study of the relative effectiveness of the various services' weapons in strategic warfare to study their relative achievements in the war against Japanese shipping.

The United States Navy sank 78 percent of all Japanese ship tonnage lost; the Army Air Forces 15 percent. The Navy sank 87 percent of all Japanese warship tonnage lost; the Army Air Forces 6 percent. The Navy sank 87 percent of all Japanese tanker tonnage lost; the Air Forces 7 percent. Forty-five percent of all Air Force merchant-ship sinkings were in the last 6 months of the war, after the Jap merchant fleet, largely destroyed by the Navy, had already been forced back to its home waters. Most of the Air Force tanker sinkings were in the last few months of the war when the Japanese no longer had access to their oil fields.

Most of the Navy sinkings were by submarines, which accounted for over half of the Jap tankers and other merchant ships sunk, plus 30 percent of the warships, or specifically for over 5,000,000 tons of Japanese vessels. It should not be necessary to labor further the submarine contribution to the war; sinking ships was their job, and they did it magnificently with a relative handful of men. What is more important is to compare the respective contributions of naval aviation and the Army Air Forces to see what lessons may be found therein.

Carrier aircraft sank, single-handed, 40 percent of the Japanese navy's tonnage. Combined with other forces they sank about 875,000 tons of Japanese warships, or 48 percent of the total lost. Carrier aircraft were in on the sinking of 6 battleships, 13 cruisers, 13 carriers, 29 destroyers, and 13 submarines. Of these 79 major vesseis the carrier planes polished off 62 without assistance, including 5 battleships, 10 cruisers, and 10 carriers.

Army aircraft were credited with a full or partial share in the destruction of only 22 vessels of the same classes; in only eight of these cases were they unassisted and all eight of these were destroyers, the smallest of these classes of vessels. Army aircraft did not strike the major blow that sank a single enemy battleship, cruiser, or carrier (as against 25 for our carrier planes), though they assisted in five of the sinking of these heavy ships. Even the Navy and Marine land-based planes has as good a record against warships as Army planes; they sank four destroyers and four submarines unassisted, and were a major factor in the sinking of four battleships and cruisers.

United States Navy carrier aircraft sank 76 Japanese tankers, amounting to nearly 400,000 tons. Army aircraft sank less than one-fourth this tonnage. The carrier sinkings, furthermore, were concentrated in the period from February 1944 to January 1945, and thus exerted maximum effect on curtailing the Japanese fuel supply at the time most critical for Japan. During this period carrier planes sank 15 times the tanker tonnage destroyed by Air Force planes.

It was during this same period that the Japanese merchant marine as a whole was taken off the high seas. It was the cumulative injury suffered during this period that induced thoughtful Japanese leaders to begin work for surrender before the B–29 raids first began, because they saw that with their shipping reduced to a fraction their military and industrial machine was already crippled beyond hope of recovery. This is attested by reports of the strategic bomb survey.

In this important 12-month period the Army Air Forces accounted for only 300,000 tons of Japanese merchant vessels, or one-thirteenth of the total sunk by all forces. Carrier aircraft sank 191,000 tons in 2 days at Truk, and 100,000 tons at Palau 6 weeks later, to equal the Air Forces year total during the first 2 months of the 12.

It is commonly regarded that the capture of the Philippines marked the complete military and strategic defeat of the Japanese. This campaign lasted from September 1944, through January 1945. During this period 1,975,000 tons of Japanese merchant shipping were sunk, but only 8 percent of this by the Air Forces.

During this same 5-month period carrier planes, alone or in cooperation with surface ships, sank 787,000 tons of merchant shipping in the Philippines, against 105,000 tons by Far East Air Force; 322,000 tons of enemy warships against 32,000 tons by FEAF. The carrier forces sank over 100,000 tons of shipping at Manila on September 21–22 alone, the same amount again on November 13–14, and 158,000 tons in the China Sea on January 12 alone. The most credited to the Far East Air Forces in any entire month is 57,000 tons of merchant and naval vessels.

It is from the Far East Air Forces, led during the war by General Kenney, that have come the most strident claims of Air Force superiority in the war at sea. Let us examine the record. From the beginning of the war through January 1945—38 months—the Far East Air Forces were credited with sinking only 330,000 tons of merchant shipping unassisted, plus some 40,000 tons with the assistance of other forces. This total was far exceeded by the career forces in the 3 months of September to November 1944 alone.

The Far East Air Force record against major Japanese warships is negligible: 4 destroyers sunk unassisted, 7 with the help of other forces, plus Air Force assists in the sinking of two light cruisers damaged in the Leyte battle. And a host of small patrol craft, but no submarines.

The principal FEAF claim to fame was the attack on the convoy off Lae in March 1943. The whole available air force was thrown into this battle against approximately 25 ships, most or all of which the Air Force claimed to have sunk. This tonnage was far exceeded by naval aircraft on each of over 20 different days during the war.

The lessons to be drawn from the foregoing are these:

1. Army Air Forces claims and statements may generally be taken with a large grain of salt.

2. Navy claims, particularly aviation claims made through the lackadaisical surface-minded Navy public-relations organization, can safely be considered conservative.

3. Naval carrier forces, being highly mobile, can penetrate deep into enemy territory to seek out the most important and vulnerable targets. Air Forces planes are tied to land bases, which can be moved forward only very slowly and with difficulty. A major reason for the Army Air Force failure to destroy much shipping, particularly tankers, was the inability of Air Force planes (other than heavy bombers whose accuracy was seldom adequate to hit targets as small as ships) to reach this shipping. This was particularly true in the Philippines campaign, when Far East Air Force immobility was embarrassing. The carrier force had repeatedly to attack Japanese reinforcements en route to Leyte, with which the Air Force could not cope from its limited bases ashore. This resulted in delaying for 3 months the first Navy attacks on Tokyo.

4. Naval carrier planes are capable of attacking small, fast-moving targets such as ships with great accuracy and efficiency. This efficiency was so great that naval aviation's successful campaign against Japanese warships and major merchant vessels required only 10 percent of the total attacks made by naval planes.

5. These factors of mobility and accuracy are applicable not only to attacks on shipping but to attacks on all types of small land targets located on or near coasts, including vital strategic targets such as bridges, power stations, rocket-launching sites, and camouflaged or partly buried factories, which cannot be seen or hit accurately by high-altitude Army long-range bombers. These are the targets of tomorrow's war.

6. These facts are pertinent to the unification controversy, and to the struggle over methods of warfare will continue even under unification. It is no secret that the Air Forces wish and intend to restrict the development and employment of naval aircraft, by one means or another, in directions that will prevent the full application of their potentialities to the strategic and atomic air warfare needs of the future.

For many purposes naval planes and methods are superior for strategic attack to those of Air Force bombers. Naval aviators fear, the Air Force enthusiasm in behalf of unification confirms, and the private statements of Army airmen illuminate the intent, that the present unification bill is designed as a major means of facilitating this restriction. Army airmen generally affect contempt for naval aviation. The figures quoted herein suggest that this affected contempt may well be sired by an Air Force feeling of inferiority to naval aviation in some of the more important aspects of air warfare, or by an equally dangerous ignorance of the comparative capabilities of the two air services.

STUART B. BARBER.

ARLINGTON.

New Soft-Coal Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Winchester (Va.) Evening Star of July 11, 1947:

NEW SOFT-COAL CONTRACT

Thoughtful citizens will view with alarm the new soft-coal contract promulgated by John L. Lewis and the Nation's coal operators. Superficially, it is an ordinary agreement, but the consequences are not limited to the participants. The effect will be felt by the entire economy of the Nation. Specifically, coal, a basic commodity, will be increased in price approximately $1 per ton. Everything made by industries which use coal as fuel will cost more to make, and as a result will cost more to the public. In one industry, steel, the increase is estimated by the Wall Street Journal at $5 per ton. This will be reflected in every article made of steel or in which steel enters. Another of the very many examples of the accumulative and expanding effect concerns rail freight. Since the railroads use coal as fuel, every article carried will cost more to carry. With such a substantial increase in the cost of so basic a commodity as coal, the upward price spiral is automatic.

So much for the effects. What of the principals to the agreement? Did they have in mind the consequences to the public or did they act solely upon their respective private interests? Concerning Mr. Lewis, little need be said; his past actions give a reasonable clue. On the other side, the leading representative was Benjamin F. Fairless, president of United States Steel, who spoke for the mines controlled by that giant corporation.

Mr. Fairless, seeking peace at any price (so long as the price will be paid by the consumer), met every Lewis demand, and even agreed to that which Representative HARTLEY, coauthor of the recently enacted labor law, feels "clearly reflects collusion between the mine operators and the United Mine Workers with the intention of violating the law." He warns that the operators face

criminal prosecution. If such is the case, it should start, we think, with Mr. Fairless, who, defending his actions as hopeful it would bring industrial peace," virtually compelled acceptance by the lesser operators. According to discerning Washington correspondents, many feel his action resulted from the fact that United States Steel is wallowing in orders and is hopeful of vast profits. Able Mark Sullivan, of the New York Herald Tribune, seems to sum up Mr. Fairless' attitude: "He appeased what he feared." Continues Mr. Sullivan: "But even if the appeasement achieves what he hoped for (industrial peace), a different kind of tragedy can come to America as a result of the course he took—boom-bust inflation."

The entire affair is sordid and shameful, and the public has been shown that it can expect little more consideration from Mr. Fairless than it has received from Mr. Lewis. To this newspaper it seems apparent that, in this case at least, big business and big labor are conspiring to benefit themselves at the expense of the Nation as a whole. "The public be damned" seems to be the order of the day.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 15, 1947

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am against peacetime conscription for the following reasons:

First. It is a radical departure from our American system and adopts the very thing that has brought nations of the world to ruin. Every country that has had compulsory training, such as our recent enemies—Germany, Italy, and Japan—has ended in a heap of rats, rubble, and ruin. Coercion and compulsion are repugnant to freemen.

Second. When men are forced against their will to enter military training, the nation is lulled into a false sense of security. France had conscription, built the Maginot line, and thought its Army was unbeatable, but they were run over in a few weeks' time.

Third. If we are to improve both education and health of our citizens, it must start from birth and not when boys reach the age of 18. That is too late to form habits and attitudes which will continue throughout life.

Fourth. Military life is abnormal and artificial, and neither the minds nor the character of 18-year olds will be built by segregating them from the wholesome influences of home, church, school, and friends.

Fifth. This program will cost the taxpayers at least two billion or more dollars a year. This money could be better spent, sir, in scientific research and technological development. Instead of teaching boys to do squads right and squads left, saluting brass hats and braid, let them remain free to follow their own inclinations instead of being placed in an Army strait-jacket and forced to obey orders. Give them freedom in the laboratories to look through microscopes and dig into test tubes to discover more secrets we do not yet know. This is the thing that has made America great. Should we ever curb this freedom, God help us. Military obedience is imposed from without; self-discipline comes from within. Follow conscience and not the bark of a hard-boiled sergeant.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the following letter addressed to me:

JULY 11, 1947.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHORT: Receipt of Is Umtee the Answer? a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is acknowledged with thanks. To those of us who feel convinced that Umtee is wrong, is an instrument of further destruction to our moral fiber as well as that of the world, it is heartening to find others of like mind, especially in public service, for I feel a swamping pressure being brought to bear to enact compulsory training legislation.

Because I attend the movies only occasionally I am struck by the fact that for the past 10 months there has each time been a "short"—longer if you please than any other of the news bits—planking for Umtee. Not one have I seen against. This is important. It is effective propaganda. I fear that it is being bought with my money and yours, and I have no effective defense or even fair chance except at the hands of the few who, like yourself, espouse what seems to be the unpopular role of defender. It seems to me that we are in the grip of circumstance when great emotional appeals overcome all our wisdom and intelligence to compel a great Nation to sink into the same kind of mire older nations have been in for generations. Where is the value of experience here?

As an ex-United States marine from the First World War I know something of military ways. I am not opposed to war if we can't avoid it, and I'm willing to carry my share of the stinking load. I am heartily opposed, however, to inflicting on helpless generations the burden of our ignorance and fumbling until we have exhausted other means.

Please accept this letter as an expression of gratitude for the position you have taken.

Very truly yours,
DONALD C. RUBEL,
Parrish & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, only a few from the many papers from all over America, do I offer these press comments on the Compton Commission Report. It goes to show that the people of this country have not been fully informed or made aware of what is going to happen to them.

The quotations follow:

The Portland Oregonian, June 3, 1947:

We are inclined to interpret the Commission's recommendation for universal military training as in effect a recommendation against it. How else can one view the priority given to scientific research, stockpiling, industrial mobilization, the perfection of a mobile striking force, and all that? It is like saying there should be a new coat of paint on the house but not ahead of a new roof, a new furnace, ceilings, and floors, when the financing of the entire job is obviously out of the question.

The Raleigh News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C., June 8, 1947:

France and Germany long compelled youth to undergo the compulsory training now proposed in the United States. Their experience shows its ineffectiveness.

* * * Democracy and compulsory military training cannot exist together. When compulsory military training in peacetime comes in at the door, democracy will go out the window.

The Brooklyn Tablet, June 7, 1947—Roman Catholic newspaper:

Nor did the Commission weigh the possibilities that future aggression in this country may follow the pattern so obvious in eastern Europe. At least one of the powers that is likely to plan campaigns of aggression against us is relying more upon subversion and internal weakness than upon atom bombs and bacteria. How the regimentation of our youth will safeguard us against this form of aggression is difficult to see. Universal military training is a negative thing sired by fear out of confusion.

Knickerbocker News, Albany, N. Y., June 4, 1947:

A year or so ago the general in charge of Army publicity was asked by a group of editors if he could lay down a course of youth training that would include the new influence of the atom bomb and he admitted that he could not. Unhappily, the report gives no acceptable answer to that $64 question.

Indianapolis Star, June 3, 1947:

In any future war it seems certain that millions of half-trained kids would be of no more use than millions of untrained kids. The kind of military organization today's warfare requires is an integrated team of men from industry, from scientific laboratories, and military professionals. To carry out their plans, we need a relatively small but highly trained Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps ready for instant use.

Our military leaders admit that there is no defense against the atomic bomb except political statesmanship. Universal military training would not defend us. The bomb, our industrial power, and our scientific know-how gives us our present military advantage. But we shall never be safe until peace through the United Nations is made secure throughout the world.

Chicago Tribune, June 4, 1947:

The Commission fails to make out a case for a mass army as the best means of defense. In a war involving scientific horrors it would seem that defense and counterattack would most safely be entrusted to technicians rather than to semitrained youngsters.

With the enactment of conscription we should take another long stride toward military dictatorship.

Hartford Times, Hartford, Conn., June 19, 1947:

The parents of America also do not believe that universal training is the most democratic method of building an army unless and until the new volunteer system fails to provide the necessary manpower. Only grim necessity can make coercion democratic.

Chicago Daily News, June 3, 1947:

Their findings, however, are not likely to persuade anyone not already persuaded. * * * The fact is, however, that the technological revolution has been so rapid and is continuing with such speed, that there would be real difficulty in deciding what to teach young men even if we decided to train them. New specialties crowd us too fast.

New York Post, June 3, 1947, column by Samuel Grafton:

It is lame to say that by arming ourselves on the scale called for, we can contribute to the strength of the United Nations; for the United Nations was set up to make such individual displays unnecessary and was sold to us on the argument that we would save these costs. To say otherwise is like hailing a small outbreak of flu as a help to an immunization program.

Oregon Statesman, Salem, Oreg., June 4, 1947:

We confess to considerable skepticism as to the virtue of a 6-month basic training as a means of national defense. It would subject youth to the regimen of army life, to camp discipline; but in 6 months they could learn little of modern warfare.

Chicago Sun, June 4, 1947:

It can be argued with some force that by increasing our military strength we can acquire new bargaining power in international councils to secure peace. On the other hand, if the possession of atomic weapons and incomparable economic strength has not given us the necessary bargaining power is it likely that 6 months training of 18-year-olds would do so? Can universal disarmament really be attained by universal rearmament? Does the road to peace lie through the increase of military force at a time when a war-weary world cries out for relief from military burdens?

The Marshall Plan Versus the Truman Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an analysis of my own on the Marshall plan in the Appendix of the RECORD:

On March 12 President Truman set forth the Truman doctrine in an address to the Congress. In my judgment, this attempted to establish a policy of indiscriminate intermeddling in any part of the world, in unlimited amounts, and unlimited in scope, whenever Russia or any other nation might act, either directly or through organized minorities, in any other country. When the Congress approved the Greek-Turkish loan and miiltary mission, this policy was substantially ratified. No matter what the terms of the Greek-Turkish bill were, every nation in the world, as well as the bulk of my own people, looked upon this as stamping an O. K. on the President's speech. I opposed this program. It gave to Russia certain control, not only over our foreign commitments, but, to some degree at least, over our own domestic policy. We were pledged to oppose all Russian action anywhere, except possibly in the Western Hemisphere, or else ignominiously to abandon the policy. Russia was in position, therefore, to force us to move or to retreat by acting when and where she saw fit to do so. Russia was able to damage our prestige or force upon us commitments and expenditures which could not be estimated even approximately, but which could easily run to five or ten billion dollars annually. The President's speech was directed straight at Russia.

This month our Secretary of State, George Marshall, has outlined what is known as the Marshall plan. Many people have asked me what are the essential differences between the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine. There are two main distinctions or aspects. The Marshall plan is a reasoned approach to the international problem. It seeks to find out what the other nations can and will do before we undertake any blank check commitments, or even any obligations at all. Secondly, it is an obvious attempt to bail out the Truman doctrine. Since Truman's enunciation of it, this has already been demonstrated to be fallacious by the Russian coup in Hungary and by the progress made by the Communist movement in Italy and France, where the Communists now control the entire labor movement in both countries. We have not been able to do anything about this except to listen to some heated statements by the President. These have had no visible effect. Our prestige has suffered correspondingly. Secretary of State Marshall is seeking to substitute an intelligent program for the Truman doctrine. The latter has turned out exactly as predicted in my previous talks on this subject.

In one part of his speech at Harvard University Secretary Marshall almost directly contradicted President Truman, a most unusual thing for a Secretary of State to do. He said:

Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be a revival of a working economy in the world, so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist. Such assistance, I am convinced, must not be on a piecemeal basis as various crisis develop.

President Truman's speech was aimed at Russia and at communism and contemplated intermeddling in every piecemeal crisis, stirred up by Russia whenever Russia saw fit to make trouble and force us to overextend ourselves.

In addition, Secretary Marshall's first concern is to learn how much the overall program will cost and whether others will help. President Truman never even thought of the cost until weeks after he had made our commitment to anti-Communist foreign aid. General Marshall demands that the European nations do three things: First, they must draw up a balance sheet of the resources and needs. Secondly, they must work out a blueprint of self-help. And thirdly, they must submit to the United States how much they need and how the United States can best help them to help themselves. He requires Europe to take the initiative to get together, to pool their resources and to present a workable plan. If Europe does that, and only if, then the United States will study Europe's plan and decide whether it is sound and whether it has a reasonable chance of accomplishing its intended purpose, and whether it is worth while for us to cooperate. The Secretary also opened the door for Russian cooperation with the rest of Europe in his plan. If Russia does not go along, then the Secretary of State offers western Europe, outside of the Soviet Union, the privilege of attempting to work out their own salvation for themselves. He recognizes that the misery of the countries in Europe is interconnected and that there can be no recovery for one without recovery of all. Impliedly, he recognizes the fallacy of our policy to date. We have been giving Europe a dole on the theory that Europe would be able to come back on its own. There has been little reconstruction or rebuilding of industry. Europe is not much more self-sufficient today than it was 2 years ago. Our money has merely tided them along. Most countries of Europe have not made much effort, nor have most European countries—in justice to them—had much with which to work. What we have sent to Europe to date has, for the most part, been wasted insofar as creating any material recovery in that area, or placing that part of the world on a self-sustaining basis.

I believe the Marshall plan has great possibilities. It will require a gigantic statesmanship in Europe. Can these European countries submerge their differences, outlooks, and viewpoints, and work together? Experience during the past years is not encouraging. The greatest source of failure lies in Europe itself. If Europe does not take these preliminary steps, then clearly our efforts would be futile, whatever they might be. Therein lies the soundness of the Marshall plan. We are to find out first. Only thereafter do we make commitments or take action.

If Europe proves that it can and will attempt the seemingly impossible, then the United States will be confronted with two questions. Can we afford to reconstruct Europe? We must learn of our own resources and of the cost of the program before deciding this. On the opposite pole is the further question: Can we afford not to reconstruct Europe, in view of what the failure to do so will have on our economic position?

Mr. Speaker, the above statement, in substantially this form, was presented by me over radio station WHP at 1:30 p. m. on June 29, 1947, shortly after the Marshall plan was adopted.

A Select Committee To Study Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein a resolution which I introduced on January 3, 1947, creating a select committee of the House of Representatives to conduct an investigation of the economic and political foreign policy of the United States.

I wish to compliment and congratulate the leadership of this House upon the decision to establish a special committee with power to investigate both at home and abroad the requirements of war-devastated countries and the resources and the ability of the United States to assist in the economic rehabilitation of the world.

At this crucial juncture in world affairs such a committee will prove to be

of inestimable value in charting the course of the United States in the troubled months and years to come. The executive branch of the Government through special committees appointed by the President and through the State Department is conducting economic surveys. It is very gratifying to know that this will now be done on the congressional level and that the House of Representatives by means of a special committee will investigate and study prior to taking action.

I am including in the RECORD a resolution which I introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress on November 29, 1945, and reintroduced it in the Eightieth Congress on January 3, 1947.

I hope the powers of the special committee will be sufficiently extensive to do what I have suggested in this resolution.

House Resolution 28

Resolved, that there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 23 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 1 of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct—

(1) a comprehensive study of all phases, both economic and political, of the foreign policy of the United States, including a complete review of our interests in all parts of the world; such study to be made with respect to each foreign country and each geographical region, such as the Balkan States, the Middle East, Central and South America, and so forth; and

(2) an investigation of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States.

(b) Such study and investigation shall be made for the purpose of enabling the committee to make such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to—

(1) the formulation and execution of a realistic over-all foreign policy for the United States which will serve the best interests of the United States;

(2) improvements in the operation and administration of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States;

(3) methods for securing accurate and up-to-date information concerning world conditions; and

(4) the communication of such information to be people of the United States.

SEC. 3. Such recommendations shall be embodied in reports to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) which shall be made by the committee during the present Congress at intervals of not more than 90 days; the first report to be made within 90 days after the date of the passage of this resolution and the final report to be made on January 2, 1949.

SEC. 4. For purposes of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Flying Saucers Prove United States Isn't Prepared for Surprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop:

FLYING SAUCERS PROVE UNITED STATES ISN'T PREPARED FOR SURPRISE

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON, July 13.—The flying saucers have served at least to pound one lesson home. That is that the United States has developed no effective warning system against surprise attack in this age of the new and terrible weapons. For if such a system had been in existence, the military authorities could instantly have ended speculation. They could have given those assurances which an effective warning system would instantly provide: "We know all that passes through the American air. You saw sunlight on the wings of high-flying aircraft—or you saw nothing—or you saw a meteor in the night sky." No such assurances were forthcoming. We do not have an effective warning system. We are not prepared for the worst.

Adequate defensive preparation for an all too possible worst will mean, in the opinions of those charged with planning for national security in this era of the atom bomb and the guided missile, two things. First, it will mean a radar umbrella extending over the whole continental United States, to give instant warning of any object which passed through the air over America. The incidental benefits of such an umbrella will be considerable; for example, it will undoubtedly serve to decrease air accidents. But its real purpose will be to flash in a moment to all defense headquarters news of the direction and weight of any enemy attack.

Such a system will be expensive. But the second prerequisite of an effective warning system will be more so. For advance warning bases, pushed out beyond the borders of the country, will also be necessary to provide those extra minutes or seconds for the launching of the American defensive counter-attack. To meet this dire necessity, very little has been done. The chain of joint American-Canadian warning stations and air bases projected along the Arctic frontier is still in the dream stage. One such base, at Churchill, on Hudson's Bay, does exist, for preliminary testing purposes. But its value even as a test base is doubtful.

Moreover, such bases, each in itself a major project, must be spaced at 200-mile intervals across the Arctic frontier. For the outer limit of radar range is 100 miles, and any gap might render the whole system valueless. Present estimates indicate that such an advance warning system will require an initial investment of at least a billion and a quarter dollars.

Yet unless the nightmare of surprise attack conjured up by the flying saucer scare is to become hard reality or unless a really secure world settlement is unexpectedly achieved, the money must be spent. The reason is simple. Very long-range supersonic aircraft and guided missiles have yet to be built, either by ourselves, by the Russians, or by anyone else. Yet such weapons are universally acknowledged to be possible, and therefore, unless there is a world settlement, certain to be built within a few years.

Moreover, intelligence reports indicate clearly that the Soviets are making an all-out attack, not only on the atomic problem, but on the whole vast mysterious area of the guided missile. In this total effort, the Soviets are being aided by no less than 7,000 hireling German scientists. Indeed, under Soviet supervision, the German scientists continued to manufacture the V-2's, the first successful supersonic missiles, in the eastern zone of Germany for some time after the war. One achievement of this continued experimentation was the A-9 rocket, designed first at Peenemunde during the furor in Sweden some months ago.

Employment of Aliens on Merchant Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following survey showing the effect of that part of Public Law No. 27, Eightieth Congress, which limits the employment of aliens on board merchant vessels of the United States after April 1, 1947, has been compiled by union officials at my request.

It indicates a material shortage of American seamen which was not anticipated at the time of the adoption of the above-mentioned legislation:

REPORT ON EFFECT OF PUBLIC LAW NO. 27 ON EFFICIENT MANNING AND DEPARTURE OF SHIPS IN PORT OF NEW YORK MONTH OF JUNE 1947

A survey has been made of the vessels leaving the port of New York from June 1 to June 30, to determine to what extent the exclusion of alien seamen has affected the sailing of ships on time, and fully manned. In this 30-day period, 75 vessels have left short one or more of the ratings called for in the crew complement. Fifty ships have been forced to delay departures from 1 day to 10 days, in an effort to obtain as complete a crew as possible. During this period there was a sufficient number of seamen available and anxious to ship, but who were denied permission to do so due to Public Law No. 27, which went into effect on June 1.

For example, while 59 ships left without a full crew, they were short a total of 88 able-bodied seamen. Our survey shows that there were 108 alien seamen on the beach during this period with able-bodied seaman endorsements.

There were 351 alien seamen waiting to ship during this month period—282 of them (5 out of 6), have skilled ratings, such as fireman, cook, able-bodied seaman, etc.

Among them there are 175 men with from 2 to 10 years at sea; 118 with from 11 to 20 years at sea; 20 with from 21 to 24 years at sea and 39 with from 25 to 45 years at sea; 59 with over 20 years at sea.

There were 107 torpedoings among these men, during the war. One hundred and three are married to American citizen-residents and 70 have American-born children.

The following are the names, companies, dates, and ratings of vessels which sailed late or short-handed due to Public Law No. 27:

S. S. *Charles D. Poston*, United States Lines; was due to leave on June 18; finally left June 24; still short one able-bodied seaman.

S. S. *Richard M. Johnson*, United States Lines; due to sail June 21; sailed 4 days late,

June 24; waiting for four able-bodied seamen and one fireman-water tender.

S. S. *Leonardo Romero*, Polarus Steamship Co.; sailed 3 days late, waiting for four able-bodied seamen and one fireman-water tender.

S. S. *Joaquin Miller*, Cosmopolitan Steamship Co.; due to sail June 19; finally sailed June 21, short one able-bodied seaman.

S. S. *Knob Knot*, Fall River Co.; sailed 2 days late, short one able-bodied seaman and one oiler.

S. S. *Michael J. Monahan*, United Fruit Co.; sailed 2 days late, waiting for two able-bodied seamen.

S. S. *Beckett Hitch*, Marine Transport; due to sail June 9; finally left June 11, short a boatswain and two able-bodied seamen.

S. S. *George Pendleton*, Grace Line ship; due to sail June 4; finally sailed June 6, short two able-bodied seamen and one fireman-water tender.

S. S. *Eastern Guide*, Prudential Steamship Co.; was delayed 1 day; finally sailed short boatswain, two oilers, and two able-bodied seamen, on June 24.

S. S *Cape Ann*, United Fruit Co.; vessel sailed a day late on June 11, short two able-bodied seamen.

S. S. *Florida Sword*, Sword Line Co.; sailed a day late waiting for two firemen-water tenders.

S. S. *Manderson Victory*, United States Lines; sailed a day late, waiting for one able-bodied seaman, one oiler, one electrician, and one fireman-water tender.

S. S. *Santa Marta*, United Fruit Co.; sailed a day late, still short two able-bodied seamen and one oiler.

S. S. *Biddeford Victory*, United States Lines vessel; sailed a day late, waiting for two able-bodied seamen; one fireman-water tender, and one oiler.

S. S. *Logansport*, National Bulk Carriers; sailed a day late, waiting for two deck mates and one able-bodied seaman, on June 5.

S. S. *William Halstead*, Moore-McCormack; sailed a day late, on June 5, waiting for two able-bodied seamen.

S. S. *Santa Sofia*, Grace Line ship; sailed 10 days late, on June 16, still short three able-bodied seamen, one junior engineer, one oiler, and one fireman-water tender.

S. S. *American Ranger*, United States Lines; sailed 5 days late after waiting for a deck utility and two able-bodied seamen.

S. S. *Santa Catalina*, Grace Line; was due to sail June 6; finally sailed June 10, 4 days late, short one fireman-water tender and one oiler.

S. S. *American Merchant*, United States Lines; was due to sail June 22; finally sailed short a boatswain and deck utility man.

S. S. *American Traveller*, United States Lines; sailed 3 days late on June 25 still short an able-bodied seaman and one fireman-water tender.

S. S. *American Scout*, United States Lines; sailed 3 days late waiting for a carpenter, a deck utility, two able-bodied seamen, one oiler, and an engine utility.

S. S. *Mormacpenn*, Moore-McCormack; due to sail June 12; sailed June 14 short one deck utility.

S. S. *Mormacsun*, Moore-McCormack; sailed June 20, 2 days late, after waiting for a boatswain, deck utility and an able-bodied seaman and wiper.

S. S. *Santa Inez*, Grace Line; 2 days late on June 4; short one fireman-water tender and one oiler.

S. S. *Coastal Captain*, AGWI Lines; sailed June 20, 2 days late, still short a boatswain, two able-bodied seamen and a deck mate.

S. S. *Mormacoak*, Moore-McCormack; sailed June 25, 1 day late, short three junior engineers.

S. S. *Exford*, American Export; sailed a day late on June 26 after waiting for two able-bodied seamen.

S. S. *Mesh Knot*, AGWI Lines; sailed June 25, a day late, after waiting for two able-bodied seamen and two oilers.

S. S. *Mormacisle*, Moore-McCormack; sailed on June 24, a day late, short four able-bodied seamen and one fireman-water tender.

S. S. *Santa Ana*, Grace Lines; sailed June 18, a day late, short one fireman-water tender.

S. S. *American Forwarder*, United States Lines; sailed 1 day late on June 5, short 1 able-bodied seaman and one deck utility.

S. S. *Cape Alexander*, AGWI Lines; sailed on June 14, a day late, waiting for three able-bodied seamen, one oiler, one fireman-water tender, and one electrician.

S. S. *Exporter*, American Export; sailed a day late on June 11 while waiting for one able-bodied seaman.

S. S. *Santa Clara*, Grace Lines; sailed on June 25, a day late, short two junior engineers.

The following vessels sailed shorthanded in the month of June:

S. S. *Anchor Bend*, United Fruit, sailed June 21 short deck mate and able-bodied seaman.

S. S. *Attleboro Victory*, United States Lines, sailed June 14 short one able-bodied seaman.

S. S. *Cape Isabel*, United Fruit, sailed June 21 short one oiler.

S. S. *Cape Race*, AGWI Line, sailed June 11 short one able-bodied seaman.

S. S. *Creighton Victory*, Black Diamond, sailed, June 21, short one able-bodied seaman.

S. S. *Crown Diamond*, Marine Transport, sailed June 19 short two able-bodied seamen.

S. S. *Gainesville Victory*, Black Diamond, sailed June 10 short two able-bodied seamen and one deck mate.

S. S. *Gulf Mills*, Gulf Oil, sailed June 21 short one pumpman.

S. S. *James Wheeler*, Grace Line, sailed June 21 short two firemen-water tenders.

S. S. *Pacific Victory*, American export, sailed June 20 short two able-bodied seamen.

S. S. *Union Victory*, Black Diamond, sailed June 24 short three able-bodied seamen, one deck mate.

S. S. *West Linn Victory*, Black Diamond, sailed June 24 short one deck mate.

S. S. *African Moon*, American South African, sailed June 21 short one able-bodied seaman.

S. S. *Exchequer*, American Export, sailed June 21 short one deck mate and two able-bodied seamen.

S. S. *Nonpareil*, Lykes Bros., sailed June 21 short one able-bodied seaman.

S. S. *Kendall Fish*, Lykes Bros., sailed June 14 short one able-bodied seaman and one firemen-water tender.

S. S. *Arthur Riggs*, Polarus, ship sailed June 28 short a bosun, and one deck mate a day late.

S. S. *Augustana Victory*, United States Lines; sailed June 28 a day late waiting for a deck mate, four able-bodied seamen, and one junior engineer.

S. S. *Gainesville Victory*, Black Diamond, vessel, sailed June 28 short one junior engineer.

S. S. *Leader Loop*, North Atlantic & Gulf, sailed June 28 a day late short one deck mate.

S. S *Norcuba*, North Atlantic & Gulf, sailed June 27 short one deck mate.

S. S. *Parkersburg Victory*, United States Lines; sailed June 28, 2 days late, short one able-bodied seaman.

S. S. *T. J. Stevenson*, Stevenson Co., sailed June 27, a day late, waiting for one officers' steward and two able-bodied seamen.

S. S. *Union Victory*, Black Diamond; sailed June 24 short three able-bodied seamen, one deck mate.

S. S. *West Lynn Victory*, Black Diamond; sailed June 24 short one deck mate.

S. S. *Whittier Victory*, Moore-McCormack; sailed June 30, 2 days late, short one deck mate.

S. S. *Santa Eliana*, Grace Line; still waiting on June 30, waiting for three able-bodied seamen, two acting able-bodied seamen, one wiper.

S. S. *AGWI Queen*, AGWI Line; still waiting on June 30 for one chief electrician.

S. S. *Marine Perch*, American Export; left June 26, short one engineer, utility.

S. S. *Santa Maria*, Grace Line; sailed June 27 short one junior engineer.

S. S. *Mormacmoon*, Moore-McCormack; still waiting on June 30, already 2 days late, waiting to get three able-bodied seamen and two oilers.

S. S. *Belle of the Sea*, United States Lines; sailed June 28, a day late, short one deck mate.

S. S. *Mormacswan*, Moore-McCormack; sailed June 27 short an oiler.

S. S. *Stag Hound*, United States Lines; sailed June 26, waiting for one carpenter, one deck utility, one acting able-bodied, and one OS.

S. S. *Defiance*, Lykes Bros.; sailed 3 days late, June 28, short one FWT.

S. S. *Mormacelm*, Moore-McCormack; sailed June 14 a day late, short one able-bodied and two acting able-bodied seamen.

S. S. *James Bennett Moore*, United States Lines; sailed 1 day late, short one able-bodied.

Address by Hon. Francis J. Myers Before Pennsylvania Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Where Do We Go From Here?" delivered by me at the annual encampment of Veterans of Foreign Wars of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, Pa., on July 16, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to express my appreciation to your State commander, Mr. John U. Shroyer, for this invitation to address you today at your annual encampment. I have always had a high regard for the Veterans of Foreign Wars as an alert, effective, and vigorous organization, and I want to congratulate you all as members and delegates for the way you and your organization in the past have gone about the task of translating veterans' needs and desires into direct action.

It is because the VFW has shown such vigor as well as vigilance in the veteran's interest that I think I can today discuss some of the major issues facing us all, and particularly facing the veteran, and discuss them in the knowledge that if I can succeed in presenting a convincing and a reasonable approach to some of these issues that this organization and you delegates today representing it can be counted on not only to interest yourself in these problems—you have already shown great interest in the great issues facing America—but to proceed to do something about them.

Down in Washington, we in the Congress are now rushing pell-mell into the home stretch of a comparatively short but of a very turbulent session of Congress. It is the second full session since the end of the war. My own opinion is that it has not been a particularly productive session, but I do not want to dwell on that aspect or on my opinions because that might be reaching into the realms of politics, and I do not think politics deserve a place in my remarks at a meeting of this type.

I mean, of course, partisan politics. Any discussion of what this Congress, now in session, has done which I think it shouldn't have done or has not done which I think it should have done would, undoubtedly, be construed as partisan for the simple reason that I am a member of the minority party in the Congress.

But politics, properly speaking, means the science of government, means aspects of public policy, and therefore touches closely on any discussion today of anything and everything which affects our lives, our health and safety, our very existence as a nation.

I am going to touch on some of these things, but I want to assure you that I want to keep that discussion involving politics on the level of politics in the highest sense.

It may be something of a surprise to you, as it was to me, to discover that a lot of Americans, only two short years after the end of this last war, seem to believe that insofar as our veterans are concerned, everything has been taken care of and there remains very little for our Government or our country to do for veterans as such. Of course, this is not true; but, nevertheless, since we have appropriated billions upon billions of dollars for veterans and for their benefits, this impression seems to be gaining that the money in itself and by itself takes care of just about all of our obligations and so we can sit back now and forget about the veteran as such and devote all our energies to looking out for ourselves, conducting business as usual, politics as usual, and government as usual.

This complacent feeling is not only restricted to matters affecting veterans; it is, in fact, mushrooming out to such an extent that a lot of Americans, far too many Americans, are becoming complacent about everything, are settling back into deceptive security in the false belief that everything is going to turn out all right, so why worry?

Perhaps it is natural after a war as long and as hard and as bitter and as bloody and as costly as this past war that our people, burdened as they were by the strains and the worries and the sacrifices that war brought to them, should insist now, nearly 2 years after the end of that war, that they be given an opportunity to relax.

But, my friends, there is a happy medium in relaxing as in everything else. We in America, many of our political figures particularly, and many of our people, seem to think that letting down from the strains and the demands of war means going to the other extreme and relaxing with all our might—working, you might say, at this business of taking things easier and not getting excited.

I think America has relaxed a little too much, and I think you will agree with me.

Let's go back, say, 2 years or so, for a little perspective. The war in Europe was over but many of you and millions like you were still in Europe, still, for all practical purposes, at war. Hundreds and thousands and millions of the troops in Europe this time 2 years ago were headed for Japan. Others were headed home but with no idea when you would actually get home. I know you were pretty pessimistic about the prospects and the talk was going around that you weren't going to get home, either, because you would be sent to new stations in the Far East or otherwise kept abroad so that you would not come home to create an unemployment problem. I know how strong that conviction was among many of our troops in Europe 2 years ago. Of course, that talk was false, but it was a little bit hard, I imagine, for you to disregard it.

On the other side of the world, those of you who were there were being told, or you began thinking on your own, that you were going to be there for perhaps 3, 4, 5 years before the job you were doing—the dirty, bloody job—would be finished.

That was the dark side of the picture 2 years ago. There was a bright side, too. In nearly all your letters from home, no doubt, and in the newspapers you might have been receiving from home, and over the radio and in little documentary movies and in the magazines which might have found their way to you and in the speeches in the Congress you might have read if anyone in your outfit was able to come across a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you were being told how much all of us in America appreciated what you were doing and how we were going to see to it that when you got back nothing—nothing—would be too good for Joe. It would be an altogether different America from the America you left. It would be a different world. You wouldn't know the place.

Perhaps all that sounds a little hollow now, undoubtedly a good many of you have a let-down feeling. Things haven't quite worked out as rosily as we were convinced they would.

But there is one point about all of this that I insist you must believe. When the people of the United States—all of us—told you 2 years ago how wonderful it was going to be and what all was going to be done primarily in your behalf, they meant it. They really did; take my word for it, nobody was kidding.

Well, then, what happened to make some of those promises ring so hollow today? What happened to the homes we were going to have waiting for you? What happened to all of those postwar wonders in washing machines, television, and sleek automobiles, and snazzy gadgets that you were going to be able to buy? Our factories are turning those things out now in volumes but somehow, for some reason, the veteran is not on a buying binge. It is a very simple reason: he just doesn't have the money. Jobs are plentiful—in most parts of the country; that is, and in most of Pennsylvania, too, although not in all parts of the State—and wages are pretty high. Just imagine where you young veterans of World War II would be sitting today with your present income if prices were something like they were in 1939, if housing were as reasonable as in 1939.

I don't want to belabor the point because I think that each of you has thought more than once, thought often, of this very situation. Prices did not have to go as high as they have gone and housing did not have to shoot up to such ridiculous pricing heights that the veteran, even the comparatively well-to-do veteran, is priced out of the market.

Although there were plenty of warnings 2 years ago and last year that we were headed for just such in inflationary spiral as we are now experiencing, that we were relaxing—in this case relaxing controls—too quickly and that the result would be unfair to the veteran particularly, I sincerely believe that no one really expected things to get as bad as they are insofar as housing and prices are concerned. I sincerely think that everyone expected a certain degree of moderation would prevail. Unfortunately, however, everyone looked to the other fellow to practice that moderation and thought perhaps that if most prices remained stable, demand being as high as it is, the occasional individual here or there could raise his own prices a mite without really disrupting our economy. It was a surprise to those who operated on this optimistic theory to discover that after they raised their own prices a mite everyone was raising prices in turn and the result now is little short of chaotic.

In the meantime complacency took such a strong hold that we have had no action on long-range housing or long-range social and economic problems which cry for solution, which will be infinitely harder to solve as we let them go without attention.

The VFW has done an outstanding job, I think, in support of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft long-range housing bill, reintroduced this year as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It has done an effective job, too, I think, in spot lighting the needs of the veteran on education or on-the-job training subsistence allowances and it has otherwise done a fine job in representing the veteran. On some of these things your organization and the other veterans' organizations are meeting with great success, particularly when the veteran angle is clear and obvious. On other matters where the veteran shares with the rest of our citizens in programs designed to maintain and expand our prosperity and improve conditions generally—and I mean, particularly, the housing bill—the success is not as spectacular because of the failure of many of our officials in the Congress and in the legislatures to realize how closely bound up to the veteran morale and veteran need and veteran requirements some of these programs are. A great deal more education on this aspect of the problem would help to solve the problem. The VFW can be proud of its efforts so far in this direction.

Perhaps the most important single problem facing the veteran is the same problem facing everyone in America and everyone in the world, that is, the problem of achieving a real and enduring peace so that we can, for the first time in our history and in history, know that a peace so dearly won is going to last.

Two years ago the United Nations was being created in an aura of friendship of trust and of alliance among all nations except those which had so recently tried to bathe the world in blood. That San Francisco Conference was one of the most thrilling chapters in modern history. We ascribed to the infant organization it created all the virtues and few if any vices. Familiar with the failings of the old League of Nations—failings for which we were to some important extent responsible because of the refusal of this country to join the League a generation ago and help make it work—but, familiar with the failings of the old League, we were determined to avoid those mistakes this time. The charter which was drawn up at San Francisco was regarded by most people as solving all the problems of peace all by itself.

Of course, it didn't; of course, it couldn't. It has been with reluctance, however, that we have discovered the weaknesses in the charter, as they have developed because all of us wished with all our might that the charter would not develop weaknesses and that with it in operation we would just sit back and relax here, too, and let this question of peace largely take care of itself. You see, we all wanted so much not to have to worry all the time about world peace along with all of our other problems.

During the period, however, when we were almost convinced that world problems were just about all solved, we began to find in this country a renewal and a revival of the isolationist sentiment which almost resulted only a few short years ago in disaster for us and for the whole world. The feeling began to grow again in areas and among groups where it had once been strong that we did not have to devote much time or money or effort anymore to assuring peace because we had done our share and everything was in good shape. At the same time, a new trend developed with the end of the war for drastic Government economy. Here again the idea was that everything was taken care of now, that the United Nations was going to maintain peace, that the people of the devastated countries would suddenly, and as if by magic, revive their agriculture to the point where it could feed them and revive their industries to the point where their plants could provide them with the necessities of life and enough in addition so that they could engage again in foreign trade and help restore their economies. That was the comforting idea of those who hoped to see drastic Government economy.

The result of this hope—a false hope, a hope not based on realistic understanding of the colossal nature of the problems of reconstruction—was an overpowering drive to cut and cut and cut, to cut the Army and Navy and our Air Corps, our military research programs, our programs for relief and aid abroad.

These two forces, the reviving isolationism and the postwar reaction against high taxes and government costs, inevitably met and fell in love. Their partnership now provides us, and the world, with one of our greatest obstacles to achieving that real and enduring peace we all seek.

There are, of course, additional factors—the spectre of expanding communism, less as an economic force—that comes later—than as a political force, a force for the creation of chaos where none exists, for the exploitation and the ballooning and the encouraging of chaos and of misery and of hunger and despair where they do exist.

The historic Marxian-Trotsky theory that security for communism in any one nation—for instance, now in Russia—can be assured only by a world won for communism—is again on the march. Although Trotsky was banished and hounded and finally assassinated, the theory he left with the Soviet Union has lived on and is now, apparently, Russian policy.

I think we have an infinitely more attractive brand of political philosophy to sell to the men and women of Europe and the world than the Communists have. I believe, with further and expanded efforts on our part to show the peoples of Europe how firmly we stand committed to personal liberty and to individual economic as well as political freedom, we can win this war of ideologies, a cold and bloodless war which has in it, however, the makings of real conflict.

But we must do more than outfight the Russians economically; we must continue to make clear to Russia, and to all other nations, that we still stand committed wholeheartedly, unwaveringly, to a decent world, to the world we envisaged when the San Francisco Charter was being drawn up in such an aura of hope and of friendship, and that we are ready, at any time, to discuss fully and completely the issues which carry within them the seeds of possible conflict.

Unfortunately, Russia, within the United Nations and without, has shown no disposition, particularly in the last year, to discuss anything except on Russia's own terms, terms often absurdly indifferent to the realities of an atomic era.

We have made every effort—we have even been accused of going much too far and of appeasing her—to cooperate with the Soviet Union on solving the vital issues of atomic energy, of feeding Europe's starving, of restoring political self-determination to some of the former enemy nations, of finding common grounds for establishment of an international United Nations police force capable of maintaining peace, of finding common ground on the definition of what constitutes liberty and freedom and human rights. In every one of those instances we have failed to reach real accord. We have failed because the cooperation was a one-way street. Russia has conceded nothing, has budged on nothing.

Now had we not gone as far as we did to try to find a common ground with this rival colossus, had we given up trying to cooperate after the first half-dozen or dozen snubs and rebuffs, we might today be divided over whether or not we had really done our best to achieve real peace. I think now there is common agreement in America and among the peoples of all free nations—those who have access to the factual news of world affairs—that in the present mood of the Russian leadership cooperation and understanding are beyond achievement at this particular time. We know that now, although, here again, it is a decision we had to force ourselves to make and when we did make it we did so with the utmost reluctance, for we in America, and I think all free peoples, hate to concede that cooperation with Russia seems to be unobtainable at this time.

Where does all this leave us, and where do we go from here?

Members of the VFW, all of whom have participated in at least one bloody war overseas, and some of whom have participated in two or even three, are no more and no less involved in this dilemma than are all Americans, but you men, who have experienced war and know its curse first hand, are in a remarkable position to help the rest of the citizenry realize its obligations.

We must, of course, remain strong, powerful, alert, and mobile until the day is reached—God grant it be soon—that the true international cooperation we foresaw 2 years ago at San Francisco is made into actual reality.

We must, also, pursue unwaveringly the commitments we have made in Europe and elsewhere to see to it that free peoples, particularly those who fought so nobly with us in the past war, can retain control of their own destinies, their own futures, especially if that can be assured merely with effort and with dollars. It is a difficult road ahead, there is no doubt. It is not one to encourage complacency. It is a rocky road, and, yes, it is an expensive one to travel. We don't even have the guarantee that after we have traveled it, we will achieve our final aims of a free and decent and peaceful world.

But, my friends, do we have any alternative but to allow the world, by default, to sink into its own misery and despair, sink so low as to drag us, eventually, into the very conflicts we hope to avoid?

Isolationism and "economy," hand in hand, present us an attractive deception. We can't afford to be fooled by it.

You men, who have seen what those twin deceivers can bring us to, can be counted on, I am sure, to see to it that America never again drops its guard, never again crawls into its own self-sufficient shell unmindful of the dangerous waves lapping on our shores.

Rebuilding the National Integrity of Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able and informative address by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] before the national convention of the Young Republican National Federation, at Milwaukee, Wis., June 7 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American private capital investments in Asia, Europe, and South America, backed by American brains, ingenuity, and know-how, will gradually raise the standard of living of the world.

To encourage the investment and operation of such capital it is necessary to rebuild the national and international integrity of the nations of the world.

Each of the nations of the world should become as near self-supporting as reasonably possible. International trade breeds competition between nations and ultimately leads to war. This is the record over the last 2,000 years.

Congress does not know how to lend money; they only know how to give it away.

Private business not only knows how to lend and invest money, but it also knows how to collect it and to make the investments pay dividends.

Few remember that when America woke up after the Civil War it was England's businessmen and private investors who furnished the first substantial financing for our transcontinental railroads and heavy industries in this country because they knew that this Nation had integrity and that the country would grow and prosper.

The situation is now reversed. Our businessmen have the experience, the credit, and the know-how. The opportunities for profitable investment throughout the world are almost unlimited, providing the integrity of the nations members of the United Nations Organization can be established and maintained.

The objective is permanent peace while increasing the standard of living throughout the world.

It must be recognized, however, that the 55 different standards of living represented by the 55 members of the United Nations present a definite problem in trade relations.

A partial answer to the problem is the determination of the differential of the cost of production on specific products between this Nation and wherever our chief competition is located. That differential should be represented in this country by an import fee. Imports are not prevented by such an import fee, but the fees bring the goods in on the basis of an equal wage-standard of living level; as the standard of living wages are raised in other countries the import fees here are reduced in proportion—and when the standard of living of the competitive country approximates our own—then free trade is the immediate and automatic result.

Such a flexible import fee is included in the 1930 flexible tariff act in which it is provided that the President of the United States may at any time request the Tariff Commission to compute the differential of cost of production of any specific product between this country and such competitive nation—that amount can then be made the tariff or import fee by Executive order.

When money is loaned to foreign nations by the Congress of the United States, such loans should only be made to increase the productivity of that country—and should never be loaned to a government (as it has in the past) simply to pay the current running expenses of that government.

We should secure what we loan by taking a lien or mortgage on the increased production, and thus have a reasonable prospect that the loan will be repaid. This routine precaution is observed in connection with our own citizens.

We have put out approximately $17,000,000,000 through various agencies of the Government in so-called loans, gifts, and food supplies since the end of World War II and unless our policies are changed in this connection this is only a start.

I have learned about more ways of siphoning the taxpayers' money out of the Treasury and into the pockets of foreign nations during my 5 months on the floor of the United States Senate than I ever knew existed—it is incredible.

First, comes the direct appropriation by Congress loaned to a foreign nation; the Greek-Turkey loan is an example—second, there is the financing through the Export-Import Bank, as in the case of the loan to Mexico—third, treaties like the Italian agreement just ratified by the United States Senate in which it is provided that raw materials from Russia and other nations are proc-

essed by the Italian workers without wages of any kind as reparation payments, leaving someone (meaning Uncle Sam) to feed them while they are doing slave work for the Russians during a period of 7 years—fourth, the World Bank is set up to sell securities to the investors of this Nation, whose money is then loaned to the foreign nations, with every prospect that thousands of small investors in this country will lose as in the case of English investors through the Bank of England when the same thing was tried there many years ago.

The fifth method, even more dangerous than the first four, is the proposal by the State Department to divide the markets of this country with the foreign nations through the so-called reciprocal-trade program. More harm may be done to the economy and standard of living of this country by our State Department in Geneva during the next 3 months than Congress could repair in several years.

The cumulative result of these plans can only be greatly reduced wages and similarly reduced standards of living in this country.

If these methods are allowed to continue indefinitely we can easily spend ourselves into a form of government we would not knowingly vote for—some kind of a collective or authoritarian form that it could require generations of time to throw off, if in fact we could ever overcome it.

There is now in the course of organization a world trade organization which is supposed to operate by majority vote and establish trade relations throughout the world. It is difficult to see how we can win.

There is no better organization than the Young Republican National Federation to get into this fight and help straighten out our thinking.

Let us get our feet back on the ground and face this thing—we have no friends in the world today except through the protection or of the money that we can offer them. Every nation but ours is being intensely realistic and practical—other nations are working on every angle to improve their position.

England has just completed a trade treaty with Russia providing that she will, in effect, process Russia's raw materials—furnishing Russia with the manufactured goods that Russia needs, including jet planes and other heavy industrial machinery the Communists can use in case of war.

It is time that we adopted an American policy in furtherance of an American international policy geared to our national economy that makes sense and that we can continue to support through good times and bad.

It is time that we adopted a definite policy in the method of emergency feeding the people of any country, of appropriating the necessary funds and of notifying such nations that the required credit has been established through the proper agency in this country. When shipments of the supplies are made in the approved manner, then the invoice should be sent direct to the Treasury of the United States for payment—quit sending them the cash to be expended anywhere in the world and in any way they may decide.

Treat them like a groceryman treats a contractor whose payments for his work are delayed. The contractor gets credit; he does not get the money from the groceryman so he can go across the street and buy from his competitor.

Adopt a policy of loaning money to foreign nations, and only loaning for the purpose of increasing their productivity. Take a lien or mortgage on the increased productivity to run until the loan is repaid; loan the money for the purchase of industrial and farm machinery, equipment for the production of fertilizer and income-producing materials.

Handle it just like the people treat a good neighbor who has had a bad fire; loan him a team of horses and a plow, and maybe sign a small note at the bank to buy his seed corn and a few necessary things until he makes his first crop.

Put the wrecked nations in the way of supporting themselves, otherwise there is no end to their needs; they will be just as hungry next year as they are now.

There is no magic way to bring everybody up to our standard of living overnight. This thing of making war has been going on for 5,000 years of recorded history. The record shows that there has been almost continuous war in progress somewhere in the world all of those centuries. They are in progress right now, and more are in the making.

What can we do in the meantime? The answer is comparatively simple. Remain strong, make our system work, keep up our armed forces, and continue with our laboratory experiments in methods of warfare; keep our secrets to ourselves so that no nation ever knows just how strong we are. No one ever picked a fight on the street with Jack Dempsey. Establish and maintain the best intelligence system in the world and know at all times what other nations are doing. And get back to our business of making a living and minding our own business.

Entry of Displaced Persons Into the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from the New York Times of July 15 and 17 and the Baltimore Sun and Washington Post of July 16 with regard to the question of legislation authorizing entry of a number of displaced persons into this country.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 15, 1947]

IT'S NOT TIME THAT'S LACKING

Senator VANDENBERG came out of yesterday's bipartisan conference with President Truman with the announcement that it seemed "all but impossible" to adjust the immigration laws at this session to admit displaced persons. If this is true, the Stratton bill and one of similar intent in the Senate will die. Something else will die, too. We have posed as a great humanitarian Nation. In loans and gifts, made and projected, we act in a humanitarian manner, but our kindliness, down to the present moment, seems to be for far-away peoples. We turn chilly at the prospect of admitting, by an adjustment of quotas, within a space of 4 years, the equivalent of one stranger for each 350 of our present population. The strangers would be of several faiths and various national origins. The overwhelming majority of them would be refugees from communism, which most of us don't like, either. What will die if these bills die is the refugees' faith in us.

Congress is in a hurry to get home. The refugees, who have spent 2 or more years in camps, without homes, are probably in a hurry to get somewhere too. The proposal to let some of them in by diverting unused quotas has been before the Eightieth Congress since January 6, when President Truman included it in his message on the State of the Nation. The Stratton bill has been in the House since the beginning of April. There has been time enough.

The program of the Stratton bill is a little thing to do for those who stood with us in the late war, and stand with us now. It is much more of a thing to do for ourselves, for these would be carefully selected immigrants, many of them bringing skills we need. Congress can find time for this measure, or for a compromise between this and the Senate bill, if it wants to. If it does want to, it can make many more than 400,000 friends for us; it can increase our own self-respect; it can answer the critics who call us hardhearted hypocrites.

[From the New York Times of July 17, 1947]

LAST APPEAL FOR THE DP'S

The strong voice of Secretary Marshall has now been raised in a final plea to Congress to admit "a substantial number" of Europe's 850,000 displaced persons to this country. Congressional leaders offer only a plea in avoidance—that there is not time before adjournment to pass the Stratton bill, providing for the admission of 400,000 of these homeless and stateless refugees in the next 4 years. Mr. Marshall's answer is that it must be done if our national honor is to remain untarnished. Otherwise we shall stand before the world as a nation which fails to practice what it preaches and draws aside while urging others to come to the rescue.

There has been plenty of time to pass such legislation. It has been hanging fire for almost 7 months. The stubborn opposition to it is seldom openly formulated, but it seems to be based chiefly on the idea that lowering the bars to these immigrants would open the way for a Communist infiltration. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Most of these tragic people are fugitives from Soviet tyranny—Balts, Poles, Yugoslavs, Ukrainians, and others—who would rather die than return to the slavery and oppression they have known at first hand. Almost all of them are middle-class skilled workmen and tradesmen who would soon find a place among us. Russia demands their forcible return. There they would be ground to extinction as labor-camp expendables.

At least we will not consent to that. Secretary Marshall points out that if we permit them to remain where they are (and, incidentally, at a cost of $182,000,000 a year to our taxpayers), they will be a continual source of conflict and friction with Russia. But the Secretary's appeal is based on altogether higher and broader grounds—our professed humanity, the good opinion of mankind, and the old tradition of America as a home for oppressed and freedom-loving people. "That is the significance of the Statue of Liberty," he told one recalcitrant committeeman.

His plea before the House Judiciary Committee is backed by Secretary of War Patterson and Secretary of Commerce Harriman in equally strong terms. Many other countries, among them Great Britain, Belgium, Norway, Brazil, and Venezuela, are opening their gates while we refuse. The issue has become a test of our sincerity and moral leadership in the world. If we put up our own iron curtain against these helpless victims of chaos, it will not be they alone who lose. We, too, will lose something precious—the respect of our friends and our faith in ourselves.

[From the Baltimore Sun of July 16, 1947]

ARE WE TOO BUSY FOR THIS?

One outcome of the meeting of congressional leaders with President Truman was an agreement that the rush of legislative business made it all but impossible to take

action on a proposal to allow a substantial number of Europe's displaced persons to seek refuge here. Congress wants to close shop on July 26, and that supposedly does not leave time enough for its members to think about the 900,000 homeless refugees now wasting away in detention camps.

Is this Nation going to turn its back on a homeless multitude just on the flimsy excuse that we do not have the time now to think about them? After all the talking we have done about being the great humanitarian influence in the world, the champions of peace and good will, it would be a sorry spectacle if we did nothing to help the victims of Nazi slave labor and political oppression to find new homes. The liberation of Europe's uprooted and persecuted families was one of our primary reasons for going to war, and liberation does not mean freedom to rot in a detention camp.

Congress should never be so busy that it does not have time for such a matter. It costs us nothing to help people who only ask for the chance to help themselves. It does not even cost us much of our precious time. The issue of the DP's plight has been clearly presented. Any opposition to their entrance here has been discounted as mere prejudice against foreigners. Now Congress has only to decide whether this country will live up to its obligations and highly vaunted ideals or let the world know that we stand for America for Americans only.

President Truman may accept Congress' excuse that it is too busy to uphold our traditional policy of furnishing refuge for the oppressed, but the general public will not let our lawmakers off that easy. Anyone who has seen Congress in action is certain that our representatives are never too busy with political affairs to do something constructive, if they really want to.

[From the Washington Post of July 16, 1947]

TOO LITTLE TIME

Europe's 850,000 displaced persons seem doomed to sympathy but precious little action as far as the United States is concerned. Senator VANDENBERG'S announcement that bipartisan congressional leaders find it impossible to wedge in the Stratton refugee bill before adjournment must come as a cruel joke to the men and women who have already spent 5 or even 8 years of their lives in a homeless limbo. Statistically, no doubt, it is possible to show that Congress has its hands full with other matters without taking up the bill that would admit 400,000 refugees to this country within a period of 4 years. But these people are not mere statistics; they are 400,000 human beings with human aspirations, coldly classed under the label of "DP's." During the concentration-camp days many of them lived by sheer spiritual strength in the hope of deliverance. That hope cannot sustain them much longer when the verdict on the measure that would enable them to reestablish themselves is "too little time."

We have been generous, yes, in feeding and caring for DP's, the bulk of whom are in our zone in Germany. But this is an expedient which in the end may be far more costly than a permanent solution, for what the great majority of these people want is not a soup-kitchen existence as vagrants but an opportunity to earn their bread and lead constructive lives. Our ability to absorb refugees in the numbers envisaged in the Stratton bill within our quota system is beyond question. So, too, is the fact that these people, most of them anti-Communist and of the hardiest stock of Europe, would contribute greatly to the income and welfare of this country. The principal barrier is the necessary adjustment of immigration quotas and permission to employ unused existing quotas—plus the matter of time. We share a sense of the difficulties facing Congress in winding up the legislative session. We also know that Congress is capable of both speedy and humanitarian action when it sets its mind to it. Anything less in this case would be unworthy of the high principles the United States is upholding before the world.

Commencement Day Address by Hon. Francis J. Myers at Villanova College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a commencement-day address delivered by me at the annual commencement exercises at Villanova College, Villanova, Pa., on June 16, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America is now in the midst of a mad rush to forgetfulness.

To many of you young men today receiving degrees—to most of you, I believe—this trend, this stampede in America to the mental comforts of a lost past must indeed be a baffling phenomenon. I say this because I know that many of you have lived through experiences which do not lend themselves to forgetting, and it must be hard for you to see how so many of your fellow citizens are forgetting so quickly things you cannot forget, things which do not deserve forgetting.

Let's see now, how long ago was it—3 years and 10 days ago—June 6, 1944, that American troops hit the beaches at Normandy? Was that really so long ago? That was within the span of the college careers of you men now graduating.

In normal times, in other years, it would not require much reminding to turn the minds of a college-graduating class back to something which happened in their freshman year.

Some of you were sophomores—those of you who were in school at the time—when the landings were made on Iwo Jima and the Philippines and Okinawa; when carrier task forces were hitting Formosa and Tokyo and Paramushiru. Those of you who were in school in those days were not spending much time on nuclear energy in your physics classes because we didn't know about the atomic bomb in those days and atomic energy was a subject of slight and casual concern to the average college sophomore.

The things that have happened in the past 3 years, in the past 2 years, are of such recent events, such immediately recent, acutely alive yesterdays, and yet to many Americans, to too many Americans, they seem to be catalogued now as ancient history. America is in a mad rush to forget.

This is a difficult year for commencement speakers because of this fact, because all the old rules and all of the old and traditional approaches of the commencement speaker are obsolete now.

The graduating class of Villanova College this year, as in all colleges, is composed not of starry-eyed youngsters, but of men who were rushed to maturity suddenly and by necessity and who have come back now to complete educations interrupted by the war. No one can give you sugar-coated descriptions of a world of milk and honey and love and brotherhood because you have seen the world. You have seen men and nations at their worst. You have seen power politics in action in its worst manifestations, in the slaughter of innocent people and in the strangulation of moral principle.

On the other hand, if I or any commencement speaker were to paint for you a picture all black in its tones, to reach into your own memories, to call up the horror you have seen and the bad you have experienced, and to say to you this is the future, you would be perfectly justified to reject that, too, because it would represent a defeatism and a cynicism out of all proportion, and a repudiation of all the things that you thought you were fighting for in those terrible days of those acutely alive yesterdays you remember so well.

Not only would you be justified to reject such a picture; I am sure you would reject it. It is a picture I have no intention of trying to paint for you.

Things are bad, and time is running out, and the prospects for the future are dim—yes, the old cliches apply. But there are in this country today perhaps 14,000,000 young men and women who have been through times far more terrifying and have kept their sanity because they knew there had to be something better ahead.

Whether he participated in the battles of World War II or not, every young man coming out of college today lived those years in close proximity with all their horror, and vowed, I know, to bend his efforts to see to it that wars indeed might be banished from the face of the earth.

Now's your chance.

I can think of no finer task to which you could dedicate your efforts. I can think of no finer group than a group such as this to set to the task. You may have been disillusioned often enough in recent years to have lost naïveté, but not sufficiently, as have some of your elders, to have lost all hope and all enthusiasm.

I mentioned earlier those acutely alive events of the past 2 or 3 years. There were some other aspects of those years—not quite so easily remembered today—the world-wide conviction of 2 years ago that this time there would be a submersion of intense nationalisms and the gradual emergence of a world committed to decency among men and among nations.

Today, in contrast, the headlines outline for us an unmistakable division of the world into new armed camps, into new power blocs, into new frontiers bristling with suspicions and hates as well as with arms.

Headlines oversimplify, of course, and most people recognize the fact. They are, however, symptomatic, and they are generally based on some substantial evidence.

The evidence on which the scare headlines of the last few months, the last year, have been based, has indeed been substantial, even though all of it by no means is scientific, factual, or supportable.

There is no denying the evidence that we face a prospect of a future war. Two years ago, a year ago, we might have denied it, and we would at that time have had a vast amount of accumulated evidence to support our denials. Good will then was a commodity which, although not world-wide in its distribution, was nevertheless apparently strongly established throughout most of the areas of the world.

There is little good will in the world today, and every nation in the world realizes it and is acting accordingly.

But the good will which existed 2 years ago, even a year ago, can still be summoned back—yes, there is yet time for that. And we must take the lead to reestablish this commodity as the world's number 1 value.

The Government of the United States has done, I think, its full share—more than its share—so far to build a world founded on decency. We have poured out billions upon billions of dollars without reluctance into agencies over which we had no direct control for the relief and rehabilitation of an entire world. In some instances, we have suffered the biting of the hand that feeds, but we have not withdrawn our hand and the succor it proffered. For that we deserve to have some pride, yes, but we have not asked for, nor should we have expected the groveling, elaborate gratitude of the beggar receiving a handout. We had a duty, a stern duty, to make available enough from our abundance to rescue the starving and the despairing and the hopeless victims of a war which should never have been allowed to start, of a war which we, a generation ago, had we been so inclined, might have helped to prevent.

We ignored our obligations a generation ago; we have not, so far, ignored them this time. I pray that we do not.

We have not been entirely altruistic in our generosity, for we had and still have, a tremendous and vital stake, a selfish stake, in the resurrection of a decent world, and up to now, we alone have been in a position to encourage the rebirth of such a world. But, although we have not acted entirely out of unselfish motives, we have been intelligent enough to recognize our obligations—to recognize where our selfish interest lay—and to act accordingly, and for this we deserve not gratitude, not idolatry, nor fawning thanks, but respect.

We deserve the world's respect for having done our part, and more, toward the establishment of a world in which men can be free from fear and from want and from despotism. That world is far from achievement, yes, but the starts have been made, and it was largely we who made those starts possible.

What now? Do we sit back and protest that because our efforts are in some cases misunderstood, in others suspected, in others feared, that we should retreat now behind our own iron curtain of self-defense and complete self-concern?

We cannot. We dare not. I am sure we will not.

In these days of atomic bombs and biological warfare, perfected to their horrible potentialities, we know—we must realize—that we are never safe behind any iron curtain no matter how thick its plates of armor. What holds for us holds true also for every other nation. Isolationism, unilateral action, either in offense or defense, must fail, and that is the story we must tell to a world which, confused as we are, frightened as we sometimes are, gropes for a solution and finds none in the international structures of other eras.

There are those who tell us that the world we sought has been lost irrevocably unless we begin to evidence a more cooperative spirit, charging that we have not shown cooperation and that we are to blame for the world's present sorry mess. I repudiate this thesis completely. As I said, I think we have done more than our part—not just in the feeding of the hungry, in the restoration of despairing populations, but in our evident willingness, demonstrated time after time, to submit to international controls the most basic concepts of traditional sovereignty. Nothing could be more cooperative than our proposal on the atomic bomb. It has been snubbed by one nation only, but by that nation whose agreement alone could make it work.

We have entered wholeheartedly into the entire structure of the United Nations, including all of its subordinate agencies. This cooperation also has not been echoed by that one other nation, which alone can join with us to make them work.

In my mail I frequently receive very sincere letters from Pennsylvanians and others, persons as seriously concerned as I am over the prospects for a future world without war, in which the opinion is expressed that if we were to extend anew the hand of cooperation to Russia which some think we have withdrawn, that there might be a possibility for reaching an understanding yet in time.

These letters are, I repeat, sincere. But too often they are based on the assumption that it is America which has held aloof, whereas, in fact, our record is one of continual effort to reach agreement and understanding.

It is too bad, I believe, that there is not the opportunity for the people of Russia to pressure their government as our people can and do pressure our government. A hot letter from a constituent can make a profound impression on any public figure. It would do the Kremlin good to receive a few.

We are trying to reach the average Russian through the only means of communication open to us—the short-wave radio. It would be the height of folly to cripple this program now, when there is yet time—a little time—to tell our story to a people which is, I am sure, not conditioned against us, but which is certainly undergoing tremendous pressure these days to suspect our motives and to question our sincerity.

In the meantime, we must continue our efforts through the United Nations, and in support of free nations and of free peoples everywhere, to see to it that all those who would cooperate among each other and with us are to be given the opportunity to retain control over their own destinies.

To some this sounds warlike. I think it is our only path to securing the real and enduring peace we seek and must have—a real and enduring peace which would replace this new era of nervous suspicions and unnerving belligerency.

And that is why I find so disturbing the current trend in the United States back to a lost past we can never recapture, to isolationism, because it is cheaper than international cooperation and causes few immediate headaches—but much more harrowing experiences later—to selfish individual interest at the expense of and in complete disregard of national and international interest, to false security behind an atom bomb which in itself breeds less rather than more security.

I know you young men, as you face your future, do so with some misgivings. You have been jerked around and tossed around and cruelly deprived of years of youth. You are worried.

But you've got something to give to help make a decent world.

Can we count on you to give it wholeheartedly, unselfishly, devotedly, because you know that otherwise there is no alternative but chaos?

With God's help, we will, we must, succeed in this greatest of all causes, and I am sure you will give that cause your utmost effort.

The Appropriation to Soil Conservation Service for 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following is the official table showing the United States expenditures for this agency since its inception:

Appropriations and other funds available for programs of the Soil Conservation Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1934 to 1947, 1948 budget estimates, and House bill [1]

Fiscal year	Appropriations and reappropriations				Other funds available [4]	Total funds available
	Salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service	Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land [2]	Water conservation and utilization projects [3]	Total		
1934	$287,313			$287,313	$1,777,264	$2,064,577
1935	275,839			275,839	13,595,914	13,871,753
1936	6,308,220			6,308,220	44,950,188	51,258,408
1937	22,613,715			22,613,715	25,783,156	48,396,871
1938	22,134,749	$9,594,719		31,729,468	14,691,911	46,421,379
1939	21,291,503	11,983,912		33,275,415	25,671,007	58,946,422
1940	21,255,422	6,315,458		27,570,880	18,369,896	45,940,776
1941	18,626,606	2,392,212	$580,000	21,598,818	14,395,916	35,994,734
1942	25,441,986	2,727,962	1,500,000	29,669,948	8,630,237	38,300,185
1943	23,811,516	1,523,162		25,334,678	1,095,809	26,430,487
1944	23,845,136	1,276,120		25,121,256	660,848	25,782,104
1945	29,637,248	1,250,000		30,887,248	298,288	31,185,536
1946	34,503,500	1,231,300	1,165,066	36,899,866	772,803	37,672,669
1947	44,723,000	1,559,000	700,000	46,982,000	2,817,719	49,799,719
1948:						
Budget	44,860,000	3,260,000		48,120,000	1,997,500	50,117,500
House bill	38,673,000	1,600,000		40,273,000	1,997,500	42,270,500

[1] Amounts for fiscal years 1934 to 1947 are adjusted, where necessary, for comparability with the appropriation structure in the 1948 Budget.

[2] Includes reappropriations, as follows: 1939, $8,213,000; 1940, $2,586,567; 1941, $1,245,134; 1942, $701,743.

[3] In addition, unobligated balances of funds from prior years available as follows: 1942, $580,000; 1943, $1,811,607; 1944, $1,520,298; 1945, $1,282,068; 1946, $415,883; 1947, $1,095,979; 1948 (budget and House bill), $1,042,576.

[4] Allocations and transfers, including Emergency Relief, Public Works, National Industrial Recovery, Civilian Conservation Corps, flood control, and other funds, made available to the agency for a national program of soil and water conservation and erosion control, including the development of water facilities, the construction of various improvements on land utilization projects, the acquisition and construction of water conservation and utility projects, and preliminary examinations and works of improvement for flood control purposes.

Prepared by Office of Budget and Finance, Budgetary Reporting and Statistics Section, June 17, 1947.

There are also annual Federal appropriations for soil conservation and soil fertility conservation to, first, agriculture experiment stations for soil work. These funds were not reduced at all for 1948. Second, Extension Service with its soil specialists who for 30 years have done this kind of work. Their funds were not reduced for 1948. Third, the AAA program where over $10,000,000 of their appropriation was used in 1946 for terracing and services, and over fifteen million were used in 1944 for the same purposes; and where a total of over thirty-three million have been used for terracing and service. Under the AAA there were one hundred and thirty-seven million used for fertilizer, mostly

phosphates, and over one hundred and eighty-six million of the Federal funds used for liming material. The one hundred and eighty-six million Federal expenditures for lime and one hundred and thirty-seven million spent for fertilizers makes a total of three hundred and twenty-three million spent for this purpose from 1938 to 1948, or less than 10 percent of the total AAA appropriations. The fertilizer and lime expenditures for 1947, however, were over 25 percent of the appropriation. Fourth, the TVA distribution of fertilizers largely in the South. This was distributed a few pounds to one individual and a carload to another free. Fifth, farm forestry has had an important place in soil conservation. Funds for the tree planting program were not reduced for 1948. In addition to the regular forestry program the AAA has also accomplished some work in this field and have used some $35,000 for seedling trees. Sixth, in addition there is the soil conservation service, where the appropriations for each year are shown in the above table.

The official table shows that the appropriation for the next fiscal year is the highest for any year except 1947. I have noted the propaganda sent out from Washington and the columns of the New Deal columnists. Their injection of cheap politics into the picture was not necessary, nor has it been helpful.

The facts are that the Eightieth Congress is cognizant of the soil problem. Any administration that discriminates against the livestock industry like it has against the livestock industry for these many years in order to oversubsidize soil-depleting crops; any administration that has not lived up to the law in supporting livestock products at not less than 90 percent of parity at the same time it puts a floor of 150 percent of parity under a soil-depleting crop; any administration that functions in such a manner as to reduce hog numbers from 83,000,000 to 56,000,000, as this administration has during the past 4 years; any administration that functions in such a manner that the sheep numbers of America have been reduced by 35 percent during the past 4 years; any administration that functions in such a manner as to reduce cattle numbers in the United States by over 4,000,000 head in the past 4 years; and an administration that lowers the duties and invites imports of livestock products and secures 30 percent of the custom receipts to be used as section 32 funds under the guise of disposing of surpluses, and then uses these funds to grind up tobacco for fertilizer, subsidize insecticides made of tobacco and pay export subsidies on tobacco, wheat, corn, and other soil-depleting crops is in a rather vulnerable position when it takes upon itself the responsibility of pointing a finger at the Eightieth Congress, or any group or any individual and accuse them or it of being antagonistic to soil conservation. Even some of our Democratic friends resented the cheap politics exhibited in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill. The soil and agricultural problem is a serious problem and should not be subjected to cheap politics. Agriculture, with 20,000,000 people on the farm out of a total population of 140,000,000, has a job on its hands to obtain anywhere near its share of the national income for itself.

Everyone knows that livestock farming goes hand in hand with soil conservation. Anyone really interested in soil conservation should realize that America should be self-sufficient so far as livestock and livestock products are concerned. The self-sufficiency in the United States for livestock products or for that matter for all agricultural products has not prevailed since 1925, and this disparity or lack of agricultural sufficiency was more pronounced from 1932 up to 1939. The war changed the export-import, as well as the general agricultural picture.

Our colleague, the Honorable HAROLD COOLEY, of North Carolina, has recently introduced H. R. 4150, the purpose of which is to coordinate the activities of the education work being carried on by the various agencies in connection with soils. The bill, H. R. 4150, will consider the coordination of the experiment station soil work; the Agricultural Extension Service soil work; the AAA soil program; and the Soil Conservation Service. While no hearings can be held this session, this bill will have complete and full hearings immediately after January 1, 1948. Our colleague, Mr. COOLEY, in the Seventy-ninth Congress introduced the Farm Home Administration Act, which later became law. This Farm Home Administration Act coordinated several of the direct loan agencies and consolidated these agencies. The legislation passed in regard to the Farm Home Administration has been constructive.

The House of Representatives appropriated $38,000,000 for the Soil Conservation Service for next year and $24,000,000 for the Agricultural Extension Service.

The land utilization and water conservation are a part of the Soil Conservation Service, and the amounts used under these programs are shown in the table.

The total appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service have been a little over $500,000,000 to date. The exact amount is $554,336,120.

The Palestine Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, together with a number of my colleagues, I have today introduced a resolution stating it to be the sense of the Congress that the United States announce its continued adherence to the Palestine policy heretofore established both by the President and the Congress and its willingness to join in the carrying out of a solution to the Palestine problem along the lines of such policy.

In connection with the consideration of this measure, refraining with design from dealing with the deeply moving humanitarian considerations involved, I have prepared a brief, entitled "A Legal View of the Palestine Question," which deals only with the legal rights and obligations of the English, Arabs, and Jews in trouble-infested and strifetorn Palestine. I submit it to my colleagues with the earnest request that they study the legal points involved as prefatory to their consideration of this legislation.

In the preparation of this brief I desire to express my gratitude for the substantial assistance rendered by a distinguished lawyer of my constituency, Mr. Sol M. Linowitz, a member of the law firm of Sutherland and Sutherland, who, prior to his service in the Navy, for 2 years occupied with distinction and great ability the position of assistant general counsel of the Office of Price Administration.

In my opinion the contribution in painstaking legal research which Mr. Linowitz has made, with admirable restraint and detachment, to the cause in which he has manifested such an intense interest, cannot be overestimated.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include my legal analysis of this international problem, as follows:

A LEGAL VIEW OF THE PALESTINE QUESTION

Barrels of ink and buckets of blood have been poured over the Palestine question. The vital nature of the issue has led to commingling of political, sociological, moral, and emotional considerations in various analyses of the situation. The legal aspects of the problem have to a large extent been shunted aside. Yet today, more than ever before, it is important to understand the relative legal positions of the English, Arabs, and Jews. Palestine is the tinder box of the post-Hitler world. Bombing and bloodshed are being written large in the country's day-to-day history. On whose side is the law in the Palestine picture?

This article will undertake to answer that question, and that question alone. Political aspects, which have loomed so large in the tragic Palestine story, will be ignored. Sociological and economic considerations will be dealt with only to the extent necessary to permit an informed decision with respect to legal rights.

The point of departure for a legal analysis of respective rights and obligations is the Balfour Declaration issued by Lord Balfour on November 2, 1917. The text of the Balfour Declaration follows:

FOREIGN OFFICE,
November 2, 1917.

DEAR LORD ROTHSCHILD: I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which have been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet.

His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist federation.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.

For almost 30 years, English, Arabs, and Jews alike have indulged in partisan research and interpretation of this document and its genesis. The fact remains, however, that by itself the declaration was legally impotent. Great Britain had no sovereign rights over Palestine; it had no proprietary interest; it had no authority to dispose of the land. The declaration was a statement of British intentions and no more. It states that (1) England views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a home for the Jewish people; (2) Britain will use its best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object; and (3) nothing shall be done to prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in other countries.

The importance of the Declaration lies in the fact that the preamble to the Palestine mandate issued by the Allied powers in 1922 specifically recites that Great Britain as mandatory is to be responsible for putting the declaration into effect. Significantly, it states that recognition has thereby been given to the "historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country". The mandate is set up to effectuate these purposes, and the mandatory assumes the obligation of exercising the mandate in accordance therewith.

The mandate device utilized by the Allied Powers in the Covenant of the League of Nations was an innovation in international law. While President Wilson and General Smuts had conceived of the mandate as a trust arrangement, the other powers had accepted their mandatory roles as a convenient manner of obtaining desired territories. (Intimate Papers of Colonel House, (1928) pp. 293 et seq; Lansing, the Peace Negotiations, (1921) pp. 149 et seq.) It was therefore, hardly surprising that the administration of the various mandates was inevitably molded to the political aims of the mandatories. The British action in assigning mandatory functions to the colonial office was as frank an indication of this attitude as was their use of the mandated territory of Haifa as a naval base. The British conception and administration of the Palestine mandate must be recognized as part and parcel of this essentially uniform policy. I say this not in a spirit of criticism, but as a historical fact.

Article 2 of the Palestine mandate obligated the mandatory (1) to place the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as would secure the establishment of a Jewish national home as laid down in the preamble; (2) to develop self-governing institutions; and (3) to safeguard civil and religious rights of all inhabitants of Palestine. Article 5 made the mandatory responsible for seeing that no Palestine territory was ceded or leased to, or placed under the control of, the government of any foreign power. The administration of Palestine was charged, by Article 6, with the obligation of facilitating Jewish immigration into Palestine under suitable conditions. Article 27 required the consent of the League of Nations to any modification of the terms of the mandate.

The touchstone for an analysis of what was sought to be achieved and the method for its attainment lies in the words "Jewish national home." In the report of Palestine Royal Commission (1937) at page 39, it is stated: "The primary purpose of the mandate as expressed in its articles is to promote the establishment of the Jewish national home."

Borrowed from the original Zionist platform at Basle, the words "national home" were novel in the field of international law. The unfamiliarity of the term spawned variegated interpretations of its meaning. By the application of established principles of legal construction, however, its intended meaning is readily ascertainable; the establishment of Palestine as a place to which Jews could emigrate with the understanding that if such immigration should prove to be large enough, a predominantly Jewish state or commonwealth would come into existence. Lloyd George, President Wilson, and countless others so understood the term, and their testimony offers an irrefutable "legislative history" of statutory meaning.

Thus at page 24 of the report of Palestine Royal Commission it is stated: "It would depend mainly on the zeal and the enterprise of the Jews whether the home would grow big enough to become a State. Mr. Lloyd George, who was Prime Minister at the time, informed us in evidence that if the Jews had meanwhile responded to the opportunity afforded them by the idea of a national home and had become a definite majority of the inhabitants, then Palestine would thus become a Jewish commonwealth."

See also Baker, Woodrow Wilson, and World Settlement, volume 7, pp. 256, 305. Also the London Times of March 5, 1914, quoted President Wilson as follows: "The Allied Nations with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth." See also Miller, My Dairy at the Conference of Paris, volume 4, p. 263.

Everything in the mandate itself conforms to this interpretation. The mandatory is to take such steps as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home (art. 2). The administration of Palestine is to facilitate Jewish immigration (art. 6). The administration is to facilitate the acquisition of Palestinian citizenship by Jews (art. 7). The Jewish agency, which is to advise with the Palestine administration, may itself undertake construction or operation of public works, services, and utilities subject to arrangement with the administration. (art. 11).

Of equal importance in this connection is the specific provision in the declaration and mandate for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine. Read in the light of the contemporaneous preoccupation of the Allied Powers with the minorities in other lands, this provision could only signify the contemplated reduction of the non-Jewish communities to a minority in Palestine and the concern with the preservation of their rights as minority groups.

In the face of those facts, both the British mandatory and the Arabs have urged various interpretations designed to indicate a contrary policy. Without burrowing for motives, it is sufficient to observe that the British position has been to a large extent based on an interpretation of the particle "in" contained in the term "establishment in Palestine of a national home." From the Churchill white paper of 1922 until the report of the Royal Commission in 1937, it was urged that the use of the word "in" signifies an intention to establish a national home in a part rather than the whole of Palestine. To clothe a naked particle with such drastic significance appears to run counter to the whole mandatory scheme. By article 25 of the mandate, Great Britian is authorized, with the consent of the Council, to postpone or withhold application of the mandate provisions to Trans-Jordan. By clear implication, therefore, the mandatory could not withhold application of the mandate in the rest of Palestine or apply it only to a portion of western Palestine.

That a time came when political considerations became paramount seems apparent from the statement of the Shaw Commission in 1940 that the primary duty which is laid upon the Palestine government was one of holding the balance between the two parties in that country. There was no clear direction to assist either party in the fulfillment of their aspirations.

This should be compared with the letter accompanying the Balfour Declaration by Mr. Balfour to Lord Rothschild as a declaration of sympathy with the Jewish Zionist aspirations.

Then came the white paper of 1939, which provided for total future Jewish immigration to Palestine of 75,000; rigorous restrictions on land purchase by Jews; and ultimate establishment of Palestinian state with Jews as one-third minority. The Permanent Mandates Commission of the League unanimously held the white paper to be inconsistent with the constant interpretation theretofore placed on the mandate. A majority held that it was directly contrary to the mandate.

An argument extensively advanced by Great Britain to support its various curtailments of Jewish migration is based on a reading of article 8 of the mandate. The administration of Palestine is directed by that article while insuring that the rights and positions of other sections of the population are not prejudiced, to facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions. This provision has been construed by the mandatory to authorize the limitation of immigration in accordance with the economic absorptive capacity of the country, a position with which I cannot seriously quarrel. But the difficulty is that discredited estimates of absorptive capacity have been relied upon to justify the restraints imposed.

Cultivable areas were estimated in the report of the Palestine Royal Commission on the basis of work methods of the average Arab peasant, not the advanced methods used by Jewish farmers. In adhering to this position, it has been necessary to overlook the fact that objective study now clearly indicates that, with proper development of the Tranjordan Valley and other natural resources, Palestine can settle several million additional persons.

For example, Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk, Assistant Chief of United States Soil Conservation Service, estimated that if there were full utilization of the Jordan Valley depression for reclamation and power, at least another 4,000,000 persons could be absorbed in addition to the 1,800,000 already in Palestine and Trans-Jordan.

The Arab view of the declaration and mandate is based on two contentions: (1) Palestine belongs to the Arabs and cannot therefore become either the Jewish national home or a Jewish state; and (2) the McMahon-Hussein correspondence of 1915 precluded the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine. Without rehashing the pro and con arguments as to relative original sovereign rights of Jews and Arabs in Palestine, it may be noted that the Jews were at one time sovereigns of the land, were deprived of it by force, and have never renounced their right. Of more importance, however, the Palestine mandate—issued after the Allies had conquered the Turks and Palestine, and after the Arabs had fought with the Turks—specifically recites in paragraph 3: "recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country". Implicit in this recognition is the acknowledgment by the Allies of the validity of the Jewish claim to sovereignty. The quarrel of the Arabs today on this score is not, therefore, with the Jews but with the victorious Allies who in solemn proclamation recognized the prior Jewish rights to Palestine.

The second facet of the Arab argument is that England had, prior to the Balfour Declaration, already committed itself to the Arabs in the McMahon-Hussein letters in favor of the establishment of an independent Arab state in Palestine. The salient facts regarding this correspondence are these: On October 24, 1915, Sir Henry McMahon, High

Commissioner for Egypt, seeking to secure Arab assistance against the Turks, wrote a letter to Sherif Hussein of Hedjaz. The letter stated that insofar as England was free to act, she was prepared to recognize and support the independence of the Arabs within certain areas proposed by the Sherif of Mecca. The districts of Mersina and Alexandretta and portions lying to the west of the districts of Damascus, Hama, Homes, and Aleppa, were expressly excluded. The tortuous ambiguous language of the letter has been studied with painstaking care. It is sufficient to observe that Sir Henry McMahon himself, Winston Churchill, and two other Colonial secretaries, all agreed that the letter was not intended to refer to Palestine. Even King Hussein's son, Emir Feisal, accepted this view 4 years after the letter was written. On January 3, 1919, Emir Feisal and Dr. Chaim Weitzman (representing the Zionist organization) signed a treaty which dealt with the establishment of an Arab State, exclusive of Palestine.

Generally overlooked in the refined search for intentions, however, is the paramount and all-important fact that at the time England had absolutely no right of disposition and no legal or proprietary interest in Palestine, which was then a Turkish province. Regardless of what commitment England might have made, she was neither sovereign over Palestine herself nor was her action ratified either by Turkey (the then sovereign) or the League of Nations (the later sovereign). In the Treaty of Sèvres in 1920, Turkey renounced her rights to Palestine in favor of the Allies. The treaty did not become operative, however, and in the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923 (after the Palestine mandate), Turkey renounced all right and title to territories outside of the boundaries laid down in that treaty, "the future of these territories * * * being settled or to be settled by the parties concerned."

The web which has been spun about the McMahon letters, therefore, is of most flimsy construction and represents merely a loose collection of political threads.

This alinement of the respective legal position of the parties to the Palestine dispute leads to the following conclusions: (1) Jewish claims are predicated on a formal international document of unquestionable legal validity and supported by the terms and legislative history of the mandate; (2) the Arab position rests on a claim of prior sovereign rights rejected by the Allied Powers after World War I and on an interpretation of a legally ineffective letter from Sir Henry McMahon; (3) Great Britain, as mandatory, has not fully recognized the legal requirements of the mandate.

What avenue is available to the Jewish people to obtain the relief to which they are legally entitled? Their rights under the mandate are as third-party beneficiaries. Both the civil and the common law recognize the right of a third-party beneficiary to assert his legal position against a deprivation of contract rights. Nor is the position of the Jewish people that of a mere donee beneficiary. The recognition in the preamble to the mandate of the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country constitutes sufficient basis for considering their position that of a creditor beneficiary who has been promised payment of a debt rather than a gift.

Clause 3 of the Atlantic Charter recites the determination of the signatories "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." The Jewish people—recognized as a people in the mandate—were forcibly deprived of their rights to self-government. Their restitution is fully as important as the re-creation of any other state. The United Nations is the international forum before whom the rights of the Jewish people should be asserted. An earlier international body after an earlier world war pledged the restoration of the rights of which the Jewish people had been deprived. Achievement of that purpose has been frustrated. Now, after a second war, the nations of the world cannot achieve a lasting system of international law if the legal rights of the Jewish people are left without remedy.

The Townsend Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, the Townsend convention came and went. It made and left its impression on Congress. The delegates were as fine and as determined a body of men and women as ever came to Washington. They were interested in a human cause—interested in old-age security. They were interested in getting H. R. 16, the Townsend bill, brought up on the floor for disposition on its merits.

What little old-age assistance we have is the result of the Townsend movement. If the Townsend movement had never crystallized, the aged would, at present, be given very little, if any, consideration. It was this movement that made the Nation conscious of the duty of the Nation to the people who created its wealth—to the people who created the wealth with which we won World Wars I and II. The Townsend movement awakened and quickened our conscience to the Nation's duty to its elderly people.

The time has come for Congress to realize that the existing old-age assistance is not sufficient. It does not afford security. It does not give freedom from want or freedom from fear of insecurity. In fact, it is largely lip service wrapped in a bundle of red tape.

Under the present Federal law, the State must match, dollar for dollar, the amount paid to the aged by the Federal Government. If the State, as many States do, require the aged to assign their homes, or other property or interests they may have, to the State welfare board, in order to get assistance, then the Federal Government demands one-half of the amount recovered.

In other words, the present old-age assistance law is not a home preserver, but a home wrecker. It joins hands with the States that require the assignment of the home, and in some cases takes the home from the children after the parents pass on. This practice should be stopped. A Nation's strength depends upon its home owners.

The time has come that every Member of Congress be informed that under the present Old Age Assistance Act, some States still pay as little as $14 per month to aged individuals without any other income. Surely when the purchasing power of the dollar is only worth 37 cents, as compared with the purchasing power of the 100-cent dollar in 1937, we realize that no one, in any part of the Nation, can live on the American standard for $14 a month.

The phrase "Old age pension"—old age assistance—should be changed to "Old age compensation." We know that every person who has worked from the age of 18 to the age of 60, has created enough new wealth to last for the rest of his lifetime. It matters not what kind of work such a person performed. It makes no difference whether such work was agricultural, educational, industrial, or professional. The public got the benefit.

Again there are also those who are totally physically disabled. These are unable to make a living at any stage of life. They must be taken care of by the public. The best and cheapest way to take care of these, unless they are mental cases or living in penal institutions, is by direct assistance. Their disability is not voluntary. It is not their fault. They are in a world where human instinct tells us they should be taken care of, and life made secure and pleasant as far as possible.

The time has come for Congress to make an intelligent study and survey of this whole subject. It is a Federal responsibility. The Government, as a whole, is interested in the physical well-being of all its citizens.

If we enact H. R. 16, and a few other laws for human welfare, then we need not fear communism. Then we need not fear fascism or nazism. These isms all come from out of poverty. Poverty and misery are the seedbeds in which communism prospers and grows.

Give to the aged sufficient compensation for their past labor, so that their sons and daughters, brothers and sisters will be glad to take care of them. When that is done, there will be no room for communism or fascism. Love of country and love of Government will be spontaneous.

The trouble with the present old-age assistance is that there is so much red tape and so much waste and useless expenditures in the machinery that the old are almost forgotten. Some simple method of providing for the aged, without any red tape and without too many intervening expenditures, is what the Nation needs, and what the Townsendites are looking forward to.

There is nothing in H. R. 16 that need frighten us. This bill simply provides a method of raising the funds with which to take care of our aged. It devises a simple method by which these funds are to be distributed—a method of distribution where those who come under its provisions get the benefits, rather than a horde of intermediates.

If our form of government is to continue, is to keep abreast of civilization, if our form of government is to avoid communism, fascism, and nazism, it must again become interested in all of its citizens. It must assure them freedom from fear. It must assure them future security—freedom from want.

We must remember that those who created the wealth of this Nation are entitled to at least some return when they reach the age of inability—as a rule

the age of 60. Under our present Government we see billions voted for foreign nations, even billions for liquidators of other nations' people, but very little is being done for our own aged.

Our committees bring in tax bills, and they bring them in under a gag rule so that the Members have no opportunity to offer amendments to increase the appropriations for our own people, and yet on the same day other committees bring in bills requiring millions and billions in appropriations for foreign nations. The rule seems to be, foreigners preferred—Americans forgotten. The time has come to make a change. Let it again be, Americans preferred, but with justice and decency to all the world.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR
PREVENTION OF WAR,
Washington, D. C., July 16, 1947.

Hon. HARRY L. TOWE,
Chairman, Subcommittee of House Committee on Armed Services,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOWE: Reports in the press with respect to the intentions of your subcommittee in handling the requests of great national organizations for opportunity to testify against universal military training have been confusing.

One realizes that you and your committee are under tremendous pressure from the War Department to report out a bill before the end of this session, regardless of the fairness or unfairness of such action.

May I call your attention to the following list of national organizations which have asked for an opportunity to be heard, which apparently is not going to be granted:

Religious bodies: Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, the Methodist Church, Disciples of Christ Church, Evangelical and Reformed Church, American Unitarian Association, United Council of Church Women, Brethren Service Committee, Society of Friends.

Educational associations: National Educational Association, American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education, Commission on Christian Higher Education.

Farm organizations: National Farmers Union, National Grange.

Labor groups: Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, International Association of Machinists, Workers Defense League.

Other national organizations: National Council Against Conscription; National Council for Prevention of War, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, National Association for Advancement of Colored People.

Representative WALTER G. ANDREWS, chairman of your committee, was quoted in the Buffalo Evening News of July 12 as follows:

"Representative WALTER G. ANDREWS, Republican, of Buffalo, today refuted charges by the National Council for Prevention of War that he had ignored requests of organizations and individuals who asked to testify on the universal military training bill.

"Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, which today concluded hearings, Mr. ANDREWS declared that all requests made by leaders of national organizations would be honored by the subcommittee on training, which he said will continue hearings on the bill.

"Committee policy, he said, is to hear from the larger and more prominent organizations, no matter which side they represent."

It seems to me that it is only decent that Chairman ANDREWS' pledge should be kept, even though it is reported that, voting in your subcommittee of which he is a member ex officio, he himself voted to close the hearings this week in direct violation of his pledge.

A brand new bill of 76 pages sponsored by you (H. R. 4121) is before your subcommittee It was printed only last Friday, July 11. Few Congressmen have seen it. Still fewer have given it proper study—and this holds even for members of your committee. One-third of the bill is devoted to punishments for its infraction. Its provisions for the treatment of conscientious objectors are entirely new and have not been circulated by you to the religious press nor to the historic peace churches. Other aspects of the bill into which I will not go here will require careful study throughout the country before the bill should be "frozen" beyond possibility of amendment in committee.

For these reasons it is earnestly to be hoped that your subcommittee will continue the hearings now until all of the national organizations listed have been heard, together with such prominent and well informed individuals as your committee may invite.

Much has been made by the War Department of Gallup polls. The superficiality of Gallup polls purporting to show a majority of the American people as supporting military training is plainly revealed by the great national strength of the informed opposition that is represented by this list of opposing organizations. When the wording of a Gallup poll is changed, or an alternative offered, an apparent majority fades into an insignificant minority.

These great organizations are convinced, as you will find when you consult them, that universal military training will regiment our youth, indoctrinate them with a totalitarian outlook, and take us on the road to a completely militarized state, upsetting our educational system and our whole national economy with tremendous moral and financial loss. They believe that national disaster threatens us, not, as the militarists believe, if we fail to adopt military training, but if we do. Consequently, orderly resumption of hearings next winter is the only tolerable procedure in a democracy like ours. If you act in haste, the country will "repent at leisure."

Respectfully yours,

FREDERICK J. LIBBY,
Executive Secretary.

United States Military Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hanson W. Baldwin, from today's New York Times:

UNITED STATES WEAKNESS DECRIED—POTENTIALLY NATION'S MILITARY STRENGTH IS SAID TO EXCEED ANY OTHER COUNTRY'S

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

WASHINGTON, July 16.—Recent continued emphasis on the weakness of United States military strength is doing no service to our cause abroad.

Statements by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, former Justice Owen J. Roberts, and numerous Army and Navy leaders, stressing the elements of our weakness without emphasizing sufficiently our factors of strength, have somewhat distorted the actual picture and have created in some minds an illusion of United States military weakness.

The statements, of course, have been intended for domestic consumption as part of a drive to secure the passage of universal military training and to impress Congress with the need for more funds for the armed services. But unfortunately they are transmitted abroad and, because of the official source of these statements, they are bound to make some international impression in the current battle for the minds of men.

INIMICAL IMPRESSION

That impression can be only bad and inimical to the best interests of the United States. For a little people, living in the shadow of fear and menaced by the specter of communism, will not be comforted or persuaded by statements exposing the weakness of their only possible savior. Frankness is an American birthright and it is the best possible basis for effective propaganda, but today, when we are struggling with Russia in the psychological and ideological conflict by which our system stands or falls, frankness should be complete; the good should temper the bad.

We are certainly not "weak," absolutely or relatively, in either actual or potential military strength, this correspondent feels certain after a Nation-wide tour. We have elements of weakness, but we also have great elements of strength. Potentially, we are still—by virtue of our industry, our sea power, our air power—the greatest military power in the world, far superior to Russia.

Actually, our Army is much smaller in size than Russia's, but it is better equipped. The Russians have virtually no navy, and ours is bigger than all the rest of the world's navies put together. Our air force—though smaller in numbers of planes in operation—is probably well superior in quality to the Russian air forces. Today we possess the atomic bomb, and today we have the ability to use the seas for our own purposes and to deny, if necessary, that use to Russians. More than 1,500,000 men under arms and more than $10,000,000,000 for a defense budget do not represent "weakness" in any country on earth.

PRIORITIES SYSTEM URGED

We should do well, then, to stress some of the factors of our strength, while frankly recognizing our deficiencies. As Americans, we generally tend to emphasize the unimportant at the expense of the important. We are spending profusely on defense, but we need to spend more on some items and less on others; we need, and must have, a system of defense priorities unless real and serious weaknesses in our defense structure are to develop. To name only two items, the air services, now the first line of military force, should have more operating planes and more funds, and industrial mobilization planning must have greater emphasis.

We must, in other words, maintain a posture of military strength. But, at the same time, we must remember that the principal factors in the world conflict of ideologies now raging are not military factors, but political, economic, and psychological ones. Our domestic actions and the statements made for home consumption will inevitably affect the international situation. We must never "sell the United States short."

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters from the New York Times of July 16, 1947, and James Patrick McGovern, Washington, D. C.:

LEGISLATION NOW IS URGED, EVEN IF IT MEANS A SUMMER SESSION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Some weeks ago a distinguished committee appointed by the President to make a study of problems arising from the atomic age published its report.

This committee was composed of eminent personages, most of whom are leaders in their respective fields. As for their political, economical, and social views, they represented all shades of opinion from extreme liberal to conservative. They were, of course, given access to confidential and secret files and were afforded every opportunity to study our problems from all angles. As a result of their studies, and despite their original divergencies of opinion, the recommendations they made were unanimous.

One of their most urgent recommendations was the immediate installation of a universal military-training program. What has been the reaction of our Congress and our people? Complete apathy. Some Congressmen thought it was too late in the season, others openly remained on the fence, and the public response was scattered and slight.

Are we as a Nation going to continue to bury our head in the sand rather than face unpleasant facts? Twice before we have been guilty of this and have been saved by a combination of good luck and allies able to cushion the initial shock. Next time we will only be saved by our own abilities and preparedness, and our time for preparation is limited.

Let us as citizens arouse ourselves and make Congress pass this legislation, summer session or not, for only by doing this will we be fulfilling our primary duty of insuring the safety of this Nation.

We don't want a historian of the distant future to dismiss the United States as a country which was powerful for a short time, but which was utterly destroyed because of the narrow self-interest and lack of vision of its people.

D. B. LAWRENCE, Jr.
BRONXVILLE, N. Y., *July 6, 1947.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 16, 1947.*

Hon. OWEN J. ROBERTS,
Chairman, Citizens Emergency Committee for Universal Military Training, Chester Springs, Pa.

DEAR JUDGE ROBERTS: I am communicating with friends in the Congress in furtherance of the efforts of your good self and associates to have action taken at this session on the pending military training bills, and, if afforded an opportunity to do so, shall be pleased to become a member of your committee.

While in London in 1912 I listened to the debates in Parliament on the so-called military compulsion training bill, particularly that of February 20, 1912, in which latter the principal speakers were Lord Roberts, advocating the passage of the measure, and Lord Haldane, in opposition to the proposed act. As you know, the bill was defeated, and I shall always feel that had the vote been otherwise, there might not have been a First World War. In any event, the thought occurs to me that you may see your way clear to ask the Library of Congress to submit those debates for your consideration. In the present circumstances they should be enlightening.

With assurances of high esteem, I am,
Sincerely,
JAMES PATRICK MCGOVERN.

On Aid to Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, the extreme importance of the issue of aid to foreign countries, otherwise known and referred to as the Truman plan and the Marshall plan, calls for the most serious consideration on the part of every citizen in this country, from those who have the responsibility of recommending and fostering our international policies, to the folks on the farms and in the towns and cities throughout the Nation.

An editorial in the Wall Street Journal of July 14 contains food for thought in this connection, and I wish to include it in my remarks, that others may have an opportunity to read it:

WHO'S LOONY?

The American form of government has lived more than a century and a half; with one exception the world's oldest continuous government.

In that period the people living under that form of government have developed a continent, become the strongest nation economically in the world, potentially the strongest militarily; and, while they constitute a small percentage of the world's population, they are being asked to support a great deal of the world.

It's just a little fantastic to suppose that blind luck can continue for a matter of two centuries and so we suggest that it is just possible that on the balance the American people may have acted wisely. Undoubtedly they have done stupid and foolish things but they must also have done things of an opposite nature.

We make this suggestion because we have just been reading and listening to people who seem to be proceeding on the theory that the American people are just dumb and stupid beyond all repair and that someone must take them gently but firmly by the hand, instruct them in their duties and try to have them perceive the error of their ways.

Here's a columnist. He feels it unnecessary to prove the dimwittedness of the people. He merely asserts it. This columnist quotes another columnist who asks plaintively: "How are we going to get them to see?"

What these columnists see so clearly but what they think is hidden from the American people is that a lot of money must be poured out of this country to other countries and they fear someone will raise questions.

It is interesting to see the record of some of these gentlemen who write columns and gather about Washington and New York luncheon tables to exchange mutual congratulations about the clarity of their own vision. Generally they said the United Nations meant a peaceful world, that the agreements set up at Bretton Woods insured international monetary stability, later that the British loan would accomplish the job and a good many thought that one who questioned the motives of Mr. Stalin was probably a "Red baiter."

There are a good many signs that the American people—dumb as they are—will not appropriate more money for gifts and loans until they have a satisfactory answer to the question, For what?

There is under way at Paris a meeting of the nations of western Europe. It was called in response to a suggestion of Secretary of State Marshall that Europe look to its own resources and plan to live on them before this country be asked for further aid.

If out of that meeting come any suggestions that raise reasonable hopes that the countries of Europe are eliminating commercial and currency practices which blight their economic life, which kill incentives, which lead to hoarding of gold and strong currencies, then there will be some hope that further aid will be helpful. Initially that can come from the International Bank; surely that institution can perform some small portion of the great good claimed for it. If its resources are not sufficient, there will be time enough for government action.

But if out of that Paris conference come merely some more schemes for state controls, we will venture the guess that the American people will not respond. Also last week at Paris was a conference dealing with cereal grains. It framed a resolution proposing strict government controls of all grains, that all dealings be registered with the government, that the government inspect all private records to see that distribution is kept in authorized channels; in other words, strict rationing and government control everywhere. If that is the sort of thing that international conferences are to produce, we believe and hope that the American people will not furnish one red cent.

Columnists to the contrary, the American people know very well that they have the opportunity to assume the leadership of the world. They know something else. It is not leadership merely to finance a journey along the socialistic paths they do not care to travel.

Modernize Our Presidential Election—V. The Allotment of Two Electoral Votes to Each State Regardless of Population

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, under the census of 1940 the total population of the United States was 131,699,275. Ten of the large States had a population of 69,014,043, which means that the remaining 38 States had a population of 62,655,232, or 6,358,811 less than the total population of these 10 States. These 10 large States have 20 electoral votes allotted them by the Constitution regardless of population. The other 38 States have 76 electoral votes allotted them regardless of population.

This gives 56 electoral votes more to the 38 States having less than half of our population than is allotted to the 10 big States.

Under the present apportionment 531 electoral votes are allotted to the States. Of this number, 96, or 2 for each State, are allotted regardless of population. Therefore, the electoral votes allotted to

the States regardless of population constitute over 18 percent of the total electoral vote.

Such assignment of electoral votes has an important bearing upon our electoral problems so far as the Presidency is concerned.

It is interesting to note the effect of the 2-vote allotment to each State on the candidate as shown by the election returns in the election of 1944. Roosevelt carried 36 States, which gave him 72 of the 96 electoral votes that are assigned to the States regardless of the population. So he received exactly 75 of this class of electoral votes, while he had 53 percent of the total popular vote of the Nation, and 81 percent of its electoral vote.

Table IV illustrates how these votes were counted in the last Presidential election and how they would have been allotted under the proposed amendment. It will be understood, of course, that there would be no separate computation of this particular class of popular votes. This table merely shows what would have been the effect of these votes as credited under the present system and as they would have been under the proposed plan of election.

Had these votes been credited to the candidates in proportion to their popular votes, Roosevelt would have received 54.167 electoral votes and Dewey 40.801. Thus, under the proposed plan the majority of these electoral votes which would have gone to Roosevelt would have been 13.366 instead of 48. In other words, the difference resulting from the proposed plan of crediting votes would have been 34,634 electoral votes. They would have been assigned justly, in proportion to the popular vote instead of the present practice, which compels an arbitrary credit of the whole 2 electoral votes in each State to the candidates receiving the plurality vote.

This arbitrary allotment of these 34 electoral votes in the election of 1944 gave the beneficiary candidate a greater vote than a candidate could receive from any other State in the Union excepting New York and Pennsylvania. It was a greater vote than that of either Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Texas, or California. That unearned vote more than equaled the combined vote of Massachusetts and New Jersey in the election of 1944.

The plan we advocate does not propose to take from any State, even from the smallest, the two electoral votes that are assigned to it by the Constitution. The granting of such votes was a strong influence in securing the unanimity of the States by which the Constitution was adopted.

A fair division of the large number of electoral votes awarded the States regardless of population, among the candidates in proportion to their popular votes, would greatly minimize any criticism that can now be directed against the present method of their allotment.

Assigning to one candidate the whole of two votes given the State, without reference to its population, carries something of the idea that a candidate is getting votes that do not belong to him. Give the candidate credit in proportion to his popular vote and it seems more like he has earned his part of such votes.

Of course, it is apparent that a candidate carrying a large number of small States is very materially benefited by the two votes allotted to each State regardless of population. The benefit of these two votes is greatly emphasized by the fact that the plurality candidate in each State gets the benefit of both of them.

Let us take a State with four electoral votes, two allotted in proportion to population, and two regardless of population. Suppose 150,000 votes were cast, of which the plurality candidate received 60,000, and 2 or more minority candidates received 90,000. Thus the candidate who received 40 percent of the popular vote would receive 100 percent of the electoral vote. Fifty percent of the vote he received, or two electoral votes, came to him regardless of the proportion of population or popular votes to justify the votes he received.

A distinct merit of the proposed amendment would be that it would discontinue the practice of allotting the two electoral votes to the plurality candidate alone, and do the just thing of dividing them proportionately between the candidates.

This would not only be just to the candidates, but to all the other States participating in the election.

This table shows what would have been the votes received by the two major candidates, on account of the two-vote assignment to each State, of electoral votes in the election of 1944.

TABLE IV.—*Two-vote allotment*

	Under present plan		Under proposed plan	
	Roosevelt (Democrat)	Dewey (Republican)	Roosevelt (Democrat)	Dewey (Republican)
Alabama	2		1.625	0.363
Arizona	2		1.175	.817
Arkansas	2		1.399	.596
California	2		1.129	.859
Colorado		2	.927	1.064
Connecticut	2		1.046	.938
Delaware	2		1.087	.905
Florida	2		1.406	.593
Georgia	2		1.634	.344
Idaho	2		1.031	.961
Illinois	2		1.030	.960
Indiana		2	.934	1.047
Iowa		2	.949	1.039
Kansas		2	.783	1.204
Kentucky	2		1.089	.904
Louisiana	2		1.611	.387
Maine		2	.948	1.048
Maryland	2		1.037	.962
Massachusetts	2		1.030	.916
Michigan	2		1.003	.983
Minnesota	2		1.048	0.937
Mississippi	2		1.760	.041
Missouri	2		1.027	.968
Montana	2		1.085	.898
Nebraska		2	.828	1.171
Nevada	2		1.092	.907
New Hampshire	2		1,042	.957
New Jersey	2		1.006	.979
New Mexico	2		1.069	.928
New York	2		1.046	.945
North Carolina	2		1.334	.665
North Dakota		2	.909	1.076
Ohio		2	.996	1.003
Oklahoma	2		1.111	.884
Oregon	2		1.035	.938
Pennsylvania	2		1.022	.967
Rhode Island	2		1.171	.825
South Carolina	2		1.752	.087
South Dakota		2	.833	1.166
Tennessee	2		1.208	.784
Texas	2		1,428	.332
Utah	2		1.208	.788
Vermont		2	.858	1.141
Virginia	2		1.247	.747
Washington	2		1.136	.844
West Virginia	2		1.097	.902
Wisconsin		2	.971	1.007
Wyoming		2	.975	1.024
Total	72	24	54.167	40.801

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to comment upon the President's message to the Congress as of yesterday on the subject of flood control.

President Truman outlines a 10-year program with a $250,000,000 expenditure to control the floodwaters of the Mississippi River and its tributaries. There is no question as to the need and the advisability of such a long-range project. It is almost inconceivable to imagine the accomplishments which could be brought about in such a gigantic undertaking of soil and water conservation. Imagine what it could have meant to this country if the billions spent for war, and which are continuing to be spent as a result of war, could have been applied to such measures.

Certainly I am personally interested in seeing measures taken to control the floodwaters of the great Missisippi and Missouri Valley. However, flood control is a Nation-wide problem and should be all-inclusive. The President has alluded to the lower Mississippi carrying the flood water discharged from every tributary river basin from the Appalachian to the Rocky Mountains. Attention is invited to the fact that waters from the great rivers of Texas flow directly into the Gulf of Mexico and are not included in the geography mentioned by the President. My statements here are not in opposition to flood-control measures in the great Mississippi Valley, but I do think the program as outlined by the President should take into consideration the tremendous needs of the great Southwest, where problems of flood control are equally important to the entire Nation.

Civil Government for Former Jap Mandated Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the other day this Congress enacted legislation to enable the President, on behalf of the United States, to accept trusteeship of the former Japanese mandated islands—the Marshalls, the Marianas, and the Carolines. The trusteeship agreement which we have agreed to follow in the administration of these islands was drafted by the United States Departments of State, War, and Navy. Neither the Congress nor any civilian agency of the Government except the then Army-Navy dominated State Department had a hand in the drafting of the trusteeship agreement.

It has been stated that the trust agreement makes ample provision for the political, economic, social, and educational development of the inhabitants of the islands. I would like to say right here and now that pious platitudes in a trusteeship agreement will not provide political, economic, social, and educational development for these island peoples. Those are goals which will be achieved through long years of patient and concentrated effort on the part of the people themselves and the persons who will be charged with responsibility for administering the trust. They are goals which are best achieved under enlightened and democratic practices. In my opinion, they can only be achieved under civilian administration along democratic, American lines. They are not goals which can best be achieved as mere incidents to the maintenance of naval establishments in the islands.

I am informed that upon acceptance of trusteeship by the United States a declaration will be issued ending American military government in the islands. But what then? The people of the islands have not been authorized to form a government for themselves. The Congress has not enacted legislation establishing a form of government in the islands. As a consequence, gentlemen, it looks as though the trust territory of the Pacific islands will have another so-called naval civil government.

Gentlemen, not long ago I had the good fortune to accompany the Secretary of the Interior on a Pacific island inspection tour. In the course of that trip we visited two United States possessions—Guam and American Samoa. They are beautiful, sun-drenched islands inhabited by some 40,000 loyal American nationals and by thousands of American civilians and servicemen.

During the course of our short visit I learned much about these bits of America in the Pacific. But, gentlemen, what I learned about the nature of the government which the greatest democracy on earth has imposed on the people of Guam and American Samoa is utterly and completely shocking. What I saw then and what I have since learned about these governments leaves me sick and disgusted. For half a century we—the United States of America, the champion of democracy— have ruled these island peoples under so-called naval civil governments in which the legislative, executive, and judicial powers of government are lodged in the person of a United States naval officer under appointment as governor by the President. Through the years of American sovereignty these governments have been as absolute and as undemocratic in many respects as were the governments of our recently defeated enemies.

The United States Navy Department is at present responsible for the administration of the Pacific islands and is governing the islands under a form of military government similar to those which we have imposed on our conquered enemies in Europe and Asia. Since early in the Pacific war the economic affairs of the islands have largely been in the hands of the U. S. Commercial Company, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Little if anything is known as to the kind of job either the Navy or the U. S. Commercial Company have been doing in the islands.

The U. S. Commercial Company, which has administered the Pacific Ocean program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has supplied the needs of the civilian populations of the Pacific islands and has provided the only outlet for the products of the islands during the years of American occupation. I am informed that the Navy is about to take over that program. It appears that in the process, practically all of the civilian personnel will be released and hereafter the program will be handled by naval personnel. Thus, gentlemen, the consolidation of naval control in the Pacific islands move another step nearer completion. When the U. S. Commercial Company has been eliminated from the economic phases of Pacific island affairs and when a naval governor for the trust territory of the Pacific islands, responsible to the Secretary of the Navy, has been appointed there will have come into existence another Guam and Samoa—another naval government of civilian populations in time of peace.

The native people of the Pacific islands, although small in number and widely scattered over hundreds of thousands of square miles of ocean in primitive communities, are entitled to a decent form of government and a fair share of the social and economic benefits which are universally associated with the United States. We owe them more than bare subsistence in poverty and hopelessness on an isolated island in a modern world. We owe them more in the way of government than a Guam-Samoa type of naval civil government. They enjoyed more than that under Germany—even under Japan—and now that they are our responsibility, not our victims, we must see that they are adequately provided for. I, for one, want to see the Congress of the United States enact organic legislation for these islands without delay. I want to see local self-government in the various island communities. I want to see civilian administration for the trust territory—and I want to see it before the end of the Eightieth Congress.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the President, in his message on yesterday relative to the need for vast expenditures for flood control in the Missouri and upper Mississippi Valleys, stated that the conservation of our natural resources and their wise use are essential to our very existence as a nation. He pointed out that during a 10-year period a total of more than a billion dollars in flood damage has been suffered in the Mississippi Basin.

I am certainly sympathetic with the need for continued control of those devastating floods. But while the President addressed his message to the flood damages in that one area, I am sure he did not mean the need for control of floods in other sections of the Nation is not of equal moment.

It happens that I come from a section that is frequently harassed by flash floods and overflows. Because of the seriousness of the resulting damages, many surveys have been made by the Army engineers. Many needed projects have been recommended in order to cope with the problems. Congress has authorized a number of dams and reservoirs, and other surveys and plans are in the making. In the district I represent, construction is now proceeding on the Horde's Creek flood control project and on the North Concho dam and reservoir. Because of a rather strict limitation on the budget this year, funds to continue the latter project may be exhausted early next year, at which time additional funds must be provided.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, surveys have long since been completed for a reclamation project on the Colorado River in Coke County, Tex., and it has been approved by the Reclamation Service. There is already authorization for flood control on Brady Creek, and the Army engineers have recommended a flood-control dam on the Colorado River and also on the San Saba River. Surveys are continuing on the Nueces River, on the Llano Rivers, the San Saba, the Guadaloupe, and Sulphur Creek that runs through the city of Lampasas, and others.

I mention these various projects merely for the purpose of illustrating the fact that while the Mississippi Basin situation is serious, damages are mounting in other areas of the Nation that are deserving of continued attention.

The Land Is Our Sustenance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hugh H. Bennett from the Washington Evening Star:

THE LAND IS OUR SUSTENANCE—EROSION HAS DAMAGED MORE THAN HALF OF OUR FARMLAND AND THREATENS WORLD'S FOOD SUPPLY

(By Hugh H. Bennett, Chief, Soil Conservation Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture)

Conservation of what remains of the world's still-shrinking acreage of food-producing land is one of the most pressing problems facing our own and other nations today.

Yet land waste through accelerated soil erosion is as old as civilization itself. It extends just as far as man has spread over the world with his herds and plows. Accelerated erosion means speeded-up or man-made erosion, as contrasted to the slow process of geologic erosion which, across the ages, has shaped the earth's surface.

We have reached a point where the loss of productive land anywhere on the globe affects the people and the nations of every other part of the globe; for every acre which goes out of production means, to some degree, that the pressure is increased on the remaining good acres. Soil conservation is the only known way to protect the productive land of the world.

Today there is left in the world, as well as I have been able to estimate it, only about 4,000,000,000 acres of immediately arable land. That land must feed more than 2,000,000,000 people, whose numbers are increasing at the rate of about 20,000,000 a year. The great bulk of our food comes from this land, as well as all of our wood, leather, wool, cotton, and various other vegetable fibers and oils. Nutritionists tell us it takes about 2½ acres of reasonably productive land, on the average, to provide each person with a minimum adequate diet. Some countries have less than that much now—some less than 1 acre per capita. Whole nations and civilizations in the past have perished because they misused their land.

UNITED STATES APPROACHES DANGER LINE

The United States is better off with respect to the amount of good land we have, because we had so much to start with and have been using it only a comparatively short time as the life of a nation goes. Even so, we have none too much left and have no reason to be complacent about our land security. Although there once were those who thought our supply of productive land was inexhaustible, we now know better. We know that we ourselves have come all too close to the danger line in using up our irreplaceable soil resource.

More than half of our farmland has been damaged by erosion—millions of acres of it ruined for further practical cultivation and other millions of acres almost as seriously affected. Soil-conservation surveys indicate that we have left only about 450,000,000 acres of good cropland in this country, and all but about 100,000,000 acres of this is subject to erosion. Moreover, some 80,000,000 acres of the 450,000,000 still needs clearing, drainage, irrigation, or other improvements to make it productive. Meanwhile, erosion likewise has been taking its toll from a vast acreage of our range and pasture lands.

Worse, we still are losing in the United States the equivalent of about 500,000 acres every year through soil erosion. That is despite the great progress we have made in our national soil-conservation thinking and action within less than 20 years. This removal of fertile topsoil from our fields and pastures has been costing us more than $1,000,000,000 a year. That is the estimated toll in such items as direct cost to farmers, contribution to the Nation's food bill, siltation of reservoirs and harbors, damage to highways and railways, and other charges. It does not include such other drains on the Nation as the development of rural slums, narrowed tax base, and reduced income and purchasing power.

Examples of how this price of soil erosion is paid by landowners, the public, and Government are found in every agricultural area of the country. To pick one at random close at hand: During the past century the Federal Government has spent more than $112,000,000 in the Chesapeake Bay for dredging and channel maintenance, and much dredging remains to be done. The material that has to be dredged at such great cost to keep trade channels open and business flowing once was productive soil back on the watersheds of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. Erosion and resultant siltation likewise have contributed largely to the decline in Chesapeake Bay's oyster production from 13,000,000 bushels in 1880 to only about 3,000,000 bushels a year now.

SILT MAKES GHOST TOWNS

Various settlements in Maryland became ghost towns when ships no longer could reach their wharves. Joppa Town, Bladensburg, Port Tobacco—these and others fell victims to erosion-produced sediment that filled their navigation channels.

Our hope for the future security of the land which is our sustenance depends on our safeguarding it with the permanent, acre-by-acre conservation treatment and use which today is spreading so steadily over the country and also is being adopted by a number of other countries which are sending their agricultural technicians to the United States to study our methods of soil conservation.

Actually we are today in a race. The sides are already drawn. On the one side we are faced with a steadily increasing population. Year after year, even during the war, the number of people on earth has grown larger. No one can say with authority where, or when, the growth will level off. On the other side we can see our remaining area of productive land shrinking steadily before the onslaught of erosion.

These are the forces we must deal with. Regardless of what can or should be done about the matter of population, we can and must do something about erosion. No nation—or the world, for that matter—has too much fertile land. Neither the world nor any nation can afford to lose any more productive land. Too many nations have much too little now. In relation to world population, our total world ability to produce food has already arrived precariously close to the danger line. In some countries the danger line was crossed long before World War II.

There is no more land to waste.

Pertinent Observations Concerning Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, communism in America is under attack at last. The so-called Dies committee—on which I served 6 years—did the spadework for the present Nation-wide attack upon communism. It was during the heyday of the Dies committee that evidence was secured, sorted, tabulated, and filed away. That evidence is now being used in an attack upon communism which has secured such a toehold in the United States. The Dies committee seized documents, records, membership lists, and other valuable evidence in connection with numerous subversive groups and individuals; compiled, sorted, and classified the same; and built up a card index catalog listing the names of approximately 1,000,000 people who are or have been members of one or more subversive organizations. This valuable work was done before war was declared, before these organizations went underground and either hid or destroyed their records. It is not generally known that after Pearl Harbor representatives from the FBI, Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, and Federal Secret Service searched the Dies committee files daily, obtaining evidence which led to prosecutions and convictions in hundreds of cases of subversive activities.

The present Nation-wide drive against communism is taking on the nature of a three-pronged drive: (1) Against Communists in Government positions; (2) against Communists in the labor movement; and (3) against Communists in our American schools. So today the much-maligned, ridiculed, and almost discredited Dies committee has at last been fully vindicated and its work is now being capitalized upon as the basis for an all-out drive against communism.

The Committee on Un-American Activities did not rate very high at first in the opinion of many so-called liberals. Its activities were known as "red-baiting." Today no real American wants to see the House Committee on Un-American Activities abolished. The tide has turned and is now running strong against the Communists within our gates. I am proud to have had a small part in laying the foundation for the present all-out drive against communism in America.

Mr. Speaker, historians of the future, in writing the history of 1947, are likely to refer to it as "the year we turned to the right." The American voter turned to the right last November. Congress responded immediately, and the White House followed several months later. Four substantial steps to the right were taken during March—all away from communism:

March 12: President Truman addressed a joint session of Congress urging action to stop further aggressions of Communist Russia against freedom-loving people anywhere, and recommended help for Greece and Turkey without delay.

March 21: Prodded by the persistent demands of Congressmen, the State Department at long last published the complete texts of the secret agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. As a result, Americans learned additional facts about our appeasement program toward Russia from 1941 to the present time.

March 22: President Truman issued an Executive order for a "loyalty purge" of all Government employees, at long last acting upon recommendations repeatedly made by the House Committee on Un-American Activities over the past 8 years.

March 26: J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, was given clearance by the administration to speak his mind at a public hearing held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Hoover spoke in short, blunt, significant words. He said, "The Communist Party of the United States is a fifth column. Its goal is the overthrow of our Government."

One can easily see from these four steps that appeasement of Communist Russia has ceased to be our American policy, and that Communists are (we hope) finally to be driven off the Federal pay roll. What the future holds is yet uncertain, but a united America is striving prayerfully to avert war and protect our freedom.

Mr. Speaker, communism in order to function requires a dictator. Dictators

are fundamentally opposed to trade unions. As soon as a dictator comes to power he destroys trade unions, applies strict discipline to all labor, fixes wages and hours of work by government decree, and takes away the right to strike. He uses the military power of the government, the concentration camp, or the firing squad whenever necessary to get results. Labor has experienced all these things in Italy, in Germany, and in Russia.

If Stalin fastens his economic program with its compulsory labor requirements upon the greater part of Europe, American industry will find it difficult to meet the competition such cheap forced labor will provide. Such competition will result in a lowering of American wage and labor standards, and it will bring about a lower standard of living for the American people. Thoughtful leaders of American labor should realize this situation and guide themselves accordingly. Stalin's followers, found in the ranks of American labor, do not have the interests of the American workingman at heart. The best answer to communism and socialism in all their forms is the success of the American system of free enterprise.

David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, and a vice president of the A. F. of L., has long been a leading foe to Communists in the American labor movement. Mr. Dubinsky says:

No organization in American life has been immune from Communist penetration. Obedient to centralized direction, Communists have bored within church bodies, educational institutions, women's clubs, scientific groups, and, believe it or not, businessmen's associations. But the labor unions have been their special target. Without control of the trade unions the Communists would be lost. The unions form their economic base. * * * For this reason the significance of Communist operations in trade unions can scarcely be exaggerated. Like termites, they bore into the house of labor, but are not an integral part of the structure because the spirit and aims of totalitarian communism are totally distinct from, and hostile to, the ideals and policies of trade unionism.

Mr. Speaker, Clare Booth Luce, in an article entitled "Communism Challenges Christianity," says in substance:

Communism is avowedly a materialistic philosophy that shuts out all spiritual concepts. The basic creed of all Communist leaders and teachers is that man is an animal without a soul. Every Communist leader from Marx to Lenin to Browder to Foster has fanatically proclaimed that man's nature is wholly materialistic, therefore the No. 1 enemy of communism is Christianity, because the teachings of Christ are in direct opposition to the teachings of communism. Communists deny the Christian concept of man as a child of God, a creature with a soul.

Clare Luce closes her excellent article with the timely warning that whenever Christian people adopt scientific materialism, which is the heart of communism, then freedom of the individual will be lost forever, and the world will perish in a totalitarian night.

I subscribe to the thoughts expressed by Clare Booth Luce in her article and desire to emphasize her warning.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that patriotic Americans everywhere, regardless of nationality, race, creed, or political party, should unite in a Nationwide, all-out drive against communism in America. We must rid our fair land of this atheistic Red menace before we are destroyed by it.

Let's Not Forget the Trinity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the proposal of the President that this Nation inaugurate a broad program to harness the floods of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. Our Government, as a government, is duty bound to protect the lives and property of its citizens, and it is certainly false economy to save a dollar when that dollar, if properly expended, would preserve property of the value of many dollars. Spending to save is the safest spending.

But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot fail to point out to the Members of this House that President Truman has failed to note the ravages of other rivers within our boundaries. There is in Texas a stream which almost annually floods thousands of acres of our most fertile soil and wreaks hundreds of thousands of dollars in damage. I speak of the Trinity River. I respectfully urge the Members to broaden their views regarding flood control beyond the Missouri-Mississippi watershed and consider other streams, such as the Trinity, which should be brought under control.

Personal Income-Tax Reduction Bill Should Be Signed by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, both Houses of the Congress have now passed for the second time the much-needed war-tax-reduction bill. It received a very large majority vote in both Houses in which both political parties joined. The overburdened taxpayers throughout the Nation are entitled to a break by relieving them from some of these excessive war taxes now that the war has been over for 2 years.

Our experience following the World War I was that by reducing the taxes the Government received more tax dollars than before the reduction. This was due to the fact that it gave opportunity to capital dollars to receive proper returns on investments and capital was invested in productive enterprise, increasing jobs and buying capacity and as a result Federal tax receipts were increased although the rate was reduced.

The feeling is growing stronger throughout the Nation that unless the taxpayer is given some relief from the burden of war taxes he will not continue to support a program of sending American tax dollars to foreign countries to relieve the peoples of those nations. As a matter of fact we have sent overseas over $20,000,000,000 since the war ended and the program now under consideration will require several billion dollars additional each year. It is true we must make adequate payments on the national debt and this will be done from excess revenues received after this tax reduction bill becomes a law.

Mr. Speaker, I include in these remarks two editorials from the two metropolitan daily papers in Portland, Oreg., in my district, one a Republican paper and the other Democratic, both urging that this tax bill be signed by the President. The editorials are as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian of July 12, 1947]

TAX REDUCTION DUE

President Truman's insistence on delaying Federal tax reduction until next year—a Presidential year—at which time he would present his own tax bill to Congress, is taking unfair advantage of taxpayers for political profit. Moreover, from where we sit, it doesn't even look like good politics for him.

The new tax-reduction bill, which would eliminate millions of low-wage earners and scale down payments of other earners from 30 percent in lower brackets to 10.5 percent in the highest bracket, is dated to go into effect January 1, next year. If the President's veto again is upheld, he will be in the position of asking Congress next year to do that which Congress voted twice to do this year, for a difference of 6 months in effective date. We think the voters, who also pay taxes and who are deserving of a reduction in burdensome war rates, will not be fooled.

[From the Oregon Daily Journal, Portland, Oreg., of July 11, 1947]

THE TAX-REDUCTION BILL

President Truman has announced that he again will veto the income-tax-reduction bill. This is the same bill that he vetoed June 16, except that its effective date is January 1, 1948, instead of July 1, 1947. There may be enough votes in the House to override the veto. What may happen in the Senate is problematical.

In his veto message the President said that the bill offers the wrong kind of tax reduction at the wrong time.

It may be that the Republican Congress is anticipating any possible suggestion for an income-tax reduction at a later date by a Democratic President.

There is Presidential politics in this thing on both sides. The issue should be determined on its merit. It will not be.

Tax reduction was promised by the Republicans. They twice have fulfilled their commitments in the Congress.

The President, who, too, has responsibilities concerning the economic structure, does not agree with the Congress.

By this second veto of the tax bill, the President will be in a difficult situation if he proposes tax reduction in his message to the Congress next January.

In the meantime, the taxpayers, small and large—and they are legion—are being made the cat's-paw of Presidential politics.

The Journal's opinion is that the President should sign the bill.

Bad Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include therein an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of Thursday, July 17, entitled, "Bad Medicine," referring to the "Federal Employees Loyalty Act of 1947":

BAD MEDICINE

The House of Representatives has passed a thoroughly bad bill in the name of a thoroughly good cause. The cause, stated generally, is a wish to make certain that those who hold public office in a democratic government actually believe in the democratic method and do their best to make it work successfully. The present instrument for accomplishing this wholly desirable purpose is a bill bearing the title of the "Federal Employees Loyalty Act of 1947." It has been passed in the House by a vote of 319 to 61, with many of the most respected conservatives in that branch of Congress protesting against it, to their credit.

The bill would create a Loyalty Review Board, which would have power to rove anywhere and everywhere into the business of any and all other departments and agencies in Washington, looking, with the enforced aid of the FBI, for disloyal suspects. On discovering such a suspect it would notify the person under investigation in writing of its preliminary finding, together with a factual statement upon which such finding is based, concealing as far as possible the source or sources of the information. The accused, thus denied his rightful opportunity to confront his accuser, would have 15 days to reply. If he failed to satisfy his inquisitors—in such matters, for example, as whether there were reasonable grounds for believing that he had sympathetic association with any organization on a list to be arbitrarily designated by the Attorney General on his own personal say-so as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive—the accused would be dismissed summarily from Government employment. There is no provision for appeal. There is no right of review from the decision of this roving and omnipotent board. The accused would be dropped, with the soul-searing finding—worse for many than a prison sentence—that he was disloyal to the Government of the United States.

This bill lacks all of the safeguards and protections embodied in President Truman's own recent proposal in the same field. It lacks all the elements of a decent respect for democratic rights and the standards of fair play. It is a bad bill. It should never have been passed by the House. It should be thrown out of the window by the Senate.

Charles Oscar Andrews

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOE HENDRICKS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHARLES OSCAR ANDREWS, late a Senator from the State of Florida

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, we all mourn the death of Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS. Whatever tribute I may pay him would be as much a tribute to a man and a citizen of the State of Florida as it would be to a United States Senator. I had the pleasure of knowing of Senator ANDREWS and knowing him personally long before he became United States Senator. Senator ANDREWS was a man highly respected in the State of Florida as one of our outstanding citizens and a friend of the people. He was loyal and kind to his personal friends and held their loyalty throughout the years that I knew him. He was a good father and a loving husband.

In the Halls of Congress, Senator ANDREWS voted his convictions without regard to the popularity of his position. He had a keen judicial mind, a sense of justice, an innate endowment of statesmanship. The people of Florida paid their highest tribute to Senator ANDREWS in life and he will live in the hearts of his friends.

Importation of Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I include the following communication received from William H. Emerine, Alvada, Ohio, and request the committee having jurisdiction investigate the matters set forth in the communication:

STAMSOGAR

A gigantic conspiracy intent on controlling all peoples of the earth by controlling the availability of these nine basic products:

1. Steel.
2. Tungsten carbide.
3. Aluminum.
4. Magnesium.
5. Sugar.
6. Oil.
7. Gas.
8. Alcohol.
9. Rubber.

Whereas in this day and age all mankind cannot for very long do without any or all of these basic products; and

Whereas it is now known that 23 powerfully rich men of earth are bent on gaining control of these basic products; and

Whereas those 23 men are determined to control the people of all earth by controlling these nine basic products; and

Whereas sugar affects all of us directly through our diet; and

Whereas sugar is necessary to our diet: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned, wish you, ALVIN F. WEICHEL, to introduce a resolution in Congress to investigate as to why sufficient sugar is not being imported into the United States from sugar-producing countries and remove sugar from all rationing.

William H. Emprine, Harold J. Reinhard, Mrs. Harry Geogline, Mrs. C. R. Bresler, Mrs. Ida Lewis, Donald Bringman, C. R. Bresler, Mrs. Howard Sander, Mrs. E. D. Gooch, Mrs. O. T. Crawford, Mrs. Henry Fox, Mrs. Edith Fries, Mrs. G. M. Rosendale, I. L. Wright, Mrs. E. Flowers, Mrs. G. D. Myert, Milton Bockbrader, Mrs. J. C. Breneman, G. A. Ketcham, Earl W. Barger, K. N. Murphy, Aaron Ruehl, Chas. C. Few, Leo Clark, Zila B. Konold, R. V. Konold, Ward Mullen, Mrs. Estella Brubaker, Mrs. Luther Dyer, Mrs. Merrill Mallott, Guy E. Hummel, Florence Hummel, Sylvia Yates, Chas. Haldeman, Mrs. C. N. Gesen, Mrs. Harry Faylor, Ione Stoner, Fred Stannard, Carie Kennedy, D. E. Shearel, J. E. Wirt, Lula Evans, Mrs. N. C. Elarton, R. P. Elarton, Mrs. Chas. Shook, Henry Black, Mrs. W. H. Miller, Jacob W. Hunt, Homer S. White, Edith Bankey, Mrs. Betty Caswell, Jacob Gase, Mary C. Gase, Helen Crawford, Laura L. Goon, Helen L. Ohler, Herald C. Ohler, Helen Standinger, Irma Millburne, E. F. Struner, C. E. Hiser, B. B. Milligan, Mr. and Mrs. Oliver Staats, Mrs. C. T. Walton, Mrs. John F. Clause, Mrs. William Eidson, John Gelter, Mr. and Mrs. Floyd W. Lee, Lillian Strausbaugh, Mrs. W. O. Campbell, Mrs. Harry Smith, Mrs. Carl R. Anderson, Mrs. Herbert Havens, Mrs. I. H. Dornan, W. M. Houtz, Tura M. Houtz, Mrs. Robert Boff, Warren House, Wm. Jacobs, Amanda Whiteman, Mrs. Robert F. Cole, Chas. Swinehart, Chas. Topping, Mrs. D. J. Stahl, Mrs. C. E. Kempher, Mrs. H. G. Green, Mrs. Howard E. Frantz, Mrs. Wilbur Bell, Miss Bessie Wollam, Mrs. Martin Wollam, Martin Wollam, Mrs. Georgeann Lyman, Mrs. A. H. Mullholand, Mrs. F. A. Bowman, B. Painter, Ben Wildman, Wm. N. Holman, Burton J. Bauman, Mrs. Burton J. Bauman, Mrs. Elize Irene Myers, Dewey Ponn, Mrs. John Good, Edyth Murphy.

E. E. Harrison, Mrs. Blake A. Myers, Mrs. Clayton H. Purkey, Mrs. G. B. Krupp, Mrs. Darrell Masamer, S. Q. Masamer, D. O. Masamer, Mrs. S. O. Masamer, Mrs. B. E. Tefft, B. E. Tefft, A. Koons, Mrs. Rosie Shaw, Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Bowser, Mr. and Mrs. A. B. Stearns, I. Strausbaugh, Mr. and Mrs. John Stearns, S. H. Morgart, H. A. Baker, Warren Hathaway, Ivan L. Harrison, Mrs. Geo. Stainbrook, Mrs. R. F. Munger, Mrs. J. F. Duding, Mrs. Robert S. Long, C. E. McLaughlin, Mrs. C. E. McLaughlin, Mrs. M. L. Snyder, Mrs. R. M. Bomer, Mrs. Chas. G. Hooper, Mrs. Jacob Reiss, Mr. and Mrs. Jesse Warner, Mr. and Mrs. Homer G. Dyer, Mrs. Richard Droll, Mrs. Emmitt Droll, Mrs. Earl Graham, Earl Graham, Mrs. Geo. Bundy, Arthur Fulton, Mrs. Willard Radcliff, Mrs. Paul Wentz, Mrs. John Derck, Chas. Thomas, A. H. Thomas, Robert Hicks, Mrs. B. Brown, Lee Pelton, Richard Miller, Ora Flechtner, Kenneth Ault, Mrs. Frank Dibling, H. E. Crosby, H. E. Yoder, M. C. Adams, Pearl Adams, Mrs. F. Higgins, Mrs. W. Murphy, Mrs. W. Peters, Mrs. Wm. Williamson, Mrs. F. W. Zeperwick, J. A. Hathaway, Dell Frankart, Thos. E. Frederick, Mrs. H. D. Keogh, Mrs. Clyde May, Clifford Tory, Mrs. Danny Rhoad, Mrs. J. W. Piper, H. A. Piper, Mrs. C. A. Luman, Eugene Fry, Mrs. L. B. Stearns, Mrs. R. W. Muir, Helen Muir, Mrs. Cleon Murphy, Geraldine Kreais, Mrs. G. A. Brooks, Mrs. Jennie Turley, F. L. Stearns, Mrs. H. A. Yost, Mrs. W. M. Turley, W. M. Turley, Arthur Turley, Mr. and Mrs. Nick Frankart, Mary Louise Frankart, Mrs. Bessie Welch, Grace Lewis, Merrill C. Smith, Joe Nathmeyer, Ray Wetty.

H. N. Brandiberry, M. H. Moyer, Mr. and Mrs. Eugene E. Reinhard, Mr. and Mrs. Ross Fry, Mr. and Mrs. T. L. Brown, Mrs. and Mrs. J. A. Snow, Harry Stearns, Harry Turley, Marie Hendryckx, E. A. Kreais, D. J. Baird, J. L. Durbin, George Hummel, Harold Canterbury, R. W. Stoudinger, Leonard G. Bumpus, C. P. Stein, J. H. Baird, N. W. England, Mrs. Clyde Stearns, Mrs. Walden Bruns, Mrs. Roy Kimble, O. E. Himber, Mrs. K. L. Kreais, Mrs. A. M. Dennis, Mrs. E. C. Hall, Mrs. Daisy Bradner, Mrs. T. J. Stall, Mrs. F. H. Bloom, Mrs. Roller Fox, Mrs. Gertrude Ketcham, Mrs. Charles Sawyer, Mr. and Mrs. Andrew J. Wiseginer, Mrs. C. A. Rosendale, Mrs. George W. Bower, Royal Robbins, Mrs. Sadie A. Bower, Mrs. Robert Huffman, Mrs. H. L. Breneman, K. K. Stannard, David Carman, Mrs. Nora Kelly, Mrs. William Manecke, Mrs. Clara Lee, Mr. and Mrs. George W. Addy, Mr. and Mrs. Earl Hummel, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Pelton, Mr. and Mrs. Donald Johnson, Arthur Bundy, R. B. Ketcham, Mrs. H. P. Bresler, H. P. Bresler, Mrs. L. G. Bumpus.

Charter Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Barnet Nover from today's Washington Post:

CHARTER REFORM—IF THE UN IS TO FUNCTION
(By Barnet Nover)

The acutely critical situation in Greece underlines the wisdom of the move, now under way in Congress, to strengthen the United Nations by curbing the great power veto.

For some weeks the Security Council has had before it the report of the Balkan commission. That body, appointed last December, spent months looking into charges that Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia were supporting guerrilla warfare in northern Greece.

Evidence accumulated by the commission makes it clear that these charges were not unfounded. Russia and her Communist-dominated satellites in the Balkans are out to destroy the present Greek Government and set up in its place a regime that will do the Kremlin's bidding.

It was for the precise purpose of blocking such a development, which would leave the entire Middle East open to Soviet domination, that, at President Truman's request, Congress authorized large-scale aid to Greece and Turkey.

Democracies move slowly.

President Truman's appeal to Congress was made on March 12. Only now, more than 4 months later, has the Griswold mission arrived on the scene in Greece. Actually, Congress has yet to appropriate the Greek aid funds that were authorized.

In the meantime, the pressure on Greece from the Soviet north has not diminished. If anything, it has been stepped up considerably.

The success of the Soviet-supported guerrilla campaign in Greece would now serve a double purpose. It would not only round out Russia's sphere of influence in the Balkans by eliminating the only non-Communist government in the peninsula. It would also deal a tremendous blow to American prestige at a time when 16 European nations have banded together to carry out the Marshall plan.

It is an ominous circumstance that the increase in Soviet pressure on Greece is taking place at the very moment when the Security Council is considering the problem.

Russia and her Balkan satellites do not appear to be particularly concerned with what the Council may do. Should it reach a show-down on the question of carrying out the recommendations of the Balkan Commission, Russia can always block action by employing her veto.

In the meantime, the mere threat of a veto has been enough to prolong the Greek discussions in the Council and thus gain time for Russia's satellites along the Greek frontier to continue their dirty work.

A bipartisan group of Senators, headed by HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, and a group of House Members, headed by WALTER JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota, have introduced resolutions whose common purpose it is to bring about a revision of the United Nations Charter.

It must be recognized that, statesmanlike and absolutely necessary as this move is, it can have no immediate effect so far as the strengthening of the UN is concerned. At San Francisco, despite the vigorous objections of the Canadian and other delegations, the amendment of the Charter was made extremely difficult.

The Charter provides for two distinct but related methods of amendment. In the first place an amendment can go into effect if it is approved by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly, followed by ratification by two-thirds of the members of the United Nations. The approving nations must include, however, all the permanent members of the Security Council. There is that veto again.

Amendment is also possible through a general conference of the United Nations. Again final approval requires the unanimous vote of the big five.

There is no reason to believe that Russia is in the least inclined to give up her veto power. She regards it as far more important than all the rest of the Charter since it enables her to block action which may be contrary to her interests and the interests of her satellites.

Russia's record as a UN member suggests, in fact, that her only interest in the new world organization lies in preserving the veto and the negative power it gives her.

Nonetheless, it is to be hoped that Congress will give its fullest possible approval to the Ferguson and Judd resolutions.

Such action would clearly demonstrate America's determination to make the UN a real instrument of peace. It would also combat the frequently made charge that the United States is as interested in retaining the veto provision in the Charter as is Russia.

Just a $1,000 Check?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit an editorial from the Chicago Times of July 15, 1947:

This was sent to me by a constituent who feels very strongly about the Centralia Coal Co. disaster and the amount of the fines levied:

JUST A $1,000 CHECK?
(Guest editorial from St. Louis Star-Times)

Remembering the shock and indignation which came with the grim, dark deaths of 111 men in Centralia Mine No. 5 only last March, it is hard to believe that all echoes of the tragedy may be stilled by the scratching of a company executive's signature on a check for $1,000. Yet such is the narcotic effect of time that this anticlimax has become a too genuine possibility.

The Centralia Coal Co., owner of the Illinois death trap, was fined $500 on each of two counts by a judge in Nashville, Ill. The case against it was not contested.

Counsel said that "the company doesn't feel like entering a plea of guilty," but would like to dispose of the matter to avoid expensive litigation. And that was good enough for court and prosecutor. Other charges were dropped.

At the same time, Robert M. Medill, former director of the Illinois Department of Mines and Minerals, and his assistant, Robert Weir, asked for a change of venue. This probably will be granted since Judge R. W. Griffith said that "when you consider that 111 men lost their lives in this county and that people gathered in great numbers and saw the ambulances taking out the victims, I can conceive there might be prejudice against the persons responsible."

There certainly might be. And it might be justified.

Whatever the future may bring to these two men, it begins to seem highly improbable that there is any intention of calling for an accounting of his stewardship from anybody else involved. Neither the officers and managers of the mining company, nor Governor Green and his political henchmen who ignored a pathetic plea from the miners to save their lives and preferred, instead, to use mine safety inspectors as lug collectors, seem to have much cause for worry.

Even Congress now seems callously indifferent to the lessons of the disaster. Once again the men who go down into the earth must depend for protection on such safety clauses they have been able to write into their contracts.

Is the story of Centralia really to end in this sorry way? Is public indignation really so ephemeral?

Are those 111 graves to be forgotten, and is one to continue to regard mining as an inevitably hazardous occupation in which man must gamble each day for his life?

Will Government not even stretch the odds a little more in his favor?

Statement to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by Mr. Marion B. Folsom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. Marion B. Folsom, treasurer of the Eastman Kodak Co., and one of the most progressive and learned businessmen in the United States, appeared before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, of which Senator TAFT, of Ohio, is chairman. Mr. Folsom appeared by invitation of that committee.

It was my privilege to be associated with Mr. Folsom for 3 years, during which time he served as director of the staff of the House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning.

I regard him as not only a progressive businessman, but a sound economist, and because of my high regard for him and knowledge of his ability, I submit herewith the statement which he made before the Taft committee today.

I think the congressional membership will find it most interesting and valuable reading. Mr. Folsom's statement follows:

I am Marion B. Folsom, treasurer of the Eastman Kodak Co. During the period from March 1944 through December 1946, I served as staff director of the House of Representatives' Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning under the chairmanship of Congressman COLMER. Rather than give only my personal views on the problems which are being considered by your committee, it seemed to me that it would be more profitable to outline to you some of the recommendations on current and long-range economic problems which were made by the Colmer committee in its final report, issued in December 1946. While the situation has changed in some respects during the intervening 6 months, the basic problems are practically

the same and many of the recommendations of the committee are still pertinent.

This 18-man bipartisan committee issued a series of 11 reports, based upon extensive hearings and study, and many of its recommendations were carried out by Congress. The final report summarized its views on the then current economic problems and certain longer-range problems. All these reports received approval of the entire committee, there being no minority reports.

MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT IN ITS EFFECT ON ECONOMIC POLICY

The committee called attention in its final report to the need for a standing committee to advise Congress on all aspects of economic policy, pointing out that the existing committee structure was deficient in this respect. It stated:

"Frankness requires the confession that most of the standing committees of both Houses are concerned with the special interests of that sector of the economy with which they are mainly charged and that it is with the greatest difficulty that the relation of these policies into a coherent program is achieved at the legislative level."

Your joint committee is in an ideal position to fill that need. It would seem to me that reports by your committee from time to time on major economic policies would serve as useful guides to the various committees of both Houses. They would also provide the background for the recommendations which the committee will make on the President's report.

The Colmer committee also pointed out the need of a better coordination of the executive departments and agencies as they affect the over-all economic policy of the Government. An attempt was made during the wartime to bring about this coordination through the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. While the experience of this Office was not entirely satisfactory, it did offer a valued example as to what could be accomplished if there were a proper staff organization within the executive departments to coordinate the activities of the departments and many independent agencies. The Council of Economic Advisers would fit logically into such a general staff organization, but the Council alone is not sufficient. The committee stated:

"The scale of peacetime operations of any modern government involves the necessity of bringing into line general fiscal policy, social objectives, foreign policy, and domestic politics. To accomplish this requires a governmental agency that coordinates not only the major departments but the large number of independent regulatory commissions and the many governmental corporations created by act of Congress.

"The committee, therefore, recommends to Congress the study through its appropriate committee structure of the legislative aspects of such policy formation in peacetime."

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

The Colmer committee in its December report pointed out that, although employment was at unprecedented peacetime levels, production in several important industries was considerably below the rate to be expected from this high level of employment.

In many industries costs had increased appreciably since the end of the war because production per man-hour had not increased sufficiently to offset the increase in wage rates and material costs. The law productivity was due to a number of reasons, such as the high rate of labor turn-over, the large proportion of workers without adequate skill and training, the delays in the flow of material—partly caused by strikes.

Since the first of the year employment has increased still further and there has been an improvement in productivity in many industries. Labor turn-over has declined appreciably; the workers are becoming better trained, and there is a better flow of materials. Also the installation of new machinery and the improvement of methods are beginning to show results. These factors should continue to operate, and we may expect a further improvement in productivity. This, of course, is the most important factor in increasing the supply of goods and thus preventing further inflation.

It is probable, however, that the increase in productivity will not be as great as it was during the first few years after the First World War. For a period in the early twenties, output per man-hour increased almost three times the normal rate of about 3 percent per year. Figures are not available as to the increase in productivity we are now obtaining, but it is probably not in excess of the normal prewar rate. One factor which will probably prevent a marked increase in productivity, particularly over the long run, is the lack of incentives compared with the period after the last war. With the extremely high level of personal income taxes and the corporate income taxes being more than three times their level after the last war, the incentive to invest new capital in machinery and equipment is much less than it was. This is one important reason why great effort should be made to reduce Government expenditures and taxes. As the Colmer committee stated, the only way we can expect to continue to improve the standard of living of the people is through increase in productivity.

In the important construction industry, where there is the greatest need and also the greatest possibility of increase in productivity, only slight progress has been made.

The critical period for unemployment will probably be reached when deferred demands for many products have been met and exports decline. If before that time productivity has increased and costs and prices have been reduced, we may be able to avoid any serious unemployment. The Colmer committee pointed out that with the proper foresight and action by the Government, industry, and labor, the danger of a serious decline in business and farming should be minimized, but that we should be prepared to take care of any unemployment that will develop. They considered that the present unemployment compensation system is a sound and practical means of providing for the unemployed.

In one of its earlier reports the committee urged States to liberalize the unemployment benefits, and considerable progress has been made since then. Now many States provide benefits of over 20 weeks duration with maximum weekly benefits of $20 or more. A number of States, however, are still below these levels, and the committee recommended that those States which have not liberalized their benefits should do so; the reserve funds are sufficient to permit an increase in benefits. The committe also thought that the system should be extended to cover workers in small firms, the present system being limited in many States to employers of eight or more.

The committee recommended that action should be taken immediately to extend the coverage of the Federal old-age insurance plan to include groups now excluded, such as domestic servants, farm labor, employees of nonprofit organizations, Government, and self-employed groups—normally numbering 12,000,000 people. Many of these were covered during the war because they were in industry, but now that they have returned to the normal employment they will lose the benefit of their contributions, unless these occupations are brought under the system.

PUBLIC WORKS AND CONSTRUCTION

In its seventh report, the postwar committee made a number of recommendations regarding postwar public works and construction. I would suggest that your committee carefully consider these recommendations as they are as pertinent now as at the time they were made. The report was based upon a careful study of the problems involved after exhaustive hearings and after consultation with many experts in the field. The committee pointed out construction is too small a factor to be successfully used to stabilize the entire economy, but that concerted efforts should be made to stabilize the construction industry itself. It recommended that public construction be limited during this period of active private construction to projects of immediate necessity, but that at the same time plans and specifications be drawn up in advance of need by public agencies—Federal, State, and local—so that the public programs can be expanded as private ones slacken.

In the past, the record has not been very good in this respect, as public construction expenditures generally rise and fall with private expenditures. This is a field in which your committee could do effective work. Good progress has been made to date in the preparation of drawings and specifications and also in carrying out the program of withholding public works during this period of high activity in private construction. But this postponement has probably been due to high costs. There is considerable money available in the State and local governments for various projects. Some of these are absolutely necessary and probably can be postponed only for a short time. Deliberate effort, however, should be made by all Government agencies to hold back as much as possible of this construction so that they will be available to fill the gap in private construction when things fall off. The Colmer committee felt that additional money should be made available by the Federal Government for advances to the States and municipalities for the preparation of plans and specifications and also for the Federal Government projects already authorized by Congress.

The committee recommended that machinery should be set up to coordinate the construction policies of the various agencies of the Federal Government and, in turn, to coordinate these policies with those of the State and local governments and with private industry. The Council of Economic Advisers would seem to have the authority needed to set up the machinery, and the committee recommended steps to this end should be taken at once.

The committee in its final report expressed a serious concern over the implication of current high-construction costs. It pointed out that there was a danger in the industry pricing itself out of the market and that—

"If costs cannot be reduced substantially, the industry will be confined largely to producing only enough housing for the increase in families and will not reach the rehousing market. It is important that the industry improve its methods so that costs can be reduced with increased volume, to bring it into line with other industries."

FEDERAL BUDGET AND TAX POLICY

In its fourth report, issued in September 1944, the committee stated that the basis for the postwar Federal budget and tax policy should be a firm determination to hold Federal expenditures down to a minimum consistent with the proper functioning of the Government. It pointed out, however, that Federal expenditures after the war would be much higher than prewar years and stated in this report, that—

"It is not unlikely that in the first years after the war the total of Federal expenditures will approach $20,000,000,000 per annum."

The following statement is quoted from the final report of December 1946:

"The committee wishes to reiterate more strongly than ever the necessity of reducing expenditures substantially. It realizes that we cannot reach the $20,000,000,000 level

during the next fiscal year. It would, however, urge serious consideration to reducing expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, to $30,000,000,000, with further substantial reduction during the following year, but with the objective of a $20,000,000,000 budget at an early date.

"The committee feels that a budget of $30,000,000,000 is a realistic budget and that expenditures can be reduced to this level without interfering with national defense or other normal functions of the Government. At this level the cost to the Federal Government per family of four would be over $850 per year."

It was pointed out that with this reduction in Federal expenditures a substantial surplus could be created and also that reductions could be made in Federal taxes.

As to tax policy, the committee stated:

"Tax policy: Unless high levels of production and employment are maintained, the burden of necessary taxation may prove intolerable. Unless a tax program is adopted which will minimize the repressive effects of Federal taxation, this goal may not be reached. Thus, in addition to holding Federal expenditures down to a minimum consistent with the proper functioning of the Government, it is necessary to develop a Federal tax system which will raise the necessary revenue and still distribute the tax burden in a manner that will provide adequate incentives for venture capital, creative effort, and business growth, and also permit expansion in consumer demand.

"Partly as a result of the prewar trend and partly due to wartime necessities, the Federal tax system has placed steadily increasing burdens on risk-taking enterprise. On the one hand, it puts a premium on the avoidance of risk provided by the refuge from taxation through tax-exempt securities. On the other hand, it has imposed double taxation on income derived from business dividends and has placed excessive burdens on those businesses and individuals to whom we must look for a large share of the funds required for the expansion of employment opportunities. An adequate reduction in such tax burdens will be essential.

"Equal consideration must be given to a lightening of the tax loan on the lower-income groups which provide the great bulk of the demand for consumption goods on which employment so largely depends. Social considerations also require that Federal taxes shall not depress the living standards of those who are at a bare susbsistence level. Nevertheless, if expenditures are held down to reasonable levels, the committee believes it should be possible to reduce present income-tax burdens on all income groups. Such reductions should do much to stimulate venture capital as well as to provide substantial relief for the lower and middle income groups."

My personal opinion is that the greatest contribution the Government can make at this time toward the maintenance of the present high level of employment is the reduction of Government expenditures, so that both the debt and taxes can be reduced. It is inequitable to maintain these extremely high wartime taxes for the third year after the war—this being particularly true for those in the middle-income and fixed-income groups. But more important, if these high taxes remain frozen much longer in our economy, we run the risk of killing off the incentives which have been such an important factor in our progress over the years, and of placing too much dependence upon Government rather than private enterprise.

If viewed with the proper perspective, a budget of $35,000,000,000, representing over 20 percent of the national income and four times the prewar budget of 1939, would seem to be entirely too high. With Government expenditures at this level, governmental policy plays a much more important part in the economy of the country than heretofore. It is extremely difficult for governmental action in the economic field to be properly timed—due often to the political situation and to the delays caused by obtaining both the executive and legislative approval. There is thus a danger that larger governmental expenditures are apt to lead to wider swings in economic activity.

MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

The committee in its final report called attention to the rapid rise which had occurred in consumer debt since the end of the war. The figure is now slightly above the peak reached in 1941. The committee did not take a definite position in regards to the continuation of the regulation of consumer credit on a permanent basis, but because of the effect which consumer installment credit might have upon swings in the business cycle, it felt that this was a matter which should be carefully studied by the appropriate congressional committee.

The committee also studied the credit and capital needs of small business. As a result of its studies, it concluded—

"That with the funds available in banks throughout the country, in both large and small centers, with the plans which have already been formulated by the banks to help smaller companies, the bank-credit situation for business concerns of all sizes can be considered satisfactory.

"With regard to equity capital, however, small and new business is probably in a less advantageous position than with regard to bank credit. The cost of issuing securities is considerable and the organized markets are not receptive to the issues of little-known firms.

"It has been maintained that this situation has been aggravated by the elaborate requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the registration of securities. Some relaxation in favor of small business seems to be compatible with adequate safeguards."

The committee called attention to efforts already being made by businessmen and bankers to provide equity capital for small business.

As one means of offsetting the inflationary pressure which still exists, the committee thought that there should be a vigorous promotion of both the retention of Savings Bonds to maturity and purchase of additional bonds. It suggested that the Treasury should be allowed to defray expenses incurred by issuing agents in the operation of pay-roll deduction plan. It also suggested the possibility of changing the terms of the "E" bonds so that they would be more attractive; for example, the interest of 2.9 percent might be continued for an additional period on matured bonds and the bonds might be made negotiable for loan purposes.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

In a report issued in May 1945, the committee pointed out that a substantial foreign trade and investment flow is an essential part of continued prosperity. It stated that—

"The enormous capacity of our country to produce, to consume, and to save must result in the postwar period in extensive exports, extensive imports, and extensive foreign investments."

The economic program recommended provided for the relaxation of barriers to international trade and international payments.

"The reduction of trade barriers would serve to attain a political as wel' as economic goal by substituting economic cooperation for economic warfare and thus would assist greatly in the establishment of a peaceful world order."

Since the end of the war extensive loans have been made to foreign countries. As the result of these loans and the reduction of balances previously accumulated, exports have been maintained at a very high level and considerably above the level of imports. Currently, exports are being made at $15,000,000,000 per year, and imports at the level of $6,000,000,000 per year. Obviously this situation cannot continue unless we expect to receive little in return for the loans. The country must be prepared to accept a larger volume of imports to pay the interest on the loans and to amortize the principal. Unfortunately, many of the loans have simply been used to maintain the economies of the individual countries and have brought about little increase in production. Eventually we should expect that production would increase and that these countries would be in a position to export more to United States.

Full advantage should be taken of the stock-piling program in obtaining certain strategic materials in repayment of loan.

In commenting on the situation which existed at the end of 1946, the committee outlined the difficulties we are facing in bringing about a healthy foreign trade. These comments still apply:

"It is obvious that serious obstacles are yet to be overcome if the system of unrestricted multilateral trade envisaged by the committee is to become a reality.

"Special barter arrangements on a bilateral basis are multiplying. Many of the countries of the western world and all the countries under the domination of Russia are using primarily state trading devices.

"In place of the completely multilateral system originally foreseen by the committee, we are now confronted with a strong possibility that the world may become divided into two great economic blocs with trade between the two conducted only under the most difficult conditions. Even within the western group of countries, moreover, opinion is by no means unanimous that a system of unrestricted, multilateral trade will be mutually advantageous for all countries.

"Under these conditions, an immediate removal of all barriers to trade is hardly to be expected. More than anything else, a serious postwar slump in the United States would impede the adoption of multilateral and relatively unrestricted trade. For this reason, the committee reiterates its statement in the sixth report that 'high levels of ouput and employment at home * * * are an essential requirement for an expanded world trade.'

"The difficulties which are now being faced serve to emphasize again the growing responsibility of the United States for directing the course of future world trade. If a division of the world into economic blocs is unavoidable, it is all the more important that trade within the western group of countries should be conducted along the multilateral lines recommended in the committee's sixth report. And more than any other country in this western group, the United States today is in a position to take the initiative in this endeavor. Unlike many other countries, our productive capacity is high and there is almost no possibility that we shall have difficulties with our balance of payments. In the future, the dollar will be used even more as an international currency than it has been used in the past. If we can achieve economic stability at home, and if we continue to advocate the international economic policies which have previously been recommended, there are good reasons to believe that a high and stable level of international trade can be achieved despite the political and economic uncertainties which confront us in a large part of the world."

ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION IN EUROPE

The most important factor in the development of a sound foreign economic policy is obviously economic reconstruction in Europe. As a result of a visit of seven members of the Postwar Committee to Europe in 1945, the committee issued a report in November of that year on the "Economic Reconstruction in Europe." A number of recommendations were made which have since become the policy of the Government. Reference will be made here only to one aspect of the problem, namely, the reconstruction of Germany which is probably the key to the whole problem.

The committee's report was probably the first authoritative statement of the probable break-down in Germany of the plans which were in operation and its forecasts have been generally borne out by events of the past 2 years. The following recommendations from both its 1945 report and its final report would still seem to apply. It is encouraging to note that these conclusions are now being generally accepted.

NOVEMBER 1945

"The committee is convinced that to strip Germany of the factories necessary for the ordinary industries of Germany would be to impose a burden of relief on the western powers, principally the United States, if widespread starvation and dangerous conditions to the public health are to be avoided in all Europe.

"The simplest analysis shows the dependence of the industries of all the other countries surrounding Germany upon German raw materials and German manufactures. To go beyond the limits of destroying the war-making power of Germany is to depress the whole standard of living of Europe and, through it, of world recovery. It follows, of course, that our own foreign trade with Europe would suffer in proportion."

DECEMBER 1946

"Given the present Rusian attitude, it becomes necessary to force the issue by integrating the western zones into as nearly a self-sufficient basis as possible, putting a complete stop to the agreed schedule of reparations for Russia until such time as Russia is prepared to live up to the basic agreement of unifying the economy of Germany.

"It is true that in the short run Germany's production is limited by the shortage of fuel more than by prospective reparations deliveries from the western zones. In the longer run, after the next 2 years, however, the limitation of Germany's ability to become self-sustaining will be affected by the application of a level of industry too low to support the greatly increased population of Germany in an impoverished territory.

"A small investment in raw materials and some basic machinery made available to the Germans, plus a stop on reparation payments and the building up of foreign exchange as rapidly as possible, seems to be the only method of cutting down the indefinite continuation of this large burden of feeding our ex-enemies that is now imposed on us. This means a productive loan now, or relief and chaos indefinitely.

"It further emphasizes the points made at length in the eighth report, and particularly in part 2, of the heavy dependence of other European states on German recovery. While at the time the committee's report was issued the position taken was regarded as extreme, it feels that the evidence of the stagnation of European recovery on a normal basis sufficiently bears out the elementary analysis already offered: Until Germany is able to pay for its own imports, world commerce suffers and those countries which have been heavily dependent upon German production will be retarded to a critical degree in their own recovery."

SHIPPING AND SHIPBUILDING

This industry is the particular concern of the Government because of our dependence upon it for national security in time of war. As a result of its study, the Colmer committee made the following recommendations regarding the postwar problems of the industry:

"(1) The maintenance of an enlarged merchant marine under our flag is essential for our national security.

"(2) Operating and construction subsidies should be paid, as needed, for merchant vessels the operation of which is considered essential in the interest of national security. The appropriations for such subsidies should be recognized as part of the cost of national defense.

"(3) For shipping not considered essential for national security, the comparative costs of rendering transportation service should be the determining factor. No subsidies should be provided to such shipping.

"(4) With the exception of a strategic reserve for defense purposes, vessels which cannot be sold either to American operators or to foreign countries should be scrapped. The expense of maintaining ships in sanctuary should likewise be considered a cost of national defense.

"(5) The maintenance of a shipbuilding industry in times of peace is considered to be in the interest of national security. Its utilization for the continued technical improvement of our merchant marine should be encouraged through the cooperation of the technical experts of the armed services, with subsidies to be paid to the extent necessary to maintain a needed nucleus of skill and capacity. The construction of types of vessels of which a deficiency still exists should be initiated as soon as possible."

POSTWAR AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

The report issued in August 1946, by the House Postwar Committee, made a number of recommendations in regards to the immediate and long-run postwar agricultural policies. This report was based upon numerous hearings at which leading authorities on agriculture appeared, and a thorough study by the committee aided by some of the best qualified students of the problems. As conditions in agriculture will play such an important part in maintaining the high level of productive employment in this country, I would call your attention especially to the recommendations contained in that report. One recommendation that might well fall within the province of your joint committee related to a study of the whole question of parity prices:

"The committee further recommends—especially in view of the obviously uneconomic price relationships represented by present parity levels for individual commodities—that a thorough reconsideration of parity concepts be made in two respects: The relative level of parity prices between one commodity and another, and the validity of the general level of all agricultural prices as defined in terms of the 1910–14 base. Study should be conducted and legislation prepared prior to the end of the Steagall period so that farmers will not be called upon to make their plans in the dark."

CONCLUSION

As a conclusion to its final report to Congress, the Postwar Committee made certain observations on the general economic problems which we face and the role which Government should play in meeting them. I would particularly commend these comments to your attention as they represent the judgment of this 18-man committee after a study extending over a period of almost 3 years.

"The national income is considerably above the peacetime level and only slightly below the wartime peak. There have been further additions since the end of the war to the large liquid savings in the hands of the public. Purchasing power is at an unprecedented level and could be exerted to push prices higher.

"It is thus necessary that moderation be shown by all groups in order to check the threat to a continued inflationary trend—by consumers in spending, by labor in wage demands, by business in pricing policies, by Government in its own spending, tax, and monetary policies.

"The greatest contribution to the solution of these problems can be made by an increase in productivity of all factors of production which would both reduce costs and increase supplies.

"At the present time there are many who feel that we are going to experience a business recession in the months to come. It must be granted that there is evidence both in the current levels of prices and of operations and in the form of historical analogy which seem to lend support to such fears. The committee, however, does not feel itself able to judge at the moment whether the present maladjustments are such as to presage a general business decline or whether readjustment in specific lines will occur as they have over the past year, one problem following another but without bringing about general retardation.

"Considering everything, the committee feels that there is no necessity for either a depression or recession. The country, as has been pointed out, has the greatest buying power and the greatest pent-up demand for consumer products in its history. Loose talk of depressions and business recession is unjustified and serves no good purpose. There is nothing wrong with the country that hard work and resultant production will not cure.

"The committee in its assignment was primarily concerned with economic problems of the immediate postwar period. It has, therefore, not studied those problems relating to the reduction of the wide swings in business activity we have experienced in the past. This is one of the most serious economic problems which the country faces in the future. It is particularly with this objective in mind that the committee recommends that a permanent over-all economic policy committee be set up in each House of Congress with adequate joint staff to conduct a long-range study of this subject or that the Joint Committee for the President's Economic Report be implemented to do this work. Such a committee should work in close cooperation with both the President's Council of Economic Advisers and the executive agency which the committee recommends replace the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. These studies should be directed primarily at the effect which Government policy has on these business swings.

"There are certain governmental activities which would have to be carried on even if we were perfectly free from economic depressions. Where practical, we should carry on these normal functions in a way which will help minimize cyclical variations. With the Federal debt and annual budgets at such high levels, the Government's fiscal policy will be a most important factor, and it is vital that a long-range program for the handling of the debt be formulated. Other necessary programs could be developed with the primary objective of cushioning the impact of economic stress or discouraging economic excesses. Such programs would include unemployment insurance, proper scheduling of public works, and the proper handling of social-security funds.

"Where should we draw the line? This committee feels that our experience to date

points to the conclusion that the Government cannot and should not take full responsibility for maintaining economic stability or full employment. Such a government could neither accomplish its purpose nor remain a democracy. We were able to mobilize our economy for war only by surrendering temporarily the basic democratic freedoms which we were fighting the war to preserve. We should not be misled by those who urge that we can equally well mobilize for full employment in peacetime. To do so would be to accept totalitarianism—which we fought to prevent having imposed upon us.

"Most of the world that has accepted socialist and even totalitarian controls has done so through the destruction of private capital during and between the two wars. Whatever the cause of their establishment, these systems have not produced a standard of living remotely approaching our own.

"In the past under the American competitive-enterprise system wages and the standard of living have steadily advanced over the years because of the increase in productivity. Hours of work have been gradually reduced and labor standards raised to the highest of any country in the world. The individual freedoms enjoyed by all groups of producers, both management and labor, and by the ordinary citizen in every walk of life have, in spite of defects under the system, unleashed the creative powers of human initiative and enterprise to accomplish these unparalleled results.

"Confidence in this free system, derived from its accomplishments and its prospects, is the basis for the committee's recommendations on economic policies. With the excellent record achieved in reaching the present high level of employment, with the backlog of demand for many products still unsatisfied, and with the unprecedented amount of liquid savings in the hands of the consuming public, the committee feels that we have the basic conditions for maintaining a high level of both production and employment. A start has been made toward this goal. The task ahead is to develop economic conditions which will encourage stability of productive employment at a high level."

Changing Times in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following group of articles on industry, research, labor, and agriculture from Kiplinger magazine of July 1947:

CHANGING TIMES IN THE SOUTH

The South of mid-1947 presents a rapidly expanding economic opportunity to the Nation. In the great tier of States reaching from the Atlantic marshlands, across the Mississippi and on to the western plains, times are changing. Changing for the better. Everywhere, in southern industry, research, labor and agriculture, there is a significant stirring which makes for good in our whole economy.

Important among the developments that brought about this activity are: 1. Wartime industrial expansion and good wages (along with the flow of new capital). 2. The Supreme Court's recent decision on rail rates which should result in greater equality for shippers of southern-made goods. 3. The dethronement of cotton as king and a machine-made opportunity to make this sick commodity a strong one. 4. The tremendous upsurge in research, both agricultural and industrial.

Thus the South is emerging as a solid economic fact. For men in the North, East, West as well as the South—men with brains, capital and goods to sell, here is a vast market, a source of natural wealth, a reservoir of labor.

The South of mid-1947 is not the South described by Franklin Roosevelt a few years ago as the "Nation's No. 1 economic problem." The South can be called a grave social problem, but economic gains are being made despite the continued backwardness of southern politicians and violent racism.

Most intelligent southerners are convinced that greater economic strength will provide at least a partial solution to the problem of poor education, bad health and the conflict of races.

The South has much to do to lift its standard of living but, to its credit, more is being done now than ever before. It is an error to dismiss these 13 potentially rich States as a pattern of oppression and an area apart from North, East and West. It is good business to take sharp note of the fact that times are changing for the better in the South.

INDUSTRY—NORRIS, OF THE SOUTHERN RAILWAY

The Southern Railway System has long been a symbol of the South—an important index of the South's industrial condition.

And today, all along the Southern's 8,000 miles of track in 13 Southeastern States, there are signs of bustling activity. Some of these signs are:

In the last 2 years almost 700 new industries have established themselves; 175 existing plants have enlarged their facilities; more than 30 warehouses have been constructed for the assemblage and distribution of manufactured goods.

Fifteen big Defense Plant Corporation factories in the Southern's territory have been acquired by such here-to-stay concerns as Western Electric, Borg-Warner, Quaker Oats, International Harvester, Goodrich, and Reynolds Metals.

Construction has begun on three great new rayon and nylon plants, totaling an $80,000,000 investment, for the Celanese Corp. at Rock Hill, S. C., for du Pont at Chattanooga, and for American Enka near Morristown, Tenn.

What is happening along the Southern's tracks is only part of a general industrial expansion throughout the South. From 1939 to 1945 the South's food industry and related factories increased the value of their output almost $1,500,000,000. Textile and chemical production went up a billion dollars each; mineral production climbed one and one-half billion; iron and steel, three hundred million; and machinery, three hundred and fifty million. Last year construction awards hit the $2,000,000,000 mark for an unprecedented high.

One of the most important personalities behind all this new activity which has nurtured the Southern Railway and been nurtured by it, is Yankee-born Ernest Eden Norris, the Southern's president.

Under Norris' leadership, assisted by heavy wartime revenues which came as a gift from heaven, the Southern has been transformed from a poky line into an energetic and progressive enterprise. And while he has been making a go of his job, Norris has emerged as an articulate promoter of the South's new growth, and of the significance of that growth to the rest of the Nation.

Immediately after the war Norris' road sponsored a series of advertisements in national magazines and business publications.

One ad showed an old sun clock standing by a magnolia tree and across the fields in the distance a modern, streamlined factory. The caption, "Times have changed." Another ad, "New view of the Old South," pictured the latticed doors of a plantation house swung open to reveal a modern freight train loading before a large and obviously humming plant. "Nowhere else can you find such a happy blending of the old and the new," ran the copy over Norris' signature.

Throughout the ads spoke of mellow tradition and courteous people, charming homes, and quaint streets, while stressing the availability of friendly labor, raw materials, low-cost power, growing consumer markets, and a favorable manufacturing climate.

"Listen to the noonday whistles of busy factories," said the biggest of all Norris ads, "the clang of shovels in mines, the crash of pine trees in the forest. Listen! And in the background, always, you'll hear the hiss of steam, the roar of Diesels, the clicking of wheels, the thousand sounds of a mighty mass transportation system at work."

The system which the aggressive, hawk-eyed Norris heads is the third largest railroad east of the Mississippi River. Its lines are flung out over every State south of the Potomac and Ohio Rivers except West Virginia. The Southern's greatest track concentration is through the Piedmont region of North and South Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee. But its long arms reach out to every important South Atlantic port—Norfolk, Charleston, Savannah, and Jacksonville. The road runs south to New Orleans and Mobile on the Gulf; westward it reaches the Ohio River at Cincinnati and the Mississippi at St. Louis and Memphis.

Norris has worked for the Southern for 45 years, been its president for the last 10. He was born 65 years ago in the little town of Hoopeston, Ill., on the eastern border of the State. Fresh from school, he landed a job as a telegrapher with Western Union, worked briefly with the Chicago & North Western Railway, then went with the Southern in Washington as a car-service agent. He pushed steadily up to the top.

In 1937, when Fairfax Harrison retired from the presidency of the railroad, Norris, then operating vice president, was the unanimous choice to take over. Harrison had come up to the presidency by way of the legal department. He was brilliant but eccentric, more scholar than railroad man. Harrison seldom toured the road he headed, subbornly opposed the installation of such modern comforts as air conditioning.

Norris' background, philosophy, and operating ways are in sharp contrast with those of his predecessor. He is fascinated by railroads and enthralled by the drama of Southern history. He shuns the comfortable surroundings of his Washington office and the paper work that goes with being in it. Norris prefers to shuttle around the countryside in his private car "ringing doorbells," and he has the reputation of spending more time on the road than any other big railway president.

On the road Norris often walks up through the forward cars to invite passengers back to have lunch or a chat in the company diner. Or, when inspecting yards, he'll swing down from his car to ask a workman by the side of the tracks to have a cup of coffee with him. Human, friendly, and hardworking, he has done much to shake the Southern out of its stuffy, history-cluttered ways.

The Southern Railway System has evolved through the merger and consolidation of more than 100 smaller lines, many of which

were built during the Civil War to help move Confederate troops and supplies. The core of the system was the Richmond and West Point Terminal Co., a loosely organized and inattentive parent to three north-south lines.

When the panic of 1892–93 sent the mismanaged Richmond system into bankruptcy, the directors asked Drexel, Morgan & Co. to reorganize its roads. After considerable persuasion, Morgan agreed and in 1894 the Virginia Legislature authorized the successor company to incorporate and adopt a new name. On July 1 of that year, with about 2,000 miles of line, the Southern Railway Co. opened for business.

The road hit a peak in 1926 with a net profit of $23,500,000, but by 1932 the depression had dropped its revenues more than 50 percent and the profit had given way to an $11,200,000 deficit. In this brief span the company's working capital plunged from $36,500,000 to less than five million.

Traffic rose after 1932 but in an effort to conserve its cash the Southern held back on outlays for badly needed maintenance and equipment. The result was that operating efficiency slumped to a dangerously low point. By 1938, a year after Norris had assumed the presidency, the Southern owed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation $31,400,000. Southern preferred stock had dropped from a 1937 high of $60.50 a share to $8.50, and the 6½ percent junior bonds were selling for only 28 cents on the dollar. Then came the war.

With its tracks sprawled throughout the Southeast and with Washington as its northernmost terminal, the Southern was in a good position to profit by the tremendous wartime increase in traffic. A great many of the country's military camps and a large share of its heavy munitions plants were located in the area which the Southern covered. Its gross revenues boomed from $89,000,000 in 1938 to $261,000,000 in 1944. The highest earnings in its history—$33,400,000—were recorded in 1942, when the Southern paid dividends again after a 10-year lapse.

Taxes and high operating costs, together with a falling off of passenger traffic, have sliced profits from the wartime high-water mark. The Southern made $22,000,000 in 1944 and $16,000,000 in 1945, but last year turned a profit of only nine million.

But today the road is probably in better financial and physical shape than it has ever been. Norris completely retired the RFC debt by May 1941, and has decreased the funded debt by almost $60,000,000. In addition, he has simplified the road's highly complicated corporate structure by dissolving subsidiaries and satisfying their mortgages. From 1940 to 1945 the Southern plowed back $62,000,000 into capital investments, laying down 214,000 tons of new rail and carrying out an extensive program of grade reduction and curve elimination.

Like most other United States railroads, the Southern has embarked on a far-reaching modernization program. The company is spending $16,500,000 to make its locomotives and rolling stock among the country's finest.

Although the Southern seems to be doing all right, Norris is perturbed over the economic future of the railways. He sometimes wonders about their survival.

"The railroad business," he says, "is like any other business. It goes bankrupt if it's forced to spend more than it earns. What the iron horse needs is more take-home hay. He is literally being starved, financially, because what he gets for what he does isn't enough to cover the cost of providing the service—to say nothing of improving it."

This feeling of anxiety, perhaps a professional requirement for railroad presidents, certainly is not dominant in Norris' thinking, which is conditioned principally these days by good omens.

The Southern's development department is working overtime selling southern plant sites to the Nation's industrialists. The engineering staff is being swamped with hundreds of applications from small as well as big business for industrial sidetracks along the line. There is a new song of the South: the exciting clatter of new and busy industry.

THE SOUTHERN RESEARCH INSTITUTE—INDUSTRIAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, AGGRESSIVELY SUPPORTED BY BUSINESSMEN, IMPROVE FACTORY AND FARM

The rambling white-pillared mansion in Birmingham is almost too apt a symbol of what modern technology is doing to the economy of the South. A few years ago the old Cartwright home, on its 2 acres in Birmingham's Five Points section, was just a leftover from the mint-julep tradition. Today, as the temporary home of the Southern Research Institute, it is a nest of research laboratories.

Here, as in more than a dozen other laboratories scattered from Florida to Kentucky, the most exciting economic adventure in the South is going on: an organized attempt through scientific research to speed the diversification of southern industry and agriculture.

The Southern Research Institute is the creation of a group of southern industrialists led by hard-bitten Thomas W. Martin, chairman of the institute and president of the Alabama Power Co., who got the idea from Dr. George D. Palmer, of the University of Alabama's School of Chemistry. Martin recruited scores of other southern big shots and their money, organized the institute, and, as its chairman, keeps it ticking.

Martin devotes nearly all of his time and his unquestionably tough executive abilities to this absorbing interest of his old age. Under his benevolent domination the institute performs two main functions:

It carries out industrial and medical research of its own as a public benefit.

It contracts, for enough money to cover costs and operating expenses, to perform for private sponsors any research on any industrial problem involving scientific skill. Results are confidential and all patent and commercial rights go to the sponsor.

These functions really arose from a growing southern conviction of industrial destiny. Dr. Palmer convinced Martin long ago that southern firms without means to conduct independent research must have a medium for improving products and processes if the South were to compete with other areas as a full-grown industrial combatant.

Martin was able to convince other business leaders—and get their cash—by drumming on this idea and by citing two simple, shattering percentages:

Only 8.7 percent of United States manufactured wares (by value) are produced in the nine Southeastern States. Sixty-five percent are produced east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio Rivers.

Only 2.9 percent of all patents are issued to men living in the Southeastern States. Seventy-eight and two-tenths percent are issued to men living east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio.

These figures meant that while manufacturing developed in the South, many key processes would continue to be done in the East, since it was the East that invented or bought the methods.

This prospect, Martin's big argument, helped to organize the Southern Research Institute, which today has an advisory council of over 200 industrial and professional leaders. It has a working staff of 45 scientists and laboratory technicians, under the direction of Dr. Wilbur A. Lazier, formerly of the du Pont laboratories. An organic chemist who holds 69 patents in his own name, Lazier has a breadth of vision that embraces the long-run social and economic effects of technology in the South.

During the last 2 years—a short time for research to bear fruit—the institute has devised new products and new methods which already are brightening the future of manufacturing firms throughout the South. (Its staff can claim credit for 114 patents and 243 technical papers.) And among the 38 projects now in hand are some which might affect the economy of the entire region or even the country.

A project carried out for the Perfection Mattress and Spring Co., of Birmingham, is a good illustration of how a single firm was benefited. Like other makers of sleeping equipment, Perfection has long wanted a really fire-resistant mattress, not just one with fire-resistant covering.

The institute's textiles section came up with a three-quarter-inch insulating layer of fine-spun denier glass wool covered by fire-resistant ticking which did the job. This new mattress is not absolutely fireproof but lighted cigarettes or matches barely singe it.

The institute's work on cast-iron could mean whole new industries for the South. The iron ore of the region is abundant, cheap and good enough for foundry use, but its high phosphorus content dulls cutting blades, so that for modern high-speed machinery it has to be mixed with hard-to-get low phosphorus scrap.

Institute experiments to modify the microstructure of the iron ore so as to neutralize the dulling effect of phosphorus are in progress. The technicians have already found a way to increase machinability, but they don't know yet whether other properties have been affected in the process. No claims are made, but the work is going on.

The problem of cotton research shows why some southerners consider the institute the most promising development in a lifetime.

Cotton is basic to the South's economy. But the prosperity of cotton has been undermined by synthetics like rayon and by foreign competition. Meanwhile, less than one-third of 1 percent of gross cotton farm income goes for research, while the rayon industry puts 2 percent of its gross income into laboratory work.

The future of cotton depends mainly on better fabrics and lower prices. After exhaustive study of actual mill operations, the institute set a specialist to work on the slasher and shed-test operation. The objective is to improve yarn sizing, reduce lint-shedding, and thus get better cotton weaves. Success will have real dollar value for the cotton processors.

Other basic southern crops include peanuts and citrus fruits. The institute's food technologists have improved "spreadability" and stability of peanut butter. Research on concentrated orange juice has resulted in improvements in a southern sponsor's product. An outstanding achievement is a process to convert the active ingredient of natural spearmint oil from citrus fruit.

For a railroad company, the institute is making progress on the treatment of southern lumber to make waterproof and age-resistant cross ties. It hopes also to accelerate the seasoning of green timber, and has found new and profitable ways to utilize woodmill shavings.

As a public service of its own, the institute has underwritten a self-help housing plan by which poor rural families would be trained to build simple homes with their own labor and materials, for around $800. The institute is helping to work out designs of standardized concrete building blocks (cement is cheap in the South; sand comes from

the nearest river bed) which the farmer himself can mold and place.

When this project is completed the institute thinks an educational campaign may enable many southern families to house themselves decently for the first time in their lives.

For more ambitious homebuilders, the institute is working, at the request of the Southeastern Electric Exchange and another sponsor, on improvements of the heat pump, which heats and cools buildings by air. The aim is a more compact and efficient unit.

The fact that this project will have national application shows that there is nothing narrow in the emphasis on regional research. One of the institute's most ambitious programs is carried on in cooperation with Cornell's Memorial Hospital in New York City as part of a national cancer campaign. This is a study of the effect of various urethan compounds on white mice suffering from leukemia, or cancer of the blood. The institute's biochemical division injects urethan compounds containing radioactive carbon into the mice, and tries to determine how and why urethan affects the development of leukemia.

Other medical achievements of the institute include an ointment which speeds up the healing of burns, and local anesthetics that have proved, in tests on rabbits, more potent and less toxic than cocaine.

Much of the institute's accomplishment to date can be learned only by detailed inquiry; its officers are not anxious to raise exaggerated hopes. Merely getting the institute under way was hard enough; it meant bucking widespread complacency, and teaching the value of research to businessmen who had never considered it as a vital competitive aid.

But not all Southern businessmen were complacent. In fact, almost as soon as Martin's impatient spurring got the research project under way at the Alabama Research Institute in 1941, industrialists everywhere in the South wanted to take part. The field had to be widened greatly, and the name was changed in 1944.

Today more than 550 firms back the Institute, and its capital fund has grown to one and one-fourth million dollars. In a year or 2 the trustees hope to have two and one-half million, most of which will be used to buy equipment and erect a laboratory building occupying the entire block where the Cartwright house now stands.

The brilliant promise of the Southern Research Institute in Birmingham should not detract attention from the upsurge of interest in science and technology all over the South. Government war research gave a helpful impetus; it brought ideas, experts, and much valuable equipment into the region. Since the war additional work has been carried on by state, industrial, and educational groups.

The Institute's cotton experiments, for example, are only part of a pattern of investigation going forward in such groups as the Department of Agriculture's Southern Regional Research Laboratory in New Orleans, in the Philadelphia laboratories of the National Cotton Council, the Institute of Textile Technology at Charlottesville, Va., and in many land-grant colleges.

The Industrial Research Committee of Memphis carries on a continuing survey of economic and scientific possibilities in the Memphis region.

Already a great many economic advances have been made in these and other Southern research centers. During the years ahead there is hardly a Southern product, from Jimson weed to petroleum, which will not be exhaustively measured and analyzed by scientists.

The Southern Research Institute can reasonably claim that it gave one of the first really hard pushes to set this ball of economic progress rolling.

Kentucky and Arkansas—Symptoms of Progress

(Two examples of growing southern progressiveness are the improvement and expansion programs of Kentucky and Arkansas. Each is making an organized effort to make itself a better place to live in and for the rest of the Nation to do business in. Kentucky is attacking public welfare deficiencies as well as industrial and agricultural problems. Arkansas is concentrating on one big fault—its unbalanced economy. But both programs have had enough initial success for other States in all parts of the country to study and perhaps follow.)

KENTUCKY

In 1943, the citizens of Kentucky elected a Republican governor and a Democratic legislature, thus unknowingly forging the first link in a chain of progressive reform. The second link was the unique and aptly named Committee for Kentucky.

At that time industry was passing Kentucky by. Her farms were run down or were washing away. Two-thirds of the State's milk supply was not pasteurized. Schools ranked low by United States standards. The State constitution was antiquated and binding. Kentucky was simply not keeping pace, either economically or socially.

Most Kentuckians weren't aware of these deficiencies. But many did remember that in 1927, when one party captured the executive branch and another the legislative, a savage political fight stultified government. The legislature stripped the Governor of all powers except to appoint notaries, and State government came to a frustrated standstill. Nothing constructive was done.

Fearing a repetition of this mess, the Kentucky Merchants Association called a meeting of other State-wide organization to petition both Governor and legislature to cooperate for the State's sake. This meeting resulted in formation of the nonpartisan Committee for Kentucky, now composed of 76 organizations: farm, labor, civic and business groups, educators, women's clubs, and—a big departure—Negroes.

Electing as its president Harry W. Schacter, head of the Merchants Association and of the Kaufman-Straus department store in Louisville, the committee set experts to work diagnosing Kentucky's ills. Ten subjects were studied: Agriculture, education, health, the State constitution, welfare, housing, labor, industrial developments, taxation, and natural resources.

Reports on the first five have been published. One fact after another jarred Kentucky complacency:

Kentucky teachers got $1,014 a year (national average $1,599).

On at least half of Kentucky's farms the soil was run down.

The State's aged received only $11.59 a month.

Over 300 communities had no water supply.

Most county almshouses had no electricity, central heat, or running water.

Mental illness was a crime.

There was only 1 doctor per 2,300 people in rural areas.

Shocked by these facts, the legislature held an unprecedented special session in 1946 to hear the committee's proposals. Later the legislature raised teachers' pay, hiked appropriations for schools and old-age assistance, authorized five new tuberculosis hospitals, and permitted counties to issue bonds for building clinics, welfare, and recreation projects. Another sweeping program is ready for the 1948 legislature.

Perhaps the most significant thing about Kentucky's awakening is that Kentucky was awakened—and from within. Bitter resentment would have met any outsiders who exposed what the committee exposed.

But Kentuckians will manfully swallow their own medicine, as shown by the fact that local committees are already forcing economic and social reforms based on the reports, without waiting for the full fruits of the legislature's progressive deeds.

ARKANSAS

Arkansas has oil, natural gas, timber, coal, 94 percent of the United States bauxite (for making aluminum), the only diamonds, and some 35 commercial minerals. It has fine growing conditions for rice, cotton, corn, wheat, truck crops, poultry, and cattle. It has rich sources of hydro power.

Yet it also has the lowest per capita income of all States, excepting only Mississippi. The desire to do something about this paradox besides moan sparked what is known as the Arkansas plan—a program now beginning to pay off through the cooperation of businessmen and the State government.

This plan aims to balance the State's lopsided agricultural economy by encouraging the spread of industry, both native and imported. Before 1938, virtually all the State's natural products left it in raw-material form. Bauxite was leaving at a few dollars a ton and coming back as dollar-a-pound aluminum pots. Raw cotton at 9 cents a pound was returning as shirts at a dollar or more a pound.

Even partially processing the raw material before kissing it goodby, the Arkansas planners felt, would stimulate State prosperity. Results to date have borne them out. Manufacturing employment rose 23 percent from 1940 to 1946 with the establishment or expansion of 1,461 plants, 451 in 1946 alone.

The Arkansas formula has been simple. Energetic businessmen formed the Arkansas Economic Council—State Chamber of Commerce. The State later set up a resources and development commission. Working in close harness, both groups peddle the State's industrial potentialities.

They teach local communities how to take stock of their industrial assets, how to organize for action, and how to choose an industry. They barrage outside industries with promises of cooperation and statistics on farm, forest, and mineral products. They bring communities and interested out-of-State industries together by reporting on detailed physical requirements of specific companies.

Purely local enterprises get financial aid via a bank pool and small funded industrial development corporations. The result has been a spurt of small local shops; canning factories, quick-freeze lockers, leather shops for the Ozark tourist trade, poultry hatcheries, cement and cinder-block and pottery-clay industries.

Out of State industries, big and little, have poured in. A dehydrated sweetpotato industry was brought from Louisiana, a musselshell button industry from Iowa, a caracul industry from California. Among the bigger fry have been the Dixie Cup Co., the International Shoe Co., and Reynolds Metals.

The Arkansas plan has its difficulties. Some towns won't cooperate at all; they fear the influx of "a lot of foreigners who cause strikes and labor trouble." Other towns ask in highly competitive, low-wage industries, virtually hand them factories, and invite them to exploit labor.

But more and more communities are coming round to an idea reiterated both by chamber of commerce spokesmen and organized labor—that the State wants neither ghost factories nor short-term, low-wage industries; that it wants industries which will use

Arkansas materials and pay top wages and prices, so that Arkansas workers and farmers can be good customers.

THE QUIET WAR TO UNIONIZE THE SOUTH—ORGANIZED LABOR ABANDONS FLAMBOYANT POST-WAR MEMBERSHIP DRIVE FOR A LONG, HARD PULL

Just as the industrialization of the South is on the rise, so is the organization of southern industrial labor.

Today, throughout the 13 Southern States, squads of union organizers, business agents and union propagandists are widely deployed.

Their hunting ground, potentially productive but hard and slow to work, is a labor force of 7,000,000 industrial and service workers, many of them newly skilled as a result of the war. Only a bare third of the total force was organized when the CIO in March of last year announced its "Operation Dixie."

The flamboyantly advertised "Operation Dixie" had as its goal a million new members within a year. The AFL promptly inaugurated a similar drive with the same goal. But practical unionists knew that these figures were pipe dreams, obviously incapable of achievement. They knew that the southern drives would be tedious, expensive, and frustrating. This practical judgment was confirmed when organization soon fell far behind its goals.

The two big labor organizations together now claim fewer than 600,000 new southern cardholders, the CIO putting its gains at 200,000, the AFL "at well" over 300,000 new members. Each group sneers at the other's claims, and unbiased observers think each claim is inflated by thousands.

Despite these discouraging beginnings, both CIO and AFL are doggedly sticking things out. They really have no other choice. Lower wage rates in the South are a constant drag on wage rates in the rest of the country, a worrisome threat to the well-being of organized labor elsewhere. Moreover, the South is the last great citadel of the open shop, which the unions are convinced must be breached.

The unions are able to approach this citadel with some high-powered ammunition. They can hammer home at the southern worker the fact, documented by the Government's Bureau of Labor Statistics, that the South ranks last among major United States areas in straight-time average hourly earnings.

With regional wage positions listed in order, the BLS analysis comes out this way: Pacific, Middle Atlantic, Great Lakes, New England, Middle West, Border States, and, at the bottom, the Southwest, and then the Southeast.

This low-wage level in the South is accounted for, says the BLS, by "the predominance of agriculture and the relatively large supply of unskilled labor competing for jobs in comparatively few industries. Other important factors include a large population relative to employment opportunities, decentralization of industry, comparative lack of unionization, and limited degree of protective-labor legislation by the States."

Although southern wage scales are not uniformly below others, examples which illustrate the general pattern may be readily found. Earnings in the women's dress industry in the Middle Atlantic States have been as much as double those in the South. In cotton textile yarn mills—regarded as the bellwether of the southern industrial economy—wages in the South are 14.3 percent below those in New England.

The contrast is even more striking because wage rates in cotton textiles have risen sharply in the South during the war. In 1939 southern textile workers averaged around 38 cents an hour. In February of this year average hourly earnings were 89.8 cents. Still they're relatively low.

Although this North-South wage differential ought to be a potent argument, the unions are having tough sledding. Southern labor, often languorous and often illiterate, is generally either frightened, dubious, or just plain apathetic. Workers are not asking for union organization to correct wage inequities or other grievances; the unions are finding themselves saddled with a selling job.

This is an old, familiar story to the unions, which have been trying to organize southern workers for some 60 years. So the effort this time is a planned and careful one. The organizers are well-heeled.

When the CIO launched its drive it raised a kitty of one and a quarter million dollars. The Steel Workers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers chipped in $200,000 each; the Textile Workers gave $125,000; and the Automobile and Electrical Workers each dug down for $100,000. Then last November, when the CIO convention resolved to go on with the campaign, contributions were increased. More money than ever is being spent now; CIO leaders say the outlay is far over $100,000 a month.

Chief CIO strategist in this campaign is a veteran of nearly 50 years in the labor movement—Van A. Bittner. Bittner is a short, bespectacled man with a deceptively mild manner and he has known Phil Murray since they were both young men in the coal fields.

Bittner's talents as an organizer have been strengthened by an old trade-unionist conviction: if you're going to organize, lay off politics and social theories and stick to organizing. When he took over the job he made that a stern injunction, told CIO political thinkers not to mix in.

Bittner's southern drive leaders didn't get going until about a year ago. It had taken them that long to find a permanent headquarters. They found space, finally, over Jimmy's Steak House at 79½ Poplar Street in overcrowded Atlanta. Then they went to work with 200 organizers drawn mostly from textiles, steel, and autos. The emphasis was on men with war records and southern origins. Of the 200 organizers, 120 are on the southern organizing-drive pay roll. The national CIO has provided about 20 more, and various internationals have sent in crack men to make up the total.

When the AFL decided to match the CIO's drive, it had a ready-made chairman for its Southern Policy Committee—a round-faced veteran named George Logan Googe. Googe, who also has offices in Atlanta, was born and bred in Georgia's Tattnall County, and got his start as a printer in Savannah.

His line is that the AFL is not running a counter campaign, but is just extending its normal operations in the South. This is not strictly true, although in the AFL the internationals and the locals tend to go their own independent way and are always actively organizing. The result is that Googe's operations as chairman are absorbed by local activities.

But the AFL is highly sensitive to competition from the CIO, and the number of people the AFL has working on its own campaign is a measure of its eagerness to win.

When the AFL first took up the CIO challenge, Googe had 36 organizers, city and State federations had 20, the internationals had about 350. Moreover, there were about 2,000 business agents in the field. By this spring Googe had 187 organizers on his own staff, which was later reduced to 125; city and State federations had 60 men; the internationals had 500.

This big edge in number of organizers is one reason why the AFL has been doing better than the CIO in the South. But there are other reasons, too.

The CIO has picked the toughest nuts to crack, and has tried to organize whole industries. But it is hard at this stage to win numerically magnificent victories in big industries. Most of the CIO's newcomers are in 14 major unions. The AFL gains, Googe says, are compounded of 1,200 new locals spread through about 80 craft unions.

The general picture faced by the union organizers shows four basic industries: coal (organized by John L. Lewis, now in the AFL); steel and fabricating, where the CIO is in control; lumber, scattered all over the South and embracing probably 500,000 workers; and textiles, with 590,000 workers.

The textile industry is the CIO's big target. It is the most unorganized mass-production industry in the South—about 80 percent nonunion. CIO leaders privately believe that unless they can crack this phalanx they will lose the South.

Both the big labor organizations are running into plenty of employer opposition—the CIO much more than its rival. Even the AFL, which parades its conservatism and boasts its freedom from Communist elements, has no picnic. In one southern town, when the carpenters were trying to organize a furniture factory, a newspaper provided an example of typical sympathy with the employer's point of view. The paper produced immediately before the employees' election a contribution from its editor, who wrote:

"Why join a union and pay a privilege toll in the initiation fee and monthly dues to keep some high-up union boss in an expensive apartment, provide him with a luxurious automobile, servants, traveling expenses all over the country, expensive liquor, champagne, and women?"

Some die-hard employer groups use semi-religious hate-sheets such as Sherman Patterson's Militant Truth and "Parson Jack" Johnston's the Trumpet. Both papers have been distributed among workers just before union elections, attacking CIO leaders as un-Christian Red foreigners.

The CIO says that although 19 organizers have been beaten, violence is light compared with that in some of the big northern drives a decade or so ago.

A prime instrument in the antiunion fight is, of course, racial bigotry. In the Carolinas the CIO Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers have been able to organize about 10,000 Negroes. This success has inflamed many a textile employer to subscribe to such appeals as: "You don't want to be in the same union with a bunch of niggers, do you?" The fact is that about 5 percent of southern textile workers are Negroes.

These obstacles, strangely enough, are looked on by organizers as no more than normal. Bittner says, "Organizing the South is essentially like organizing any other section. It's just a long, hard job all the way."

But the new campaign ran into a more stubborn obstacle—one that became the big hurdle in textiles particularly. Prosperity set in. The satisfied worker has been hard to sell on unionization.

Both economists and union spokesmen agree, however, that whatever the outcome of "Operation Dixie" and the parallel craft union campaign, the movement of unionism in the South is inexorable. It will go hand-in-hand with the growth of industry. And Bittner is sure that in time the South will be as highly industrialized as any other section of the country.

COTTON: SALVATION FOR AN OLD SINNER?—NEW MACHINERY IS REVOLUTIONIZING AN ANCIENT CROP AND GIVING IT AN ECONOMIC CHANCE AGAINST NEW ENEMIES

Cotton is moving. Geographically, it is moving onto the better land of the South and is looking westward. Competitively, it is breaking its shackle of hand labor and belatedly entering the age of mechanization. Its bid is to reduce production costs enough to hold its own with foreign cotton and with other fibers, especially paper and rayon.

The economic struggle will be long and the odds are stiff, and it may revolutionize southern rural life; but never was there a better time for cotton to move. Cotton now has one of its best chances in history to shake off the evils of one-crop economy, with which it has long plagued large areas of the South.

Like a delinquent tenant, cotton was sooner or later going to have to move. But the South was an easy-going landlady and had never set the date. Now it is more a matter of opportunity to improve than of being evicted, but there is an element of both in the change.

The reduction in cotton acreage, caused partly by higher yields in recent years, is sizable. Whereas cotton was grown on 46,000,000 acres in 1925, only 17,000,000 were used in 1945 and 23,000,000 will be cultivated this year.

There has also been a shift in labor. During the 15 years from 1930 to 1945, the number of tractors in the South increased by 352,000, while the number of farm operators fell off by 342,000.

The changes couldn't come to a needier industry. For many years American cotton has been a sickling, a back-sliding member of the world commodity market. And those who worked in its fields too often had no cotton to wear or sleep on.

The Government took surpluses of cotton off the sagging market, but for years those millions of bales stood in warehouses as painful proof that something was radically wrong.

The war removed the surplus by creating a military demand and quadrupled the price of cotton. Only recently the Government disposed of practically the last of an 18-year accumulation. That slate is clean. Cotton can start over.

But its fresh balance sheet starts with two huge entries on the bad side: a reduced world market and the new competition from substitute fibers.

Production of cotton abroad increased between 1920 and 1940 from 8,000,000 bales to 18,000,000, while American production fluctuated around the 13,000,000-bale mark (in 1945 it fell to 9,000,000). About half of the American crop is ordinarily sold abroad. But some of the South's best prewar customers became enemy countries and are not yet fully back in the market. Other countries lack the dollar exchange necessary to buy.

The Government has sent Germany and Japan sizable quantities of raw cotton, to be paid for in textiles and other exports, and it hopes to move 1,000,000 bales annually to each of them for a while. But dollar exchange elsewhere gets worse, posing a grave problem for cotton. At the same time, production of cotton abroad is rising, making more competition.

The threat from synthetics and other fibers comes from both home and abroad. The synthetics threaten not only in lower prices but also in superiority for many uses. Since 1940, when war started blacking out production abroad, American rayon production has nearly doubled. Last year it equaled one-sixth of all the cotton consumed in the United States. Rayon's big blow at cotton came during the war, when the synthetic took over one-sixth of the tire cord market, formerly cotton's largest single domestic outlet. The price of rayon has been cut so fast that it is now slightly under that of cotton.

Another million-bale competition come from paper, used for sugar, cement, and fertilizer bags, for towels, napkins, window shades, handkerchiefs, etc. Cotton is also fighting nylon, casein and many other industrial products.

As the price of cotton falls, it will gain an advantage on synthetics, but to hold that edge it must keep up with the research strides of the synthetics—which it is not doing. Even with the help of government laboratories, cotton is lagging behind the chemical industry.

On the good side of cotton's new books are dramatic developments in machinery which many think will cut costs enough to keep King Cotton on his throne. The best known of these is the mechanical picker finally developed to remove the bolls from the plants.

The success of this big machine is now proved, though this success is somewhat restricted in its application. The high cost of mechanical pickers, about $5,000, limits the number of farmers who can buy them, but bigger operators owning pickers can harvest other farmers' crops for them.

There is no doubt that cotton can be picked more cheaply by machines, though some bugs must be taken out of them before they do as clean a job as hand labor does. The International Harvester Co. is about ready to produce pickers at its new Memphis plant. Other types of pickers, called "strippers," are doing satisfactory work on some types of cotton.

Until recently, a major brake on the rapid spread of pickers was the fact that plenty of labor still had to be kept around for the tedious job of hoeing. It made little sense to have both a large labor force and a mechanical picker to save labor.

This fact stimulated Price McLemore, of Waugh, Ala., to invent the "Sizz Weeder," his name for a flame-throwing cultivator that burns out the weeds and forces the cotton farther up on the stalk of each plant. Besides eliminating hand hoeing, this makes it possible to keep the picker out of the dirt.

The combination of these two machines and the tractor (which is at least as important) is turning the trick. An experimental station figures that the cost of flame cultivation is 47 cents an acre, against $4 for hand hoeing. McLemore's own results are amazing. With machinery he can produce a bale of cotton and put it on the wagon with only 11 hours and 45 minutes of labor. The Alabama hand-labor average is 235 hours.

McLemore, a slender, talkative optimist, calculates the difference in costs at the rate of 40 cents an hour—$4.70 against $94 per bale for labor alone. Typically, he adds that most farm hands do not make 40 cents an hour. But they should, he says, and that's what he pays the men on his two plantations.

Several thousand flame cultivators are already being used in the South, many of them made in blacksmith shops while lawyers argue over patent rights.

Production is a bottleneck, but much more of a problem is what to do with the people machinery will displace. The specter is raised of the pickers and fire-spewing weeders driving hundreds of thousands of southerners off the land. But McLemore is one of those who fear no such thing, even though his own engineering principles have reduced his labor force from 200 people for 2,000 acres to about 4.

This appears to be shabby treatment for a lot of people, but Mr. McLemore sees it this way: About 90 percent of those displaced are women and children who would be better off in homes and schools than in the fields. They were in the fields because they had to work to supplement the family head's meager income. But the wages of the chief breadwinner will be raised by the use of the machinery. The whole standard of living will be higher.

That there is room for improvement is not doubted—the average southern farm laborer earns about $500 a year. Last year, McLemore's tractor driver earned $1,800 and his wife stayed home while the children attended school a full term.

Still, 196 of McLemores' people were displaced for each 2,000 acres. And at least the family heads had other jobs to find. Such displacement, many times multiplied, obviously would create serious problems.

Another phase of the revolution in southern agriculture is crop diversification, a fancy term for raising something besides cotton. For many years southern leaders have been crusading for more livestock and less cotton acreage, both as a way of building up the tired, eroding soil, and of reducing the risk that goes with growing any single crop.

This evangelism is slowly paying off. In Georgia, for instance, the share of farm income from livestock before 1941 had never been above $40,000,000 and the income from cotton had been as high as $362,000,000. In 1945, however, Georgia farmers took in only $72,000,000 from cotton, against $113,000,000 from livestock and its products. Diversification is making similar progress in Tennessee, Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, and other States.

Leaders like McLemore never tire of pointing to the strange fact that Birmingham imports milk from Wisconsin. The possibilities for growing the South's food in the South are great and the march of machinery will free more land for their development.

As cotton moves away from some of the marginal land of the South, leaving diversification to take its place, some of it will go West. Nothing like the big migration of the 1920's and earlier is expected, but there is already some shift. Although only a small part of the Nation's cotton crop is now grown in the West, production there has been increasing at a faster rate than that of the eastern areas. For instance, the shrewd firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co., world's largest cotton brokers, last year acquired control of 56,000 acres of California's rich San Joaquin Valley land, at least part of which will be used for cotton.

While the machines tend to increase the average size of southern cotton farms, diversification will help to make the remaining small farms more nearly self-sufficient, bracing them against the whims of a one-crop economy.

But the future is not rosy for everyone. Undoubtedly the high-cost producers, and even some on the margin, will be forced out. Some observers say that as many as 3,000,000 people will be pushed from southern agriculture by changes already foreseeable. Others are sure that these people will be soaked up naturally in the growing industrialization of the South and in consequently increased economic activity all along the line. They cite also that hundreds of thousands of poor southerners have moved to northern industrial jobs, relieving pressure already.

These claims may be debatable, but it is certain that only more efficient methods will save cotton and the people employed in it, however many they may be.

It is not the mechanization of cotton, nor its movement West, that is the chief peril—it will be the speed with which the change comes and the economic state of the Nation at the time that will determine the amount of human suffering, if any.

If the change comes too suddenly, the new machines will be cursed as steel demons. But in the long run they are bound to mean

better conditions for all regions. Moreover, any basic change in cotton has good chances of being a good change.

Let Us Be Faithful to Our Traditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a veto of a tax bill by a President of the United States is a clear violation of section 8 of the Federal Constitution, which provides that "the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises."

Only on one previous occasion, so far as I can ascertain, has a President of the United States seen fit to veto a tax bill. Aside from Presidents Roosevelt and Truman all Presidents have very carefully observed that constitutional injunction.

President Truman, like his New Deal predecessor, has seen fit to flaunt the plain intent of the Constitution of the United States, and in doing so has thrown the issue into the 1948 campaign, assuming the veto is not overridden by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, less than 2 years ago President Truman signed a revenue bill that released American corporations from paying nearly six billions in taxes but he balks and gags at giving the individual 49,000,000 taxpayers $4,000,000,000 in relief.

Great Britain and Canada have each had two tax reductions since VJ-day but Mr. Truman evidently feels that the American taxpayer should continue to keep his nose on the grindstone so that he may have more money to send to other countries, and to spend at home.

It would seem that as between corporations and individuals Truman favors the former when it comes to collecting money from a tax-harassed people.

Not alone has Mr. Truman flaunted the Federal Constitution but he totally ignores the needs of our economy. Let him explain to our people why we should be further taxed to help nations that already have given tax relief to their people; let him explain why he favors corporations as against the individual; also why he is opposed to giving relief to our own people.

He might also explain why he is against increasing the home-take pay to the toiler in the form of tax reduction.

Mr. Truman has had much to say about the dangers of inflation, yet has repeatedly supported moves to increase wages, which are reflected in higher prices. He chooses to favor wage increases for our own people and in the same breath opposes tax reduction, which would give the worker more take-home pay, with no increase in prices.

Either Mr. Truman is badly muddled in his thinking or he is being badly advised by his advisers. Whatever it may be he has placed himself in an untenable position that will be reflected in the November 1948 outcome. He cannot escape from the consequences of his blind and stubborn folly.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert a telegram from the Committee for Constitutional Government which explains the constitutional aspects of Mr. Truman's invasion of the constitutional right of the Congress to lay and levy taxes. To me the points raised are unanswerable. Let Mr. Truman attempt to answer them if he can:

JULY 14, 1947.

To Members of Congress:

After centuries of struggle during which English liberty had been established by parliaments wresting the taxing power from the king the founding fathers wrote into our Constitution the wise provision that taxing power and tax policy should rest in the Congress and not in the Executive.

Now the representatives of the American people, in both Houses of Congress, have twice voted overwhelmingly to reduce income taxes. This reduction is essential to provide incentive and to permit the capital accumulation needed to finance new enterprises and to expand old ones, thus providing a broader base for taxes and greater assurance of continuing employment. More important a great constitutional question is at stake.

The President alone is the obstacle to the fulfillment of the people's will. Do you believe that the decision should rest, as provided for in the Constitution, with the people's representatives or with one man?

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, INC.

The Use of AAA Funds From 1937 to 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following official table shows the expenditures under the AAA program:

The use of funds by the AAA from 1936 to 1947—Conservation materials and services for all agricultural conservation programs—Quantities and costs of materials obtained through Government purchasing arrangements and furnished farmers during each program year

Program year	Region	Triple superphosphate		Normal superphosphate		Mixed fertilizer and potash		Raw rock phosphate		Liming materials	
		Tons	Cost	Tons	Cost	Tons	Cost	Tons	Cost	Tons	Cost
1937	East Central	24,673	$783,141								
	Southern	408	13,068								
	Total	25,081	796,209								
1938	East Central	56,771	1,847,148							21,002	$46,891
	Northeast	7,962	303,301							17,076	57,361
	Southern	2,214	69,932								
	Total	66,947	2,220,381							38,078	104,252
1939	East Central	92,444	3,367,500							342,901	745,000
	Northeast	30,825	1,217,220							243,534	1,220,734
	North Central	617	23,398								
	Southern	10,767	383,564							95,756	239,474
	Western	4,119	145,944								
	Total	138,772	5,137,626							682,191	2,205,208
1940	East Central	112,159	4,037,724	71,418	$1,214,106					1,051,477	2,102,954
	Northeast	20,804	789,782	33,720	573,240					557,917	2,814,062
	North Central	15,219	578,322							1,346,345	2,799,584
	Southern	18,617	668,714	54,387	815,805					252,453	757,359
	Western	10,310	412,400							10,288	51,440
	Total	177,109	6,486,942	159,525	2,603,151					3,218,480	8,525,399
1941	East Central	60,334	2,292,709	218,481	3,482,816					1,661,584	3,605,899
	Northeast			151,529	2,518,809					694,911	3,457,138
	North Central	23,337	933,480	50,435	900,900					4,613,226	7,895,850
	Southern	22,632	865,091	82,173	1,238,612					263,560	795,831
	Western	8,164	244,707	20,125	346,792					24,542	76,285
	Total	114,467	4,335,987	522,743	8,487,929					7,257,823	15,831,003

The use of funds by the AAA from 1936 to 1947—Conservation materials and services for all agricultural conservation programs—Quantities and costs of materials obtained through Government purchasing arrangements and furnished farmers during each program year—Con.

Program year	Region	Triple superphosphate		Normal superphosphate		Mixed fertilizer and potash		Raw rock phosphate		Liming materials	
		Tons	Cost	Tons	Cost	Ton	Cost	Tons	Cost	Tons	Cost
1942	East Central	12,723	$440,520	[1] 286,310	$4,648,930					2,465,689	$5,288,000
	Northeast			158,484	2,849,031	150	$6,300			1,057,905	5,270,180
	North Central			144,005	3,239,855	77,910	1,805,953	13,763	$176,166	8,106,414	15,100,524
	Southern			[1] 198,981	3,584,478	493	11,834			261,188	741,027
	Western	13,308	621,668	5,440	92,480					94,138	219,604
	Total	26,031	1,062,188	793,220	14,414,774	78,553	1,821,087	13,763	176,166	11,985,334	26,619,335
1943	East Central			[1] 599,946	11,416,972			3,945	45,367	2,636,102	6,985,670
	Northeast			166,229	3,340,903	33,947	1,013,204			1,185,125	5,861,987
	North Central			307,890	5,029,230	59,650	1,384,507	56,050	727,141	6,182,720	13,666,845
	Southern			[1] 203,830	4,005,259	668	19,225			404,823	1,040,395
	Western			40,407	1,149,175					115,993	341,019
	Total			1,318,302	24,941,539	94,265	2,416,936	59,995	772,508	10,524,763	27,895,916
1944	East Central			[1] 203,048	4,129,163					2,884,663	9,362,678
	Northeast			268,760	5,702,207	2,821	98,738			2,130,331	10,664,988
	North Central			157,449	3,420,128			35,640	474,784	6,414,274	14,798,210
	Southern			[1] 238,484	4,588,362					2,312,748	8,788,442
	Western			38,250	1,085,911					480,900	1,221,630
	Total			905,982	18,925,831	2,821	98,738	35,640	474,784	14,222,916	44,835,948
1945	East Central			[1] 352,487	6,563,405			7,935	87,286	1,954,473	5,391,773
	Northeast			174,068	3,163,550					2,046,060	9,343,516
	North Central			244,879	5,012,586			84,150	925,650	5,542,059	9,376,374
	Southern			[1] 383,188	5,830,937			291	1,630	762,758	2,218,983
	Western			25,397	538,873					735,537	1,604,185
	Total			1,180,019	21,109,351			92,376	1,014,566	11,040,887	27,934,831
1946 [2]	East Central	9,152	346,837	[1] 320,221	5,678,761	14,525	233,008	40	320	2,381,985	6,636,088
	Northeast			218,105	3,475,684					2,015,947	7,647,115
	North Central			200,000	3,150,000					7,550,000	12,835,000
	Southern	9,311	362,910	[1] 431,822	6,630,603	4,342	43,210	10,393	166,291	1,213,927	3,568,005
	Western			16,288	363,568					881,639	1,953,113
	Total	18,463	709,747	1,187,136	19,298,416	18,867	276,218	10,433	166,611	14,043,498	32,639,321
	Grand total [4]	566,870	20,749,080	6,066,927	109,780,691	194,506	4,615,979	212,207	2,604,635	73,013,970	186,591,213

Program year	Region	Seeds		Kudzu crowns		Seedling trees		Terracing and services, cost	Borax		Total value
		Pounds	Cost	Thousands	Cost	Thousands	Cost		Tons	Cost	
1937	East Central										$783,141
	Southern										13,068
	Total										796,209
1938	East Central	$270,000	17,426								1,911,465
	Northeast										360,662
	Southern	1,011,000	44,147								114,079
	Total	1,281,000	61,573								2,386,206
1939	East Central	298,547	56,569								4,169,069
	Northeast	3,373,202	741,790								3,179,744
	North Central										23,398
	Southern	657,717	55,159								678,197
	Western	1,383,300	71,207								217,151
	Total	5,712,766	924,725								8,267,559
1940	East Central	3,428,800	184,754								7,539,538
	Northeast					685	$5,307				4,182,391
	North Central										3,377,906
	Southern	39,468,205	2,762,774			2,512	3,768				5,008,420
	Western	150,300	10,521								474,361
	Total	43,047,305	2,958,049			3,197	9,075				20,582,616
1941	East Central	3,730,181	217,070								9,598,494
	Northeast					655	4,723				5,980,670
	North Central										9,730,230
	Southern	13,944,426	601,673	17,804	$120,092	769	2,022	$67,169			3,690,400
	Western	194,600	14,720								682,504
	Total	17,869,207	833,463	17,804	120,092	1,424	6,745	67,169			29,682,298
1942	East Central	9,496,440	685,469								11,062,919
	Northeast					714	3,839				8,129,350
	North Central										20,322,498
	Southern	63,664,010	4,453,137	6,793	61,138	1,851	6,528	161,563			9,019,705
	Western	1,676,200	67,989						800	$31,193	1,032,934
	Total	74,836,650	5,206,595	6,793	61,138	2,565	10,367	161,563	800	31,193	49,567,406
1943	East Central	34,811,124	3,118,728								21,566,737
	Northeast					2,545	9,204				10,225,298
	North Central										20,807,723
	Southern	47,785,001	3,551,381	2,475	26,160			474,000			9,116,420
	Western							55,063	1,500	55,507	1,600,764
	Total	82,596,125	6,670,109	2,475	26,160	2,545	9,204	529,063	1,500	55,507	63,316,942

Footnotes at end of table.

The use of funds by the AAA from 1936 to 1947—Conservation materials and services for all agricultural conservation programs—Quantities and costs of materials obtained through Government purchasing arrangements and furnished farmers during each program year—Con.

Program year	Region	Seeds		Kudzu crowns		Seedling trees		Terracing and services, cost	Borax		Total value
		Pounds	Cost	Thousands	Cost	Thousands	Cost		Tons	Cost	
1944	East Central	8,681,293	$697,910					$97,647			[1] 14,287,398
	Northeast	75,148	9,933					31,108			16,507,034
	North Central							343,378			19,036,500
	Southern	50,074,156	7,956,788	9,828	$89,306			14,565,377			35,988,275
	Western								4,570	$211,694	2,519,235
	Total	58,830,597	8,664,631	9,828	89,306			15,037,510	4,570	211,694	88,338,442
1945	East Central	12,631,494	1,011,405					935			13,054,804
	Northeast							96,365			12,603,431
	North Central							1,027,526			16,342,136
	Southern	57,544,098	4,466,217	4,223	41,005			5,156,261			17,715,033
	Western								4,725	174,000	2,317,058
	Total	70,175,592	5,477,622	4,223	41,005			6,281,087	4,725	174,000	62,032,462
1946 [2]	East Central	19,039,303	1,504,403								14,399,217
	Northeast										11,122,799
	North Central							3,000,000			18,985,000
	Southern	86,227,109	7,498,387	5,777	54,033			7,975,860			[3] 26,483,847
	Western								4,386	139,150	2,455,831
	Total	105,266,472	9,002,790	5,777	54,033			10,975,860	4,386	139,150	[3] 73,446,694
	Grand total [4]		39,799,557		391,644		$35,391	33,052,252		611,544	398,416,834

[1] Includes basic slag converted by taking 50 percent of actual tonnage.
[2] Preliminary.
[3] Includes $184,548 for 7,098 tons of sulfur.
[4] These totals computed in my office.

Source: Conservation Materials and Services Section, Office of the Director, Field Service Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture, March 1947.

NOTE.—This report does not include materials purchased by farmers for cash and used under the programs

For the 10-year period from 1937 to 1947 about four billions of dollars was appropriated under the AAA. The above table shows the amounts used for certain soil improvements, including fertilizer and lime purchases. There were 73,013,970 tons of lime, valued at $186,591,213, purchased by Government funds. Government funds were used to purchase 7,040,510 tons of fertilizer costing $137,750,685. Many other activities were carried on in addition to the fertilizer program. This was especially true up until the war influence was reflected by an increase in farm prices.

There were less than 10 percent of the total funds used for soil improvement, including lime and fertilizer. During the past 4 years about 25 percent of the appropriation was expended for fertilizers, lime, terracing, seeds, borax application, and tree planting.

There are 350,000,000 acres of cropland in the United States, so one can easily see what a problem it is going to be to maintain the fertility of the soil. The total value of fertilizer used has been an average of 40 cents per acre of cultivated land in the United States, and 53 cents per acre for lime per acre of cultivated land in the United States.

The soils of the United States are less fertile than 1 year ago, less fertile than 10 years ago, less fertile, in fact, each year. This situation even applies to Wisconsin where millions of tons of feed are purchased each year.

The fertilizer and lime used under the AAA program should make the American producer more cognizant of the problem of soil fertility than he has been in the past.

The following from the subcommittee hearings show the AAA appropriations by years from 1937 to 1947:

Appropriations

1938	[1] $340,000,000
1939	[2] 345,000,000
1940	[3] 499,560,000
1941	[4] 438,556,740
1942	499,388,671
1943	450,000,000
1944	400,000,000
1945	302,500,000
1946	300,000,000
1947	[5] 271,746,000

[1] In addition, $160,000,000 reappropriated.
[2] Exclusive of $155,000,000 reappropriated.
[3] In addition, $70,000,000 reappropriated.
[4] Excludes $3,260 transferred to "United States official mail and messenger service, Post Office Department (general fund)," pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939 and Reorganization Plan No. IV. In addition, unobligated balances estimated at $23,400,000. In addition, not to exceed $60,000,000 reappropriated.
[5] Together with $42,500,000 of unexpended balances of appropriations for 1944, 1945, and 1946 made by section 32 of the act approved August 24, 1935.

In total, this makes total appropriations of about $4,000,000,000.

Cause of Peace Needs Strong UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of July 13, 1947:

CAUSE OF PEACE NEEDS STRONG UN

The United Nations, which has just passed its second birthday, is not growing as it should. It has no teeth. The veto power in which its Russian nurse insists on swathing it prevents it from developing any strength. If Russia has its way the infant collective security system never will get enough body building food or exercise to amount to anything.

Russia expects to look out for itself by other means than UN. It is interested only in preventing UN from ever developing sufficient strength to look out for others. Above all Russia wants to prevent UN from ever being strong enough to prevent Russia from imposing its will on others.

This treatment of UN is intolerable to all who wish it to become the principal safeguard of everybody's peace. It is particularly intolerable to the United States which presided at UN's birth and has been its most indulgent and attentive nurse ever since.

The United States would like to work through UN whenever a blow has to be struck for peace, freedom or economic recovery, but Russia's systematic weakening of UN has disqualified it for such services. So when there was a crisis in Greece the United States could not work through UN as it would have preferred. Economic assistance cannot be given effectively to needy Europeans through UN as at present constituted.

This unfortunate state of affairs is aptly summarized by Congressman WALTER JUDD. We have only three choices with respect to UN, the Minnesota Representative points out:

"We can abandon it, as useless; we can continue to give lip service to it and use its machinery to handle marginal, fringe problems but by-pass it when some major situation demands attention, or we can strengthen it so it can preserve the peace as it was intended to do."

JUDD and 21 other Members of Congress have launched a nonpartisan campaign in Congress to have the United States take the lead trying to provide the United Nations with enforcement teeth. They want to revise the charter of UN so that no nation can keep the collective security machinery from becoming operative by abuse of the veto power.

They would like to have Russian help in strengthening UN. They insist on UN being strengthened even if Russia is opposed.

Already cautious people in Congress as well as in UN are warning against such action at this time. They fear it may lead to Russia's withdrawal.

Our answer to that warning is, "So what?"

Is it not better to have a collective security system with real power to preserve the peace adhered to by that large number of nations sincerely desirous of peace with freedom, even though Russia and its satellites are outside that system, than to have no system at all?

Those are the real choices in these fateful days when the world is determining whether there is to be another major war a decade or so hence or a long era of peace.

When Russia had to choose between cooperating with the non-Communist powers in the rebuilding of Europe's shattered economy and prosecuting the Communist revolution, it chose revolution. It made Czechoslovakia stay outside the reconstruction effort along with Russia's more obvious satellites Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Albania, despite Czechoslovakia's keen desire to participate.

We hope Russia will take a more enlightened attitude toward reconstruction of UN, but if it refuses to go along with the collective security effort it at least will be enlightening to know where Russia stands and who are the dependable friends of collective security.

Back the effort to strengthen UN without further delay.

Address by Hon. Owen Brewster at Seventeenth Congress, General Society of Mayflower Descendants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 18 (legislative day of Wednesday July 16), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Maine before the Seventeenth Congress of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants at Plymouth, Mass., on September 10, 1946.

There being no objections, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor general and friends, this is a most delightful respite from campaigning, so far as I am concerned, as, during the past 6 weeks, in what are still rather strenuous days in Maine. Our constituentcy still requires that we come around and exhibit ourselves, even though they may have fully made up their minds they are going to vote for us, and they look us over very carefully, particularly our wives who accompany us on these tours.

I always remember the judge when he was impaneling the jury, and stated that if anyone in the rear of the room could not hear him, they could stand up and he would excuse them from service. He wondered why no one stood up.

If anyone doesn't hear me, I shall be glad to enlarge my voice. But along toward the close of the campaign, I heard Mrs. Brewster say to the Governor's wife, "I must have another cup of coffee tonight, because I must listen to those speeches all over again."

I come here with the refreshing impression that you at least have not heard this speech before, and, second, that there is nothing you can do about it anyway, as the votes are in the box.

I have that most delicious of freedoms for a politician—the capacity to speak his mind without fear of reprisal of any character. I have 6 long years ahead, according to the mandate of the people of Maine, and we never begin to worry about reelection until about the fifth year, and then we begin to behave ourselves.

I venture here with a little hesitation, because, well, though I have, for a long time, been a descendant of the Mayflower pilgrims, I had not affiliated myself, as some of your Maine associates may testify; I found that my most formidable political rival in all Maine was the head man in the Mayflower descendants, and I wasn't quite sure what kind of an initiation I would receive—although I finally got rid of him by appointing him to the supreme court of Maine while I was Governor. [Laughter.]

Meanwhile, my habits had been formed, and so it was just within the last year that I rather took myself out of the mongrel class of the Brewsters who had not affiliated, and I have been laboring with the lineage papers which my mother worked out very carefully before she left me. It has only been within recent years that the Library of Congress has been willing to vouch that the very handsome and very bewhiskered gentleman who adorns the walls of the President's room in the Capitol, as some of you may know, with the name of Brewster written under it, is really my ancestor. I confess also I am particularly happy when I get down in the rotunda of the Capitol, where some of you may have been, and observe the scene of the departure of the pilgrims—the only curious part of it being that, according to this authentic record in the rotunda of the Capitol, they did not sail on the Mayflower. By what curious thinking they adopted the name of the boat that turned back as the name of the boat in which the pilgrims came to Plymouth has always been beyond my comprehension. I don't know whether the rest of you have noted the error.

When I accepted this invitation to address you on the day following the Maine election, of course, it implied a certain measure of confidence in the constituency of Maine, as it certainly would have been most embarrassing if I should have been compelled to come down here as a defeated candidate. But, fortunately, the citizens of Maine have lived up to their traditions, along with Vermont, so that we may go forward now.

In 1936—in that unhappy period when we stood alone with a lantern hung aloft in the night, as you will remember—Mrs. Brewster and I took a trip to Mexico and arrived at the Embassy, where the good Josephus Daniels presided over its destinies. He invited us to a Thanksgiving dinner, although we didn't think we had very much to be thankful for—but a Republican is always too glad to get anything that is handed out in these days. When we arrived at the dinner, the Ambassador said, "Now, Governor," as he always calls me, "you needn't feel so badly up there in Maine. We're not going to give you to Canada; we're going to keep you for seed." [Laughter.]

And I have been happy to remind him in the days that have since transpired that the seed seems to be doing all right, as we have quite a lot of company now—I think in some 20 or 25 other States—and we have a lot more company in the Senate and House. How much more we are going to get this fall is another story which I won't labor on here today.

After this recent episode, I come to you with naturally more faith in the wisdom of the American people, and, particularly, in the people of Maine, and with renewed courage to go on in a fight for what we conceived to be the same fundamental principles that animated those whose memory we here revere; those who started out on that fateful voyage 300 or more years ago, which finally ended up here.

I always have before me the picture of my good old grandfather who according to the author of Saints and Strangers, used to bow his head each day through that dread and fearful winter, and thanked God that he was permitted the sack of abundance of the seas and of the treasures hidden in the sands, those things treasured being the raw clams on which he was compelled to subsist for some 2 or 3 months, as we understand.

But that was the spirit which, as we know, animated them, and when I see some of our friends in this country, in the midst of all the material marvels of the present day, in the midst of all this thing that is America, the productivity marvel of all the earth, pouring out the so-called good things of this life, with twice as much as any other people on earth are privileged to enjoy, and 4 to 10 times as much as most of them—as those of you who have been in the Middle East, in India, or in China in the recent decade can well testify—sitting down like a hound baying at the moon, and sitting on a burr as though we were the most forlorn of creatures, I am compelled to bow my head in shame and shudder at what would be thought by those who rest here on the hill if they could know the depths to which these descendants of America had descended.

To be sure, these are difficult times. But they have been difficult before. This is very far from being a period such as they knew in 1620, or a century and a half later when they declared their independence, and it is curious with what timeliness these things seem to come. I have been amazed at the cycle of every five generations. The English Revolution of the early 1600's launched the voyage of the *Mayflower*, which landed here upon Plymouth Rock, and yet has not achieved entirely its goal. The end of that voyage is not yet until the freedom to which they aspired has become the common property, not only of America but of all the peoples of the world. They saw far beyond the material horizon which all too often circumscribes our views.

The little band set forth and landed here and America was born in that *Mayflower* compact, representing the birth of the Nation of which we now so proudly boast; and in England, at the same time, the King's head was coming off, and then five generations later—a century and a half—came the American Revolution, the offshoot, perchance, of the French Revolution, when once again humanity was in ferment and there was born here this new Nation dedicated under God to the service of mankind, and now another century and a half has passed—five generations more have told their story. The comfortable Victorian days, in which some of us were born and bred have had their time. We thought we should go on in an ascending scale, with heaven just around the corner, not too far away to be achieved and not too near to be uncomfortable, and that we never again should know throes of world-wide strife, and now we have, within our day, twice experienced these world-wide conflicts that have challenged the very concepts upon which America was founded.

Let us have no illusions; the end is not yet; this is only the beginning. After the First World War, we thought that everything would now be well. We had demonstrated to the world our power—our material might beyond any dreamed of before. We took the enemy and came home confident that all would now be well, and yet, within another generation, the world was once again plunged into this strife.

I am reminded of the hired man up in Maine who didn't get along very well with the farmer's wife. She thought he was a

rather lazy lout, as hired men sometimes are, even in the State of Maine, and he thought she wasn't a very good provider because they didn't always have pie for breakfast. One evening, long before it was getting dark, he asked the farmer whether he could borrow the lantern to court the hired girl at the next farm. The farmer said, "Well, Jim, when I was a young fellow and went acourtin', I didn't take any lantern with me." Then Jim said, "And look what you got." [Laughter.]

After the last war, we didn't take any lantern with us. We just closed our eyes and came home and thought we could ignore events elsewhere in this world, and terrible it is to hear the discussion of the Third World War already reverberating about the council chambers in Paris. I am quite persuaded that it is far better that we should recognize this peril, rather than to drink the draught that quenched our thirst in 1920 and which led us to believe that the era of eternal peace was immediately at hand.

Getting through Harvard Law School some years ago, I went to Dean Thayer, and with the usual yearnings and anxiety of a young man, I told him I was very much concerned; I was worried that I would become simply a lawyer and cease to be a man. And he said to me very wisely, "As long as you are worried about it, you are all right." [Laughter.]

And that was a very profound truth. As long as this world is worried about the possibility of war we may, I think, continue more confidently, and we may, perhaps, take the measures essential to its preservation.

Now, this is nothing new. We pay tribute to these ancestors of ours; we extol their sturdy virtues, and all too often forget their application to the present time. It is the same problem that has always faced humanity—the lust for power, the avarice, the national jealousies, the national ambitions, the dictatorships, those who would ruthlessly achieve power at the expense of their fellowmen.

You remember the slow train of Mark Twain out in Arkansas, and as the traveler went along, he said the train was so slow that every time it came to a house it stopped, and when it came to a double house it stopped twice. Finally out in the middle of the prairie where they weren't any houses it stopped, and when the brakeman came he asked what the trouble was, and the brakeman said, "Well, there is a cow on the track."

They finally rumbled on, with moderate progress, and after three more hours in the middle of the prairie they stopped, and as the brakeman came through the traveler said, "Well, what is it this time, Jim? Is there another cow on the track?" And Jim said, "No, it's the same old cow." [Laughter.]

Well, now, it is the same old calf that challenged the love of freedom of the Pilgrim Fathers; that challenged the freedom-loving citizens of colonial days, where, at Bunker Hill, they fought for independence, and at Concord and Lexington, where the embattled farmers fired the shot heard around the world, the same urge to freedom that is animating men everywhere, and will continue so as long as life remains, and the only problem for you is whether we permit the encrustations of tradition to so trample us that we shall not be able, ourselves, to assert the freedom that is ours.

Revolution? Why should we be afraid of revolutions? We are the legitimate authors and descendants of the freedom of the first great revolution, when the Pilgrim Fathers struck forth, and probably most of us can trace also to the American Revolution in which our ancestors also were privileged to participate. The only thing we have to fear is that the world shall not understand.

A revolution is a thing about which we have no occasion to be concerned. It is in our blood. But let us be sure that the emblems of tyranny conceived under the guise of liberty shall not fasten their chains on us again. That is the subtle suggestion that we now find abroad throughout this world. It came a time ago in the guise of fascism that was going to solve all our economic and social ills. The poor, tottering democracies were not equal to the task of this new day, and so, in the interest of efficiency and progress, democracy must be done.

Hitler assembled his hosts and pooled his lightning bolts to strike while democracy slept, and finally this dull animal awoke, and Hitler and Hirohito learned, to their sorrow, the might potentials of this yen for freedom among men, and they, like their distinguished predecessors of the First World War, were doomed and are no more.

But still tyranny would fasten on its chains. The distinction between the dictatorship of Berlin and Moscow is impossible to define. Communism, likewise, would fasten on its plodding disciples the same chains. They make no pretense of freedom to which America has long subscribed. Stalin is as terrific an autocrat as any the world has ever seen.

They say they are doing it for the good not only of the Russians but of all mankind. We have no primary responsibility for the welfare of the Russian people. It is for them to work out their salvation in their own way, but when they come to sell this particular bill of goods to us here in America, we are at least entitled to look it over and to see of what stuff it is made, and whether or not, perchance, it is a Trojan horse. Now, you notice how I pronounce "horse."

Mr. Harold J. Lasky is in America today, I understand. Rather quietly he came last spring, and after sojourning for a time enjoying our hospitality and supplies, he confided in us that our economic system was hopelessly demoralized and that the more quickly it was scrapped, the better it would be for America and for the world.

Mr. Lasky is entitled to his opinion, as former chairman of the British Labor Party. I wish them well in their great experiment in modified socialism that seems to be less and less modified as they go along, as they are inevitably driven from one industry to another in the amalgamation of them in the Government control, and I have no further comment or criticism to make upon their course. They have a very great capacity to survive, to muddle through, and I surely wish them well. They are great allies, and they probably always will be our allies, so far as this century, at least, is concerned.

But, on the other hand, before we scrap our system, it seems to me it would be well for us at least to pause and consider before we adopt the complete totalitarianism of the Russian system which is producing about one-fourth of what we produce in America at the present time, and the inhabitants of Russia are enjoying somewhat less than one-fourth as a result of their dedication to war.

Now, we have a country of great resources, although other countries, Russia in particular, has resources equal to our own, and the British Empire as a whole has. We have done fairly well with this thing in the last century. Under our system of what we call free enterprise—they like to call it capitalism because that is sort of an accursed word—we have made America the productive marvel of all the earth.

Stalin and Churchill paid us tribute when they said that it was only the industrial mobilization and production of America that enabled them to win over the Axis Powers. And this is with no challenge of the fighting qualities of our allies. They were good fighting men, but they needed the modern mechanism of war—the planes, the tanks, and guns, and finally, the atom bomb, which alone was a tribute to our productive genius, as no other country faced with war could divert $2,000,000,000 worth of men and materials to that great experiment that might well have failed. That was a tribute not only to our scientists but to the productive energies of this America.

And so, with these resources, we feel that we have done rather well. We have recognized throughout, the cooperation of Divine Providence, as did the Pilgrim fathers. And yet, we have recognized that we, too, have responsibilities in blood, sweat, and tears.

There was a little New England town, where, in the neglect of the years, there had gradually grown up in its center, where formerly had been a lovely spot, a great growth of brambles. Finally, one of the old settlers, disgusted with the thing, devoted the spring to cleaning up the brambles and planting grass seeds and flowers. He labored through the warm days of June and July, and along in August, it was blossoming like the rose—and it looked very lovely there in the center of the town.

The parson came walking down one nice hot day while the other gentlemen was laboring, and he said, "Well, my good man, you and the Lord have certainly done a wonderful job of this patch of brambles."

The old fellow looked up at him through the sweat and said, "Parson, I wish you could have seen this when the Lord had it all alone." [Laughter.]

We wish that all the world could have seen this America when the only ones who had it were the Indians and the Lord. We think we have done quite a job. We are happy to welcome Mr. Laski and all his kind and all the Russians who will choose to come bearing gifts and bearing friendship, and we would like to show them what we have done. We are in glad competition to see whether or not there is a better way to run this world and run this particular part of it that is in our charge.

But until some other country has demontrated a better way of life, will it not be well for America to pause and consider before scrapping all the lessons of 10 generations of our ancestors in favor of what is still nothing more than experiment, however noble it may be in purpose. [Applause.] And that, I think, is a lesson that we here in America must inculcate in these days to come. Sometimes we get discouraged. That is a very dangerous thing. That is, in my judgment, the chief weapon of the devil in putting us to sleep. We get discouraged, we say we are so few in number.

Lord Bryce in his very keen study of the American commonwealth a half century ago, pointed out that the great peril in America was what he termed, "mob fatalism"—that we would become a great nation of more than 100,000,000 people scattered all over this vast continent and that gradually the individual would become convinced that he was too insignificant to count.

Why should I bother? What am I among 100,000,000 people? What does it matter what I think or what I do? And so, I shall take my ease and enjoy myself and get what I can of the world's goods, and why should I concern myself about my neighbor? Then the Mayflower compact would be destroyed and Plymouth Rock would be shattered to the extent that that decadent idea would become dominant in this America of ours.

We may seem very few here today—this little group—but think how few were they when they landed on this rock and the vicissitudes which they were compelled to endure.

Our recent "debunker" contends that really the saints were very few. It seemed the Elder William Brewster was the only fellow who really amounted to something. The author pretty well destroyed all the rest of them to his own satisfaction. [Laughter.]

But we do not need to worry about those gentlemen, nor about the strangers of whom he spoke. We may remember what Calvin Coolidge said, you know, when they started this debunking of George Washington. Someone came to the White House and asked Mr. Coolidge about George Washington, and Cal just wheeled around, looked out, and said, "Well, the Monument still stands." [Laughter.]

Plymouth Rock still stands, and with it all it stands for, even though in the left wing seances of the present, there is very great concern that the wave of the future of which they so fondly sing seems to be shattered upon this Plymouth Rock of ancient moralities for which America is increasingly beginning to yearn. And so my faith is great, and let us not be concerned about our number.

When I get a little discouraged, when Maine and Vermont were all alone, we consoled ourselves with this thought: Abe Lincoln called a meeting at his office in Springfield, as he relates, to consider the salvation of the Union which seemed to be threatened with disunity and dissension, and he records in his diary that the meeting was attended by his law partner and the office cat. That, was the total number apparently concerned with the salvation of the Union in 1858, and yet, 2 years later, he set cut upon his great task.

"Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them."

It only remains for us, individually, to bear our part. There is no vicarious atonement. It is with the individual that humanity be saved, and we, as the descendants and the disciples of this great tradition, have upon us a great obligation. "Noblesse oblige." He who is greatly privileged is obligated greatly now to serve.

As we go back to our several communities, let us continue to carry this torch, right here at this great shrine that we still treasure, and in all the memories of this historic spot, conscious of the fact that your destiny and the destiny of this country of ours is fulfill within our control, and that if we fulfill our part in our communities, there is no power under heaven that can divert our course.

Henry Van Dyke wrote an epic poem of the voyage of Henry Hudson, on its tercentenary, some years ago, and he told the story in epic verse of those great voyages of Henry Hudson, and how, after getting up the Hudson River, he set forth on that great quest of those centuries to find the passage to the Indies

And so he found Hudson Bay, and up there, his mutinous crew set him adrift and went back to the gutters of London from which he had rescued them. They set him adrift in a little boat with his helmsman named John King, and his son, 12 years old. The last seen of Henry Hudson was as he disappeared across the horizon, still constant in his quest.

And so I see that *Mayflower* voyage of ours that set out so many centuries ago still keeping constant on the course toward freedom for all mankind which was the vision and inspiration of those great ancestors of ours.

And so we too are privileged, if we will, to keep the faith and to give the command to the Captain of our ship of state to continue constant on the course no matter what may be the perils to the right or to the left, until we shall finally loose our anchor in that port for which the *Mayflower* voyage was destined so many centuries ago.

And I want to conclude with what seemed to me the symbolic language of Henry Van Dyke in this little poem, as we, too, give command to our Captain to continue on his course.

"The world is round and God is everywhere,
And while our shallop floats we still can steer
So point her up, John King, nor'west by north,
We'll keep the honor of a certain aim.
Amid the peril of uncertain ways,
And sail ahead, and leave the rest to God."

[Applause.]

Coordination of Agricultural Conservation Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding coordination of agricultural conservation agencies and programs, by Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I am delighted that bills providing for coordination of agricultural conservation agencies and programs have been introduced in both the Senate and House," Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said in a statement issued here today. The bills to which he referred are H. R. 4150 by Representative HAROLD COOLEY, North Carolina, Democrat; H. R. 4151, by Representative WILLIAM HILL, Colorado, Republican, and S. 1621, which was introduced jointly in the Senate July 12 by Senator CLYDE REED, Kansas, Republican, and Senator TOM STEWART, Tennessee, Democrat.

"Representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation were ever glad to collaborate with these Senators and Congressmen in the preparation of this legislation," Mr. O'Neal declared. "These bills embody objectives and recommendations advocated by our organization for many years. The overwhelming majority of farmers in every section of the Nation are in favor of the basic principles embodied in these bills. I sincerely hope that every Member of the Senate and House will give them careful study and support their enactment.

"Such legislation is long overdue. For many years farmers have become increasingly concerned over the duplication, overlapping, and conflicts in agricultural agencies, with so many field organizations reaching out from Washington to the individual farmers, advising them how to carry on their farming operations. This results in needless expense, confusion, and frequently conflicting advice to farmers," he explained.

"It is significant that both the Senate and House Appropriations Committee urged coordination of agricultural agencies and programs in the reports submitted by these committees on the agricultural appropriation bill. Both committees reviewed the activities and operations of these programs thoroughly before making these recommendations. The enactment of the proposed legislation would carry out to a large extent the recommendations of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees for coordination."

The president of the Nation's largest farm organization explained that the proposed Coordination Act of 1947 would save millions of dollars yearly by eliminating duplication, overlapping, and conflicts, both of personnel and activities, among various agencies engaged in agricultural and water conservation, which, as now being carried on by several different agencies, is causing great confusion among farmers. By decentralizing administration of the programs and giving more responsibility to State and county levels, as the bill provides, programs could be handled more efficiently and could be better adapted to the needs in the various localities.

"This legislation does not kill or eliminate any needed service to farmers," he continued. "On the contrary, it will make possible greater results in conservation among the masses of farmers."

"The Agricultural Coordination Act of 1947 will, in the Farm Bureau's opinion, make possible much more rapid progress in restoring and conserving soil and water resources throughout the Nation," Mr. O'Neal declared. "We want to see developed a program that will reach the rank and file of farmers everywhere and one that will meet the varying conditions and needs in different areas. One of the best features of this legislation is that it will extend conservation programs to the masses of farmers, instead of only to a selected few reached in the past by the Soil Conservation Service. Despite the fact that the Soil Conservation Service has been in existence since 1935 and has spent a total of more than $273,000,000 in its conservation operations, it actually has only helped a few hundred thousand farmers develop conservation plans and, in many instances, these plans have been carried out only partially," he asserted.

Oil Fuel Consumption for Electric Power Generation and Replacement Possibilities From Hydroelectric Developments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, within the past 48 hours newspapers have carried the story that because of the serious shortage of oil, naval orders have been isued to reduce the speed in the operation of our ships. That is a temporary shortage. Far more critical is the probable permanent depletion of our domestic oil supply.

A barrel of oil taken from the ground and used is gone forever. According to the best available information, as I have said before on the floor of the House, there are an estimated 20,000,000,000 barrels of oil in our visible national oil reserve. That oil is being used at the rate of 1,750,000,000 barrels a year. Many million barrels are wasted in the generation of electric power in areas where hydroelectric power could be developed as an incidental to irrigation and conservation of otherwise excellent farming areas.

I sincerely trust that every Member of the House will take heed of what I am about to say and remember the imperative importance of conserving every possible barrel of our oil supplies.

In 1946 the United States consumption of oil fuel for the production of electrical energy in public utility power plants, both publicly and privately owned, amounted to approximately 36,000,000 barrels of oil. Of this amount, 11,693,000 barrels of oil were consumed in the 11 far Western States where the hydroelectric potentialities are still far from being completely developed. Approximately 89

percent of this oil consumption was in California alone, but even so, 1,300,000 barrels of oil were consumed in the other Western States. This annual, and increasing, use of oil for electric generation in the West could largely be saved because in this part of the country we have vast and as yet far from completely developed hydroelectric resources.

The oil used in these 11 States produced 4,200,000,000 of kilowatt-hours of energy. At the same time our great hydroelectric developments, public and private, including the large output of Hoover, Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and Shasta hydroelectric power plants, produced 35,200,000,000 of kilowatt-hours. While percentage wise, the production of energy from oil-fired power plants is only 11.9 percent of the hydroelectric output, the important fact is that this amount of 12,000,000 barrels of oil per year could be saved for more useful purposes by further development of our hydroelectric resources.

The power producing industry as a whole has not wastefully been using the oil. Every kilowatt-hour that could be has been generated with existing generating hydro capacities. Yet this is not enough, so we are obliged to dip into the oil reserve which could be used so much more advantageously for other purposes.

In the Northwest we generated 181,000,000 kilowatt-hours from oil-fired power plants in 1946, while at the same time the hydro output was approximately 14,188,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The ultimate potential hydroelectric resources in the Columbia Basin is estimated to be over 60,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. Even with the vigorously growing load of the Northwest, once we catch up with the demand, we will practically eliminate the use of oil for electric generation in that area. California in 1946 used approximately 12,650,000,000 kilowatt-hours generated in hydroelectric plants and also generated over 3,680,000,000 kilowatt-hours in oil-fired plants. A further considerable amount of energy was also produced by gas-fired plants. California needs that energy and needs it badly because it is still growing like a lusty boy. Today it is barely able to supply its load demand by putting in service all its reserve fuel plants even though some of them are very inefficient.

Until 1943 Arizona had to depend quite largely upon steam plants for its electric energy. In that year, Parker power plant came into operation and from then on has produced about three quarters of a billion of kilowatt-hours annually. But this is still not enough since last year 86,650,000 kilowatt-hours of energy was produced from oil. The area is still so short of energy that a train mounted steam-power plant, built for war purposes, has been pressed into service.

In California undeveloped hydroelectric resources are capable of producing over 20,000,000,000 of kilowatt-hours in an average year. Some of this may not be financially feasible but much of it will be. In the lower Colorado River within transmission distance of southern California, Arizona, Nevada, and even into New Mexico, there is a further potential development amounting to over 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. One plant alone, the proposed Bridge Canyon plant which is above Hoover Dam and Lake Mead, is estimated capable of producing about 4,750,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year.

In these areas, particularly California and Arizona where the greatest amount of oil has been used, there is also a very considerable amount of electric energy produced by gas. But that supply of fuel is dwindling so fast that it must be saved for the homes and industrial plants where gas is most valuable and necessary. For some years the electric central stations in this area have been forced to turn off their gas burners and substitute oil as the winter months brought increased consumption in the domestic homes. Most recently a new pipe line has been extended from Texas to California to supplement this dwindling gas supply. But even so, the transportation of this gas is a costly matter and again, although Texas has immense quantities of gas, it will not last indefinitely, even though its use is limited to homes and necessary gas consuming industries. The growing scarcity of oil and the need for its conservation is well illustrated by the fact that fuel oil at Los Angeles is now $1.80 a barrel, whereas earlier this year it was $1.45 and several years ago it was much less.

It is no longer a question as to whether we can afford to spend the vast sums of money necessary to develop our potential hydro resources. We cannot afford not to develop our hydroelectric resource if we are to save our oil fuel which can be utilized to so much better advantage elsewhere. In developing these hydro resources, it is to be noted that power generation is actually a byproduct. The water itself in the West is the most precious commodity and its use for irrigation and potable purposes is by far of prior importance. So in developing and conserving these water resources by the building of reservoirs, we practically get a gift of the electric generation as the benefits from irrigation far exceed the total cost. Yet, paradoxical as it may seem, the electric generation will produce the actual cash to pay the cost of its development and much of the whole water development in addition.

	1946			
	Consumption of oil in public-utility fuel-fired power plants (barrels)	Generation in oil-fired power plants (kilowatt-hours)	Hydroelectric generation (kilowatt-hours)	Estimated annual energy from ultimate hydroelectric undeveloped resources (kilowatt-hours)
United States	36,316,000	14,081,848,000	78,405,973,000	
Western United States (11 States)	11,693,000	4,167,616,000	35,231,295,000	
Northwest (Washington, Oregon, Idaho)	515,900	181,802,000	14,188,058,000	60,000,000,000 (Columbia Basin).
California	10,398,000	3,681,112,000	12,649,816,000	26,000,000,000 (central and northern California).
Arizona (Arizona Edison Co., Central Arizona Light & Power, Tucson Gas & Electric Co., Salt River Valley Water Users Association).	226,250	86,650,000	2,437,555,000	10,000,000,000 (lower Colorado River).
Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Nevada.	552,700	218,053,000	----------	

Commission for Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial, Commission for Preparedness, appearing in the June 4, 1947, issue of the Press-Telegram of Long Beach, Calif., expressing editorial favorable comment on a proposal made by Brig. Gen. James J. Meade, United States Marine Corps, retired. By reason of his many years of outstanding service in the United States Marine Corps, the views of General Meade, formerly of Boston—Charlestown—Mass., who rose from private to brigadier general, are worthy of deep consideration.

The editorial follows:

COMMISSION FOR PREPAREDNESS

David Lloyd George summed up the ineffectiveness of early British efforts in the war against Nazi Germany with his unforgettable phrase, "Too little and too late." The words are an accurate description of advance preparations for war by most democratic nations.

Once the American people are at war, they give themselves and all they have to their country. The same generally has been true of other democratic peoples. But they are apt to be careless about military preparedness until war comes, leaving all the advantage to militaristic nations, which arm themselves in advance and start war when they think the situation is favorable to them.

Men in the military and naval professions know the importance of preparedness but to obtain popular support for it, and the necessary appropriations from Congress, calls for greater skill in public relations than Army and Navy officers are apt to have. After all, they go to West Point and Annapolis to make themselves proficient in entirely different fields of activity.

Brig. Gen. James J. Meade, USMC, retired, in a talk prepared for delivery at a recent meeting of the Long Beach Rotary Club, suggests that a commission of 24 outstanding citizens chosen from all sections of the United States be established to meet in Washington at least once a year and give support to the budget requests of the armed forces.

Exclusively civilian personnel, the commission, composed of eminent Americans representing all parts of the country and

various vocational groups, would be powerful as advocate of preparedness before the bar of public opinion and before Congress in getting the necessary appropriations.

"I know just how difficult it is for chosen military leaders, all outstanding men in their work, to obtain the necessary funds to keep the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Forces strong in order to meet any emergency that might arise," General Meade wrote.

A commission of the character proposed by General Meade should be a potent factor for national preparedness and, therefore, for national safety.

Adequate Old-Age Pension Must Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have always favored the adoption of an adequate old-age pension system for the benefit of the aged people of the United States. On coming to Congress I had hoped that legislation to provide such a pension system would be considered and enacted into law by the Eightieth Congress. My desire to advance the principle of old-age pensions prompted me to join with a number of my colleagues in sponsoring H. R. 16, which was introduced on January 3 by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]. Now we find the session coming to a close without any action whatsoever being taken by Congress to provide economic security to our senior citizens, many of whom are in dire need.

In my opinion, Congress has failed in its Christian duty by refusing to act. The consideration and respect that a people give the aged reflects their level of civilization. As we are commanded in the fifth of the Ten Commandments, "Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long on the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee."

It was a practice of some primitive tribes of the past to kill their aged and infirm. While I am sure that every Member of the House is revolted by the thought of such barbaric practices, yet we cannot look with too much scorn upon the lowly savage. For the Congress is neglecting the fathers and mothers of America—allowing them to be buried in institutions, or condemning them to poverty by offering no more than a pittance in old-age assistance. Surely it is high time that the Members of the Congress—as the elected representatives of a Christian nation—to do something concrete to provide economic security for our old folks.

There is an ever-increasing need for a comprehensive program on the part of the Federal Government to give proper care to our senior citizens. The national average age is steadily increasing as the result of medical science, the drop in infant mortality, and higher standards of living. In 1850 only 13 percent of our total population was over 45 years of age. Today about 25 percent are over 45, and about 7 percent have reached the age of 65. It has been estimated that by 1980 there will be 60,000,000 Americans of 45 and over, 22,000,000 of them past the now generally accepted retirement age of 65.

It is one of the ironies of our time that we have made great advances in science which enables more people to survive middle age, but have failed to solve the problem presented by their survival. To discover an answer to this question is one of the great tasks of the twentieth century and the Christian duty of the citizens of our democracy.

America can solve its old-age problem by working constructively on two fronts. In the first place, we must adjust our thinking with respect to employment. We must repudiate the idea that a person is old at 65 years; employers must give up the conviction that old age necessarily means infirmity. Experiments conducted at Harvard University have found little decrease in quality or quantity of work after 45. Researchers also point out that any lessening of speed from advancing years is often counterbalanced by increasing skill and judgment.

During World War II, when manpower was at a premium, 700,000 men and women of retirement age returned to industry—55,000 of them gave up pensions to do so—and demonstrated their ability to do excellent work.

Let me remind the House that men and women in all walks of life have made great contributions when long past retirement age. For example, Ben Franklin became Ambassador to France at 78, and the late Justice Holmes served on the United States Supreme Court until he was nearly 90. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has recently celebrated his eighty-second birthday, and still serves with great distinction as one of the outstanding liberal leaders of the House. Bernard M. Baruch is one of the Nation's top political leaders at 76; Dr. Albert Einstein is carrying on his scientific work at the age of 68; and Ireland's George Bernard Shaw is over 90 and remains one of the world's greatest writers. About 41 percent of the United States Senate is over 65 years.

If American employers would forget their hiring-age prejudices, millions of our senior citizens would be happy to give their services to society. Opportunity for employment would eliminate many of the fears and feelings of insecurity which now accompany one's declining years.

In the last analysis, however, the only logical solution to the old-age problem is Federal legislation to establish a comprehensive, uniform, and liberal old-age-pension system.

By a comprehensive pension system, I mean that every man and woman in America of 60 years of age should be eligible to receive a pension. Pensions should also be made available to all who cannot be employed because of disability.

The coverage of our present pension system is far from complete. Although nearly 47,000,000 people are covered by the present Social Security Act, less than 2,000,000 of our senior citizens are receiving old age and survivors insurance payments. An additional 2,000,000 persons are receiving old-age assistance, and 225,000 people receive pensions from the Civil Service and Railroad Retirement Act. Only a few thousand people receive pensions from private retirement systems.

In this connection, I would like to remind you that many people are today ineligible for old-age assistance because of property qualifications—such as the Minnesota Lien Law—which have been established by various States as a condition for assistance. Such property qualifications are grossly unfair—a form of cruel discrimination.

Conservatively speaking, the various pension systems taken together, governmental and private, have a coverage of no more than 50 percent of our people who have reached retirement age. I insist that one underlying principle of any sound pension system is that coverage should be made 100 percent.

A second basic consideration in the establishment of an equitable pension system is that pensions should be uniform. Under our present system, old age and survivors insurance payments range from $10 to $85 per month. Old-age assistance payments during 1946 varied from $14.98 per month average in Georgia, to $55.02 in the State of Washington. In the latter instance, the fault lies in the practice of having the Federal Government match State funds up to a certain sum, an arrangement which is most unfair. I maintain that the citizens in one State deserve the same treatment as those of any other State, and that pension payments should be uniform to all people in all States.

Finally, I insist that a sound pension system will provide payments which are liberal and adequate. By adequate I mean a sum sufficient to buy the necessities of life—food, clothing, shelter, and medical care. Surely those who have labored their entire lives for the welfare of society deserve enough to live decently when they reach the age of retirement.

In this respect the present Social Security System is far from adequate. The national average for old-age-assistance payments is only $35 per month; the average monthly payment in my State of Minnesota is $34.89. Such a miserly pittance means poverty and substandard living conditions for old folks who are dependent upon these payments alone. The recent inflationary rise in the cost of living—living costs have nearly doubled since 1941—has further reduced their living standards.

In my opinion, the minimum pension payment should be $100 per month, as provided for in H. R. 16. While $100 per month is hardly adequate, it would represent a great improvement over existing pension levels.

The time has come for the Congress to recognize that funds for honorable old-age pensions should be a part of our national budget. The public will support us in taking such action. A recent poll showed that 39,432 of those polled support additional old-age security legislation, with only 1,912 in the negative.

The fact that the public is so disposed is a tribute to the untiring efforts of Dr. Francis E. Townsend, who has done more than any man in America to advance the cause of social security for our senior citizens.

Congress has a sacred obligation to our old folks, and we must not let them down. We have already adopted legislation to help everybody else. Last year $4,000,000,000 in tax relief was given to big business. We have appropriated money during this session to protect cattle from hoof-and-mouth disease, to protect wild ducks, and to feed the Japanese and the Germans. If we can do this, surely we can afford funds to provide economic security to the fathers and mothers in America.

Let us not adjourn this Congress until we have passed legislation for old-age security. Let us accept our obligations and place such legislation on the must agenda for this session.

Reduction of Federal Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress passed one tax bill which was vetoed by the President; the Congress passed a second tax bill which was also promptly vetoed by the President. I am of the opinion that his veto will be sustained in the other body and if we pass a third bill it would also receive the ax.

Now I want to point out to the Members of the House that one-third of our national income is eaten up by Federal, State, and local taxes. The average man works one day in three for the Government.

The tax bill passed by the Republican Congress would have reduced Federal income taxes more than $4,000,000,000. It would have cut taxes in the lower income brackets 30 percent. Certainly such a saving would be welcomed by those in the low income bracket.

All available estimates indicate that there will be enough money in the Treasury next year to reduce taxes, to balance the budget, and to pay several billion dollars on the national debt.

The President argued in vetoing the first tax bill that the money should be applied on the public debt. The question to be determined by his second veto is whether it is intended to reduce the national debt or whether we are building up this surplus for a backlog for European spending in 1948. Again I say, everything for global spending but not a dime for the American taxpayer who has all these years been carrying the load.

In view of the fact that the Democrats have built the debt up from $20,000,000,000 to $260,000,000,000 since 1933, and have gone about it so enthusiastically, this sudden alarm over the Nation's finances sounds a little strange.

Particularly does this argument ring hollow when we take into account the fact that the President insisted that his huge budget of $37,500,000,000 could not be cut without impairing vital services.

If our peacetime budget must remain at $37,500,000,000, there is little hope of tax relief for the American people. They must bow their necks and work for the Government. The little man will continue to pay out money that he needs for his family and himself.

The money that the taxpayer would have saved by this tax bill would have been used for new businesses and to expand old ones—if the veto is sustained it will go into the Treasury. It will go into the Federal Government to be dissipated by bureaucracy or world spending rather than into productive enterprise in this Nation to create jobs. The only organizations able to expand today under existing conditions are the big corporations, the ones with huge resources and reserves. The small businesses are out of luck.

Our existing tax structure is destructive of private enterprise. If continued long enough, it will drive all private business to the wall.

How can the President continue to reconcile his opposition to a tax cut now, with his support of the 1945 tax bill—and that a time when the country faced a $50,000,000,000 deficit, the administration put through a $9,000,000,000 tax reduction.

The President wants to see the continuation of heavy spending. His $37,500,000,000 budget indicated that clearly. He wants the Government to do the spending rather than the individual. The Republicans have cut the President's budget, but Mr. Truman has refused to cut taxes as a result. He sees the debt as a great bogey. The debt is huge and should be reduced. The President says he is for "the right kind of a tax reduction, at the right time." What is the right time? Perhaps it is next year when Mr. Truman is running for the Presidency.

We on this side of the House have been concerned over the debt for a long time, but this concern on the part of Mr. Truman for debt reduction is a comparatively new development.

Our side of the House and many on the other side want to cut expenditures, cut taxes, and to make an adequate payment on the debt, and it must be admitted that on cutting expenditures we have been fought vigorously every foot of the way. They argue that every cut has been a "phony cut," and it becomes evident that the administration wanted no cuts at all.

I cannot believe that the average person wants to continue to pay the present high taxes so the Government can continue to spend a lot of money. That is contrary to common sense. I cannot believe that the average American wants to continue to toss billions of the American taxpayer's money all over the world on what is now referred to as "operations rathole." It is a most appropriate name.

It appears that the administration is playing politics with taxes. There is no other valid excuse for the President's action in disapproving the revenue measure for a second time when both tax bills were passed overwhelmingly in both Houses.

The President indicated some time ago that he may agree to a cut in taxes in 1948. But it is clear that the reasons used to justify his veto this year on these two tax bills will be equally valid next year; in fact, more so. However, next year the argument on reducing the public debt will by then be discounted and the reason will be our European responsibilities to maintain world peace. And again Uncle Sam will pay through the nose.

It is discouraging to find the administration engaged in partisan politics. It destroys confidence. It causes controversy. It presents the spectacle of a divided Nation at a time when of all times we should be united. So get yourselves set either this fall or early in 1948 as Congress will then be asked for five or six billion dollars a year for 4 or 5 years for reconstruction, rehabilitation, and financing of European nations and all talk about debt reduction will be forgotten. Spend, spend—all over the world—but not a dime for the American taxpayer who has been carrying the load. Certainly the American taxpayer has a right to rebel against this administration's attitude.

I submit, however, that this situation is not the fault of this Republican Congress. It is the fault of an administration which is more concerned with politics than with the welfare of our own people, and this responsibility should be placed where it rightfully belongs.

Interest on Federal Reserve Notes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics, New York University, and executive vice president of Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy, in the June 19, 1947 issue of the Commercial and Financial Chronical calls attention to an action taken by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System which appears to be of urgent and earnest concern to the Congress.

He notes that the Board in a release (Z–2040) of April 24, 1947, as published on page 518 of the May 1947 Federal Reserve Bulletin, stated it "had levied an interest charge on Federal Reserve notes in circulation, as a means of reducing by 90 percent the earnings of the Reserve Banks for the year 1947," amounting to approximately $60,000,000. Further, that this $60,000,000 was to be paid into the United States Treasury and that the first payment of about $15,269,000 was to be paid to the Treasury April 24.

In the above-mentioned release the Board says:

On the basis of present estimates, it is expected that net earnings of Federal Reserve banks for 1947, after payment of the statutory dividends to member banks, will aggregate more than $60,000,000. In view of these facts, and of the fact that at the end of 1946 the surplus of each Federal Reserve bank was equal to its subscribed capital, the Board has decided to invoke the authority, granted to it under section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, to levy an interest charge on Federal Reserve notes issued by the Federal Reserve banks. The purpose of this interest charge is to pay into the Treasury approximately 90 percent of the net earnings of the Federal Reserve banks for 1947.

The Board then specifically refers to paragraph 4 of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act for its authority in taking the action indicated. It states:

Paragraph 4 * * * provides that each Federal Reserve bank shall pay such rate of interest as may be established by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on the amount of its outstanding notes less the amount of gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve agent as collateral security. The Board has now decided to establish such rates of interest as will make it possible to transmit to the Treasury approximately 90 percent of the net earnings after dividends of each of the Federal Reserve banks for 1947.

The authority to levy an interest charge on Federal Reserve notes not covered by gold certificates has not been used previously, chiefly because of the existence, prior to 1933, of so-called franchise tax provisions of the law which had a similar effect; that is, of transferring excess earnings of the Reserve banks to the Treasury. Under these provisions, which were repealed in 1933, each Federal Reserve bank was required to pay a franchise tax to the Government equal to 90 percent of its net earnings after it had accumulated a surplus equal to its subscribed capital.

Dr. Spahr contends that the action taken by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is contrary to law, that there is no language in section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act which authorizes such action; further, that the Board has invaded the province of Congress.

It is my opinion that Dr. Spahr's observation is correct. It appears to me that the following language in section 16, 4 is so incisive as to permit of no other construction than that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is authorized to charge interest only on that portion of Federal Reserve notes issued in excess of those covered by gold certificates:

* * * pay such rate of interest as may be established by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on only that amount of such notes which equals the total amount of its outstanding Federal Reserve notes, less the amount of gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve agent as collateral security.

It would appear that the Board has violated the statute in at least two respects; in levying an interest charge on all of the Federal Reserve notes, and distributing the proceeds by paying them into the United States Treasury. I can find nothing in the Federal Reserve Act which authorizes the Board to perform such acts.

I regard this matter as being of serious import to the Congress, as well as to the Nation, and earnestly feel that it should receive immediate consideration.

Dr. Spahr raises another question which ought to be clarified, namely, what official at the Treasury becomes a party to this transaction by receiving the funds paid into the Treasury by the Reserve Board without legal authority?

To clarify this point, I have written the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable John W. Snyder, asking him to cite the statutory authority under which he received these funds.

Who the People Are From Whom This Congress Has Its Mandate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lowell Mellett from the Washington Evening Star:

WHO THE PEOPLE ARE FROM WHOM THIS CONGRESS HAS ITS MANDATE

(By Lowell Mellett)

The men in control of the present Congress say they have a mandate from the people. They say it over and over. Whatever they do, they justify by this mandate from the people. Now, as the first session of the Congress begins to wind itself up preparatory to adjourning on the 26th, it is becoming clear just who the people are that the majority leaders take their mandate from.

Very clear, it is that they are not all the people, but selected groups of people—not what we sometimes call the little people or the masses. The little people aren't the ones that have kept the majority leaders in there fighting with the President over an income-tax bill that would reduce their taxes $15 or so a year. It must be the people who would save $15,000 or so.

And the little people haven't been hollering their heads off in support of the budget slashing that will deprive them of many services heretofore rendered by the Government. Quite the contrary. They have hollered loud and long, in some instances, when they've discovered what the budget cuts mean—as in the case of the western farmers when the reclamation program was on the point of being wrecked. (The farmers' protest was partially successful, incidentally. It caused their own Congress Members to revolt against the leaders and obtain a restoration of some of the funds.)

ABLE TO DO MANY THINGS

In the time not used up by taxes and budget cutting, the Congress has been able to do a good many things for the people from whom it really takes its mandate.

The real-estate people, for example. Rent control has been pretty well abolished and all attempts at legislation to improve the general housing situation put on ice.

The railroad people seem about to get what they want, which is legislation excusing them from the operations of the antitrust laws.

The electric power people will be free from Federal control, to a large extent, if the Senate follows the lead of the House.

The gas and oil people, ditto.

And the people who hire other people, in any large numbers, will be free from the unions—if the Hartley-Taft bill works. Of course, if we have many situations like that in coal mining, where John L. Lewis and the operators appear to recognize no mandate from anybody, it will be a different story.

NOT BEING CARRIED OUT

But people who object to being lynched and people who object to paying a poll tax for the privilege of voting are not getting much satisfaction. If they gave this Congress a mandate, it is not being carried out. Republican House leaders toyed for a time with the idea of passing antilynching and antipoll tax laws, but, as they said, it was just to put some of their southern Democratic colleagues on the spot. The idea hasn't advanced very far.

People who fear their wages may drop, or whose wages already have dropped below 60 cents an hour, don't find Congress recognizing any mandate to raise the statutory minimum wage. The same is true of people who ask for an antidiscrimination or fair employment practices law.

Then there are the people who would like to have their children decently educated and the people who would like to have access to better medical care. Congress has listened to them and given them sympathetic assurances. But Congress cannot do everything at once. First things come first. And Congress has made evident what it regards as first things:

Real estate, railroads, power, gas, oil, big incomes.

These, so far as Congress is concerned, appear to be the people.

Anoka, Minn., Centennial, 1847–1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, it is not every day that a city celebrates its hundredth anniversary, but the delightful city of Anoka, which lies in the congressional district that I have the honor to represent, is today celebrating the centennial anniversary of its founding.

Since the continuance of the session of Congress makes it impossible for me to accept the kind invitation that Anoka has extended me to attend their celebration, under leave to extend my remarks I include a short history of some of the outstanding events in the hundred-year-old history of this community which now exceeds 8,000 population.

HISTORY OF ANOKA

"Anoka" is a Dakota Indian word meaning "on both sides" and was applied to the present city and county of Anoka because of the significant fact that the original plat of the village of Anoka was laid out on both sides of the mouth of the Rum River at its confluence with the Mississippi.

Anoka is the county seat of Anoka County situated 18 miles north of Minneapolis. It lies in that peninsula of land between the Mississippi and St. Croix Rivers that was successively under the flags of France, England, and the American Colonies. Next it was part of the Northwest Territory, and Wisconsin conducted a strenuous, but unsuccessful,

fight in Congress to have this area included within its boundaries when the State of Wisconsin was created. This Mississippi-St. Croix peninsula is the only portion of the original Northwest Territory that was added to any portion of the original Louisiana Territory to form a State. In this particular, this area is unique in the United States.

THE FIRST WHITE MEN

The first white men known to have visited the land included in the present State of Minnesota were two French traders, Medart des Groselliers—pronounced Gro-zay-yay'—and his brother-in-law, Pierre Radisson. Whether these two men ever set foot in Anoka County is not certain, but at all events they were very near it. In 1659 they journeyed from Quebec to La Pointe—now Bayfield—on the south shore of Lake Superior, afterward visiting the Huron villages between the Black and Chippewa Rivers in what is now Wisconsin. They then made their way to the Sioux villages in what is now Kanabec County, Minn., where they spent the winter.

THE RUM RIVER

Following the treaty of Paris between the French and English in 1763 the Northwest was opened to English explorers and traders. Capt. Jonathan Carver, a native of Connecticut, who had been in the provincial army, started on an exploring tour to the upper Mississippi. With respect to his excursions above St. Anthonys Falls, Carver says:

It might, however, perhaps, be necessary to observe that in a little tour I made about the falls, after traveling 14 miles, by the side of the Mississippi, I came to a river nearly 20 yards wide, which ran from the northeast, called Rum River.

Carver undoubtedly translated the Chippeway name into its English equivalent. It can hardly have been "called Rum River" by the Indians, as Carver states that no one but himself and Hennepin had ever explored the Mississippi as far north as the mouth of the St. Francis River. The Chippeway name for the river is usually written Isko de Wabo and means liquor; broth; or any beverage. However, Carver's name has persistently stuck to the stream, notwithstanding some determined efforts to change it.

THE BATTLE OF RUM RIVER

In the spring of 1839 some 800 Chippeways assembled at Fort Snelling. Believing that they were to receive their annuities at that point, the men had brought their wives and children with them. Finding that the annuities were not forthcoming, they made preparations to return home. Meanwhile the Sioux living in the vicinity of the fort visited the Chippeway camp and were hospitably received and participated in the feasting going on. July 1 the two tribes smoked the peace pipe, and the Chippeways began their homeward journey, some ascending the Mississippi River and some going by way of the St. Croix. Among the Chippeways were two young men whose father had been murdered by some Sioux near the fort the previous year, and they took advantage of the opportunity to visit and weep over their father's grave. The thoughts of their murdered parent kindled a desire for vengeance, and on the night of July 1 they placed themselves in ambush on a trail which led past Lake Harriet. Early the next morning they shot and scalped a Sioux known as Badger. The friends of the victim soon heard of the occurrence and brought the body home wrapped in a blanket. Yeetkadootah, a relative of the dead man, removed the ornaments from the corpse, kissed it, and said he would die for it. His appeals for revenge roused the war spirit, and in a very short time he found himself at the head of a party eager for the fray, each member of which bound himself to take no captive, but to kill all whom his weapons might reach. The warriors followed the trail of one of the Chippeway bands up the Mississippi River on the east side to Rum River, which they reached on the 3d day of July. The Chippeways were not expecting any trouble. They probably had not even heard of the murder, which had been committed after their departure from the fort. Their camp was pitched northwest of Round Lake on ground occupied by the farm upon which Andrew J. Smith lived many years.

Here, within sight of a mound which told of the people who had lived beside the beautiful lake centuries before occurred one of the bloodiest battles that marks the long feud between the Sioux and Chippeway tribes. The fight took place before sunrise on the 4th of July, and the appearance of the ground when first seen by white men would seem to indicate that the Chippeways were surprised in their sleep, and that many of them were butchered where they lay. Those who were able to grasp their weapons made a desperate resistance, but succumbed to overwhelming numbers. Yeetkadootah galloped on horseback to a wounded Chippeway and dismounted to take his scalp, but the injured warrior summoned all his remaining strength and succeeded in shooting the Sioux leader through the neck.

THE FIRST HOUSE

Early residents of Anoka remember a log house which stood on the east side of Rum River near its mouth. Only a few years ago several cellars were still visible near the spot where it stood. This was the first house built in Anoka county. It was built in the fall of 1844 for an Indian trading post, by direction of William Aitkin, who had been for many years a trader of the upper Mississippi and who at that time had his headquarters at Sandy Lake. The building was constructed by a French trader named Joseph Belanger, assisted by George Cournoyer, Pierre Crevier, Joseph Burnet, and Maxime Maxwell. The men cut the logs on the point between the two rivers and carried them on their shoulders to the place where the house was to be built. The house was divided by a partition, one room being designed for a living room and the other to be used as a store room for the goods. In October Mr. Aitkin came to inspect the new post, left his clerk, Mr. Crebassa in charge of the stock of goods, which had been procured from H. H. Sibley's trading post at Mendota.

TRADERS AND PROSPECTORS

The first lumbering done on Rum River was in the winter of 1848–49. The work was done by Daniel Stanchfield, with Sumner W. Farnham as foreman of one of his two crews. The logs were cut on Stanchfield Brook to the amount of 2,200,000 feet, and driven down to the mill at St. Anthony. Mr. Stanchfield found the ruins of the old camp where the soldiers had cut logs for the construction of Fort Snelling in 1821, and located one of his own camps within a hundred feet of it.

EARLY SETTLEMENT

A trading post was opened at the mouth of the Rum River within the present limits of the city of Anoka in 1846. One of the employees brought his family to the post the next year, thus beginning the settlement of the village. In 1847 a post was opened about 2 miles above the mouth of Rum River on Big Island. One of the employees there also had a family. The village of Anoka grew rapidly and in 1855 numbered nearly 300 inhabitants.

In 1849 an energetic young man named George W. Branch found his way to Rum River, coming thither from New Brunswick. He and another man explored Rum River to its source, poling a boat up the river to Mille Lacs. The next year he returned to New Brunswick and induced his brother-in-law, Horace W. Taylor, to come to Minnesota. Taylor made a claim and built a house on the west side of Rum River north of the present railroad tracks on what was afterward known as the McCann farm, upon a part of which the driving park is now located. This was in July, 1850. When the land was surveyed, Mr. Taylor found himself on a school section and moved to a point directly across Rum River where he continued to reside until the time of his death in 1893. Taylor located at this point which was the fording place of the old Red River trail, thinking that a town would grow up there. The State insane asylum is now situated on the old Taylor homestead.

THE FIRST COLONY

In the spring of 1850 the first colony to locate within the present limits of Anoka County made their homes in what is now the town of Ramsey. The colony consisted of Daniel Harthorn, John, Emerson, and Penuel Shumway, Penuel Shumway, Sr., and Cornelius Pitman, with their families and Nathan Shumway and Eber Harthorn. The two last named being single men, made the first trip to spy out the land, and Nathan Shumway erected a log house at E ½ NE ¼ section 35.

THE FIRST STORE

As early as August 1853, Edward P. Shaw began to deal in merchandise in a small way at his father's house, the Orin Rice house, in Anoka, among his sales being some nails for J. C. Varney's house. This was the first store in Anoka.

COUNTY ORGANIZATION

One of the early acts of the first Territorial legislature, which convened in 1849, was the organization of eight counties, viz: Ramsey, Benton, Washington, Itasca, Wabasha, Wahnata, Mahkahto,

and Pembina. Rum River was the dividing line between Ramsey and Benton Counties. The Territory now embraced in Anoka County was partly in each. In 1856 Sherburne County was detached from Benton, and that portion of Territory lying east of Sherburne County and west of Rum River was also detached and became a part of Ramsey County. By an act of the Territorial Assembly passed May 23, 1857, so much of Ramsey County as is embraced within the following described limits, was organized into a separate county to be called Anoka County. The seat of justice was fixed at Anoka.

On the same day an act was passed creating the county of Manomin. This county was identical with the present town of Fridley.

BEGINNING OF THE CIVIL WAR

Immediately after his inauguration President Lincoln called a conference of the governors of loyal States to consult upon the measures to be taken for the preservation of the Union, and when the news of the firing upon Fort Sumter was received Governor Ramsey was in Washington. The President decided to issue a call for 75,000 troops. Governor Ramsey immediately offered a regiment of Minnesota men, which was promptly accepted, and he telegraphed to Lt. Gov. Ignatius Donnelley and also Ex-Gov. Willis A. Gorman the substance of his offer. Gorman, who was a Mexican War veteran, was in Anoka attending the session of the district court which was being held in the Shuler Building. When the telegram reached St. Anthony it was placed in the hands of a messenger who carried it on horseback with all speed to Anoka. A recess of the court was taken, Gorman addressed the assembled people, and called for volunteers. Aaron Greenwald was the first to record his name, and in all probability he was the first man in America to volunteer for the defense of the Union under the President's call. James W. Groat and five others were enrolled at the same time. Josiah R. King and others signed a similar paper agreeing to enlist at a meeting in St. Paul on the evening of the same day.

EARLY EDUCATION

The first school in Anoka County was a private school taught by Miss Julia Woodman (Mrs. Hamm) during the winter of 1853–54. It was kept in the old company boarding house, which stood on Van Buren Street just east of Second Avenue. This building was afterward moved out on Main Street and was for years in use as a barn in the rear of Charles Church's residence. It should not be confused with the new company boarding house, which was built somewhat later and stood on the present site of the Anoka National Bank. The present school is one of the most modern in the State and is under the direction of Mr. Bye, an outstanding educator.

CITY OF ANOKA

Two unsuccessful attempts were made to incorporate the city of Anoka. The first act authorizing incorporation was passed by the legislature in 1858, but the charter was rejected by popular vote. A charter authorized by act of March 5, 1859, met with a like fate, and it was not until March 2, 1878, that the city was set off from the township of the same name. At the present time the city is free of debt and has a low tax rate. Its mayor is the enterprising R. B. Ehlen, who is an outstanding leader in the civic life of his city and State.

POST OFFICE

The first post office in Anoka County was established at Itaska in May 1852. But Itaska dwindled after the bill to move the capital failed while Anoka grew. It was inconvenient to get mail at Itaska. During the fall of 1853 Mr. Larned used to get mail at St. Anthony and bring it up in his hat. Some time that winter, 1853–54, a post office was established at Anoka and George W. Branch was named as the first postmaster.

RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Early religious life in Anoka County followed the prevailing pattern of the regions from which the settlers came. Nearly all the pioneers were of Christian background and tradition, and, as a consequence, cabin homes were scarcely ready for habitation before small groups of people of common or similar denominations arranged to gather from time to time for prayer and worship. Groups of Protestant persuasion met in the earliest 1850's in Ramsey Township and Anoka village. About the same time mass was being said occasionally in cabins at Centerville. The pioneers of the Manomin area, for the most part, attended worship in St. Paul and Minneapolis.

As the settlements spread, groups of worshipers became more numerous. It was not long before formal organizations were perfected. A Methodist Episcopal class was organized at Anoka as early as December 10, 1854, and this was later followed by a church organization. The First Congregational Church of Anoka was organized in 1855. The Church of St. Stephen (Roman Catholic) of Anoka, the First Baptist of Anoka, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bethel, and the Church of St. Genevieve (Roman Catholic) of Centerville were organized in 1856, and at the same time the Quakers started their meeting at Bethel. In 1858 Trinity Episcopal Church of Anoka, and Trinity Episcopal Church of Manomin (Fridley) was organized. Other churches followed in the 1860's, and before long the influx of Scandinavians and Germans brought about the establishment of Lutheran churches.

NEWSPAPERS

Anoka County has three newspapers, all weeklies. The Anoka County Union and the Anoka Herald are published at Anoka, while Columbia Heights is the home of the Columbia Heights Record.

The Anoka County Union was established August 31, 1865, as the Anoka Union. On August 5, 1866, the name of Granville S. Pease appeared as one of the publishers, and in June Mr. Pease became sole proprietor. His son, T. G. J. Pease is the present publisher and owner, and Arch G. Pease, the grandson of the original editor, who has just returned from a distinguished war record, is the present editor. The continuity of the ownership of the Anoka County Union by the Pease family for 81 years has established a record among Minnesota newspapers.

The title of the Anoka Herald has varied. Starting as a weekly newspaper on September 7, 1867, the publication was changed to a weekly farm journal called the Minnesota Farmer. On June 6, 1867, it became a weekly newspaper again and since January 3, 1885, has been known as the Anoka Herald. In 1904 Roe G. Chase became the sole publisher and editor and continued the high standard previously set by Alvah Eastman and A. A. and I. A. Caswell. When Roe G. Chase passed away his wife continued as editor and has proved herself an outstanding and courageous newspaper woman.

EARLY TRANSPORTATION

One of the Red River trails passed through Anoka County, following the course of the Mississippi River. Over it traveled the Red River carts, usually drawn by oxen, loaded with furs and other products of the wilderness, and bound for St. Paul, where they were reloaded with supplies for the settlements on the Red River near the Canadian border.

AGRICULTURE, LUMBERING, AND OTHER INDUSTRIES

Anoka County agriculture had its beginning in the early 1840's in the Centerville area, where a few settlers who came from the St. Paul settlement started to raise vegetables for their family tables. A small farm was opened by a trader at Anoka as early as 1848. Farming began on a more extensive scale in 1850. The first crops were corn, potatoes, and small grains. Agriculture in the early days was closely interlocked with the lumbering industry. Settlers opening farms left their families in their little clearings and worked in the woods and on the log drives in the winter and spring. In the fall they cut railroad ties and cordwood. The lumber camps also provided a market for produce and for wild hay cut from the marshes.

At the present time Anoka is the home of the Federal Cartridge Corp., makers of small arms ammunition, whose employees were so helpful in starting the Twin City Ordnance plant at New Brighton during World War II. This plant was one of the arsenals of democracy and had one of the finest records of production of any makers of ammunition during the war period. Anoka is also the home of the John R. Kovar Manufacturing Co., makers of farm equipment. It has its stores, lumber yards; the Northern Wood Products Co., now making furniture including dressers and lawn chairs; the Adams Manufacturing Co. making chair frames; the T. C. M. P. A. which is making the best powdered milk in Minnesota; a municipal swimming beach, 12 churches; a 9-hole golf course with fairways and greens second to none in the State; a volunteer fire department, and an excellent police department.

THE HALLOWEEN CAPITAL OF THE WORLD

In 1923 the Anoka merchants joined together in a move to stop Halloween pranks. They suggested a big Halloween party for the children, with free candy,

popcorn, apples, and so forth, and entertainment. The idea rapidly took shape, and in October 1923 Anoka's first Halloween celebation was held. That celebration has been held every year since, with the exception of 2 years during the war when it was canceled. However, last year the celebration blossomed forth bigger than ever, as it was the silver anniversary of Halloween in Anoka, the Halloween capital of the world. The Anoka Halloween idea has been copied by cities and towns throughout the Nation, and the results are the same. Pranks are at a minimum, and everyone has a whale of a good time. Anoka is nationally known for its Halloween celebrations.

WITH THE COLORS

The contribution of Anoka and Anoka County has been outstanding in all wars. A fine history of the participation of Anoka County in World War I was prepared and published under the title, "With the Colors—Anoka County," by Roe Chase, in 1919.

In the summer of 1946 the community did honor to its Gold Star Mothers of World War II at a large banquet which was addressed by former Gov. Harold E. Stassen, who had just returned after a distinguished record in the Pacific, where he served as aide to Admiral Halsey.

CONCLUSION

At the end of its first hundred years Anoka can look forward with confidence to an excellent future, as it has the people and resources to continue its march in the vanguard of successful Minnesota cities.

A Solution to the Slum Clearance Problem Without the Use of Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jos. H. Deckman, chairman, special housing committee, National Home and Property Owners Foundation:

A SOLUTION TO THE SLUM CLEARANCE PROBLEM WITHOUT THE USE OF FEDERAL AID

Any solution to the problem of slum clearance should only be confronted after consideration of the basic fact that old houses do not cause slums. Slovenly housekeeping and buildings not kept in proper repair are the real causes of slums.

With these facts in mind, the problem of slum clearance is reduced largely to the proposition of promulgating and enforcing proper building codes and sanitary laws at the local municipal level.

With the enforcement of sound housing codes and sanitary laws in the various cities of the country, slums should rapidly disappear and at no cost to the general taxpayer.

No responsible person will defend the owner of rental property who does not keep his property in repair or does not equip it with minimum plumbing and heating facilities. Public opinion, therefore, dictates that housing codes are essential to define minimum standard housing and make it illegal to rent substandard dwelling accommodations. By this method good used housing at low rents will be provided for the low-income groups, and this much-publicized problem will be cured.

As in the case with the irresponsible property owner, no one can conscientiously defend the tenant who lives in squalor of his own making. Again public opinion is heavily in favor of sanitary laws which would bring about good housekeeping wherever a public nuisance is maintained.

If the enforcement of housing codes and sanitary laws do not completely solve the whole problem of slum clearance in any given city area, the final phase of the solution can take the form of local redevelopment agencies.

These agencies in each city would be granted the power of eminent domain for the purpose of redeveloping slums and blighted areas. No action, however, would be taken by any agency without the housing code and sanitary laws being fully enforced for a sufficient time. Coupled with this, public approval must be given to any redevelopment plan after adequate public hearings have been held.

Redevelopment would then be carried out under the plans approved by the citizens and the municipal officials by the use of private enterprise purchasing the land and constructing all buildings. The only exception would take place where public parks, buildings, or some other public use is approved.

The mechanics of the clearance of slums through a redevelopment agency in brief would simply mean that a municipality would create the agency through regular legal means. The agency would then be financed by the municipality providing funds for planning and land preparation. The cleared land would then be sold or leased to private enterprise under competitive bids for the use as provided for in the publicly approved redevelopment plan. If any write down in the land takes place at the time of sale due to planning low-rent housing, then this initial loss would be made up over a period of years from the increased taxes accruing from the proper use of the former slum or blighted area.

It is to be noted that the solution to slum clearance is based on a complete local-level procedure. This is the case because it is quite obvious that slums are a local problem and must be solved at the local level if our economy is to remain healthy.

By no stretch of the imagination can a true American conceive that it is the obligation of the Federal Government to take the money paid by all the taxpayers and spend it to rectify the mistakes of the specific owners and taxpayers in a comparatively few large cities where slums exist.

In like manner it is not the obligation of the Federal Government to house any of the citizens of the Nation except military personnel.

Public Housing draws its greatest support from the statements made by its advocates that it clears slums and houses the lower-income groups in new low-rent housing. From the reams of propaganda emanating from public-housing sources, one is led to believe that the Federal Government, through some magic means, is able to build low-rent housing more economically than private enterprise. Because of the general impression implied that public housing is the economical way to house the needy and clear slums, pressure is continually exerted on Congress to authorize more and more Government housing.

The myth of public housing is soon exploded when one goes slightly below the surface and analyzes its cost and general operations. The first shadow is cast over the beautiful picture of clearing slums and housing the needy by the Federal Government when the enormous cost to the taxpayer in subsidies and tax exemptions is exposed.

Public housing enjoys not only local tax exemptions on real estate, but also is given annual subsidies amounting to interest and amortization charges for each low-rent housing project. It is these stupendous subsidies which are required to provide low rents and only a small segment of the tenants in public housing enjoy low rents for comparable accommodations to private enterprise.

Tax exemptions are the greatest evil of the Federal public housing scheme as the final result of continual pyramiding real-estate tax exemptions is financial collapse of the free-enterprise system and the change of our Government from a republic to some form of state socialism.

It has often been stated by the public housers that they propose to house the lower third of the population in Government-owned and operated housing. This means that the Federal Government will become the Nation's greatest single landlord and will have for its tenants one-third of the country's voters. The serious political implications from such an arrangement is only equalled by the adverse effect on the economic structure of the Nation.

If the lower third of the population should ever become housed in tax-free subsidized housing, then the middle third could not bear the burden and would also have to be housed by the same method. This would mean the collapse of our economy as private ownership of real property is the foundation of the free-enterprise system and is the source for the bulk of our tax revenues.

It takes very little imagination to foresee that the eating away of the foundation of the tax structure by increasing the quantity of tax-exempt Federal property would reach a point where the free American economy would be toppled into the abyss of state socialism.

Those who campaign for complete Government ownership of property, to be intellectually honest, should also tell their followers that, when their purpose is finally accomplished not only housing, but all other work will be done by slave labor. The only exception will be the small percentage of ruling class at the top who will never stand for election and will virtually own the country.

Anyone who thinks the public-housing theory through readily arrives at the conclusion that it is economically impossible to house the lower third or any appreciable number of the Nation's citizens in public housing without wrecking the American way of life and the American form of Democracy.

Likewise, it is quite evident that it is a physical impossibility to house the low-income groups in new public houses if the plan is carried to its final conclusion. Enough new houses cannot be built in any one year to do the whole job and consequently much secondhand public housing would have to be used to house large segments of the low-income groups. As the years roll by, all public housing will deteriorate like private housing and its replacement will be a subsidy piled on top of a subsidy.

Today public housing, which has already been constructed is in need of repairs and much of the cost was not calculated when the original rents were set. Public-housing rents have already been raised to meet some of the increased operation and maintenance costs, yet private rents are frozen by law.

A complete study of public housing from the economic view-point brings one to the conclusion that the public housers are only using slums and the needy as political foils to gain their purpose of throwing America into State socialism by the means of a wholesale program of Government ownership of the home.

Europe Can Send Us Working Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore given, I place in the RECORD this thought-provoking editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of July 19, 1947:

EUROPE CAN SEND US WORKING FARMERS

(By William G. Downs, Jr.)

In a recent issue of Country Gentleman, William M. Shelton, of Buckner, Va., calls attention to the increasing labor shortage on farms of this country and the sad plight of thousands of European farmers. Mr. Shelton suggests that a large number of these unfortunates could be brought to this country, for their and our salvation. From my own experience with both aspects of this problem, I can very strongly second his pertinent suggestion.

I have been back from active duty in the European theater a bare 5 months. I had 2½ years of active service there, much of it in close contact with the common people of a number of countries. As a practicing farmer myself, I naturally paid particular attention to the farmers of these countries, their problems, methods, and techniques.

The plight of the farmer is essentially the same throughout Europe, and makes a sad, dismal picture. Labor is scarce, due to war losses, displaced persons, and prisoners of war. What labor there is is lethargic and dull, because of the apparent hopelessness of the outlook. At the same time, there is an ever-increasing population anxious to be fed by the farms. This puts very great pressure on the farmers to produce more and ever more foodstuffs, which were never adequate for the Continent's needs. Yet government controls the distribution; prices are rigidly fixed at a level that does not encourage a maximum of effort. No farm implements are to be had, and none are in sight. The tools in use are antiquated, patched, and repaired like the one-hoss shay. No commercial fertilizer is to be had for farms that have been overworked and underfertilized for years. This is not enough seed, and the quality of the small supply is poor.

It is not uncommon to see an old single-bottom plow with a moldboard hand-hammered out of sheet metal, pulled by a milch cow and one, two or three women and children. Leaves are gathered and hauled long distances by small handcarts for feed. Such conditions exist nearly equally in France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Czechoslovakia, Austria and Hungary. Yet in each of these countries, even after years of industrialization, the population is essentially of rural origin and its roots go back for centuries into farm lands.

The European farmer—I have in mind more especially the German one, for reasons I shall state later—is normally a hard and intelligent worker, willing, cooperative and tractable, when he is fed and when he can see any hope ahead. He has been accustomed all his life to long hours, hard work and small pay. He has had to make the poorest of make-shifts do the job. He makes the most desirable kind of helper, under direction.

In all of Europe, I talked to virtually no one from any walk of life—and those I talked to numbered thousands—who did not passionately desire to come to the United States. My driver for many months—a wizard with all kinds of machinery, and with a farm background—told me repeatedly that if I could only get him over here, he would work for me for years, just for his living. Since my return, God knows I wish I had him here. Long hours, arduous duties, all kinds of weather, prisoner-of-war food, never fazed him.

Contrast this with what I have found since my return to my own farm. I have 315 acres, about 200 of which is cultivable. My chief crops are beef cattle and hogs, which means that a lot of feed and hay must be raised, a lot of fence built and kept in repair, much machinery operated and cared for. I am 50 years of age, and not nearly so husky as I was 10 or 20 years ago. All the money that my wife, my father and I have is invested in this place. It is apparent that my 76-year-old father, a retired professional man, and I cannot do the necessary work. Nor can we begin to afford to pay the wages which the scanty available labor, supported by governmental edicts, demands. We could pay a reasonable sum and give our labor a good, comfortable, modern and cheerful home, which would be heaven for the vast majority of Europeans, especially Germans.

Any farmer who has attempted to procure labor in this country recently can tell you what the situation is here. First, few unemployed men are willing to work on farms at all. They want to be near the bright lights, juke boxes and gin mills. If they will consider coming to the farm at all, they want 80-cents-an-hour minimum wage with time and a half for all over 45 hours. If hired under these conditions, they still take no real interest in their work, and are careless with their employer's tools, implements, stock and feed. There are undoubtedly exceptions to this rule, but in my own experience and that of my neighbors, the exceptions are rare. Were such labor more efficient and easily available, present wages would soon wipe out the farmer's meager profit.

What are the possibilities of meeting these two needs by bringing willing European workers to America's labor-starved farms? An inquiry at the Department of State elicits the information that skilled agriculturists may be admitted on first-preference quota visas, but is our need for skilled agriculturists? I think not, unless by that is meant willing, hard-working farm laborers who want to work for a decent living and a fair hope for the future. From my own knowledge of Government interpretations, I am quite sure that this is not what is meant.

Thousands of competent workers can be found in any country in Europe which you may prefer. A movement to import such workers will inevitably bring opposition. Organized labor will object on the ground that it is bringing cheap labor into competition with high-standard American labor. Any farmer who has tried to get satisfactory labor at a price that he can pay can answer that one. Some of the veterans' organizations and professional patriots will object, because of supposed danger to American institutions from European ideologies. This is pure tommyrot. American institutions have been largely erected by Europeans who have fled from intolerable conditions over there, and these are more intolerable today than at any other time in history.

I said previously that my own preference would be for German labor. This is the result of careful and objective thought, with no special love for the Germans. My reasons are that the German of today who wants to come here and work, is thoroughly tractable. He has had his belly full of political and economic isms. Now he wants it full of food. He will be everlastingly grateful for an opportunity. His living standards of cleanliness, neatness, and sanitation nearly approach our own. He will be more than willing to put Germany behind him forever.

Where could he learn democracy and adapt himself to it better than on an American farm? He would be not greatly different from those millions of Germans who came over from the Rhineland, the Main Valley, Baden, and Bavaria in the last century, and whose families are today among our finest farmers and best citizens in Pennsylvania and in the Middle West and on the western plains.

Many French farmers would fit our needs as well as many Germans. So would many Belgians and Czechs and Hungarians and those of other European origins. From the recent observations of Mr. Herbert Hoover and other competent observers, it looks very much as though we Americans would have to play a major role in feeding and supporting Europe for many years to come. Some of the cost of this aid can be borne by getting European help and cooperation at the point where it is most greatly needed—right here on our farms.

We have brought many scientists and technicians from Germany to assist in fields in which we already lead the world—physics and chemistry. Is there any reason why we cannot bring more humble Europeans to help us till our soil? Is there any reason why we should import scientists to help us prepare for war, when we can't at the same time bring in farmers to help us feed a hungry world?

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following, a radio address made by me recently:

Greetings, Montana friends. The recent floods in the Mississippi Valley will go down in history as one of the worst disasters ever to strike the Middle West. It is appropriate and timely to examine the cause of the floods and the steps we can take to prevent a recurrence of the disaster.

This is not, and should not be, a political or partisan matter. It is too big and too vital for such considerations.

Yet no sooner had the floods begun than Drew Pearson, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, various left-wing Washington correspondents, and others with just as little experience in the West, began to advocate a Missouri Valley Authority as a cure-all for the trouble. Some even went so far as to say that passage of an MVA act a year or two ago would have prevented the floods. This is foolish on the face of it, but the widespread publication of such statements makes necessary a calm appraisal of the problem.

The Missouri Basin is about one-sixth of the United States and includes all or part of 10 States. Flood control is only one of the problems which affect the welfare of this great basin. Irrigation, power development, silt control, recreation, wildlife management, and other beneficial uses of the water must be considered.

We must have dams and reservoirs on the Missouri River and its tributaries which will help in flood control, and also will provide for irrigating dry lands in the upper valley and produce the electric power we need for industrial development.

All of this requires a great deal of study and planning by experts in the various fields. The local people and the States have a right to participate in the program. It cannot be done in 1 or 2 years no matter who does it.

For many years the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has been devoting its efforts to flood control and navigation on

our great rivers. The Engineers have built up a vast store of knowledge and experience which cannot be duplicated. The Bureau of Reclamation has been doing similar work on irrigation and other beneficial uses of water. Other agencies of the Government have become expert in the related problems of soil conservation, reseeding denuded areas, and silt control and wildlife management. The people of the West and their State agencies have acquired a vast experience in the actual practical application of conservation on the land and soil resources of their country.

Working together, using the knowledge and experience gained in many years of hard work, the people of the West and these agencies of Government have created the Pick-Sloan plan for development of the Missouri River.

One hundred and five reservoirs are planned to harness the Missouri and its tributaries. The Army engineers will be responsible for 12 large storage projects on the main river, including the great Garrison and Fort Randall dams in the Dakotas. The Bureau of Reclamation is to do the work on 93 smaller dams and reservoirs on the tributaries. Montana projects in the plan include the Tiber Dam the Lower Marias irrigation project near Big Sandy, Yellowtail and Boysen Dams, south of Hardin, the Medicine Lake Reservoir north of Culbertson, and the Canyon Ferry near Helena.

These reservoirs will provide storage of approximately 85,000,000 acre-feet of water for flood control, irrigation, navigation, hydroelectric power, municipal water supplies, recreation, and other uses.

Not only the great river itself, but all of the soil and mineral resources of the basin will be developed in connection with the Pick-Sloan plan.

The Pick-Sloan plan is a reality. It has been approved and authorized by Congress and the late President Roosevelt. Congress has appropriated millions of dollars for studies and initial construction work that are now under way. The Army engineers are working at Garrison. In Montana, surveys are almost completed on the Tiber Dam and are well along on other projects. Contracts have been let at Boysen on the Big Horn River. The work is going ahead just as rapidly as men, materials, and equipment are available. The very best talents of experienced Government and local agencies are at work.

Why, then, do we read statements asserting that the recent flood damages prove the Pick-Sloan plan to be inadequate? A careful appraisal of the facts proves that such charges are without foundation. The floods were worse in the Mississippi and its tributaries above Cairo, Ill. Very heavy and prolonged rainfall in the immediate area were primarily responsible for the floods. This is an area where the Army engineers have not completed their flood-control work. Farther down the river, where work is more nearly complete, the levees, cut-offs and spillways prevented heavy damage. The floods prove nothing about the Pick-Sloan plan except the great need for its fulfillment.

Why should we scrap the work we have done in exchange for a Missouri Valley Authority? Why waste the studies and experience of our most competent engineers so that some new people can start afresh? For that is what the MVA people want to do. They ask for 2 years in which an MVA board would create a plan for the basin. Experience shows that it would take 5 years or more to develop such a plan. Actually, adoption of the MVA program would only delay the basin-wide development on which we are now engaged. These people are deliberately sabotaging the Pick-Sloan plan—the comprehensive plan for river and resources development—the work that we need so vitally in the West.

The answer must be that these people are interested not as much in the development of our resources as they are in changing our system of Government.

The Pick-Sloan plan provides for the full cooperation of the people, municipalities, States, and Federal agencies. The broad outline of the plan is complete. Work has started and is proceeding as fast as men, materials, and supplies are available. The final achievement will be one of the greatest developments in all history.

We must not be misled by those who are more interested in a change in our social and political philosophy—more interested in authoritarian control—than they are in the prompt and orderly development of our basin and its resources.

The lesson to be learned from the recent terrible floods is not that we should abandon our carefully worked-out plans for the Missouri River. The lesson is that we must press the plans to completion with all of our energy so that this river and all the resources of the Missouri Basin will become a blessing to the Nation.

Thank you.

The Constitution Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 1, 1947

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, because of the interest in the recently enacted Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 I submit my observations and comments on this legislation.

THE CONSTITUTION LIVES

If the Government of the United States verged on one-man rule during the era of the man Roosevelt, it is a long distance from such a danger now. Constitutional processes are still living instruments of government in the United States. This is fully demonstrated by the method in which the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 has become the law of the land.

The citizens of this country spoke in no uncertain terms at the ballot boxes last November. Their voice was reflected in the so-called Taft-Hartley bill, officially the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947"; the first fundamental change since 1935 in the law governing labor relations. This law is the result of months of study on the part of the Congress, followed by extended debate in both Houses.

GAMBLED AND LOST?

Many persons believe President Truman gambled and lost when he sent his veto message to Congress. To have signed the bill would have severed his political ties with labor. Yet his veto was unmercifully overridden in both branches of the legislature, indicating representatives of the people do not cringe when the Chief Executive cracks the whip. Will this inability of the Chief's stalwarts to round for him sufficient support cause labor to cast about for a new leader in the Democratic Party? Many believe it will. Perhaps the President gambled and lost.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

The new labor law—Public Law 101—available at my office on request, declares:

Industrial strife which interferes with the normal flow of commerce and with the full production of articles and commodities for commerce, can be avoided or substantially minimized if employers, employees, and labor organizations each recognize under law one another's legitimate rights in their relations with each other, and above all recognize under law that neither party has any right in its relations with any other to engage in acts or practices which jeopardize the public health, safety, or interest.

It is the purpose and policy of this act, in order to promote the full flow of commerce, to prescribe the legitimate rights of both employees and employers in their relations affecting commerce, to provide orderly and peaceful procedures for preventing the interference by either with the legitimate rights of the other, to protect the rights of individual employees in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to define and proscribe practices on the part of labor and management which affect commerce and are inimical to the general welfare, and to protect the rights of the public in connection with labor disputes affecting commerce.

BOARD ENLARGED

The National Labor Relations Board is enlarged from three to five members, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and a general counsel who shall handle the administrative work now carried on by the Board. The salary of the Board members and its counsel is increased to $12,000 per year.

Many of the sections of the act become effective immediately. They include creation of a new statutory Federal mediation service to replace the present Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor; emergency machinery for handling national-paralysis disputes or strikes which imperil the national health or safety; stability of unions; regulation of welfare funds and check-off; banning of strikes by Government workers; appointment of a joint congressional committee to study labor-management relations and to observe the workings of the new law.

Sections which do not become effective for 60 days include those applying to the NLRB, the general counsel, unfair labor practices by employees, outlawing the closed shop, regulating the union shop, requiring registration of data by unions, depriving unions with Communist officers of their rights under the law and forbidding foremen a recognition by law.

WORKERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

Clearly and specifically the law gives every worker:

The right to know how much money his union has, how much it pays its officers, and how much of the union's money the officers use for their expenses.

The right to vote by secret ballot in free and fair elections for his own choice of union officers.

The right to know what he is striking about before he is called out on strike, and to vote by secret ballot in a free and

fair election on whether to strike or not after he has been told what his employer has offered him.

The right to join with his fellow workers to select as their bargaining agent the union that they want, not the union that is forced upon them.

The right to vote by secret ballot in a fair and free election on whether his employer and a union can make him join the union to keep his job.

The right to keep on working and getting his pay in spite of sympathy strikes, jurisdictional disputes, illegal boycotts, and other disputes that do not involve him and his union or his employer.

The right to have a fair hearing, before an impartial board, without cost to himself, whenever he believes that any employer or any union is depriving him of these rights.

The right to express his opinion concerning union policies, union officers, and candidates for union office, and to make and file charges against his employer, the union, or union officers, without suffering any penalty or discrimination.

Those labor leaders who now defy the law and recommend its violation to the rank and file union members are serving no good purpose. Some day an aroused public opinion can speak even more emphatically than heretofore.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have studied with great interest the message from the President delivered to the Congress on Wednesday, dealing in general with the problem of the development of our great river systems and in particular with flood control. I certainly am in full agreement with the President's statement that a comprehensive program for flood control in the entire Mississippi River Basin is essential. There must be an orderly program of appropriations for the prosecution of the necessary work.

We all recognize a definite relationship between public works and the condition of the national economy. When employment is at a very high level and there is a shortage of raw materials, public works have to be limited as much as practical. In times of unemployment public works should be stimulated so as to support the economy of the country. Yet in each and every year a considerable amount of flood-control work must be done if we are ever to achieve safety from floods for the inhabitants of the valleys of the Mississippi Basin. In the President's budget which was sent to the Congress for the new fiscal year there was included $650,000 for construction work on the authorized flood wall for Louisville, Ky., the principal city in my district. At present cost levels the completed Louisville flood wall project will amount to approximately $18,000,000. To date there has been appropriated less than $2,000,000. I tried to find out just how the figure of $650,000 was reached out of a total of $175,000,000 in the appropriation for flood-control work. Apparently, the United States Army engineers were given a formula which they were obliged to follow. This formula was not based on need, but on many other factors, and it resulted in the figure of $650,000 for the Louisville flood wall. If Louisville were to suffer a flood today similar to that in 1937, the financial loss in my district would be in excess of $100,000,000. In spite of that staggering threat, the request for funds from the Bureau of the Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, amounted to only 3 percent of the estimated costs of flood protection.

I am sure that the message from the President will be favorably received by the Congress, especially those Members who come from the Mississippi River Basin, which includes most of the territory lying between the Appalachian and the Rocky Mountains, and I hope that the Department of Engineers of the United States Army can in the future be given sufficient latitude in the allocation of funds to permit a realistic solution to the whole problem of flood control.

I should like at this time to pay tribute to my distinguished colleague from Michigan, the Honorable ALBERT J. ENGEL. He has a sympathetic and understanding knowledge of our problems in Louisville, and he gave us a very fair and courteous hearing before his committee when this matter was under discussion. I know of no man better qualified to activate the President's suggestion that the Congress undertake a program which will provide for the substantial completion of flood-control projects necessary for the protection of the lives and property of so many Americans.

Single Department of National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the American Legion at its National Convention held in San Francisco on October 4, 1946, and an editorial on the subject from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., for Monday, June 30, 1947:

[Resolution adopted by the American Legion at its national convention held in San Francisco on October 4, 1946]

Resolution 816

SINGLE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Whereas the American Legion at its twenty-seventh annual national convention established its policy on unification as follows:

"We endorse the principle of a unified command of our armed forces with Army, Navy, and Air Forces on an equal level."

Whereas Congress recognizing the need for unification of the armed forces has voted to reorganize its Committee on Military and Naval Affairs to accomplish unity of action; and

Whereas closer coordination between branches of the armed services is essential to adequate preparedness and economy of supply: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress is requested to enact appropriate legislation to establish a single Department for National Security with provision for the Army, Navy, and Air Forces on an equal level therein.

[From the Washington Evening Star, of June 30, 1947]

AMERICAN LEGION URGES UNIFICATION NOW—LEGION ASKS CONGRESS TO PUT SERVICES UNDER SINGLE DEPARTMENT

The American Legion urged Congress today to establish a single Department of National Defense "with provisions for the Army, Navy, and Air Forces on an equal level therein."

The Legion's views were presented to the House Expenditures Committee by John Dwight Sullivan, of New York, and Arthur F. Duffy, Jamaica, N. Y. The committee is holding hearings on legislation proposing unification of the armed forces.

The two Legion representatives presented the conclusions of the veterans' organization as follows:

1. In the opinion of the Legion the time for action is now.

WAIT HELD UNNECESSARY

2. While the opinions of our military and naval leaders are to be considered with respect and while it is desirable that they resolve their differences as far as possible, it is neither necessary nor advisable that we wait until they are in complete agreement on details before this necessary action is taken.

3. No branch of the armed services "has any vested interest in the national security and that the sole question to be determined is as to the manner in which the national security can best be preserved."

4. The end to be attained is the centralization of civilian authority and control under the President.

More Truman Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of July 16, 1947:

MORE TRUMAN INFLATION

President Truman has kicked about high prices ever since he has been in office. Yet he is responsible for more skyrocketing of prices than any other one man in American history.

His term of office has been a parade of different varieties of inflation.

We are having the boom. The bust is on its way. Unhappily, the boom we have been having has no more real substance than a swelling soap bubble—which it greatly resembles.

The various inflationary steps which President Truman has taken are much too numerous to list in full.

First and foremost was his decision, two summers ago, to back up labor bosses in their

demand for large wage increases immediately after the war ended.

These wage boosts were not economically sound. Production was declining, total production and per man production. The President was warned that the wage increases he was urging were inflationary, that they were bound to push prices up.

But he supported the labor chieftains in insisting on them. He ordered OPA not to let prices rise. He might as well have told his bureaucrats to stop the ocean's tide from coming in. OPA couldn't hold back the price bulges and wrecked itself and the Democratic chances for last year in trying.

The President had been sold on a theory in economics. The theory sounded good, but was cockeyed. It put the cart before the horse.

Because mass production, increasing the amount of output per worker, therefore also permits him to be paid higher wages, the President thought it would be all right to give the workers the higher wages first, and tell production to catch up.

This didn't work. The American people had to pay the cost of the experiment in their grocery bills and other articles which they had to buy. Prices soared. Inflation took another spurt.

Every financial program which President Truman has laid down has been highly inflationary. There are really three of these. When the war ended, 2 years ago, drastic revision of Government spending was in order. The President had it in his power to balance the budget then. He could and should have stopped all war-spending at once, and pulled the costs of Government down well inside the revenues.

He didn't do so. He "let things coast." He did cancel a number of long-term appropriations—but this was merely routine. They were items which had been lined up on the basis of the war running 2 or 3 years longer. His economies were entirely in the field of distant-future spending. The day-to-day extravagance of the New Deal wasn't touched.

, This was an inflationary decision. Still more obviously inflationary were the two annual budgets he has submitted since then, calling for much the highest peace-time budgets and taxes the country has ever seen—10 times what used to be normal, 4 or 5 times the biggest prewar Roosevelt budgets.

Recent weeks have seen two new varieties of Truman inflation. One has to do with the so-called "Marshall program" on calling upon the American people to underwrite the cost of a score or so European governments in rebuilding war damage—and getting ready for a Third World War with Russia!

This is inflationary for a very simple reason. This country doesn't really have either the cash or the credit to finance this gigantic undertaking—which is beginning to have the earmarks of a new, super-duper WPA project.

Our Nation already is in debt, one way and another, for considerably more than the total value of all the assets and resources owned by the American people. And, as we have begun to realize, we are tax-poor—we can't really afford to support our own Government in the style to which it has become accustomed to live, let alone finance a couple of dozen improvident governments in Europe and elsewhere.

The single word, "inflation," tells the whole answer to the inevitable question about the Marshall-Truman doctrines: "Where's the money coming from?"

Still another piece of inflation, which will have a large effect upon price levels, and which again traces directly to the White House, is the new labor contract jammed through by John L. Lewis on behalf of the Nation's coal miners.

This is inflationary because the cost of the wage increases and other concessions to the miners is being tacked directly on the price of coal. That means that coal itself will be considerably higher. It means also that everything which uses coal—especially the basic commodity of steel—will also rise in price.

This new contract, which probably will be copied by other union groups as rapidly as they are able to do so, is the inevitable consequence of President Truman's opposition to the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, and his intemperate remarks about it while the fight was on.

He in effect told labor that he would back them up in any attack on the new law—either a head-on attack, or an attempt to by-pass it. The Lewis coal contract is an open effort to get around the restrictions which Congress attempted to write, after a mandate from the American people, on such labor agreements.

Here again there is a cockeyed theory of economics in the background—a piece of idiocy which is part and parcel of the Keynes' theory of an expanding economy which is rapidly wrecking the British Empire.

The theory is something like this: That the spread between original cost and final sales price can be widened indefinitely, if the central government is made strong enough to compel people to buy at the higher prices and stop their complaining about the cost of living.

Take coal. In the ground, it is worth nothing, or next door to it. Its cost is the total of the wages paid to dig it, plus a relatively small royalty to the owners, plus the overhead of management and management's investements, plus transportation.

The new theory of economics is that any conceivable amount of profit can be saddled on top of these costs. In the present instance, it is labor rather than management which wants to extract a much larger profit at the expense of the ultimate consumer.

Now, if coal were an essential commodity with no competition, perhaps there might be something in the theory; but coal has many competitions—water power, electricity, oil, gas, etc.

In a free economy, the top selling price for coal, roughly speaking, is the price which meets these various types of competition.

The big coal strike 20 years ago, which also was the work of John L. Lewis, was the worst disaster which ever hit the coal industry. Why? Because it opened the door to the competitors of coal.

Oil burners first became common at that time. Their somewhat higher costs were compensated for by the fact that oil was believed to be in steady supply. That was the time when the pressure began for the National Government to start building huge power plants. Again, why? So that electricity might be available when strikes interrupted the supply of coal. At that time, also, people first began to take a serious interest in heating with gas and electricity.

The coal industry has never regained the place in American economy, or any measure of the prosperity, which it had enjoyed prior to that disastrous strike. John L. Lewis has grieved openly and eloquently many times for the plight of coal miners—and no one who has had contacts with the industry is going to deny that it is a hard and dangerous way to earn a living.

But Lewis has never been frank enough to admit that his stubborn strike 20 years ago crippled the industry in a fashion from which it has never recuperated.

Likewise with his present contract. At the moment he is on top of the world. He is the envy of all other labor bosses, and his contract is something they hope to use as a model.

But this contract may prove the deathblow to the coal industry.

If he can tack $1.20 a day onto mine wages this time, he can tack $2.40 next year, and $10, $20, or $50 any time in the future. The sky is the limit, once the laws of business economics are abandoned.

This is more than a "bulge"—it's a breakthrough. The drift toward coal substitutes will be accelerated as never before. The picture of continual interruptions in supply and constantly rising prices can have no other effect.

There is only one institution which could head off that threat of competition which will eventually put coal mining virtually out of business—and that would be a labor dictatorship at Washington, powerful enough to tell the American people that they had to go on buying coal, whether they could afford it or not.

The costs of this experiment in screwball economics is going to be carried by those who are not immediately able to move over to other fuels and heating devices, and therefore will have to keep on buying coal at the higher prices—for the time being.

And that makes it another chapter in Truman inflation.

Unification of Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Fielding Eliot, from the New York Post of July 10, 1947:

UNIFIED INTELLIGENCE MAKES A LOT OF SENSE, GETS A LOT OF SNIPING

(By George Fielding Eliot)

"The United States should never again have to go hat in hand, begging any foreign government for eyes with which to see."

These are startling words. They are words worth thinking about.

They were spoken by Lieut. Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, then Director of Central Intelligence, in testifying before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate with regard to the service unification bill.

This bill provides, among many other matters, for a centralized American Intelligence Service—the first in our history.

General Vandenberg was referring to the fact that for many months, at the beginning of the late war, we had to depend on the British intelligence system because we had none of our own. "This trust" added the general, "was generally well placed. * * * But we should not again find ourselves confronted with the necessity of developing our plans and policies on the basis of intelligence collected, compiled, and interpreted by a foreign government. We should be able to do these things for ourselves."

This would seem to make sense—a lot of sense. Yet the proposals for a central intelligence agency are being sniped at in Washington, and some of the sniping is getting into the public prints.

For example, it is being charged that Central Intelligence wants to do away with the intelligence services of the Army and Navy. Nothing could be further from the truth. What is desired is that information collected by military and naval attachés, and by such other means as are available to the War and Navy Departments, should be made available to Central Intelligence to be "put into the

hopper" with all the other information received from other departments having foreign reporting staffs and from all other sources. The net result, after careful sifting and cross checking, becomes national intelligence.

It's true that some of the special agents of Army Intelligence are going out of the picture, but this is with the express approval of the Secretary of War in order to avoid duplication of effort. In this process some toes have been stepped on, some little empires have been swept away. Hence, some of the sniping.

Again we are told that the agents of the FBI in Latin America are getting the ax, and being replaced by amateurs from Central Intelligence. The fact is that FBI doesn't have enough money to take care of its vital work right here in the United States of America, and has no desire to spend any part of its budget on foreign intelligence, work which is the proper job of Central Intelligence.

As for the steps Central Intelligence is taking to replace these Army and FBI activities, would you expect these to be published for the information of all interested parties? They are effective steps, I am told, by a man who knows and whose word and ability command my confidence. My information stops right there, and it ought to.

One little item that has been noised abroad I am able to say is a downright falsehood. That is the pretty tale to the effect that one of our ambassadors has threatened to resign because he was compelled to have a Central Intelligence man attached to his embassy without any authority over the man's activities. This has been thoroughly checked on the highest level of authority. It just isn't true. But it shows the sort of thing that gets around when small-time personal empires are threatened with destruction.

We need a central intelligence service desperately in this atomic age. A difference of a few hours in getting information, a difference of a few words in its accuracy, may in the future make the difference between life and death for this Nation. And right now we can never discharge the heavy responsibilities laid upon us unless we have eyes with which to see the facts—and to see clearly. We cannot depend on the separate, uncoordinated intelligence efforts of the various departments. We had that before; the result was Pearl Harbor.

Central Intelligence is not designed to make policy any more than eyes are designed to think; but sound policy cannot be made without facts on which to base it, any more than a blind man can find his way through a trackless jungle.

Modernize Our Presidential Election—VI. The Election of the President by a Nation-Wide Popular Vote Regardless of State Lines Is Impractical and Undesirable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, as to State elections, the general policy of our country is to elect our officials by popular vote. The voters meet at the ballot box on equal terms. All votes cast are counted. The candidate receiving the highest vote—the plurality candidate—is elected.

With knowledge of this situation, we may naturally ask, "Why not elect the President in the same way?" This suggestion is plausible, but not practical. The answer is rather obvious. Such a change would eliminate from the Constitution two very important provisions, each intended for the protection of the States.

One provision so eliminated would be that which assigns two electoral votes to each State, regardless of its population. The other provision which would be eliminated is that which assures each State electoral votes in proportion to its population, not in proportion to the number of its voters.

An amendment to the Constitution providing for the direct election of the President regardless of State lines would result in a change of power in the control and operation of the Government; it would be almost revolutionary. It would vastly concentrate power in the States of greatest population, with a corresponding decline in the strength of every other State.

If the election of 1944 had been conducted under a system of Nation-wide voting regardless of State lines, among other things we would have had the following results: 31 of the 48 States would have had their relative strength in electing the President decreased; 17 would have had their relative strength increased.

Each of our 10 largest States has 15 or more electoral votes. They have 6,000,000 more than half of the total population of all the States. Nine of these large States would have had their relative strength in electing the President greatly increased. All of the 9, except 1, would have had their voting strength enlarged by more than 24 percent. One of the 9 would have had its strength enlarged over 19 percent, and 1 would have lost strength by more than 44 percent.

Of the 12 States having from 10 to 14 electoral votes, inclusive, 4 would have had their voting strength enlarged by an average of more than 23 percent. The other 8 of these States would have lost a substantial part of their voting strength.

The 13 States that would have gained as above stated have 272 electoral votes and have much over one-half the population of the United States.

There are 26 States having 9 or less electoral votes that constitute a majority of the States. This group of States has 145 electoral votes, or 27 percent of the total of 531 electoral votes of the Nation.

Of the 145 electoral votes allotted to these 26 States, 52 of them, or more than one-third, are due to the two votes assigned to each State regardless of population.

The Nation-wide election by popular vote would deprive them of those 52 votes, or 35 percent of their present voting strength.

Taking away 2 electoral votes from the very small States would deprive each of them of a large percentage of their present influence in electing the President. A State with 4 electoral votes would lose one-half of its votes; a State with 6 electoral votes would lose one-third of them; a State with 8 electoral votes would lose 25 percent of its present voting strength.

I have prepared table V which illustrates the relative strength of the States under the present plan of electing the President, on the basis of the figures of the 1944 election.

The first column of figures represents the present relative strength of each State on a percentage basis in electing the President.

The second column represents what would have been its relative strength if the two electoral votes awarded to each State regardless of population had been omitted from the count. As an examination of the table will show, outstanding differences are due to the decreased relative strength of all the small States due to omitting these two electoral votes; to the disparity of voting populations as between the different States and also within the same States at different elections.

This illustration is made not because we propose the omission of those two votes for each State, but rather because we cannot understand the operation of our electoral vote system without knowing how it affects the small States.

The third column represents the relative strength of each State under a Nation-wide system of popular votes, regardless of State lines. As I have indicated, such a system of election would do away with the allotment of two electoral votes to each State regardless of population. It would also withdraw from the State the right to participate in the election of a President in proportion to its population.

In other words, assurance is now given the State of its relative strength according to its population, and regardless of the number of its voters. Under such a change the State would have no definite assurance of strength. Its relative strength would be measured solely by the number of its votes as compared to the total vote of the Nation at each particular election.

The fourth column of figures indicates the States which would gain relative strength under a system of a Nation-wide election regardless of State lines.

The fifth column represents the States which would lose relative strength by such a plan of election and the percentage of their loss as contrasted with their present relative strength, as indicated in column 1.

In other words, table V shows the relative strength of the States under the present system in column 1. In column 2, it shows the relative strength of each if the two electoral votes were omitted. In column 3, it shows the relative strength under a Nation-wide popular vote, under which plan the two electoral votes now due each State are omitted; the provision which definitely assures a State of its relative security is omitted; and the relation between the States would be controlled solely on the basis of the relative popular votes cast by each at a given election.

The average loss per State of the 31 States losing under such a plan of election would be more than 45 percent of their present relative strength.

The average gain per State of the 17 States gaining by such a method of election would be more than 27 percent.

The total population of the States gaining by such a change is much greater than that of the States which would lose in their voting strength.

It is apparent as a practical matter that in view of the decreased influence that many States would suffer, particularly the small States, by a Nation-wide election, regardless of State lines, that the approval of a sufficient number of States could never be secured to adopt such an amendment.

More substantial reasons are that it is unnecessary and impracticable to make such a revolutionary change in the relative rights of the States to participate in such an election and in the affairs of the Federal Government.

TABLE V.—*Relative strength of States by percentages in electing President*

	Under present plan	If two electoral votes omitted from each State	Under Nation-wide popular vote		
			Relative strength	Gain	Loss
Alabama	2.071	2.068	0.509	------	75.423
Arizona	.753	.459	.286	------	62.019
Arkansas	1.694	1.609	.443	------	73.849
California	4.708	5.287	7.331	55.713	------
Colorado	1.129	.919	1.051	------	6.909
Connecticut	1.506	1.379	1.732	15.006	------
Delaware	.564	.229	.261	------	53.724
Florida	1.506	1.379	1.004	------	33.333
Georgia	2.259	2.298	.683	------	69.766
Idaho	.753	.459	.433	------	42.497
Illinois	5.273	5.977	8.403	59.358	------
Indiana	2.448	2.528	3.481	42.197	------
Iowa	1.883	1.839	2.191	16.356	------
Kansas	1.506	1.379	1.527	1.394	------
Kentucky	2.071	2.068	1.807	------	12.748
Louisiana	1.883	1.839	.727	------	61.392
Maine	.941	.689	.617	------	34.432
Maryland	1.506	1.379	1.266	------	15.937
Massachusetts	3.013	3.218	4.185	38.898	------
Michigan	3.578	3.908	4.591	28.311	------
Minnesota	2.071	2.068	2.343	13.133	------
Mississippi	1.694	1.609	.374	------	77.923
Missouri	2.824	2.988	3.272	24.695	------
Montana	.753	.459	.431	------	42.763
Nebraska	1.129	.919	1.172	3.808	------
Nevada	.564	.229	.112	------	80.142
New Hampshire	.753	.459	.478	------	36.521
New Jersey	3.013	3.218	4.088	35.678	------
New Mexico	.753	.459	.316	------	58.035
New York	8.851	10.344	13.152	48.593	------
North Carolina	2.636	2.758	1.646	------	37.557
North Dakota	.753	.459	.458	------	39.177
Ohio	4.708	5.287	6.565	39.443	------
Oklahoma	1.883	1.839	1.504	------	20.128
Oregon	1.129	.919	.999	------	11.515
Pennsylvania	6.591	7.586	7.901	19.875	------
Rhode Island	.753	.459	.623	------	17.265
South Carolina	1.506	1.379	.215	------	85.724
South Dakota	.753	.459	.483	------	35.857
Tennessee	2.259	2.298	1.063	------	52.944
Texas	4.331	4.827	2.395	------	44.701
Utah	.753	.459	.517	------	31.342
Vermont	.564	.229	.261	------	53.724
Virginia	2.071	2.068	.808	------	60.986
Washington	1.506	1.379	1.783	18.393	------
West Virginia	1.506	1.379	1.490	------	1.063
Wisconsin	2.259	2.298	2.788	23.417	------
Wyoming	.564	.229	.211	------	62.589

Tax-Reduction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of July 15, 1947:

AS WE SEE IT—NOT ENOUGH VOTES

The Senate passed the tax-reduction bill with a January 1, 1948, date substituted for July 1, 1947. The vote was 60 to 32, just short of two-thirds.

This makes it highly improbable that President Truman's expected veto can be surmounted. Tax reduction, if any, will probably wait until next year's session.

This is regrettable for a variety of reasons. The chief one is that the tax cut is a sound measure and ought to have been adopted.

We also regret the damage to a wholesome constitutional tradition, which has hitherto recognized Congress as chiefly responsible for the Nation's tax policies, just as it recognizes the Executive as chiefly responsible for foreign affairs.

Franklin Roosevelt was the first President to veto a tax bill in all American history, and Congress overrode that veto. President Truman's veto of the tax-cut bill a few weeks ago was the first in American history to be sustained.

He was, of course, within the letter of the Constitution in vetoing the bill. But the primacy of Congress in taxation was the fruit of a historic struggle between Parliaments and Executives, and we may have reason to regret the weakening of the precedent by this example.

New American Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of July 17, 1947:

NEW AMERICAN INITIATIVE

The realistic new policy toward Germany, the Marshall plan for European recovery, the projected peace settlement with Japan, and the expected end of fruitless Korean negotiations with Russia form the pattern for a sound, consistent American position in world affairs.

The Wedemeyer mission to China offers promise of a constructive substitute for our policy of drift there.

By taking the initiative in these several fields, we are recognizing that the living men in the Kremlin are a greater threat to world peace and stability than the ghosts of Hitler, Goebbels, and Goering.

The program for revival of Germany as a peaceful but productive nation is a belated acceptance of the facts of European economic life. Germany is the industrial heart of Europe. Rehabilitation must begin there. A sound German economy is even more vital to success of the Marshall plan than American financial aid.

Two years have been wasted as we dallied with the stupidities of the Morgenthau plan. But having scrapped Mr. Morgenthau's scheme to turn Germany's "Pittsburgh" into a farming community, perhaps now we can avoid similar blunders in Japan and south Korea.

Russia apparently is not going to have the veto power in the Japanese settlement, which is a substantial gain. The other nations should have no great difficulty in reaching agreement.

The stalemate in Korea suggests that we shall have to go it alone there, as we are in Germany.

The situation in China is largely of our own making. It grew from President Roosevelt's policy of treating Chinese Communists as honest reformers, and from misplaced faith in Russian agreements. Consequently most of Manchuria and half of Korea are in Soviet or Chinese Communist hands. There's nothing we can do about it now. The present question is, How much of China itself can be salvaged from Red revolution and civil war?

European Reconstruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item and an article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop:

[From the New Orleans Item]

UNITY IS A "MUST"

Great and small, all 16 European nations now participating in the Paris conference should realize that they are engaged in a mission too serious to be sacrificed to frivolous objections and trifling disputes.

A Molotov plan is to be Russia's counter to the Marshall plan. Whatever its provisions, it can't match the latter in resources, sincerity, or basic power for good. The United States has the productive capacity, the food, the factories, the know-how, and the financial ability to make its proffer of assistance meaningful, whereas, on the record, the only nation Russia is bent on helping is Russia. Her satellites within the eastern bloc know that Russia has drained her neighbors to her own benefit. The United States, on the other hand, has been giving—wastefully and foolishly at times, it may be, but giving.

However, the eastern orbit has one thing the western group lacks. It has a realistic and ruthless purpose, under Russia's central direction and command. Ostensibly concerned over the invasion of small nations' sovereignty by United States assistance, Russia allows her satellites no sovereignty whatever, either economic or political. Russia speaks and they obey, with no nonsense about self-determinism.

The West has everything else. It can therefore make resources, know-how, productive energy, and good will outweigh Russia's unity-or-else domination by maintaining a voluntary solidarity in the Paris council. So let there be no more serving notice by small countries that they will not let the large powers do any dictating. Cooperation implies a willingness to forego certain prerogatives of individualism. Without such a sacrifice in small things, big results can't be achieved. The quaint idea entertained by some small powers that their part of the cooperation will be solely to receive while that of others will be to give might as well be rectified first as last.

Either the solid substance of complete economic recovery and unified strength is worth more than the shadow of sovereignty's empty trappings or it isn't. If it is, well and good. Let there be a more realistic appraisal of the relative worth of petty dignities as against the ultimate good of continental Europe and its peoples.

For all practical purposes Europe is now divided into a totalitarian eastern bloc and a democratic western bloc. The eastern bloc,

under Moscow direction, will stick together and operate as a unit. The western bloc, to be effective, must also achieve unity—voluntarily.

MATTER OF FACT—THE ANSWER IS "YES"

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

A great national debate, of the deepest historic significance, is clearly looming ahead as to whether Secretary of State George C. Marshall's words at Harvard are to be backed by American money and American goods. The debate will be heated, and with November 1948 on the horizon, it is sure to have intense political overtones. The central question of the debate will certainly be: "Can we afford it?" It is worth pointing out that, at least as far as money is concerned, the answer is quite evidently "Yes."

This answer is founded on unofficial but reliable estimates. The figures on which these estimates are based are simple enough.

The total Government income for the last fiscal year, ending June 30, was something over $43,000,000,000. Last January President Truman submitted to Congress an estimated budget for the present year of over $37,000,000,000. The Congress is now hard at work trying to reduce this sum. Even if not a penny is cut, the estimated outgo would still be nearly $6,000,000,000 below last year's income. If Congress pares off as much as three billions, the difference between last year's income and this year's outgo will then be almost $9,000,000,000.

The level of employment and of business activity (contrary to the gloomy crystal ball gazing of the economists) is now higher than it was during the last fiscal year. The highest estimate thus far made of the total cost during any 1 year of the Marshall program is $6,000,000,000. Thus, assuming that the Government's slice of the national income during the present fiscal year is as high as it has been during the year just ended, it is obvious that there will be more than enough surplus in the Government "kitty" to finance America's part in the plan.

Two very large strings must of course be firmly attached to that statement.

The first is the qualification that the United States must suffer no economic depression, nor even a fairly mild recession, during the coming year. For even a moderate drop in the present great level of national income would knock all estimates galley-west. But here, curiously enough, in the view of reliable economic forecasters, something like the opposite of the all-too-familiar vicious circle will tend to come into operation. If the Marshall proposal had not been made, the enormous volume of American exports would have begun to fall off sharply in the next few weeks or months. The European countries which are now running out of dollars would have been forced, regardless of consequences, to hoard their last few million against a sudden emergency. The resulting plunge in the American export level would have made inevitable at the very least a distinctly painful recession.

However, with the European response to the Marshall proposal getting under way, the European leaders will certainly be inclined to take a chance.

Faced with desperate internal economic situations, they will undoubtedly gamble that the American Congress will choose to back Marshall up. Thus the American level of exports will hold up, while the Europeans scrape the bottoms of their dollar barrels. And this in turn enormously reduces the likelihood of a serious recession in the near future, and makes it probable that the United States will have the money available to play its part in the Marshall proposal. Thus is the happy circle neatly completed.

The second string which must be tied to any expectation of a large surplus for financing European reconstruction is, of course, taxes. The President has announced his intention of vetoing the tax-cut bill now going through the congressional mill. But it is very far from certain that his veto will be upheld. The tax-cut measure, if passed over the veto, will, of course, cut into the estimated velvet in next year's budgetary kitty. Even with a tax cut, however, since it would not begin to operate until January 1, there is a fair chance that the Government could finance the Marshall program without going to the money lenders.

What all this adds up to is that, in terms of dollars and cents, this country can well afford the effort which must be made to put dying Europe back on its feet. No sensible estimate, of course, can be made entirely in dollars and cents. Money has meaning only in terms of the things it can buy. Yet despite inflation, despite high taxes, despite the housing mess, the plain fact is that this country is living better in terms of things to buy than it or any other country has ever lived before. And no informed person believes that this happy state of affairs will long continue if Europe is allowed to descend into a political and economic chaos which will profit only the Soviets.

Finally, of course, there is politics. As the Presidential year approaches, the temptation will be enormous for both sides to use for political advances what will surely be the paramount issue of the times. Yet politics and all, this country has always squeaked through in the pinches. When Secretary Marshall made his speech at Harvard he was taking a calculated risk that it would do so again.

Legislative Program of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Legislative Program of Congress," which I delivered on Saturday, July 12, 1947, over the Mutual Network.

There being no objection, the adress was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great privilege and honor for me to appear in the place of Fiorello LaGuardia, truly one of the great liberal leaders of this country today. I share the hopes of the host which loves him that he will have a speedy recovery.

We are now far enough from the end of the war to see what the reactionary group, dominating the Congress and in cooperation with the powerful and privileged elements in the country, has done to our people. When the war ended, the hours of the workers were reduced. That meant the workers' take-home pay, at the end of the week was cut down. Meanwhile, those who had goods to sell demanded that the Government relax controls and forced up prices. The workers then were caught in the crush between falling wages and rising prices. The special interests demanded that the Government stay hands off, that it adopt no policy with respect to wages or prices which would protect the people. Meanwhile, big business in America took advantage of the carry-forward—carry-back tax law, which entitled them to draw back from the United States Treasury some of the excess profits they paid in during the war, if they had current losses, and determined to break the labor unions. Hence they refused to cooperate with fact-finding boards appointed by the President to determine whether they were able to pay higher wage rates to the workers of the country. They even refused settlements recommended by the President, himself. They forced strikes upon the working people of the Nation. This was a part of their design to prejudice the people against the workers and to lay the ground work for anti-labor legislation which would make it possible for big business to cheapen the labor of the Nation's workers. Finally, these business magnates raised prices so as to make the American public pay what wage increase they finally granted.

Meanwhile, those in the Congress, who were thinking more of profits for the few, already making the highest profits they had ever made, rather than the welfare of the people, abolished all price control. And prices shot up to new heights, while the housewife's budget steadily shrank.

In November, the American people did what they did after the last war. They turned the Democrats out of power in Congress and put the Republicans in power. Yet the vote was exceedingly light, indicating that the liberals and the workers of the country had got discouraged and did not see much hope of stemming another postwar reactionary tide.

Now, what have the Republicans done? Of course, one of the first things they did was to put through Congress a proposed constitutional amendment, limiting the number of years any President could serve, and taking away from the people the power to elect a President as many times as they wanted to do so. This was simply an after-death attack upon Franklin D. Roosevelt by those who could not defeat him in his lifetime. This Republican Congress has finally, for all practical purposes, destroyed the last protection the people had under Government controls—their ceiling on rents. The new rent bill practically assures flat increases of 15 percent and will lead to elimination of all rent controls whatever in a short time This is a direct blow at the veterans, for example, who are fortunate enough to occupy houses and apartments. The next blow they have struck is at the hopes of veterans who thought they might be able to build homes. For this Congress has now eliminated the control over material allocation, so all commercial building now competes for building materials with the veteran trying to build a home for himself and his family.

It was natural that this Republican dominated Congress would make its principal attack upon labor. The Taft-Hartley bill is the result. This bill should be called a bill to cheapen American labor. Its design was to crush the organized labor movement of the Nation and to make the workers of the country again the prey of the exploiter. The bill totally ignored the fact that in 1946, corporate profits in the country increased $3,000,000,000, while, in the same period, salaries and wages fell $5,000,000,000. These men who were determined to make labor powerless to defend itself and the American standard of living were callous to the knowledge that real wages of the American worker had been falling since January, 1945. This bill even attempted to strike down the right of the workers of America to unite effectively in politics. It tried to destroy their ability even to inform their members of the records of public men and to write editorials in their own newspapers about political matters.

Meanwhile, the same dominant majority is now trying to thrust through the Congress, over the President's veto also, the so-called tax cut. This bill, like the other legislation in general, which they have passed is for the

benefit of the privileged few and gives hardly anything to the masses of the people. For example, it would reduce the taxes on a married man with two children, earning $2,500 a year, namely about half of the families of the Nation, only $19, 36 cents a week, but for a married man with two children, earning $100,000 a year, it would give a tax saving of $12,000. It is wrong to raise the level of luxury to the fortunate family before you raise the level of living to the unfortunate family.

Moreover, we all know that, in the time of high income, we should be cutting down the great debt which we had to build up during the war. We have got to pay it sometime. When can we expect to be better able than now? Further, this tax bill, if the Republicans can pass it over the President's veto, is, as a practical matter, going to mean the defeat of the Marshall Plan and shatter any hope of our saving Europe from collapse and chaos. That will not only tend toward totalitarianism and war, but, if we lose the foreign markets we have today, which are due principally to American loans and credits abroad, it will make the difference between prosperity and depression, full employment and mass unemployment in the Nation. What can it profit even the rich to get a tax reduction, the inevitable effect of which will be to produce more chaos in the world and reduce eventually the businessman's income and the worker's wage here at home?

But legislation which would provide homes so badly needed to the people of the country, which would give increased allowances and compensation to the veterans, which would add to old-age pensions, which would make possible decent health care for the Nation's people, which would raise the level of public education for America's children—yes, legislation which would further develop our natural resources, raise the minimum wage of the underpaid workers, give women for equal work equal pay with men, make available funds for adequate research in such killers as heart disease and cancer, and the like—languishes, little noticed, either in congression committees or on the calendars of the Congress.

Our foreign relations since the war have grown steadily worse, and I must say that many of the powerful and selfish interests of this country have done what they could to make them worse instead of better. We still have our isolationists, and, though they appear in one disguise or another, they have worked day and night, with every means at their disposal, to break up the unity of the Big Three which won the war to divide our one world into fighting fragments, to undermine and sabotage the United Nations and every effort to save the world from economic and political chaos, a new fascism, and war.

Not so long ago pressure from the privileged forced the President to weaken our Trade Agreements Act. While an international conference to lower tariff barriers and increase the volume of world trade was in progress at Geneva, initiated by us, the Congress passed the so-called wool bill to raise tariffs and impose quotas on wool coming into the United States. Now many of the spokesmen of the large financial interests of the country are telling us that we must reduce taxes and that we cannot afford to help Europe to get on its feet again. They are saying it is time for us to stop squandering our substance upon foreign people. Congress has yet given no assurance that it will support General Marshall even if Europe presents an acceptable plan of helping itself while asking help from us. On the contrary, many influential Members of Congress have said it was unthinkable for us to commit ourselves to any large or comprehensive plan of further foreign aid.

Foolish people urge us to start another war, not realizing that civilization cannot stand another war and that such a war will mean the utter collapse of what we call the capitalistic system in every nation in the world, including the United States. What we see, therefore, is a nation in the grip of a sentiment very similar to the one which followed the last war. We see a group in power which is the spokesman, not for the whole people but for the privileged few; a group which fails to understand what real democracy means in the United States and in the world; a group which cannot or will not see that the welfare of the masses of the people is the only key to the Nation's prosperity and security; and that America's role in the world is to lend its great God-given strength to the struggle of all other peoples striving to reach the kind of democracy we enjoy here.

The hope of America and the world is not less democracy but more. The people now have it in their power to have both prosperity and peace here and in the world if they will but demand it. With the immense resources at our disposal, with the techniques of modern science at our command, with the great genius of America to serve us, the people of America can have decent jobs, decent homes, decent schools, decent health care, and the private-enterprise system can flower beyond the dream of man, if the American people will but determine they are going to reach these goals and work together to achieve them. And we can do away with the burden of armament and the curse and threat of war, if we will stand with our full strength in the councils of nations and of men for that kind of democracy throughout the world and against any who threaten it or the peoples' peace.

I have faith in the people. I believe the people are just waking up here and throughout the earth to their responsibilities and their opportunities. The common man is on the march. He is determined to go forward, not backward. He not only believes there is a happy valley ahead; he will not stop until he reaches it.

Benefits of Missing Persons Act Should Be Extended to Filipino Veterans—Editorials in the Washington Post and the Evening Star Urge It—House Approved Bill; Only Senate Action Needed

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am including editorials of the Washington Post and the Evening Star, both urging the approval by Congress of the bill, H. R. 3191, extending the benefits of the Missing Persons Act to Filipino soldiers who were with our Army in the Philippines during the last war.

The House passed the bill on June 19; the Senate Committee on Armed Services reported it favorably on July 16; and it is now in the Senate calendar, with favorable action expected momentarily.

The bill should become law. It should be done in this session of Congress. It provides for the payment of back pay of Filipino soldiers that goes back to 1941.

Filipino economist and lawyer, Vicente Villamin, and his Filipino associates have been urging the passage of this bill. They emphasize its urgency and its simple justice. There is no question about the validity of the payment. There is no new appropriation required. But if the bill is not passed, the Filipinos will have to wait another year. They have waited too long already. As Mr. Villamin said, "The same number of Americans in the same circumstances would not have the admirable patience that the Filipino unpaid soldiers have exhibited all this time." So let us do them justice by approving the present bill before adjournment.

President Truman sent to Congress recently a bill giving Filipino veterans more benefits under our veterans' legislation. The bill will be taken up next year for lack of time this year.

With the enactment of that bill, it is expected that the whole Filipino veterans' question will be solved once and for all. It is hoped that Mr. Villamin will give his views and suggestions for the purpose of improving the bill on behalf of the Filipino veterans. What Congress wants is information given in simple and effective form. He could give it.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington Post of July 18, 1947]

FILIPINO PRISONERS

Before it adjourns we hope the Senate will take a few moments of its time to pass the bill extending benefits of the Missing Persons Act to members of the Philippine Army. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the War Department to resume back-pay settlements to Filipino soldiers for the period after they were taken prisoner by the Japanese in 1942. There is no question as to the legal obligation involved. The Philippine Army was part of the armed forces of the United States at the time of the Bataan surrender, and approximately 55,000 Filipino soldiers became prisoners of war. Some 2,500 back-pay claims had already been honored when the First Recession Act was passed by Congress early in 1946. In an effort to avoid giving Filipinos other veterans' benefits, Congress inadvertently tightened that act so as to nullify further expenditures for legitimate back-pay claims. The new legislation requires no additional appropriation. The War Department has ample funds among those already voted. All that is needed is congressional assent. We believe, therefore, that the Senate should without delay second the approval that already has been given by the House. This is a painless way to end the ill-feeling toward the United States that has been festering because of last year's slight.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 18, 1947]

OUR GOOD FAITH AT STAKE

A bill is pending in the Senate Armed Services Committee which should be reported out and passed before adjournment as a matter of good faith. So far as known there is no opposition to it. It is in danger, in the closing days of Congress, because it has been given no place on the leadership's legislative priority list.

During the war we followed the practice as a Nation of continuing the pay and allowances of men in the armed services who were, in line of duty, absent from their regular posts—such as prisoners of war. Filipino soldiers were included as Americans in this category. Many of those who stood with our forces on Bataan were captured, sent to prison camps, and some of them never came

back. The War Department adjudicated and met claims for arrears in pay (the Filipino private on Bataan drew $9 a month) of some 1,400 living Filipinos and about as many who were dead.

But in enacting the law which severed our ties with the Philippine Commonwealth and recognized the independence of the new Republic, restrictions were written into the statute barring further claims (with some exceptions) of Filipino veterans. The restrictions were interpreted as applying to the missing persons and that interpretation stopped the work, then in progress, of completing payments under the missing-persons law. The House corrected this mistake, for certainly it was a mistake, by passing unanimously and without debate the same bill which is now pending in the Senate Armed Services Committee, under which valid claims, under the missing-persons law, would be paid. But unless action is taken soon, the bill will perish from inaction.

The results would be unfortunate. The members of the Philippine Army were entitled to the same treatment as American soldiers, in respect of pay due them while missing. This was recognized by Congress, approved by the War Department. The present corrective legislation is recommended by the War Department. It is merely to meet a just obligation. The money involved is not nearly so important as the principle and if the principle is repudiated by inaction we shall unnecessarily raise, in the minds of the Filipinos involved, a question of good faith on the part of this country. It would require a minimum of effort by the Senate to dispose of this bit of unfinished business, with credit to ourselves.

Soviets Say "No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Catholic Action of the South:

SOVIETS SAY "NO"

Refusal of Soviet Russia to participate in the plan for the economic recovery of Europe is one of the most discouraging incidents of the postwar period, first, because of the apparent revelation and confirmation of Soviet attitude of opposition to an economic recovery, in keeping with Communistic policies of dissatisfaction and turmoil, and secondly, because of the division that may result among the nations of the world.

The latter fact is a most dangerous situation for the peace of the world. This, coupled with constant talk of another war, casts a pall of gloom over the world. The picture of the nations divided into antagonistic camps inevitably evokes the threat of war between the opposing groups.

The Soviet attitude in refusing to cooperate, when almost all other nations are agreed on this, and her willingness to allow demoralization and economic chaos to continue, must inevitably arouse bitter condemnation of the Soviets from the Christian and humanitarian standpoint. But adding to this the many incidents constantly revealed of communistic activities, infiltration and violence in one part of Europe after another, one can feel only concern and anxiety at what appears to be a well-set policy.

Well-meant efforts of our own leaders and those of other nations and patient negotiations seem to be of little avail. Our own Secretary of State Marshall seems to have reached the point of exasperation.

In the vision of Fatima, Our Blessed Mother referred to the conversion of Russia. We believe that a mighty appeal of prayer, particularly the rosary, for the Blessed Virgin's intercession, is in order right now, that peace may be preserved, and that we be spared the wrath of another war.

Loyalty Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Rees bill recently passed by the House has caused great concern. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix the remarks of George E. Reedy, of Station WOL, as follows:

The No. 1 subject of conversation in Washington today is the question of loyalty among employees in the Federal Government. It has been touched off by a report of the House Civil Service Committee that nearly 1,000 subversives have been dropped.

The firings took place during the 9-month period from July 1946 to the end of last March. They were confined to six agencies and, significantly enough, the largest number were in the War Department.

The report, as it appears in the headlines, is stunning. Even though the number involved is a tiny percentage of Civil Service, it is a shock to be told that many have worked themselves into the Government.

Yet the situation raises perplexing and disturbing questions to those who want to protect our American Government and also protect our liberties. It is not the sort of thing that can be forgotten in a few days.

It is impossible to read the report without asking one paramount question—a question to which there is no answer. It is: Just what is meant by subversion? Just what were the acts of disloyalty, for which these employees were fired?

In many instances the firings were described as cases involving communism. But there is no clear statement as to how the communism was involved. Were the employees party members? Were they fellow travelers? Or did they just have some Communist friends?

The public is entitled to know the answers. The milkman in Omaha, Nebr., should be told just why these people, whose salaries he paid, were dropped. All he can read in the headlines is that the Government got rid of some Reds and Pinks.

The second question that leaps to the forefront is why the agencies have suddenly decided to fire 1,000 subversives. It is obvious to anyone familiar with the present Washington scene that practically all these cases involved charges of communism.

There has been a Communist Party in the United States since the early 1920's. It is only recently that they have wormed their way into the Government. Or, is it only recently that the Government has decided to get rid of them?

No matter how that question is answered, the response is bound to be embarrassing to the administration that ordered the firings. Either Federal safeguards against subversion have been dropped, carelessly, or they have been dropped deliberately.

It is definitely a time for sober thought on the whole subject. We are faced with the grave danger of running to extremes. We can be too soft with Communists in protecting our civil liberties, or we can run wild and fire everybody in sight who has a few thoughts.

Sober thought can be brought about only by exposing all the facts to public view. Only then can we work out a firm and reasoned policy, which will truly protect our Nation from the Communists and from any other type of subversion.

Reduction of Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of July 18, 1947:

WHEN WILL THE TIME BE RIGHT, HARRY?

"The right kind of tax reduction, at the right time, is an objective to which I am deeply committed." (Harry S. Truman, June 16, 1947.)

President Truman, who on June 16 vetoed Congress' first effort to give us taxpayers some relief, is expected to take another shot at Santa Claus today. Over the yelps of 302 of our Representatives and 60 Senators, who for the second time voted to slice income taxes by $4,000,000,000 annually, Mr. Truman has announced that he will swing his veto again.

Such free-and-easy vetoing is, of course, a President's legal right, though there is some muttering that that particular constitutional power ought to be whittled down in the near future.

But our feeling right now is that our Presidents, when they use their current power to override the decision of the people's representatives, ought at least to give the citizenry a courteous and convincing explanation of how come.

Referring you to the Truman quotation at the head of this column, tossed at Congress in the first veto message, we submit that Mr. Truman has been courteous enough, but has been more mysterious than convincing.

Talking like a wise father to his nice but dumb kids, he merely told Congress and us Americans that papa knew best; this just wasn't the right time to lower any taxes—period. And to this day, as far as we know, neither Mr. Truman nor any of his mouthpieces has told anybody when we citizens can expect a bit of tax reduction, if ever.

We hope that Mr. Truman proposes to be more talkative about this question in the near future, although at his press conference yesterday he indicated that his veto message would be exceedingly short. If there are any good reasons why taxes can't be cut we think the American people can be trusted with the secret.

There are rumors, for instance, that some of the boys have quietly been figuring out the eventual cost of the Marshall plan for feeding and clothing Europe indefinitely.

TAX-CUT MYSTERIES?

This job will cost a lot of money, and if we take it on we'll probably get our taxes raised instead of reduced. But we think Mr. Truman ought to tell us if that's his main veto reason.

There are other theories, of course, which Mr. Truman might discuss in detail. Some of our gloomier administration characters

hint that we may be having a war any day, and shou'd hold on to our wartime tax rates, even though Great Britain and Canada have reduced theirs.

If, as may happen, the President simply chooses not to chirp about when that "right time" for tax reduction is going to arrive, some people might even begin to suspect that the "right time" may prove to be 1948—a Presidential year.

Just to clear up this political fog, and to give us taxpayers a little bit of hope, Mr. Truman ought to give us either a definite tax-reduction date or a good, full explanation, now.

National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 18, 1947:

TRAINING SCIENTISTS OR SUPPORTING BUMS?

Influenced by an assertion that Russia is trying to train 100,000 scientists, the House has passed a bill to put the Federal Government into the promotion and support of scientific research and training. The Senate has already passed a similar bill and a conference will adjust the differences.

The National Science Foundation is not going to go very far toward meeting any Russian challenge, assuming, as is unlikely, that the present academic system of the country is not more than capable of outdoing the Russians. The scientific leaders of the next generation are already on the college campuses and the only discernible menace to continued American leadership in the field is the activities of the conscription fanatics, who would draft these students or their younger classmates and send them across the world to be killed in some war cooked up by the Washington meddlers.

So far as the National Science Foundation is concerned, it is far more likely in the long run to produce 100,000 academic bums than it is to produce 100,000 scientists.

The House bill provides for a foundation of 24 eminent members, with a paid Director and various divisions concerned with different branches of science. The Foundation would develop a national policy of research and education. It would support research, and activity which people who have studied the bill suspect may be used to let the Government claim title to any important patents developed in the future. It would grant scholarships and fellowships, exchange information with other countries, and correlate the Federal program with that already being carried on by the educational institutions and commercial laboratories of the country.

It can be expected that initially the members of the Foundation will perform their duties conscientiously, as efficiently as the magnitude of the task will permit, and with little, if any, regard for politics. It can be expected with equal certainty that within a fairly short time the politicians will move in and science will flit out the window. A national program of scientific research and training of scientists can't be run like a rivers and harbors bill, and that is exactly how it will be run in due time.

If the Government buys the University of Chicago a new cyclotron, some cow college with a professor of electronics, who prepared himself for his career by repairing radios, will get after its Congressmen to get it a cyclotron. If scholarships are to be distributed, every Senator and Congressman will be on the alert to see that his State or district gets at least its share, regardless of the ability of the candidates or the competence of the institutions in that area to train scientists. That isn't going to put the United States anywhere in the field of science, but it is going to cost the Government and the taxpayers more and more every year.

Congressmen were influenced by stories of Russian programs in voting for this measure. The best argument against it, as a matter of fact, would be the experience of Russian science under the Government control, toward which the National Science Foundation is a step. In Russia, science is inextricably entangled with Communist politics. Scientists who dispute the theories of the political favorites are likely to find themselves carrying on their research with a pick and shovel in some Siberian labor camp.

The biologists have to adjust their discoveries to bolster Marxian economics. Directors of research institutions are expected to conduct their affairs to provide a maximum of material for Stalin's propaganda agencies. We have a few such phonies in this country, it is true, but nothing like the number we shall have once the politicians get into the control of the Science Foundation.

Statement by Jackson J. Holtz, Department Commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Jackson J. Holtz, department commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Boston, Mass., on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Jewish War Veterans March on Washington, in reference to their stand on Palestine:

DEPARTMENT OF
MASSACHUSETTS,
JEWISH WAR VETERANS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Boston, Mass., July 16, 1947.

CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Attached please find a copy of a statement by Jackson J. Holtz, department commander of Massachusetts, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, released to the press yesterday on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Jewish War Veterans March on Washington, which occurred July 15, 1946, in reference to our stand on Palestine.

Our stand has not changed, but has become strengthened. I am sure that you will be interested, as you have been in the past.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR J. TOYE,
Northeast Division Chief Marshal, July 1946 Washington Demonstration.

STATEMENT BY JACKSON J. HOLTZ, DEPARTMENT COMMANDER

One year ago today, thousands of Jewish War Veterans, representing posts throughout the country, converged on our Nation's Capital to protest British policy in Palestine and to urge our Government to use its good offices to secure immediate admission of 100,000 immigrants to Palestine.

One year later the Jewish War Veterans reaffirms its plea to the conscience of the world. Circumstances have become more unbearable, and the plight of the displaced persons makes more urgent the request, even as it has publicly been urged by the President of the United States.

Has the world become so callous as to let another year go by without sending the hapless peoples of the displaced-person camps to their promised land? We refuse to believe that the leaders of our Nation, great land that it is, can sit by content with mere resolutions and expressions of sentiment in the face of flagrant violations of moral ethics.

We refuse to believe that the world conscience will tolerate the collective punishments being inflicted on Palestinian Jews by their former ally, Great Britain.

On this day, therefore, we once again reaffirm our position. As Americans of the Jewish faith, having served our country in time and having sacrificed thousands of comrades in action, of need, we ask justice for our less fortunate brethren overseas.

As a matter of national honor the United States of America must stand by the promises for a Jewish national homeland made by every President of the United States from Wilson to date, the specific platforms urged by both major political parties, Congress after Congress, and solemn treaties to which this country was a signatory.

As veterans we must recognize the valiant fighting service of our Palestinian allies with its volunteer army fighting on the side of the democracies.

Poland: The Dreyfus Case of a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, through the activities of the officers and members of the Polish American Congress, Inc., western Massachusetts branch, information concerning Poland and its people is brought to the attention of thousands of American citizens every Sunday. On July 13 the speaker on their Justice for Poland program was the noted news analyst, lecturer, and magazine writer, Mr. William Henry Chamberlin, who spent many years in Europe as a foreign correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor. The title of his talk was, "Poland: The Dreyfus Case of a Nation."

I believe that the members of Congress will be interested in his address which once again forcibly portrays the cruel treatment accorded to a great nation and a brave people following the success of the Allied Nations, of which Poland was an outstanding and heroic member.

The address follows:

POLAND: THE DREYFUS CASE OF A NATION

(Broadcast by William Henry Chamberlin)

Poland was the first nation which took up arms against Nazi Germany. The Polish people did not stop fighting when German and Soviet forces, then acting in close cooperation, overran their country. The Polish

underground was one of the best organized and most effective in Europe. Hundreds of thousands of Poles fought for the United Nations cause on the western front, on land, on sea, and in the air.

Poland, as much as any nation, deserved an honest application of the Atlantic Charter principles to which America, Russia, and Britain all solemnly subscribed and which read as follows:

"Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

"They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

"They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Unfortunately these high principles have been crudely and flagrantly violated in the case of Poland. More than 40 percent of the territory of prewar Poland, including such historic Polish cities as Lvov and Wilno, has been annexed to Russia without any semblance of free plebiscite. And Poland is under the power of a made-in-Moscow government in which key posts are held by Moscow-trained Communist agents of Stalin. It was pledged at Yalta and Potsdam that the Polish people could hold free unfettered elections. But the only election which has been held in Poland since the war, last January, was pronounced a fraudulent farce by practically all the foreign observers who witnessed it. To Poland victory over Nazi Germany brought not liberation but subjugation to another totalitarian tyranny. Poland was one of the first and most glaring illustrations of the Soviet method of conquering peoples outside Russia's frontiers by a mixture of force and fraud, a method which President Truman has called dangerous to United States security.

One of the reasons why the American people acquiesced in the injustice which was inflicted on Poland, a gallant fighting ally, is that Poland was made the victim of an extraordinary campaign of misrepresentation of downright falsehoods and misleading half-truths. The case of Captain Dreyfus, the innocent French Jew who was unjustly condemned, has become a synonym for organized slander. The campaign against Poland might well be called the Dreyfus case of a nation. Facts were grossly distorted. Untruths were imprinted on the public mind through frequent repetition.

The motives of this campaign were mixed. Communist propaganda was active. There were considerations of supposed wartime expediency. General American unfamiliarity with east European history and politics made it easier to create a false picture. It is typical of the kind of biased information the American public was receiving about Poland during the war that a leading monthly selected as the author of the only two articles which it published about Poland an extreme and avowed Communist sympathizer, and refused to grant space for the presentation of a contrasted point of view. I shall now set down eight of the most familiar misstatements that were circulated about Poland during the war, and the reasons why each of these misstatements is a falsehood.

1. It was said that the Curzon Line was a fair impartial settlement of Poland's eastern border. But the Supreme Allied Council, when it proposed this delimitation on December 8, 1919, was thinking of a temporary demarcation line, not of a permanent frontier. This is proved by the Council's statement: "Rights which Poland may claim to territories situated to the east of this line are expressly reserved." The Soviet Government, in 1920, admitted that the Curzon Line was extremely unfavorable to Poland and renounced any claim to Polish territory east of this line on several occasions. It had no more legal or moral right to seize eastern Poland than it would have to seize Alaska, which once belonged to Russia.

2. It was said that the majority of the people living in the land east of the Curzon Line are Russians. Actually about one percent of these people are Russians. There were ethnic minorities in eastern Poland, as there are in Russia and in most countries of eastern Europe. But, in the absence of a free plebiscite, there is no reason to assume that these ethnic groups, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Jews, apart from a few Communists, would have preferred Soviet rule to Polish.

3. It was said that Poland unjustly took the territory which the Soviet Union claimed up to the Curzon line during the Soviet-Polish War of 1920. But when that war ended Poland obtained a less favorable boundary in the east than the line which the Polish Armies held when the war began, in April, a line which the Soviet Government was willing to accept as a basis of peace negotiations.

4. It was said that Poland before the war was a feudal country where titled aristocrats exploited and oppressed the peasants and owned most of the land. But Polish law recognized no titles of nobility, and over 80 percent of the farm land was in holdings of 125 acres and less.

5. It was said that the Polish Government-in-exile was an unrepresented group of landlords, aristocrats, and Fascists. As a matter of fact, there was not even one landlord or aristocrat in this Government. After the death of General Sikorski in an airplane accident the Prime Minister of this Government was Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, leader of the Peasant Party. The last Prime Minister was Tomasz Arciszewski, veteran Polish Socialist and leader in the underground struggle against the Germans until he was flown out to England. To call such men reactionaries is sheer nonsense or deliberate falsification.

6. It is said that all Russia wants in Poland and in the many other countries it has occupied in Europe is what America wants in this hemisphere, namely, friendly neighbors. This is an insult to the good-neighbor policy, to historical truth, and to common sense. Even before our good-neighbor policy went into effect there were no blots on our record in Latin America comparable with the Soviet action in imposing made-in-Moscow governments on countries which were occupied by the Red Army. Never in American history have we committed an atrocity comparable with that of the Soviet Union in dragging from their homes and deporting to slave labor under most brutal conditions over a million people from eastern Poland, of whom hundreds of thousands perished from overwork and starvation.

7. It is said that because Soviet troops drove the Germans out of Poland Russia had the right to annex as much Polish territory as it may want. By this curious line of reasoning America and Britain would be entitled to seize large parts of France and Italy. The war was a common enterprise. If the Red Army, with the help of Polish underground units, drove the Germans out of Poland, American, British, and Canadian lend-lease aid certainly helped to drive the Germans out of Russia.

8. It is suggested that because Poland's record in political democracy, social progress, and treatment of ethnic minorities before the war is open to criticism Poland has no right to exist as an independent state. This is a completely illogical position. For, if Polish standards of political and civil liberty were not those of the United States, Sweden or Switzerland, they were far above those of the Soviet Union, if one takes such reasonable bases of comparison as the numbers of people executed or imprisoned for political reasons in the two countries.

A good example of this contrast is provided by the fate of the polish Jewish Socialist leaders, Henryk Ehrlich and Viktor Alter. In so-called reactionary Poland these men, who made no secret of their radical social, and economic views, could sit in parliament and go abroad to attend Socialist congresses. It was the Soviet Government that put them to death after a secret trial, on the fantastic charge that they were spreading Nazi propaganda. Many Ukrainian nationalist leaders also lost their lives at the hands of the Soviet political police.

Imperfections of internal administration which Poland shared with other east European countries furnish no excuse for destroying the independence of a country that was the first to fight Hitler, especially when one finds these imperfections on a far larger scale in Russia.

It is time to make an end of this Dreyfus case of a nation. It is time to recognize that the reasons which were advanced for consenting to Poland's territorial mutilation and loss of liberty were based on falsehood and slander, much of it originating in Communist sources.

The abandonment of Poland's cause by America and Britain at Yalta was dishonorable, in the light of Poland's war record and the professed ideals for which the war was being fought. It was also a grave political blunder, and for two reasons. Poland is the key to eastern Europe. By subjugating Polish manpower and the manpower of other east European countries and regions with a total population of more than 100,000,000 the Soviet Union has gained an advantage in its struggle to conquer and communize all Europe.

Moreover, Germany is the heart of Europe. The reduction of Poland to the status of a Soviet vassal state makes it easier for Russia to apply overwhelming armed pressure on the eastern frontier of Germany. In order to achieve something like a fair balance between east and west in Europe anti-Communists should be as free to influence the political life of Poland as Communists are to influence the political life of France.

It may be that future generations, if not the present generation of Americans and Britons will pay dearly for the weakness, folly, and cynicism of the Yalta agreement. Recently President Truman struck a hopeful new note when he said, "Totalitarian regimes imposed on free people by direct or indirect aggression undermine the foundation of international peace and hence the security of the United States." Poland, under its present Moscow-sponsored rulers, is a glaring example of this kind of regime. The United States should make every effort to restore the freedom of Poland as an indispensable cornerstone of the freedom and prosperity of Europe.

Opportunity for Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Rear Adm. F. E. M. Whiting, United States Navy, retired, newly elected president of Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc.:

It is too early for one who is just coming into such a responsible position in this industry to do more than make clear his own convictions, as to the importance of the undertaking, and the opportunities which it offers to perform a national public service.

In the first place, I am convinced that the progressive, far-seeing men of this industry, who established LBI for the purpose of obtaining better public understanding and support are realistically sincere in their desire to do whatever is possible to accomplish that objective. I expect to undertake, and I am convinced that the leaders of this industry want me to undertake, a constructive program of action and information inside and outside the business that will enlist public support. In our efforts to bring about greater public knowledge and understanding of the licensed beverage industries, attention will be given to deeds as well as to words.

AN AFFIRMATIVE CONTRIBUTION

Secondly, I am equally convinced that the licensed beverage industries have made and are making an affirmative contribution to our Nation, to its people, and to its economy. In saying this I am fully aware of the social implications associated with the industries' products. Let me emphasize my belief that it is the abuse of the product and not its use that has clouded the vision of many well-meaning but misguided people. There is a real place for the products of this industry in the social customs and usages of this Nation. The many benefits of the use of this industry's products in moderation have not been fully understood nor brought home to the American people.

The broad objectives that Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., endorses are as follows:

(a) To expose and combat the false ideas that result in prohibition.

(b) To encourage sane liquor laws, their proper administration and complete observance.

(c) To foster the moderate use of licensed beverages.

SERVING THE PUBLIC WELFARE

The legal sale of alcoholic beverages has a rightful place in our way of life. The industry and its products, despite some of the problems which have received wide and occasionally sensational attention, are entitled to the same intelligent and unemotional judgments at the hands of the people as are given to other industries and other businesses.

There is no doubt in my mind about how most of the people of this country feel about this industry. They expressed themselves most forcefully in favor of a licensed industry in bringing about the repeal of prohibition. Under a system of sane liquor laws, completely observed, properly administered and effectively enforced, the public welfare is best served.

THE PACIFIST AND THE PROHIBITIONIST

The misguided advocates of prohibition can also be understood. As a group, they resemble most closely the pacifists of a generation or so ago who would have us scrap our preparedness programs. As an officer who has served through two World Wars, I am well acquainted with the arguments of the pacifists. There is an alarmingly close parallel between the arguments of the pacifist and the prohibitionist. If the ideas of the pacifists were followed, the United States would be in grave danger from the international gangsters, who, make no mistake about it, would be ready to take over if they could. If the prohibitionists' ideas were followed, we would return the United States to the local or national gangsters, who operated with such devastating effects during all of the prohibition years.

Because of the opportunity for service to the country, I have a great deal of enthusiasm for the job I begin today. Because of its high importance I approach it also with humility. The convictions I have tried to make clear have been strengthened in the past several weeks by observations of the many informed citizens to whom I have talked and who have given serious thought to this industry and its problems.

In the accomplishment of our objectives we will need the organized and vigilant support of everyone in this industry, including producers, distributors and the 165,000 retailers in this country, as well as the cooperation of liquor administrators, enforcement officials and the public. It will take considerable hard work, but I firmly believe that in the course of time, we, in LBI, can accomplish this mission.

F. E. M. WHITING.

JUNE 23, 1947.

Hope at Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Chicago Tribune of July 16, 1947:

HOPE AT LAST

Sponsored by Republican leaders, including Speaker MARTIN, a resolution authorizing the appointment of a committee to investigate foreign loans and gifts was introduced in the House in Washington yesterday. Under the proposal, a committee of 19 Members will be instructed to find out how much the United States can afford to send to Europe without material harm to our own economy.

The resolution will have the support of most of the Republican leaders and its adoption seems assured. As Mr. MARTIN put it, the Republicans in the House have come to the conclusion that they cannot rely upon the statements of European need and American capacity to fill it which come from Presidential advisers.

This is the most hopeful news that the American people have received in many months. The Republican majorities in Congress long ago refused to follow the New Deal leadership in domestic affairs, but in foreign affairs, the ascendancy of the New Deal has thus far remained unbroken. Mr. Truman, like Mr. Roosevelt before him, has gone unchecked. Now Mr. MARTIN promises that in this field, too, the Republicans intend to assert themselves.

It is high time they did. For many years the Republicans in Congress have been urged by us and others to spare themselves the ignominy of accepting the New Deal foreign policy in all its wickedness and folly. The advice was largely ignored. In consequence, the Republicans, with some exceptions, contributed to misleading the country on the worth of the worthless UN; made no clear issue of the ruinous and brutal Morgenthau plan; registered no protest against the absurdity of reposing faith in Russia's willingness to cooperate. On the contrary, the Republicans in Congress, under renegade leadership, seemed to take a perverse pride in supporting the bipartisan foreign policy concocted by the generals in the State Department and the Wall Streeters in the Cabinet.

Mr. MARTIN's announcement may foreshadow the end of this discreditable chapter. Much will depend, of course, upon the caliber of the men he appoints to the committee of inquiry. We may hope that among those chosen will not be such whited sepulchers as Chairman EATON of the Foreign Relations Committee or any other man who has been a party to every folly committed in the name of American foreign policy in the last dozen years.

The appointment of the committee will serve as a warning to the Europeans now meeting in Paris to temper their demands on us. It also will warn the State Department to present accurate facts and figures.

If the right kind of committee is appointed, the State Department isn't likely to get away with any more of its characteristic falsehoods. The propagandists of the Department succeeded in persuading the American people that UNRRA would solve Europe's problems. Then it was UN. Then it was the international bank. More recently it was the Greek-Turkish loan. At last the Republican Members of the House of Representatives appear to have learned the score.

Foot-and-Mouth Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, failure of the Federal Government to adopt a constructive plan of research in the campaign against the foot-and-mouth disease of cattle is one of the most menacing features to the campaign now being waged against the disease in Mexico jointly by the United States and the Mexican Government.

Despite two tragic and costly epidemics of the disease in this country some years ago, there has been no research or study of the underlying causes of the disease, or methods of cure. As a result, the disease has broken out in Mexico in epidemic form, and presents a very grave menace to cattle across the border in this country. American cattlemen are seriously concerned about the ability of those waging war on the disease to keep it on the other side of the border.

This epidemic in Mexico comes at a serious time. It is costing this Nation millions of dollars in our efforts to help the Mexican Government eradicate it so that our beef supply will not be curtailed or wiped out. Especially is this important in view of our efforts to supply food to many nations of the world, and still retain normal supply for our own use.

Millions of healthy cattle are backed up against the border in northern Mexico and some effort must be devised to process those cattle, many of which were purchased by the United States before quarantine went on. Plans are being studied for the killing and canning of healthy cattle held in Mexico by our quarantine, to be sold overseas. Unless some plan of disposing of the good beef is devised soon, serious consequences will develop for cattlemen. We are vitally concerned with this issue because there is no guarantee that cattle now awaiting disposition across the border may not

find some illicit way into the United States. Our Government should help find the means for processing that beef, and markets sufficient to absorb it.

In the infested areas of Mexico now thousands of cattle are being slaughtered and buried in trenches at a cost of millions to us and to Mexico. Infection has been traced to imported cattle. Brazil has waged a sincere campaign of research in an effort to find some means of combatting the disease. We should have participated in that research program and we might have been able to save ourselves some of the money now being used in an effort to fight the disease.

When the present campaign is brought under control I believe we will find it a source of economy to appropriate moderate sums for research in connection with other nations, and probably prevent spending fabulous sums periodically in an effort to curb the disease. My trip through the ravaged cattle areas of Mexico convinces me we will be fortunate if we can stop the disease before it has crossed the border. To do it we will have to spend large sums for the payment and killing of millions of diseased cattle.

It is my intention to recomend to the Congress an annual appropriation to participate with Brazil and other nations in a comprehensive program of research until the answer to this devastating disease is found. This current epidemic proves once again it will be money well invested.

Lecture by Francis P. Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following lecture given by Francis P. Miller, formerly colonel, GAS, at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., on April 28, 1947. It is a splendid statement by an outstanding American:

One of the many reasons why I am very pleased to be here is that it gives me an opportunity to pay a tribute to some of the recent graduates of this academy with whom I was associated or who served under me in the European theater during the year following the end of operations. These men were distinguished by intelligence, technical competence, sensitivity to their country's honor, and capacity for indignation at conduct which dishonored their country. I am sure that the academy will continue to send officers of this type into the Army during the years to come.

I have been asked to speak about military government in occupied areas. The only military government with which I am familiar is the Military Government of Germany from June 1945 to June 1946, but no doubt some of the things I say will be applicable to other occupied areas as well as to Germany.

It is, of course, too soon to make a final appraisal of our Military Government policy in Germany or of the execution of that policy. Much good work has been done, notably in supplying the German people in the United States zone with a framework of institutions by the use of which they may be able to learn something about the meaning of democratic society. The Germans are so essentially undemocratic in their outlook that it will take them a very long time to begin to understand what democracy is and how it works. They cannot be reeducated by anybody but themselves. But we have at any rate supplied them with the necessary procedures for political reeducation. It will be interesting to see whether they are able or willing to use them.

However, the good work accomplished has been hampered by a number of costly mistakes, three of which I shall mention:

1. For almost 2 years after the end of operations there were two headquarters in Germany instead of one—the theater headquarters and the military government headquarters. The result was duplication of staff, overlapping of function, waste of manpower, and a vast amount of unnecessary administrative confusion. In many instances the chain of command was none too clear, and nothing is more conducive to chaos than that. At long last this situation has been remedied by the recent merger of the two headquarters.

2. The point system of redeployment was handled so mechanically and unimaginatively that most of the officers who had been carefully trained for military government assignments and who had been sent to Europe early in order to be on hand when needed were ordered home in 1945 before they had really got started on their jobs. The result was that many important military government posts were filled by wholly untrained officers

3. Military government did not learn the lessons of the operational phase of the war regarding Intelligence, and neglected to organize a proper Intelligence Service for the collection of the political, economic, and social information necessary for the civil government of Germany. Trained staffs were allowed to disintegrate with the consequent loss of irreplaceable experience which these staffs had acquired the hard way. The result was that military government not only did not receive sufficient information about conditions in the United States Zone, but was for the most part uninformed about conditions in the Russian Zone and in the territories to the east.

Instead, however, of spending this hour in discussing occupation policy or the technical aspects of military government, it occurred to me that I could perhaps help you most if I said some of the things that in retrospect and in the light of experience I wish someone had said to me before I was assigned to duty with military government.

The first thing I should like to say is that every officer on occupation duty automatically assumes a new role, a role which has heretofore been associated more with diplomats and the State Department than with military men and the War Department.

Every officer now on duty in Europe or Japan represents the United States abroad. He cannot escape being a representative of America however much at times he might like to. Now representation is something more than complying with Army regulations. On occupation service the character of an officer, the moral factor, ceases to be a private concern of the individual and becomes a matter of national interest to this country. What we are as men, what we show ourselves to be in an occupied area, speaks so loud that Europeans and Asiatics can't hear what our Government in Washington says democracy is like.

As an officer assigned to military government you will represent the United States of America to the people of an occupied area. What is the U. S. A.? It is not just a Constitution, though we pride ourselves on having the most perfect Constitution that the mind of man has yet devised. Nor is the U. S. A. merely the place where the best machines in the world are made, though we know that to be a fact.

Well, what then is the U. S. A.? The U. S. A. is a particular kind of government and a particular way of life. Our way of life has its roots deep in the past. The soil out of which it has grown includes among its essential ingredients the traditions of ancient Greece, expressed for example in Pericles' oration over the Athenian dead, and the traditions of the Christian community as narrated in the New Testament. How many of you know the oration of Pericles? How many of you have learned by heart the Sermon on the Mount? Out of these ingredients was compounded another—our Federal bill of rights. (I almost said "our Virginia bill of rights," and if I had, it would not have been mere provincialism, because Virginia played a decisive role in the preparation and adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution.)

This is the soil out of which our institutions and our way of life have grown. The American way of life is not, of course, the way of life of all the people who live in this country. At times it appears that only a minority understand it, or believe passionately in it. But even so, it supplies the soul for our body politic. It is our most precious possession as a Nation, and it is destined to spread over the entire world. As a representative of the United States abroad an officer is obligated to try to understand the meaning of this way of life and to reflect it in his own personal conduct. That means being a Christian gentleman.

What is "a Christian gentleman"? It is essential for you and me to understand and put meaning into this phrase, since the very concept of a gentleman seems to be disappearing from the contemporary scene. A Christian gentleman is the end product of the American way of life. A gentleman is known by his instincts, his feelings, his tastes, his manners, his attitudes—and these traits cannot be acquired overnight. They can only be acquired by long and often painful training, cultivation, and self-discipline. The result of such training is a person sensitive to the interests of others, characterized by a spirit of fair play and decency, clean in mind and body—with a vein of iron in his character. That is a Christian gentleman.

Congress cannot make you gentlemen. I mention this because of an incident that occurred in Berlin while I was there. Some officers had been rebuked for a bit of particularly obscene vulgarity in a mess. The next day one of them was heard to remark: "He said we weren't gentlemen, but we are. Congress made us so." Congress can do a lot for you, but it can't do that.

It is the inner mind and spirit of a man that makes him a gentleman; what he believes about the nature and destiny of man; what he believes about his country and its place in the family of nations; and, most of all, what he believes about the purpose of creation and the ultimate nature of things.

The officers corps must be composed of such gentlemen if the United States is to be adequately represented abroad. It is your responsibility to make the concept of a Christian gentleman the distinctive mark of the officers corps and its most cherished tradition. The Nation will be indebted to you if you do.

Now to turn to the officer and his relations with others.

First and most important of all, there is the officer in relation to his men. The American boy is the best raw material in the world for military purposes. But there is a strain of the bum and the hooligan in him, too, and this makes the maintenance of proper discipline at times very difficult, par-

ticularly under the trying conditions of occupation service.

At the same time the GI will respond to an officer who is concerned for his welfare. By "concern for welfare" I do not mean going into a soldiers' club and throwing your arm around a GI for publicity purposes, as has sometimes been done. The GI is intelligent enough to see through such posing, and discipline is never improved by officers pretending to be "good fellows" with their men.

By "concern for soldiers' welfare" I mean genuine concern for the simple essentials—concern for the enlisted men's mess, for their billets, and for their recreation. The officer who cares more about how his men are eating than about how he eats, who cares more about how his men are billeted than about his own billet—such an officer will seldom have any serious difficulty with the problem of morale or even the problem of discipline, provided, of course, he is at the same time scrupulously fair and absolutely firm in matters that require disciplinary action.

You have heard reports about GI resentment of the so-called caste system. An effort was made to give the impression that this resentment had been created by the agitation of Communists and other subversive elements. The facts are that the Communists did not artificially fabricate or stimulate GI resentment against a caste system. Unfortunately situations did occasionally exist which justified such resentment, and it is true that the Communists were quick to move in and take full advantage of these situations. But the situations existed prior to Communist exploitation, and they existed wherever selfish and greedy officers were so preoccupied with looking after themselves that they paid insufficient attention to the welfare of their men.

There are of course other factors that contribute towards the creation of situations which the GI describes as caste. Some officers acquire over a period years a false sense of loyalty to the Officers Corps. Instead of being loyal to its highest traditions (and consequently critical of everything that dishonors those traditions) their false loyalty expresses itself in the attitude that the Officers Corps can do no wrong. This attitude breeds an intellectual crookedness and moral dishonesty in handling the just and reasonable complaints of soldiers and junior officers which contributes directly to the feeling among the men that there is a caste. The unconscious acquisition of this attitude as you grow older will be one of your greatest temptations. Resist it.

If you are assigned to military government in Germany your relations with the Germans will preoccupy you from the moment you report for duty. Their plight will naturally move you to pity. Be on your guard lest your pity permit the sentiments of the conquered to conquer you. To illustrate what I mean I will tell you a story. In August 1945 shortly after I arrived in Berlin I looked up one of my old German friends who was a well-known public figure and who was reputed to have worked with the plotters of July 20, 1944. It seemed to me nothing but ordinary human decency that I should look him up Our conversation began by my asking about the fate of mutual acquaintances, but we had not been talking more than 20 minutes when he abruptly said, "Colonel, what are you Americans going to do about the fate of Christian civilization?" Somewhat dazed by the dimensions of his question I replied, "Well, Doctor, I don't find much evidence of Christian civilization anywhere these days, but obviously we must all do the very best we can to save what is left.". "Oh," said he, "you misunderstand me; you Americans have a moral responsibility for destroying Christian civilization; after all, you armed the Russians, didn't you?" And this German had the effrontery to say that to me 3 months after the capture of Berlin. Not a word about what the Germans had done to western Europe. The Americans were to blame for all. That is the kind of poison—sometimes in far more subtle forms—to which you will be subjected as soon as you arrive in Germany.

You must constantly remind yourself who the Germans are and what they have done to the world. Remember that for 200 years the Germans have been turning more and more to the east, deserting western Europe and betraying their cultural heritage which since the ninth century has been the same as ours. Hitler's totalitarian methods and his secret police were essentially oriental ways of doing things—not occidental. Now that this final German rebellion against Europe and against Christian culture has been crushed, the Germans who survive wish to drag us down with them into the abyss. Never forget that many Germans (behind their facade of honeyed friendliness) hate us more than they hate any other people in the world because it is we Americans who, twice in one generation, have thwarted their schemes for world conquest.

With very few exceptions, Germans cannot be trusted. Given certain conditions they would gladly ally themselves with the Russians against us. Immunize yourselves to their fawning and cringing. Be meticulously courteous and fair, but always distant and cool in your relations with them. It may be several generations before they become dependable members of the western community again.

I don't know how many of you will receive assignments that will bring you in contact with the Russians. Perhaps very few. Be that as it may, I am sure that by now you all realize that our relations with Russia constitute our No. 1 problem.

Do not make the mistake of underrating the Russians. They are potentially one of the most formidable forces the world has ever seen. Why? Not primarily because of resources. Not primarily because of numbers. Primarily because the Russians are believers. The party members and top officials (civilian and military alike) believe profoundly in the Marxist doctrine and in the form of government and social institutions which they have erected on the basis of that doctrine.

Over a year ago a Russian general with whom we did business in Berlin sent for one of our officers who could converse fluently in Russian. Stalin had just made one of his major policy statements, and it appeared that this Russian general had been instructed to underline to his American colleagues some of the things that had been said. When the American officer entered the door, the Russian general said to him, "Colonel, have you read Karl Marx?" "Yes," replied the American. "Then," said the Russian, "you know what is going to happen in the world." Then you know what is going to happen in the world." Think of the assurance, of the self-confidence, of the arrogance in that sentence. After that the Russian general proceeded to expound the Marxist theory of history for the space of 2 or 3 hours—not without numerous skeptical interpolations from the American colonel.

This incident gave me profound food for thought. I wondered how many officers there were in the American Army who might, under certain circumstances, send for a Russian officer. I wondered whether I had the stuff under comparable circumstances to send for a Russian officer, and when he came in to ask him, "Colonel, have you ever read the American Bill of Rights or the New Testament?" He would reply, "I never heard of these documents," and I would say, "Then go, and find copies, and read them, and they will tell you what we believe about the purposes behind this world, and what we believe about man and his destiny on this planet, and what we believe about the way man is supposed to live—a way of life that someday will spread over the whole world, including the USSR." Did I believe in my way of life enough to say that to a Russian officer? Did I? I found it rather humiliating to have a Russian teach me such a lesson.

But it is a lesson we all need to learn, for the fact is that there can be no real cooperation between the Russians and ourselves. Cooperation, if it means anything, means a joint operation in the interest of a common end. But the ends that we seek are different. Our philosophy of life cannot be reconciled with theirs. In Russia party members believe that man is made for the state. In America the great tradition we have inherited affirms that the state is made for man. Between those two views no compromise is possible or desirable.

The best we can hope for in our present relations with the Russians is the maintenance of an equilibrium of power such as General Marshall is trying brilliantly to establish (the maintenance of an equilibrium through the United Nations and by unilateral action when necessary), trusting that with the passage of time Russia may lose some of her crusading zeal for a world Communist state. But meanwhile we must be prepared for anything.

In the course of occupation duty, some of you may have the good fortune to be thrown with the British or the French. Never forget that they are our closest and most valued friends and neighbors. They are fellow members of our common North Atlantic society which is the present trustee of Greek, Roman, and Christian culture. Their customs and institutions grew out of the same soil as ours. Behind the facade of superficial differences their basic interests are the same as ours. If you have the opportunity, get to know French and British officers. Cultivate their acquaintance, and create as much good will as you can among them for this country. We have needed their help before. Some day we may need it again.

And now I would like to make some random comments on odds and ends.

Something needs to be done about the officers' mess in our Army. It represents an unused—sometimes a misused—asset of great potential value. It can be a most effective means of maintaining morale and setting proper standards of conduct. It would be possible to organize an American mess so that, in addition to eating and drinking, officers who desired to do so might find a quiet place to read or write or play games or even converse with a friend. Good conversation is an art in itself. It is an art from the practice of which many of our messes would greatly benefit. The service itself would also benefit if officers learned to combine with their normal mess life intelligent conversation regarding their military duties and problems. Perhaps some day some of you may be mess officers and have a chance to do something about this.

Avoid the black market as if it were the black plague.

Watch your drink—especially with the Russians. I speak from experience.

And I cannot end without saying a word on behalf of intelligence. In modern war, intelligence is essential to successful operations. When we began the Second World War we had very few trained intelligence officers, and the organization of our intelligence was unequal to the demands made upon it. Consequently, in the early days of the European theater we naturally had to lean heavily on the British. By the end of the war, in some phases of intelligence we were as good as the British—here and there we were even better. But as soon as the war was over we—characteristically—proceeded to forget much of what had been learned. We dissipated

trained personnel and squandered our experience. It is still assumed by the high command that any good officer is good enough for an intelligence assignment, even though he may never have had any previous intelligence experience. This is not so. Intelligence requires special aptitudes and long training. I trust that some of the ablest cadets here will try for intelligence assignments and will continue to be interested in intelligence as long as they are in the Army.

The position of our intelligence in this war was very much like the position of our field artillery in the First World War. In 1917 our field artillery was far behind the field artillery of England and France. Realizing this deficiency, some of our ablest officers became artillery conscious, and by the Second World War the performance of American artillery surpassed that of every other nation. The same transformation is needed for our intelligence. Become intelligence conscious.

In conclusion. What is your highest loyalty? Not to the Officer Corps, devoted as you are to it. Not even to the Army under whose authority you serve and whose orders you obey. Your highest loyalty as an officer is to what the United States stands for as a Nation and to the way of life in which we as Americans believe. That loyalty must infuse and inspire all your other loyalties and transform you into the kind of officer your country requires.

The sap of our American Tree of Liberty is faith. There have been signs recently of blight on the tree, and some of its fruit is sour and rotten. That is evidence that the sap is not rising as it should. What is the extent of your faith? Do you really believe in America and in its way of life? If you do, we need have no fear for the future. The sap will rise again, the blight will disappear, and the fruit will become sound and sweet. And if in the years ahead it should ever happen that the storm returns and the tempest once more rages, the tree will not crash before the blast. It will stand, because of your faith.

These are some of the things that I wish someone had told me before I was assigned to duty with the Military Government.

Article by Herman A. Lowe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS L. OWENS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Herman A. Lowe:

TODAY—HOW UNIONS LOBBY; WHITNEY TELLS ALL; FOOD FOR CONGRESSMEN; PUBLICITY FUND SOUGHT, TRAINMEN BALKING

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, July 16.—How a labor union goes about the job of lobbying in Washington and what it spends are generally considered union secrets. However, a peek behind the scenes has just been given by handsome, whitemaned, old A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Whitney is a blunt fellow with a low boiling point. This bluntness has led him to rip aside a portion of the blue denim curtain with which labor normally conceals such operations.

Whitney's bluntness, you will recall, achieved Nation-wide headlines in May 1946. That was when he announced he would spend the whole $47,000,000 in the union treasury to beat Mr. Truman for reelection, after the President had smashed the railroad strike. It made the country mad and had other unions explaining apologetically that Whitney was no mouthpiece of theirs.

Subsequently the trainmen boss cooled off and shaved his purge kitty to a mere $2,500,000. Still later the whole thing petered out. This time Whitney has come to a boil in an intraunion row with two trustees of the union funds who are balking at his proposed extracurricular lobbying expenses over and above what it costs the trainmen to support its five registered lobbyists—more politely known as legislative representatives.

Whitney has carried his case, in a circular letter, to the delegates to the union's last convention, letting down his hair and listing some of the brotherhood's lobbying enterprises. He explains that he was out to block what later became the Taft-Hartley Act and did not care what it cost. He apparently spent about $25,000 over and above routine lobbying activities, but is irate because he wanted to go much higher and was blocked.

Some of the items are interesting:

On March 12 last, Whitney spent $246.50 to feed 41 Republican Members of Congress at the Mayflower Hotel. The following evening he took another $199.70 bite out of the expense account to provide victuals and refreshments for 35 Democrats.

"Most of our guests," Whitney explains in his letter, "were serving their first term in Congress and they were delighted to have an opportunity to be informed upon the brotherhood's program, and its attitude toward the labor bills pending in Congress. This action was a forward step of great value in our public relations program."

Not content with feeding the inner man, Whitney also provided the Congressmen with $17 worth of Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen pencils, and later distributed $62 worth of pictures taken at the dinners.

Another step in the campaign was hiring Walter J. Munro, former conciliator with the United States Department of Labor as a public relations representative. For 3 months from March 1 to May 31, Munro was paid a total of $3,170 in salary and expenses. Adding to Brother Whitney's wrath, because it is still unpaid, is another $137.95.

The union chief notifies the ex-convention delegates that trustees E. C. Bassett and B. J. Baumberger "objected to reimbursing Walter Munro, our public-relations representative in Washington, for the cost of dining Members of Congress, press representatives, and other influential persons connected with labor legislation. As early as January 6, 1947, I recognized that we would have to spend some money for this purpose.

"Since the time of our national legislative representative (registered lobbyist Harry See) was largely consumed at his office, he delegated Munro to make contacts for him, and under every rule of reason and decency, Munro should be reimbursed for money spent in dining these Representatives." Harry See's bill for entertaining Congressmen and others" appears to have been paid.

Whitney also listed salary and expenses for a law firm of Miller and Hornbeck. He explains this "has reference to contacts made by Hornbeck with influential Republicans in the Congress, urging them to proceed cautiously in the matter of adverse labor legislation."

Whitney also wants to create a Public Affairs Research Institute. It would be financed by the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen and anybody else who cares to kick in. Whitney originally figured it should cost $100,000 a year and wanted his union to carry it alone until such time as others should see the light and contribute.

"Its objectives," explains Whitney to the brothers, "would be to provide essential data on matters about which policy is to be made and to high-light the real policy issues and alternatives involved in the maze of political jockeying by serving friendly Members of Congress, participating labor unions, progressive religious and other groups with basic background memoranda on pending legislation affecting labor."

After talking it over with Philip Murray, CIO president, Whitney shaved the initial budget to $40,000, but the recalcitrant brothers Bassett and Baumberger once more said "thumbs down." This was embarrassing for Whitney who had already hired Dewey Anderson, former top Government economist, to head the institute. So Whitney took Anderson over on the brotherhood pay roll at $1,000 per month and gave him half a dozen assistants to work with.

Whitney also retained Charles Kramer. He explains in his letter: "Kramer was highly recommended by Senators HARLEY M. KILGORE and CLAUDE PEPPER, and I was advised through other sources that he was a capable writer and research specialist. His services were terminated due to trustee Bassett's vehement protests."

Whitney is now conducting a mail ballot among the union delegates, seeking approval for his Washington program, including the expenditure of $40,000 for the research institute.

Representative THOMAS L. OWENS (Republican of Illinois) has wondered aloud in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD why Whitney should spend $25,000 or more "in lobbying against legislation (Taft-Hartley bill) which specifically excludes any and all persons who are subject to the Railway Labor Act." The letter does not throw any light on this point.

OWENS also points out that Whitney's itemized expense lists refer to specific instances of lobbying by persons not registered with Congress in accordance with the Lobby Registration Act. He thinks it is time for the proper Government authorities to look into such matters.

National Security Act of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to strong support advanced for the armed forces unification bill by the executive committee of the Army Ordnance Association in a recent meeting. The action of the committee follows:

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, ARMY ORDNANCE ASSOCIATION, MARCH 12, 1947

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

The president proposed the consideration by the committee of a draft of a proposed bill now before the Congress of the United States, entitled "National Security Act of 1947." There was unanimity of viewpoint by members of the committee that the proposed bill contains many desirable provisions, notably those in respect of the formation and functions of (a) War Council, (b) Joint Chiefs of Staff, (c) Joint Staff, (d) Munitions Board, (e) Research and Development Board, (f) National Security Council, (g) Central Intelligence Agency, and (h) National Security Resources Board.

The national need for these planning agencies and for the integration of military policy with foreign policy is urgent. The autonomy of the respective armed services—Army, Navy, and Air Force—is not infringed upon. Accordingly, the committee recorded unani-

mous approval of the provisions of the proposed bill. It also unanimously agreed to transmit its views on this subject to the presidents of all posts of the association with the request that the governing bodies and members of posts study the subject and report their concurrence to the committee at the earliest practicable date.

Lecture by Mr. Antoine Gazda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, during the war the State of Rhode Island made an outstanding record of production. One of the great contributors to its success was Mr. Antoine Gazda, a native of Austria although now a citizen of Rhode Island. He was a flyer in World War I, well known for his armament and aviation inventions. He revolutionized aviation when he brought out the first jet-propelled helicopter 3 years ago.

On April 22 of this year he delivered a lecture before the American Society of Civil Engineers and the Rhode Island Society of Professional Engineers. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, gentlemen, it certainly is a great honor for me to be with you tonight, and I was happy to be able to accept Mr. Blais' kind invitation to address this distinguished gathering.

Not being much of a speaker, and my Austrian mother tongue still struggling with my English, I felt a little uncomfortable when Mr. Blais asked me to address you. As a matter of fact, I felt like the Duke of Wellington before the Battle of Waterloo, when he was asked what his chances were and what he thought about his generals; he answered, "When the enemy is as afraid of my generals as I am, then I shall win the battle." And he did.

Another problem for me was the subject on which to speak to you.

Being in New England, the cradle of the great American industry, and having myself been connected for a life-time with patents and industry, I decided to talk to you about New England industry, particularly in Rhode Island, where I settled in 1940 to organize a new branch of industry.

You may be interested to know why I chose Rhode Island.

I came to this State in 1940, although this was not my first visit to America. As a matter of fact, I had been here eight times before, each time fascinated anew by the tremendous and exciting strides in ideas and production methods made by America's justly famous engineering talent. I was already very familiar with American mass production—especially in the automotive and aviation industries, in which I had many friends, having previously visited their plants from the east to the west coast.

When I flew to the United States in May 1940, a few weeks before the collapse of France, I carried with me all the manufacturing drawings of the 20-mm. Swiss Oerlikon cannon. This new weapon had by then been recognized by the British as the right answer to the dive-bomber, against which they were now engaged in a life-struggle, and it was my intention to organize the production of this cannon in the United States for the British Admiralty. After my arrival in 1940 I traveled all over the States, renewing my friendship with industrialists, Wall Street bankers and Government officials, and trying to interest them in the manufacture of this weapon, or parts of it, for the British.

To my astonishment, I discovered, during this visit, that this big, highly industrialized country—America—famous for its mass production, as a peace-loving Nation had the smallest defense industry, in proportion to its size and resources, that I had ever come across. In fact, for its gun models it was almost entirely dependent upon foreign designs and licenses. Switzerland, the oldest democracy in the world, is also well-known as a peace-loving nation, though a small one, but I found that in America there was not one armament factory organized and equipped in a manner to compare with our Swiss-Oerlikon Works. There were practically no machine tools to be had for immediate use for armament work. There was only a minimum percentage of toolmakers and skilled workers for armament work. This situation, of course, was not favorable for my program. However, I was not discouraged by all these setbacks, and proceeded with my plan, as I wanted to fulfill the promise I had given to the British Admiralty when I warned them of the collapse of France—that I would insure delivery of Oerlikon cannons from America. When the unbelievable happened, and France did fall, the Swiss Oerlikon Works were, of course, no longer able to deliver to England, and my purpose was to hasten production here of the 20-mm. Oerlikon AA cannon which the British fleet now needed so urgently.

I had heard about New England's machine-tool and textile-machinery industries. Also Governor William Vanderbilt of Rhode Island had heard of my presence in this country and of my plans. He sent Mr. William Allen, chairman of the industrial commission of the State of Rhode Island, to New York to invite me for a visit to Providence. This visit soon convinced me of the skill of New England's labor and its adaptability to my plans. A large proportion of the plants and shops in Rhode Island were at that time idle, and my idea was that these would form an excellent basis for the American production of Oerlikon cannons. I made headquarters with the Rhode Island Industrial Commission, who furnished me with a desk in its offices, and I immediately went to work, with the assistance of the secretary of the commission, Mr. Clifton N. Lovenberg, and Mr. Cockrell, consulting engineer of the commission, to locate production capacity for this cannon in Rhode Island.

Before I left Switzerland, the Swiss Oerlikon Works had shipped a 20-millimeter Oerlikon antiaircraft cannon, as a prototype to the United States. Unfortunately, this cannon never reached the United States, as it was captured on the boat in Bordeaux by the Germans when they overran France. Nevertheless, I was able to arrange with the British Admiralty to bring another Oerlikon cannon to the United States by destroyer, and when this cannon reached New York I shipped it immediately to Providence. As soon as the Oerlikon arrived here, I contacted Gen. Herbert R. Dean, then in charge of the Rhode Island National Guard, and asked for his assistance. General Dean gave me his full cooperation, and placed at my disposal the State Armory in Cranston, where this Oerlikon cannon was exhibited, under heavy guard, so that interested manufacturers might be able to compare our drawings with the actual parts.

I invited Rhode Island manufacturers to view the cannon and drawings, and discussed their possibilities of manufacturing parts for this cannon. When I realized the favorable potentialities existing in Rhode Island, I instructed one of our Swiss Oerlikon engineers, Mr. Lameraner, whom I had left in London, to come to Providence to assist me in establishing the subcontracting organization for producing this gun in Rhode Island.

I am happy to say that here in Rhode Island I received a great deal of eager and active cooperation in my plans. However, among other obstacles—which I found particularly in Washington—I had to overcome resistance from Rhode Island sources which had no sympathy with Britain's war, ignoring the possibility of this country's being involved, and showing little appreciation of the danger the world was facing in those days. I also had opposition from sources which did not care to see competition in Rhode Island labor market.

Finally, it was in this little State of Rhode Island that I had the privilege of transforming idle workshops and textile-machinery plants, in the shortest time, into important participants in the foundation of what was to become a gigantic United States armament industry. In spite of the lull existing in those days, it was the traditional fame of New England's industry that brought me to this progressive State of Rhode Island 7 years ago.

When Gov. J. HOWARD MCGRATH took office, he asked a friend of mine to arrange a meeting with me. When I met the young Governor, he complimented me on what I was doing to improve the economic status of the State, and for the Allied war effort, and urged me to call on him directly in any matters in which he could be of assistance. From that time onward he was my keenest supporter in all I did for the Allied war effort.

With its traditional industrial spirit, Rhode Island proved equal to the task when, 18 months before Pearl Harbor, I started there mass production of the now-famous 20-millimeter Oerlikon antiaircraft cannon for the British Admiralty

Soon came the terrifying news of the fall of France—which I had foretold, which everyone had refused to believe, and which was the reason that brought me to America this time. The Nazi occupation of France made it impossible for Switzerland to continue deliveries to England, and the British Government immediately sent me a hurry-up call to investigate the possibilities of speediest delivery of Oerlikon cannons from America. The British had by now learned by tragic experience of the danger of air power. They had seen the terror of the dive-bombers, which had devastated Poland and Belgium, and which had sent many of their own ships to the bottom of the sea. No longer did the British ridicule the danger from the air to ships, as they did in 1936, when I developed this Oerlikon cannon model and proposed it as the only defense against the coming dive-bomber.

You will be interested to hear that it had taken me almost 3 years to convince the British Admiralty of the necessity of this new antiaircraft defense. During the years 1937, 1938, and 1939, I had to fight against many skeptical ordnance experts to get this powerful cannon introduced into British Admiralty service. Most of these experts felt that the mighty battleships and destroyers of the Royal Navy could easily cope with any threat from the air, and that they had nothing to fear. Some even relied on their mighty 16-inch cannons. My records of those years show that it took me 238 meetings with the Admiralty officials, during 380 days' stay in England, to accomplish the introduction of this defense which they came to need so desperately.

In my efforts to convince the British Admiralty of their need of this new armament

against the coming dive-bomber, I was fortunate in having the support of Lord Louis Mountbatten—then a commander in the Royal Navy—who was one of the first to recognize the significance of this powerful new defense, and who gave me his unceasing assistance and encouragement. It was he who arranged so many of my important meetings and who accompanied me on my visits to influential officials. Indeed, it was largely due to Lord Louis Mountbatten's foresight and persistence that the British Admiralty finally accepted the Oerlikon cannon as antiaircraft defense. He even came to America at the beginning of 1941, and, on the basis of his own battle experiences as commander of destroyer flotillas, convinced the United States Navy of the fact that the Oerlikon cannon was the best defense against the Axis dive-bomber. Throughout those difficult years of struggle, I was indeed grateful to have Lord Louis' support. I am happy to say that during that time there developed between us a real friendship, of which Lord Louis gave ample proof during a temporary period which was for me personally a dark and critical one. Only a few months ago we met again, in happier circumstances, in Switzerland, when now Admiral Viscount Mountbatten of Burma had to interrupt his skiing holiday to obey the order he had just received to assume the difficult task of being the last Viceroy of India.

When America entered the war, little Rhody was ready for Uncle Sam, and was able to shift its Oerlikon cannon production for the British Admiralty to the United States Navy. The Oerlikon cannon was immediately adopted as America's best defense against dive-bombers and Kamikazes. Everything afloat in the Allied navies—from the humblest fisherman's boat to the mighty *Queen Elizabeth* (which carried 80 Oerlikons)—had to be equipped with 20-millimeter Oerlikon AA cannons. My Rhode Island organization, the American Oerlikon Gazda Corp., whose mass production was by then in full swing, also had to help to tool up the General Motors and the United States Navy Hudson plants, as well as numerous subcontractors for the speediest manufacture of Oerlikon cannons for the United States Navy.

Now it may be revealed that over 460,000 men and women were employed in making this 20-millimeter, rapid-firing, antiaircraft cannon in the United States during the war, and on this Oerlikon program alone the United States Government spent over $2,800,000,000. Rhode Island itself produced $187,000,000 worth of Oerlikon cannons.

These figures show, not only how vital to the war effort this Oerlikon cannon proved to be, but also what an important contribution to that effort was made by Rhode Island industry.

I believe I am not wrong in saying that some of the gentlemen here tonight have contributed a significant share to the production of this cannon in Rhode Island.

As industry is so obviously dependent on invention, and as many new industrial ideas first saw the light in New England, I should like to say a little about inventions.

Everyone realizes that it is to American inventive genius that the prosperity of this great country is so largely due; the names of some of great American inventors—Edison, Steinmetz, the Wright brothers, Henry Ford, and others—are a proof of this. The American mode of living, economically and socially, is and always will be influenced by the achievements of inventors and scientists; indeed, the course of the whole world's progress will depend upon the achievements of such men. Unfortunately, those responsible for guiding the world's destiny do not always recognize this. For example, when the San Francisco Conference tried to shape the postwar world—a world of peace—they came to the anachronistic conclusion that the key to a peace guaranty would be a strong air force. In so doing they neglected to take the scientists into account, and it was not long afterward that they were shocked into realization of the power of the scientists. The atomic bomb was released, demonstrating a force whose significance had been entirely disregarded by the United Nations representatives at San Francisco, and on which the nations of the world have still been unable to agree. A new problem has been posed, and its solution will unquestionably be a major factor in the shaping of the world's future, whether for peace or for war.

We know that inventions contribute to progress, and lead to the creation of new employment opportunities, but for an inventor to be successful, those three great characteristics—intelligence, courage, and determination are indispensable, as from idea to production is a long and thorny path, and not every inventor has lived to see his brain child materialize.

As an inventor first of all looks for protection of his invention by a patent, it may be of interest to recall how the early American inventor was protected.

It was under President George Washington that Congress passed an act, in 1790, for the granting of patents to inventors. The Secretary of State in those days was authorized by the President to perform this office, and it is known that, during the George Washington administration, Thomas Jefferson, in his capacity as Secretary of State, personally examined and granted many of the petitions for patents. At that time petitions for patents were accompanied by a model of the invention, and not merely by a drawing and a description, as is the case today.

So it was in the year 1790 that the American inventor was first protected by a United States patent. With the granting of patents, American inventive genius was encouraged. The year 1790, so important for the American inventor, was also important for the industrialization of America, in which New England has played such a noteworthy part. It was in that year that Samuel Slater started to run his first spinning machine in the Slater Mill in Pawtucket, and by so doing he laid the foundation for the now gigantic American textile industry in this smallest State of the Union.

Only 4 years later Jefferson issued a patent for the cotton gin, the machine for separating the seeds from raw cotton, which, in the truest sense of the word, revolutionized the United States.

American industry is still in search of new ideas for production, and before the end of the war, as recently stated by the Commissioner of Patents, industry checked over two and one-half million inventions, patented since 1790.

Some of these inventions, so ingeniously, painstakingly, and precisely contrived, have been fated to lie dormant for a long time, to be hailed as something new and startling when rediscovered years later. Our old patent for the zipper, for instance, granted in 1893, remained practically unknown to the general public until comparatively recently, and the same is true of many ideas which have contributed to the smooth running of American life and industry.

The helicopters, jets, rockets, and other sensational developments, which have revolutionized their spheres in the twentieth century, were invented long, long ago.

Rockets were successfully used by the ancient Chinese thousands of years ago. Jet propulsion, a sensation in the field of modern aviation, was invented by the Alexandrian philosopher, Hero, in the pre-Christian era, and was again demonstrated, in the seventeenth century, by the English mathematician, Sir Isaac Newton.

The helicopter was invented by the great Italian artist and inventor, Leonardo da Vinci, who designed and even built a model of a helicopter 400 years ago. That versatile genius was responsible for originating more devices than he could launch in his lifetime, and which we now take for granted as part of our everyday existence.

It's the same old story—there's nothing new under the sun, but a new application of an old idea will awaken people to the value of that idea.

Two or three years ago I was thrilled to learn that there was to be an auction in New York of 20,000 early American patent models, and for a number of reasons I was keenly interested. In the first place, having myself trod the thorny path of the inventor for over 30 years, I thought I could appreciate what a story of enthusiasm, hope, and often bitter disappointment those records could tell. Secondly, I saw in those models contributions of that American inventive genius to which the prosperity of this great country owes so much.

Having a profound admiration for these models, I tried to obtain some of them. My interest was intensified when I learned that the models to be auctioned included some from early inventors of New England, and particularly Rhode Island. Therefore, I was anxious to bring them back, if possible, where they belonged—that is to say, to the State of Rhode Island. Fortunately I was able to secure 35 of these early patent models, all of them invented by Rhode Islanders. Eight of these models, apart from their historical value, are of particular industrial interest to the State of Rhode Island, being closely identified with the great American textile industry, the cradle of which is Rhode Island. I brought these models to Rhode Island, repaired them, put them into working order, and awaited a suitable occasion for presenting them to their native State. I found such an occasion when, on December 13, 1944, the United States Alien Property Custodian exhibited alien patents in the Providence Public Library. At that time I had the honor of presenting to the State of Rhode Island these 35 historical models of early Rhode Island inventors, and they were graciously accepted by Gov. J. Howard McGrath. They were placed on permanent exhibit, as an incentive to present and future Rhode Island inventors to contribute further to the progress of New England industry.

As I said a little while ago, almost all inventions have to suffer obscurity for a time and experience a rebirth before their value is recognized. I am certain, however, that this will not discourage inventors from continuing to strive for improvements in American industry, and especially for progress in New England. No amount of discouragement or disappointment—material or spiritual—can quench the spark when an inventor has faith and inner conviction in his idea—when he feels that he has something to offer which, in one way or another, will prove to be an advance in our civilization. Indeed, with the all-round acceleration which we, in our generation, have witnessed—especially in the last decade—inventors of today can surely hope that their aspirations will be reached much sooner than those of their predecessors. Whilst the pioneer spirit of New England is necessarily tempered with wise caution, there is today a keener desire than ever, on the part of industry, to find new, forward-looking ideas. It is the men of vision who always have and always will form the real backbone of any nation's progress, and when that vision is supported by specialized training and the keen business sense for which New England is famous, satisfying rewards may be confidently expected.

The end of the war found New England eager to induce new, out-of-State industries to replace the mushroom growth of heavy war industries, and in Rhode Island the industrial commission made tremendous efforts to bring such industries to us here.

Such plants, however, although the location on the waterfront and waterways may

look attractive for transportation and export, do not appear to me as suitable for New England. This region has no steel mills, nor coal mines, nor any of the basic requirements necessary to support a mass production program in competition with other, more favorably endowed regions.

I do see New England's successful future guaranteed by its traditional specialization in quality and skill, as proved so well in precision tooling, textile machinery, jewelry, and similar industries. Adhering to this principle, New England industry will solve the difficult problem of successful competition with other industrial States in the Union.

Thank you.

What About Immigration?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter headed "What About Immigration?" written by Merwin K. Hart, president of the National Economic Council, Inc.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ABOUT IMMIGRATION?

Should America let down the bars to a large fresh wave of immigrants—regardless of what they are?

Is our country under a moral duty to give refuge to hordes of refugees uprooted by the war? Would it be in the interest of our people? Would it be in the interest of the future well-being of the world?

These questions have been raised by the Stratton bill, designed to modify our present immigration policy by admitting 400,000 quota immigrants.

First, let us ask:

Why is the United States?

What is the purpose for which our Republic was founded, and for which it has been maintained? As the French would put it—what is its raison d'etre?

Underlying the thinking of those who believe we are under a moral obligation to give refuge to all the world's oppressed, is a certain assumption as to how this question should be answered. More often than not it is a hidden assumption—of which even the advocates of mass immigration may be unaware. But it is always present. This hidden assumption is: (1) That the primary purpose for which the United States exists is to serve as the world's refuge and asylum; (2) that if there are secondary reasons for the founding and maintenance of our Republic, they cannot give rise to duties which would be higher than the duty of providing this refuge and asylum.

At first sight this may seem exaggerated. But a closer examination will reveal it is simply accurate. The notion that America is under a moral duty to receive the world's unfortunate, regardless of practical effects, rests squarely on the proposition that America exists primarily for their sake, and not for the sake of the people who already live here. Upon no other ground can it be pressed upon us as a moral issue. Yet who can doubt that the propaganda disseminated in support of mass immigration has been skillfully addressed to the conscience of the American people?

But does our country exist to provide a haven for the world's disinherited? Must all other interests be subordinated to that purpose?

Those who understand the origins, history and purpose of the American Republic must answer, "No."

Our Constitution begins with the words:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The men and women who fashioned our Republic knew they were doing a new thing in the history of mankind. How new it was is not even today fully understood by millions who share in its benefits. For this Republic of delegated, defined, and limited powers flowing from the people, was designed to be the instrument of a new kind of human society. It was set up by free men to be the instrument of their convenience in mutual association, for the maintenance of justice, tranquillity, defense, and well-being. Above all it was to make safe the blessings of hard won liberty—"to ourselves and our Posterity."

The founding fathers knew—although some of their successors have forgotten—that no political charter or instrument could automatically guarantee the success and continuation of the new American Society. They knew that it could only be maintained by a citizenry that understood the principles of its construction and was passionately devoted to those principles. The American Society would grow and become strong, they knew, so long as it ordered its life by them. It would sicken and die if, at some future time, exchanging its distinctive principles of freedom for other schemes of government, it stepped out of the American culture and adopted another. As Benjamin Franklin said, when asked what kind of government the Convention had set up—"A republic—if we can keep it."

The writings of Jefferson, Madison, and Washington are replete with reiteration of hope for success of the experiment. In the words of Washington's Farewell Address, "With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles."

Our founding fathers were convinced, and history supports their insight, that the growth of the American society would furnish to the world its greatest bulwark of liberty and deterrent to despotism. Therefore, to them, the supreme service one could render to human freedom was to maintain unimpaired both the soul and body of the American society. Can we, the heirs of their agony and triumph, survey the tragic world of our times and not realize that only the sound core of the American society stands as the last stronghold of human liberty? And that to weaken it is not service, but disservice to all mankind?

Now we come back to our question: Why is the United States?

The United States exists for the purpose of maintaining a society of freemen. And in our day its continued existence and strength furnish the only reasonable hope that humanity may escape a new dark age of slavery.

Those who love freedom, then find that the highest obligation is not to admit to our borders millions who may or may not share our devotion to freedom. They find their supreme moral duty to be the maintenance of the society which is freedom's only hope.

So the matter of immigration now appears in a different light. It is not a mere passing gesture of good will, devoid of consequence. It is a matter of sheer self-preservation for the American society, which differs from all other societies in the world, to be certain that large human elements offered it for assimilation are really assimilable. This is not, in the crisis which now grips the world, a matter of mere convenience or preference. It is not a matter of exhibiting a petty, parochial temper. It is a matter of life or death.

Already the infection of ideologies that would corrupt our American character and disintegrate our society has found fertile breeding-ground among us. If the admission of a half-million or more immigrants from Europe now will strengthen the American society, then we ought to let them in. If, on the other hand, it is likely to add to the internal pressure against the principles upon which the life of America is staked, then we ought resolutely to keep them out.

The key to the problem, then, is recognition that the American society is different from all other human societies, and that in the very differences lies the explanation of its settlement, growth, progress and promise. Whatever will strengthen that society we should do. If there is doubt whether admission of these large numbers now will strengthen or weaken us, we ought not to admit them. We cannot afford to gamble with the future of the "world's last, best hope."

Professional "one-worlders" who are in the American society but not of it, go blithely about ridiculing "narrow nationalism." They lump all "nationalisms" together, as if American nationalism were not essentially different from the nationalism of some petty principality or artificially articulated Balkan state. If they do not know the nature of the American society, they are dangerous, ignorant men. If they do know, or have known, their shallow slogans are an appalling retreat from reality, from solid historical fact, which is no less dangerous.

"The knowledge of our own history is our memory," said the great historian William Stubbs at Oxford University in 1871, "and so the recorded history of a nation is the memory of a nation. Woe to the country and people that forget it; an infant people has no history, as a child has a short and transient memory; the strong man and the strong nation feel the pulsation of the past in the life of the present; their memory is vital, long, and strong. Neglect of historical study and knowledge is to a nation what loss of memory is to a man—a sign of old age and decrepitude, or the effect of some terrible disease in an individual; it is in a nation a sign of lost independence in manners and ways of thought—a moral decrepitude waxed old and ready to vanish away."

The Stratton bill and all other bills designed to let down the bars and permit increased immigration should not be passed because:

1. Such relaxation is generally against the interests of the American society.

2. Deceit and fraud have been practiced in bringing in refugees in the past, and apparently huge numbers have entered the country unlawfully and have been permitted to remain.

3. Increased immigration would tend to increase unemployment and to make the housing problem worse. Before letting down any more bars we ought to ascertain the extent, the sources, the quality, and the effects of such unlawful immigration.

First, these measures are generally against the interests of the American society. Nobody disputes the fact that here and there among the refugees who have entered in recent years are some of outstanding ability and character who are able to make a genuine contribution toward our country's welfare. But, generally speaking, much of the recent immigration appears not to have been of this type. Much of it has been unassimilable into the American society. A continuation of this kind of immigration, certainly any increase of it, will obviously be against our vital interests.

Immigrants to the United States down to 1880 were mostly from northern and western Europe, and shortly after arrival they became well adapted to their new country. They had been attracted hither because they believed traditionally American institutions offered genuine freedom. They sought to copy our manner of life and living. They became genuine Americans.

After 1880 the trend in European immigration shifted emphatically to a great influx from southern and southeastern Europe. Commencing particularly in the first decade of the present century and through the second and into the third, immigrants were of a different type of mind and attitude toward the United States. Many came not to benefit from our institutions but to bring their own customs, ideas, and ideologies with them. The trend with them was, as a recent pamphlet entitled "Operation Immigration," published by Foundation for Freedom, Inc., said, "toward the alien concepts of force, intrigue, and class warfare."

Immigration down to about 1880 had benefited the United States, swelling the number of people who were glad to support the American society. But the general quality of immigration in the next three or four decades was different. This led the Congress to pass, first, the Immigration Act of 1921, and then that of 1924. The Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice said that this latter act "represented the will of Congress to preserve the racial composition of the United States through the selection of immigrants from those countries whose traditions, languages, and political systems were akin to this country."

No further immigration legislation of importance has been enacted since 1924. The war, of course, slowed down immigration, as did indeed the depression of the early 1930's.

This country was set up by its founders as a Republic—a representative Government in which a clear separation of powers was made between legislative, executive, and judicial, and in which under the Federal Bill of Rights and the Bill of Rights of the 48 States, the rights of minorities were fully protected.

The past 15 years has seen an attempt to break away from our form of Government, tending in effect to merge the three powers, thus helping to bring about, as James Madison said, "the very definition of tyranny," and tending at the same time by aid of the interpretations of a Supreme Court that represented the party in power, to blur out, if not to blot out, the individual rights of minorities.

Without question one of the great factors contributing to this turning from Americanism to socialism was the character of our immigration over the past 30 or 40 years. It is true that some of the leaders in this internal revolt against the American society have been men and women whose ancestors have lived in the United States for generations. But most of them have been of this southern, southeastern European stock.

In World War II, on behalf of other peoples, this country gave 300,000 of her most precious lives, suffered nearly a million other casualties, used up a staggering proportion of her irreplaceable natural resources, and spent the bulk of her people's savings of wellnigh three centuries. We were able to do this because of the freedom made possible by American institutions. Slowly, our people are discovering that our sacrifices have not brought, either to us or to the rest of the world, the benefits that many expected. And if we now open the doors to mass immigration, we shall risk the loss of the American society itself.

Many Latin-American countries are cautious about admitting refugees. They are naturally considering their own vital interests. The United States is still the greatest country in the world, even after all her recent expenditures of men, natural resources and material savings. But if she relaxes her vigilance now and indiscriminately lets in other people, admitting hordes who have no understanding of our institutions or love for our principles, merely because they wish to come, then her greatness is doomed.

The prime consideration, therefore, is whether letting down the bars to further immigration is in the interest of our American society. It is not in that interest. Nor is it in the interests of other peoples of the world. If through letting down the bars we weaken ourselves much further we cannot maintain America as the bulwark of liberty. Nor could we in the future render assistance to other peoples in need. No surer way to continue the undermining of the American society could be devised than by admitting masses of aliens who connive or propagandize, openly or subtly, to change our form of Government. And to undermine the United States today is to strike a blow at the future of the civilized world.

Many who favor the Stratton bill speak of the 400,000 as though passage of this bill would limit additional immigrants to this number. Quite conveniently they seem to forget that each of these 400,000 can later bring in his spouse and minor children! Over a period of time this could amount to a very considerable number.

Moreover, in addition to the usual quota immigrants, under the law of 1924, there is the question of nonquota immigrants. In 1946, while about 29,000 quota immigrants were admitted, nonquota immigrants numbered 79,000.

If the Congress were to pass the Stratton bill, therefore, it would go a long way to destroy the wholesome effects of the law of 1924. Would that be in the interest of the American people?

Second, it cannot be successfully denied that misrepresentation, deceit, and fraud have been practiced in the past in permitting unlawful immigration. Nor can it be denied that the current demand for legislation is based on a vast amount of manufactured propaganda.

It is safe to assume that this propaganda is produced by, or at the instance of, people of the same kind of mind and thought as those who are likely to come in if the Stratton bill is passed. In the office of the National Economic Council is a bulky file of newspaper clippings, mostly from New York City, illustrating the incessant propaganda to promote the increase of immigration—particularly the immigration of refugees from Central and southeastern Europe. The number of committees to bring these refugees here seems almost endless.

Deceit has been practiced—and recently—in the bringing in of refugees. A good illustration is the 984 refugees unlawfully brought in by President Roosevelt during the early days of the war and interned in the so-called Fort Ontario refugee shelter at Oswego, N. Y. Since Mr. Roosevelt had no authority to do this, he merely informed the Congress of the fait accompli. It was asserted then that they would be returned to Europe after the war. But no sooner had they been settled in the Oswego camp than a propaganda drive began to urge that they be kept here. And nearly all of them were kept here.

A few weeks ago one Serge Rubinstein, an immigrant of a few years standing, was convicted of draft dodging. So great had been his influence and that of his friends that he won the help and support of many high officials. He had been a dinner guest at the White House. Yet Federal Judge John C. Knox, of New York, called him "an undesirable alien" whose record—if "half true"—shows "not a creditable thing he has done." Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York Journal American said June 4, 1947, that "Rubinstein was allowed by the Roosevelt administration to enter this country 9 years ago on a questionable passport obtained in China, through his adoption at the age of 31 by a Portuguese family!"

From many parts of the United States for several years stories have multiplied of immigrants illegally entering the country in large numbers—particularly through Latin-American countries. One need not go so far as to accept the recent statement of the national commander of the American Legion that for every legal immigrant, there are at least 10 illegal immigrants. But if there has been only one illegal immigrant for each legal immigrant, then about half a million persons have illegally entered America during the past 10 years.

In any event, it is certain that refugees appear to be living in this country in far greater numbers than the official immigration figures suggest. In New York City they are a great factor in swelling the population of apartment houses, large and small. The same story comes from Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and from other cities. In recent years our Government bureaus have contained numerous officials sitting in key positions who have not been unfriendly to letting in these persons in veritable droves.

Third, mass immigration would tend to increase unemployment, and to make the housing problem worse.

Now the country is moving into the acute stage of the postwar readjustment. There is great uncertainty as to employment prospects. Obviously, until this is clarified, there should be no general and indiscriminate increase in our labor supply.

The housing problem is now so serious and the prospects of its solution so remote, that it should not be accentuated and enlarged. If the number of persons seeking living accommodations is suddenly and abnormally enlarged by an influx of mass immigration, our housing problem will become desperate.

Today our Nation is deeply involved in ideolcgical warfare. Certainly now there should be no increase in the number of immigrants, and especially when among them are bound to be numerous and important carriers of ideological germs designed further to infect the American Society.

According to William O'Dell Nowell, who testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities February 6, 1947, the MVD (formerly known as the NKVD), the secret political police in the Soviet Union, systematically trains terrorists in an institute in Moscow. Nowell told of his experiences in the Soviet Union to which he had gone from Detroit to be educated in revolutionary tactics for use in the United States upon his return from Moscow. Certain ex-UNRRA employees have spoken in confidence of the existence of this institute and its systematic training of terrorists.

These terrorists, after being thoroughly educated in their nefarious work, are then dispatched to the Russian zone in occupied Germany, and through various channels they presently turned up in the displaced persons' camps in the American and British zones. The second step is for them to pass on, through connivance with private groups who ostensibly or actually are seeking to relieve the distress of displaced persons.

It is thus well-nigh certain that displaced persons admitted from Europe include some of these terrorists. It seems likely that as more displaced person are brought over here from Germany, Russia will see to it that freshly trained terrorists escape into Germany; and the process will go on.

Therefore, until this situation is thoroughly investigated, no more displaced persons should be permitted to enter the United States.

What has been said implies no lack of sympathy for those oppressed persons who have been the victims of either Nazi or Communist tyranny. We all should have the keenest sympathy, for example, for those

Poles who fought on our side throughout the recent war—more than 160,000 officers and men. They carried on during 6 years of conflict, during which Poland's allies—America and Britain—for expediency's sake and in order to appease Soviet Russia, sold Poland down the river.

Since most of these Poles are now in England, and since the Stratton bill covers only persons who now are in Germany, Austria, or Italy, the Stratton bill actually excludes them. Yet of all the Europeans who deserve well of the United States, these Polish soldiers head the list. They are young and courageous; they are experienced soldiers—and in the next 2 or 3 years we may need more experienced soldiers. They are devoted to freedom and would make excellent citizens of the United States. If the drive to permit mass immigration is really based on humanitarian grounds, why not so amend our immigration laws that none but these Polish ex-soldiers shall be admitted to this country now?

Some plan should be worked out whereby the so-called displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy could go to Africa. Both Britain and France have huge, fertile territories there where such persons could settle and begin life anew. That is what certain displaced persons in England did three centuries ago, and they laid the foundation for the greatest country in the world. And there are still large areas where people who really desire freedom can establish for themselves a society of freemen. With all that the United States has done for Britain and France, and with all they will look to us to do for them in the future, it ought to be relatively simple for the United States to arrange for this in a brief time.

No country, no society, will long survive that cannot and does not protect itself against unwanted and undesirable infiltration by those who do not share its principles. The assertions of unlawful infiltration of the United States across our borders are in their aggregate too impressive to ignore.

Before the American Congress lowers the bars a single inch it should cause effective investigation to be made as to the extent of this infiltration; and whatever commission makes this investigation should be asked to recommend means for getting rid of those who have unlawfully entered the country and means for more effectively screening out undesirable applicants of whatever origin.

The American Society must be maintained. It will be, if the American people think this thing through—and demand it.

MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council, Inc.

Authority To Purchase GI Loans Should Be Restored to RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 11, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the termination of the authority of the RFC to purchase veterans loans which enabled veterans to purchase homes in many localities has so far given definite indications of disastrous results. In many localities there is no agency to purchase such loans and the veterans are being left out on a limb. In my district I have received notice that at least 200 and possibly many more veterans will be unable to buy a home because they cannot secure the 100 percent GI financing they so urgently need.

There are many other veterans in many other localities who cannot be served through their local banks or small lending agencies and who are unable to obtain the loan benefits provided by Congress in the GI bill of rights. By eliminating the RFC as a secondary market I believe we have done the veterans a great disservice. We have literally told them that we do not have enough faith in the integrity of these GI loans to make them eligible for purchase by the RFC.

Under the amendment I have offered, H. R. 4158, the RFC would be permitted to buy GI loans but only from the person who originally made the loan. There can be no shifting or bickering of paper back and forth. Also, by setting the $300,000,000 limit, the danger of a calamitous unloading on the Government would be avoided. The RFC under this amendment could only buy the loans at par. In other words, the original lenders could get back from the RFC the money that they themselves had loaned the GI. Those who sold the loans would then be allowed to service them, collect the interest, and so forth, for the RFC on the standard going rate, the lowest minimum rate available or allowable in the insurance practice, which is one-half of 1 percent.

This amendment simply gives authority to the RFC so that we can have a market to sell the loans in localities of this country where banks cannot afford to loan more money on account of small capital stock and must get rid of some of the loans in order to accommodate more veterans. It is a great injustice to a majority of our veterans. We must treat them all alike wherever they are located.

The point I want to stress is that the most needy GI borrowers will be the principal ones to suffer if this provision is not adopted. Unless there is some secondary line of credit where such 100 percent loans can be disposed of, the provisions of the GI bill are not going to be implemented and we are going to deny to the most needy individuals in the GI group the benefits that we have promised them.

I think the following letter sounds an additional note to the urgency of the present situation:

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., *July 8, 1947.*
Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEFAUVER: Recent curtailment of RFC functions has eliminated the RFC Mortgage Company as a secondary market for guaranteed loans to veterans. You will, of course, be stormed with telegrams urging the restoration of this market, from lending institutions and individuals who have an ax to grind. I believe that you would like to have an unbiased appraisal of the situation as it appears to an impartial, but interested, observer.

I have been in the mortgage and title business for more than 30 years and a loan guaranty officer of Veterans' Administration, in Tennessee, for more than 2 years but I am not now connected with either and I have no special interest.

Without the RFC market, the loan guaranty feature of the GI bill will serve the investors in mortgages better than it will serve veterans.

Before the RFC market was opened, a few months ago, life insurance companies and others imposed restrictions on lending which effected for them a lending plan, sound by conventional standards, and with Federal guaranty as a bonus. The guaranty was a safety feature added to a good conventional loan. Housing facilities were not increased. Veterans were not assisted.

After the RFC market was opened, life insurance companies began removing their restrictions and were definitely swinging back to the more liberal lending program which the GI bill sought to encourage. It is clear that the RFC market was the one instrument of pressure that would force the insurance companies into line.

Federalized savings and loan associations cooperated for veteran readjustment to a high degree, but those associations are limited. They ran out of money and could carry few GI loans. Many of them did qualify for the RFC market and were making GI loans for delivery to RFC, without profit, as a community service. Closing the RFC market takes those associations out of the GI lending field.

Commercial banks, State and National, did not dare to load up on long-term slow paper of the GI type without a definitely fixed automatic outlet for that paper in event of future need. After the RFC market was opened, many small banks all over the State began making a few GI home loans, in an effort to serve the needs of their communities, relying on the RFC market. Closing the RFC market takes those banks out of the GI lending field and, at once, leaves them holding the bag of loans on hand.

This same RFC secondary mortgage market certainly did solve a national problem in home finance in the early years of the Federal Housing Administration program. The mortgage loans accumulated in that operation were later sold at a premium rate that is said to have brought RFC a handsome profit.

I could go on for many pages but I think that is enough to suggest that the closing of the RFC market will seriously delay relief from an awful housing situation.

Very respectfully,

DANA MILLIGAN.

Oil and the Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, once again our foreign policy seems to be running contrary to our exports. It has not been too long ago for us to remember what happened to scrap iron we so readily sold overseas, and in what form it came back to us. Now it seems we are faced with a similar condition in regard to oil, and I would like to insert here newspaper articles appearing side by side in the same newspaper dealing with oil exports to Russia, and the widening breach between the East and West because of Soviet refusal to cooperate. The following articles are from the Los Angeles Times of July 12:

SOVIET WIDENING BREACH BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

WASHINGTON, July 11.—Secretary of State Marshall reportedly told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee today that Russia's

refusal to participate in the Paris rehabilitation conference has created a grave situation by widening the breach between eastern and western Europe.

He soberly warned committee members at a 90-minute secret session, it was said, that the United States must be prepared for any trial which may lie ahead. But he held out hope that Russia and her satellites may yet be induced to take part in the "Marshall plan" for European recovery.

WANTS PLAN SUPPPORTED

Marshall was said to have told the Senators that he wants the plan to go forward despite the Russian bloc's boycott. The Russian attitude, he was reported to have said, has injured but not crippled American efforts to help Europe help herself.

MARSHALL PLAN PARLEY TO OPEN WITH 16 NATIONS

PARIS, July 11—Sixteen nations of western Europe tomorrow will launch an attempt to rebuild their war-torn economy with the promise of United States aid. Soviet Russia and the states within her orbit will not participate.

Emphasizing the gravity of the split between east and west, Russia will be absent from a major conference involving the future of Europe for the first time since the end of World War II.

RUSSIAN SHIPS RESUME LOADING OIL AS TRUMAN EMBARGO ON EXPORT ENDS

With President Truman's oil-export embargo of June 29 lifted, Russian ships in Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor yesterday resumed loading 248,000 barrels of oil.

The first to resume was the Liberty-type freighter *Suchan*, which has a license to take aboard 35,000 drums of oil. Alongside the *Suchan* at Victory Pier, Long Beach, was the freighter *Novorossiysk*, which will sail with a similar cargo.

The tanker *Maikop* was due to move up to an oil dock to fill her tanks, which already carry 26,500 barrels taken aboard before the embargo was put into effect.

Riding at anchor was the tanker *Taganrog*, with 70,000 barrels already loaded. It was not learned whether she would take any more oil aboard.

STEEL EXPORTS VIEWED AS OIL INDUSTRY PERIL

WASHINGTON, July 11.—Russell Brown, counsel for the Independent Petroleum Association, today expressed fear that continued exports of steel needed by the petroleum industry will result in a Midwest oil and gasoline shortage this winter.

He told a Senate Small Business Subcommittee that most of the steel being exported is for the use of American firms who have holdings overseas. The Senators are investigating the steel shortage.

Brown advocated that the steel, needed for drilling and transportation, be kept at home until the domestic industry is in a position to meet demand and build reserves.

RUSS GET OIL—LOS ANGELES PORT BUSY AS UNITED STATES ISSUES LICENSES

Oil for the lamps and machines of Siberia was being loaded aboard Russian ships here today, and port officials expected two other Soviet vessels to put in here for American petroleum products.

Despite reimposition of wartime embargoes on shipment of oil to nations other than Canada, the Russians have obtained special export licenses in Washington and are busily loading two vessels.

The Red freighter *Suchan* is taking aboard 35,000 drums of oil at Victory pier, Long Beach, and a similar cargo was destined for the holds of her sister ship, the *Novorossiysk*.

The Russian tanker *Maikop*, already carrying 26,500 barrels of oil, was due to move into an oil dock to take on more. The *Taganrog* is at anchor with 70,000 barrels aboard.

Due in Los Angeles harbor are two other Red ships, the tankers *Asterohn* and *Denetdsk*.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Marshall sees a grave situation due to the widening breach between eastern and western Europe because of Russia's failure to cooperate. He warns that we must be prepared for any trial which may lie ahead.

In the same paper for the same day we read a statement by Russell Brown, counsel for the Independent Petroleum Association that continued exports of steel needed by the petroleum industry will result in a shortage of oil and gasoline for this country in the coming winter. We have been warned by our own Government experts from time to time that our oil supply is running low.

Despite the fact that Congress has reimposed wartime restrictions on the shipment of oil to all nations except Canada, Russia, playing the part of the obstructionist in the settlement of world chaos in economy, still is able to get from Washington special export licenses to export oil we may need at anytime to meet what Secretary Marshall warns us may be any trial which lie ahead because of Russia's refusal to cooperate.

As one Member of the Congress who may be expected to give an intelligent explanation, if such there be, to his constituents for this sort of foolhardy business, I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, who is responsible for this glaring inconsistency, and by what authority? To what depths of stupidity must bureaucrats in this Nation sink before they learn to quit playing with fire?

World Health Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

FOR WORLD HEALTH

The general desirability of good health is about as noncontroversial a subject as one could mention. The techniques which promote health are as effective in Russia or Latin America as they are here. Consequently, it looked as though the World Health Organization, for which a constitution was drawn up in this city last July at a meeting attended by representatives of 61 nations, would go through without a hitch. All that was needed was ratification by 26 members of the United Nations. But now nearly a year has gone by and at last reports only 14 nations, 10 of them members of the United Nations, had ratified. The United States, in spite of a strong endorsement by Secretary Marshall, has not yet acted.

In the meantime the work that the Organization might do is illustrated by what its interim commission, with an 18-nation representation, is actually doing. In Greece it is engaged in a nonpartisan fight against malaria and tuberculosis; in China it is trying to control cholera, plague, tuberculosis, and a deadly tropical fever called kalaazar, and is training doctors, nurses, and technicians, testing drugs and assisting in public health administration; in Yugoslavia it is training personnel in plastic surgery; it has sent medical specialists into Austria and Hungary; it is awarding 200 scholarships in 13 countries.

These are samplings of what might be done in a really world-wide crusade against disease—beyond which would lie a positive drive for better general health. The tentative 1948 budget is $4,800,000, of which the United States would pay less than $2,000,000. One can't think of a better investment, even in these exacting times. There can be no determined opposition to our ratification, but there is real danger that the proposal will be lost in an end-of-session rush. This ought not to happen.

Synopsis and Analysis of Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (Taft-Hartley Act)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that there exists general confusion and misunderstanding with regard to the labor-management legislation recently enacted by the Congress, generally referred to as the Taft-Hartley Act. This confusion is understandable in the light of the unusual amount of propaganda published throughout the 6 months the legislation was under consideration; the numerous radio broadcasts on the subject, and the President's veto message.

Some employer groups and corporate interests seem to have the hope and idea that this law will weaken or even wreck labor organizations and the labor movement. It does no such thing.

On the other hand John L. Lewis has described the law as monstrous. Mr. Green of AFL has said it was a slave-labor bill, while Mr. Murray of CIO said it would destroy labor. It is none of these.

The truth is the law is very mild and reasonable as compared with what one group demanded and the other group feared. And in the hope it may be of some public service, to the people generally and particularly to employers and workers, I have undertaken and attach hereto a sample, and I hope accurate synopsis of this law; that is, I have reduced the long and technical language of each paragraph to a brief, simple statement, easily understood.

There should be no difficulty in understanding the intent and purpose of the law. It is stated in simple words in the first section. The purpose is to define the rights of both employers and employees, to provide orderly settlement of labor-management disputes, to protect employees in their relations with labor organizations, to prevent practices on the part of both labor and management

which endanger the general welfare of the Nation, and to protect the rights of the public.

Certainly these are desirable and worth-while objectives. But only time and experience under the law will answer how well and how fairly the provisions of the law carry out these objectives. It may be helpful to refer to some of the provisions of the law which undertake to carry out its purposes.

First, as to the individual worker in his dealing with his employer and his union. It will be seen the law seeks to protect the worker—

First. By safeguarding his right of self-organization, to form, join or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through his own representative, to engage in other activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and also his right to refrain from any and all of such activities;

Second. By protecting him from unfair labor practices by his employer, his union or its agents;

Third. By prohibiting the union from charging him excessive or discriminatory fees or dues when required to join under a union-shop contract;

Fourth. By preventing his discharge because he filed charges or gave testimony against his employer;

Fifth. By prohibiting his employer from discriminating against him in regard to hire or terms or conditions of employment because he is or is not a member of a union;

Sixth. By compelling his employer to bargain with his chosen representative;

Seventh. By protecting him in freely expressing his own views and opinions;

Eighth. By prohibiting his union from having officers who are Communists;

Ninth. By protecting his right to choose or change his bargaining representative;

Tenth. By preserving his right to present grievances direct to his employer;

Eleventh. By authorizing him to petition the National Labor Relations Board;

Twelfth. By permitting him to vote by secret ballot in deciding (a) what labor organization will represent him, if any, and (b) whether a union shop will be put into effect;

Thirteenth. By requiring his written consent before the employer can deduct union dues from his pay check;

Fourteenth. By requiring his union to give him an itemized statement each year showing the salary and expense account of all its officers, an audit of all financial transactions of the union, its assets, liabilities and expenditures;

Fifteenth. By protecting him against any suit by his employer for breach of collective bargaining contract, by providing that such suits can be filed only against the union;

Sixteenth. By providing that neither he nor his property shall be liable on any judgment secured against his union;

Seventeenth. By promoting the peaceful settlement of labor-management disputes, without strikes, so he can stay on the job and get his pay regularly;

Eighteenth. By protecting and preserving his right to strike;

Nineteenth. By requiring the fair and honest administration of any trust fund or welfare fund set up for his benefit and the benefit of members of his family, and insuring that such funds are held in trust and are not expended for any other purpose; and

Twentieth. By prohibiting an employer from trying to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization.

Next, what does the law do to protect the right of the employer? It will be seen he is protected—

First. Against certain unfair-labor practices by the union of its agents;

Second. By not being required to pay for services not performed or not intended to be performed;

Third. By protecting him against secondary boycotts;

Fourth. By protecting him against jurisdictional strikes in flights between two unions when he is in no way at fault;

Fifth. By giving him the right to freely express his views and opinions;

Sixth. By requiring the union to give him 60 days' notice of its intention to terminate a binding collective-bargaining contract so as to have time to try to make a new contract before a strike;

Seventh. By requiring guards employed to protect his property to form their own independent union if they desire to organize;

Eighth. By protecting him from having to deal with a union which has officers who are Communists;

Ninth. By requiring the union, as well as himself, to bargain in good faith, without compelling either party "to agree to a proposal or to make a concession," and by requiring that they modify the Mediation and Conciliation Service if they are unable to reach an agreement;

Tenth. By authorizing the employer to sue the union for damages for the violation of a valid, voluntary, and binding contract concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions; and

Eleventh. By relieving him from retaining in his employ supervisors who are not loyal.

And what does the law do to try to protect the people and the country as a whole? The general welfare and the public interest should be served—

First. By making secondary boycotts illegal;

Second. By prohibiting jurisdictional strikes;

Third. By promoting the settlement of labor-management disputes by peaceful means and without stoppage, thus saving a great loss to the worker, the employer, and the Nation;

Fourth. By requiring both the employer and the union to bargain in good faith;

Fifth. By requiring both the employer and the union to live up to and carry out their contracts when they have been freely entered into;

Sixth. By requiring both the employer and the union to give 60 days' notice of desire to change or terminate a contract, and not to engage in a strike or lock-out during the period while they are trying to agree on a new contract;

Seventh. By denying benefits of the law to labor unions which have Communists as officers;

Eighth. By authorizing the National Labor Relations Board to prevent unfair labor practices by either employers or unions;

Ninth. By prohibiting strikes or lockouts for as long as 80 days when a Nation-wide or industry-wide strike is threatened and which will imperil the health of the people or endanger the safety of the Nation, so as to give the President an opportunity to bring about a peaceful settlement; and

Tenth. By authorizing a national labor-management panel, to be appointed by the President, consisting of six in the field of management and six in the field of labor, with the duty to study and advise on ways to avoid industrial controversies and of promoting settlements through mediation and voluntary adjustment.

The law does not stop strikes or the workers' right to strike. It sets up some regulations and conciliation services which should, with the cooperation of employers and labor unions, greatly reduce the need and number of strikes. It restricts the right to strike only in the following instances:

First. When a valid collective-bargaining contract is in effect the labor union must give the employer 60 days' written notice if it desires to terminate or modify such contract; there must be no strike during that 60-day period while the parties are trying to get together on a new contract. The penalty is the employer is not required to reemploy any worker who strikes during this 60-day period.

Second. When a Nation-wide or industry-wide strike is threatened and the President finds that such strike would imperil the national health or the safety of the Nation the right of the worker to strike may be restrained for not exceeding a total of 80 days, during which time the President undertakes to bring about a settlement of the dispute.

Third. When a strike is conducted to enforce a secondary boycott or in aid of a jurisdictional strike.

It will thus be seen that the only restrictions this law places on the worker's right to strike is, first, where the worker by striking during a period of 60 days would violate his own solemn contract with his employer; or, second, where by striking during a period of 80 days he would endanger the health of the people or imperil the safety of the Nation; or, third, in the case of jurisdictional strikes or secondary boycotts. It is for each person to determine whether he thinks these restraints justify the charge that it is a slave-labor law.

It will be seen that section 305 prohibits employees of the United States from striking against the Government. This was already the law, carried in numerous annual appropriation bills, and is reenacted in this act and made permanent legislation.

Neither does the law permit the unrestricted use of injunctions in labor disputes. Nowhere does it authorize an injunction by a private employer, and the only instances in which injunction is permitted, even by the Government, are in the following cases:

First. Where a union is engaging in a secondary boycott or a jurisdictional strike and it is necessary to stop the boycott or strike in order to prevent irreparable injury. Application for this kind of injunction is made by the National Labor Relations Board itself.

Second. If either an employer or labor organization is charged with committing any unfair labor practices the National Labor Relations Board shall promptly hear the complaint. If the one charged is found guilty the Board orders the discontinuance of such unfair labor practice, and if the order of the Board is not obeyed the Board may then apply to the circuit court of appeals for enforcement of its order or for appropriate temporary restraining order.

Third. Whenever the President finds that a threatened or actual strike or lock-out will imperil the national health or safety he may direct the Attorney General to apply to a United States district court to enjoin such strike or lockout or the continuing thereof. The injunction must be discharged at the end of 80 days if the dispute has not been settled by that time.

Fourth. The National Labor Relations Board is given power to apply for a temporary injunction to restrain the commission of unfair labor practices if the Board has found upon investigation that a complaint should issue and has actually issued a complaint charging the commission of an unfair labor practice.

It will thus be seen that the use of injunctions is permitted only upon application of the Government itself and only in cases where it becomes necessary to protect the public, the employer, or the union from irreparable injury. The employers and employees are all treated alike—the injunction may be sought against either. It remains for each person to decide for himself whether this limited use of the injunction under such circumstances justifies the charge that this law "takes us back to the days of "yellow dog" contracts and Government by injunction."

The law recognizes that collective-bargaining contracts entered into by employers and labor organizations should have the same dignity and binding effect as any other legal contracts between American citizens and that both parties should live up to such contracts. It also recognizes that the right of collective bargaining cannot be preserved unless the contracts resulting from such bargaining are protected and enforced. It, therefore, authorizes suits by either party for the violation of such contracts. Whoever is injured by illegal boycotts or jurisdictional disputes may sue and recover the damages sustained thereby.

This law prohibits the closed shop. This is already the law in a number of States. Many inquiries are made as to the difference between the closed shop and the union shop. Under closed-shop arrangement the employer can hire only union members, and the complaint has been that this permits the union and not the employer to select the employees. Under the union shop the employer selects his own workers, and then they must join the union within 30 days or lose their job.

Section 304 of the law seeks to prohibit all corporations and labor organizations from making contributions or expenditures in connection with Federal elections, primaries, political conventions, and so forth. This was not intended by the Congress to prohibit newspapers or the regular publications of employers and labor organizations from publishing freely and full news and views with regard to candidates and elections, and their approval or opposition to candidates. It is reported that the Attorney General is inclined to rule that this section would prohibit the publication of such news and views, and so forth. If such interpretation is correct, then this section would be a serious infringement of the right of free speech and free press, and the Congress should and probably will promptly modify this section accordingly.

It will be noted that several of the provisions of this law were requested by President Truman in his annual message to Congress on January 6, as follows:

First. The President stated:

We have lacked sufficient governmental machinery to aid labor and management in resolving differences.

The Mediation and Conciliation Service established in this new law should be of great help to employers and labor organizations in reaching agreements.

Second. The President stated:

The national labor policy based upon free collective bargaining as the process for determining wages and working conditions should be continued.

That policy is continued and preserved in this law.

Third. The President stated:

I urge your cooperation in the early enactment of legislation to prevent certain unjustifiable practices. First, are jurisdictional strikes—I consider them indefensible. Second, is the secondary boycott:

When used for certain purposes.

It will be observed that the Congress cooperated with the President by prohibiting both jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts.

Fourth. The President stated:

Collective-bargaining agreements, like other contracts, should be faithfully adhered to by both parties.

This law undertakes to require both the employer and the labor organization to fully and faithfully adhere to and carry out their agreements and contracts.

SYNOPSIS OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 1: Declares purpose of law to be (1) to provide orderly and peaceful procedures in settlement of labor-management disputes, (2) to protect the rights of individual employees in their relations with their union, and (3) to protect the rights of the public in connection with labor disputes.

AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Section 101: (1) Declares that commerce is obstructed and strikes are caused by refusal of employers to permit workers to organize and bargain collectively and by certain practices of labor organizations; and that it shall be the policy of the United States to reduce obstructions to commerce "by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing."

(2) Definition of certain words.

(3) Increases the National Labor Relations Board from 3 to 5 members, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Also provides for the appointment by the President of a general counsel of the Board, who shall have general supervision of all attorneys employed by the Board and shall have charge of all investigation of charges and prosecutions before the Board.

(4) Fixes salary of members of Board and general counsel.

(5) Provides where the Board shall have its offices.

(6) Authorizes the Board to issue rules and regulations for administering the law.

EMPLOYEES' RIGHTS PROTECTED

(7) Provides that "employees shall have the right of self-organization, to form, join or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purposes of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and shall also have the right to refrain from any and all of such activities" except that where a majority of employees have voted for a union shop then an employee can be required to join the union within 30 days.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

(8) Declares it to be an unfair labor practice for an employer—

(a) to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed employees in section 7 (above);

(b) to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization or contribute financial or other support to it;

(c) to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment; provided employer may make an agreement with a labor organization to require as a condition of employment membership in such organization (union shop) if it is the representative of the employees and if at least a majority of the employees have voted to authorize such organization to make such an agreement.

(d) to discharge or otherwise discriminate against an employee because he has filed charges or given testimony against the employer; or to discriminate against a nonmember employee when membership is not available to him on same terms and conditions as to other members;

(e) to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees.

Declares it to be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents (not as to employees)—

(a) to restrain or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 (above);

(b) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee;

(c) to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer;

(d) to engage in or induce the employees to strike or engage in a boycott, that is, to refuse to use, manufacture, transport, or handle any goods or articles, when the object is (1) to force an employer or self-employed person to join any labor or employer organization, or (2) to force any employer or other person to stop using, selling, handling, or transporting the product of any producer or manufacturer, or (3) to force another employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization unless such organization has

been certified as the representative of the employees of such other employer or if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees, or (4) to force an employer to assign employees of a particular labor organization or craft to particular work rather than employees of another organization or craft unless the employer is failing to conform to an order or certification of the Board;

(e) to require an employee, in order to join the union under a union-shop contract to pay a fee in an amount which the Board finds excessive or discriminatory; in making its finding the Board shall consider the practices and customs of the labor organization and the wages currently paid to employees in that industry;

(f) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to pay or agree to pay any money or thing of value for services which are not performed or not to be performed.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Declares that it shall not be an unfair labor practice (by employer, labor organization, or employee) to express any views, argument, or opinion, oral or written, provided they do not contain any threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit;

DUTY TO BARGAIN FREELY

Declares it to be the duty of both the employer and the representative of the employees to bargain collectively in good faith, but provides that neither party is compelled to agree to a proposal or to make a concession; and that where a contract is in effect the party who wishes to terminate or modify such contract shall.

(a) give the other party 60 days written notice;

(b) offer to meet and confer for the negotiation of a new contract;

(c) notify the Mediation and Conciliation Services within 30 days after such notice of the existence of a dispute;

(d) continue such contract in effect, without resort to strike or lock-out, for a period of 60 days after giving such notice; any employee who engages in a strike during such 60-day period shall lose his status as an employee of the employer, unless reemployed.

REPRESENTATIVES AND ELECTIONS

9. (a) The representative selected by a majority of the employees in a unit shall be the exclusive representative of all employees in such unit for purposes of collective bargaining; provided any employee or group of employees has the right to present grievances to the employer and have them adjusted if the adjustment is not inconsistent with the terms of an existing contract or agreement and the bargaining representative is given an opportunity to be present.

(b) The Board shall decide in each case whether the unit for purposes of collective bargaining shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit or subdivision thereof; but guards employed to protect the property of the employer or the safety of persons shall not be included in a bargaining unit with other employees but such guards shall be certified as an independent bargaining unit;

(c) The Board shall investigate every petition of an employee, group of employees or labor organization to be represented for collective bargaining, and also the petition of an employer to the effect that one or more individuals or labor organizations have presented to him a claim to be recognized as the representative. If the Board finds such a question of representation exists it shall direct an election by secret ballot. But no election shall be directed if a valid election was held in the bargaining unit in the preceding 12-month period.

(e) If a petition is filed with the Board by a labor oraganization alleging that 30 percent or more of the employees desire to establish a union shop, or if 30 percent of employees petition that they desire such authority to be rescinded, then the Board shall take a secret ballot of the employees and certify the result to the labor organization which represents the employees and to the employer; but such elections cannot be held oftener than one a year.

INFORMATION FOR EMPLOYEES

(f) Before the Board is authorized to hear and consider complaints and petitions of a labor organization, and before a labor oganization can serve as representative of employees or request a union shop election, it must file annually with the Secretary of Labor—

(1) A copy of its constitution and bylaws, and a report showing its name; address of its principal place of business; the names, titles, compensation and allowances of its three principal officers and of any of its officers or agents whose aggregate compensation and allowances for the preceding year exceeded $5,000 and the exact amount paid, the manner in which such officers and agents are elected, appointed or selected; the initiation fee new members are required to pay; the regular dues or fees required of members; and explanation of the procedure followed with respect to the qualification for or restrictions on membership, the election of officers and stewards, the calling of meetings, levying of assessments, imposition of fines, authorization for bargaining demands, ratification of contract terms, authorization for strikes and disbursement of union funds, audit of union financial transactions, participation of insurance or other benefit plans, the expulsion of members and the grounds therefor; its receipts of any kind and the sources of such receipts; its assets and liabilities at the end of the last fiscal year; the disbursements made during the last fiscal year and the purpose for which made.

(2) Furnish all of its members copies each year of such financial report.

COMMUNISTS

(h) Before the Board can consider a labor organization's right to represent employees, or its petition for a union shop, or its complaint as to unfair-labor practices, it must file with the Board, and annually thereafter, an affidavit by its officers and by its national or international officers that such officer is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member of or supports any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

PREVENTION OF UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

10. (a) The Board is empowered to prevent any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice.

(b) Whenever it is charged that a person has engaged in or is engaging in any unfair labor practice, the Board shall have such person served with a complaint, setting out the charge and notifying him to appear before the Board for a hearing. Such charge must be filed and complaint served within 6 months after unfair labor practice occurred. The person charged may file an answer and appear in person or by attorney.

(c) If the Board finds the person is guilty it shall issue an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair labor practice. If the order is against an employer the Board may order reinstatement of employees.

(d) Board may modify or set aside its order unless the record has been filed in a court proceeding.

(e) The Board may petition the circuit court of appeals for the enforcement of its order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order. The rules of procedure by court are set forth.

(f) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Board may obtain a review in the circuit court of appeals. Procedure set forth.

(g) The commencement of proceedings in court will not operate to stay the Board's order unless the court so orders.

(h) Jurisdiction of court in such cases is not limited by the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

(i) Court shall hear cases expeditiously, within 10 days if possible.

(j) As soon as Board issues original complaint it may petition district court for temporary relief or restraining order.

(k) The Board is empowered and directed to hear and determine jurisdictional disputes between labor organizations unless settled within 10 days.

11. For the purpose of its hearings and investigations, the Board shall have access to, for examination and the making of copies, any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against may also issue subpenas for the appearance of witnesses and production of evidence.

12. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Board or any of its agents or agencies may be punished by fine of $5,000 or imprisonment for 1 year, or both.

RIGHT TO STRIKE

13. Nothing in this act, except as specifically provided herein, shall be construed so as to either interfere or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right.

SUPERVISORS

14. Supervisors may become and remain members of a labor organization, but no employer shall be compelled to treat with supervisors for collective bargaining.

STATE LAWS

State laws shall be respected as to membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment, that is, with regard to the closed shop and union shop.

CONCILIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

Section 201: Declares it to be the policy of the United States "that sound and stable industrial peace and the advancement of the general welfare, health, and safety of the Nation and of the best interests of employers and employees can most satisfactorily be secured by the settlement of issues between employers and employees through the processes of conference and collective bargaining between employers and the representatives of their employees" and that such settlements "may be advanced by making available full and adequate governmental facilities for conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration."

Section 202: Creates as an independent agency the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, under the direction of a Director to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Section 203: It shall be the duty of this Service to assist parties to labor disputes to settle such disputes through conciliation and mediation.

Section 204: In order to prevent or minimize interruptions growing out of labor disputes, employers and employees and their representatives shall—

(1) Exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions, including provision for adequate notice of any proposed change in the terms of such agreements;

(2) Whenever a dispute arises over the terms or application of an agreement and a conference is requested by a party thereto, arrange promptly for such a conference to

be held and endeavor in such conference to settle such dispute expeditiously;

(3) In case such dispute is not settled by conference, participate fully and promptly in such meetings as may be undertaken by the Mediation and Conciliation Service. The parties are not required to submit the dispute to arbitration.

Section 2025: Creates a National Labor-Management Panel, composed of 12 members appointed by the President, 6 of whom shall be selected from among persons outstanding in the field of management and 6 of whom shall be selected from among persons outstanding in the field of labor. It shall be the duty of the panel, at request of the Director, to advise in the avoidance of industrial controversies and the manner in which mediation and voluntary adjustment shall be administered, particularly with reference to controversies affecting the general welfare of the country.

NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

Section 206: Whenever in the opinion of the President a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, will, if permitted to occur or continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute, and to make a written report to the President within such time as he shall prescribe. Such report shall include each party's statement of its position, but shall not contain any recommendations. It shall be made public.

Section 207: Such board of inquiry shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine. It may conduct such hearings as it may deem necessary.

Section 208: Upon receiving a report from a board of inquiry the President may direct the Attorney General to petition any United States district court having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin such strike or lock-out or the continuing thereof, and if the court finds that such threatened or actual strike or lock-out, if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any such strike or lock-out, or the continuing thereof, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate.

Section 209: (a) Whenever a district court has issued such an order it shall be the duty of the parties to the dispute to make every effort to adjust and settle their differences, with the assistance of the Mediation Conciliation Service but neither party shall be under any duty to accept any proposal of settlement made by the Service.

(b) Also the President shall reconvene the Board of Inquiry. Unless the dispute has been settled at the end of 60 days the Board of Inquiry shall report to the President the current position of the parties and the efforts which have been made for settlement, and shall include a statement by each party of its position and of the employer's last offer of settlement. Such report shall be made public. Within the next 15 days the National Labor Relations Board shall take a secret ballot of the employees of each employer involved in the dispute on whether they wish to accept the final offer of settlement made by their employer, and shall certify the results to the Attorney General within 5 days.

Section 210: Upon the certification of the results of such ballot, or upon a settlement being reached, the Attorney General shall move the court to discharge the injunction, which motion shall be granted and the injunction discharged. The President shall then submit to the Congress a full report of the proceedings, together with his recommendations. The provisions of this title shall not be applicable to any matter which is subject to provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

SUITS BY AND AGAINST LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Section 301: (a) Suits for violation of contracts between an employer and a labor organization, or between labor organizations, may be brought in any district court having jurisdiction of the parties.

(b) Labor organizations representing employees and employers shall be bound by the acts of their agents. Any such labor organization may sue or be sued as an entity and in behalf of the employees whom it represents. Any money judgment against a labor organization shall be enforceable only against the organization as an entity and against its assets, and shall not be enforceable against any individual member or his assets.

CHECK-OFF AND TRUST FUNDS

Section 302: It shall be unlawful for any employer to pay or deliver, or agree to pay or deliver, any money or other thing of value to any representative of any of his employees, and it shall likewise be unlawful for any such representative to receive or accept or to agree to receive or accept any money or other thing of value. Except this prohibition shall not apply to a representative for his compensation as an employee, or to judgments of courts or arbitrators, or the purchase of merchandise, or membership dues, or employee trust funds.

Provided, before any employer may deduct membership dues from the wages of an employee he must hold a written assignment from the employee, which assignment shall not be binding longer than 1 year or the termination date of the effective collective agreement; and

Provided further, with respect to trust funds, the same must be held by the labor organization or employees representative in trust for the purpose of paying, either from principal or income, or both, for the benefit of employees, their families and dependents, for medical or hospital care, pensions on retirement or death of employees, compensation for injuries or illness resulting from occupational activity, or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or unemployment benefits, or life, disability, sickness or accident insurance; the basis on which such payments are to be made shall be specified in a written agreement with the employer, and employees and employers must be equally represented in the administration of such funds. An annual audit shall be made of the trust fund and made available to all interested persons.

BOYCOTTS

Section 303: It shall be unlawful for any labor organization to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, or commodities or to perform any service, when the sole purpose of such strike or boycott is to cause the commission of the unfair-labor practice defined in section 8 (b) (a) above. Whoever shall be injured by such boycott or jurisdictional dispute, may sue the labor organization therefor in United States district court and recover the damage sustained.

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Section 304: It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Section 305: It shall be unlawful for any individual employed by the United States or any agency thereof, including wholly owned Government corporations, to participate in any strike. Any individual employed by the United States or by any such agency who strikes shall be discharged immediately from his employment, and shall forfeit his civil-service status, if any, and shall not be eligible for reemployment for 3 years by the United States or any such agency.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Section 401: Establishes a joint congressional committee on labor-management relations, to be composed of seven Members of the Senate and seven Members of the House, to conduct a study and investigation of such relations, including:

(1) Means by which permanent friendly cooperation between employers and employees and stability of labor relations may be secured;

(2) Means by which employees may achieve greater productivity and higher wages, including plans for guaranteed annual wages, incentive profit-sharing, and bonus systems;

(3) The internal organization and administration of labor unions;

(4) The labor-relation policies and practices of employers;

(5) The desirability of employee welfare funds;

(6) The effects of industry-wide or regional bargaining;

(7) The administration of present laws relating to labor relations.

Forest Service Division of Wildlife Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, the sportsment of the Nation were disappointed that Congress did not see fit to include in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill a budget estimate of $163,000 to continue the Forest Service's Division of Wildlife Management. That small group of scientists administers the wildlife resources of 170,000,000 acres of national forests, a great natural resource, and the finest free recreational opportunities that any nation provides for its people. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news bulletin of July 17, issued by the Wildlife Management Institute, in which this and other wildlife matters are discussed.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Outdoor News Bulletin, issued biweekly by the Wildlife Management Institute, Washington, D. C., July 17, 1947]

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT DIVISION OF FOREST SERVICE ABOLISHED

The deer, elk, moose, antelope, bear, and other wildlife on the national forests are orphans, it was learned today from the Wildlife Management Institute. In passing the agriculture appropriation bill, the Senate committee failed to restore the $163,000 budget for the Forest Service's Division of Wildlife Management, which was eliminated by the House, so this important custodial Division must be abolished.

Over 4,000,000 people hunt and fish in the national forests each year, and they with millions of others will be dismayed to learn that this perishable resource is considered so lightly by the Congress. An annual administrative cost of $163,000 is small, a penny-wise saving, when it is known that this tiny Division was supervising the wildlife resources on 170,000,000 acres of national forest land in 38 States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. In fact, one-third of the country's big game and 70 percent of the big game in the 11 Western States is on national forests.

The record shows that in 1921, the first year for which reliable big game census figures are available, the estimated number of deer on national forests was 450,000. Ten years later, this had been increased to almost 900,000, and in 1946 had climbed to an all-time peak of 1,992,000. Similar management success reports could be given on the other big game species—but where to now?

FOREST AND SOIL-RESOURCES CONGRESS PROPOSED

A congress composed of delegates from each of the 48 States will be called by the President to draft and recommend a program for conserving the Nation's forest and soil resources, if Senate Joint Resolution 142 is enacted, the Wildlife Management Institute advised this week. The pending proposal, introduced by Senators TYDINGS, of Maryland, and HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, specifies that the congress shall meet in September 1947 at a place designated by the President.

Delegates to the congress are to be appointed by the governors from men who are experienced and generally qualified in forest and soil conservation. They will not be paid, except for travel and subsistence.

The program recommended shall include its probable annual cost and must be transmitted to the President 30 days after adjournment of the meeting and as soon thereafter as possible to the Congress of the United States. The joint resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

STATES NEED SURPLUS FEDERAL (WAR) PROPERTIES

All of the States need and can make good use of certain of the surplus Federal (war) properties for wildlife purposes, I. T. Bode, president, International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, and Livingston E. Osborne, director, Illinois Department of Conservation, testified in Washington last week. Hearings were held on the Wherry bill (S. 1155) and Burke bill (H. R. 4018), companion measures which provide for the transfer of surplus Federal properties to the States for wildlife purposes, and no opposition to the legislation was registered.

Clark Venable, field director of the Amateur Field Trial Clubs of America, who also represented the Outdoor Writers Association of America, stated, among other things, "the taxpayer bought these areas once to win a war—without this legislation—he must buy the land again, if he wants to use it for public enjoyment, and many of the properties are not suited for other than wildlife purposes."

Both bills are expected to be reported favorably by the committees, the Wildlife Management Institute advised, but more widespread public support would help.

ATTACK ON WEED PESTS RESUMED

Duck hunters, fishermen, and the boating public will be delighted to know that the Army Corps of Engineers has resumed operations to exterminate the water-caltrop scourge in the Potomac River Basin. This is more than a local problem, the Wildlife Management Institute said today, since this spiny-fruited Asiatic invader also is well established in the Hudson River system and, if given an opportunity, probably will spread elsewhere.

The Potomac River infestation has been under siege by the Army Engineers for several years and victory is nearly in slight. More than 20,000 acres of recreational waters have been cleared of the pest growth, but the campaign must be continued until the last plants are gone—else all the good work will be quickly undone.

It also is good news that a gigantic program soon will be under way in the South to eradicate completely the water-hyacinth nuisance from this country, the institute advised. Many years and much money will be required to complete the task, but it will be a profitable investment. Tremendous sums have been spent annually in temporary reductions of hyacinth growth to keep navigation channels open.

Both plants, water-caltrop and water-hyacinth, literally blanket the waters they invade and smother desirable native aquatics by excluding essential light from them. The dense foliage of the pest species is a favorite retreat for breeding mosquitoes, and wherever the plants have appeared in North American waters, duck hunting, fishing, pleasure boating, and swimming become things of the past.

There are other pest plants, native and exotic, that need to be weeded from lakes and marshes: the lotus lily or yockernut in the Mississippi Basin, giant cutgrass in the Southeast, reed or reed-cane over much of the country, and similarly the widespread cattails, though excellent for muskrats, are almost worthless in other respects. These and other local pest plants usually can be dealt with by local measures—either by mowing or through the use of new herbicide chemicals.

Eliminating obnoxious plants is one way of salvaging some of the residue of the Nation's badly depleted aquatic and marshland resources. Agriculture and industry, through drainage, pollution, and silting, have claimed a large share of the country's former waterfowl and fishing habitat and now weed invaders are threatening what is left. A continuing campaign to control pest plants will do much to restore and to perpetuate the sports of hunting, fishing, and boating for the constantly increasing recreation-seeking population.

CONTINENTAL WILDERNESS SYSTEM ADVOCATED

Meeting on an island in Rainy Lake in the heart of the continent, the council of the Wilderness Society recently launched a campaign to extend throughout North America a system of wilderness areas for permanent preservation, it was learned by the Wildlife Management Institute today.

The council, governing body for the society's membership in all the 48 States, in Canada, and in foreign countries, adopted plans for enlisting the cooperation of other conservation organizations, educational and scientific institutions, civic groups, and State, Provincial, Dominion, and Federal governmental agencies in preserving, before too late, representative remnants of the once extensive and greatly varied American wilderness.

Wilderness areas, it was pointed out, have unique scientific values and are of historical and educational importance but their outstanding value is in preserving for all Americans the choice they now have of finding recreation in the wilderness if they so wish. The influence of the wilderness was described by the council as essential to the survival of our American culture.

"Already it is too late to save a sample area of every type of primitive America," Aldo Leopold, noted wildlife authority, told the council. "Gone entirely are all large stretches of the primitive prairie," he said.

A State conservation commissioner of Wisconsin, Leopold, who is vice president of the Wilderness Society, declared that for about half of the types of primitive America all substantial remnants have already disappeared. He pointed out further that it will be most difficult to find areas of some other types. But there still is opportunity, he said, to preserve a wilderness system that will be of inestimable value to future generations, as well as to the present.

WILD TURKEY BEING RESTORED BY SOUND MANAGEMENT

Under its Federal-aid-in-wildlife-restoration program, the Texas Game Fish and Oyster Commission has trapped and restored native wild turkeys on areas of favorable range, the Wildlife Management Institute said today. The wild birds have been secured principally from refuges of the Fish and Wildlife Service in Mississippi, Alabama, New Mexico, and Texas, and they are doing nicely, according to W. C. Glazener, of the Texas commission.

The turkeys, trapped during the fall and winter months, are released on large, especially protected refuge tracts after the areas have been prepared with roosting sites, watering places, and feeding ranges. Each bird is tagged with a numbered leg band so as to check the effectiveness of the restocking program.

Landowners on whose lands the birds are released must assist in protecting the turkeys for a 5-year period and cooperate in the management program.

ABANDONED RICE FIELDS IDEAL FOR WATERFOWL

Abandoned rice fields along the southeastern coast not being used for agriculture should be acquired and developed by private and State agencies for waterfowl wintering and feeding grounds, according to James Silver, regional director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Atlanta. More waterfowl areas are needed to supplement the Federal refuge chain stretching from St. Marks in Florida to Pea Island in North Carolina, Mr. Silver says. All the Service refuges are being utilized to the utmost, and the States could plan to use Federal aid in wildlife restoration (Pittman-Robertson) funds to purchase additional lands for development.

Abandoned rice fields offer some of the best waterfowl development possibilities in the region, the Wildlife Management Institute agreed, because control of water levels is accomplished easily and the soils are exceptionally fertile. Extensive growths of favored waterfowl food plants could be produced on these tracts. Although some States may not use Pittman-Robertson funds to acquire and develop these natural waterfowl areas due to a lack of personnel trained to manage the area to their maximum capacities, others are planning to acquire and commence work on tracts as soon as the increased Federal aid funds are available.

EELGRASS TRANSPLANTING PROGRAM IS BEARING FRUIT

The eelgrass transplanting program sponsored by Ducks Unlimited, the Fish and Wildlife Service, Wildlife Management Institute, and several cooperating Atlantic Seaboard States, literally is bearing fruit, it was learned today. Recent spot checks

of several of the plantings show that the plants are making favorable growth and in some instances are found to be bearing fruit or seeds.

Eelgrass, one of the important foods of migratory waterfowl, principally brant and black ducks, was virtually exterminated along the entire eastern coast in the early 1930's by a blight, reportedly caused by labyrinthula, a microscopic organism that attacks the leaves of the plant. Why any plants survived still is questioned.

The initial survey for the cooperative transplanting program was made during March and April, and the plantings in Connecticut and Rhode Island were made in late April and early May. In Connecticut, the transplanting work was done under the direction of Arroll Lamson, State game management supervisor, with State department personnel. In Rhode Island, sporting clubs volunteered to do the transplanting and Charles Amann of the Narrangansett Salt Water Club, Arthur Clarke of the Jamestown Rod and Gun Club, and Harold Gibbs of the Warren Rod and Gun Club acted as club representatives and actually did much of the work.

The plantings this year were planned as a series of trial or demonstrational areas and many types of water and bottom conditions were planted to give the experiment a severe test. In Connecticut and Rhode Island approximately 600 settings of plants were transplanted from places having a remainder of hardy stock to areas rendered barren by the blight.

Reports from fish and game department technicians and local club members indicate that many of the plants are thriving. Some of the transplants are reported to have grown as much as 3 feet and many were found to be producing seed.

A recent report from Robert Johnson of the Massachusetts Conservation Department stated that "in one half-acre plot of eelgrass planted last year, American brant grazed the patch clean." These birds will be looking for more next year.

What Price Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including, as part of my remarks, a provocative article which appeared in Time magazine as of July 21. We may not be in agreement with it, but at least it is a challenging article.

WHAT PRICE PEACE?

Last week Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, went into a New Hampshire railroad station to buy a ticket to Washington. He got his ticket, and a lecture with it.

"I don't know what the hell you think about this Marshall plan," the station agent said, "but I don't understand it, and by God I don't think you understand it."

"I don't claim to understand all about it," Bridges said. "Why?"

"Well, I think we've done about enough for the rest of the world and Europe," the agent said. "I see where we've spent $20,000,000,000 on them since the war ended, and they're not a damned bit better off than when we started. It's about time we used our money to do things in this country."

What is the answer to the New Hampshire station agent—and to millions of Americans who are thinking along this line? They deserve a better answer than cracks about "isolation" and "penny pinching."

The United States spent $350,000,000,000—$350,000,000,000 is more than the incomes of all the American people in the years 1936 to 1940, inclusive, and more than all the receipts of the United States Government from the founding of the Republic up to the present—to keep Germany and Japan from dominating the world. The main reason it cost so much was that the United States did not start spending in earnest until the Germans had under their control nearly all of Europe and the Japanese had the most important parts of Asia. The United States brought victory in about the toughest possible market.

Now the leaders of another country—Russia—want to dominate the world. Is it certain that they do, or are some nervous Americans just imagining things? The evidence of Russia's intention is overwhelming. It is stronger than the evidence of German and Japanese intentions in 1937. Communist leaders subscribe to a philosophy that says the whole world must adopt their social and economic system, and "the international soviet shall be the human race." The Communist philosophy says further that good men should work like beavers to bring about this world victory of communism.

Stalin, who ought to know what Communists think, made, on February 9, 1946, his now famous election speech, a key to postwar Soviet policy. In it, he assessed the chances of peace: "Perhaps military catastrophes might be avoided if it were possible for raw materials and markets to be periodically redistributed among the various countries in accordance with their economic importance, by agreement and peaceable settlement. But that is impossible to do under present capitalist conditions of the development of world economy."

If peace depends on redistribution of raw materials, and if Stalin holds such redistribution to be impossible under capitalism, it follows that he thinks there will be no peace as long as there is capitalism.

When the head of a great country thinks that world peace is threatened by the very existence of another social system, he ought to try to do something about it. Stalin tries. He inspires and directs Communist parties in all non-Communist countries to weaken their social systems and, if possible, to destroy them. In a nutshell, the evidence that the Communists intend to dominate the world boils down to this: (1) The Communists say they do, and (2) they act as if they mean it.

THREE ROADS TO WAR

It can be taken as settled that the United States will go to war in an effort to stop any nation from dominating the world. In fact, twice in this century the United States has gone to war when it looked as if rival nations had become threats to the United States.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not yet as strong as that—so there is no present reason for the United States to go to war. But the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics might start to get that strong, just as Germany did between 1933 and 1941. Once that process started, the price of safety for the United States would go up every year—and it might get a lot higher than $350,000,000,000.

Here are three changes which would make a Russian-United States war likely, and hard for the United States to win:

1. If the United States, because of a long, deep depression or serious internal unrest, became so weakened that Russia would feel safe in being much more aggressive than she now is.

2. If the Communists got control of China and/or India. To become stronger than the United States, the Communists would have to hold China and/or India for quite a few years—perhaps as many as 30. The Japanese found that the slave labor of industrially undeveloped countries did not pay off much in the first year or two. But the Japanese did multiply the industrial production of Manchuria in a decade. If Moscow had 400,000,000 Chinese or Indians and their resources working for it for 30 years, the Communist power would probably become stronger than the United States.

3. If the Communists got control of Europe. In that event, the United States would not have 30 years to prepare for the catastrophe. The 500,000,000 non-Russian Europeans include thousands of scientists, millions of skilled workers, millions of trained soldiers. In a few years—say, 5—Russia plus Europe might be stronger than the United States. The Communists could not then be stopped from grabbing Asia, and safety for the United States could not be bought at any price.

A $15,000,000,000 PREMIUM

So the first requirement of United States policy is to keep Europe from going Communist. That is what the "Truman doctrine" and the "Marshall approach" are all about. One of the advantages the Communists have over the Democrats is that the Reds thrive when want, frustration, and disorder prevail, as they do now in Europe. One of the many advantages the Democrats have over the Reds is that Europeans, like other people, would rather not be hungry, frustrated, and disordered. The United States has the means to help Europe acquire food, hope, and stability.

How much will it cost to help Europe get to a point where it will not drift to chaos, and from there to communism? As of today, United States State Department experts figure about $15,000,000,000, spread over 7 years. That's a lot of money for an insurance premium, especially since nobody can guarantee that the insurance will pay off.

Of the $20,000,000,000 the United States has pumped out since the war, much was just plain wasted. The deal that looked best when it was made was the $375,000,000,000 loan to Britain. It did not help Britain much toward recovery, but it did supply food to stave off a British collapse (see Foreign News). Before the United States decides that the British loan was a waste, somebody will have to calculate how many billions the United States would have had to spend if Britain had collapsed. The figure would be much higher than $375,000,000,000.

NOT THE HARTFORD WAY

Judged by a hard, New Hampshire dollars-and-cents standard, the Truman Doctrine was far more dubious than the British loan. Truman said, in effect, that when a country threatened by communism got into really bad economic health, the United States would rush in and help it. If insurance were taken out only by the sickest people, insurance companies would not last very long. So the companies do not do business that way—at least, not the ones in Hartford.

Then Secretary Marshall came along with his Harvard speech. He did not have a plan, but he did have an idea. It was neither original nor complicated, but it was sound. Underneath it lay a line of Washington reasoning that went something like this:

"If we try helping each European nation separately, beginning with the worst risks, we will simply be pouring money down a row of rat holes, beginning with the deepest. Let the Europeans get together, figure out what they can do to help each other, and then tell us what Europe as a whole needs for recovery. If that looks like a reasonable amount, and if there is some sign that this expenditure will really get Europe on its feet, then let's go through with it."

A lot of "if" was loaded into that conclusion. European nations, for instance, will have to relax or abandon the tight net of restrictions on currency and commerce that now strangle trade between them. The French will have to put enough faith in the

Allied control of Germany to let the German steel industry work for Europe at a higher production level. This will be even more difficult for a Frenchman than for a citizen of New Hampshire to resign himself to seeing another $15,000,000,000 go out of the United States. But unless both France and New Hampshire face the facts, the "Marshall approach" will not work.

HOW IT LOOKS TO MOSCOW

How much chance has it, anyway? Nobody can say until the work now beginning in Paris (see International) comes to fruit next September. But the prospects are far from hopeless. Apparently, the Kremlin thinks the "Marshall approach" is a pretty good move—on the United States side of the board. Before Molotov in Paris turned down the invitation to participate, the argument in Moscow's Politburo may have gone like this:

(In favor of participation:) "The Paris meetings will result in requests for help so high that the United States Congress will throw up its hands. Then Europe, disillusioned and bitter, will turn to us. So let us play along with the Paris Conference, get the requests up as high as possible, and put the blame for failure on the United States."

(Against participation:) "Unattractive as this idea will be to Congress, it will realize that it has no alternative. Bevin and Bidault are strong enough to keep the requests within reason. If we get into this thing we will have to let the eastern European countries in; that means they will be trading freely with western Europe, and will be drawn out of our orbit. We must back away and try to save what we can—eastern Europe."

The present pulling and straining of the Soviet satelites, anxious to get into the only prospect that offers Europe hope, attests the wisdom of the latter argument—from a Soviet standpoint. Where will Poland find a market for her coal? How can the Russians pay Czechoslovakia for quality factory products? When Molotov at Paris broke Europe along the Stettin-Trieste line most of the best insurance risks, most of the countries with high labor productivity, were not on Molotov's side of the line. If central and western Europe begin to revive with United States' help, Molotov may well find the peoples of Russia's satelite countries increasingly restive.

THE LONELY MAN

The world, as well as the Kremlin's Politburo, wondered whether the United States Congress and people would back the Marshall approach. So far, Congress is showing both a healthy skepticism and an unhealthy cynicism. One United States Senator said privately last week that he was willing to see Europe get $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000—but no more. If Europe's recovery could be bought for $5,000,000,000 instead of $15,000,000,000, that would be fine. On the other hand, if $5,000,000,000 gets Europe only a third of the way out of the pit, $5,000,000,000 would be a waste, and $15,000,000,000 might be a good investment.

JOHN TABER, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has held up the emergency aid to Greece for 2 months while he tries to pare down the $300,000,000 appropriation by roaring haggling questions at State Department witnesses. Even though piecemeal aid to Greece does not make much long-range sense, the crisis in that country is getting worse and JOHN TABER does not seem to have any ideas for coping with it. Last week the Greek Government arrested 4,000 Communists on charges of plotting to take over the country (see Foreign News). From Communist-run Albania, a new guerrilla drive over the Greek border began. Suppose either internal or external Communist pressure, or both, succeeded in overthrowing the Greek state. Does JOHN TABER have any estimate of what it would cost to dislodge a Communist government from Athens? Or any estimate of how much a Communist coup in Greece would increase the cost to the United States of saving Turkey or Italy or France from communism?

These questions face the Congress as well as the State Department. As usual, however, the Department carries the unpopular load of responsibility on its none-too-sturdy shoulders. As George Marshall faced doubting and irate Congressmen last week he might have reflected that he was not the first Secretary of State to be where he found himself. Henry Adams had noted:

"The Secretary of State has always stood as much alone as the historian. Required to look far ahead and round him, he measures forces unknown to party managers, and has found Congress more or less hostile ever since Congress first sat. The Secretary of State exists only to recognize the existence of a world which Congress would rather ignore; of obligations which Congress repudiates whenever it can; of bargains which Congress distrusts and tries to turn to its advantage or reject."

THREE TESTS

Nevertheless, the United States Congress and the United States people had nearly always come, however, reluctantly, to the point where they backed broad, essential foreign policy when both the need and the workability of a given program was clear. The need for United States action to stop Russia was plain enough; this summer's work at Paris would give the Congress and the people an idea of whether it was workable. To whatever Paris produced, the United States would apply certain tests. Among them:

(1) That the United States will be paying for rehabilitation, not for mere relief which would open up endless vistas of spending.

(2) That United States financial and technical experts will be able to examine how the money is spent so that the people who pay for it know it is not being frittered away.

(3) That the political result of the program is a lessening of the Communist threat.

THE ALTERNATIVE

Is it true that the United States has no alternative to spending more billions on Europe? It has just one. The United States could start dropping atomic bombs on Russia now, before the Russians can retaliate. It could, but there isn't one chance in 10,000,000 that it will. Sixteen centuries ago a great Christian (St. Ambrose) laid it down that Christians have no right to go to war "unless driven to it." There are enough people in the United States who feel the way Ambrose felt about it, so that the Russians need not stay awake nights.

For those Americans who do not agree with Ambrose, there is another—and a highly practical—reason for not jumping into a preventive war with Russia. At the end of that war, the world, the United States Treasury, the United States economy would be in such a mess that the postwar chaos might create more Communists than the atomic bombs had killed. The United States obviously, would always fight if it had to. The trick was to keep from having to.

The Marshall approach is one obvious way of trying to stave off a situation in which war would be inevitable. Another attempt is the Wedemeyer mission (see National Affairs) to find out how to help China and Korea stay out of the hands of the Communists. If that mission develops a "Wedemeyer approach" to Asia, it may cost the United States a few billions, too.

But both together will not look big compared to the United States bill for World War III; $350,000,000,000 plus. Peace between the United States and Russia is probable as long as the United States stays out in front. If Russia begins to catch up, the price of United States safety might go up at the rate of $15,000,000,000 a month.

Aid to Foreign Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is no point beyond which our export trade cannot be still further expanded so long as our taxpayers will lend the people in foreign countries the money with which to buy our goods. The next step will be for our foreign debtors to say to our taxpayers as creditors: "If you expect to be paid you must lend us the money to pay you with. To save your investments you must restore our solvency by loaning to us until you are bankrupt."

Such an appeal is irresistible to our happy care-free spenders and lenders who wish to build a Utopia with American credit. Let us not forget that credit in any form represents debt in some other form.

Under leave to extend I am inserting a list of the few "small" loans and gifts which "Uncle Shylock" has recently made:

	In thousands of dollars
Albania: Through UNRRA	40,502
Argentina: Cultural and technical aid, bank credits	297
Austria: Supplies, bank credits, surplus property	63,000
Australia: Lend-lease and fixed war installations	54,894
Belgium: Loans, lend-lease, surplus property	494,000
Bolivia: Cultural and technical aid	245
Brazil: Bank credits, cultural and technical aid	70,680
Burma: Lend-lease	11,000
Canada: Alaska Highway	138,312
Chile: Bank credits, cultural and technical aid	42,195
China: Export-Import Bank credits, surplus property, lend-lease	1,482,793
Colombia: Bank credits, cultural and technical aid	859
Costa Rica: Inter-American Highway, cultural and technical aid	1,540
Cuba: Cultural and technical aid	190
Czechoslovakia: Export-Import Bank credits and surplus property	31,304
Denmark: Export-Import Bank credits and surplus property	40,000
Dominican Republic: Cultural and technical aid	75
Ecuador: Bank credits, cultural and technical aid	1,288
Egypt: War installations	11,800
El Salvador: Inter-American Highway, cultural and technical aid	327
Ethiopia: Export-Import Bank credits and surplus property	4,000
Finland: Export-Import Bank credits and surplus property	92,500
France: Export-Import Bank credits and surplus property	1,950,000
Germany: supplies	400,000

	In thousands of dollars
Great Britain: Loan, surplus property	4,400,000
Greece: Economic assistance, UNRRA, lend-lease, surplus property	790,000
Guatemala: Inter-American Highway, cultural and technical aid	627
Haiti: Cultural and technical aid	86
Honduras: Inter-American Highway, technical and cultural aid	418
Hungary: Surplus property	15,000
Iceland: Fixed war installations	65,000
India: Surplus property	50,000
Italy: Economic relief, Export-Import Bank loans, special considerations	528,000
Iran: Surplus property, lend-lease	30,000
Iraq: Educational aid	41
Japan: Supplies	267,000
Korea: Supplies, surplus property	62,000
Lebanon: Educational aid	90
Liberia: Civic improvements	20,200
Mexico: Bank credits, cultural and technical aid	87,574
Netherlands: Export-Import Bank credits, lend-lease, surplus property	277,384
New Zealand: Surplus property, war installations	5,707
Nicaragua: Inter-American Highway, cultural and technical aid	2,430
Norway: Export-Import Bank credits, lend-lease	56,500
Panama: Inter-American Highway, cultural and technical aid	47
Paraguay: Cultural and technical aid	38
Peru: Bank credits, cultural and technical aid, war installations	2,930
Philippines: War claims	695,000
Poland: Export-Import Bank credits, surplus property	90,000
Portugal: War facilities	(1)
Saudi Arabia: Export-Import Bank credits, surplus property	12,000
Spain: War installations	136
Soviet Union: Lend-lease	250,000
Syria: Educational aid	10
Turkey: Economic and military aid, Export-Import Bank credits	270,000
Uruguay: Surplus property, cultural and technical aid	733
Venezuela: Cultural and technical aid	144
Yemen: Surplus property	1,000
Yugoslavia: UNRRA aid	(1)

[1] Value undetermined.

Nations not receiving United States aid: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Ireland, Luxemburg, Rumania, Siam, Sweden, Switzerland, Union of South Africa.

Revision of UN Charter Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

STORM OVER THE UN

There is no mystery about last week's congressional blow-up over the UN. It was overdue.

Congressional emotion has been building up during two long years. It broke out in a concerted demand that the American administration take the lead in reforming the UN structure so that it can do its job.

This job is not keeping the little countries in order. It is not providing a headquarters for international cooperation in matters of health, control of dangerous drugs, economics, finance, or education. There are plenty of other ways of doing this.

If millions of Americans decided to reverse the isolationist decision that followed World War I and become a charter member of the UN, it is in order that the UN so fortified should keep the peace of the world.

In the course of the first 2 years, as 10 Congressmen put it, "Experience increasingly indicates that the UN, in its present structure, is not fully adequate for this task."

Its inadequacy first showed itself in the matter of getting the Soviet troops out of Iran. The international organization had to be underlined by the power of the United States before it proved effective.

Since then, largely because of the veto power in the hands of the Soviet Union, it has proved inadequate in every disputed question.

Fully cognizant of this situation, the American administration has sedulously bypassed the UN in its discussion of really important matters.

Washington wants atomic control made subject to an autonomous body responsible only indirectly, if at all, to the UN Security Council.

Washington decided on unilateral American aid to Greece and Turkey with only a belated curtsy to the international organization at Lake Success.

In offering its aid in the economic rehabilitation of Europe, Washington ignored the UN Social and Economic Council.

More recently still, British Delegate Sir Alexander Cadogan informed his UN colleagues that if the international organization proved unable to prevent Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania from interfering in Greece, it had better pack up.

Congressional displeasure with the UN performance showed itself clearly in this debate over American aid to Greece and Turkey. Some 60 or 70 Senators and Representatives expressed their sympathy for the UN. A number stated flatly that if the UN in its present structure proved inadequate to keep world's peace, it ought to be remodeled.

This was a warning. But the American administration chose to ignore it. President Truman has, I imagine, nothing against a reform of the UN, but he is not sure that the people yet want it. American Delegate Austin at Lake Success feels, I think, that reform is probably necessary but premature.

But a number of Senators and Representatives prefer to follow the Federation of Atomic Scientists in the belief that now and not later is the time to stop the next war.

So as intelligent and patriotic American leaders, they have acted.

Senators FERGUSON, TOBEY, BALDWIN, FLANDERS, CAIN (Republicans); MCMAHON, BYRD, SPARKMAN, O'MAHONEY, and TAYLOR (Democrats), introduced a resolution asking that "action be taken to propose and adopt amendments that will strengthen the United Nations into an instrument to preserve world peace."

Representatives HALE, JUDD, MUNDT, MUHLENBERG, NIXON (Republicans); HAYS, KEFAUVER, MANSFIELD, RICHARDS, and BYRNE (Democrats) went further: They introduced a resolution asking the President immediately to take the initiative "for the purpose of making the United Nations capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war."

Whereupon Senator TAYLOR, preferring the House to the Senate version, collected his colleagues, Senators CHAVEZ, PEPPER, MURRAY, JOHNSTON, and TOBEY, and introduced the House version as a second resolution in the Senate.

This is a warning that neither the President nor the other United Nations can ignore. It is a sign that the patience of the American people is growing short.

The next UN General Assembly in December may be decisive. Either at that meeting the present international Organization will prove itself able to get results or there will be a concerted drive to reform it.

The first step will be getting rid of the veto.

Potsdam Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it was high time that the administration moved to correct the intolerable situation in Europe created by the Potsdam agreement. It may be that the Presidential directive issued to General Clay, who is in command of our military government in the occupied zone, will have a salutary effect upon the whole European situation. As part of my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star of July 18:

CORRECTING POTSDAM

Although covering many other phases of occupation, the directive just issued to General Clay in Germany is chiefly significant for its economic meaning. At Potsdam 2 years ago, the United States joined Britain and Russia in adopting the principle that in organizing the German economy, "primary emphasis shall be given to the development of agriculture and peaceful domestic industries." Since then we have come to learn that this was a mistake harmful to the recovery of Europe. In effect, General Clay's instructions represent a formal American recognition of that fact, and they serve notice that all possible corrective measures are to be taken.

The new directive, superseding the one issued to General Eisenhower in May of 1945, sweeps away the idea of a more or less pastoralized Germany. As commander of the American zone, General Clay is instructed to carry out his responsibilities with this basic fact in mind: "An orderly and prosperous Europe requires the economic contributions of a stable and productive Germany as well as the necessary restraints to insure that Germany is not allowed to revive its destructive militarism." In other words, even as he promotes policies designed to keep the defeated Reich disarmed, he is to do everything he can to revitalize the country's industrial potential in order to benefit the continent as a whole, or at least the western half of it.

This is a far cry from the Potsdam principle placing "primary emphasis" on agriculture and peaceful domestic industries—a watered-down version of the so-called Morgenthau plan to reduce Germany to a nation of farmers. The reason the principle has been dropped is that it could not be practiced without hurting Europe as a whole. The German economy, its productive capacity, is an integral part of the continental economy, and it must be vigorous if European recovery is to be achieved. That is the key point in the directive to General Clay. His job in the Allied Control Council

is to seek the economic unification of the four zones. Short of that, given continued Russian aloofness, he is to make the most of the bizonal arrangements with the British and to try to persuade the French to merge their zone with ours and Britain's.

In view of the fact that they are taking a leading part in the Marshall proposal for European recovery, it seems reasonable to expect that the French will act favorably on this score. They have a natural and justified distrust of an industrially strong Germany, but if there are adequate guaranties against resurgent militarism, such a Germany need not be feared. It has rightly been described as the workshop of Europe. With something like the American-proposed pact to keep it disarmed, it can be made to hum again without endangering its neighbors. Until it does hum, until its resources are properly utilized, there can be no real economic come-back on the continent.

Only Outsiders Get Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Telegram:

ONLY OUTSIDERS GET RELIEF

The Senate has again passed the GOP's revived income-tax-reduction measure by a vote of 60 to 32. The figures look good, but not good enough to meet the two-thirds majority needed to override another veto by High Tax Harry.

The bill was sent to its doom in the customary manner, with all hope for relief to the 45,000,000 American income-tax payers virtually gone. If two Republicans had not deserted their party to vote against the new Knutson bill, 45,000,000 Americans could have looked ahead to January 1 with confidence restored and with the knowledge that the back-breaking tax burden would be lifted a little.

The House is expected to override the veto with ease. Then it will go back to the Senate with High Tax Harry's veto and a message from him which will tell the 45,000,000 Americans they must carry the burden of his high-tax administration so that we (the same 45,000,000) can spend more money abroad.

Billions for European relief—perhaps twenty-five or thirty billions—but four billions for American relief. That is unthinkable, as High Tax Harry said before "at this time."

It doesn't look as though the Senate could muster the extra votes to override the expected veto, even though some of the more optimistic gentlemen, such as Senator GEORGE, the Georgia Democrat, and Senator MILLIKIN, the Colorado Republican, are still predicting a "fighting chance."

The only thing the people can look forward to in the matter of high-tax relief is a new bill, a "political" bill, some time in the next session, which meets in January 1948. It will be a political bill, because Mr. Truman, in an election year, will try the impossible trick of trying to convince the 45,000,000 he was for lower taxes all the time.

Nobody is going to be fooled by any economic nonsense in 1948. The need for relief from wartime taxation is now, not at some future date that is based upon political "timing." If the Senate cannot produce the votes to make the reduction effective on January 1, the people will be certain to register their judgment of the high-tax administration in the 1948 elections.

We feel that the people of this country want to stand behind Secretary Marshall in helping poor, starving but courageous European nations which are bucking the Soviet slavery system, but with forty-one billions in revenues coming to the administration it is obvious that by prudent management both forms of relief could be effected if the administration would curb its wild desire to spend for politics' sake.

Pass Antilynching Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a letter which I have received from the Honorable William Terry, mayor of the town of Lovejoy, Ill., in my congressional district.

Mr. Terry is one of the most able community officials it has ever been my privilege to know and to work with since I have been in public office. He speaks with deep feeling on the subject mentioned in his communication. The specific incident which he mentions may come entirely within State authority but I cannot let the matter pass without saying "amen" to Mayor Terry's remarks. There is one thing Congress can do and that is to enact antilynching legislation. I hope a sufficient number of Members will join with me in signing discharge petition No. 9 to force consideration of such legislation before adjournment of this session of Congress. Mayor Terry's letter follows:

LOVEJOY, ILL., *July 16, 1947.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please permit me to apologize for intruding upon your valuable time asking your consideration of this letter, but I feel that the issues involved are as important as any question now pressing upon your busy attention. Thousands of Negroes in our "Democratic" country are terribly shocked at the recent occurrences in the State of Georgia.

I take the liberty of writing you upon a subject which so vitally affects the honor of the Nation and the very character and integrity of our institutions that I trust you will think me justified in speaking very plainly about it. Very sadly I am now referring to what appears to be a deliberate massacre inflicted upon a number of helpless Negroes in a segregated prison stockade in Glynn County, Ga., July 11. Gleaming from the reluctant testimony of the witnesses before the coroner's jury, we have reason to believe that the killing of those Negro prisoners was not to any degree justifiable.

Silence and neglect on the part of Congress will merely result in compounding atrocities.

Outbreaks similar to the one above referred to convinces the Nation, as it has on many other occasions, that the time for action has come.

The local environment and prejudicial spirit of that part of our country echoes no voice of justice to our colored people.

The Negro's loyalty and patriotism to his country is unquestionable. The Negro says to his country, "Though you slay me, yet will I serve."

Sir, as time marches on, the reminiscences of the Negroes' devotion and loyalty to this country are focused in our national history. His blood offering is not for himself or for his race, but for his country. His blood flowed like a stream through our Nation's history from the Commons of Boston to Carrizal.

The Negro was with Washington in the dark days of Valley Forge. The black troops fought courageously with Jackson behind the fleecy breastworks at New Orleans. Two hundred thousand black boys in blue responded to the call of the immortal Lincoln for the preservation of the Union. The Negro was the positive cause of the Civil War and the negative cause of the United Nations with which we face the world today.

Sir, let us bear in mind that every high-minded American must be touched with a tinge of shame when he contemplates that his rallying cry for the liberation of humanity is made a delusion and a snare by these racial barbarities.

In the name of justice and humanity, may I appeal to you for the part you may take in bringing this hideous, un-American, and cowardly deed before Congress and the Department of Justice in the hope of bringing about such legislation that you may deem proper?

Trusting that divine providence will assist you and your colleague in this matter, I am,

Yours truly,

WILLIAM TERRY.

It's Simple Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, in the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 the Congress provided for relief from income taxes in the case of men and women dying in active service in the Armed Forces of the United States or of any other of the United Nations. Any Federal income tax for 1941 and later years outstanding at the time of the death of such individual was forgiven. However, the forgiveness of taxes applied only if the soldier, sailor, or marine had not paid his taxes before he died. Now this is a most unusual distinction to draw, Mr. Speaker, and I for one cannot explain why the conscientious serviceman who felt the duty to try to keep current in his income-tax payments should be denied the same tax treatment as the individual who decided to forget all about income taxes for the duration of the war.

It has been suggested that the enactment of the bill H. R. 479 will provide an unjustified exemption from taxation of unearned income of a deceased member of the Armed Forces. The obvious

answer to that, in my opinion, is that the Congress decided upon the policy of abatement of income taxes for deceased members of the Armed Forces in 1943, and there is no justification whatever in trying to distinguish between the families of soldiers who paid their taxes and the families of those who did not.

If the Internal Revenue Code is to provide benefits or special treatment for members of the Armed Forces or for veterans and their families, Mr. Speaker, then I for one am in favor of seeing that all service personnel and all veterans similarly situated receive the same treatment. I shall vote for H. R. 479.

Oil at Lake Charles, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of a news release from the New York Times of July 18, 1947, regarding the building of the largest solvent refined lubricating-oil refinery in the world at Lake Charles, La.

Mr. Speaker, Lake Charles is the principal city in my district, and during the war the Government established more than $200,000,000 of war plants to manufacture critical war matériel, two of the largest of which are the Cities Service Co. high-octane gasoline refinery and the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. synthetic-rubber plant. In addition, other plants manufacturing other critical chemicals for the war effort were constructed at Lake Charles, and all of these plants made a magnificent contribution in the winning of the war.

Mr. Speaker, these industries were not located at Lake Charles, La., on account of the salubrious climate but for the reason that Lake Charles is located in the center of the petroleum-producing area of Louisiana, and due to our having established there one of the most modern and substantial ports in the Gulf area at Lake Charles on the Calcasieu River, inland 33 miles from the Gulf of Mexico.

The unique fact in the building of this fine port with its excellent and modern facilities is that the people of Calcasieu Parish and Lake Charles expended $7,750,000, contributed by local taxes, without 1 penny from the United States Government.

The establishment of the new refinery by the Cities Service Co. and the Continental Oil Co. at an estimated cost of between $20,000,000 and $30,000,000, will add greatly to the industrial development of the city of Lake Charles, which together with the established and operating industries there assure a steady and permanent growth of this fine city in my district, and I am proud to join Lake Charles in welcoming this new enterprise to Louisiana and my district.

The article carried in the New York Times is as follows:

COMPANY FORMED FOR REFINING OIL—CITCON CORP., OFFSHOOT OF CITIES SERVICE AND CONTINENTAL, TO BUILD HUGE PLANT

The Cities Service Co. and the Continental Oil Co. announced yesterday formation of the Citcon Corp., for the manufacture of solvent refined lubricating oils. The announcement said the new company, which will be 65 percent owned by Cities Service and 35 percent by Continental, will have the largest plant of its kind in the United States. Construction of the plant on a 162-acre tract near the refineries of both companies at Lake Charles, La., will begin in the fall. The plant will have a daily production capacity of 6,000 barrels of 95 VI oils and will house facilities for making various grades of bright stock, neutral oils, and fully refined crystalline waxes. More than 500 persons will be employed by Citcon.

W. Alton Jones, president of Cities Service, was elected chairman of the board of the new company, and Burl S. Watson, a vice president of Cities Service, president. Vice presidents are Harold Osborn, vice president of Continental, and A. P. Frame, vice president of Petroleum Advisers, Inc. Directors of the new company, including the foregoing, are H. L. O'Brien, L. D Mann, and G. L. Mateer, of Cities Service, and E. F. Battson, Serge B. Jurenev, and F. W. Mann, of Continental Oil. B. R. Johnstone and C. E. Weger were elected secretary and treasurer, respectively, and F. M. Simpson was appointed resident general manager.

Flying Saucers—American Dollars Flying Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include my district news release for next week.

This interesting letter was composed by my secretary, Mr. William S. Royce, and I feel is a very satisfactory explanation of the "flying saucer" mystery.

HOT WEATHER WONDERINGS

Newspapers here devote considerable space to denying that weather in the Nation's Capital is any different from that found in any other city of eastern United States. There is, however, something about Washington in midsummer that makes one see mental flying saucers on numerous occasions.

For instance, one of the little daily dope sheets which is freely circulated about the capital announced last week that the United States Treasury would write off $8,000,000,000 worth of RFC loans as bad debt. That, to quote this informant, is the money which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation figures has gone down the rat-hole in recent years.

But we needn't worry about it, the authority assures us. Since loans to RFC were charged off the Government books as expenditures when made, any return that might have come on these loans would have been considered income. Since no balance sheet exists, they tell us, "this won't affect finances at all."

HOW MANY WORKERS?

The article called Our Illusory Labor Force, by L. C. Walker in American Affairs Quarterly, has stirred up the economists and great thinkers in the capital. Through a great deal of mathematics, Mr. Walker has asserted that the United States is apparently 10,000,000 workers short of enough to produce the 1929 standard of living under today's wage-hour-working conditions principles.

The boys who so freely predicted wholesale unemployment right after the war have been a little slow in replying to that one. The man who wants a new car, a new house, or almost anything else these days knows that, despite terrific production records, we are still a year or more short of supplying national demands.

When we are siphoning off a tremendous portion of our production into foreign relief and rehabilitation work, we are only complicating the problem. Perhaps we can blame the weather for the recent decision to allow exportation of bathtubs and plumbing fixtures because, the Commerce Department announced, the domestic demand has been filled. Wenatchee and Spokane home-builders disputed the point immediately, stating they still could not get enough plumbing for houses they are building.

WHERE IT GOES

Speaking of rehabilitation—now more commonly termed here "Operation Rathole"—summertime has brought disturbing waves of information about what has been happening to our generous loans abroad. The $3,750,000,000 loan to Great Britain, which was to be used to reestablish that country's national economy, is better than half used. But British economy, apparently, is in worse condition than ever before. We understood the money was to be spent primarily in this country, which would stimulate our foreign trade. Actually, the greater portion of it has been used not for industrial stabilization but for subsidization of the high-cost, backward practices which have so long strangled British trade. Now the United Kingdom has announced its intention to continue empire-preference and is negotiating a 4-year trade agreement with Russia.

All in all, since the war ended, we have exported nearly $20,000,000,000 to 60 different nations, nearly all of which are in worse condition today than at war's end. The net effect to us has been the draining off of that amount of American goods, shortages at home which would be almost negligible otherwise, and forcing domestic consumers to bid up the prices on what goods are left.

PRICES VERSUS CREDITS

Hot-weather economic discussions, unfortunately, are likely to be conducted without due regard for such simple facts as that, when there is only one side of beef on the market and two people want it, they will increase its market value by bidding against each other.

Last week former OPA chief Leon Henderson, again predicting his long-awaited depression, told Congress that the way to bring wages and prices in line would be to raise Government salaries and put five billion more dollars into the Export-Import Bank. These two actions, of course, would merely put that much more money into world circulation, competing with existing money for available goods. It would not in any way increase production, which is the only way to make more goods available.

All of which leads us to believe, as we mop our perspiring brow, that there is more than a psychological illusion to those "flying disk" stories. From here, they look like nothing other than American silver dollars chasing back and forth searching for something to buy.

VISITORS

From Spokane: Mrs. Margaret Dorrah, Mr. and Mrs. F. O. Arnold, Miss Minnie E. Brown,

Miss Cecilia Ring, Mr. John Gurr, S. J. (formerly Gonzaga University), Miss Alice Farrell. Others were Mr. and Mrs. L. A. Cagle, Opportunity; Mr. and Mrs. Charles Washburn and daughter, Patricia, Bridgeport; Mr. and Mrs. A. G. Button and Mabel Pateros; Bob Brayton, Omak; Mr. and Mrs. Carl Jensen and Mr. and Mrs. H. G. Polson, Waterville; and Maj. W. G. Turnbull, Wenatchee.

Unification—Fear of Military Domination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FRANK WILSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every time the subject of reorganization of our armed forces comes before Congress it is opposed by some on the basis that it will pave the way to military control of our Government and to eventual overthrow by military dictatorship. This charge of militarism has been leveled at the pending unification bill, H. R. 4214, to which it does not apply at all. This suspicion of the military is traditional to the American people, although throughout the history of the United States there has never been any justification for it.

The framers of our Constitution, mindful of military tyranny abroad in the world at that time, provided adequate safeguard against military domination in their newly founded Government. In the first place they provided that the civilian head of the state, the President, would be Commander in Chief of the armed forces. Furthermore the executive departments which administered the armed forces are controlled by civilian secretaries. And most important, the constitutional clause limiting military appropriations to a period of 2 years absolutely retains ultimate control in the hands of the legislator, and consequently the people. This power of the purse string is in the last analysis the real guarantee against any military threat.

There is another safeguard against military domination, and that is the very character and nature of our professional soldiers and sailors. The nucleus of the American Officer Corps comes from West Point and Annapolis. Every Member of Congress is certainly conscious of the democratic method by which appointments to these great institutions are made. The graduates of the two academies represent a cross section of American intelligence, leadership, and ideals. They are in no way regimented or molded into militaristic form. They are a part of the national life. There is no caste system which separates them from the people whom they serve. Furthermore the officers who enter our armed forces direct from civilian life certainly represent a nonmilitary, unbiased viewpoint. And they represent in time of war a great majority.

Some of our greatest soldiers have become the most ardent of civilians once they have laid down their arms. Men like Washington, Andrew Jackson, Zachary Taylor, Lee, Grant, Stonewall Jackson, Pershing—surely these cannot be cited as menaces to the American system. Neither can such great citizens as Secretary of State Marshall, or General Eisenhower, or General MacArthur.

The charge of "militaristic" is often hurled at a man who happens to have spent some time in the service of defending his country. This charge as applied to an American soldier or sailor is pure jingoism. Certainly the 11,000,000 veterans of World War II did not become "militarized." Just what does "militarism" mean? Let use use the dictionary definition "predominance of the military class or prevalence of their ideals; the spirit which exalts military virtues and ideals." Now surely militarism as thus defined cannot be considered a serious threat to the United States. Of course, there are certain military matters which military men must know about and there are certain procedures and practices which military services must follow in order to be effective, but that does not mean that militarism itself is lurking behind every corner.

As a matter of fact it might be said that the average American citizen reflects a greater amount of militarism than our professional forces. Evidence of this might be found in the numerous uniform veterans' organizations, in the lodges and shrines and other temple organizations which parade and hold ceremonies exceedingly military in appearance. On the other hand, in time of peace the average soldier or sailor hastens to don civilian clothes when not on duty.

No; there is no justifiable fear of military domination under this unification bill. The safeguards written in the Constitution, the democratic background of our professional armed forces, and the long history of a civilian-controlled Federal Government conclusively convinced even the most cautious of us that the fear of military domination is a humbug. Of course, we must always be alert to guard our liberties, but we must not allow our vigilance to obscure and obstruct progress toward more effective national security, because without proper preparedness the United States may indeed find itself faced not with a threat but with the actuality of military domination—by some other country's military force.

The unification bill should not be used as a means to bring out an ignorant prejudice. Nor should the charge of militarism be allowed to obstruct prompt action on H. R. 4214. With that, Mr. Speaker, I recommend speedy passage of this unification legislation.

Farmers Should Have Their Former Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in the sale of surplus property, former owners have been given preference in the purchase of ships and other property, but farmers have not been given such first right to get back home-farm lands. Thousands of farmers were forced to give up home farms for the use of war plants.

Now these lands are being sold as surplus property.

Mr. Speaker, the former owners of such lands should have the first right to purchase these home-farms from the Government.

I have introduced the following bill:

A bill to provide that former owners of farms and agricultural lands shall have the first right to purchase their former lands now being sold through War Assets Administration

Whereas the Government in prosecuting the war effort took by condemnation and otherwise large areas of farm and agricultural lands throughout the United States; and

Whereas these lands were used in agriculture and were the homes of farms and other persons for many years; and

Whereas such lands being declared surplus: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the Government in the sale of surplus lands shall give the former owner of such farm and agricultural lands, the first right, opportunity, and privilege to purchase any such lands heretofore taken by condemnation or otherwise and used in the war effort and now or in the future declared surplus.

From Illusions to Realities in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Henry Chamberlin from Human Events:

FROM ILLUSIONS TO REALITIES IN FOREIGN POLICY

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The longer I stayed in Europe, during an extended visit last year, the more I became convinced of the desirability of a thorough investigation of the Roosevelt administration's political conduct of the late war. For, in country after country, I found that American military victory had been followed by American political frustration. And the course of postwar events increasingly exposes as disastrous illusion every main assumption on which this foreign policy was based.

It now seems high time to hold an inquest on the strange deaths of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." These were American war aims, which received at least the formal acquiescence of our allies. But they have proved to be a negation, not a blueprint, of the shape of things to come, both in Europe and in Asia.

Instead of freedom from want and from fear one finds destitution on a scale unknown since the Thirty Years' War. Almost everywhere there is haunting fear of a third world war, sometimes varied by desperate hope that such a war will come. This hope is whispered among the millions of miserable people who have lost everything they had because of arbitrary territorial changes, accompanied by mass expulsions and the setting up of tyrannical dictatorships.

There is no freedom of press in the police-state. And the police-state is the rule, not the exception, in the large area of Europe behind the iron curtain. Freedom of religion has fared little better. Characteristic of the European new order are such developments as the forcible absorption of the Uniat into the Soviet Orthodox Church in Ruthenia and the widespread terrorizing of Catholic priests in Croatia and Slovenia, culminating in the arrest and sentencing to a long term in prison of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinats, of Zagreb.

Let us recall the first three clauses of the Atlantic Charter:

"First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Tell that to the million and more people who were deported from eastern Poland to the Soviet Union, those of them who have survived the ordeal of transportation in cattle cars and subsequent slave labor. Tell that to the hundreds of thousands of Poles, Letts, Lithuanians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Yugoslavs, Russians who have been dispersed as fugitives all over Europe! Tell that to the Germans who formerly lived in East Prussia and the territory between the Oder-Neisse border and the former German frontier—to those of them who are still alive as beggared refugees after undergoing orgies of pillage, rape, and murder.

II

Our foreign policy during the war was largely in the hands of ungifted amateurs who seem to have made the gravest international decisions on much the same basis of hunches, or perhaps lucky numbers, which, we are told, determined financial policy in the early years of the New Deal. Four principal assumptions on which American wartime diplomacy was based have proved to be costly mistakes. These were:

(1) That Russia, after a victorious war, would be a cooperative do-gooder or, at least, a passive factor in the international scene. It was assumed, with truly amazing naivete, that Soviet foreign policy would continue to be restrained when every element of check and balance in Europe and Asia had been smashed.

(2) That the way to get along with Stalin was to give him everything for which he asked. Curiously enough, the advocates of this policy were often the most violent critics of concessions to Hitler. The aftermath of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements proves that an appeasement policy is always in the red, because it is invariably interpreted by a dictatorship as an invitation to new aggression.

(3) That Germany was the sole source of international evil, past, present, and to come; that no country except Germany had waged an aggressive war in the past or would wage one in the future. This highly emotional judgment overlooked the historical evidence that the strongest military nation in Europe habitually yields to the temptation to abuse its power. It was childish oversimplification to confront the problem of aggressive war with a crude formula for destroying Germany.

From a practical standpoint this assumption that only Germany could be an aggressor was extremely harmful. For it discouraged any attempt to come to an agreement with forces in Germany which, as first told in this country by Human Events and included by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—WALTER H. JUDD, were working for the overthrow of Hitler's dictatorship. How much more hopeful the outlook would be if, instead of a destitute, broken, divided Germany, we could today deal with a united western-oriented Germany, under the leadership of the men who took part in the anti-Nazi rising of July 20, 1944.

(4) That America could completely destroy the balance of power in Europe without, as a sequel, facing a bitter choice of alternatives. These alternatives are either to throw America's full weight into the scales to help create a new balance of power, or else to watch all of Europe slide bit by bit into dependence on the single strong land power which existed at the end of the war, namely, the Soviet Union. Whichever horn of this delemma is chosen, the result will be continuous nervous tension and unprecedented drain on our national resources.

III

Some future historian may well devote considerable time and research to finding a plausible answer to a baffling question: Why did Franklin Delano Roosevelt, disposing of the greatest concentration of combined air, naval, and mechanized land power ever assembled, nevertheless make such an amazingly poor showing in translating his own professed ideals into accomplishment?

The treaties concluded after the First World War were subjected to severe and, in some degree, justified criticism. It was a wisecrack of 1919 that Wilson should have received the Nobel Prize for mathematics, because he made 14 equal 0. But the gap between the Fourteen Points and the Treaty of Versailles was far less formidable than the yawning chasm between the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms on the one hand, and the present European shambles, on the other.

Our future historian may find a clue in a remark once made to me by a journalist of national reputation and long and ripe experience.

"Roosevelt never takes any interest in matching deeds with words, performance with promise. His reaction is that of an actor. If a slogan, a phrase, a set of principles serves the immediate purpose of arousing a favorable reaction he is not much concerned with its future implementation."

IV

A good illustration of the schism between phrase and deed that marked the Roosevelt foreign policy was the attitude toward one world. If you did not accept without reservations the bland assumption that we are living in a world of United Nations you were a Fascist, a reactionary, an advocate of no world.

Yet the definitive prepeace arrangements in which the Roosevelt administration acquiesced were most distinctly calculated to make not for one world, but for two worlds. This was accomplished by underwriting exclusive Soviet spheres of interest in various parts of Europe and Asia. There was never any serious attempt to obtain the realization of the pledges of joint Three-Power action "in assisting the peoples liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of the former Axis satellite states in Europe to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems," to quote the language of the Yalta declaration.

American efforts to maintain the principles of the political and economic unity of occupied Germany were feeble and halfhearted.

"Liberated" Korea was slashed into two parts by a demarcation line along a wholly unnatural frontier. In order to obtain wholly unnecessary Soviet participation in the war against Japan, railway and harbor concessions that fairly reeked with old-fashioned imperialist odor were made to the Soviet Union in Manchuria at China's expense.

Wars are apt to inspire hallucinations and half-truths. A good example of pure hallucination was Mr. Henry Wallace's amazing declaration that the late war was being fought so that everyone in the world could have a quart of milk a day. To anyone who has seen the post-war European Continent this "quart of milk a day" interpretation of the late conflict is heartbreaking irony.

The late Wendell Willkie gave nation-wide publicity to the phrase "One World." This idea is perhaps more dangerous than a downright hallucination, because it is a half-truth. Science and technology have indeed diminished space and distance and made countries more vulnerable to atomic bombs and to ideas.

Unfortunately, side by side with the advance of a scientific invention, which should make for greater global unity, there has been a parallel growth of totalitarian practices. These surround large areas of the globe with Chinese Walls of deliberate thought control and censorship. There was a far freer circulation of ideas in the Europe of 1913, without benefit of airplane and radio, than in the Europe of 1947.

Now we must, for the time being, abandon the pleasant illusion of one world for the hard reality of two worlds. We must forget the illusion of an eternal wartime alliance and face the reality of a new and grim international alinement. We must replace the illusion that appeasement could be successful with realistic recognition that a firm stand is essential to preserve the basic principles of freedom.

To awaken from illusion to reality, and in time, is the primary necessity of our foreign policy.

Letter of Hon. Sumner Welles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BAR HARBOR, MAINE, *July 16, 1947.*

Hon. JOHN DAVIS LODGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your kindness in sending me with your letter of July 11 a copy of my recent article which you had published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9. It is most gratifying to me that you found this article helpful at this time.

The coming months, I think, will bring with them the determining crisis. It is tragic when this Government during the past 4 years has had such overwhelming advantages on its side that it should have failed so lamentably in bringing effective help to that great majority of the Italian people who want democracy, who are bitterly opposed to communism, and who are convinced that the independence and prosperity of their country can only be assured through intimate cooperation with the western powers. Remedial action of a sort is, of course, now under way, but the hour is very late indeed.

I was particularly sorry not to have the chance of seeing you again before I left Oxon Hill, but I shall hope for better luck next autumn.

With my kind personal regards, believe me,
Yours very sincerely,

SUMNER WELLES.

Soil Conservation in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the excessive rains in Iowa this spring and early summer have emphasized anew the need of soil conservation. Our food production is completely dependent upon the fertility of our soil. The thin coverlet of productive earth sustains life on this planet. Its loss is an irreparable loss.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two statements made by R. K. Bliss, extension service, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa. He expresses an informed viewpoint on this important subject:

CONSERVING SOIL RESOURCES—OUR PARAMOUNT LONG-TIME ECONOMIC PROBLEM

I have a letter from a friend who lives in the lower Des Moines River Valley. In regard to recent floods he raises the question as to whether "the Des Moines River acted this way 500 years ago" and then answers his own question by saying "the best records we might secure would tell us that it did not so act." He goes on to comment that "slowly but surely the approach (to soil losses in Iowa) is in the direction of conditions in China and India."

And so during this Soil Conservation Week I urge each one to look about and see what is happening to the soil. During the past few days I have driven several hundred miles through parts of Iowa. Everywhere soil erosion is plainly and seriously evident. In regions where heavy dashing rains have fallen soil erosion is little short of appalling. How long can we maintain our prosperity as a State and permit these losses to continue?

All who possibly can arrange to do it and who are interested in Iowa's future should take time out and drive through the country. They should note the severe washing on cultivated, hilly land and especially in the regions that have had heavy, dashing, torrential rains. By so doing one gets a demonstration and picture far more forceful and compelling than any written word or lecture could possibly be.

As you drive through the country be sure to note the washing on what we usually consider gentle sloping land and particularly if it is a long slope. In most cases washing has been very severe on land that we do not generaly consider subject to soil erosion. Such land will also have to be cared for by better conservation if Iowa is to maintain her great production.

And why has land washed so badly this year? For one thing, Iowa has had a number of heavy dashing rains. There is nothing new, of course, about hard rains. We have always had them, but they have been unusually numerous and have come at corn-planting time when the ground was bare. Another reason for the serious soil washing is that through heavy and continuous cropping the humus of welding material in the soil has greatly diminished. Such soil runs together or puddles and does not absorb water easily. Under such conditions land washes readily.

As regards soil washing the handwriting on the wall or in this case the handwriting on the hillsides and sloping lands of Iowa is perfectly plain to all who will take the time to look and see. We must either stop this continual loss of soil and soil fertility or the time will come when we, like many other civilizations older than ours will be "weighed in the balance and found wanting."

Now, while nature puts on this great soil-erosion demonstration for us is the time for both country and city people to see what is going on. Now is the time to more carefully and effectively organize and develop ways and means of meeting the situation which confronts us. It can be met if we have the will to meet it.

As you drive through the country it is well to remember that the rich soil of Iowa is in reality your bank account. It is your guarantee of future prosperity and security. It doesn't matter whether you live in the country or whether you live in town. Loss of soil may not affect you quite so directly or quickly if you live in a city, but it will some day affect you or your children or your children's children, no matter where you live.

And why will this be true? The answer is that all life is supported by a thin layer of topsoil. Even the fishes of the sea depend directly and indirectly upon this precious topsoil. Destroy it completely and life would perish.

Everything you had on the table today except the water and a few sun vitamins came from the topsoil. You ate today a mixture of what was once rain, heat, cold, and sunshine. It took millions of years of the combined action of rain, heat, cold, and sunshine to build the few inches of topsoil on which the lives of all of us depend. According to the best of information available it takes nature from 500 to 1,000 years to build an inch of topsoil. But it takes only a few short years for man to destroy it.

People, human beings, are the great destroyers of topsoil. And of all people in recorded history the American people seem to have destroyed the topsoil at the fastest rate. Our mechanical ingenuity in building bigger and better machinery to cultivate more land faster has to date apparently enabled us to destroy soil at an accelerated rate. We boast of our technological advancement in general farming, our use of science in breeding grains and livestock, and in crop production generally, but we should remember at the same time that we are most unscientific when it comes to saving soil. We are foolishly and needlessly wasting our soil inheritance.

We need to reflect on what has happened to Iowa after 100 years of farming. Ten years ago, according to a report of our soil scientists and the State Planning Board, 9 percent of Iowa land was severely eroded, 31 percent was seriously eroded, 14 percent considerably eroded, and 33 percent slightly eroded. This left 13 percent that was not eroded. It was estimated that 30,000,000,000 tons of topsoil had been lost to Iowa through erosion.

What has happened since the foregoing report was issued? During the heavy, dashing rains 3 years ago in 1944 the Soil Conservation Service estimated that Iowa lost 150,000,000 tons of soil in 2 weeks. During the past 3 weeks we have certainly lost more soil than 3 years ago. Iowa has almost certainly lost more soil during the past 4 years than in any other 4 years of her history.

Saving of the topsoil is a problem in which all of our people are vitally interested—and not just the farmers. Blot out soil fertility, the topsoil in Iowa, if you can imagine such a calamity, and the State would all but die. Industry would largely perish along with agriculture. Under such conditions a crow would have to carry provisions with it if it attempted to fly across the State. But just to the extent that we lose this precious topsoil—to that extent both country and city suffer.

All people are interested in a fertile soil because all people need good food. There is an ever-increasing mass of evidence to show that animal health is largely dependent on soil health. In short, that soils deficient in proper plant foods produce inferior and weak animals. It is highly probable that people who eat the produce from such soils are affected the same as animals. If so, city people have even a larger interest in products grown on good soil because there are six persons living in the towns and cities for every one person living in the country.

We can save the topsoil if we will but use the intelligence God has given us. We can balance our soil budget. Working with nature we can build and replace soil as fast or faster than it is lost. All interests, rural and urban, need to combine, organize, close ranks, and march forward in a united effort to save the topsoil. We should look on money spent in saving soil as an investment in future security and not as a tax. We have piled up a deficit in soil losses the past 100 years. We need now to pay it off to set the machinery in motion to rebuild our soils this second hundred years. Saving and rebuilding our soil resources is our paramount long-time economic problem.

CONSERVATION FARMING PAYS HIGH PROFITS

One question that has bothered farmers in the hilly and rolling parts of Iowa is: Will conservation practices on my farm increase my net returns?

This question is answered decidedly in the affirmative by the farms now being operated by the Iowa State College Foundation. But let us first briefly state how these farms are operated.

A good friend of the college donated these farms to the Iowa State College Foundation in 1938. They were all distressed farms in most cases badly washed, eroded, and much below average in fertility. The plan was to see what could be done in rebuilding them and in making them profitable.

In carrying out this plan each farm has had to pay its own way. Expenditures have been made mostly for soil-building practices and on a basis that any landowner could follow. This practical approach to the problem makes the results of especial value. Any landowner can do the things that have been done on these farms and make a profit.

Let us take what is known as the Edwards farm in Louisa County as an example. Mr. Hotle operates this farm, and Jim Wallace farm manager of the foundation, advises and consults with him in the farm operation.

In 1938, when the foundation took charge, the farm was appraised at $26 per acre. The farm has no level land. The description of the farm briefly reads as follows: "The farm is badly cut up by drainage ways and has a rough terrain. The fields are out of shape and not easily accessible from the road, being separated by a railroad and a creek."

Pictures of the farm were procured soon after it was taken over by the Foundation. These pictures show several gullies from 5 to 7 feet deep. One was large enough to hide a car in. There were, of course, numerous smaller gullies running up low places in the hillsides. It was indeed a problem farm.

The only help that Hotle and Wallace had on this farm was that of a technician from the Soil Conservation Service who staked out the original contour lines. Contour lines are lines at the same level around hills and slopes. All the rest of the work such as terracing, filling ditches, changing fences, and strip cropping was done by Hotle, the farm operator, as his part of the program.

An old discarded road grader was purchased for $12 to build terraces and fill ditches. To make a long story short, this farm without any level land on it is now terraced with ditches filled, and farmed on the contour. Strip cropping is followed, that is, a strip of cultivated crops around the hill adjoins a strip of meadow or of oats. The cultivated strips are about 100 to 200 feet

wide, depending on the slope. These strips are too narrow for serious washing to occur.

Lime and phosphorus have been used in rebuilding the soil. A regular system of crop rotation is carried out. The livestock program provides barnyard manure for about 15 acres annually. These details have been given in order to show that the farm is operated on a purely business basis.

What have been the results? That is the question that farmers want answered. The answer is that the farm has been very profitable both to the Foundation and to the operator. Much of this profit is due to good management of the livestock enterprise and not altogether due to the farm. However, crop yields on the farm have more than doubled since the conservation program was started and apparently are headed for a still higher level. Most of this increase was due to soil-building practices.

The most impressive thing about the farm is that it has stood the test of heavy dashing rains the past few years with very little soil washing and practically no soil leaving the farm. I was on the farm last year following a torrential rain in that locality which gullied cornfields terribly that were planted north and south, east and west, up and down hill without regard to slope. The Edwards farm did not wash. The farm held again this year. Contour farming, terracing, strip cropping, and rotation of crops not only held the soil but increased the yields.

The best sold person on this kind of farming is the operator, Mr. Hotle. It has made money for him. He is so well sold that he lays out contours for neighbors when time permits. This, to me, is important. It demonstrates the fact that farmers can do these jobs themselves and make more money by doing it. It should be kept in mind that all the help Mr. Hotle had on the Foundation farm was help in laying out the original contour lines. He himself built the terraces and filled the ditches. With the advice of Wallace, Foundation manager, rotations were established and strips for cropping were determined and the livestock program agreed upon.

This farm provides a clear-cut demonstration that saving the soil pays and pays well. It demonstrated that with a little help in laying out contour lines any farm operator can do the rest with available farm machinery. It demonstrates too that tenants and farm owners can cooperate in a soil-conservation program that will put dollars in the pockets of each almost from the start. Over a period of years the increased returns from soil-conservation farming over up-and-down-hill farming on rolling land would be greatly increased.

There is no good reason why Iowa cannot save her soils even on rolling land and make much additional profit at the same time. Many farmers are doing this now but many are not doing it. To conserve soil there are several habits and customs that we will have to change. The cultivated rolling or hilly farms in regions of heavy dashing rains that have stood the test employed several methods not commonly in use. They were, for example, farmed on the contour. In addition to contouring those that held under dashing rain conditions were terraced and strip cropped. A good program also calls for a rotation of crops, and the saving and applying of manures in order to build humus and soil texture. In the long run these are all money-making practices.

Our soil scientists tell us that it takes nature from 500 to 1,000 years to build an inch of top soil. We know that man by poor soil practices can destroy several inches of top soil in a very few years. We have demonstrated this fact on a large scale here in the United States. We have many millions of acres of worn out and abandoned land. Conserving soil is now a great national problem.

We know we can destroy land quickly but may it not also be true that we can build land. How long would it take to build an inch of top soil if man cooperated fully with nature. How long would it take to build an inch of top soil if we prevented soil washing and kept the soil supplied with plenty of humus so that bacterial growth would be encouraged. Perhaps by such a system of farming Iowa can not only increase crop production but also by the application of deficient minerals actually and steadily increase the productivity of the soil. These are questions upon which we need additional information as we develop our soil-conservation and soil-building program and as we look to our future security.

Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have received copies of two resolutions adopted by the National Association of State Directors of Veterans' Affairs at their annual convention. One resolution relates to the need for coordination of all veterans' services under one agency, and the other requests the removal of income ceilings for on-the-job training. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include these resolutions in the Appendix of the RECORD:

To the Members of the United States Congress.

GENTLEMEN: The National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs, in annual convention assembled in Chicago on June 21-22, 1947, adopted the following resolutions which are respectfully submitted:

"Whereas the service formerly rendered to States and communities on a national level by the Retraining and Reemployment Administration has been discontinued; and

"Whereas a definite need for this type of service still exists: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs petition the President of the United States to establish within the executive branch of the Government, or under the administration of some other agency, an office to cordinate the work of all Federal departments engaged in service to veterans; to distribute laws affecting veterans and their dependents and to make available to States and communities an informational service concerning all matters pertaining to veterans and their dependents.

"Whereas the specific limitation on compensation derived from productive labor and subsistence allowances which may be received by veterans pursuing courses of education or training on the job is that restrictive as to cause many veterans to discontinue such training courses: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge the present Congress to repeal the proviso of Public Law 679, Seventy-ninth Congress, which imposes the said limitation, or ceiling, in favor of legislation which makes for more liberal allowances.

"Whereas on account of the increased cost of living, more and more veterans are finding it impossible to subsist on the allowances provided by Public Law 346, as amended, and still continue to pursue courses of education and training at our higher institutions of learning: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the present Congress be urged to enact legislation which will provide more liberal allowances for those veterans with dependents who are taking institutional training."

Your earnest consideration is requested.

Yours very truly.

JOE DARWIN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Fire the Disloyal, but Protect the Loyal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 18, 1947:

FIRE THE DISLOYAL, BUT PROTECT THE LOYAL

In the 9 months ended last March, the United States Civil Service Commission estimated yesterday, more than 800 employees of the Federal Government were removed from their jobs on loyalty grounds. A large majority of those dismissed were charged with being members or sympathizers of the Communist Party.

This indicates progress on a vitally urgent housekeeping task, but far from enough progress. The estimate is for removals in only six of the many Federal agencies, and the War Department alone accounted for all but a handful of them.

We believe thorough investigation would disclose that, among the more than 2,000,000 Government employees, there are many others whose loyalty is not to the United States or to democratic principles. National safety demands that they all be removed. To that end, the House of Representatives has just passed what we are compelled, reluctantly, to call a dangerous bill.

Dangerous because the system it would set up for eliminating the disloyal provides wholly inadequate protection for loyal employees who might be unjustly accused.

A five-member loyalty board would be both prosecutor and final judge. The votes of three members would be sufficient to dismiss any employee from the Federal service. The accused person would have no opportunity to face or cross-examine his accuser. The Board would be required, so far as possible, to conceal from him the source of the information against him. He would have no right to appeal from the Board's decision, no recourse in any court or other tribunal.

This bill, we think, would make it possible for innocent Government workers to be ruined on information planted by Communists or other subversives. And "ruined" is not too strong a word. Dismissal on a charge of disloyalty to the Government could be a sentence of economic death, a permanent bar to decent employment anywhere, and a life-long brand of disgrace.

For the fact that a large House majority voted for this extreme measure, the Communists are to blame. Many Members of Congress, knowing that great numbers of these Red vermin and their fellow travelers have found their way into Government agencies, knowing that it is standard practice for Communists to lie to conceal their affiliations and achieve their ends, felt understandably that drastic legislation is needed to deal with a great peril.

But surely the Government can fight these tactics effectively without adopting undemocratic methods. The Senate, if it acts on this bill, should write into it adequate safeguards for the rights of loyal employees. Failing that, it would be better to leave in effect President Truman's Executive order, which requires Government departments to oust the disloyal but does not deprive Federal workers of all real opportunity to defend themselves.

Connecticut's Attitude Toward the Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of July 19, 1947.

The stream mentioned in the article is in the Fifth District, which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Speaker, this is an indication of the willingness of our Connecticut citizens to aid those who were so unfortunate as to suffer disabilities in the service of their country.

THANKS, DISABLED VETERANS
(By T. E. Murphy)

The best-stocked trout brook in Connecticut is so exclusive that not even the Governor of the State would dare to throw a hook into it, even though the State does the stocking. It is near the highway, with benches at the water's edge so a man can sit as he fishes. But the admission fee is high—an arm or a leg, in most instances.

You'll be pardoned if there's a catch in your throat as you read the sign: Wheel chairs have first priority. Then you notice a young fellow in a wheel chair who can't move his legs because of shrapnel wounds. He is happy, though, for this is a stream kept brimming full with rainbow, brook, and brown trout. There are free rods and reels, donated by sportsmen, and there's young Richard Pitney, himself an ex-serviceman, to untangle lines, bait hooks—or do such things as advise that young blind fellow how far he should cast.

This grand way to say "thank you" to disabled veterans was the idea of Lyle Thorpe, aquatic biologist of the State and former Navy officer. When he was in the Pacific, Thorpe worried some about getting disabled and being unable to go fishing again. Returning home unscathed, he lost no time discussing with Dr. Russell Hunter, head of the State's fish-and-game department, a plan to cheer up less lucky anglers. In one of the State's quickest make-over jobs, roads were run to the bank of the stream, ramps were built and thousands of belligerent trout were dumped in just before opening day. Now nearly 100 regulars visit the spot frequently.

Richard Pitney, who had a 25-percent disability himself, says that they are the most patient fishermen he has ever seen. A blind boy is his favorite. "He's absolutely independent," Richard remarks. "He says, 'Just face me toward the brook and tell me how much line to cast.'" Another regular has no hands, yet does well with a special rod. Still another chap with two artificial legs goes right into the brook.

Pitney says all the men are good-humored about their disabilities. Recently a one-handed veteran, pulling in his catch with the aid of his teeth, lost both his false teeth and the fish. Pitney regained the former and the veteran soon had another fish.

Constant vigilance must be exercised to prevent the excitement of a hooked fish from causing the angler some harm. A veteran of the First World War, now suffering from a calcified spine, came there for his first fishing expedition in 20 years. He was wheeled up to the ramp by his wife. Later Pitney espied the veteran dangling perilously over the edge of the stream, his wife holding onto his belt for dear life. He had become so excited that he had lost his balance.

The other day I talked with Bob McCall, who got a bit of shrapnel while fighting with the Eighth Infantry Division in Europe. "These are electrified worms," he said, grinning. "My father sends current into the ground to drive them out." Another fisherman brought over a huge night crawler, urging, "Try this." A moment later Bob landed a 12-inch trout, and the other man remarked, "Now my day is happy. I like to see a fish caught, no matter who gets it."

Lyle Thorpe kept his fingers crossed when he opened this exclusive fishing spot. He explains. "It cost money and I wasn't sure the veterans would use it." His worry was brief. The first day and the first fish ended it. "When I saw the look on the face of that boy as he pulled in a rainbow trout." says Thorpe, "the project was paid for. He was paralyzed from the waist down." The happiness that subsequently has come to hundreds of disabled men is sheer dividends.

Twentieth Century Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE. L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an article from the Shelbyville Gazette, a splendid newspaper of the Fifth District of Tennessee, concerning a book written by our colleague, Congressman KEFAUVER, regarding the reorganization of the Congress. The article is as follows:

JUST BETWEEN US
(By John W. Weatherly)

Twentieth Century Congress by ESTES KEFAUVER, Representative from the Third District of Tennessee in Congress, is a must in reading matter for all of us. Mr. KEFAUVER clearly outlines the need for a reorganization of Congress, for closer relation between the executive and legislative branches of our National Government. Under the proposed changes expedition of the passage of bills will be expedited, filibustering will be eliminated, voting will be speeded up. Committees will be smaller, some entirely dispensed with.

How many of us know that two Mondays a month are spent by Congress making laws for the District of Columbia, which has no law-making body of its own. This has to be taken care of by Congress.

And the most important is that the Senate and the House of Representatives will be more nearly on an equal footing.

The House is more closely connected with the electors than the Senators. There are 96 Senators, 2 from each State. There are 435 Representatives, 1 from each district.

Which is more nearly representative of the people? Yet the Senate has the most power.

For those of you who want to know more about your Government, more about the affairs and where the money you pay for taxes goes, read the book which gives you an insight into the workings of the most democratic form of government in the world.

Mr. KEFAUVER has written a book which every citizen interested in the progress and survival of our country should read.

River Control as an Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to submit copy of an editorial contained in the New York Times, of date July 16, 1947, as follows:

RIVER CONTROL AS AN ECONOMY

In his message of last January 6, President Truman urged that "the development of the great river systems of America * * * be pushed with full vigor." The House of Representatives commented on this proposal by drastic cuts in appropriations for the already authorized long-term program for the control of the Missouri River. This turned out to be a bad year for that sort of economy. While the House economists were counting the dollars that were to be saved, the Missouri went on a rampage which may cost the country, as the President estimated in hi flood-control message of last Wednesday. half a billion dollars or more.

Mr. Truman, under these tragic circumstances, seems to have the best of the argument. As he says, we now have, under existing laws, comprehensive and detailed plans for most of the work needed to eliminate destructive floods and provide for the beneficial use of water in the Mississippi River Basin. This basin takes in more than 40 percent of the continental area of the United States. The big river into which all its water pours may discharge as little as 70,000 cubic feet a second and as much as 2,800,000 cubic feet a second. Attempts at control have been going on since 1824. They have been intensified on paper and to a large extent in practice, since the big lower Mississippi flood of 1927 and especially since the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority showed how a big stream could be tamed and put to work.

The question is how much time, how much argument, and how big a flood it will take to persuade Congress that it is worth while to spend a dollar to save ten or hundred or a thousand dollars. Do we have to wait for the grandfather of all floods which might result, as Mr. Truman said, if high water occurred simultaneously on the Missouri, Ohio, upper Mississippi, Arkansas, and Red Rivers? One hopes not.

Mr. Truman is not asking much from this session of Congress. He proposes to start a 10-year program with an initial appropriation of $250,000,000, most of which would go to the Army engineers. During the coming decade $6,000,000,000 would be spent, of which three and a half or four billions would be directly or indirectly for flood control. But the rivers must be used as well as controlled. Irrigation, power, navigation, recreation, wildlife protection, the prevention of disease-bearing pollution, all must be in the picture.

Mr. Truman speaks rather cautiously of "the ultimate establishment of valley authorities." The immediate requirement is flood

protection, which the Army plan and the so-called Pick-Sloan program can, in part, provide. Sooner or later, however, the multiple-purpose development of the rivers on regional bases will have to be considered. Next January, perhaps, Mr. Truman will be ready to make specific proposals for a Missouri River Authority. In the meantime, Congress can save the country some money by spending the $250,000,000 now requested.

World's Largest Breakwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in inviting the attention of the House to the fact that the harbor of Long Beach, Calif., will soon be enclosed by the world's greatest breakwater, construction of which is expected to be completed by the end of 1948.

The accomplishment of such a vast undertaking again indicates the tremendous advancement of southern California in the industrial life of the United States and the understanding of the Congress in authorizing this great work which will enclose the largest man-made harbor on the face of the earth.

The following article is from the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram of July 13, 1947:

Steadily stretching farther eastward off Long Beach is a deep-water breakwater that will be the longest in the world when work is completed.

The present contract, to complete the last 8,650 feet of a 13,350-foot detached extension of the breakwater—which actually was begun at San Pedro in 1899—was awarded by the Los Angeles District, United States Engineer Department, on June 24, 1946. The contract also included restoration of a 12,500-foot detached unit.

Involving a total Federal expenditure of about $25,000,000, the completed breakwater will provide approximately 30 square miles of sheltered anchorage for Navy vessels, many of which will make this their home port, and for other shipping. The vast area already sheltered by the breakwater construction has given Long Beach one of the few ports boasting a large protected anchorage and modern marine terminals on the ocean front, as well as docking and transit facilities on the man-made inner harbor.

When the last 8,650 feet is completed, probably by the end of 1948, the breakwater will extend to a point 1,000 feet easterly from Belmont pier. This will give a total length to the massive island structure of about 7 miles.

The San Pedro breakwater, 11,152 feet in length, constructed of cut stone superstructure on a random stone base was completed in 1912. The need for a more extensive mole system already had been felt.

Today there is agitation to continue the breakwater even farther east, to run it shoreward in the vicinity of Sunset Beach to "lock" Alamitos Bay and the harbor of the naval ammunition and net depot at Seal Beach.

SEVEN-MILLION-FIVE-HUNDRED-THOUSAND-DOLLAR JOB

The Connolly-Case-Kiewt Construction Co., with John Connolly, local superintendent, and Louis Richeter, field superintendent, is building the present extension and doing the restoration work at a total cost of $7,500,000.

Resident engineer for the Government is Robert E. Louden. O. E. Gurney is assistant to Louden and safety engineer; William J. Matthews, assistant engineer, and Irvil Dunbar, chief inspector. Col. A. T. W. Moore is district engineer.

The present work is being done in several steps. Dredges already have completed a sand core, covered with clay and quarry waste, for the entire extension. This is about 260 feet wide at the ocean floor. The depth of the water, varying from 44 to 57 feet below mean low tide, assures negligible water action and that the sand and clay will not wash away.

Pyramided above the base ridge are three separate layers of rock, each layer a different sort of material. The layers are called A, B, and C, the A being cap rock and largest.

HEIGHT 75 FEET

The only rock visible is the A rock. The B rock ends 10 feet below the surface at mean low tide. The A rock rises 14 feet above water level at mean low tide, and measures 16 feet across the leveled top. Height of the completed breakwater from the ocean floor is 75 feet. In a foot cross-section of the breakwater, the A stone weighs 80 tons, and the B and C rock each from 140 to 150 tons. The sand and clay base weighs about 100 tons to the foot. The present contract calls for approximately 2,000,000 tons of stone. Restoration of the 12,500-foot detached breakwater consists of rubble stone enrockment only.

Twenty percent of the cap rock is quarried at Catalina, brought here on barges and placed by huge cranes mounted on other barges. The other 80 percent is brought by rail from Riverside and placed on barges at pier A. No class A stone piece used weighs less than a ton, and 75 percent weigh 10 tons or more each.

Placing of the C stone is 90 percent completed, and the B stonework is 17 percent finished. Fifteen percent of the A stone has been placed.

Denver Post Strongly Urges Congress Not To Recess Before Passing Mundt Bill To Authorize Foreign Information Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, if plans for our summer congressional adjournment are carried out, we shall be voting on a sine die adjournment motion 1 week from today. Before such a summer recess is authorized, Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that both Houses of Congress will vote their approval of H. R. 3342 which several weeks ago passed the House of Representatives by a 3 to 1 affirmative vote.

H. R. 3342 authorizes the establishment of a foreign information service abroad, Mr. Speaker, and it puts this important feature of our State Department activity on a permanent basis. In his recent appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary of State Marshall urged that this legislation be approved before adjournment primarily so he would be able to attract personnel to this important activity and develop an administrative staff equipped to direct this great peace-serving and peace-preserving program.

Secretary of State Marshall rightfully and logically pointed out that it was impossible to staff this information service with the type of personnel he desired to invite in from private life while it continues in its present nebulous status without authority in law and subject to complete termination at the end of the fiscal year. No able and active American is going to be willing to leave his business or profession to take up administrative duties in a State Department foreign information service until and unless he knows it has been authorized by Congress and that it is a continuing and accepted part of our Government service. Certainly no Senator or Representative can expect Secretary of State Marshall to invite any outstanding American to become the captain of a sinking ship.

The Denver Post is rightfully concerned about this continued hesitancy of Congress to give our information service an authorized and approved status in an era of history when the failure to tell the world the truth about America may literally lead to the failure of peace and the sacrifices of war. As a consequence it urges that this so-called Mundt bill be enacted into law now.

There is yet time for action in the closing days of this session of Congress. I hope the Congress and the country will move forward shoulder to shoulder in taking the action required to equip our State Department with the essential tools it has repeatedly said it requires to build an enduring temple of peace and to ward off the forces now loose in the world which are fomenting the sentiments from which wars are made. The House has measured up to its responsibilities and passed this measure. It is devoutly to be hoped the other branch of Congress will do likewise in the next few days.

The following editorial is from the Denver Post:

OUR VOICE IS IN DOUBT

The sticky heat of the Potomac lowlands has settled upon Washington and with it has come the stuffing of congressional pigeonholes which is an outstanding symptom of adjournment fever.

Some of the measures which may languish in committee over the summer and autumn are hot potatoes which uncertain lawmakers would like to talk over with the folks at home. But others with the uncontroverted backing of both necessity and popular support may lose out simply because Congress fails to recognize their urgency. Such is the Mundt bill, which would set up a long-range program of foreign information and cultural exchange.

After long, and often annoyingly inconsequential, debate the House approved the information program by the heavy majority of 272 to 97. It has now gone to the Senate, where without positive action by the Republican leadership it will probably die in committee. The fate of the bill thus rests in the hands of Senators TAFT, WHERRY, MILLIKIN, VANDENBERG, and BROOKS.

When the House Appropriation Committee struck out funds for the information pro-

gram from the State Department allotment, the protest was quickly raised that this would leave America without a voice in the battle of ideas. Under heavy fire, the House back-tracked, passed a stopgap appropriation to continue the voice of America broadcasts, and finally completed its reversal by passage of the Mundt bill.

If the Mundt bill is pigeonholed, the United States information program will be reduced to a small-scale, temporary effort confined principally to the Voice of America transmissions. Precious months will be lost in implementing the adequate long-range program which Secretary of State Marshall pleads is vital in carrying out our foreign policy.

Professional men of the high skill needed for this program will not accept positions which offer a dubious future. Without such talent, our information efforts may be worse than nothing. That is the problem which will confront Secretary Marshall if the Senate leaves the Mundt bill bottled up during the long summer and fall.

What the adjournment-minded Congress must realize is that there can be no vacation in foreign policy.

The World's Santa Claus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry Hazlitt from Newsweek magazine of July 21, 1947:

THE WORLD'S SANTA CLAUS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

More and more the strange idea is being put forward that America must make loans or gifts to foreign countries, not primarily to save them but to save itself. We are told that we must make these gifts or loans not as a humane or charitable duty but out of shrewd self-interest. Newspaper commentators in the recipient countries have more and more been interpreting our generosity to them on this theory. On June 25 Pravda declared that the Marshall plan was influenced by a desire to prolong a postwar "boom in the United States" and to "lessen the ripening economic crisis" here.

That Communist Russia should hold such a view is not surprising. It fits in perfectly with all the other claptrap that Communists have long preached about capitalism. But the theory is just as eagerly embraced elsewhere.

A year ago, in its issue of July 12, 1946, the Eastern Economist of New Delhi put it forward in its most candid form. "The United States lend-lease plan of helping the Allies in the recent war has been acclaimed as an act of unparalleled generosity," it said. "But it was also a brilliant and ingenious way of solving what would otherwise have been an intractable problem. * * * The productive power of America has multiplied itself so fast that it is now admitted that she cannot continue to give 60,000,000 jobs unless she is able to have a large export trade. * * * In such circumstances it would not be such a foolish thing (as some might imagine) to give away goods to other countries, for on balance it would be better to part with surplus goods than to create unemployment. * * * Machinery should be set up by America whose purpose would be to provide gifts of loans to countries. * * * The United States * * * will buy the goods, give them as gifts, and reimburse itself by additional internal taxation. * * * If this is to play the world's Santa Claus, the United States is both rich enough and should have sense enough to fill the role."

This idea, in both crude and sophisticated guise, now runs like a refrain through the French and British press. More surprising, it is endorsed by some American businessmen and even by some American economists. Yet it is unadulterated nonsense.

If we could create prosperity merely by making goods to give away, then we would not have to give them to foreign countries. We could make the goods to give away to our own poor. We could furnish them with free overcoats, free lunches, and free automobiles; build any amount of good new housing, which we badly need, and turn it over to them. Simplest of all, we could turn over to them direct additional money taken from the taxpayers and let them buy with it whatever they themselves wanted. Why confuse the issue by bringing in foreign nations and foreign trade?

It ought to be clear to the meanest intelligence that nobody can get rich by giving his goods away. What seems to confuse otherwise intelligent people when this proposition is applied to a nation instead of an individual, however, is the fact that particular firms and persons within the nation can profit by such a transaction while the rest of us are forced to absorb the losses. The exporter may profit because he makes additional sales. But if the foreign loan is not repaid, then the loss must be made good out of increased taxes on every American. American consumers will then have just that much less money to buy American goods. Domestic business will lose as much as export business has gained. And the country will be poorer by the amount of goods it has given away.

This would be the consequence of unsound foreign loans at any time. But the country is now in the midst of an unprecedented inflationary boom. Precisely when this inflation should be prevented from going further, a Government foreign-loan policy can only intensify it. The theory that we need to create an export surplus by unsound governmental loans would be foolish enough even if we had unemployment and wished prices to go up; it becomes downright idiotic in a period of full employment and when everyone is already complaining of high living costs.

Necessity of an Adequate Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, last week we debated the matter of appropriations for the Air Force, and discussed the question of bringing it up to 70 air groups. In connection with that subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "First Line," from the Boston Globe, which deals with the vital question of having an adequate air force.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST LINE

Whatever may be the disagreements among Americans on such problems of national defense as universal military training and the unification of the armed services, on one subject they are practically unanimous. We are united in our opinion of the prime importance of air power. Few Americans would dispute the theory that ultimate victory in any future war can only be won by dominating the air.

While all our effort is directed to prevention of another war, nevertheless common prudence demands that we take steps to maintain our security in a world that is as yet far from a stabilized and peaceful community.

Seldom is victory achieved by the same weapons that won a previous war. But nearly always the most powerful weapons of a war are forecast by developments of a previous struggle. Thus in World War I air power played a minor role, but sufficient to indicate the future possibilities of fighting aircraft. In World War II the potentialities indicated 25 years earlier were realized and air power was a major factor, achieving equality with land and sea forces. The tremendous contribution of air power to final victory in World War II is a sure portent of even greater weight in the scales of combat in the future.

No belligerent in the late war developed its air forces so rapidly or so efficiently as the United States. Our conceptions of both the strategic and tactical use of air power were sound. Beyond the strictly combat function of the airplane we utilized this fast means of transport to hurdle obstructions that blocked every other means of travel. Our air routes circled the world in a transport and communications net more complete and more speedy than any other. The record of our combat planes is too conspicuous to need more than mention.

We won our place as primary air power at terrific cost. To cite only one figure, our combat losses of heavy, four-engined bombers in the European theater amounted to 8,300 airplanes. Such an extended and prodigious air force as we had in World War II can only be maintained by maximum production of both airplanes and the trained personnel to handle them.

We learned something else about air power. Only continuous, first-rate research and experiment can keep aviation equipment abreast of technical development. Starting behind other belligerents we reached unchallengable superiority by the end of the war, thanks to a number of factors that may not be present again.

Now, 2 years afterward, it is disturbing to hear that our Army Air Force is deteriorating, as compared to other air forces, both as to quantity and quality. This is particularly serious because, as usually happens following the stimulus given to such a science as aviation by wartime necessities, the postwar refinements are numerous and have already made planes of 2 years ago obsolete.

Yet only last Saturday Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE lost his effort to restore a cut of some $600,000,000 to Army Air Force appropriations. This sum was needed, Senator LODGE declared, for an air forces of 70 groups of about 4,000 planes—less than half the number of heavy bombers we lost over Europe in less than 3 years. This week the Air Force announced that owing to budget cuts, only 9,786 of 28,000 Reserve flying officers can be given the part-time training for which they had enrolled.

Fears have been expressed that lack of orders may seriously cripple key units in the airplane-building industry and cause a dispersion of trained workers. For the same reason, the production of new types of advanced planes may be slowed down, and experiment curtailed.

Training aviation personnel, either for ground duties or for flying, cannot be compressed into much less than 1 year. The production of a new airplane, even under the pressures of wartime, required 2 to 3

years, and sometimes longer. Putting a new plane into operation is one activity that cannot be done hurriedly.

Today the United States is in a different position than ever before in our history. We are now in the forefront of international affairs.

Not again may we expect the priceless 2 years' grace that was given us in the first two world wars to prepare for catastrophe. Thus the necessity for keeping our Air Force, our best and surest defense, at maximum efficiency and in adequate strength seems self-evident.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Gambling With Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to extend in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of Saturday, July 19, 1947, entitled "Gambling With Security":

GAMBLING WITH SECURITY

In bowing last March to the opposition in Congress to extension of selective service for another year, President Truman warned that if enlistments did not meet expectations a re-enactment of this statute might become necessary This is an issue which Congress has studiously avoided to date. Now it is approaching the stage of crisis. By next January the question will be acute.

Let us look at the record. In the first 6 months of the calendar year enlistments were 70,000 below minimum requirements of 30,000 a month. In May the totals for the Army were only 14,907. In June—traditionally one of the best enlistment months of the year because of high school graduations—the total was only 24,830. By next January, when Congress reconvenes, the indicated deficit is 140,000 men, or almost 40 percent. With the Army already more than 100,000 men below the minimum of 1,070,000 set by our military leaders, counting those men on terminal leave or in hospital with little prospect of return to service, the Army faces the probability of having less than 900,000 effectives in service next January 1. The Navy and Marine Corps, which always have found enlistment goals easier to obtain, also are said to be faced with a slump. They, too, may find difficulty—because of large indicated expiration of enlistments during the year—in meeting requirements of 571,000 men.

This is an alarming situation. At a time when certain aspects of the international situation certainly are not improving, when there has been no cancellation of the commitments which our armed services must carry through, the Army and Navy are faced with a deficit in manpower about which nothing has been done or is being done. Unification, which seems assured of passage by Congress, will do little in itself to correct the situation. No such claim ever was made for it. Congress has passed the Navy appropriation bill with only relatively minor trimmings and probably will pass the Army appropriation bill in like fashion. But dollars cannot take the place of men. A reform of military justice, such as the House Armed Services Committee has blueprinted, was needed, but it is not enough of a stimulation to enlistment to make up more than a fraction of the deficit. The Army as a career, so far as pay, food, quarters, entertainment, and other emoluments are concerned, has been made just about as attractive as it can be made, or probably ever will be made.

The least that can be done by Congress is for the House and Senate committees that are charged with the military phases of our national security to schedule a full-dress inquiry immediately into the whole problem, and especially into the basic phase of the problem—manpower. If a special session is called this fall, the spadework will already have been done. If there is no special session, a full report will be ready for the opening of the regular second session of the Eightieth Congress in January.

To ignore longer this critical situation would be reckless. If the facts are presented clearly to the American people we believe they can accept a hard choice. They always have before. They can and will accept it if the alternative is a gamble with national security. And that is exactly the way to describe the attempt to maintain by voluntary means as large a military force as we need, in view of our responsibilities.

What General Eisenhower said in April 1946, when he was pleading with Congress for an extension of selective service for one more year, is as true today as it was then. "How many young men will decide to make the Army their career or give it a whirl in the next 18 or 20 months?" he asked. "I don't know and Generals Hershey, Paul, and Texter don't know. And I say with all respect to you gentlemen that you don't know. It's a gamble any way you look at it. And gentlemen, in my opinion, any gamble with the national security of the United States at this time is a gamble with the peace and security of the world. With all the sincerity and force that I possess, I urge you, do not take this gamble."

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Sidney Parks, executive secretary of Gate City Lodge, No. 144, B'nai B'rith, Atlanta, Ga., has forwarded to me a resolution adopted by that body at its meeting on July 9, 1947. For the information of Members I insert this resolution herewith:

Whereas the plight of displaced persons of all faiths in Europe today, victims of Nazi persecution and brutality, who continue to exist in camps notwithstanding the cessation of hostilities more than 2 years ago, is a blot upon civilization and represents an urgent claim upon the conscience of the world; and

Whereas Americans are directly concerned with the fate of these displaced persons, who have been uprooted from their homes and country as a result of events subsequent to the outbreak of World War II and are unable or unwilling to return to the country of their nationality or former residence because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions; and

Whereas many Americans, civic, service and labor organizations, interested in the fate of these displaced persons, as well as relatives of such persons, are interested in assisting in the resettlement of a fair share of these displaced persons in suitable American communities without having them become a charge on the United States or the community; and

Whereas under present immigration laws a system of quotas is created, the larger proportion of which quotas are unused because of their nationality distribution and the low quota available for victims of Nazi barbarism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Gate City Lodge, No. 144, B'nai B'rith, That it urge Congress by House bill 2910 and other appropriate bills, to adopt emergency legislation, making available these unused quotas, admitting during a fixed and limited period of time a maximum amount of such displaced persons to the United States so as to enable the rescue and the rehabilitation of victims of war, persecution and oppression and thus maintain our proud tradition as a haven for the oppressed and a refuge for the homeless and distressed.

Judge Robert P. Patterson, Great Secretary of War and Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, it was with extreme regret that I read this morning of the resignation of Judge Robert P. Patterson as Secretary of War.

About 7 years ago, when Judge Patterson resigned as a member of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals and came to Washington to contribute his splendid ability and services to the Nation, I had the pleasure of meeting him for the first time. A small group of Congressmen were having a meeting to discuss problems of the armed services. We had invited Judge Patterson to discuss several matters with us. He made a profound impression upon me at this meeting. His sincerity, earnestness, unselfishness, and remarkable knowledge of the overall problem of the armed services convinced me that America was most fortunate in having him in the position of Under Secretary of War.

Since that time I have followed his career with interest and appreciation. During the 7 years Judge Patterson has served as Under Secretary of War and Secretary of War we have seen the armed might of this country grow to great heights, and we have seen the orderly demobilization of a large part of our fighting might. These accomplishments have required the direction of men of great patriotism and ability such as Judge Robert Patterson. Judge Patterson made a great personal sacrifice in giving up his lifetime position on the court of appeals. However, in the best American tradition, he was willing to serve wherever he could be of the greatest benefit to his country. I know of no one who has worked harder or has shown greater patience than Judge Patterson. In his appearances before congressional committees he was always appreciative of every Member's viewpoint, and he was careful to give the fullest of explanations of all steps taken by the War Department when called upon by members of committees.

I feel that Judge Patterson is truly one of the great men of America. He is a gentleman and a patriot. I hope that the people of the Nation may have the benefit of his great capacities in some other executive or judicial position.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly concerned about the failure of the Eightieth Congress to enact legislation regarding benefits to the survivors of our deceased servicemen and to our disabled veterans. It is my sincere conviction that most of us have forgotten too readily the sacrifices of the dependent parents who lost a boy in the war, or the young widows and orphan children who are dependent upon their pension checks and insurance, if any, for the necessities of life.

It was, and is yet, my hope and prayer that educational benefits will be extended to these young widows and that proper provisions will be made to provide the orphans of deceased servicemen a college education. I introduced such a bill on January 21, 1947 (H. R. 1181), because I feel that since the fathers of these children have given their lives for our safety and well-being, it is our responsibility to provide their children with the education they would have wanted them to have.

The Eightieth Congress has enacted some veterans' legislation, but there are far too many bills awaiting action after being thoroughly considered by the Veterans' Affairs Committee and reported to the House. It is to be regretted, Mr. Speaker, that the Republican leadership has delayed action on veterans' legislation which in many cases was unanimously reported by the committee and endorsed by all the major veterans' organizations.

Public Law 5 of the Eightieth Congress allows veterans to reinstate their national service life insurance without the necessity of a physical examination. This will benefit millions of veterans who have allowed their Government insurance to lapse since being discharged from the service.

Public Law 34 will benefit World War I veterans who desire to renew their 5-year-level premium Government insurance as this act authorizes a fifth 5-year period policy.

Public Law 115 has increased the revolving fund from $1,500,000 to $3,000,000 in order that disabled veterans may borrow from the fund when undertaking vocational training.

H. R. 246 remains in the Rules Committee after being reported unanimously by the Veterans' Affairs Committee. This would increase the ceiling of wages and subsistence for those veterans undergoing on-the-job trainings to $250 per month for veterans without dependents, $325 to veterans with one dependent, and $350 per month for veterans with two or more dependents.

H. R. 3888 would increase subsistence payment under the GI bill of rights to veterans with one dependent to $105 per month with an additional $20 being paid for the first child and $15 for each additional child.

H. R. 4007 to provide automobiles to blind veterans in addition to amputees who are now eligible is still awaiting favorable consideration by the Rules Committee.

Other bills of equal merit have not been allowed to come before the House for debate and for a vote. I sincerely hope that the majority party leaders will allow the House to decide whether or not these bills should be enacted.

The National Health Insurance and Public Health Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made before the Subcommittee on Health, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of the United States Senate, on July 11, 1947, on Senate bill 1320, the National Health Insurance and Public Health Act of 1947.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I should like to submit, for the committee's consideration, this statement as to why I am proud to co-sponsor the National Health Insurance and Public Health Act of 1947, S. 1320, and why I must oppose the passage of S. 545. I should like to discuss, in this statement, the bearing which these two bills have on the needs of America's farm families. We have, in the past few years, learned much about the heavy toll levied on rural America because of inadequate health services and poor medical care. S. 1320 will, I believe, correct these deficiencies in a relatively short time. S. 545, on the other hand, will aggravate the evils.

Organized preventive services are most important to the 57,000,000 Americans who live in rural areas, and 43 percent of our Nation's population live in communities of less than 2,500 persons.

Preventive services are important to farm people because by their widespread application we can most effectively combat the evils which are preventing rural America from achieving a health parity with our urban population.

For example, cities of 100,000 or more have an infant mortality rate about one-fourth lower than do rural communities. Similarly the big city maternal mortality rate is one-third lower. Diseases which are entirely preventable, such as typhoid fever and diphtheria, cause several times as many deaths in rural as they do in urban areas. It is reported that tuberculosis, long thought of primarily as a disease of the city, is becoming more prevalent among rural residents since the newer technics of mass surveys and modern treatment have been applied with vigor only in the cities.

Despite the need for these preventive services, 40 percent of the Nation's population in 1946, primarily all rural, was not serviced by district or local public-health departments, and in a third of the counties that were serviced there were no health officers. Twenty-three of the States do not have even a single local public-health unit that measures up to minimum medical experience and training standards. Instead of the one to two dollars per capita required to provide adequate preventive services, rural areas are spending 50 cents. Is it any wonder that with this lack of provision for adequate preventive health services in rural areas preventable diseases still take an inexcusable toll of life.

Title III of our bill, the title on "Development and Expansion of Health Services" would provide means for correcting these very deficiencies. The Federal grants-in-aid to the States for expanded preventive health services, for maternal and child health services would come as a blessing to those millions of rural residents who do not now have the protection of full-time adequately staffed and well-financed public health departments. Not only can programs for the control of tuberculosis and the venereal diseases be strengthened and extended, but impetus would be given to the establishment and maintenance of programs for the early detection, prevention, and treatment of mental disorders, dental disease, cancer, heart disease, and other diseases of our aging population.

In addition to adequate preventive services, our rural people are vitally interested in having access to hospital beds and in having enough physicians, dentists, nurses, and other health workers available to serve them. Congress has taken cognizance of the inadequacy of the Nation's hospital facilities by its passage of the bipartisan Hospital Survey and Construction Act. I am not sure, however, that the great disparity between rural and urban areas in this regard is generally appreciated. Generally speaking, rural States have about half the supply of hospital beds found in the highly industrialized and urban States. Moreover, rural hospitals are usually small, poorly equipped and without free beds since they are often privately owned. Large cities have a 60 percent higher rate of hospitalization than do farm areas, and this lower hospital-bed occupancy exists in those very areas that have the fewest hospital beds. This is not because farm people need or desire less hospital care, but because they are less able to afford to purchase it.

The construction of hospital facilities under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act by itself will not bring sick farmers into the hospital. As a matter of fact, even for construction to be undertaken under that act proof must be shown that the hospital can be maintained—a difficult task in a low-income rural county. A prepayment system that removes the economic barrier to hospital care and guarantees a community purchasing power to furnish the necessary maintenance is provided for by our bill. In title II there is the provision that hospitals would be paid their full cost of service. In addition, the amount of money authorized under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act is increased and the span of its authority is extended from 5 to 10 years.

The need for physicians, dentists, and other health personnel in rural areas is acute. They have 43 percent of the population but only 18 percent of the health workers of the country. This maldistribution of physicians means that there is only 1 country doctor for every 2.6 urban physicians. And the situation is growing worse since large numbers of doctors who went into the armed services from rural areas are now settling

in the cities. Many rural counties have up to 5,000 and even 10,000 persons per physician against a minimum desired proportion of 1 to 1,000. Eighty-one counties recently reported no physician at all.

The unfavorable economic status of so many rural areas means a low medical purchasing power. This has been the major reason why professional people no longer settle in these areas. By assuring adequate pay for physicians in rural communities, the national health insurance fund would attract doctors to country districts. Furthermore, section 256 of title II, Rural Areas, makes special provision to end the shortage of professional people in rural areas by guaranteeing a minimum annual income, by paying transportation expenses of physicians establishing their practices in such areas and by authorizing loans for the purchase of necessary office equipment.

We all know that up-to-date and adequate medical care is expensive. The use of insurance so as to meet this cost on a group basis is now a generally approved device. Most farm families do not have the incomes to meet the high cost of medical care on an individual basis. And voluntary health insurance plans are no help in rural areas. Insurance is no good when you have no doctor. Besides the $100 a year which is the average cost of comprehensive medical care for a family, is a sum out of the reach of about 80 percent of all farm families. The largest rural program of voluntary prepaid medical care, originally sponsored by the Farm Security Administration, has been sharply curtailed. The Blue Cross hospital plan, so popular in the cities, reaches about 3 percent of farm families and even this plan takes care of only about one-fifth of the average family's yearly medical bill. Voluntary health insurance sponsored by the State medical societies cover only about 1 percent of the rural population and usually insure only against surgical and maternity care in the hospitals.

S. 1320 mobilizes the total resources of our Nation through an insurance plan based on income. Only in this way can farm families participate in a system which provides comprehensive health services at a cost they can meet.

I should like to indicate in closing several of the implications of the Taft, Ball, Smith, Donnel bill, S. 545, which I feel will be disturbing to rural people. Farm people do not like to take charity. They do not want charity medicine as a substitute for health insurance. They want to pay their way, but they want the medical care they need. They would not willingly submit to a means test such as that required by S. 545. S. 545 is apparently designed to give over control of the program to organized medicine, a monopolistic trend in medicine which I oppose as much as I oppose monopolistic trends in investment banking and in railroads. Both the National Grange and the Farmers Union have been outspoken in their opposition to medical monopoly; to the exclusion of the people who pay for medical care in the planning and management of medical society prepayment plans. In about 20 States there is restrictive legislation which prevents the consumers of medical care from forming their own health insurance plans. Cooperative plans for the distribution of medical care have been very successful in many rural areas and our farmers will fight any attempt to prohibit the continued development of these plans in a democratic fashion.

Finally, S. 545 would set up a double standard of medical care—one for the rich and one for the poor. Since so many of our farmers are unable to meet the high costs of medical care, they will not support legislation which at best would provide medical care of an inferior quality.

Therefore, in the interests of our Nation as a whole and particularly because it is badly needed by our farmers and their families, I urge prompt and favorable action on S. 1320—the National Health Insurance and Public Health Act of 1947.

The Wool Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 19 (legislative day of Wednesday July 16), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter relative to the wool tariff, written by Arthur Besse, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From American Affairs for July 1947]

CURIOSITIES OF OUR TRADE POLICY

To the EDITOR OF AMERICAN AFFAIRS:

The United States must present curious spectacle to foreign statesmen, students, and economists who seek to follow our foreign trade policy as it is expressed from time to time by people of prominence in this country.

Picture the puzzlement of the Britisher used to hearing the slogan "Buy British" when he learns that United States Secretary of Commerce Averell Harriman says that we in this country should abandon the slogan "Buy American." "Let's import," says the Secretary, firing the first gun in what seems to resemble a campaign to boycott our own products and promote the sale of items made in some other part of the world.

In an article in the Saturday Evening Post, the Secretary says, "We must import to live," but when he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House on April 28, the only items he could think of which we should import in increased volume were hand-made toys and penny candy for the children. He listed some other items in his Saturday Evening Post article but most of them are raw materials imported without duty. These we are importing in such volume as we can use except for a few articles of which there is a present shortage.

Picture the astonishment of a Belgian lace manufacturer who reads that an American group called the Public Affairs Committee wants the United States to import Belgian laces at lower prices than our manufacturers can quote, saying that our citizens would buy more lace if the price were not so high. The Belgian lace manufacturer knows that we make lace in the United States and that we pay our lace workers more than three times what the same workers receive in Belgium. The Belgians themselves could buy lace more cheaply from China, but the Belgians maintain a tariff to keep out foreign laces.

Imagine the difficulty of a foreign student of employment trends in trying to understand the statement of Philip Reed, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co., that "new foreign products not produced here would create employment in the distributive and service industries." The foreign student might be stumped to discover what those new products were, but he would quickly realize that there would be much more stimulus to employment in the United States if we went further and produced the items ourselves instead of merely distributing them after they arrived here from some foreign country. The foreign student might or might not realize that when the heads of General Electric and other manufacturers of electrical equipment urge us to increase our imports, they are not referring to imports of motors, light bulbs, and switches—but to imports of the kinds of goods made by industries other than those in the electrical field.

A thoughtful foreign economist might be puzzled, too, by a sizable loan made by the United States Export-Import Bank to Finland for the sole purpose of promoting in the United States the sale of Finnish products competitive with products already being made here by our own manufacturers. Mr. Martin, the head of the Export-Import Bank, made the statement that an important factor in making foreign loans was the extent to which the loans would be used to promote the production of items which could be sold in the American market. That might help Mr. Martin to get the bank's money back, but what happens to the money invested in the American enterprises which cannot meet the competition of foreign enterprises financed with these United States Government funds?

And are the foreign economic experts able to understand the viewpoint of Mr. Aldrich, chairman of the board of the Chase National Bank and formerly president of the International Chamber of Commerce? Mr. Aldrich wants private investors to supplement our Government loans abroad, despite the fact that no foreign nation believes that the colossal sums the United States has already loaned abroad can ever be repaid. Some of the foreigners tried to be honest; they told us they could not repay a loan and asked for a gift. We make defaulters cut of them by calling the credits loans. Mr. Aldrich says, "Our imports must be brought more nearly into balance with our exports." One suspects that the more objective foreigners might figure that for a country that didn't really need the imports the way to achieve such a balance would be to put a brake on exports or, perhaps, to become realistic and label the exports honestly as gifts.

A foreigner may also be pardoned for being confused over our emphasis on having the "escape clause" in reciprocal trade agreements in view of the State Department's efforts to convince foreign nations that we are going to admit their goods to the American market in a truly big way. The "escape clause," to be included at President Truman's direction, if it means anything, means that if it develops that a tariff concession granted by the United States proves effective in giving an increased slice of our market to foreign producers the concession will be withdrawn.

Do foreigners understand our trade philosophy? If they do, they must be skeptical of our sanity.

ARTHUR BESSE,
President of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers.
BOSTON.

Are Public-Opinion Polls Fair to Organized Labor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of an

article entitled "Are Public-Opinion Polls Fair to Organized Labor?" by Arthur Kornhauser, from the winter 1947 issue of Public Opinion Quarterly magazine, which is published at Princeton University. The review appeared in Nieman Reports, published by the Society of Nieman Fellows at Harvard University in July 1947.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE PUBLIC-OPINION POLLS FAIR TO ORGANIZED LABOR?

(By Arthur Kornhauser, in Public Opinion Quarterly, winter 1947, Princeton University.)

Newspapermen who cover labor news are well aware that the total effect of polls on labor questions is to give the reader an unfair impression of labor. This is one of the things they most often discuss and criticize in newspaper treatment of labor. If anybody doubts it the evidence is overwhelmingly detailed in this case study by a member of the board of applied social research at Columbia.

He shows how it can be corrected if those who gather and publish polls on labor want to correct it. It is obvious that not all of them do. The same forces and pressures apply here that tend to bias reporting of labor news generally. The topic selected for polling frequently implies an anti-social attitude by labor. The phrasing of the question often suggests an unfavorable answer or fails to suggest all sides of the question. The interpretation and use of the polls commonly gives labor the short end.

All the material on labor in the seven leading opinion polls was studied for 1940 to 1945, altogether 155 questions. This is a thorough test.

Of the 155 questions, only 8 deal with favorable features of unionism, such as the protection and improvement of the lot of the working people. Of the rest 66 are neutral or doubtful, 81 are concerned with union faults or propose restrictions on unions. The questions then, to begin with, run strongly against labor.

"The polls aid and abet the process of directing public attention persistently to the negative side of organized labor. Avoidance of this bias would properly seem a special responsibility of those who ostensibly represent a scientific approach to areas of public controversy.

"Why no questions on whether unions help protect the interests of the common people, whether they serve as a useful counterweight to the power of big business?"

On the wording of questions "four disturbing types of bias" against labor are found.

1. The questions which offer a choice between a recognized evil and one particular proposed remedy, usually a law. Any other remedy besides a law is eliminated as a possible answer.

2. Questions on technical or specific points which, for lack of particular information, are answered in terms of general sentiments.

An illustration from Fortune: How many labor leaders in your community do you think do a good job in representing labor? Are fair in dealing with employees? Are honest in handling union funds?

3. Questions in which biases arise from hidden assumptions and oversimplification.

An example: Which do you think is trying harder to help national defense production—labor leaders or industrial leaders?

"Is this fair? The function of business managers is to get out production. That is not the function of the union leader. Why should questions make him appear responsible for matters over which industry gives him no authority?"

Another example: Do you think that workers should be forced to stay in a union if they want to resign or get out?

"The question leaves out everything that is important about maintenance agreements and becomes a mere caricature of these plans."

4. The use of suggested or slanted phraseology, or of wording that makes it especially easy to accept the idea asked about.

One of Dr. Gallup's, for example, asked: Would you like to see labor unions change their way of handling things?

"The implication is strong that an affirmative reply is expected."

The conclusion of the study is definite: "One cannot escape the conclusion that the labor-poll material is biased. It contains many varieties of bias, but they all point in the same direction. In the choice of topics, in the wording of questions, and in the reporting of results, unionism fails to receive balanced and impartial treatment. The polls taken as a whole are clearly not fair to organized labor. Few indeed are the questions to bring out the faults of business. No dearth of questions on unions' interference with wartime production, but not one on management's hoarding of labor or its self-interested delays in accepting Government contracts. Questions on unions' blame for strikes but not on employers' blame for substandard wages or for unsafe conditions in coal mines. The contrast is striking. Even when an occasional poll touches the sensitive spots of big business, the question and the report are mild and cautious in tone compared to those on labor."

This study should be provocative to those who buy polls for public consumption.

L. M. L.

False Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "False Economy," appearing in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on July 14, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FALSE ECONOMY

Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, a day or so ago told a Senate committee that curtailing proper flood-control projects is "extravagant waste rather than sound economy." The same idea in picture form may be found on this page today in a cartoon reprinted from the Kansas City Star, a newspaper serving a great part of the Corn Belt area recently so badly hurt by floods.

It is worth while to repeat a paragraph or two from Senator MCCLELLAN'S testimony to the committee, for it amounts to another hard smash right on the head of a nail that needs to be driven. He said:

"It is urgently essential that we do that (exercise economy in operating the Government), but the serious curtailment or withholding of appropriations actually needed to advance our comprehensive flood control in rivers and harbors programs, as authorized by Congress, in its correct analysis, is extravagant waste rather than sound economy:

"If we lose sight of this and fail to support and accelerate water resources improvement and protection, the Congress will be responsible for invoking a false economy upon the Nation that will greatly retard our economic progress and ultimately double the cost when the job is finally done, as it must be."

What Senator MCCLELLAN was saying is summed up in that old but still true maxim that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. It is often difficult to persuade people that the cost of preventive work is usually negligible compared with that of trying to save something from the wreckage after disaster strikes. The people who live in the valleys of the great rivers of this section, however, have had the lesson borne in upon them by many a tide of dirty and destructive water.

Congress ought to listen to the voice of experience and reflect that the damage and devastation caused by floods mean losses to the Nation as a whole, aside from the emergencies of those immediately in the path of the waters.

Labor's Stake in a Columbia Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by a former Member of this body, Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell, before the Washington State Federation of Labor in its annual convention at Seattle, Wash., on July 14, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is timely and appropriate for the Washington State Federation of Labor to give the Columbia Valley Authority a prominent place in the convention proceedings.

Union delegates meet here in the shadow of the most drastic antilabor law known to recent history. The uncertainties of the days ahead for labor have been fabricated by a Congress which tries to deny to the Pacific Northwest the benefits from resources bestowed by nature.

The time has come for labor to assess its responsibilities for the future and to plan a constructive course of action. A Columbia Valley Authority will have a part in that plan.

The State Federation of Labor is a steady and consistent supporter of a CVA. Not only is your president, Ed Weston, one of the vice presidents of the League for a CVA, but union locals and individual members are actively interested in furthering the objective of the league.

The goal that organized labor seeks, in common with many other citizens of the Pacific Northwest, is the orderly, democratic development of our natural resources. Union members and all thoughtful citizens wish to be stockholders in a profitable community enterprise—a governmental organization to make natural resources mean more jobs and better living for all the people.

By working hand in hand with the State Grange and other groups, for industrial growth and resource development through a CVA, the Washington State federation merits warm praise. This teamwork between organized labor and farmer is healthy evidence of progressive action for a prosperous

economy. It is a sure sign that the Grange and the unions have fundamentally common aims—sustained purchasing power for labor and decent prices for farm crops.

In working for these common aim through a broad positive regional program, organized labor gives a convincing answer to those who hope to weaken and divide its ranks. Labor has a common cause with all other groups working for a better America, and labor will not allow itself to be isolated from community life.

In the past few months people throughout the country have learned anew the simple but important lesson that our great river system must be brought under control. Raging floods of the Missouri and Mississippi have destroyed lives and property and carried precious topsoil to the sea. A Congress that puts the dollar sign before soil conservation and resource development would rather wait and pass around the hat for flood victims, would rather wait and rebuild damaged homes on depleted soil, than plan and invest now in the instruments to prevent such disasters.

Nature left to her own devices or to haphazard exploitation can and will cause havoc and ruin. Nature, wisely controlled and managed for human need, will produce in abundance.

Lawmakers who are so anxious to see injunctions issued against labor union activities, might better devote their time to ways and means of preventing the irreparable damage of raging rivers.

We who work for a Columbia Valley Authority say that the valley authority is the appropriate instrument for this task. We have before us the Tennessee Valley Authority as the greatest demonstration project in the world for conserving and developing natural resources. Flood control is only a small part of the work to be done in building up the soil and generating power for industry. But the TVA does its work well because it has a multipurpose unified program for the region and the mechanism for intelligent administration. The Tennessee, under TVA management, is the best-controlled river system in the world.

The Pacific Northwest can benefit from the instructive example of the TVA. In this area the flood problem is secondary but almost every day we are given fresh evidence of the need for an integrated program of resource development. People who attended the meetings at Walla Walla concerning an alleged moratorium on Columbia and Snake River dam construction, came away saying: "That's the best argument I've heard for a CVA."

At the Walla Walla interagency committee meeting we saw a bureau of the Federal Government announcing a departmental decision to delay for 10 years any dam construction on the lower Snake and Columbia Rivers. We learned then that this bureau decision was not the departmental decision.

Just in this off-and-on moratorium story alone we see the indecision of Federal bureaus demonstrated by bureaus which are within a single department of Government. Multiply this indecision by the fact that some 30 bureaus in 3 main governmental departments have to decide each step in the Pacific Northwest program and you have the reasons for a Columbia Valley Authority.

But what is the story of Walla Walla? Basically it is the story of an agency without legislative authority, without any formal responsibility and having no power to reach a decision trying to settle tremendously difficult problems. Such an agency can not do the job. Walla Walla demonstrated that publicly. Walla Walla forced a cabinet member to clarify a muddled situation with a public statement. In the clarification we found that a 10-year-dam-construction moratorium announced by the Fisheries Bureau was but a bureau hope and not a departmental decision.

And why all this furore? Simply because the multipurpose planning job for the development of the Columbia and its tributaries had not been done. No one and no agency had seen to it that all cogs of a great program were meshed so that publicly important gears could turn smoothly.

And because all or some of the multitude of Federal bureaus operating in the Pacific Northwest had failed in their jobs, we had a spectacle at Walla Walla which could well make one wonder at the efficiency of our democracy.

The question at issue should have been simply one of determining why fisheries planning had not kept up with irrigation, power, navigation, and flood-control planning. If the so-called interagency committee could assign blame for this failure and correct the difficulty it might serve some useful purpose. But as it is, it merely serves as a debating society to help those who would slow down the entire Columbia Valley resources development program.

Despite Congressional action over the years the salmon propagation program has been regretfully slow. The problem was known even before the first great step toward the building of Grand Coulee and Bonneville. Congress has repeatedly asked the agencies in charge what they needed. But in the face of a favorable Congressional attitude the fisheries agencies still ask for 10 or 15 years more.

Why wasn't the job done in the last 15 years? I say it was because there was no agency urging speed upon the fisheries experts. They were more interested in problems of Alaska, or of New England, or of the Gulf of Mexico.

The agency which should have been working and fighting for orderly development in the interest of the Pacific Northwest is the Columbia Valley Authority. Any CVA board sitting down to review our problems would have known immediately that a settlement of the salmon problem was one of first priority.

But there was no CVA. There was no other agency doing a Pacific Northwest program checking job. Therefore there was no one to say that the salmon propagation problem had to be settled and settled quickly.

The failures publicized at Walla Walla have been pointed out again and again by all who have made any real study of regional development problems. And among those who have done so I can name such national publications as the New York Times and Collier's Weekly.

Now a new student of our national affairs has reached the same conclusion. In his best seller, Inside the U. S. A., John Gunther wrote:

"A river does not recognize bureaucratic frontiers—any more than it recognizes State lines. Above all, the region as a whole needs systematic research, over-all research coordinated with a plan which can in turn be converted into a coordinated program under a single budget. But this is impossible under the present arrangement, with its duplication of authority and lack of integrated leadership. Each Federal agency reports individually and separately to Washington, and the result is crippling. No one knows what is going on in the other agencies and no one wants to intrude."

And Gunther wrote his book before the interagency committee debate at Walla Walla.

No, the claims and counter claims in evidence at Walla Walla did not serve to yield intelligent answers to the important problems which concern our people. The answers cannot be found by endless bickering and futile delays.

The economic development of a great region is at stake. It is a program for jobs and farms. It is a program for a better Nation by building a better Pacific Northwest.

According to the Bureau of Reclamation 238 projects are involved, 238 projects which will bring water to five and one-half million acres of land to provide some 70,000 new farming opportunities. These in turn would provide new employment opportunities for 1,000,000 people.

It's a program too of producing 55,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm energy with its great job potential.

The annual cost to the Nation would be less than $300,000,000 during the 50-year amortization period but the projects would bring an estimated monetary return of more than $385,000,000 each year, even during those 50 years. Once construction costs have been paid the annual profit to the Nation would approximate an estimated $300,000,000 each year.

The feasibility of the program is based on the relationship of power development to industrialization. Once again we have demonstrated the tie-up between farm and industry. The industrial use of power at reasonable rates promises a sufficient return to help along the weaker irrigation projects. Industry helps to build agriculture. When both are healthy and strong, jobs are many and markets are good.

Such an important program cannot proceed in an orderly and efficient manner by the pulling and hauling of special interests and of overlapping agencies. We need an organization that can analyze all the problems and mesh the parts into a balanced whole. We need continuity of policy and program by an organization working for the people. In short, we need a Columbia Valley Authority.

To those who are against a CVA, we say: "The obligation is yours to come up with something better." Something better, not something worse, or just anything at all. Spurious alternatives to the CVA, whether they be interagency committees or interstate agreements, cannot become efficient instruments for resource development.

I say these alternatives are spurious because they are designed to head off the type of organization proven by experience to be most effective in regional multipurpose development. The TVA has shown how the authority, prestige, and facilities of the Federal Government can be vitalized by local initiative and brought to bear in a democratic way on a wide range of economic problems affecting an area.

The interagency committee is merely a debating team, a device for airing agency conflicts. It shoves these conflicts up to a higher plane, but does not settle them. The first loyalty of each committee member is to his own agency rather than to the long-range interests of the region. Each agency jealously pursues its own career, and its lines run back to Washington, D. C.

Likewise, the interstate agreement or compact cannot cope with the complex multipurpose features of resource development. Such arrangements bring to the fore State conflicts in place of Federal conflicts. Lacking the jurisdiction and unable to use the facilities of the Federal Government, the interstate arrangement does not provide even the skeleton of a development program.

Those of us who work for a CVA have the experience of a TVA on our side. We have yet to see a more effective instrument devised to get the resources of the Federal Government working in a democratic way, under local guidance, for the best interests of the region as a whole.

The brief but bitter experience with recent legislative policy has made us realize more sharply than ever before the danger of haphazard resource management. Ever since the present congressional majority came to office, the Pacific Northwest has been beset

by one crisis after another. I have said before, and I say again, that so long as the economic policies of the present majority hold sway the Pacific Northwest will live in constant crisis and its economy will be held back. We cannot advance when we have to work overtime to keep from going backward.

In place of crisis, conflict, and uncertainty, we need CVA as a stabilizing factor to lay out long-range plans and to move steadily forward in developing our great natural resources.

The Congress which today holds the economy of the Pacific Northwest in a political strait-jacket has given new heart and new hope not to the people, but to the enemies of CVA. Lobbyists for the giant utility combines have come out of hiding. Today they are busy advisers to eastern Congressman who drum up new bills and jokers to check the expansion of Federal public power, and to raise the rates for sale of existing power.

It would take a whole day just to describe the complex ramifications of these legislative assaults on the western economy. Just two bills sponsored by Representative WILLIAM J. MILLER, Republican, of Connecticut, would so far nullify Federal jurisdiction over streams and rivers as to make integrated river development through valley authorities impossible. It is no accident that in a parade of 24 witnesses testifying for the Miller bills in a House hearing, not less than 8 were private utility spokesmen.

If the private power lobby succeeds in getting Congress to stop dam construction and to raise wholesale power rates, the heavy burdens of economic stagnation will be lifted onto the back of labor. Low-cost power of the Columbia River is the energy base for industrial expansion—for pay rolls and jobs. In the flowing waters of the Columbia regulated by dams, lies the employment potential of the future. If there waters are allowed to flow idly to the sea, opportunities for productive labor will likewise be gone.

More than that, if Northwest industries can no longer receive the benefits of present low power rates, in their struggle to survive these industries will seek to lower costs of production by cutting wages. Higher-cost power generates a drive for lower-cost labor. Those who would vote an increase in Bonneville rates also give their approval to lower wages and a lower standard of living for the working man of the Pacific Northwest.

We work for a CVA because we desire that nature be mastered for the benefit of people. Our human resources will derive vigor and strength from intelligent organization of our natural resources. For all people we seek the creative opportunities that lead to good living and lend dignity to the human spirit.

That is why the fight for a CVA carries special significance for organized labor. The men in Congress today who are against a CVA, who do the bidding of entrenched wealth and greed, repudiate the people and make a mockery of their aspirations for a better life. The same interests that oppose the CVA rejoice in the passage of the Taft-Hartley law against labor. Those who condemn the CVA as an instrument for mastering nature, give their blessing to the Taft-Hartley law as an instrument for mastering men.

The infamous Taft-Hartley legislation is an insult to the free-laboring men and women of America. It robs labor of its dignity and would make of labor a mere commodity. The law was conceived and enacted in a spirit of vengeance and prejudice. For mutual goodwill and cooperation among workingmen it would substitute mutual suspicion and distrust. It seeks to play one workingman against another, and all against their chosen leaders.

Those who favor this law fear the collective strength of men and women joined together for mutual protection of their livelihood. They desire the wage bargain to be a one-sided affair. The effect of the Taft-Hartley law is to bring the policeman's club to the bargaining table and to put it into the hands of employers.

Does it surprise anyone that the Senator who gave his name and sponsorship to this antilabor legislation belittles the accomplishments of the TVA? Senator TAFT marshalled Senate forces against the confirmation of David E. Lilienthal as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission solely because of Mr. Lilienthal's outstanding record in the TVA TAFT failed in this effort because the great majority of citizens in all walks of life have a sure and steady conviction that the TVA is a constructive and democratic force for better living. They want atomic energy development to take the same course.

The final Senate vote proved that this conviction cannot be shaken by the attacks of bitter unrelenting foes of TVA. All the old hackneyed arguments against TVA, all the misrepresentation, innuendo and malicious gossip were dragged up to the Senate debates. In the end these counted for nothing except to fill up the time of the Senate and the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with costly nonsense.

We in the Pacific Northwest who are working for more public power and efficient, democratic development of resources through a CVA, helped to get the message across in support of Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation. We realized that those who opposed him are hostile to the program for which we work, a program for spreading widely to all the people the benefits of resource development.

But we need to look no further than our own Pacific Northwest to see how attitudes against labor and against resource development are closely tied together.

For the discussion today it is important to note this relationship as exemplified by the actions of one of our Senators.

He singled out CVA supporters for a vicious attack on the Senate floor.

Just as he echoed the TAFT call for a national budget cut, detrimental to western development, just as he echoed the TAFT call for a vote against labor, so he echoed the TAFT cry that public acclaim for Lilienthal was so much propaganda. On the Senate floor he labeled our CVA support of Lilienthal as premeditated maliciousness.

This same man whose incredible explanation of his refusal to sustain the veto on the Taft-Hartley bill was, "I cannot vote to retard progress," said that CVA advocates were "unwilling to agree that any proposed further extension of the valley-authority principle should be exposed to additional study, research, and analysis, leading to a determination based on fact, need, and conclusive proof."

There you have it. Despite a decade of accomplishments by the TVA, this opponent wants more study and conclusive proof for a CVA. But he needs no more study, no conclusive proof to vote against labor. When a constructive program is proposed, he wants to wait. When an evil and destructive program is proposed, he is willing to go ahead and gamble.

This makes us wonder why the attitude can be so different when the subject is changed.

A noted industrial engineer has said—and not in jest—that there are "57 varieties" of private interests working against unified watershed developments—"57 varieties" of private interests working against the public interest.

He points out that at least 30 organizations have been created to consolidate and make more effective the opposition to valley authorities. These organizations, mainly located in the West, hold meetings at strategic times and places, and line up directed support through the press, chambers of commerce, college teachers and other amenable agencies. A few of these organizations tie their propaganda in with some legitimate social or economic objective, thus throwing some confusion and doubt into the mind of potential valley authority friends.

These back-country propaganda organizations, which are widely distributed, closely joined, and highly vocal, head up in various Washington lobbies. A lobby may be a single individual or a team, but all the lobbies opposing public power, valley authority legislation, and other important measures, work together as a well-knit group. They draft legislation for Congressmen, help to rig hearings with witnesses friendly to their side, and generally subvert the legislative process in behalf of the private interests which employ them.

The National Association of Electric Light Companies, to take one example, regards lobbying as a big, full-time job. It pays its Washington representative $65,000 a year under a long-term contract. He is the real thing—a registered lobbyist under the La-Follette-Monroney Act.

We who believe that industrialization is basic to the growth of our Pacific Northwest and that a CVA will give the needed impetus to industrial development must lay out the definite tasks ahead. First and foremost is the need to keep a watchful eye on our opposition. We must know who organizes these groups, we must study their methods and keep the public posted about their operations.

That is an important part of the work we must do in the league for a CVA. It is our responsibility to keep league members and the general public accurately and systematically informed about the basic facts of western development and the benefits that can be realized through a Columbia Valley Authority. Those who are hostile to this program for resource development are well-organized and vocal. It is up to us to become well-organized and vocal.

Labor union members have good reason to know the dangerous consequences of a public ill-informed and confused by constant publicity for self-seeking, private organizations Propaganda of the NAM type led too many people to believe that strong labor organization was a hindrance rather than an aid to economic well-being and industrial harmony. The NAM was more successful than organized labor in getting its story across to the public. Passage of the Taft-Hartley bill reflects in no small measure the prevalence and persistence of NAM-type publicity.

The Pacific Northwest cannot afford to let the opinions of the Power Trust and associated organizations prevail in regard to CVA any more than organized labor can afford to let the NAM instruct the Nation in labor law.

Our plans for CVA development work call for a full-time director of information, a systematic educational program, and a newspaper to bring to CVA league members and the public an objective account of developments affecting the economy of the Pacific Northwest.

The all-out support of organized labor is necessary to bring these plans to fruition. I am confident that this support will be forthcoming, because labor has a large and permanent stake in a CVA.

By participating actively in the work for a CVA, organized labor demonstrated its understanding of the role of modern technology in a democracy. We have the knowledge, resources, and equipment to achieve and maintain a prosperous economy. The CVA signifies an efficient means for putting these facilities to work.

Organized labor knows that the answer to fascism, communism, and totalitarianism of any kind is a dynamic democracy which takes full advantage of man's ability and nature's bounty for the good of all the people.

Liquor Advertisements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news item which appeared in the Washington Post of July 6, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NCPT HITS LIQUOR ADS

The board of managers, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, yesterday advocated the prohibition of alcoholic beverage advertising at its annual conclave now in session in Chicago.

It was one of several recommendations submitted to the NCPT for inclusion in its active legislation program.

Other recommendations of the board were: Appropriations to carry on the Federal school lunch program; support of American participation in the resettlement of displaced persons; national legislation to aid in reducing juvenile delinquency; legislation to provide "equal education advances" for Indian children and Federal aid in demonstrating public library services to persons lacking it.

Mrs. L. W. Hughes of Arlington, Tenn., NCPT president, said that the school-lunch program now receiving Federal aid had been "seriously curtailed" because the Federal Government and some State governments had failed to appropriate sufficient funds.

The alcoholic beverage recommendation urges support of a Senate bill which would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of liquor advertisments or radio broadcasting of such advertisements.

Chinese-American Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine article on Chinese-American relations, written by two very distinguished lawyers of my home town of Seattle, Mr. John J. Sullivan and Mr. Fred H. Lysons.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No one questions the high purpose or the good faith behind the Secretary Marshall plan for world rehabilitation. But essential to accomplishment under any proposal of such nature is that first things shall be put first.

Pertinent to that thought is this statement by a high ranking Member of Congress in 1939:

"I feel that we are making a great mistake in trying to determine our probable conduct as to future wars in Europe before we determine our present conduct as to an existing war in the Orient; we have let our excitement about what may happen to our remote interests in Europe blind us as to what is now happening to our immediate interests in the Pacific. We have no treaty in Europe comparable to the nine-power Pacific treaty that is being violated daily, with increasing effrontery. * * * I feel certain that if we solve this immediate far eastern problem first it will go far toward solving the rest of our international problems, and that until we decide this immediate problem, we cannot reach any very satisfactory conclusion on the general problem."

That is a statement of June 3, 1939, in a letter by Congressman JOHN M. VORYS to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which he was a member.

Substitute Russia for Japan, as used in that letter, and it expresses precisely the situation existing today.

First, let it be said that today's talk of the coming of a third world war is an inaccuracy of expression, for in truth there has been no cessation of international hostilities since the Kaiser launched his famed defiance of a "scrap of paper" in 1914.

While that was engaging Europe, Japan saw her opportunity to take over China, which she sought to do under her notorious "twenty-one demands." This move President Wilson halted with an ultimatum of courage and statesmanship to Japan; but Japan's subtle efforts continuing, China met them with a weapon in the use of which she was skilled—a trade boycott; a boycott of such far-reaching severity that Senator Borah upbraided China for it as being the equivalent to a state of war, as to Japan.

The boycott had an unexpected result. A business depression which we were suffering, of particular severity to our agricultural economy, was found by an official investigation by a joint Senate-House committee to be due to China's boycott of Japan. We asked China to abate the boycott for our relief. Convinced by China that to do so would expose her to Japan's aggression we made a deal with her by which we negotiated, and concluded at Washington Conference of 1921, the Nine Power Treaty which obligated the signatories, including the United States and Japan:

"(1) To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China;

"(2) To provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain, for herself, an effective and stable government."

No treaty ever concluded between nations met with higher acclaim. Hon. Henry L. Stimson appraised it as "One of the most admirable and farsighted treaties in the history of modern civilization."

Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes, chairman of the conference, said that by the treaty the open door in China has at last been made a fact.

Baron Shidehara, Japanese Ambassador to the United States and head of the Japanese delegation to the Conference, said that the treaty had disposed of "the Chinese problem, which, it was often asserted would one day lead to world-wide conflagration."

Elihu Root, who drafted the treaty, explained to the Conference that it was "the separate obligation of each individual signatory" thus imposing upon the United States the direct obligation to compensate China for her boycott abatement in our interest.

What a different story would be world history of today had we in 1939 heeded the admonition of Congressman VORYS and given our attention to Asia as well as to Europe.

And, similarly, from now on, if we do likewise.

Our people today are pondering the query "Why are we trying to determine our probable conduct as to future wars in Europe before we determine our present conduct as to an existing war in the Orient" just as pertinent today as when posed by Congressman VORYS to his committee associates in 1939 even more so—the soundness of his inquiry at that time having been abundantly established by intervening events.

Moreover, we are in Europe today where we haven't even a pretense of obligation, other than moral, instead of in China where our obligation to be there is of combined honor under a treaty, and of consideration under China's boycott abatement. Why are we abandoning the recognized central government of China which is suffering distress of our making through nearly two decades of past indifference? The government with which we negotiated and concluded the treaty and which paid us the consideration of bolcott abatement.

We are in Europe contributing of our substance in voluntary effort of attempting to check a Communist threat there, while ignoring in the continent of Asia the fountainhead control of the world-wide Communist movement in its nefarious efforts to destroy freedom and liberty in China.

That Russia is not a party to the Nine Power treaty is immaterial, since the action here suggested is action by ourselves in regulation of our own conduct under the treaty, as contemplated by Mr. Root, the treaty draftsman, and as ratified by the Senate.

The Nine Power treaty is still our obligation, pertinently applicable to this contingency.

Russia is the fountainhead of world troubles, disturbances, and threats.

Secretary of State Marshall is reported in the press recently as July 3, to have said: "Any government which maneuvers to block the recovery of other countries cannot expect help from us."

Such has been and is today Russia's continuing policy toward China and it invokes our protection of China under the Nine Power treaty. Our failure to meet this obligation in full measure constitutes our treaty-bargain violation and reflects upon the honor and integrity of our Nation.

While commendably in Europe today voluntarily administering a salve to the fruits of a crime, why are we not likewise in Asia dutifully injecting a poison into its roots?

The course we are now pursuing is the equivalent of attempting to stamp out a contagion by administering to its victims while still cultivating the contagion.

Having reduced China to her present state of poverty and helplessness by supplying the treaty-violating agencies of her destruction, but one course is open to us today in our relations with that hepless nation: In both honor and in retribution, a course of righteousness in our treaty relations by carrying out with sincerety and effect its treaty provisions and thus help China stamp out communism and bring to its patient and suffering people the peace they so really deserve which shall inure with benefit to our Nation and the world of generations to come.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an edi-

torial regarding the tax bill published in the Camden News and written by Mr. Al Rose, one of the finest editorial writers of my State.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today want to commend Senators McCLELLAN and FULBRIGHT for their vote against the politically inspired GOP tax bill when it passed the Senate this week. They knew it was certain to pass, but they expressed their opposition to it, and we are proud of them for it. Senator McCLELLAN lost his fight for the community-property clause, and Senator FULBRIGHT aided him in this fight. To show how unfair were the tactics of the GOP's, they would not agree to extend the same law to the 12 States without community-property exemption as the other 36 States now have. In other words, Arkansas, along with 11 other States, has to pay higher income taxes than do the 36 because of the law granting the husband and wife community-property exemption.

But as was mentioned here a few weeks ago and which is an unpopular topic with some, especially the selfish few who make a lot of money and want to pay less taxes, now is no time for tax reduction along the lines proposed by the Republicans. It would help the big boys far more than the little fellows and this measure was inspired purely for political motives, and to try to get votes in 1948. Why, after this bill was killed by the President a few weeks ago, would the elephantine boys try it again? Purely to try to get more votes. They have their eyes on the 1948 elections and are letting them be covered to the real condition of this country.

We have many obligations to meet. Whether you like it or not, or whether you know it or not, Uncle Sam (which means you) is way in the red. We haven't paid for World War I yet and haven't even begun to dent the payments for World War II. There are many places to put the revenue that these taxes will bring. In the first place, let us begin to retire the national debt first. There is the little matter of war bonds to be paid off, in addition to the high cost of our national defense. We can't afford to throw away our Army, our Navy, and our Air Forces, although we'll admit the Republicans are sure doing a pretty good job of scuttling all defense agencies as well as other needed services. It costs a lot to stay prepared. Do you want this country left wide open for attack? What good would your little money do you when some invader comes and takes your home, your Nation, and maybe your life?

We remember the howls raised by a few of the folks here who had made more money in the NAD boom days than they had ever in their life, when they thought the Navy might close it up. It costs money and plenty of it to operate this naval ammunition depot. It played a big part in furnishing rockets to win this recent war. It is needed badly now. This is just one of the many naval and military establishments throughout this Nation needed to keep our fighting forces in a semblance of preparedness. We have air bases and other such defense projects in this country, not to mention the occupation army and bases in the occupied countries. Those operations are not run on paper. It takes dough and plenty of it, and the only way to raise it is by taxation. If we stop the taxation levies, then we go just that much more in the red. But the ones who howled loudest about losing NAD are leading the "tear jerkers" and big mouths now for tax reduction.

If this country was poor and people were without funds, then we'd say cut taxes, but everybody has made more money in the past 5 years than they ever made in their life, despite the bloody war. The war didn't hurt the businessmen or the continental limits of the United States. There were no bombs dropped on this country. No cities were destroyed. No homes were blasted off the face of the map. No; we sat back and bought War bonds (at a fancy profit) and did without a little sugar, bacon, a new auto, and a few other things but got fatter and ate regularly. Only the families who gave up sons and daughters and the men and women who served in the various branches really made sacrifices. The bulk of the American people sacrificed very little. It was mighty hard to get enough of them to staff Red Cross centers and to roll bandages for the wounded. Don't hand me the line about how much you sacrificed. I know better. Just the group mentioned above, the parents, the families, and kin of loved ones who didn't come back and the men and women who served in some war capacity really made sacrifices.

The rest worked at good pay, and manufacturers made their biggest profits in history. Industry of all kinds exceeded all net earnings records. Business, including even the lowliest hamburger stand at Chitling Switch, made its own weight in money. Now, why not share a little of that with the Uncle who is responsible for all this? Without that Uncle Sam, none of us would be here enjoying the vast blessings of a free Nation. We hate to hear the gripers and bellyachers yelp about taxes and a few inconveniences when they have so many God-given riches thrown right in their lap for nothing. Nothing they ever did to earn any of them. The only way they can lend a hand and share in the maintenance and operation of this world-leading Nation and our richest heritage is through a few measley and paltry dollars each income-tax paying time. Now a few want to cut those down beyond the limit of solvency for this great country. Don't come around lipping to me about high taxes, brother; I won't give you any shoulder to cry on. Pay up and be proud to have a share in the greatest business on earth.

Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Tyrrell Krum:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS—AN OPEN LETTER TO ALL AMVETS

(By Tyrrell Krum, lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve, retired)

May I be among the first to congratulate all of you for the signal honor and the mark of distinction which has been bestowed upon the American Veterans of World War II, or Amvets as you call yourselves, by having been chosen as the first group of veterans of the second big show to be officially chartered by the Congress of the United States.

When President Truman attaches his signature to your coveted charter at the White House within the next few days, another important milestone in the endless path over which millions of American ex-fighting men and women have trod since the days of Concord and Lexington will have been passed.

From my observation of your activities since the day you came into existence as Amvets nearly 3 years ago, I have found you to be men of good standing, high caliber and lofty ideals whose only aim in life—unlike the Communist-dominated American Veterans' Committee—is to serve in a truly American manner your erstwhile comrades-in-arms who are now your partners-in-peace.

There have been times when it would have been easy and financially remunerative to have abandoned the right as you saw it, and to have drifted to the extreme left of radicalism and un-Americanism. But you stood your ground.

And so today you occupy the unique position of being the only veterans' organization made up of ex-service men and women of World War II exclusively to have had conferred upon you the supreme honor of a national governmental charter, which places you alongside the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars which emerged out of previous conflicts.

As a "retread" who served in the Second World War, I am proud to have been of assistance to you in overcoming the many obstacles which beset your path during the past couple of years in which you were getting started.

You have the whole world before you, Amvets, and I hope that, with your charter under your arm, you'll continue onward to fulfill your destiny in a manner befitting the American men and women who make up your ranks.

Hold high the torch and keep your escutcheon unblemished.

My highest salute, Amvets, my warmest wish for your continued success and the best of luck to all of you.

Aid to Foreign Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the constant flow of our taxpayers' money abroad is the result of powerful propaganda of a character to create emotionalism rather than reason to bear on the solution of international problems.

Has any one of the nations to which our loans-gifts have been made and our credits extended formulated realistic programs for rehabilitation?

How long can our taxpayers support foreign purchases of our goods with American dollars advanced as gifts, loans, and credits by our own Government?

Why should American taxpayers supply dollars to those countries which are short of dollars instead of the "dollar-short" countries borrowing from their neighboring countries that have an abundance of gold and of dollars?

It appears that the spending virus has so weakened the resistance of those officials in this country who are charged with the grave responsibility of controlling the "purse strings" of our Government that nothing short of national insolvency will turn their attention to the national solvency of the United States.

Many of the men who are now in charge of the "purse strings" of our Government were less than 8 years old in 1920, and some who have cut the "purse strings" and opened the money bag of "Uncle Shylock" to all nations were not yet born in 1920. The call from abroad to "Uncle Shylock" then was "We are emotionally and politically mad. We have only sanity enough left among us to know that we are. Simply we cannot think economically. Think of a way in which we may go on here in Europe. For unless

you can we shall go to pieces. Bring us a plan."

We did so then, now in 1947 the international spending debauch is again inaugurated.

What is the plan of 1947? It is the same old plan under a new name, recently presented as a result of the same old foreign appeal that followed World War I. Did Germany pay reparations? Yes, she did, but how and with what? Germany's net payments on reparations amounted to $2,350,000,000. She borrowed from other countries at the same time the vast amount of $3,750,000,000. To be specific she borrowed $1,400,000,000 more than she paid on account. Where did Uncle Shylock, as our ungrateful European debtors called Uncle Sam, come into the transaction? He furnished practically two-thirds of $3,750,000,000. Out of every dollar Germany borrowed she paid 63 cents in reparations and kept 37 cents. Do you recall what German officials said in urging other countries to loan to her? Let me quote because it has such modern appeal:

> Responsible government has it's back to the wall in Germany. Uphold us for your own sake as much as ours, for if this government falls we shall all of us have to face communism in Germany.

What did the leaders of our debtor nation tell the German people? "Why," said they, "if the creditor nations would desist from demanding payment of reparations the wages of German workmen could go up." Yes, they were told that "only for payment on reparations, taxes would come down. Poverty in Germany would vanish."

There is such a thing between nations as an ugly debtor mentality and the creation of such a Frankenstein to the detriment of the United States is in the making right now. This time it is not one debtor but many. It will not make for peace on earth good will toward men.

It will require more than the United Nations organization to destroy this destructive war breeding ugly debtor mentality. This time our happy international spenders and wasters, who should be the trustees and meticulous stewards of our taxpayers' money, are using our money and our resources to make the nations throughout the world our ugly debtors.

Possible Foreign Relief Needs Preclude Tax Reduction for Present Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the column, From This Side, written by John Pruniski for the North Little Rock (Ark.) Times:

> One of the arguments advanced against the $4,000,000,000 income-tax reduction had to do with foreign relief, but this point was not stressed as much as some others in the talk which preceded passage of the measure.
>
> The substance of this argument was that the $4,000,000,000 may be needed—in fact, it probably will be needed—to foot the bill for food and other needs in war-torn countries. Food would be the tangible item in this case, but even more important than that would be the insurance against the spread of communism which the money would buy.
>
> It will be a tough break for John Q. Taxpayer as long as he does not get this cut in his annual tax bill, but it's the long haul that counts here and in the end same J. Q. T. may not suffer as much as he thinks he will.
>
> By their actions to date, Joe Stalin and his crew of Commies have not demonstrated any desire to build a firm foundation for peace. They and/or the United States must do the job. But the Soviets are ready to work on our side only when they are allowed to call all the signals.
>
> For that reason, the American taxpayers will probably have to pick up a number of checks for meals they'll never eat. However, there does seem to be some wisdom in collecting smaller ones now rather than waiting for larger checks that war or the threat of war would bring.
>
> About hunger in foreign lands, those of us who made trips across the seas on war business can tell you a few things. At some time or another during the late war, many of us saw genuine hunger and can aver that it's not a very substantial basis upon which to build order for a peaceful world.
>
> While jockeying an ambulance through the hills of Italy, this writer stored away several vivid pictures of hunger at its best—or, more properly, at its worst. The finish of our meals (and they were no gourmet's delight even when hot and fresh) was usually the signal for the rush of hungry hordes of little Italians to gather up the food that had been left uneaten—a few crusts of bread or a spoonful of margarine or perhaps some cold bully beef.
>
> The pictures which we brought back were not pretty things.
>
> Hungry foreign lands will turn to the United States—or to Russia. If nothing is offered from our side, empty stomachs will cause the bait which communism will dangle in front of them to be grabbed readily.
>
> All of us would like to have the debt reduction offered by Congress. But it will not be wise to lose sight of another important consideration—one that involves the basis for world peace. After the prodigious spending that we did to win the war, it would, indeed be foolish to become niggardly now in making provision for winning the peace.
>
> The concept of one world should not be obscured by many words about a $4,000,000,000 tax reduction for some 130,000,000 people. It is a grim fact that there is something wrong in an economy that gives one man a yacht and denies another the chance for a few square meals.

Anti-Poll-Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am offering a statement in opposition to the poll tax now prevailing in several Southern States. They are Virginia, South Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Texas. It might be asked how important is this subject to the people of the country. "Do not seek to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee." These poll taxes are devised to disenfranchise vast numbers of voters as we shall see later in the article. The basis for the poll tax is primarily prejudice against poor white as well as colored people. The poll tax is deliberately maintained to bar them from the polls. That same prejudice is like a cloud that casts a shadow over the votes in Congress of the Representatives and Senators from the poll-tax States which ultimately affects national legislation, particularly in such legislation like the FEPC and the minimum wage increases. Naturally, therefore, the country, should watch with interest legislation concerning the abolition of the poll tax.

Because the poll-tax question is of vast national importance, I have introduced a bill to provide for its abolition.

We are told that what each State does with respect to poll taxes may be none of our business. My answer is that no State acts in a vacuum. Whatever happens, especially as to voting in our Republic, anywhere, in a poll-tax State or non-poll-tax State, particularly in a Presidential or congressional election, concerns all of us. There are States' rights, but also national rights.

Article I, and especially section 4 thereof, of the Constitution sets up national rights and gives Congress a full measure of control over Presidential and congressional elections. Congress is invested with those national rights as trustee for all voters and all the people everywhere.

Those national rights are paramount to States' rights. States like Vermont, New York, and California have as much right in the national elections as Texas, Mississippi, and South Carolina.

Is it just for the people of New Jersey, North Dakota, and Connecticut to be legislated for or have their own Federal interests administered by officials elected on any, shall I say, undemocratic basis—on a type of franchise that discriminates among the citizens unduly.

If a State can impose, say, a poll-tax requirement of $2 or $3 a year, it can impose one of several hundred or several thousand dollars. Now, a State can do that as a prerequisite for voting in a State election. It can do anything it pleases in that regard. But when it seeks to impose burdensome taxes upon the voter as a condition precedent to voting in a national election, then we Members of Congress have some concern therein and can regulate it.

Instead of a poll tax, the State can say that nobody can vote unless he be a regular church goer. The State can say that no one can vote unless he is married. Well, that is all right for State elections. But they cannot impose those conditions if Congress will say that those conditions are improper.

In other words, the State can exact any unreasonable or any capricious condition it wishes for State elections, but not for national elections. A State can burden the local franchise in any way it sees fit. The bills that have been introduced in Congress all refer to national

elections in seeking to abolish the poll tax as a condition of voting.

At some stage the Federal power must intervene to protect the republican form of government guaranteed by our Constitution. The States cannot go hogwild on the subject of imposing conditions.

That is exactly what the Supreme Court said in the United States against Classic, decided May 1941 and reported in volume 313 United States Reports, particularly page 315:

While in a loose sense the right to vote for Representative in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States; this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution, "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers. * * *"

Obviously—

And this is the decision of Chief Justice Stone—

Obviously included within a right to choose secured by the Constitution is the right to qualify voters within a State to cast their ballots and have them counted at congressional elections. This Court has consistently held that this right is a right secured by the Constitution; and since the Constitutional command is without restriction or limitation, the right, unlike those guaranteed by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, is secured against action of individuals as well as of States. We are now concerned with the question whether the right to choose at a primary election a candidate for election as a representative is embraced in the right to choose representatives secured by article 1, section 2 of the Constitution. We think that the authority of Congress given by section 4 includes the authority to regulate primary elections when, as in this case, they are a step in the exercise by the people of their choice of representatives in Congress.

It goes on to say:

Not only does section 4 of article 1 authorize Congress to regulate the manner of holding elections, but article 1, section 8, clause 18, Congress is given authority "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any department or officer thereof."

This provision leaves to the Congress the choice of the means by which its constitutional powers are to be carried into execution. Hence the right to participate through the primary in a choice of Representatives in Congress, clearly secured by the Constitution, is within the words and purpose of section 19 in the same manner, and to the same extent as the right to vote at the general election.

I have quoted at length this decision because I think it is decisive in the question as to the constitutionality of legislation which seeks to abolish the poll tax.

The history of modern poll taxes indicates a studied purpose to curtail voting. See the statistics of votes cast for Representatives in Congress in any one of the seven poll-tax States. Compare them with the votes cast for Congressman in New York, or in Illinois or in Maryland. It is like 5,000, 6,000, or 7,000 votes as against 100,000 votes.

The poll tax not only falls heavily upon colored people, but also upon white people. Thousands of white farmers in poll-tax States are tenants or share croppers. Payment of poll taxes, or cumulative poll taxes, is arduous and burdensome. Many of these are disfranchised; they cannot pay the accumulated debt, the poll-tax debt, that hangs over them.

We know that the poll tax may be used, and is sometimes used, as a modern tool of corruption. I refer to the statement made in the House of Representatives on October 13, 1942 by my distinguished colleague from Tennessee, Representative JENNINGS. He said as follows:

In my State of Tennessee, I speak from knowledge gained by observation and exhaustive investigation of the abuse of the poll-tax requirement. The poll-tax requirement is a pestilential source of corruption. It is the ready and powerful weapon of the boss and the mother of corrupt political machines. A band of political corruptionists pool their funds and pay the poll taxes of thousands of voters who are needy and who many times in this way are given a taste of corrupt influence. These poll taxes many times are paid in block by the thousands. In this way the outcome of a county and even a congressional or State-wide election may be determined.

To my mind, suffrage is the greatest weapon of democracy. Insistence upon payment of the poll tax as a precedent to voting so blunts the edge of democracy as to make it ineffectual.

The boast of freedom is inane when people on one side of the railroad track can vote and those on the other side cannot. Payment of a poll tax has nothing to do with intelligence, residence, sanity, integrity, or age. Many States lay down conditions concerning intelligence, residence, sanity, integrity, and age.

Payment of the poll tax is not even a property-holding qualification. As I said, somebody else can pay one's poll tax.

I wish to draw attention to a portion of the text of the speech of President Truman recently delivered at the thirty-eight annual conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

He said, among other things:

We cannot wait another decade or another generation to remedy these evils. There is much that State and local governments can do in providing positive safeguards for civil rights. But we cannot any longer await the growth of a will to action in the slowest State or the most backward community. Our National Government must show the way.

Electors and the Electoral College Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States is by all odds the biggest and most important business in the world. When a young Nation, we could muddle through more easily and could make mistakes with less injury than we can today. We have now come of age. Our domestic and foreign responsibilities are staggering. Unless we make democracy work at home, we have little chance of teaching it abroad. There is an old facetious and vulgar saying that, "God looks after sailors, drunks, and the United States of America". God has been good to us indeed, but He may not always smile upon us. In the matter of reform, we are often like the Irishman who refused to repair his roof when the sun was shining. There is at least one major repair job that should be made before our structure of Government is seriously impaired—before some storm blows our house down. This job is to abolish electors and the electoral college and to substitute an honest and democratic method of electing Presidents.

This subject is by no means new. In fact, it is as old as the Government itself. Many resolutions to this effect have been introduced in the Congress from time to time. In the Seventy-second and Seventy-third Congresses, House committees unanimously reported such resolutions, of which Congressman LEA, of California, was the author. In 1934, the Senate twice voted on a proposal by Senator Norris to do away with electors. The first vote was 42 yeas to 24 nays, and the next vote was 52 yeas to 29 nays. In both cases the necessary two-thirds vote was lacking. Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, introduced a resolution in 1941 providing for the election of presidents by direct popular vote. He has again introduced such a resolution in this Congress.

Under the existing system, as you know, no citizen has ever been permitted to vote directly for a President. In fact, under our present system, the votes of millions of our citizens do not count in the final tally. We elect the most important officer of our Government through a hocus-pocus method called the electoral college. We vote for electors, who in turn, through a dubious, confused, and technical procedure, vote for one of the candidates for President. The candidate who receives the greatest number of popular votes in a particular State gets all of the electoral votes of that particular State, each State having a number of electoral votes equal to the number of its Members in the Congress. If no candidate gets a majority of the electoral votes of the Nation, the issue is then thrown into the Congress to be decided among the high three candidates.

The several resolutions now pending before our Judiciary Committee would do simply this: Abolish the electors and the electoral college and provide that one vote directly for the candidate of his choice for President and Vice President. We retain the electoral vote, however. Under the proposed reform, New York would still have 47 electoral votes, Pennsylvania 35, Texas 23, and so forth. We would not tamper with or change the relative voting strength of the States or the States' absolute control of the franchise and of elections. These

matters would be left to local State sovereignty and responsibility. However, a candidate would get a proportion of the electoral vote of each State in the exact ratio with his popular vote. In other words, if the Republican candidate received 33⅓ percent of the popular vote in Texas, he would get 33⅓ percent of our 23 electoral votes. You would have a direct vote on the President in terms of electoral votes. The count becomes a matter of exact mathematics. The high man wins.

Let us examine a little history of the electoral college system and see how badly it has worked. The men who wrote the Constitution, while being good and great men as a rule, and men of wisdom, were by no means commoners. There were no farmers or small artisans among them. They were the aristocracy of the day. They distrusted, and some even despised, the popular will. How to select a President was perhaps the most confusing issue to be decided by them. A dozen different plans were proposed and several plans agreed upon at one time or another, then changed. In the Virginia plan, the Pinckney plan, and the New Jersey plan, provision was made for the election of a President by the national legislature. No one seriously suggested a direct vote for President. George Mason even said that such a thing would be "as unnatural as it would be to refer a trial of colors to a blind man." Some suggestions were made that the chief executive be elected by the governors of the States. Finally, it was Hamilton's compromise plan that was written into the finished document. Our eighteenth century elders envisioned electors as men of great wisdom and intelligence who would meet together and select the best fitted individuals in the country to be the President and the Vice President; the man receiving the greatest number of electoral votes was to be President, the one running second high to be Vice President. They did not anticipate the creation and growth of political parties, nor did they foresee any of the procedures to which resort was subsequently made.

Almost immediately the idea backfired. In the very first Presidential contest in 1800, Jefferson, the man intended for President, and Burr, the man intended for Vice President, turned up with a tie vote in the electoral college. The matter was then thrown into the House of Representatives for a decision. Bickering and bitterness resulted, and had Burr exerted himself in the premises, he doubtless would have been selected President. Almost immediately the Congress submitted to the States, and the States ratified, the twelfth amendment to the Constitution which provided that electors should vote for a President and a Vice President. This cured one fatal defect in the original scheme but it left all of the others.

Twelve times Presidents have been elected with an actual minority of the popular votes; in 1824, 1844, 1848, 1856, 1860, 1876, 1880, 1884, 1888, 1892, 1912, and 1916. Three Presidents have been seated who had a lesser vote than did their leading opponents, that is, Adams in 1842, Hayes in 1876, and Harrison in 1888. In 1824, Andrew Jackson led his nearest opponent, John Quincy Adams, by a substantial popular vote and by a substantial electoral vote. However, lacking a majority over his three opponents, the election was thrown into the House of Representatives. As a result of the manipulations of Henry Clay, John Quincy Adams, the minority choice, was selected over Andrew Jackson for President. In 1876, Mr. Tilden had a plurality of over 250,000 and a natural majority of more than 78,000 over Mr. Hayes. Again the selection was left up to Congress, and again through political manipulation, if not fraud, the popular will was defeated and the minority choice, Mr. Hayes, became President. In 1888, Grover Cleveland, with a plurality of more than 100,000 votes and with an actual majority over Mr. Harrison, was defeated. The entire career of Mr. Cleveland illustrates the foibles of the electoral college. In 1884, in the State of New York, Cleveland got 563,084 popular votes, while Blaine got 562,001; with barely more than 1,000 popular votes Mr. Cleveland got all of the electoral votes of the State of New York. A change of 600 votes in New York would have elected Blaine President. In 1892, in the State of Ohio, more than 1,000 voters cast their ballots for Mr. Cleveland's elector No. 1, while not voting for the remaining Cleveland electors as they intended. The result was the success of one Cleveland elector, the Republicans winning the rest. Had the 1,000 Democratic voters registered their choice correctly Mr. Cleveland, instead of Mr. Harrison, would have carried the State of Ohio. Every election illustrates the incongruity of the electoral college. In the last campaign Governor Dewey received 2,663,484 votes in 10 States from which he received 62 electoral votes. In New York, however, he received 2,997,586 votes, considerably more than in the aforesaid 10 States combined, yet for these he received no electoral votes. In effect, nearly 3,000,000 New York Republicans had their votes counted for Mr. Roosevelt. Out of 47,000,000 popular votes, President Roosevelt received 3,000,000 more than did Governor Dewey, yet received 432 electoral votes to the governor's 99. With 54 percent of the popular vote, Mr. Roosevelt received 81 percent of the electoral vote.

Back in the first Lincoln campaign, Douglas, while receiving 74 percent of Lincoln's popular vote, received only 6⅔ percent of his electoral vote. Douglas also received three times as many votes as did Bell, yet got only one-third as many electoral votes. In the 1912 campaign, Woodrow Wilson received only 42 percent of the popular vote of the Nation, yet received 82 percent of the electoral vote. Mr. Wilson received one electoral vote for each 14,500 popular votes, while for each electoral vote received Mr. Taft got 435,000 popular votes—31 times as many popular votes per electoral vote as in the case of Mr. Wilson. In 1924, Mr. John W. Davis received 6,000,000 popular votes for which no electoral votes were received.

Now let us make some specific charges against our present system of electing Presidents, all of which would be removed under our proposed amendment.

First. Existing provisions as to the choosing of electors, the manner in which their votes are cast and counted, and the deciding of elections in the Congress is an open invitation to fraud and chicanery and unless changed will some day result in disaster. While electors are morally bound to vote for certain nominees they are not legally so bound. In the very first contested election in the Nation's history, in 1796, three electors who were supposed to vote for Thomas Jefferson voted instead for John Adams. As a result, Adams received 71 electoral votes to 68 for Jefferson. Jefferson would have been elected except for this abuse of discretion by said three electors. There are other instances where electors have not followed the instructions of their electorate. In the last Presidential campaign serious difficulties arose in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas over the selection and duties of electors. If and when a Presidential election is hotly contested and is close between leading candidates we are likely to have serious upheavals and defections within and between our parties. Congress itself may even throw out legal votes or count illegal ones.

Some of the record on this point is of interest. In 1857 the Wisconsin electors were prevented by a violent snowstorm from meeting at the State capitol on the appointed day to cast their votes. Had these votes been decisive in the election, the majority in Congress might have counted or have thrown them out as suited political expediency. In 1837 six persons who lacked the constitutional qualifications for electors had their votes counted on the grounds that they were de facto officials. In 1818 the votes of Indiana, in 1821 the votes of Missouri, in 1837 the votes of Wisconsin were thrown out on technical grounds, involving the electoral college. In 1869 and again in 1881 Georgia's electors voted on the wrong day and their votes were not permitted to be counted. In 1873 only half of the electors of Texas ever reached the State capitol. In 1873 also the electoral vote of the State of Arkansas was rejected by the Congress and the State disfranchised because the return certificate bore the seal of the secretary of state instead of the great seal, an article which the State did not possess at that time.

Thus from the bottom to the top this archaic vehicle is fraught with peril. Under the proposed method all these controversies would be avoided, because the States would have no electors to choose, and Congress would have no election contests to decide.

Second. The electoral college confines and largely restricts national campaigns to a half dozen pivotal States. The national campaign committees and the political strategists of both parties sit down with a map of the Nation and decide where to do their work and where to spend their money. Their job is to elect Presidents. Under modern scientific techniques of sampling public opinion and with the history of past campaigns to go by, their problem is relatively simple. The seven largest States in the Union, with their electoral vote, are as

follows: New York 47, Pennsylvania 35, Illinois 28, Ohio 25, California 25, Texas 23, and Michigan 19. Texas, being in the solid South, counts for little. Neither party would spend any money or make any effort of consequence there, so Texas is checked off. The same is true of other States of the so-called solid South. These States are solid largely because of the electoral college. California sometimes becomes a battleground. However, by and large, it is safe to say that 75 percent of all the political efforts by both parties is concentrated in five big pivotal States, to wit, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan. Any party carrying all of these States has a cinch to elect a President. Any party carrying a majority of them has almost a cinch.

Third. The electoral college greatly restricts the field of Presidential possibilities. Certainly so important an office should have the whole Nation as a field from which to select potential Presidents. The electoral college, however, narrows the field of Presidential hopefuls almost exclusively to the aforesaid pivotal States. Since the Civil War, no President has come from the South. With the exception of Herbert Hoover, none has ever come from the West. In the last 50 years, we have had three Presidents from Ohio and three from New York. In fact, to be a governor or an ex-governor of the great State of New York, gives one the inside track in the Presidential derby. Why? The answer is obvious. The change of a comparatively few votes in the State of New York will ordinarily give to a candidate 47 electoral votes and usually the election. Only one time in the last 70 years has anyone been elected President without carrying the great State of New York. No one can dispute these facts and no one can defend the result on democratic principles.

Fourth. The electoral college permits and invites irresponsible control and domination by small organized minority groups, within the large pivotal States. It aggravates and accentuates the building up and solidification within these States of religious, economic, and racial blocs. Small, definable, minority groups, organized along religious or economic or racial lines, by voting together, can and do hold a balance of power within these pivotal States. As a result, the political strategists in both parties make special appeals to these various groups as such. These groups have become more and more politically conscious. They know their power. In many instances, they have no political alinements or philosophy as such, but are simply up for sale to the highest bidder. To encourage economic, racial, and religious group consciousness and group action, is a dangerously undemocratic practice, aside from its other evil consequences.

At the danger of stepping on some toes, let us get down to specific cases. Let us take a look at the political platforms of both major parties in the Presidential campaign of 1944 and see how they were built and designed to appeal to minority groups and blocs in the large pivotal States. First, both parties wrote the FEPC into their platforms. The platform makers of both parties will tell you frankly, off the record, of course, that this was done as a bid for the Negro vote. There are enough Negroes in New York City, when voting en bloc, to determine often how the entire electoral vote of the State of New York is cast; enough in Philadelphia if cast en bloc to probably determine the result of an election in the State of Pennsylvania; enough in Detroit to perhaps decide the vote of the State of Michigan; enough in Chicago to carry the State of Illinois. Hence, a dangerous and radical proposal in which neither party believes was written into both platforms as political bait for a minority-group vote within the large pivotal States.

A second minority group that was wooed by the platform makers of both parties was the radical wing of organized labor. In the large pivotal States above mentioned, the votes controlled by the Political Action Committee of the CIO was a tremendous potential political threat. The votes allegedly controlled by this organization in the large pivotal States, if cast en bloc, would be sufficient to swing the votes of such States and perhaps elect a President. Hence, both parties wrote platitudinous provisions into their platforms concerning industrial-management relations. Both parties pussy-footed the labor question because of organized labor's power through the electoral college.

Now, with all due deference to our many fine Jewish citizens, they constitute a third group to whom a specific overt appeal was made in the platforms of both major parties. There are 2,500,000 Jews in the city of New York alone. When they vote even substantially en bloc, it means the balance of power in our largest State. The candidate for whom they vote carries New York State and probably the presidency. What did the platform makers of 1944 do? Both of them wrote into their platforms specifically and without equivocation the so-called Palestine resolution, calling upon Great Britain to immediately open Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration. Regardless of the merits of the Zionists' cause in Palestine, this was political demagoguery and dangerous meddling with British foreign policy in the Holy land. As a result of platform endorsements by both major parties, we passed a resolution through the last Congress calling upon England to open up Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration. Within a few weeks after this resolution was passed, England asked us if we were ready and willing to back up our request with the Army and the Navy if she got into war, as would have been the case had she followed our request. We stuck our noses into British foreign policy for purely political reasons and to the detriment of all of our citizens, Jewish and otherwise.

Then there are numerous other minority pressure groups within these large pivotal States to whom continuous political overtures are made by the strategists of both parties. There are more than a million Italians in New York City. There are 2,000,000 Irish, many of whom are still politically conscious where Ireland is concerned. There are half a million Poles and other large racial groups. Recently there was a great Slavic rally in Madison Square Garden, at which Tito was praised. Perhaps our concern for the votes controlled by these peoples in the large pivotal States has occasioned this tenderness for a despicable dictator. Because of the electoral college, the American Labor Party in the State of New York has power and trading position out of all proportion to its numbers, to say nothing of its merit. It is entirely possible that because of this political strait-jacket, the electoral college system, that said American Labor Party will determine who will be the next President of the United States. Of late, we have become rightly alarmed over the activities of the Communist Party in the United States. Strange to say, this party has its greatest following and influence in the aforesaid large pivotal States. This party and its fellow-travelers are shrewd political manipulators. What grim irony it would be if they should swing the balance of power and be responsible for the election of a President of the United States. Again, mention might be made of the undue power and influence given to the big city political machines through the electoral college. Through, and because of the electoral college, a few big cities have elected and will probably continue to elect Presidents of the United States. It is largely within these big cities that the racial, religious, and economic blocs are found, and in which they operate.

Now, please understand, I have no objection to the Negro in Harlem voting, and to his vote being counted, but I do resent the fact that both parties will spend a hundred times as much money to get his vote, and that his vote is worth a hundred times as much in the scale of national politics as is the vote of a white man in Texas. I have no objection to a million folks who cannot speak English voting, or to their votes being counted, but I do resent the fact that because they happen to live in Chicago, or Detroit or New York, their vote is worth a hundred times as much as mine because I happen to live in Texas. Is it fair, is it honest, is it democratic, is it to the best interest of anyone, in fact, to place such a premium on a few thousand labor votes, or Italian votes, or Irish votes, or Negro votes, or Jewish votes, or Polish votes, or Communist votes, or big-city machine votes, simply because they happen to be located in two or three large, industrial pivotal States? Can anything but evil come from placing such temptation and such power in the hands of political parties and political bosses? They, of course, will never resist the temptation of making undue appeals to these minority groups whose votes mean the balance of power and the election of Presidents. Thus, both said groups and said politicians are corrupted and the Nation suffers.

Fifth. The electoral college deprives great masses of our best citizens of the educational benefits of national campaigns and lessens their concern in national affairs. Most of our citizens outside of the great pivotal States never see a Presidential candidate or a campaign speaker, and never heard a campaign speech except by radio. Neither

the platforms nor the speeches are designed to appeal to them. Furthermore, millions in these areas refrain from voting in general elections, knowing that to do so is futile, since their votes will have no bearing on results.

Sixth. The electoral college places unconscionable burdens and temptations upon a President elected by it. A President starts out heavily obligated to the organized minority pressure groups in the great pivotal States and to the political machines, often the big-city machines, that were most responsible for his election. Again, there are those who, with great logic, contend that by keeping the political machines and the minority pressure groups of the large pivotal States in line, a President can easily reelect himself, if not actually perpetuate himself, in office. Further, the political satellites and those who benefit from his tenure of office are constantly urging him to do this very thing. Certainly, a President is constantly under great temptation to devote undue attention to, and confer undue favors upon, these strategic political areas at the expense of, and to the detriment of, the rest of the country. I certainly would not accuse any President of playing cheap politics, but no President should be subjected to the harassment of groups which, under the electoral-college system, hold such disproportionate political influence and power.

Now, let me discuss briefly some of the main arguments against our proposed amendment. While a vast majority of our political scientists, legal scholars, and serious students of government agree that our present system is dangerously defective, they do not agree upon proposed remedies. Some favor electing Presidents by direct vote of the people. A direct vote method raises all of the issues between the large States and the small States, and such an amendment could never be ratified. Again, it would destroy State sovereignty in the matter of national elections. It would aggravate rather than alleviate sectional differences. It would reduce all States to the lowest common denominator. For example, all States would have to lower their voting age to 18 to be on a parity with Georgia. Again, in a sectional controversy, New York might vote their dogs, cats, and dead grandmothers, and Texas would retaliate by doing the same thing. Each State would be accusing the other of fraud in piling up big votes, and each would probably be correct. Under our proposal, it is of no concern to Texas how many vote in New York, and no concern to New York how many vote in Texas. New York would still have 47 electoral votes, divided, however, in the exact ratio in which they were cast. Texas would still have 23 electoral votes, divided, however, in the exact ratio in which they were cast. Another argument against doing away with the electoral college is that it would destroy the two-party system. Our reply is that it would have the reverse effect, and that our major parties under the proposed amendment would succeed or fail on real merit and not upon their success in juggling or manipulating the archaic, undemocratic vehicle known as the electoral-college system. Again, some submit statistics trying to show that the proposed amendment would favor one or the other of the major parties. We submit that no truthful statistics on such a score can possibly be offered. For example, under our proposed amendment, had it been in effect during the last campaign, Governor Dewey might possibly have been passed over by the Republican Party for some other nominee. Furthermore, the Republican ticket doubtless would have polled at least a million more popular votes in the so-called solid South. Nothing could be more nonpartisan than the proposed amendment. It would be absolutely fair to all political parties. It would give our two great major parties new life and vigor. It would free them of the leeches and parasites that now cling to the backs of each. It would make them in truth and fact national parties, not sectional parties, appealing to prejudice, passion, and bias. Each party would then write its platform and make its appeal on national rather than sectional bases.

To summarize and generalize the affirmative arguments for the proposed amendment: We are convinced that the safety and welfare of this Nation demands the abolition of the electoral-college system of electing Presidents. This system now denies a majority of our people any effective voice in the election of Presidents. The proposed amendment would remove the overpowering incentive in the present system to coddle and corrupt organized minority groups in the pivotal States, since under the proposed amendment, there would be no pivotal States. The proposed change would remove the incentive to buy those who may be for sale to the highest bidder, because their votes would not mean a balance of power and the election of a President. Under the proposed change, there would be little or no compulsion or incentive for fraud and chicanery in national campaigns. Such campaigns would no longer be sectional. The general welfare would then become a party's paramount concern. Principles would then inevitably rise above politics, and statesmanship would then count for more than mere political expediency.

Let us act before it is too late.

Admission of Displaced Persons to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert L. Norton from the Boston Post of July 18, 1947:

ROBERT L. NORTON COMMENTS ON THINGS LEFT UNDONE BY CONGRESS

WASHINGTON, July 17.—There is no sound reason why Congress should not respond to the final plea of Secretary Marshall that a substantial number of Europe's 850,000 displaced persons be admitted to this country.

SEES COMPROMISE

No revision of the immigration laws is required. The opposition to the Stratton bill, calling for the admission of 400,000 over a period of 4 years could well be compromised, as suggested, by letting in 100,000 of these unfortunates during the next year.

Then we could see how it would work out, and the fears and narrow intolerance exhibited by those who have blocked consideration of the measure might be allayed or disproved altogether.

The responsibility for putting this legislation on the agenda during the closing days of the session is up to the Republicans. Their leadership has played politics from the beginning with this measure and deliberately stalled the bill in committee, preventing it from coming to the floor of both Houses for free discussion and decision.

OTHER OBJECTORS

But the blame is not altogether on the Republicans, since there has been narrow and insular objections from some of the southern Democrats, as well as from the "Bible belt" in the Middle West and from some leaders of veterans' organizations.

The case for the admission of these suffering people has been pretty thoroughly presented in all of its aspects, both human and practical.

From the human viewpoint there has been a shocking indifference to the pitiful plight of these people. They hunger not only for food and drink, but for justice and mercy. They look to the United States as an island of light in a sea of darkness.

They cannot return to their native land for reasons which are purely obvious. The greatness of America has come from just such groups and the arguments of professional Americans, interested as they allege in preserving us from alien influences, is the purest buncombe. They are all descendants of immigrants from which the greatness of America has come.

Side Lights on Unconditional Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an exchange of letters between 14 Congressmen and Secretary of State Cordell Hull in the spring of 1944 on unconditional surrender and war aims generally.

Also included is an editorial entitled "Return to Reason," from the Brooklyn Tablet for July 19, 1947.

The whole story of the ghastly stupidity of the insistence on unconditional surrender is yet to be told. But bit by bit the whole truth about how unconditional surrender prolonged the war and played into the hands of the Communists is coming to light.

The letters and the editorial follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 21, 1944.

HON. CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As direct representatives of several million Americans in the Congress of the United States, we have

a solemn responsibility to these people. Especially is this true during a war in which both the lives and the savings of many of them will be destroyed by the war activities of their Government.

Many of these patriotic Americans are asking us pertinent questions about this conflict which we can answer adequately only if the executive branch will cooperate and give us the necessary factual information.

Specifically, among others, we are asked this question: "What are we fighting for?"

It is not sufficient to inform these anxious loved ones that, as they already know, we are fighting Japan because of the Pearl Harbor attack, and Germany because the responsible authorities determined the Nazi-military program a threat to our Nation. They know that our entrance into this conflict was not the time to determine the peace terms that we would eventually offer our defeated enemies.

We have been at war, however, well over 2 years. The war effort and the program for the defeat of Germany seem sufficiently advanced to determine terms for a vanquished Germany. If the declaration labelled "Unconditional Surrender" is still the official objective, some elaboration of that phrase is in order. Does it mean extermination of the German people and utter destruction of their country? If not, what does it mean?

Shouldn't the American people, who carry the burdens of this war, be advised of the conditions which the German Nation must accept to secure a cessation of hostilities?

It has been suggested that the German people, learning those terms, might possibly overthrow their war leaders.

Do not the thousands of American boys who are scheduled to die in invasions have the right to know the aims of the peace for which their lives are to be sacrificed?

We want no secret or vital military information, nor details on special problems on which the Government of the United States cannot appropriately or realistically commit itself at this time. But we do request now the answer to the question that, spoken or unspoken, is in the mind of every American today: What are we fighting for? What conditions must be brought about to secure a cessation of bloodshed and tragedy in Europe?

Our soldiers, their fathers, mothers, wives, sweethearts, and children want to know now. They are asking us these questions. What answer shall we give them?

Respectfully yours,

Wm. P. Elmer, Missouri; Wat Arnold, Missouri; Max Schwabe, Missouri; Wm. C. Cole, Missouri; Howard Buffett, Nebraska; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; C. A. Johnson, Illinois; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio; Henderson H. Carson, Ohio; Edward O. McCowen, Ohio; Edward Rowe, Ohio.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 29, 1944.

Hon. HOWARD BUFFETT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BUFFETT: I have received your letter of March 22, 1944, enclosing a communication of March 21 signed by you and several other Members of the House of Representatives. In this communication you inquire, "What are we fighting for?" and regarding unconditional surrender.

The first question was discussed fully and answered fully in an address which I delivered some time ago entitled "The War and Human Freedom." I enclose a copy of that address, in the belief that its broad treatment will be more useful to you and your constituents than a brief reply.

On the subject of unconditional surrender, the President in a message to Congress, dated August 25, 1943, said, in part:

"Except for the responsible Fascist leaders, the people of the Axis need not fear unconditional surrender to the United Nations. I have said that we shall bring food for the starving and medicine for the sick in the areas liberated by the United Nations. We have done so, under lend-lease, in north Africa. We are doing so in Sicily. We shall continue to do so in other areas, as they are liberated, to prevent economic break-down and to aid the liberated peoples to produce and to help themselves. We shall provide these necessary civilian supplies in support of our military operations and as a matter of simple humanity. The people of Axis-controlled areas may be assured that when they agree to unconditional surrender they will not be trading Axis despotism for ruin under the United Nations."

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

[From the Tablet of July 19, 1947]

RETURN TO REASON

The Government has decided to scrap what George Sokolsky in Wednesday's New York Sun called "the barbarous Morgenthau plan" and to endeavor to make Germany self-sustaining. Here is another example that hatred does not pay. The policy of unconditional surrender, followed by destruction of German industry and the piling of millions of people on land which could not support them, not only cost thousands of American lives and millions of dollars but has likewise prevented the establishment of peace and an opportunity for western Europe to get on its feet. And now, after spending lives and untold wealth in destroying Germany, we have decided to spend additional billions in rebuilding Germany because Germany, France, Italy, and other countries cannot prosper—and we cannot continue to support millions of Germans on the dole.

Unconditional surrender was just that, a surrender to hate and liquidation.

Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of July 20, 1947:

SENATE'S UPHOLDING TAX VETO PUTS INTERESTS OF NATION FIRST

Since President Truman's veto of the bill to reduce income tax payments, there has been an increased justification for the rejection of a measure which would serve the interests of individual citizens at the expense of the Nation as a whole. The President has accordingly acted with wisdom and courage in returning this bill to Congress a second time without his signature. The Senate has shown sound judgment in sustaining the veto.

There are indications that the United States is going to need the money which would be lost to the Government if the tax-reduction bill were to become effective. Representative CHARLES A. EATON, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, warned yesterday that the "United States is within sight of a shooting war this minute in Greece," and that this country must either hold the fort in Greece or permit Russia to take over.

This is an unpleasant estimate of the situation in Europe at the moment and it may be slightly overdrawn. It is hardly conceivable that Russia, whose economic plight is as desperate as that of any nation, would permit her aggressive diplomacy to get out of hand to the extent of a shooting war. But the situation in Greece is, nevertheless, as tense as it is represented by Mr. EATON.

It must be met by the United States, and money is essential to this purpose. President Truman has reiterated his familiar objections to tax reduction at this time, emphasizing particularly the necessity of reducing the great public debt by substantial amounts during a period of national prosperity. The soundness of this policy cannot be questioned.

What is equally important is provision for a future which is uncertain, if not perilous. Europe is descending swiftly into economic chaos. Gradually, under the stimulus of Moscow, there is developing a desperation of spirit which, if not controlled, will serve the purposes of the Soviet Union. The United States has undertaken the revitalizing of a sick, if not dying, continent. Success is vital to Europe and to our own place in the world of tomorrow. Since the Marshall program was initiated there has arisen logically the question of the ability of the United States to provide economic sustenance for Europe without impairment of our own economic structure. The costs will be high and they are likely to run beyond even the most liberal estimates. But they can be met safely if there is no cut in tax revenues and if there is no recession.

President Truman has wisely determined that the resources of the National Government shall be conserved for purposes more important than the financial benefit of corporations and individual citizens.

The Ahoskie (N. C.) Automobile Raffle and Work Among the Navajo Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in this morning's mail I received a letter from North Carolina, which I feel I should acknowledge because it contains a delicate thrust, which I appreciate, and at which I take no offense. The letter comes to me from Mr. A. B. Stoney, of the North Carolina General Assembly, and comments on my statements made the other day on the floor of the Senate concerning the Negro man in Ahoskie, N. C., who was denied an automobile. The writer does not object to my remarks, but he rather takes me to task and calls my attention to the fact that there are some 55,000 Navajo Indians in my own State to whom I might well direct my attention.

Mr. President, I am in complete accord with what the gentleman says about the Navajo Indians. I have tried to direct my attention and efforts in their behalf, and shall continue to do so. But enclosed with the letter is a very interesting article written by the Right Reverend James M. Stoney, bishop of the missionary district of New Mexico and southwest Texas, dealing with the Navajo

problem. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORGANTON, N. C., *July 19, 1947.*

Hon. CARL A. HATCH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: Press reports indicate that you have expressed a justified indignation at the recent discrimination against a Negro of Ahoskie, N. C.

As soon as the facts become known, amends were quickly made by action of North Carolina citizens. It is reported that the matter has been adjusted to the complete satisfaction of the Negro boy and all others concerned.

We, in North Carolina, appreciate your interest in the welfare of one of our citizens, and welcome any expression of the same, be it on the floor of the Senate of the United States or elsewhere.

In view of your recent statements and activities concerning this single occurrence in North Carolina, I am sure that you will not resent the action of a public servant of North Carolina in calling to your attention the pitiful plight of 55,000 citizens of your State. I refer to the Navajo Indians.

Will you be so kind as to read the attached article from the current issue of the Southern Churchman by my brother, the Right Reverend James M. Stoney, Episcopal bishop of New Mexico? And will you advise him or me as to what, if anything, you are doing to correct this infamous situation?

No man as influential as you are in the councils of your State and Nation can escape the moral responsibility of a neglect which has isolated the Navajos in poverty, ignorance and disease in direct violation of the terms of a solemn treaty between them and the United States Government.

Many thousands of Indians live in North Carolina, as do hundreds of thousands of Negroes. We will welcome any inquiry you care to make concerning our treatment of these minority groups from an educational, political, religious or humanitarian standpoint. Senators CLYDE R. HOEY and WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD, of North Carolina, will be glad, I am sure, to furnish you with any information you may desire.

Here in North Carolina, we are facing and solving the problems of our citizens of minority groups in a manner that may well serve as a pattern for the other States of the Nation, including the great State of New Mexico which you have the high honor to represent in the United States Senate.

Respectfully yours,

A. B. STONEY,
North Carolina General Assembly.

[From the Southern Churchman]

A PAGE FROM A MISSIONARY BISHOP'S DIARY

(By Rt. Rev. James M. Stoney, bishop of the missionary district of New Mexico and southwest Texas)

FRIDAY, April 25.—Mrs. Stoney and I left Albuquerque at 8 a. m. for the Navajo Reservation. After 160 miles along the more-or-less paved highway, we turned off across the plains to St. Luke's-in-the-Desert, our Navajo outposts. Our first stop was at Carsons Post, where the missionary, Rev. George A. Stracke, lives with his wife and 13-year-old daughter, Ann. The Strackes make a wonderful missionary team. The three work beautifully together. Their living quarters consist of three small rooms attached to the community house. They have a dining room-kitchen, a living room, and a bedroom. Ann sleeps on a couch in the living room, and a bathroom really is not needed where the water supply is limited. Neither do they have electricity or gas. These are savings that make it possible for the Strackes to live on his modest salary.

At Carsons we were joined by the Venerable and Mrs. Robert Y. Davis, who had driven over from the San Juan Indian Mission. Mr. Davis is archdeacon of the Indian work in New Mexico, and Mrs. Davis works right with him.

We had to abandon our cars at Carsons, as the sand from there on was too heavy even for our desert-trained Chevvy. We piled into a Navajo's wagon for the final lap of the journey, but even that did not do the trick. On the last hill the sand was so deep that the horses could not get a foothold, and we had to pile out again, to lighten the load.

When we got to St. Luke's the congregation was already gathering. The children had come over from the nearby Huerfano School, a Government day school of 45 pupils—most of whom stay there all the time. While waiting for service, Ann Stracke and the children sang some of the simpler church hymns, and they sang as well as any other group of normal youngsters.

At 3 o'clock the service started. The mission was crowded to the doors. First, Archdeacon Davis baptized five children and two adults. This made 57 persons baptized since last June, when the Strackes came. After that, morning prayer—yes, morning prayer at 3 in the afternoon, for that is as far as the Navajos at St. Luke's have gotten. Few of them know much English and fewer still can read. The teaching is very slow as it has to be lined out, a little at a time. The difficult words of the prayer book are just sounds to most of them, but they have learned the general confession, the Lord's Prayer, the Venite, the Jubilate, the Apostles' Creed, and the General Thanksgiving. After morning prayer came my sermon. Preaching to the Navajos is the worst thing I do. My Navajo vocabulary consists of just six words, and I am not sure of them. Many of the Navajos have as sketchy a knowledge of English. Once I preached through an interpreter, and that was worse. My wife hasn't stopped laughing about that sermon yet.

When time came for confirmation, 15 Navajos were presented. There had been but one confirmation service at St. Luke's before. In the twenty-odd years of its existence, the occasional candidates went over to the San Juan Mission. There were seven girls, three boys, three women, and two men. This was a real day of triumph for St. Luke's and for Mr. Stracke. After the service we all adjourned to the community house for coffee and cookies. Later we drove over to Farmington where we spent the night.

Saturday, April 26: Mrs. Stoney, Archdeacon Davis, and I went down to the Fruitland project, where the Government has settled several hundred Navajo families on small farms of about 10 acres each—and good farmers many of them are making. The Fruitland School has about a hundred students. Many of the children were around, as they live too far to get home even on week ends. They all seem well fed and happy. Three classrooms have been set aside for dormitories. The boys have two, as the older ones and the younger ones have to be separated. The girls, however, are all crowded into one classroom. They have double-decker beds, so close together that it is all but impossible to walk between them. About 40 girls live in this one room. The beds are not very attractive, for the Government seems short on sheets and is not able to supply enough for them all. However, the children do not complain, as it is better than what they have in their hogans.

The teaching is painfully slow, as few of the children know English when they come and have to learn that before they can go much further. In this school of over a hundred students, only two are as far as the fourth grade. Attendance is purely voluntary, as school facilities are insufficient. The Federal Government has provided schools for about 25 percent of the children on the reservation. If attendance were compulsory a great many more schools would be required. We were much impressed with some of the drawings and crayon paintings of the older pupils. They do not fall behind any group in their abilities. We sang with some of them, too, when Mrs. Stoney got to a piano, and they did as well as the youngsters at St. Luke's-in-the-Desert.

There is room for only a few of the Navajos in the schools, though adequate schooling and medical service formed a part of the treaty with the Navajos when they were placed on the reservation. This treaty has been carried out only fractionally, at best. And now an economy-minded Congress is threatened further to restrict these services. In this rich and powerful Nation of ours, the Government is preserving an oasis of ignorance, disease, and poverty among our first citizens—and a fine people they are.

Sunday, April 27: The first thing this morning was a visit through the hospital at the San Juan Mission. Archdeacon Davis had just returned from a trip down the river, and had come back with 30 Navajos packed into a pick-up truck. How he did it, I do not know. It was dangerous, of course, as the roads are very rough. But until some one gives us a school bus, there is nothing else we can do. We have to use tools that we have. As usual, things were clean, bright, and cheerful in the hospital. Besides the isolation room, there are three wards—one for maternity cases, one for men, and one for women. The children go into whatever ward their ages and sex require. The missionary doctor, Michael Moran, is a brilliant and sympathetic man. For a negligible pittance, he gives part-time service, being paid for about a tenth of what he does. In addition, there is Jane Turnbull, R. N., who has dedicated her life to the Navajos. Archdeacon Davis is superintendent of it all, and his deep, warm spirituality keeps the entire atmosphere conscious of the fact that this work is done in the name of the Lord. While I was there, a woman was brought in, badly injured when her horse fell on her. The caseload at the hospital has been twice what the budget allows, but what can one do? Two patients are refused for each one that is received, and still we can't keep within the budget. There has been much sickness on the reservation this winter, and one does not say, "You will just have to go home and die in your hogan," unless it is necessary.

Soon it was time for the service. The beautiful chapel, built to seat about 30, had over twice that number crowded in. Almost as many more were in the hall outside, in the women's ward across the hall and on the front porch. There were 11 confirmed this time, maybe in spite of my terrible effort at a sermon. One lad, recently out of the Army, took this, his first chance to renew the solemn promise and vow that he had made at his baptism, before he was drafted. The Navajos are not allowed to vote, but over 3,000 of them rendered valuable war service, in the armed forces and otherwise. This trip to the reservation has been a wonderful experience, with eager faces and hearts convinced that the church cares for them, even if they are forgotten by many others.

Monday, April 28. Mrs. Stoney and I returned to Albuquerque today, and my heart is filled with both rejoicing and sadness. I am amazed that our tiny staff of two clergymen, one part-time physician and one registered nurse can accomplish so much. I am truly grateful that it has fallen to my lot to help develop this work. I rejoice at the results accomplished with so little to go on.

But I am distressed, too. This powerful church of ours can find many millions for beautiful churches and gorgeous cathedrals, but it is hard to get a few extra thousands so needed in the Navajo mission. The Federal Government can get hundreds of mil-

lions for the depressed people of other countries, and this is right. But is it not also right that they should get a few extra millions for the sake of these people who have always fared badly at the hands of the white man; who have been deprived of their lands and put on a reservation; who for 80 years, now, have been kept as wards of the Government, with little chance to improve their lot; who have been left in poverty, ignorance and disease, though they were promised many fine things when they surrendered to the Federal forces in the sixties? The Navajos have increased from about 8,000 to 55,000 in these 80 years. They are amazing everyone with their rapid growth. Until they are prepared for citizenship and absorbed into the general population, isn't it penny-pinching to handicap the Indian service even more, by making their task harder, by forcing them to make bricks with even less straw?

I am thankful that we have about a hundred Navajo children taking both week-day and Sunday religious instruction, but what are they among so many?

The Roosevelt Shrine in Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Roosevelt Shrine in Georgia," published in the Atlanta Constitution of June 25, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROOSEVELT SHRINE IN GEORGIA

Today there come men and women from many parts of the world, the Nation, and our State, to gather at Warm Springs, close by the little white clapboard house where Franklin D. Roosevelt knew and loved life, and where the final messenger of death found him.

The small, modest cottage came to be called the little White House, and Georgia was his second State. It is fitting that Georgia should take over the house and the grounds as a national shrine to the man whom destiny raised up to world leadership in the time of the world's greatest crisis.

The people loved him and trusted him.

The fact has plagued, and still plagues, a great many persons who feel that it should not be so.

But it was so. And it is so. And it will continue to be so.

His name fits well with those of Wilson, of Lincoln, of Cleveland, of Jackson, Jefferson, and of any other man who has served his country greatly and with success.

The people know some things in their hearts, and that is where they knew Roosevelt.

The measure of his service is that our country alone survived the great revolutions and profound social and military upheavals which brought great change in government and destruction and misery to the rest of the world.

So the little house to which he liked to come to rest and relax, drawing comfort and strength from Georgia pine and Georgia air as he did in the days when as a young governor he came seeking health, will become a shrine. To it will come, through the years ahead, millions of people, seeing where he lived; the rooms, the old chair in which he sat when the final messenger came for him on that fateful April 12, 1945.

Georgia, in great pride and in grateful memory, accepts this trust and welcomes today those who come to do honor to the man who led us to victory through world depression and world war, and left our institutions of freedom and government stronger and more dearly valued than before.

Need for "Uncommon" Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, we read with a great deal of interest the national reaction to the appointments made by the President for the new labor board. Generally speaking, the appointment of Robert N. Denham seems to have won universal approval. He has demonstrated the ability to approach problems in a nonpolitical and judicious manner.

The appointment of Senator Murdock is challenged by the Sunday Star of this city. Senator Murdock served four terms in the House and one in the Senate, and was defeated in the last election. Throughout his career he was constantly inclined to approve and support the New Deal without general regard for the well-being of the country.

The third appointee, Mr. J. Copeland Gray, has nothing in his record which would indicate that his approach to the controversial labor problems will be either nonpolitical or judicious. Too little is known about him.

I happen to be one who believes the Wagner Labor Act, and the National Labor Relations Board created under it, might have worked had the late President Roosevelt attempted seriously to find men of judicious approach. However, appointments were made of individuals who had a prolabor, antibusiness record or were members of the private political house of the President; the primary reason for such appointments was always the coming election. We have seen how this policy worked out. The Taft-Hartley bill is the result.

While the Taft-Hartley bill has been referred to as a slave labor bill and has been subjected to the most slanderous invective in the English language, the attacks on this legislation have been weak and have appealed to emotion and prejudice and not to reason. The authors of this bill have time and time again ably countered the abuse hurled at them and their bill, and have shown that it is not a slave labor bill, nor is it guilty of the many defects claimed principally by labor bosses. Time will test this law, and I am confident that as time passes we will hear less and less of the slave labor and other epithets. The important question before the Nation today is the character and ability of the appointees who will administer the law.

For the last several years we have been hearing a great deal in high political office, both in the States and nationally, about the great triumph of the common man. I doubt very much if any individual or group of people have been so eulogized as this abstract being, the common man. This eulogy has been deceitful and dishonest. It has but one purpose—votes. Anyone with intelligence, including an abstract common man, knows that the world is made up of common men. The great problem we have is to find some uncommon men. It is very possible that the President in his appointments has failed to see through this political fog of the common man, as was the case in his veto of the tax and labor bills. The President's prolific arguments in his message vetoing the Taft-Hartley bill could not possibly stand up against reasonable argument. His argument was purely and simply political buncombe. The same is generally true of the President's statements in vetoing the tax bill.

We are beginning to hear and read many loud-mouthed commentators and poison-penned columnists that the Eightieth Congress will adjourn or recess having taken care of their own selfish interests and the wealthy class of society, with utter disregard of the common man. This will be the battle cry of the New Deal crowd. Yet today, the condition exists, which developed under the New Deal, where there is a greater concentration of wealth into fewer hands than has ever been the case in our Nation's history.

The President should think carefully as he moves forward in making appointments to the new Labor Board. We want judicious men who will approach the problems with a sound interpretation of the law, not men who think in terms of votes and elections. Yes, Mr. Speaker, most of all, the President needs uncommon men. The country needs them and the world needs them.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial from yesterday's Sunday Star, published in Washington, D. C.

NEW LABOR SET-UP

It should be obvious to anyone that the new Labor Board and its general counsel—the administrative instruments for applying the Taft-Hartley Act—ought to be composed of men beyond suspicion of any anti-labor bias. Ideally, they would be men who would act exclusively in the public interest, without personal inclinations toward either the labor or industry viewpoint. But since this ideal is hardly attainable, it would seem better, especially in the early stages of this law's operation, to place its administration in the hands of men whose primary qualifications are that they believe in the law, that they think it is a workable law, and that they are resolved to enforce it to the best of their ability. The question is whether the appointees named by the President meet these standards.

The reaction to the appointment of Robert N. Denham to the important post of general counsel has been quite favorable. There are those who would have preferred a man who is better known, and there is little in Mr. Denham's record to indicate any extensive administrative experience. In other respects, however, it is a very satisfactory appointment. He has had broad experience as a trial examiner under the old Labor Board, he has shown himself to be a man of integrity and independence, and he has said explicitly that he believes in the new

law and its workability. These are important qualifications, and they should equip him to discharge his new responsibilities in satisfactory fashion.

There has been a less favorable reaction to the two men named as members of the new board.

Abe Murdock has served four terms in the House and one in the Senate, having been beaten in last year's election. His record is that of a consistent New Dealer, who has been an honest and ardent prolabor man. As a member of the House in 1940 he helped write a minority committee report vigorously opposing the proposed Smith amendments to the Wagner Act. Many of those amendments, in substance if not in form, have been adopted in the new labor law. Hence, there arises the question whether Mr. Murdock is still opposed to them, or, if he has changed his views, when did he do so, and why? This is important, because if he does not believe without reservation in the new law, then he should not be a member of the Board charged with the duty of administering it.

The other Board appointee is J. Copeland Gray, of Buffalo. Mr. Gray has served in some public capacities and also as an industrial-relations counselor. His name has been put forward as an industry representative on the Board, but there are those on the industry side of the fence who look with anything but enthusiasm on his selection. To most people, however, he is almost unknown, and it would be premature to attempt to pass judgment on his qualifications at this time.

What obviously is needed is a thorough hearing by the Senate on these two nominations. The new Labor Board and its personnel are going to play a vital part in determining whether the Taft-Hartley law becomes a success or a failure. This being so, the Senate ought not to confirm the nominations of Mr. Murdock and Mr. Gray until it is fully satisfied as to their qualifications.

Minimum Wage Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of July 20, 1947:

WHY MINIMUM WAGE BOOST IS VITAL

A short speech by the general manager of a mill that operates in Whitehall, Ga., was reported before the Hartley House Labor Committee recently. From the content of it we could write a good script for a movie short or novel. The thing would be called Why Some Americans Act Like Russians.

Here is the essence of the warning thrown at the workers in the mill:

"The company will never pay you spinners $37 for 40 hours again. If you people don't want to go back to work you won't hurt me or the owner of this mill.

"I can tell you one thing—if you don't go back to work all of you poor people can get out of Whitehall. When you get hungry don't ask me for any food, for I won't give any one of you a crumb of bread."

The report did not state whether the spokesman held a long whip in his hand like Simon Legree. He didn't need one, as a matter of fact. The control that the company held over the lives of the workers was more effective. They were promised work at starvation wages or starvation without work.

At the present time there is a bill before Congress to increase the minimum wage from 40 cents an hour to 65 or 75 cents an hour. It is aimed at conditions such as this instance reveals. There are sections of the country where exploitation of human beings for personal profit is still prevalent. Wide areas in the South could be cited. Federal legislation on the matter is imperative. Congress found the votes to override a Presidential veto on the Taft-Hartley bill. It should rise to the occasion and override those who are strenuously lobbying against a necessary, but still inadequate, floor to the wage-hour law.

We are less surprised to see American workers begin to have doubts about the free-enterprise system when things like this Georgia affair are allowed to go on. Some American workers begin to think, talk, and act like Russians because they have the misfortune to work for bosses who show them the example of how Russian commissars treat the worker.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday July 21, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article written by me entitled "The Marshall Plan." This appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union and in the Manchester Evening Leader, Thursday, July 17, 1947. Both papers are published in Manchester, N. H. The article follows:

THE MARSHALL PLAN—MARSHALL AT HARVARD

On June 5, Gen. George Marshall delivered at Harvard University an address which has already taken its place as one of the foremost pronouncements ever made by any Secretary of State. As a result of this speech 16 nations of western Europe are currently meeting in Paris in an effort to create a plan for the economic rehabilitation of that continent. In his remarks at Harvard, Marshall said that the United States should assist in the economic recovery of the world. "Such assistance," he affirmed, "I am convinced must not be on a piecemeal basis as various crises develop. Any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative."

"It is already," he continued, "evident that, before the United States Government can proceed much further in its efforts to alleviate the situation and help start the European world on its way to recovery, there must be some agreement among the countries of Europe as to the requirements of the situation and the part those countries themselves will take in order to give proper effect to whatever action might be undertaken by this Government. * * * The initiative, I think, must come from Europe. The role of this country should consist of friendly aid in the drafting of a European program and of later support of such a program so far as it may be practical for us to do so. The program should be a joint one, agreed to by a number, if not all European nations."

I have included in this article the above pertinent quotations from the statement made by General Marshall in Cambridge because they form the basis of the economic discussions which are now proceeding in the French Capital.

THE THREE-POWER CONFERENCE

On June 27 a three-power conference including Great Britain, France, and Russia convened in Paris. The Marshall plan was the subject of discussion. On July 2 Russia decided not to participate in this plan. Foreign Minister Molotov in a statement issued on that date said, "The Soviet Government considering that the Anglo-French plan to set up a special organization for the coordination of the economies of European states would lead to interference in the internal affairs of European countries, particularly those which have the greatest need for outside aid, and believing that this can only complicate relations between the countries of Europe and hamper their cooperation, rejects this plan as being altogether unsatisfactory and incapable of yielding any positive result. * * * It would lead to no good results."

It is slightly amusing to have concern about interference in the internal affairs of European countries come from Russia, since beginning in 1939 she has annexed territory exceeding 273,000 square miles, with a population of over 24,000,000, and has extended communism by puppet governments to at least 12 countries, with a population in excess of 165,000,000. That her control is most effective is shown by the manner in which Moscow has recently prevented her satellites from particiating in the present Paris Conference.

The Soviet Union in rejecting participation in the Marshall plan and by preventing her satellites from entering into negotiations shows that Russia wants a divided, disorganized, and a prostrate Europe. The objectives of the Kremlin have been made crystal clear. Boldly, bluntly, and baldly the Soviet Union has informed the world by statements and particularly by actions that she desires a distressed and divided Europe. Obviously, this is for the purpose of spreading communism and of continuing the program of relentless Soviet expansion, with the ultimate purpose of dominating the world.

MEANING OF MARSHALL PLAN

The Marshall plan, as outlined in the Secretary's speech at Harvard, calls for a survey of the economic resources and economic needs of Europe. It calls for the development of a program of self-help. After the survey has been made and the plan has been formulated it will be presented to the United States. We will then be called upon to assist in the economic rehabilitation of Europe as a whole. The nations of western Europe can help themselves by an exchange of their available resources. Thus, the Marshall plan will cost this country less than if we were to proceed to assist each country individually.

In my Washington report of last month I stated in my suggested sixth plank for a realistic foreign policy that economic assistance to rehabilitate the countries of Europe must be extended by the United States. I further emphasized that in connection with giving aid we should follow an important principle, namely, the principle of helping nations who receive assistance to help themselves.

THE MOLOTOV PLAN

Russia in disagreement with the Marshall suggestions has begun to develop a program of economic help to other countries known as the Molotov plan. She is endeavoring to have the European nations who are in need, particularly those in the east, turn to Moscow. The Soviet Union and her satellites have been making bilateral economic treaties. Last week Russia and Czechoslovakia concluded a 5-year treaty for the purpose of exchanging goods. It is reported that under this treaty Czechoslovakia will receive wheat and fodder from Russia and in return will supply the Soviet Union with manufactured goods. Russia and her Balkan satellites have reached a plan for the integration of the

Balkan railways into the system of the Soviet Union. The Russian plan calls for cooperation among the nations where there are communistic systems.

Thus the split between the east and west is widening. Russia asked for it and is insisting upon it. I believe the course of the United States is clear. We must stand for the economic rehabilitation of western Europe as a means of guaranteeing our security.

THE CONFERENCE FOR EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

On Saturday, July 12, 16 nations met in Paris to start discussions on the Marshall plan. In speeches made by Foreign Minister Bevin, of Great Britain and Foreign Minister Bidault, of France, the door was still left open for participation by the Soviet Union and other countries. Bidault said, "We still hope that seats left empty today will be occupied some day." Bevin pledged the support of Great Britain to the Marshall plan in the following words: "On behalf of the British Government, I am authorized to state that, not only its own resources but, insofar as it can influence them, the resources of the great Commonwealth will be directed as far as possible to help rehabilitate Europe. We regard that not only as our duty but as our interest, since the quicker Europe can be brought back to a state of economic health the more we shall all mutually benefit."

NATIONS PRESENT AND ABSENT

I am including data on the countries present and absent as reported by the New York Times of July 15:

"NATIONS ATTENDING

"Present at Paris are the delegates of 16 of Europe's 27 countries. They are:

Country	Square miles	Population
Austria	32,369	7,055,000
Belgium	11,775	8,400,000
Denmark	16,575	4,330,000
France	212,741	41,100,000
Greece	50,267	7,700,000
Iceland	39,709	130,000
Eire	26,601	2,955,000
Italy	119,733	46,000,000
Luxembourg	999	300,000
Netherlands	12,742	9,530,000
Norway	124,556	3,065,000
Portugal	35,424	8,275,000
Sweden	173,341	6,750,000
Switzerland	15,940	4,485,000
Turkey	296,500	19,100,000
United Kingdom	93,991	49,700,000
Total	1,263,263	218,875,000

"Absent are the countries lying east of the Stettin-Trieste line. They are:

Country	Square miles	Population
Albania	10,631	1,140,000
Bulgaria	42,741	7,000,000
Czechoslovakia	49,321	12,300,000
Finland	130,160	3,870,000
Hungary	35,911	8,900,000
Poland	120,782	22,600,000
Rumania	91,934	15,900,000
Yugoslavia	95,983	15,700,000
Russia	8,308,634	193,000,000
Total	8,886,097	280,410,000"

THE SPECIAL SESSION OF CONGRESS

Several leaders in Washington including the President seem to think that there may be no need for a special session of Congress to consider the European situation. Before the Marshall plan can come into being it will be necessary for Congress to act. As I have stated on numerous occasions I am in accord with the Marshall plan and am ready to vote now for the funds necessary to put it into effect. The Paris Economic Conference should have its report and recommendations completed by early fall. I believe that the Congress should meet in special session next October to receive the results of the conference and to deal with questions of foreign policy exclusively.

Time is exceedingly important. There is a hard winter ahead. We must move quickly to win the peace. Delay can be disastrous. If the effectuation of the Marshall plan is postponed until the second regular session of the Eightieth Congress, it will be spring before action is completed. Long hearings will be required, lengthy debate will be insisted upon and in all probability if Congress does not convene this fall the Marshall plan will not be voted upon before Easter. Therefore, my belief in the need for a special session.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND THE CONGRESS

Recently the Secretary of State has been in secret conferences with the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate. Since the House of Representatives is the branch of the Congress closer to the people—because it is elected every 2 years—since the Marshall plan cannot be adopted unless and until the House agrees to approve it and since the legislation to effect and implement the plan must come before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, I am of the opinion that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House should be brought into the same relationship with the State Department and the Secretary of State as the Foreign Relations Committee of the other branch of the Congress.

Since in the United States the people must support any foreign policy if it is to be effective and since in order to bring this about, there must be a thorough dissemination of full and adequate information, I believe that secrecy in the consideration of foreign affairs should end, that the State Department should place all the facts before the people and that conferences with congressional committees should be made public. I have confidence in the people. They will make correct decisions if the Department of State will furnish them with the information freely, frankly, and without fear or hesitancy.

THE UNITED STATES MUST ACT

The policy which the United States should follow is clearly obvious. We must encourage western Europe to act quickly on the Marshall proposition even though the Soviet Union will have nothing to do with it. An economically strong European continent will help guarantee the security of the United States. Twice during the past 30 years this Republic has engaged in war to prevent the march of aggression. I sincerely hope we will not stand idly by now while another tyranny bent on control of the world reaches out to grasp and to subjugate every country in its path

We have the resources and the power and the will to call the bluff of the communistic dictatorship in Russia. By extending assistance to keep western Europe independent, free and economically strong, we will be making an investment in world security. Political isolation has ended; economic isolation must also end. I am convinced that financial aid to the war-devastated countries will help us win the struggle to establish world peace.

THE RUSSIAN RECORD

I have already emphasized that Russia is bent on expansion and the spread of communism. The Soviet Union has violated the spirit of the Atlantic Charter, the Charter of the United Nations, the Potsdam and the Yalta agreements. The Kremlin has wrecked conference after conference, the most recent being the three-power conference in Paris. Again and again the veto has been used by the Soviets in the United Nations. Feverishly the Communists are trying to develop the largest military potential in the world. Ever since the end of the war the Russian Government has obstinately refused to cooperate. By their statements and more specifically by their actions we are forced to no other conclusion than that the leaders of the Soviet Government wish a world in dire turmoil so that communism can be spread and so that every nation possible can be brought under the heel of the tyranny whose head is in the Kremlin. If there is anyone who doubts the ultimate objective of the Soviet communistic dictatorship, he needs only to read the record to be convinced of the points I am making. Yes, by their fruits ye shall know them.

WHAT UNITED STATES AID MUST ACCOMPLISH

In the near future the Congress either in special session or in regular session will be called upon to make important decisions which are bound to influence the course of world history for decades to come. We must decide on the adoption of the Marshall plan and the appropriation of the money to carry it out. I believe that our aid to western Europe is necessary in the self interest of the United States. Our assistance must result in the rehabilitation of the war-devastated countries. Our aid should help these countries to help themselves. Aid from the United States must prevent the nations of Europe from going communistic. Most important of all, American assistance must check the march of aggression by Mr. Stalin, his associates, and their successors.

A stable Europe is imperative for a stable world. An economically strong Europe is essential to the security of the Western Hemisphere. I hope that the United States will rise to the present occasion and devote the same energy to winning the peace as it devoted to winning the war. We must not let this opportunity of laying the foundations for a decent world society pass without utilizing it to the utmost. If we become guilty of this grievous error, historians of the future will record our hesitancy, our lack of understanding, and our indecision as one of the most colossal blunders in the annals of mankind.

Admission of Displaced Persons to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of William F. Laukaitis, supreme president of the Lithuanian Alliance of America, to the Subcommittee on Immigration of the House Judiciary Committee:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM F. LAUKAITIS, SUPREME PRESIDENT OF THE LITHUANIAN ALLIANCE OF AMERICA, ON H. R. 2910

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the House Judiciary Committee, among the displaced persons now living in the displaced persons camps are thousands of Baltics—people from the formerly independent Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. They have suffered untold misery, oppression, exploitation, racial persecution, and brutalities, not only under the Nazis, but also under the Communists. These people have been filled with abhorrence for all foreign domination and for all totalitarian systems.

They refuse to return to their former homelands because of the communistic system now in force there. This system they consider totalitarian, imperialistic, antidemocratic, and totally lacking in intellectual, spiritual, and economic freedoms.

These Baltic people cannot forget their tragic experiences under Soviet occupation of their respective countries, with its deportations, imprisonments and executions. They cannot forget the suppression under the Soviets of civil liberty of religion and religious worship. These experiences and sufferings have deepened their devotion to liberty, independence, freedom, and the democratic way of life. These are the type of people who would worship at the shrine of democracy. They yearn for the American way of life, and the blessings afforded by this, our great Republic of the United States of America.

What I have just stated about the Baltic displaced persons is, of course, applicable to the other national groups who find themselves in the displaced camps of Europe. These are the type of people who would be admitted to our shores under the provisions of the Stratton bill if it becomes the law of the land. This bill would give asylum to thousands of brave souls who have steadfastly refused to be assimilated into the Soviet system.

This is my answer to those who make the assertion and argument against the bill that aliens are unassimilable and have undesirable political ideas. People who oppose totalitarianism do not possess undesirable political ideas. People who desire the four freedoms do not possess undesirable political ideas. These are the ideals for which we fought two world wars. These are the ideals for which thousands of the flowers of our manhood made the supreme sacrifice.

The history of the United States is the best evidence of the assimilability of our aliens in the past. Their contributions to the great American melting pot needs no comment. I do beg leave to bring to the attention of this committee this fact. The provisions of H. R. 2910, the Stratton bill, provide for a thorough screening of the displaced persons before they could enter this country. Nowhere in the history of our past immigration was such a screening provided for or established by law. There can be no doubt but that practically all unassimilable persons or persons possessing undesirable political ideas would be screened out under the Stratton bill.

It has been argued by the opponents of this bill that its passage would aggravate the housing and unemployment problems. Based upon some personal experience and observations with such displaced persons as have already entered this country, it is my opinion that the displaced persons, given an opportunity to work as free men in a free country, will make excellent citizens. Those who have thus far entered the country are gainfully and usefully employed.

Displaced persons comprise not only professional people, but farm hands and domestics as well. These farm hands and domestic servants could readily relieve a great shortage of farm labor and domestic servants existing in the United States at this time, and their admission should cause no labor problem. The truth of this statement is evidenced by the fact that William Green and Philip Murray, the presidents of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, have given their support to the proposition of the admission of a fair share of displaced persons to the United States.

The displaced persons who would come to our shores under H. R. 2910 would find sanctuary in the homes of friends and relatives. No serious burden to the housing problem would result, in my opinion. Rural settlement of displaced persons could very readily be brought about by persons interested in the problem. The fraternal societies and orders in the United States whose membership is composed of people who either originally or whose ancestors originally came from countries in Europe from which the displaced persons have fled would, I feel certain, take up the problem and task of aiding in the housing and employment problems that might be presented, if any such problems did arise. I am certain that Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish organizations, fraternal, charitable, and benevolent in their nature and scope, not only are willing but are able to house displaced persons, and thus prevent their becoming a burden on our economy. The Lithuanian Alliance of America, of which I am the national president, has already taken steps in this direction by rejuvenating one of its fraternal benefit funds, known as the immigrant fund. I feel sure that the same step is either being taken or will be taken by other societies, fraternal organizations, and groups interested in these displaced persons.

The displaced-persons problem is, in part, an opportunity for our national growth. It is in the soundest American national interest to take steps to enlarge our productive population. (We are, in population, comparatively the smallest of the great powers of the world. We need, as our history has shown, the brain and muscle of immigrants. The rate of our population growth is declining.) Opening the doors of the United States to our fair share of the displaced persons would constitute an addition to the greatest resources that our country or any country can have—that of human beings willing to work in the interest of our economy.

The displaced-persons problem now constitutes a drain of millions of dollars a year on the American taxpayer. A substantial part of the cost of American occupation in central Europe calls for the maintenance of displaced persons in camps. The solution of the displaced-persons problem, with the United States accepting a fair share of the responsibility, will be a substantial relief to the American taxpayer, and will bring to this country people who would eventually share our tax burden.

The Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and France officially declared that no people would be forced to return to their homes against their will. This principle has been endorsed by the United Nations. The United States of America, as a leader in international affairs, should take the first step in the direction of practically confirming these principles. The rest of the world will then follow, as day follows night.

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following letter by Ernest H. Gaunt, of Lawrence, Mass., which was published in the Boston Traveler of Tuesday, June 24, 1947:

NO SUCH LIMITATION WAS INTENDED

To the PEOPLE'S EDITOR:

I was much interested in your editorial, How Big Is Business? That editorial is correct in saying that the small businessman "may be the one physical ingredient essential to civilization," and that "on this ground, if no other, he is worth protecting."

However, may I point out that the editorial seems to define the small businessman as merely the one who shines our shoes, presses our suits and washes our shirts, and runs a small retail store, etc. This definition seems to include only service businesses and those of a personal nature.

These are assuredly small businesses; but the writer of that editorial apparently slights or overlooks the very great number of independent, competitive, small businessmen who are manufacturers who use machinery, buy raw materials, and process them; also wholesalers.

This stress on small business in the editorial as applying to personal services—makes me wonder whether the writer of that editorial thinks that all manufacturing and processing of materials, must or ought to be done only by large companies. If so, there is abundant factual evidence of a reliable sort to show that small manufacturers and medium-sized manufacturers are often more efficient in operation than are large manufacturing concerns.

May I point out another sign of an inaccurate analysis and weighing by the writer of that editorial, when he mentions that there are a million more small firms today than at the dawn of the century. This statement does not seem to take into account that this country has grown by many, many millions of people since the dawn of the century.

What we need to keep in mind in connection with small business and the increasing concentration of industry into a few hands, is that 2 percent of American business establishments "wag the dog" and have attained a monopolistic, dominant position which allows this 2 percent to often control the votes of our Congress which is supposed to represent the little people, including the independent small manufacturers, independent small wholesalers, and independent small owner-operated family farms.

There is much propaganda being handed out today, or inspired by the 2 percent, of business establishments to try to lull the small, independent, entrepreneurs and the citizens into a false sense of security as to the alarming and accelerated growth of big private monopoly and cartels not only in international business but within our Nation.

A current example of the power of this dominant 2 percent is in their ability to influence our Congress to pass the Bulwinkle bill in the House a year ago, and this very week to probably pass it in the Senate.

If this bill is enacted, it will be the Fort Sumter of a new economic revolution, allowing the railroad monopoly which is the keystone of all our industry and is dominated centrally by big private banking and investment concerns to secede from our American system of competitive free enterprise, by exempting the railroads from the Sherman Act when antimonopoly cases are before the United States Supreme Court and a district court which charge the railroads with violating the Sherman Act.

ERNEST H. GAUNT.

LAWRENCE.

The Late Most Reverend Walter J. Fitzgerald, S. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I have to announce the death in Seattle, Wash., on Saturday last of the Most Reverend Walter J. Fitzgerald, S. J., Catholic bishop of Alaska. Thousands in Alaska of all faiths will mourn his passing. He had served as bishop of Alaska since 1945, and before

then was coadjutor, vicar apostolic, and bishop coadjutor for the Territory. Before then he had served as president of Seattle College and Gonzaga University.

Bishop Fitzgerald was known throughout Alaska. Despite poor health he made it a regular practice to visit the far-flung missions of his church, traveling by dog team and by airplane and by foot over the vast expanses of Alaska. Alaska and Alaskans will miss him. He was a great and good man.

Accomplishments and Failures of the Republican Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the text of my remarks Saturday, July 19, over radio station WIND, Chicago:

Mr. Announcer, thank you for the kind introduction. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience. Though the Congress has been in session for 7 months, and we expect to adjourn only a week from today, I find that this Republican Congress has failed to pass any legislation which could possibly be considered to be in the interest of the American people.

It has, on the other hand, devoted itself to emasculating and amending and repealing legislation passed by the Democratic Congress under the leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Meanwhile, the Republican Congress is giving the people the same lip service and false promises as in the 1946 election campaign.

It is, indeed, amazing how the Republicans not only try to mislead the American people, but also delude themselves by claiming they were given a mandate in the last election to repeal price control, to wreck the veterans' housing program, to destroy effective rent control, and to weaken or smash the labor unions by passing the Taft-Hartley slave-labor bill.

They certainly follow the mandate of the National Association of Manufacturers, but not that of the American people.

They came to power under bland assurances that they would end shortages and black-market prices on the necessities of life.

Not only have they failed to eliminate critical shortages, but they have succeeded in forcing higher prices on every commodity.

My listeners, I am sure, are interested in what has actually been accomplished, the laws that have been passed, and the fate of legislation recommended by President Truman on which no action has been taken.

"SOAK THE POOR" TAX BILL

The Republicans have talked a great deal about reducing taxes, for that is a question always attractive to taxpayers.

But instead of passing a fair tax bill, they have passed a bill which would save a married man earning $2,500 a year 56 cents a week or $29 a year, while a man who gets $25,000 annually would save $22.65 a week or $1,704 a year, and the rich man with an income of $5,000,000 would save almost $9,000 a week or $450,000 a year.

In other words, the man with a small income would have his tax reduced by pennies but the rich man by thousands of dollars.

That was one of the reasons the President was obliged to veto both of these Republican tax bills, because he believes that instead of relieving those accumulating great profits, who can and should pay their fair share, it is our duty to aid the Government in reducing its great indebtedness and thus, while we are so unprecedentedly prosperous, preserve the national credit and protect the billions of dollars in bonds purchased and held by 30,000,000 of our citizens. In that I have wholeheartedly agreed and supported the President in his vetoes.

Ah, yes, during the last few weeks they have again been talking about imposing a sales tax on our country. This is another smooth way of transferring the burdens of Government from the shoulders of those best able to carry them to the backs of the toiling masses.

I shall enumerate some of the acts which this Republican Congress has passed.

It will be found that not a single one was in the interest of our country.

They have passed many laws, but unfortunately every one of them will add to the cost of living, contrary to the urgent pleas of President Truman to reduce prices.

The very first action of the Republican Congress was as I stated the emasculation, and then the repeal, of the Price Control Act. They promised that with OPA gone prices would be held in check and the vicious black market would be eliminated.

REPUBLICAN PROMISES NOT KEPT

I feel that it is unnecessary for me to state that the promises given to the people in the 1946 campaign have not been kept and that the avaricious industrialists, who seem to control the Republican Party, have taken advantage of their opportunity and have boosted the prices on nearly every item that goes into the cost of living.

Time will not permit me to explain again how the packers who made such a vicious fight for repeal of OPA, went on strike against the public, refusing to slaughter or to release meat from their storage, precluding the American people from getting even a small supply of meats. However, when the Price Control Act was weakened, cattle and hogs owned by the packers came into the market, many of them from feed pens in close proximity to the slaughter houses.

Yes, meats became plentiful, but at what prices! Instead of prices being reduced, they went up and up and just a few weeks ago meats were boosted from 10 to 20 cents a pound higher. Correspondingly, these excessive, high prices apply to milk, eggs, butter, cheese and, in fact, to every food and necessity of life.

YIELDED TO REAL-ESTATE LOBBY

Under the great pressure of one of the worst lobbies in the United States, working in conjunction with other lobbyists infesting the Capitol, the real-estate lobby prevailed upon the Republicans to kill housing legislation and to amend the Rent Control Act on the theory that houses would continue to be built on a large scale, and that the 15-percent increase provision in the rent control bill only called for the voluntary agreement on the part of the tenants.

But by this time the people all over the United States realize that the 15-percent-increase provision does not really allow them to agree voluntarily to an increase, but serves as a big stick or club, if they wish to have a roof over their head, and the 15 percent is now being extracted from nearly all tenants.

Where are the houses which private enterprise promised to build if the controls on building materials were removed? And if you find a few of these houses, have you noticed the prices? They were built for those who can pay $12,000, $15,000, or even $25,000 or more for a house, but not for the people of small earnings who need houses most and can pay only from six to eight thousand dollars.

The Republicans did not stop there—they passed the sugar bill that will cost the consumers from two hundred to three hundred millions a year, the wool bill, and the bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, and the enactment of these bills will further increase the cost of living, adding millions and millions in costs to the consumers.

For many months I have urged the passage of my resolution to investigate and prosecute food profiteers and gougers of the public. I am pleased that in several instances the Department of Justice has proceeded against the lumber and other combinations and interests, but the Republicans cut the appropriations of this Department to preclude a real investigation and prosecution of these avaricious industries and the collusive practices on the part of trusts and combinations.

NO CRITICISM OF LEGITIMATE BUSINESS

I am sometimes accused of being too harsh on business and industry, but anyone who will consider the enormous profits American corporations are making, which continuously impose additional burdens upon the masses, would be obliged to concede that I am not trying to hurt legitimate business but to stop excessive prices and unwarranted profits.

Only a few days ago it was reported that 228 corporations made in the first 3 months of this year 305 percent greater profit than they made during the most prosperous year of 1946. Anyone reading financial reports must be familiar with the tremendous and ever-increasing profits of nearly all of the big corporations; and still the Republican Party continues to legislate in the interests of these avaricious profiteers and against the consumers. Some representatives of these industries claim that the wages of labor have increased and it is necessary that they include these higher costs in the prices of their products.

Yes; I concede that the wages of some organized labor has increased, but such is not the case of unorganized and white-collar people and people living on small, fixed incomes. Their interests and their needs are ignored by the Republican Party, notwithstanding the pleas and appeals on the part of those who find it nearly impossible to pay these tremendous increases in the cost of the necessities of life.

WEAKENS DEMOCRATIC LABOR LAWS

But upon the persuasion of these great industries, the Republicans have passed the Taft-Hartley antilabor bill, vicious antilabor legislation which largely repeals beneficial laws passed by the Democratic Party in the interest of labor, all for the purpose of weakening or destroying organized labor, and actually has weaken the Wagner Labor Relations Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

They forced this legislation notwithstanding the fact that there were less than one-tenth of 1 percent of workers out on strike and the industrialists were never so prosperous, with over 60,000,000 people employed and relations between labor and management the most friendly in the history of the country.

To frighten labor into docility they joined in the hammer chorus to Americans that depression was coming and eight or ten million people would be out of work. Even then, before the war had ended, I assured the country that such statements were not warranted; that, in fact, there would be no unemployment for many years to come and that demands for labor would increase because of the tremendous requirements for our own population and for foreign nations.

I am indeed gratified that my statements then have come true under the leadership of the Democratic administration, and in spite of every effort of this Republican Congress, under the whiplash of the reactionary old guard, to destroy our prosperity and high employment.

I am fully aware that Republican leaders feel they must hold the support of the vested interests in order to obtain unlimited millions for their 1948 campaign slush fund by passing legislation of special privilege

under which those interests can recoup manyfold what they pour into the Republican war chest.

Surely they will need the dough, for no matter how many millions roll into their pot it will not be sufficient to bribe or buy the American people.

Yes, they passed a measure called a loyalty bill, a bill which actually is disloyal to every tradition of American freedom and individual rights, and which invades the civil liberties guaranteed under the Constitution to two and a half million Government employees.

This bill would restrict every Government worker from expressing his views on any controversial subject, and reduces them to living in constant fear from any eavesdropper.

This bill does, in fact, legalize a witch hunt.

PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS IGNORED

The President has made many recommendations for legislation—among them passage of the Wagner-Taft-Ellender housing bill which would provide homes not only for ex-servicemen, but also for homeless families in our country.

He has also recommended the adoption of the FEPC and strict antitrust and combine legislation for the purpose of reducing their great prices, and he urged and recommended revision of minimum-wage legislation and to broaden the social-security law.

Only a few days ago the President and the Secretary of State urged and recommended the adoption of a humane act to permit some displaced, suffering, and homeless people, most of them women and children, to be admitted into the United States, but the Republican Congress has not acted on any of these measures.

The Republicans have given a great deal of publicity as to how they were going to reduce governmental expenditures by $6,000,000,000 but, I am sure, when all the appropriation bill have been passed, not only will they have not reduced expenditures but, in all likelihood, will increase them above the President's recommendations.

They have done not one thing toward implementing the flood control program recommended by the President, nor the investigation of the real estate lobby, but they have passed innumerable resolutions to investigate this, that, and the other minor matter, all of which, by strange coincidence, involve expensive junkets all over the United States and even to Europe, Asia, and the South Seas.

Furthermore, they have voted subsidies to many industries in many ways. Only day before yesterday to the mining industry to the tune of $70,000,000. When all these subsidy authorizations are compiled the record will show, though we have been at peace over 2 years, they are increasing instead of reducing expenditures.

BUDGET BALANCE

Meanwhile, due to the prosperity we are enjoying, the administration for the first time in 18 years, including 4 years under Hoover and in 1 year under a Republican Congress, balanced the budget.

I shall not dwell on their failure to act on the antilynching bill. All that this Congress has done has been to legislate in the interest of those who seek greater power and profits for the large profit-making industries. They have gone on the theory that in 1946 they gained victory because of their attack on the New Deal, and consequently ignored the rights and interests of the people and seem to have followed the dictates and policies of big business.

They feel that the demands of these great interests are paramount to the needs and interests of the people.

Do not be fooled or misled by the false propaganda of the Republican publicity machine. This tax bill was of no benefit to the people, and the increased prices made possible by scuttling all price controls have taken many times more out of the consumers' pockets than the few dollars the tax bill would save.

Members of Congress will be going home soon to report to their constituents on their stewardship. I think that Republican Members are going to be greatly embarrassed as they will try to explain their sins of commission and of omission.

It is my candid opinion that they cannot fool the people as they did in 1946, and the polls so far taken indicate the people see the mistake made in electing a Republican Congress, which again has shown itself indifferent to their interests.

Aspirations of the Irish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, recently an article by Demaree Bess, entitled "Ireland Turns Away From the U. S. A.," was published in the Saturday Evening Post. The Anti-Partition of Ireland League took exception to that article and has issued a reply in which is reiterated the long-standing friendship between America and Ireland. The reply also discusses what it calls the misleading picture of the aspirations of the Irish people which Mr. Bess presented. It occurs to me that in the interest of fair play the Anti-Partition of Ireland League is entitled to have its point of view given attention and consideration. I ask unanimous consent that its reply be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPLY TO ARTICLE ENTITLED "IRELAND TURNS AWAY FROM THE U. S. A," BY DEMAREE BESS, BY THE ANTI-PARTITION OF IRELAND LEAGUS

The Anti-Partition of Ireland League takes exception to the article entitled "Ireland Turns Away From the U. S. A.", that appeared in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post, and proposes to show that through ignorance or otherwise, its author, Mr. Demaree Bess, has presented a misleading picture of the aspirations of the Irish people.

To those who are familiar with the long history of American-Irish relations, and with the similarity of the national and international objectives of both peoples, the title of the article comes as a complete surprise. In the circumstances, much more convincing proof of the correctness of the author's conclusion is necessary.

The unpopularity, in the United States, of Irish neutrality in the recent war, and the unjust criticism of unanimous policy of the electorate in the free portion of Ireland on this issue, are cited as reasons for the alleged cleavage between the Irish people and the people of this country. It is true, indeed, that the Irish populace momentarily resented our attitude in that controversy. They were, in addition, bitterly disappointed at our refusal to furnish them, for cash, the weapons, ships, and other supplies they deemed necessary for the defense of the neutral portion of their country, at a time when we were extending loans and credits to Turkey and other neutrals for that same purpose. But the long-standing friendship between Ireland and the United States could not nevertheless be impaired, and already those grievances are but memories almost forgotten.

In support of his conclusion that Ireland is turning away from the United States, Mr. Bess points to the lack of Irish immigration to this country, and to the meager volume of commercial intercourse between both nations. While his statements are substantially correct, it is utterly fantastic to conclude that those conditions indicate a diminishing friendship between the United States and Ireland.

A recent statement issued by our consulate at Dublin, to the effect that lack of sufficient personnel has slowed the processing of visa applications, should be sufficient to convince Mr. Bess of his error. In the matter of commerce, the author failed to mention that approximately $2,000,000,000 worth of Irish credit has accumulated in Great Britain, which credit can be utilized only within the sterling area. "Because trade between the two countries can be so easily balanced," Mr. Bess concludes, "the present predominance of British trade here is likely to be permanent." He should be more nearly correct if he had stated that the Irish people are awaiting the dissolution of the sterling area restrictions, when their credits in Britain will become available for Irish-American trade.

Concurrently with his effort to prove a cooling off in friendship between this country and Ireland, Mr. Bess attempts to show a converse Anglo-Irish trend. In proof of this, he cites the geographical proximity of Britain and Ireland; he speaks of the many English tourists currently visiting Ireland, and displays a photograph of Mr. de Valera in conversation with Britain's Mr. Herbert Morrison.

What the author says is "the most obvious and the most permanent tie between these islands"—geographical proximity—is undoubtedly the least tenable of all his contentions. By the application of the same line of reasoning, France, which is but half the distance from Britain, should long ago have become completely Anglicized, while strife between contiguous states should be unheard of. The fact is that the geographical proximity of Ireland and England has been a major contribution to centuries of strife. Geographical proximity is a desirable condition, indeed, when the ideals of peoples are similar. In the present case they are far apart.

In the meaning of its ordinary application, the word "tourists," as used by Mr. Bess to describe the current English visitors to Ireland, is somewhat flattering. Factually, the visitors are there as a matter of dire necessity—in search of food. Here the author seems to make a slight concession by saying that the present invasion of Ireland (by the tourists) may be described as a flight from austerity—which it really is—but by his subsequent description of conditions in Ireland he renders "confusion worse confounded" by painting a picture of Irish austerity rivaling that in Britain. It seems strange that the British people should be so misinformed on the plight of their neighboring islanders.

The de Valera-Morrison photograph, presented with a caption proclaiming that "de Valera is now courting England's favor" scarcely merits serious comment. But if Mr. Bess chose to reveal the true significance of the picture, a "Made in Dublin" caption should have occurred to him. His readers then could easily determine who is courting whom, if indeed they could withstand the shock of beholding a British statesman in the Irish metropolis for the purpose of currying favor from his traditional foe But then statesmen are unpredictable individuals, and expediency covers a multitude of sins and inconsistencies. The remaining two illustrations accompanying the article are discounted forthwith: The one captioned "On O'Connell Bridge," which was very definitely not taken

there; the other depicting an unsumptuous dining room scene—a picture that is surely more typically British than Irish. As chosen and presented, however, the illustrations serve the author's purpose well.

While discussing Irish-British friendship and the alleged dependency of Ireland upon Britain, Mr. Bess completely forgot to mention that the Irish Government has repeatedly refused British requests to forgive a portion of her indebtedness.

The greatest obstacle to genuine Anglo-Irish peace and good will, however, is the existence of the partition of Ireland. While such a condition exists, neither wishful thinking, British friendship overtures, nor the conclusions of observers can substitute for international harmony between both countries. An objective discussion of this topic should, of itself, completely refute the contention that Ireland and England are drawing closer to each other. Indeed, a discussion of the general topic as attempted by Mr. Bess is of necessity partial and prejudiced if the partition background is omitted. It is unfair to his readers, many of whom are undoubtedly uninformed, albeit interested, either in a practical or an academic sense.

It should be explained, therefore, that immediately following the termination of World War I, the people of all Ireland voted overwhelmingly for the establishment of a republic. (That majority extended into four of the presently partitioned six counties.) Having officially taken part in the conflict, which was ostensibly fought for the right of self-determination for small nations, they chose to exercise that right. But the reply of the British Government was the misnamed Better Government of Ireland Act, which was enacted over the protest of Irish political leaders of every shade of opinion, all of whom refused to participate in the voting. By virtue of that act the Irish partition monstrosity came into being; the first of Europe's puppet states was created, and although many others have since come and gone, the original pattern remains, existing only by means of annual subsidies from Great Britain, and despite the persistent pleas and protests of the Irish populace. For reasons well known to Mr. Bess, the appalling economic and political conditions prevailing within the partitioned area are persistently denied the light of publicity. It is not our purpose to expose those conditions here.

By numerous modifications, the remaining portion of Ireland has achieved the status of a republic under the leadership of Mr. de Valera. Within that section of the country, in the period between 1943 and 1946, there were two general elections, one Presidential election, five byelections, and many local ones. Four political parties took part in them, and all were strongly contested. Those parties differed on almost all public questions except one. The exception was partition. Thus it is readily seen that this is not an "Irish question," as British propagandists would have it understood. It is the remnant of a British question.

Discussing Irish national defense measures, Mr. Bess makes the astounding statement that during the war "the 'Irish Free State' chiefly entrusted its defense to Great Britain." It is true, of course, that Britain protected her sea lanes as best she could (while Irish ships refused convoy protection), but the spectacle of Ireland depending on Britain for national protection at a time when Britain was unable successfully to protect herself, and was rapidly losing the war before American intervention, must have been as sorry to those who saw it in that light as was the spectacle of Polish dependency, although with less tragic consequences. The truth is that Ireland, like our own country—and Britain too—was totally unprepared for war. But when it came an Irish purchasing commission visited the United States with the results as stated above.

Why the Irish people chose to remain officially neutral in the war, we do not presume to say with authority. Neither do we presume to question their right of choice. And today, in the light of the fate of other small nations, we hesitate to question the wisdom of their choice. Considering their bitter memory of the past, their present action limited to a choice between neutrality and cooperation with atheistic communism—an evil they have never underestimated, and a menace they have never overlooked; with their traditional friend, America, drawn into the conflict despite her avowal of neutrality, it is not difficult to appreciate their dilemma. But their sympathy inevitably lay on the side of the United States. Eventually that sympathy manifested itself in the form of 200,000 of Ireland's manhood working in British factories, 250,000 serving with the armed forces (not 20,000 as Mr. Bess reports), and the remaining workers supplying food from their Irish farms. In addition, Ireland's entire fleet of nine oil tankers was made available to Britain; Allied airplanes were permitted to fly over certain areas of her territory, while approximately 70,000 homeless British refugees were sheltered by the Irish people.

It is doubtful, indeed, if Ireland's official participation in the war could have increased her effort. It might well have diminished it, since her ports, ships, and other facilities were vulnerable to attack. On the other hand, as Secretary of the Navy Forrestal wrote to the late Senator Walsh, "the Allied losses were less than they might have been, because Ireland failed to furnish affirmative assistance to the Axis nations." This is a consideration that Mr. Bess and many others conveniently ignore.

The author goes all out in his praise of the contribution made by the partitioned area of Ireland. While there is no desire to minimize it, it should not be forgotten that neutrality or belligerence was not a matter of free choice for the puppet government there. But it is almost a certainty that were it not for the existence of that regime; if Ireland were united and free under her chosen form of government, the entire country would have taken part officially in the conflict.

Mr. Bess' assertions that the partition issue involves religious and economic issues are denied by the facts which he does not present fairly. Both in the country as a whole, and within the partitioned area, agriculture is by far the largest industry. The Catholic religion is the largest single religious sect in the six-county area, although the number of its adherents is outnumbered by the combined Protestant sects in the proportion of approximately three to 2. That the religious issue is a red herring is immediately apparent to those who are familiar with the harmonious relations existing between the various sects. Oppressive discrimination and even occasional riots, mentioned by the author, are, unfortunately, a matter of record. Discrimination is perpetual, while the occasional incidents of civic unrest are the direct result of the public utterances and actions of the puppet politicians. A considerable number of British Labor Government leaders have publicly expressed their abhorrence of the conditions existing under the puppet regime, but Mr. Bess is again in error when he states that the London Government opposed the extension of wartime emergency powers to that regime. The opponents of the measure were of the opinion that the northern government did not deserve to survive if it could not maintain itself except by extreme police measures, but permission to use them was nevertheless granted.

That, then, is the story in brief, of Ireland's position. As it stands today, the country is not only economically and politically divided as a result of partition but the military defense of the western approach to Europe is rendered vulnerable. Therein should lie America's interest in the Irish grievance. If our future is linked with the welfare of Britain and the European Continent we should see to it that the coordination of British-Irish defenses is effected. In rectifying this condition we shall not only take action to restore democracy to the Irish people, but we shall, ipso facto, strengthen our own.

Mr. Bess' gratuitous advice to America to keep hands off this Irish family quarrel is short-sighted and misplaced. This is not a family problem. It is one of international moment, particularly to the United States, to whom the peace-loving peoples of the world more than ever before look for cooperation in peace, and for military aid in war. With little effort the United States can bring to a speedy end the mutilation of Ireland, and for selfish reasons, if for no other, this should be done.

Establishment of Pulp Industry in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include letters addressed to me by Mr. Robert L. Jernberg, president of the Ketchikan, Alaska, Chamber of Commerce, and Mr. Norman C. Banfield, representing the municipalties of Juneau, Douglas, Sitka, Petersburg, and Wrangell, Alaska, and an editorial from the Ketchikan Daily Alaska Fishing News. All of these have to do with legislation now before the Congress which would make possible establishment of a pulp industry in Alaska. As all who have followed this matter know, the subject of Indian rights has proved a complicating factor. There are widely divergent views about this and I think Congress in considering this legislation should have all views, including the ones presented here.

The matter referred to follows:

KETCHIKAN, ALASKA, *July 18, 1947.*

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
Delegate to Congress from Alaska,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARTLETT: I have been sent to Washington by our organization for the purpose of assisting in obtaining the enactment of legislation permitting the Forest Service to conduct the sales of timber in the Tongass National Forest. We have followed with intense interest the courses taken by House Joint Resolution 205 and Senate Joint Resolution 118 which permit the aforesaid sales, and provide for the protection of all Alaska people

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 10, 1947, at page 8568, there appeared a statement on Indian rights, and because of the errors contained therein we feel that the purposes of the legislation are misunderstood. We would like to take this opportunity to correct the record as follows:

INDIAN RIGHTS

1. The statement advances the theory that Alaska Indians have certain property rights, based on statutes, administrative action, and Government recognition. We feel this is not a full and accurate statement.

The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, in the case of *Miller et al.* v. *United States*, ruled last spring that Alaska Indians possess only individual rights and not aboriginal tribal rights. Alaskans and Government agencies recognize these rights, but tribal rights have never been recognized as Alaskan Indians were never organized into tribes but were grouped into clans in each race or large family group such as Thlinget, Haida, or Tsimpseans. Such individual rights are definitely and wisely protected in the pending legislation.

The Department of Interior hearings mentioned in the statement were held to determine whether the Indians had any possessory rights only, with the results indeterminant until former Secretary Ickes apparently made his determination which was not in accordance with the facts recorded at the hearings.

ENCROACHMENT ON PRIVATE PROPERTY

2. There will be no encroachment on private property as the legislation protects all Indians, as well as the property of non-Indians.

CONSTITUTIONALITY

3. The ruling of the circuit court, as mentioned above, determined that aboriginal rights were extinguished by the treaty of 1867 with Russia.

We have always understood under our system that a decision of a court of last resort was the law. The opponents of the legislation do not concede the decision to be superior to Mr. Ickes' determination.

Russia, through the medium of the newspaper Pravda, a few years ago inferred that the title to Alaska did not pass to the United States because the Russian people did not participate in the drafting of the treaty of 1867. Would not a tribunal of justice determine such an issue, or would our country be bound to follow the fiat of some official?

PULP INDUSTRY

4. Several pulp companies planning Alaska pulp development have stated for the record that House Joint Resolution 205, which passed the House, gives Indians as well as companies protection.

COST TO GOVERNMENT

5. Paragraph 5 of the statement of opposition warns that if the legislation is enacted the courts will eventually protect the parties despoiled of their property and the Government will be liable for large damages. As stated above, we are under the impression that the Miller case, which was an Alaskan case involving property, held that no aboriginal rights existed, which in itself should be strong evidence that such a suit would have no merit.

Such a threat has no foundation in fact and we assume it will not be considered.

FAIR PLAY

6. The question of fair play, or unfairness to the Indians, is not involved. The recognition of any Indian rights not based on court decisions would give many valuable rights to a small group of Indian citizens at the expense of all other citizens since these large areas of Alaska land under consideration are not, and never have been, recognized as being owned by Indians.

PAUPERIZING THE NATIVES

7. Instead of pauperizing the Indians, the establishment of the pulp industry would have the effect of benefiting their economy.

The Indians have never obtained a livelihood from the lands in question, except to the extent of wild-berry picking and hunting by individuals and such activities are carried on by all citizens, including Indians.

Development of industry would furnish year-round employment for many Indians, as well as non-Indians, which would contribute much toward making the Indians self-supporting rather than relying on the short seasonal work in fisheries.

THE ALASKA INDIAN

8. Many do not know the place the Alaska Indian has in Alaska life. He is a citizen. He votes, pays taxes, and enjoys all the privileges of citizenship.

Indians attend public and Government schools.

There is no racial discrimination in Alaska. Race from our point of view is little more than cause for anthropological observation. We know that there are certain groups and individuals, most of whom have no experience or knowledge about Alaska, who, in their enthusiasm to create causes, have led many to believe each of our communities has a line dividing Indians from non-Indians. Our churches, our shows, our schools, our hotels, and all facilities are open and are used by all Alaskans. The fact that skin pigment makes no difference is taken for granted.

We have Indians holding high offices in unions, sportsmen's groups, and in our local and Territorial governments.

We know that a few Indians, encouraged by outside influences who see a chance to accumulate great wealth at the expense of the country's resources legally owned by all of us, have claimed to represent all Indians in the affected territory. A group of 1,000 Indians in Ketchikan have notified the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Public Lands that they wanted the pulp industry developed now because it would stabilize their economy, by providing continuous and profitable employment.

There are approximately 28,000 persons in the affected area, one-fifth of whom are of Indian extraction. The establishment of a pulp industry now would mean a stronger, healthier, and more prosperous Alaska, and it is contemplated that the Federal Government will also benefit from such installations, because it will mean Alaska can assume the expense of many things now a drain on the Treasury.

Thank you for this opportunity to answer the one-sided statement of opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 118 and House Joint Resolution 205. We feel we should be treated equally with our fellow citizens, the Indians. We ask no special privileges and do not consider ourselves a special class.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. JERNBERG,
President, Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce.

JUNEAU, ALASKA, *June 18, 1947.*

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
Delegate to Congress from Alaska, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARTLETT: The people of Alaska are unable to understand the difficulty you are having in obtaining congressional legislation to validate the sale of timber in Alaska by the Forest Service and the Interior Department to prospective pulp and paper manufacturers. The cities of Juneau, Douglas, Sitka, Petersburg, and Wrangell, Alaska, are sending me to Washington, D. C., as their representative to assist you in securing the passage of House Joint Resolution 205 which is now pending before the Senate or Senate Joint Resolution 118 which has been approved by the Senate Public Lands Committee. Other cities and chambers of commerce are sending representatives as they realize the opportunity to start a pulp and paper industry in Alaska will be lost if neither of these resolutions are adopted.

It appears the Members of Congress fear these resolutions are designed to take land, timber, or possessory rights from the natives. Such fears are unfounded as these resolutions cannot possibly be interpreted to deprive any native or white of any land now occupied or under the control of any person. The lands involved are the unappropriated and unsettled public domain within and outside the Tongass National Forest.

The natives in Alaska are not reservation Indians and they reject all efforts to establish reservations for their exclusive use. They are, and insist on remaining, in the same status as whites, enjoying the benefits and privileges established under the land laws established by Congress for all residents of Alaska. The prominent place they occupy in all communities, industries, and local government is sufficient testimony of their ability to be on the same status as whites without special privileges or treatment.

The adverse economic conditions which have prevented the manufacture of pulp and paper in Alaska have recently been completely changed. Two large companies are anxious and ready to establish mills. Three others are making investigations but have not yet decided to enter this new field. Unfortunately, they cannot make such large investments so long as there is any doubt as to the validity of the contracts offered by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior, which are otherwise acceptable.

These doubts were created by a former Solicitor for the Department of the Interior and his staff of assistants, who claimed the natives were entitled to the exclusive use, possession, and title of all areas in Alaska over which the natives hunted, fished, or picked berries to the exclusion of all white residents who have enjoyed the same privileges in the same areas since the Russians first came to Alaska. Nobody ever heard of these aboriginal claims before Mr. Ickes and his assistants decided to collectivize the natives of Alaska, reserve the land for their exclusive use, disregard the treaty with Russia which abolished all tribal rights and claims, and to appropriate vast areas jointly settled and developed by natives and whites as belonging to the natives alone. The natives rejected this proposal, refused to be brought under reservations, and have consistently contended they did not want the land reserved for their exclusive use as it would then remain undeveloped. On the other hand, the glittering prospect of selling this land for fantastic sums, coupled with the agitation, opinions, and promises by these governmental officials has resulted in the natives forming organizations for the advancement of their claims to the land of Alaska, the employment of professional lobbyists, and the joining of organizations whose principal object is to influence legislation for natives.

Their attorneys know they have no chance of establishing such claims in the courts and hope to obtain from Congress the receipts from the sale of Government timber as a reward for relinquishing claims which have been denied by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in Miller and others against the United States. Since these claims are made on behalf of tribes which have disbanded and scattered over the United States as well as Alaska, it is impossible: (a) to find any authority or organization capable of giving a valid relinquishment; (b) make an equitable distribution of such receipts from timber sales; (c) grant title to any organized tribe; or (d) induce the natives to return to tribal status.

The attorneys, leaders, and lobbyists for these native organizations oppose the sale of the timber until they have been granted a right to the proceeds. The resolutions now pending propose to do nothing more than validate, by the plenary power of Congress over Alaska, all contracts made for the vast timber lands in Alaska and to place the money in escrow in the United States Treasury to revert to the Treasury unless the natives can establish a claim thereto. These natives will be deprived of nothing they now possess as the resolutions do not validate the sale of any timber under the occupancy or control of a native. The resolutions leave the door wide open for the natives to prove their claims in court or to secure future legislation for the disposition of the timber

receipts as Congress shall find equitable and just when it considers the validity of these claims.

The passage of these resolutions, or either of them, would assure those companies who have made complete plans for investment in Alaska and relief of an increasing paper shortage in the States, that they will have an adequate supply of timber at a definite contract price for a period of time which will allow the amortization of their investment.

To us Alaskans who have tried to develop Alaska so it can take its place as a State, it is inconceivable that Congress should hesitate to pass this necessary and simple legislation which is of national importance.

Yours very truly,

N. C. BANFIELD.

[From the Ketchikan (Alaska) Daily Fishing News]

REPORTS OF ALASKA INDIANS AND WHITES

Four Alaskan Indians, three of them members of the Territorial Legislature, recently testified in Washington on a couple of bills now before Congress to clear the way for pulp-mill development.

While there they signed a lengthy statement setting forth their objections to the provisions of these bills. Perhaps the most astounding assertion in this statement, to the home folks at least, is that the Alaskan Indians need at least 160 acres of land each in order to provide them with subsistence.

The following is a part of the statement signed by the four witnesses:

"The resolution would deprive the Indians of land which is sorely needed by them in order to make a decent living. It provides exceptions only for 'town sites, smoke houses, gardens, hunting or fishing cabins, or other buildings and structures, missionary stations, or burial grounds, or any timber actually possessed and used.' The effect would be to bottle them up on little tracts of land only large enough to live on but not large enough to provide them with a subsistence.

"The resolution would deprive them of all means of livelihood, except fishing. This is not sufficient since it provides employment for only a few months of the year."

The statement continues:

"The tracts of land awarded to the Indians 2 years ago average only about 160 acres per capita, which, for this type of land, is barely sufficient for a livelihood. The Indians have been gradually driven off much larger tracts of land which rightfully belonged to them; they should not be deprived of this last small area that still remains in their possession. If they are disinherited in this way, they will be unable to support themselves and will have to be provided for by the Government.

"If this bill and its companion bill S. 1446, concerning fish traps, are passed, the Federal Government will tie up fish traps by 15-year leases, and all timber in southeastern Alaska by 50-year leases, thereby effectively removing from the local Territorial (or State) government any control whatsoever over these natural resources."

Now, in the pulp-timber proposals made by the Forest Service, there is nothing about 50-year leases on "all timber in southeastern Alaska." As we understand it, a pulp company would buy a certain amount of timber located in a certain area but submitting bids for that timber. The company would be allowed so many years to cut the timber, and would do the cutting under regulations issued by the Forest Service, so as to provide for reforesting.

As to State or Territorial control, large parts of most of our Western States—up to one-half of the State, in one instance—are in national forests which are controlled by the Federal rather than the local government.

In southeast Alaska, whoever heard of an Indian, or a white man either, living on and utilizing and making a living from 160 acres of land?

The Indians in southeast Alaska are not now and never have made use of the land for making a living. They have used it for their villages, which are huddled together along the beaches, and for a small garden plot, and so forth.

Did anyone ever see any tract of land that had been cleared by the Indians for agriculture, or any that was used by them for grazing their cattle or sheep or goats?

The argument that 160 acres or more per capita are needed might very well appeal to a Midwest Congressman from a wheat-raising or a grazing section, but anyone familiar with this part of Alaska will find it spurious.

As a matter of fact, the Indian has every right that the white man has to take up a homesite or a homestead, and in addition has the right to take up an Indian allotment of land as an individual. Under this latter law, he can use but cannot sell such land.

For some years the Indians, when they did not burn driftwood, used some timber for heat, but a survey of most of the villages shows that they now burn stove oil, shipped in from California.

Rather than depriving the Indians of a means of livelihood beside fishing, the development of pulp mills would give them opportunities for employment. In addition, the logging of some of the river-bottom lands in this section might open some wider areas for agricultural development.

Indians are employed beside whites in almost every industry in this part of Alaska. For the same work, they receive the same wages as a white man; they participate in the social-security program and in unemployment compensation; a great many Indians receive old-age-assistance benefits and other benefits through the Territorial department of welfare. All this is in addition to the assistance they receive from the Federal Government under the Bureau of Indians Affairs.

As one observer pointed out, about the only aboriginal right they have lost is the one to make war between tribes and to make slaves of members of another tribe.

If these four men, Frank Peratrovich, Fred Grant, Andrew Hope, and Frank Johnson, express the feelings of the majority of their race, it is apparent that although they ask for equality and have received the right of the ballot and other rights of full citizenship, the Indians are not yet ready to take their places beside the white residents to work for the development and betterment of Alaska.

Reduction of Publication of Unnecessary Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, all the practicing lawyers of the country and the judges know the great problem which today anyone seeking to know what the case law of the country is encounters when he tries to examine the vast volume of current judicial decisions. A treatise on the subject, Some Suggestions for the Elimination or Reduction of Publication of Unnecessary Opinions, was delivered by an eminent citizen of Florida, and distinguished member of the Florida bar, Mr. Francis P. Whitehair, before the Fifth Circuit Judicial Conference held in New Orleans on May 23, 1947, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the manuscript will exceed by three-fourths of a page the two pages allowed under the rule, and the cost of printing will be $195.25.

There being no objection, the treatise was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OR REDUCTION OF PUBLICATION OF UNNECESSARY OPINIONS

As long ago as 1911, Mr. Justice Brandeis in one of his infrequent interviews, said:

"I have not got as much from books as I have from tackling concrete problems. I have generally run up against a problem, and painfully tried to think it out, with a measure of success, and have then read a book and found to my surprise that some other chap was before me." [1]

And, it is to this extent that I have shared, at least, one Brandeis experience; for, in tackling the problem, "Suggestions for the Elimination or Reduction of Publication of Unnecessary Opinions," I went about it, drawing solely upon experiences gained during 25 years at the bar, in an effort to develop practical methods of accomplishing procreant results. Later, with manuscript complete, I searched for written data on the subject and, "found to my surprise that some other chap was before me." A sizable bibliography was assembled in a few days and with limited facilities. It contains over 100 proposed solutions of the problem; and yet I am certain that the reference material does not begin to cover all that has been written and discussed on the subject by judges, lawyers, professors of law, law book publishers, and others.

In fact, as I perused the stacks of material on my desk and floor, a recent occasion in the Nation's Capitol came to mind. For weeks the Senate Committee on Labor had listened to arguments urging favorable consideration of pending amendments to the existing labor laws. Day after day briefs were presented and read by executives of management or their lawyers. Despite the monotony of the proceedings, the committee room remained filled with spectators. They were willing to endure the ordeal for a bushy eyebrowed labor leader was scheduled, according to press forecasts, to be "put on the spot" before the hearings adjourned. Finally the day and hour arrived. As the labor leader took the witness chair, newsreel cameras began to grind, photographers scrambled for an advantageous position, flash bulbs illumined the room like star shells over the enemy's ship at sea, and the members of the committee in statesmanlike manner proceeded to arrange pad and pencil to jot down notes. The prominent figure, once seated, looked at Senator Taft and said: "Mr. Chairman, to epitomize, organized labor is opposed to any and all amendments. That's all I have to say; I thank you."

Let it be understood that I did not expect "ruffles and flourishes" when appearing here today, but, in view of the innumerable articles and addresses on the subject, and anticipating the worst when the arena of the forum is thrown open following this effort, would that I could say: If the court please, to epitomize, the problem has been placed in repose. However, two reasons give

[1] Brandeis, Lawyer and Judge in the Modern State, by Alpheus Mason, p. 86, quoting from Ernest Poole's interview published in the American magazine, February 1911.

me fortitude to proceed: One, the honor and privilege of being here as a delegate from my beloved State of Florida, and the other, a warning sounded by the mistaken prophecy of the Commissioner of Patents in his annual report to Congress in 1843. The Commissioner wrote:

"The advancement of the arts, from year to year, taxes our credulity, and seems to presage the arrival of that period when human improvement must end." [2]

Four years later Thomas A. Edison was born. Therefore, although many of America's eminent jurists, learned lawyers, distinguished professors, and others have contributed classical articles on and irrefutable syllogisms of the evils of publishing unnecessary opinions, I shall proceed in the hope and with a desire that the open forum to follow this prelude will result in the fifth circuit adopting an efficacious, sound, and workable formula to solve its problems.

What I shall say cannot be considered original. It is, at most, no more than an earnest attempt to lift the wheat from the chaff with due respect to all of those whose written discussions of the problems have been examined and ruled out.

In 1942 a Chicago lawyer made a study of the reported decisions, Federal and State, to date, put the figures on a graph, and projected the curve into the future to 1990. The results were as follows:

Growth in the volume of reported case law

Period	Number of decisions	Total number of decisions
1790–1840	50, 000	
1840–90	450, 000	500, 000
1890–1940	1, 250, 000	1, 750, 000
1940–90	[1] 2, 000, 000	[1] 3, 750, 000

[1] Estimated.

It is evident that by 1942 the conscience of the judiciary and the bar was awakened to the necessity of meeting the deplorable condition arising from the growing multitude of published opinions. Wider interests and deeper sympathies were openly manifest. Law reviews, bar journals, and other legal periodicals had by then published, with strong endorsement, informative, piquant, and apperceptive articles dealing with the subject. The interest has increased with such intensity that by now very few judicial conferences, bar associations, or other legal fraternities as such, have failed to focus their attention on this and kindred subjects at one time or another. As a result, there is greater unanimity of opinion among the judges and members of the legal profession, on the necessity of reducing the volume of published opinions, than the most courageous and optimistic prognosticator would have predicted, in 1942, could ever exist among them on any question. And yet, despite this brotherly adhesion—that something must be done about it—little progress has been made by many of the Federal and State courts and legislative branches of government, toward a permanent and lasting solution.

The volume of case law has become a serious burden, but, it seems, the judicial opinion factory is not to be outdone in this industrial age of mass production. Five-to-four, two-to-one, and four-to-three decisions, with a liberal assortment of dissenting opinions to give solace to the aggrieved; opinions of no value except perhaps to the litigants and their attorneys; cumulative opinions; and fact-finding opinions are a few of the models rolling off the judicial assembly line in large volume. A survey [3] contained in the reports of the American Bar Association groups the opinions, as follows: On procedural points, 48 percent; construction local statutes, 23 percent; purely fact questions, 11 percent; purely reiterative, 8 percent; and new developments, 10 percent.

The judges of the fifth circuit contributed 192 opinions for the Federal Reporters published in 1926, with an average of two and four-tenths columns of legal wisdom per opinion. The deep South's subsequent ability, even under an agrarian economy, to furnish its Federal appellate judges with the essential raw material to set the pace in the number of judicial pronouncements for their brethren having conterminous jurisdiction, is shown by the fact that in 1946 the fifth circuit contributed 420 of the 2,345 published opinions.[4] Moreover, the 1926 pattern of two and four-tenths columns per opinion was increased to four and three-tenths columns per opinion in 205 of them. Hence, the fifth circuit has managed to provide the private publishers with reams and reams of salable legal merchandise which they "avidly seize upon * * * and the book shelves are full of them." [5]

The lawbook publishers, to make certain that none of the impressive utterances, prosaic writings, legal monographs, or prolix jargon of the judiciary shall be entombed, not only prints them once, but frequently twice.[6] And, when the triple pass from lawyer to judge to book publisher is complete, the wheels of American salesmanship are, with painstaking care, set in motion. Circulars are mailed to all lawyer prospects announcing a new volume and containing convincing information on the necessity of purchasing the latest model. This service is so efficient, and apparently the coverage so broad, that in my own case I had been in the States less than 60 days, after 3 years vacation in the South Seas as a guest of Uncle Sam, when someone restored my name to the master mailing list. From that time on I have been deluged with circulars detailing the library requirements to properly practice law in a village of 8,000 souls.

With an admission to the bar and a slight prewar professional knowledge as principal assets, I recently undertook to assemble a law library. Among the requirements were: First Federal, 300 volumes, period covered 1880 to 1924; Federal, Second, 158 volumes, period covered 1924 to April 1947; Federal Supplement, 69 volumes, period covered 1932 to April 1947. When I inquired what cases are now included in these volumes, the salesman replied: "All cases are published in which an opinion is written." I shall not burden you by reading the list of all books considered necessary to round out a workable library, but you may be interested to know that it contains 3,200 volumes and requires about 530 linear feet of shelving. Placed vertically, side by side, the volumes would completely encircle the largest building in my home town, and then some. As a distinguished lawyer friend of Washington, D. C., recently wrote: "I can readily see that law reports as they are now arranged present an impossible burden to the lawyer who runs a modest office." And the struggling lawyer is asking, with acerbity, how long will the opinion factory continue to produce more and more unnecessary tools for his legal workshop?

I am not unmindful of the fact that our discussion is limited, in a sense, to the reduction or elimination of publication of unnecessary opinions of the circuit court of appeals and district courts within the fifth circuit. However, it would not be amiss to briefly summarize what the several State courts and legislatures are doing or have done to regulate the writing of opinions and subsequent publication thereof.

New Mexico and Missouri provide for a commission which determines which written opinions shall be published.

Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, New York, Texas, and Virginia leave the matter of selection of opinions for publication to the discretion of the court from whence they issued or to the discretion of the reporter with whose choice the court must concur.

Still other States, Nebraska, Alabama, Mississippi, Utah, and Rhode Island, prescribe by statute in which cases the court must issue a written opinion and then require the publication of all written opinions.

The balance of the States require that either every opinion be published or a report of some type be published in every case.[7]

Within the compass of the fifth circuit, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, and Texas have already taken steps to reduce or eliminate opinion writing and publication under either self-imposed limitations or authority of legislative enactment. The Texas Supreme Court blazed the trail by adopting four rules, after consideration of bench and bar, and under legislative authority, one of which is quoted, in part, as follows:

"Rule 452. Opinions to be brief: Opinions of the courts of civil appeals shall be brief as practicable. * * * In every case where application for writ of error is unqualifiedly refused or is granted, the opinion shall be ordered published; in other cases opinions shall be ordered not published when they present no question or application of any rule of law of interest or importance to the jurisprudence of the State."

The Alabama law is found in section 66, title 13, reading, in part, as follows:

"The justices of the supreme court and the judges of the court of appeals shall not be required to write opinions in cases where the decisions merely reaffirm previous decisions, or relate to questions of fact only, or when the cases decided would in their opinion serve no useful purpose as precedents."

The clerk of the Alabama Supreme Court advised, under date of May 10, that "It has been the practice of this court to report practically all of the court's opinions."

In Mississippi, the Annotated Code of 1942 provides, inter alia:

"Section 9031. The reporter shall cause such of the decisions of the supreme court as may be deemed by him or any of the judges of sufficient importance to be printed and published * * *." Section 1963. "In all cases settling important principles, in cases to be remanded, and in all cases where the judgment or decree of the court below is reversed, and in all felonies where the punish-

[2] Commissioner of Patents, Annual Report 1843, Library of Congress.

[3] Vol. 17, pp. 366, 367, 368.

[4] According to Reference Department, Library of Congress.

[5] The Multitude of Published Opinions, by Hon. Samuel H. Sibley, senior judge of the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, published in vol. 25, p. 166, Journal of the American Judicature Society, April 1942.

[6] The editorial counsel of West Publishing Co. wrote under date of May 15, 1947, "* * * the members of the bar cannot be fully served by the court if the court does not publicize all of the opinions rendered by it regardless of how long or short such opinions are * * * and we firmly believe that the number of cases appealed will be less if the court publicizes its position on each question which comes before it, either by an opinion or by references to the previous decisions serving as stare decisis." The more cases the greater the business and remunerative profit sounds axiomatic, but not so according to the editorial counsel of West Publishing Co. who wrote on May 10, 1947, "* * * it would doubtless be more profitable to the publishing house if a lesser number of cases were to be reported in that a greater number of lawyers would feel disposed to purchase."

[7] Regulation of opinion-writing and publication thereof in the several States, by State Law Section, Reference Department, Library of Congress.

ment prescribed is 10 years or more, the opinion of the supreme court shall be in writing stating the reasons upon which the decision is made; and the opinion shall be recorded by the clerk. * * *"

The official supreme court reporter, under date of May 4, commented:

"As a matter of practice, the supreme court writes an opinion in any case they so desire. * * * When the written opinion is handed down by the supreme court the judges indicate thereon those opinions that are not to be officially reported."

In Florida, where we always devise a new and different way of doing things, the members of the supreme court have informally put into effect two measures, providing:

"1. Through the clerk of the court they instructed the publisher of the Florida reports and the West Publishing Co. * * * to desist in printing per curiam orders and headnotes to them, and adopt instead the short recitation naming the parties to the appeal following by 'Supreme Court of Florida,' followed by the division of the court deciding the matter if decided by a division rather than by the court en banc, the date of the judgment, denial of the rehearing if rehearing was denied, followed by the one word 'affirmed.'" [8]

"2. The members of the court agreed that in the future opinions would be written and published only in cases that involved questions that have not previously been decided, or such cases as the facts and circumstances make it advisable that an opinion be written and published." [9]

A bill has been introduced in the Florida Legislature (which is now in regular session) to provide for the procurement, preparation, publication, etc., of the reports of the supreme court of Florida * * *. The bill has passed the house and is now pending in the Senate. It is supported by the committee on law reporting of the Florida Bar Association. The bill proposes to change the present law so that the Florida reports may be printed outside the State. At least 27 States now use West Publishing Co. to print their reports, and I am advised that considerable saving thereby accrues to the lawyers. Under Florida's existing system of publishing reports, few lawyers use them with the result, according to the clerk of the supreme court, "There has accumulated and is occupying valuable space now in the supreme court, at Tallahassee, 44,000 volumes of Florida reports published from time to time through the years for which there has been no demand."

The courts of Georgia [10] and Louisiana have not seen fit to impose limitations on publication of opinions. The Legislature of Georgia has not acted on the subject.[11]

In view of the above, it appears that the good sense of the judiciary, supported by the legislative branch in some instances, is slowly but surely ridding the State court contribution to the multiplicity of opinions of a mass of written verbiage by reducing the length of opinions for publication and eliminating altogether the publication of others. Can it be that like efforts are in effect in enough States of the Union to produce the results shown by telegraphic advices from West Publishing Co. on Monday of this week? [12] I quote: "1931 reported over 28,000 cases; 1934 reported over 27,000 cases; 1944 over 18,000 cases; 1945 and 1946 under 18,000 cases."

I am not equipped to measure accurately the contribution made by the courts to the substantial decrease in the number of reported cases, as indicated above. But, when I examined the statistics furnished by the clerk of the fifth circuit and found that there has been a steady decline in the number of cases docketed [13] with the clerk from and during the court's fiscal years [14] 1940 through 1946, inclusive, it became clear that a falling off of litigation has played a part in the decrease. This decline in reported cases and cases docketed may be caused by the substantial decrease in civil litigation in which the United States is a party. However, private cases in the Federal district courts increased about one-fourth during the fiscal year 1946, "indicating a strong trend toward a return to the prewar volume in private litigation." [15] Nevertheless, whatever reasons may be found to support or explain the decreases, it does not follow that the question under discussion should be considered with less enthusiasm.

The "Prayer for general relief" of the 1,644 [16] lawyers of Alabama, 2,706 [17] of Florida, 1,322 [18] of Mississippi, and the 7,998 [19] of Texas has been duly considered and granted by their respective State courts acting with or without legislative assistance. It remains for the Federal courts and the State courts of Georgia, with 2,620 lawyers,[20] and Louisiana with 2,034 [21] to fall in line so that the bench and bar of the fifth circuit may contribute a clear and convincing share in the whole work of judicial improvement and progress in this field.

The question of pressing moment is: What do the judges of the fifth circuit intend to do about curtailing the publication of opinions? Obviously, it is a matter within their discretion and one which, as I see it, should be squarely met, without delay. In search of information on other circuits, inquiry was made of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts who, on May 15, advised that:

"I would say that none of the 11 judicial circuits (including the District of Columbia) has adopted a rule regulating the publication of opinions of the circuit, and the matter is left to the discretion of the judges and courts concerned."

The Director also remarked: "The best thing [I know] on the subject [is] an address [22] by Circuit Judge John D. Martin, of the sixth circuit, before a judicial conference of that circuit in 1942." About 10 months prior to the publication of Mr. Justice Martin's address the American Judicature Society published an article [23] on the Multitude of Published Opinions written by the senior member of the fifth circuit—the Honorable Samuel H. Sibley. So, within the space of about 10 months we have the published view of 2 of the 57 United States circuit judges condemning the ever-increasing avalanche or multitude of published opinions. But what, if anything, has been or will be done about it? That's the question.

No one will deny that the problem is one of grave importance and the courts should proceed with caution. But, surely by now, the judges who have heretofore marked time realize that the matter deserves serious and prompt consideration. No longer can minority elements call the adoption of a program to curtail publication of judicial opinions "a bold experimentation." Moreover, no authoritative spokesman is advocating the limitation in writing opinions, or in the publication thereof, to the extent of infringement upon the indispensable prerogatives of the American judge whose duty, as well as desire, is to uphold, preserve, and maintain the sacrosanct virtues of our system of jurisprudence. And above all else, I want it understood that nothing herein proposed is intended to deprive litigants, lawyers, and the public of a well-reasoned opinion in every case which justifies one.

As I reach the point of presenting suggestions, I find myself stricken with the fear of a legal tyro, for who am I to lay before this gathering of eminent jurists a plan or program designed to cure the weaknesses of a system of opinion writing and publication, which has been in use and widely discussed for decades. However, since the only return to preemptory writ of mandamus is performance, I respectfully submit the following:

1. That the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit invite one outstanding member of the bar from each of the six States within the circuit to undertake a collective study and investigation of all programs which have been activated, tried, and abandoned, or are being followed by United States Federal and State courts to either improve opinion writing or reduce or eliminate the publication of certain opinions, or both, and report their findings with recommendations.

2. That during the study and investigation suggested in (1) above, consideration be given to the practicability of a separate publication containing all Court of Claims, tax [24] and patent opinions and all other Federal court opinions on cases originating with administrative tribunals. The specialized nature of the present-day law practice, and the growth of administrative law in the past few years, which, according to Mr. Justice Murphy, "seems destined to be augmented even further in the future" [25] is sufficient cause to justify this consideration.

---

[8] For illustrations see 27 So. (2d) p. 341. For contents formerly published, see first column 8 So. (2d), p. 17.

[9] According to the clerk of the Florida Supreme Court, the members of the court have adhered to the informal agreement, supra, and this new policy has contributed very definitely to a decrease in space of published opinions.

[10] Mr. Justice Sibley, senior judge of the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, stated that the Georgia court at one time imposed a limitation on the number of published volumes per annum. He did not know whether this rule was now in effect.

[11] Telegram from Hon. Wright Lipford, assistant attorney general of Georgia, reading: "No limitation imposed on reported court opinions."

[12] The editorial counsel wrote on May 10, 1947: "The number of opinions rendered by the Federal courts has been materially decreased * * * the cases published used as precedents have already begun to work."

[13] Fiscal years: 1940, 398 cases; 1941, 406 cases; 1942, 386 cases; 1943, 350 cases; 1944, 354 cases; 1945, 329 cases; and 1946, 302 cases. Approximately 80 percent were appeals from United States district courts; about 12 percent from tax courts; 5 percent from NLRB and balance from administrative tribunals, viz: Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Power Commission, Administrator of Wage and Hour Division, Civil Aeronautics Authority, Federal Trade Commission, Alcohol Administrator and United States Processing Board.

[14] Fiscal year begins July 1 and ends June 30.

[15] Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts (1946), p. 6.

[16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21] Number of lawyers, by States, listed in Martindale-Hubbell Legal Directory, 1947 edition.

[22] "The Problems of Reducing the Volume of Published Opinions" published in condensed form in vol. 26, p. 138, et seq., of the Journal of the American Judicature Society, February 1943 issue.

[23] Published in vol. 25, p. 166, Journal of the American Judicature Society, April 1942 issue.

[24] Vol. 158 of the second series, Federal Reporter, was used to make a test. There are 37 cases reported dealing with internal revenue. Only 6 of the 37 carry headnotes having to do with any other branch of the law. To the general practitioner not interested in tax cases, 31 cases could have been eliminated from this one volume.

[25] *Oklahoma Press Publishing Co.* v. *Walling* (66 S. Ct. 494), dissenting opinion.

3. That in pursuing the study and investigation the Attorney General of the United States, the chairman of and the counsel for the United States Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary, the Director of the Administrative Offices of the United States Courts, the deans of at least six prominent American colleges of law, the president of the American Bar Association, the president of the American Judicature Society, a representative of the West Publishing Co., and a representative of the Association of American Law Libraries be invited to submit their views on the study and investigation, especially on the question of the advisability of requesting Congress to enact a law authorizing the appropriate Federal courts to promulgate rules embracing any or all features of the subject.

4. That the expense of such an undertaking be borne by the respective bar associations of the several States within the fifth circuit, to be allocated on the basis of the number of practicing lawyers in each State.

5. That the foregoing suggestions, or any similar ones, which may be adopted be submitted to the bar associations of the respective States for approval before the invitations referred to in (1) above are extended.

6. That the following excerpts taken from the published articles of Mr. Justice Sibley and Mr. Justice Martin, supra, and from the court's opinion in *Huchens* v. *State ex rel Rhamey* (116 N. E. 413), be considered by the judges of the fifth circuit, as soon as practicable, for such action toward reduction in preparation and publication of opinions as may be deemed appropriate by them.

By Mr. Justice Sibley:

"Long opinions are |not| necessary."

"Courts, * * * ought to restrain the publication of those |opinions| not of general importance."

"In cases that are affirmed, we often make memorandum judgments, without opinion. This practice could be extended with some profit, where the case presents nothing new."

By Mr. Justice Martin:

"United States district judges have the means with which to make the first contribution."

"Excellent work of all the district judges in this circuit |makes| possible the omission of formal opinions in numerous appealed cases."

"In reviewing tribunals * * * cumulative opinions should not be exacted as proof of deliberation."

"The court of appeals for this circuit has, by frequent affirmance order, already contributed * * * to reduction of the number of appellate court opinions."

"The first signpost on the highway to opinion reduction points to a simple order of affirmance, without opinion, in a case in which the findings of fact are based upon substantial evidence and the conclusions of law are correctly drawn and clearly stated, whether or not the district judge has filed a written opinion. The rare exception to total abstinence from affirming opinions might well be cases of genuine first impression, presenting real rather than pseudo novelty."

On National Labor Relations Board and other administrative agencies cases:

"Abstention from long fact opinions."

In tax-litigation cases:

"When the court of appeals agrees with the reasoning and conclusions of the board, an order of affirmance * * *."

In diversity of citizenship cases involving only the pronouncement and application of settled local law:

"Refrain from writing" |opinions|.

"Where judgments below are reversed * * * if the ground for reversal can be made crystal clear by a mere order, why write an opinion."

"When a case is reversed upon the facts, what contribution to the sum total of jurisprudence is made by lengthy factual discussion in published opinion form? A purely fact opinion, resolving no conflict of law, is of no practical or authoritative importance in the adjudication of other fact cases."

"A trend to shorter opinions would be an efficient adjunct."

From *Hutchens* v. *State ex rel. Rhamey:*

"When it clearly appears that no question is properly presented for our consideration, when the questions involved relate to some question of practice which has been decided so often that it is no longer an open question, where the questions are elementary and not of public interest or of sufficient importance to justify the preparation and publication of an opinion * * * we shall in the future, as we have in the past, exercise our discretion in the matter of writing an opinion * * *."

7. That the judges of the fifth circuit court define what is considered by them to be "unnecessary opinions"[26] as regards publication and determine if the lawbook publishers will consent to desist from publishing same so designated.

Suggestions contained in paragraphs Nos. 6 and 7 are offered as a means of affording immediate relief. Suggestions contained in paragraphs Nos. 1 through 5, inclusive, require time and expense in performance. They may for that reason be ruled out. If so, and especially in view of Mr. Justice Sibley's statement: "I doubt if, without the aid of law, this activity (referring to wholesale publication of opinions by private publishers) can be restrained," in his article on The Multitude of Published Opinions, I suggest that the problem be presented to the United States Senate, of the Eightieth Congress, in the form of a proposed resolution to create a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary with ample authority to make a general study along the lines above suggested.

Drastic changes must be made in the present methods of deciding and reporting cases, and as I have said before, a strong unanimity of opinion to this effect prevails among bench and bar. Moreover, I believe that the West Publishing Co. and other private publishers will cooperate with any plan which is adopted by and made clear to be the wish of the court. There are dissenters to be sure; especially among the lawyers who believe in appealing all cases, prompted, I suppose by the encouraging percentage of reversals in their favor. These litigators will never approve any plan. Litigating for the sake of litigating, is their stock in trade. However, these litigators are in infinitesimal minority who will have an abundance of precedents upon which to appeal should the 50 American courts of last resort and the numerous intermediate—opinion writing—courts reduce their output 75 percent.

Sir Francis Bacon sounded a warning by assuming the cloak of the prophet nearly 330 years ago, when as Lord Chancelor of England he recommended to King James I:

"The reducing or perfecting of the course or the corps of the common law" by omitting from the reports all "cases wherein there is solemnly and long debated matter whereof there is now no question at all"; and, cases "merely of iteration and repetition."

How many of our judges intend to continue to add opinions to the printed mass which are of little or no value to the body of the law? Must the myriad of published opinions continue to grow at the rate of several thousand each year simply because certain judges and courts refuse to exercise the discretion resting in them? If these judges and courts answer in the affirmative, I will run the chance of being classed among the puerile by predicting that their action or lack of it will exacerbate the issue to the point of resolving it into an acrimonious controversy.

Our prayer for the solution of a problem centuries old is hereby renewed.

[26] Editorial counsel of West Publishing Co. writes under date of May 10, 1947, "* * * it would be difficult to determine 'the unnecessary opinions,' and to secure a unanimous decision as to which were the unnecessary opinions."

Two Years of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Two Years of the UN," published in the Atlanta Constitution of June 26, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO YEARS OF THE UN

It was 2 years ago today that the peoples of the world breathed a little prayer that the infant United Nations Organization, born that day, would be truly an instrument for preserving peace.

There were ponderous speeches by statesmen and demagogs alike hailing the United Nations into being. It would be, they promised, unlike the League of Nations, which died a lingering death from sheer neglect and malnutrition. The United Nations would grow and in a short time became strong enough to handle any threatening situation that might develop anywhere in the world.

Among the United Nations' strongest points, they said, was control by the great powers, all of whom avowedly wanted peace and any of whom were powerful enough to deal with disturbances between the smaller nations.

It has been, as we said, 2 years since that day. And as yet the United Nations has not amounted to much. It too often has been merely a sounding board for the grievances, real or fancied, of the individual powers. This is not to say the UN has failed; it is too early to say that. But it has fumbled fearfully and it has not as yet the confiedence of the peoples of the world.

Even so, there can be no denying that the United Nations contains the necessary machinery for preserving world peace as well as for maintaining harmonious relations among the sovereign powers. The UN Charter is well conceived and is utterly realistic. Much criticism has been directed against the veto power given any of the Big Five, but the framers of the Charter well understood that without the unreserved cooperation of the major powers any world organization would be doomed. All the machinery is there; it simply has not been functioning properly.

What is it, then, that is lacking? Why has the United Nations largely been ineffectual? Can the entire blame be placed on Russia, whose lip service to peace is interspersed by one power grab after another? Could the United States have acted differently and achieved a greater measure of cooperation? Have Britain, France, and China been guilty of selfish aims?

Any of these questions, we believe, would be likely to evoke answers which, however

true, would be entirely extraneous. For underlying all deliberations of the UN has been deep suspicion and distrust, particularly between Russia and the United States.

And until that suspicion and distrust are replaced with understanding and confidence, the United Nations cannot amount to much. Since understanding and confidence are built on knowledge and familiarity it behooves this country, and Russia as well, to promote any measures which will acquaint the peoples of the two countries with the problems of the other. This is among the reasons we have supported vigorously the Voice of America broadcasts. And if we thought our influence would be felt, we would just as vigorously clamor for the Soviet to lift the iron curtain and let the peoples of the world see.

Conservation Silliness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Conservation Silliness," published in the Farmers Guild News for June-July, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION SILLINESS

Residents of Indiana have just undergone a pressure campaign by one of its metropolitan newspapers conducted in conjunction with its land-grant college, to stop soil erosion and save the soil of the old Hoosier State. It sounded good on paper, and seemed to serve a lofty purpose as thousands of high school students were persuaded to take time from useful projects and submit an essay on conserving the soil. Like a lot of other claptrap that proceeds from American universities, this effort lulled the populace into thinking that something was being done to conserve crop land and assure urban areas of an unfailing supply of cheap food.

In common with most college thinking, the campaign dealt with effects and not with fundamental causes. By no possible process of intellection could the directors of the campaign connect soil erosion with the farm-price problem. If the overhead expense on a farm is for example $2,000 a year, and cash corn is selling at $1 per bushel, then it is obvious that this particular farm must market the equivalent of 2,000 bushels of corn a year or become insolvent. If corn drops in price to 50 cents per bushel then the farm in question must market 4,000 bushels, and a 25-cent-bushel price demands the marketing of 8,000 bushels. In either of the latter instances erosive soil must be put to the plow to make ends meet and to give the farmer purchasing power over his production costs.

Why should any farmer worthy of the name deliberately set out to destroy his farm? Is it not his very nature to conserve? Is it not economic necessity that forces soil depletion? An Illinois clodhopper who "figgers" things out on the back 40, recently wrote us as follows:

"The University of Illinois developed the McLean county system of swine sanitation so I could raise 8 pigs per litter instead of 6, and the Government killed 6,000,000 little pigs. The university developed a new variety of wheat to produce 5 bushels more per acre than the then current variety and the Government fined me for growing too much wheat. Then, while I was being told that we had overproduction, the Government offered me free limestone and phosphate to stimulate production. The State Department cut farm tariffs to encourage importation of competing farm products so that for every acre I took out of production we imported more than an acre of foreign farm products. In exchange for my vote the Government offers me crop insurance, mortgage insurance, school lunches to the township kids to consume our surplus, loans to boost my prices, and a cock-eyed loan to my boy who came back from the war. Now I will be offered a soil-conservation payment to conserve my soil. Why does not the Government fix the factory roof for the industrialist that neglects his own property?"

All of the Indiana high school students together could not state the issue more succinctly. It all adds up to the fact that the soil-conservation campaign is a lot of silliness, launched to prove that some bureaucrat is on the job protecting the public interest. It never occurs to most people that our annual production of grains had stood at 7,500,000,000 bushels for many years in spite of bureaucratic tub-thumping about soil erosion.

Much of the responsibility for the complete misinterpretation of conditions and ignoring of fundamentals lies at the doors of American universities. The mind of the average faculty member is a cloistered rut turning out thousands of specialized thinkers highly informed about one subject, but wholly unable to coordinate that subject to the problems of society as a whole. A surefire method of ruining the Nation was demonstrated by the rule of theoretical lawyers in the OPA during the war. An alternative would be to choose an orthodox economist from any American university.

It is distressing to note the waste of billions of dollars to operate our universities during this generation. It is more distressing to note that soil conservation has come to mean merely the prevention of the erosion of dirt and not a challenge to reason from effect back to cause. The one question that could be posed to cover the situation can be simply stated: In this Nation is there a single university with sufficient moral courage to study the fundamental needs of agriculture and then publish its findings?

Time and Experience Will Prove the Benefits of or Defects in the Labor-Management Relations Bill of 1947

REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, time and experience are two of man's greatest teachers. Time heals many wounds, changes many prejudices. Experience proves many presumed fallacies to be true, sheds light and truth on doubt and suspicion.

Time and experience will prove the true value of the labor bill recently passed by the Congress over the President's veto. Time and experience will prove whether the judgment of more than two-thirds of the House and the Senate is better and sounder in the public interest than the judgment of the President who disagreed by his veto with this large majority of both Houses of Congress.

Charges of prejudice, acrimony, discrimination, and even hatred of labor unions against those who voted for this bill is false and not founded on fact. Many of those who voted for this bill have been loyal supporters of labor for years. Many who voted for this bill voted against the Case bill last year.

It was President Truman himself who in May of last year proposed the "work or fight" labor bill which was far more restrictive and penalizing than the present labor bill, and yet he vetoed the labor-management relations bill of 1947.

I would much prefer to see labor and management settle their differences, negotiate their contracts and determine wages, working conditions, welfare funds and retirement plans with the very least, or if possible, without the necessity of any, Federal legislation at all rather than to find it necessary to pass legislation to regulate these relations between labor and management.

I believe with Thomas Jefferson that "A Nation is governed best that is governed least." But, of course, this is an ideal and presumes that all men will be fair and equitable with each other. Unfortunately this has not been true as between labor and management, and the result is the necessity of Federal laws to temporize and equalize the sharp differences that have not only affected labor and management, but especially the public at large who have become the unfortunate victims of these differences, and, in many instances, suffered because of the economic upsets resulting from the differences and misunderstandings between labor and management.

WILLING TO HELP LABOR

During the years I have been in public office since 1933, I have always had and still have a sympathetic interest in and a willingness to help labor solve its problems. My voting record in Congress and as a Los Angeles County official will prove this.

I have on many occasions voted on the side of labor, bringing criticism upon myself and sometimes jeopardizing my official position. My vote for the present labor bill and to override the President's veto was not cast because I have or have had any prejudice, acrimony, or hatred of labor unions. On the contrary my vote was cast for the bill because I believed it would help clear up many of the differences between labor and management as well as bring about more freedom and independence to the rank and file members of labor unions. If I had not believed that, I would have voted against the bill and to sustain the President's veto.

I was privileged to vote as I pleased for the best interests of my constituents and

of the Nation. I was under no obligation to any group of labor or management, or to any party obligation. I voted my convictions as I believed them, just as I voted my convictions when I opposed the Case bill and sustained the President's veto of it last year.

LABOR'S PROBLEMS ARE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC

Labor's problems have always been, in my opinion, economic and social. I have never viewed them as political. I believe labor's problems are economic because they have a direct and great bearing upon the economic life of the community and the Nation. They affect the production of all the commodities and services that enter into the life of the Nation. They affect the cost and price of these commodities and services and their distribution and thereby affect the cost of living and comfort and well-being of all.

Labor can make the cost and price of these commodities and services high or low. They can make these things hard or easy to get and can bring great suffering or comfort to the people of the Nation. This is great power and carries with it great responsibility, greater than the average wage earner fully realizes when he blindly follows labor leadership which often uses him to promote its own ambitious political position at the expense of the rank and file of labor.

Labor's problems are social because the wage earner is entitled to sufficient wages to properly provide food, clothing, and shelter for his family, for recreation and education of his children, and retirement in old age. Labor is entitled to safe and sanitary working conditions, and to be free from the worry and fear of his position in the social and economic life of his community.

Without sufficient wages for food, clothing, and shelter, the wage earner's family suffers and becomes a social responsibility of the State and county. Without sufficient wages to give proper recreation and education to his family, the health and future of his children are adversely affected, which also affects the social conditions of the State and county.

Safe and sanitary working conditions are necessary to prevent injury and protect the health of the wage earner as well as an adequate old age retirement to give the wage earner the dignity and self-respect he is entitled to as an American citizen, and to remove the worry of becoming a charge upon the State or the county.

Labor's problems, therefore, enter into all phases of community life and are, in my opinion, of such wide scope and importance that they become greater than partisan politics and should never be tied to either of the major political parties but should be treated strictly on a nonpartisan basis. Labor itself should never for its own future benefit adhere or identify itself with one party, but should look to both parties to help it work out its problems.

CONGRESS WANTS TO HELP LABOR

I believe all Members of Congress in both parties want to help labor solve its problems with management. I sincerely believe that desire is based on the hope for industrial peace and security that will come with the solution of these problems.

I am confident that a majority of the Members of Congress would gladly support amendments to the present labor bill that need correction. No bill was ever written that was entirely perfect. I will be glad to lend my support to improving this bill as it is found necessary.

Time and experience will bring out its benefits and defects. Labor, by its negative attitude toward any legislation at all, lost an opportunity to write into this bill the kind of legislation that it knew was necessary.

Labor can, by viewing this bill objectively, reduce the misunderstanding and ill feeling to a minimum. On the other hand, labor can increase the ill feeling and misunderstanding by prejudice and misinformation.

Time and experience will give labor a golden opportunity to enhance its position in the mind of the public and to rise to a position of high respect and dignity to which it is entitled, and in fact needs for its own future. If labor does not recognize this opportunity, it will bring criticism and ill-repute upon itself by bickering, confusion, and misinformation on what the bill will do.

This bill was not designed to kill or injure labor unions, and time and experience will prove this.

WHAT DOES LABOR WANT?

Does labor want communism to remain in the unions to destroy them from within, or does it want communism removed from its ranks as this bill provides?

Does labor want jurisdictional strikes, tearing the union apart from within to the detriment of the workers and the public alike, or does labor want an end to these senseless conflicts which arouse public wrath and indignation, which this bill guarantees?

Does labor want coercion of political beliefs and union assessments which force a union member to contribute to the support of a candidate he does not approve, and in fact opposes, or does labor want individual political freedom which this bill guarantees?

Does labor, a minority group among many minority groups which make up our great Nation, seek to dominate all others and impose its will upon the Nation, or is it willing to cooperate with the will of the majority of citizens?

Does labor expect all other groups to be held responsible for their acts, to deal fairly and without prejudice, while labor refuses to assume its responsibility, or is labor willing to accept its proper place in the Nation and accept the same responsibility for its actions which it demands from others?

LABOR LOYAL TO THE NATION

I believe that American labor is loyal and willing to accept its responsibilities to the Nation. I know that, given a chance, it will recognize the true value of the labor bill and accept its benefits and its responsibilities.

If any phase of the bill proves restrictive or penalizing I know it will find its representatives in Congress more than willing to enact corrective amendments.

What Air Transportation Means to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. C. R. Smith, chairman of the board of American Airlines, before the Western Regional Air Power Conference of the American Legion at Bakersfield, Calif., June 14, 1947:

WHAT AIR TRANSPORT MEANS TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Every man within the range of my voice has undoubtedly served in the armed forces of the United States, or has worked in support of those forces. And the women of this country not only have served but they have worked and sacrificed in the same national emergency. All Americans, I am sure, would be willing to serve again if the progress and peace of our country were threatened. None of us are looking for another war. On the contrary, we would like reasonable assurance that we, and our sons and our daughters, will not know the tragedy of battlefields again

But our experience has made us practical; we are neither naive nor uninformed. There is no indication that human nature has changed, or will change in the visible future, so that we can be assured the threat of war has been removed forever from the horizon. We must realize, and we do realize, that war can come again. Therefore, we must not only be prepared for that eventuality but we must be prepared to win. Preparation is more than a physical thing; it is also a national mental discipline.

The will to win is inherent in the American people. However, at this time an old and dangerous impression is abroad in the land. I speak of the national conversational conviction that the United States cannot lose a war. This fallacious reasoning is rooted in just one fact, the fact that we have never lost a war. From that fact, the self-satisfying conclusion has been reached that we never will lose a war. This is shallow thinking and is a dangerous impediment to sensible planning on problems of our national security.

It is tempting for the average citizen to look back and conclude "there was never any doubt that we would win the war." That shows how quickly the Nation can forget the dark days after Pearl Harbor, and the doubtful days of the north African campaign. There were many times; as we were belatedly trying to gear our national production to war power, when the going was tough and the outlook was grim. We faced the possibility that, for the first time in American history, we could lose a war. It took stout hearts and strong minds in those days. It took an unbeatable determination to win. There are too many battle records of doubtful results and marginal victories to justify either complacency or comfort. Those of us who served in the Army, the Navy, or in the air must not be complacent or comfortable about the future.

It is our responsibility to guard against this insidious attitude of senseless self-sufficiency, this willingness to endanger the national existence, by putting off until some distant tomorrow the obligation of preparing our Nation against a threat of war which can come, either in this or in succeeding generations. Our own lives, and the lives of our

families and of our country, are too precious a possession to be risked in the intoxication of a nebulous whimsy.

Let us turn back a few pages in history and see what the words "preparedness" and "mobility" could have meant not long ago. A very small, highly mobile military force, ready to move instantly, could have prevented Hitler's return to the Rhineland. A somewhat larger, similar force, could have prevented the annexation of Austria and the invasion of Czechoslovakia. Had Hitler been stopped in those places, the holocaust of World War II might have been ended before it began. The general public does not realize the time necessary for planning and production of war materials. It is quite possible that very few people know that no airplane developed after Pearl Harbor fought during the entire war. Our airplanes spearheaded the winning of the last war simply because, by freak circumstances, we had months and years to get the massive power of the American aircraft industry into production, and we overwhelmed the enemy with numbers. These facts should be pondered deeply by those unctuous and smug blatherskites who spread the narcotic nonsense that the Nation can rise miraculously and immediately against any threat that confronts it.

That is exactly the state of mind that any potential enemy would have us hold. We all should know, since that devastating, historic day of Hiroshima, that the tempo and impact of modern warfare has changed; that the concept of future warfare has been completely revolutionized. There will not be time again to prepare after we have been attacked. We must be ready to strike with blinding and victorious strength, and strike instantaneously.

As General Eisenhower recently said, "The decision in the future conflict would be determined by our ability to act and react in the first 60 days, rather than the twelfth, eighteen, or twenty-fourth month, as in past wars." It is not necessary to be a military expert to visualize our position in this uncertain world. Military science is not one of my capabilities, and I have an understandable impatience with anybody who, solely because he or she has served in the armed forces, becomes an armchair strategist, and is ready, "at the drop of a hat," to view with alarm. However, all of us have gained much useful experience in the recent war, and we should utilize that experience in planning for the future safety of our Nation.

One thing we learned in the armed forces was that each should do the job for which he or she was best equipped, by ability, specialization, and training. And if we are to be of real value to national defense, each of us should stick to the thing for which we have been trained. It happens that my specialty is air transportation, and I began that specialty in 1928, including the years spent in military air transportation. Therefore, I would like to discuss with you some of the requirements for the maintenance of America's premier position as the greatest air power the world has ever known.

Air transportation is a most vital element of that air power. The Greeks had a word for it—logistics or supply. Air power cannot exist without air logistics. That theory has become a fact. The definition of air power was not clear to all of us at the beginning of the recent war, but experience, and hundreds of millions of miles of it, has dispelled most of the uncertainties. We have now a definition of national air power which is undisputed by informed people, and we have also learned that we must maintain the peace power for America by the maintenance of its air power.

The war has taught us that air power is a total of three elements:

1. A striking element of the combat forces.

2. The productive capacity, including research, training, development, and production of the manufacturing establishments.

3. Air transportation to guarantee the necessary modern mobility for transport and supply.

You cannot have air power unless you have these three elements each in adequate capacity and each of proven capability. Other nations of the world had some of these three elements in the recent war, in varying degrees of capability and strength, but only the United States had adequate, balanced air power, and air power was an American contribution to the side which won the war—our side.

The first of the three elements, striking power, is an element which depreciates rapidly in effectiveness, unless it is continually modernized and sustained. The science of aerodynamics moves forward with lengthening strides, and it has nothing except contempt for those who willingly lag behind. We have recently been idly adding numbers, proving by sheer numerical strength that American air power is as capable today as it was when it dominated the skies of Europe and the Pacific. But many of the aircraft which we include in our totals are aircraft of yesterday, aircraft of the war of 1944 and '45. But our job is to provide air power for the war of the future, not the war of the past. The P–51, which streaked past you in the war of 1944, seems slow and cumbersome by the standards of 1947. There is an urgent requirement that we modernize our air forces, and that we continually keep them modern.

All of that requires the will to keep ahead, and the will to provide funds with which we can keep ahead. Our experience indicates that funds wisely expended in timely preparation will save lives, and greater sums, if and when the day of requirement arrives. It is in the interest of the national economy, as well as the national security, that we keep ahead in research, development, production, and utilization.

The Congress is now considering the national appropriations. I believe that they are convinced that the American people will pay, and pay with willingness, for a program sensibly designed to keep American air power strong. If that be so, the Congress will appropriate sums sufficient to assure American air power, and the people of the United States will say well done. The details of the requirement for an adequate striking force we shall leave to the good judgment of our military and naval airmen and to the Members of the Congress charged with providing for the national security. The Congress should be aware, and is, that the American people believe in air power, believe in its utility and its requirement, believe that they are entitled to and shall have the best, and are willing to pay for it. On that basis, I am sure that the Congress will provide for the reasonable requirements of American air power.

The second member of the team of air power, productive capacity, has been and is having difficulty. Three years ago our airplane factories were capable of producing 10,000 airplanes a month, and constituted one of our great American industries. Yet, at the beginning of the recent war, airplanes, of all types, were so scarce that the commanding officers could recognize each airplane by serial number. We had too little productive capacity at the beginning of the war; we ended the war with greater capacity than the peacetime economy could or should support. It is obvious that we must maintain a sensible structure of aircraft productive capacity, both in being and in reserve. But we cannot support in peacetime all factories which gained the technique of wartime production. We must, therefore, choose the most capable of the group, and we must have a program which will insure their continued maintenance, without doubt and without reservation.

The aircraft manufacturers have been expending their resources, awaiting the time when a formal program for the maintenance of aircraft productive capacity, as a part of national air power, could be decided, announced and made effective. This program cannot be longer delayed, for the resources of the manufacturers are limited and they cannot maintain operation indefinitely. I am hopeful, as you are, that as soon as the measure of available appropriations is known, both the Army and the Navy will announce to the manufacturers the types they will require, the numbers they will require, the time schedule of production and the factories they will depend upon. The number of factories, establishments, or companies should be, must be, limited to those of superior capability, and the number must be a number which we can and will undertake to support in reasonable volume. You cannot win a war without air power and you cannot have air power without productive capacity, and you cannot have productive capacity in time to do you any good unless you maintain in readiness a capable nucleus from which to expand.

Air transportation was not an accredited member of the air power team at the beginning of the recent war. I doubt that even the professional military airman realized its inherent capabilities, or realized the need for transportation mobility in a war which covered a substantial proportion of the area of the world. The mobility which we required could be supplied only by the transport airplane and by the end of the war the Army's Air Transport Command, its Troop Carrier Commands, and the Naval Air Transport Service had gained full admission to the team of air power, on the basis of the requirement for air transportation and on the basis of capability in supplying it.

There is no need to go into the details of how Kenney used the transport airplane to supply the troops of MacArthur, how Naval Air Transport Service supplied the distant bases of the Naval Forces, how the Troop Carrier Command and the theater transport units supplied the mighty march of Patton's troops. There is temptation to live over again the days of the "Hump" operation, between India and China, where in any ordinary day you could find a thousand transport flights going over the Himalayas to keep China in the war. All of that is history, glorious history, but well known to you. You do not require the refreshment of detail to reinforce your conclusion, and the conclusion of the public, that you do not have air power unless you have air transportation capacity. But here, in reminiscing over the days of several years ago, we are discussing the air transportation requirements of a war which has been concluded. Our real job is to make sure that air transportation capacity is hereafter available in sufficient quantity and is of sufficient capability, to warrant the conclusion that we have adequate American air power.

We began the war with less than 100 military transports and we ended the war with more than 10,000. In between, there were days and weeks and months of heartbreaking insufficiency. We used the time available to us well, but that much time will not again be available; we must, next time, be better prepared.

In forming plans to maintain the strength of American air power we readily discover, as we did in the recent war, that there is an essential element of difference between the composition of the "striking" element, and the "air transport" element. The striking element, for reasons which are obvious, is composed of aircraft, airmen, and air facilities assigned to the military and naval services, or else assigned to the reserve strength of those establishments. But, the air transport element of air power is, and will continue to be, for reasons which we will discuss, composed of the strength in air transportation capacity available both in the military, naval, and civilian establishments.

On the basis that we employed 10,000 transport aircraft in the recent war, it seems advantageous to plan that we shall have on hand, ready for employment, something approximating half that strength. We may well require in the next war a transport strength of more than 10,000 planes, but some of the total requirement may be produced during the war, provided we have before the war a number sufficient to give us great relative and immediate strength.

It is idle to believe that we can justify in the armed services a fleet of 5,000 transport aircraft, for there is no way that number can be usefully employed in the services during time of peace, and the national economy will not permit them to be maintained in idleness or in nonproductive storage. For that reason, we must plan that the services will continue to have available a number sufficient for its peacetime military requirement, and a nucleus transport corps capable of transport operation. But the great bulk of the transport which we should maintain "ready" must be numbered in the civilian air transport organizations; the air lines and others engaged for livelihood in air transportation. In that way, and in that way only, can a substantial proportion of our air power transport fleet be maintained on basis of minimum drain upon the national Treasury, for most of the fleet can thereby be maintained in self-supporting service.

We, in air transportation, are making progress, substantial progress, in building up our fleets. Already the transportation capacity of the civilian transport fleet is many times that of prewar days. But, in spite of a remarkable expansion, the civilian fleet of transport aircraft of appropriate types numbers somewhere in the neighborhood of 1,000 airplanes. Add to that the several hundred still available in the Army and Navy transport fleets, and you still have a number very inadequate for the potential airpower requirements for air transportation.

This part of the job, like that of maintaining our productive capacity, requires better planning and sounder augmentation. If we decide that 5,000 transports should be available, and that as many of them as is possible should be in self-supporting service, then new and different methods of employing transport aircraft in our national transportation system must be devised. The only alternative to employment of the fleet in civilian service is to provide the services with the fleet which the national interest requires. That, everyone agrees, is the expensive way of doing the job. The over-all cost to the public is lowered by a plan to employ the fleet in civilian service. The planes would be capable of performing a civilian service of transportation and communication, and always available to the armed services in case of necessity.

We in civilian air transportation recognize that we contribute to national air power by augmentation of our fleets, and the fact that the air-carrier fleets are being augmented and modernized is proof of that fact. But, in the national interest, the rate of augmentation is too slow. The country requires a program, a sound, sensible, definitive program for the provision of the air-transport element of national air power, and until we have such program we will not be making the progress which air power reasonably requires.

The Army and the Navy should, by joint action, determine:

1 What air-transportation capacity is required in order to insure that the air-transport element of natjonal air power shall have adequate strength?

2. How many airplanes, and what types c airplanes, are necessary in order to fulfill that requirement?

3. How many of those airplanes will be assigned directly to the services, and how many will the Nation depend upon the air carriers to provide?

4. What is the time element, the schedule, for the provision of that number of transport aircraft?

When this decision has been made, a national program should be drawn up by the Army and Navy, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Department of Commerce, and the Post Office Department. These Government agencies, working closely with the air carriers, should enforce the plan which will insure that the number of aircraft to be provided from civilian sources will be provided, at times scheduled for their provision, and under the arrangements made for their continued maintenance and operation. Frankly, everyone agrees we must have air power, and that we must have strong air transportation, as an essential element of national air power, but the industry has not yet been told what strength is reasonably required, and no program has been proposed that will insure its provision.

We made plans for air transportation, with readiness during the war, for we had to provide air transportation quickly in order to win the war, but plans for the requirements of the future have lost the tempo of 1944, and we either need again to get going or we need to confess that we have no appropriate program for the air-transport element of air power. Many useful programs to expand the usefulness of civilian air transport have been suggested, such as transporting first-class mail by air, transportation of air parcel post, and increase in air-freight schedules, but the rate of progress in putting those programs into effect is too slow for national comfort.

There are other individual elements in the broad element of air transportation which require our continuing attention.

The basic requirement for a national system of Federal airways is the potential defense of the United States. In peacetime it is the civilian operator, including the private flyer, who makes most extensive utilization of the Federal airways. But in wartime the ferry flights of military aircraft take first precedence, and the Federal airways are essential for that purpose. If we come, at some future time, to the requirement of defending the country on our own soil air power will be our first line of defense, and the Federal airways will give our aircraft mobility, the ability to fly day or night, and in any kind of weather. Like all other elements of national air power, the backbone of requirement of Federal airways lies in its potential contribution to national defense. For that reason the airways must be maintained on modern basis, always equipped with devices of latest type and effectiveness. And in the maintenance of our airways the civilian operators, Federal Government, and the military services have mutual responsibility.

Our national airport system also is a basic necessity for national defense and for adequate air power. The same detailed interest must be taken in the provision of adequate airports during peacetime as was necessary during the days of the war. Sufficient funds must continue to be available for the construction and maintenance of modern airports on the basis, and on this basis alone, if necessary, that a modern airport system is essential for national defense requirements. Reasons for the airport system, beyond the necessities for civil air transportation, are obvious, especially for air-forces training and for airborne-troop training. A modern network of airways and airports throughout the Nation is a fundamental requirement for American preparedness and security.

I have outlined some major constructive aspects of a national program that seems to me an integral part of the purpose of our meeting. It is of primary importance for each of us to make sure that our constructive efforts are not offset by negative efforts coming from well-meaning but uninformed persons or organizations. I cannot overemphasize the necessity that we work closely with State and municipal departments on behalf of the national objective. Your motto is "air power is peace power." And, national air power can only be maintained through a sound national policy.

With that policy in being, the States and municipalities and the individuals should hold the national welfare above local and personal considerations. Although the airplane has manifold local uses, it is a most important instrument of national interest. I urge that the State and civic bodies consider carefully any legislation or regulation that might restrict the fullest development and use of this transport instrument. An airplane, even at the present transport speeds of 300 miles per hour, has difficulty in recognizing State boundaries. At military attack speeds of 600 miles per hour, our Nation separates the Atlantic and the Pacific by a scant 4 hours.

Failure to recognize the essential attributes of the airplane, many States, even counties and municipalities, have ventured toward the regulation of the interstate air commerce. Nothing will so quickly or effectively handicap the capacities of the airplane, or cripple its contribution to national air power. The air age requires air-age education. I think those of you who have seen the actual impact of air power have a definite obligation to carry that message to State and municipal officials so that this country may avoid the pitfalls of State and municipal regulations which duplicate or approximate those which should be left in the hands of the Federal Government. By onerous State taxation and regulation, we nearly destroyed the utility of highway transportation for a long time. And that was a form of transportation averaging less than 50-miles-per-hour speed. Imagine the confusion, needless and expensive, involved in operating airplanes according to the individual regulations of each State over which the airplane passes. One State, for example, has suggested that airplanes using the air space over the State, and not even landing in the State, be taxed. That type of legislation is obviously dangerous to any conception of efficient interstate air transportation.

The amazing miscellany of proposed and pending legislation and regulation throughout the States and municipalities of the country is a jigsaw puzzle without an answer. I believe that these must be coordinated into a program that will permit air transportation to operate effectively for the benefit of the Nation. We have obligations to pay taxes in each of the States in which we operate, but we should pay taxes on the same basis as comparable business institutions for the privilege of that operation. Taxation should be governed by broad principles and no taxes should be assessed that duplicate charges already levied against the taxpayer in some other form. We have an obligation, also, to observe the regulations of the States we serve, but no State regulation should handicap the air carrier in the performance of its national functions. I would request you, ladies and gentlemen of the Legion, as well as all citizens, to think of air transportation as an essential element of the national air power, and air power as the most vital element of this country's security.

You, as citizens, and citizens with experience in the defense of your country, should contribute your strength and influence to a national program which will:

1. Insure that the striking force is maintained in adequate strength, with aircraft of latest type and greatest capability. Lend your support to the Congress in insuring appropriations for that purpose. Support the Congress by maintaining an informed public at home, a public which knows why we require air power and how we can best maintain air power.

2. Insist upon a program which will assure that the production-capacity element of national air power is maintained, under a formal sensible program and with adequate appropriations for its sustenance.

3. Insist that the third element of air power, air transportation, shall be given due recognition in the national plan. That the Government decide and announce what is required, and produce a plan to provide it.

In conclusion, I would ask that you undertake a most important mission. Urge upon your State legislators that the basic national reason for air transportation is, in wartime, to become an integral part of air power, and in peacetime, to provide transportation and communications between the communities of the Nation. Emphasize to the States and the municipalities that their requirements from air transportation must not sap its strength by restrictive legislation and taxation. Because air transportation is a part of our everyday lives, we are likely to overlook its tremendous potentiality in the national-defense program. That is why the significance of our air-transport system should be constantly in the minds of legislative and civic officials. When jet fighters flash over the sky and the mighty bombers thunder on their missions, remember that these are helpless without the thousands of transports necessary to maintain and supply the combat forces. Neither could we have airborne armies, nor flying hospital ships, nor many other essential movements of modern war without air transports.

I would like to leave these thoughts with you as you consider national defense. The United States lives in a sorely troubled world. We are to a great degree the guardians of the future democratic way of life. The American way is no high-sounding phrase. It is a fact visible in the faces of your families, as well as in the privileges of our laws. The air power of the United States is the greatest guarantee of world peace. That is why you must unceasingly remember and work unceasingly under the words of your motto, because it is an enduring truth that air power is peace power.

Importing Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, current discussion of a resolution pending in the other body with respect to questionable elections and their investigation prompts me to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on April 29, 1947. It is a reminder that elections are ofttimes influenced by artifices more subtle than the brazen theft and miscount of ballots. The editorial to which I refer reads as follows:

THE PENDERGAST MACHINE IMPORTS SOME VOTES

The Bureau of Internal Revenue has announced that its processing division will move from the Bronx to Kansas City by July 1. Paving Blocks Flynn apparently couldn't stand up against the three Missouri stalwarts, Messrs. Truman, Snyder, and Hannegan.

The location of the bureau in Kansas City should prove something of a boon to the revived Pendergast machine. Some 40 small fry of that organization have been indicted for vote-fraud activities in the primary election purge last spring of Congressman Slaughter by the Pendergast candidate, Enos Axtell. (Axtell fell by the wayside in November.) If the Pendergast boys can't steal votes any more, there is no law to stop them from importing them, in the form of loyal New Deal pay rollers.

The processing division verifies individual income-tax returns against employers' reports of taxes withheld from wages. "Experience has proved," says the bureau's publicity release, "that a more central location is necessary." Inasmuch as the division handles its business by mail, it probably could do just as good a job in Key West, Fla., or Fairbanks, Alaska, as in either the Bronx or Kansas City.

The decentralization of Government bureaus is sound in principle. Washington would be a healthier place politically if more of the detailed work of government were done throughout the country, where the pay rollers would be in the minority and the taxpayers could keep an eye on them. If this were done, Members of Congress wouldn't be under such tremendous pressure from the pay rollers, and their landlords, to keep unneeded people in Government employ.

On the other hand, the New Deal has frequently used decentralization as an excuse to colonize the Democratic voters in politically critical States. The suggestion is sometimes made that Government employees be required, in return for the protections of an honest Federal civil-service system, to surrender their franchise in congressional and Presidential elections. Much can be said against this proposal, but if it were adopted decentralization could proceed on the basis of efficiency without the temptation to use it to carry doubtful States.

Antitrust Laws Must Be Strengthened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address which I delivered on Station WWDC in Washington, D. C., on Saturday July 19, 1947. This program was sponsored by the National Federation of Small Business, Inc. It is one of a series of programs sponsored by this Small Business Association, in which the things that must be done to assist small businesses are discussed. The address is as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., is devoted to preserving the traditional American system of free enterprise and of helping create an economy in which small businesses have a chance to grow and prosper. In carrying out this purpose, the organization has properly decided that the prevention of monopolies is absolutely necessary. I am glad to have a part in this program because I believe in the purposes and goals of the National Federation of Small Business and I am particularly interested in that part of the program having to do with the prevention of monopolistic mergers.

CURBING MONOPOLY NOT PARTISAN ISSUE

This is not a partisan issue. President Hoover and the late President Roosevelt and President Truman all recommended a tightening up of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. The Federal Trade Commission has informed Congress from year to year of the tremendous number of unhealthy monopolistic mergers which have been made possible by the existence of this loophole. The Temporary National Economic Committee studied the defects in section 7 of the Clayton Act and strongly recommended an amendment to remove the present loophole.

We must decide very quickly what sort of country we want to live in. This Nation was founded and built by men who believed in individualism. It has grown great under a system carried on largely by individual capital. The increased concentration of economic power is dooming free enterprise. The present trend of great corporations to increase their economic power is directly contrary to meritorious competitive development. It is no accident that we now have big Government, big labor unions, and big business. The concentration of great economic power in a few corporations necessarily lends to the formation of large Nation-wide unions. The development of the two necessarily lends to big bureaus in the Government to deal with them. The inevitable result is statism of one sort or another. Local economic independence cannot be preserved in the face of consolidations such as we have had during the past few years. The control of American business is steadily being transferred from local communities to a few large cities in which central managers decide the policies and the fate of the far-flung enterprises they control. Millions of people depend helplessly on their judgment. Through monopolistic mergers the people are losing the power to direct their own economic welfare. When they lose the power to direct their economic welfare they also lose the means to direct their political future.

LOOPHOLE IN CLAYTON LAW MUST BE PLUGGED

This brings me to the major point of my discussion. What are we doing to prevent this steady rise in monopolistic mergers? You may ask why isn't the Federal Trade Commission stopping these mergers and acquisitions. You may say that the Federal Trade Commission was given the power to prevent acquisitions of stock of competing companies by the Clayton Act way back in 1914. Actually, after this law was passed, clever corporation lawyers discovered that although it prevented acquisitions of stock—which at that time was the current and prevailing method of effecting mergers—it said nothing about assets. As a result of Supreme Court decisions, the loophole was enlarged until the law became a nullity. Today, whenever the Federal Trade Commission tries to stop a stock acquisition, the intent of the law is easily circumvented by the purchase of assets plant, buildings, etc. Moreover, when acquisitions are made in the first instance through the purchase of assets, and no stock is involved in the transaction, the Commission has never had any authority to take action. In other words, the Commission is completely powerless whether or not stock is involved. Yet the intent of Congress in passing the Clayton Act—and I quote from the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of January 22, 1914—was "to arrest the creation of trusts, conspiracies, and monopolies in their incipiency."

The Commission itself has been fully aware of this glaring loophole in the antitrust laws, and since 1927 has recommended that it be plugged. Year in and year out the annual reports come to Congress from the Federal Trade Commission; year in and year out they urge the Congress to take action which would make the present law effective; and year in and year out we do nothing. It is true that lengthy hearings have been held in both houses of Congress; it is true that voluminous testimony has been taken; and it is true that practically no logical opposition to the bill has developed. Yet action has not been forthcoming.

During the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives held extensive

hearings on a bill designed to plug the loophole, which I filed. The small business organizations strongly supported the bill, as did numerous independent small businessmen. The House Judiciary Committee voted to approve the bill and it was sent to the Rules Committee of the House—where it died.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HAS REPORTED BILL

Again, this session the House Judiciary Committee has approved the bill, H. R. 3736. In a report No. 596 dated June 17, 1947, by Representative GWYNNE of Iowa, the majority of the Judiciary Committee stated:

"The history of legislation previously adopted to prevent monopoly, the great increase in recent years of competition-destroying mergers, the damage to small business, the blighting of opportunity for our young people—all cry out for the enactment of legislation to stop the rising tide of monopoly."

The report concludes with these words:

"In adopting the Sherman Act and later the Clayton Act, the Congress, without partisan division, gave expression to a virtually unanimous demand that our competitive economic system be protected against those forces of monopoly which would destroy it. The platforms of both major political parties have consistently carried planks approving the course thus charted. Both President Hoover and the late President Roosevelt recommended tightening up of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. President Truman has specifically recommended this amendment to the Clayton Act."

I must say that at the present time it appears that history is going to repeat itself. In the last session of Congress we held extensive hearings, the Judiciary Committee approved the bill, but the Rules Committee killed it. This session we have again held hearings, the Judiciary Committee has again approved the bill, but the Rules Committee will not give the House a chance to consider the measure.

One of the most forceful statements made in support of this bill before the Judiciary Committee was by Edward Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Small Business. Mr. Wimmer has been devoting a great part of his time to this monopoly question for many years and his statement made a deep impression on the members of the committee.

PRESENT CONCENTRATION PICTURE

What is the present concentration picture? As a result of a long-term, 75-year trend, economic concentration has reached dangerous heights, even before the outbreak of World War II. Thus the 200 largest nonfinancial corporations increased their relative importance from ownership of one-third of the assets in 1909 to 48 percent in 1929 and to 55 percent in the early thirties. In specific industries, the increase was even more dramatic. The four largest steel producers in 1880 owned 25 percent of the country's rolling-mill capacity; by 1938 they held 64 percent. Similarly, the three largest automobile companies accounted for 42 percent of the total output in 1909 and for more than 90 percent in 1938. And in copper, the four largest producers increased their share of the industry's output from approximately 50 percent in 1910 to 82 percent in 1937.

As a result of this sweeping rise of concentration, the role of the self-employed enterpriser has steadily dwindled. We are becoming, more and more, a Nation of people who work for others rather than for ourselves. Owning your own business and being your own boss appears to be going the way of the horse and buggy. Thus, while self-employed enterprisers constituted 37 percent of all the gainful workers in 1880, the proportion had fallen to only 19 percent in 1939. The only way to halt this decline in the area of individual enterprise is through measures such as H. R. 3736, which will arrest the increase in monopoly. There are few greater dangers to our free democratic way of life than a continuation of this trend toward working for others.

Although concentration had reached extreme heights even before the war, the conditions of war production gave it a further boost. Whether justified or not, contracts for war production were largely centralized in the hands of a few giant corporations. The 100 largest corporations received no less than 67 percent of all prime war contracts. This figure would undoubtedly have been even higher had not Congress established a special agency for small business, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which assisted in obtaining for small business nearly 60,000 prime contracts, with a value of some $6,000,000,000.

UPWARD MONOPOLY TREND SINCE WAR

With the end of the war, it was hoped that the level of concentration would turn downward and sink at least to the prewar levels, which, themselves, were much too high. But this was not to be. Big business emerged from the war with immense amounts of funds. At the end of 1945 the 62 largest manufacturing corporations held enough net working capital to purchase the assets of nearly 90 percent of the total number of all manufacturing corporations in the United States. Big business lost no time in putting this immense amount of money to work. Almost as soon as the outlines of victory appeared on the horizon, the merger movement turned sharply upward. Since 1940 over 1,800 formerly independent, substantial competitive firms in the manufacturing and mining industries alone have disappeared as a result of mergers and acquisitions, most of which have disappeared since 1943. On the basis of a 40-hour week, this averages about one every day!

The value of the concerns acquired amounted to nearly 5 percent of the total asset value of all manufacturing corporations—truly a sizeable chunk of the economy to fall out of the competitive picture in such a short period. Moreover, most of these acquisitions have consisted of the the purchase of small companies by big concerns. Nearly three-fourths of the total number of firms acquired have been absorbed by larger corporations with assets of over $5,000,000. More than a quarter of the total acquisitions have been made by companies within the Nation's top 200 manufacturing corporations. The other half of this picture of larger corporations taking over small firms is indicated by the fact that fully 70 percent of all the firms bought out have held assets of less than $1,000,000.

These are the inevitable conclusions from the undisputed testimony.

STATE CONTROL WILL RESULT UNLESS TREND IS CHECKED

(1) Economic concentration leads straight to State control and collectivism. There is not a single other highly industrialized nation in the entire world today which has not succumbed to one form or another of collectivism. And the invariable forerunner of state control has everywhere been the same—private monopoly. The reason for this is obvious. Under the capitalistic system as we know it, the public interest is supposed to be protected by competition. But when monopolies take over then the public interest must be protected in some other way. And the only "other way" available has been state control. If, then, we wish to prevent the emergence of collectivism in this country, we must take a leaf from the page of history and direct our efforts at the root cause of collectivism—private monopoly.

BIGNESS DOES NOT NECESSARILY MEAN EFFICIENCY

(2) Bigness does not necessarily mean efficiency. Several of the witnesses from small business emphatically denied the widespread belief that big organizations are always more efficient than small concerns. They emphasized the fact that the mere bringing together of separate independent concerns under common ownership contributes little, if anything, toward greater efficiency. In fact, several of them contended the reverse was true, that big corporations are actually less efficient than small firms, that they are vast bureaucratic organizations in which it is frequently all but impossible to "get things done," that in order to be independent from outside suppliers the big outfits often purchase expensive machinery and equipment which they actually use only a small part of the time, and that this idea that bigness is always better is nothing more than sheer propaganda of, by, and for monopoly.

PRESENT LAW IS ABSURDITY

(3) The present law regarding mergers is an absurdity. It is nothing short of ridiculous to prevent acquisitions of stock but to remain silent on acquisitions of assets. This type of loophole makes a mockery of the law. Either the law should prevent both types of acquisitions or it should prevent neither. But no one has suggested that the power to prevent stock acquisitions, which dates back to 1914, should be repealed. Consequently, if for no other reason than to make the law consistent with itself, the bill should be passed.

SHALL WE MAINTAIN FREE ENTERPRISE?

(4) The economic effect of the loophole in the law has been to create a striking contradiction which should be removed. Because of the loophole a premium has been placed upon the attainment of monopolistic ends by the completely final method of consolidation, as against the weaker and more vulnerable methods of cooperation among different firms. In other words the weaker, less effective methods of eliminating competition are clearly prohibited by the antitrust laws, but the permanent and more effective method of consolidated ownership under a single management is permissible. Moreover, the more effective is the enforcement of the law against collusion among competitors, the greater is the incentive to achieve the same ends through purchase, consolidation, and merger.

If we are going to maintain a competitive system, H. R. 3736 should be passed quickly. If the present tendency toward mergers continues we will be confronted soon with the choice of having the economic life of the country managed by private groups and by public groups. Nothing can be more important for the preservation of our way of life than the passage of necessary legislation to stop the march of monopolies.

Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at Bakersfield, Calif., during the western conference of the American Legion on air power:

We are gathered here today because a grave cloud hangs over our country. In these troubled times, so soon after World War II when the need for adequate national security is bitterly obvious, America is losing the race for air power.

There is no better evidence of this fact than the intensive Nation-wide campaign which the American Legion has launched to help America regain its leadership in the air and to educate the American people on the importance of air power as the spearhead of our national defense and security.

You are a wise audience, well schooled in the ways of war. Some of you served in the First World War as I did. A large portion of you here today have even a fresher memory of war because you served around the globe in the conflict that ended less than 2 years ago. As a consequence I know there is no need to point out to you the value of preparedness and the place of the airplane in our national security. You know what the airplane is, what purpose it serves in war and how much our Nation depends on military and naval air power for its defense. We of California have a greater awareness of air power than any of our sister States.

I think you will agree with me that the foremost mission of air power is to guarantee the air security of the United States and its air approaches, and to enable America to fulfill its role of leadership in achieving a peaceful world. You know full well that there is a better role which air power plays. It is the best and most forceful preventive of aggression that exists.

Our United States has been caught in two consecutive world wars in a position of complacency and extreme military weakness. In both these conflicts in which we played a part, our military and industrial machines were inadequately organized and staffed to cope with emergency mobilization. Only by virtue of time we didn't earn, and because of our immense reserves, because of the ingenuity of our industry, and the will of a frightened people and because of the years of grace won by our grimly fighting allies, were we able to prepare in time to finally bring the force to bear that helped win those two wars.

It has been true that America, always late to arm, has always decided the war.

The vital element, however, has been time. It took years to perfect the weapons for the Air Forces. Not until war jabbed us into activity did we overtake our enemies in the quality and quantity of our equipment and the size of our forces.

In this age of atomic air warfare which has come upon us so swiftly we can be dead certain that if there is a next time we will not have the luck and the time to prepare that we have had in the past. We will be the first target of a lightning mass attack by weapons of fantastic speeds and range and accuracy.

There will be no time to design and build masses of aircraft and to train crews to fly them. When a single bomber can wipe out a city and kill 100,000 people, the first 24 hours of any future war could see this Nation knocked out of action if we are again caught unprepared. We would have no warning. It would be Pearl Harbor all over again on a fantastic and sickening scale.

I am not being a warmonger nor an alarmist. I am merely stating the facts as I see them. The day of the 10,000-mile range bomber is here. Any city anywhere in the United States is a closer and easier target for a future aggressor than Pearl Harbor was to the Japanese in December 1941.

I'll tell you exactly what I mean. Last fall we Americans were patting ourselves on the back because of a flight over the North Pole. You know the facts. The B–29 called *Pacusan Dreamboat* took off from Honolulu and made a 9,000-mile flight over the North Pole to Cairo, Egypt. We were very proud of that flight. It was our first nonstop venture over the broadest military highway in the world—the polar region.

That was in 1946. That B–29 was the first plane we had with which we could attempt such a military flight. But here's something I don't want you to forget when you start measuring our prowess in the air. Nearly 10 years before the B–29 made its flight over the polar region someone else flew the polar region, only they came the other way.

On July 15, 1937, while our first long-range bombers were still a dream, three Russian airmen established a world's nonstop distance record over the polar air highway.

Mark this well, you who live here in California: Three Soviet airmen, Gromov, Danilin, and Yumashev flew their plane from Moscow to San Jacinto, Calif., in 62 hours and 2 minutes. They flew nonstop 6,262 miles from the heart of Russia right into our own back yard.

I don't think it is necessary to elaborate further on what that flight, made nearly 10 years ago, means in the annals of world air power today.

I want you to remember that Russian nonstop transpolar flight when you hear a lot of foolish chatter about what Russia can't do with its military air power. The same people who starved our air forces in the years before World War II are the same people who are telling us today that we have nothing to worry about and nothing to fear from any nation, because we can outfly and outfight them all and always have.

Less than 2 weeks ago the papers here in California and those across the country made a great to-do about the new-type airplanes which were previewed for the aviation writers convention in Los Angeles. The jet bombers produced by North American, Douglas, and Convair, and the jet fighters by Bell and Douglas, were thrilling things to watch in the air.

But to place our faith in one single handful of test models could be typically American

There are undoubtedly people here today and others across the country who saw pictures of those new planes in the newspapers and went to bed feeling fat, smug, and satisfied with themselves and with their country.

Let me tell you that those who did are doping their minds with delusions of grandeur and with air power that is still in the incubator stage. One experimental plane, though essentially important in itself for what it represents, cannot make a striking force nor win any air battles. These new plane types that you hear so much about are good omens of good intentions, but they are only tokens of the air power we need to defend this country in a troubled world. They do not constitute an air force in being.

Let me give you another example of how easy it is for the American people to delude themselves about the strength of our air power. About a month ago our eastern cities were raided by more than 100 B–29's. They made a great to-do about these raids in the papers. But what they failed to emphasize, and what you and I fail to realize, is that those 130 B–29's constitute the entire United States strategic air force.

Think that over. They represent, I repeat, every B–29 that the Army Air Forces could fly at this time. More than that, they had weeks to prepare for the raid. They wouldn't have 1 day's preparation if war struck us as it did at Pearl Harbor. But, keep this in mind, those 130 B–29's wouldn't make a good little finger in 1 day's aerial fist. We put thousands of planes in the air in 1 day over the beaches of Normandy and we thought nothing of sending 500 or more B–29's on a single raid against Japan Today all we can put in the air as a strategic air force are those 130 airplanes.

As you have heard from the other speakers today the entire picture of American air power is a sad and discouraging one. I want to add another segment to that story. It is one with which I am personally familiar.

Just 2 weeks ago on the floor of the House, the Army Air Forces appropriation bill for 1948 was brought up for approval. The amount that was finally submitted by the President to the Congress for a vote was less than half the security minimums originally recommended by the Army Air Forces. Their request for a 70-group striking force as the barest essential to defend our country had been thoroughly slashed by the War Department and by the Bureau of the Budget before it was sent to the Congress.

I can say, fortunately, that although our Congress is in a budget-cutting mood at the moment, the House of Representatives voted every cent that the Air Forces was given by the Bureau of the Budget because, during a last-minute rally from the floor we were able to restore a $40,000,000 cut for new planes.

The point I want to make is this. The AAF appropriation now allows a grand total of 749 new planes for the Air Forces. That means not all jets and B–36's but 749 new planes of all types. Most of these planes, the big ones, will not be delivered to the Air Forces for service until about 1950.

That total of 749 planes added to the 575 planes which were allowed by the Congress to naval aviation adds up to the staggering sum of 1,324 planes. Even the combined figures for the two services are less than the 1,700 planes which General Spaatz of the Army Air Forces asked for in his testimony and in the initial Army Air Forces budget request alone.

The fact that our military air services have been granted 1,324 planes for 1948 is a sad commentary in itself. However, when one realizes that this total is less than one-half of the number of military planes recommended by the President's Air Coordinating Committee as the rock-bottom minimum necessary for an aircraft industry upon which we could depend in time of emergency to produce the planes we need.

The Air Coordinating Committee after a 2-year study made the flat recommendation that if the aircraft industry, the core of our air power, is to be of any value in a national emergency it must produce a very minimum of 3,000 military aircraft and transports each year. That recommendation was based on the condition that the United Nations was thoroughly functioning, with a police force of its own and that the world was pretty much at peace. That isn't the case today, as you well know.

A critical world situation, such as we now have, would require an annual output of not less than 5,780 planes a year according to the Air Coordinating Committee. In other words, we have allotted sufficient funds to produce less than one-fourth of the planes absolutely essential to the minimum existence of both our aircraft industry and our Air Forces. That means that you and I as Americans have a long, hard way to go before we can regain our leadership in the air.

In these days of economy in government those who are aware of the significance of air power take little heart from the fact that the House did restore that $40,000,000. As far as our national air power security is concerned that budget restoration and the entire budgets voted for Army and Naval air power are far below the security minimums which you and I need to protect our homes and families and our country. The best we can expect under current operating conditions is a second- or third-rate air power. Let me warn you again A second-rate air power is like a second-best poker hand. When the showdown comes, it can't win.

Thus far we have spoken of military air power and the fact that our United States is losing the race for military air power to at least two nations we know of—Great Britain and Russia.

Air power as it relates to our national security is a far broader thing than the air striking force.

One of the finest and most comprehensive concepts of air power is contained in the

American Legion program. The Legion lists the six segments of air power as follows:

First. Public air-mindedness: A complete public understanding of the singular importance of air power to our national security, to world peace, and to the United Nations is the vital requirement for American leadership in the air age.

Second. Intensive aeronautical research: An intensive program of aeronautical research and development is a basic, urgent requirement for American leadership in the air.

Third. Sound industrial preparedness: The air battles of World War II were as much contests between Allied and Axis industries as they were between air forces. For this reason, our future national security in the air depends equally upon both military and industrial preparedness.

Fourth. Healthy air-transport system: A sound and growing air-transportation system, competent to assume its role in the movement and communications of any future war, is of vital importance to American air power.

Fifth. Alert aircraft industry: As World War II proved, a strong aircraft industry, capable of rapid expansion in any emergency, is the bulwark of an adequate air force and, consequently, of our national security.

Sixth. Strong air forces: In this age of lightning warfare and increasingly terrible weapons, America has no defense or no security unless they are spearheaded by strong, permanent air forces which have superior equipment and adequately trained personnel.

These six segments of air power cannot be tackled as individual entities on a haphazard, piece-meal, year-to-year basis. For instance, we can't suddenly decide that all our money should go into aeronautical research and let the other factors lag while we try to catch up in research, simply because research cannot be considered as a separate item. It is only one of the integrated components of air power.

We cannot regain leadership of the air by making starts and spurts. It must be an integrated and continuous over-all effort. The root of the entire problem, to my mind, is a national aviation policy. Such a policy group would encompass a continuing study of and getting action on all the integrated phases of air power as they affect this Nation and the world, militarily and economically.

In these days of continual and even revolutionary progress in aviation, it might amaze you to know there has been no governmental review of commercial and military aviation policies leading to positive national action since the survey conducted by the Morrow Board in 1925. The legislation directly resulting from the Morrow Board survey—the Air Corps Act of 1926 and the Naval Air Corps Act of 1926—is now more than 20 years old. Even the Civil Aviation Act of 1938 is nearly a decade old.

The net results of this lag in our national thinking and policy is comparable to handling a jet plane by the same rules that we did the horse and buggy. There is little need to remind you that there have been extraordinary changes in the techniques and in the economics of air power since the days of the Morrow Board. Top air speeds in those days were around 175 miles an hour. Today we have planes that are probing the transonic at nearly 700 miles per hour. Guided missiles and rockets are moving at speeds three to five times that figure and we are entering a period of commercial aviation of traveling at 300 or more miles per hour.

As we discussed earlier the mightiest lesson of World War II was the advent of air power as the greatest striking force in the world. When that happened, as it did in the final months of World War II, it gave this and every other nation in the world a new prime instrument of national policy. Today air power is the instrument for maintaining world peace and our own national security. During the reign of British and American sea power the great navies of the world were the instruments of national and international policy. Today there is no argument that air power has superseded sea power although we can make good use of both when the situation warrants.

It is certainly evident that air-power policy must have a severe and immediate overhauling in all its aspects so that it can be reshaped to meet the crying need today for American strength and world leadership both at home and abroad.

I am happy to report here today that a bill which I had the pleasure of introducing into the House of Representatives to formulate such an air policy has been passed by the House and is now in the hands of the Senate. This bill H. R. 3587 would set up a National Aviation Council charged with charting a coordinated Federal aviation policy covering all aspects of air power. This Council will replace the Air Coordinating Committee which was established in September 1946. The National Aviation Council would include representatives of the State, War, Navy, Commerce, and Post Office Departments, and the Federal Communications Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Council would be advised by a 10-member board drawn from the ranks of the aviation industry.

As stated in the bill itself, the Council's duties would be "formulating, unifying, and clarifying national policies relating to or affecting national aviation, including policies related to maintenance of an adequate manufacturing industry and of monitoring and harmonizing the pertinent activities of the affected branches of the Government in accord with such policies."

Here and now I would like to thank the American Legion, and in particular the Aviators Post, No. 350, of Los Angeles, for the strong resolution in which they endorsed a national air-policy board. The terse and sound reasons which that post cited in its resolution are precisely the ones which urged me to introduce the air-policy bill. As I understand it, this resolution has now been adopted by the national executive committee of the American Legion and has become a cornerstone in its air-power program.

I sincerely hope that, as the first comprehensive attack on the problems in air power that this Congress will pass a national air-policy bill which formally establishes such a group as a Government agency and which requires regular surveys and reporting of the facts to the Congress so that new challenges and new problems can be coped with before it is too late. Once such a group is established, it will need the heartiest possible support of the American Legion, of all aviation supporters, and of all clear-thinking, security-minded Americans. Without such an air policy we can never regain world leadership in the air.

The facts are hard and obvious. We have let American air power dwindle from a world giant to a pigmy. In doing it we have torn our air defenses from the skies and left our homes and cities open to attack from any direction, particularly from over the polar regions. We are inviting attack and disaster even as we did in 1941. When I say that we are responsible, I mean every American has it upon his conscience. This critical situation in air power is almost unbelievable in the face of the world situation, which hardly improves by the hour.

A big stick in Moscow and a palsied hand in the United States are not compatible. Either we are unbelievably impractical in going before the world with a definite stand for democracy and self-determination for small nations or downright stupid in destroying our air power, which first and foremost could prevent totalitarianism from running wild on the face of the earth. In short, the United States stands in the world picture with a first-rate responsibility and a third-rate air power. Instead of having a big stick and a soft word to get results on the international scene, we Americans carry a twig and sing basso profundo. If this strange combination adds up to world peace or hope of freedom or our own national security, then all of history is a perjured witness.

The Fears of Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech made by Oveta Culp Hobby at the May meeting in Boston of the Advertising Federation of America. The subject is The Fears of Transition:

Madam Chairman, members of the Women's Council, and guests, for 22 solid months, we have been quaking in our boots—terrified of our own creation, atomic energy.

No Dr. Frankenstein could be more pitiably afraid of the monster he made, than we have been and are of potentially the most marvelous discovery man has ever produced.

It is high time—it is imperative—that we straighten up, look our terror in the face, and master our attitude toward the new force which we have unleashed.

It is exactly as though Benjamin Franklin had caught lightning with his kite—and then raced home and hidden under the bed from fear.

It is as though James Watt—after expounding the theory of steam—had then called in all his neighbors to help him bury the teakettle, and had spent the next 2 years worrying himself to a shred for fear a Spaniard or a Frenchman across the channel would make the same discovery by watching their teakettles.

Steam can blast a man to bits, scalding his flesh and wrecking his boiler room. But harnessed by men, it has been our domestic animal which has pulled our railroad cars across the continents, which has carried oil to China, silk to San Francisco, coffee and/or tea to Boston, and travelers to every port of the seven seas.

Lightning can kill without the benefit of the science of man, and electricity is used to give the most gruesome and sizzling deaths to murderers in the electric chair. But do you live in constant dread of it? It powers our streetcars and our telephones. It lights our bedlamps, our primping mirrors, and our reading rooms with far less danger and far greater obedience than the old-fashioned candle could.

And we have harnessed it to our washing machines, our deep-freezes, our lawn mowers, and even—this is a painful thought—even to our alarm clocks.

I knew a newspaperman once who went on a hunting trip in the mountainous backwoods of Alabama. He ran across a 12-year-old boy who had never been out of his backwoods home and forest in his life. He had never seen a paved road, much less a town. The man, really touched by the boy's lack of experiences, took him back to Birmingham for a visit. They parked the car in front of a cafeteria, but before they could get inside a streetcar rattled by. The little boy, startled as a woodland creature, fled across the sidewalk and cowered terrified in a door-

way, convinced that this clanking, jangling monster meant his death.

Only a superstitious mountain child would fear electricity. Yet we are being as frightened of the whole idea of atomic energy as that 12-year-old mountain boy was of a streetcar.

It could be tolerated—this flight into fear—if the results of our fears were not so stultifying.

A minister recently preached a muchly bruited sermon on Men of Science—the New Evil.

Science is not evil—unless we turn it to evil purposes. Splitting the atom is not in itself evil—it is potentially the most glorious single event in human history.

After 22 months of quaking, the time has come for us to stand up and hail atomic energy for what it is—the instrument of a new world, courageous or callow.

Taming atomic energy is admittedly not an easy job. Breaking a wild horse from the range wasn't easy either. But only the man who had the courage to tackle the beautiful and powerful animal ever achieved a fine saddle horse.

Unless we begin to bridle this great new power now, we cannot expect to enjoy the limitless beauties and thrills of its use.

Controlling atomic energy before it conquers the spirit of mankind and decimates him as a specie is a dangerous job—a thrilling and a challenging job, with everything to gain and nothing to lose.

It means that we as people must vault to political maturity.

In his remarkable document Modern Man Is Obsolete, Norman Cousins has analyzed man's ability to reach this new greatness.

"Modern man is obsolete," he said, "a self-made anachronism becoming more incongruous by the minute. He has exalted changes in everything but himself. He has leaped centuries ahead in inventing a new world to live in, but he knows little or nothing about his own part in that world. He has surrounded and confounded himself with gaps—gaps between revolutionary technology and evolutionary man, between cosmic gadgets and human wisdom, between intellect and conscience.

"Given ample time, man might be expected eventually to span these gaps normally, but by his own hand he is destroying even time. Decision and execution in the modern world are becoming virtually synchronous. Thus whatever gaps man has to span, he will have to span immediately.

"Man is left, then, with a crisis in decision. The main test before him involves his will to change rather than his ability to change. That he is capable of change is certain. For there is no more mutable or adaptable animal in the world."

Reducing it to flat terms, Mr. Cousins has said that before man can master atomic energy he must first master his own fears.

That he must transform himself from the national man into the world man.

That—and this is the point to which all others are leading—we men of all nations must find and establish our self-government on a world basis before we can enter the new era. America obviously cannot live in the atomic age, leaving other nations behind in the obsolescent machine age, and at the same time she scarcely dares turn atomic energy loose in anything but a unified one world.

"Man is a world warrior," Mr. Cousins says. "It is time for him to grow up and become a world citizen. He will have to recognize the flat truth that the greatest obsolescence of all in the atomic age is national sovereignty.

"It is a tribal instinct * * * We have invested it with nonexistent powers. We assume that it stil means national independence, the right to get into war or stay out of it. We even debate the question of surrendering some of our sovereignty—as though there is still something to surrender. There is nothing left to surrender. There is only something to gain. A common world sovereignty."

Do you remember when you were a child studying history in grade school? Do you remember the passage about the American Revolution, when the Redcoats—finest troops of the time—marched down a dusty American road just as they would have marched to battle on the Continent. That was the custom of war as they knew it.

But American woodsmen, hardened to alertness and guile in Indian warfare, worked from behind trees and simply mowed down the correctly marching troops.

The Americans were smart, the Redcoats pathetically stupid in their excellent training and outmoded convention.

But those Redcoats were no more stupid in 1776 than was the United States of America in 1941. Powerful, well trained in all the so-called rules of war, we were amazed when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. We called it a sneak attack. We felt that they should have sent us a formal declaration of war, that they should have said "Hold still, America, we are going to hit you."

The Japanese were amused at our child-like faith in the rules by which war should be fought.

National sovereignty today is another of those naive rules. As a nation, we can grow up, mature, use our minds and intelligence to find the way to a new era in history. Or we can cross our fingers in that childish "king's X" which we call national sovereignty. If another nation violates our "king's X," we can try to shout "That's not fair"—if we are still alive to shout. But the gamble on the security of rules and phrase doesn't look too sure.

If on the other hand, we used the United Nations forum as a meeting hall to which all nations may be called, in order that we may lay before them a plan for world federation, then we have placed our chips on the side which loses us nothing, and gains us a chance at life.

War has never gained any man or any nation a lasting achievement. For one moment, stop and think. Forget that you are a New Yorker or a Bostonian, or a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian, forget that you are an American—remember only that you are a part of all mankind.

As a human being, part of a single species, do you desire peace, or one last final smashing war which will destroy all the major part of your kind? The answer is obvious—a matter of simple gumption.

So long as the world is divided into parts—even two parts—the chance of war remains. But if all mankind is fused into a single government—just as Texas and Massachusetts and California and Florida are fused—there are no two forces between which war can exist.

The will to unite, to become one people, the decision of man to become cooperative rather than competitive on this one small world, is now up to mankind.

Mankind is not a great anonymous "they"—it is you and I and all like us.

And let us be completely honest—the job is really more ours than it is for most men on earth.

For two reasons—we are literate and we are American.

On the first count, look at the educational statistics of this country alone: In the 1940 census, of 85,000,000 persons over 20 years of age quizzed, almost 3,000,000 had never gone to school at all, and another 8,000,000 had had only between 1 and 4 years of school. Still another 28,000,000 had never gone beyond elementary school.

This makes a total of 39,000,000 Americans who cannot be counted upon to understand their own Government, much less to help plan so vast a thing as a world government. Half of these probably can't read their daily newspapers, and not many of the other half could analyze the ideas expressed in the newspapers even if they were to read them.

There are not many men who, on 2 or 3 years of schooling, gain sufficient impetus to go ahead with their reading and their self-education. I know of one man who became a millionaire and a Member of Congress on only a few months of grade school. But the fact that he is remarkable enough to mention, proves his rarity.

You know from your own business experience that the average man or woman who had only 1 to 3 years of school has lapsed back into functional illiteracy by the time he is grown. The selective service turned down thousands of men because though they could read and write their own names—and technically should be labeled literate—they could not use reading and writing with enough intelligence to function in modern mechanized warfare.

Thus—simply by being a high-school graduate—one goes among the select few. And any citizen who has had college training has had a privilege so rare that he automatically receives a responsibility of civic leadership, of active citizenship in self-government of man by man.

Simply by being sufficiently literate to be a business woman or man, to attend this meeting today, you have proven your obligation to society.

Second, as Americans—that point is obvious. America, for a time at least, is top nation in the world. We are not hungry—and most of the world is. We are not cold—and most of the world was so this winter.

We have reached a certain maturity as an industrial nation—which much of South and Central America has not—but we are not yet past our prime and crippled by war, as much of Europe and Asia is.

Therefore, America as a nation has the responsibility to lead among nations.

This means that the brunt of world leadership falls upon educated Americans. On you.

And what are educated Americans doing? Sitting fearfully at home behind the strong line of General Marshall's diplomacy—as far behind it as we can shrink—but still apparently sure that doom is inevitable.

If anything is un-American, that is. Timorousness, caution, self-doubt—they are against everything we mean when we say "American." The great American tradition has been the self-confident, the cocky, the surely shrewd. With all the world numbed by two wars, this is no time for America to lose its esprit.

Out of fear, for 2 years we have been pandering to expediency. We have had international palsy since VJ-day.

The time has come for us to take command of our own souls and our own destinies.

The hour of decision approaches. Shall we stick our heads in Henry Wallace's sand, or shall we take our medicine manfully? The strong member of a family assumes responsibility. The strong members of a good community assume leadership. Strong nations must assume leadership. Leadership of any kind is not easy, cheap, or comfortable.

Bigness, productivity, resources carry responsibilities and the hardest of these is the decision to carry the load of leadership.

Henry Wallace knows this. He recognizes our strong desire to live alone and like it.

He is planting the seeds of discord in an attempt to destroy the effectiveness of our announced foreign policy. Unfortunately, some of these seeds will fall on receptive soil—but God grant that thinking Americans will pick up the pack of leadership.

The next decade may be the proving ground of peace or the prelude to war. We must live dangerously. So, if we must—let us live fearlessly for peace rather than fearfully for war.

The Rubber Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Organization and Mobilization of the Armed Services Committee is charged with the task of preparing legislation which will assure a permanent synthetic-rubber industry in this Nation. As chairman of that subcommittee, I feel that the Congress should be informed of the progress that has been made with respect to the development of this legislation. However, before discussing the various proposals that have been made and the problems involved, I would like to submit briefly the reasons that make necessary a permanent synthetic-rubber industry in the United States.

In time of peace, rubber is as necessary to our economy as coal, food, and oil. In time of war rubber is so essential to the Nation that without it victory is impossible. It requires 75 tons of rubber to commission a battleship. One ton of rubber is needed to produce each tank. Airplanes, jeeps, submarines—everything with which we fight modern war requires rubber.

When we entered World War II our total natural-rubber stock consisted of 533,000 long tons with an additional 100,000 tons afloat. This was less than 1 year's peacetime consumption and considerably less than the 700,000 tons per year required for military and essential civilian needs. When Singapore fell to the Japanese in 1942, 90 percent of the world's natural-rubber supply was denied the United Nations. From January 1, 1942, to VJ-day, the United States imported only 315,000 long tons of natural rubber, or less than one-half of the prewar average annual imports. So serious was the rubber supply in the Nation that in September 1942 Bernard Baruch reported to the President:

> We find the existing situation to be so dangerous that unless corrective measures are taken immediately this country will face both a military and civilian collapse.

Immediate steps were taken. Gasoline rationing, tire inspections, maximum speed limits, and other efforts were undertaken to conserve our limited supply of natural rubber. Scrap rubber collection drives were inaugurated which were successful in obtaining 900,000 tons of scrap rubber, but this could not be substituted for new natural rubber in many cases. A substitute for natural rubber had to be found. When we entered World War II, only a small start had been made in the production of synthetic rubber. In 1941, 8,000 long tons of synthetic rubber were produced in small privately owned plants throughout the United States. But this was woefully inadequate. Thus, in order to supplement our small supply of natural rubber, we expended over $700,000,000 to build the synthetic-rubber industry to a point where we were able to produce, in 1944, more than 1,000,000 long tons of synthetic rubber.

With the end of the war a natural-rubber supply of limited quantity was reopened to world trade. But during 1946, natural rubber was in short supply and it was necessary for Congress to continue allocation, specification, and inventory controls as it had done during the war. Due to a continued shortage, in March of this year Congress enacted Public Law 24 which extended these controls to March 31, 1948. In addition, that law states that it is the policy of the United States that there shall be maintained at all times in the interest of national security and common defense a technologically advanced and rapidly expandable rubber-producing industry, of sufficient productive capacity to assure the availability in times of national emergency of adequate supplies of domestically produced rubber to meet the industrial, military, and naval needs of the country.

I think we all agree that we must never again be in the precarious position we were in after Pearl Harbor. We can no longer be dependent upon foreign supply for a product as essential as rubber. Thus, in order to assure the continued availability of rubber, it is necessary that we prepare and pass legislation which will not only provide for the continuous operation of synthetic plants but will also provide sufficient stand-by capacity to adequately fill the essential needs of the country in time of war. In addition, we must assure the Nation of a continued technological development in synthetic rubber. Synthetic or domestic rubber is in its infancy and it is felt by many that in the not-too-distant future domestically produced rubber will be superior in all respects to natural rubber. Even now synthetic rubber is far superior to natural rubber in certain respects. For example, synthetic rubber is far superior to natural rubber in the production of rubber fuel hose. Inner tubes made from butyl are in many respects far superior to those made from natural rubber. Still there is much improvement necessary. We cannot yet make a satisfactory truck tire using a substantial amount of synthetic rubber. Airplane tires still must be made with natural rubber. Even the inner tubes to which I referred cannot compete with natural rubber tubes in exceptionally cold climates. There is much room for advancement in domestic rubber. We have only scratched the surface. But we must continue to advance and we dare not allow the plants and know-how we now possess to be lost.

Thus, on May 8 of this year, the subcommittee conducted an informal meeting with many representatives of the rubber industry and the various Government agencies. At that time, it appeared possible that industry and Government could agree on at least an acceptable working outline for proposed legislation. We requested the Army-Navy Munitions Board to meet with industry and to prepare these recommendations. At the same time we asked industry to consult freely with members of the committee and to feel free to offer any constructive suggestions that they might have with regard to this legislation. We did this because members of the subcommittee felt that legislation so far-reaching must have the support and cooperation of industry. We felt that this was highly desirable since this legislation must inevitably affect the entire future of the rubber industry in this country. Since the rubber industry must live with the legislation, we felt that it should have a large part in the framing of workable legislation.

Pursuant to the subcommittee's request of May 8, the Army-Navy Munitions Board prepared recommendations for a proposed rubber program. On July 9 of this year, the Army-Navy Munitions Board presented an outline of proposed legislation which met with the majority approval of the Government agencies involved but did not meet with the majority approval of industry.

In effect, this proposed legislation would establish a National Rubber Council consisting of the Secretary of Commerce as its chairman, the Secretary of State, Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy and such other Cabinet members as the President might designate. In addition, it would establish within the Department of Commerce a rubber administration under the direction of an administrator appointed by the Secretary of Commerce with the approval of the council. It is proposed that the council should promulgate regulations with respect to the mandatory use of synthetic rubber in articles and products manufactured in the United States as it determined to be necessary to carry out the general policy of maintaining a domestic rubber-producing industry. Such regulations would only be issued after consultation with an industrial advisory committee appointed by the council. The council, under the proposed legislation, would report to the President and Congress at least once each year.

The proposed legislation also would limit the mandatory amount of general-purpose synthetic rubber that must be put into tires and tire-retreading materials to not more than 85 percent of the entire mandatory use of general-purpose rubber. In this connection, it is important to note that the Board recommended that Congress should determine that the total active and stand-by capacity of the United States to produce general-purpose synthetic rubber should be 600,000 long tons per annum and that one-third of the total of general purpose and natural rubber consumption should be general purpose synthetic rubber and 4 percent of the estimated total of new rubber consumed should be synthetic rubber suitable for the manufacture of automobile inner tubes.

As for disposal of existing plants, the legislation suggests that the RFC request offers in writing from private industry. Such offers would be submitted to the Council for the formulation of an overall disposal plan. But, until such plants are disposed of, they would continue to be operated by the RFC. The stand-by facilities not disposed of would be placed under the jurisdiction of the Council but would be maintained by the Federal Works Agency as directed by the Council.

In other words, these recommendations provide for the consumption of synthetic rubber, mandatory usage of synthetic rubber, a governmental agency to administer the act including a rubber council and a rubber administration in the Department of Commerce, and an over-all assurance of the production of at least 600,000 long tons of general purpose synthetic in the event of a national emergency.

Industry has already made known to the subcommittee its opposition to these recommendations. It opposes the creation of a new agency to regulate the controls of consumption of rubber and it opposes, at present, a program that does not terminate within a short period of time. Some rubber manufacturers state that in the near future synthetic rubber may be able to stand up competitively with natural rubber. Thus, some feel there is no need for any long-range policy involving the creation of a new bureau. Why it is not easy to obtain unanimity in this project is obvious.

The United States is the largest importer of natural rubber in the world. Were we to manufacture domestic rubber entirely and no longer import any natural rubber, we would affect disastrously the economies of many nations. It is not our desire to do that. In addition, since there are still many products made of rubber that are superior to those made from synthetic, we do not desire that the American consumer should have to unduly suffer as the result of this legislation. We must determine how much synthetic rubber should be produced annually in this country. The estimates in that respect run from 100,000 tons a year to one-third of all the rubber consumed in the Nation in any one year. This involves the actual production and ultimate consumption of synthetic rubber. We must determine how much stand-by capacity should be preserved. When we have determined this amount we must decide how we are going to keep these stand-by plants in preservation.

Assuming that we have determined the amount of synthetic rubber that will be produced in this country and the amount of potential synthetic rubber that can be produced in the event of a national emergency, we must then determine how this rubber will be consumed. Should we make its use mandatory under end-use-specification control or should we subsidize the manufacture of synthetic rubber? After these questions have been satisfactorily answered we must then determine what types of synthetic rubber should be manufactured and what types should be protected and what types should involve required consumption.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, when I use the term "synthetic rubber" I cannot confine that to a single rubber. There are various types of synthetic rubber. By far the largest amount produced during the war was GRS or general-purpose rubber, out of which most of our passenger tires were manufactured. That type of synthetic rubber can be mixed with natural rubber and today passenger tires use a high percentage of synthetic rubber. There is another type of synthetic rubber known as butyl which is used in the manufacture of inner tubes. This synthetic rubber cannot be mixed with natural rubber. Then there is neoprene, which is used in the manufacture of such things as fuel hose. Therefore, it is necessary to determine what types of synthetic rubber must be protected by the Government in order to insure their continued availability. We are told by some that butyl can stand on its own feet in competition with natural rubber. Others say that it cannot stand against natural rubber either in quality or in price competition. Some say that neoprene is so far superior to natural rubber that it needs no protection. Others say that the better part of discretion would be to protect at least a small amount of neoprene production.

Even after we have found a solution to all of these problems, Mr. Speaker, we must then determine what effect our synthetic-rubber program will have upon the world markets. There can be little doubt that the very fact that we are preparing legislation which will assure the production and consumption of synthetic rubber in this Nation has had a salutary effect upon the price of natural rubber in the world markets.

Since Government purchasing ceased in March of this year under Public Law 24, the price of natural rubber has fallen more than 6 cents per pound and today it is selling at approximately 14½ cents a pound. This may be attributed either partly or wholly to the fact that the Government ceased being the sole purchaser of all natural rubber for American consumption after March 31 of this year, or it may be due in part to the fact that we are going to continue the production of domestic rubber.

After we have solved the question of the international effect of our synthetic-rubber program, we then come to the most perplexing question of all. How should we dispose of the synthetic plants now owned by the Government? Should we lease them at high or low rentals? To whom should we lease the plants? Should we sell them to the highest bidder? Even after we have decided upon the method of disposal, we are still faced with the problem of who will purchase or acquire these plants. At present, synthetic rubber is selling for approximately 18½ cents a pound. This is 4 cents more than natural rubber. During the period when natural rubber sold for more than synthetic rubber, the purchasers of synthetic rubber were relatively happy to buy domestic rubber, at a price less than that charged for natural rubber. At that time there was a market for synthetic rubber based on price alone. Now, however, the price of natural rubber is 4 cents less than synthetic, and those who must purchase synthetic, in effect, pay a premium. If we require the consumption of a certain percentage of synthetic rubber, we will in effect be granting a monopoly to those who operate the synthetic plants.

On the other hand, if we do not assure a market, no one will assume the risk of operating the plant. Having found the solution to these problems, we must also provide in our legislation for the assurance of technological development in production and use of synthetic rubber and then we must protect our own American producers from foreign importations of all-natural-rubber products. After having solved this we must then determine how the act will be administered.

Speaking for myself and for other members of the subcommittee, I can assure you that we do not desire to establish a Government bureau that will control the rubber industry with volumes of red tape and regulations, necessitating expensive bookkeeping and endless reports. It is our conviction that this legislation should involve the barest minimum of Government control.

These are some of the perplexing problems that face us, but with the benefit of the views of the Army-Navy Munitions Board and with the advice of industry, the subcommittee is confident that it can present to Congress in January a workable, efficient bill which will accomplish the purposes desired. The subcommittee will meet during the congressional recess and hold hearings on the entire rubber situation.

Veterans' Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

Gen. OMAR N. BRADLEY,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL BRADLEY: As a result of the discussion of veterans' insurance participated in by you, Mr. Harold W. Breining, Assistant Administrator, the Honorable Dayton Phillips, chairman of the Subcommittee on Insurance, Col. Victor C. Cole, and I, on July 16, 1947, and from information secured during the recent survey of veterans' insurance procedures made under my direction, we make specific recommendations for changes in Veterans' Administration insurance procedures and practices which it is believed will result in improved insurance service to veterans and their dependents.

We are aware of the fact that the recommendations contained herein are not new. They have been made before by procedures experts both within and outside of Veterans' Administration. The usual reasons given for failure to adopt or put into effect such procedural changes heretofore have been lack of time to properly organize the VA insurance operation, lack of time to train personnel, the existence of large backlogs and an inadequate number of personnel in the Insurance Division.

We have been sympathetic to these conditions. We believe, however, that sufficient time has now elapsed since VJ-Day to make it imperative that the VA insurance operation be established on a permanent and modernized basis at the earliest possible date and that services commonly provided by commercial insurance companies be included in

the insurance services rendered by Veterans' Administration.

It is believed that the limit has about been reached as to the number of people Veterans' Administration will be permitted to employ. It is pointed out that the Insurance Division of VA now employs more people per policy in force than any of the commercial insurance companies. It is believed that the matter of training and the time necessary to accomplish training has been overemphasized, particularly with respect to clerical employees performing routine tasks. If backlogs have not been liquidated after 2 years of operation it is probably because methods employed on current work continue to create new backlogs.

We believe that the present VA insurance procedure, including the premium billing and accounting system, which may have been adequate for the requirements of World War I, does not meet today's requirements and that the entire system needs overhauling and modernization. This conclusion is supported by the failure of the present system to provide services which are standard practice among commercial insurance companies. Among such services are:

Prompt issuance of insurance policies to all holders of insurance, term or otherwise.

Prompt payment of dividends when surplus is accumulated.

Mailing of premium notices a few days prior to due date rather than at the convenience of the office.

Mailing of warning notices to unpaid accounts after due date but prior to expiration of the grace period.

Prompt replies to letters and prompt action on requests for changes.

There is no valid reason why the veteran should receive any less efficient insurance service for his dollar when he spends it with his Government than he would receive if he spent it with a commercial insurance company.

The Assistant Administrator for Insurance has indicated that his time is largely consumed on matters concerning Government insurance law, precedent, and history and that he has, therefore, been unable to devote any appreciable time to methods and procedures. Certainly the important subjects of Government insurance law, precedent, and history on which the present Assistant Administrator is so eminently qualified constitute, of themselves, a full-time assignment. In the face of this situation, it is apparent that the Assistant Administrator has lacked capable assistance in the function of business management of the VA insurance operation.

The following recommendations, therefore, are submitted for your consideration. It will be greatly appreciated if you will advise me not later than September 1, 1947, what action if any, has been taken or is contemplated on each of these recommendations at that time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. The present Assistant Administrator for Insurance be appointed to a position where the Administrator may have the benefit of his full-time counsel on the important subjects of Government insurance law, precedent, and history and that the business management of the VA Insurance Division be delegated to an experienced business executive, not necessarily an insurance expert, who will be responsible for management, methods and procedures, personnel, and service in the VA Insurance Division.

2. The Administrator assign a procedures expert, preferably from within Veterans' Administration but not an employee of the Insurance Division, to make a procedural study of the Insurance Division and submit to the Administrator recommendations for speeding up VA insurance actions and providing commonly accepted insurance services which are not now available under present methods, with special consideration being devoted to the following possible procedural changes:

Organize the correspondence sections of the insurance division in each branch office so that form letters and form paragraphs will not be used in cases where they do not provide an intelligent reply to letters, inquiries and applications which justify and require a personally dictated reply. The use of dictating machines should be encouraged and, where necessary, directed in these correspondence sections in order to speed up production, reduce cost of dictation, and utilize available clerk-typists.

Print in bold-face type on the address side of the premium notice-remittance envelope the phrase "Please mail your remittance in this envelope to avoid error."

Redesign the present premium-account card to include horizontal lines.

Microfilm, then destroy premium-remittance envelopes and transmittal envelopes as received.

Adopt the cycle billing system which will provide for mailing premium notices to the insured a few days before premium is due.

Provide for a warning notice to insured after due date and prior to expiration of grace period.

Strip miscellaneous correspondence from open mail remittances before routing to posting clerks to speed up posting.

Eliminate posting of postmark date on timely remittances.

Adopt negative posting for all remittances covering exact amounts.

Destroy all NAN correspondence.

Develop a plan and method for the early issuance of policies to all insured veterans, including holders of term insurance.

Develop a plan and method for early payment of dividends from accumulated surplus.

Reinvestigate thoroughly the advantages which may accrue through the adoption of punch-card-accounting methods in the insurance operation with special attention to: faster operation, better controls of funds, and reduced costs. (Investigate combination punch card-Pollard Alling addressing system used by Fortune-Time-Life.)

3. The Administrator request the General Accounting Office to make a preaudit of VA insurance funds.

We know we can expect your continued cooperation on these important matters which directly affect the welfare of veterans and their dependents.

Yours very truly,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman.

DAYTON E. PHILLIPS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Insurance.

Another Injustice to Enlisted Men Corrected—Terminal Leave Controversy Started by Leib

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Senate sent to the White House legislation authorizing approximately 9,000,000 veterans to cash their terminal-leave bonds.

This ends a controversy that has been waged in the halls of Congress and throughout the Nation for a number of years. I am proud of the fact that I assisted in this great cause.

It would be timely and interesting at this point to bring to the attention of the Congress the history back of this most important piece of legislation.

How did it originate?

What were the issues and the circumstances that made this law necessary.

Here is the story of its origin.

It started late in 1943. Soon after J. H. Leib, free-lance writer, received a medical discharge from the armed forces he heard former officers discuss their terminal leave pay.

Looking into the matter Leib found that the Army and Navy were granting dismissed officers paid leave that they had accumulated while in the service, but that these same privileges were denied enlisted men.

He called upon the War and Navy Departments but got no place fast. No one seemed interested to do anything about it.

So Leib got out his typewriter and began asking embarrassing questions, Why was this discrimination permitted?

He joined Costello Post, largest American Legion unit in the District of Columbia and made a number of speeches on the subject.

Word started to get around and interest began to crystallize. Soon Leib became vice commander and later service officer of the post. He hammered away at the "caste system" terminal leave exclusively for officers, and the Veterans' Administration.

Other veterans' posts throughout the Nation began to take up the cudgel. Congress got interested and legislation was introduced.

In October 1945, Leib brought the matter to the attention of the first AMVET national convention. Later as legislative director he flooded the Nation with speeches demanding fair play for the enlisted men.

After a bitter fight a law was passed by the last Congress giving GI's accumulated leave in bonds, cashable 5 years after date of issuance.

Now the new law, awaiting only the signature of the President, permits the enlisted man to cash these bonds after September 1, 1947.

On April 1, 1946, Representative BARRETT, of Wyoming, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1829, a statement by Mr. Leib showing the basis of the original terminal leave Army and Navy regulations.

In order to understand the complete story I desire to include part of that statement in these remarks, as follows:

At this point AMVETS would like to cite the history, background, as well as the unfairness of the terminal pay as it is now constituted. Research shows that this caste-system compensation is based on a weather-beaten law that dates back to August 3, 1861 (10 U. S. Code, No. 841 Rev. Stat., sec. 1265), and reads as follows:

"Officers when absent on account of sickness or wounds, or lawfully absent from duty and waiting orders, shall receive pay; when

absent with leave, for other causes, full pay during such absence not exceeding in the aggregate 30 days in 1 year, and half pay during such absence exceeding 30 days in 1 year. When absent without leave they shall forfeit all pay during such absence unless the absence is excused as unavoidable."

In addition to the foregoing there is another moth-eaten statute, dated July 29, 1876 (10 U. S. Code, No. 842), which says:

"All officers on duty shall be allowed, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, 60 days leave of absence without deduction of pay or allowances; provided, that the same be taken once in 2 years; and provided further, that leave of absence may be extended to 3 months, if taken once only in 3 years, or 4 months, if taken once only in 4 years."

Attention is directed to the fact that no mention whatsoever is made relative to enlisted men, and no amendments to these statutes have been adopted as of this date.

GI's are entitled to 30 days' furlough leave per year, but they are not permitted to accumulate this time, if it is unused. Such a privilege is given only to officers, and for that reason the following bills have been introduced in the Congress to correct the mentioned discriminatory laws that now appear on the statute books of this Nation.

Even more astonishing is the fact that the Congress enacted Public Law 226, Seventy-ninth Congress, signed by the President on November 21, 1945, to allow officers who are receiving terminal pay to secure jobs in the Government service, and thus draw an additional salary. Obviously, this was done under pressure from the brass hats in the War and Navy Departments. Yet the Congress refuses to take up for immediate action legislation to benefit the enlisted men.

The bills now pending in the Congress follow:

HOUSE

H. R. 356. Representative BECKWORTH, Texas.
H. R. 411. Representative FORAND, Rhode Island.
H. R. 1160. Representative BECKWORTH, Texas.
H. R. 2454. Representative BRYSON, South Carolina.
H. R. 2478. Representative RANDOLPH, West Virginia.
H. R. 3890. Representative FORAND, Rhode Island.
H. R. 3894. Representative HARTLEY, New Jersey.
H. R. 4051. Representative ROGERS of Florida.
H. R. 4310. Representative BENNETT of Missouri.
H. R. 4422. Representative KUNKEL, Pennsylvania.
H. R. 4511. Representative GILLIE, Indiana.
H. R. 4518. Representative BENNETT of Missouri.
H. R. 4743. Representative PACE, Georgia.
H. R. 4791. Representative EARTHMAN, Tennessee.
H. R. 4849. Representative SPRINGER, Indiana.
H. R. 4893. Representative MANSFIELD of Montana.
H. R. 4984. Representative GREEN, Pennsylvania.
H. R. 5147. Representative PRICE of Illinois.
H. R. 5505. Representative RIVERS, South Carolina.
H. R. 5543. Representative BRUMBAUGH, Pennsylvania.
H. R. 5409. Representative GRANT of Indiana.
H. R. 5642. Representative ANGELL, Oregon.
H. R. 5637. Representative HAND, New Jersey.

SENATE

S. 721. Senator JOHNSON of Colorado.
S. 827. Senator MCFARLAND, Arizona.
S. 904. Senator MCCARRAN, Nevada.
S. 1552. Senator FULBRIGHT, Arkansas.
S. 1624. Senator SHIPSTEAD, Minnesota.
S. 1693. Senator PEPPER, Florida.

The Key to Next Year's Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

THE KEY TO NEXT YEAR'S CAMPAIGN

When Mr. Truman vetoed the tax bill, he used a word that shows the inside of his mind as plainly as a machine in a doctor's office shows the safety pin the baby swallowed.

Here it is, and it fortells next year's campaign. It is the word "inequity."

If you have wanted to believe that the real Truman is a follower of Jefferson and not of Karl Marx, read on.

Truman says it is inequitable to reduce taxes on the top incomes 10 percent, on the middle incomes 20 percent, and on the lower incomes 30 percent. That is sinful, immoral, and inequitable. It offends the law laid down by the prophet, Karl Marx. In short, the tax on the top incomes should have been reduced only 5 percent, or not at all, or, perhaps, increased. So, Truman vetoes the bill saying that if it became law, "the inequity of these provisions (proposed reductions) would be frozen into the tax structure."

This can mean just one thing. If it is inequitable to reduce top income taxes 10 percent while reducing low income taxes 30 percent, then it is "inequitable" for the top man to ever have the income in the first place. That is Truman's logic. It shows the socialist trend of his thinking. According to him, the taxing power should be used to level off the "inequities" of income and do so regardless of whether any man's higher income represents value given to society by superior ability, skill, and sweat, or, on the other hand, the gain from cracking a safe, or robbing a labor union's treasury. Both are taxed alike.

If larger income, honestly earned, is no longer equitable to have and to hold, then differences in the holdings of property, land, houses, or Government bonds are inequitable also.

Under the Truman doctrine, States and local governments should begin to tax homes at graduated rates rather than at the same rate per $100 of value. If, as he implies, it is inequitable for someone to have a $50,000 income when others have only $2,500 inomes, then it is wrong for anyone to have a $50,000 home.

The worst thing the Republican Party ever did to this Republic was to pass the sixteenth amendment, authorizing the taxing of incomes without any limit or ceiling whatever. Government, in time of peace, should have no more absolute power over a man's property than over his life or liberty.

Now look at a prophecy made 50 years ago by one of the greatest judges who ever sat on the United States Supreme Court, Justice Stephen J. Field, in a famous income-tax decision in 1895. Read it. And then read Truman's veto again. Here it is:

"The present assault upon capital is but the beginning. It will be the stepping stone to others, larger and more sweeping until our political contests will become a war of the poor against the rich, a war constantly growing in intensity and bitterness."

Most everybody pooh-poohed Justice Field 52 years ago. But was he right or wrong? The "beginning" he spoke of was a tax of only 2 percent levied on only a few. The "larger and more sweeping" tax which Mr. Truman refuses to reduce now reaches 77 percent. Justice Field went on to say that a majority may fix the amount of income exempted from tax "so as not to include any of their own number."

Between Truman's belief that the power to tax should be used to redistribute wealth and level life's rewards and Justice Field's effort "to hold the shield of the Constitution between the citizen and despotism" there is a great gulf. It is the difference between Jefferson and Marx. Jefferson said, "To take from one, because it is thought that his industry * * * has acquired too much in order to give to others who have not exercised equal industry" is to violate the principles which made America. Mr. Truman did not quote this at Jefferson's home last Friday, the Fourth of July.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Marine Hospital, Chicago, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by North Shore Post, No. 21, the American Legion, Chicago, Ill.:

Whereas the Government of the United States of America owns and operates a large, well-equipped and capably staffed hospital, known as the Marine Hospital, at 4141 Clarendon Avenue, on the north side of the city of Chicago, Ill.; and

Whereas there are at all times many empty beds in this fine hospital, which is equipped and staffed to accommodate a large number of patients; and

Whereas many veterans could be accommodated at this hospital, except that the Veterans' Administration refuses to permit them hospitalization there, except for a relatively small quota; and

Whereas on account of its location, this hospital, and its excellent facilities, would be far more convenient for veterans who live on the north side of Chicago, and Cook County, than other veterans' hospitals in and around Chicago; therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Members of North Shore Post, No. 21, the American Legion, in regular meeting assembled, urge either that the Veterans' Administration take over this hospital from the bureaus now making partial use of the same, or else that the quota of veterans to be treated there be increased so that this hospital, with an office of the Veterans' Administration on the premises, will henceforth operate at or near its capacity; and be it further

Resolved, That we recommend the passage of this resolution by the seventh district, and thence through channels to and by the Department of Illinois, with the insistence that all possible pressure be exerted until its objective is met; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to our distinguished member, the Honorable THOMAS L. OWENS, Member of

Congress from the Seventh District of Illinois, and later to any other officials in Washington, D. C., as it may appear advisable.

Unanimously passed by the members of North Shore Post, No. 21, the American Legion, in regular meeting assembled this 23d day of June 1947.

LUDWIG H. BEHREND, *Commander.*

Attest:

WM. J. BALLOU, *Adjutant.*

Wonderful Wisconsin's 1948 Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject of the forthcoming centennial of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union as the thirtieth State.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INSPIRING OCCASION FOR BADGER CITIZENS AND ALL AMERICAN VACATIONERS

I warmly invite the attention of my colleagues and of all America to the fact that on May 29, 1948, the Badger State—56,000 square miles of "heaven on earth"—will celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of its admission to the Union as our thirtieth State. During the whole of next year all of the three and one-fourth million souls in America's Dairyland and the State's countless sons and daughters who have made their marks in the far-flung corners of the world will rejoice on the completion of the Badger State's first century of statehood.

Splendid plans are being made throughout our State for the celebration of this unforgettable occasion. Every citizen is pitching in with typical Badger enthusiasm.

CENTENNIAL PLANS

An outstanding State centennial committee of distinguished citizens and officials has been working tirelessly under our late, revered Governor Goodland and under Acting Governor Rennebohm to help fulfill the highest expectations of our people.

There will be an initial series of celebrations on January 5 at the State capitol, opening centennial year. On May 29 our actual birthday, a gala celebration is scheduled in Madison. Then between August 7 and August 29 there will be a festive centennial exposition at State Fair Park. This promises to be the most unforgettable exhibition ever held in our State, which has a magnificent record of State fairs.

The centennial committee's subcommittee on religion has received the splendid cooperation of the spiritual leaders of our State. They will assist in appropriate centennial observances in churches of every denomination during the early part of January and on May 30. In addition, county centennial committees are enlisting the eager aid of our citizens in planning local celebrations in every on of the State's 71 counties.

COOPERATION IN WASHINGTON

It has been my pleasure to cooperate in every possible way with the centennial authorities. On January 10, 1947, I introduced the original centennial coin bill, for the purpose of having 500,000 Wisconsin commemorative coins prepared by the United States Government mint. With the grand aid of my fellow Members in the Wisconsin congressional delegation, this legislation was finally enacted by the Senate on July 17, following passage in the House. Unfortunately the President chose to veto the bill—an ill-advised action which shocked our State. This coin would have been sold by the mint to our State treasurer at cost for resale to the public at a premium, with the proceeds being used to finance the centennial celebration.

Along the line of other centennial plans, I have been glad to make arrangements with (a) the Post Office Department for the preparation of a special centennial stamp, and (b) with the Library of Congress for the holding of a 3- to 4-month exhibition in that great institution in Washington, commemorating the Badger State's progress. At my request, there was also prepared Senate document 76, which lists all of Wisconsin's representation in the Senate and House of Representatives during our century of statehood. A copy of this document is readily available to every interested citizen upon request to my office.

I may add that the various foreign embassies in Washington, D. C., have been keenly interested in my report to them of our State's centennial plans, and many fine expressions of cooperation have already come to me from them.

CENTENNIAL'S ECONOMIC MEANING

Every citizen of Wisconsin knows that the 1948 centennial, inspiring itself in its patriotic meaning, is important economically to our State.

Wisconsin knows that, through the means of the centennial, the Nation will become more fully acquainted with the incomparable economic opportunities provided for new industries and the expansion of old industries in the Badger State—"God's country." Although we are thirteenth in population, we are already first in harmonious balance between farming and industry.

OUR INDUSTRY

Let us remember that the value of Wisconsin war production in prime contracts alone reached in excess of $5,000,000,000. Subcontracts added several billion dollars to that figure. Our Badger industries received over 175 awards of Army-Navy E flags, ordnance flags, Maritime Commission M awards, and Navy E awards.

Now this magnificent industrial and business potential, with outstanding manpower, is rolling in high gear to beat all previous peacetime and wartime records of production.

One-third of our Wisconsin people are working at or living from Wisconsin industry. Seven thousand corporations are located in cities and villages throughout our territory. With incomparable Badger manpower, they make shoes and rubber footwear for us and the Armed Services. They make fur clothing, automobiles, trucks, automobiles and truck frames, auto and truck tires, tractors, paper, lumber products, aluminum ware of all kinds, furniture, agricultural machinery, castings, forgings of every size and kind, road-building machinery and excavating machinery, plumbing equipment and supplies, air conditioning and chemicals, ships for inland waterways. We now rank first in the production of marine engines, generators, and turbines. Our production machines and tools are among the best and largest in the Nation.

Each year Wisconsin mines produce 1,250,000 tons of iron ore, more than 1,000,000 tons of lead and 7,000 tons of zinc.

At Madison there is located the Forest Products Laboratory in recognition by Uncle Sam of Wisconsin paper, pulp, lumber, and veneer importance.

OUR AGRICULTURE

The 30 percent of our people on farms produce 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, 86,000,000 bushels of corn, one-third of all the vegetables which are canned in America and 17,000,000 bushels of potatoes. We are first in the production of milk, casein, tame hay and peas, and stand second in production of cranberries. Eighty percent of the farms handling this magnificent produce are individually owned, while in other States 42 percent of farm dwellers are tenants. Every fourth Wisconsin farm has a tractor and 9 out of 10 of our farmers have their own automobile.

American vacationers this year, next year, and every year will particularly want to see many of our 125,000 dairy farms which, for example, produce more nutritious, delicious, aromatic cheese than is produced by all the other 47 States combined. In the summer season, out of juicy grasses, sweet-scented clover, luscious alfalfa, and cool spring water, the greatest chemist in the world—the milk cow—makes the milk for vitamin-rich, delectable cheese and butter. In the wintertime, out of silage from the nut-brown corn, ground wheat, and oats, hay, and alfalfa, the milk cow makes this perfect food.

TOURIST PANORAMA

Yes; Wisconsin is all this, and a lovely natural paradise too, blessed by the Creator with a cool, comfortable climate, with ideal location, with incomparable scenic beauty. Through the centennial, millions of vacation-hungry Americans will learn anew the peerless beauties of the little bit of heaven which is known as Wisconsin. They will learn anew of the 170,000 acres of our State's parks and forests, of our 7,000 lakes and hundreds of miles of rivers and streams, ideal for fishing, canoeing, motorboating, sailboating, rowing, swimming. They will learn the unparalleled facilities for summer sports and winter sports easily reached by car or bus over our 80,000 miles of model highways, by our railways and planes and steamships. With the aid of our efficient State American Automobile Association, they will have the time of their lives.

Yes; hundreds of thousands of tourists will learn of our beautiful cities and our thousands of villages and towns, nestling alongside breath-takingly lovely streams and lakes.

All of Wisconsin is vacation land; the green, rolling dairy country with its purebred cows, No. 1 in the Nation; the cool lakes of southeastern Wisconsin; the hills and valleys of the southwestern part and the Green Bay region, rich in historic lore; the ever-changing glories of the lands and beaches bordering Lake Michigan and Lake Superior; the sportsman's northwoods region, with its thousands of spring-water lakes; the lordly Mississippi on its west border.

Everywhere in these regions are abundant and well-kept hotels and resorts, large and small, together with forest lodges and lakeside cabins, modest cottages, and cabins in the pines, available for inexpensive rental. They are managed by folks who pride themselves on their high standards as gracious hosts, and who take pride in their State's national reputation for unexcelled hospitality.

OUR PEOPLE

There is a little bit of all the world in Wisconsin. We have absorbed the best of the Old World culture, blending it with the freedom and fraternity of the New World.

From our rich blend of pioneer stock came Wisconsin's servicemen, and from their ranks came our 12 Congressional Medal of

Honor winners, including our late Ace of Aces, Maj. Richard Ira Bong. It is to Wisconsin that America's magnificent soldier-statesman, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, will return from Japan.

CHALLENGE TO WISCONSIN

Our citizens know that the centennial can mark the beginning of a new and more prosperous era than ever before for our State's farmers, for its workingmen, its businessmen, its lumbering industry, its mining industry, its fisheries, and its other important economic fields.

Our State has always been a leader in the Nation in sane, orderly, and clean government.

The name of Wisconsin and the fame of Wisconsin will spread throughout America to a greater degree than ever before in the Wisconsin Centennial. And it will be up to each of our citizens to add new luster and glory to that name and fame by individual efforts to make of Wisconsin a still greater, more prosperous State in the century which lies so challengingly before us.

SEAWAY BILL

It will indeed be appropriate if in 1948, our centennial year, there will be finally enacted the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project, which has been the cherished dream of the people of Wisconsin ever since it conception so many years ago. It was my privilege this year to serve as chairman of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee which reported the seaway bill (of which I am a cosponsor) without dissent to the full committee. Thereafter, in spite of strong opposition, the full committee voted in favor of the resolution. I will certainly continue to do everything within my power to bring about the passage of the resolution on the seaway as early as possible in 1948. We in Wisconsin are located at approximately the very heart of America, 1,000 miles from the Atlantic Ocean, 1,000 miles from the Gulf of Mexico, 2,000 miles from the Pacific Ocean. Through the seaway, Wisconsin will be able to achieve yet unforeseen heights of advancement.

FORWARD WISCONSIN

Moreover, I will do everything else within my power to further our centennial plans, not only because it is my privilege and honor to represent Wisconsin in the Senate, but because every national legislator, I believe, must back up the State governments. We must help add new honor and new importance to our States. Therein is the salvation of our Republic—establishing strong and independent States to act as a check and a balance on our Federal Government.

The people of Wisconsin have always felt a great pride in their State and in their State government, and I trust and believe that through this centennial, they will feel more closely than ever the ties that bind them as members of the great Badger community.

Forward, Wisconsin.

Wool Imports Make a Large Contribution to United States Custom Receipts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the following official table shows the weight, value, and duties collected on wool, and the total duties collected on all dutiable items:

Raw wool: Imports, duty collected, and total duties collected, 1935–46, inclusive

Year	Imports, all dutiable wools			Duties collected		Percent of total from wool
	Actual weight	Clean content	Value	Raw wool	Total dutiable items	
	1,000 pounds	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 dollars*	*Percent*
1935	45,924	29,746	8,449	9,437	357,241	2.6
1936	118,632	75,558	20,671	24,096	408,127	5.9
1937	155,358	94,253	49,476	30,836	470,509	6.6
1938	32,641	20,991	8,869	6,536	301,375	2.2
1939	99,453	59,529	22,339	19,155	328,624	5.8
1940	221,181	117,253	51,545	39,035	317,711	12.3
1941	603,352	327,913	155,806	109,805	437,751	25.1
1942	525,795	306,928	150,301	99,351	320,117	31.0
1943	624,627	380,813	190,962	126,901	391,304	32.3
1944	529,722	332,532	158,174	107,326	347,326	30.9
1945	657,115	406,090	201,057	133,863	378,075	35.4
1946 [1]	807,472	468,920	228,731	150,341	482,578	31.2
Average, 1941–46	624,080	370,533	180,805	121,264	393,067	30.9

[1] Preliminary.

NOTE.—The duties collected include duties on small quantities of specialty hair, the imports of which are not included in this table.
Source: Official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

What does this table show? First that over the years from three hundred to four hundred million dollars has been the average custom receipts. Second, please note that during the past 6 years that the duty collected on wool imports has been from 25 to 35 percent of the total custom receipts from all imports.

Then consider how 30 percent of these custom receipts set aside as section 32 funds—what have these section 32 funds been used for? One, to subsidize wheat and cotton exports, though these crops enjoy the benefit of embargoes on imports of their product. Second, for subsidizing new uses for cotton. Third, for relief and institutional distributions. Fourth, for school lunches. Fifth, For subsidizing fertilizer made from tobacco; for subsidizing tobacco insecticides and for subsidizing tobacco exports. Surely the lowly sheep has been a great provider of funds to be used for worthy purposes and for some purposes that are economically and agriculturally questionable.

It is regrettable that the American sheep industry has had to contend with an administration attitude that evidently will entirely liquidate the industry. The sheep numbers in the United States have been reduced over one-third the past 4 years.

And then the people wonder why there is not any lamb and mutton at the market place. The Members of this Congress do not want to assume the responsibility of legislatively liquidating the sheep industry of the United States. The section 32 funds of one hundred to one hundred and fifty millions per year has been a blank check to the Secretary of Agriculture. Its use has demonstrated how unwisely it has been spent. It would make more sense to subsidize wool or the sheep by the head than it does to obtain funds from the sheep industry and dissipate the funds.

Over $1,000,000,000 of these section 32 funds have been used by the Secretary of Agriculture under the guise of removing surpluses when more of many of these over-subsidized crops were imported than were purchased for distribution. This procedure does not make sense, nor can it be justified by any legislative yardstick.

Do you believe an appointed Federal officer should be given a one hundred to one hundred and fifty million dollar blank check each year and subjected to the sectional as well as political pressure incident to its use? The answer is "No."

A Bill To Encourage the Purchase Abroad of Works of Art for Donation to Museums and Public Art Collections in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent granted me I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD a few remarks relative to a bill I am introducing today. This bill is as follows:

A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 1547, chapter 4, title 19, United States Code be amended as follows:

At the end of paragraph 1547 (a) strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: *"Provided*, That such works of art imported for the sole purpose of donation to museums or to other public collections for display free of charge, shall be admitted free of duty."

Strike out parenthetical language in paragraph 1547 (b). At the end of paragraph 1547 (b) strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: *"Provided*, That such works of art imported for the sole purpose of donation to museums or to other public collections for display free of charge, shall be admitted free of duty."

One of the great crises of our times is the dollar crisis, the short supply of dollars in the hands of foreign nations. The crisis remains, although the United States, since VE-day, has sent abroad the stupendous sum of $20,000,000,000 in the form of loans, grants, gifts, and other kinds of aid. No conquering nation in

the history of mankind has ever done so much to relieve the postwar distress of its allies and enemies. Yet the end of the dollar crisis is not in sight. The damage done to the economies of other nations by the war is far greater than anyone had calculated when the shooting stopped.

Thus, our recent loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain is being exhausted at a rate far greater than anticipated; and this is true, too, of her Canadian loan of $1,250,000,000. Canada herself, now our largest customer, is facing a dollar shortage as she buys more from us than she sells us. Latin America, not long ago plentifully supplied with dollars as the result of wartime sales to us, is now scraping the bottom of its dollar bin. France, Italy, the Netherlands, Scandinavia—all the nations of western and northern Europe with the sole exception of Switzerland—are painfully short of dollars. This year we are exporting more than we are importing at the rate of $1,000,000,000 a month. The deficit is being made up by loans, gifts, sales to us, gold and securities by other nations, remittances to foreigners by their American relatives, and tourist expenditures.

We alone can supply most of the world's needs for goods. Therefore, most of the nations must buy heavily from us, while they can sell us far less than they must buy. Hence their shortage of dollars. This goes to the heart of the world problem of recovery. It is related to all that we must do in terms of world rehabilitation and vigorous expression of the democratic ideal. The gap between the world's needs and its dollar supply widens every day. We can close it by buying more goods abroad. But we cannot buy as much as we sell, because other nations are not yet in a position to produce fully, and they themselves need many of the things we might buy from them. We can export more dollars in the form of tourist expenditures. But Europe is not ready to receive tourists on a large scale.

There is another course of action open to us. It is to put more dollars in the hands of foreigners by stimulating the purchase of works of art by American citizens.

Everybody knows that our art museums are no longer mausoleums, as many of them once were, but are a part of the life of the communities to which they belong. Thousands of people, drawn from all walks of life, constantly visit such great museums as the Metropolitan, the Whitney, and the Museum of Modern Art in New York; thousands of others delight in the museums of Worcester, Boston, Cleveland, Kansas City, San Francisco, Chicago, Washington, and other cities. It is conclusive evidence of the widespread popular interest in art that popular magazines with mass circulations running into millions of copies a week—as, for example, Life—devote dozens of color pages annually to reproductions of paintings by foreign and modern masters. Other magazines—for instance, Time and Newsweek—have regular art departments, while dozens of newspapers devote regularly allotted space to discussions of painting and sculpture. These activities prove that art is of immediate interest, not to a few cultists but to the body of the American people.

Similarly, art galleries and department stores sell thousands of excellent reproductions of paintings by ancient and modern masters that hang in American homes. So, too, interest in the crafts is high in the United States; interest in glass, wood carvings, rugs, tapestries, silver, copper, and iron works. It is the expressed interest not of a few connoisseurs but of millions of everyday Americans. It is an interest indicative of our coming of age culturally; of the advance of our education; of the constant growth of our taste. It is reflected in the excellent taste displayed in millions of American homes, and in the demand that even utilitarian articles, such as washing machines and refrigerators, should be not only efficient but, so far as possible, beautiful. No one knows better than American business that beauty pays, while for the individual beauty is always a source of pleasure and delight.

What has all this got to do with the world-wide shortage of dollars? The answer is simple. During the 10-year period 1937–46 we imported works of art to the value of $104,254,091. These are considerable imports despite the fact that the flow of works of art into this country was slowed, and then almost stopped, by the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939, and our own entrance into the war at the end of 1941, while hostilities came to an end only a little more than 2 years ago.

I propose, therefore, as one method by which we can ameliorate the dollar crisis, this: Whenever an American citizen buys works of art abroad for donation to a public institution, he shall be permitted to deduct sums expended for this purpose from his income tax.

This would cause an unascertainable but not devastating loss of revenue to the Treasury. But assuming that philanthropic citizens, stimulated by this incentive, should spend large sums of dollars abroad, these dollars would be spent here for American goods and services. Consequently, whatever losses the Treasury might sustain in one quarter, would be recouped in another quarter. Furthermore, to the extent that private dollars are sent abroad, the need for Treasury or public dollars is diminished; and this, in turn, diminishes our tax burden.

If this proposal seems novel, we must bear this in mind. It has always been the policy of our Government to encourage the dissemination of knowledge and extend the Nation's cultural boundaries. Original works of art therefore enter this country duty-free, while other objects, such as furniture, silverware, and so forth, enter duty-free when they are more than 100 years old and may be legitimately classified as antiques. So, too, scientific apparatus and books for the use of our institutions of learning come in duty-free, while not long ago, in order to stimulate the sale and reading of books, Congress sharply lowered the postage rate of books.

It is, then, merely an extension of our principle of encouraging the dissemination of knowledge, to propose that special incentives be offered to our citizens to import works of art for donation to public institutions. But in our times, this proposal put into action, would also serve the purpose of helping to put the world on its feet by making more dollars available to it.

I want, however, to be clear on one point. I regret the necessity for proposing the step that I have outlined. I wish the state of the world were such as to make it unnecessary. It is not evidence of a desire to gobble up everything in sight, simply because others are in distress. It is, rather, evidence of a desire to be helpful even when to help in the manner suggested is not without painful aspects. Yet, this, too, must be said. Works of art have always been for sale in the markets of the world. Some of them pass through many hands for centuries before they come finally to rest in public museums. They then become part of the patrimony of the nation. But we want nothing to do with purchases of art from governments. We are not scavengers. We do not want to strip any nation of a fraction of its cultural patrimony, even if a nation hard-pressed should be tempted to part with it. What I propose therefore has to do only with the course of the art business as it has been pursued for centuries with an incentive given to the American citizen who would enrich the culture of his country by donating his purchases to a public institution of his own selection.

To this end I have introduced legislation which in the regular procedure will be considered by the Committee on Ways and Means as it amends the tax laws which are to be given careful study in the coming months.

An Analysis Concerning Alien Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an analysis in regard to certain types of alien property. This analysis was prepared for me by the Office of the Alien Property Custodian:

ANALYSIS OF DEBT CLAIMS FILED WITH THE OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

The primary objective of this analysis is to determine to what claimants or groups of claimants the largest amounts of money may be paid under the debt-claim program of the Office of Alien Property.

The analyst is seriously limited by three factors: (a) The short time available to make the analysis; (b) the fact that debt claims have been received by the Office during the past 3 months in such great volume that it has been impossible to compile statistical card records; (c) the lack of information on the validity of the claims and, frequently, on the eligibility of the claimants.

Within these limitations it is possible, however, on the basis of information collected on claims filed through March 1947, and on the basis of spot checks of claims recently received, to arrive at conclusions that should prove useful in indicating the

general nature of the debt-claims program. In addition, the Office has the advantage in making the study of a detailed knowledge of most of the cases in which large sums of money were vested, including frequently some knowledge of the types and number of claims that could be asserted.

GENERAL STATISTICS

It is estimated that the Office will receive a total of approximately 24,000 debt claims with respect to vested German and Japanese property from persons eligible as to nationality to receive payment of their claims under existing legislation. (Another 2,000 or 3,000 unsecured debt claims are expected from foreign nationals resident outside of the United States, who are ineligible for payment on unsecured claims.) Under these claims it is estimated that a minimum of $150,000,000 will be claimed.

The total amount claimed is, however, of limited significance. Often a claim for $1,000,000 or more is received against the account of a debtor from whom only a few thousand dollars have been vested. Since the Office is authorized to pay the debts of a particular national only out of property vested from that national, many claims obviously cannot be paid in full.

After allowing for these insolvent accounts, it may be estimated that the gross amount payable by the Office from assets vested from debtors, if all 24,000 debt claims are found valid, will amount to approximately $55,000,000.

For statistical purposes it is obviously necessary to regard all claims as valid since no legal opinions with respect to their validity are available. It is possible, however, that invalid claims may run as high as 30 percent.

This $55,000,000 is classified in table I (appended hereto) according to the major claimants and classes of claimants.

The nature of the claims asserted under each item of table I is described item by item in the succeeding sections.

A. Claims by one vested property against another

In numerous instances one vested property may have a claim against another. For example, one vested bank may be owed money by another as a result of transactions that took place prior to vesting. Under such claims, if all are found valid, vested properties could pay each other $13,000,000.

Payment of these claims would not directly reduce the amount of vested property but would involve merely the transfer of money from one account to another. Such payments could, however, indirectly affect, in certain cases, the total amount of debt claims payable by the Office to private persons. For example, if account A is rendered insolvent by the existence of a claim by account B, private claimants would receive less from account A than if the transfer between accounts had not been made; conversely, if account B is rendered solvent by payment to it of funds from account A, private claimants would receive more from account B than if the transfer between accounts had not been made. The net result, insofar as total payment to private claimants is concerned, should prove immaterial.

B. Secured debt claims

A secured debt claimant is one who asserts a direct interest in a specific piece of property as pledgee, lienholder, mortgagee, etc. Secured debt claims are, therefore, in the nature of title claims and may be payable in accordance with section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act (Public Law 322) rather than section 34 (Public Law 671). Thus, secured debt claims may be asserted not only by United States citizens and noncitizen residents, as in the case of unsecured claims, but also by nonhostile foreign nationals eligible to recover property and property interests under Public Law 322.

1. Claims listed and described: Six of the claims, all involving large amounts, are listed and described below (the descriptions of individual claims contained in this analysis are based upon statements in the notices of claim received from claimants. The amount claimed will not necessarily be the amount payable by the Office if a claim is allowed since it may be allowed only in part or there may be insufficient property vested from the debtor to make payment in full):

Claimant: Swiss Bank Corp. (Switzerland). Alleged enemy debtor: Chemical & Pharmaceutical Enterprises, Ltd. Amount claimed, $1,236,652.

Claim No. 4195 asserts that $1,236,652 is due and unpaid on a loan made by claimant to Chemical & Pharmaceutical Enterprises, Ltd., for which claimant took as collateral security therefor, together with other property, 43,994 shares of common stock and 2,225 shares of preferred stock of Schering Corp. (New Jersey), 10 shares of common stock of Schering Corp. (New York), and 100 shares of common stock of Sherka Chemical Co., Inc. (New York), all of which are now vested in the Attorney General.

Claimant: Sjo-Ooh Brandforsaktiebolaget "Svenska Veritas" (Sweden) Alleged enemy debtor: Muenchener Rueckversicherungs Gesellschaft. Amount claimed, $215,781.

Claim No. 4037 asserts interest, right, and title in 3,753 shares of Pilot Reinsurance Co. stock which were allegedly transferred to it by the Muenchener Rueckversicherungs Gesellschaft of Munich, Germany, as security for unearned premiums and outstanding losses and for claims and liabilities arising out of reinsurances ceded by the claimant. The liability of the German reinsurers is stated to have amounted to $215,781 plus interest on December 31, 1942, and the claimant seeks the liquidation proceeds of the stock (now vested in the Attorney General) in satisfaction of the liability.

Claimant: Aterforsakringsaktiebolaget (Sweden). Alleged enemy debtor: Muenchener Rueckversicherungs Gesellschaft. Amount claimed, $201,230.

In Claim No. 4036 claimant asserts that it entered into an agreement with Muenchener Rueckversicherungs Gesellschaft, Munich, Germany, whereby the latter transferred 5,000 shares of Pilot Reinsurance Co. stock to the claimant as security for unearned premiums and outstanding losses and for claims and liability arising out of reinsurances ceded by the claimant. The liability of Muenchener is stated to have amounted to $201,230 on September 30, 1942, and the claimant now asserts an interest, right, and title in the 5,000 shares of stock (now vested in the Attorney General) which were allegedly pledged by Muenchener to secure its liability.

Claimant: Forsakringsaktiebolaget "Atlantica" (Sweden). Alleged enemy debtor: Union Rueckversicherungs Gesellschaft. Amount claimed, $176,250.

Under claim No. 4038 the claimant asserts interest, right, and title in 3,750 shares of Pilot Reinsurance Co. stock which were allegedly assigned to it by Muenschener Rueckversicherungs Gesellschaft, of Munich, Germany, for the purpose of securing liabilities arising out of reinsurance ceded to Muenchener by the claimant. When the war broke out Muenchener transferred all reinsurances in force, ceded by claimant, to the Union Rueckversicherungs Gesellschaft, of Zurich, Switzerland. The arrangement with respect to the Pilot Reinsurance Co. shares remained unchanged and the claimant now seeks satisfaction of liabilities of $176,250, plus interest, out of the liquidation of the stock (now vested in the Attorney General) allegedly held as security.

Claimant: James E. Egan, public administrator, New York County. Alleged enemy debtor: August Diehn. Amount claimed, $250,000.

Under claim No. 1264 the claimant asserts the right to the interest of August Diehn, who died intestate, in a syndicate or group managed by Hope & Co., which syndicate alleges on behalf of itself and its members a collateral security interest in approximately 465,000 shares of stock of American Potash & Chemical Corp. The 465,000 shares have been vested and sold to American citizens.

Claimant: Hope & Co. and Continentale Handelsbank. Alleged enemy debtor: Winterschall A. G. and Salzdetfurth A. G. Amount claimed, $5,000,000.

Claim No. 1137 asserts a secured debt claim of an estimated amount of $5,000,000, based upon loans by claimants to a Dutch syndicate of which they were members for the purchase of 475,000 shares of stock of American Potash & Chemical Corp. and for commissions, profits, interests, and costs due claimants pursuant to a contract with the syndicate for management of the shares and other services. Claimants state that the syndicate and its members have a lien on 465,000 shares as security for payment of the amount claimed. The 465,000 shares have been vested and sold to American citizens.

Since all of the above claims are asserted by or on behalf of foreign nationals residing outside the United States, they cannot be paid as unsecured claims if the claimants fail to establish recognizable security interests or fail to prove themselves nonhostile nonenemy nationals within the standards of Public Law 322.

2. Other claims: A large proportion of the remaining 200 secured debt claims arise from mortgage bonds issued by Nippon Club, Inc., an organization whose assets were vested by the office and from attorneys' liens. The remaining claims assert lien and mortgage interest of various kinds. If it should be determined that these claims are not secured claims, most of them may be reconsidered as unsecured claims since the claimants are mainly United States citizens and residents.

C. Preferred claims

1. Wages and services: No claims for wages and services under which substantial amounts might be payable were found. The 4,750 wage and service claims involve an average amount payable of less than $2,000.

The greater proportion of wage and service claims involve:

(a) Claims for wages and salaries by employees of enemy nationals, particularly employees of enemy-owned United States enterprises whose assets have been vested.

(b) Claims for services by attorneys who prosecuted patent applications for enemy nationals, represented enemies in probate matters, provided legal services for vested enterprises, etc.

(c) Claims for telephone and utility services supplied to vested enterprises or enemy nationals.

(d) Claims for fees by United States agents of enemy nationals for caring for their American property (including claims for reimbursement for maintenance expenses in connection with buildings, etc.) or for representing enemies in business transactions.

2. Rent: The only known sizable rent claim is that of 61 Broadway Corp. against the Hamburg American Line. Sixty-one Broadway Corp. asserts a claim for $623,000 under a rental contract on a building in New York occupied by Hamburg American Line-North German Lloyd. This claim, if valid in full amount, could probably be paid at no more than 50 percent owing to anticipated insolvency of the account. Other rent claims are relatively insignificant in amount.

3. Steamship ticket refunds: All of the steamship ticket cases are small, and the average amount claimed is about $350. Most of the claims are against Hamburg American Line and North German Lloyd. The claims against Hamburg American can probably be paid only in part; with respect to North German Lloyd, after payment of taxes it does not appear that there will be sufficient vested assets to pay debt claims. A few steamship ticket cases involving Japanese lines probably could be paid in full.

4. Other refund claims for goods and services not received: A few claims have been filed asking for the return of amounts paid for goods and services (other than steamship transportation) not received by claimants. None of these claims involve significant amounts.

5. Materials.

(a) Claims listed and described. Two large claims have been filed for payment of the unpaid purchase price of goods delivered to enemy nationals. These claims are listed and described below:

Claimant: General Petroleum Corp. of New York. Alleged enemy debtor: Mitsui & Co., Ltd. Amount claimed, $878,782.

Claim No. 122 is for balance due with interest as payment for merchandise (oil) allegedly furnished to Mitsui prior to December 7, 1941, pursuant to contract dated July 29, 1937.

Claimant: Tidewater Associated Oil Co. Alleged enemy debtor: Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha, Ltd. Amount claimed, $138,325.

Claim No. 302 is for value of merchandise, consisting chiefly of oil, allegedly delivered to Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha.

(b) Other claims: Other claims for payment for materials delivered to enemies are relatively small. A number of them seek payment for goods sold to United States enterprises whose assets have been vested; in these cases the specific goods to which the claims relate (or their cash proceeds) are among the vested assets.

D. Unpreferred claims

1. Bonds: The largest group of unpreferred claims was filed by American residents who hold bonds and similar securities of the German and Japanese Government or of German and Japanese corporations and other organizations. These bonds are frequently held in small amounts as investments by trustees and by persons of limited financial resources. Some, however, are held in large amounts by American financial institutions and other substantial investors. The largest claim of this kind received to date is by the Bank of America, which holds $2,284,000 of German Reich treasury note participation certificates. Owing to insolvency in the German Reich vested property account, probably not more than 10 or 15 percent of this amount can be paid.

Similarly, the Office can make only limited payments on most other bond claims owing to the insolvency of the accounts.

2. Deposits in vested banks: Approximately 8,000 claims are being received from depositors in vested banks in Hawaii. Most of these claims are small since the principal of most deposits has already been paid pursuant to the laws of Hawaii governing banks of deposit. The total amount payable under these claims, if all are allowed, is estimated at $700,000.

3. Other claims.

(a) Listed and described: A number of analyzed unpreferred claims on which large amounts may be payable are listed and described below (the descriptions given are frequently limited as to details because of the absence of such details in the notices of claim received by the Office):

Claimant: International Silk Guild, Inc. Alleged enemy debtor: Bank of Chosen, Ltd., and others. Amount claimed, $578,426.

The International Silk Guild, Inc., an organization of all branches of the silk industry in the United States to further the interests of the silk industry, was financed in part by assessments levied against silk shipments originating in Japan. The levy was collected in Japan and billed to and paid for by United States importers. Remittances covering the amount of the assessments collected were made to the International Silk Guild, Inc., until May 1940, when they were suspended because of Japanese Government interference in the transfer of funds. Following that date the assessments continued to be collected in Japan but were not remitted to the Guild. The Guild now claims $578,425.60 in collected assessments, which it alleges have been deposited in various Japanese banks and United States branches thereof and were never forwarded to the Guild in the United States.

Claimant: National City Bank of New York. Alleged enemy debtor: Mitsui Bank, Ltd. Amount claimed, $329,944.

Claim No. 1566 requests payment of $354,637.42 less offset in amount of $24,693.77, or a net amount of $329,943.65. Claim is based upon balances allegedly owed by Mitsui Bank, Ltd.

Claimant: National City Bank of New York. Alleged enemy debtor: Sumitomo Bank, Ltd. Amount claimed, $29,311.

Claim No. 1563 requests payment of $236,080.85 less an offset of $206,769.92, or a net amount of $29,310.69 (less possible additional offsets). Claim is based upon balances allegedly owed by Sumitomo Bank, Ltd.

Claimant: Eugene T. Singer (as assignee of Standard Vacuum Oil Co.). Alleged enemy debtor: Yokohama Specie Bank, Ltd. Amount claimed, $1,495,061.

Claim No. 2011 requests payment of $937,500, constituting the balance of the account of Standard Vacuum Oil Co. (claimant's assignor) in Yokohama Specie Bank in Yokohama. Claim No. 2012 requests payment of $557,561, representing yen allegedly transferred by Standard Vacuum (claimant's assignor) to Yokohama Specie Bank in exchange for dollars to be paid in New York.

Claimant: Federal Reserve Bank. Alleged enemy debtor: Mitsui & Co., Ltd. Amount claimed, $208,215.

Claim No. 29 asserts that Mitsui & Co., Ltd., of New York is liable as endorser of acceptances of Yokohama Specie Bank, Ltd., of New York, drawn to claimant, account Commonwealth Bank of Australia.

Claimant: John Woodson, executor. Alleged enemy debtor: Bank of Taiwan. Amount claimed, $119,709.

Under claim No. 5246, executor (John Woodson) of estate of Joseph Rice, deceased, claims above amount which was allegedly deposited in two Philippine Islands banks and transferred to Bank of Taiwan by order of the Japanese Government during occupation.

Claimant: Guaranty Trust Co. of New York. Alleged enemy debtor: Fried. Krupp A. G. Amount claimed, $338,587.

Under claim No. 2237 claimant asserts that it accepted trade acceptances drawn and endorsed by Krupp A. G., Essen.

Claimant: Mrs. C. Herter. Alleged enemy debtor: Gustave Herter. Amount claimed, $200,000.

Claim No. 4909. The basis of the claim is a note in the amount of $200,000, dated November 8, 1919, made by Gustave Herter to Clarence S. Herter, deceased husband of claimant. It is alleged that no part of the note, now held by claimant, has been paid.

Claimant: Manufacturers Trust Co. Alleged enemy debtor: Berliner Handelsgesellschaft. Amount claimed, $984,230.

Under Claim No. 4934 claimant states that it seeks payment of indebtedness in the form of 90-day drafts representing advances made by Manufacturers Trust Co. to finance exportation of merchandise under the guarantee of Berliner Handelsgesellschaft, Berlin, Germany.

Claimant: Manufacturers Trust Co. Alleged enemy debtor: Reich-Kredit Gesellschaft A. G. Amount claimed, $845,793.

Under Claim No. 4928 claimant states that it seeks payment of indebtedness of Reichs-Kredit Gesellschaft A. G., Berlin, Germany, in the form of 90-day drafts representing advances made by Manufacturers Trust Co. to finance exportation of merchandise under the guaranty of Reichs-Kredit Gesellschaft A. G., Berlin, Germany.

Claimant: Bendix Aviation Corp. Alleged enemy debtor: Robert Bosch, A. G. Amount claimed, $74,335.57.

Under Claim No. 826 claimant states that it seeks payment of unpaid royalties due claimant from January 1, 1941, to June 30, 1941, amounting to $74,335.57, under certain license agreements; and all royalties, if any, which have accrued or may be accruing to the claimant's account since June 30, 1941.

Claimant: Edward L. Murphy. Alleged enemy debtor: I. G. Farbeindustrie, A. G. Amount claimed, $294,399.58.

Claim No. 1941 is brought by Edward L. Murphy as an assignee of Kleinwort Sons & Co. The notice of claim states that the latter firm advanced moneys for the acceptance and payment in England of certain bills of exchange issued by I. G. Farbenindustrie, for which neither Murphy nor Kleinwort Sons & Co. was ever repaid. In June 1941, the claimant brought suit against I. G. Farben in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and a warrant of attachment was issued against the property of I. G. Farben. Warrants of attachment were served against a New York bank account of I. G. Farben and several debts owing to I. G. Farben by United States firms. Judgment by default in the sum of $294,399.58 was entered in the office of the clerk of the county of New York in September 1941.

Claimant: Manufacturers Trust Co. Alleged enemy debtor: Dresdner-Leipziger Schnellpressenfabrik, A. G. Amount claimed, $53,702.

Claim No. 1924 is asserted against Planeta Druckmaschinenwerke A. G., Radebuel, Germany, successor of Dresdner-Leipzinger Schnellpressenfabrik A. G., Coswig, for payment of an alleged past-due indebtedness "in the form of 90-day drafts representing advances made by Manufacturers Trust Co. to finance exportation of merchandise for account of the debtor."

Claimant: National Shawmut Bank. Alleged enemy debtor: Berliner Handelsgesellschaft. Amount claimed, $605,970. Claim No. 4667 arose through obligations allegedly due the National Shawmut Bank of Boston by the above-named bank, to which the National Shawmut Bank of Boston had granted credits, never paid, and carried for some years under the "German Standstill Agreement."

Claimant: National Shawmut Bank. Alleged enemy debtor: Hardy & Co., G. m. b. H. Amount claimed, $107,560. Claim No. 1441 arose through obligations allegedly due the National Shawmut Bank by Hardy & Co. and carried for some years under the "German Standstill Agreement" and still unpaid.

Claimant: Standard Security & Casualty Co. Alleged enemy debtor: Kawasaki Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha. Amount claimed, $341,200. Claim No. 2219 is composed of various claims and contingent claims for "indemnification and exoneration of claimant as surety on certain bonds * * * and payment of premiums on such bonds until finally discharged." The bonds referred to above are various "judicial financial guaranty" or "court" bonds, executed by the claimant for Kabushiki Kaisha Kawasaki Zosenjo and Kawasaki Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha.

(b) Other claims: Other unpreferred claims consist of a wide variety of different types of claims. The bases of these claims are, among others, the following:

1. Insurance premiums owing to United States insurers by enemy nationals.

2. Insurance benefits owing by enemy insurance companies.

3. Dues and assessments of nonprofit organizations.

4. Unpaid drafts, checks, and other instruments.

5. Loans and advances.

6. Balances between banks arising out of foreign exchange and other financial transactions.

7. Balances owed under German standstill agreements.

8. Deposits in enemy banks located abroad.

Most of these claims are in small amounts. Many, however, are for large sums but can be paid only a few cents on the dollar, since the property vested from the particular debtors involved is worth far less than the aggregate amounts claimed.

CONCLUSIONS

Under the Office's debt-claim program a total of 24,000 claims relating to alleged debts of German and Japanese nationals from whom property has been vested are expected from claimants eligible as to nationality.

Under those claims a total of $55,000,000 can be paid if all claims are valid.

About $13,000,000 of this $55,000,000 would represent transactions among vested properties and would not reduce the Office's holdings of vested property. Another $9,000,000 might be payable as secured claims; under these claims, persons assert property interests in specific assets.

Thus, the total amount that might be payable to unsecured private claimants would be about $33,000,000, or less than $1,500 per claim.

A large number of claims may, however, be found invalid when the Office examines them at the time they are considered for payment. Hence, total payments to unsecured debt claimants should be less than the $33,000,000 estimate.

While most claimants will receive only small amounts, a few may receive large payments. This analysis shows that, under 19 large claims, a total of $5,000,000 may be payable.

It is, of course, possible that other large claims, not studied in this analysis, are among the claims currently being received by the Office. Such claims would not necessarily, however, increase the number of claimants to whom large amounts would be payable. In fact, they should have the opposite result. Large claims are generally concentrated against particular accounts, which become more insolvent as additional claims are received. Thus, if new large claims are received against already insolvent accounts, the result will be a decrease in the amounts payable to other claimants seeking payment of substantial sums.

TABLE I.—*Distribution by type of claim of estimated number of debt claims and estimated amounts payable under debt claims*

Type of claim	Estimated number of claims	Estimated amounts payable if all claims are valid
A. Claims by one vested property against another	300	$13,000,000
B. Secured debt claims:		
1. Claims listed and described	6	7,080,000
2. Other claims	200	2,000,000
Subtotal	206	9,080,000
C. Preferred claims:		
1. Wages and services	4,750	8,500,000
2. Rent	150	700,000
3. Steamship-ticket refunds	1,500	250,000
4. Other refund claims for goods and services not received	150	500,000
5. Materials:		
(a) Claims listed and described	2	1,017,000
(b) Other claims	300	2,500,000
Subtotal	6,852	13,467,000
D. Unpreferred claims:		
1. Bonds	6,000	6,500,000
2. Deposits in vested banks	8,000	700,000
3. Other:		
(a) Claims listed and described	17	3,989,000
(b) Other claims	2,500	8,000,000
Subtotal	16,517	19,189,000
Grand total	23,875	54,736,000

Percentage classification of wage and service claims by principal types

Type	Percentage of sampled wage and service claims	Average amount payable per claim
General attorney fees. These fees are for legal services rendered, disbursements made, and expenses incurred in representing the former owners of vested property.	30.2	$2,398
Attorney fees for prosecution of patent applications. These fees are for legal services and expenses rendered in connection with the filing and prosecution of patent applications for enemy nationals.	29.0	464
Salaries, allowances, and deductions. These claims were filed by former employees of enemy nationals for services rendered, retirement allowances and bonuses allegedly due them, and for bond and pension deductions which had been made from their salaries.	13.2	3,443
Technical service, primarily relating to patents	6.6	1,643
Brokerage fees and commissions	6.3	1,541
Charges for liquidation, management and administration of property	3.9	1,167
Freight charges	1.8	667
Electric, gas, and telephone services	2.7	29
Accounting and auditing fees	1.8	1,856
Advertising charges	1.2	117
Other services (photostating, repairs, weighing, etc.)	3.3	420
	100.0	1,625

Independence Day Declaration of the Free Representatives of Eastern European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: Independence Day declaration of the free representatives of eastern European nations, made public at a press conference held by Mr. Ferenc Nagy, former Hungarian Premier and leader of the Smallholders Party, and Mr. Georgij M. Dimitrov, leader of the Bulgarian Peasant Party, on July 3, 1947, in Washington, D. C.:

In felicitating the American people and its democratic institutions on this one hundred and seventy-first anniversary of American independence, the undersigned representatives of the peasant parties of eastern Europe—at this fateful moment when in our countries democratic movements are being crushed, self-government is being suppressed by force and independence is being obliterated—deem it to be our duty to make known to the enlightened world our faith in the dignity of man, in the freedom of the individual and in representative government. We are in complete agreement as to the community of our aims.

First. As leaders of the peasant parties in our countries we have fought for the realization of these aims, which are the aims of the overwhelming majority of the peoples of eastern Europe. Our organizations represent the interests of more than 100,000,000 human beings. We hold our mandates from these millions of citizens, now deprived of their inalienable rights. We, and not the present subservient dictators who were trained by and are imposed on our nations by a foreign force, are the real representatives of the people. We do not believe in vengeance against those who have been misled. We know only too well that our exhausted people need reconciliation. The historical responsibility for the moral and material destruction of our people rests with the present oppressors and their masters.

Second. From the ideological point of view our movements have stood for and continue to stand for political and economic democracy. The four fundamental freedoms of the Atlantic Charter and the principles of the United Nations Charter for international unity and collaboration have been and remain the basis of our programs. We have been and continue to be decided opponents of all ideologies with totalitarian and dictatorial tendencies.

Third. The social, political, and economic structures of our countries are predicated upon the ideas of individual liberty and private ownership based on productive labor. These are fundamental elements of our conceptions of freedom, human integrity, and democracy. It is for these that our followers have fought and destroyed feudalism in the past; they have resisted nazism and fascism at the price of heavy sacrifices, and continue to resist the forces which tend to efface the individual and to transform self-government into the dictatorship of a political clique. We are agreed that the necessary reconciliation of the individual and social interests is attainable only by free cooperativism, and therefore we are categorically opposed to general collectivizations and cooperatives imposed by force and carried to the point of reducing the population to slavery and pauperism.

Fourth. The individualistic and industrious peasants, who are behind us, are the backbone of democratic institutions in our part of the world. True to our trust and enlightened by our recent experience, we repudiate the practices of discrimination on account of social status, creed, race, political beliefs, or occupation. We are guided by the recommendations of the agrarian organizations of the eastern European countries concerning economic and political collaboration, contained in the declaration of the International Agrarian Conference of July 1942 held in London.

Fifth. We hold democracy to be one and indivisible. The recent events in our countries have clearly proved that the so-called eastern democracy is but a dictatorship of Communist minorities, imposed by foreign military force which endeavors to perpetuate its authority by means of civil strife and terrorism, thus adding new destructions to the already accumulated ruins. Bending all our efforts toward the realization of these principles, we are contributing to the cause of lasting peace, international understanding and cooperation, and to the general rehabilitation of Europe. In the past our hopes were centered in the League of Nations. Now we place our reliance for the future on the United Nations. At a time when trusteeships are being created for the preparation of dependent peoples for independence and self-government, we strongly believe that the democracies will not permit the subjugation of nations which have posssessed independent existence and cultural attainments for centuries.

On this Fourth of July, we raise our voices on behalf of those who cannot speak. When free people everywhere are commemorating the birthday of this great and humane nation, we appeal to the United Nations and to the American people and its Government for their generous support and assistance in the realization of these noble aims. We

remind them of the fate of those who are being deprived of the most elementary human rights, in order to afford evidence to our peoples, who are fighting for their freedom and independence under most trying circumstances, that they are not being abandoned to their cruel fate and that they will be upheld in their efforts to become masters of their own destinies.

We appeal to the democratic peasant parties of other countries, which so far have not had the possibility to associate themselves with our efforts, to join with us in the creation of a democratic international peasant union and the eventual realization of the United States of Europe, with the ultimate aim of establishing world-wide democratic unity.

Our isolated attempts have met with failure—our joint efforts will succeed.

FERENC NAGY,
Former Hungarian Premier, Leader of the Hungarian Smallholders Party.
DR. VLADKO MACEK,
Former Vice Premier of Yugoslavia, President of the Croatian Peasant Party.
DR. MILAN GAGRILOVIC,
Former Member of the Yugoslav Government, President of the Serbian Peasant Party.
Dr. GEORGIJ M. DIMITROV,
Former Member of the Bulgarian Parliament, Leader of the Bulgarian Peasant Party.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 4, 1947.*

The present declaration was framed with the participation of the representatives of the Rumanian and Polish Peasant Parties.

BACKGROUND MATERIAL—EXCERPTS FROM THE PEASANT PROGRAM

The declaration of the International Agrarian Conference, the so-called peasant program referred to in the above declaration (in point 4), was signed in London on July 9, 1942. The signatories of the program were:

Bulgaria Dimitre Matzankieff (at that time on the executive committee of the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union).

Czechoslovakia: Dr. Ladislav Feierabend; Ján Lichner (members of the Czechoslovak Government in exile).

Greece: Dr. Vrasidas Capernaros (attached to the Greek Ministry of Finance in London).

Hungary: Arnold Dániel (worked at the Czechoslovak Academy of Agriculture, and in March 1939 left Prague for England); Count Michael Károlyi (president of the Hungarian committee in London).

Poland: Stanislav Mikolajczyk (Deputy Prime Minister of the Polish Government in exile); Witold Z. Kulerski (secretary to the Polish National Council in London).

Rumania: Dr. Pavel Pavel (at that time close collaborator of Maniu).

Yugoslavia: Dr. Rudolf Bicanic (deputy governor of the Yugoslav National Bank in London); Rev. Francis Gabrovsek (connected with the Yugoslav Government in exile); Dr. Milan Gavrilovic (Minister of the Yugoslav Government in London).

(Note: Dr. Bicanic expressed later the view that, if the conditions prevailing in May 1944 had existed in 1942, he would not have signed the program.)

The program stated inter alia:

"We declare that we remain opposed to dictatorship in all its forms and heartily associate ourselves with the United Nations.

"We endorse the general purpose of the Atlantic Charter. * * *

"The Nazis regard central and eastern Europe as the booty which they hope to extract from this war.

"After victory we must be relieved from the grip of the German taskmaster; and this can only be achieved by opening new markets for us in Britain and western Europe, and by a closer all-round association between us and the United Nations. The permanent subjection of this region by Germany would mean German domination of the whole Continent; and this would involve not merely the final suppression of liberty in the nations concerned, but insecurity for all, including the great powers themselves.

"We proclaim our faith in the principle of democracy and the "four freedoms" proclaimed by President Roosevelt. We believe that the right of the people to choose and to interpret their own destiny is essential in human destiny.

"The main basis on which a sound and progressive agricultural community can be built up is that of individual and peasant-owned farms. We do not, however, believe that the peasant can live in isolation, and we recognize the desirability of voluntary cooperation in land cultivation.

"Experience of the past 20 years proves that land reforms alone are not sufficient. They must be followed by further constructive measures. The peasants themselves should control marketing, credit, and the supply of agricultural equipment by their own institutions, democratically organized. This method of combined action, being the practical expression of the cooperative principle, should be extended to factories for processing agricultural products, to the markets of the products thus made, to village communities engaged on special types of production, and to the promotion of agricultural education.

"The exaggerated nationalism of the nineteenth century gave us a legacy of national strife. We desire in the twentieth century to serve better cause. We are all fighting for our nations against Nazi tyranny; but when, with the aid of Britain, America, and the Soviet Union, we have won our freedom once more, we are determined to bury past feuds and to show the world that we have a common purpose."

Passenger Transportation in the North Atlantic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, in one or two instances in the past I have mentioned to the House the thoroughly disgraceful conditions of passenger transportation on wartime-built transports now used for passenger transportation in the North Atlantic.

The following article, published in the Washington Daily News of July 21, is, to the best of my belief, an accurate account of conditions now existing on many of these ships and illustrates most forcibly the need that the Congress shall soon take some action toward the construction of suitable passenger vessels for service under the American flag in the North Atlantic:

SOMEBODY OUGHT TO CLEAN UP OR RENAME THE STEAMSHIP "ERNIE PYLE"

(By Theodore Andrica)

BREMEN, GERMANY, July 18.—Friends of the late Ernie Pyle should start a concerted action to remove his name from the former troop ship which is now bearing it.

Conditions on this ship make one marvel that the Government, owner of the vessel, allows American citizens to travel on it.

There were about 890 passengers. Women with children were given berths in cabins holding from 6 to 12 beds. The other women and all men, except a few privileged ones, were given bunks in the hold. By chance, my "room" had only 35 other passengers in it. Other rooms housed from 60 to 100 each.

The beds were canvas bunks, tied to steel tubing by rope. I slept on the lowest bunk of the tier, and the space between my face and the back of the man above me could not have been more than 2 inches. Every time I turned, my nose got an involuntary massage.

To describe the inadequacy of sanitary facilities would require several articles. Pools of water on the washroom floor were so permanent that one wondered if the floor was ever dry. There was plenty of hot water to wash with, except that it was scalding hot.

Men paid $135 for the passage. Some women paid the same amount, but a great number paid $195, on the pretense that they would be given berths in the smaller cabins and that they would eat in the dining room and not in cafeteria style; that is, standing in line for food.

I met plenty of women, however, who paid $195 but who slept in bunks in the large rooms and who ate their meals in cafeteria style.

No effort was made to make the trip as pleasant as it might have been. There were only a few public rooms and they were uncomfortably crammed with people.

The quietest group aboard consisted of 31 pro-Nazi repatriates whom the United States Government was sending to Germany after holding them in internment camps in America for the past 5 years.

I became acquainted with the peculiar mode of thinking of several German repatriates. One spent 21 years in the United States but when the ship was nearing Bremen, he said, "Well, at last I am going home." Another German, apparently annoyed by the indiscreet reference to "home," angrily snapped, "Shut up."

Army-Navy Unification Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 22, 1947:

MILITARISM RIDES HIGH

Something that looks suspiciously like a supergovernment of militarists has been established under the so-called Army-Navy unification bill. This legislation was approved Saturday by the House with shockingly thoughtless dispatch. It had previously been passed by the Senate. Although a few minor changes were made in the language, the bill now goes to a conference committee in virtually the form it was originally written.

It is a complex piece of legislation. Very few Members of Congress seemed capable of appreciating its dangerous implications, and certainly the country at large is almost wholly ignorant of its provisions. In a gen-

eral way, the people probably were induced to believe that the bill was intended to establish some sort of unity of command over the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, to simplify the problem of national defense, and to achieve economy in the procurement of material and supplies.

These supposed objectives, however, were merely a smoke screen for what the bill actually does. First, it is fatal to hope that the Regular Army and Navy can be subordinated in defense plans to an army of civilian soldiers, organized around the National Guard. The bill is predicated upon the continuing existence of an immense regular military and naval establishment. The pending conscription bill, already approved by a House subcommittee, alone would produce this result, for upwards of 100,000 officers and men, at the very least, would be constantly required for training the draftees.

Second, the bill injects the Army and Navy into fields which were hitherto considered to be solely of civilian concern. Through the supersecretary of national defense, and the subsecretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force, they are to have a voice—and probably a controlling voice—in foreign policy, in obtaining access to raw materials in foreign lands by whatever means are required, in regimenting industry for war, in directing scientific research, and in running a spy service at home as well as abroad.

Third, the executive order by which President Truman proposes to implement the legislation provides for the use of "such missions and detachments for service in foreign countries as may be required to support the national policies and interests of the United States." Language so vague is subject to alarming constructions. There is no authorization here that Congress is to be consulted if the President is persuaded by the Army and Navy to get into military adventures and nondeclared wars anywhere on earth.

Not content with this, the President, in a companion bill now pending, asks the further authority to send troops to put down internal disorders in foreign countries, to police them, maintain the open-door policy, manage waterways, and advance American economic interests. The only restraints are that the foreign government concerned must ask for the troops, and that the President must judge intervention to be in the national interest of the United States. Again there is no recognition that, constitutionally, Congress alone has the war-making power.

The unification bill isn't going to mean a smaller and less expensive Army and Navy, but a bigger, better, and more arrogant pair of services. It gives the militarists power in spheres hitherto closed to them. It constitutes an ex post facto ratification of Mr. Roosevelt's one-man commitments to illegal wars. Such wars now become perfectly permissible.

Congress, if it permits this legislation to stand, will live to rue the day, for it has established the means of destroying the Republic.

Justice for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, as this, the first session of the Eightieth Congress, comes to a close, it occurs to me in reviewing what has happened during the past 7 months that there has been a gross and grievous omission. There has been much said and done in behalf of veterans, displaced persons, Government employees, the laboring man, business executives, the white-collar worker, and the farmer, but with few exceptions there has been little if anything said or done for the old people of this country. It is interesting to note that with the improvement and growth of medical science, the percent of our population over 60 years of age is steadily and rapidly increasing. According to the Social Security Board the percent of our population over 60 years in 1930 was 8.6 percent. In 1945 it was 11 percent, and in 1950 it is estimated to be 12 percent and by 1970 20 percent. We recognize the importance of the problem when we observe that all employers without exception insist on youth when hiring new employees and are always looking for opportunities to replace an employee 60 years old with a younger one.

My district of south Florida, by reason of its warm climate and favorable living conditions, is rapidly becoming the residence of more and more people who have passed the age of 60, and who are attempting to live out the balance of their lives on meager old-age benefits, small savings, and insurance payments. By reason of the high cost of living, many of these people are finding it next to impossible to make ends meet and are forced to become subjects of charity against their wishes. You may ask, "Well, what about old-age assistance?" But how is it possible to live on monthly payments of $33.06? That is what old-age assistance is providing to the old people in my district. It is absurd even to think that they can live on such a small sum.

This problem, however, is not one that is peculiar to Florida or California even though the need has become more pressing in those two States because of the number of their old people. The problem is Nation-wide and affects with increasing pressure every district in every State in the United States. The time has come when we can no longer ignore this growing problem, and this Congress should start making plans to meet it now.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] introduced a bill known as H. R. 16, which attacks the problem boldly and affirmatively. The bill not only recognizes the desirability of providing for the welfare of everyone over 60 years of age, but in so doing it insures a stable purchasing power which is so vital in keeping the wheels of industry turning. Unfortunately, the bill has been pigeonholed by those who are not aware of the magnitude of the problem nor of the provisions of the bill. For that reason there has been placed on the Speaker's desk a petition to discharge the committee and bring the bill before the House. I am happy to state that I have signed that petition as have all the Members of the Florida delegation, and I urge others to do so. The sooner we can start consideration of this bill and the sooner we can acquaint the Members of Congress, as well as the general public, with the ever-growing importance of the problem, the sooner the remedy will be arrived at, and the sooner the old people will be saved from the ignominy of charity. When we stop to consider that one-fifth of our population will soon be over 60 years old, nonproductive, and in need of assistance rewarding them for previous years of hard work, we can appreciate the urgency and the dire necessity for the Congress to begin moving toward a solution to the problem.

It would be easy to make flowery and sentimental speeches about the old people and our filial duty to them. Much time could be consumed in pointing out the great contribution which they have previously made to the development and growth of this country, but I do not like to approach this problem from that level, as I think the problem of assistance for old people is not alone sentimental, but practical and realistic. The problem is basically an economic one which is vitally and inextricably bound up with our whole economic structure and one which, if not met now, will in the future plague and weigh down our entire economy. The logic presented by a consideration of the facts and the figures is persuasive enough. It should be met on that basis and it should be met immediately.

Section 32 Funds Used for Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the section 32 funds made available to the Secretary of Agriculture by setting aside 30 percent of the custom receipts has provided a fund of one hundred to one hundred and fifty millions of dollars per year. This is a huge sum of public funds to be turning over to any public official. I say this without any personal reference to the present Secretary of Agriculture. The set-aside was provided to furnish funds to dispose of Agriculture surpluses, sectionism and crop favoritism could be expected. It is one proposition to start a new-use program for a product but it overreaches a new-use program when it is extended to a million dollar yearly subsidy to a few manufacturers using cotton for insulating purposes.

Here is one more example of oversubsidizing soil depleting crops. An embargo was erected on cotton imports to secure funds for the oversubsidizing of a soil-depleting crop like cotton, the New Deal reduced the duty and invited the importation of livestock and livestock products. Then 30 percent of the custom receipts was set aside as section 32 funds to be used to oversubsidize a soil-depleting crop. Then we hear talk about soil conservation with more demands for more appropriations.

The official table showing the subsidizing of cotton with funds obtained by taking 30 percent of the custom receipts

even though there is an embargo on cotton imports. This shows how far and how comfortable some groups have been sitting and are trying to continue to sit on the New Deal gravy train.

A total of $153,000,000 of section 32 funds has been used for cotton under many programs. Cotton has enjoyed many other legislative assists. Funds for the export subsidy on cotton has been provided for example under the general surplus disposal program since this law was passed by the Seventy-eighth Congress. In other words cotton while a peacetime surplus became a wartime surplus.

TABLE II.—*Cotton domestic diversion programs (sec. 32 funds)*

[All figures in thousands]

Fiscal year	Insulation		Bale wrappers		Paper		Automobile batts		Road fabric		Mats for curing concrete		Miscellaneous new uses		Total excluding binder twine		Binder twine		Total	
	Approximate number of bales	Approximate cost	Approximate number of bales	Approximate cost	Approximate number of bales	Approximate cost	Approximate number of bales	Approximate cost	Approximate number of bales	Approximate cost	Approximate number of bales	Approximate cost	Approximate number of bales	Approximate cost	Approximate number of bales	Approximate cost	Approximate number of bales	Approximate cost	Approximate number of bales	Approximate cost
1935-36									4.1	$363.2	4.1	$365.5			8.2	$728.7			8.2	$728.7
1936-37													0.05	$6.8	.05	6.8			.05	6.8
1937-38													1.4	133.8	1.4	133.8			1.4	133.8
1938-39			7.6	$195.9									2.1	244.2	9.7	440.1			9.7	440.1
1939-40			5.8	143.2	1.1	$33.4									6.9	176.6			6.9	176.6
1940-41	0.7	$16.9	10.9	207.0	5.1	82.5									16.7	306.4			16.7	306.4
1941-42	2.4	75.4	14.8	454.9											17.2	530.3			17.2	530.3
1942-43	8.7	133.6	23.7	792.3											32.4	1,125.3	40.5	$4,248.0	72.9	5,373.3
1943-44	22.6	243.2	13.0	498.4											35.6	1,341.6			35.6	1,341.6
1944-45	19.4	744.1	1.3	[1] 10.9											19.7	755.0			19.7	755.0
1945-46	28.4	1,090.0			15.0	312.5	3.3	$67.7							47.4	1,470.2			47.4	1,470.2
1946-47	[2] 44.5	[2] 1,425.0			[4] 56.2	[3] 1,124.6	[4] 26.7	[4] 525.4							127.0	3,075.0			127.0	3,075.0
Total	126.1	4,527.6	76.7	2,302.6	78.0	1,553.0	29.7	593.1	4.1	363.2	4.1	365.5	3.55	384.8	322.25	10,089.8	40.5	4,248.0	362.75	14,337.8

[1] July through September 1944.
[2] July 1946 through April 1947.
[3] July 1946 through May 17, 1947.
[4] July 1946 to varying dates, Dec. 1, 1946, to May 11, 1947.

The Kansas City Democratic Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for over a week now the Democrats in another body of the Congress have been filibustering a resolution to investigate the whitewashing of the 1946 vote-fraud scandals in Kansas City, Mo., by the Attorney General and the district attorney. If there is nothing they seek to hide by these tactics, it is difficult to imagine why they are resorted to. The American people are demanding favorable action on the Kem resolution to throw the light of inquiry on this national scandal which reaches so near the White House.

The New York Journal-American yesterday carried the following article, by Charles Finston, giving the background of the amazing series of events which have led to Missouri's hour of shame:

WHAT'S BEHIND KANSAS CITY'S POLL SCANDAL

(By Charles Finston)

WASHINGTON, July 21.—A year ago President Truman summoned to the White House young Jim Pendergast, heir to the political throne of Kansas City ruled for years by his late notorious uncle, Tom Pendergast.

Truman curtly ordered young Jim to purge Roger Slaughter, rebel Democratic Congressman from the President's home domain in Jackson County, Mo.

Truman complained Slaughter had opposed many White House policies in the powerful House Rules Committee.

CALLS IN HIS WARD HEELERS

It didn't matter that the Pendergast machine already had endorsed Slaughter for renomination at the August 6, 1946, primary elections for Federal and State offices. Slaughter was running in the Fifth Congressional District.

Truman was the boss.

Young Jim returned to Kansas City and called in his ward heelers.

He pointed to a framed $6 White House check hanging over his desk. Dated December 7, 1945, it signified that Harry Truman was a member in good standing in the Pendergast-operated Jackson County Voting Club. And he was still the club's vice president, too.

Attached to the framed check was a letter to "Dear Jim," declaring:

"I hope the outfit is still doing good." It was signed, "Sincerely yours, Harry."

Shortly after—on July 8, 1946—Pendergast announced the machine had thrown Slaughter overboard. The outfit would now support attorney Enos Axtell, 38. Axtell was picked by Truman, who knew the young lawyer as a boy. The elder Axtell's farm adjoined the Truman farm.

Truman's purge order unleashed a sordid chain of events, including a murder, dynamiting, and wholesale ballot thefts, which have shaken Kansas City to the roots.

The repercussions have been felt throughout the country. It is shaking the faith of the average voter in the "sacredness of the secret ballot and the fundamental principle of universal suffrage."

Recently, on the Senate floor, Missouri's own Senator KEM exclaimed:

"The vital issue is none other than that of free elections, the bedrock of our free institutions."

It will become one of the major issues in the 1948 Presidential campaign.

The new Pendergast outfit went to town.

What happened since last August overshadows the scandals of the 1936 Kansas City vote-fraud inquiry which sent 259 boys of the old Pendergast gang to the penitentiary.

It should be told here that all of the old gang were out of the big house before last August, what with Presidential pardons and other clemency potions passed around.

The machine-controlled precincts delivered, all right. They rolled up anti-Slaughter majorities like 88–0, 145–1, 200–2, 60–0, and 374–5.

"The outfit was still doing good" as Truman hoped.

WITH STRINGS TIED TO THEM

After it was over, Democratic National Committee Boss Hannegan hailed the results as "a strong vote of confidence in President Truman."

But the lopsided vote started many tongues wagging and by September 28 the Kansas City election board and city council demanded that Attorney General Clark open a full and complete investigation of vote frauds.

Clark agreed. He sent FBI agents into Kansas City on October 17 with strings tied to them. His orders were to restrict the inquiry to interviews with four election board members and two newspapermen.

Even so, the FBI did a thorough but limited job and compiled a 355-page report after spending 7 days in the Missouri city. The report began to gather dust.

Axtell, Truman's protégé, lost in the November general elections to a Republican, Albert L. Reeves, Jr.

The Republican victory did not still the cries for a complete probe of the vote frauds.

While Attorney General Clark dawdled, a State grand jury went to work last March. Two months later, in May, this body returned indictments against 71 Pendergast lads.

Less than 12 hours after the indictments on May 27, vaults of the election board were dynamited. The thieves took with them 7,965 ballots from 32 of the worst precincts.

ORDERS FULL-DRESS INQUIRY

On the following day Attorney General Clark became "so incensed" he ordered the FBI to start a full-dress investigation, what the citizens of Kansas City had been crying for 9 months earlier.

The outfit, however, had done its job good. All the evidence was gone against all but 3 of the 71 persons indicted.

To top it off, a housewife was killed with a shot-gun blast in front of her delicatessen on July 12. Her name was Mrs. Mary Bono.

Clark told the FBI she was a possible witness in the investigation, and ordered her murder investigated.

On Capitol Hill, however, lawmakers cried: "A hasp and a lock to the well-known empty barn."

Red Reptiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I find there are pinks, reds, and so-called border line "liberals" who resent any reference to communism, yet to patriotic Americans the penetration of Communists into the Army, Navy, State Department, and into every key position of Government is of vital consequence to the welfare and safety of our Republic. The exposure of the various hidden dens of reptiles causes loud hissing when the sunlight finally penetrates the hiding places of these subversive elements.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article by Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange Monthly:

COMMUNISM IN AMERICA

THERE ARE TERMITES IN THE TIMBERS OF OUR NATIONAL STRUCTURE TODAY, AND THEY SOMETIMES IMPEDE THE WHEELS OF PROGRESS

(By Fred Brenckman)

When the House Committee on Education and Labor, after hearings and an investigation, reported on May 31 that the 76-day strike at the plant of the Allis-Chalmers Co., near Milwaukee, in 1941 was called under the direction of the Communist Party because of the important work being done there for the Navy, it placed the seal of official verification on a conclusion that many well informed people already had reached themselves.

Soviet Russia had a nonaggression pact with Germany at the time of the strike and was opposing as imperialistic the war with Germany then being fought by the Allies with the aid of materials from the United States. As matters then stood, American Communists were opposed to our preparedness program. But the moment Hitler attacked Russia, they experienced a change of heart, and when the United States was drawn into the war as a belligerent by the Japanese assault on Pearl Harbor, the Communists of this country were among the most vociferous advocates of the opening of a second front in Europe. This clearly shows that the Communists of this country bear allegiance to Russia, and not to the United States.

PUBLICATION DEFERRED

Publication of the full report of the committee to which reference has been made has been deferred at the request of the Department of Justice, to which the document was turned over as evidence of false testimony by Harold Christoffel and Robert Buse. Mr. Christoffel was president of Local 248, United Automobile Workers, CIO, when the Allis-Chalmers strike of 1941 was called. Mr. Buse, now president, directed the 329-day strike at the same plant which ended on March 23 this year, and which has also been called Communist-inspired.

The Allis-Chalmers plant, which had defense orders aggregating $45,000,000, was singled out by the Communist leaders as a focal point in 1941 because of the work it was doing for the Navy, according to the report of the congressional committee. In calling the strike, it is charged Christoffel used 2,000 fraudulent ballots and betrayed his employer, his country, and his fellow workers. It is also alleged that both Christoffel and Buse perjured themselves during hearings on labor control legislation held by the Committee on Education and Labor last March. Both denied to the committee that they were Communists.

This story is typical of the way that Communists work to achieve their ends. They are the sworn enemies of our American system of free enterprise, and their purpose is to overthrow the Government of the United States.

UNDER COMMUNIST BANNER

The whole country was shocked to learn that in the May Day parade in New York City this year thousands who wore the uniform of the United States marched under the Communist banner. The Daily Worker, Communist Party publication, boasted that the largest group of veterans in the parade were members of the Communist Party.

"Men and women from all the armed services," said the Daily Worker, "soldiers, sailors, marines, Wacs, Waves, and Spars, made up the Communist contingent of 4,500 veterans. The Communist vets—men and women—marched by in spick and span uniforms and smartly dressed lines and shouting recruiting slogans together. Join the Communist Party! Fight for freedom, they shouted. Join the Communist Party! Fight for peace!"

Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, called on the heads of the armed services to take action against uniformed persons who took part in this parade, which he termed a "treasonable demonstration" which provided "flagrant evidence" of infiltration by Communists into the armed forces.

In 1942 Francis Biddle, then Attorney General of the United States, in reviewing the deportation proceedings of Harry Bridges, found that the Communist Party from the time of its inception in 1919 believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow of the Government of the United States by violence.

ON FEDERAL PAY ROLL

Nevertheless, many Communists have held important positions under the Government during recent years. According to J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, since July 1, 1941, his organization has investigated 6,193 cases under the Hatch Act, which forbids membership on the part of any Government employee in any organization advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States.

The Attorney General has ruled that a number of organizations, in addition to the Communist Party, are subversive under the Hatch Act because of Communist influence. Over 100 Federal employees were discharged as a result of these investigations, 21 resigned, and in 75 cases administrative action was taken by the various departments. A total of 1,906 individuals with communistic affiliations are no longer employed by the Government, while more than 120 cases are presently pending in various Federal agencies. While this sounds somewhat impressive, the feeling is that the surface has merely been scratched. Those who are best qualified to judge are of the opinion that there are still plenty of Communists on the Federal pay roll, and a systematic campaign must be waged to drive them out.

INFILTRATING UNIONS

Nobody in the United States knows more about the workings of the Communists than J. Edgar Hoover, who has already been mentioned. He declares that the Communist tactic of infiltrating labor unions stems from the earliest teachings of Karl Marx, which have been reiterated by party spokesmen down through the years. They resort to any means whatsoever to gain their ends and often succeed in getting control of labor unions and taking them over before the rank and file of the members are aware of what has happened.

The American Federation of Labor has done its best to keep Communists from entrenching themselves in the unions affiliated with the federation.

Philip Murray, president of the CIO, is a member of the Catholic Church, which abhors the doctrines of communism, which are based on atheism. But the fact remains that many Communists hold key positions in unions that come under the CIO. Occasionally Murray announces his determination to throw the Communists out, but they are like termites in the timbers of a house. It is difficult to eradicate them.

Communists are well schooled in the tactics of propaganda. They are past masters in stirring up hate, discontent, and sedition. They know how to worm their way into key positions where they can poison the fountains of truth, practice deception, divide the people against each other, and demoralize society in general.

It has been noted that Communists are prolific letter writers. Some of the most energetic follow the practice of directing numerous letters of protest to editors, but signing a different name to each. Members of Congress know immediately when the Communists are launching a campaign by the flood of mail that follows the party line.

Nor is the motion-picture industry overlooked. Communist influence at Hollywood is a force to be reckoned with. It is said that the party is content and highly pleased if it is possible to have inserted into a picture a line, a scene, or a sequence conveying the Communist lesson, and more particularly if they can keep out anything that would injure the Communist cause. It is reported that some producers and studio heads realize the possibility that the entire industry faces serious embarrassment because it might become the springboard for the dissemination of Communist propaganda.

SEEK RADIO CHANNELS

The party no longer depends upon the printing press alone to spread its propaganda. Communists and their sympathizers have taken to the air, and they are today making efforts to secure radio channels.

America's Town Hall of the Air, which is a fine institution, recently devoted one of its programs to a debate on communism. It was rather surprising to hear a prominent Episcopal clergyman, speaking in the most cultured accents, proclaim his belief that the church and communism could get along together splendidly. No wonder that Dorothy Thompson, one of the speakers opposing communism, remarked that the fellow travelers sometimes succeeded in seducing even preachers. We might as well think of being happy with snakes in our boots as to delude ourselves with the idea that communism is not incompatible with all that every decent American holds most dear.

According to the best available information, there are about 75,000 enrolled members of the Communist Party in the United States. New York leads, with 30,000 members, followed by California, with 8,500; Illinois, 6,500; Ohio, 3,800; Oregon, 3,600; Washington, 2,750; New Jersey, 2,487; and Michigan, 2,135.

However, the Communists themselves claim that for every party member they have, there are 10 others who are ready and willing to do the party's bidding. Quite a proportion of these are self-styled liberals and intellectuals, who appear to have been born without the saving quality of common sense.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I will vote against H. R. 29, a bill to make unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election.

Because of the importance of this legislation, I wish to make my position absolutely clear.

I am opposed to the payment of a poll tax as a requirement to be met before qualification as a voter. It is outmoded, unfair, discriminatory, and undemocratic. I am opposed to the type of political systems that have been built up in several of our States largely because of this unfair voting qualification.

I believe the poll tax should be abolished.

Why, then, do I cast my vote against this bill?

I do so because this bill, while striving to correct an admitted evil, encourages a still greater one—the usurpation of the basic rights of the several States, in this case, the right of the States to determine the qualifications of their voters, within the limitations laid down by the Constitution.

That right is carefully written into that document. Can we take away that right by congressional action? Can we take away that right without obtaining the permission of the States through the regular constitutional process?

I do not believe we can; I believe this bill is unconstitutional. If I am wrong, if the Supreme Court upholds this law, then we have broken, by that process, the right of the individual States to determine the qualifications of their voters. If that happens, if we can lawfully say to the States, "You can no longer qualify your voters by this means," then can we not, just as lawfully, by passage of another law, say to the States, "You must now qualify your voters in such and such a manner"? If that is the full import of this bill, it is a sickening blow at our Federal system of Government. It is for that reason that I strongly oppose it.

If we cannot, or should not, do it by statute, how then can we do away with this undemocratic institution?

There is only one way, of course. That is by the legal way. That is by asking the consent of the States to take from them a portion of a certain right which we guaranteed to them in a document which they signed in order to make the Union of the States possible. It can be done by the submission of a constitutional amendment, such as is proposed in House Joint Resolution 73, which would forbid any State to deny the right of any citizen to vote because of his failure to pay a poll or property tax.

I am confident that such an amendment would pass the House. I am equally certain that it would succeed in the other body. I have no doubt it would be quickly ratified by two-thirds of our States. There would be no question then of the desire of the people to have this particular right—the right to levy poll taxes—taken away from them.

We should then have legally and constitutionally accomplished our purpose. Even more important than that, we should have kept faith with the spirit and intent of our Constitution by preserving the right of the States to determine the qualifications of their voters, within the limitations which they themselves have agreed to accept.

Mr. Speaker, early in this session, realizing the importance of this issue, I asked the Library of Congress to prepare a summary of the arguments, both for and against relief by statute. I ask unanimous consent that this summary, prepared by Mr. Frank B. Horne, of the Federal Law Section, Library of Congress, be included as part of my remarks:

THE POLL-TAX QUESTION

I. INTRODUCTION

The controversy over State poll taxes which has engaged the attention of the Congress in recent years has revolved largely around a single question: Is the requirement of the payment of a tax as a condition precedent to voting a "qualification" within the meaning of that term as used in the Constitution?

One school of thought reads article I, section 2, in the light of the historical background of Constitution and court decisions and concludes that the poll tax is a qualification, the destruction of which will require an amendment to the Constitution. It therefore opposes an attempt at abolishment by means of an act of Congress on constitutional grounds.

The other school of thought contends that the poll tax is a pretended qualification bearing no relationship to the real qualifications of a voter; that it is merely a device whereby a large segment of the population is disenfranchised. This school reads article I, sections 2 and 4, together throughout their constitutional development and interpretation concluding that an amendment is unnecessary, in fact that it is undesirable in that such an amendment would lend respectability to other schemes for disenfranchising segments of the population by means of pretended qualifications.

In both schools are found outspoken advocates of the abolishment of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting.

II. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The controversy over the poll tax, insofar as the Constitution of the United States is concerned, revolves about the application, meaning, and intention of the following provisions:

1. Article I, section 2

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

2. Article I, section 4

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

3. Article I, section 8, clause 18

"The Congress shall have power * * * To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

4. The fourteenth amendment

"Section 1. * * * No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. * * *

"SEC. 2. * * * But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive or Judicial officers of a State, of the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any male inhabitant of such State being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

"SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

5. The seventeenth amendment

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years * * * The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

6. The nineteenth amendment

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

7. Article X

"The powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

III. THE POLL-TAX STATES

There are at present six poll-tax States: Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, and Virignia. Poll-tax laws appear to have sprung into prominence following the certification of the ratification of the fifteenth amendment in 1870 in the following order: Virginia, 1875; Mississippi, 1890; Arkansas, 1892; South Carolina, 1895; Alabama, 1901; and Texas, 1908. (See p. 65, hearings on H. R. 7, 78th Cong., before Senate Committee on the Judiciary.) (The Tennessee poll-tax litigation is now before the United States Supreme Court. See 15 L. W. 3184.)

Poll taxes were not unknown to the members of the Constitutional Convention. New Hampshire had a provision in its constitution requiring the payment of a poll tax, while in Massachusetts the requirement was statutory. (Hearings, pp. 102–103.)

IV. STATUTORY RESTRICTIONS RELATING TO READMITTED POLL-TAX STATES

The point has been raised that the poll tax contravenes the prohibition contained in the readmissions acts following the Civil War which prohibited constitutional changes whereby the right to vote would be abridged (see for example 16 Stat. 62).

Without entering into this phase of the controvery, it has been suggested that where statehood is tendered it cannot be specifically qualified so as to deny to the prospective State the equal rights of sovereignty enjoyed by the several States. (See *Coyle* v. *Smith* (1911) 221 U. S. 559).

V. BASIC ARGUMENTS

A. As voiced by proponents of statutory relief (see Poll Taxes, hearings on H. R. 7 before Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 78th Cong.):

1. If the poll tax, as we claim, is clearly an abridgment of the constitutional right of citizens of the United States to vote for

Federal officers, then Congress can clearly legislate to protect the Federal right. If the poll tax is not a legitimate qualification for Federal suffrage in the constitutional sense, Congress has the power to protect the rights of national citizenship. A constitutional amendment is not necessary to achieve a result within the existing power of Congress. (Pressman, p. 38.)

2. Since the right of American citizens to vote for Federal officers is protected by the Constitution of the United States, Congress has the clear authority to protect the integrity and the free exercise of such a right.

3. Congress has ample power to pass H. R. 7. This power is available to Congress regardless whether the poll-tax statutes of the various States are unconsitutional or not. (Pressman, p. 34.)

4. The States do not have any authority to impose any and all types of conditions upon the exercise of the right of American citizens to vote for Federal officers merely by terming such conditions "qualifications" of electors. Where such conditions actually have no reasonable relationship to the qualifications for discharging the obligation of citizenship by voting, Congress may, in the interest of protecting the integrity of the Federal constitutional right, veto such conditions.

There are those who urge that article I, section 2, leaves entirely in the hands of the States the uncontrolled power and discretion to decide who may or may not vote. It is true that the State may prescribe qualifications but in this connection it should be recalled that the basic right to vote for Federal officers is one which is given by the Constitution of the United States.

5. The fifteenth and nineteenth amendments of the Constitution do not establish any precedent that States may be prohibited from creating qualifications for electors only through such constitutional amendments.

These amendments merely took note of the fact that the conditions such as race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and sex had been historically recognized as appropriate qualifications. The amendments decreed that thereafter the right to vote should not be denied on account of these conditions either by the United States or by the States. (Pressman, pp. 37-38.)

6. The record of the constitutional debates and subsequent statements of the framers of our Constitution demonstrate conclusively that the Federal Government was vested with the supreme authority to protect the all-important Federal right of suffrage. Further, these records disclose that the very issue now under discussion had been considered and disposed of in a manner as to assure Federal protection against arbitrary action by States to deny the people their right of suffrage. (Pressman, p. 38.)

7. Congress has recognized its authority to legislate regarding the qualifications of electors for Federal officers in recent enactments.

On September 16, 1942, Congress passed a statute which provided that: "No person in military service in time of war shall be required, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof."

It would be interesting to hear from one who challenges the constitutionality of the proposed bill as to how Congress had the authority to enact H. R. 7416 which contained the quoted provision.

8. The poll tax is not a revenue measure, it has no relationship to the qualifications that American citizens should have before exercising their right to vote, but is simply a legal trickery to favor a particular class of candidates in success of elections. As such it not only can be but must be condemned by Congress if the integrity of the constitutional right to vote is to be protected. (Pressman, p. 37.)

9. The right to vote for Federal officers is a right protected by the United States Constitution; it is a privilege and immunity of citizens of the United States protected by the Constitution: it is not a privilege to be conferred or withdrawn at the whim of any State. For this reason Congress has the obligation to protect the exercise of this fundamental right. In discharging this duty, Congress cannot be restricted by any narrow and stultifying interpretation which would prevent adequate protection being afforded to citizens in the exercise of their right to vote. (Pressman, p. 32.)

10. The Federal power of affirmative action being thus clear, the sole determination that this committee has to make is a factual one: Does the poll tax produce consequences which in effect impede the proper exercise of the constitutionally guaranteed right to vote? If this committee answers that factual question in the affirmative, Congress has ample power to take action to remove the effects of the poll tax by this bill. And in so doing, the committee need make no determination as to whether the poll tax is constitutional or not. (Pressman, p. 36.)

11. The power of Congress to enact this bill does not depend necessarily on the constitutionality of the poll-tax law. As in many other instances, the State poll tax may or may not be constitutional but Congress may nevertheless ascertain whether the existence of the poll tax presents an evil falling within congressional remedial power and if Congress so finds and acts on that finding, any inconsistent State legislation will fall.

"Does the poll tax then present to Congress a situation in which there exists an evil within the power of Congress to remedy and which affects Federal rights in such a way as to require congressional action? It is not an answer to say that the poll tax is simply a qualification prescribed by the State within the meaning of article I, section 2, and that therefore Congress must find in the poll tax no evil consequences which require congressional action." (Pressman, p. 35.)

12. One final thought should be presented on this question of constitutionality. Neither this committee nor Congress can usurp the powers of the courts of this Nation. It is the duty of Congress to enact legislation in accordance with the policy necessary for the welfare of the Nation. Congress may act within the scope of its constitutional powers. But it is for the Supreme Court and not for Congress to decide close questions as to constitutionality. Had Congress usurped the powers of the Supreme Court to the extent of never enacting any legislation as to which there was any constitutional doubt, there are many statutes which would not today be on the books of the country. Had Congress been swayed by the views of some 58 prominent names in the legal profession, Congress would have concluded that it had no power to enact the National Labor Relations Act. The Supreme Court acting within the scope of its functions later made the final determination.

But whether the committee will agree completely on this proposition or not, the members of the committee must agree that there is far more than a reasonable foundation for believing that the Supreme Court would uphold congressional power to enact this statute. That being so, it is the duty of this Congress to act in the light of the Nation's needs and to leave to the Supreme Court the final determination. (Pressman, p. 39.)

13. James Madison, in No. 57 of the Federalist: "Who are to be the electors of the Federal representatives? Not the rich, more than the poor; not the learned, more than the ignorant; not the haughty heirs of distinguished names, more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States."

14. Alexander Hamilton, in Federalist No. 59 and No. 60: "Nothing can be more evident than exclusive power of regulating election for the National Government, in the hands of the State legislatures, would leave the existence of the Union entirely in their mercy. They could at any moment annihilate it by neglecting to provide for the choice of persons to administer its affairs. It is to little purpose to say that a neglect or omission of its kind would not be likely to take place. The constitutional possibility of the thing without an equivalent for the risk is an unanswerable objection. Nor has any satisfactory reason been yet assigned for incurring that risk" (p. 38).

B. As voiced by proponents of constitutional amendment:

1. There is no right of national citizenship to vote. * * * The right to vote for Members of Congress is given only to such United States citizens as possess qualifications for voting in the States for the most numerous branch of the legislature (Warren, p. 79).

2. In arriving at this method of disposing of the question of the right to vote in the Federal Convention of 1787 there was a threefold contest. The contest was between those Members who wished a uniform qualification for electors (freehold property or otherwise) to be prescribed in the Constitution itself; there was another group of Delegates who wished the power to prescribe to be vested in Congress, and there was still a third group who wished the Constitution to prescribe qualifications—not uniform qualifications but qualifications such as the respective States prescribed for their own people.

It was the last group who prevailed, and after 2 days of active debate, they left the Constitution in this respect as it now stands in this much-read section—section 2 of article I.

You notice that that is not a grant of power specifically to the Congress of the United States. In fact, it is not a grant of power to anyone. It is a requirement of the Constitution for the formation of the new Government. The first part of it is a requirement that the people of the several States shall choose Members of the House of Representatives every second year. That was no reliquishment or delegation of power from the States. That was a constituent part of the formation of the new Government and was a command to the States to elect their Members of Congress every second year. That was a command. It was neither a delegation of power nor was it a prohibition. It was a command and is so referred to in the recent cases in the Supreme Court.

The second thing that section 2 did was: It vested a right in the electors in each State who have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislation—a right in those persons in the State and those only who were entiled to vote for Members of Congress. (Warren, p. 80.)

3. The members of the Constiutional Convention knew that acting under these constitutions, several of the States had also statutes prescribing certain qualifications which were allowed by the legislatures. They had all that before them, and yet it is asked now, "Why didn't they describe what they meant by 'qualifications'? Why wasn't there some debate on the use of that term?"

Answer is, of course, that every delegate from every State knew what his State constitution meant by "qualifications" or what his State legislature meant by "qualifications" and they certainly were not giving power to this new Government to define what

their own State constitutions meant or to define what the State legislatures meant.

That was a matter for the State exclusively. No legislature can define the meaning of a word in its constitution, no one can define except the people of the State or the State judiciary, as to everything in connection with the construction and interpretation of section 2. There is an absolute absence of any right granted to Congress to decide or define what a State by its constitution or legislature could demand of one of its inhabitants in order to qualify him to vote for a State legislature. (Warren. p. 85.)

4. Section 2, of course, contains no power, specifically, of Congress to prescribe to the States who they shall qualify to vote for the members of their State legislatures and you have got to find such a power implied if anywhere under the necessary and proper clause. * * *

Before 1787, the States had absolutely full and unlimited power to lay down any requirements which the people of the States, through the constitutions or legislatures of the States in their absolute discretion and judgment, desired in order to qualify any one of their inhabitants to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature.

There was no limitation whatsoever. The State had the power, either in its constitution or its legislature as the case may be, to say to whom it desired to grant the vote for members of the legislature or from whom it desired to withhold the right. (Warren, p. 83.)

5. How could the Federal Convention get behind that action of the people of the States through their own constitutions? They did not attempt to meddle with the constitutions of the States in any explicit powers given in article I section 2 and I can see no implied power under the necessary and proper clause which gave to the Congress the right to say to the people of the State who had already before devised and established their own constitutions, to say to the people of a State, "You shall not have the right to grant or to deny the right to vote for your own legislatures." Imagine that proposition put up to the members of the Federal Convention, that they were embodying in section 2, a denial to a State of its right through its own States constitution to establish the requirement of a State voter to vote for a member of a State legislature. (Warren, p 84.)

6. First, Congress undoubtedly has power to legislate (under art. I, sec. 2) so as to see to it that the States do elect Members of Congress every second year. Congress undoubtedly has the power to protect the right which the Constitution vested in such persons in the States as had the qualifications requisite to vote for members of the State legislature. Congress undoubtedly has that power; and since Congress has, under the necessary and proper clause, power to legislate so as to see that the States make the same provisions for qualifications of electors of Members of Congress as they do for electors of their own legislature. (Warren, p. 81.)

7. Section 2 contains undoubtedly an implied prohibition on the States against fixing for electors of the Members of Congress and different requirements for suffrage from those which they fixed for the electors of their own most numerous branch of their legislature, i. e., any qualifications which were not those requisite for to render an inhabitant of their own State elegible to vote. (Warren, p. 81.)

8. To define a word, any word, in the Constitution of the United States is purely for the court. Congress can no more define a word than it can insert a word. (Warren, p. 87.)

9. Not only is it not within the power of Congress to interpret the legal meaning of that clause (art. I, sec. 2)—it must also be absolutely true that if you cannot interpret a clause of the Constitution through the exercise of congressional power, you certainly cannot insert something into the section. Of course, if Congress can insert the word "reasonable," it can insert the words "except poll-tax requirements" or any other words that it desires. (Warren, p. 85.)

10. When the fourteenth amendment was adopted * * * it was claimed that that privilege and immunity clause of the citizens of the United States denied to the State the power to restrict the right of suffrage, and when, in 1868, the fifteenth amendment was under consideration, Mr. Boutwell and some others thought it was not necessary to pass the fifteenth amendment in order to give the Negro the right to vote because they said it could be done by a simple act of Congress under the privilege and immunity clause, that is, by an act of Congress enforcing the privilege and immunity clause. That attempt was soon dropped. That bill was debated in the House but it was soon dropped, and the fifteenth amendment was adopted in order to establish the power by the Constitution.

* * * The idea that the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States denied in some way the right of the States to control suffrage, that idea prevailed for a number of years until, in 1875, there came along the Slaughterhouse cases; and in those cases there was laid down * * * for the first time, the distinction between the rights of a citizen and a State and the rights of a citizen of the United States, as such, that is, the rights which grew out of some peculiar relation of an inhabitant of a State to the United States Government (Warren, p. 93)

11. When what is now the first section of the fourteenth amendment was reported to the House, it was drafted by John A. Bingham, a Republican Member of the House from Ohio, and in answering it on May 10, Mr. Bingham made these statements (this is on page 2542 in the Congressional Globe if anyone wants to look it up). Mr. Bingham said:

"This amendment takes from no State any right that ever pertained to it. The amendment does not give, as the section shows, the power to Congress of regulating suffrage in the several States."

And in the second section—that was the section, you remember, that reduced the representation of the States in case they denied to any person the right of suffrage—Bingham said:

"The second section excludes the conclusion that by the first section suffrage is subjected to congressional law."

In the Senate, this first section was discussed by Senator Howard, who was heading the committee in the absence of Senator Fessenden; and he states (May 23, p. 3165, et seq.):

"The first section of the proposed amendment does not give to either of these classes the privilege of voting. The right of suffrage is not, in law, one of the privileges or immunities thus secured by the Constitution. It is merely the creature of law. It has always been regarded in this country as a result of positive local law."

As to section 2 (on p. 2766), Howard said:

"This section does not recognize the authority of the United States over the question of suffrage in the several States at all. Nor does it recognize, much less secure, the right of suffrage to the colored race. It leaves the right to regulate the elective franchise still with the States and does not meddle with that right."

In closing the debate, June 8, and just before the joint resolution was passed upon by the Senate, Senator Howard said (p. 3039):

"We know very well that the States retain the power which they have always possessed of regulating the right of suffrage. It is the theory of the Constitution. That right has never been taken from them; no endeavor has ever been made to take it from them; and the theory of this whole amendment is to leave the power of regulating the suffrage with the people or legislatures of the States and not to assume to regulate it by any clause of the Constitution of the United States." (Warren, pp. 88–89.)

12. Then arose that very heated condition (after 1865) growing out of the situation at the end of the war and if there was ever a time in our whole history, and especially in our whole legislative history * * * that a claim should have been made that the United States Congress had any power to regulate the question of suffrage in the States, that claim would have been made during the debates over the civil-rights bill of 1866 and the debates on the fourteenth amendment in 1866. * * * With the exception of one Senator, there was not a single Senator on the floor of the Senate who claimed or contended for 1 minute that the States did not have full control of the suffrage. (Warren, pp. 87–88.)

13. There is no pretense to say that the power in the National Government can be used so as to exclude any State from its share in the representation in Congress. Nor can it be said with correctness that Congress can, in any way, alter the right or qualification of voters. (Storey's Commentaries (1933), vol. I, sec. 820.)

VI. COURT DECISIONS

A. As cited by proponents of statutory enactment:

1. *U. S.* v. *Classic* ((1941) 313 U. S. 299): The Classic case raised this very issue. It was contended in that situation that Congress could only determine the time, place, and manner of the final elections, which did not include any authority over primaries. In other words, the attempt was made to limit the authority of Congress as against the so-called all-embracing sovereignty of the States to legislate regarding Federal elections.

The United States Supreme Court dismissed this specious argument and held that the Constitution of the United States, which created this basic and fundamental right for American citizens and delegated to Congress the authority to protect such right, could not be interpreted in such a narrow fashion. (Pressman, p. 33.)

2. The Classic case applied: "While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States, see *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. 162, 170); *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214, 217-218); *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 38–39); *Breedlove* v. *Suttle* (302 U. S. 277, 283); the statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers' (p. 315). See *Ex parte Siebold* (100 U. S. 371); *Ex parte Yarbrough* ((1884) 110 U. S. 651)."

In the Yarbrough case the Supreme Court had held:

"The States in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualification for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for the Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress."

The conclusion, we submit, that is to be drawn from this exposition of the constitutional provisions governing the privilege of voting is, that, to the extent the voter proposes to cast his ballot for State officers he is acting as a State elector and is subject to the laws of the State; the Federal constitutional provision respecting qualifications being inapplicable. But to the extent that the voter proposes to vote for Federal officers he acts as a Federal elector in the particular State and his privilege to vote, although delineated in the first instance by the State itself, emanates from the Federal Constitution and is a privilege protected by that Constitution. Accordingly, the fourteenth amendment withdraws from the States any prerogative they may have theretofore asserted to abridge as they saw fit such privileges when attempted to be exercised by citizens of the United States. (See *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58).)

3. *Ex parte Yarbrough* ((1884) 110 U. S. 651): "But is it not correct to say that the right to vote for a Member of Congress does not depend upon the Constitution of the United States" (p. 663).

4. *Missouri* v. *Holland* ((1920) 252 U. S. 416): "The (constitutional law) case before us must be considered in the light of our whole experience and not merely in that of what was said a 100 years ago" (p. 433).

5. *McCulloch v. Maryland* ((1819) 4 Wheat. 316): "No trace is to be found in the Constitution, of an intention to create a dependence of the Government of the Union on those of the States, for the execution of the great powers assigned to it. Its means are adequate to its ends; and on those means alone was it expected to rely for the accomplishment of its ends. To impose on it the necessity of resorting to means which it cannot control, which another government may furnish or withhold, would render its course precarious, the result of its measures uncertain, and create a dependence on other governments, which might disappoint its most important designs, and is incompatible with the language of the Constitution" (p. 424).

B. As cited by proponents of constitutional amendment:

1. The Supreme Court has held for 40 or 50 years that the right to vote for Congressman was a Federal right secured by the Constitution, but the question is: The right of whom to vote for Congressman (Warren, p. 79).

2. *Ex parte Yarbrough* ((1884) 110 U. S. 651 : "The States, in prescribing the qualification of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualifications for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress" (p. 663).

3. *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* ((1900) 179 U. S. 58): Judge Gray quotes the Yarbrough case: "They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress" (p. 63).

4. *Minor* v. *Happersett* ((1874) 21 Wall. 162): "Certainly, if the courts can consider any question settled, this is one. For nearly 90 years the people have acted upon the idea that the Constitution, when it conferred citizenship, did not necessarily confer the rights of suffrage. If uniform practice long continued can settle the construction of so important an instrument as the Constitution of the United States confessedly is, most certainly it has been done here. Our province is to decide what the law is, not to declare what it should be" (pp. 177–178).

5. *Guinn* v. *U. S.* ((1915) 238 U. S. 347): "It says State power to provide for suffrage is not disputed, although, of course, the authority of the fifteenth amendment and the limit on that power which it imposes is insisted upon. Hence, no assertion denying the right of a State to exert judgment and discretion in fixing the qualification of suffrage is advanced and no right to question the motive of the State in establishing a standard as to such subjects under such circumstances or to review or supervise the same is relied upon, and no power to destroy an otherwise valid exertion of authority upon the mere ultimate operation of the power exercised is asserted" (p. 359).

6. *Pope* v. *Williams* ((1904) 193 U. S. 621): "A State, so far as the Federal Constitution is concerned, might provide by its own constitution and laws that none but native-born citizens should be permitted to vote, as the Federal Constitution does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone, and the conditions under which that right is to be exercised are matters for the States alone to prescribe, subject to the conditions of the Federal Constitution, already stated; although it may be observed that the right to vote for a Member of Congress is not derived exclusively from the State Law. * * * The question whether the conditions prescribed by the State might be regarded by others as reasonable or unreasonable is not a Federal one" (p. 633).

VII. THE TERM "QUALIFICATION"

1. To say that Congress has the duty of enacting legislation prohibiting a limitation which it determines not to be a qualification, would be to say that Congress has the power to define the term "qualification" which is purely a judicial function. (See Warren, pp. 86–87.)

2. We must come to the conclusion then that the term "qualification" does have limits—limits determined by the proper definition of the word. The restriction which the State seeks to place upon the right to vote must be a restriction which can reasonably be determined a qualification of a voter. (Pressman, p. 37.)

As the poll tax is not a legitimate "qualification" for Federal suffrage in the constitutional sense, Congress has the power to protect the right to vote and a constitutional amendment is unnecessary to this end.

VIII. LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Without attempting an exhaustive search of legislative proposals to abolish the poll tax, it should be noted that the question has been before the Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-nine Congresses. Bills which proposed a statutory solution were:

Seventy-sixth Congress: H. R. 7534.

Seventy-seventh Congress: H. R. 970, 1024, 6654, and S. 1280.

Seventy-eighth Congress: H. R. 7, 52, 642, 651, 987, 1017.

Seventy-ninth Congress: H. R. 7, 193, 308, 406, 657, 2183, 2324.

Eightieth Congress: H. R. 7, 29, 66, 230, 779.

Resolutions which proposed amendments were:

Seventy-eighth Congress: House Joint Resolutions 126, 284 and Senate Joint Resolutions 132, 284.

Seventy-ninth Congress: House Joint Resolution 54.

Eightieth Congress: House Joint resolution 73.

Of these bills and resolutions, two (H. R. 1024 and S. 1280—77th Cong., H. R. 7—78th Cong., and H. R. 7—79th Cong.) passed the House; were reported favorably in the Senate, but failed of passage.

How Not To Fight Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, last night I read with great interest the following article entitled "How Not To Fight Communism," by Eugene Lyons, published in the Liberty magazine for August 2, 1947. I feel that it is as illuminating an article as I have ever read on the subject of Red fascism and accordingly ask unanimous consent of this House that it be printed in toto in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I commend its reading to many Members of this House who are not as familiar with the methods which must be used to defeat communism in this country as they might be. The article I refer to reads as follows:

HOW NOT TO FIGHT COMMUNISM

(By Eugene Lyons)

The pendulum of American public opinion is swinging violently against the Communists.

On the official side, the President has ordered a systematic purge of disloyal elements from the Government pay rolls. A Supreme Court decision has strengthened the hand of timid bureaus and agencies in this long-overdue job of national house cleaning. A start is being made in the exposure of Soviet spy masters. State and Federal legislators are probing the Communist infiltration of American life and studying laws to curb the process.

In short, after a decade of political color blindness Uncle Sam has begun to see red. What he was inclined to dismiss with characteristic smugness as a nuisance, he suddenly recognizes as a menace. It has dawned on him that there is a crucial difference between a political party, however extreme its views, and a foreign conspiracy, however skillful its disguise as a political party.

Fighting the Communists, their stooges, and fellow travelers has already become respectable. It threatens to become highly fashionable.

I happen to be among the hardy, or perhaps foolhardy, few who fought the Communists when it was neither fashionable nor comfortable. In a book called the Red Decade, I exposed their methods of worming into our free institutions. As editor of a monthly magazine, I tried to warn my countrymen against the wartime illusion that Stalin had been miraculously changed into a freedom-loving Democrat.

The comrades and their muddled liberal dupes have abused me with great vigor and relish, and I flatter myself that I have earned their every unflattering adjective. Under these circumstances I might be expected to don an I-told-you-so smile, now that the average American has caught up with the facts of life on the left. Instead of which, alas, I wear a worried expression. And here's why—

It seems to me that in the sudden upsurge of anger at the Communists and their works, there are disturbing overtones of hysteria. Yesterday's complacency has given way, in certain quarters, to a case of jitters. There is an up and at 'em boys impatience which endangers the innocent along with the guilty. They seem exasperated by the Constitutional and traditional obstacles to an all-out man hunt of Communists and Communist collaborators.

Most alarming of all, anti-Communist sentiment is being used by some unscrupulous or bigoted people as a convenient cover for racist obsessions, anti-labor bias, dislike of foreigners, and other assorted prejudices. They think they can serve any dish of malice if they douse it with anti-Communist sauce. Unless that trend is stopped, unless common sense prevails, the cure for communism may prove as pernicious as the disease itself.

Our justified determination to unmask and neutralize the Stalinist conspiracy in our midst must not degenerate into know-nothing persecution. If it does, we shall be playing into the hands of the Communists and all other enemies of democracy.

We abhor the totalitarian way of life because it violates our concepts of justice, decency and human dignity; because it dismisses with contempt the individual and his "unalienable rights." We shall be destroying those very values, however, if we put mob passion rather than democratic restraint in command of the anti-Communist drive now shaping up in our country.

Obviously the task of exposing and defeating the Communists, native and imported, would be easier if we were not hampered by our deep-rooted respect for civil liberties—if we adopted their own ruthless code of conduct. The temptation is to force their own medicine down their throats.

But it is a temptation more dangerous to ourselves—and to our cherished political morality—than to the Communists. To destroy the Bill of Rights in the process of safeguarding it against totalitarian enemies would be like curing a headache by decapitation.

I recall once in Moscow posing a moral problem to a bright little Soviet playmate of my daughter. "Supposing," I said, "that a hundred people were arrested for treason to the U. S. S. R. You knew that one of them was guilty but did not know which one. What would you do?"

"I'd shoot them all," the youngster replied without hesitation.

The answer came so glibly because it was part of his indoctrination in school, in the Young Pioneers, in the books he read. What are 99 innocent lives when the safety of the enthroned state is at stake?

An American child would rather take a chance on freeing one guilty man than punishing the guiltless. Such are our democratic and Judeo-Christian prejudices. It is precisely this strict sense of justice, this respect for the individual, that we seek to salvage from the cyclone of totalitarian terror now ravaging the mind of mankind.

The American people are getting a lot of advice these days on how to fight the Communists. That's all to the good. But in the interests of balance and sanity we need some advice on how not to fight the Communists. By way of a starter, here are a few common-sense "dont's" that seem to me basic:

1. Don't confuse Communists with honest liberals and radicals.

Radicalism has a rich and honorable American tradition, from Tom Paine, Andrew Jackson, and John Brown to Eugene V. Debs and Norman Thomas. Our country was born in revolution and has flourished on social experimentation. Its history is replete with extremist movements—abolitionism, populism, muckraking, socialistic colonies, technocracy—some of which do not seem the least bit crackpot in retrospect. Even anarchism, which has such an ominous "foreign" sound, has strong home-grown roots in American literature and philosophy.

Under the American concept a man has as much right to be a radical or liberal as a conservative or reactionary. Our political framework is wide and pliant enough to withstand the clash and pressures of conflicting ideas, theories, and programs, from extreme right to extreme left and back again. No one in his senses wants to prevent change and reform; criticism and opposition are the lifeblood and the pulse of a democracy.

We do not quarrel with the Communist about his economic or political beliefs, but about his traitorous loyalty to a foreign power. In sober fact he has no beliefs, but merely a fixed foreign allegiance. He is the blind agent of a Soviet-directed conspiracy, following one policy "line" today, its opposite tomorrow, as ordered.

One of the Communist's most cynical techniques of confusion is to put the label "Fascist" on anyone who disagrees with him. We shall be helping him to deepen that confusion in which he thrives if we put the label "Communist" indiscriminately on all those whose views we dislike or fear. In making martyrs of innocent liberals and radicals we would be enabling the guilty Communist also to masquerade as a martyr.

The most effective work against the Stalinist ideological invasion of America has been done by the left rather than the right. Liberal, Socialist, and labor publications have been more conscious of the threat, and more intelligent in meeting it, than any other one group.

2. Don't, in your just anger at the Communists, fall for their ideological brethren at the other end of the scale, the assorted Fascists and near-Fascists.

The distemper from which our generation is suffering is totalitarianism. It finds many and various expressions, of which communism is today the most menacing. But let us not forget that we have just fought and won a war against its other and no sweeter expressions, the Italian Fascist and the German Nazi brands.

When a Communist attacks fascism in any of its forms, he is not protecting democracy but promoting his own red brand of Fascism. By the same token the anti-Communist rantings of people obsessed by race hatred, anti-foreign phobias, and other typical symptoms of the totalitarian mind and heart are merely peddling their own antidemocratic line of goods. The Communist-Fascist rivalry is at the bottom a family quarrel in no way related to your fight and mine against totalitarianism in any guise.

3. Don't tell the Communists to "go back where they came from."

Propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding, the vast majority of them "came" from the 48 States of this Union. True, the rank and file of the official Communist Party are in large measure drawn from our immigrant population. Not yet fully adjusted to the democratic environment, often trailing hangovers from political struggles in their native countries, they are especially vulnerable to the blandishments of hatemongers, whether Communist or Nazi.

But our proudest, most American traditions are summed up in the melting-pot idea and the right of political asylum. Our job is to wean the tiny pro-Communist element among the foreign-born away from their leaders, rather than to punish all foreign-born for the sins and the stupidities of a handful.

The most effective part of the Communist fifth column in our country is in its fellow-traveling contingent, in literally scores of false-front organizations. The membership, at times totaling millions, is drawn almost entirely from native Americans—from professors, preachers, society ladies, movie actors, and the like. The top leaders of the Communist Party, too, are natives. If you sent them "back where they came from," William Z. Foster would be exiled to Massachusetts, Earl Browder to Kansas, Eugene Dennis to Washington, Robert Minor to Texas.

4. Don't let your hatred of communism overflow into attacks on organized labor.

The Stalinist crowd admittedly has enjoyed notable successes in capturing a number of large labor unions. Its methods have been of the same order as those of gangsters who hi-jack control of a union here and there. Neither one group nor the other is representative of the mass of the union membership. The rank-and-file members are in every instance innocent victims of a clever and unscrupulous mob.

What your views on organized labor, they have no reference to the problem of Red infiltration. To blame trade-unions for their Communist termites would be about as reasonable as blaming education or journalism, because in those areas, too, the Communists have made deep inroads.

Organized labor, particularly the American Federation of Labor, has been every bit as active as the United States Chamber scourge. Within the CIO, the Communist-controlled unions have always been a minority and today it is a shrinking minority. Some CIO leaders have been remiss and ill advised in tolerating this minority. That is a commentary on these men, not on the principle of unionism. Complacency toward communism of the same general order can be charged against our Government, the churches, and cultural organizations.

5. Don't fall for the once-a-Communist-always-a-Communist line.

A notion, propagated by some writers and agitators, that the stain of sympathy for communism is indelible, ignores the fact that thousands of well-meaning and high-minded Americans have been lured into the Communist fold by glittering phrases and humanitarian pretensions. Warm-hearted young people, impatient to set the world straight, are readily trapped by propaganda baited with idealistic verbiage. It takes time for these victims to cut through illusions. When they do they are likely to become the best equipped opponents of Stalinism.

The "turn-over" in the American Communist Party is so great that a member of 2 or 3 years' standing is almost a veteran. It is estimated that less than 3 percent of the present membership dates back to the founding of the organization in the early 1920's. This means that the Communists are more successful in duping people than in keeping them duped. To treat former Communists or sympathizers with their cause who are now actively fighting communism, as if their sin in ineradicable, is ungenerous, narrow-minded, and mischievous nonsense.

6. Don't automatically denounce the people and causes the Communists may be defending, or vice versa, defend the things Communists are attacking.

Red Fascists, like Fascists of other hues, have a great talent for making propaganda capital out of suffering and discontent wherever they may find it. One recalls, for instance, how energetically they exploited popular distress in the depression years, among share croppers, "Okies," the unemployed, and the scared middle classes. One marvels at the skill with which they can blow up some local case of injustice into a campaign of national dimensions, or exploit the bitterness of homeless veterans, or play on the emotions of some mistreated racial minority.

The fact that Communists use good causes for their own bad purposes, however, does not make those causes any less worthy. On the contrary, in the measure that decent, patriotic Americans take the initiative on good causes they will cut the ground from under the totalitarian gentry. By the same logic, men and movements may be utterly bad despite the fact that the Daily Worker also attacks them.

7. Finally and most important, don't let the anti-Communist drive get out of hand in hysteria.

Americans old enough to remember will agree that the frenzied "Red scare" after the first World War, with its rash of raids, deportations, and mob violence, was entirely self-defeating. Public opinion in the end re-

volted against the excesses of overzealous officials and self-appointed vigilanties. Let's not have a repetition of that sorry episode.

Former Ambassador William C. Bullitt summed it up simply and well when he said, in testifying before a congressional committee: "The last thing we want is to make martyrs of anybody and throw away the Bill or Rights."

Lucian Hunter, Jr., Elected Commander of AMVETS House of Representatives Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it was announced last night that Lucian O. Hunter, Jr., Leitchfield, Ky., popular House employee, was elected without opposition to the commandership of the House of Representatives Post of the AMVETS—the veterans' organization of World War II that won a congressional charter several days ago.

Hunter, who is 25 years of age, is now employed as legislative aide in the Speaker's Lobby.

Allan M. Ames, Ellicottville, N. Y., Assistant Doorkeeper of the House, was elected first vice commander.

William E. Brady, Evansville, Ind., House Gallery Doorkeeper, elected second vice commander.

Karl Standish, Lowell, Mass., clerk of the House Veterans' Committee, was elected third vice commander.

Richard G. Jefford, Philadelphia, Pa., Assistant Sergeant at Arms, was made adjutant.

Jack W. Watson, Council Bluffs, Iowa, clerk to the House Administrative Committee, finance officer.

S. A. Morichetti, Hurley, Wis., House gallery doorkeeper, sergeant at arms.

W. HOWES MEADE, Paintsville, Ky., Member of Congress, chaplain.

J. H. Lieb, Arlington, Va., chairman of the legislative committee.

Hunter served in the Army for over 2½ years until he was injured in a tank accident. After 10 months in a military hospital, he was given a medical discharge, returning to the House of Representatives, where he was employed prior to his war service.

Upon arriving in Washington, Hunter was appointed clerk to the Postwar Military Policy Committee. It was this committee that held the initial hearings on the unification of national defense and submitted the plans that were adopted by the House at this session.

As a member of the Costello Post of the American Legion, District of Columbia, Hunter served as chairman of the committee on postwar problems and contributed much to the success of the organization.

Hunter has an A. B. degree and expects to receive his master's in law at George Washington University. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. L. O. Hunter, Leitchfield, Ky.

On Friday, July 27, 1947, Commander Hunter will present an honorary life membership in AMVETS to Speaker MARTIN.

The Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the New York Times of July 6, 1947:

THE MINIMUM WAGE—ADEQUATE ADJUSTMENT IN RATE IS URGED TO MEET LIVING COSTS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

At long last it appears likely that Congress will act in the matter of raising the Federal minimum wage from the pitifully inadequate level of 40 cents per hour. Although welcome no matter what its motivation, the last-minute decision to add this to the category of must legislation is obviously intended to sweeten somewhat the bad taste resulting from the Taft-Hartley battle.

It is to be hoped that the action to be taken in the remaining days of the present session will result in a realistic adjustment of the minimum wage, not in an immaterial gesture toward solving the problem. Hearings are currently being conducted on the Landis bill which would raise the 40-cent minimum to 60 cents, with no extension of coverage.

It is probably too much to expect favorable action at this time on wider coverage but is it too much to hope that a higher wage will be recommended?

On the basis of thousands of pages of expert testimony, the Senate Labor Committee recommended on February 14, 1946, that the minimum be raised to 65 cents at once, and stepped up to 70 cents and 75 cents in 2-year intervals. On June 11 the House Labor Committee voted out a bill recommending an immediate rise to 65 cents. No law, however, was enacted last year because of failure to get the House bill released for floor debate.

FACTOR OF HIGHER LIVING COSTS

Are we not taking a significant step backward today in talking about a 60-cent wage? Between the date of the Senate committee's decision and today, living costs have risen more than 20 percent and average hourly earnings for all manufacturing employees have increased by 19 cents. If 65 cents was the proper recommendation then, today's recommendation should be at least 75 cents.

From every conceivable angle there is a powerful case for a substantial raise in the legal minimum. When the Fair Labor Standards Act was first enacted in 1938, the average wage for all manufacturing employees was 65 cents; the national income was at about $64,000,000,000, and the cost of living was just about normal for the prewar period. Today, the average wage for manufacturing employees is at $1.19, national income is at the rate of over $180,000,000,000, and the cost of living is higher by 55 percent for moderate income groups; probably about 75 or 80 percent higher for the lowest income groups with which we are here concerned.

Is any elaborate evidence needed to establish the need for a 65- or 75-cent hourly wage to assure the barest subsistence level? How much of the absolutely essential needs can be supplied at $26 or $30 a week? Where such a wage is earned by the third or fourth wage earner of a family, such a wage might possibly cover the extra financial costs of maintaining the individual. But where such a wage is received by the head of a family, or even by a single person living alone, the arithmetic of the situation is just too obvious. A private in the Army who has two children receives higher total cash payments.

FEDERAL ACTION AS CORRECTIVE

The last few years have seen significant wage changes for millions of American workers, organized and unorganized. Only Federal action, however, can extend these wage gains to the relatively few workers who have been left out. It is the only guarantee that an inequity will be corrected. It is estimated that no more than 1,250,000 workers would be affected by a 65-cent minimum wage at this time. The cost would come to about two-tenths of 1 percent of the pay roll in manufacturing industries, and less than one-half of 1 percent of all profits before taxes.

The overwhelming majority of American employers want to, and do in fact, pay wages substantially above any minimum wage that would conceivably be set by Congress. The textile and apparel industries, at one time the most sweated industries in America, today pay at least a 65-cent minimum wage, and in most cases even more. Why should a relative handful of employers, however, be permitted to take advantage of an immobile labor market and pay anything less than 65 cents in 1947?

The history of minimum-wage legislation for the Nation and for the individual States is replete with dire predictions of the effect of such legislation. Yet industry has always found the way to accommodate itself to such changes.

DISTASTEFUL TO SOME

It is quite discouraging to find some Americans—Congressmen among them—who still find the very institution of minimum wage legislation distasteful and even "un-American."

At one of the hearings last week before the special committee conducting hearings on the Landis bill, one Congressman found that the logic of his opposition led him to State that the "right to pay starvation wages" was part of his basic economic philosophy. Fortunately, the overwhelming majority of Americans have long given up this eighteenth-century philosophy.

Through minimum-wage legislation, State or Federal, we are recognizing a minimum responsibility to the individual wage earner, whose economic situation is tied up more with the success of the complete economic system of which he is a part than with his own resourcefulness or capacity.

The first hearings have also revived a frequently voiced but not proved claim that lower living costs in the South warrant a differential for that region. The error here flows from the confusion between standards of living and costs of living. Every study on the subject has demonstrated that the cost of buying equivalent goods and services is almost identical as between North and South.

It is, of course, quite obvious that lower incomes in the Southern States have created a lower standard of living, but who among us, northerners or southerners, wants to see a perpetuation of this condition?

The Nation can stand, and in fact must have, a substantially increased Federal minimum wage. It is as simple as the proposition stated by Senator WAYNE MORSE in a famous case before the National War Labor Board, of which he was then a member: "American labor should not be asked to subsidize American industry by working for wages below the level of health and decency."

HYMAN H. BOOKBINDER,
Assistant Director of Research for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO.

NEW YORK, *July 2, 1947.*

Development of Medical Program of the Veterans' Administration Relative to Tuberculosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, all too little is accurately known of the splendid work done by Gen. Paul R. Hawley, Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, in reorganizing the veterans' hospitals in such wise as to give these veterans the benefit of the best in medicine, surgery, nursing, and rehabilitation at amazingly low cost. I will let Dr. Hawley tell us in his own words a part of the story:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to join you in a celebration and a commemoration of four decades of solid work that is so happily joined with laying of new plans for the future, and a determination to complete the job. In no other four decades has there been such progress in the tasks that you set for yourselves. It is no accident that such great leaders should have assigned themselves these tasks, nor that you should have elected such men as Homer Folks or that he should have attracted such able staff workers. I am glad that some of his staff are our consultants and that as consultants to us and members of your staff they have helped us bring our tuberculosis hospitals in your State out of their magnificent isolation as Government institutions.

We have attacked the problem of isolated hospitals in several ways. We have refused to locate hospitals except near medical centers. We have released our existing staffs from old restrictions. We have recruited new blood and sent our doctors to medical meetings and post-graduate courses. We have invited in such groups as yours and taken on outside consultants both as lecturers and as part-time staff members. These parts of the program may be endangered by a false search for economy. The entire consultant program in our tuberculosis hospitals has cost us but 12 cents a day per patient. Yet as a result of it we have increased from 5 to 37 the number of hospitals that may safely do such extensive surgery as removal of a lobe or an entire lung. These 37 thoracic surgery centers are strategically located geographically and result in an actual money saving in avoiding expensive transfer of patients, as well as giving the patient the enormous medical and human advantage of being operated upon by those who are near him and know him. As this audience well knows, prompt surgery improves the patient's chances of recovery and shortens his period of invalidism and economic waste. In one of our hospitals in your State, veterans remained chronic invalids for years because 40 percent refused the surgery that was offered them, and what is worse, many eventually died of their diseases. The percentage that refused operation (40%) had remained constantly at that figure for a number of years. Since we adopted the twelve-cents-a-day consultant program the refusals have been reduced to zero, and I pray it remains there. These results speak for themselves, and the economy of paying the price of good medicine instead of suffering the price of cheap medicine is obvious. In no other field can false economy reap such a toll in the human resources of our Nation. The veteran who refuses needed surgery remains in our hospitals longer and so costs the Veterans' Administration more, but he also goes home against advice as well. There he sets up a chain of infections that remain a cost to you and to the Nation. Inevitably we are in this game together and we shall share the results of either good or bad medicine.

Part of the so-called expense of good medicine is in the intelligent use of adjunct and related fields of work. Social service and medical rehabilitation are as much responsible for the reduction of refusals of surgery as are good medicine and good surgery. They are all of one team and move forward together. In recognition of this we have increased the number of social workers in your State alone from 19 in January 1946 to 91 in April 1947. Though this adds to the pay roll and to the personnel ceiling, we intend to add more, as they become available, for we have no doubt of the real economies they produce in the Nation's human resources. Further, in recognition of our efforts in this field the three schools of social work in New York are placing their students at a number of our clinics and hospitals for their field work. Medical rehabilitation boards or teams are at work in two of our tuberculosis hospitals in New York and rehabilitation in the Veterans' Administration really got its first start in one of our hospitals here. Col. Esmond Long, our consultant in tuberculosis, as one of his first duties, with Mr. Lowell Iberg, visited the hospital and determined that a rehabilitation program was most necessary to help correct the rather notorious drunkenness which had existed there for years. When this team with its social workers moved in, the manager of the hospital was soon able to secure the cooperation of the community, the service organizations, the police department, and the taxi companies, in a new program of self-discipline and bed rest for the patients. The best evidence I have of the result is a report that the taxi company has been able to retire one cab and the owner of the saloon across the road wants to sell out. No one hospital manager could have accomplished that—it took the resolution and the determination of a whole community of interests, and, foremost among them, the patients themselves. Courageous and sympathetic leadership brought this about and it deserves and will get our firm support.

The Medical Rehabilitation Service of the Veterans' Administration is a new service. During the past war the experience we received with the reconditioning and rehabilitation programs in the European theater of operations proved that a great many injured servicemen could be returned to duty by means of such programs. I felt that such a rehabilitation program would be helpful in accomplishing two objectives in the Veterans' Administration. First, to help the sick and injured veteran to get well faster and, secondly, to learn to care for himself and even to start to learn a job—so providing a motivation for the severely handicapped to leave our hospitals.

With these objectives in mind, the Physical Medicine and Medical Rehabilitation Service was established. It now includes physical therapy, occupational therapy, corrective physical rehabilitation, educational therapy, and manual arts therapy. The veteran patient can receive not alone acute care from the Physical Medicine Section, but he is also supplied a motive to leave the hospital when he is physically able.

It is our wish that every veteran through the Physical Medicine and Medical Rehabilitation Service will be given every opportunity for physiological, psychological, social, and economic adjustment. A good example of this occurred in one of our larger general hospitals which has an 80-bed neurological ward filled mainly with World War I veterans. The majority of them had been flat on their backs for periods up to 10 years. For 6 months the Neurological and the Medical Rehabilitation Services have been bringing to bear every facility in the hospital on these patients. Some of them at the start had to be carried on stretchers to the Physical Therapy Department.

The results at the end of 6 months were astonishing. In this 80-patient ward, 35 patients had become able to care for themselves, to dress themselves, feed themselves, to be ambulatory, and were able to be discharged from the hospital. Some of them were able to work again. Of the remainder all but 5 percent were able to be up and around and to care for themselves within the hospital. The 35 patients who were discharged from the hospital would have a life expectancy of at least 5 years. At $10 a patient-day cost these 35 patients represent a savings of a half million dollars alone. We of the Veterans' Administration are firmly convinced that a sound Physical Medicine and Medical Rehabilitation Service pays off.

The 18 months in which we have had to organize the Department of Medicine and Surgery have been all too short, but even so we can report some gains. These gains were often costly but had to be accomplished to keep pace with the ever-increasing load of an Army demobilizing at an unpredictable rate, with an unpredictable quota of tuberculous veterans. In this time we more than doubled the number of tuberculosis beds to 15,000. The number of tuberculosis hospitals has increased from 14 to 19 and the number of tuberculosis services in general medical and surgical hospitals has increased from 12 to 29. We have recruited 213 physicians trained in tuberculosis to increase our staff in tuberculosis hospitals and regional offices from 178 to 355. These are now augmented by 176 ASTP and V-12 physicians, but these will soon leave us. In almost every tuberculosis hospital we have men with experience as clinical teachers of tuberculosis and on these we must depend to train our future staffs. It is not proposed that we enter into an unending competition with other Federal and non-Federal agencies for the recruitment of the small trained pool of tuberculosis specialists in any field—medicine, surgery, nursing, social service, or rehabilitation. We must actively train our own. We propose to train our tuberculosis specialists in internal medicine and our internists in tuberculosis.

We shall rotate our general surgeons through thoracic surgery and our sanatorium surgeons through the surgery of nontuberculous pulmonary lesions. Our acute hospitals will be paired or teamed with chronic hospitals and the staff will be trained through each to the benefit of both. Such a program is being arranged between our hospitals at the Bronx and Castle Point. Other special fields will share in these rotations. Some of the neuropsychiatric residents in the metropolitan area will rotate through the Castle Point tuberculosis hospital, where they will prepare clinics for the visiting consultant psychiatrist from New York. In this manner we will attempt to broaden the training of each specialty—to the strengthening—not the weakening of any specialty—and to the advantage of all classes of patients. With this aim psychiatrists have been sent to the Trudeau School of Tuberculosis and a special study is being arranged on the role of the emotions in tuberculosis, through Dr. Karl Binger of New York and Dr. James Waring of Denver. These are only some of the opportunities and the challenges represented by the task and the privilege of rendering the best medical care to our veterans, who are confronted at one and the same time with chronic illness and with readjustment to a torn civilian life.

The preparation of veterans' hospitals for the training of nurses in the care of tuberculosis has proceeded with a speed that no one had a right to expect. Within a year of the

appointment of our Nurse Specialist in Tuberculosis, we have begun receiving affiliate student nurses in two of our tuberculosis hospitals. It has been with the greatest gratification that I read a letter from Miss Anna D. Wolf, Director of Nursing at the Johns Hospital, in which she states that of seven students sent to our Oteen, N. C., hospital for cadet training six have expressed the desire to return to the Veterans' Administration and to tuberculosis nursing. I think that is something of a triumph. Your Veterans' Administration hospital at Sampson, N. Y. has just been approved for cadet nurses though it has opened so recently that it has scarcely got its feet on the ground. These accomplishments are not only new to the Veterans' Administration, they are somewhat unique in the tuberculosis field. It will be foolish economy if we cannot proceed with the modernizing of all our tuberculosis hospitals so that they all may be training centers for the benefit of all veterans and all tuberculous patients. I need not tell this audience what a boost to patient morale it is to have these ambitious young student nurses appear on the wards. The whole face of the place changes just as it does when you introduce teaching in any department of a hospital. Teaching means competition among the students, and on competition our American system has distinguished itself throughout the world. Our veterans know this and appreciate it.

It is gratifying when one can point to a Federal economy and still more so when this can be found in Federal research. It pleases me also that this particular research has yielded byproducts almost as important as the research itself. I refer to our work with other Federal agencies on streptomycin. The important byproduct here is in the heightened morale of both patients and staff in every hospital in which the study has been conducted. Fortunately for the world at large, it may also be reported that by far the majority of the patients treated have been improved. Though most have suffered some damage from the drug, this damage is not important in view of the serious nature of the disease in the patients selected for treatment. While over 700 veterans have been treated in some 20 Veterans' Administration hospitals and $1,300,000 have been spent for the drug, the purely administrative cost of this study has been largely confined to the salaries of one secretary and one and one-half doctors. Yet in spite of this, the effectiveness of the study has recently been threatened by the absence of funds for the necessary travel of the investigators.

You will all be interested in case finding and follow-up. All hospitals and clinics are authorized to conduct both activities up to the limit of their resources. Only one branch office has so far consolidated its results and reports a total of 40,762 cases surveyed during the period September 15, 1945, to September 15, 1946, of which 519 or 12.91 per thousand were found to have active tuberculosis. These 519 newly discovered cases represent an additional load upon our hospitals in that branch—an additional load that we had been unable to predict. Due to the peculiarities of the veteran population—highly screened by previous X-rays and so much prolonged exposure abroad—we are unable to forecast our total needs in beds. All we know is that 12,000 are now hospitalized at Veterans' Administration expense, that 22,000 are receiving checks for disability due to tuberculosis, and that 35,000 were discharged from the services because of tuberculosis. We are setting up case registers in both central and branch offices, of the 35,000, in the hopes of finding all these veterans and determining their need for care. Through this same mechanism we expect to restudy the 22,000 on compensation rolls, to be sure that all are deserving of a place on such rolls.

For this last purpose we have set up in Washington the largest X-ray file ever known. Here there are already 38,000,000 X-rays so filed that they are available for day-to-day study and comparison with subsequent X-rays. We are still filing them at the rate of 35,000 a day and 10,000,000 are still in their cases awaiting filing. Though this file is an invaluable storehouse of research material, a thorough study of the compensation cases alone will pay for the file and still save the Government untold sums.

Now don't let me give you the impression that as Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, tuberculosis is my only problem; but I have been asked to pay especial attention to it at this meeting and I have a deep concern and sympathy for this tragic aftermath of battle. Tuberculous patients have, over the years, accounted for only about 10 percent of all Veterans' Administration hospitalized patients. It has, however, a certain irritant value far outweighing its 10-percent load. Of course they stay longer with us and have time to find out all our faults. They are also highly vocal and we hear much from them. Furthermore, they are, due to your efforts, well tutored in the disease and its treatment, and are represented by highly organized and powerful groups such as this, and the National Tuberculosis Association, that are capable of arousing public opinion and action. As a matter of fact I have been somewhat surprised that you should have allowed me 18 months in which to develop my program without storming my office with your impatience at our progress. That we have made good progress I have tried to indicate, but I must confess that I have never been more vulnerable to attack than over the past few months. During these months I have had to suspend many of the promises that I made to the hospitals and their staffs, both old and new. My plan of clinical supervision of these hospitals is now in abeyance through lack of travel funds for the branch office staff. A splendid course of lectures and clinics by a visiting faculty is postponed. Registration of our doctors at two regional postgraduate meetings had to be canceled. Eight of our doctors and nurses cannot be sent to the National Tuberculosis Association meeting to fill their places on the program. The studies on streptomycin were endangered through lack of funds for a conference. A personnel freeze prevents my opening much-needed tuberculosis beds, and lack of funds for conversion and remodeling prevents the use of a splendid medical-school faculty in a tuberculosis hospital. In spite of these immediate and serious shortages, however, General Bradley has promised that he will not ask me to operate hospitals with inefficient and inadequate staffs. The serious question then arises that, since we do not have enough beds for all tuberculous veterans—do you as communities take care of the excess, or do we close general medical and surgical hospitals in order to take care of the tuberculous? Whether or not one of these courses becomes necessary, of one thing I am certain—in that General Bradley gives me his full support—"I shall not be a party to any retrenchment that might threaten to drag this agency into the backwaters of American medicine," nor shall I countenance any reduction that might imperil our medical program" or "endanger the results we have obtained."

The Egg and I—and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in regard to the use of section 32 funds that are obtained by setting aside 30 percent of the custom receipts supposedly to be used for the disposal of surplus agriculture commodities.

The following official table shows the section 32 funds used in connection with eggs:

Use of sec. 32 funds for the purchase and distribution of eggs—fiscal years 1936–45

Year	Food stamp plan, shell eggs		Purchases for direct distribution						Total value
			Shell eggs		Dried eggs		Frozen eggs		
	Dozens	Value	Dozens	Value	Pounds	Value	Pounds	Value	
1936			644, 160	$198, 604					$198, 604
1937			8, 628, 630	2, 136, 766					2, 136, 766
1938			8, 088, 330	1, 726, 868					1, 726, 868
1939	161, 959	$38, 415	3, 230, 910	532, 134					570, 549
1940	12, 210, 000	2, 655, 000	67, 378, 560	12, 834, 520					15, 489, 520
1941	46, 440, 000	11, 534, 000	15, 265, 380	3, 213, 263					14, 747, 263
1942	59, 250, 000	20, 327, 000	22, 168, 230	5, 650, 967					25, 977, 967
1943	21, 829, 000	9, 014, 000	591, 660	220, 327	2, 200, 000	$2, 661, 498			11, 895, 825
1944			15, 925, 557	5, 883, 402					5, 883, 402
1945			3, 688, 456	1, 479, 016	873, 193	1, 178, 635	1, 170, 480	$414, 382	3, 072, 033
Total	139, 890, 959	43, 568, 415	145, 909, 273	33, 875, 867	3, 073, 193	3, 840, 133	1, 170, 480	414, 382	81, 698, 797

From 1936 to 1940 before the war, $4,732,787 of Federal funds were used to dispose of surplus United States eggs, though during the same period and same years, there were $5,398,000 worth of eggs imported. In dozens the relation of imports to the number used under section 32 funds was much greater, somewhere near twice as many no doubt. In other words, we did not distribute the imported eggs. The duty on egg imports has been reduced so that the future egg picture may make the surplus problem even more complicated.

To obtain the egg picture in full, I am inserting tables from the official agricultural statistics showing the United States production of eggs and the prices received by the farmers of the Nation:

Eggs: United States production and price, 1910–48

Year	Production	Price
	Million dozen	*Cents per dozen*
1910	2, 475	20. 9
1911	2, 695	17. 5
1912	2, 594	20. 2
1913	2, 576	19. 4
1914	2, 558	20. 5
1915	2, 741	19. 4

Eggs: United States production and price, 1910–48—Continued

Year	Production	Price
	Million dozen	*Cents per dozen*
1916	2,640	22.1
1917	2,539	31.8
1918	2,567	36.0
1919	2,796	41.3
1920	3,248	43.5
1921	2,823	28.3
1922	3,025	25.0
1923	3,208	26.5
1924	3,171	26.7
1925	3,207	30.4
1926	2,644	28.9
1927	3,541	25.1
1928	3,544	28.1
1929	3,476	29.8
1930	3,581	23.7
1931	3,532	17.6
1932	3,327	14.2
1933	3,255	13.8
1934	3,156	17.0
1935	3,081	23.4
1936	3,166	21.8
1937	3,443	21.3
1938	3,424	20.3
1939	3,561	17.4
1940	3,629	18.0
1941	3,828	23.5
1942	4,430	29.9
1943	4,972	37.1
1944	5,305	32.4
1945 [1]	5,060	37.7
1946 [1]	5,030	37.6
1947		
1948		

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Agricultural Statistics, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture. 1946 data from Livestock and Poultry Division Department of Agriculture.

To complete this egg information, I include the official table from the United States Department of Agriculture showing the exports and imports of eggs and value each year from 1940 to 1947:

Eggs and products: United States imports and exports—quantity and value, 1910–46

Year	Imports		Exports	
	Quantity (shell egg equivalent)	Value	Quantity (shell egg equivalent)	Value
	Thousand dozen	*Thousand dollars*	*Thousand dozens*	*Thousand dollars*
1910 [1]	3,300	167	5,683	1,264
1911 [1]	5,141	257	13,276	1,792
1912 [1]	7,965	152	18,962	3,425
1913 [1]	11,263	243	17,669	4,460
1914 [1]	19,010	1,564	21,019	3,782
1915 [1]	16,819	1,237	22,323	5,093
1916 [1]	26,482	1,032	28,266	6,345
1917 [1]	40,268	2,001	19,886	7,641
1918	28,775	2,823	20,938	9,146
1919	48,845	8,865	38,789	18,944
1920	50,084	7,852	26,842	13,879
1921	52,397	4,090	33,291	10,967
1922	53,803	5,558	34,620	9,225
1923	30,995	6,755	30,659	8,479
1924	41,193	5,788	28,117	7,514
1925	57,666	8,988	24,999	7,579
1926	52,923	7,289	26,634	7,758
1927	36,216	5,174	28,707	7,849
1928	35,353	6,779	20,192	6,222
1929	53,293	8,584	12,075	4,143
1930	44,490	4,869	18,579	5,105
1931	33,563	1,812	7,684	1,778
1932	10,026	813	2,319	511
1933	9,609	537	1,866	391
1934	7,483	443	1,928	478
1935	22,495	1,679	1,812	555
1936	26,664	2,023	2,098	604
1937	31,679	2,468	2,376	697
1938	6,408	524	2,092	621
1939	4,957	383	2,697	695
1940	6,714	548	4,571	1,133
1941	15,064	2,138	73,411	46,751
1942	3,430	613	461,477	163,278
1943	912	295	697,092	270,070
1944	509	126	730,790	302,592
1945	4,181	894	429,642	188,944
1946	668	434	364,294	154,048

[1] Year ending June 30.

Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. Compiled from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States.

What facts do our analysis of these official tables reveal? They are—

First. That $81,698,797 of section 32 funds have been used for disposing of eggs through various channels.

Second. That dollar value of exports or of imports of agriculture products do not furnish a real factual picture. For example in 1926 there were 52,923,000 dozens imported showing 7,289,000 in dollars as imports while the same year in 1926 only about half as many or 26,634,000 dozens were exported showing an export value of $7,758,000 or showing more in dollars than was shown by the 52,923,000 dozens of imports. People do not eat dollars, they eat pounds, bushels, and tons. All imports and exports in dollars must be considered in this light, though on many commodities there is not the wide difference as shown in the example above. It does show however that the 1946 agriculture imports of $2,300,000,000 may have in pounds, bushels and tons exceeded the $3,000,000,000 of 1946 agriculture exports. Official tables by the Commerce Department showing the volume of imports and exports indicates that from 1925 to 1942 the volume of agriculture imports exceeded the volume of agriculture exports. In fact in 1944 more food was imported than exported in pounds, bushels, and tons according to the Commerce Department's reports and charts. We may have been feeding the world so to speak so far as wheat is concerned, but the world has been feeding the United States to a greater extent when it would appear it would be the best world food policy to keep their food for their own dire needs. Food imports from Italy for example show this situation. The dollar exchange no doubt causes this situation, because they surely have great need for their own supply of food.

Third. That every year from 1917 to 1941 or for a 24-year period we were on an egg import basis. In the 1920's we imported many more eggs than we exported and some years twice as many. In 1935, 1936, and 1937 when we were spending millions of dollars for not producing American foodstuffs and borrowing money to pay for not doing it, we imported 10 to 12 times as many eggs as we exported.

Fourth. That an enormous increase took place both in United States production of eggs, and in egg exports during the war.

Fifth. That in the prewar period as in 1936, there was a net import ($2,023,000 exports minus $604,000 of egg exports) of $1,419,000 worth of eggs, and $198,604 of Federal funds were used to dispose of surplus eggs. The $198,604 used for surplus disposal was only 13 percent of the dollar imports and much less percentage in dozen imports.

Sixth. The egg industry is a great industry. It has stood on its own feet. It has not succumbed to New Deal economic medicine. The egg producers of the Nation have demonstrated time after time that they did not ask for special legislative preferences.

While many people thought that the large consumption of eggs during the meat shortages of wartimes might reduce the domestic demand for this great animal protein product, the present consumption and demand has demonstrated that the consumers of America continue to appreciate this great food product.

Seventh. The duties collected on egg imports have been from $76,000 to $913,000 per year from 1910 to 1920; from $798,000 to $3,046,000 from 1920 to 1930; and from 1923 to 1947 the receipts from duties collected were, as follows:

1923	$1,491,000
1924	2,265,000
1925	3,411,000
1926	3,023,000
1927	1,793,000
1928	1,947,000
1929	3,043,000
1930	2,608,000
1931	2,024,000
1932	616,000
1933	749,000
1934	805,000
1935	1,911,000
1936	2,227,000
1937	2,613,000
1938	417,000
1939	367,000
1940	787,000
1941	1,145,000
1942	317,000
1943	62,000
1944	23,000
1945 [1]	143,000
1946 [1]	36,000

[1] Preliminary. U. S. Tariff Commission, June 1947.

Eighth. There were large imports and exports of eggs in the 1920's. In the 1930's, especially 1935, 1936, and 1937, there were large imports, but the exports had dived to 1,866,000 dozens in 1932, and these exports had increased to only 2,697,000 dozens in 1939, when the war demands changed the picture. In the 1940's the exports have been from 73,000 dozens in 1941 to 730,790,000 dozens in 1944. The expansion of egg production was one of the great achievements of the wartime food products.

Ninth. The following agencies in Wisconsin received eggs under the program of food distribution from the section 22, funds:

Direct distribution of shell eggs to State and county hospitals, children's orphanages, old folks homes, school-lunch feeding programs, welfare families.

Direct distribution in 1941: Milwaukee County institutions, Sauk County Asylum.

With the bulk going to eligible schools, public-assistance cases (those not eligible under the food-stamp plan).

Direct distribution in 1942: Milwaukee County institutions, Ashland County Old People's Home, Fond du Lac County Asylum; with the bulk going to eligible schools and public assistance cases.

Source of information: Mr. Blood, Extension 2335, Agriculture.

It should be noted that none of these surplus eggs were distributed in the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin. A total of $81,000,000 of section 32 funds has been used for egg distribution from 1936 to 1947. The total section 32 funds used was $1,056,788,924 for all uses.

Colorado River Controversy Should Be Settled in the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, any measure relating to the use of the waters of the Colorado River at once attracts the close interest of the people of the seven great States which lies in the basin of that River. For a reason which I shall discuss, that is particularly true in the coastal plain of southern California, where live over 4,000,000 of the American people, a greater number, as it happens, than reside in the other six States of the basin combined.

The Colorado River is controlled by an interstate compact, called the Colorado River Compact, by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, under which the great Hoover Dam was built, and by other statutes, court decisions, and contracts, all of which, taken collectively, are sometimes called the "law of the River." Unfortunately, each of these documents has been challenged as containing ambiguities and uncertainties, with the result that for many years controversy has raged through the basin, and particularly between Arizona and California, as to the true meaning and intent of these documents. This controversy relates particularly to how much water of the river each of these two States can rely on for its permanent development. There is not enough water in the great Colorado to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the two States. There is far more land in each of them which could be irrigated and made fruitful than there is water. And by a most regrettable treaty, which, strangely, Arizona supported, though California opposed it, there was granted to the Republic of Mexico an unnecessarily and unfairly large share of the waters of the river. Thereby, the struggle between the States for the remaining water was intensified and made more acute.

But Arizona, after vigorously supporting the Mexican treaty, is not willing to stand the consequences of her generosity. She is desirous of improving her economy, even though, to get more water from the Colorado put to use within her borders, she must invade the water supplies long set apart by contracts made by the United States for projects in California, and even though those projects have been planned for over a quarter of a century, have been placed in operation and have been financed by California communities which depend on them, to a total cost of over half a billion dollars.

Arizona has indicated the course she would follow, by introducing in the Seventy-ninth Congress two bills, one for reauthorization of the Gila project, and another for authorization of a grandiose power and water scheme called the Central Arizona project. Neither bill was acted on by the last Congress, and the bills have been reintroduced in the Eightieth Congress.

The bill before the House, which relates to the Gila project, as introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress, would have increased the claims of Arizona to Colorado River water to such a point that water which is needed by California communities, and to which they are entitled, would definitely have been taken from them. In this Congress, the bill has been amended so that it is hoped that this result will not take place.

As a result of these amendments, the Gila bill is, of itself, of comparatively minor importance. It provides for cutting down the area of one section of the Gila project and adding and initially authorizing another section. The quantity of water to be used on the resulting acreage is definitely limited to an amount, 600,000 acre-feet, which is probably not greatly in excess of that to which Arizona is entitled. Were the bill standing alone before the Congress, it would arouse little concern.

But the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands has, in recent weeks, been holding hearings on another bill, S. 1175, which would authorize the central Arizona project. From the economic viewpoint this project is simply fantastic. It would ultimately cost $1,000,000,000, five times the cost of the great Hoover Dam project. It would furnish a water supply, for land that is worth $200 to $300 an acre, at a cost of over $2,000 per acre. The farmers, according to the financial analyses of the Bureau of Reclamation could not afford to pay $1 of the construction of the irrigation features of the project. In fact, says the Bureau, they could not contribute even as much as one-half of the cost of operation and maintenance of the irrigation features of the project. Such a wildly profligate use of money of the taxpayers of the United States has never before been dreamed of.

Neither the Bureau of Reclamation nor the Department of the Interior has approved the central Arizona project. They have not even submitted to the Congress a final report on its cost, its justification nor its engineering details. It is sponsored by Arizona alone. But enough can be gathered from preliminary investigations by the Bureau to see plainly that the cost of the irrigation project can be borne in only two ways, either by a staggering outright capital subsidy from the Treasury of the United States, on the order of $450,000,000, or by selling the power from the project to the only substantial market which exists, namely the power users of southern California, at a price which would be loaded with enough surcharges to pay for the entire cost of the irrigation works, plus more than half the cost of operating and maintaining them, forever.

Experts in this field in California consider that Arizona is not entitled to enough water from the Colorado River to provide any water at all for the new central Arizona project. The project can have water, according to their view, only by taking it away from existing, authorized and operating projects, chiefly in California. And the bitter irony of the scheme emerges to view, when it is realized that the people of California are blandly supposed to pay for a project in Arizona which would take their own water away from them. Of course, they would do nothing of the sort. The Federal Treasury would stand the loss.

I have spoken of the long-standing controversy between California and Arizona. Until it is settled, further development in the lower basin of the Colorado cannot proceed. The Gila project will, in the opinion of California, exhaust the last drop of water that remains for Arizona projects. The two States have, times without number, attempted to settle their differences by agreement. This laudable purpose has not been achieved, for a basic reason that I have mentioned, namely, that there is not enough water in the river to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of both States.

In the belief that the controversy should be set at rest, California's Governor, Earl Warren, recently addressed identical letters to the Governors of Arizona and Nevada, suggesting that they explore the possibilities of disposing of the dispute by any of the three avenues which are possible, that is, by negotiation of a compact, by arbitration, or by seeking a court determination. The replies which he received are interesting. Governor Pittman, of Nevada, replied that the experience of the past had convinced him that negotiation would not lead to a result, and that he favored a determination by the Supreme Court. Governor Osborn, of Arizona, replied that he was convinced that there is no controversy; that all issues have been settled by the compact, statutes, and contracts in favor of Arizona. This remarkable position is obvious sophistry. Each of the States still stoutly maintains that its interpretations of the basic documents are correct and the two sets of interpretations are as far apart as the poles.

With the matter in this position, the Gila bill, H. R. 1597, came on for hearing before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Public Lands Committee of this House. Eminent engineers and lawyers from California appeared and explained the facts to the subcommittee. After full deliberation, the subcommittee unanimously adopted and the full Public Lands Committee approved and placed in its report the following statement:

> It is the intent of the committee that nothing in this bill is to be construed as affecting the rights of the States of Arizona or California as to the use of the amount of water in the lower Colorado River Basin, that each State is entitled to under the existing compact, contracts, or law. The committee feels the dispute between these two States on the lower Colorado River Basin should be determined and settled by agreement between the two States or by court decision because the dispute between these two States jeopardizes and will delay the possibility of prompt development of any further projects for diversion of water from the main stream of the Colorado River in the lower Colorado River Basin.

Therefore, the committee recommends that immediate settlement of this dispute by compact or arbitration be made, or that the Attorney General of the United States promptly institute an action in the United States Supreme Court against the States of the lower basin, and any other necessary parties, requiring them to assert and have determined their claims and rights to the use of the waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin.

This recommendation of the committee is as plain as words can make it. It is the judgment of your committee that the controversy between Arizona and California should be settled. Unless the States are able, immediately, to settle it themselves, the committee recommends that an action be commenced by the Attorney General in the Supreme Court against the States, which would require the matter to be brought to a head and disposed of. Finally, in the committee's judgment, the existence of the dispute will delay, until it is settled, the development of any further projects for diversion of water from the main stream of the Colorado River in the lower Colorado River Basin.

In saying this, may I emphasize that the committee's statement has nothing to do with the authorization of projects in the upper Colorado River Basin. The upper basin's water supply appears ample for considerable development.

To bring it to a point, the committee has, in effect, gone on record that until there is a determination of the grave uncertainty as to whether there is any water supply for a central Arizona project, it will not consider such a project possible.

The committee's conclusions are sound and logical. I heartily commend them. Indeed, no group of men who are responsible for the integrity of Government investments in reclamation projects could well come to any other result. I bring the committee's statement to the attention of the House so that the record may show without equivocation that the Committee on Public Lands has closed the door against the authorization of further irrigation projects in the lower basin of the Colorado, until the all-important question of water supply has been determined.

Acreage Limitation in Reclamation Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Rev. William J. Gibbons, S. J., associate editor, America, board of directors, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Public Lands, May 12, 1947:

INTRODUCTION

On behalf of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference I wish to express appreciation for this opportunity to express the conference's views on the subject of acreage limitation in reclamation projects, the repeal or modification of which is proposed in several bills now pending before the committee.

The National Catholic Rural Life Conference is an organization of Nation-wide scope, comprised of bishops, priests, and lay persons, whose objective is to further the religious and the socio-economic welfare of those living by agriculture or simply residing in the rural areas. In matters affecting the land it expresses the interests of 83 dioceses, practically all of them predominantly rural in character. Official relations with these dioceses are maintained through the diocesan directors designated by their local bishops. Within the dioceses actively affected by the program of the conference are 24,570 priests, 91,700 religious, and over 13,000,000 lay Catholics. The conference headquarters is located in Des Moines, Iowa.

AGRICULTURAL TRENDS

The position taken by the National Catholic Rural Life Conference on the subject of acreage limitation is based upon its concern for the future of our American families and its conviction that the needless concentration of productive capital will seriously affect the social and economic life of the Nation in the years ahead.

The conference takes a long-range view in considering the land and is therefore more interested in the net effect of present trends in agriculture upon the Nation as a whole than in the prospect of immediate financial gain for a minor portion of our population. It takes the position that any small savings effected in the price of food for urban dwellers through unregulated agricultural development will be more than canceled out by the social and economic loss incurred.

In the colonial period of our history and during the early years of the Republic large farms, with resulting concentration of productive capital, were fairly common in certain parts of the eastern seaboard. First, indentured servants and later slaves were used in great numbers to cultivate these semifeudal estates. In New England, however, and in the upper Middle Atlantic States the family-type farm was the rule. At first it was on the subsistence-homestead pattern but as the years went on these farms were integrated into the rest of the economy.

During the nineteenth century the American people, convinced that wide distribution of ownership among families living on the land is more in accord with our democratic ideals, progressively rejected the semifeudal pattern and accepted the family-type farm as the norm. When the West developed this ideal was kept in mind. At this point I would like to quote from the report of the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning:

"Agriculture is the cornerstone of our economy. The independence of the Nation was won by the stubborn resistance of the subsistence farmers who made up the greater part of the population in the early years. American agriculture, throughout its development, was characterized by individual family-sized owner-operated farms. This contributed greatly to the independent spirit and the moral character of the entire population and was the backbone of our political and economic democracy as they developed in America." (Tenth Report of the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning: Postwar Agricultural Policies (August 6, 1947, 79th Cong., 2d sess.; H. Rept. No. 2728).)

CONCENTRATED LANDOWNERSHIP

The corporate and semifeudal patterns of farming, to the extent to which they persist, have been a constant source of trouble to our Federal, State, and local Governments. Associated with the large-scale farms are abuses requiring Government intervention and the expenditure of public funds. In this way the Nation as a whole has been called upon to subsidize their claimed efficiency. If public moneys are to be spent for the benefit of agriculture—and the National Catholic Rural Life Conference has no objection to their wise expenditure—it should be directly for the widest possible number of our rural people and rather than indirectly to remedy conditions resulting from corporate exploitation of the land for expanding profits.

Among the abuses arising from the unregulated exploitation of the land may be counted: Impoverishment of the soil and the preparing of the way for serious erosion and floods; land speculation; exploitation of agricultural workers and the encouragement of a migratory class of seasonal workers; the importation of persons from other countries with no other purpose than to secure cheap agricultural labor. The over-all outcome of large-scale commercial farming has been the tendency to cut production costs without regard for the consequences upon our natural resources, our people, or upon the legitimately competing family farmer.

While the plight of our own rural proletarian class of agricultural workers, by and large, has not been as bad as that of such workers in other countries, we must not close our eyes to the dangers. Looking abroad, we see that the growth of great landed estates and large commercial farms has long since harmed such countries as Germany, Hungary, Poland, Spain, Italy, certain Latin-American nations, Japan, the Philippines, much of the Orient and Middle East. In these countries the concentration of landownership has been accompanied by underdevelopment of agricultural resources, the withholding of land from cultivation, and the proletarianization of many rural people, with resulting restiveness on their part. When this situation is accompanied by industrial underdevelopment the whole economy is endangered, for in such case productivity does not keep up with population. Even when there is sufficient industrialization to absorb excess rural population and to forestall the full effects of concentrated landownership, the general effect of such concentration has been the loss of a sense of ownership among more and more of the people, and the growth of a corresponding willingness to accept radical socio-economic reforms. Widespread ownership in agricultural land is the surest safeguard against the threat of collectivized agriculture and the best means of forestalling popular demands for governmental expropriation of land and its redistribution after the concentration has become an accomplished fact. The land policy of the United States should be directed toward preventing the evil of excessively concentrated landownership from arising. This is much simpler than attemptin, to cure the abuse once it has taken root. Our country is not immune to the disease even though in our highly technological society it may take somewhat different forms than it has elsewhere in the past.

Of more than passing interest is the attitude of our Government toward the correction of land abuses abroad. In Germany we have looked with favor upon the plans of reconstituted political parties to effect proper distribution of land. In Japan a memorandum to the Japanese Government from the General Headquarters Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, under date of December 5, 1945, treated of rural land reform. Point 3 ordered the Japanese Government to submit a plan for correcting

abuses. Certain of the provisions are especially noteworthy:

This program shall contain plans for:

(a) Transfer of landownership from absentee landowners to land operators.

(b) Provision for purchase of farm lands from nonoperating owners at equitable rates.

(c) Provisions for tenant purchase of land at annual installments commensurate with tenant income.

(d) Provisions for reasonable protection of former tenants against reversion to tenancy status. (AG 602.6 (9 Dec. 45) CIE.)

ACREAGE TRENDS IN UNITED STATES

The January 1947 issue of Agricultural Situation presented a factual summary of contemporary land trends within the United States. Without entering into a sociological discussion it provides us with facts of interest to all concerned with the welfare of our rural population. The statistics provided in the summary show that—

1. The number of larger farms is increasing substantially throughout the country. Large commercial enterprises are progressively taking the place of family-size farms, although in many places the size of this latter type farm is also increasing.

2. Over half of the farm land in the country is in units of over 500 acres, and units over 1,000 acres now account for 40 percent of the farm land compared with less than one-fourth after the First World War.

3. Well over two-thirds of the large farm units of over 1,000 acres are in 11 Western States. In that region the increase in such units has been 90 percent within the last quarter century.

4. In 1920 farms between 10 and 500 acres made up two-thirds of all farm land, today only half.

5. The moderate-size farm, 100 to 260 acres, is on the decline. The percentage of farms falling into this category is lowest in the far West, and greatest in the East where the traditional family-type farm pattern has been maintained better than elsewhere. The decline in the number of such moderate-size farms has been most persistent in the regions settled by homesteading.

These facts, as well as others readily available from the censuses of agriculture and the general census, lead to certain conclusions not drawn in the survey in Agricultural Situation referred to above. These conclusions are:

1. American land policy, although favoring the family-type farm in the era of settlement of the West as evidenced in the homestead acts, was not sufficiently vigorous in restricting acreages. The institution of fee simple ownership stood in the way of Federal restriction upon acreage once title to the property had been secured. Yet even in the period of original settlement our Federal land laws allowed too much room for speculation in newly entered lands and did not resist strongly enough those who wished to engage in agriculture as a business on an absentee-ownership basis.

2. The unit size of an economically efficient family-type farm is not the same in all localities. The 160-acre norm is merely an approximation. Although in semiarid regions large units are needed, in more fertile and productive regions smaller units are quite satisfactory and therefore, from the family-farm viewpoint, more desirable. Much of the land in the areas being reclaimed through irrigation is of such a character. Where larger units are found within the irrigation and reclamation projects, it is usually evidence of a trend toward land speculation or large-scale commercial farming.

3. The time to forestall the evils of land concentration and land speculation is at the time of original acquisition and during the period when the original settlers are developing family-type farms on moderate acreages.

From past experience it should be evident that we are entering a crucial period for the family-type farm. If positive steps are not taken to keep commercial agriculture within bounds and to prevent speculation in land, we can only look forward to an increasing number of factories-in-the-fields, employing hired labor often of a migratory kind and exploiting our soil resources solely for purposes of profit. There is no purpose in proclaiming the ideal of the efficient, owner-operated family-type farm if we do not take steps to protect it from the inroads of land monopoly. The alternatives which confront us are discussed summarily in an article appended to this testimony. (Farmer's Future—a Real Concern, by William J. Gibbons. America, November 9, 1946.)

THE FAMILY FARM

Let me say at the outset that in advocating the family-type farm the National Catholic Rural Life Conference is not unaware of the economic problems facing American agriculture. It realizes that upward of a third of our farms as at present constituted are marginal or submarginal in character and therefore not adequate income for a farm family. The conference believes that these farm units should be improved by assisting the owner-operators to improve the quality of the soil where possible, to acquire larger acreages if that is a feasible solution, or to resettle elsewhere if necessary. When new land is being made available through reclamation and irrigation, family farmers desiring resettlement should be given first choice provided they are prepared to learn new farming techniques necessary for the operation of an efficient unit.

The conference realizes also that the productive capacities of modern American agriculture are today so great that fewer full-time farmers are necessary to provide our people with adequate food and fiber and to engage in export than was the case a half century ago. Yet despite this fact, or rather because of it, the conference does not see why corporations and large landowners should be permitted to take over our agricultural production when family farmers are perfectly able to do the job. This they can do, given the necessary education and the equipment adapted to the needs of family-size farming operations.

The relationship of the family to the land has been well expressed in a statement issued jointly by rural leaders of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths during 1945. The statement reads in part:

"Since the family is the primary institution, access to the land and stewardship of land must be planned with the family unit in view. The special adaptability of the farm home for nurturing strong and wholesome family life is the reason for the universal interest in land use and rural welfare. A unique relationship exists between the family and the vocation of agriculture. The farm is the natural habitat of the family. The family's welfare must therefore have the first consideration in economic and social planning. Throughout the history of the United States these fundamental principles have been worked out through National and State legislation, and they have been upheld by court decisions and popular acclaim.

"Efficiency in land use is not to be judged merely by material production but by a balanced consideration of the spiritual, social, and material values that redound therefrom to person, family, and society. The land is not to be a source of benefit to a favored few and a means of servile labor to the many."

Second only to making land available to the family is the responsibility of society to encourage and to educate the land stewards in the proper and efficient use of the land and in such techniques as will make them masters of their own economic destiny (Man's Relation to the Land: a statement of principles which shall underlie our National, State, and individual actions).

Three of the methods suggested in this statement for practical application of the principles are especially worth noting:

Make the family-type farm operated by the owner a major objective of legislation and planning.

Discourage large land holdings as undemocratic and unsocial.

Where large-scale production is necessary and advisable, encourage the use of cooperative techniques with local ownership and management.

In contrast to the reasonable economic security of a family operating an efficient farm unit is the insecurity of seasonal agricultural workers, whose existence makes possible large-scale farming operations. The hundreds of thousands of seasonal workers who may rightly be called migratory, form a definitely depressed class within our economy. These migratory workers traditionally receive a wage only a fraction of the going wage in nearby industry. As often as not, they are exploited because of their race or foreign origin and rarely do they or their families have the economic, educational, religious, and social advantages of families living a more stable kind of life. But even apart from the migratory workers, large-scale farming operations presuppose readily available quantities of cheap labor at the proper seasons. It is all part of the pattern. During the week ending September 11, 1943, for example, 75,000 people were employed in seasonal work in California's Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys alone. The picture is the same wherever unduly large commercial operations replace the family farm unit. In view of our American traditions of economic and political democracy, it hardly seems necessary to emphasize the undesirable character of such insecure agricultural employment. (Seasonal Farm Labor in the United States, by Harry Swartz. Columbia University Press, 1945, p. 35.)

EFFECTS OF DIVERGENT FARM PATTERNS

Ownership of productive property lends stability to the family. When this ownership is in land it gives it additional security even in times of depression. While our agricultural people suffered much during the depression of the thirties, few of them were without food. In fact many additional families took to the land and rural living just to tide themselves over the depression. An owner-operator farm unit gives a family, in addition to relative economic security, the light, space, and air which the family needs for its proper development. Add the benefits of satisfactory rural education, improved roads, rural electrification, and the improvements modern farm and dwelling buildings can have, and it can be readily seen that family living on the land can be made a genuine bulwark of the family and of democracy. On the other hand propertyless workers, especially without roots in any one community, are the natural breeding ground for collectivism.

The study of the towns, Arvin and Dinuba, within California's Central Valley, provides good examples of the two types of farming community which can evolve. The results of the study were included in the report of the Senate Small Business Committee made last December and are well known to everyone interested in rural welfare. An article comparing these towns appeared in the New Republic for February 3, 1947. I quote from the article:

"These two towns prove that a small-farm community is a good place to live in and that a large farm one is not. When a farmer owns 50 acres they make a home for him and his children, but when he owns a 2,000-acre farm it becomes a money-making factory and deprives 39 other families of real homes. It boils down to this. Is it better to have 39 wage-labor families with no homes and one owner who only wants to make a killing, or

to have 40 families living on 50-acre farms making good livings and providing good homes for their children? (New Republic. Two Towns, February 3, 1947.)

The supposition is, of course, that 50 acres is sufficient for an efficient family unit. In some irrigated spots this has already been demonstrated as adequate, but normally larger units are required. In any case the point is clear. For every undue expansion of an individual's or corporation's land holdings, there is a corresponding restriction of opportunity for widespread private ownership by families.

The position of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference is, briefly, that economics has for its end the providing of man's material needs, not the accumulation of profits. Any system of production is to be judged in the last analysis upon its respect for man's inherent rights and its capacity for producing the goods needed and distributing them to the largest number of persons. The family-type farm system does just that. Acreage limitations provisions are directed to the same end.

One of the arguments brought forward by those who favor repeal of the acreage limitations is that the restrictions hold up production of agricultural products and hence mean higher food prices for urban dwellers. In their minds the disadvantages flowing from corporate exploitation of the land are offset by certain economic gains supposed to occur. The goal they set up as the end of economic life is the maximization of national income irrespective of its distribution. The effect upon our natural and human resources is either disregarded or accepted as the inevitable consequences of economic laws.

This approach to the land question is obviously inadequate. Concern for the welfare of the family and for the distribution of private property must also be taken into consideration. If they are not we will drift gradually but surely into collectivism, under private auspices it is true, but nonetheless collectivism. Such a situation—the logical outcome of encouraging large-scale holdings in land as in other productive resources—is but a step from governmental collectivism and state capitalism. Far from being socialistic and communistic the acreage limitation provisions of our reclamation laws are bulwarks against communism. On the constructive side, they are aids in building the moral, physical, and economic health of our American families.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H. R. 29, known as the anti-poll-tax bill, because I think its adoption would be a violation of the right of each State to fix the qualifications of its own voters. In my opinion, the bill is unconstitutional.

My own State, Georgia, has abolished the poll tax entirely and has amended its Constitution so that even if the poll tax were reimposed, its payment could not be made a prerequisite for voting. I voted for the constitution which contained this provision and personally think the State of Georgia acted in accordance with democratic principles in abolishing this tax as a prerequisite for voting.

But I am unalterably opposed to this effort on the part of the Republican majority in Congress, purely for political reasons, to interfere in the internal affairs of the States which still have the poll tax.

Disposition of Revenues From Reclamation Bureau Power Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday July 21, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, it may come as a surprise and a shock to Members of the House that an attorney for an executive department has ventured to advise that department that the common understanding of the act of Congress governing the disposition of revenues from Reclamation Bureau power projects should be set aside and that a dollar of those revenues, which is required by the act of Congress to be paid as interest on power investment, may be credited as such interest and also, by this attorney's fiat, be credited as a dollar of repayment of irrigation construction cost.

Yet the opinion I have mentioned has been rendered and the Department of the Interior has taken stock in it; enough stock so that it has, on certain recent projects, made up reports relating to feasibility of the projects on the theory that the attorney's opinion is correct and that the same dollar can be used to pay two separate debts. The Department has also taken enough stock in the opinion that it has in recent years kept the so-called interest component on the Grand Coulee project in a suspense account, awaiting a time when it might carry the opinion into action, thus, in effect maintaining two sets of books on this project. But it has not been sure enough of its ground to make the actual application of the money on that project in the way the opinion would suggest.

Needless to say, ever since this attorney's opinion became known to Members of the Congress, in the year 1944, a deep-seated resentment at such incomprehensible trifling with the will of Congress and with the revenues of the United States has grown up. This feeling has not been limited to Members of the Congress. The National Reclamation Association, a comprehensive organization of those concerned with reclamation throughout the 17 Western States, adopted a strong resolution condemning the unsoundness of the attorney's opinion and set up a committee for the express purpose of drafting and submitting to the Congress legislation to set the Department of the Interior on the course which Congress has always intended it should follow. It is plain that this association fears that the cause of reclamation will suffer unless it is placed on a sound and honest financial basis.

Advocates of public power development also have been alarmed by the proposed scheme of accounting, by which the same dollar would be used to pay two debts. At its recent meeting held May 23, 1947, the American Public Power Association, which comprises all the leading public power agencies in the country, adopted a resolution demanding that the accounting practices of the Bureau of Reclamation be corrected, to protect the best interests both of public power and of reclamation.

In my own State, general and widespread opposition to the attorney's opinion has required me to participate actively in the support of the main feature of the bill under discussion, H. R. 2873. I have before me, and ask that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of this statement, together with the resolution of American Power Association, resolutions or communications opposing the double application of interest on power investment, from the following:

First. The Irrigation Districts Association of California, the 115 members of which include virtually all the operating irrigation districts in California.

Second. Colorado River Board of California, a State agency created by law to represent the interests of California in the Colorado River.

Third. The Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, the largest municipal water and power utility in the United States.

Fourth. The cities of Pasadena, Glendale and Burbank, which, like Los Angeles, distribute Hoover Dam power.

Fifth. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which includes 17 cities in southern California, extending from Los Angeles to San Diego.

Sixth. Imperial Irrigation District, which is the largest irrigation district in the United States and distributes both water and power.

Seventh. The Central Labor Council of Los Angeles, embracing all labor organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Eighth. The California State Chamber of Commerce, Agriculture and Industry, a comprehensive State-wide organization.

Ninth. The Colorado River Water Users Association, which comprises over 70 percent of the actual water users of the Colorado River Basin

My position in support of legislation which would put the intention of the Congress as to accounting for the "interest component" beyond dispute is, therefore justified by the most important interests of my State and I am proud to have been of service in this cause.

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association favors the continuing development of the West through Federal reclamation, and the construction of the multiple-purpose projects upon which such development depends. But in view of the heavy subsidies to irrigation which are carried by power on those projects, the following safeguards for the power users are deemed essential:

1. Power developed on Federal multiple-purpose projects should be disposed of in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible

rate to consumers consistent with sound business principles.

2. The burden supported by power in a multiple-purpose project should not exceed the amount which power would have to pay if the project were constructed as a single-purpose power project.

3. Inasmuch as the irrigator pays no interest and the power user does, the interest rate which enters into the calculation of the power rate should be as low as can be justified, and there should be no discrimination between projects with respect thereto. A rate of 2 percent is recommended.

4. Inasmuch as the purchaser of power from a Government reclamation project pays rates sufficient to return to the United States the capital invested in power facilities, plus interest, he is entitled to an accounting by the Government which makes it clear that he is repaying capial, plus interest, and is not receiving power at a rate subsidized by the United States Treasury. It is difficult to make this clear answer to the critics of public power under he Reclamation Bureau's present practice of applying the interest paid by the power user as though it were capital being returned, with resulting confusion as to whether a subsidy is thereby extended to irrigation, as intended, or to power, as contended by some critics of public power. The accounting practices of the Bureau should be corrected, in the best interests of public power and the reclamation program.

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the American Public Power Association at its meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, May 23, 1947.

CARLTON L. NAU,
Secretary and Manager.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

RONALD HARRIS,
Hotel Washington,
Washington, D. C.:

Association today approved in principle S. 539 and H. R. 1886 with amendment as in your telegram.

IRRIGATION DISTRICTS ASSOCIATION
OF CALIFORNIA.

APRIL 29, 1947.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

The Colorado River Board of California, representing the State with respect to the Colorado River and the six public agencies of southern California having rights to the use of water and power from the Colorado River upon the continued integrity of which depends the irrigation of over 1,000,000 acres of land and domestic and industrial water and power for a present population of over 4,000,000 people opposes the principle in the Lemke bill of using the interest component on power investment for repayment of capital cost as being economically unsound and hence detrimental to the best interests of western reclamation.

COLORADO RIVER BOARD OF CALIFORNIA,
RAYMOND MATTHEW, *Chief Engineer.*

DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 7, 1947.

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POULSON: This is written in response to your request for comment as to the proper treatment to be accorded interest earned upon the capital invested by the United States in power facilities at reclamation projects, and upon the bills referred to above insofar as they bear upon this much-disputed question.

The present practice of the Reclamation Bureau is to set power rates sufficiently high to repay to the United States all capital allocated to power, plus interest on that capital. This is a perfectly sound and businesslike basis for fixing rates.

However, the accounting for that portion of the power revenues properly applicable to interest on the power capital (frequently referred to in the testimony on these bills as the interest component of power rates) is, to say the least, unorthodox. A single dollar of revenue is accounted for once as a dollar of interest earned and again as a dollar of capital repaid.

In reporting upon anticipated power revenues and in determining the economic justification of proposed reclamation projects, the Bureau follows this same anomalous accounting theory. Power rates are proposed at a level sufficiently high to return power capital, plus interest. But the interest component of these anticipated revenues, amounting sometimes to tens of millions of dollars, is accounted once as an interest earning and again the same revenues appear as a return of capital.

Upon this point, the issue before the committee is simple and direct: The Lemke bill (H. R. 1977) approves the present practice of the Bureau; the Rockwell bills (H. R. 1886, 2873, and 2874) squarely reverse the Bureau's practice.

Upon this issue we believe that the principle of the Rockwell bills is sound and should be supported.

As I have pointed out above, the purchaser of power from a reclamation project must pay rates sufficient to return to the United States the capital invested in power facilities plus interest. Having paid these rates, the power purchaser is entitled to a clean accounting by the Government which makes it clear that he is repaying capital plus interest; in other words, that he is not receiving power at a rate subsidized by the United States Treasury.

But we know that so long as the present accounting practices of the Bureau are continued, there will be many Members of Congress, and of the public generally, who will remain honestly and sincerely of the belief that the public power program is being subsidized by interest-free Government money. Upon this point there can be no doubt after observing the hearings upon these bills. Witnesses before the committee testified directly and earnestly that this diversion of interest constituted a subsidy to the power users. Other witnesses stated flatly that it did not constitute such a subsidy. Members of the committee, after hearing the testimony, appear to be divided in their belief as to whether the present practice of the Bureau does, or does not, result in a subsidy to power users.

This confusion is inevitable, since every citizen who has ever loaned or borrowed money knows that you cannot, by the payment of a single dollar, pay off a dollar of accrued interest and also pay off a dollar of debt. Finding that on reclamation projects a single dollar is being credited as interest on power capital and also as return of irrigation capital, the citizen is convinced that one of these credits is unreal and represents a gift or subsidy from the Government. But, once entangled in the accounting and the attendant argument, he may well become (and remain) confused as to whether the beneficiary is the power user or the irrigator.

I believe that this accounting practice does a great disservice to the reclamation program in general, and particularly to public power.

First, it casts doubt on the soundness and reliability of all the accounts of the Bureau and all reports and estimates based on those accounts. I believe that in the reclamation program, as in every other large enterprise, public or private, accounts must always be kept on a basis which commands complete confidence.

Second, as you know, the public-power program in the United States has never lacked able and aggressive opponents. If reclamation project accounting creates any element of confusion or doubt as to whether public-power facilities are subsidized, we may be sure that the situation will be exploited fully by opponents. Nothing could be more detrimental to the future of public power in the United States than a widespread belief among the Members of Congress and of the citizens generally that public-power projects owe their apparent success to a subsidy from the Federal Treasury; that their stability and economic soundness rest not upon fact, but upon accounting sleight of hand.

Since, as I have emphasized above, the purchase of power from reclamation projects pays rates sufficient to reimburse the Government's investment in power facilities plus interest, and enjoys no subsidy in the form of interest-free money it is unfair, to customer and to the Bureau alike, that any such question should exist. Yet I believe that the Bureau's treatment of interest invites just that question and that the charge will never be put completely at rest until that practice is changed. In other words, the Bureau's power rates are sound and can be defended anywhere. But their practice in accounting for interest is wholly unsound and inevitably creates doubt as to the validity of the rates themselves, and the economic soundness of all power projects under the jurisdiction of the Bureau.

A question may arise in your mind, as it has in mine, "If this accounting practice is so wrong and so detrimental, why is it so valiantly defended before Congress?"

The answer, I believe, lies in the fact that the diversion of interest earned on power capital to repayment of irrigation capital affords a very large subsidy to some irrigation projects, and affords this subsidy in such an ambiguous and elusive manner that, as you know, many members of your own committee who have been considering the matter actually believe that the subsidy, if any, is being given to the power customers. Without arguing the merits of subsidy grants to irrigation projects, it is clear to me that provision for any such subsidy must be cleanly divorced from the accounting for principal and interest on power capital repaid in full from power rates. I am not prepared to see the long-range interests of a sound and economically justified public-power program sacrificed to provide an unobtrusive subsidy for irrigation projects.

In conclusion, I wish to remind you that each of these bills is deficient in that it prescribes no ceiling for power rates. Each bill is careful to require that power pay enough, but no one of the bills makes any attempt to guard against power being required to pay too much. On reclamation projects power is frequently called upon to bear a share of the irrigation costs. This practice is perfectly proper so long as it is within reasonable limits but I believe that a definite limit should be prescribed by statute. Mr. Tillman, of our legal division, in testifying before the committee, proposed a formula for a ceiling on power rates. I believe this formula is sound and I hope that you will attempt to get such a provision incorporated in any bill approved by the committee. In addition, I commend to your attention the language of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890), which prescribes that power developed on flood-control projects be disposed of "in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles."

Sincerely,

SAMUEL B. MORRIS,
General Manager and Chief Engineer.

PASADENA, CALIF.

NORRIS POULSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Pasadena, Calif., a contractor for Boulder power, favors Rockwell bill amendment to 1939 reclamation law and opposes Lemke bill same subject.

HAROLD M. HINES,
City Manager.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *May 16, 1947.*

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Glendale, Calif., an allottee of Boulder power, opposes Lemke bill amendment to 1939 reclamation law and approves Rockwell bill same subject.

CHARLES R. BAIRD,
City Manager.

BURBANK, CALIF., *May 16, 1947.*

NORRIS POULSON, *Member of Congress,*
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Burbank, Calif., a contractor for Boulder power, favors the Rockwell bill amendment to 1939 reclamation act and opposes Lemke bill same subject.

PAUL L. BROWN,
Mayor, City of Burbank, Calif.

COLORADO RIVER WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION NO. 2—ADOPTED AT THIRD ANNUAL MEETING, LAS VEGAS, NEV., MAY 1-2, 1947

Resolved, That the Colorado River Water Users Association urges the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Public Lands Committee to approve Congressman Rockwell's bill denying the Bureau of Reclamation authority to divert the interest on power features of multiple-purpose projects to apply on the costs allocated to irrigation features of such projects, and to disapprove Congressman Lemke's bill authorizing such diversion of funds.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 9, 1947.*

NORTHCUTT ELY,
American Security Building:

Following wire sent WELCH with copy to POULSON: "The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California is a public corporation and one of the major allottees of energy from Boulder power plant. The board of the district desires to record with you its disapproval of the practice of diverting interest component in rates for energy in multiple-purpose reclamation projects to subsidize irrigation. Under the practice advocated by the Bureau of Reclamation, power users are properly charged with interest on money allocated to power development, but the interst component in the power rate is applied as though it constituted repayment of principal on investments allotted to irrigation. This creates an unfortunate misunderstanding and has even been interpreted as a subsidy to power users. This practice is believed to be against the interest of reclamation in the West and against the interest of public development of power. This board respectfully requests that legislation be enacted requiring the return of interest to the Treasury or the reclamation fund and prohibiting the application of such interest to retirement of principal allotted irrigation except as such moneys may be specifically appropriated therefor by the Congress."

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.
JOHN H. RAMBOZ.

EL CENTRO, CALIF., *April 30, 1947.*

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman, Public Lands Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The board of directors of this district indorses the principle of Rockwell bill, H. R. 2873, with amendment offered by Mr. ELY. We believe that the interest component of repayment of money advanced for public-power development must be used to pay interest on money advanced and not applied on payments of principal of money advanced for any purpose. In the best interest of western development and sound principle of public power, we believe this principle must be clean-cut.

EVAN T. HEWES,
President, Board of Directors, Imperial Irrigation District.

LOS ANGELES CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 2, 1947.

Be it resolved, That the Central Labor Council of Los Angeles is opposed to the practice of diverting interest component in rates for energy in multiple-purpose reclamation projects to subsidize irrigation, as set up in the Lemke bill, H. R. 1977. That the practice of charging power users with interest on money allocated to power development be approved, but that the interest component in the power rate should not be applied as though it were repayment of principal on investment allocated to irrigation. The practice of so diverting interest is believed to be against the best interest of reclamation in the West, and against the interest of public development of power; be it further

Resolved, That legislation be approved requiring the return of the interest component in power rates to the Treasury or to the reclamation fund, as provided in the Rockwell bill, H. R. 2873, and prohibiting the application of such interest to the retirement of the principal allotted to irrigation, except as specifically appropriated therefor by Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the chairmen of the Public Lands Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives in Washington, and to the Members of the Congress from California.

W. J. BASSETT,
Secretary.

CALIFORNIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY,
San Francisco, Calif., June 2, 1947.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman, Public Lands Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WELCH: The California State Chamber of Commerce is interested in the passage of H. R. 2873 amending section 9C of the reclamation law to set aside the opinion of the solicitor of the Bureau of Reclamation and forbid applying the interest component on power and municipal water features to repayment of irrigation capital investment on reclamation projects.

We favor the principles of H. R. 2873 and oppose the principles of H. R. 1977 which would justify what we consider to be false reasoning. On April 12, 1946, the Board of Directors of the California State Chamber of Commerce adopted the following policy which we believe is involved in these two bills:

"That the State chamber of commerce oppose any substantial changes in the provisions of the National Reclamation Act of 1902, and acts supplementary thereto, insofar as they may relate to the economic feasibility, repayment, and local control provisions of the act."

We wanted you to know that we would like to see H. R. 2873 passed and H. R. 1977 defeated.

Very truly yours,

JAMES MUSSATTI.

Enforcement of Loyalty by Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in today's Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE OTHER HAND—CONGRESS MAY DO THE UNFORGIVABLE IN SEEKING TO ENFORCE LOYALTY BY LAW

(By Lowell Mellett)

In an attempt to do the impossible, Congress may do the unforgivable. The House already has done its worst—but lack of time is likely to prevent the Senate from following suit immediately.

The House seeks to enforce loyalty by law. The Members who voted to do this will tell you this is not quite true, that all they seek to do is to make sure that no disloyal persons shall have employment in the Government.

To this end all persons about to be employed, as well as the hundreds of thousands already employed, would be given searching examinations as to their loyalty. The business would start with the Civil Service Commission looking over its own files and fingerprints and then proceeding to the records of the FBI, the Army and Navy, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, local law-enforcement agencies, and any other sources that might occur to anybody.

If somewhere along the line something derogatory should be turned up—such as somebody making serious but unsupported charges against the man or woman under consideration—the name would be certified to the FBI for a full-fledged investigation. The result of this investigation would be presented to a Federal Loyalty Board, created by the act. This board would decide whether the employee or candidate for a job was loyal. If not found loyal, he would be fired or not hired.

DEFENSE HOBBLED

The board would make its decision on evidence—but the accused person would not see or hear the evidence. He could have counsel, but the counsel could not confront his accusers, subpena witnesses or cross-examine any witness.

The man or woman found guilty of disloyalty through this utterly unfair and un-American process would be branded for life. He would find it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain other employment. The man or woman found loyal would, in many instances, be in no better situation. The very fact that he or she had been subjected to suspicion and dragged through such proceedings would leave its stigma, a smear that would stick.

That is the unforgivable thing the House is willing to do. And as said, it is also attempting the impossible.

Loyalty is a state of mind and heart. It is a matter of the spirit. The same is true of disloyalty. Overt disloyalty or treason is a crime and punishable as such. Like every other country, we have plenty of law for that. But only the Japanese, in the heydey of their military men, could conceive of thought police as a means of reaching the impure mind. Only the Japanese—until the present strange hysteria hit the House.

It is to be hoped that this hysteria will subside before Congress comes back in Janu-

ary. If it doesn't get better, it may get worse. We may find Federal employees compelled to take new and fearsome oaths, written in their own blood, as a requisite for serving Uncle Sam.

TO HARM INNOCENT

Yet, loyalty will remain a matter of spirit, with no man able to say who does and who does not possess it. You may feel that any man who volunteered in the last war and offered his life in defense of his country had loyalty beyond questioning. But it won't be beyond questioning if he applies for a Government job.

You may have other odd ideas about loyalty. You may think the Members of the House owe a certain amount of loyalty to these same veterans—owe them some loyal assistance or protection in the matter of housing, for example. Many Members, however, including some who voted for this loyalty bill, have a different notion on that subject. Their loyalty has gone instead to the real-estate interests.

Loyalty is, indeed, a thing difficult to get at. The House is attempting to get at it in the worst possible way. And, in the process, it is certain to do grievous harm to many innocent persons.

Hernando de Soto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very scholarly paper on Hernando de Soto, presented by Herbert Lamson before the Jacksonville Historical Society, at Jacksonville, Fla., on February 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERNANDO DE SOTO

(Paper presented by Herbert Lamson to the Jacksonville Historical Society, February 12, 1947)

Ladies and gentlemen, on May 30, 1939, the four hundredth anniversary of the landing of De Soto in Florida, the monument commemorating that event, given by the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the State of Florida, was unveiled at Shaw's Point near Bradenton, Fla. For it is the consensus of the best informed opinion of the present day, that it was there at Shaw's Point, at the southern extremity of Tampa Bay, that the followers of that peerless leader of men first set foot upon the soil of Florida,[1] on the 30th day of May, in the year of our Lord 1539, now nearly 408 years ago. In describing his arrival, in a letter to the Secular Cabildo of Santiago de Cuba, dated Espiritu Santo, Fla., July 9, 1539, De Soto said: "I left Havana with all my fleet on Sunday, May 18. Although I wrote that I would leave on the 25th of that month, I forestalled that day in order not to lose a favorable opportunity we had. When we were entering the gulf, the weather changed into a calm for us, yet not so continuous a calm that it kept us from coming to anchor on this coast within a week's time, namely, on Sunday, the feast of the Holy Spirit. Having fallen 4 or 5 leagues below the port, without any of my pilots knowing where the port lay, it was thereupon determined that I should go in the brigantines to look for it. We took 3 days to do this and to enter the mouth of the port. Also, since we had no knowledge of the channel—a bay which extends for 12 or more leagues to the sea—we were so greatly delayed that I had to send Vasco Porcallo de Figueroa, my lieutenant general, with the brigantines to seize a town which lay at the head of the bay. I ordered all the men and horses to land on a beach, whence with great difficulty we went on to meet Vasco Porcallo on Sunday of the Most Holy Trinity."[2] In recounting these same events, the gentleman of Elvas says: "On Sunday, May 18, of the year 1539, the adelantado left the Havana with his fleet, consisting of nine ships, five vessels with topsails, two caravels, and two brigantines. For 7 days, they sailed attended by good weather. On Whitsunday, May 25, they sighted the land of Florida, and for fear of shoals anchored a league from shore. On Friday, May 30, they disembarked on the land of Florida, 2 leagues from a town of an Indian chief called Ucita. They disembarked the 213 horses which they carried, in order to lighten the ships so that they would need less water. All the men landed and only the seamen stayed aboard, who in a week, by going up with the tide for a short distance daily, brought the vessels near to the town."[3]

In his letter of July 9, 1539, De Soto goes on to say: "The Indians of the land, because of certain fears they conceived of us, abandoned all the land, for in a distance of 30 leagues no man stayed behind. On my arrival here, I heard of a Christian who was held by a cacique. I sent there Baltasar de Gallegos with 40 horsemen and a like number of foot soldiers in order to try to get him. Gallegos found him a day's journey away from here together with eight or ten Indians whom he brought to my hands. We rejoiced not a little on seeing him because he knew the language of the Indians. He had lost our language, although he soon regained it. His name is Juan Ortiz and he is a native of Seville and a nobleman. After this I went in person to this cacique, and brought him back in peace."[4] This Juan Ortiz was a most valuable addition to De Soto's company, and rendered faithful and efficient service as interpreter until his death 3 years later. His loss was greatly felt.

The date, May 30, 1539, marked the beginning of the realization of De Soto's dream. Of that day he had thought long, for it he had planned well, and on it he began the long and perilous marches, fraught with danger, suffering, and woe, that he thought would lead to further fame and fortune, but that led instead to disappointment, disaster, and death. That date now nearly 408 years ago, marked the high tide in De Soto's hopes. Up to that point his fame and fortune had been advancing steadily ever onward and upward; but from that date his fortune was to decline, and, from his viewpoint, his life was to end in failure. Yet, after all the suffering and hardships he was to endure, he was destined to gain immortality, and to go down in history for an achievement whose very meaning was hidden from him, in his discovery of the Mississippi River, which was likewise to be his burial place. For while we know him best as the discoverer of the Father of Waters, he had gained both fame and fortune on many a hard-fought field, before coming to Florida. Indeed, so great was his reputation in Spain, in 1538, that when it was known that he was fitting out an expedition for the conquest of Florida, many flocked to his standard, and besought him to take them with him. Elvas says: "From Salamanca, Jaen, Valencia, Albuquerque, and other parts of Spain, many persons of noble family gathered in Seville; so much so that many men of good condition, who had sold their estates, remained behind in San Lucar because there was no ship for them, although for other known and rich countries it was usual to lack men. Thus they passed in review, and those who were to the liking of De Soto and whom he wished were counted and enrolled and went with him to Florida. Those who went numbered in all 600 men."[5] They sailed from San Lucar on the 6th day of April 1538 in seven large ships and three smaller vessels.[6]

The commander of this expedition was born in the year 1500, at Jarez de los Caballeros, a town in the Province of Estramadura, in southwestern Spain, near the border of Portugal.[7] Although his family was distinguished, it was in very straitened financial circumstances. It is said that he was unusually handsome, and grew up tall, well-formed, and with remarkable muscular strength and agility. When he was a young man, de Soto attracted the attention of Don Pedro Arias de Avila, better known as Pedrarias Davilla, the notorious governor of Darien. It is said that Pedrarias sent de Soto to one of the Spanish universities, probably that of Saragossa, and maintained him there for 6 years; that later de Soto was received as a member of his family, and fell in love with his daughter, Isabella; and that when Pedrarias found out about this love affair, he was greatly incensed; and to separate the lovers, took de Soto with him to Darien.[8] At any rate, it seems clear that whatever the cause, de Soto went with Pedrarias, in 1519, at the age of 19 years.[9] There he remained in the service of Pedrarias for the next 10 or 12 years. The Spanish colony of Darien, located on the isthmus of that name, better known to us by its modern name of the Isthmus of Panama, was, like all Spanish colonies of that day, a hotbed of intrigue, cruelty, and malice. While de Soto undoubtedly in the performance of his duty as a soldier, had a hand in some of the cruelties inflicted on the natives, he seems to have kept his name clear of any particular outrage; which, considering the nature of his surroundings, was no mean achievement, in itself, and speaks well for his character. Many exciting incidents of his service in Darien might be related, but time will not permit of it. One story, which illustrates both his fearlessness and his sense of justice, is that of his punishment of the murderer of his friend, M. Codro. It is said that this friend had carried a letter from de Soto to Isabella de Bobadilla, daughter of Pedrarias, on a visit to Spain, and had brought back one from her to de Soto in return. Pedrarias, because of this, had M. Codro brutally murdered on shipboard by a band of cutthroats. It happened that nearly a year later de Soto took passage along the coast of Darien to

[1] The Landing Place of de Soto, by John R. Swanton, published in the Florida Historical Quarterly, vol. XVI, No. 3, January 1938.

[2] Letter written to the Secular Cabildo of Santiago de Cuba by Hernando de Soto, Espiritu Santo, Florida, July 9, 1539, published in the Florida Historical Quarterly, vol. XVI, No. 3, p. 174, January 1938.

[3] True Relation of the Hardships Suffered by Governor Hernando de Soto and Certain Portuguese Gentlemen During the Discovery of the Province of Florida. Now Newly Set Forth by a Gentleman of Elvas. Translated and edited by James Alexander Robertson, vol. 2, pp. 31 and 32, published by the Florida State Historical Society, DeLand, 1933, pp. 31 and 32.

[4] Letter written to the Secular Cabildo of Santiago de Cuba by Hernando de Soto, supra, published in the Florida Historical Quarterly, vol. XVI, No. 3, p. 175.

[5] Portuguese Narrative, supra, pp. 12 and 15.

[6] Ferdinand DeSoto, J. S. C. Abbott, p. 144.

[7] Report of the United States de Soto Expedition Commission, An Outline of Hernando de Soto's Career.

[8] Ferdinand de Soto, the Discoverer of the Mississippi, by John S. C. Abbott, chapter 1.

[9] Idem. chapter 2.

Leon in a small vessel, commanded by one Valanzuela. De Soto, unaware of the doom that had befallen his friend, happened to hear the captain bragging to the crew about how he had tied M. Codro to the mast, had had him doused with sea water for 2 days, until he was almost dead, and how, just before his death, M. Codro rallied his strength and said: 'Captain, your treatment has caused my death. I now call upon you to hear the words of a dying man. Within a year from this time I summon you to meet me before the judgment seat of God." Interrupting the captain's derisive laughter at the recollection of this remark, de Soto asked him when the year would expire. "In about 2 weeks," the captain replied. "But I have no fear but that the prophet will prove to be a liar." He shall not," said de Soto. Whereupon he drew his sword, and, with one blow, cut off the captain's head before them all, so that it rolled upon the ship's deck among his nefarious crew. Turning to the crowd assembled, de Soto said: "Gentlemen, if any of you are disposed to hold me accountable for what I have just done, I am ready to answer you according to your desires. But I consider myself bound, in reason and in courtesy, to inform you, that M. Codro, the man whom this villain murdered, was my friend; and I doubt not that he was condemned to death for doing me an important service." This satisfied the crowd, who were used to such scenes of bloodshed.[10]

Accounts differ as to whether or not de Soto fell out with Pedrarias. According to one account, de Soto and Pedrarias came at last to the parting of the ways to such an extent that, for the last 3 years of his stay in Darien and vicinity, de Soto held himself altogether aloof from the governor, under an oath he had taken never again to draw sword under his command.[11] Another account omits all mention of this estrangement.[12] Be that as it may, when Francisco Pizarro determined upon his final raid upon Peru, he sought the services of de Soto, and was so eager to assure his presence that he promised him the post of second in command of the expedition. De Soto accepted Pizarro's offer, and decided to go to Peru; but, when he arrived at Pizarro's camp on the island of Puna, off the coast of Peru, from whence the invasion was to begin, he found that Pizarro, with his customary duplicity, had awarded the place of second in command to his brother Hernando Pizarro, leaving de Soto the post of third in the leadership of the expedition. De Soto, although naturally incensed at such treatment, concealed his disappointment, and proceeded, by his skill and daring, to win such a place for himself in the esteem of his men, that he became second in command in fact, if not in name. While the conquest of Peru is generally credited to Francisco Pizarro, de Soto took a major part in whatever fighting it required; so much so that it is hard to discern how the expedition could have succeeded without him. He had no part in the treachery displayed by Pizarro toward the Inca, Atahualpa, in taking him prisoner, nor in his subsequent execution. He was the friend of the Inca, and it was through de Soto's influence that the ransom of a roomful of gold was paid by Atahualpa for his release, which release was denied by Pizarro after the ransom had been paid. For his share in the Peruvian conquest, which engaged his energies from 1532 to 1534,[13] de Soto received immense treasure. Maynard says: "His share of the ransom of Atahualpa had been enormous, and he had added to it—out of the spoils of Cuzco and during his other campaigns—until it reached the gigantic figure of a hundred thousand pesos. Allowing for the increase in the value of money, Peru had made him a millionaire.[14] But he had enough of the perfidy and quarrelsomeness of the Pizarros; and so left Peru, in 1534, and returned to Spain, after an absence of 15 years.[15]

He had left Spain an unknown, penniless soldier of fortune. He returned, a renowned commander, possessed of fabulous riches. He received a royal welcome; he married Isabella de Bobadilla, his boyhood sweetheart, who had waited faithfully for his return, and who, in turn, had been reduced from riches to poverty during his absence; honors were showered upon him, and he began to live in lavish style, the life of a Spanish grandee. But adventure was in his blood, and when Cabeza de Vaca, who had escaped to Spain, one of the few survivors of the ill-fated expedition of Panfilo de Narvaez to Florida, painted in glowing terms the wonders and riches of that fabled land, DeSoto decided once again to fare forth in search of further fame and fortune; [15] obtained authority of the king who made him governor of Cuba and adelantado of Florida; [16] and set sail from San Lucar, on the 6th day of April, 1538, for Cuba, and from thence to Florida, which he reached on May 30, 1939.

And so he set out, the leader of a splendid force, in full panoply of war; upward of 150 horsemen, clothed in heavy armor, and some 350 foot soldiers likewise clad in armor, with equipment and supplies in abundance, to seek for gold and treasure, and with priests to convert the Indians to Christianity.

As he hoped to establish a colony as well as to find gold and convert the natives, de Soto took along other things besides arms and armor. Irving says: "As a leading object with the governor, also, was to found a Colony, he was encumbered with many things that embarrassed the march of his army. Among these are particularly noted 300 swine, with which he intended to stock the country when he should settle, having been found the most advantageous stock for the sustenance of new colonies. These animals were placed in charge of a company of horse to keep them to the line of march, and guard them in traversing the swamps and rivers.[17] A garrison was left at Ucita to guard the stores and ships left there.[18] His route, according to good authority, ran northerly to Lake City, through Limona, Zephyrhills, Dade City, Inverness, Hernando, Orange Lake, Micanopy, Alachua, and Guilford; westwardly from Lake City to the neighborhood of Tallahassee, through Live Oak, Ellaville, Greenville, Aucilla, and Lloyd.[19] This ground was covered in about 3 months, the first winter being spent near the present site of Tallahassee. In constant contact with the Indians, his way from Tallahassee took him into Alabama; thence northeasterly to Silver Bluff, on the South Carolina side of the Savannah River, about 20 miles below Augusta; thence into the mountains near Franklin, N. C.; on into Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, and on to the Rio Grande, as Elvas calls it—the great Mississippi River itself, which he saw for the first time—the first white man ever to lay eyes on it—on Saturday, the 21st of May, 1541. The exact spot where de Soto first saw the great river is shrouded in uncertainty.[20] But wherever that spot may be, to him unqualifiedly goes the honor of the great discovery. Crossing the Mississippi, de Soto l·d his men on to the west, ever in search of gold and treasure. But the search was fruitless. The only thing resembling treasure, that they encountered in all their wanderings, were the pearls given them by the Indian princess of Cutifachiqui, at Silver Bluff, on the Savannah River; [21] and even those were lost in the fatal battle of Mabilla, in which many Spaniards were killed, and in which they lost everything they possessed, even to their very clothing, when they themselves burned the town in an effort to defeat the Indians.[22]

For a year after his great discovery, De Soto bravely led his men, in aimless wanderings, ever hoping to discover gold, constantly at war with hostile Indians, and in hourly danger of death. Gradually his hope faded. His iron resolve upheld him, and he kept his men in line. He showed indomitable will, and would not give up the search. In May 1542, he fell ill with a fever, which confined him to his bed. His illness lasted 7 days. When convinced that death was near, he called his men in and bade them farewell, asked their forgiveness for any wrongs he might have done them, appointed his successor, Luis de Moscoso, commended his soul to God, and died on the 21st day of May, 1542, exactly 1 year from the day he discovered the river.[23]

Such, briefly, was Hernando de Soto. In an age of cruelty, he was distinguished for his moderation. In an age of adventure, he was distinguished for his initiative. In an age of military prowess, he was distinguished for his strategy. In an age of hardship, he was distinguished for his patience. In an age of brave men, he was distinguished for his great courage. In an age of leaders, he was distinguished for his splendid qualities of leadership. In an age of discovery, he was distinguished for his great discovery. In an age of religious fervor, he was distinguished for his faith in God. Through more than 400 years, his fame has come down to us; and so long as the doings of mankind are recorded, his name will be honored as typifying the best of the many fine qualities of the Spanish cavalier.

[10] Ferdinand de Soto, by Abbott, supra, chapter 4; The Life, Travels, and Adventures of Ferdinand de Soto, by Lambert A. Wilmer, pp. 122–125.

[11] Ferdinand de Soto, by Abbott, supra, p. 65; Wilmer, supra, p. 102.

[12] De Soto and the Conquistadores, by Theodore Maynard, p. 41.

[13] Abbott, supra, p. 137.

[14] Maynard, supra, p. 113.

[15] Abbott, supra, p. 138 et seq.; Wilmer, supra, p. 279 et seq.

[16] Elvas, supra, p. 7; The Conquest of Florida, by Theodore Irving, vol. 1, p. 31.

[17] Conquest of Florida, Irving, supra, p. 89.

[18] Maynard, supra, p. 159; Elvas, supra, pp. 51 and 52.

[19] Route as traced on present map of Florida by Federal writer's project under supervision of Dr. Carita Doggett Corse. See also p. 30, de Soto Report, and p. 1.

[20] Maynard, supra, p. 229.

[21] Maynard, supra, p. 191.

[22] Maynard, supra, p. 214.

[23] Elvas, supra, pp. 224 to 227; Maynard, supra, pp. 261 to 263; Abbott, supra, pp. 337 to 339; Irving, supra, vol. 2, pp. 172 to 175.

Columnar Collusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Columnar Collusion", appearing in the Washington Post for July 15, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMNAR COLLUSION

In attacking the Messrs. Lowell Mellett, Marquis Childs, and Tom Stokes as the dupes

of a Government propagandist—because they happened to write on the same subject on the same day—Representative MILLER of Connecticut was guilty, we think, of injustice not so much to the columnists as to some of their colleagues whom he ignored. Also on the same day there appeared in the pages of our contemporary, the Washington Daily News, a devastatingly lucid analysis of the Miller bills under the by-line of Miss Ruth Finney. And in the same paper, same edition, same day, there appeared an editorial titled "Don't Let Utilities Backslide" which, by clear implication at least, referred to the Miller bills when it warned: "The utilities are backing half a dozen bills in Congress designed to put them back where they were in the 20's."

Such unanimity may well be deserved. We are glad to join, though belatedly, in condemnation of measures which would remove most of the utility companies, now subject to Federal regulation, from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and subject them merely to the inadequate supervision of State regulatory bodies; which would drastically limit the FPC's licensing power by posing an absurd definition of navigable streams. These proposals of Representative MILLER seem part and parcel of a concerted attack in which his Republican colleagues, Representatives ROCKWELL and DONDERO, have joined with companion measures designed to subvert and reverse the established power policy of this country.

Whether this attack was inspired by some utility company propagandist we are not prepared to state. If so, we presume that Members of Congress have a right to listen to the lobbyists of their choice and even simultaneously to reflect his views if they choose to do so. On the whole, however, it seems to us rather more remarkable that a sheaf of bills, all designed to advance the interests of the utilities, should be brought forward in a single session of Congress than that several alert and public-spirited commentators should simultaneously expose the iniquities of those bills.

Construction of Dams on the Snake River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Oregon State Grange and statements by the Washington, Oregon, and Idaho State Granges at a public hearing on July 9, 1947, before the Army engineers, on the construction of certain developments on the Snake River.

There being no objection, the letter and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE GRANGE,
Portland, Oreg., July 15, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing for your information the following:

1. The statement of the Oregon State Grange before the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee at its hearing at Walla Walla on June 25, 1947 with reference to the construction of new dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

2. The statement of the Oregon State Grange before the Army engineers at its hearing at Lewiston, Idaho on July 9, 1947 in connection with the construction of dams on the Snake River.

3. A joint statement by the Washington, Oregon, and Idaho State Granges before the Army engineers at the Lewiston, Idaho, hearing.

In the fish versus dams controversy the Grange takes the position that we can have both fish and dams. We suggest the expansion of both the State and Federal programs to make the rivers more habitable for fish and also the scheduling of dams which may be authorized in the future in such a manner as to permit the fishing interests the maximum time to adjust their industry to the new conditions.

In connection with the Snake River development, the Grange takes the position that Hells Canyon Dam should be constructed at an early date. We feel this is necessary in order to assure early development of our much needed supply of low-cost electricity.

We appreciate that there is no congressional action pending which involves these questions. However, we wanted to keep you advised as to what the Oregon State Grange has done in this connection.

Sincerely,

MORTON TOMPKINS,
Master, Oregon State Grange.

STATEMENT BY THE WASHINGTON, OREGON, AND IDAHO STATE GRANGES AT THE PUBLIC HEARING ON JULY 9, 1947, BEFORE THE ARMY ENGINEERS ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF MOUNTAIN SHEEP, HELLS CANYON, AND OTHER DAMS ON THE SNAKE RIVER

The Granges of Washington, Idaho, and Oregon have a common interest and a real stake in the immediate development of Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River, for such development is a condition precedent to the production of phosphate fertilizer from western phosphate resources, to development of cheap power for irrigation pumping, and for industrial uses. We therefore favor this project on the assumption that it will never interfere with existing priorities on water for irrigation use.

The National Grange, as well as the 100,000 Grange members in the Northwest States, have asked the Federal Government to undertake the dam and transmission-line construction program necessary for the development of our western phosphate resources.

NATIONAL GRANGE ENDORSEMENT

The National Grange, at its 1946 convention, adopted the following resolution covering the national need for development of a western phosphate fertilizer industry.

"Commercial fertilizers are essential for the efficient production of high-quality nutritious crops and for soil improvement. They are basic to good farming and a sound agricultural program. A national fertilizer policy, therefore, should be such as would assure farmers an ample quantity of high-grade fertilizers at as low a cost as is consistent with efficient production and distribution with due allowance for a reasonable profit. Furthermore, a national policy should provide for the exploration and development of natural resources, research in fertilizer production and use, an educational program to secure the widespread adoption of improved fertilizer practices, and the enforcement of modern fertilizer-control laws by States. To achieve these objectives, the National Grange recommends:

"1. The Federal Government should encourage and assist in the exploration of phosphate and potash resources, and further the development of western phosphate resources by assisting in process development, the extension of electric-power lines of sufficient capacity to transmit an adequate supply of low-cost power from Federal dams to the phosphate deposits, and assembling information pertaining to the selection of plant location. Potash and phosphate resources on the public domain should be leased to industry with preference to farmer-owned or controlled cooperatives under terms assuring efficient development and safeguarding the public interest."

The reasons for the Grange's concern over the development of the western phosphate resources is apparent when the western farmers' need for phosphate fertilizer, his source of supply, and the price he pays for such fertilizer are considered.

PHOSPHATE FERTILIZER NEEDED

The advances in the science of agronomy and the intensified cultivation of farm lands during the war has made widespread use of phosphate fertilizer a must in farming. There is a widespread realization of the fact that the West should not repeat the errors of the East, but rather that it should replace soil nutrients as they are used instead of waiting until the soil is exhausted.

Phosphate is the one basic soil element which cannot be created or replenished by cultivation and crop management. It must be replaced through the application of processed phosphate fertilizer. There is, therefore, a present need for substantial amounts of phosphate fertilizer in the West and this need is rapidly increasing.

WESTERN DEPOSITS UNDEVELOPED

The other side of the picture is this: More than 60 percent of the Nation's phosphate resources are located in southeast Idaho and the adjoining sections of Montana and Utah. These deposits are virtually undeveloped. There is no concentrated phosphate fertilizer (20 to 37 percent available) and only a small amount of low-grade phosphate fertilizer (12 to 18 percent available) produced in the West from these deposits.

The result has been that the West, despite the fact that it has the largest and richest phosphate deposits in America, pays the highest price in the United States for phosphate fertilizers. The West will continue to pay the highest price so long as western production of phosphate fertilizer is less than half of its needs because prices will continue to be fixed on the basis of costs of eastern production plus transportation costs across the United States. (Baltimore is the phosphate fertilizer basing point.) Moreover, the West will continue to pay the highest price so long as the major portion of the phosphate fertilizer produced is low-grade, for this compels the farmer to pay freight and handling costs on as much as 90 percent useless filler.

MIDDLE WEST NEEDS WESTERN FERTILIZER

The adverse effect upon farmers of the Nation's failure to develop its western phosphate resources is not limited to the West. It affects all farmers west of the Mississippi River. The development of the western phosphate resources through electric processes which produce concentrated fertilizer would increase the supply and decrease the price everywhere west of the Mississippi River. This fact is recognized in the National Soil Fertility Act of 1947 (S. 1251), which is sponsored by Senators HICKENLOOPER, WHERRY, HILL, CAPPER, THYE, STEWART, AIKEN, BUSHFIELD, YOUNG, and WILSON. It calls for the immediate study of our western phosphate resources and provides that a preference be given to cooperatives which would borrow funds to construct western phosphate-fertilizer plants.

The economics of the phosphate-fertilizer industry are such that power must be taken to the area where the phosphate rock is mined. It is for this reason that there is an urgent need for the immediate development of the large power-producing projects on the Snake River, such as Hells Canyon. These are the dams closest to the phosphate beds.

HELLS CANYON DAMS SUPPORTED

Either Hells Canyon or Mountain Sheep dams would supply the needed electric power. However, from the information at hand, it

appears to us that Hells Canyon should be the first to be built for it is not only one the largest power projects, but it is also the only one with a large storage reservoir. The development of up-stream dams with usable water storage will benefit both navigation and power production on the lower river, and will provide additional flood control.

It is, therefore, respectfully urged that steps be taken to obtain authorization for the construction of Hells Canyon Dam at the earliest possible date.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT BY THE OREGON STATE GRANGE AT THE PUBLIC HEARING ON JULY 9, 1947, BEFORE THE ARMY ENGINEERS ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF MOUNTAIN SHEEP, HELLS CANYON, AND OTHER DAMS ON THE SNAKE RIVER

The Oregon State Grange wishes to make the following additional statement in support of its advocacy of the immediate construction of Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River.

EASTERN OREGON POWER SHORTAGE

There is a serious power shortage in eastern Oregon which adversely affects the area's development. Moreover, power rates in eastern Oregon to REA coperatives are too high to permit farmers to make use of electricity for irrigation pumping. The area, therefore, needs not only additional power supply but power at a price that will permit its use for irrigation.

It is the grange's view that the solution to this problem lies in the immediate development by the Federal Government of Hells Canyon Dam.

OX BOW DAM

Another fact should be mentioned. Early this year the Idaho Power & Light Co. announced that it would develop the Ox Bow Dam site if the Oregon Legislature would amend the part of the Oregon hydroelectric law relating to the amortization of the investment in hydoelectric projects and also the part relating to the right of the State to take over such projects upon payment of the owners' net investment. Despite a gubernatorial veto these amendments were approved by the Oregon Legislature.

The Oregon State Grange last week filed with the secretary of state of Oregon the necessary signatures to refer this law to the voters. Since the announcement that the grange would invoke the referendum, the Idaho Power & Light Co. has announced that it will construct the Ox Bow Dam even though the law is not amended.

Hells Canyon Dam will completely submerge the Ox Bow Dam site.

The Oregon State Grange considers the Idaho Power & Light Co. proposal to develop Ox Bow Dam as an attempt to create a road block to retard if not prevent the development of the Snake River program. There is no comparison between the benefits to be derived from the projects.

DAMS COMPARED

Hells Canyon Dam is almost 10 times larger (1,330,000 kw.) than the Ox Bow Dam (135,000 kw.).

Hells Canyon Dam will provide 3,500,000 acre-feet of usable water storage. This storage will increase the power productivity of all the dams below Hells Canyon on the Snake and Columbia Rivers and will also benefit navigation. It is in many respects like Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River for it will provide the stream control on the Snake River that is necessary for full utilization of the downstream power and navigation projects.

Hells Canyon Dam will create a navigable lake more than 100 miles long which will open for exploration and development the mineral resources of hitherto inaccessible areas in the Snake River Canyon.

The Ox Bow Dam provides none of these advantages. Its construction would only serve to delay and increase the cost of Hells Canyon Dam.

It is therefore urged that Hells Canyon Dam be constructed now, thereby settling this issue and getting under way the program for the development of the Snake River.

The Oregon State Grange is also mindful of the fact that the planning of any one dam on the Columbia or the Snake River acquires coordination of those plans with the plans of the entire river development. We recently filed with the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee a statement of our views concerning the development of the Columbia Basin. A copy of that report is attached for your use and is made a part of this statement.

Respectfully submitted.

MORTON TOMPKINS,
Master, Oregon State Grange.

STATEMENT OF THE OREGON STATE GRANGE BEFORE THE COLUMBIA BASIN INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AT ITS JUNE 25, 1947, HEARING ON COORDINATED DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The Oregon State Grange has more than a passing interest in the development of the Columbia River. Our interest antidates by many years the present fish versus dam controversy or even the building of the first Federal dam on the Columbia River. The Grange's interest has sprung from a realization that the Columbia River was our greatest permanent wealth-producing resource and that in its orderly development lay the Oregon farmer's hope for a western market for his products.

PRIOR GRANGE ACTION

The Oregon State Grange does not appear on behalf of its 31,000 members as a special pleader for fish or dams or reclamation or navigation. That would be contrary to its tradition.

It was the Grange which, more than two decades ago, successfully urged the outlawing of fish wheels on the Columbia River to protect our fishing industry.

It was the Grange which was a consistent and outspoken advocate of the development of the power resources of the Columbia River when such a program was considered by many to be tingued with radicalism.

And during its 75 years the Oregon State Grange has planned and worked toward the day when the Columbia River would irrigate a vast acreage of arid land and be fully developed as an artery of commerce.

TYPE OF PROGRAM NEEDED

The present controversy between those whose primary interest is in fishing or power or navigation is of deep concern to us. Such proposals as that of the navigation group that there be a 10-year moratorium on salmon fishing or as that by the fishing interests that there be no more dams constructed on the lower Columbia and Snake Rivers are ill-conceived and harmful to the welfare of this region.

The Columbia River is not the exclusive preserve of the fishermen. It is not a waterway for the primary benefit of the barge and ship owners. Nor is it a place where power or irrigation can be developed without regard for other interests. The greatness of the river is in its ability to produce many types of wealth.

Therefore, we must plan the program for the development of the Columbia River around the concept that all the river's wealth-producing abilities must be protected and developed simultaneously.

GRAND PROPOSAL

Accordingly, the Oregon State Grange proposes and urges the adoption of the following program for the development of the Columbia River:

First, fish: There must be a frank recognition that dams are not the sole or even the chief cause for the decline in the salmon runs. There must be immediate and effective State action to prevent pollution of the river and there must be joint Federal-State action to remove obstructions, screen diversions and provide better fish ways at all barriers along the river.

Secondly, there must be an intensification of our research and experimentation program to provide artificial propagation and the reestablishment of spawning beds closer to the ocean. The easy-going and complacent research and experimentation of the past must be replaced by research that has the sense of urgency which developed the atomic bomb. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of all groups to see that adequate appropriations are made available immediately to carry on this work.

In addition, the fishing interests must exercise self-restraint. Fisherman must learn the lesson which is fundamental to good farming, namely that their first concern should be the protection and development of the breeding stock. There must be longer closed periods or less fishing gear in the river and offshore during the fishing season if adequate fish runs are to reach the spawning beds.

And lastly, where possible without committing a greater injury, new power and navigation construction which is not now authorized should be scheduled so as to permit this new fish program to be fully developed.

2. Dams: The fact that the destiny of the Northwest lies in its hydroelectric resources cannot be denied. Only those who are uninformed, or deliberately misinformed, will assert that no additional power developments are necessary. Presently authorized dams, with one possible exception, must be constructed immediately. These include McNary, Foster Creek, and Hungry Horse. Dams like McNary should have incorporated in their design and construction the latest and best fish ways that can be devised.

An effort should be made to obtain immediate authorization for the construction of Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River and to substitute it for the four dams presently authorized for construction on the lower Snake. This would provide the power needed to develop western phosphate resources and at the same time minimize for the time being the number of barriers which the salmon runs returning to the Salmon River must traverse.

Future dam construction should be scheduled so as to provide the maximum time for the fishing industry to accommodate itself to the new conditions.

And last, it should be recognized that where the construction of dams make necessary the flooding out of Indian fishing grounds or of long-established and profitable fishing businesses, that the owners of these grounds or businesses should be adequately and even generously compensated. Legislation authorizing the dams should recognize this problem and make provision in the initial appropriation for this compensation. Equity and fair play should be the guide in determining who is entitled to compensation rather than legal technicalities.

3. Irrigation and navigation: The major irrigation projects along the Columbia River lies in the upper-river regions. The deferring of irrigation projects on the river below the confluence of the Snake River until adequate provision has been made for the fishing industry is one of the compromises inherent in the program which we propose.

Navigation cannot be overlooked in the scheduling of the river-development program. However, navigation is a service that prospers only if the area it serves prospers. We recognize that there can be no abandonment of the ultimate navigation program. However, the scheduling of future dam construction so as to permit the fishing interests time to make the needed adjustments should be agreeable to navigation people.

CONCLUSION

It is folly to propose or consider a plan for the development of the Columbia River that advocates the abandonment of the power, navigation, or irrigation programs or the cessation of salmon fishing. Cooperative and joint action by the interested groups can provide a plan which meets the needs and aspirations of all concerned.

Respectfully submitted.

MORTON TOMPKINS,
Master, Oregon State Grange.

Poland Betrayed—Former Ambassador Lane Tells the Real Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the July 14 issue of Life magazine the former Ambassador to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, wrote a most informative article in which he points out just how Russia rules Poland. The State Department and former President Roosevelt must share the responsibility for what has happened in that unfortunate land. As part of my remarks I am including the article in question:

HOW RUSSIA RULES POLAND

(By Arthur Bliss Lane, United States Ambassador to Poland, 1944–47)

This is an account of a diplomatic assignment to a puppet state, Poland. I was appointed Ambassador to the Polish Government in exile in London, of which Stanislaw Mikolajczyk was then Premier, in September 1944. In July 1945, after we had recognized the Lublin government, I flew to Warsaw, where I lived for 20 months. In March 1947, after the travesty of free and unfettered elections held on the previous January 19, I resigned so that I could talk and write publicly about the perpetration of an international fraud which has effectively condemned the Polish people to loss of freedom and independence.

The process of destroying Poland from within was well advanced before my arrival there. The Communist-controlled stooge government had been set up in Warsaw. Further, the core of the Polish resistance movement had been liquidated by the Russians only a month after the Yalta Conference when 15 leaders of the underground, all non-Communist, were tricked into an ambush near Warsaw by an invitation to a political meeting and then taken to Moscow for trial. The fate of some of them is still unknown to the outside world. From the Kremlin's viewpoint its aims had been virtually attained. All that was needed was to conduct elections under the guise of legality, thus giving final proof to the world of the holiness of the USSR's aims.

I did not wish my appearance in Poland, as a representative of the United States—one of the Yalta guarantors of Polish independence—to be interpreted as whitewashing Soviet methods. On the other hand one avenue of constructive diplomacy was still open to us: to let it be known to the Poles that the United States was ready to help them not only with economic relief but with sympathetic support; that we still stood for ideals of freedom and independence.

In my last meeting with President Roosevelt before leaving for my assignment, I stressed the great importance of our insisting to the Soviet Government that the independence of Poland be maintained. I said that if we were not going to be strong in our attitude at a time when we had the largest Army, Navy and Air Forces in the world, and at a time when the President had just received another mandate from the American people, I did not know when we ever could be so strong. The President asked somewhat sharply, "Do you want me to go to war with Russia?" I replied that there was no such thought on my part. It was my feeling, I added, that if we took a strong line and did not deviate from it we would accomplish our objectives, I said that the Soviet view, however, of an independent Poland was quite different from ours. The President replied that he had entire confidence in Stalin's word and felt sure he would not go back on it. I said I regretted that I could not agree with him, as Stalin's previous actions had shown him not to be dependable regarding Poland. I had in mind that, despite the existence of nonaggression pacts, Stalin had attacked Poland in September 1939 and had annexed Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in 1940.

Our diplomatic party, in the three C–54s, landed at Okecie Airport (7 miles from Warsaw) on July 31, 1945—the first American airplanes to land there in 7 years. The field was knee-deep in grass and pitted with weed-filled holes. Our only welcome was wind and rain. In that wasteland there presently materialized a solitary human figure, an unkempt and taciturn soldier who had heard nothing of plans for receiving the American Ambassador's party. (It later developed that the telegram announcing our arrival, dispatched 5 days before from Paris, had not reached Warsaw.) Almost an hour later Lt. William Tonesk, who was to be assistant naval attaché and my interpreter at all important conferences, arrived in a jeep. He was followed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, the Soviet Ambassador, and the chief of protocol. The car of the Foreign Office, which bounced over the ruts of the airfield, turned out to be a former Berlin taxicab, the only means of conveyance available to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

I had last visited the city in 1937, when it was one of the most beautiful capitals in Europe. But best of all I remembered it from 1919, when as a very junior secretary I served in the first American legation. At that time the armistice with Germany had been signed; the Treaty of Versailles was about to be concluded; Poland had risen as a free nation from the period of subjugation that had followed the third partition of Poland in 1795. The Warsaw of 1919 had plenty of troubles; food was scarce; accommodations were difficult to obtain; there was a frontier crisis with Czechoslovakia and a latent threat from the Bolsheviks, culminating in the attack on Warsaw itself in 1920. But one sensed in the Warsaw of 1919 a gaiety of the soul, an intoxicating sense of freedom after nearly 125 years of servitude. General Pilsudski was chief of state, the beloved Paderewski was prime minister. Whatever their limitations, they were Poles and masters in their own house.

But this time as we drove from the airport to Warsaw, I sensed the chill of deep depression. I looked in vain for a familiar square or building, until in the center of the city on Jerusalem Street I spotted two tottering towers of twisted metal and recalled that this was once the luxurious railroad station. Warsaw had been burned, block by block and house by house, by the Nazis. If rubble is the measure of a nation's suffering, the rubble of Warsaw speaks more eloquently than that of any other large city in Europe. When former President Herbert Hoover saw the acres of debris and crumbled brick in the Ghetto, destroyed in the spring of 1943, he said quietly, "It should be left like this forever as a monument to Nazi bestiality."

In Stare Miasto, or the "old city," there is another monument of rubble, a monument as much to Russian perfidy as to Nazi ruthlessness. Here it was that a band of Polish patriots in August 1944 rushed out from the swift-flowing sewers and attacked the Nazi army. They were crushed after 63 days of fighting. But they were crushed because their expected aid from Russia did not come. The Russians just across the Vistula, lured the Poles to their destruction by exhortations to attack and by the implied promise that they would attack simultaneously. Instead the Red Army, only 10 miles away, made no move when the insurrection began and thus allowed the destruction of an ally whose existence would have been a threat to the Kremlin's plans for expansion toward the west. Had General Bor-Komorowski and his underground army succeeded in liberating Warsaw they would surely have been the heroes of all Poland, the saviors of the nation and the nucleus of the government within Poland. "It would have been most difficult under such circumstances," a Communist official explained to an American private citizen of note, "for the Soviet Government to have maintained the Lublin-constituted Polish Government in power."

My wife and I found ready for us in the Polonia Hotel a suite consisting of a double bedroom and bath and a large living room which was also to serve as my office. With its modernistic, overstuffed chairs, its metal, circular Turkish table, its imitation fireplace and its very fine antique pieces as well, it was sumptuous. It was not homelike but we had no right to complain, for many times the incongruity of our position assailed us. Inside the hotel, which had been spared by the Germans because it housed the Wehrmacht, we had comparative physical comfort, plenty of food and usually running water and heat. Outside were ragged men, women, and children, hunger, illness, and that heartbreaking phenomenon of a broken Europe—dozens of one-legged children.

The view from our window westward across the railroad tracks was a study in despair. The place was inhumanly silent. There were no streetcars, scarcely any automobiles, only a few horse-drawn carts and bicycle-propelled pushcarts to serve as taxicabs. Lines of people with pails formed every morning in front of the faucets on the main boulevard to obtain water for drinking and washing. The two arc lights in front of the Hotel Polonia were the only street lights at night.

The funereal emptiness that had depressed me on my arrival deepened as time went on. During my first summer the Red Army that had surged into Germany began in part to return to Russia through Poland. Day after day horse-drawn convoys, guarded by armed cavalry, poured through the city—carts laden with furniture, sewing machines, crockery, bed linen, bicycles, plumbing fixtures. Even this loot did not satisfy the Russian soldiers' acquisitiveness. Almost every night shots and screams were audible to us in the hotel, as Russians quarreled with Poles over Polish property.

It was not so much the ruin of Warsaw as the ravagement of the Polish people that depressed me. Various people, chiefly of the government, came to my office to plead for American assistance in the form of clothes, food, trucks, and machinery of all sorts and descriptions. Other kinds of people came also—timid, lonely, frightened people. They did not ask for food or money, although they had little or none. They desired protection from arrest or deportation, some means of escape from Poland.

The sham of present-day Poland is that the outward facades of constitutional and representative government are to the uninitiated observer intact. But behind this front the state is a collection of automatons who follow the bidding of Communist masters. The tragedy is that this sham takes place in a nation that is technically a victor in

World War II. When I made my first official call on Mr. Vincent Rzymowski, the scholarly-looking minister for foreign affairs, he murmured the usual amenities. But it was soon apparent that he was only nominally in charge of his own ministry. At his elbow at almost all times was the vice minister, a short, spare, erect figure; a keenly intelligent face, with bright, shifty eyes, one Zygmunt Modzelewski. This man made the decisions. He is now the foreign minister.

STATESMEN WITH SHIFTY EYES

President Boleslaw Bierut, to whom I presented my credentials on August 4, had his office on the second floor of the Belvedere Palace, the former official residence of Marshal Pilsudski. The windows look out over the beautiful Lazienki Gardens, laid out 2 centuries ago. The haziness of a conspirator's past obscures Bierut's background. Of Polish origin he is reputed to have turned Communist at some point during World War I, became a Soviet citizen and to have been arrested by Pilsudski as a Russian agent. He later was released and went to Russia. He is now 55, has a small, Hitlerlike mustache, affects a deceptively polite manner and has a disconcerting habit of never looking one in the eye. In fact if he and the men around him show a single common trait, it is shiftiness of the eye.

Bierut's Communist colleagues, like himself, were almost unknown in Poland; intriguers and conspirators, rather than statesmen and administrators, cruel and cynical men, untrammeled by sentiments such as patriotism. None publicly opposed Nazi-Soviet spoliation of Poland in 1939. Many of these Polish officials were trained in Russia. Twice while I was in Bierut's office the telephone rang. Both times he spoke extensively in Russian, an anomalous practice for the head of a professedly sovereign state. Some of these people are able—Modzelewski for one, and Hilary Minc, Minister of Industry, the economic and financial boss, for another. At the Potsdam Conference in July 1945, Minc favorably surprised United States representatives with the amount of economic information about Poland stored in his head. One could do business with Minc—unless the proposition ran counter with the Soviet line.

None of these men appears to be the real boss of Poland, however. In the innocuous post of Under Secretary of State of the Council of Ministers is a quiet, dignified man with a mobile, sensitive mouth, an elegant but forceful manner of speaking—Jakub Berman. His hands are delicate in shape and gesture. His appearance gives no indication of brutality or coarseness. At public functions he always slips into an inconspicuous position. He materialized, along with other Lublin men, out of the Soviet revolutionary machine. He is, I am reasonably sure, one of the Kremlin's prime agents in Poland, one of the men who gives the orders. How can one be sure? There is a fairly reliable test. If, in the course of seeking action upon a delicate matter, one is referred from official to official, sooner or later one comes finally upon a key person who knows how to get things done. That was how we found Berman. The puppets turned to him for instruction. We often turned to him for action.

Beyond and apart from these men of Lublin stood a man of calmness and strength, stocky and massive, with blue eyes which look directly at one—the leader of the Polish Peasant party. Mikolajczyk. In commending his fine qualities to me in November 1944, President Roosevelt said, "He is the most outstanding of all the foreign statesmen who have visited me." Succeeding to the prime ministership of the government in exile on General Sikorski's death in 1943, Mikolajczyk directed the underground home army. Then, after the formation of the provisional government of national unity in June 1945, he returned to Poland as vice premier and minister of agriculture.

"Why did you come back to Poland?" I asked him. "It was my duty to do so," he answered. I recalled the fate of the 15 underground leaders. "You are a brave man," I said, "the bravest I know."

THE YALTA STRATEGY

From the moment the Lublin puppets descended on Poland their energies were exerted principally on one big task—concocting the sham elections. At Potsdam Bierut had promised Mr. Bevin that general elections would be held in Poland early in 1946. Less specifically, the Polish Ambassador in Washington, Dr. Oscar Lange, promised the State Department in April 1946 that the elections would be held "in 1946." Partly on the strength of Dr. Lange's promise, a credit of $90,000,000 was made available to Poland by the United States Government. But as time ran out on these two promises a typical Soviet stratagem became discernible. The method usually employed in settling political differences between states is to negotiate, perhaps with difficulty, an agreement in principle. When such an agreement is reached the details can easily be worked out in harmony with the principles agreed upon. Playing upon the human desire to accept as a diplomatic victory the token of a seemingly easy solution, the Soviet tactic is to agree at the outset upon general principles, thereby giving the impression that the most critical phase has been amiably concluded, then, step by step, to frustrate and hamstring their opponents on the details.

These tactics worked for Stalin at Yalta, where President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill were seemingly satisfied with his guarantee of "free and unfettered elections." Similarly, Bierut and his cabinet ministers, in their preliminary dealings with me, were all warmth and cordiality. An American commercial airline into Poland? That should present no particular difficulty. American scholarships for young Polish scientists, doctors, engineers? An excellent idea. Compensation for nationalized American property? Yes, of course. Protection of American citizens arrested for political reasons? Of course.

Weeks have become months and months have become years, and none of the understandings in principle has ever been consummated in practice. Commissions have been set up to evaluate American-owned property and to determine whether or not claimants to American citizenship are Polish or American citizens. But as yet there has been no definite assurance as to method of compensations nor have we, with one exception, been able to visit claimants who are in jail.

Since Bierut and his Russian masters had no intention of holding elections until they were sure of the result which they required to remain in power, the game from the start was to procrastinate while they perfected the ideal instrument for putting down opposition: penetration by the secret police into every city, village, and farm. The preparations for the free and unfettered elections took nearly 2 years. It is all painfully familiar, so much like Hitler's plebiscites, even to the government's overwhelming majority of more than 80 percent and to the swaggering bands of the Citizens' Militia Reserve Corps who, with their red and white arm bands, rifles slung over their shoulders and their methods of breaking up opposition party meetings, revived memories of the brown shirts.

TRIAL RUN FOR THE ELECTIONS

In August 1945 President Bierut carefully explained to American representatives that the elections could not be held the following winter because of the deep snows which would make it impossible to transport the voters in the countrysides to the polling places. Mr. Bierut was convincing and Polish records bore him out: seldom had elections been held in the winter. Then, in November 1946, the government reversed itself and ordered elections to be held on January 19, 1947, in the dead of the Polish winter. The important fact was that the secret police by then were well organized. Moreover the government's controlled machinery had been given a trial run in the national referendum of June 30, 1946, and had fully met the Moscow specifications of victory, at all costs, for the Lublin government.

The referendum itself had no direct relationship to the Yalta decision. So far as our immediate interest was concerned, it was important only because the procedure to be adopted in the referendum would give a line on the methods to be employed in the general elections. The government was not merely satisfied with its control over the referendum result through censorship of the radio and press, the beating and arrest of opposition leaders, and the voting of government employees en bloc. It also arranged for the votes in key districts to be counted not at the polling places but at police headquarters. These districts were given in advance the figures to be publicly announced. Understandably the government won by more than 80 percent, the approximate figure already decided upon.

The United States and British Governments criticized the procedure as prejudicing the coming elections. The notes went unanswered. Mr. Bierut resented being reminded that his government, no less than ours, the British and even the Russian, had solemnly agreed that in the elections "all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates." When it suited his purposes he could give an almost convincing portrayal of a Polish patriot. "I never knew before," he once said to me softly, his eyes squarely fixed on his shoes, "that a foreign government has any right to make suggestions about the internal affairs of another country."

Thereafter Bierut turned cold and aloof in his diminishing dealings with me. The puppet press criticized American policy with rising boldness. Its omissions and distortions followed the Russia lead. President Truman, Secretary Byrnes, and Senator Vandenberg were pilloried as "Fascists."

By 1946 the eastbound Russian convoys had come to an end. Fewer and fewer Russian uniforms were seen on the street and more and more Polish ones. The Red army strength was reportedly cut from 300,000 to 100,000 men. But the wags observed that the new Polish Army was remarkably fluent in Russian. Moreover, the Vice Minister of National Defense and many commanding officers of the air force and the armored corps had been trained in the Red army. There was no question of the Russian control of Polish armed forces. The Minister of Public Security himself, Stanslaw Radkiewicz, on one occasion admitted to me that his security police were being trained by 200 Soviet NKVD instructors. These secret police were heartlessly efficient in the pre-election period: Murder, imprisonment, threatened loss of homes and jobs, torture (some men were made to stand 3 days knee-deep in icy water), censorship of the opposition press and radio and the outlawing of the Polish peasant party in a quarter of the country.

The elections were held on a bitterly cold Sunday. We sent observers to all parts of Poland. To see for ourselves what was going on, my wife and I visited several polling booths on the outskirts of the city. Instead of listing the candidates on one ballot, each party or group of parties had its own ballot. The government ballot consisted of a square piece of paper marked with a large black "3." Many of the voters, we observed, picked out No. 3 ballot and, making a show of disdain-

ing the envelope provided for secrecy, consigned it ostentatiously to the ballot box. But others—mostly nuns, priests, housewives, and peasants—quietly claimed the envelopes and inserted secretly the ballot of their choice, despite the fact that Government observers watched the polls and took notes of everything.

Shortly afterward the results were announced: for the Government, 87 percent. Out of 444 seats in parliament, Mikolajczyk's majority party received 28 percent. Mikolajczyk's exit from the Government, although he retained his seat as a deputy in the Sejm, signified the practical extinction of the Polish democratic state. A few remnants of the resistance organizations still prowl the Polish forests and occasionally hold up automobiles and beat up Communists. Their very persistence has caused many observers to suspect that the Government finds these guerrillas useful as an excuse for attacks, both physical and in the press, on imaginary Polish "reactionaries" or "Fascists." In any case these undisciplined bands cause the Government little inconvenience.

In fact there has been little inconvenience from any quarter. In the new "democratic" Poland an old and distinguished statesman rose to his feet in Parliament and cried that the elections which brought the Government to power were fraudulent. On the next day he rose again to protest that the official gazette in its account of his speech had expunged the essence of his criticism. On the third day he rose once more to complain bitterly that his second speech had been omitted entirely. When later he complained about the inordinate budget for the Soviet-controlled armed forces in Poland the Government deputies shouted him down as a Fascist.

KEY MINISTRIES WENT TO COMMUNISTS

Following the elections, Premier Osubka-Morawski was replaced by a member of the same Socialist Party, Josef Cyrankiewicz, who had been the leading Socialist agitator for a united bloc between the Communist and Socialist Parties. All of the key ministries went to Communists: Foreign Affairs, Industry, Public Security, and Western Territories—which in effect put the Kremlin in direct administration of the added German provinces. To convince the public that the Government was no longer provisional, a formal diplomatic reception was held in the President's palace. For the first time the President and his closest associates appeared in cutaway coats and striped trousers as if through the fraudulent elections they had all suddenly come of age.

Although Bierut's administration made praiseworthy efforts to rebuild Warsaw and to restore the agricultural output of a devastated country, the machinations of the police state discouraged incentive. There stands in the medieval city of Lublin an enormous prison with bleak, gray walls, where enemies of the people are lodged. Visiting day is once a week. On that day we have seen thousands of people, with tiny food parcels in their hands, lined up before the massive iron gates at 8 o'clock in the morning. So long were the lines that 10 hours later, when the gates clanged shut to remain closed for another week, hundreds who had waited in vain all day were forced to leave.

The Soviet system of double surveillance extends into the foreign office, where it is reported that double sets of clerks decipher and encipher all messages as a safeguard against foiling Communist policy. The puppets, however, have in addition their own security police—at least 118,000 by their own figures. It goes by the name of Urzad Bezpieczestwa. Like the Gestapo and the NKVD upon which it is modeled, the UB is a force against which no man has recourse. It is the dreaded footfall in the night; the terrifying knock on the door; the black abyss awaiting the individual—prison; concentration camps; firing squads; a repetition of the nightmare which Poles endured under Hitler. Director of the UB is the sleek, obsequious Public Security Minister, Stanislaw Radkiewicz. His headquarters in 1945 was in a dingy building on the outskirts of Warsaw on a short cross street, closed to traffic by wooden barriers and patrolled by soldiers armed with submachine guns. (It has since moved to a more impressive building.) On my first and only call on Mr. Radkiewicz I inquired whether any Americans were under arrest. Although we had conclusive evidence that 30 American-born citizens were in prison at the time, I was assured that there were none. Radkiewicz never received me again. Whenever I called he was always out of town, in conference, or indisposed. By last February the claimants to United States citizenship in his custody had, by our estimates, increased to 100.

One case involved an Embassy employee, a Mrs. Dmochowska from Chicago, born in the United States and hence in our eyes an American citizen. She had gone to Poland prior to World War II and remained in Warsaw throughout the Nazi occupation. On the reopening of our Embassy she was employed as translator and was authorized a passport by the Department of State. On the morning of August 23, 1946, she failed to come to work. The day passed without word from her. An officer of the Embassy, thinking she might be ill, went to her apartment. She was not there. The UB had taken her away during the night.

In its good time the Polish Government furnished the Embassy with its case against Mrs. Dmochowska: possession of a revolver, contrary to law; knowledge of a murder which had not been divulged to the authorities; assisting enemies of the government to escape from Poland. In November Mrs. Dmochowska was given a public trial in a Warsaw court. Under the Soviet type of prosecution which appears able to induce defendants to confess whether guilty or not, she not only admitted all the accusations but went on to name others as having knowledge of forbidden activities. She was sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment but later was released under the amnesty of March 1947.

Toward the end of our stay in Poland I could feel an invisible wall closing around the Embassy and our apartment. Our Polish friends stopped coming to the hotel. World came to us that it would be dangerous for them to be seen entering our apartment. Many of the hotel employees were UB spies. UB girl employees watched the manual telephones in the hotel corridors on each floor and reported the conversations. The servants proved to be ignorant of the most elementary duties but seemed childishly inquisitive about callers and the contents of wastebaskets. Our friends had reason to be apprehensive, as was proved by the unfortunate incident involving the British Ambassador, Mr. Victor Cavendish-Bentinck, and his friend, Count Grocholski. Their two families had known each other for 35 years and it was natural that the Ambassador, upon his arrival in Warsaw, should seek out his friend. The UB, taking a different view of the relationship, arrested Grocholski, accused him of supplying information to a foreign power and then, after a public trial in which he "confessed," had him shot.

In Poland as elsewhere the essence of Communist policy is to break up all nationalist elements so that a Communist minority government may be imposed. This explains the betrayal of the Warsaw insurrection, the deportation of the 15 Polish leaders and the liquidation of the opposition parties from the government. The danger for the future is that the Russians are endeavoring to control Polish youth. I fear that the Communists, through the inculcation of their doctrines in the schools, universities and in all government-controlled establishments and industries in the country, will persuade the Polish youth that the brave stand of the resistance movement was folly. And a Communist-dominated government within Poland may well mean that future generation of Poles will be imbued with devotion to Communist principles, or lack of principles.

There is no way for these young people to learn the truth except by word of mouth from their elders. No mention is ever made in the government-controlled press that eastern Poland, including the beloved cultural center of Lwów, was forcibly separated from Poland by the U. S. S. R.; nor is Stalin's cooperation with Hitler in the 1939 partition of Poland ever mentioned publicly. But let the United States Secretary of State suggest that the terms of the Potsdam decision be carried out with respect to the Polish western frontier (i. e., referred to the peace conference for settlement), and the press will erupt with violent abuse of the "fascist" policy of a capitalistic government.

Under the pressure of Soviet power the Polish spirit is subdued and weary, but it is as inherently strong as any in Europe. The Polish people are homogenous in race, language, and religion. Poland's very topography makes for unity. These elements impel me to believe that Russia will have a hard time swallowing Poland. The Polish spirit is well illustrated by the behavior of a bishop after the recent elections. He was asked by the government to offer a mass celebrating the government's victory. His answer was, "I shall offer Mass on Sunday as I would on any other Sunday. If any of my communicants wish to give thanks for any event, it will be a matter for their own conscience."

It is easy at this late date, when decisions involving strategy may still not be understandable to the layman, to criticize mistakes of United States policy of 2 or more years ago when a war was being fought. But it is obvious today that the present plight of Poland and other nations is due partly to our appeasement tactics at Tehran and Yalta. This policy encouraged the U. S. S. R. to proceed on its expansionist march through Poland, Hungary, and the Balkans and may later tempt the Kremlin to drive through western Europe and to the Atlantic.

In the face of a deliberate Soviet policy of communizing Europe and of aping Hitler's policy of world domination, by conquering nations one by one, it is essential that we should maintain the closest contacts with all peoples who yearn for the independence which we have promised them. We should, therefore, continue diplomatic relations with all puppet governments even though their anti-American attitudes may be irritating and humiliating. By maintaining our mission in Warsaw, for example, we will present steady proof to 23,000,000 Poles that a land of freedom friendly to Poland exists in the West. We will be encouraging the Poles, as well as the peoples of Europe who are also in political slavery, that there is hope in the future, however far distant it may be. This is the least we can do to atone for our tacit acquiescence at Yalta to the selling of Poland and Yugoslavia down the river.

I have always felt that in matters of this sort, which may eventually involve our own security, the greatest frankness is necessary. On March 1, 1946, long before the elections were held in Poland but at a time when the repressive measures of the Soviet-controlled security police were already evident, I wrote to a high official in the Department of State, partly as follows:

"We should give publicity to what is going on in Poland and other nations in an analogous position. The solution of the Polish question boils down in the last analysis to a decision as to what our policy is going to be toward the Soviet Union. We may

be criticized that by making known the unpleasant facts regarding Communist domination of the countries of eastern Europe (and perhaps later of western Europe) we are creating difficulties with the Soviet Union. I emphasize, however, that the American public has a right to know the truth; that unpreparedness nearly cost us the last war; that appeasement would be just as dangerous today as it was at the time of Munich; and that we run far more risk of war if we ignore the dangers of aggression than by honestly facing the facts."

It is, therefore, the American people themselves who can exercise their great influence in the interest of peace. This influence can be effective if the people appreciate fully the crisis which faces them; if they will support their Government and their representatives in Congress wholeheartedly in the maintenance of a strong policy for the protection of American rights and prestige, and if they will condemn any policy of appeasement or inertia which in the long run will spell disaster for us all.

Conservation and Development of Basic Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, before the Valley Authority conference, on July 18, 1947.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today as never before this country must concern itself with the vital problem of conserving and developing its basic resources. The full utilization of our resources is necessary for the progressive development of our economy and the achievement of higher standards of living for our people.

Many countries of the world are also depending upon the basic resources of the United States to assist them in bridging the gap until they can support themselves through the development of their own resources. At the direction of the President, two committees of Government economists and experts and a committee of private citizens are studying this problem. They are trying to appraise the effects of a comprehensive program of foreign aid and reconstruction on our own resources and the impact of such aid on our economy.

Despite the prodigal fashion with which we have exploited our resources in the past, this country is still basically very wealthy. There are vast areas in the country, particularly in the West, where we have barely scratched the surface in the development of our resources. In addition to providing this country and the world with the materials and supplies they require, the full development of these underdeveloped areas will provide millions of additional jobs, business and farm opportunities for our citizens.

As the President said in his State of the Union message to Congress, "The major opportunity of our generation to increase the wealth of the Nation lies in the development of our great river systems." Of course, he meant the construction of multiple-purpose dams that will harness the waters of our rivers for flood control, irrigation, navigation, fish and and wildlife propagation, and recreation. But he also meant when he spoke of increasing our wealth that these river systems should produce cheap and abundant supplies of hydroelectric power. As he said at Kansas City last month, "We have a long-standing policy that public-power resources should be developed for the benefit of the people."

I do not want to minimize the need for flood control and other benefits of water development in the Missouri Basin and on other river systems in the West, but I want to emphasize that such flood control and other benefits must be achieved without sacrificing the productive benefit—the creative benefit—of hydroelectric power.

Just as a century ago the railroads opened up the West, so cheap power will develop its resources. But the difference will be that instead of making the West a colonial empire of the East by carrying away its movable assets, cheap power, if we maintain our present public power policies, will bring a balanced development and a prosperity based upon a diversified economy.

Advancing technology places increasing reliance upon power for the production of the things we use and for processing the raw materials of our mines, our fields, and our forests. The electric furnace and the electrolytic cell are our means of overcoming the depletion of our high-grade mineral reserves because through them a large variety of our low-grade mineral ores can be made to yield their metals and chemicals, if cheap power is available. Electricity today is an indispensable raw material of production.

Even though these last 100 years have seen us skim the cream of our western minerals and forests and land resources, we have the tools whereby those resources that remain can be made to continue the enrichment of the American economy. For instance, the application of cheap power to our forest resources opens up vast potentialities for economic activity in plastics, alcohol, and other chemicals. We can make the full tree become a producer of wealth, instead of one-third lumber and two-thirds waste. This development is already well under way in the Pacific Northwest where a variety of products are now being processed from what was once wood waste.

The same principle applies to our fishing industry. At the present time we discard at our fish canneries almost as much value in vitamins and proteins as we process. Given adequate research and the application of cheap power, we will some day be producing synthetic fibers, artificial leather, and a variety of pharmaceutical substances from the scrap of the fishing industry.

The availability of abundant cheap power means not only the conversion of resources, now wasted or untapped, into useful products, but the diversification of the raw material economies of our underdeveloped areas. As an area begins to process some of its own raw materials, its prosperity increases and it becomes a better market for the goods manufactured in the other regions of our country. The diversification of industry reduces the reliance of a region upon the exploitation of its basic raw materials. Consequently, there is more opportunity for the conservation of the region's basic resources without impairing its prosperity.

The same dams which produce the power so important to the economic progress of our underdeveloped areas, store the water and make it available for irrigating arid lands. Through land reclamation, we can provide additional acreage to grow the food needed, in ever greater quantities, at home and abroad.

In addition to increasing our supply of arable land by irrigation and reclamation projects, we must conserve our soil resources and restore the fertility of land already under cultivation. For this purpose farmers are demanding ever greater quantities of phosphate fertilizer.

In the Northwest there is almost an infinite supply of phosphate awaiting development by the fertilizer industry. Through the electric-furnace process developed by the TVA, we believe that low-grade phosphate shale may be used as effectively in the production of plant food as is the high-grade rock under the other methods. Here again the availability of the abundant supplies of cheap hydroelectric power can assist in the development of a mineral vitally needed for conserving one of the Nation's most valued resources.

In recognition of the importance of the development of our western phosphate reserves, the Department of the Interior undertook to develop a coordinated program involving most of its 12 bureaus and divisions. Our phospate program involves the surveying and testing of western phosphate deposits, the study of commercial feasibility, the transmission of power to the areas slated for development, adjustments in our mineral-leasing policy to facilitate development, the study of transportation, market and other factors influencing the production of phosphate and the coordination of the agencies responsible for those various functions. We are also working cooperatively with the Department of Agriculture and the TVA on this project.

The coordination of Interior agencies involved in the program was facilitated by the Pacific Northwest Coordination Committee which had been established by the Department to pull together and correlate the programs of the several bureaus in that region. The execution of the phosphate program in proximity to the people of the region affected has given added impetus to the development.

This kind of approach to the problem of resource development has demonstrated the value of intensified efforts to coordinate existing agencies of Government in the area within which the work is to be done, both within and between the several departments.

I am not citing this example of an effective attack upon a resource problem in order to lead this conference away from its subject. Nor is this an attempt to prove what you already know—that competent, earnest people working on the solution of a problem for the public benefit will do a good job irrespective of organizational difficulties and administrative hurdles. I am aware that the problem to which this conference addresses itself is not whether we should have coordination in the development of our rsources or why we should have coordination, but how this can best be done.

We are seeking the most effective, efficient, and economical method of doing our resource conservation and development jobs. We are seeking the most competent vehicle for the planning and administration of these programs. We are seeking a method that will not depend merely upon the goodwill of a few good people. We want machinery that will facilitate not frustrate the good work of good people.

I have been fortunate in having had a rare opportunity to observe the various approaches we have used in developing our resources. I was employed by TVA for several years, during which much of the initial planning and construction were under way. I then went to work for the Bonneville Power Administration and had an opportunity to observe the problems of resource development in the Columbia River Basin. The Bonneville Power Administration, as you undoubtedly know, is the power marketing agency for dams built and operated by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation on the Columbia River. Currently, I am working in the Department of the Interior and, as I have indicated, we have at-

tempted to coordinate the bureaus and divisions of the Department to achieve our conservation and resource development objectives.

Out of this experience has come a conviction that the planning of resource development should be on a river-basin basis; and that the most speedy, efficient, and economical method for carrying out both the planning and execution of the program is by a regional development agency which has ultimate authority and responsibility for the total job to be done. The budget process through which our national resource agencies must operate is such that it is well nigh impossible to achieve the dovetailing of plans and programs of work in a given river basin. Even if the agencies should submit budgets which are properly related to common objectives in river basins, there is no guaranty that the various congressional committees which will consider the programs and requests for funds of the several agencies will coordinate their actions. Moreover, national agencies have broad interests in relation to which the problems of any one river basin are relatively less important. Consequently, responsibility must be concentrated in a regional agency which is solely concerned with the development of the resources of that basin.

The establishment of a valley authority does not require the replacement of the Federal agencies with special competence, which perform those functions in the area which are clearly a part of a general national program. But under the unified planning of a valley authority which is responsible for the results achieved and is vested with the ultimate authority to get the job done, the timing and scope of these agencies' respective programs would conform to the requirements of the valley's development.

A good example of the lack of such unified attack on a river basin is represented by the Rio Grande Valley, which constitutes one of the most acute problems in the country. In this valley the water supply is inadequate and irregular. From time to time spring or summer floods cause extremely heavy damage to rural and urban properties and transportation facilities. The flood danger is steadily becoming worse, due to the rising level of the river bed caused by the ever-increasing deposits of sediment. The river bed is already several feet higher than the adjacent valley land over long stretches of the river. It is at least several feet higher than the main business and industrial section of the city of Albuquerque. The present levee system becomes less and less effective as the bed of the river rises.

The aggrading river bed is causing the water table underlying the adjacent valley land to rise and is rendering the present drainage system more and more ineffective. Irrigated farmlands are being abandoned as they become waterlogged or are covered by sediment brought down by the floods.

To put an end to the devastation and property damage caused by soil erosion, floods, and deposits of sediment requires a completely integrated valley program. The developments on the main river for downstream flood and sediment control, irrigation, and power must be related to the developments for upstream erosion control and the rehabilitation of the resources on the watershed. Plans for the downstream program are the primary responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and of several other cooperating agencies. Plans for the upstream and watershed development are the primary responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. Funds were approved by Congress for carrying forward the reclamation and downstream flood-control investigations and plans during the war. Appropriations and work on the upstream flood-control or watershed investigations by the Department of Agriculture were suspended during the war.

The reports and plans of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers were scheduled for completion July 1 of this year. Investigations of the upstream phases of the problem by the Department of Agriculture have not been resumed as of this date, and reports and plans will not be completed short of 2 years or even longer if funds for this purpose are not made available for the fiscal year 1948. All three reports should have been prepared, been fully coordinated and presented at the same time so that there may have been laid before Congress a complete over-all plan for the Middle Rio Grande Valley.

Similarly, other rivers are broken up into special problems and attacked upon a piecemeal basis.

Only the development of the Tennessee Valley stands out in sharp contrast to the development of our other great river basins. While the Rio Grande Valley problem still awaits a solution, the Tennessee Valley has achieved watershed control in step with dam construction so that the river now runs clear and the soil in that valley stays on the land.

If we have learned the lesson of the intimate relationship between natural resources that permits their unified development, it is largely because of the example of the Tennessee Valley and the TVA. It would be extremely dogmatic to assert that a river could not be developed except by a valley authority modeled after TVA. But it is irrefutable that despite the long years of effort by our other resource development and construction agencies, and the millions of dollars of expenditures, the Tennessee is the only river that has been completely harnessed and controlled in the interests of the people.

Compare the Tennessee Valley with its neighbor, the Missouri. In the past few weeks we have witnessed some dramatic contrasts between the two regions—the one devastated by floods; the other secure from such depredation and ready to benefit from the storage of the waters derived from heavy rains by releasing them through turbines to generate electric power.

There are other significant, if less dramatic, bases for comparing the Tennessee and Missouri Valleys. During the 10-year period 1930 to 1940, the Tennessee Valley gained 12 percent in population; the Missouri Valley lost one-half of 1 percent of its population. The value of manufactured goods produced in the seven Tennessee Valley States increased 27.7 percent, and industry expanded; in the Missouri Valley during the same period the number of manufacturing plants decreased from 20,000 to 17,000, representing a loss of employment for 110,000 wage earners. Land values which had been on a parity in the two valleys in 1930 increased from about $39 per acre to an average of $46.30 per acre in the Tennessee Valley and decreased to $25.28 in the Missouri Valley. In other respects the economic well-being of the people of the Tennessee Valley improved during the 10-year period with resulting benefits to the entire Nation. The Missouri Valley, which comprises one-sixth of the land area of the United States and is vastly richer in other natural resources, does not carry its proportionate weight in the national economy.

These comparisons demonstrate that it is important not only that we make the necessary investments in the development of our basic resources, but that we do it in such a way as to achieve a balance of interests. The active participation of the people of the region in the planning for the development of the resources, on which their future well-being depends, helps materially in formulating and crystallizing the common purpose in relation to which conflicts can be resolved in the public interest.

Most of us have agreed upon the desirability and even the necessity of developing our river basins through valley authorities. But just because this is the most sensible plan doesn't mean that it will be easy to achieve. All of us remember the years it took the late Senator Norris to secure the passage of the lame-duck amendment which made good sense and hurt no one. In addition to being right, he had to work at it. We can do no better than to follow his example. We should do no less.

Modernize Our Presidential Election—VII. Geographical Distribution of Electoral Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, 435 electoral votes, or 82 percent of the 531 total, are allotted to States under uniform rules in proportion to their population. The variations in administering these rules are so insignificant and so widely distributed as to sections, as to be substantially inconsequential.

They raise no notable question of unfairness, inequality of treatment, or sectional advantage.

The remaining 96 electoral votes, or 18 percent of the total, are allotted to the States regardless of population. Manifestly, the award of these votes has no balanced relation to population nor as to popular votes as between the different States.

These votes were allotted on an area basis as a special concession to the smaller States to increase their influence and prestige for their protection against the larger States. In part, this allotment to the smaller States was to allay their fears against anticipated conflicts between the interests of the large and small States.

Now we have a greatly expanded country and a greatly increased number of smaller States. Experience has not demonstrated conflicts between large and small States to the extent once feared.

The possession of these votes, however, does add to the influence of the smaller States.

Now we must consider the distribution of these votes allotted regardless of population, from the sectional standpoint rather than that of conflicts between the small and large States.

I have prepared table III as a means of concretely illustrating the geographical distribution of electoral and popular votes, both from the State and sectional viewpoints.

One conclusion to be drawn from this table is that any possible inequality or sectional advantage due to this allotment of votes is substantially minimized by their widespread distribution, and especially when these different sections are considered by groups. This large block of votes, instead of being segregated in groups of small States, consolidated in support of economic, political, or sectional issues, is more likely to be allied with groups where both large and small

States are combined. The influence of these particular votes, therefore, to a greater or less degree, tend to counteract each other.

Manifestly, 96 electoral votes is a large number to be allotted regardless of population, but the areas which particularly gain an advantage from these votes are so dissociated as to greatly reduce their consolidated influence as against the rest of the country. The greatest beneficiaries of the 2-vote assignment are the New England and Rocky Mountain sections. The whole Rocky Mountain group has only 32 votes, 16 of which are due to the 2-vote assignment. New England has 12 of its 40 electoral votes due to the 2-vote assignment.

Fortunately we cannot reasonably visualize any situation in which the little States would be completely arrayed against the larger States.

Table III divides the country into six geographical sections designated as New England, Central Atlantic, Mid-Continent, Southern, Rocky Mountain, and Pacific Coast groups.

This table gives the number of electoral votes in each of these groups and the population represented by one electoral vote in each of these areas. In the final column, the table gives what would be the population represented by one electoral vote, in case the two electoral votes, allotted regardless of population, were eliminated; based on the election of 1944.

If these votes, allotted regardless of population, were awarded proportionately everywhere, they would constitute 18 percent of the total electoral vote in each State. A State with three electoral votes would have two-thirds of its electoral votes due to its allotment of electoral votes regardless of population. In a large State, say a State with 20 electoral votes, the 2 electoral votes so allotted would represent only 10 percent of its vote. By aggregating the electoral votes of these groups, we find that the 2 vote allotments represent percentages of these sections as follows:

New England	30
Central Atlantic	10+
Mid-Continent	15+
Southern	17+
Rocky Mountain	50
Pacific Coast	15

Thus we find that 12 percent of the electoral vote of New England, and 32 percent of the Rocky Mountain section, are in excess of the average percentage of these votes accorded the country generally.

The groups having less than the average of 18 percent are as follows:

The Central Atlantic with 10 percent plus, or less than 8 percent of the average in the country.

The Midcontinent with 15 percent, or less than 3 percent of the average of the country.

Southern with 17 percent, or less than 1 percent of the average of the country.

The Pacific coast with 15 percent, or 3 percent less than the average of the country.

It will be observed that the Southern States have practically an even balance of electoral votes with its population, as compared with the average of the whole country—only 1 percent less of the benefit due to the two-vote assignment than the average of the country.

The only section whose population would substantially vary from the other five areas of the country if the two electoral votes were omitted from each State would be the Rocky Mountain and New England groups.

I draw two main conclusions from table III. The first is that the possible evil in the two-vote assignment regardless of population is substantially minimized by the geographical distribution of these votes.

The second is that any injustice, or sectional or political advantage that might otherwise occur, would be greatly minimized by the division of the two-vote allotment in each State according to the popular votes of the candidates in that State, as proposed in House Joint Resolution 124 and others now pending before the Judiciary Committee.

TABLE III.—*Geographical distribution of electoral votes*

States by groups	Population, 1940	Electoral votes	Population for each electoral vote in the election of 1944	If 2 electoral votes omitted from each State
1. NEW ENGLAND				
Maine	847,226	5		
New Hampshire	491,524	4		
Vermont	359,231	3		
Massachusetts	4,316,721	16		
Rhode Island	713,346	4		
Connecticut	1,709,242	8		
Total	8,437,290	40	210,932	301,331
2. CENTRAL ATLANTIC				
New York	13,479,142	47		
New Jersey	4,160,165	16		
Pennsylvania	9,900,180	35		
Delaware	266,505	3		
Maryland	1,821,244	8		
West Virginia	1,901,974	8		
Total	31,529,210	117	269,480	300,278
3. MIDCONTINENT				
Ohio	6,907,612	25		
Indiana	3,427,796	13		
Illinois	7,897,241	28		
Michigan	5,256,106	19		
Wisconsin	3,137,587	12		
Minnesota	2,792,300	11		
North Dakota	641,935	4		
South Dakota	642,961	4		
Nebraska	1,315,834	6		
Iowa	2,538,268	10		
Missouri	3,784,664	15		
Kansas	1,801,028	8		
Oklahoma	2,336,434	10		
Total	42,479,766	165	257,453	305,609
4. SOUTHERN				
Virginia	2,677,773	11		
Kentucky	2,845,627	11		
North Carolina	3,571,623	14		
South Carolina	1,899,804	8		
Tennessee	2,915,841	12		
Florida	1,897,414	8		
Georgia	3,123,723	12		
Alabama	2,832,961	11		
Mississippi	2,183,796	9		
Arkansas	1,949,387	9		
Louisiana	2,363,880	10		
Texas	6,414,824	23		
Total	34,676,653	138	251,280	304,181
5. ROCKY MOUNTAIN				
Montana	559,456	4		
Idaho	524,873	4		
Wyoming	250,742	3		
Colorado	1,123,296	6		
Utah	550,310	4		
Nevada	110,247	3		
Arizona	499,261	4		
New Mexico	531,818	4		
Total	4,150,003	32	129,687	259,375
6. PACIFIC COAST				
Washington	1,736,191	8		
Oregon	1,089,684	6		
California	6,907,387	25		
Total	9,733,262	39	249,570	294,947

Contradiction Is Seen in Truman Pledge for Tax Cut Equal to Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

CONTRADICTION IS SEEN IN TRUMAN PLEDGE FOR TAX CUT EQUAL TO RISE

(By David Lawrence)

Either somebody who prepares President Truman's messages made a slip or else Mr. Truman really has made an extraordinary promise in his veto message last week on the tax bill which contradicts everything else he said in the same message.

The President said:

"When the time comes to lessen this wartime tax burden, it is only fair that we should follow a pattern which is the reverse of that under which the burden was imposed. That is to say, this wartime tax burden should be reduced on a basis that is fair to low-income groups as well as to high-income groups."

Actually if the pattern of the wartime tax rates is followed in reverse, it would mean that higher incomes should have bigger cuts in taxes, because everybody knows that when the wartime schedules were imposed the middle and higher brackets received a much more drastic percentage increase in tax rates than did the lower incomes.

If Mr. Truman's words are to be taken on their face, it would mean that he favors bigger reductions for the higher incomes than were contained in the bill he vetoed. This seems to be at variance with his whole argument against signing the tax-reduction bills presented to him by an overwhelming majority of both Houses of Congress.

THREE ILLUSTRATIONS MADE

The President mentioned three illustrations—the taxes for the married man in the $2,500, and the $100,000, and the $1,000,000 classes, respectively. Here is how the 1939 taxes were raised to their wartime peak in

1945 and then slightly reduced in 1946, and what they would have been under the 1947 tax-reduction bill that Mr. Truman has vetoed twice:

Net income	1939 tax	1945 tax	1946 tax	New tax
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$2,500	None	6.4	3.8	2.7
$100,000	32.0	68.6	62.3	49.9
$1,000,000	67.9	90.0	83.9	72.8

The foregoing is figured on the basis of a family of husband and wife and two children.

Obviously, the persons with the high incomes took the deepest cut. Hence, the proposed tax-reduction bill which was vetoed did not remove the high tax rates in the same way that they were imposed. For if that had been done, the taxes of the $100,000 man would have been reduced to what they were before the war, namely 32 percent of net income.

Does Mr. Truman mean that he believes the $100,000 man should have his taxes reduced downward in exactly the pattern of rates that sent them upward in wartime? His language can be so construed, for he speaks of reversing the patterns of rates as imposed in wartime.

CONTRADICTION IS SEEN

But if that is the President's idea what can he possibly mean by arguing that the Knutson-Millikin bill that he vetoed gave proportionately more reduction to middle and high incomes than to the lower incomes?

Actually the proposed tax law represented a reduction from a rate of 3.8 percent to a rate 2.7 percent on $2,500—from a tax of $95 to a tax of $67.50. This is a total reduction in taxes of about 29 percent.

Now the $100,000 man would have had his taxes reduced from $62,300 to $49,900 or a saving of $12,400, which is a reduction in taxes of about 19 percent.

How can Mr. Truman say that the taxpayer in the lower brackets who got a 29-percent tax reduction is being treated inequitably as against a $100,000 taxpayer who is getting a saving of only 19 percent under the proposed bill?

Maybe Mr. Truman means that the Knutson bill that he vetoed did not go far enough to help the wealthy taxpayers or else he made a mistake in his statement that he wanted to reduce wartime taxes so that the man who took the deepest cut in wartime would be given the biggest saving now.

There is no way short of confiscation by which the incomes of $100,000 and $2,500 can be equalized by legislation. If the Truman program is to equalize incomes by Government order, then the end of the system of initiative and incentive is at hand and a communistic philosophy is to become the Democratic campaign doctrine in 1948.

Industrial Wastes and Stream Pollution—Scientific Approach to a National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the problem of stream pollution in the United States is of vital interest to the health and welfare of all Americans, and it is time for Congress to act upon adequate legislation for the control and elimination of stream pollution.

Several bills are now pending before the Public Works Committee of the House for such control, and these bills should receive careful consideration and attention. No informed person can fail to recognize the danger to health from the present gross contamination of rivers, lakes, and tidal waters. For the past 50 years attempts have been made to pass legislation which would control pollution, but to date none has been successful, and with growing problems of industrial waste, sewage disposal, garbage, and so forth, the situation is becoming critical.

The scientists of America are eager to give their time and skill to solution of the problem of stream pollution. To this end, Industrial and Engineering Chemistry, the official publication of the American Chemical Society, recently published a symposium on the subject of industrial waste disposal which was presented to the Members of Congress for use in their study of stream pollution. This symposium provides accurate authentic reference material, and the American Chemical Society and the editors of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry are to be highly commended for the publication of this work.

The following article on stream pollution appeared in a recent issue of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry. It is an interesting and informative commentary on this problem and the need for immediate control.

American chemists and chemical engineers are anxious to participate more directly in political, social, and economic problems. They wish to abandon the traditional ivory tower of the past and join with others in concerted efforts to find solutions to the pressing questions that confront all. The dawn of the atomic age with its social, political, and economic implications has served to stimulate the somewhat latent desire on the part of the chemist and chemical engineer to enter more actively into the life of the Nation. This desire is built on the premise that a mind highly trained along scientific lines can contribute to problems that are not strictly associated with the natural sciences. Today the natural sciences are inexorably interrelated with social, economic, and even political questions, and this relation will be accentuated in the future. We are ready to serve. Into what channels should we direct our efforts? Scientists have exerted tremendous influence in shaping legislation in such matters as the control of atomic energy and a national science foundation. What else can we do?

One such field is that of steam and air pollution caused by manufacturing operations. Indeed this is an ideal field to which we may direct our energies, for the chemist and chemical engineers possess technical skills which are essential to a proper understanding and solution of the problem.

Few national questions have so consistently received congressional interest as has the pollution of the Nation's watercourses. During the past 50 years more than 100 bills have been introduced into Congress relating to Federal regulation and control of stream pollution. None of those bills has been enacted into law. No informed person can fail to recognize the need for correcting the present gross contamination of rivers, lakes, and tidal waters, but so far groups fostering regulatory measures have been unable to agree upon the nature and extent of Federal control. An adamant position has been taken by both advocates and opponents of Federal regulation. Those favoring drastic Federal control claim that the States, individually and collectively, have failed to solve the problem, and that adequate corrective measures may be effected only through Federal legislation. This viewpoint is held largely by sportsmen's associations and by recreational and similar groups. Opposed to this viewpoint are individuals and the collective membership of certain State and national technical societies and associations.

The latter have strongly opposed bills placing the direction and control of stream pollution regulation under the Federal Government. In general, those opposing Federal control have favored Federal legislation which limits the activities of Government agencies to fact finding and to aiding as an intervenor to coordinate Federal and State activities. Whether Federal funds should be allocated to support waste-abatement projects is another question which is inseparably involved in the questions of State against Federal control.

Extensive hearings were held during the last session of Congress by the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and voluminous testimony was taken in an effort to guide legislative action. This resulted in the introduction into the House of Representatives of the Mansfield bill (H. R. 6024), which was approved by the committee and finally reported to the House. Although this bill was a compromise measure, it was vigorously criticized in many quarters. Since no action was taken during the session, it died on adjournment of Congress.

The failure to pass any of the bills introduced last year has not lessened the activity of groups desiring Federal control of stream pollution. On January 3 Congressman MUNDT introduced H. R. 123, which is nearly identical to the Mansfield bill. Other measures have been sponsored, including the Barkley-Taft bill (S. 418) which is said to have powerful bipartisan support. Hearings began on April 22 on this and other proposals before a Senate Public Works Subcommittee.

The struggle for stream pollution control will continue as in the past, with little hope of constructive legislation until the opposing factions can meet on some common ground of understanding. Without attempting to prophesy, it appears that Federal legislation may be enacted during the present session of Congress. The best interest of all groups will be served if such Federal legislation is critically examined with but one purpose in mind: What is best for the country as a whole? If unbiased and intelligent analyses are made of the proposed legislation, and sufficient guidance along these lines is rendered to the legislators by reliable groups, worthwhile and constructive laws can be passed. If not, the problem of stream pollution will remain muddled and uncontrolled for years.

Last summer the editors of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry decided that they could perform a public service by publishing a symposium on the subject of industrial waste disposal, in which facts could be presented in an unbiased manner. It was felt that surveys by industry would disclose the special problems of each and would also indicate what has been accomplished so far and what remains to be done. Certainly an exhaustive study would demonstrate the gaps in our present technical knowledge. Obviously it is impossible for any individual author to survey an industry adequately in a report of this type, and it was not the intention that the articles propose a solution of the Nation's industrial stream-pollution problem. However, these papers do show how certain industries have met the problem in specific localities. All who have been associated with such work realize that there

can be no standardized procedure, and the solution of each problem must be guided by local conditions. The editors think that heavy emphasis on a chemical engineering approach will prove effective. Through the use of chemical engineering techniques they believe that manufacturing processes can be modified further to eliminate much of the waste at its source. In this way the volume of material requiring disposal in our lakes, rivers, and streams might be reduced until it could be assimilated by the purifying capacity of the stream itself. Furthermore, chemical engineering techniques may so change the wastes that they will be relatively harmless when ready for discharge.

The objects of the American Chemical Society as set forth in its Federal charter provide ample justification for the publication in one of its journals of a symposium of the character presented in this issue:

"To encourage in the broadest and most liberal manner the advancement of chemistry in all its branches; the promotion of research in chemical science and industry; the improvement of the qualifications and usefulness of chemists through high standards of professional ethics, education, and attainments; the increase and diffusion of chemical knowledge; and by its meetings, professional contacts, reports, papers, discussions, and publications to promote scientific interests and inquiry, thereby fostering public welfare and education, aiding the development of our country's industries, and adding to the material prosperity and happiness of our people."

In planning one of the most important issues in the 39 years of the existence of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry, the editors enlisted the aid of Sheppard T. Powell, widely known consultant in the field of industrial wastes, and wish to express their indebtedness to him for selection of subjects and authors and assembly of papers. When the officers of the ACS divisions of water, sewage, and sanitation chemistry, and of industrial and engineering chemistry were advised of the plan for the symposium, they requested that it be presented under their cosponsorship at the one hundred and eleventh meeting of the society at Atlantic City. The editors were delighted to cooperate although it caused a delay in publication from February to May.

Every Congressman and Senator is receiving a copy of this issue, not with any thought of influencing legislation, but to make available scientific and technical data and information. Reprints at nominal cost will also be made available to others who are interested.

Industry generally, we believe, is now recognizing its responsibilities in the matter of industrial wastes. The chemical industry, for example, through the Manufacturing Chemists' Association, is attacking the problem vigorously through its special committee on stream-pollution abatement. This committee is headed by R. W. Hess, of the national aniline division of Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., and author of the bibliography of references which is part of this issue. Other members of the committee are: I. F. Harlow, of Dow Chemical Co.; G. A. Yocum, Monsanto Chemical Co.; Lyman Cox, du Pont Co.; R. M. Taylor, American Cyanamid Co.; H. D. Lyon, Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp.; and Warren N. Watson, secretary of the association. The purpose of the committee is to work toward reduction or elimination of trade waste in the effluent waters of the chemical industry. Recognition of industry's primary responsibility has now reached the stage where, frequently, selection of a manufacturing process is strongly influenced by the waste material which will occur; enlightened companies are insistent that the waste-disposal problem be solved before any process enters the commercial-production stage.

This is the more favorable side of the picture. As George D. Beal, of Mellon Institute, pointed out at a recent symposium on the chemist's responsibility in the control of industrial wastes, held by the Pennsylvania Chemical Society, unfortunately industry has not yet fully recognized that disposal of waste from a plant "is just as much a manufacturing cost as sweeping scraps from around a machine." The speaker then went on to say that, although we have accepted the need and expense of facilities for removing waste ashes and garbage from our homes, we have not always considered that waste disposal from plants is actually a part of the manufacturing cost.

We are mostly concerned with wastes in our streams, but we must recognize the problem of air pollution as well. One paper was included in the symposium to discuss industrial atmospheric pollution.

If the problem of stream and air pollution is attacked on a scientific basis, if it is recognized that a long-range project confronts us, and if all interested groups will pull together for the common good, American ingenuity and American scientific and technological attainments will provide adequate answers.

How To Sell America to the Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. ELSAESSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1947

Mr. ELSAESSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry C. Link, Ph. D., vice president of the Psychological Corp., as published in the United States Investor for June 28, 1947:

HOW TO SELL AMERICA TO THE AMERICANS

(By Henry C. Link, Ph. D., vice president of the Psychological Corp.)

The profitable sale of services and products is, we know, the immediate concern of every private business. However, every day it is becoming more obvious that the underlying concern of every business is not the sale of its products, not the sale of the company as a public institution, not the sale of an entire industry, but the sale of that one great institution which makes all these others possible, that is, the American system. This unique American system has been rapidly dying from neglect. America, for some years now, has been living on the momentum of her great past.

No less a person than Dr. Conant, president of Harvard University, recently gave broad expression to this situation. Speaking at the conference of the New England Council last November, he said: "It is my contention that the social structure of the American Nation is unique; it is something the world has never seen before." Then, observing that he had found many well-educated foreigners unable to understand the unique structure of the American system, he said: "But do we understand it ourselves? Do we realize how important it is for our future to nourish those elements of strength in our chaotic democracy which, like taproots, reach back into our history?" One would like to ask Dr. Conant whether the great universities in recent years have not done more to starve than to nourish those taproots.

CONSCIOUS OF FAULTS, NOT OF MERITS

In one of our community and plant surveys last year we found that many of the townspeople were displeased with a certain plant because of the smoke nuisance. As a matter of fact, this plant, within the past 5 years, has spent enormous sums to reduce the soot content of its smoke by over 70 percent. People were simply not aware of this great improvement. This survey finding illustrates the situation regarding free enterprise and the American system generally. People have become more and more conscious of its faults and less and less conscious of its merits.

Some people claim that the Americans are already so completely sold on America that it is foolish to speak of selling it to them again. To be sure, they are sold on her comforts, her pie à la mode, her radios, automobiles, refrigerators, but they are not sold on the principles, the taproots, which make those comforts possible. The real America lies not in her present wealth, her present luxuries, but in the system which produced them. It is not merely so important for Americans to know that one in every five has a telephone, as compared with one in every 125 in Russia as to know the reasons why.

Today we find many Americans not only unconscious of the foundations of the American system, but even believing certain things which are definitely untrue. Our Nation-wide surveys and those of other research organization have revealed highly erroneous beliefs in respect to wages and profits, advertising, the advantages of Government control of business, of Government grade labeling, and in other areas. To give but one example:

Last year we asked a cross section of 5,000 people this question: "If the Government owned and managed industries, would you get more or less for your money than you do now?" The results were:

General population, October 1945	College students, October 1945	General population		Comments
		May 1946	May 1947	
Percent 43	*Percent* 63	*Percent* 33	*Percent* 34	Said they would get as much or more under Government ownership.
38	26	35	36	Said they would get less under Government ownership.
19	11	32	30	Were uncertain.

When asked why they could get more under Government ownership, the two principal reasons given were "Government ownership would eliminate profits," and "would eliminate unnecessary advertising." In short many millions of Americans believe that socialism or state capitalism would be more efficient than the American system of private capitalism.

Where do people get these beliefs and how can they be dealt with? One of the popular answers in recent years has been that they grow out of the failures of free enterprise and can be dealt with only by improving that system. As one writer put it, quite typically, "If we are afraid of communism in this country, let us work to make our own system better. Then standards of honest comparison will leave little doubt as to the relative merits of each."

THE AMERICAN SYSTEM IS UNIQUE

What have we been doing for 300 years, if not improving that system? While still not perfect, there is today little or no comparison between the American system of private capitalism and any socialist or communist system in the world. As Dr. Conant said, the American system is unique. Never in all history have the great masses of a nation achieved so high a level of economic equality and freedom. As compared with

the common man in Europe, Russia, China, and in fact most of the world, the common man in America, even the man on unemployment relief, is a bloated plutocrat. Therefore, to say that the best or the only way to stop communism or socialism is to improve our present system is not only naive, it is sheer nonsense. The one point at which socialism and communism has excelled Americanism, with all its faults, is in its promises, its propaganda, its missionary zeal, its education. We Americans have practically stopped indoctrinating the youth of America in those principles which made America unique, which Dr. Conant referred to in such nostalgic fashion.

CAPITALISM FAILS IN EDUCATIONAL REALM

No, it is not in the economic or material realm that American capitalism has failed—even including its depressions—but in the realm of ideas, in the educational realm. It has almost completely failed to develop its own ideology. It has distributed wealth, but not the principles and morals which made that wealth possible. It has educated people in slogans about its products, such as "Ask the man who owns one," "When better automobiles are built, Buick will build them," but it has not educated the public in the moral significance of such slogans. The thousands of brands and trade-marks of American business are the very promises men live by, promises far more reliable than those in the fields of politics, government, or international relations. Its surplus wealth supports the largest, I will not say the greatest, educational system in history, but its lack of an adequate ideology encourages that system to turn out more and more socialists who would destroy the very system which made their education possible. That is one reason why I have described the American educational system in some of my writings as "The most elaborate plan ever conceived for obscuring and even denying the elementary facts of life." But let us not blame the educators, let us blame ourselves, because while we have supported education with our dollars, we have neglected to guide it with our principles.

Within the past year there have been the first important developments of concerted activity to educate Americans by direct methods. The United States Chamber of Commerce, the Association of National Advertisers, and the American Association of Advertising Agencies, through joint committees, have developed a basic outline for an educational campaign through national advertising and also through local activities. The chamber of commerce launched its part of the program at the national session in Washington in April, under the excellent slogan "American opportunity." The outline of this program is available through local chambers and the Washington office. It is primarily a program for local application to which the banks could contribute enormously—not in money but in cooperation.

A FEW PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS

The greatest problem is not whether or not such education should be undertaken, but how to do it. Therefore, it is my purpose here to concentrate on a few practical suggestions, or "do's" and "don't's" in connection with this program. These suggestions grow out of a series of studies we have been making since 1945 in what we call the "Techniques of Communicating Ideas" as contrasted with products. As you know, some of the Nation's leading companies have been conducting large educational and advertising campaigns in defense of free enterprise. Our studies in "Communicating Ideas" included many tests with national and local advertising campaigns, tests of articles in plant or employee magazines, tests of financial statements or advertisements, and tests of pamphlets and booklets. I shall not burden you here with the details of these tests except to say they were tests of three main points: 1. Was the material interesting enough to be read? 2. If read, was it understood? 3. If understood, did it have the desired effect?

Some of the materials tested we found excellent on all these points, but much, far too much, we found neither readable nor understandable. Sometimes it even influenced people to believe the exact opposite of what was intended. In general, it was quite obvious that industry was not nearly as good in selling the principles of free enterprise as it was in selling its products. As we analyzed our results, here are a few of the practical conclusions to emerge.

AVOID POLYSYLLABICAL PROFUNDITIES

First, many advertisements, booklets, and employee publications are written far above the educational level of the people addressed. In a recent labor dispute, the president of the company wrote a lettter to all the employees. When we analyzed that letter, we found it to be written on an eleventh-grade reading level so that only about 20 percent of his employees could readily grasp its meaning. The letter was rewritten so that it would be readable by at least 90 percent of the employees. Much has been said in recent years about the importance of increasing one's vocabulary. The real problem for many executives and their highly educated assistants is to shrink their vocabularies so that they can eschew verbose and esoteric philosophical multiplicities, and sedulously avoid all tautological and polysyllabical profundities. In short, so that they can speak simply, clearly, and without double-talk.

Second, giving people the correct facts will not necessarily correct their misunderstandings. The current facts are important, to be sure, but even more important is the manner of their presentation. Advertisers are bombarding people these days with facts and statistics. It seems as though the academic disease which has blighted much education has now invaded industry. The disease I refer to is the theory that facts are the cure-all for personal and social problems. As with sex, for example. We are told that more education will eliminate many of its problems. Accordingly, via the schools, the magazines, and other media we have provided the facts of sex to an unparalleled extent. Yet, what do we have? The highest rate of social disease, the highest rate of sex crimes, of juvenile delinquency involving sex, the highest divorce rate, and the lowest birth rate in our recorded history.

The belief that if children or even adults are given the unbiased facts, covering both sides of an argument, they will then make the correct decisions, is one of the fatuous fallacies of our time. The simple truth is that facts, without elementary morals or standards, are likely to create confusion rather than understanding. People are not automatic calculating machines. They have hearts as well as minds, passions as well as brains. When they do read one of the many ads or pamphlets thrust upon them, they interpret the facts in terms of their emotional attitudes and moral standards.

A BANKER'S LIFEBLOOD

Therefore, to present the cold facts is not enough. The facts about sex are at least interesting, which is more than can be said of many of the facts about banking and free enterprise. The most interesting of all facts to the president of a bank or a company is his financial statement. Its details are more than cold facts to him. They are his lifeblood. But to the great majority of people, all financial statements are a deadly bore, no matter how they are dolled up with pictures and charts that are supposed to make them easy to read. Aside from the stockholders, the point at which such facts may become important is among the employees of a particular company. Even there the mere presentation of the facts is not enough. The employees must be led to absorb and understand them. A personal presentation of earnings and expenses by an officer of the company may be one effective method. Another is to offer cash prizes to the employees, their wives, and especially their school children, for the best 50-word essay on "What one figure in this financial statement means most to me, and why?" The company officers, who know the problem, would naturally be the judges of the essays chosen and published.

PRESENT MATERIAL TOO PEDANTIC

Therefore, we say, emotional appeals should be used even if this means a decrease in the number of facts which can be presented. Do you remember the prize contests of Old Gold, and many other products? A hundred thousand dollars in prizes, fifty thousand, ten—for the best 25-word description of the product? This represents an effective use of an incentive or emotional appeal. On a modest scale, it could be used by local companies and chambers to good advantage in selling the facts and principles of the American system. Our experiments in the "Techniques of Communicating Ideas" show that much of the present material is too factual, too pedantic. Instead of preaching to the public about free enterprise, why not stimulate it to preach to itself?

POWERFUL EMOTIONAL APPEALS

When we examine the reasons for our great success in selling goods or material things as against ideas and principles, what do we find? We find besides the extensive use of prize contests, many other powerful emotional appeals. For example, "Always a bridesmaid, never a bride." What should that mean to free-enterprise advertising? How about, "Always a dues payer, never a boss?" or, "Always a yes-man, never on his own," referring to the man who always runs with the gang, the crowd, the mob, instead of acting independently. And again, "The man who never took a chance," referring to the person who relied on social security and Government aid instead of striking out for himself. These and many other ideas could be used to give an emotional impact to the concept of American opportunity.

It is now apparent that our discussions of free enterprise in recent years have been entirely too factual, too statistical, too self-centered. Therefore, it is not surprising that research men should have found that the term "free enterprise" meant very little to the general public. In a study made in 1942 we found that the terms "free enterprise," "capitalism," "competitive business," "independent industry" were little understood or had little appeal to the average man. However, during 1945 we discovered that "free enterprise" and "Americanism" meant much the same to people. But, whereas "free enterprise" had no emotional impact, "Americanism" had a terrific emotional impact.

Because of this situation the choice by the chamber of commerce of the term "American opportunity" for its share in the program of selling America is most appropriate. The term "American opportunity" expresses the very essence of Americanism, which is to provide opportunity not merely for big business or even little business but for every individual regardless of race, class, or present status. America has offered and today offers more opportunity to every individual, regardless of race or creed, than any other nation. These opportunities are made possible by the basic principles or ideals which make the social structure of America the unique thing it is.

OWN FAMILY INDEBTED TO AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY

One of the most powerful emotional appeals in driving home the full meaning of American opportunity is to point out individuals or families who have made use of that opportunity. These families exist in every

city and every town, and there is no reason why the local chambers of commerce or associations cannot from time to time select individuals or families who represent the fruits of American opportunity. I feel strongly on this subject because my own family is so deeply indebted to American opportunity. My parents came to the country as almost penniless immigrants when they were about 25 years old. My father went to work in a planing mill, 10 hours a day, 6 days a week, $12 a week. At night he studied English and mechanical drawing in the free public school, and after about 12 years became a foreman. There were six children and, as we have just learned in recent years, we were distinctly of the "underprivileged third." Fortunately, we did not know it then. We were taught, at home and in school, that America was the land of opportunity for those who had the ambition and the self-reliance to make use of it. Our privileges included a free grade-school and high-school education. With help from home, part-time work, and a few scholarships from capitalistic colleges we were even able to get college degrees.

What happened in our family was not unique. It happened among our neighbors, our friends, in the large German population, among the Poles, the Italians, the Irish, not to mention the native Americans. In fact, this process has become so general among Americans that we no longer appreciate it. Therefore, if communities all over the country were to select, periodically, concrete cases of families who had made use of their American opportunities, who had improved their position, gotten an education, purchased their own home, started their own business, assumed responsibility in the community, and were to extend public recognition to such families, the appreciation of American opportunity would be rapidly increased.

A "NATURAL" FOR THE BANKS

This type of publicity or education is what might be called a "natural" for the banks. The banks are so full of human-interest stories about people who were helped out of difficult circumstances or who were helped to develop new business opportunities, that bankers tend to become inhuman about them. It would be more accurate to say that bankers become so accustomed to these adventure stories that they take them as a matter of routine. Just because of the powerful emotions involved in these incidents, the banker naturally has to cultivate an unemotional and objective point of view.

If I may be excused another personal reference, during the late nineties, when my father was laid off for 12 weeks in a period of depression, he was able to borrow from a bank a thousand dollars, merely on his character. He used this money to buy lumber and materials with which he built a small house on a lot he had bought some time before this. This was our first home. At the age of 45 he began building houses for himself, again with the help of the banks. During the depression in 1931, some of his friends urged him to take his cash out of the bank. He considered the matter pretty carefully, but his final answer was "No." "The banks," he said, "have always been good to me. Why should I desert them now?" That remark produced a profound change in my feelings for the banks as institutions. But the banks are full of stories like this and these stories are infinitely more interesting and educational than many of the formal statements about mortgages, trust funds, safe deposit boxes, and other services.

Naturally, the stories, the incidents should be selected according to certain specifications so as to illustrate clearly the basic principles which make American opportunity possible. We must demonstrate again and again that the essence of American opportunity lies not in its material wealth or material success, but in its spiritual heritage; not in its automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, radios, and houses but in its principles and ideals.

PRINCIPLES ABOVE PROFIT

Every coin of the realm still bears the slogan, "In God we trust." What does it mean, or rather what did it mean? It points to the very cornerstone of Americanism, which is to put principles above profit and God's moral order above economic order. Today when anyone talks about spirtual or moral values, people tend to shy off as from someone impractical or even slightly unbalanced. When one mentions the dignity of the individual, however, there is immediate assent that this is a fundamental characteristic of Americanism. And yet, the dignity of the individual is strictly a spiritual concept. Dignity is not something which the individual acquires with a new pair of pants or an inside toilet. The dignity of the individual is made possible by a set of ideals and laws such as the Ten Commandments. What would man's dignity mean without the Commandments. Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not bear false witness? These moral laws are the very foundations of American opportunity and the dignity of the individual. That is why communism has to get rid of religion and its morals, because they are the bulwark of individual freedom and opportunity. Socialism, including so-called Christian socialism, cannot even get started until it steals the property and freedom of its citizens, of course by legal means or by the democratic vote if possible.

There are many liberals today who believe that if the majority votes to rob the minority, it is perfectly moral. Their slogan is that prize piece of doubletalk, "Human rights are more important than property rights."

No, it is not Russia that constitutes the great threat to America, as the President and many high Government officials have only recently begun to preach. It is the moral obtuseness of Americans themselves. Increasingly, we Americans, regardless of class, have repudiated the moral heritage which made America possible. We have done so formally as well as informally. The highest court in the United States, in a series of decisions, has declared that stealing is legal when committed by certain labor unions; that violence is legal when committed by labor unions; that bearing false witness is legal when committed by labor unions. In short, this court has declared that the moral law is illegal. No wonder that the respect for law generally has been so extensively undermined throughout this country. No wonder that the opportunities of American workers are being progressively restricted by organized coercion and by violence to persons and property.

FALLING BEHIND IN THE RACE

Industry, above all, has paid so much attention to the laws of physical science, the laws of matter, and so little to the laws of ethics, the laws of human relations, that we have fallen far behind in the race against socialist and communist materialism. Your chairman was kind enough to refer to my recent book The Rediscovery of Morals. In it I have tried to reinterpret the moral foundations of the American Creed in respect to our present industrial conflicts. However, the daily statements and actions of business leaders are far more important than any one book or collection of books. According to our most recent surveys, the public today is unusually receptive to the statements of business executives. However, there is little sense in talking to the workers about free competition, free markets, and private property, unless we are willing to defend the rights and opportunities of the workers themselves. Employers who enter into agreements which restrict the freedom of those who want to work are destroying American opportunity at its very source.

During the strikes a year ago, we were making surveys including this question: Do you think that company executives should or should not negotiate with the unions while pickets are preventing the company officers and office workers from entering their plants? This was the condition in several cities, and a substantial majority of the citizens interviewed answered, No, they should not negotiate. Those businessmen who made an issue of their legal rights and those of their nonstriking employees were reinforcing the very foundations of American opportunity. In the days ahead, and regardless of new laws, these issues will probably be tested again and again, and increasingly in the banks. Each test is potentially as good or better than an expensive advertising campaign. Businessmen simply cannot afford to sacrifice the basic freedoms of their workers, no matter what the temporary effect on their profits.

We seem to have gotten away from education but, as we have tried to point out, education in the facts of American opportunity, if not founded on the basic principles of American opportunity, is bound to fail. The most important factor in resurrecting the American faith is a more searching reappraisal of the principles which have made America possible. If we are not to smother what remains of free America in a plethora of verbiage and propaganda, we must act on these principles. Great principles make many words unnecessary, and action based on these principles makes fewer words count.

No Moratorium on Inventions—We Cannot Block Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Telegram of July 20, 1947:

NO MORATORIUM ON INVENTIONS; WE CANNOT BLOCK PROGRESS

Some days ago a worried individual called for a halt on all new inventions. Late in his career, Thomas A. Edison suggested a moratorium on inventions himself. He said that Americans required new inventions far less than they needed to learn how to use the existing ones intelligently. In 1938 a few subordinate officials in Washington proposed that labor-saving machines should be taken away from people. This, they believed, would quickly increase the call for manual labor and so would solve the problem of unemployment.

Inventions do create problems as well as solve them. For example, the automobile brought traffic congestion and peril on street and highway, in addition to enjoyable and profitable transportation.

Labor-saving machines do destroy jobs as well as save work. But they also create new jobs. Nearly 20 years ago Henry Ford argued that when a worker was displaced by a machine, then another worker was required to help build that machine. His theories were vindicated. Labor-saving machinery, mass production, furnished more and more employment.

Statistics have been cited, but they are not necessary to prove the point. Mere observation, common sense, and logic will do it. Labor-saving machinery cannot arrive by magic. It is manufactured—by work, and with the aid of machines and machine tools. Parts and materials must be made, and machines must be repaired and occasionally replaced. All of this results in work, by many persons in many places throughout the world.

The housewife turns a faucet and gets hot water. She no longer lifts a huge boiler onto a hot stove. It's easy for her now. But the water-supply system and the heating equipment do not run themselves. Their installation and maintenance call for much work and provide many jobs. She turns a knob on the electric range. She no longer brings in chunks of wood and keeps the kitchen fire going. It's remarkably convenient and effortless. But men are working at the power plant which supplies the electricity, and men fix the wires after a thunderstorm has brought damage.

The radio listener turns the dial and relaxes. But the programs are not presented without work, and the broadcasting requires the employment of many engineers and technicians. A piece of farm machinery may do the work of 20 men, but it has to be manufactured by the work of many nonfarmers.

It is true that a man replaced by a machine cannot always find a new job immediately—particularly a job near home and to his liking. When sound films arrived and orchestras were no longer necessary in movie theaters, violinists did not immediately find jobs in factories where sound-film machinery was made. Neither did they quickly obtain new jobs as musicians. But readjustments did come. Those musicians are not roaming the streets today, jobless on account of sound films.

Anything radically new always brings dire predictions. Many persons instinctively hate change. Some New Englanders once called the automobile a mere "fad, with no future." The Wright brothers were ridiculed. There were groans of dismay when horses were replaced by trolley car and auto. Motor busses, it was said, would never compete with the trolley, and could never be practical for long trips.

The hostility toward new inventions is an old story. Not only are there fears of change and anxieties about jobs but sometimes interest in a profession or pride in a skill may suffer. The typewriter was not a boon to the expert penman.

Yet there is no widespread desire for a return to the simpler days. People would not like to be without the telegraph, the telephone, the sewing machine, the electric ice box, the gas stove, the movies, the radio, the airplane, and countless other inventions. They would not care to ride in an old-time train, with its gloomy cars, uncomfortable seats, stuffy air, grime, and cinders. After an invention has become commonplace, people look back and say, "How did we ever get along without it?" Readjustment is fairly rapid.

Moreover, the revolutions are not always quite so complete as predicted. The automobile and motortruck did not destroy the railroad; the motion picture did not destroy the stage, and the radio did not destroy the motion picture or the newspaper. We still have both synthetic and natural rubber. Despite plastics, with all their satisfactoriness, things are still being made of such old-fashioned materials as wood and steel. Despite electricity and gas and oil, we still depend upon coal mines—to our sorrow, at times.

Nobody denies that inventions at first bring confusion and uncertainty in spots. But their total effect is progress—greater productivity. This total increase in productivity is sometimes higher than is assumed, at first thought. For the amount of labor which is required to build a labor-saving machine must be deducted from the amount of labor which the machine saves when it is used. That is, when a labor-saving machine creates jobs, it also creates the necessity to work. The over-all release from toil is far from 100 percent.

Thus machinery provides no path to universal wealth and effortless ease for all. But it does mean progress. We are steadily forging ahead, and what is good for the people as a whole will finally be good for each individual.

When the National Machine Tool Builders' Association met in Worcester in 1932, speakers declared that technological unemployment could be avoided by careful planning. That is still true today. There are, at times, a few displaced persons who are the temporary victims of inventions.

They are refugees from the sweep of progress.

They can be helped, but a moratorium on inventions is not the way to do it.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Flood Control," published in the Washington Post for July 15, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL

It is estimated that in the course of the current year alone, floods have swept away close to a quarter billion dollars' worth of property in the Middle West. These same floods have washed out irreplaceable topsoil valued at no less than half a billion dollars. The bill presented by the Midwest's rampaging rivers in a single season comes, then, to almost the same amount as the total cost that has been involved in the entire Tennessee Valley Authority undertaking—$782,000,000. And the TVA, it should be remembered, has been paying dividends to the Federal Treasury from its sale of power amounting to about $10,000,000 annually as well as rendering incalculable benefits to the people of its region in the form of soil conservation, increased farm prosperity and industrial enterprise, improved navigation and recreational advantages.

These benefits have grown out of TVA because it was a carefully planned undertaking, designed to develop the entire resources of a region in addition to providing primary protection from disastrous recurrent floods. TVA was an experiment—an experiment which has proved of immense value in itself and which can have immeasurably greater value for the Nation if we give heed to the lesson it has taught. That lesson is that the water and soil and forests and power potentialities of a great river system ought to be treated, to use Mr. Lilienthal's apt term, as a unity.

We have not done this in the past with the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. We have applied patchwork remedies to particular spots—often with the result of confining the river at one point only to enhance its rampaging at another. We have built dikes and levees only to have them overrun. It is time to look at the river problem of the Midwest in its totality. This is what we hope the President will do in the special message he is expected to send to Congress this week. This country needs to harness its river systems, not merely for the sake of keeping them under control but also for the sake of utilizing them for the general welfare. No doubt such an undertaking would entail a great financial investment. It would also afford the promise of great economic gains.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARVE TIBBOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Johnstown Tribune, Johnstown, Pa., on July 19, 1947:

FLOOD CONTROL

The floods of the Middle West have made the public flood-conscious again. It happens each time some major inundation occurs, but the enthusiasm unfortunately dies down almost as rapidly as the water ebbs back into its natural channels.

President Truman has asked Congress for an appropriation of $250,000,000, above appropriations heretofore made or considered for the fiscal year, to get a flood-control program of major proportions under way. He isn't likely to get it in the closing stages of Congress; and he is undoubtedly aware of that. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in a plea for additional appropriations, notes that the House has authorized projects totaling about $40,000,000 less than requested in the President's January budget. The amount approved for flood control on the Mississippi and its tributaries, however, was higher than that requested for the purpose last January.

In this same connection, Mr. Truman last August recommended to the Secretary of War that he keep his work plan for flood control under $95,000,000 for 1947 and $110,000,000 for 1948; and the New York Herald Tribune observes caustically that last year there were no devastating floods but there was "instead a Nation-wide desire for governmental economy." It isn't necessary to go that far back, however. The Budget Bureau, which is responsible to the President alone, this year cut back the appropriation request for the Conemaugh Dam to $3,200,000, although Army engineers estimated the amount needed for the year's work at $5,200,000. Western Pennsylvania leaders went to Washington to make a direct plea for the additional $2,000,000 for a flood-control project that Pittsburgh considers imperative.

We shall get nowhere with flood-control enthusiasm that rises and subsides along with the floods. What is needed is a steady, sustained interest in the subject. Whether those who must be entrusted with the work can obtain the necessary equipment, labor, and materials for a $250,000,000 program in the next year is a matter which Congress must determine. Although the time is short between now and adjournment, Congress would be well advised to make financial provision for whatever can reasonably be done until it meets again.

Student Division of Americans for Democratic Action Submits a Suggested Student's Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1947, Students for Democratic Action, the student division of Americans for Democratic Action, submitted a comprehensive report on civil liberties in American colleges and universities to the President's Committee on Civil Rights. The report, based on a detailed questionnaire to over 600 American colleges, stressed the necessity of the adoption of a series of standards whereby college administrations could both protect their own legitimate rights and guarantee the greatest amount of freedom of action to political associations on American campuses. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement which is an abstract of the report of SDA to the President's committee:

We wish to call to your attention the very considerable extent to which restrictions are placed on the rights of American college and university students to engage in political activity and discussion and to participate in organizations for that purpose. We realize that in the legal sense this is not a question of civil rights, since the only penalty for violating such restrictions is expulsion or academic discipline. But in practice, it is just as important to guard the student in a school in the enjoyment of the right of free expression as it is to guard the citizen in the community.

COLLEGE REGULATIONS

While in school a student's freedom of thought and action can be just as effectively restricted by college regulations as can that of the citizen by an arbitrary government. Usually the campus is the student's world. If he disagrees, he cannot go elsewhere unless he is willing to sacrifice or interrupt his education, so that he almost always falls into any pattern set by the administration. In the absence of free discussion, particularly of political and economic issues, he even falls into the pattern of thinking set for him.

It would seem particularly important, if the truth democracy seeks is to emerge from the free contest of ideas, that this free climate should be maintained in the schools in which our ideas become set and from which much of the Nation's leadership comes. Academic freedom, as regards teachers, has, after a hard fight, been pretty generally accepted as a fundamental American tenet. But no matter how free the faculty, the students are still too often left with only the single choice of the faculty's opinion or no opinion at all. A student opinion or discussion of opinions is still regarded as either socially undesirable or downright illegal.

FAIR STANDARDS

We are discovering that the present drive to eliminate the Communist-front American Youth for Democracy from the campus is being reflected in greater restrictions on all organizations. We know from experience that communism cannot be defeated by suppression. The danger is that suppression will extend to other groups, that all discussion will be stopped, while communism will be merely driven underground, gaining additional support as the victim of unjust oppression. We feel that this situation is developing into a crisis, so far as the rights of students and freedom of opinion in American education are concerned.

We realize that institutions must have some regulations to protect them from irresponsible use of the institution's name, liability for debts of student organizations, and interference with classes and study. What we are asking is that college administrations accept a set of fair standards which will at the same time protect these legitimate interests of the institutions and guarantee to their students reasonable freedom of opinion and action.

In drafting our set of standards, we have kept in mind the legitimate interests which colleges do have a right to protect in dealing with student organizations. First, the institution has a right to demand that its name will not be used off the campus irresponsibly or in such a way as to identify the institution with the partisan views of any person or group. Second, it has a right to see to it that student organizations do not incur financial or other liabilities for which the institution would be responsible. Third, it has a right to see to it that student organizations do not interfere unduly with regularly scheduled classes and college functions. All of these legitimate interests of the institution make certain rules necessary and mean that there must be some latitude in the administration of the rules. In all cases the administration of such rules should be in the hands of a body which includes regularly elected student representatives.

The students, on the other hand, have the right to expect every freedom which does not conflict with the legitimate interests of the institution. It is again necessary to have a set of rules protecting this freedom. When questions of interpretation arise, the body responsible for decisions on student activities should feel the same responsibility for enforcing the latter rules as for enforcing those mentioned in the first paragraph. It is for this reason that elected student representatives are particularly important. But the most important thing is that the rules protecting student freedoms are actually stated and accepted as the policy of the institution.

STUDENT "BILL OF RIGHTS"

The set of standards which we recommend here is based on "A Student 'Bill of Rights,'" published in 1945 as part of a pamphlet entitled "What Freedom for American Students," by the Committee on Academic Freedom of the American Civil Liberties Union. We have departed somewhat from the ACLU version.

1. The policy of every college in relation to student activities outside the classroom should be set forth in definite terms, and accepted by the college community. Interpretation of this precise policy should be in the hands of a body which includes elected student representatives. To leave complete discretion in such matters solely to a college president, executive officer, or faculty committee is to risk putting the determination of critical issues in too few hands influenced by the accidents of the moment, or by the pressure inevitably surrounding a particular crisis when it arises. Democratic decisions require representation of all interests involved, with authority and responsibility clearly fixed.

2. A college's stated policy should make clear that students are free to organize associations for political, religious, social, and other purposes, and to maintain any opinions not contrary to law. Student organizations may properly be required to register with the college authorities their names, purposes, bylaws, officers, and activities. Disapproval of any of these shall not be grounds for interference by the college, unless they in some way are contrary to another of these rules. Secret societies may, of course, properly be prohibited or regulated.

STUDENT ASSOCIATIONS

3. Student associations should be permitted to take the name of the college and to use their names in all activities on college property consistent with the aims of the various organizations. Restrictions may fairly be placed on the use of the college name by any association when its activities extend beyond the college campus, such as participation in picketing and in demonstrations and parades; but such restrictions should be administered only by the representative body specified in paragraph 1.

4. The use of college property outside its primary use for instruction should be made available to any registered student organization carrying out its stated purpose, in accordance with the regulations for the use of college property. Students should be free to post material on bulletin boards. Such restrictions should be imposed by the representative body specified in paragraph 1. Student organizations should not be disciplined for meeting off the campus.

5. No control should be exercised by college authorities over the subjects or outside speakers chosen by student groups.

FACULTY ADVISERS

6. In institutions where it is thought desirable to have faculty advisers for student organizations, such advisers should be chosen or approved by the student organizations themselves. In no case should advisers have authority to regulate or veto the activities of a student group. Nor should student groups be forbidden to function because no faculty member will consent to serve as their adviser.

7. No disciplinary action should be taken against students for engaging in activities off the campus such as campaigning for political candidates, picketing in labor disputes, participating in public demonstrations, etc., provided such students do not claim to be representing the college. Every precaution should be taken against misrepresenting the college to the outside public and to impress on students their obligations to their institution's repute, as suggested in paragraph 3. The activities described in this paragraph should also be permitted on the campus, except insofar as they result in the destruction of property or interfere with regular classes or college functions. Again, decisions of this nature should be in the hands of the representative body specified in paragraph 1.

PRESS CENSORSHIP

8. College students should be permitted to publish such newspapers or magazines as they wish, subject to the provisions for registering with the college authorities the name, purposes, and editors No censorship in advance by the college authorities should be exercised over the contents of any publication. If student editors should abuse their responsibility by improprieties or indecency, or fail to live up to responsibilities accepted, disciplinary action should be taken by the representative body specified in paragraph 1.

9. The boards or committees of students responsible for each publication should be free to select editors without control by the college authorities or faculty. A student editor should be removable only by the student board or by the representative body specified in paragraph 1.

10. Every college should have a system of genuinely democratic student government as the agency for student activities and opinion. But experience has shown that freedom of organization on the campus is no safer in the hands of a student council than in the hands of any other person or body. Consequently, whatever regulation student government exercises over student organizations should be subject to the same

safeguards, as suggested in this set of standards, as regulation by the college administration.

Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of June 18, 1947:

THERE ARE TOUGH ECONOMICS SURROUNDING TRUMAN TAX CUT VETO

Although the Presidential veto of the tax reduction bill actually killed all hope for whittling down income taxes this year, there is at least room for some rather justifiable rationalization.

For one thing, we are being told that if we are to prevent the rest of the world from being sucked into the vast orbit of socialism, we are going to have to tax ourselves to the limit and pump American greenbacks into Europe's moribund economy on a scale that staggers the imagination.

It is hard to see how we can cut taxes and buy off Europe at the same time. It's hard to see how we can do it without increasing taxes, as a matter of fact.

Then there's the matter of our national debt. Somewhere in the back of our minds is the suspicion that both our major political parties are trying to make an asset out of this thing. The GOP can always blame the Democrats for accumulating the debt. The Democrats can always call our attention to the fact that Republicans aren't really serious about paying it off because they're talking about lower taxes.

The fact remains that we can't talk that debt out of existence. Sooner or later, one way or another, this money and the interest we pay on this money is going to come out of the taxpayers' pockets.

We also have the question of tax reduction and inflation. Prices are still rising. Looking at the situation objectively, it seems reasonable to support a policy of higher taxation in times of inflation and tax reduction in periods of deflation.

And, lastly, a good many people didn't think the tax-reduction plan which the President vetoed was a very good plan anyway. Critics of the plan maintained that the 30-percent tax reduction for the little fellow wasn't going to work out as well as it sounded. He would actually get an increase in his net income of only 7 percent at the outside.

It was pointed out likewise that the 10.5 percent tax reduction for the big-money incomes was far from being the small and innocent figure that it sounds like. Some men who received tax reductions of only 10.5 percent would nevertheless be getting increases up to 46 percent in their net incomes.

These arguments, of course, were countered by the reasoning that men in the upper brackets have been vastly overtaxed for many years and that this plan would restore them money which is at present being taken away by completely unfair and arbitrary taxation. It is also pointed out that the present high tax rate on large incomes sends money into the national Treasury which would much better be invested in the creation and expansion of American business enterprise, thus creating jobs and contributing to national wealth and prosperity.

It seems a little doubtful, however, if either one of these arguments fully offsets the other. For this reason a better plan might be one which would give all taxpayers a more or less uniform percentage increase in net income.

With the presence of both inflation and new needs for Government spending, tax reduction is a questionable measure. It becomes even more questionable when the plan proposed would not appeal to the majority of the taxpayers as a fair and equitable one. A better tax-reduction plan may be possible at a later date, when and if we can really see our way clear to tax reduction at all.

Congress Must Act on Resource Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON H. CARSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the February 1947 issue of Sports Afield:

CONGRESS MUST ACT ON RESOURCE CONSERVATION

With the exigencies of the war past, the Eightieth Congress must now concern itself with rehabilitation and restoration of the vast damage done to our natural resources. It is committed through the public statements of its leaders to a program of economy. Will it be dollar wise and resource foolish? The budgets of the various governmental agencies may expect to feel the sweeping strokes of scalpel-edged pens as the lawmakers exercise their constitutional power. In such assiduous effort, let reason rise above the expediency of the moment, and may wisdom and vision consider the future to strengthen that on which the life of this Nation will depend.

Were it not for the greatness of our natural resources, the fertility of our soil, the wealth of our minerals, the storehouses of our forests and the bounty of our waters, this Nation and this Congress might not exist today. And as these resources, once thought boundless, racingly continue to disappear into the greedy maw of ill-considered use and short-sighted waste that cares not for the morrow, the Congresses of the future will need not be concerned with the saving of dollars. Like the poverty of other nations who lived too freely on their natural resources of piercing problem will become the sustenance of life itself.

As the exact appearance of a stellar body which science predicts to the moment a century hence, the signs by which the course is charted are evident. It cannot happen here must also be the scoffer's echo to the dry winds parching sands across the once great richness of civilization's forgotten, dust buried ruins. While it considers ponderously the immediate problems of this Nation, and orators dream of the golden age of the atom, the specter of decline stalks with greater strides to gain quality on resource waste, to gain stature on puny restoration plans.

We can already count on the fingers of one hand the years of supply left for certain of our minerals. Our depleted forests are moving to the mills faster than nature can produce its crop, while insistent voices cry for more. Our rivers are so polluted that industry begins to find it cannot use their waters. And with water tables falling, nearly one-third of this Nation, including the Congress must drink that which has been flushed through at least one bathroom while science taxes its knowledge to restrain disease from moving nearer to human lips.

In the next 2 years that Congress meets, it is estimated that 4,000,000,000 tons of life-sustaining top soil from an already too thin surface will muddy American rivers on its way to total loss. Since the First Congress met, one-half of the fertile top soil of this Nation has been lost, and millions of acres of land abandoned as useless to food production while we now stand on the brink of our last frontier.

Will this Congress prove itself wise enough to pause for the treatment of symptoms and courageous enough to seek for the cure of causes? Will it continue to spend billions of dollars to dredge American farms from the bottom of rivers and harbors, to spend billions to build vast impoundments that will defeat their own purpose through siltation? Will they begin to refute spectacular political expediency that pours concrete against already formed flood waters to begin more consideration for the restoration of the watersheds on whose bosom the floods are borne? Congress may legislate the laws for human behavior, but it cannot veto the laws of nature.

It is not presumptuous for these words to appear on the pages of an outdoor publication. The 17,000,000 sportsmen of this Nation, whose numbers are growing, are awakened to the urgent need for resource conservation and restoration through their love of the outdoors and their concern for their recreation.

By their consistent loss of outdoor opportunities, they see first hand the infallible signs of resource waste and depletion. The polluted water does not sustain fish, and the wasted soil, the barren forest land does not sustain wildlife. These are barometers for human life, which also depends on the basic resources. We are selfish to fight for the restoration of soil, water and forests for its proven direct benefits to fish, wildlife and for the constant improvement of our fishing and hunting. But in a larger sense, it is the pioneer fight to protect existence of all life.

The time is urgently here to plan for a vigorous and implemented conservation policy. The Congress must awaken to the vast restoration needs.

Governor Stassen, Governor Dewey, and the New York Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday our colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] voiced sincere and strenuous objection to a recent statement of Governor Dewey offering to give Montana 50,000 New York Communists to add to its population. Although it would appear that Governor Dewey was probably speaking in a facetious vein, I can well appreciate the indignation felt by the gentleman from Montana. Neither Montana nor any other State in the Union should be designated as a depository for unwanted New York Communists. New York should take care of its own Reds.

Former Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, is responsible for pointing up the

necessity for taking some immediate action with reference to our American Communists, most of whom are in the State of New York. In an address broadcast over the National Broadcasting Co. on July 14, 1947, Governor Stassen pointed out that New York is the center of Communist activity in the United States. Mr. Stassen stated that Government records reflected the fact that 40 percent of the known Communist members of the United States are in New York, and that most of the serious inroads into organized labor by the Communist Party have taken place there.

Governor Stassen recommended 12 specific steps to be taken as the most effective way of clearing communistic infiltration in this country. He especially urged a vigorous, coordinated, comprehensive, and bipartisan program developed and put into effect through the cooperation of the President and the Attorney General of the United States, the Governor, and the attorney general of the State of New York, the mayor and the prosecutor of the city of New York.

Since Governor Stassen's talk is probably responsible for initiating the exchange of comments between Governor Dewey and Representative MANSFIELD, I think it would be fitting if we examined Governor Stassen's proposed solution to the Communist problem in New York and in the United States. During his tenure as Governor of the State of Minnesota, Mr. Stassen was eminently successful in driving the Reds and fellow travelers out of Minnesota. His recommendations are deserving of our consideration. The talk referred to follows:

ADDRESS OF HAROLD E. STASSEN OVER THE NATIONAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY 14, 1947

AMERICA VERSUS COMMUNISM IN ONE WORLD

Good evening fellow citizens, today in Paris 16 of the nations of Europe are meeting at an economic conference. Eight of the nations of Europe, all located on Russia's doorstep, turned down the invitation to the conference. Russia rejected the request of England and France that she join in calling the conference.

Obviously this development is of major and grave postwar significance. The conference is being held as a direct result of an address by Secretary of State Marshall on June 6 at Harvard University. He stated that America would continue to assist in rebuilding Europe but that Europe itself must get together and agree on a plan, including their own self-help, and present a proposal and statement of needs to the United States.

The split is there because of Russia's refusal to join in such a proposal. As a result it is more clear than ever today that there will be a continuing major competition and clash of economic systems and of ideologies between Russia and the United States. It is the greatest competition of systems of all history. It is of basic importance that we recognize this fact and that we seek to understand just what it means. The hope of mankind is that a decision may be reached on a basis of a competition of economic systems and of ideas and not through a resort to force.

I have abiding faith in the rightness and the strength of the fundamental concepts of our American system with individual freedom of men and women, economic freedom as well as social and civil and religious freedom, and with respect for the individual dignity of a human being.

I have deep confidence in our modern American capitalism and in our representative form of government of free citizens as together constituting an excellent system to give expression to these basic concepts.

But I can also understand, at least partially, from the history of Russia and her czars and her revolutions and from the nature of her present form of government and economic system, why the rulers of Russia do not now share that faith and that confidence.

I do not believe that there will be a major change in Russian policy for the better until the members of the all-powerful Politburo, including Generalissimo Stalin, become convinced of two things: First, that notwithstanding the strains of war and postwar conditions, our economic system can continue to function with high production and high standards of living and without a major economic crash and devastating depression; and second, that the Communist Party cannot successfully infiltrate and dominate or sabotage this country or any other one of the major powers of the world.

If they become convinced of these two things, both of which I am confident are true; and if at the time they reach that decision America is strong and resolute in its military position; then there is grounds for hope of a major favorable change in Russian policies; and her friendly, vigorous people, who want peace as badly as any of us do, will then take their place in sharing constructive leadership in a peaceful, progressing world.

On the basis of this analysis there are three fundamental developments of our American policy I urge tonight. First: That we move promptly and effectively to assure the success of the European program developed at Paris. Second, that we do not abandon the eight nations of Europe who did not accept the Paris conference invitations. Third, that we proceed promptly with an intelligent, coordinated program, to clear up Communist infiltration in the United States.

Clearly our first priority now must be the success of the economic group that is being formed in Paris. It is good news for us and for the world that the Administration is moving in the direction of a continued helping hand in the rebuilding of this war-torn area. It was dark news when statements were made in early May that no more was to be done this year. It was bright news when the indication of the change of policy came forth in June. Action is urgently needed for their future and for ours before another grim winter sets in over Europe.

Speed is essential. The administration should confer with the leaders of both parties in Congress to see whether preliminary authorization cannot be given to an appropriate agency of the Government to place advance orders for the articles that will be critically needed. Our American manufacturers can then expand their production of these items, such as coal-mining machinery and equipment, farm implements, hydroelectric installations, and transportation facilities. Authorization to place a half-billion-dollar order for this type of equipment, extended before this session of Congress ends, can make a major difference in the success of the economic program being developed in Paris, and can also ease the ultimate strain on the American economy, which is home base for the success of our entire future. If these orders are not placed early, later when the plans are finally complete sudden heavy orders will place a sharp burden on already crowded manufacturing facilities in America, without proper time for expansion, will increase our shortages of these same items and will delay the reconstruction of Europe. The actual delivery of these supplies should properly await the deliberated major congressional decision, probably at a special session in the fall, after the European plan is presented. But a beginning now on our production-for-peace program is of major importance.

It is my view that the majority of the peoples of every other nation of the world prefer to move in the direction of a system of individual freedom and human dignity, and yearn for opportunities and means and methods to do so. The peoples of Finland and Poland and Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia and Rumania and Hungary and Bulgaria and Albania do not want to turn away from us, do not want to turn further and further away from individual freedom. But is it not equally clear that these small nations located as they are cannot defy Russia? It would be a major world tragedy if because of our request for a joint European program, and the declining of invitations by these countries, it would be interpreted now that we abandoned them. The reply that the division was actually caused by Russia's refusal to join and by her insistence that these countries decline, is not a sufficient excuse. Clearly the peoples of these eight nations did not cause the decision by Russia. If our original proposal took this particular form to cause Russia to show her hand, that has been accomplished, and we should now continue our economic program with due humanitarian regard for all the peoples of the world.

We should also keep in mind that the economies of these eight countries are not entirely socialized and collectivized, the land is still peasant-owned, the merchants are nearly all individual operators and not state-possessed, and the people do not wish to move toward a complete, socialized, regimented economy, and if these peoples do not move further in the regimented direction, the ultimate working out of our world economic and ideological relationships will be easier to attain.

I consider it to be imperative in this world-wide competition of ideas and economic systems that we immediately make it clear that we do not turn our backs to these eight countries, that we do not foreclose the probability, under proper conditions, of extending to them desperately needed economic assistance.

The conditions of such aid clearly must include that the press and radio be able to report to the outside world without censorship what is happening within the country, that the assistance should reach the people for the purposes for which it is intended, that it should not be used to decrease their individual freedom or to clamp down additional socialization upon them, and that the people should be given the facts of the aid program.

As one specific example, the peasant farmers of Poland desperately need farm machinery. Their own was almost entirely destroyed or taken away as the grim tides of war swept their homelands over and over and over again. These peasant farmers are on their own farms. They are not collectivized. Europe desperately needs the food they could raise. If their Government will agree that the farm equipment we would send them would go to the peasants themselves and would not be held by the Government as a lever for collectivizing their agriculture, if they would agree that our press could report without censorship the developments, and that they would announce to the people the amount of aid delivered then I would be in favor of granting aid in farm machinery to Poland.

We must ever make it clear that we are not narrow or selfish or bigoted, that we sincerely desire the advancement of mankind, that we want others to share the freedom and the plenty that we enjoy, and that we believe that the best way for them to so share is to be set free within their own countries to work and to trade, to manage and invest,

to speak and to assemble, to vote and to worship.

We should constantly make it equally clear that to attain these objectives they do not need now or ever to subjugate themselves to us, that we believe basically that men should be free, that they should not be slaves to other men either within or without their own borders.

As the third phase of our prompt action, I consider it to be imperative that we do develop and place into effect a well-thought out, effective program, to not only decrease the infiltration of communism in America, but also to make it very clear to Russia that this infiltration cannot succeed. If we permit the Politburo to miscalculate the extent of the effectiveness of Communist infiltration in America, this could be almost as serious to future world developments as an actual dangerous infiltration. With their very limited numbers Communists have already caused a disproportionate disruption in labor relations and in false propaganda within our country.

The center of Communist activity in the United States is New York. This is the location of their publication, the Communist Daily Worker. It is their headquarters. It has been revealed that it was the scene of the activities of Gerhart Eisler, recently convicted key Communist. Known facts that have been reported show that a disproportionately high percentage of the known paid membership of the Communist Party is in New York. In fact, according to official Government reports, 40 percent of the known enrolled Communist members of the entire United States are in New York. Most of the serious inroads in organized labor by the Communist Party stems from New York. It should be recognized, of course, that the fact that New York is a news and communication and trade center and a gateway from and to Europe has made it especially attractive for concentrated effort by the Communists.

Needed, and needed badly, is a vigorous, coordinated, and comprehensive bipartisan program developed and put into effect through the cooperation of the President and the Attorney General of the United States, the Governor and the attorney general of the State of New York, the mayor and the prosecutor of the city of New York, to clear up this center of Communist activity.

I suggest these 12 specific steps as the most effective way of clearing Communist infiltration:

1. Expose thoroughly the identity of all known Communists and fellow travelers. Give the exact evidence of their connection. Some of the press have made an excellent start.

2. Insist that they stand up and be counted and speak out in their genuine capacity, that they do not hide behind false fronts, false names, or false issues.

3. Prosecute them vigorously for their violations of law with the effective cooperation of Federal, State, and local governments, making certain that the people understand the nature of the violations so that they are not made martyrs.

4. Have basic faith in the American working people and keep them fully informed of the facts.

5. Meet squarely through frank discussion on the merits, the issues the Communists raise.

6. Move continually to correct deficiencies, maladjustments, or evils which they point out in our American social, economic, or political rights.

7. Expose the unsound and disruptive proposals that they make.

8. Urge our fellow citizens to refuse to associate with them in organizations, insisting that they either be expelled to form organizations of their own, or else the citizens who do not wish to follow their line withdraw and label the organization as a definite front.

9. Do not lightly use the charge of "Communist" against anyone unless we are certain of the evidence, then present the evidence with the charge.

10. None of them should be permitted on public pay rolls—Federal, State, or local.

11. See to it that the members of labor organizations have a chance to vote by secret ballot on their own officers so that the workers can themselves remove union officers who are exposed and proven to be Communists.

12. Take all these actions with complete respect for civil liberties and for legal rights.

By this approach I am confident that not only the influence of Communists in America would be sharply decreased but it will also soon become evident to the members of the Politburo in Russia that Communists cannot successfully infiltrate or subvert or sabotage the American political or economic system.

I am confident of the effectiveness of this 12-point approach because it worked in Minnesota. In 1937 and 1938 Minnesota had one of the centers of Communist activity in the United States. Minnesota then had more than its share of labor violence due in part to their influence A third political party captured State control and Communist fellow travelers moved into key positions. Our Republican Party took a direct position in the first campaign of November 1938 that we would clear them out, would not permit them on public pay rolls, and constructively would seek the cooperation of the working people to decrease their influence in organized labor. With the cooperation of Federal and local Governments we were able to make a sharp change in their whole disruptive practices in labor and in political and social events. The third political party was defeated and eliminated. Within a few years, with the active assistance of the loyal organized labor men of the State and of an alert citizenry, the situation was greatly improved and now for years Minnesota has had less than her share of the national Communist difficulties.

I emphasize emphatically that this program should not be approached on a basis of any hysteria and should be carried on with full recognition and respect for civil rights and liberties. But it is important, not simply because of the dangers of their activities, but because of the even greater dangers in the world situation if we do not make it clear to the Politburo in Russia that Communists cannot successfully infiltrate in America.

I emphasize these major developments of our policy in the world economic field and on the domestic subversive front because I believe prompt action is needed, and I have confidence in our ability to move upon them. We must constantly keep in mind that physically and geographically and scientifically this is one world, and that while there is and there will be sharp competitions and conflicts and clashes of ideas, and of economic and social systems, the world cannot be successfully divided. If we consistently and fairly present and advocate our dynamic ideas of individual freedom and human dignity on which our America is based, then I have a sober optimism that we can win peace and plenty and freedom for ourselves and for others in the years ahead.

The House of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday afternoon, July 19, the House of History at Kinderhook, Columbia County, N. Y., represented by me here in the Congress, was formally opened as a museum with appropriate ceremonies. Acting Gov. Joe R. Hanley spoke after which members of the county's historical society entertained in the square spacious rooms of this mansion. Red damask curtains, designed and woven by Franco Scalamandre hung at the long parlor windows again. Hostesses, wearing last century's finery from a collection in the house, served tea from a dining table made by Duncan Phyfe to guests seated on original Phyfe settees. Many fine old furniture pieces were on view for the first time.

Guests of honor at the dedication of the House of History were descendants of its several owners. Great great grandchildren of the original Vanderpoel include Mrs. Stephen C. Clark, Cooperstown, and Mrs. John W. F. Treadwell, Albany. Mrs. Frank McNamee is a great niece. Mordecai Myers, second owner, was represented by a great great grandson, Peter Van Buren Hoes. Also present were Mrs. Stuyvesant Morris, Southampton, and Martin Van Buren Morris, great great grandson of the eighth President.

The House of History will remain open as a museum for the rest of the year. Visitors are free to enjoy its picture of the past and are encouraged to use an upstairs reference library of about 2,000 volumes, most of them dealing with the county's history and personalities.

Built about 1810, this House of History reflects the great prosperity and leisure of the community around it as well as the fine American taste of the period. Barnabas Waterman, a Hudson, N. Y., architect, put it up for James Vanderpoel, who, appointed circuit judge of the supreme court 20 years later, found commuting to Albany too much for him and sold the House of History to a second owner.

Mr. Waterman managed a graceful combination of Hudson Valley and New England architecture for the outside of the house, which stands about 100 yards back from the town's main street. It is square built, with brick walls of the soft, rosy shade characteristic of only Hudson River kilns. Details over the doorways—pineapples for hospitality and eagles to reflect the coming 1812 war fever—are of delicate white iron, after the manner of bullfinch. The back door is as elegant as the front, because carriages rounded the long driveway and deposited Kinderhook society there.

Inside, four square rooms on each floor open from a center hallway. A flying staircase, smaller than average and delicately carved, climbs in an almost perfect ellipse. Mantelpieces are carved to match the woodwork over doors, and the cornice carvings of each room are individual.

Bought by the Columbia County Historical Society only after it had descended to being a two-family residence, the house has come back little by little to its present perfection. It began with a few Duncan Phyfe pieces, given by James E. Leath, the society's president, and filled in with loans of old Hudson River pieces. During the war its ground floor was used to show trophies sent home to Columbia

County families by veterans all over the world.

This year Mr. Scalamandre has specially woven and presented to the House silk damask draperies for three of its rooms. The draperies reproduce authentic fabrics of the period and were worked out in cooperation with Miss Nancy M. Clelland, whose old wallpapers make part of the restoration.

In the formal parlor two cane-seated settees made by Duncan Phyfe now flank the carved white mantelpiece. Red silk damask draperies looped up at the windows are inspired by an old letter describing a party given in the room. Among its other treasures are globes, made by E. Wilson, the country's first globetrotter.

The dining room holds a Duncan Phyfe mahogany table with matching chairs. Green and gold silk damask draperies are topped with new possessions of museum importance—cornices of American pine, intricately hand-carved and gilded. A dinner service made and monogrammed for Martin Van Buren, born in Kinderhook, and later President, add to the room's lived-in look.

A smaller room on the main floor has its walls covered in shield-patterned paper and blue damask draperies to match. Here 257 old glass paperweights, composing what is said to be the world's largest collection, are on view. The earliest dates from about 1840 and the group includes many rarities, like a large one in which a green lizard is carved.

Upstairs a front bedroom is all old-time feminine charm, with mauve and white wallpaper and white embroidered Swiss muslin curtains. Big carved four-poster bed and dressing table are by Duncan Phyfe.

Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am still greatly concerned about the situation in this country, in regard to immigration. I called this matter to the attention of this House on January 29, 1947, after I had made unsuccessful attempts to get information on the subject from several Government agencies concerned with the operation and enforcement of our immigration laws. Although I was unable to get a clear picture I became convinced that a veritable flood of immigrants were coming into this country legally and illegally. Since then a great deal has been said and written on the subject but I am sure we still do not know the full story nor have we taken the proper steps to stop this flood of illegal immigration. That my fears are shared by others who have the welfare of our country at stake is evidenced by the opening remarks of Paul H. Griffiths, national commander of the American Legion in his address before the Fifty-sixth Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington on May 22. After remarking on the common interest of these two great patriotic organizations in the welfare of our country he said, "Immigration in 1947 has run amuck. It has become a lawless torrent that is undermining the very foundations of our American way of life. It is robbing the returned veterans of his opportunities. It is building up a fifth column in this country that may well be the margin by which we may meet disaster in the next war."

The strong pressure now being exerted to get the Congress to let down the bars in immigration convinces me more than ever that the Congress and the people should know the whole truth about this matter.

This country was built by immigrants from western and northern Europe and by their descendants. Their ideas of personal liberty, individual responsibility and initiative, and of government as a servant of the people rather than their master, who plans their lives and looks after their welfare, has been built into the framework of our Nation. These people spread out over this vast land, carved out its farms, cut its timber, and worked its mines. They established its great transportation systems and built its business enterprises great and small. They were animated by the desire to get ahead under the system of free enterprise. They took no stock in socialistic ideas.

When, in 1924, the people and the Congress became concerned by the changing character of our immigration and the tendency of the new arrivals to crowd into our large cities and industrial centers, the national origins provision of the Immigration Act was passed, setting up a quota system. The primary purpose is to preserve the traditions and political system of the United States by giving preference to those who, because of their characteristics and history, would be readily assimilated into our national life, customs, and views of the Government. The provision has worked fairly successfully, although immigrants continued to crowd into our cities and great industrial centers. In his able speech on this subject on July 2, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman ED GOSSETT, Democrat, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, stated that last year less than 1 percent of the immigrants who entered legally went to the farms; at least 95 percent poured into our big and overcrowded cities.

As long ago as 1940, when our Government in the interest of national defense, required the registration of all aliens, over half of the 5,000,000 registered were resident in 7 eastern seaboard industrial States. There is little doubt that the hoard of illegal entrants have followed the same course. The census figures show that 35,000,000 of our 140,000,000 population are of recent immigration origin. The report further shows that in 6 cities of over 500,000 population only 40 percent are of native birth. In 1940, there were 1,047 foreign newspapers printed in 38 foreign languages and read by an estimated 15,000,000 foreigners. The last report shows nearly 5,000,000 aliens in the United States who have not taken steps to become citizens of this country.

There is every reason to believe that the quota provisions of the law were fairly well enforced before World War II, but every indication points to the fact that carelessness, if not downright collusion to evade it, has characterized the administration of the Immigration Act since the war began. I base the above statement on facts that have been reluctantly revealed by Government agencies when pressed by committees of Congress. In my investigation I have found much evidence of irregularities in the issuing of visas to foreigners. I am convinced that there is more than just a finger of suspicion pointing to several of our consulates and officials who have not been above bribery and other irregularities. At least two individuals have been arrested with several thousand fake passports in their possession. They of course were being sold at fancy prices to foreigners who desire to flock to this country. I am further convinced that there are several hundred thousand individuals who came to the country under the nonquota provision which has no limits and they have now overstayed their visits or official business visas. No attempt is being made to send these people home. They enter into direct business competition with their own citizens which is a direct violation of the immigration laws. Our Government agencies have been entirely too lenient under the nonquota provision of the law.

The directive issued by the Attorney General on May 2, 1939, banning the divulging of any information on immigration by any one in the Department of Justice, including United States district attorneys, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States marshals and Federal penal and correctional institutions without the consent of the Attorney General has had much to do with keeping the Congress and the people in the dark about what has been going on. Gradually, however, the truth is being forced out into the open. Legal immigrants entering this country per year are variously estimated at from 100,000 to 154,000. These include those who come in under the quota provisions. Nonquota persons such as husbands, wives, and children of citizens, ministers and their wives, professors and their wives and children and women who have been citizens are admitted outside the quota provisions. In addition there are great numbers who enter this country as visitors or students and manage to stay here for a long time if not permanently. In February of this year, I called the attention of the State Department to the fact that airplanes were being chartered by organized groups in this country to fly individuals into the United States from southern Europe and northern Africa. At first they denied this arrangement, but when later confronted with photostatic copies of the passenger list and manifest by Skyways International, they were forced to admit that such an arrangement for flying these

foreigners from Cairo, Egypt, and Tel Aviv existed. This is still being carried on at increased tempo.

These are a mere trickle of the people who are pouring in over our borders. The Baltimore Sun on July 19, 1946, credits Attorney General Tom Clark with the estimate that 60,000 per month are entering this country illegally. They come in over the Canadian and Mexican borders and from all the Western Hemisphere countries which are not under the quota system. The island of Puerto Rico is another gateway for illegal entry. Some are apprehended and returned but many of them hide away in our great industrial centers. The great majority of these illegal entrants can by no stretch of the imagination be considered desirable as future citizens of this country. They come here because they think this is a land of plenty and they expect to be taken care of. They bring with them their foreign ideologies and habits of acting as groups under orders of powerful leaders. These foreigners generally settle in the congested areas of our large cities. These settlements resemble foreign countries. Many of them are plague spots and are saturated with crime and undesirable individuals. These newcomers do not easily adjust or affiliate themselves into our society.

In the face of this serious situation great pressure is being brought on the Congress to further weaken our immigration laws by admitting 400,000 people in the next 4 years from the displaced persons camps in Europe. Who are these people and why should they be brought to this country? Mr. George Meader, investigator for the Mead committee, has this to say about them:

> These persons are, for the most part, penniless and do not desire to work, but expect to be cared for and complain when things are not as well done as they think they should be. Mr. Goldman, the UNRRA director of the camp, said that he had not been able to get more than 400 of the 3,000 to do any work, even fixing up their own dwelling space. When he did get any work out of them it was because of offering special inducements such as extra cigarettes.

Hearings before the committee that held hearings on the Stratton bill developed the facts that since the war over 7,000,000 displaced persons have been repatriated. Ninety percent of some 800,000 persons in some 300 displaced persons camps still under our supervision could and should have been repatriated. To be a displaced person in an American camp has long been a preferred status since the most of them have been much better fed and clothed than have others. Most of them are overweight. Seventy percent of them were not displaced before the end of the war but have displaced themselves and flocked into our camps.

While a few good people remain there the most of them are undesirables, even criminals, and black-marketeers, who have changed their names and gone from one camp to another and repeated the performance. Major General Rooks, Director General of UNRRA, in a statement appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on June 4, 1947, said that of the 7,000,000 repatriated since the end of the war, not one substantiated instance of persecution or reprisal has come to his attention. Before supporting the well organized and heavily financed drive to get these people admitted to the United States one should ponder the facts that are stated above.

If our country is to remain strong amidst the upheaval that has followed World War II it is necessary for us to give first place to our problems at home. We are faced with a serious housing shortage that is bearing hardest on our veterans. While employment has reached an all-time high in this country there are still several million unemployed. For the next few years our veterans who are now in school will be seeking jobs and we have no assurance that we are not faced with a recession if not a depression.

I believe it is time to have a full-dress investigation of this immigration muddle. Only in this way can we impress the country with the seriousness of the situation and stop the flowing illegal entry into the United States. It will focus the spotlight of law enforcement agencies in every town, city, and State and help to stop the flow of these foreign-born individuals to the United States who have ideas and ideals of human rights and human freedoms, alien, and hostile to those of America. Indeed this whole immigration problem needs close scrutiny and a thorough investigation. We cannot afford to let any undesirable individuals who have communistic tendencies and who will not make a contribution to our way of life, enter the United States.

Danger of Transportation Monopoly to Our Entire Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1947

GOOD-BY ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question as to these bills exempting railroads, trucking companies, air lines, and other interstate carriers from prosecution under the Sherman antitrust laws.

This legislation is sought and sponsored by officials of the American Association of Railroads, abetted by other freight forwarding interests.

I guess every Member of Congress knows this. The lobbying for this bill has been notorious and complete.

From an economic point of view, this is the worst bill offered to Congress in the past 25 years. It means economic slavery, and opens wide the door to monopolies of the worst sort, with regional cartels in every business in the United States, binding hand and foot the business of the Nation. If enacted into law, we shall be at the mercy completely of the United States transportation systems: railroads, trucking companies, water carriers and pipe lines who would be authorized to agree on rates—railroads with railroads, railroads with trucking companies, water carriers with other common carriers. They could discriminate against areas and sections of the United States at will.

The antitrust laws are the bulwark of free enterprise.

They guarantee the freedom of the market place, and against the restraints and evils of monopoly, and trust agreements.

The antitrust laws insure the freedom of all men, wherever, in the United States, they may reside and engage in free private enterprise, to feel safe and be safe in these undertakings and businesses, so far as dangers of monopoly and cartels might adversely affect their legitimate activities. In the language of Theodore Roosevelt, these laws would guarantee to every one "a square deal."

To enact legislation, under any pretext, that would insulate or eliminate any one from the application of these laws, is monstrous. And yet we have, in H. R. 221, section (8), page 4, the following:

> Parties to any agreement approved by the Commission under this section (meaning section 5a (b) with subsections (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9), and other persons are, if the approval of such agreement is not prohibited by paragraph (3), (4), or (5), hereby relieved from the operation of the anti-trust laws with respect to the making of such agreement and with respect to the carrying out of such agreement, etc.

And in the Senate bill, S. 110, a little more adroitly put, the following:

> (9) No agreement approved by the Commission under this section (meaning Section 5a (b), subsections or paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8), and no conference or joint or concerted action pursuant to and in conformity with such agreement, as the same may be conditioned by the Commission, shall be deemed to be a contract, combination or conspiracy, or monopoly in restraint of trade or commerce within the meaning of the anti-trust laws.

And antitrust laws are aimed at, and make unlawful, contracts, combinations, conspiracy, and monopoly in restraint of trade and commerce.

By these bills, such contracts, combinations, conspiracies, and monopoly are blessed and made legal, if entered into or carried on by transportation companies.

Why should one ask to be relieved from the operation or application of laws against monopolies and conspiracies in restraint of trade and commerce? Why should such a request be granted?

This is a dangerous bill. It ought never to pass.

Business and free competitive enterprise have the right to be protected by law against monopolies, trusts, conspiracies, and combinations by carriers or anybody else.

I am not willing to make these things lawful on approval by any person or body of persons, agency or commission or bureau.

The transportation systems constitute America's biggest business; and this system—transportation—substantially controls every other business.

Already discrimination in freight rates has made or retarded business in different sections of the United States. Under this area discrimination some have thrived and grown great, while those in other sections have suffered and dwindled away; or in more instances have been unable to proceed at all.

Why this haste in passing this far-reaching legislation, whittling away the Sherman antitrust law and the Clayton Act? And this at the spot most vital to business and enterprise throughout the country.

Railroads have already been found guilty of these violations of fair play, even though we have all along had standing by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This is not particularly an indictment of the Commission or its personnel; but shows the impossibility of their exercising control over the transportation system of the country; and the necessity of retaining our antitrust laws, applicable to them as fully as to any.

Through the device of a hierarchy of associations, headed by the Association of American Railroads, the transportation monopoly in combination with monopolies in other basic industries, such as steel and oil, has so fixed transportation charges as to maintain the industrial status quo and stifle free enterprise and competitive business, resulting in monopoly practices and prices to the exclusion or suppression of fair competition, attended by high prices to the consumer.

Resort to the antitrust laws has been and will continue to be the only forum for redress or correction of these evils.

The arbitrary rail rate structure established by the illicit monopoly has prevented the southern and western regions from developing industries.

To concentrate these industries makes for unjustified long hauls, stifles the growth of industries, and unreasonably concentrates population, to the over-all detriment of the Nation. The bill would legalize and perpetuate the coercive power and control by the railroad association of all transportation.

Section 5 of the House bill is an illusion—a snare. It feigns a provision that the Commission shall not approve any agreement establishing a procedure for determination of any matter through joint consideration, unless it finds that under the agreement, opportunity to act contrary to the determination arrived at through such procedure is afforded to each party to the agreement which did not concur in the determination.

What could a small or one large road, or truck line, or water carrier do independently of a determination made by the association? Nothing. Freight that originated on one of these carriers could not move over lines within the association. They just would not get any interstate business.

Competition between the various forms of transportation—railroads, trucks, barge lines, pipe lines, has been effectively curtailed through joint action between the organizations of these various modes of transportation, which have agreed and conspired, successfully, to raise the level of rates in each form to the highest point. This notwithstanding the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission has been existent.

The proposed legislation would facilitate the strengthening of these combinations in each mode of transportation as amongst the several forms, and as well between and within the various forms with each other.

This legislation would make lawful all such combinations intra and inter the various modes of transportation.

Section 11 of S. 110 would approve whatever may be the judgment of the Supreme Court in Georgia against Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and others, but only so far as any announced principle relates to the parties to that suit.

This may help some—but, even so, not much—only the parties to that particular action.

The bills comprehend agreements to fix rates, to limit services, to control the construction and utilization of equipment and facilities and other matters connected with the transportation industry. It excludes nothing from the conspiracy, made lawful, but pooling, division, consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, acquisition.

Under specific provisions of both bills, the transportation industry could set up and perpetuate a private government which would have the power, through combination and concerted action, to control rates, facilities, and all else affecting transportation in every form, in every part of the United States, limited nowhere, except possibly as any such combination might relate to the parties in the Georgia case and there restricted very little.

The immediate origin of this legislation was likely the exigencies of World War II, when the Government was the principal shipper, in an emergency, and such legislation was only defensible to meet the temporary emergency situation.

Now it has been seized upon as a permanent machinery for the control of transportation rates by the transportation companies, acting in concert to the lasting detriment of the public. It ought not to be allowed.

The phrase "agreement between two or more carriers concerning or providing rules, and so forth, for consideration, initiation or establishment of rates, fares, charges, including charges among or between carriers, classification divisions, and so forth, or the promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation," is so broad as to authorize agreements, combinations, conspiracies, and concerted action comprehending every phase and activity of the transportation field. It could hardly be broader. The shipper will have no recourse in law.

Now, the antitrust laws apply to "protect independence of action by individual carriers, and to preserve the area of competition within the zone of reasonableness."

Enact into law either of these bills and that public protection is gone.

As the law is, the several carriers are in competition for business; they may, within the zone of reasonableness, acquire business by the adjustment of rates and fares so as to retain the desired traffic for their own lines; but under this proposed law, these charges are fixed by combined agreements, and no one of them would dare breach such agreement, or even refuse to enter into it.

The power to fix rates, and so forth, is not vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission now, but it is in the power of this Commission to say whether rates and fares of carriers are within the zone of reasonableness.

Our antitrust laws say they shall not be fixed by concerted action, in restraint of trade or commerce.

The power to fix each rate is too vast and complicated to be exercised in detail by a responsible agency or regulatory body. The several carriers, individually, may prepare their schedule of rates, charges, and fares, and submit these to the Commission for approval or modification.

But to grant the carriers the power to get together some dark night and agree on fares, rates, charges, and everything pertaining to transportation, including all forms of transportation, is bestowing on them the control of the entire economy of this Nation, affecting every man, woman, and child in it, and those unborn.

To say this vast, complicated machinery is subject to the approval of the Commission is mockery and without force or assurance.

Not even 10 Solomons in all their wisdom could do such a job.

The Commission can operate in single cases, and within the zone of reasonableness to each; if fortified by our antitrust laws against combinations in restraint of trade.

Please do not allow this legislation. It is bad. It menaces, not only areas and sections, but the entire Nation.

Separate Peace Treaty With Germany and Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a digest of a debate on the subject Should the United States Make Separate Peace Treaties With Germany and Japan? which was broadcast on CBS People's Platform on June 1, and in which I participated.

There being no objection, the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE UNITED STATES MAKE SEPARATE PEACE TREATIES WITH GERMANY AND JAPAN?

(Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS (Democrat), of Utah, a ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and James Burnham, professor of philosophy, New York University, debated on a CBS People's Platform, June 1.)

Senator THOMAS. The United States is legally bound not to make a separate peace

with Japan or Germany. On January 1, 1942, the United States joined with the other principal allied and associated powers in the United Nations declaration, by the provisions of which each government pledged itself to cooperate with the governments signatory thereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemy. Certainly, this obligation cannot lightly be brushed aside, and it would seem to me that it would be difficult to justify a separate peace, unless we had exhausted every effort to negotiate satisfactory terms with Russia and other Allied and associated powers. We made a separate peace with Germany after the last war, but only after Germany had made peace with all the other countries that fought her and only after Germany had a government that could negotiate such a peace.

Mr. BURNHAM. But don't you think that before going too exhaustively into the legal side of it, we ought also to look at the facts? First of all, we're in the ridiculous position of paying heavy reparations to the nations that we have defeated; second, we are keeping Japan and Germany in a situation where they are plague spots, infecting the entire world. Japan and Germany, in a healthy condition, are essential to the health of the world, and it should be our aim to make them so; and third, we are allowing the Soviet Union to carry on its policy of sabotaging all of the world which it does not control. If we don't take the leadership and responsibility for stopping that, far from bringing about a situation that will be in accord with the United Nations declarations, we'll let the world go to pieces. I've always understood it to be a legal principle that when one party to a contract violates its provisions, not in some minor way, but in the major way in which the Soviet Union has broken all of its contract and treaty provisions during these past several years, then that contract becomes null and void.

Senator THOMAS. The trouble with that is that there are more than just the United States and Russia parties to a contract. Assume that we made a separate treaty with Germany or with Japan, what about the condition of the rest of the world? The rest of the world hasn't made peace with either country. Therefore it becomes necessary for us to sustain what agreement we've made with Germany and Japan, and that puts us more than ever against the whole world in sustaining two new governments.

Mr. BURNHAM. But the question is not our going alone, but our willingness to take the leadership. Now, take Japan, for example. I'm convinced that if once we gave the word, the British Dominions, France, and China, who are the main other parties concerned, would be only too glad to go ahead with us.

Senator THOMAS. Yes, that may be true, but see what happens to your world organization, the United Nations. You're back again into a bloc system. You're back exactly where we were after we organized the League of Nations and the United States refused to go along.

To judge from the standpoint of history and the speed with which we move on now the United Nations is not doing very badly; Japan is not doing very badly, when you realize that she was a completely crushed nation in a war which she herself brought on herself, and Germany herself is not doing badly. It seems to me that if you read the charges against the German war criminals and find that practically every charge ends up with the breaking of a covenant, the breaking of a treaty, and that Russia, the United States and other nations were represented on the court that tried those men, the worst moral stab we could give to the whole world would be to forget our pledged word.

Mr. BURNHAM. But the problem is not the question of breaking a treaty. The Soviet Union has already broken every treaty of importance in which she is engaged, including the Potsdam Conference agreement, which is supposed to cover the German question. Now, Germany at the present moment is living at the lowest economic level conceivable, lower than even after the last war. I'm basing myself here in part on the figure which the Hoover committee has presented in its formal reports to the President. Furthermore, it isn't a question of whether we like the Germans or whether we think they deserve to starve or not. The problem is that they now have become a plague spot that infects the rest of the world.

Senator THOMAS. By making a separate peace, you merely bring conflict into the picture.

Mr. BURNHAM. The conflict already exists. The Soviet Union already goes ahead with its own policy in eastern Germany; it's integrating it into its own territory. It's enlisting the Nazis into the Communist Party. It's using the German factories to build up Soviet war potential. Instead of that, it seems to me, we've got to begin with what we have. We've got to get together with England and with France, integrate the remaining zones of Germany; permit the Germans to work for the well-being of Europe.

Senator THOMAS. Accept your own thesis—make a separate peace with Germany. Are we going to make a peace with Russia's Germany separately?

Mr. BURNHAM. We will have to begin with what we have.

Senator THOMAS. In other words, we've got to drive Russia out of Germany. Is that your proposition? That isn't making a separate peace; that's starting another war.

Mr. BURNHAM. But you cannot be in favor of the present policy we are following in Germany. That policy is independent of Russia. It isn't a question of being against Russia; it's a question of whether we allow Russia to be a millstone around our neck.

Senator THOMAS. If one believes in the concept of one world, he cannot fail to agree that the making of a peace is decidedly a joint enterprise. If we were to conclude a separate peace now, it would be an admission of failure, a recognition that all hope for peace through collective security and cooperative action has been lost. While we may reach that point eventually, surely we do not want to admit failure until we have exhausted every effort.

Mr. BURNHAM. But no one is proposing—Mr. Hoover hasn't proposed and certainly I would never propose—to make peace next week or the week after next with Germany. The problem is the direction that we are to take—whether we are to take an independent direction, together with our friends in the democracies, in the British Dominions, France, and England; whether we are to go ahead without waiting to find out whether Russia is going to sabotage further, as she sabotaged consistently for the past 2 years; whether we are going to try to build up Germany in a way that would guarantee that it could never again be a military menace, but at the same time can integrate itself into the well-being of the rest of the world? In my own opinion, this policy should be adopted in such a way as to look forward to a United States of Europe, a Europe united both economically and politically.

Senator THOMAS. Now you're getting right around to my own camping ground. I have a resolution with Senator FULBRIGHT before the Senate of the United States calling for the creation of a United States of Europe. I've been standing for that ever since the days of Briand.

Mr. BURNHAM. I certainly agree with you a hundred percent on that resolution and I hope it's going to come to discussion.

Senator THOMAS. We can go ahead with that, but not if we break promises, because you cannot build up any respect for a United States of Europe if, for instance, we forget our pledged word in every other part of the world.

Mr. BURNHAM. Well, it seems to me that, not only with reference to the United States of Europe, but with reference to the goal of a world government, you and I are completely in accord. Our debate really is on how to get there. How long are we going to wait for the Soviet Union to build up its own Fortress Eurasia as a bastion from which it plans to attack the rest of the world? How long for it to sabotage all the world outside of the iron curtain—to prevent recovery in Germany, to use its Communist Party, perhaps before the end of the year, to try a coup to take power in France, to use it to prevent anything getting done in Italy, to use it throughout South America to carry on anti-United States propaganda there, to refuse to come to any agreement in any conference since the war, unless that agreement is entirely on its terms? Are we going to wait till the November conference of this year and then a conference a year from that November and 2 years from that November—meanwhile, the world steadily going downward, perhaps into a catastrophic economic depression and perhaps into the opening stage of a new war?

Senator THOMAS. Russia has got to reform herself, unless she is completely immobilized or completely destroyed by war. Now, it seems to me that the best thing is to take the study of Russian history and see how much progress she's really made and then see how we're coming along. I surely don't want to stand in favor of the single-will state anywhere in the world; I do not like communism, but I do like to deal fairly with people, and I think if the United States remains in its great moral sphere and leads the world, she will gather support from all sides to such a place that you'll find Russia coming along in due time. That is slow, but that's the only way in which the world has ever been changed, and it's the only way in which the world can ever be changed in a lasting way. Let's put our faith in morals first—and Russia will come along, you'll see.

Mr. BURNHAM. But you can't divorce faith and morals from facts.

Senator THOMAS. Let's try in some constructive way to build up the economy of the world and the political sensibilities of the world. Let's not suggest, the minute discouragement comes in, to turn our backs on all the promises we made.

Mr. BURNHAM. How are you going to rebuild the economy of Europe without getting the German economy to work—not to work just to raise the level of the German people to a luxurious standard, but to work for Europe as a whole and thereby for the world as a whole? In considering a separate treaty with Japan, I think the situation is far more developed in Asia than in Europe. In the case of Japan, you now have a functioning government. You now have a reasonable development along the lines that we had planned from the beginning, in introducing a number of democratic reforms and achieving some stability, in beginning to get the Japanese people back to work. You do not have any underground in Japan. So far, the problem of the Communist Party there has been handled admirably by MacArthur. At the same time, the Japanese food supply is insufficient to feed its people. Moreover, the industry is operating at only a small percentage of its potential capacity. The export industry of Japan is working only at about 3 percent of the prewar level. For the sake of Asia, for the sake of the American taxpayer, to eliminate the drain of more than a half a billion dollars, it seems to me we have to make up our minds and let the Japanese people know what they can expect; again, preserving military guaranties, making sure that we retain a position in which we will be able to guide Japan from now on, we ought to let them know, so that they could

get back to work, so that they could reestablish their export industry, so that they could aid in building up China and the entire Pacific area.

Senator THOMAS. Now you're talking along the right direction. A separate peace with Japan, though, would certainly not give Japan the things she needs in the way of a permanent peace settlement. It would not end the state of war between Japan and the countries other than the United States. It would not make Japan's entry into the United Nations possible. It would not result in any effective boundary settlements, nor would it result in a satisfactory solution of the reparations problem or the demilitarization of Japan.

Mr. BURNHAM. But there are already indications that China, France, England, and the British Dominions are quite prepared to go along with a Japanese settlement.

Senator THOMAS. That's fine—and we want to do it under United States auspices. But the United States and Japan cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, make a peace that will mean very much to anybody except the United States and Japan.

Mr. BURNHAM. Why not, if France, England, Australia, and the other Dominions come in with it?

Senator THOMAS. Are you going to ask France, England, Australia, and the other Dominion countries to break their word in the United Nations Covenant? Don't you want to build up respect for it?

Mr. BURNHAM. Precisely. And the only way to build up respect for it is to show people that we can really build up a democratic world order, where people can be free, free politically, free to do the world's work and to build up the world's economy. No one has proposed that the United States in and by itself tomorrow sign a peace or impose a peace on Japan and Germany. What is proposed here, what I understand to be proposed, is that the democratic nations of the world, the United States and its friends, under the leadership of the United States, with the United States accepting responsibility for that leadership, as it must, because of its power, go ahead and make the world start to function again—that they stop the sabotage of the world by the Soviet Union's unilateral policy, that they stop the absurd economic policy that prevents the recovery of Europe, not only in Germany, but in France, in Italy, in England, and everywhere else that is going to drag us into another depression within a year or two, if the world doesn't get back to something like normalcy.

Senator THOMAS. That is not the proposition that was laid down at all. The question was: Shall we make a separate peace with Japan and Germany? And I can only discuss that question. I'd like a world quite different from the one in which it is.

Mr. BURNHAM. How are you going to get it then? So far, you've made no concrete proposals whatsoever, except living up to an outworn and violated treaty, in 1942. It seems to me it would take more than that to make the world work. You have to get the industries going; you have to get countries removed from this terrible pall of fear that is over them now; you have to be willing to take the responsibility of the power that we have; you have to reestablish export and import trade throughout the world.

Senator THOMAS. I'm willing to do all those things. I'm willing to go ahead, under American leadership, and carry on with every nation in the world that is willing to carry on, build them up under a system of dollar democracy, if you want to use that term. I'm perfectly happy to try the Truman experiment in Greece and I'm perfectly happy to make loans to Italy, but I will not under any circumstances agree to any kind of a scheme which will cause the United States to break its pledged word to the world.

Mr. BURNHAM. It seems to me that this empty ideal of a pledged word, which has already been upset by the events of history, which has been negated by the actions of the major other party to the contract, is now merely a millstone around our neck, which, if we do not shake it off and get rid of it and adopt an independent course, is going to drag us and the world along with us, down to the bottom. It's time for the United States to see what its responsibility is, to be ready to act. That is what the people of the world are waiting for—not only the people outside of the iron curtain, but the people already inside it. And once they are convinced that the United States is ready to move under its own steam, to take that leadership openly, we will find that the democratic peoples of the entire world and the peoples now oppressed within the nondemocratic parts of the world, will come along with us and build a genuine democratic world order.

False Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., on July 16, 1947. This editorial well describes the folly of false economy.

OUTRAGEOUS FALSE ECONOMY

Congress should take heed of facts herein set forth. They relate to what is termed governmental economy, but which makes the United States Government a party to tax evasion and the perpetrator of an outrage.

In the Springfield-Peoria, or eighth United States revenue collection district, 62 thoroughly trained, efficient field deputies have been dropped from the employment rolls.

Because of inadequate appropriations these essential employees have been removed from office to save their relatively small salaries.

This same form of economy is being carried out not only here but in other districts. It is vitally important, therefore, that Congress heed this exhortation to examine the facts.

In this district alone, the 62 employees dismissed from their position have a record of delinquent-tax collections during the last year of $2,306,170

Those are astounding figures, and they are official.

In other words, that production of delinquent taxes by those small-salaried men who collected an average of approximately $40,000 in delinquent taxes last year per man, has suddenly been suspended.

Some men on the list of discharged employees accounted for collection of delinquent taxes in the sums far in excess of $100,000 each per annum.

Not only that, but the field organization in this collection district is disrupted and the Treasury Department's policy of equalized taxation is temporarily abrogated.

Under this peremptory order of false economy not only is tax evasion encouraged, but the burden of taxation which tax evaders should be compelled to share, is placed entirely upon the shoulders of honest taxpayers.

Furthermore, those underpaid and overworked, thoroughly efficient, conscientious employees have devoted liberally of their time giving assistance to taxpayers in preparation of returns. Curtailment of the force involves proportionate curtailment not only of delinquent-tax collections, but of courteous and capable assistance to taxpayers.

The State Register makes these revelations after careful inquiry. Facts and figures here given are respectfully but forcefully called to the attention of Members of both Houses of Congress and more particularly to the Senators and Congressmen from Illinois.

The outrageous false economy should end and end now.

France's Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by William Philip Simms which appeared in the Washington Daily News of July 23, 1947:

FRANCE'S FEAR

(By William Philip Simms)

PARIS, July 23.—According to high French officials, France neither will wreck the European recovery plan over the Ruhr issue nor unduly retard its operation. But, they say, she will not buy temporary assistance—desperately needed though that may be—at the price of her national security.

France, as the cornerstone of continental democracy, must be fitted into the jigsaw puzzle of European recovery if recovery there is to be.

Her position is this: Three times within living memory France has been invaded by Germany. She does not intend it shall happen again if she can help it. And the best way she can think of to prevent it is to destroy Germany's war potential at the source—in the Ruhr.

France has no objection to increased coal production in the Ruhr. On the contrary, she would like a lot more Ruhr coal for herself. She does object to German use of that coal to make Germany again Europe's principal steel producer. Given Ruhr coal, peace-loving France, Belgium, and Luxemburg could be the continental steel center instead of warlike Germany. If Germany is allowed to rebuild her heavy industry, chemicals, etc., France feels it is only a question of time before history repeats. Every French man, woman, and child shivers at the thought.

It is all right for the great powers to talk glibly of the United Nations, of British and American friendship for France, of democratic solidarity against aggression, etc. France had the Triple Entente with Britain and Russia, but that didn't save her in 1914. She was a charter member of the League of Nations, but Germany ravaged her just the same in 1940.

France sets great store by her friends. She has great hopes for the UN. But she says now is the time for her to insist on certain safeguards with regard to Germany. And, in her opinion, the best way to begin is to see that this time Germany is not allowed to dominate Europe through a combination of steel, coal, chemicals, and other war materials.

Once this is understood in Washington and London, I am informed, there should be no further serious obstacles in the way to an understanding about Germany insofar as France is concerned.

Some here feel that since France's collapse in 1940 certain international circles are too

inclined to ignore her claims to a place among the great powers; too ready to become impatient with her stubborness, too prompt to shrug off her demands for security. But, they add, it ought to be clear by this time to those who are trying to save Europe that without France they will never succeed. In any European council, therefore, her voice should get the same attention and her views carry the same weight as those of any present.

Nut-Marketing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 8, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I have several times before called the attention of the House to the plight of the filbert growers in the Pacific Northwest. May I again emphasize the dangerous situation confronting this valuable segment of American agriculture. The following editorial written by Phillip Bladine, who is extremely well informed on this subject, should be of interest to every Member of the House. Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial from the McMinville (Oreg.) Telephone Register of July 17, 1947, in the RECORD:

NUTS!

Whatever other people may think of the situation, the nut-marketing problem in the United States is just plain "nuts" to growers in Yamhill County.

Cause of complaints is the forecasted importation of around 30,000,000 pounds of filberts from the Mediterranean area into this country this year. From September 1946 to May 1947 total shipments reported were 24,682,433 pounds of filberts, representing in the neighborhood of $3,600,000 loss to domestic growers. The loss will be greater this coming season.

Importation of filberts is figured as a direct loss by local growers in this way: Prices paid for filberts early last season were as high as 28½ cents a pound. After Mediterranean nuts moved onto the market, local growers were forced to cut prices to as low as 17½ cents a pound in order to move approximately one-third of last year's crop. Had this cut in price not been made, it is believed that growers would still have over 30 percent of the 1946 crop on hand.

Indications now point toward a bumper crop of filberts this year; consequently, the marketing situation will be more acute, come fall, than it was last year unless something constructive is done. However, even growers apparently cannot suggest any remedy so long as the present administration "continues to carry out the policy formulated by Cordell Hull and fostered by the Roosevelt administration to encourage foreign importations of goods even at the expense of domestic production."

Unfortunately nut growers are not in the same picture at all with producers of some of the other foods. Europe as a whole will be needing large quantities of American-grown foods, insuring a substantially high price for those foods for months to come. Just why filberts from the Mediterranean area could not be routed in larger numbers to feed hungry European mouths is a complicated problem—perhaps more political than gastronomic. Persons cannot be expected to live wholly on nuts; nor can impoverished nations be expected to pay cold cash on the line as can Americans.

Basically, there is only one real solution to the problem; and that is protection of the domestic market by establishing tariff barriers. So long as the administration will not entertain thoughts of erecting those barriers, "there is," as John E. Trunk, manager of the Northwest Nut Growers Association states, "nothing we can do about it until we have a change in administration; and this won't be for another year and one-half." Trunk has some sound advice to give to growers. He says "hold on if possible. Keep up the orchards by cultivation and pest control, or grub them out and go back to prunes. An unkept orchard soon means no orchard at all."

This problem is vital with filbert growers, but close to every Oregonian. This State produces nearly 21,000,000 pounds of nuts annually. That figure represents a sizable revenue and, especially in Yamhill county, a large portion of the agriculture income of the region.

Industrial Nationalization: America's Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I am inserting a most timely address delivered by W. G. Vollmer, president, Texas & Pacific Railroad Co., before the American Farm Bureau, Southern Regional Training Schools, San Antonio, Tex., on July 14.

I wish it were possible to place a copy of this informative address in the hands of every American as it presents a phase of our national development that is too often overlooked by the Congress in legislating on our transportation problems.

The address follows:

INDUSTRIAL NATIONALIZATION: AMERICA'S THREAT—IS INDUSTRY'S UNINVITED GUEST, PUBLIC OWNERSHIP, MOVING IN ON OUR NATION, THE WORLD'S LAST MAJOR PORT OF INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM?

For more than 100 years, a working partnership has existed between the railroads and the farmers of the Nation.

This partnership, of course, is unofficial. Nevertheless, it is utterly real. The farmers and the railroads were the ones who slowly rolled back the sparsely inhabited and hostile Western frontier. That was a task which required determination, stamina and courage.

Therefore both industries—farming and railroading—are fundamental and basic. And there always has existed between the farm and the railroad a dependency of one upon the other throughout this historic partnership period. Both have suffered adversity and enjoyed prosperity side by side. Indeed they represent a firm cornerstone of our national economy.

Because of this long and close relationship, I believe you will be interested in examining with me a situation mutually grave to the future existence of railroading and agriculture. It now not only confronts your old partner, the railroads, but subsequently may confront you and every basic industry in the United States—coal, power, steel, communications. It is the threat of public ownership.

I consider this a definite long-range probability, not an immediate one. And in the instance of the railroads, one of public ownership's chief encouragements is that under present restrictions they are experiencing great difficulty in making both ends meet. To do it, they must be permitted to earn a rate of return that will attract private capital in volume.

To offer a plain illustration—if you as a private citizen have money to invest you probably are not going to invest it in the railroads whose current earnings on invested capital is slightly less than 3 percent. To attract your money in volume, the railroads must rise at least to the 6-percent-earning-power level on capital investment which industry in general offers.

When a basic industry such as the railroads reaches a point where its earning power is so low that it ceases to attract such venture capital, then the Government, of necessity, must step in and run things on the taxpayers' money. The Government would have to step in because the economy of the Nation would collapse without the mass transportation which only the railroads provide.

So the Nation is going to have to have the railroads, whether it be under the competitive system of private ownership or the noncompetitive system of Government monopoly. It's the country's choice to make. And even though the actual nationalization of railroads is in the distance, symptoms like their subpar earning capacity are already here and must be fought. It is true that major economic change comes slowly, sometimes imperceptibly, and thus does not attract public attention until a crisis is reached. But then it is usually too late for corrective action. The damage has been done. And therein lies the danger of this, the gradual drift toward public ownership of basic industries.

Such a trend is one of today's uninvited isms moving in on our Nation, the world's last major port of industrial freedom.

Here is an example of what I mean by industrial socialism moving in on us:

At a meeting in Chicago a few weeks ago, directors of the Progressive Citizens of America with great solemnity and zeal demanded the immediate nationalization of the coal mines, railroads, and electric power in the United States.

You cannot sell an organization like this short. It has some prominent citizens of this country enrolled as members—and they mean business.

So let me repeat, America is the last great fortress to stand between world socialism and the free-enterprise system. Russia, France, and Mexico, to mention a few of the leading powers, already have succumbed. Great Britain is on the way, with government ownership and operation of transportation effective January 1, 1948.

We in the United States now stand virtually alone on the battle line. The question which we must consider, and ultimately reach a decision upon, is what are we going to do about it? Are we going to be maneuvered into accepting nationalization of basic industries, beginning with the railroads? Or are we going to reject it as a false economic concept and begin to strengthen our competitive system?

That question is neither presented nor designed to arouse fear. Instead, it is meant to direct attention to this subtle and insidious movement and kindle a desire to fight it.

Certainly the followers of agriculture are well qualified to join in the fight against the nationalization of basic industry. The farmers of the Nation are grounded in the rudiments of resourcefulness, ingenuity and courage. And this representative farm group,

in particular, knows what it means to use those attributes in cooperative effort to fight a common enemy.

Wasn't it the boll weevil as a common enemy to the southern cotton farmer which lent impetus to the formation of this Farm Bureau Federation 20 years ago?

We need that sort of combined offensive to defeat the onrush of industrial socialism. It is eagerly waiting outside to put its foot in the door. After first seizing the railroads, an expansion of the movement to take over other basic industries will be a comparatively simple matter.

I therefore appear before you today to solicit earnestly the consideration and support of this regional convention of such measures as are deemed necessary to place the railroads of the Nation on a sound and solvent basis.

The idea is to stop the public ownership boosters cold. And I hope you will want to enlist the help of your 1,000,000 fellow members in the Federation.

Let's take a look at the facts and see what has happened to the railroads of the world. With a few minor exceptions here and there, the 137 class 1 railroads in the United States and one in canada, the Canadian Pacific, are the only privately owned and operated class one railroads in the world. All the rest are run as a government monopoly with public tax money footing the bill, usually a deficit bill.

This condition today compares with 35 years ago when 67 percent of the world's railway mileage was owned by private companies. You can thus see that the trend toward public ownership and operation is obvious and definite.

It is worth while to take a short excursion into some of the places where the public operation of railroad exists. That way you can see for yourselves just how it is working.

In the country south of us, there are approximately 8.000 miles of railroads government operated. To run them requires 56,000 employees—a ratio six times greater, for instance, than the 9,500 persons needed to operate by private management the Texas & Pacific.

O. M. Stevens, an American transportation consultant, made this comment upon seeing those lines in operation: "No man short of death ever left the railroad pay roll once he climbed aboard."

Better than anything else this example illustrates the political plaything railroads become whenever government operated. And you can imagine what kind of service you, as a shipper, would get if that ever happens in our country.

To go on with this actual example of the government-operated railway system:

At the start of the Second World War, 75 percent of the locomotives were over 25 years old.

One third of the 30,000,000 crossties were defective.

Rails generally were the lightweight, 80-pound variety.

To alleviate this condition, an American study commission recommended the expenditure of millions of dollars to rehabilitate the system. However, the hitch is that the taxpayers will have to meet the bill, as is always the case with publicly owned and operated properties.

Now suppose we take a look at the 55,000 miles of nationalized railroads in Soviet Russia. As I sketch a few of the high lights of the Government enterprise, compare it with the services provided by the railroads of the United States.

To operate this 55,000 miles of Russian layout, approximately 1,500,000 employees are required, which compares with an estimated 1,350,000 employees needed to operate the 237,000 miles of railroads in the United States. Their equipment compares with the old wooden cars which were discarded by the American railroads over a quarter-century ago. A trip on a Russian train is an ordeal, not a pleasure.

And on Soviet railroads, passengers are frowned upon for traveling a distance comparable, for example, to that from San Antonio to El Paso. To make sure no one travels too far, passenger fares are set higher for longer distances than for short ones.

Another interesting practice on the Russian railroads is their peculiar method of bolstering the morale of the employee. A shock corps constantly tours the system to encourage efficiency and loyalty by use of the persuasive strong-arm method.

Although the British Government does not take over the railroads, barges, trucks, busses, and other modes of transportation until next January it is interesting to see how the shipping and traveling public is going to be affected.

Under the British transport bill, the right of the shipper to select the kind of transportation best suited to his needs is drastically curtailed, if not wiped out entirely. A wholesaler, for example, cannot operate his own truck in competition with the State-operated trucks. He will be forbidden to drive his trucks more than 40 miles from its base of operation. A San Antonio dealer would be unable to make a delivery to a customer beyond the radius of 40 miles. Nor would you gentlemen who operate farms be permitted to deliver your products in markets located more than 40 miles from your base of operation.

That gives you a general idea of what real nationalization of transportation means and how it circumscribes and shackles the freedom of action of the shipping public. It is an experience which a majority of Americans do not care to share with their British cousins.

Some of you may recall that we in this country had a painful example of Government operation of our railroads during the First World War. It was not only painful, it was expensive.

Despite the fact that the Government increased freight rates 25 percent and hiked passenger fares 50 percent back in 1918, the railroads lost money under Government operation. To be specific, the experiment cost the American taxpayers $2,000,000 a day in 1918–19, even with the rate increases.

In World War II the railroads were privately operated at no loss whatever to the taxpayer. In fact the railroads during those 4 years 1942–45 paid an average of nearly $4,000,000 daily in taxes to the Federal Government.

From our own sad experience in governmental operation of the railroads and from what we can learn about the public operation of railroads in other countries, I am confident that a majority of Americans are opposed to the nationalization of our transportation system.

But more than passive resistance is needed to repel public ownership in this country. This is one instance where the easy-going American will have little opportunity to undo a wrong by simply passing a new law in Congress. This industrial socialism is no ordinary enemy to be treated in an ordinary way. It requires planned, effective antidotes applied in liberal doses by interested organizations such as yours and the railroad industry.

One of those effective antidotes is a strong railroad public relations program.

Proof of its importance to industries battling public ownership comes from a British railway official. He was asked during a visit to the United States what, in his opinion the British railways should have done but did not do to prevent legislation for government ownership. His reply was that the greatest mistake had been in not carrying on an adequate campaign of public relations.

I am a strong follower of those who believe that to defeat a problem is to learn it.

In that vein, let us look at several of the major factors, progressively, confronting the railroads today and which tend to provoke public ownership.

1. Since 1939 the average increase in wages and prices of materials have risen 61 percent, while the average increase for hauling a ton of freight has risen but 15 percent.

2. The Federal, State, and local governments, through the expenditure of taxpayers' money, provide airports, highways, and improved inland waterways. This is done without making an adequate use charge, although these modes of transport are engaged in business for a profit. Preferential treatment gives these transport agencies a definite advantage over the railroads.

A third condition leading to public ownership of railroads is a rate structure that is inadequate. It does not provide the revenue required to meet the increased cost of operations and at the same time provide a reasonable return to the private investor who has loaned the capital.

Exactly what is that return? For the past 25 years, including the boom decade of the 1920's and the tremendous traffic years of the war, the average return has been only 3⅔ percent. In 1946 when the railroads handled the heaviest traffic in peacetime history, they earned only 2¾ percent on their investment. And for this year the outlook is for a rate of return around 3 percent.

This dismal earning record is not due to excessive capitalization, or debt, or fixed charges, or salaries to officers, or to the payment of improved dividends. All those have been reduced or have stayed practically the same over the past few years. For example, the railroads have retired financial debts in the shape of bonds held publicly in the amount of $1,000,000,000, largely during 1944–46. They have reduced their over-all debt by $2,000,000,000. And the railroads have slashed interest charges on their debt by more than $150,000,000.

The simple truth is that in all those years, the railroads gradually have been hemmed in by restrictive legislation, vastly increased operating costs, and subsidized competition which lumped together have created low earnings and have cast the railroads in the role of a poor relation.

It's time steps were taken to reverse the trend. Won't you join us in doing that? Now, to sum up the situation which is the essence of the railroad problem—and no less the farmers' problem:

1. Adequate and low-cost railroad service is an essential element in carrying on the business of agriculture as it is known and conducted in the United States.

2. Adequate and efficient railroad service for the future depends upon continued investment in improved railroad plant and equipment.

3. Continued investment in improved railroad plant and equipment depends to a large extent upon the prospect for investors earning a fair and adequate return upon the money invested—something they now are not even approaching.

In the final analysis, whether the railroads are permitted to earn the 6 percent commonly accepted as standard in other industries is a question to be determined by the public authorities who regulate transportation and by the people which the railroads serve.

If anything, by rights the railroads should be permitted to earn more than the standard 6 percent, purely in light of the costly nature of operating an industry whose plant is not stationary. Fortune magazine brings this factor down to earth when it shows that $4 worth of railroad plant is needed to produce $1 worth of revenue. It takes $22,000,000 in plant facilities to produce $800,000,000 in airplane equipment, whereas it requires $1,000,-

000,000 in railroad plant to get $360,000,000 worth of transportation.

Well, these preceding remarks give you an idea of the mountains to scale in halting the trend of industrial socialism to the United States. And in any event you gentlemen and your fellow members of the federation are influential components of the American public. What you have to say upon the question will have an important bearing. Because that is so, I commend to you several suggestions for your earnest consideration:

1. Go on record by resolution, or some other suitable instrument, opposing any organization or legislation which encourages public ownership and operation of industry in the United States.

2. By a program of speeches and written material, acquaint the membership of your organization and farmers in general with the evils inherent in the nationalization of any basic industry. This should get special attention through vocational agriculture classes where nationalization of farming could be shown in actual practice as an example.

3. If you believe that an adequate return is needed to attract private capital to the railroads, then support the application of railroads for increased rates.

4. If you believe that a sound and solvent railroad system, privately owned and operated, is essential to our national well-being, talk to your friends about it, and enlist their support in behalf of the railroads' applications for increases in freight rates.

What happened during the war and what has happened since clearly show that this country must have adequate rail transportation. Adequate rail transportation costs money, but inadequate transport costs far more. The way to better transportation, and cheaper in the long run, is through giving the railroads a chance to make adequate earnings now. Such earnings should not be less, as an average for railroads as a whole and over the years, than the 6 percent which 9 out of 10 persons think is no more than a fair profit for any business.

The only way to have adequate rail transportation is through continued investment in improved rail facilities. The only way to insure this needed investment in the future is to allow railroads to earn not less than 6 percent on what is already invested in their properties. Six percent is approximately double the rate which railroads are expected to earn in 1947.

In conclusion, let me emphasize that the railroads seek no special or preferred treatment. All we seek is equal treatment and the opportunity to survive as a privately owned and managed industry.

Tobacco and Section 32 Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the section 32 funds are obtained by setting aside 30 percent of the custom receipts to be used according to law to dispose of agricultural surpluses. However, this has developed in a blank-check assignment to the Secretary of Agriculture to be used for various and sundry purposes.

The custom receipts have been from three hundred and fifty-seven millions to four hundred and thirty-seven millions each year from 1935 to 1945; 30 percent of these custom receipts provide the section 32 funds. These are rather large sums to be giving anyone to allocate who is not elected by the people, and I say this without feeling toward the present Secretary of Agriculture, who did not hold this office at the time of the enactment of the legislation.

Here is an official report on the use of these section 32 funds for tobacco:

TABLE IV.—*U. S. Department of Agriculture Production and Marketing Administration*

SECTION 32—TOBACCO PROGRAMS

Year	Diversion to byproducts and new uses				Exportation	
	Fertilizer experiment		Nicotine insecticide			
	Hundredweight	Value	Hundredweight	Value	Hundredweight	Value
1936			150,647	$1,090,213		
1937			179,645	1,716,756	3,469	$3,881
1938	35,000	$487,616	111,301	1,068,222		
1939	93,996	260,092	42,178	140,805		
1942			90,173	367,361		
1943			233,435	2,092,965		
1944			248,888	2,708,475		
Total	128,996	747,708	1,056,267	9,184,797	3,469	3,881

The fertilizer experiment program was designed primarily to relieve the market of surplus low-grade dark tobacco. Fertilizer produced under this program was distributed largely to institutions.

The nicotine insecticide program was originally an attempt to remove burdensome surpluses of certain types of low-grade dark tobaccos, and to assure production of needed quantities of nicotine sulfate for use in insecticides. Later, the war cut off imported materials such as derris root, and limited the availability of critical domestic materials—copper and arsenic—formerly used in the manufacture of insecticides. Nicotine sulfate, a tobacco byproduct, was used as a substitute in part for these scarce materials.

We have all heard our tobacco friends state on the floor that tobacco had not cost the United States Treasury a dollar. Maybe not directly, but the above is a way it was done. You will note that these funds were used, first, to subsidize tobacco fertilizer made I presume from the lower quality tobacco. Grind it up and subsidize the sale as fertilizer. Let United States taxpayers pay for it; second, the subsidy of using tobacco for insecticide; third, the use of the section 32 funds to subsidize the exports of tobacco.

Incidentally our tobacco friends have had erected for their avowed protection a bill to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed. This was the worst trade barrier ever erected by any administration in the history of our country.

The 30 percent of the custom receipts on wool were over $45,000,000 in 1946. Will it not be wonderful to use these funds by inviting more and more imports of livestock and livestock products and furnish more blank checks to the Secretary of Agriculture to subsidize soil depleting crops like tobacco and cotton? It will be of interest to note what use of the section 32 funds will be made in 1947. There are too many political and sectional pressures, and the Secretary should not be subjected to them. Anyway, now you have the official information as to where over $9,000,000 has gone, and the next time you see the tears in the eyes of the pleaders, you will at least have official evidence as to exactly where some of these section 32 funds have been distributed. I expect to add on a few of the other "special privilege" groups that have been enjoying special consideration by the use of these section 32 funds.

Of course this crop provides large amounts of funds for the Federal Treasury, through the many domestic taxes. However, do you think it is a desirable public policy to secure funds by importing one group of agricultural products and submit to sectionism, and crop preferences in its distribution of section 32 funds?

Imperialism Dies Hard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN,
United States Representative
to the United Nations,
Lake Success, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. AUSTIN: Dutch imperialism is on a rampage against Indonesia. Native Indonesian troops are being used to spray with machine guns their fellow Indonesians. For three and a half centuries the Dutch have ruled the Netherlands Indies, and the pickings were always good. There were precious metals, petroleum, sisal, and the patroons of the House of Orange were the main beneficiaries.

The war changed all this and the Indonesians demanded their independence. They wanted a share of their own productivity, resources, and labor.

It is contended by the Dutch Colonial Government that the Republic of Indonesia had not lived up to the agreement signed on March 27. Actually, the attack by the Dutch was begun while negotiations on different provisions of the agreement were still going on. There seems to be little doubt in well-informed quarters that the Dutch took an arbitrary, high-handed attitude and most certainly made no attempt to exhaust the machinery of arbitration provided for in the very agreement it is alleged the Republic of Indonesia breached.

In this day and age the tactics employed by the Dutch are amazing and shocking.

This situation is a threat to the peace and security of the world, and it is thus imperative that it be considered by the United Nations with proper dispatch to prevent the conflagration from spreading and to prevent further bloodshed.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Europe's Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tacoma (Wash.) Times of July 17, 1947:

DECISION ON THE DP'S

President Truman once again has appealed to Congress for legislation which would permit some of Europe's displaced persons to come to this country. There are, according to Mr. Truman, nearly a million homeless people existing in European camps. They survived the persecutions of one type of totalitarianism, and now refuse to go home and live under another type.

There are many Members of Congress who share these displaced persons' dislike of communism. Yet, oddly enough, much of the opposition to the DP's admittance is found among the strongest congressional anti-Communists.

The argument is that the United States today is overcrowded and underemployed. European refugees, it is said, would take the homes and jobs that rightly belong to veterans. It is also said that there might be subversive elements among them—though it is hard to understand why European opponents of nazism and communism should be feared in this country.

Let us look at these arguments again. There are a million European DP's or about 2.5 percent of our population. But this country is not asked to take all of them. The bill most likely to be considered calls for admitting 100,000 a year for 4 years. A hundred thousand persons are about seven-hundredths of one percent of our population. Can anyone seriously think that such an increase would work a hardship upon the American people?

If Congress should decide to allow their admittance, the displaced persons would have to pass the regular immigration examinations, as Mr. Truman pointed out. They would be screened to eliminate those who had criminal records, those who were likely to become public charges, and other undesirables, including—let the fearful legislators take heart—those with records of subversive activities or sympathies.

Many of these Europeans who want to come here have relatives or friends in America. All have fellow countrymen. They are people, as the President said, with a wide variety of professions, crafts, and skills. On the basis of our past history, they would be more likely to enhance than to injure our national life.

Congress' decision, however, will be much more important and far reaching than the question of whether some of these persons are to be permitted to come here and live among us. The decision will reveal to the world some answers to questions which must puzzle many, both here and abroad.

Will the Government of the American people raise a hand to help all those who stand for democracy and individual freedom, or are those blessings to be reserved for American citizens? Are the basic issues of a war in which a quarter million Americans gave their lives to be so quickly forgotten?

Will a prosperous America, untouched by war, refuse to risk the shock of increasing its population by 0.07 percent in a year?

The displaced persons survived nazism and outlived it. Today they prefer the restrictions of a concentration camp to the restrictions of communism. They were on our side in the war and they are still on our side. Are we on theirs? That is the real question that Congress must answer before the world.

Medal for Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, now that World War II and its epics of valor have gravitated to the realm of the historian, and due homage has been bestowed on our military heroes, the Nation, through its Government, has begun to assess the equally vital deeds of home-front leaders. It takes none of the glory from the combat soldiers who stormed Tarawa and the beaches of Normandy to acknowledge that they could not have done it alone—not without the technical and scientific wizardry of industrious men and women who labored out of uniform, far from the danger zones.

Among the military, it is a centuries-old custom to reward with symbolic recognition the courage and heroism of soldiers who respond before the enemy in a manner that is above and beyond the call to duty.

This past war was an all-out war. Never before in history were the men who shouldered arms so gravely dependent upon their brothers of the nation whom they set out to defend. The problem of devising newer, superior armament, the maintenance of troop health and morale in all quarters of the globe, the science of military logistics—these reached an apex in complexity. To solve them, a civilian army struggled mightily within its own realm.

Thus, as a tribute to men heralded for their exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services, a grateful Nation has created the highest award which the President of the United States can confer upon a nonmilitary person—the Medal for Merit.

Wearers of the Medal for Merit are a heterogeneous group, with backgrounds as diverse as the Nation itself. It is noteworthy that the over-all contribution of each medalist had a profound effect upon the successful prosecution of the war; in fact, that is the very measure by which each candidate for the award is judged.

They are representative of the varied skills and professions which, in concert, have built this Nation into a towering world leader. They are physicists, diplomats, and scholars; chemists, engineers, and entertainers; industrialists, bankers, and lawyers. They stem from the roots of America.

Some earned their measure of glory while serving in the Government—among whom were the notable dollar-a-year volunteers who staffed the War Production Board. Indeed, the activities of the War Production Board members in organizing our unprecedented industrial output were so significant that 17 of them—top score for any Government agency—were singled out for the award. Other medalists were rewarded for their unsurpassed achievements in private industry, on the production front and in research laboratories.

Every Medal for Merit represents an achievement which materially shortened the war, made it less costly in casualties and human suffering.

Consider:

Research in atomic energy, climaxed by the invention and production of the atom bomb.

Development of the radio proximity fuse, regarded as the second greatest ordnance discovery of the war.

Research in and the perfection of radar.

Development of lifesaving antisubmarine devices.

And among achievements equally solid, if less spectacular, one might recall laboratory work in medicine and communications, in aircraft design, and in electronics; political intelligence that paved the way for the successful invasion of North Africa; maintenance of troop morale by volunteer workers through the Red Cross, United Service Organizations, and similar agencies; and unpublicized drudgery behind countless office desks where tasks of momentous importance and decisions of grave responsibility were resolved.

Wearers of the Medal for Merit comprise a company unique in world history. Never before have so few civilians contributed so much to the success on the battlefield and in the defense of freedom.

The Seventy-fifth Congress was responsible for establishing the Medal for Merit. Conscious of the decisive role of civilians in modern war, that body on July 20, 1942, passed Public Law 671 creating the award to honor individuals whose achievements merited national acclaim. The Medal for Merit has been recognized by the President of the United States as being equal in rank to the Distinguished Service Medal. As such it is the third highest among national awards, surpassed only by the Congressional Medal of Honor and the Distinguished Service Cross, both awarded for unusually valorous conduct against an armed enemy.

Award of the Medal for Merit is made by the President of the United States and, significantly, the engraved certificate presented, together with the medal, is signed in the President's own hand; it, the President's Certificate of Merit—the next lower civilian decoration—and the Medal of Honor are the only awards given by the Government of the United States which rate this distinction.

To assist and advise him in screening individuals recommended for the Medal

for Merit, the President has as a unit of his executive department a Medal for Merit Board. The first board to perform the function of investigating, reviewing, and reporting to the President on the qualifications of nominees included the "War Cabinet"—the Secretary of State as chairman, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy. In October 1945 it was succeeded by a new board composed of the Honorable Owen J. Roberts, former Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, as chairman, and Lt. Gen. William S. Knudsen and Mr. Stephen T. Early. General Knudsen has since resigned, to be replaced by the Honorable D. Lawrence Groner, Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Justice Richmond B. Keech is secretary to the Board.

Any citizen of the United States is eligible for the Medal for Merit provided that he has performed exceptionally meritorious services to the United States. A further restriction, added by Executive order, is that activity must have been part of the integrated war effort. Acts of heroism and courage are not, save in the case of civilian foreigners, considered as qualifications for the award.

The Medal for Merit may be awarded posthumously. Among those honored in this manner were Joseph B. Eastman, wartime Director of the Office of Defense Transportation; labor leader Sidney Hillman; Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox; and Ernie Pyle, the GI's beloved war correspondent.

The Medal for Merit itself is a striking symbol cast in gold bronze. It was designed by Brig. Gen. R. Townsend Heard, United States Army, retired, and selected by the Secretary of War from among several entries indicated as suitable by the United States Commission on Fine Arts.

General Heard developed his design from the obverse and the little known reverse of the great seal of the United States. Thirteen white stars on a blue field form a new constellation depicting the birth of our Nation. Dominating the emblem is the American eagle perched on a sheaf of arrows banded together to signify the solidarity of the Union. The arrows are pointed downward, however, to denote the noncombatant nature of the award.

Inscribed on the face of the medal is the motto "Novus ordo seclorum"—"A new order of security." The laurel wreath, from which the medal is suspended, represents the traditional symbol for highest achievement. On the reverse of the medal is written "The United States of America" and "For Merit." A blank space is left for the name of the medalist.

As is the custom with military awards, a Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster is presented in lieu of a second medal when an individual again performs services worthy of the honor. The Honorable Cordell Hull is the only Medal for Merit winner to be so distinguished. He received his first medal for extraordinary wartime service, as Secretary of State and the Oak Leaf Cluster for his memorable accomplishments as father of the United Nations.

Historical precedent for the Medal for Merit—as it is for all awards and decorations given in the name of the United States Government—dates back to a proclamation by George Washington on August 7, 1782. The Continental Army had scored its climactic triumph at Yorktown and General Washington was encamped with his victorious troops at Newburgh, N. Y.

From headquarters overlooking the lordly Hudson, General Washington publicly proclaimed his desire to confer honorary badges of distinction on his gallant men. He created the Badge for Military Merit, designed as a purple heart. (The Purple Heart Medal was reestablished by the War Department in 1932 as an award to troops wounded in action.)

It is noteworthy that in his proclamation General Washington made specific reference to the propriety of rewarding all manners of achievement. He wrote:

Not only instances of unusual gallantry, but also extraordinary fidelity and essential service in any war shall meet with due award. The road to glory in a patriot army and a free country is open to all.

There are 263 recipients of the Medal for Merit, including one Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster in lieu of second medal. To date there have been forwarded for presentation 292 awards of the medal, 29 of which have not been reported to the Medal for Merit Board as having actually been presented to the recipients.

The Medal for Merit awarded by the President to civilians only for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the war effort of the United Nations and of other friendly foreign nations, is considered by him to be as important as the Distinguished Service Medal is to the military who contribute behind the field of battle to the winning of a war.

The Medal for Merit stems from the Badge for Military Merit, America's oldest decoration, established by George Washington in 1782. The Badge of Merit awarded by him was originally issued in the form of a purple heart. The decoration now known as the Purple Heart was reestablished by the Army in 1932, but it was only in part a revival of George Washington's original order for it is now awarded only to persons who, while serving in any capacity with the Army of the United States, are wounded in action against an enemy of the United States. The Legion of Merit, awarded to military personnel, and the Medal for Merit, awarded to civilians only, were authorized by Public Law 671, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 20, 1942, for the purpose of rewarding outstanding and meritorious conduct in the performance of duties in furtherance of the war efforts of the United Nations, and serve to cover, with the Purple Heart, most of the general objectives of General Washington's order of 1782 to reward services in a position of responsibility, honorably and well performed.

The names of the recipients of the Medal for Merit follow:

Acheson, Dean
Adams, James S.
Adams, Philip F.
Aldrich, Winthrop W.
Alexander, Henry Clay
Allison, Dr. Samuel King
Amberg, Julius H.
Anthony, George A.
Appleton, Sir Edward Victor
Appley, Lawrence A.
Armstrong, Edwin Howard
Armstrong, Paul G.
Bacher, Dr. Robert Fox
Barnard, Chester I.
Batcheller, Hiland G.
Batt, William L.
Behn, Sosthenes
Bell, Frank B.
Bell, Laird
Berlin, Irving
Bethe, Dr. Hans Albrecht
Biggers, John David
Blackett, Prof. Patrick Maynard S.
Blake, Dr. Francis G.
Blandford, John B., Jr.
Boeschenstein, Harold
Boulware, L. R.
Boyd, John Hervey
Boyd, William R.
Brickner, Rabbi Barnett Robert
Brown, Charles E.
Brown, Lewis H.
Buckley, Dr. Oliver Ellsworth
Bunnell, Dr. Sterling
Carroll, Frederick A.[1]
Chenoweth, Opie
Cockburn, Dr. Robert
Collyer, John L.
Compton, Dr. Arthur H.
Creedon, Frank R.
Culbert, Frederick P.
Davies, Joseph E.
Davies, Ralph K.
Davis, Elmer
Davis, Walter Nisbet
de Seversky, Alexander P.
Detmar, Charles F., Jr.
Dewey, Bradley
Dodge, Joseph M.
D'Olier, Franklin
Dorr, Goldthwaite H.
Draper, Dr. Charles Stark
Dulles, Allen W.
Dunning, Dr. John Ray
Dykstra, Clarence Addison
Earle, Dr. Edward Mead
Eastman, Joseph Bartlett[1]
Fahy, Charles
Fairless, Benjamin F.
Fermi, Dr. Enrico
Folsom, Frank M.
Ford, Edsel Bryant[1]
Ford, Henry[1]
Forster, Rudolph[1]
Foster, William C.
Fred, Dr. Edwin Broun
Friedman, William F.
Fritz, William H.
Frye, Jack
Fuller, Walter D.
Gallagher, Angus J.
Gamble, Charles K.
Gamble, Theodore Roosevelt
Garand, John C.
Gibson, Harvey Dow
Gibson, Truman K., Jr.
Gifford, Walter S.
Girouard, Philias H.
Glennan, Thomas Keith
Goldman, Albert
Goodwin, Robert C.
Graham, A. E. (Jack)
Granger, Lester
Green, William
Greffi, Pierre[1]
Griffis, Stanton
Griggs, Dr. David
Grumman, Leroy R.
Hafstad, Dr. Lawrence R.
Hanson, James W.[1]
Harnwell, Dr. Gaylord P.
Harrison, George L.
Hay, Charles M.[1]
Hill, Arthur M.
Hillman, Sidney[1]
Hodgson, Patrick H.
Hoover, J. Edgar
Hope, Bob
Hopkins, D. Luke
Houston, Dr. William Vermillion
Howe, The Rt. Hon. Clarence D.
Hubble, Dr. Edwin P.

[1] Deceased.

Hull Cordell (also received Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster)
Hunt, Dr. Frederick Vinton
Ingersoll, C. Jared
Ingraham, Mary Shotwell
Jackson, Robert Houghwout
Jewett, Dr. Frank B.
Johnson, J. Monroe
Joyner, Calvin
Kanahele, Benjamin Hokoko
Karker, Maurice
Keenan, Joseph D.
Keith, Percival Cleveland
Keller, K. T.
Kennedy, Dr. Joseph William
Kent, Robert H.
Keto, John E.
Kettering, Dr. Charles F.
Kimball, Lindsley Fiske
King, David Wooster
Kirner, Dr. Walter Raymond
Kistiakowsky, Dr. George B.
Knight, Ridgway B.
Knowlson, James S.
Knox, Frank [1]
Kramer, Harry C.
Krug, Julius A.
Kuhn, J. J.
LaGuardia, Fiorello H.
Lahey, Dr. Frank H.
Landis, James McCauley
Langer, Dr. William L.
Lawrence, Dr. Ernest Orlando
Leahy, William Edward
LeBoeuf, Randall J., Jr.
Levis, William E.
Lewis, Dr. William Mather [1]
Lofland, John H.
Lovell, Dr. C. A.
Lyon, Frederick C.
MacCormick, Austin Harbutt
MacDonald, Thomas H.
Mackenzie, Dr. Chalmers Jack
Madigan, Michael James
Marbury, William L.
Marchant, Ira G.
Martyn, John W.
Matthews, Francis P.
Mayer, Arthur L.
McCabe, Thomas B.
McCarthy, William
McCloskey, Mark A.
McGill, Kenneth Herman
McGrady, Edward Francis
McLean, Milton R.
McMillan, Donald
McNamee, Frank L.
McNutt, Paul Vories
Meek, Samuel W.
Meigs, Merrill C.
Merck, George W.
Metts, John Van B.
Miller, Watson B.
Mindlin, Dr. Raymond D.
Moore, Dr. Joseph Earle
Morgenthau, Henry, Jr.
Morse, Dr. Phillip M.
Murphy, Francis Stephen
Murray, Philip
Myer, Dillon S.
Nelson, Donald M.
Nitze, Paul H.
Nunan, James Kneeland
O'Brian, John Lord
Oppenheimer, Dr. J. Robert
Paley, William S.
Parkinson, Dr. D. B.
Paullin, Dr. James Edgar
Pawley, William Douglas
Pearson, Leroy
Pelley, John J.
Pendar, Kenneth W.
Peterson, Howard C.
Pierce, Carleton Custer
Pollock, James K.
Preston, Frederick Augustus
Price, Byron
Pryor, Samuel F., Jr.
Pugh, Dr. William Barrow
Putnam, Palmer Cosslett
Pyle, Ernest Taylor [1]
Rash, Frank Dillman [1]
Reid, W. Stafford
Richards, Dr. Alfred Newton
Rickenbacker, Edward Vernon
Rinehart, Dr. Robert F.
Robertson, Dr. Howard P.
Robertson, W. Spencer
Robertson, Walter S.
Roebling, Donald
Root, Elihu, Jr.
Rosecrans, Egbert M.[1]
Rosenberg, Mrs. Anna M.
Rosenman, Samuel I.
Rounds, Leland L.
Rowe, Albert Percival
Rowntree, Dr. Leonard George
Russell, Robert Price
Ryckmans, Pierre
Sarnoff, David
Scott, Thomas Albertson
Seton, C. W.
Shea, Timothy E.
Shepardson, Whitney H.
Sherrill, Bishop Henry Knox
Shockley, Dr. William B.
Smith, Dr. Cyril Stanley
Smith, Sidney S.
Snyder, John Wesley
Spellman, Francis Cardinal
Springs, L. Pittman
Stearns, Dr. Harold T.
Steinhardt, Laurence A.
Stephens, Harold Montelle
Stephenson, Sir William S.
Stettinius, Edward R.
Stoll Clarence Griffith
Stone, Dr. Robert Spencer
Stradling, Sir Reginald Edward
Stratton, Dr. Julius A.
Swirbul, Leon A.
Taft, Charles P.
Tate, Dr. John Torrence
Taylor, Dr. Alfred Hoyt
Taylor, Sir Geoffrey Ingram
Thomas, Dr. Charles Allen
Thomas, Charles S.
Tizard, Sir Henry Thomas
Tolman, Dr. Richard Chace
Travis, Sir Edward
Trippe Juan T.
Tuthill, Alexander Mackenzie
Tuve, Dr. Merle A.
Urey, Dr. Harold Clayton
von Karman, Dr. Theodore
von Neumann, Dr. John
Warner, Jack L.
Watson, Thomas John
Watson-Watt, Sir Robert Alexander
Weed, Dr. Lewis H.
Weil, Frank L.
Weinberg, Sidney J.
Wiebusch, Dr. Charles F.
Wigner, Dr. Eugene Paul
Williams, Albert H.
Williams, Roger
Wilson, C. E.
Wilson, Charles E.
Wilson, Thomas E.
Winant, John G.
Woodruff, Harry A.
Wright, Theodore Paul

[1] Deceased.

Total Imports and Duties Collected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following table is computed from United States Tariff Commission statistics:

Total value of United States imports and duties collected, by years, under specified tariff acts

[Value in thousands; i. e., 000 omitted]

Fiscal years 1910-18; calendar years 1919 and succeeding years	Imports for consumption	
	Declared value of total imports	Duties collected
Payne-Aldrich law, effective Aug. 6, 1909:		
1910	$1,547,109	$326,562
1911	1,527,945	309,966
1912	1,640,723	304,899
1913	1,766,689	312,510
Annual average	1,620,617	313,484
Underwood law, effective Oct. 4, 1913:		
1914	1,906,400	283,719
1915	1,648,386	205,747
1916	2,179,035	209,726
1917	2,667,220	221,659
1918	2,864,894	180,590
1918 (July-December)	1,452,961	73,854
1919	3,827,683	237,457
1920	5,101,823	325,646
1921 [1]	2,556,869	292,397
1922 [1]	3,073,775	451,356
Annual average	2,871,479	261,279
Fordney-McCumber law, effective Sept. 22, 1922:		
1923	3,731,769	566,664
1924	3,575,111	532,286
1925	4,176,218	551,814
1926	4,408,076	590,045
1927	4,163,090	574,839
1928	4,077,937	542,270
1929	4,338,572	584,837
1930 (Jan. 1-June 17)	1,705,998	269,357
Annual average	4,023,570	561,615
Hawley-Smoot law, effective June 18, 1930:		
1930 (June 18-Dec. 31)	1,408,079	192,528
1931	2,088,455	370,771
1932 [2]	1,325,093	259,600
1933	1,433,013	283,681
1934 [3]	1,636,003	301,168
1935	2,038,905	357,241
1936	2,423,977	408,127
1937	3,009,852	470,509
1938	1,949,624	301,375
1939	2,276,099	328,034
1940	2,540,656	317,711
1941	3,221,954	437,751
1942	2,769,285	329,117
1943	3,389,951	392,294
1944	3,877,895	347,286
1945 [4]	4,074,784	378,675
1946 [4]	4,817,873	482,278
1947 (January-March) [4]	1,395,503	118,236

[1] The Emergency Tariff Act became effective on certain agricultural products on May 28, 1921, and continued in effect until Sept. 22, 1922.
[2] Subsequent to June 21, 1932, certain commodities which had previously been on the free list were made taxable, and since that date have been reported as dutiable commodities. The principal commodities affected were petroleum, copper, lumber, and coal.
[3] Trade Agreements Act passed as amendment to Hawley-Smoot law June 12, 1934. Under it many rates of duty have been decreased from time to time. First agreement effective Sept. 12, 1934, with Cuba; 26 agreements in effect June 10, 1947.
[4] Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from statistics received from the U. S. Tariff Commission, Statistical Division, June 1947.

What does this table show?

First. That the total import duties collected has averaged from three to four hundred millions per year. This is a huge sum of money each year, but when compared to present-day appropriations it does not appear so large.

Second. A large portion of these duties are collected on agricultural products. The imports in volume of agricultural products increased very rapidly beginning in 1934 and there was a very marked decrease in exports.

Third. The duty collected on livestock products makes up a large percentage of the funds collected. For example, the duty collected on one livestock product alone, like wool, has accounted for from ninety-nine million to one hundred and fifty millions of dollars collected. This is a rather high percentage of the total duties collected the past 6 years. The wool alone provided 25 to 35 percent of the total custom receipts from all imports from 1941 to 1947. Of course, there has not been much of any duty collected on soil-depleting crops like cotton and wheat because the New Dealers put an embargo on imports of these products. Tobacco, another soil-depleting crop, has trade barriers around it higher than the Washington Monument.

Fourth. The section 32 funds obtained by setting aside 30 percent of the custom receipts you can see come largely from duties collected as the result of importation of livestock products. The use of these funds is subject to justifiable criticism. Though obtained through duties on livestock products largely, these funds have been used to oversubsidize soil-depleting crops. For example, tobacco has been ground up and subsidized and sold as fertilizer. Export subsidies on soil-depleting crops like tobacco, wheat, and cotton have been paid from these section 32 funds. These funds are also used to subsidize cotton for insulating purposes, cotton for bats for auto seats and cotton for paper making.

While this has been taking place we find in the 10 years $5,000,000,000 have been appropriated in the name of soil conservation. Fifty-three cents worth of lime and 40 cents worth of fertilizer per acre of cultivated land was used for the whole 10-year period from 1937 to 1947.

Fifth. The soil-conservation and fertility problem is a large problem. It will require more than the expenditure of 40 to 53 cents per acre to make any showing in regard to soil fertility and to lime needs in a 10-year period.

While this has been taking place, the hog numbers in the United States have been reduced by 40 percent, sheep numbers by 35 percent, and cattle numbers by over 4,000,000 head during the past 4 years. Then, we hear complaints about meat shortage and meat prices when the economic rug is pulled out from under the livestock industry and special-privilege legislation is continually fostered for soil-depleting crops.

Sixth. The constant demand for special privilege legislation is apparent. The manufacturer of many commodities wants high duties on imports of the finished products that compete with their products, but they seem eager to obtain raw materials without any protection to the producer of the raw material. This is not altogether partisan by any means, because certain prominent members of both parties support this position.

Across the board formula that is based on equality to each group of our society should be our objective, and not special privilege legislation for the few. There have been more vicious trade barriers erected since 1935 than ever before in the history of our country. Regardless of this fact, our New Deal propagandists continue to deceive the League of Women Voters and other groups with their honeyed words about a reciprocity and a good-neighbor policy.

Seventh. The present custom receipts, though large in dollars, are a much less percentage of the national income than in the 1920's and 1930's.

A New Approach to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial by David Lawrence, which appeared in the United States News of today, under the date line of July 25, 1947:

A NEW APPROACH TO RUSSIA

(By David Lawrence)

The Truman doctrine did not improve the relations between the United States and Russia.

The Marshall plan failed to win the confidence or cooperation of Russia. Instead of stringing along and sabotaging the plan by stages, Russia has bluntly turned it down because of distrust of its true purposes.

Russia's decision and her directness of action is of extraordinary significance. It clears the air. For it reveals unmistakably the real barrier to agreement in all past or future conferences—mutual distrust.

The cleavage between Russia and the United States has unsettled the entire world. Reconstruction waits. Economic stability waits. Fear of war and even the talk of inevitability of war grows on all sides.

Such a situation challenges the ingenuity of responsible statesmen and calls for a searching study of fundamental causes.

When we are agreed on the diagnosis, we can prescribe the remedies.

It is oversimplification to say that Russia has one ideology and we have another and that what is involved is merely a rivalry of systems. If this were all that was at stake, the matter of negotiating agreements would be relatively easy. Separate economic areas in which one would not impinge on the other could be delineated and an adjustment of one economic system to the other could be developed.

But the basic trouble is not just ideological. It is deeper and hence more dangerous.

MUTUAL DISTRUST

The basic cause of the failure of the United States and Russia to agree in international conferences is mutual distrust.

Two persons suspicious of one another cannot write a contract that will last very long. Every phrase, no matter how carefully written, can be construed with actual or potential suspicion.

America distrusts the present Russian Government.

Does anybody think at this time that the Congress of the United States would ever hand over to the Moscow Government the secrets of the atomic bomb? Of course not. The people in America have been led to believe that the totalitarian government in Russia would not hesitate to make a sudden attack on us with any weapon at its command if the provocation were present.

Russia distrusts the United States.

Does anybody think the present Russian Government believes the professions of unselfishness and the many expressions of disinterested purpose which the spokesmen for the United States utter?

We in America believe our own spokesmen. We cannot understand why any other government or people should fail to see that we are speaking the truth and that we are sincere in our altruistic endeavors to help the world to its feet.

But the inescapable fact is that the Russian leaders do not believe us or trust us.

NO SOLUTION IN WAR

Is the answer, then, a war of decision?

Wars settle nothing. They merely change the personnel of governments and a few boundaries. They promote economic chaos, multiply controls, and deprive individuals of rights and liberties. They do not conquer peoples except for a short time. Then there is a resurgent nationalism and a stimulated hope for revenge which breed new fears and new distrust.

When will statesmen learn that the problem of avoiding war and healing the wounds of war is a problem of learning to live with other peoples on a basis of fairness and equity, on a basis of mutual trust?

To understand the attitude of the present Russian Government, one must know the background of the Russian regime of today. The Russian revolution was a reaction against the despotism of the Czars. The standard of living was so low and the people were so cruelly exploited that the revolution came as a welcome relief to the masses.

Fear of the Bolshevik menace after World War I led the western democracies to intervene in the Russian internal situation in an effort to help the counter-revolutionists. This mistake is now acknowledged, but it has left scars.

Even during World War II, when we were allied with Russia, the Moscow government distrusted all its allies. Cordial conversations between the late President Roosevelt and Marshal Stalin were based on expediency. Concession after concession was made by us to win Russia's aid against Japan.

Russia kept her word. She did enter the war against Japan. Had the atomic bomb not been discovered, Russia would have played a vital part in keeping the vast Japanese army in China and Manchuria busy while our forces invaded Japan itself.

Then came VJ-day and the beginning of friction between allies. Russia distrusted Britain and considered us 100 percent behind any purpose London might manifest. The British and American representatives, on the other hand, in nearly every conference evidenced distrust of Russia.

SECURITY PARAMOUNT

An important fact soon emerged. Irrespective of ideology, the Russian policy reverted to that of the czars. We observed Russian patriotism stimulated by the war's achievements. Plans for expansion were advanced to gain security. It was instinctive, deep-rooted. Soon the security argument overshadowed all else. It was reminiscent of the bickering in 1919 when the French cried out for security and were denounced as nationalistic and as blocking progress.

There would, of course, be no need for security demands if there were no distrust.

Russia today considers eastern European countries within her realm or orbit for security reasons. If she cannot control those countries through occupying armies, because it is too expensive or too difficult, she seeks to control through political and ideological instrumentalities. Russia wants to dominate eastern Europe as the United States, in her opinion, dominates Latin America, and as Britain has exercised a paramount influence in Italy and the Mediterranean in decades gone by. We fear the effects of such expansion—we regard it as a threat to world peace.

Whenever we propose economic solutions, therefore, the Russians see political schemes

lurking therein. The Russians do not trust our statements.

We have tried the political approach and failed. We have tried the economic approach and failed. There are many who think the military and physical force approach is the only thing left. This is a counsel of despair, for there is another approach.

It is to find a way to win the confidence of the Russian Government and the Russian people.

Let us agree that many of the problems are now unsolvable and put them aside. Mere recognition of this fact means progress.

Let us then agree—if on nothing else—to try to know each other better. Can we not ask the Russian Government to permit a series of missions of understanding to be sent from each country to the other? Can we not send a group of our foremost citizens to talk with Russian groups and study the problem of Russian-American relations from a new angle?

Let us ask Russia to send to us missions of the same kind to tell us what must be done to bring trust where there is now distrust.

PROVING OUR GOOD FAITH

War is not inevitable between our two countries. War is a confession of the failure of man to use moral force effectively.

We must not be impatient. We will not overnight remove the germs of distrust which have been creating fears and suspicions for more than 25 years.

The problem is not one of accepting or agreeing with Russia's ideology or condoning in any way her totalitarian discipline in dealing with her own people. It is recognition, however, that the Russan people are in a stage of internal development which is being complicated by the bogey of international war.

It would be expedient for the Department of State meanwhile to clarify points of agreement and disagreement and to consummate what the diplomats used to call a "modus vivendi." This implies a means of understanding—an agreement directly between Moscow and Washington. Some method of living together must be found, if only on a temporary or transitional basis, until a more solid foundation can be built. It must transcend all other previous agreements or conference resolutions.

We must prove our own sincerity and our own good faith and make every sacrifice to that purpose. Then we can successfully negotiate Marshall plans and help with all our resources to rehabilitate the world and bring real peace to mankind.

Record of Death and Damage in Missouri, Mississippi Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a table of facts published in the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch on Sunday, July 20, 1947, about the loss of life and damages in major floods on the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers.

What is the answer to this problem, growing more and more serious? The same weapon that succeeded in the Tennessee Valley—a Missouri Valley Authority.

RECORD OF DEATH AND DAMAGE IN MISSOURI, MISSISSIPPI FLOODS

Facts from Weather Bureau-Army engineer records about loss of life and tangible damages in major floods on the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers—not including loss of soil—follow:

MISSOURI AND UPPER MISSISSIPPI

1902–3 (fiscal year): 100 lives, $40,425,000 damages.

1908–9 (fiscal year): $15,631,000 damages, no deaths reported.

MISSOURI

1935: 125 lives, $38,957,091 damages.

1943: 17 lives, $62,630,405 damages, 50,000 persons evacuated, 2,400,000 acres inundated.

1944: 14 lives, $50,000,000 damages, 50,000 persons evacuated, 2,400,000 acres inundated.

1945: 8 lives, $46,000,000 damages, 40,000 persons evacuated, 1,900,000 acres inundated.

1946: 3 lives, $9,000,000 damages, 20,000 persons evacuated, 700,000 acres inundated.

1947: 26 lives, $111,000,000 damages, thousands of persons evacuated, 3,000,000 acres inundated, almost half of this area being flooded twice or more.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI (ABOVE THE OHIO)

1927: $19,611,863 damages, no deaths reported.

1943: 16 lives, $42,097,371 damages.

1944: 13 lives, $32,883,500 damages, 20,600 persons evacuated, 1,050,000 acres inundated.

1945: $14,938,000 damages, no deaths reported, 12,400 persons evacuated, 461,000 acres inundated.

1946: 7 lives, $18,233,500 damages, 8,200 persons evacuated, 316,000 acres inundated.

1947: 12 lives, $52,530,000 damages, 56,400 persons evacuated, 955,000 acres inundated, of which 37 percent supposedly was protected by levees.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI (BELOW THE OHIO)

1911–12 (fiscal year): $70,000,000 damages, no deaths reported.

1927: 100 lives, $133,898,468 damages.

1944: 2 lives, $11,000,000 damages, 2,000 persons evacuated, 6,000,000 acres (largely uncultivated) inundated.

1945: 15 lives, $45,840,000 damages, 65,700 persons evacuated, 6,059,000 acres inundated.

1946: $21,700,000 damages, 1,000 persons evacuated, 3,625,000 acres inundated, no deaths reported.

1947: $1,000,000 damages, 1,600,000 acres inundated, no deaths reported, few persons evacuated, if any.

RECORD CRESTS

Mississippi at St. Louis (flood stage 30 feet): 1844, 41.39 feet; 1853, 37.21; 1903, 38; 1908, 34.95; 1909, 35.5; 1922, 33.95; 1927, 36.1; 1929, 34.6; 1943, 38.9; 1944, 39; 1947, 40.3.

Missouri at Hermann, Mo. (flood stage 21 feet): 1844, 35.7 feet; 1881, 23.7; 1903, 29.5; 1908, 25; 1909, 26.1; 1915, 25.9; 1927, 26.8; 1935, 29.2; 1943, 31.1; 1944, 30.9; 1947, 31.

Agriculture Department Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of opposition has been registered to the cutting of appropriation bills. Much of this opposition has come from particular groups that have benefited in a large measure by the spending of the taxpayers' money through the various Federal-aid programs that have spread like an octopus and if allowed to continue may constitute a dangerous foe to our free-enterprise system.

In this connection I wish to extend my remarks and include a radio address I made recently having particular reference to the Agriculture appropriation bill, which follows:

There is an urgent need for everyone to get the facts about just what this Congress is doing here in Washington.

There is even a greater need for the correction of many erroneous statements that are being handed out by groups and special interests that have little regard for the welfare of their country. I have been quite disturbed lately by some of the vicious propaganda I have seen appearing in the public press about the effect this Congress' actions will have on the farmers of the Nation.

The most flagrant violations of the truth have occurred in connection with two proposals of the Agricultural Department budget. These two sections of the budget are the appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration, and the appropriation for the soil-conservation program. I have no intention to evade the vicious propaganda that is being circulated. On the contrary, I intend to meet the criticism head-on, and I want to give you people the facts concerning both the REA and the soil-conservation budgets for the coming year as passed in the House. Here are the facts about both of these issues taken from hearings before Congress and recorded for everyone to read at will.

The Rural Electrification Administration has been in existence for 12 years. When it was established, only 11 percent of the farms of the country had electricity. REA has increased that percentage until it now stands at 57 percent. That is a good record, and no one denies that a good job has been done. Now, as the Republican Congress set to work appropriating money for the coming year, after straightening up the budget of the Nation to where we came out with the first surplus in 17 years, critics popped up everywhere overnight and spread the word that Congress was withholding funds from REA, cutting back the work it could do.

This is the truth of the matter. In reality, REA last year got more money than it could spend. It could not spend all the money because it could not get the materials that are still in short supply. As a result, on July 1, the REA had $325,000,000 over and above last year's left-over funds. This year a request came to Congress for $250,000,000 more in spite of the statement by the Secretary of Agriculture that it will be at least 20 months before sufficient transformers, conductors, and other materials will become available to take care of all applicants. The truth of that matter is, that requests now being handed to manufacturers for transformers will not be filled for another 8 months to a year. Conductors cannot be obtained for at least 2 years when ordered now. There are other bottlenecks, as you all know, in steel and copper. Neither the Government nor private manufacturers are able to get these things because enough are just not being produced.

Nevertheless, the House cut the REA 1948 request by only $25,000,000, leaving a total of $550,000,000 available for the agency on July 1. That is 90 percent of what REA asked for, and actually more than they expected to get. The REA lobby in Washington, however, gave the people the impression that REA was virtually eliminated. The truth is that the only thing that was eliminated was waste and inefficiency, something Congress has had to eliminate from all of these overgrown, fat bureaucracies in order to protect the taxpayers' money from being squandered.

The hearings before the Appropriations Committee of Congress show that REA has

employed many persons who are singularly unqualified to hold their jobs in an organization as large and complex as the REA. In one instance a top policy man in the agency turned out to be a man who had started out in the agency as a chauffeur. There are other cases that demonstrate the lack of qualifications of persons now heading the REA, whose job it is to serve the farmers of the Nation. Those are the things your House Appropriations Committee has cut out of REA for you, the taxpayers.

Congress has stated flatly, and you will find it in the record of the hearings, that REA work will be permitted to move ahead just as fast as materials are available for the work. That statement still stands. REA this year has the money to do a maximum of work with the available materials. To believe anything else is to fall hopelessly for some vicious propaganda aimed at you for the purpose of getting you to agitate for more funds.

As for the soil-conservation program, there again much propaganda has been spread at large throughout rural areas. This time the industries which would lose the pocket money coming from the Treasury are complaining loud and long, and not always truthfully. Large newspaper advertisements telling farmers in bold letters, "Your AAA program has been stopped," are, to me, shameful and misleading. Facts about farm appropriation cuts are being distorted by interests that are all for themselves, and no one else. Such advertisements are, on their very face, admissions that these interests would rather see the taxpayers' dollars poured back into their own pockets than to see those dollars go into the Treasury in these good times to build up our Government financially so that it will be in a position to help the farmers when, and if, bad times should return.

Meanwhile, your Government is staggering beneath a debt of $258,000,000,000—$7,000 for every family in the Nation—a debt that could mean chaos for us all if not handled carefully. This Congress came to Washington with a mandate to do something about the horrible state of the Nation's finances. We have been doing something about it, and the way is being cleared for a smoother road ahead that will permit tax reductions and debt reductions and balanced budgets. Yet, despite this bright fact, there are still groups and interests in this country that care less for their own Government than for themselves.

There was never a time in history when it was so vital for us all to take the "me" out of economy, as now. Most everyone is in favor of reducing spending, cutting out waste and all nonessential services. Congress is being praised until some of this budget cutting begins to touch these specially favored folks.

When these interests begin to feel the pinch of a little economy in Government activities and services, after an era of some 13 years of record-breaking governmental mismanagement of the taxpayers' money, then we begin to get telegrams and letters making all sorts of howls and hollers.

I wish everyone of this Nation could understand that to fail to cooperate in the current scaling down of these huge Federal budgets is to invite chaos. An invitation to this sort of financial ruin is an invitation for the Communists to take over our country.

Soil conservation is admittedly one of the most important programs this country can continue. The Government began it when farmers could not afford to institute the soil-saving practices on their own, and plunged itself into debt to pay for such things, and to begin such a program on the farms of America. Now, that debt has been increased by billions more representing the cost of the war. The Government cannot go on spending like this and expect to survive. It must cut back somewhere and this Government has faith in the people of the Nation, just as all Americans have faith in their Government. For that reason, farmers all over America should, and I am sure do, understand this situation when they are given the real facts.

To the farmers of my district, and to everyone there, I say, support your Government now in its efforts to get back on a sound financial basis, and your Government will still be here, ready and able, to support you when you might need it.

Do not fall for the propaganda of special groups and interests who try to undermine the Government by seeking all the advantage for themselves.

This ends my radio talk.

Since giving this address the agriculture appropriation bill has gone through the Senate where some items were put back in; then to the Senate and House conference committee where the conferees agreed to disagree on certain items. It therefore required special House action, and this time I decided to go along and help restore some of the funds for the farm program, as I feel that if huge sums of money are going to be spent for aid to foreign countries our own farmers might as well have some of it.

During the heat of the discussion in the Appropriations Committee the following article appeared in the Farm Journal for June 1947, which I consider good advice, not only to the farmer but to all citizens of our country:

THINK BEFORE WIRING

You may be asked any day now to "write or wire your Congressman."

The agricultural appropriation bills are before committees and will shortly be on the House floor. Everybody has a pet appropriation or so. Farm organizations and other groups will be asking their members and friends to tell Congress not to cut their favored items. They are for economy, but not that much.

We have a pet appropriation or so of our own—new crops research for one. But we are sending no wires.

More important than any single appropriation or any single activity of the Department of Agriculture—more than the Department of Agriculture, we might say—are these: That the Government of the United States and the American dollar keep their strength; that the mammoth debt be reduced; that taxes be lowered so that men have incentive to produce.

These things can't be accomplished unless Federal expenses are sharply lowered. Expenses can't be lowered except by cutting appropriations and cutting them hard.

Before any citizen sends his wire to protect some favored activity let him ask himself whether the reduction of expenses and taxes will not serve him and his country better.

American agriculture managed fairly well for a good many years while the funds of the Department of Agriculture were only one-fifth as much, or even less. Crops will still be harvested, and little pigs will still make pork, whether the Department has two billion or two million to spend. We believe in the usefulness of the Department of Agriculture, but right now we shall demand no more services from it than a financially bent Nation can afford.

Here is one place where farmers can take the lead to reduce Federal expenses. If we must write or wire the Congressman, why not tell him to keep on whittling the figures down?

Naming of Antarctic Geographical Features

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the naming of various geographical features of the Antarctic in honor of explorers and others who have materially assisted in expeditions there.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAMING OF ANTARCTIC FEATURES

Today, I learned of the issuance of a release by the Department of Interior's Board of Geographic Names listing some 850 names of geographical features in the Antarctic. These names were based on the names of the individuals who had first discovered those features or who have materially assisted in expeditions there. On inquiring as to Wisconsin individuals included in this list, I secured some interesting information which I should like to relate now as a measure of appropriate recognition and lasting record.

One of the features is known as Kohler Range in honor of the late manufacturer and distinguished Governor of Wisconsin, the Honorable Walter J. Kohler, who was one of the supporters of the second Antarctic Expedition and who helped furnish the seaplane from which Admiral Byrd observed the range.

BOARD'S WORK

The naming of these features is under the jurisdiction of the Board which is directed by Dr. Meredith F. Burrill. Statutory authority for this activity which has been carried on previously by Executive orders was recently given by the Congress in S. 1262 which was just enacted on Monday by the House.

According to the description of the work of this Board, it is serving to bring a rational and relatively standard nomenclature for the first time to areas and features of the Antarctic, thus ending the long bitter controversy and confusion as to names there.

It is most fitting, I believe, that the brave men who withstood the worst fury of the elements should receive immortal recognition for their exploits by having features named for them. It is appropriate too that those far-sighted individuals who supported the expeditions should receive a similar honor.

The Antarctic is, of course, a region of immense strategic importance both because of its location and because of the yet almost undreamed of mineral wealth there.

KOHLER RANGE

Kohler Range to which I have referred is an extensive mountain range rising to around 7,000 feet above sea level above Walgreen Coast, at approximately 74° south and stretching from around 102° west to 114° west. The range was discovered on February 24, 1940, by Rear. Adm. Richard E. Byrd, commanding officer of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition in a flight from the vessel *Bear*. The range bears the revered name of former Gov. Walter J. Kohler, of the Badger State.

EKLUND ISLAND

To cite another instance, we may note Eklund Island, a small rocky island rising through the ice of the western end of George VI Sound to a height of around 1,000 feet. It is off Robert English Coast 73°, 10 minutes south, 72° west. It was discovered in December 1940 by Finn Ronne and Carl R. Eklund, of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition, in the course of their laborious 1,264-mile sledge journey through the sound.

Mr. Eklund was the ornithologist and assistant biologist of the expedition. I might also add that he is a very young man, 38 years of age, formerly a major of the Army Air Corps, who has performed very valuable services to his country, both in that capacity and in his discoveries on magnetic influence in flying. Carl Eklund is the son of a humble Swedish immigrant, John Eklund, a carpenter of Tomahawk, Wis. Major Eklund is a graduate of Tomahawk High School and of Carlton College.

RESEARCH WORK

I may note finally that a major part of the extensive research into the work of the various expeditions and other background material for the activity of the Board of Geographic Names was performed by Dr. Kenneth J. Bertrand of Green Bay, Wis. Dr. Bertrand secured his doctorate of philosophy from the University of Wisconsin and I understand is now head of the department of geography of Catholic University. He was formerly assistant director of the Board of Geographic Names.

Utah Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Utah Centennial," published in the Washington Evening Star, July 21, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH CENTENNIAL

Their gentile neighbors as well as the descendants of the original Mormon settlers are celebrating the centenary of the arrival of Brigham Young and his followers in the valley of the Great Salt Lake. It was on July 24, 1847, that the company of Latter Day Saints and their president completed the long and wearisome march from Florence, Nebr. One hundred and forty-three men, three women, and two children finished the trek. Some members of the party wanted to continue westward to California. It was the personal decision of their leader to remain in the desert. "This," he declared, "is the place."

But more than a firm definition of purpose was needed to establish the empire Young had visioned. Fortunately, he realized the magnitude of the task. His example was contagious enough to serve the need of the colonists. Courage, hard labor, wholehearted cooperation went into the enterprise. The alkaline flats around America's dead sea were plowed and planted. Water from the mountains was brought to nourish the crops. A made-to-order city was designed and gradually built. Hundreds of smaller communities were organized. The hostile Indians of the area first were fought and then systematically placated. A policy of isolation slowly but effectively was abandoned. Young created the State of Deseret and was its governor from 1849 to 1851. Thereafter for 6 years he was head of the territorial administration under Federal control. When the telegraph line came in during the autumn of 1861 he sent to Washington as a greeting the announcement: "Utah has not seceded."

Now, a century after the disciples of Moroni inaugurated their experiment in the sun-baked wilderness, the success of the endeavor is acclaimed universally. If the trials and tribulations of the past are not forgotten, they at least are comprehended as the growing pains of an undertaking of world-wide significance.

Nothing accomplished by Young and his immediate adherents was easy to do, and nothing currently being attempted by the heirs of their genius is easy. Stalwart toilers, filled with faith in themselves as well as fidelity to the Lord, kept the desert blooming. The praise of alien visitors is an honorable portion of their reward.

Potato Price-Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, much has been said and written in criticism of the Department of Agriculture's administration of the potato price-support program by persons with little or no real knowledge of agriculture or agricultural marketing problems.

One of the most enlightening articles on this subject yet published was written by J. M. Eleazer, extension-information specialist of the Clemson A. & M. College, Clemson, S. C. Born on a farm, reared a farm boy, graduated from an agriculture college as an agricultural scientist, he worked for more than 20 years as a county farm demonstration agent. For the past year he has served as extension-information specialist for the South Carolina Extension Service, and is generally recognized as a writer of some of the most readable and accurate agricultural journalism in the country today. His writings on agricultural subjects are read by more persons in the South today than those of any other man. I think his explanations of and observations on the destruction of Irish potatoes which was so widely criticized by the ill-informed press of this country is worth the attention of every Member of this body. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD his article from the Greenville, S. C., News of July 20, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In June I saw Irish potatoes being dumped in old fields in the low country.

Not just bushels of them, but carloads of them—many carloads—and at many places.

On one piece of wasteland we visited, they had started dumping the day before. Fine potatoes then covered about a quarter of an acre waist deep. Purple dye was sprayed on them so they wouldn't buy the same ones again next day.

They were graded and packed in new sacks with attractive labels—ready to roll to the markets. And inspectors were there to see that they came up to grade and quality. The No. 1's brought the grower $2.17 per 100 pounds, the B grade $1.08, and the farmer got his sacks back.

I saw all of that on June 12. Now hardly a stink remains.

Much was written about the shame, the criminality, the utter stupidity of this spectacle.

Folks forget so soon.

Why was this thing done?

Simply to make sure that you and I ate, and ate abundantly. That's all.

We can't keep the horn of plenty full without its running over a bit at times. It did that last month.

During the war Congress played safe, and we all applauded. It takes months to make a crop. Farmers could not be asked to produce for war and then let them be ruined by prices when peace came. Nor could they change their plants from full wartime production to peacetime needs on short notice. So Congress promised at least 90 percent of parity price for potatoes for at least 2 years after the war was over. And farmers did the seemingly impossible by giving us abundant war-food crops with shortages of everything except the determination that went into the making of crops.

Then in the good years 1946 and 1947 the horn of plenty overflowed a bit. And that small portion of the crop had to be liquidated. Not to make high prices but to avoid disastrous ones.

Why were outlets not provided?

How could you plan an outlet for something you didn't know you were going to have? And these potatoes are highly perishable. To give them away would destroy your purpose—the maintenance of a fair price level.

Now, folks, that is the part of the story that has not been adequately told. It was a mean thing to handle at best. And let's remember this; you and I want the Nation to see to it that there is plenty of food at all times. If we are to keep the horn of plenty full, we may just as well get ready to see it run over a bit at times, and when that happens something has to be done or crippled agriculture might not be able to keep it filled in the future.

Strengthen the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

MIDDLETOWN, OHIO, *July 22, 1947.*

Hon. WALTER JUDD,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your sponsorship of the inspiring resolution for the strengthening of the United Nations. We wholeheartedly agree that there is no surer way of determining whether Russia will go along with other nations in creating a United Nations which would guarantee her own as well as our security. Frank recognition of the present defects of the UN should only strengthen our resolve to make it the strong organization

which we have all worked and hoped for. We shall stand firmly behind you in your continuing efforts to push this resolution through Congress and we shall give you, through our organization, all possible support in this most vital cause. If we are to prevent World War III we must make the UN effective at once so that it can become the instrument of all nations to prevent war and maintain world peace.

MIDDLETOWN CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS.

Our National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address made by me upon the occasion of the celebration on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the organization of the Finger Lakes Post of the Veterans' of Foreign Wars, at Ithaca, N. Y., on Friday, July 11, 1947:

My greetings to the members of the Finger Lakes Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Ithaca which is now celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of its organization My respects to those of your comrades who have passed along the pathway of life a step in advance of those of you whom they left surviving. Together, you and they, formed and nurtured this organization for the purpose of more effectively centering your common interests in the welfare of those gallant soldiers and sailors who had shared the toil and pain of battle on foreign soils and waters and for the further purpose of concentrating your efforts as American citizens toward the fulfillment of America's dream of an enduring peace among the nations of the world. Their task is finished, those who now rest in the comforting arms of eternity and whose memory we revere; but yours is not. The burden still rests heavily upon you, the living, to a degree probably greater than ever before, in the common quest of a solution for the settlement of internal disputes upon a basis of mutual respect, confidence and justice. Our goal requires the best of thought, talent, patience, understanding and determination that all of our citizens can muster if it is to be effective and enduring.

If for no other reason than the momentary restfulness which a fleeting reverie brings to a tired and troubled soul, pause for a moment and reflect upon the state of the world when this post was first organized in 1922, a quarter century ago. The war to end all wars had been fought; the principle of freedom for self-determination by the people of all nations, both large and small, had been established; military machines throughout the world had been dispersed; a new family of nations had been formed for the avowed purpose of providing the mechanism by which international accord and justice could be attained; a disarmament conference had been called which was later to place a limitation upon the size of the military establishments of the world, destined to endure but for barely a decade; and America, the great colossus of the West, who had suddenly grown into full international stature because of her unexpectedly tremendous contribution to the outcome of the war, withdrew herself from the association of nations, insisted that the price of her membership was upon her own terms and without any sacrifice of her sovereignty. The world was told that we would have none of the troubles which had harassed the old world for centuries and we convinced ourselves that the way to stay out of wars was to mind our own business and to live alone and away from the rest of the world. Having won the war, a League of Nations having been established, procedures for the limitation of armaments having been set, we decided our task was finished.

What a happy outlook that was, 25 years ago—our responsibilities in foreign affairs was over and we were free to concentrate our energies in a frenzy of material prosperity. As a result the other nations continued the organization and development of the League of Nations with the same degree of determination for its success in the program to put an end to wars as has been characteristic of the vast majority of nations which organized and are now developing the United Nations organization. It has frequently been charged and with considerable justification that had we become a full and participating member of the League of Nations, the work of that organization would have been more effective and the likelihood of World War II would have been averted. The fact remains that we did not become a member of the League of Nations and the League failed to avert war.

In many respects the condition of the world today is similar to that which existed 25 years ago. Another great war has been ended and the nations today are groping desperately for some pattern of joint action by which this scourge of mankind can be stamped out for good and all. As was the case then, an old nation has arisen in greatness and power with vast and unknown material and manpower resources. Although much of its fighting and effectiveness was due to the military equipment it obtained from our Nation, Russia now stands as the colossus of the East. Its aims and purposes are uncharted and unknown. It is an enigma in the family of nations.

Once more the people of the world have set up an organization for international peace to which all nations have joined, even Russia. Although the organization has been in existence for barely 2 years a sufficient time has elapsed during which the sincerity of the member nations has been tested and the success of this joint endeavor has been given an opportunity to be made apparent.

In spite of the patient, continuous and determined efforts of the nations to make a go of the enterprise, this one nation, the colossus of the East, has thwarted every effort for the fulfillment of the purposes of the organization. Her membership in the international organization has been in form only and not in substance. The net result is exactly the same or probably even more damaging than as though she were not a member at all as was the case that other time when we failed to join the League. By being a member and participating in UN deliberations and decisions through her wanton exercise of the veto right she has been able to completely sterilize the effectiveness of the organization. Her purposes in pursuing such a policy cannot be credited with a fear of her territorial security. Genuine offers have been made by the other responsible powers to guarantee this to her. The only purpose which can be seen for this course of conduct is that through the failure of the United Nations a complete political and economic chaos for the greater part of the world will result and through that chaotic condition she will be able to engulf the world under the banner of the sickle and hammer. This is a harsh and disappointing conclusion to draw from her conduct and attitude, but one which is entirely realistic.

What then is the wise course for us as a nation to pursue? The world looks to us for guidance and leadership—we must not fail. Our recent experience with facism of Europe is too fresh in our minds to tempt us with a policy of appeasement of Russia. As it was with fascism or nazism so it is with any "ism" which sets as its goal the political and economic conquest of other people; greed, narrowness and selfishness are the meat upon which they thrive. The more they acquire, the greater the concessions made to them, the more they desire and the greater their demands. Appeasement inevitably leads to conflict or capitulation. Both of these pathways are unthinkable for us to follow. Certainly we cannot resort to arms, the very thing which we seek to effectively outlaw as an instrument of national policy. Just as certainly, we cannot capitulate.

There is an avenue of procedure available to us which has every hope and possibility of averting both conflict and capitulation, and which will bring about the degree of international security and accord which is the next best to a complete and unanimous international cooperative effort.

The course which the world followed in that similar effort nearly a generation ago points the way for us in our present dilemma. Just as they decided then to go ahead with their plans, hopes, and aspirations with the League of Nations as the instrumentality for the removal of international discord without the membership of the United States, the colossus of the west, so should we now assume the leadership of the willing nations in the formation of a new league or federation permitting those who are not yet ready to fully perform their responsibilities to humanity and civilization to carry on as best they can outside this organizaton. The outcome of such a venture, though supported by the fervent determination of the cooperating nations, would be hazardous and uncertain, but it would be far less indefinite and dangerous than the course of nations as it exists today.

Whatever course we follow, one fact should be constantly and permanently uppermost in our hearts and mind: The road to everlasting peace is not an easy road. We tried the easy road a generation ago, and it lead us sharply into an abyss. Until such time as an effective and unanimous cooperative effort is made by the family of nations to insure peace, until the nations of the world come to regard human life as the treasure which it is, and until all peoples realize the futility of war, it will be necessary for us to preserve our own security by the maintenance of a strong military establishment. This does not necessarily mean the maintenance of a vast standing army and floating navy, but it does mean that all our people should have a greater understanding of and training in the mechanics of war. Such a program, though abhorrent to our peaceful thoughts and historic practices, in spite of the fact that it has been urged upon us from the very beginning of our country by many of our most honored leaders, is inevitable so long as the world continues in its presently seriously disturbed condition. Our national safety and security require that it be done.

Furthermore, we must expect to share a portion of our riches and resources with the much less fortunate people of the world. The degree of this sharing can be determined only by the extent of our willingness to endure some sacrifices of material pleasures for the reward of peace.

It is not enough that our political and economic leaders devote their thoughts and energies to the dangerous pitfalls that beset us nor that they devote themselves to the discovery of the proper solution or course of action; that responsibility must be shared by all citizens whose love of country and desire for peace dominate their consciousness. Upon no group of citizens does this

responsibility fall more heavily than the veterans' organizations of all sizes, types, and kinds. Representing as they do the greatest segment of our population; having themselves felt the pain of battle, they are in a better position to urge greater sacrifices but ones which are much less than those which are a part of war. Nobody knows better than they that the security of any country stems primarily from the hardihood and strength of character of its people and from the soundness of its government both financially, economically, and politically. Their desire for the improvement of their own lot and that of their comrades must always be tempered by an ample consideration of the consequences upon our national economy. In this connection, the responsibility cannot be left exclusively with the leaders of the veterans' organizations; it must be sensed and met by the individuals themselves.

I am confident that the members of the Finger Lake Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars realize the full implication of much that has been said here today and are ready to perform their part in the fulfillment of their continued obligation to themselves, their comrades, and their country. Let us all work unceasingly and enthusiastically to the end that when those who follow us are celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of this post they can point with pride and gratitude to the product of our endeavor.

Disparity in Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received a letter from a farm constituent of Minnesota wherein he presented an angle to present farm prices that should be called to the attention of the President and Congress, and I have therefore asked to insert the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

Now that the coal miners have got a nice fat raise, how about doing something for the forgotten farmers.

We are mostly dairy farmers in this community selling skim milk and butterfat. For some time now we have been getting 35 cents per hundred pounds for our skim milk and 15 cents of that goes for hauling, leaving us a clear profit of 20 cents. For that 20 cents we can't buy a gallon of gas for our tractor and we buy in the bulk. If we want to buy a drink of whisky the cheapest grades cost 30 cents and it takes just a hundred and fifty pounds of skim milk to pay for that drink, and a bottle of beer costs 20 cents. A package of cigarettes costs 18 cents so that takes a hundred pounds of skim milk to pay for those, with 2 cents in change.

All repairs for farm machinery have been raised and will no doubt be raised still more now that the coal will cost more, due to the raise the miners get.

Most people have the mistaken idea farmers got rich during the war years, but most of us paid off our debts and were just getting on our feet when the slump came.

A hundred pounds of skim milk is supposed to have the feed value of one-half bushel of corn. Where is the comparison with corn selling at $2.21 a bushel? How many of you would like to work for such small potatoes as a farmer does?

Government Seizure No Cure-all of Labor-Management Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 was passed because a fairer method of settling labor disputes in the United States was urgently needed; and, if some regulation had not been applied to strikes which were crippling the entire economy of the Nation, it would have been necessary to continue the policy of Government seizure of industries involved in such strikes, a policy which leads down the road toward Government ownership. Personally, I would prefer that labor and management negotiate and settle their differences without the necessity of Federal legislation, which, of course would be ideal.

We in America do not want government ownership of our industries. We want freedom of enterprise with adequate Government regulation to curb inequalities and to protect the best interest of labor, management, and the general public.

The record of Government seizure of plants during the war has proven that this method of settling strikes actually tends to prevent true collective bargaining, which is one of the fundamental rights cherished by labor. Graham Patterson has carefully analyzed the effect of Government seizure of plants in his recent article in the Pathfinder Magazine entitled "Government Seizure No Cure-All." I believe his conclusions are worthy of special attention.

TALKING IT OVER
(By Graham Patterson)
GOVERNMENT SEIZURE NO CURE-ALL

During the war, the Government was given authority to seize and operate vital industries when labor disputes threatened to halt their operation. When these special war powers expired, the question of the advisability of renewing them was raised. But is Government seizure of strike-threatened industries a good thing?

In the ordinary labor dispute, Government seizure is unnecessary. The emergency strike provisions of the recently passed labor act should be effective in most cases. Government seizure should be considered as a national policy, not merely in relation to coal mines. If adopted as a national policy, it could too easily be used in shipping, railroads, steel, oil, auto manufacture, public utilities and other fields.

The principal weakness of Government seizure as a means of settling labor disputes is that it tends to prevent true collective bargaining. We've seen what happened in the coal industry from 1943 to 1947 under the Smith-Connally Act. Militant labor leaders can force the seizure of industries at will, merely by making greater demands than the owners can meet.

Government seizure of an industry can prove a boomerang, for once it takes place, the Government can find it difficult to end. Unwise labor authorities usually resist return of the properties to their private owners except under conditions satisfactory to them. And this means surrender to those who are usually responsible for the seizure by the Government.

An industry that has been taken over by the Government can prove a "white elephant." The Government does not have the trained personnel necessary to administer seized properties efficiently, nor can it train them under emergency conditions. As a result, huge losses could be built up, even in prosperous times, and in a situation where competition is strong, the losses to the public treasury could be staggering.

A very significant point, and one that is too often overlooked, is this: Government seizure as a permanent policy can lead to Government ownership. This applies to all major industries as well as to natural resources such as coal. Government ownership would inevitably lead to lowered production, less efficient distribution, destroying competition, higher costs, growth of statism, loss of personal freedom for both labor and management, and even eventually destruction of the whole system of representative government upon which our Nation was founded.

The American people do not want and cannot afford policies leading to those results. England has had a painful demonstration of the benefits of Government ownership of important industries. Greater production, lower prices, and better service are always a result of competition. With important industries in the hands of politicians, this incentive is removed, and improved service to the public becomes less important than the bureaucrats' own political welfare.

The recently passed labor bill was a result of public insistence on a fairer method of settling labor disputes and controlling unwise labor leaders' use of their authority. The principle of Government seizure works in the opposite direction. With the Government authorized to seize industries stopped by strikes, labor leaders who are inclined to be arbitrary can force the Government to take over an industry and dictate their own terms to the Government.

It is a reflection upon the sincerity and intelligence of labor organizations as well as management to accept the idea of Government seizure as a means of settling their disputes. That is not even paying lip service to the merits of collective bargaining.

Personal Patronage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of July 22, 1947:

PERSONAL PATRONAGE

The disclosure that career Government employees, some of them with 15 or 20 years of service, are losing their jobs while other workers hired on a wartime basis are being kept on the pay roll as the beneficiaries of a sort of "personal patronage" system in some of the agencies calls for prompt corrective action.

When Congress resorted to appropriation cuts to force reductions in Government personnel it did not intend that long-time career employees should be the first victims of this retrenchment policy. On the contrary, it

was made perfectly clear that the so-called war-service employees—those hired on a temporary basis during the war—should be the first to go. It was expected, of course, that thousands of these would be retained in Government service after they had taken and passed examinations for permanent jobs. But in those cases where someone has to be dropped and the choice must be made between a career employee and a temporary worker, it was and is the plain intent of Congress that the latter should be the one to be dropped.

According to a report just issued by Chairman REES, of the House Civil Service Committee, however, this congressional policy has been circumvented in some agencies through the operation of a "personal patronage" system. This means, in other words, that some officials, desiring to keep on the pay roll personal friends among the war-service employees, have been staying within their reduced budgets by firing career workers. This can and should be stopped.

One way of stopping it is provided by the bill which has just passed the House and which provides that, in reductions of force, permanent-status employees are to replace any war-service workers doing comparable work within an agency. A still better method—if it is made to work—lies in the new Civil Service Commission plan to extend preference to career employees on a Government-wide basis. This means that the career employee, instead of enjoying preference only within the agency which employs him, would have the same preference as against any temporary worker doing comparable work in any agency.

Presumably the House bill has been passed because of doubt that the Civil Service Commission policy will be enforced. But the latter is the better approach, and it can be, and ought to be, enforced. For if the career employees are not given maximum protection, they will become the victims of grave injustice and the civil-service merit system can be expected to revert to the spoils system of 70 years ago.

Friendly Interchange With Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago the Board of Education of the City of Cleveland passed a resolution sponsored by Mrs. Norma Wulff, now president of the board, establishing an international relations curriculum center in Lincoln High School of our city under the leadership of Prof. Guy F. Varner who was named coordinator. Since then the center has taken part in numerous programs of understanding and of international significance. They have established a junior council of world affairs patterned after the Cleveland council with three divisions, the European, the Far East, and the inter-American. Each of these divisions is meeting twice a month and sponsoring assembly programs once or twice a semester. This forward-looking program of our Cleveland Board of Education is commendable.

I feel Members of Congress will want to know that some of our future citizens will devote themselves to a realistic and worth-while good neighbor program of understanding. I should like to include the story of a delightful episode of free interchange between this country and our Central and South American neighbors inaugurated by Lincoln High School. The students and faculty of the school prepared, printed, and sent the following words of greeting to the Ministers of Education in the 20 Latin-American nations:

Geography has made us neighbors in the Western Hemisphere.

Education for greater Inter-American understanding has made us friends and good neighbors.

Education for greater international understanding will make it possible for the American family of nations to work together in building one world of good neighbors.

GEORGE HNATH,
President, Inter-American Division, Council of World Affairs.
RUTH E. DORSEY,
Sponsor, Inter-American Division, Council of World Affairs.
E. G. BRYANT,
Principal, Lincoln High School.
GUY F. VARNER,
Assistant Principal and Coordinator, International Relations Center.

Typical of reactions to such friendly gestures is the following article which appeared in the daily newspaper Novedades of Managua, Nicaragua:

On occasion of Pan-American Day, the famous institution, the Lincoln High School of Cleveland, Ohio, United States of America, has sent to the Minister of Public Education, Dr. Mariano Valle Quintero, this diploma that we take pleasure in reproducing which says, among other things, "Geography has made us neighbors in the Western Hemisphere, education has made us friends and good neighbors." Dr. Valle Quintero is one of the greatest Americanists in Nicaragua and the message that has been sent to him in form of a diploma is recognition of his achievements toward the mission of consolidating the unity of one hemisphere.

It is these little things, Mr. Speaker, that make for true friendship. We of Cleveland are proud of sponsoring such activities and we are fortunate to have in charge of this school program of international study and understanding a man of Mr. Varner's understanding. His genuine interest was responsible for his visiting 12 of the Latin American countries last year at his own expense. He plans to visit the remaining countries next year.

Who knows how far-reaching the activities of these "unofficial ambassadors" may be?

Conservation of Our Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I am the only chairman of a legislative committee in the House who resides west of Kansas. I have been a Member of the House of Representatives for 21 years. When my party was returned to power last fall, due to my seniority rating I had the choice of one of three committees—Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Public Lands, or Labor. I selected the Committee on Public Lands which, under the Congressional Reorganization Act, includes six former legislative committees, namely, Insular Affairs, Territories, Mines and Mining, Irrigation and Reclamation, Public Lands, and Indian Affairs.

The merger of these six committees into one, under the title of Public Lands, gave to it the responsibility of nearly all of the Nation's natural resources which are principally in the Western States. In selecting this committee I did so in the hope I could help conserve our fast-dwindling natural resources, particularly our irreplaceable oil reserves and our forests.

CONSERVATION OF OUR FORESTS

Shortly after the turn of the century, as a member of the California State Senate, I was a leader in the good fight to save the Big Basin grove of redwoods in the Santa Cruz Mountains from the woodman's ax and the big lumber interests. These giants of the forest are known only to certain sections of California. As I have stated before on the floor of this House, they are the oldest and largest living things in the world—they were there when Moses was a baby in the bulrushes and when the Saviour was carrying His cross up Calvary Hill. But, Mr. Speaker, these historical facts have no appeal to those who are permitted to slash, slaughter, and destroy the remaining forests in this country.

At the present time there is being cut yearly one and one-half times more timber than is being replaced by natural growth. Last year over 1,000,000,000 board feet of lumber was shipped out of the country. Add to this the loss by devastating forest fires, also the terrible losses due to forest diseases, particularly to young trees, and it can readily be seen that it is only a matter of limited years when this country will be completely denuded of its forests. The States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin offer gruesome evidence of what is sure to happen to the great forests of California, Oregon, Washington, and Montana, and to other States that still have stands of timber.

Congress owes it to the generations to follow, in the years and centuries that lie ahead, to follow the wise policy of Belgium, Norway, Sweden, and Germany, by passing mandatory laws providing for selective removal of trees on a sustained-yield basis, followed by immediate reforestation. We should ignore the seemingly plausible pleas of those who speak for the selfish interests which would slaughter and slash, without discretion, for profit, every remaining stand of timber left in the United States.

OIL CONSERVATION

Oil and electrical energy are two of the greatest assets in our national economy and our national defense. Our national petroleum resources are limited and every barrel of oil we take from the ground is gone forever. During the past

year our petroleum resources were diminished by 36,000,000 barrels of oil used in the production of electrical energy.

The American Petroleum Institute estimates that the oil reserves from known petroleum deposits in the United States at the end of 1946 amounted to slightly over 20,000,000,000 barrels of crude oil. Consumption is now at the rate of 1,750,000,000 barrels per year. This means our known reserves will be exhausted in 12 years.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER DEVELOPMENT

Hydroelectric power is inexhaustible. Every reclamation project developing hydroelectric power conserves just that much of our oil reserves for future use and extends the life of those reserves. Money advanced for irrigation and conservation projects from which hydroelectric power can be developed is not a Government subsidy. It is an investment in the future of America, every dollar of which must be repaid.

There is no honest objection to the development of hydroelectric power by private capital. On the other hand, private power interests have no moral or proper right to interfere with public development of great hydroelectric power projects beyond their scope or with infant projects which are made economically feasible by Government participation.

The great Central Valley conservation, irrigation, and power development project could not be financed under the terms of H. R. 2873 as originally introduced in the present Congress. The Committee on Public Lands, after most careful study, amended this bill and recently reported it favorably to the House of Representatives in a form making possible the continued development of this and other self-liquidating conservation projects.

It is readily apparent from the several bills now pending before the House of Representatives that private power interests are making a concerted drive to thwart the development of power by any other means than their own. These same interests have historically not shown any desire to cooperate in the conservation of national resources that are lost by use. I have particular reference to the use of oil for power development to which I have already referred.

By the short-sighted policy written into the appropriation bill by the Appropriation Subcommittee for the Department of the Interior the completion of hydroelectric power-producing projects would be delayed for years. The Grand Coulee project would not be completed for 39 years; the Hungry Horse project in Montana would be delayed 30 years; the Palisades project in Idaho, 33 years; the Colorado-Big Thompson project, 19 years; and the Great Central Valley project would not be completed until 17 years from now.

Reclamation is no longer limited to the simple reclamation of land. Out of it has grown one of the most vital products necessary to our whole economy—the generation and transmission of hydroelectric power. One of the finest examples of this work is the great Central Valley project in California.

The Central Valley project embraces a vast empire equal to the combined area of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and one-half of New Jersey. One of the primary objects of that project has been to save over a million acres of the most fertile land in the world from salt-water infiltration. Before the Federal Government undertook this project more than 50,000 acres of land had already been destroyed.

To carry out this project it was necessary to build two large dams—the Shasta and the Keswick Dams—capable of developing 450,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power. These dams, with their power development, are an integral part of the entire project designed as a soil-conservation measure, but also of tremendous importance from a national defense standpoint as well as our peacetime economy.

AAF: Almost Grounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

AAF—ALMOST GROUNDED

How can the American people look on the disintegration of the Army Air Forces without angry, resounding protest?

How can citizens watch that great security safeguard, so recently a national pride, fade away to a mere shadow of itself without counting the almost certain consequences?

Every few days brings further evidence of the dissipation. Consider the latest news of this sort. Some 28,600 Reservists have enrolled for part-time flying. They want to keep up their aviation skills, and the country should be even more eager to keep them in trim.

Yet only 9,700—barely more than a third—can be accommodated. A small number is made even much smaller. Why? Because of the heavy trimming of the Air Forces' budget.

But this is only one detail in what General Eaker, representing General Spaatz, AAF commander, recently told the National War College was a vast "wrecking job." When VJ-day came, the United States had 2,500,000 men in its Air Forces, 230 groups, and 85,000 planes.

With our enemies whipped into submission, extensive reductions in our fighting forces of all kinds were to be expected. The AAF went along with this reduction program. It proposed a postwar force of 400,000 military and 225,000 civilians. It asked for 12,000 active planes and 14,000 wartime-built planes in stored reserve. This was a plane force, counting the stored reserve, of less than a third the number on hand when the war ended.

Almost overnight contracts involving more than $12,000,000,000 were terminated. Property valued at $25,000,000,000 was disposed of as surplus. This property included more than 100,000 airplanes of a wide variety of types.

With the redeployment and discharge of personnel went the closing of air stations. More than 600 air stations were folded up in the United States and more than 1,000 shut down overseas. Air stations that were not removed or abandoned were turned over to foreign governments, as, for example, the $5,000,000 field at Dhahran, in Saudi Arabia, and magnificent Payne Field at Cairo, Egypt.

As its wartime establishment literally fell apart, the AAF tried valiantly to interest Washington and the country as a whole in maintaining a reasonable peacetime organization and program. It asked for a direct appropriation of $1,850,000,000. The first cut was made by the War Department's own Budget Advisory Committee—under pressure from Congress. General Eisenhower, well aware of the great importance of the air arm, restored part of the cut.

The Bureau of the Budget, an agency of the executive department, cut the request an almost even 33⅓ percent. In Congress, the already much-reduced figure became the object of another tug-of-war. There were cuts and partial restoration, and then more cuts and still more restorations, until everyone became dizzy. How the appropriation came out in the end is only too well indicated by the fact that only one Reservist in three can engage in part-time training. The Army Air Forces has been all but grounded.

If war should come, we can be sure the first thing we would turn to would be the Air Forces. Those who would then cry out the loudest about inadequacy of our air power would be the very people who are cutting it far below the safety point or who are blindly sitting by telling themselves it is of no immediate concern.

Americans will wake up to what has happened to the Army Air Forces or pay the price some day for their slumber.

The West Against Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I make this further statement in order to keep the record straight with reference to H. R. 2873 as unanimously reported by the Committee on Public Lands and approved by the Department of the Interior:

It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that Monday when this bill, amending certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, was called up on the Consent Calendar, Mr. MCDONOUGH, and Mr. PHILLIPS opposed its immediate consideration obtained permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD at that point. Their remarks appear in the RECORD for July 21. Both of these gentlemen argue that the 78-year period which the Committee on Public Lands finally decided upon, as a reasonable period within which costs attributable to the power features of Federal reclamation projects should be returned, was too long. In brief, their argument appears to be that 78 years is too long because the period fixed for return of the reimbursable costs of the Boulder Canyon project is 50 years; because, so they maintain, the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 now prescribes a 50-year period for the return of power costs; and, finally, because, in any event, 50 years is too long a period. Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen are wrong on all three counts.

In the first place, no analogy should be drawn between Federal reclamation projects governed by the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and the Boulder Canyon project, for there is no similarity between them. The Boulder Canyon project has always been recognized by the Congress as a special case and the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 specifically excepts the Boulder Canyon project from treatment under it. Thus, for instance, section 18 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 now provides:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057) as amended.

In the second place, neither of my colleagues is correct in asserting that the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 now provides for a 50-year period within which power costs are required to be returned to the United States. On the contrary, the only requirement in the 1939 act governing the period in which power costs shall be returned to the United States is that they shall be returned within a reasonable period of years not exceeding in any event the useful life of the project. That is a reasonable construction of the existing law; and I defy anybody to quote me from the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 any provision specifically fixing a 50-year period within which such costs shall be returned to the United States.

Finally, it is said by the gentleman from California that 78 years is a period which was "picked out of thin air." I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is wholly inaccurate and wholly unfair to the committee over which I have the honor to preside.

In arriving at the 78-year period for the return of these costs to the Federal Government, the Public Lands Committee of the House sought to achieve two principal objectives: One, to establish a definitive period for the return of such costs in order to meet points that have been raised from time to time in the Appropriations Committee, which has been anxious to have written into the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, a definitive period of years for the return of power costs, instead of the provisions of existing law which provide merely that such costs shall be returned within a reasonable period of years not exceeding the useful life of the project; second, to fix upon a period of years that would not handicap the Government in disposing of the important resource, to wit: Hydroelectric power at reasonable rates, bearing in mind that rates must be sufficient not only to return power costs but also to return a large portion of the irrigation costs of reclamation projects. It became necessary, first, then to consider what is the average useful life of Federal reclamation projects. In this connection the Committee on Public Lands determined, after mature consideration of expert testimony on the subject, that the average useful life of Federal reclamation projects is in excess of 100 years. It determined, nevertheless, to proceed on the basis that such useful life does not exceed 100 years. This it did for the purpose of applying a most conservative measure to its deliberations on the question of the period that ought to be fixed for the return of the power investment and because it had in mind, the gentlemen from California have pointed out in part, that allowance must be made for such intangibles as physical, economic, and social changes which cannot, of course, be predicted with certainty. I hope that, as my colleague Mr. McDONOUGH has pointed out and as my colleague Mr. PHILLIPS has hinted, we are on the verge of the development of electrical energy through some application of atomic power. Not being, however, as expert on the subject of atomic development as my colleague Mr. McDONOUGH appears to be, I would hesitate greatly to say to this House, as he has said, that it is a 'virtual certainty that energy will be generated on a large scale by atomic plants before this 78-year period has more than one-third run its course." My colleague Mr. McDONOUGH would have us believe that in 26 years from now electrical energy will be generated on a large scale by atomic power plants. I hope he is right, for I know that there is a great shortage of electrical energy in this country, a shortage which is being met in part by the wasteful use of our petroleum resources. I have spoken on that point from time to time in this body. I hope that through the further development of hydroelectric plants, and if you please, through the development of atomic plants, we shall find a way to stop the wasteful burning up of our rapidly dwindling petroleum resources. I am not prepared to say, however, that atomic power plants will be producing on a large scale 26 years from now. I am prepared to say that, even if they are producing such energy 26 years from now or at any time, the demand for electrical energy is such in this country that we can absorb that energy as well as all the energy that can be produced at Federal reclamation projects in the West.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, there is no basis for analogy by my colleagues between the Boulder Canyon project and Federal reclamation projects governed by the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. The Reclamation Project Act of 1939 does not now prescribe a 50-year period within which power costs should be returned. The 78-year period arrived at by my committee, after extended consideration, is a conservative period which every Member of this House ought to approve.

Mr. Speaker, the question resolves itself as to whether the byproduct of great public works should inure to the benefit of all the people as provided for in H. R. 2873. As it is primarily a western question it is one for the West to decide.

United States Civil Service Commission Retirement System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, this week the Congress has before it several commendable bills which affect the Civil Service retirement system and the lives of thousands of present and retired Federal employees. While consideration is being given these bills, I urge that the Members read the following analysis of a plan for more efficiency and economy in Government by improving retirement information and services to field service employees, prepared by Joseph J. Tepley of St. Paul, Minn., a constituent of mine. Mr. Tepley should be commended for his efforts and research in devising this plan. It should be adopted by the United States Civil Service Commission in the administration of the present or any new civil-service laws. The analysis follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
RETIREMENT SYSTEM

FOREWORD

A prevalent lack of understanding of regulations governing the retirement system administered by the United States Civil Service Commission for the benefit of Federal Government employees has resulted in numerous instances of loss of benefits or delay in adjustments which worked to the disadvantage of present or former civil-service field workers. Investigation through contact with personnel in various Government agencies has disclosed a universal lack of interest in the retirement system because of ignorance of how the regulations apply to the individual employee. Documentary evidence and interviews developed case histories of employees who have suffered financial loss. Supervisory personnel could give no effective assistance because even highly placed administrators in various agencies and field branches lack the required information and authority to implement required action. In many instances direct contact with the Civil Service Commission has failed to produce results to the advantage of the employee because the Commission lacks facilities for disposal of the large volume of cases and the absence of an organizational structure extending to the local level to permit efficient clearance of a multiplicity of detail and prompt, decisive action. Numerous other functions of the Commission are performed efficiently and Government employees are kept fully informed as to the regulations and are assisted in conforming advantageously to the requirements. By some misadventure, however, dissemination to the field-service employee of essential information concerning the retirement system is lacking. It should be borne in mind that the retirement fund is accumulated from payments made by Federal employees and since this is their money, the employees are entitled to prompt, courteous, and accurate information service. An efficient and economical method of enabling the employee to obtain full benefit from the retirement system, and an attendant betterment of morale, is provided by the plan herein submitted.

JOSEPH J. TEPLEY.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *July 1947.*

THE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

The civil-service retirement law of August 1, 1920, with subsequent amendments, is administered by the United States Civil Service Commission. The Handbook for Commission Employees, on page 52, lists ten principal activities of which two pertain to the retirement system. These are: "Maintain service records of Federal employees," and "administer the Civil Service Retirement Act."

In describing the organization and functions of the Commission, the handbook on page 51 cites details of the location and types of agencies and jurisdiction over field branches of Federal agencies, 5,000 boards of examiners and rating boards of Navy yards, arsenals, and similar Federal establishments, of the Commission's 14 regional offices. It

states that each regional office, in addition to other functions, shall disseminate civil-service information.

Conspicuous by its absence is any mention of the retirement system as being involved in any of the functions of the regional offices which act an an integral part of the Commission's decentralized field organization for serving effectively, economically, and expeditiously the various field branches of Federal agencies.

(NOTE.—The inability of field-service employees to readily obtain official information and service locally obviously is due to the lack of provision for such service. It is a logical assumption, therefore, that the root of the trouble afflicting administration of the retirement system is due in large part to restricted service on the local level and to the lack of clear channels to higher levels of administration where the authority for decision and effective action is possessed.)

CURRENT STATISTICS

Provisions of the retirement law authorize the establishment of a fund, held in custody by the Federal Government, for the payment of benefits to civil-service employees and for the allocation to that fund of 5 percent of the employees' salaries.

As of the close of 1946, more than 2,000,000 Federal employees were covered by the law. More than 200,000 employees have retired in accordance with provisions of the law since 1920, and currently approximately 105,000 are on the retirement roll. The retirement fund now amounts to more than $2,250,000,000.

The system as now constituted is most liberal in its application and extensive in its coverage. The magnitude of the task of administration is indicated by the following comparison of claims processed:

Type of case	Processed, 1940	1946	
		Processed	Pending
Annuity	8,083	18,508	5,319
Refund	15,629	1,534,533	75,407
Death	6,711	23,461	5,886

NOTE.—Sharp reductions in Federal employment increase the number of refund cases and consequently the problem of administration.

THE PROBLEM

Ours undoubtedly is the most liberal and far-reaching of any retirement system, but it can be truly beneficial only insofar as every employee may enjoy equal advantage under it. Unfortunately many employees fail to avail themselves of the maximum benefits because they have not been informed as to how the regulations apply to them. Their ignorance, due to no fault of their own, occasions indifference. Adequate information service simply does not exist, as a study of case histories emphasizes. All too many employees do not know what they are missing and all too many times when they do find out, they cannot learn how to proceed to obtain benefits or avoid unnecessary loss.

Private insurance companies have trained specialists who advise their clients by local contact. The Federal Government does not give such service. The 14 regional offices of the Civil Service Commission do not keep the employees informed as to the retirement regulations. They have not been delegated such duty. Mandatory dissemination of pertinent information to awaken the employee to his opportunity to take advantage of beneficial provisions and changes in regulations has not been required.

It is a fact that many employees in numerous Federal agencies have worked for years without receiving ltitle more information about the retirement system than that the 5-percent deduction from their salaries goes into a fund from which they are eligible to benefit after separation from Government service. They are not informed that if they do not make certain applications, file certain documents and act within certain time limitations dependent upon various, and frequently varying, conditions of their employment they may suffer loss of benefits.

It is noteworthy that this lack of affirmative action to keep employees informed concerning the retirement system does not apply to numerous other phases of civil-service employment. The administration of civil service down through the local level is uniformly excellent.

The tremendous turnover in Federal employment both of officials and subordinate employees throughout the various Government agencies is an important contributing factor. This condition was especially bad during the depression and war years. Officials too frequently had insufficient time in which to inform themselves and the working forces under their supervision as to the retirement system. But still, today, the employee generally is not being given the necessary information and no provision under any systematic procedure has been made to give such service.

Regional civil-service offices have available only very general retirement informaton. They exercise no jurisdiction over the retirement system in the various field branches of Federal agencies within the region comparable with the supervisory authority delegated them relative to other civil-service activities.

There are no mandatory programs for local instruction of employees relative to their retirement rights or obligations. Field agency administrative personnel is not trained to disseminate such information. Employees are not being furnished with written guides or bulletins, or informed through agency-initiated interviews, group meetings or otherwise.

The employee also is hampered, even when fairly well informed as to a specific situation, by the absence of smooth channeling of pertinent official records relating to the individual. Some agencies have not been required to maintain employee retirement salary deduction basic records and transfer of the employee to one or more other agencies as a result frequently causes confusion and delay, and too many times loss of benefits. The basic records could be made available in Civil Service Commission headquarters but time and expense would prohibit the vast majority of employees from presenting their case in person in Washington, D. C.

War veterans know they have certain employment priority rights. Few of them have had an opportunity to learn of disability benefits under the retirement system. Total disability annuity after 5 years of service is provided for but claim must be made before separation from civil-service employment or within 6 months thereafter, cases of mental incompetency being the only exception to the rule. Neither do veterans generally know that a disability pension from the Veterans' Administration does not necessarily bar civil-service retirement disability benefits. Five years of creditable service may include honorable service in the armed forces. Few know that retirement rights of a civilian employee entering military service are protected.

Numerous other obscure instances of retirement benefit rights could be cited but the average employee does not have easy access to such information. The Civil Service Commission pamphlet on the retirement system contains general information and the law itself covers the subject. An expert study and interpretation of the regulations would be required, however, to permit the average employee to apply the provisions accurately to his own case. Lacking adequate guidance, therefore, the employee's potential benefits are in jeopardy and since the essential information is not available locally, the employees prevailing indifference is understandable. And even when the employee does become aware of potential benefits, the task of developing the case through the existing clogged channels to higher jurisdiction in all too many instances becomes monumental. Then discouragement often results in abandonment of the claim.

Employees in private industry covered by the Social Security Act have official information service easily available locally. The Veterans' Administration insurance and other divisions have been decentralized to branch and regional offices to improve efficiency and effect economies and better service to the individual veteran. Readily available information on the retirement system as well as on insurance problems is vital to the 800,000 veterans now in civilian Federal service. The Government, in fairness, is obligated to provide them with adequate information on retirement benefits for which they are eligible comparable to that relating to Government insurance and to that afforded industrial workers in social-security status.

Employee morale is an all-important factor contributing to efficiency in any type of employment. An employee who is investing in retirement protection but who is unable to learn essential facts about his investment, his status, and his privileges is bound to be uneasy, unhappy, and dissatisfied in his Federal job, especially if he loses benefits through failure to take advantage of many very desirable privileges under the law because he is uninformed.

CASE HISTORIES

A study of case histories discloses the extreme difficulty encountered by employees in their attempt to ascertain their status under the retirement system, available plans for their benefit, alternatives which can be exercised on separation from Government service, voluntary contributions to their retirement-fund accounts, and other problems. In numerous instances decisive action was not obtained, employees became discouraged, and claims were abandoned.

Several facts are outstanding in a large number of field-service workers case histories. No helpful information pertaining to individual accounts was secured from the Civil Service Commission. Answers from the Commission consisted of form letters, pamphlets containing only general information, various blank forms, etc. Also significant was the delay in answering inquiries. Employees who had worked for several Federal agencies ran into a blank wall when they attempted to ascertain their status under the retirement system, based on total creditable service.

The following summaries are typical of numerous case histories studied:

1. A woman employee at Fort Snelling, Minn., resigned from service on November 17, 1945. Thirteen months passed without determination of her claim, and in desperation she telegraphed her Congressman on February 24, 1947, stating: "Resigned from civil service Fort Snelling, Minn., November 17, 1945. No action taken on refund of retirement fund. Husband passed away recently. Need money desperately."

2. World War II veteran, Department of Agriculture employee before and following military service; later transferred to Veterans' Administration, where presently employed; career employee; wrote Civil Service Commission April 30, 1945, indicating desire to make deposits for previous creditable service for which salary deductions were not made; requested retirement status during military service, and asked for statement of cost to bring his retirement account to date. On August 15, 1945, received mimeographed response instructing him to forward an enclosed application form "through official channels." There being no local official with whom he could discuss

his case, he abandoned the adjustment attempt.

3. Woman career employee, Office of Price Administration, wrote Commission January 10, 1946, inquiring concerning her designation of beneficiary, and for information on total creditable service. On January 23, 1946, received unsigned reply typed on reverse side of her letter. Her request concerning designation of beneficiary was completely ignored. Instruction to contact the administrative office of her agency was confusing, since at least one of the former agencies where she had been employed had been abolished. Having been separated from service three times, she was bewildered at being told the Commission maintained no record of her deductions, while at the same time the reply stated such records were forwarded to the Commission in cases of separation from service. She abandoned her effort.

Other case histories studied disclosed the inability of the Commission to forward individually prepared replies; individual retirement account cards not available in Commission files; omission in Commission replies of answers to specific inquiries; lack of provision for obtaining information locally; and the exhaustive flow of correspondence required to obtain even incomplete information. The study produced forceful evidence of the urgent need for revision of the retirement-system regulations to provide field employees, by means of mandatory agency-initiated interviews, with easily understood information and by making easily available at all times complete and specific information relative to the status of the employee's individual account, total creditable service, and priviliges or options the employee might exercise in order to obtain maximum benefits and protection under the Retirement Act.

THE SOLUTION

Establishment of information and advisory service at the local level with a grant of authority to civil service regional offices to originate action and clear cases for final decision and disposal by the Civil Service Commission would provide a solution of the operational problem which is harmfully handicapping field service employees in their efforts to benefit fully from the retirement system.

Underlying and outstanding in all of the difficulties encountered by the employee in attempting to obtain equitable application of Retirement Act provisions to individual cases is the appalling lack of readily available, personally explained and easily understood information pertaining to the individual account. There is a way to provide this vital and urgently needed information effectively, economically, and expeditiously with equal advantage and availability to each employee.

The method recommended is reorganization in such manner that the Civil Service Commission would decentralize retirement system operating functions and services to each of its 14 regional Civil Service Offices throughout the country and thereby provide clear channels for expeditious disposition of cases easily developed at the local level through comprehensive information and advisory service.

The regional offices for many years have acted as "integral part(s) of the Commission's decentralized field organization for serving effectively, economically, and expeditiously the various field branches of Federal agencies," as stated on page 51, Handbook for Commission Employees, in all phases of the Commission's activities except the retirement system. These functions of the Commission and its 14 regional offices—authority to recruit, classify, promote, hold examinations, etc. for civil-service employees—were further decentralized recently to the countless field branches of Federal agencies by Executive Order No. 9830 issued February 24, 1947, and effective May 1, 1947.

Inasmuch as the Commission has decentralized most of its operating functions to improve services other than retirement to field agencies and their employees, it seems appropriate and logical that the Commission should apply the same principle of decentralization to administration of the retirement system.

This essential improvement could be made with only slight modification of existing retirement system regulations. Such changes would be fundamental in solving the problem existing by reason of inadequate and unequal retirement information and case-processing service now available to field service employees.

Following is an outline of a decentralization plan providing for more efficiency and economy in Government through adequate dissemination of information and advisory service for field service employees:

Administration and general policy-making authority for the retirement system should remain with the Commission headquarters in Washington to insure uniform Nation-wide performance and service to all Federal employees. Operating functions and services decentralized to each regional Civil Service office should include mandatory programs and procedures, promulgated by the Commission, for more widespread dissemination of official retirement information.

Each of the Commission's 14 regional offices, which are located in principal cities, would have jurisdiction over field retirement-system activities and be responsible for dissemination of retirement information throughout the geographic area of the region, and act as an integral part of the Commission's decentralized field organization for serving the various field branches of Federal agencies thereby effectively, economically, and expeditiously.

Each regional office would be required to:

Conduct a continuous retirement-system instruction and training program for administrative officials in the various field branches of Federal agencies in the region to enable such officials to advise their employees and keep them fully informed, through mandatory agency-initiated interviews and meetings, concerning the status of individual accounts, creditable service, alternative privileges or options they might exercise to obtain maximum benefits and protection under the Retirement Act;

Maintain (1) files of beneficiaries designated by annuitants and employees; (2) a retirement-record system of service records of employees in the executive civil service within the region; (3) records of individual accounts of voluntary deposits, and (4) retirement accounts of separated employees;

Enforce revised regulations requiring employing agencies to (1) maintain complete individual retirement accounts (Civil Service Commission form 2806) for employees on retirement-fund rolls in active service at such levels of the agency's organizational structure within the civil-service region as to make such records available at all times to their employees, and (2) issue annual statement to each employee of his total creditable service and equity in the retirement system;

Process appeals, maintain liaison and conduct negotiations with regional, area, and local officials of other agencies relative to furnishing specific information on individual accounts, and hold conferences with administrative, personnel and other agency officials for improvement of retirement-system information and advisory service for each employee of such agency;

Distribute retirement-fact literature to agencies for redistribution to all employees, and release new information to the press and radio;

Conduct interviews with individual employees upon request; and

Perform other work essential to the proper administration or Federal field retirement-system activities under its jurisdiction.

(NOTE.—Before the decentralization plan is put into operation and regional retirement officers are charged with these responsibilities and duties, they should be given intensive instruction and training so that they are thoroughly conversant with every phase of the Commission's administration and operation of the retirement system. To insure efficient operation, the Commission should appoint full-time regional retirement officers, rather than permit assignment of retirement system duties to personnel distracted by other work and responsibilities.)

Existing regulations would require only slight modification to remedy present deficiencies.

Part 29, Retirement, of the Commission's present regulations contained in the March 7, 1947, supplement to the Federal Personnel Manual provides in part: "* * * The administrative offices of the departments and independent agencies shall initiate and maintain * * * a retirement record system which will furnish all required information for each employee subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act * * *. The individual retirement account, Civil Service Commission Form 2806, shall be established for each employee * * * and shall be maintained by the employing department or agency. The retirement account * * * shall be the basic record from which the rights of individuals under the Retirement Act shall be determined * * *. Immediately upon the separation of an employee from the service of any department or agency, the retirement account shall be completed to date, and the cause and date of separation recorded. The account shall then be certified as to its correctness * * * and forwarded at once to the Civil Service Commission. * * *"

The existing regulations are a basis for action but do not extend sufficiently to fulfill each employee's urgent need of readily available retirement information and service, as for example, whenever changes in his personnel status occur and for other reasons.

Agencies should be required to currently maintain complete individual retirement account cards (Form 2806) at levels in their national organizational structure within the civil-service region near or at the place where the employee works so that official information pertaining to his retirement account is readily available to him at all times. These account cards should be forwarded to the regional office when the employee is separated from service rather than to the Commission in Washington as now required. All essential information relative to retirement could be furnished Washington headquarters by the regional office as now is the practice in connection with all other personnel activities.

The employing agency should be required to keep the employee advised as to his retirement status in order that the employee's benefit rights, options, and privilege of selection as to one of several provisions may be protected against loss which could result from the mere expiration of a specified period of time during employment or following separation from service. Likewise since many employees are transferred from their original agency to one or more agencies, the individual account record should be consolidated in the regional office nearest his place of last employment so that the complete and accurate record would be easily accessible for ready reference and for prompt final disposal action.

The primary objective of the decentralization plan, therefore, is seen to be cohesion of administrative action for the protection of the employee with the principal addition

of the information and advisory service emphasized.

As stated previously, the mandatory programs and procedures suggested in the decentralization plan should be instituted for the same reasons and principles which made it necessary and feasible for the Civil Service Commission, Veterans' Administration, Social Security Board, and other Government agencies to decentralize principal activities to their regonal and branch offices throughout the country.

Were these new retirement system programs and procedures now in effect and all field employees aware of them, as they are of functions and services of the regional civil-service offices other than retirement, most of the difficulties, confusion, and misunderstanding would be eliminated. The Commission headquarters in Washington also would be relieved of the bulk of the tremendous volume of correspondence which it admits its inability to cope with on the basis of individually prepared replies.

If this decentralization plan is adopted, the writer believes the Civil Service Commission can more effectively, economically, and expeditiously fulfill its moral obligation to furnish the pertinent facts pertaining to the retirement system to every employee, thus affording equal opportunity to enjoy the benefits provided by the Civil Service Retirement Act.

H. R. 2744

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I especially want to address myself to the explanation of title III of H. R. 2744. It is this section of the bill which constitutes a departure from the past in the handling of the Reserve components of our armed services. This section is intended to offer an incentive to add to the number of both enlisted and officer personnel of all branches of our Reserve components as well as to increase efficiency by inducing them to a longer period of service.

By way of introduction, I wish to say that this Nation must build up its trained reserves. This is of urgent importance to every one of us. We cannot continue to reduce the size of our Regular Army, Navy, and Air Establishments without providing for a larger and more efficiently trained reserve. In the Army, our enlisted strength has dropped to 1,000,000, which is somewhat below the authorized strength agreed upon by Congress. In the next 2 years, it is expected that this will fall further to the level of about 877,000 persons. As the size of our regular establishments fall, the demand to supplement them with trained reserves increases proportionately.

I might say that our recruitment program for the Army Reserve components has not brought the result for which we had hoped. In the National Guard, the figures show that we have recruited some 80,000 members to date out of a total estimated need of 681,000. In the Reserve proper, recruitment of officer strength is proceeding rather well; but I am sorry to be forced to report that the program of recruitment of enlisted personnel for the reserves has hardly begun. It is very apparent that a further stimulus is needed if we are to build up our National Guard to the required size and if we are to bring into existence full units of Reserves—not just paper units as we had before the war—and by this I mean organizations with both enlisted personnel and officers as are required by the tables of organization.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, because of the difficulties in maintaining proper Reserves and National Guard men in the past, a number of years ago a committee was formed, consisting of representatives of the Regular Army, National Guard, and Organized Reserves for the purpose of working out a program of retirement benefits which would be large enough to become an incentive to retain personnel in the Reserve components and at the same time small enough to permit this Government to finance such a program. At a later date, representatives from the Navy were added to the committee. Over a period of years, the suggestions outlined in H. R. 2744 were evolved. I myself have been working continuously upon such a program for some 5 years; and I am glad to say today that this plan, worked out after much painstaking effort, which required compromises and sacrifices from all branches of service, has the support of all of our Organized Reserve units as well as the support of all interested patriotic and reserve organizations which are dedicated to the maintenance of a proper defensive posture for this country. A similar bill to this one was approved last Congress by the House but it died in the Senate.

H. R. 2744, TITLE III

H. R. 2744, title III, provides a retirement system within the grasp of members of the National Guard and Army and Navy Reserves. As an inducement to continuous service, we provide a retirement program for the members of the Reserve components at the age of 60 years provided they have at least 20 continuous years of service. Our plan is to provide these retirement benefits based upon a system of credits which can be earned by both officer and enlisted personnel. For active Federal service—I mean full-time service with the armed services—the plan allows a credit each year equal to 2½ percent of the base and longevity pay at the highest grade, either temporary or permanent. In addition, the plan provides for an annual credit for each year of inactive Federal service equal to one-half percent of the base and longevity pay. In no case can the total credits exceed 75 percent of the base and longevity pay.

To illustrate, if an enlisted man should serve in the National Guard for a period of 20 years, 5 years of which shall be with the Army in camp or in the field, that man shall be entitled to a credit upon his retirement benefits equal to 12½ percent for his active Federal service and a credit of 7½ percent for his 15 years of inactive Federal service, making a total credit of 20 percent of his base and longevity pay. To arrive at the exact amount of his retirement benefits when he reached retirement age of 60 years, we have but to multiply his pay by 20 percent.

You may inquire just how does the individual earn the active-duty credits necessary for retirement—for H. R. 2744 provides a schedule of the minimum amount of active duty necessary to retirement. Active-duty credits are earned by war, by attending summer training camps, taking summer cruises with the Navy, calls from the Reserves to temporary active duty, and by attending the minimum number of monthly drill periods and study periods. In reference to the latter, this plan provides that every member of the Reserve components shall be entitled to a credit of 30 days' active Federal service for his work of attending the minimum number of drill and study periods during the course of the year. This 30 days' credit, together wtih 2 weeks' summer camp training program, will guarantee a minimum of 1½ months' active-duty credit to everyone maintaining the satisfactory rating as a member of any one of the Reserve components.

One of the phases of this matter which has given all interested persons most cause of study and concern was the establishment of a fair minimum active-duty requirement. Specifically, how much credit should be allowed for active Federal service performed in the past? In reaching the schedule which you will find in the report on this bill, the committee in effect compromised this matter. It sets forth a schedule requiring either 3 or 4 years of active Federal service of which a definite part of this service must be in the future. Only in the case of the veteran reservist with as much as 20 years' service in the past, of which over 4 years shall be active Federal service, is the requirement for future active Federal service waived.

Of course, Congress wants to know the costs of the program which we present to you. Fortunately, I have figures of the War Department covering the entire nondisability retirement costs estimated for the next 10 years. I find that the nondisability retirement costs for the next 10 years with the Regular Establishment begins at $1,500,000 as of next year and continues to the sum of $5,118,000 10 years hence. On the other hand, the costs of nondisability retirement of the Reserve components begins next year at the figure of $51,000 and continues for 10 years, at which time it will cost the Government $1,455,725. This means that the entire retirement plans as we present them to you today will cost at the end of 10 years less than $1,500,000 per year. It is not possible to estimate the costs of this program beyond the 10-year period. Too many variable factors enter into the situation to permit any accurate forecast beyond this period.

In conclusion, I urge the adoption of H. R. 2744 as the means of building up our Reserves. I believe now as I have always believed that a democracy is best defended by a reasonably small standing Army and by a well-trained and well-equipped civilian reserve. The Nation is depending upon at least 1,000,000 persons, both officers and men, in the Reserve components of our armed services;

and I can tell you we are a long way from this figure at the present time. Equally important as are numbers is the need for preventing rapid turn-over in the Reserve personnel and it is my belief that H. R. 2744 will provide one of the very best means of preventing rapid turn-over and will provide for continuing service.

Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the United States News of July 10, 1947:

EXTRA: "WAGNER ACT NOT DESTROYED"—A. F. OF L.

(By David Lawrence)

NATIONAL UNION'S GENERAL COUNSEL ADMITS THAT PROTECTIONS AGAINST UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES ARE LITTLE CHANGED FROM ORIGINAL WAGNER ACT—OBLIGATIONS UNDER NEW LAW RECOGNIZED IN NEW COAL CONTRACT

Last week the American Federation of Labor issued through its general counsel three bulletins giving legal interpretations of the new labor law. And what do we find? A careful statement of advice to members as to what the law permits or prohibits.

Most revealing in the third A. F. of L. bulletin is the frank admission that the Taft-Hartley low does not destroy the Wagner labor relations law at all. Here is the exact language of the first sentence in the bulletin:

"The five employer unfair labor practices contained in section 8 of the original Wagner Act are repeated in the same language in the new act."

This is something the A. F. of L. and CIO did not tell their members during the recent controversy in Congress over the Taft-Hartley bill. Nor did the A. F. of L. convey to the public any declaration similar to the one quoted above. Instead the bill was attacked as a "slave labor" bill and one that allegedly destroyed collective bargaining and the Wagner Act—the great Magna Carta of labor.

Continuing, the A. F. of L. bulletin's next sentence reads:

"However, there are other provisions added to section 8 which serve to whittle down the protections previously existing."

What is meant here, of course, is not that the original language of the Wagner Act has been amended or altered, but that certain interpretations issued on its own by the National Labor Relations Board have been nullified as being contrary to the intent of Congress.

"Protections" lost? But are these provisions substantial? The A. F. of L. bulletin resumes:

"For instance, the protections against interference and discrimination through discharge or demotion are weakened by not permitting the Board to consider employer anti-union statements (unless involving actual threats) as background evidence, so that it will now be more difficult to prove antiunion bias. Furthermore, it may be that the employer will be excused from a discriminatory discharge if he can show there was a cause for the discharge other than union membership. Finally, the requirements in respect to bargaining in good faith are diluted by a new definition of collective bargaining which does not require either party to make a concession.

"With the foregoing exceptions, the protections against unfair-labor activities of employers remain much the same as they were under the original Wagner Act, and the previous Board decisions are applicable."

Belated truth: What a manly confession of truth that last sentence contains. Here we have the general counsel of the A. F. of L. telling its unions in straightforward language that the protections against unfair-labor activities of employers remain much the same as they were under the original Wagner Act.

First of all, it will be noted that the previous Board decisions are applicable. This is important because all these cases of discharge or discrimination are largely questions of fact and the National Labor Relations Board has built up several volumes of decisions which deal comprehensively with alleged efforts of employers to discharge or discriminate for union activity.

The protections that are lost, of course, were not lost out of the original law. They were not protections at all but interpretations in which the Board stretched the law to exercise strange powers of mind reading.

If the Board, for instance, found an employer had once upon a time, even years before, made an antiunion statement either in a speech or in a conversation and if some worker who was later fired for incompetency charged that he was being dismissed because he was a union man, the Board leaned heavily on the previous statements by the employer as background evidence of bias. The new law requires the Board to stick to the facts of the case. If it finds that a particular individual was threatened by a talk or statement showing antiunion bias, the evidence on that point is to be considered on its merits without bringing in something that could really be proved only by mind reading. Certainly, antiunion bias hereafter will not be as easy to establish capriciously, but the Labor Board is still to be the judge of the facts adduced and actual discrimination can be penalized.

Most startling is the argument that the "requirements in respect to bargaining in good faith are diluted by a new definition of collective bargaining which does not require either party to make a concession."

Where in the original Wagner Act can anyone find such a requirement? The Senate, before passing the Wagner law in 1935, debated this point and assurance was given by its proponents that the collective-bargaining obligation did not compel concessions. Likewise, the Supreme Court of the United States, in its famous decision in 1937 upholding the constitutionality of the Wagner Act, said explicitly that collective bargaining did not mean compulsory agreement.

Unfortunately, many labor unions have spread the impression that it is an unfair-labor practice to reject a union's demands, and many a weak employer has been bludgeoned into agreement by this device. It has been responsible for more friction on the industrial front than any single factor in collective-bargaining negotiations. The labor unions would be the first to cry out "fascism" or "slave labor" if any law compelled either a union or an employer to make concessions, for this would be compulsory agreement ordered by law. It's surprising to find the A. F. of L. now going on record in favor of such a requirement.

A quick vindication: The Taft-Hartley law has been vindicated sooner than anyone dreamed. The Lewis contract recognizes the obligations of the new statute and mentions them specifically. The coal agreement says that all matters relating to work stoppages and disputes shall be "settled and determined exclusively by the machinery provided in the 'Settlement of Local and District Disputes' section of this agreement; or, if national in character, by the full use of free collective bargaining as heretofore known and practiced in the industry."

Is this a loss of confidence in the collective-bargaining process? On the contrary, it is an effective way of conceding that collective bargaining is here to stay.

The Taft-Hartley law, in several paragraphs, spells out what "collective bargaining" means. It puts on labor unions and employers certain obligations to refrain from work stoppages during the life of a contract. "No strike" clauses are not needed in union contracts now. While encouraging mediation and settlement of disputes by the parties themselves, the law points out that an individual who quits work without regard to the contract need not be rehired and that a union which by concerted action encourages or initiates a work stoppage during the period of a contract in an attempt to deviate from its provisions, commits an unfair labor practice and can be punished.

Legal work stoppages: The new coal contract specifically recognizes these obligations in a clause relating to termination which says: "The foregoing termination provision shall not be construed to limit or affect in any way the obligations of the parties relating to the termination of contracts under the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947."

These very obligations in the law concerning termination of contracts include also obligations not to attempt modification by one party without the consent of the other during the life of the contract. There can be inserted in a contract, of course, lots of language about employees working only when they are "able and willing to work." These are superfluous phrases because the law says the same thing and specifically guarantees the rights of the individual to quit work when he pleases. No union, however, can lawfully issue instructions for concerted action by workers to quit at any time.

While the new statute doesn't compel a worker to labor against his will, it prevents a labor union as such from ordering a strike at will. An orderly procedure and compliance with certain steps is required before there can be a legal strike.

The Nation is slowly getting the truth about the meaning of the new law.

A Universal Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by me entitled "A Universal Approach," which appeared in the Arizona Stockman, issue of July 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A UNIVERSAL APPROACH

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator, Utah, member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare)

The basic problems confronting westerners are the same as those facing all men throughout the world. While it is true that we have situations peculiar to our geographic area and to the culture which has taken roots among us, our fundamental wants are not so limited by artificial or accidental barriers. Those of us who call the western

United States home have this in common with all men: We must find solutions for the three constant menaces to our welfare—poverty, ignorance, and sickness.

Those things which we often think of as most directly concerning our region, the need for reclamation, conservation, freight rate adjustment, basin development, to name a few, are not ends in themselves. Their purpose is the promotion of human betterment through the raising of standards of living. The specific projects, important as they are, are directed toward cures for more basic ills. Essentially, the universal struggle of man is to supply his economic wants, rid himself of disease, and conquer what Jefferson described as "every form of tyranny over the mind of man." These hopes for the better life are reechoed in the hearts of thoughtful men everywhere.

A realization of the common aims of men, and the substitution of a universal rather than a regional approach to their common problems, must be developed in connection with the idea of world unity. Because of its relatively recent popular acceptance, the one-world concept might be called a peculiarly twentieth-century notion. It is, in fact, not a recent idea at all, but it has only become vogue during the last few years. It is often said, not without rhetorical ornamentation, that the world is a unit, geographically, economically, socially, and politically. Unfortunately, however, there has not been a sober contemplation of the significance and ramifications of what is generally accepted, as a general proposition, to be indisputable. In reality, the fact that the world is a unit—the one-world idea—is so big, so comprehensive, that it need never become trite. It does not mean simply that travel around the world has been reduced to the minimum of 65 hours, that a week end can be conveniently spent in Habana, that radio listeners in Kansas City can pick up the London stations, that an antitrust suit brought in New York brings protests to the American consul in Paris or Berlin. Speed and technological developments have implications of their own. They make clear the fact of global interdependence. But the one-world notion contains the elements of ideas broad enough to change our entire ways of thinking about a variety of things which we have taken for granted so long that we seldom bother to ponder them at all. It presses for a realization that events of social, economic, or political interests in far-away places have direct effects upon our lives. It demands the abandonment of a provincial attitude and the acceptance of the outlook of a world citizen.

How often do we realize, for example, that a plague in China may result in a plague in Europe or America? Do we consider the effect upon living conditions in other countries which may be brought about by raising a tariff in the United States and that standards of living abroad affect our own? Do we think that the price of wheat in Chicago is related to starvation in Greece? And yet it is inescapable that because we do live in one world, an important occurrence in the most remote corner has its chain reactions for the rest of us. Tuberculosis in India is related to the health of the vacationer in California; cancer in China is of concern to the factory worker in New York; hunger in Athens is not without its implications on one who dines at the Waldorf-Astoria. In short, sickness, poverty, and ignorance—the three ills of mankind—anywhere in the world, constitute a menace everywhere in the world, whether man is found in a highly civilized state or in the most backward surroundings. The alleviation of such ills wherever they may be is, therefore, a challenge to men everywhere.

The solutions to questions of common concern should be pointed toward the focal source of the problem. This principle was recognized and applied not long ago by the Congress in a way that is of particular interest to stockmen. The dreaded foot-and-mouth disease had spread to Mexico and was threatening to invade the stock-raising sections of the United States. It was pointed out by cattlemen in both countries and by other witnesses before the committee that endeavoring to stamp out the disease after it had come as far as the United States border was useless; the only reasonably effective method of control was to get at its source, or as close to its source as it was practical for our Government to go. Accordingly a bill was enacted to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in carrying out operations and measures to eradicate, suppress, or control, or to prevent or retard, foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest in Mexico where he deems such action necessary to protect the livestock and related industries of the United States." Rather than waiting until the disease spread to the valley of northern Mexico, and eventually to our own country, we took action to get to the source of the difficulty and there plan such preventive measures as were necessary to protect ourselves. How different is this approach to the one of a generation ago. A neighbor's sick cow is of concern to us.

In the passage of the Greek and Turkish aid bills there is similar recognition that what happens outside our borders is not without its repercussions in our own land. Gradually, sometimes unconsciously, appreciation is being developed for the relationship of human suffering in other parts of the world to our own economy and our way of life. Can it be doubted that such appreciation is one of the great lessons of our age?

For more than a quarter of a century, the International Labor Organization has been growing strong on the theory that as war anywhere is a concern of all, so also is the welfare of an individual anywhere. The thesis of this important organization has been that world-wide peace can come only through social justice and that social justice can be attained only by raising the standard of living. Just as raising standards of living in America benefits the entire world, an increased living standard anywhere else will be reflected in American life. Are these ideas startling? If they are, it is because we have not fully accepted the concept of world unity.

This parable has been related elsewhere, but its learning has particular application here and hence it bears repetition. In China, the partnership relationship confers certain exclusive right to each partner. If four men were to purchase a safe, each would have a key to a different lock, and the safe could be opened only in the presence of all four. Four partners once bought a large stock of cotton in bales and stored them in a warehouse. It was not long before rats were gnawing away at the bales, so it was determined that a cat should be purchased, each partner owning one leg of the cat under the agreement. One day the cat burned one paw while sleeping too close to the fire. The partners conferred and decided that the care of the injured leg was the entire responsibility of the partner who owned it. So the partner promptly treated it with ointments and applied a huge gauze bandage. Once again the cat came too near the fire, and the dressing burst into flames. It became panic-stricken, ran toward the cotton, and soon the whole stock was set afire and destroyed. The three partners took the fourth to court for the recovery of their investment, arguing that the burning bandage on the paw owned by the fourth had been the proximate cause of the property loss, and that the fourth should be held liable for damages. The judge listened with solemn gravity to the evidence and arguments and after due deliberation delivered his decision. It was true enough, he said, that the burning dressing on the injured paw had set fire to the bales of cotton. It was also not disputed that the paw belonged to partner No. 4. But, he concluded, he was unable to award any damages. All were responsible and all must bear the loss. One leg had been the original sore spot, but the other three legs had carried the cat, and therefore the fire, to the cotton.

The nations of the world may attempt to shove the blame for world ills to the sore spots. But if we all go up in flames, either in a liberal or figurative sense, we will be in no sounder a position than the three disgruntled partners. Only with constant effort can we in the United States, and especially the West where there has been developed a culture of unrestrained individualism, develop that attitude of mind which accepts world unity as a fact. Honest skeptics may view the effort as a worth-while end, but not capable of being attained. And no one realistic in his approach would deny that the process will be slow and at times discouraging. But not until we can make effective that system of thought which relates the parts of the world to the whole can we expect to find solutions for our common problems.

Is Congress Neglecting Our Merchant Marine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following short radio program given over station WINX and WINX-FM, Washington, D. C., on July 20, 1947, presents in a conversational way the real importance of an adequate merchant marine to the people of the United States:

IS CONGRESS NEGLECTING OUR MERCHANT MARINE?

ANNOUNCER. WINX and WINX-FM presents the seventy-ninth consecutive program in the series: Is Congress Doing Its Job?

Each week at this time a controversial subject is discussed on this nationally famous forum. Today, the issue under consideration will be: Is Congress Neglecting Our Merchant Marine?

Mr. Ed Hart, the Forum moderator, has as his guests Frazer A. Bailey, president of the National Federation of American Shipping, and Walter Oakes, executive board member and Washington representative of the Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, CIO. And now, Mr. Ed Hart.

Mr. HART. This is Ed Hart speaking from Washington.

If we are to maintain our No. 1 position in world trade, we will need an adequate, well-balanced merchant marine, second to none. Do we have such a fleet today? Is Congress seeing to it that we have such a fleet?

After World War I, you will recall, our merchant fleet was shamefully neglected. Are we going to make the same mistake this time?

To explore the answers to these questions, we are going to hear from Mr. Frazer A. Bailey, president of the National Federation of American Shipping, and Mr. Walter Oakes, a member of the executive board of the Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, CIO. Mr. Oakes is the Washington representative of his union.

Now, Mr. Bailey, as a representative of American ship operators, just what is the status of our merchant marine today?

Mr. BAILEY. Before the war, the United States operated 127 passenger ships. Today, due to war losses, we operate only 41. Our merchant marine is greatly unbalanced. Vital troop transports and naval auxiliaries are not available if another emergency occurs. Due to high construction costs, air transport competition, and unfavorable action by the Civil Aeronautics Board, we find ourselves today with only one-third of our prewar passenger fleet and none are being built in American shipyards.

In 1940, when there was great need of shipbuilding in this country and when the disturbed conditions in Europe made inoperative the existing provisions of law, Congress passed special emergency legislation authorizing maximum Government aid to private American shipbuilding. Similar conditions and a real crisis exist today. We are desperately short of passenger and certain other type vessels. Building contracts in American shipyards will be completed in the first quarter of 1948. If we are to stimulate the building of the vessels so urgently needed, if we are to preserve our American shipbuilding facilities, organizations, and skilled workmen, Congress must act again in a similar manner to what was done in 1940. We cannot wait. This must be done immediately. The hour glass is running out. Our merchant marine, our shipbuilding industry, and our national defense are imperiled.

Mr. HART. Thank you, Mr. Bailey. Now we are going to hear from Mr. Oakes of the Shipbuilding Workers Union, CIO.

Mr. OAKES. The first thing Congress must do is to recognize the obvious fact that America must have an adequate shipbuilding industry for the sake of our prosperity and for world peace. Without American ships and shipbuilding, we can't have either prosperity or security. Yet, unless legislation is passed by this Congress, shipbuilding in the United States will be stopped almost completely in less than a year. There will be no new ships built; 200,000 highly skilled workers will be lost to other industries or out of jobs; shipbuilding organizations will dissolve and all shipbuilding communities will be terribly hard hit by unemployment. Failure of the Congress to act pomptly will mean that the shipbuilding industry will collapse after World War II just as it did after World War I, with the same disastrous consequences. Can't we learn anything by experience?

Remember, gentlemen of the Eightieth Congress, we cannot and must not depend on foreign countries today for our shipping needs as we have in the past. Almost every foreign country today is controlled by a totalitarian economy. Their ships will be used as industries of foreign policy, not as neutral carriers of American goods. Once Congress realizes these facts, I hope, I pray, it will pass the national legislation so desperately needed.

Mr. HART. Thank you, Mr. Oakes. Now, Mr. Bailey, what do you think will happen if Congress fails to act?

Mr. BAILEY. Well, Mr. Hart, we will simply continue to have an unbalanced merchant marine, due to the lack of high-speed passenger-carrying steamships to operate over the principal trade routes, and we will be short of troop transports and naval auxiliaries in the event of another emergency, but what is more critical at the moment, our shipyards will run out of work and practically all of the large shipbuilding plants will be slowed down to almost complete stoppage. This will threaten the maintenance of these facilities and their organizations, together with the skilled workmen. All of these would be desperately needed should war again threaten us.

Mr. HART. Gentlemen, suppose we do not have enough ships of the right type. We built ships practically every hour on the hour during the war. So what are we arguing about? Just why do we need more ships, Mr. Oakes?

Mr. OAKES. Yes; we did build the greatest merchant fleet in history during the war, but those ships were built for war, not for peace. They are very slow, very uneconomical and wholly unbalanced for our needs in postwar trade.

Mr. HART. If we can get the right type of ships, and Congress makes this possible, just what would this mean to the average American citizen, Mr. Bailey?

Mr. BAILEY. Well, on a long-range basis, if we are to take our proper place in international affairs as a nation, we must have first-rate transportation and communication to all principal world areas. This cannot be accomplished without American passenger and other special-type ships and without communication and transportation to these principal world areas. It means commerce, it means national defense, and it also is the very lifeblood of such shipbuilding communities as Quincy, Kearney, Camden, Baltimore, Newport News, and many others.

Mr. HART. Mr. Oakes.

Mr. OAKES. Most Americans have no idea how much their jobs depend on foreign trade and how this trade is absolutely dependent upon our having modern American ships to carry the goods. If our foreign trade falls off, we cannot escape a depression in this country, Why, more than 1 out of 10 jobs in America depends directly on our exports alone.

Mr. HART. You mentioned foreign competition, foreign shipping. How does our merchant marine stack up against those of other nations, Mr. Bailey?

Mr. BAILEY. Well, adding to the surplus war-built vessels we have sold to foreign purchasers, plus the ships they are building today in foreign shipyards, their fleets in the aggregate will be in excess of their prewar capacity. In 1939, just prior to the war, we were carrying less than 30 percent of our own commerce. Now that is American commerce. We should do better than that hereafter, and we should not build up our competitors by selling them ships to put them in a stronger position. There is just so much international business. If foreign-flag ships, because of low wages and cheap operating costs, can offer lower freight rates, it will simply mean less American carriage of our own commerce and less ships when we need them for national defense.

Mr. HART. Well, don't these foreign countries need shipping? Shouldn't they render us the ship services so that they can obtain dollars? Their factories are all shot to pieces. They don't have surpluses of raw materials. Don't they need shipping in order to get dollars so that they can buy American merchandise, Mr. Bailey?

Mr. BAILEY. Now bear in mind, Mr. Hart, we are only talking about American commerce. The whole world commerce and trade between other nations is open to foreign ships, but if we were to adopt a philosophy of permitting foreigners to carry all American commerce for the purpose of earning dollar exchange, they would only earn sufficient dollar exchange with which to pay for 6 percent of the present volume of American exports to those foreign countries.

Mr. HART. Gentlemen, aren't we asking the American taxpayers to shoulder an additional burden to keep the shipbuilding industry healthy? What do you think about that, Mr. Oakes?

Mr. OAKES. Let's look at the actual figures that are involved; they are very much smaller than most people realize. The Federal Government paid a subsidy last year of $80,000,000 for the potato crop alone. The Federal Government has paid an annual subsidy for road building of over $134,000,000. Now it is calculated that a Federal subsidy for a balanced, strong postwar fleet of 15,000,000 dead-weight tons would be a good deal less than $15,000,000 a year, only one-third of 1 percent of the volume of United States world trade, a good deal less than $50,000,000 a year. Compare that with the $80,000,000 for potatoes alone and $134,000,000 for roads, and what are ships but roads across the oceans, roads to carry goods and people back and forth. Is it logical to subsidize our highways on land and not our highways on the sea?

Mr. BAILEY. If you will permit the interruption, Mr. Oakes, speaking from the operators' standpoint, the ship operators' shipping subsidy to the operators has been less than $4,000,000 per year, on the average, since the Ship Subsidy Act was passed in 1936.

Mr. HART. Gentlemen, what does our merchant marine mean in terms of national defense? We have been talking about world trade. Suppose we should have a World War III, which, of course, we all want to avoid. Just what does our merchant marine mean to our national defense, Mr. Bailey?

Mr. BAILEY. The best authorities, Mr. Hart, who are the military heads themselves, have told us that the Army and Navy would be unable to carry on an aggressive war unless supported by an adequate merchant marine. In fact, the end of the last war was delayed approximately 1 year while we built up a sufficient fleet of merchant ships to support the activities.

Mr. OAKES. And remember, they have now developed the atomic bomb, which, if there is another war, will prevent us or certainly not give us time to develop shipyards and redevelop the lost skills to build that merchant marine which will be so necessary to winning a war.

Mr. BAILEY. That is perfectly right, Mr. Oakes. We had warning before, but we have been told by the military authorities that we cannot expect such warning hereafter.

Mr. HART. Well, the shipping of foreign nations is controlled by the governments of those foreign nations. Isn't that true generally, gentlemen?

Mr. OAKES. Generally, that is true—controlled almost completely. Furthermore, in most cases, they are subsidized 100 percent.

Mr. BAILEY. And we certainly can't rely upon foreign-flag vessels to support a military action in another world emergency, and the conditions in Europe today do not lead to any complacency.

Mr. HART. Well, thank you, Mr. Bailey and Mr. Oakes, for warning us of the peril America faces unless Congress acts promptly to insure this great Nation of an adequate, well-balanced merchant fleet.

This is Ed Hart saying good-by from Washington.

The Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article which I contributed to the distinguished magazine Think in its July 1947 issue. The subject of my article was The Most Wonderful Work Ever Struck Off at a Given Time by the Brain

and Purpose of Man—the United States Constitution.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE JOURNEYS TO THE CONSTITUTION

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

A term that is frequently heard these days is: "Un-American." How can you and I be sure that it should not at times be applied to us—that we ourselves are really thinking in the American way, living in the American way, actually being American in our personal lives?

The answer to that question is not as simple as it would appear to be. There is a tremendous amount of European-type propaganda being circulated and discussed everywhere in our midst, and many of us, who are normally devoted completely to our American system of free enterprise and to all that belongs to our American heritage, may have been infected by it unconsciously. How can we be sure that our thinking and our actions have not been influenced in some way by this alien thinking which is expressed in doctrines of class and religious war, of national hatreds, by those who proclaim that there is no more hope in our system of private property, no more frontiers of opportunity?

I submit that one way by which we can be sure that we are thinking American is from time to time to take little journeys to the Constitution, there to familiarize curselves anew with the basic doctrine and the basic landmarks of the American heritage. Today we all need to be sure that we are "on the American beam," that we have not been misled by subversive doctrines, that we have not strayed from the "American way."

By "little journeys," I mean the careful reading periodically of the articles of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the subsequent amendments to it, together with interpretations thereon. I mean counting our blessings again and again as we read this precious work. There is no single document, other than the Gospel itself, which merits more studious attention by the American people than the Constitution.

There is nothing outdated about this miracle work which, since 1789, through 158 years of American life, has withstood the test of time. As we have progressed by hitherto inconceivable technological changes from a frontier civilization to an atomic age civilization, our Constitution has given us one of the oldest single continuous governments on earth today.

We might recall what a great foreign observer said about the Constitution almost three-quarters of a century ago. William E. Gladstone, Prime Minister of Great Britain, wrote: "The American Constitution is, so far as I can see, the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." We recall, too, the words of William Tyler Page in his statement of the American's Creed, adopted by the House of Representatives on April 3, 1918: "I * * * believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to observe its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

To think in the American way, therefore, is to think Constitution-wise. This means to respect and admire the wisdom of the founding fathers, the men who conceived it, and the wisdom of the strong men who administered it and gave it life, of the brave men who fought for it and the heroic men who died for it.

Calvin Coolidge wrote: "The Constitution of the United States is the single refuge of every right that is enjoyed by an American citizen."

Our respect for the Constitution does not mean that we believe that it is unchangeable, not subject to modification and to new interpretation with the years. On the contrary, we believe in its dynamic nature as Thomas Jefferson expressed it: "Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence, and deem them like the ark of the covenant, too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment. * * * Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. * * * We might as well require a man to wear the coat that fitted him as a boy, as civilized society to remain ever under the regime of their ancestors."

But through our "Little Journeys to the Constitution" we may be sure that we are on the right track, the American track, toward peace and plenty for ourselves and our children's children.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the spectacular floods along the middle and lower Mississippi and its major tributaries are the floods that usually make the headlines in the newspapers. Certainly, these floods on our major streams cause tremendous damage in many ways—people are displaced from their homes; business is interrupted; crops are drowned out and much of our best farm land is permanently damaged; city water supplies are disrupted and disease is spread among the populations affected; highways and railroads are washed out; and all too often people lose their lives.

Not as spectacular but just as real and more costly is the flood damage to property on smaller tributaries and to watershed lands due to uncontrolled run-off and erosion of soil from sloping fields.

These problems are so widespread and of such frequent occurrence that the welfare of the Nation as a whole is vitally affected. The annual flood damages along the streams of the United States amount to an estimated 250,000,000, including damages to agricultural lands, crops, equipment, and other property. The loss to the Nation's wealth from this source alone in the last 30 years is about equal to the total value of all the farm products sold or used by farm households in the United States in 1940.

At the flood control hearings, June 3, 1943, before the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, Mr. Alan N. Jordan, executive secretary of the Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress, included in his statement that the floods in the Ohio River Valley during 50 years had caused the loss of more than 1,000 lives and a property damage of more than a billion dollars.

We cannot afford to continue to suffer such losses either from the economic or moral standpoint, particularly now when there is such terrible distress in Europe and other parts of the world from lack of sufficient wheat, fats, protein, and other essentials to a minimum diet.

Congress has recognized that continuance of unbridled floods is a serious menace to the national welfare. And it was stated in so many words in the Flood Control Act, Public No. 738, passed by the Seventy-fourth Congress on June 22, 1936. By congressional policy, flood control on navigable streams or their tributaries is a proper activity of the Federal Government in cooperation with States, their political subdivisons, and localties thereof.

The Congress, in the above referred to act, authorized Federal investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways for flood-control and allied purposes to be carried out by the War Department under the direction of the Secretary of War, and Federal investigations of watersheds and measures for run-off and waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention on the watersheds to be carried out by the Department of Agriculture under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture has designated the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service to make these investigations and carry out the Department's responsibilities in application of works of improvement on the watersheds.

It goes without saying that the damages from floods are of such proportions as to require the utilization of all measures that can be devised both to eliminate or improve the man-made conditions which produce the floods and to regulate the excess waters so as to minimize the potential forces which otherwise wreck such havoc.

To begin with, then, I am convinced that no stone should be left unturned to do everything possible and practical up in the fields, pastures, woodlots, idle lands, and gullies along the tributary watersheds to slow down water and reduce soil erosion that causes sediment and then siltation at the places where the floods begin. And I want to be sure that this point is clear, that the kinds of works and measures which are recommended for this purpose not only slow down run-off but they benefit the lands on which they are applied.

Technicians of the Federal Soil Conservation Service, who have done so much in this field, have found that the lands on which the measures are applied, the farms and woodlands, are materially improved in the process. It is a matter of common observation to all of us who have been close to the soil that the more of the rainfall on sloping fields that can be put to beneficial use by storing it in the soil the better the crops will be. Less water, then, will be carried swiftly downstream to contribute to flood heights. I have talked with many farmers who are especially concerned with the ever-increasing amounts of water that run off their sloping fields, carrying good topsoil with it. The damage is especially noticeable after a heavy rain—as indicated by the gutted fields and accumulations of silt at the bottom of slopes, on roads, and in waterways. We have seen our streams become brown with the soil washed from our plowed

ground. Those who have relatively level bottom lands, served by drainage ditches, know too well how the ditches are filled with sediment, resulting not only in heavy crop losses but also in extra high expense for cleaning out the ditches. The silt that clogs such drainage ditches also comes from the land, largely from cultivated fields and gully banks above.

I think we know pretty well that floods come from water which flows unchecked off the fields, pastures, woodlands, and watercourses. Of course, the run-off from only a few fields usually does not cause a serious flood. It is the accumulation of run-off from all of the land of a watershed into restricted channelways that causes floods. Since water flows without regard for property lines or boundary fences, the efforts of individuals here and there, no matter how well conceived and carried out, are limited to their respective farms and too often are of little avail, due to forces beyond their control. Hence, action on a group basis taken according to a working plan covering their lands has proven to be by far the most effective approach. Obviously, the time and effort and money spent on a compact group of farms that cover a complete watershed is less than that required for piecemeal work.

How can this group action be effected? Is there any machinery for facilitating it? Fortunately, we have in all States of the Nation laws which enable farmers to form and manage their own soil conservation districts as instrumentalities of the State, to facilitate the conservation of soil and water including upstream flood control. Local farmers decide whether they want a district and people designated and elected by them govern activities and establish policies and procedures wherever districts are set up. When such a district is organized it can use effectively the facilities available to it. It offers a channel for correlating State and Federal assistance with local contributions for a single, unified effort. For example, technicians of the Soil Conservation Service are made available for supplying technical assistance to soil-conservation districts. They work with the landowners and operators to help them individually and by groups, to develop and apply farm plans, and where flood-control operations are authorized, to include flood-control features in their assistance to the districts.

Such plans are made a part of an agreement between the farmers and the local soil-conservation districts. The district governing bodies, through their first-hand knowledge and understanding of local conditions, are in a position to know when a practical plan has been made. Not only do these districts assist farmers to get started, but they follow through with whatever matters arise from time to time in connection with operation and maintenance of the conservation practices. Many districts in Iowa, for example, have worked with land owners and operators in the districts to grow seed of grasses especially developed and adapted for grassed waterways, thereby helping to solve the problem of stabilizing the watercourses to carry run-off safely down the slopes. This grass makes such a tough turf that it actually slows down the water flowing over it, which in itself is a good measure in the interest of flood control.

The effect of this type of work can be observed on many small watersheds throughout the country. One example, in my district, is the Jones Creek watershed, a tributary of the Soldier River, in the southern part of Monona County, Iowa. This small watershed of 2¼ square miles was being damaged by erosion at such a rate that it would have been uneconomical to continue its use as an agricultural area for more than 15 to 25 years. Gullies from 8 to 50 feet in depth were rapidly cutting up the valleys and would have ruined or rendered impracticable for agricultural uses about 465 acres of the best valley land. Sheet erosion on the slopes was carrying the soil and all it contains, so that crop yields were declining. Below this watershed, 3,270 acres of valuable crop land, farmsteads, roads, drainage ditches, and a railroad running along the flood plain of Soldier River were constantly being damaged by flood water and by heavy silt deposits.

A decision had to be made by the people in this community. They could continue to derive some income for a limited number of years and when it was no longer possible to continue farming operations, they could abandon the land or allow it to revert to public ownership through tax delinquency. Or, they could fight to bring the causes of this land damage under control. They chose the latter course. They agreed to cooperate with each other and with Federal, State, and local agencies that could provide assistance in their fight. They invested money and hard work, but for a number of years now they have been able to see the results of their efforts. Their community which was once looked on as one of the most serious problem areas of the county is now being considered as an example of what can be done in a practical way to control erosion, alleviate floods, and maintain a permanent agriculture. With new and improved methods and designs to control these destructive forces, there is no doubt but what these results can be duplicated in the other areas having similar problems. As a matter of fact, this is being done in various parts of the county.

In a recent flight over the flood area, this watershed was reported to me as standing out very decidedly because of its contrast with surrounding untreated areas. There was no evidence of serious erosion or flooding or deposition in or below this adequately treated watershed.

The farmers of Iowa are taking advantage of their State soil conservation districts law. I am talking about my home State because I am more familiar with the facts about it. As of July 1 of this year, there had been organized, and are operating, 87 of these districts, comprising over 29,000,000 acres and including in their boundaries over 185,000 farms. More than 10,000 owners and operators, with assistance of Soil Conservation Service technicians, had already worked out complete plans and started to apply the measures to improve their farms the conservation way—the best use of the land and water without waste. They have found that the practices which keep fertile top soil in place not only produce better crops, but they make field operations easier as well. The saving in cost of field operations by working on the contour instead of up and down hill is an important item in figuring the net returns from a farm.

Also, these soil conservation districts are equally well adapted to develop a combined attack on the run-off and erosion problems in the interest of flood control through their coordination of the efforts of all landowners and operators in cooperation with Federal, State, and other concerned groups.

The flood-control acts passed by Congress provide a means for determining what damages are done by flood waters and sedimentation in designated watersheds—and the nature and extent of such damages; what can be done to reduce such damages by improvement of watershed conditions; how it can be done; what it will cost; and what the benefits will be. They also provide a means for the Department of Agriculture to assist local people to reduce damage caused by floods and sedimentation.

The Soil Conservation Service has had wide experience in assisting over 1,700 soil conservation districts. Conservation plans with more than 500,000 farmers have already been developed. Complete treatment has been carried out with the assistance of this service on about 75,000,000 acres of land in districts. I have confidence in the ability of the Soil Conservation Service in this field. This work done throughout the 48 States and the Territories has given their technicians the know-how on soil and water conservation methods, and they know what is practicable to apply from a farmer's standpoint.

In the flood-control field, the Department of Agriculture, in the 11 years since the first congressional authorization previously mentioned, has developed a sound, efficient procedure for making the watershed investigations for waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention in the interest of flood control. Eighteen such surveys have already been completed and some work has been done on 32 additional surveys. Where such investigations show that a watershed-treatment program would reduce flood water and sediment damages sufficiently to justify the cost, the Department of Agriculture technicians, with the advice and suggestions of others concerned, recommend to Congress the type of remedial program needed, together with estimates of cost for installation, operation, and maintenance. This is certainly a sound, business-like procedure.

A survey of this type was made on the watershed of the Little Sioux River in Iowa and subsequently Congress authorized flood-control operations on it. The lower part of this watershed lies in my district; hence, I am familiar with it. They found, while making the survey, that flood run-off in this watershed is responsible for damages in excess of an average of one-half million dollars each year. In the main these damages are

the result of: (1) Discharge of floodwaters and sediment upon the rich alluvial plain bordering the Missouri River; (2) flood overflows along all upland streams; and (3) the rapid growth of trench type gullies on the uplands. In addition, flood run-off washes away large quantities of fertile topsoil. The important remedial measures they recommended for this watershed are: (1) The placing of lands too steep for cultivation under permanent protective cover such as grass or trees; (2) the use of soil and water conserving rotations and winter cover crops; (3) the improvement and protection of pastures and woodlots; (4) supplementary practices such as terracing, contour furrowing, tree planting, refencing, and water protection; and (5) the building of structures to control major gullies. A program of this type not only helps to check flood damages but also helps to save our land from soil erosion. At the time the survey report was prepared the Department of Agriculture estimated that the total cost to the Federal Government for completing a program of this type on the Little Sioux watershed would be about $4,280,000.

In addition, farmers and landowners would contribute about $1,260,000 in the form of labor and materials, while State and local agencies would contribute about $370,000 in the form of labor and equipment. Operation and maintenance of the program will be taken care of by the farmers, landowners, and local agencies.

Congress has authorized work of this type on 11 watersheds of the Nation, at an estimated cost of about $90,000,000—that is the cost only for watershed improvement and does not include any major dams, levees, or channel improvements. The costs on all of these projects, however, will be spread over a period of years, as Congress makes the funds available. I am informed that the Department of Agriculture estimates that about $800,000,000 could be efficiently and effectively spent on flood-control work of this type during the next 10 years, in the Mississippi Basin alone. And I, for one, believe that it would be money well spent.

Those who are devoting their energies and skills to work out the problems in controlling floods recognize, full well, the limitations and hazards of assuming that one kind of protection is adequate for all watersheds. Watershed treatment and downstream flood control works together are required in most cases to produce effective results in reducing flood damages which occur on the tributaries and along the main streams. If, in spite of any program that may be devised for the treatment of watershed lands, it appears that in large watersheds more water will reach the main stream than can be safely carried away, means must be provided for storing or otherwise controlling the excess waters.

In summary, I want to stress first, the importance of immediate and sustained action on all fronts to alleviate the irretrievable losses to our wealth and well being brought by floods—floods that in some measure affect the lives of all of us.

Secondly, the action to be taken, I believe, logically follows a course of (1) wise use and proper treatment of all the lands in the watershed whether it be farm land, woodland, urban property, highway or railroad right-of-way—with application of practices to conserve water, retard run-off and prevent erosion, (2) installation of small structures as may be needed to stabilize the watercourses and creeks feeding into the tributaries and to trap silt, (3) providing storage and other protective measures in the tributaries further to regulate the flow of storm run-off and reduce the "pile-up" of waters which otherwise accumulate in the main rivers, and finally (4) construction of large reservoirs, levees, and channel improvement works as necessary to control the flood waters reaching the main rivers and waterways.

These steps are not independent; rather they are interdependent. They should be carried out in this order, but oftentimes the extent of damage downstream is so great that it is desirable and necessary that all four of the types of controls be installed simultaneously. However, it is very important that work of the first type—wise use and sound treatment of the land—not be delayed until flood control authorizations for carrying out the other three types of controls are granted. And all these steps can be effectively and economically done on a watershed if foresight and planning are used in a practical way. Delays in installation of the primary—first type—controls will increase the difficulty of establishing the other three and there will be corresponding increases in costs. To me, this indicates (1) the importance of formation of soil conservation districts throughout the Nation; (2) the forceful prosecution in soil conservation districts of conservation farming, especially on watersheds that contribute to our major floods and (3) the making of flood-control surveys on these same watersheds as rapidly as possible. The effective use of all the resources, landowner, utility company, county, State, and Federal agencies, requires that all control measures be a part of a well-conceived plan.

The old adage "There is no time like the present" is just as true today as it was when originated. If we act now the cost will be less and the benefits correspondingly greater than if we wait until our lands are impoverished, and our watersheds are further deteriorated.

As It Looks to the Distiller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Joseph A. Engelhard, new president of the Distilled Spirits Institute, at a recent conference in Denver of State liquor administrators:

With the possible exception of the distiller himself, no one knows better than your State liquor administrators, the major problems which confront the alcoholic beverage industry today. The ending of most of the wartime controls has by no means ended our troubles, for now we are faced with new problems based upon changes in the economic, social, and political structure of the national economy.

Throughout the war period and the months following the end of hostilities, most of the planning and discussion within the industry had been based upon a reasonably rapid return to normal. It is all too apparent today, however, that normalcy is still far from realization.

I did not come here either to deliver or outline all of the problems with which the industry is confronted at this time, for time will permit a discussion of only a few—those which you as administrators share with the distillers.

As it looks to the distiller, the chief problem is the industry's stability and continued progress as a vital and important part of America's economic structure.

Social aspects also are important. Such factors as public sentiment toward the industry, the never-ending threat of the drys, local option elections, undesirable outlets, price wars, and other prejudicial influences of a social nature cannot be overlooked.

Nor can we overlook the competitive buyer's market which has arrived and which will bring added problems as it becomes even more competitive. Nor can we neglect to inject more of the point of view of the public into our thinking, not only to retain the respect the industry has built for itself since repeal, but to raise that respect to even greater heights. In foreign countries the alcoholic-beverage industries enjoy prestige and a firm position in public esteem. There is no reason why similar recognition should not exist in our own country. In addition to its many other activities in behalf of consumer, dealer, and industry alike, the DSI has and is doing its utmost to see that the industry is accorded the recognition and standing it justly deserves.

And, above all, if the public interest is to be served the laws and regulations laid down for the proper conduct of the industry must be enforced rigidly. There can be no relaxation. Lax enforcement can bring only the loss of public respect—which would be most serious. For public opinion is a great force in the world today—it can make or break an industry, a product, or an individual.

I cannot stress too forcibly the fact that the welfare and well-being of this industry, to a considerable extent, lies in the hands of the liquor-control administrators of each State. It is only by strict and impartial enforcement of the system of control that prevails in a particular State that the industry can expect to merit and receive general public acceptance.

AN INDUSTRY MENACE

In my considered opinion one of the greatest menaces to the industry today is the occasional licensee whose character and conduct are such that he gives cause for a movement to impose local prohibition. The industry has no control over such a dealer; neither has it any voice in his selection to receive a license to sell a distiller's product. The industry can only make the best of it if the licensing authorities permit undesirables to become licensees.

I realize fully that the task of reforming or weeding out undesirable dealers is a difficult one, but it is the duty and responsibility of the control boards and enforcement officers to undertake this job without fear or favor.

Violators of liquor laws cannot be coddled or educated into compliance. Something more than education is needed, because those who flaunt the law, as a rule, are not receptive to education of this sort. They should

never have been issued a license in the first place, but if once licensed, renewals should be denied them.

It has been demonstrated over and over again that bad operations on the retail end of the business are responsible for bad public relations and much of the unfavorable publicity which has been harmful to the industry as a whole. Fortunately, such operations are not extensive, as most of the men and women in the liquor business are living up to the spirit and letter of the law, and observing a high standard of business ethics.

The retail outlet, from the public-relations standpoint, is the most vulnerable spot in the industry. For it is the package store and the tavern that serve as the points of direct contact with the public. Those at the distilling and wholesaling level are only in indirect touch with the public. Therefore, the industry must depend largely on the law-abiding licensee to uphold the public respect it has built up in the 14 years of repeal.

The exclusive package store as an outlet does not present, in its social implications, much of a problem. As a point of public contact, especially to the home buyer, it does represent an opportunity to the credit or discredit of the whole industry, depending upon the integrity of the owner.

The most extensive point of contact with the public is the tavern. That is why it is of such great importance that conditions in these places be above reproach. For upon the status of the tavern, with the drinking and nondrinking people of a community, depends the status of the industry.

The laws of most of the States you represent provide for the tavern. The greater number of them are clean, scrupulously managed, and law abiding. They are operated by self-respecting businessmen, good neighbors and citizens. Such taverns are an asset to the social life of the community.

At the other extreme is the licensed nuisance where regulation or moral control is weak or disregarded. Such an establishment is always a serious source of public complaint, and its continued operation is deplorable. Why should such abuses be tolerated under license when there is a legal way to put them out of business?

THE ORIGIN OF LOCAL OPTION

We in the industry know that local option elections originate, in many instances, because of local nuisances where enforcement has broken down. There also is much evidence that men and women otherwise liberally disposed to alcoholic beverages, have worked and voted against their sale as a protest against conditions under which they are dispensed locally. Results in local-option elections, therefore, are not always a fair index of wet and dry sentiment. In some cases the license revocation of a single bad spot might have eliminated the protest vote and kept the community affected, a legitimate market for alcoholic beverages.

There is some comfort in the fact that these local-option elections normally result in little net change in the wet-dry population, though they do indicate in most instances a troublesome condition which strict enforcement of the beverage-control laws might have prevented.

Over the entire country last year, according to the carefully kept records of the Distilled Spirits Institute's local-option bureau, there was a net gain in dry population of 285,309 as compared with a dry gain of 325,815 in 1945. The percentage of population of the country living in dry territory at the end of 1946 was 19.1 as compared with 18.9 at the end of 1945. These percentage figures, of course, include the population of the three legally dry States.

As was the case in 1945, the largest percentage loss in wet population in 1946 occurred in a few Southern States. In Arkansas there was a net dry gain of 15,488; in Kentucky a dry gain of 157,469, and in Virginia a dry gain of 104,364, making a total dry gain in these States of 415,281. For the country as a whole, however, the net loss to the wet cause was only 285,309. This was brought about principally by considerable wet gains in Alabama, Texas, and Minnesota.

The comparative stability shown by the results of the local option elections, is a clear indication that repeal is working satisfactorily to a large portion of the population of the country. But there is no doubt in my mind that these small dry gains could have been prevented had State control laws been enforced with firmness, justice, and speed.

Nearly all of the Government's restrictions which rigidly controlled the industry's output for 6 years, are now happily buried in memory, and the few that remain are expected to be removed soon. But we still have the Federal excise tax of $9 per proof gallon, which appears to be with us indefinitely.

LIQUOR TAXES CLIMB

This inevitably leads to a topic I wish to touch on briefly—the tax situation. There is no other subject at the moment, more important to industry and consumer alike, than the tendency toward higher taxes on alcoholic beverages.

In the face of the continued $9 Federal excise tax, there have been an unprecedented number of revenue-raising measures introduced in State legislatures this year. And the happy-hunting ground seems to be the alcoholic beverage industry.

Records of the legislative reporting service of the Distilled Spirits Institute show that 27 bills to increase tax on spirituous liquors have been introduced this year in various State legislatures, and thus far 6 of them have been enacted into law. The States affected are Arkansas, Nevada, Minnesota, New Jersey, Tennessee, and New York, where a temporary $1.50 per gallon tax was made permanent. Municipalities also have sought to dip into the pool of alcoholic beverage taxation, as evidenced by a Baltimore city tax on distilled spirits of 50 cents per gallon.

Florida, however, turned the tables, and cut its tax from $1.92 to $1.20 per gallon.

In the light of experience, it would take an irresponsible optimist to view this situation as just a passing phase, brought on by postwar conditions. Once imposed, there's nothing so hard to eliminate as a liquor tax. The $9 Federal levy is an outstanding example. Another is Pennsylvania's 10 percent emergency tax which was enacted to help pay the costs of the relief program during the depression period in the thirties. Although the emeregncy has passed, the tax has been renewed every 2 years since then, the last time as recently as last month.

This whole reckless concept of taxation, I am satisfied, is due in a large measure to the failure of those in industry to aggressively resist the plan. The result has been that those who make the laws look upon the industry as being on the defensive.

This whole approach must be changed if a brake is to be applied to a recurring torrent of tax proposals, or, as in the case of Pennsylvania, mark-up adjustments that force prices higher. A damaging corollary effect of added taxes which force prices higher, is the fact that the public is little cognizant that such high prices are the direct result of high taxation, and might blame the industry for maintaining or increasing prices in the particular market affected, in the face of a gradually declining price situation on many other commodities.

ADMINISTRATORS CAN HELP

The administrators, as close as they are to the situation as it affects their individual States, could be and in many cases have been of real help in these tax fights. The administrators are not without influence in molding administrative policy, especially as it is brought to play upon the industry.

Apparently, too many State legislatures in their zeal to turn up more revenue, overlooked the fact that Federal excise taxes have jumped more than 400 percent since 1938, and that distilled spirits are bearing far more than a fair share of the Nation's tax burden. Nor have the State legislatures taken into consideration the fact that the State taxes when added to the $9 Federal tax, have raised the average tax per gallon to $10.22. What does that mean to the consumer? Simply this: That at least $2.04 of the price he pays for a four-fifth quart bottle of 100-proof whiskey, in tax money.

A POT OF GOLD FOR STATE AND NATION

No one should ignore the fact that the alcoholic beverage industry is now the Nation's largest industrial producer of Federal revenue. It is exceeded only by income taxes. Last year revenues collected from the alcoholic-beverage industry for support of operations of Federal, State, and local governments, amounted to the staggering total of $2,500,000,000. These returns, collected at the rate of nearly $6,800,000 a day, or a million dollars a day above the collections from this source in 1945, indicate the increasing significance of the manufacture and sale of distilled spirts as one of the top sources of revenue for sustaining the vital functions of governments.

Like the Federal tax returns, revenues returned to State and local governments from distilled spirits, have mounted steadily since repeal, and reached a record-breaking net total last year, of $464,000,000 after deducting all costs of administration, collecting, licensing, and enforcement.

You administrators might well give some attention to the unwise and unsound legislative proposals that crop up in your States. The alcoholic beverage industry does not oppose proper and workable laws and regulations. On the contrary, it recognizes the need for adequate control and welcomes appropriate measures that protect the public from those in the industry whose social conscience may be dulled or warped. Last year with only about half the State legislatures meeting, there were over 300 bills introduced affecting the alcoholic-beverage industry.

This year, with more legislatures in session, I am sure this legislative crop will be still more abundant. Some of these legislative proposals stem from prohibitory motives; some are actuated by unwise or selfish industry motives, and other are just plain "bell-ringers," otherwise known as shakedowns.

We believe that liquor control administrators occupy a vantage point from which they can judge with detachment and fairness the validity and soundness of these proposals. We believe further that liquor-control administrators should be interested in the health and well-being of the industry they control—whose life they literally hold in their hands.

From these views we conclude that liquor-control administrators should pay some attention to the flood of legislative proposals which yearly engulfs the alcoholic beverage industry, and should assist in opposing the unwise and unsound laws that threaten the welfare of the public and the industry.

AID TO THE ALCOHOLIC

And last, but certainly not least, one big thing the industry is doing without much credit from the outside, is aiding, through substantial contributions in cash, the research that is going on in the scientific profession, to solve the age-old problem of the alcoholic.

Science already has shown us the far too prevalent attitude toward the alcoholic is as archaic as it is inhumane. It has shown us that the chronic drunkard is a sick man who deserves medical care and treatment. And it has already proved that his rehabilitation

is possible—that he can be cured and returned, with self-respect, to society.

The industry, along with many progressive communities, realizes that the clinic and not the jail, is the real answer to the alcoholic's need. And the industry knows, too, that without the drunk, prohibitionists would have no cause.

Amendment of United States Housing Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed by unanimous consent S. 1361 providing for two amendments to the United States Housing Act of 1937; one to permit loans, capital grants or annual contributions for low rent housing and slum clearance projects where construction costs exceed the present cost limitations, upon condition that local housing authorities pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs. During the war emergency construction was deferred on many low rent housing and slum clearance projects for which the Federal Public Housing Authority had contracted to extend financial aid. This amendment would give any municipality with which the Federal Public Housing Authority had previously entered into a contract, the option and opportunity of going ahead with the project by simply absorbing the excess cost above the limitations of the act. It does not compel any such municipality to do so. The bill does not involve the appropriation of additional funds by the Federal Government because all moneys that would be disbursed have already been appropriated and allocated to the respective projects within the limits of the existing law. It permits these municipalities to pay the difference between the limitation of $5,000 and approximately $7,500 which is the actual cost of a dwelling unit and thereby complete the projects.

Section 2 is an amendment to the Senate bill which I advocated before the Banking and Currency Committee of which I am a member, and which had jurisdiction over this legislation. Under the regulations governing the administration of Federal low-rent housing units in the State of Connecticut as well as elsewhere, limits are set on the incomes of those who are eligible for residence in these projects. These limits were originally set on the theory that the properties should be occupied by those of low income who would otherwise be forced to live in substandard housing. During the war, however, and up to the present time, families whose incomes exceeded the limits were permitted to continue to live in the same on a payment of an economic rent rather than a susidized one. As stated by the Acting Director of the Housing Authority of the city of New Haven:

While it is true that tenants with high incomes have been permitted to remain in low-rent housing projects, all the tenants of this Authority have been required to pay increased rentals in direct proportion to the increase in family income, up to the ceilings established by the OPA, which, in our particular situation, represented economic rents.

The same condition exists in several other cities in Connecticut, as well as in other industrial areas throughout the Nation. The Federal Housing Authority, however, has issued notices of eviction to families whose income exceed the limits set. This means that in my district, particularly in New Haven alone, several hundred persons will be forced out of their homes and have no place to move to. One reason given is that there are many people, including veterans, who could make use of the vacated units. This overlooks the fact that many of the persons facing eviction are themselves veterans—men with large families whose sacrifice in going into the service was greater than those who went in as single men, came out, and have now assumed family responsibility. Under the present amendment eviction proceedings would be stayed until March 1, 1948, unless suitable quarters elsewhere can be proved available. This Congress has already passed an extension of the rent-control law to March 1, 1948, which makes it illegal for the individual or corporate landlord to evict a tenant before March 1, 1948, except on one or two conditions. Therefore, this amendment extends the same protection to tenants of Government-controlled properties who are not living in the same at the expense of taxpayers in general, but are actually paying full economic rent and have no place else to go due to the housing shortage.

Amendment of Civil-Service Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a defect in the civil-service laws, resulting in an obvious injustice, has been brought to my attention, which I seek to remedy by a bill introduced today.

One of my constituents in April 1941 took the examination for a postal carrier and received a rating of 93 percent. Later he enlisted in the Army and was badly wounded in Germany, with the result that he now has a 70-percent disability.

In March 1946 he was given a probational appointment as a substitute carrier but found that he was not physically able to do this work, which involved, of course, carrying heavy sacks of mail and a great deal of leg work. Consequently, in March, this year, he was reassigned to the position of substitute clerk.

The difficulty is, however, that, despite his rating, which with the 10 percent granted to a disabled veteran, puts him above 100 percent, he has lost all of the important seniority rights which he would have had on the postal carrier list, since his name was removed from the carrier register when he received his appointment.

The Civil Service Commission has advised that under its regulations it is not permissible to transfer an eligibility from the carrier register to the clerk register or vice versa, even though the original examination which this young man took was one given for either the position of carrier or clerk and was identical in all respects for those who were seeking appointment to either of these positions.

Accordingly, we have a case here of a veteran who was badly wounded in the service of his country, lay in an overseas hospital for many months, and finally returned to this country to take up his job after convalescence, only to find that despite his high standing in the examination, he would have to take his place far behind those who had received much lower marks in the same examination. This seems to me to present a case which cries out for remedial treatment.

The measure which I am today offering would amend the civil service law to provide that any person who, due to a disability incurred by military service, is unable to perform the duties of the position designated by him at the time of taking the examination for appointment, may upon written request at any time have his name entered on any list of eligibles for any position for which the same examination is required. It further provides that such entry shall be made without any loss of seniority or other rights of eligibility conferred by the civil service law.

This suggestion seems to me but simple justice and I hope will be received with favor.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project Is Necessary to the National Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on a subject of vital concern to the people of the United States, and especially to the people of the Midwest and Great Lakes regions—the St. Lawrence seaway project. As you may know, the House Committee on Public Works has been holding hearings for the past week on House Joint Resolution 192, which was introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and House Joint Resolution 194, introduced by myself, which authorizes the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved the companion measure (S. J. Res. 111) on July 18.

I know that many Members of the House are already familiar with the seaway issue. The project is, however, so important and necessary to the future welfare and prosperity of my district

and the entire Midwest, that I take this opportunity to summarize briefly the salient facts concerning the waterway, and outline the major arguments in favor of its construction.

WHAT IS THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT?

The St. Lawrence project involves a proposed shipping lane extending from the Strait of Belleisle at the mouth of the St. Lawrence River, to Duluth, Minn., a distance of 2,351 miles. The completion of the project would provide a channel of inland water transportation which would permit deep-sea vessels to steam up the St. Lawrence River from the Atlantic Ocean, and unload their cargoes at the Great Lakes ports of Duluth, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo. In other words, the waterway would bring ocean shipping 2,351 miles into the heart of the North American Continent.

Most of this great inland waterway is already navigable to ocean vessels. On the Atlantic side, ocean ships can enter the St. Lawrence River as far inland as Montreal, Canada, which is a distance of 1,003 miles.

From the interior, the Great Lakes system is navigable for a distance of over 1,200 miles from Duluth to Ogdensburg, N. Y., with the exception of a few minor obstructions. A few minor operations would make this section of the water route completely navigable. A new lock would have to be constructed at Sault Ste. Marie betwen Lake Superior and Lake Huron, and the St. Marys River would be dredged to a depth of 27 feet. The St. Clair and Detroit Rivers between Lake Huron and Lake Erie would have to be deepened also. The Welland Ship Canal on the Canadian side of the border would have to be improved, and the Thousand Islands section of the St. Lawrence River would require dredging. Once this work was completed, Great Lakes vessels of Atlantic size can travel eastward as far as Ogdensburg, N. Y.

There remains the 119-mile bottleneck to shipping between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal, Canada, and the improvement of this section to permit the passage of ocean vessels is the major objective of the St. Lawrence project. Some 70 miles of this distance is navigable at the present time—the Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis sections. To remove these major obstructions to what constitutes only about 2 percent of the total length of the waterway requires the construction of dams, locks, and canals at the International Rapids; between Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis; and the 10-mile stretch on the approaches of Montreal. Once these links in the waterway are completed, the midcontinent would be accessible to ocean shipping and the commerce of the Great Lakes would be joined with the main stream of world trade.

THE COST OF THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

According to the 1947 estimate of the United States engineers, the over-all cost of the St. Lawrence project would be $839,121,000. Since $164,414,000 has already been expended to improve certain sections of the project—$132,672,000 has been expended by Canada, and $31,742,000 by the United States—the actual cost to complete the entire waterway would be no more than $674,707,000 at present wage and building-material levels.

Out of the $674,707,000 total outlay needed to complete the waterway, the United States share would amount to $491,609,000. With the State of New York shouldering part of the United States share—about $93,375,000 of it—for the construction of the power facilities, the total outlay on the part of the United States Government would be approximately $398,000,000.

It should be pointed out that the $398,000,000 estimate is too high. This figure is based upon 1947 construction costs, which are at the highest point in American history. Since the construction of the project will take about 7 years, the cost of materials and wages will no doubt adjust downward and thus the total construction costs would be reduced accordingly.

But the total costs need not concern the House, for the Government of the United States will not be required to assume the burden of the cost of construction of the seaway. Both House Joint Resolution 192 and House Joint Resolution 194 contain provisions which make the seaway self-liquidating through the payment of tolls on ocean traffic. Section 3 (a) of these bills permit a maximum toll charge on cargo passing through the deep-sea navigation works in the St. Lawrence River of $1.25 per ton, with differential or lower toll rates for special types of bulk cargo, such as iron ore, grain, and dairy products.

It is estimated that such toll charges will provide annual revenues of at least $20,000,000, and it is possible that these revenues may exceed $30,000,000. It is certain that the toll revenue will be ample to pay for the cost and upkeep of the seaway. The interest payments on $430,000,000 at a 2½ percent interest rate, plus 1 percent sinking fund amortization, which will retire the debt in 53 years, plus the annual operating costs of $2,500,000, makes a total annual cost of about $17,500,000. This figure is $2,500,000 less than the most conservative estimate of annual revenues from the project to be derived from the self-liquidating provisions of the measure before the House.

In other words, the seaway will pay for itself over a maximum period of 53 years, and will not cost the United States Treasury a single penny—the initial outlay is an investment and not an expenditure.

Besides being self-liquidating in itself, the seaway will pay for itself every 10 years in the form of transportation savings to American producers and consumers. Savings in transportation costs will amount to over $3 per ton on all cargo. Taking the conservative estimate of potential traffic of 10,000,000 tons, the annual savings in transportation costs would be $30,000,000. Since the annual traffic will probably amount to at least 17,000,000 tons, the savings in transportation costs will amount to about $50,000,000.

THE MAJOR ADVANTAGES OF THE SEAWAY PROJECT

The obvious advantages of the St. Lawrence seaway are so convincing and overwhelming that it is difficult to understand the opposition to it. In fact, the mystery is not why it should be under construction now, but why it was not built years ago. I wish to outline the major arguments favoring the construction of this project.

THE SEAWAY AS AN AVENUE OF TRANSPORTATION OF TRADE

In the first place, the seaway would mean tremendous savings in transportation costs. Automobiles could be shipped from Detroit at a saving of $12.24 per ton. Wheat and flour could be shipped from Duluth at a saving of $1.61 per ton and could be laid down in Liverpool at 5 to 8 cents less per bushel. Crude rubber could be brought to Detroit at a saving of $8 per long ton. The seaway would reduce the cost of lumber laid down in Detroit by $5 per 1,000 feet. The dairy products of the Great Lakes region could be transported to the Atlantic coast as a saving of $4 per ton.

It has been estimated that the average reduction in transportation costs for all types of cargo would be about $3.90 per ton.

In addition to the great savings in transportation which would benefit both producer and consumer, the seaway would have the effect of stimulating trade relations between the Eastern States and the Midwest. Grains, flour, ores, and so forth would flow over this water highway from the Midwest to the Eastern States, and be exchanged for the textiles and other manufactured products of Eastern factories. Thus the trade between the two regions would be increased, employment would rise, and the living standards of both areas would be improved.

Several arguments have been advanced to challenge the advisability of the seaway as a channel for inland transportation. It has been said that the potential traffic would be so small that it does not justify construction. This argument has no validity. On the basis of careful studies it may be said that the seaway will attract 10,000,000 tons of outgoing cargo, and 7,000,000 tons on incoming cargo each year. Such a volume of traffic will mean savings in transportation costs amounting to at least $50,000,000 per year.

It has also been claimed that the 27-foot channel of the seaway is not deep enough to accommodate a sufficient proportion of merchant ships to make its construction practical. But studies based upon data compiled by the United States Maritime Commission show that the 27-foot channel will permit 71 percent of the world's merchant vessels, and 65 percent of American merchant vessels to navigate the channel safely.

It has been argued that ice conditions will keep the seaway closed for a greater part of the year, and that its construction would be a waste of funds. Yet a survey of past weather conditions for the area reveal that the waterway would be open for shipping for at least 8 months of the year, and at that time of the year when the need for additional transportation facilities is greatest.

It has also been said that navigation of the seaway would be extremely dangerous, and would result in many costly accidents. But statistics show

that the accident rates on the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes at present is very low, and the fog condition is more favorable to navigation than in the New York Harbor itself.

The most vocal enemies of the seaway have been the railroad interests, who have been motivated by the misguided notion that the seaway would jeopardize the economic position of the railroad companies. An analysis of the effects of the waterway on rail transport shows that these interests have nothing to fear by its construction. The average tonnage transported by the railroads during the 1930–39 period was 858,000,000 tons per year. As a result of full production and an expanding population, total transportation requirements are expected to reach 1,232,000,000 tons—an amount which the present railroad system cannot handle without expanding its present facilities.

The potential traffic of 17,000,000 tons to be handled by the seaway would be insignificant compared to the total tonnage handled by the railroad. Instead of being a threat to the railroads, the seaway would benefit them. The peak months for railroad traffic is August, September, and October when extra rolling stock is required to meet transportation requirements. After the peak is reached and passed, the railroads' rolling stock remains idle until the next season. The seaway would relieve the railroads during the peak season, thus making unnecessary the added expense of additional rolling stock which lies idle most of the year.

THE SEAWAY AS A SOURCE OF CHEAP ELECTRIC POWER

It is a well-known fact that the State of New York and adjacent areas suffer from a shortage of power which has tended to prevent the further expansion of their industries. The power facilities of the St. Lawrence project would do much to remedy this situation. The United States' share of electric power generated by the project would amount to nearly 13,000,000,000 kilowatts per year at the very low rate of 1 mill per kilowatt. According to the New York Power Commission, seaway-generated power would save the people of the State of New York some $26,000,000 per year, and would allow for the expansion of her retarded industries to employ 50,000 additional workers.

THE SEAWAY AS A CONTRIBUTION TO NATIONAL SECURITY

There can be no doubt that the construction of the seaway would be a great contribution to the national security of the United States. The truth of this conclusion is obvious. The distance from New York to Liverpool is 3,200 nautical miles all exposed to submarines. One-third of the 2,647 miles from Quebec to Liverpool is in the protected waters of the St. Lawrence River. Had the seaway been completed before World War II, one-third of the dangerous and submarine-infested Atlantic course would have been eliminated by assembling convoys in the Great Lakes and the protected waters of the St. Lawrence, and many of our doomed merchant vessels would have been saved from destruction.

The completion of the seaway would provide the United States with additional shipbuilding facilities, protected from enemy submarines and aircraft. During World War II the United States built 50,000,000 tons of shipping. Although the Great Lakes has the greatest supply of skilled workmen in the country, only 2 percent of ship construction was done in the Great Lakes yards. This was due to the lack of a direct outlet to the ocean for ships so built. The completion of the waterway will mean that our Great Lakes yards can be utilized, and all vessels built can be floated directly to the open sea.

THE SEAWAY PROJECT IS NECESSARY TO THE FUTURE OF MINNESOTA

The St. Lawrence waterway is of special interest to the people of Minnesota; it is absolutely necessary to our future prosperity and development. It is a well-known fact that the high-grade iron ores of the Mesabi Range are being fast depleted. According to the United States Bureau of Mines there are about 992,000,000 long tons of such ore remaining. At the present rate of consumption, these ores will be gone in another 20 years.

The depletion of these ores is important not only to Minnesota but to the Nation. Let me remind the House that 80 percent of the Nation's steel industry is geared to the iron ore deposits of the Great Lakes area, and that 85 percent of all Great Lakes iron ore is mined on the Mesabi Range in northwestern Minnesota.

Faced with the depletion of these high-grade ores, Minnesota must have the St. Lawrence seaway. We must have the seaway in order that we may develop our low-grade ores by permitting small amounts of high-grade ores to be imported to mix with the low-grade ores which we must use in increasing amounts in the future. Otherwise the steel mills of the Midwest will move to the east coast where they can obtain the high-grade ores of Brazil and Labrador.

We need the seaway to facilitate the development of our peat and taconite resources. Approximately half of the Nation's peat resources are located in Minnesota, most of it being located in my district. It is estimated by the United States Bureau of Mines that in St. Louis County, Minn., there are 6,000,000,000 tons of peat. Using modern methods sun-dried peat can be produced for $1 per ton at the bog, thus guaranteeing an unlimited amount of cheap fuel for the future development of the region.

Northern Minnesota is extremely rich in taconite. As Mr. J. R. Findley states in the report of the Department of the Interior, there is enough taconite ore in the Lake Superior region to last the world a thousand years. But the utilization of taconite, peat, and our low-grade ores requires the seaway.

Mr. Speaker, the failure of Congress to take decisive action on the seaway project during this session means continued waste of a precious natural asset. The seaway will open the world's market to Midwest farmers. It will bring vast new quantities of cheap electric power to power-starved New England. It will contribute to the national defense of America. It will benefit directly over half of America, and indirectly the whole Nation.

The people of the Great Lakes area and the Midwest have dreamed of the day when the seaway would become a reality. Forty years is long enough to wait for this vital project. It is more than long enough for narrow sectionalism and the private selfishness of railroad and public utility interests to block a program of utmost importance to the general welfare.

Import Revival Faces Snag as Exchange Bill Is Dropped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal of Commerce of July 18, 1947:

IMPORT REVIVAL FACES SNAG AS EXCHANGE BILL IS DROPPED

Prospects of reviving imports from various foreign countries received what importers considered a serious blow yesterday when the Senate Finance Committee decided to take no action at this session of Congress on a bill which would have permitted the Secretary of the Treasury to set foreign exchange rates for the purpose of assisting import values.

The bill which had passed the House last month had been strenuously opposed by customs lawyers for its failure to incorporate provisions for the judicial review of the Secretary's findings.

MEASURE PIGEONHOLED

In view of these objections, Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN (Republican, Colorado), chairman of the Finance Committee, announced that his group had decided to drop the measure for this year but that it had agreed to give it prompt attention at the next session if there was evidence of continued interest.

Importers and customs brokers, pointing to the fact that more than 50,000 import invoices have already accumulated in a backlog awaiting official rulings on applicable exchange rates, stated yesterday that the effect of the measure would be to discourage importers from bringing in merchandise from countries where wide discrepancies exist between the official and open market rates for the American dollar.

The difference between the two rates, according to one customs broker, can at present make a difference of between 25 to 50 percent in the duty to be paid on certain imports. Due to the present uncertainty of the applicable exchange rate, it was said, importers cannot tell whether they are operating at a profit or a loss and will consequently tend to avoid commitments.

Among the countries that are principally affected by the present foreign exchange situation are China, Italy, and a number of the Latin-American countries.

TREASURY MAY ACT

The possibility that the Treasury may take some step to liquidate the accumu-

lated invoices despite the failure of the Secretary to obtain the power which this bill would have given him was mentioned in trade circles yesterday but the exact nature of these measures was not known.

Some importers pointing to the fact that in the case of China the discrepancies between the official and open market rates have existed since before the war stated that "if we have been able to get along for 8 years without this bill, we probably can manage for another 8 months."

However other importers described the Senate Finance Committee's action as constituting almost as serious a blow to the prospects of world trade revival on a two-way basis as the passage by Congress of the first Robertson bill which would have given the President the right to impose quotas or to raise the duty on wool 50 percent.

These predicted that by discouraging imports the failure of Congress to act on the foreign exchange bill would accentuate the decline in the country's exports now anticipated for the final quarter of the present year.

GOP—Operation Bedlam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, during this first session of the Eightieth Congress the Republican majority has done its best to take away from the people all the social and economic gains made under the Democratic administration these past 14 years. They have supported the depression-causing policies followed by the Hoover administration, and have attempted to enact into law the entire Wall Street program with respect to labor, the farmer, the veteran as well as in taxation and Government finance. The welfare of the people have been consistently sacrificed on the altar of corporate profits by my Republican colleagues.

Such short-sighted policies are not confined to the Congress of the United States. Reports from my neighboring State of Wisconsin indicate the State legislature is following along in the same pattern. I think I am safe in saying that at least the GOP is consistent—consistently reactionary.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the July 17 issue of the Madison Capitol Times. This article by Aldric Revell describes the antics of Wisconsin Republicans in the State Legislature:

In preparation for SA-day (sine die adjournment) Republicans have been marshaling their forces in the legislature for months and are now putting into effect operation bedlam.

This carefully planned operation is calculated to throw the enemy (the public) into utter confusion. This is caused by the fact that GOP members rush up to the firing line and shoot off their mouths in all directions.

The party has now left its platform and is pursuing guerrilla tactics, shooting when it sees the color of the public's greenbacks.

As T. C. Douglas, Premier of Saskatchewan, says about his conservative opponents, their attitude toward a party platform is the same as toward a railroad platform—something to get on and get away from as fast as possible.

The legislature has now reached a political impasse. A political impasse, Republican style, is a valley with steep sides of stupidity through which runs a river of confusion with eddies of hypocrisy.

In the past week the legislature was dominated by a flying saucer mentality. GOP legislators were so busy running around in circles that they met themselves coming back, which naturally made many of them sick to the stomach.

The conflict is between the assembly which has twice insisted upon financing school aids through an increased surtax, and the senate which has refused to tax the corporations for anything.

While legislators toss this problem back and forth to each other, they also keep dipping huge amounts out of the general fund. At the present time there isn't a legislator who knows how much they have appropriated over and above the $105,450,000 biennium budget, or how much surplus is in the treasury.

Senators Frank Panzer (Republican), of Oakfield, president pro tempore, and Louis Fellenz, Jr. (Republican), of Fond du Lac, are flatly opposed to increasing taxes, maintaining there is enough of a surplus to finance educational aids, provided not more than $4,000,000 is spent for this purpose.

Senator Warren Knowles (Republican), of New Richmond, floor leader, and Gordon Bubolz (Republican), Appleton, chairman of the steering committee, feel that new taxes must be levied if educational aids are to be increased. This leaves your grandmother mumbling into her ear trumpet.

Some sort of public monument should be erected for the guy who announced before the session started that all would be peace and harmony since Republicans controlled 88 of 100 assembly and 27 of 33 senate seats.

The type of harmony which has been existing was illustrated in the senate last week when Senator Panzer accused Knowles of being unethical and told Bubolz he was conceited. Panzer also said he couldn't crawl on his hands and knees to Senator Conrad Shearer (Republican), of Kenosha, former president pro tempore, and Shearer replied it was immaterial to him whether Panzer crawled on his hands and knees, his back, or any part of his anatomy.

It seems that all the legislators who weren't given the opportunity to make Fourth of July speeches have been making them on the floor of the legislature. There has been much pounding of fists, raising of pinkies, and beating together of tonsils.

Legislators seem to feel that if they talk long enough and loudly enough the financial problems will go away and stop bothering them.

About 2 months after the session was under way, I wrote a column in which I predicted the present chaos and confusion. I said this was inevitable because the Republicans had no leadership.

From time to time legislators have tried to get together, but they never could agree because no one presented a program to them. Neither could a GOP legislator read his party's platform of 1946 and receive any guidance.

That platform promised that the GOP would meet every problem head-on and solve it with dispatch. Instead of facing the problems, legislators have been imitating cattle in turning their backs to them.

It seems to me that Republicans this session have given a dramatic demonstration of what happens when you elect people without convictions and without a program. The result is a floundering around which would make stampeded sheep appear calm and deliberate.

There isn't a single issue causing bedlam today which hasn't been before the legislature for months. With leadership, these problems could have been faced and disposed of weeks ago.

They all proclaim that they got a mandate from the people last November. If that is so, I can only conclude from the activities of the session that the mandate was to be stupid.

And so "operation bedlam" is being put into effect. The longer the legislature remains in session the more it costs the taxpayers. They should have stood in bedlam at home instead of coming to Madison.

Depreciation Accounting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excerpt from the Journal of Accountancy of July 1947:

ACCELERATING DEPRECIATION

There is urgent need for greater flexibility in depreciation accounting. Taxpayers hesitate to invest in fixed assets at current high prices unless they can charge off a large part of the cost within the next few years, while business prospects are bright. But the Treasury has generally disallowed acceleration of depreciation.

The value of more flexible depreciation regulations has been demonstrated in connection with the acute housing shortage. New apartment houses can be erected only at high cost. The owners could easily rent new dwellings now at rentals high enough to secure a satisfactory return on the investment, but this may not be possible after several years of active building. Hence, builders hesitate to proceed with the construction of new apartments unless they could write off a considerable fraction of the cost within 5 years.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue was asked by the Federal Housing Administration to authorize accelerated depreciation of rental housing during the years immediately following completion. Its reply was to authorize, for use by all taxpayers, a 150 percent declining-balance formula for depreciation. This method permits taxpayers to depreciate the balance of the book value of an asset at 150 percent of the straight-line rate. Appraising this formula, Paul D. Seghers in the Journal of Accountancy finds that it penalizes rather than benefits the taxpayer. It is far less desirable, he holds, than the old declining-balance method of computing depreciation, which is seldom used because of its complexity. (Editorial in the New York Journal of Commerce, February 6, 1947.)

Wool Bill, S. 1498

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a telegram I have

received from the Boston Wool Trade Association on the wool bill, S. 1498:

BOSTON, MASS., *July 22, 1947.*

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference wool bill, S. 1498, about to reach floor; we earnestly request your presence and your understanding of section 1a which calls for a fixed-price guaranty for wool higher than market price and which is contrary to traditional parity basis of support for agriculture. Government subsidizes and nationalizes a commodity when it becomes sole purchaser at a fixed price higher than market as in this bill. This fixed price for wool is unnecessary to sheep farmer because of his present record income from meats, lamb, and mutton, which comprise the large bulk of his products. A slightly lower support level, say 90 percent of the parity basis the same as provided for most other agricultural commodities, would avoid nationalization of this business and yet give ample support to sheep farmer. Since Government stopped buying wool on April 15 between sixty and seventy-five million pounds, or about 25 percent of the total clip, has been sold by growers through normal trade channels at prices satisfactory to them. Please favor substitution of parity basis in place of the fixed-price basis of S. 1498, the substitution as to be proposed by Representative HERTER. Balance of bill, namely authority to Government to liquidate stock pile, makes good sense.

Thank you.

BOSTON WOOL TRADE ASSOCIATION,
HARRY A. TILTON, *President.*

Importance of Depreciation in Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I have received from a leading tax accountant of Los Angeles, Calif., on the important subject of depreciation:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 11, 1947.*

HON. NORRIS POULSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR NORRIS: I am enclosing a clipping from page 4 of the Wall Street Journal of July 9, entitled "Congress Urged to Legislate More Liberal Tax Laws on Depreciation."

In the final analysis and over the life of a business the same net profit results whether it is divided in annual periods in which estimated depreciation is provided or whether the income of the business is computed for the entire life span from which is deducted the cost of capital assets used up in this business span. This statement necessarily excepts Federal taxes based on income as changing rates, application to yearly profits (but not losses) (this latter has to some extent been ameliorated by the loss carry-back carry-over section) and the graduated rates in certain brackets causes a variation in the result which would otherwise be obtained.

However, broadly speaking, the one method (using that of the estimated life span as computed by the business) is that of the average businessman while the other arbitrary annual application of a rate as set by the Treasury expert is the one which oftimes is economically speaking extremely fictitious.

It seems that the ultimate aim of the Treasury Department would be to get as much revenue with as little adverse effect as possible on business. One of the greatest points of argument relative to audit of income tax returns probably causing the largest administrative expenditure is that of the annual estimate of depreciation and the so-called 5-year plan which has been put into effect by the Treasury Department is no solution. It never will be so long as a Government man batters down depreciation allowance to increase the tax take in a particular year and then tries to make it stick for 5 years. It appears to me that there is much more than merely dreaming in the very practical suggestion that a businessman be allowed to determine his own depreciation rate within certain outside limits and that as suggested in this article he be allowed to limit that to net profits for a particular year. What sounds like a startling innovation or a radical idea may turn out to be rather sound tax practice to which you may agree after giving this consideration and thought.

Let us assume, for instance, a corporation starting a new business which is almost always a venture that could lose money; in fact the majority of them do. The corporation starts with $100,000 in the bank and the stockholders have $100,000 worth of capital stock. The corporation builds and furnishes the building with machinery so that they can begin manufacturing and (eliminating the discussion of working capital at present) we have the situation of a balance sheet showing fixed assets $100,000 represented by capital invested of the same amount. The following year (this is one of those unusual profitable businesses) the corporation makes $50,000 profit and its balance sheet now shows accounts receivable $20,000, inventory $40,000, fixed assets after depreciation $90,000, capital $100,000, surplus $50,000. We now have a corporation with $60,000 worth of working capital, $100,000 fixed assets on which we have estimated $10,000 depreciation, but we do not show a tax liability which will be approximately $20,000. The corporation should go out and borrow money unless it is compelled to reduce its receivables below the normal amount in order to meet this obligation, and thereby its efficiency is impaired. If they were allowed to provide for this fixed asset depreciation to the extent of $50,000 the first year and the balance in succeeding years so that instead of being compelled to borrow to pay taxes they would be able to pay subsequent taxes out of cash on hand, then we would have a much sounder basic financial structure and we would have a much more efficiently equipped industry. In the long run there is little question but what this same industry would turn out a much larger volume both in gross units and dollars which would result in a higher profit subject to taxes.

Where is the Government depreciation engineer or other man who can tell you today whether a building should be depreciated at 3, 4, or 5 percent? However, we actually have a controversy on now in which an agent is challenging the judgment of the management by a difference of 1 percent in depreciation rate. While it is true that the difference of 4 percent as against 5 percent a year is a 20-percent differential, this Government employee is attempting to say, "I know better than the management just exactly how long that building will last and you business people will have to accept my judgment in place of yours."

The proposed method would, in my opinion, be a great boon to rental housing, and that, after all, is the most essential type of housing today. The average veteran and his young wife, aged 20 to 25, with possibly one child, cannot afford nor does he decide to purchase a home in a location in which his working life may not finally be spent; likewise at this young age he does not have the accumulated backlog nor the earning capacity to be able to make payments on a $10,000, $12,000, or $15,000 home, which is what he would have to pay for the type of residence he will ultimately want to own. It is a boon to these people to be able to obtain a three- or four-room rental property for $20 to $30 a month during that interim period of time that they are becoming adjusted and that he is preparing for his life work. Two- and three-family dwellings in single units are generally owned by the comparatively small investor. This is true because it has not required the same accumulation of capital to produce these types of units as it does to combine them all in one large apartment building on a high-priced piece of land. If these same investors were entitled to deduct on their tax return each year as depreciation an amount equivalent to the net income received from rent until they had completely depreciated the cost basis of the improvements, I think it would be quite an inducement for anyone in the 30-percent bracket or more to build one or more of these small units. While this might result in some loss of revenue for the Treasury Department, I seriously doubt that this would be the case over the long pull. First, the value of this type of property would go up so that there would be a substantially greater long-term capital gain on the sale thereof; secondly, the additional building done would result in net income to those people who do the construction work and report ordinary income; third, the rent from the fully depreciated properties would be subject to tax without reduction; and fourth, there would be a decided falling off of chiselers of rent-house expenses, as the average person would take the attitude that the depreciation would be far better to use as a deduction than to think up a lot of minor expenses such as doubling the utility expenses against a particular unit.

Bear in mind that this entire letter is written having in mind the majority of honest and reasonable taxpayers. There will be chiselers regardless of any law that is written, and these must be watched in any event.

Yours sincerely,

C. C. GABRIELSON,
Certified Public Accountant.

[From the Wall Street Journal of July 9, 1947]

CONGRESS URGED TO LEGISLATE MORE LIBERAL TAX LAWS ON DEPRECIATION TO PROMOTE EXPANSION INVESTMENT

WASHINGTON.—More liberal tax allowances for capital investment and foreign income were recommended to the House Ways and Means Committee yesterday.

Alden D. Walker, a Chicago industrial engineer, told the committee the depreciation policy adopted by the Treasury Department during the Roosevelt Administration discourages needed plant expansion for full employment and national defense.

He proposed that all producers, including farmers, be permitted to deduct from gross income a maximum of 20 percent of their capital investments annually for depreciation and obsolescence. In effect, they would be permitted to write off these investments over a 5-year period.

So long as he kept within the 20 percent limit, the taxpayer would be permitted to deduct any amount he saw fit for this purpose and thus write off his investment over a longer period, providing that he was consistent from year to year. In addition, he would be permitted to postpone his depreciation allowance whenever he operated at a loss.

Under present law, the Treasury Department will not allow as much as 20 percent write-off per year in most cases. It requires

the producer to amortize his facilities over periods ranging from 10 years for tractors to 75 years in the case of warehouses.

Under present conditions, Mr. Walker said, producers cannot foresee their chances of recovering capital investments over these long periods. He estimated that in the years 1925–46, inclusive, the United States manufacturers spent an aggregate of only $11,200,000,000 on factory-building construction, about as much as the Nation spends annually for military preparedness. From 1930 to 1940, he said, the value of physical assets for industrial and farm production, commerce, railroads, and public utilities declined 22.3 percent.

"We submit that our productive industry is the real first line of national defense, and if we continue to restrict the industrial expansion and modernization to a like scale in the years ahead, we will find to our sorrow that we have built another false Maginot line," Mr. Walker warned. The plan he offered recognizes that enterprise capital will be invested first where the return of original capital is a reasonable expectation; secondly, where the anticipated return is comparable to the risk involved, he said.

Meanwhile, other witnesses urged the following changes be incorporated in the GOP omnibus tax to be introduced next year:

John S. Carlson, Tulsa, Okla., attorney, proposed that citizens absent a year or more should be exempted from taxes from income earned in foreign countries or possessions of the United States. At present this exemption is allowed only if the taxpayer is domiciled in a foreign country. It is intended to encourage foreign trade by giving United States engineers, merchants, and other businessmen the same tax advantages accorded their foreign competitors by their governments.

A. E. Brooks, Fort Worth, Tex., attorney, proposed that any income received from foreign sources by citizens who are not residents of the United States for 183 days or more be exempted from taxation.

George S. Eaton, executive secretary of the National Tool and Die Manufacturing Association, asked that machine-tool makers be given an extension of time in which to file for certificates of necessity to take advantage of the special wartime amortization rates.

John G. Lang, director of the Cuban Tobacco Co., Inc., proposed that foreign companies resident in the United States be allowed the same 85-percent exemption for intercorporate dividends to which domestic corporations are entitled.

Pentlarge & Johnson, of New York, asked that foreign personal holding companies be treated for income, estate, and capital gains tax purposes the same as domestic firms.

The Question of the Separation of Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to give Federal aid to our schools has focused attention on the traditional American principle of separation of church and state. I know of no American who would want to see that principle violated. On the other hand, I fear that this principle, on occasions, is invoked, either through misconception or prejudice to defeat worthy causes.

Since the cessation of hostilities, the United States has given generously, as it should, to the stricken and impoverished people of Europe, even though some of them were our enemies in the past war. Whatever Stalin or Tito or their henchmen did with respect to the money, food medical supplies which the United States has sent to the devastated areas, certainly we in the Congress know it was never the intention of the United States Government to discriminate against needy people in these areas, nor to deprive children of food and medical care because they attended denominational schools. Nor does such discrimination exist in the American, British, or French occupied zones. However, when it comes to giving free or low-cost lunches or medical or dental care to American children attending denominational schools in our own country, many people immediately see in such humanitarian aid a violation of the principle of church and state, in that public money is being used, so it is said, to support a school in which religion is being taught. It would seem to me that if we can spend money for food and welfare for the children of the war-torn areas of Europe, we could equally as well, and without violating the principle of church and state, give low-cost or free lunches to the undernourished children of our own country, regardless of the school to which their parents send them.

On a Sunday morning, several months ago, I was walking along Connecticut Avenue and I noticed two policemen directing traffic in front of a Protestant church. It was really edifying. I thought it was good police work and showed a proper consideration for the safety and protection of the pedestrians. The thought did not occur to me then—nor does it register with me now with any sense of sound thinking—that these policemen, paid out of public funds, in protecting the churchgoers from the hazards of Connecticut Avenue traffic, were violating our accepted principle of church and state, in that they were indirectly aiding that particular church by protecting the parishioners against traffic hazards. I can see little distinction between that case and the child who is protected from the hazards of traffic and weather by being transported to school in a bus operated by public funds. As a matter of fact, while certainly not decrying the protection given the churchgoer, in my opinion the child, who must under the State law attend school, whether public, parochial or private, is more entitled to such protection than the churchgoer who is not compelled under State law, to go to church.

I believe there is considerable confusion in the minds of many people with respect to the principle of separation of church and state. I have, therefore, requested unanimous consent to include in my remarks an article by an old college classmate of mine, Very Rev. Msgr. Edward Roberts Moore, on this subject. Monsignor Moore is the pastor of St. Peter's Church in Barclay Street, which is the oldest Roman Catholic parish in New York City. The article was published in the Barclay Street News, the monthly publication of St. Peter's Church and was written just prior to the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the familiarly known New Jersey school-bus case and is, in part, as follows:

THE QUESTION OF THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

(By Very Rev. Msgr. Edward Roberts Moore)

Some recent events have revived an old American debate. When President Truman reappointed Myron C. Taylor to be his personal representative at the Vatican, certain Protestant organizations strongly objected that the action of the President violated the constitutional principle of the separation of church and state; Cardinal Spellman strongly denied such a conclusion. Later in the year some Protestant spokesmen returned to the charge in the pages of the New York Times; this time they were answered by Archbishop Ryan, of Omaha. Again, the Christian Herald decided that American Catholics cannot honestly support the Bill of Rights and the principle of separation of church and state. At the present time the Supreme Court at Washington has before it an appeal against the decision of New Jersey courts which permits parochial-school children transportation in the public-school busses; such service, says the appeal, violates the separation of church and state. Just the other day the Davenport (Iowa) Board of Education held up distribution of New Testaments in the city's public schools, on the objection of a rabbi that the action violated the historic separation of church and state. On January 13 Archbishop Cushing, of Boston, speaking of the parochial schools as an integral part of American education, described the extreme development of the idea of separation of church and state as "fantastic and un-American." (New York Times, January 14, 1947.)

What does the phrase really mean? Since much of the current misunderstanding is based on false assumptions, an attempt is made herewith to clarify public thinking on the subject in the light of American history and constitutional law.

WHAT THE PHRASE DOES MEAN

In 1787, delegates from thirteen allied but intensely individualistic political entities met at Philadelphia to form a Federal Constitution. In their deliberations they were confronted with a religious problem serious enough to wreck their efforts to found a government of the United States. The problem was the establishment of a State religion. Of the thirteen States, five accepted Congregationalism as the public religion. Two more had established the Episcopal Church. Five others, which as commonwealths had established the Episcopal Church, had disestablished it on becoming States, for patriotic reasons. Three States never had an established church.

At the same time all the States represented at the Convention, except Rhode Island, had some religious test for those holding public office. All required belief in "God, Creator and governor of the universe, the rewarder of the good and the punisher of the wicked." Some required belief in the Christian religion. Some required acceptance of the Protestant religion. One required belief in the Trinity. Owing to such variety of religious tests for public office, it was impossible to formulate a Federal religious test satisfactory to all the States. Furthermore, Rhode Island would never have joined the Union if any such religious test had been imposed.

So apparently, there were the two insuperable difficulties facing the delegates: What religion to establish? And what religious test to impose on officials of the Federal Government?

The Convention addressed itself first to the question of the religious test. The delegates recognized how perilous it would be to ally the civil power with religious opinions

and thus to exclude dissenters from sharing in public honors, trusts, pay, and immunities. Nor did they feel that so vital a matter could be passed over in silence. What was to be done? Ultimately, devout Christian members of the Convention joined hands with nonreligious members to oppose the enactment of any religious test at all. Hence, in the Constitution we read: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." (Art. 6.)

By "the United States" is meant the Federal Government, not the governments of the various States. While the constitutions of most States have been influenced by the stand of the Federal Constitution, eight States have kept some form of religious test, all of them in constitutions ratified in the century after 1787.

The Constitution, as signed by the delegates and ratified by 11 States, made no mention of church establishment. But the question had paramount place when, shortly afterward, the delegates reassembled to draw up the 10 amendments that are known as the Bill of Rights. It was feared that if the new Federal Government were left free to set up a national religious establishment, the Union would be constantly endangered by struggles for dominance among ecclesiastics and the religious bodies which they represented. Religious liberty was generally desired, and along with it a prohibition against Government preference for any religious body; for among the champions of religious establishment in the Constitutional Convention, each one wanted his own denomination preferred by the Federal Government. As a practical solution, the Convention adopted, as its first amendment, the following: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

THE FIRST AMENDMENT

The effect of the first amendment on State laws was first indirect, later direct. Though it was not the intent of the Constitutional Convention to trespass on the right of individual States to keep their established churches, the five States that had such recognized churches established by law disestablished them, though gradually. Massachusetts did not disestablish congregationalism until 1833, and New Hampshire still retains in its constitution the provision that the State legislature may devote public funds to maintain "public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality." It should be noted, however, that the New Hampshire legislature has not exercised this power for over a century.

The influence of the first amendment became direct after the Civil War. Upon certain western States desiring admission to the Union, Congress imposed a Federal compact, preventing them from establishing any church and making them put into their constitutions the law that "perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and no inhabitant of this State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of worship."

Though of the State constitutions only Utah's in so many words forbids "a union of church and state," it became a commonplace of American jurisprudence that "in our form of government church and state are not and cannot be united."

OTHER AMENDMENTS

In further amendments the Constitution had more to say about religion. The fifth amendment had forbidden the United States to deprive any person of "life, liberty, or property without due process of law." The fourteenth amendment, passed after the Civil War, enforced the same safeguard upon the States: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the full protection of the laws." According to the decision of Circuit Justice Fields in 1879, the fourteenth amendment prevents "hostile and discriminating legislation by a State against persons of any class, sect, creed, or nation, in whatever form it may be expressed."

To sum up, the American Constitution did two things. It forbade the establishment of any denomination as the state religion of the country; and it removed any political disability in the Nation at large because of religious belief.

WHAT THE PHRASE DOES NOT MEAN

To make the meaning of what has been said clear beyond dispute, it might be well to examine some of the things that separation of the church and state does not mean.

1. It does not mean that America has politically made itself an irreligious Nation Christians colonized this country. The Republic was founded by Christians, and they founded a Christian Republic. It is a recognized maxim of law that "Christianity is the law of the land." This maxim is fully consistent with the principle of separation of church and state, for the distinction is made "between a religion preferred by law and religion preferred by the people, between a legal establishment and a religious creed freely chosen by the people themselves" (Carl Zollmann, American Church Law, 23, citing an 1828 decision of the State of Delaware). In 1844 the Supreme Court declared that Christianity is part of the common law in the sense "that its divine origin and truth are admitted, and therefore are not to be maliciously and openly reviled and blasphemed against, to the annoyance of believers or the injury of the public."

A CHRISTIAN NATION

In keeping with this, the Declaration of Independence invoked the name of God, most State constitutions acknowledge gratitude to Him and ask His blessing. The national coinage is stamped "In God we trust." The national anthem has given the Nation a religious motto. Public officials assume office with a religious oath of faithfulness to their duties. Legislatures open their sessions with prayer, some with readings from the Bible. Presidents and Governors proclaim public days of thanksgiving. Both National and State Governments support legislative, military, and hospital chaplains out of the public funds. Sunday is the weekly holiday for rest and worship; Christmas is a national holiday.

2. Separation of church and state does not mean that religion is denied a favorable position in law. Religion has always been considered a benefit to the public good. All States except Virginia and West Virginia allow church associations to incorporate. They exempt church property from taxation. They protect worship by injunctions and verdicts for damages, and by requiring licensed businesses to build outside a certain radius from church buildings. These special considerations can in no way be construed as a violation of the first amendment.

3. At the same time the Government, though it will not trespass on religious beliefs, keeps a strong watch that no religious practice (or antireligious practice) passes the boundaries of elementary Christian standards or the good of public order. So all our States demand that marriage be monogamous. The Federal Government has outlawed the former Mormon practice of plural wives, and has punished religionists who tried to spread that tenet. In 1889 the Supreme Court passed down a much quoted decision: "The existence of such a propaganda is a blot to our civilization. The organization of a community for the spread and practice of polygamy, is, in a measure, a return to barbarism. It is contrary to the spirit of Christianity and of civilization which Christianity has produced in the Western World."

Similarly the Government will not allow certain religious practices to pass under the plea of religious liberty. A religious healer cannot practice medicine without a license, and a parent who allows his child to die without medical attention because of his belief in faith healing cannot excuse himself on the ground of religious liberty. Religious bodies devoted to an outdoor apostolate cannot be a nuisance on the public streets. Blasphemy is forbidden. The law will punish those who vilely attack the legitimacy of Christ and the virginity of His mother.

4. Separation of church and state does not mean in America that the church, or religion in general, is made subordinate to the state. No approval of a Congress or Government bureau is needed for a religious body to exist, to teach, to make converts, to carry out its acts of worship. This is an extremely important point, for the kind of separation of the two powers with which the Popes have had to deal and of which they speak, almost invariably included subordination, legal disability and state control over religious matters.

5. Separation of church and state, as a principle of American law, does not put the stamp "American" on atheism or indifferentism. For it is one thing to express a principle of law, another to express a philosophical principle or a religious dogma. The Constitution does the former. It makes no claim to be a philosophical instrument, much less a religious creed for the American people.

6. Nor may the inclusion in the Constitution of the principle of separation of church and state as defined be adduced as indicating that the founding fathers held this principle to be the ultimate and ideal solution in any and all circumstances of the problem of the relationship of church and state.

As a matter of fact it did not even indicate that the founding fathers really favored the principle at all. Many actually favored an established church but could not agree as to which church was to be the one established. The end result, therefore, the agreement that no church should be established, was largely the outcome of expediency.

A COMPROMISE

Historically and juridically it represents, as much of all law must and does, a practical compromise, one that over the years has worked well, framed to meet existing conditions. It rests simply on a factual basis: one political community, a wide diversity of faiths. To quote from John Courtney Murray, S. J., in a recent article in America, "The religious liberty proclaimed by the first amendment is not a piece of religious mysticism but a practical political principle, ethically grounded on the obligations of the state to the consciences of its citizens and to its own end, social harmony, prosperity, and peace."

7. Finally, separation of church and state does not mean that therefore the American state esteems itself as the complete and exclusive agency for all matters of public concern. A good example of unwillingness to assume a power which it does not possess is seen in the 1924 decision of the Supreme Court on the Oregon school law. An older generation will remember how that despised law sought to do away with private schools. Deciding for unconstitutionality, the Court said:

"The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public-school teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

Oregon, the Magnificent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Portland Homebildor.

OREGON, THE MAGNIFICENT

"Are you tired of offices, business, and stores.
Are you tired of daily work with its attendant chores,
Do you wonder what vacationland will be satisfying, best?
We have a ready answer. Come West, young man, come West."

By west, we mean Oregon, of course; Oregon, the State that has everything from the mountains to the sea. The State where trout lurk in abundance in our crystal-cold streams, our limpid sky-blue lakes, our majestic rivers. The land of the Old West where round-ups, rodeos, and buckaroo contests are featured events all summer long, the land of the open range and the deep forests of pine, cedar, and fir, the land of snow-capped peaks and lush fertile valleys, the land of shining beaches and craggy shores. Yes; that's Oregon extending its arms in welcome to the jaded, tired, and weary.

Come out and drive over our superb flower, fern, and tree-lined highways to such recreation as your heart desires. Drive up to Larch Mountain where you can see five mighty silver-crested peaks and over 10,000 miles of matchless forested terrain. Drive the Columbia River Highway where nine waterfalls in 10 miles cause you to stand in awe; see the great Bonneville Dam, one of the man-made wonders of the world: The Dalles; the Indian village at Celilo Falls; the great Hood River orchards, the view at eventide from Crown Point where the setting sun bathes the Columbia in miles of gold, orange, and crimson. Yes; it is grand and we Oregonians never cease to delight at the glories that nature has bestowed so lavishly upon us.

Now, having seen all this, don't rush away—we have lots more in store. Drive the Mount Hood loop; see the Indian pageant on the way where the Umatillas hold tribal dances daily; stop at Timberline lodge, high up in the snows, where skiing is an almost year-round sport; continue on the loop past glaciers, waterfalls, and Nature's primeval wildernesses on the slopes of this magnificent, white-crowned sentinel, until you reach the Hood River orchards nestling below you, mile upon mile.

We also offer you Bend, in the heart of Oregon, with its great Deschutes River; the spectacular Crooked River Canyon, its lava beds and caves, eerie, weird, and awe-inspiring. Over 200 lakes in that section lure the fishermen and the rivers have those rocky eddies where the trout lie in wait for your fly.

On to Crater Lake, wonder of wonders, an extinct volcano high in the mountains, breathtaking in expanse, and exquisite in coloring. Down through Klamath Falls, Ashland, Medford, and Grants Pass, to the great Oregon caves, back up the coast where the grandest coastal scenery in the world thrills you again and again. The coast where the forests walk down to the sea.

Back through the fishing villages, resort towns, the famed cheese center of Tillamook, to Astoria at the mouth of the mighty Columbia, where salmon is king and where the sun bids Oregon, "Good night." Back to the City of Roses along the lower Columbia River Highway and then start all over again and drive through the historic and beautiful Willamette Valley. See Oregon City with its falls, original Hudsons Bay Trading Post, Salem (our capital), Corvallis, Albany, Eugene, and Roseburg, each city a gem in its own right. On this trip not only the Willamette River but rivers and streams galore add to your zest for living. Of course the queen city, Portland, is your Oregon home and you return ready for more but less extensive rambles. Drive along Terwilliger Boulevard above the Willamette River, where the East Side with a background of Mt. Hood forms a never-to-be-forgotten picture, then on to Lake Oswego, beautiful, inviting, entrancing. Drive over the Skyline atop forested mountains and view Mt. Adams and Mr. St. Helens across the Columbia, while the great fertile Tualatin Valley awaits on the lee side. Turn left and see Hillsboro, Forest Grove, McMinnville, and Sheridan, the old covered bridges, the pioneer farms, the modern homes, and then come back to the days of relaxation and charm in Portland.

Visit the extinct volcano on Mt. Tabor where the mighty forces of nature exploded in the dim past, visit our rose-laden parks, our inviting golf courses, our miles of beautiful homes, meet our splendid, kindly citizens, who spurn ostentation and cultivate sincerity, who practice the hospitality of the days of the covered wagon, whose latchstrings are out and with whom a genuine welcome awaits the visitor.

On your way east don't miss Pendleton, the home of the world-famous round-up, the Umatilla Indian Reservation, LaGrande, where you turn off to the Wallowa Mountains, the Switzerland of America, with jagged peaks and mountain lakes, back to LaGrande and on to Baker and Ontario, with all the bustling towns in between.

In Oregon see nature at its finest, humanity at its best, enjoy a zestful, restful holiday where everything delightful abounds, where life is abundant for all. The place is Oregon, your vacation home.

CARLOS W. HUNTINGTON.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the Marshall plan, which I delivered last Friday night over the National Broadcasting Co., through Station WRC.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad of this opportunity to discuss with my listeners among the American people the proposal advanced by Secretary of State Marshall for coordinating all efforts in behalf of European recovery.

I take it for granted that no serious-minded American now doubts the necessity of American aid in the stabilization of Europe particularly, and it may be of other countries, especially parts of Asia.

While our Nation was not in any way responsible for World War II, which devastated vast areas of the earth's surface, and destroyed billions of dollars worth of property and of homes, and disorganized world economy more completely and universally than ever before, human destiny has placed upon our doorsteps the responsibility of aiding in the economic, moral, and political stabilization of the nations of the world in the interests of peace.

These efforts on our part are not dictated merely by the emotions of charity, worthy as they are. They are not based solely upon a Christian duty, which we acknowledge in our pews, but sometimes deny in our politics, to serve mankind in any way that may lift his standard of life, and his enjoyment of freedom and self-government.

These efforts on our part are justified on the sole ground of national self-interest, because we know that we cannot long prosper if the rest of the world lies prostrate, and we know that democracy in America and the Western Hemisphere cannot be safe and secure so long as it is in danger, or has been destroyed in the rest of the world.

Already we have granted aid in the way of loans to Great Britain, to France, to Poland, to China, and to Italy, and to some of the other nations of Europe. Almost overnight a situation developed in Greece and Turkey that made it necessary for us to come to their aid to the extent of $400,000,000 in order that they might maintain their independence and the integrity of their nationality. It was my good fortune to be in Turkey and Greece during the discussion of these two loans in the Congress of the United States, and it was actually pathetic to observe the renewed faith and confidence that the Greek and Turkish people had in themselves and their own economic and political independence by even the prospect of help from the United States.

In addition to these direct loans, we have afforded a large amount of aid in the form of food and materials, in order to help rebuild the economy of the devastated nations of Europe, and along with our allies, we have been compelled to assume a large and continuing obligation in the occupied sections of Germany.

General Marshall has recognized that this aid cannot continue indefinitely on a piecemeal basis. The industrial situation in Europe must be improved in order that the dwellers in the city may be able to purchase the food produced by the farmers. The exchange of food for industrial products between city and country, based upon the medium of a sound currency, constitutes the basis of economic prosperity. So long as the industrial workers of Europe, by reason of unemployment or pitifully low wages, or for any other economic reason, are unable to purchase the products of European farmers, outside efforts will have to be brought to bear to feed and clothe them until they can restore their own economy.

Hunger and despair breed anarchy and chaos. Destructive ideologies feed upon hunger and despair and hopelessness, and we know already, I regret to say, that there are certain nations in Europe who are, apparently, seeking to compound the suffering of the European people, in order that they may find a fertile field for the propagation of their totalitarian ideas among people of normal democratic habits and instincts. Realizing this situation, as it has become crystal clear in recent months, General Marshall, in his address at Harvard University, suggested that the nations of Europe come together and take account of their own situation, tabulate their needs, and make a survey of their own ability to help themselves, in order that they and we might know the situation from the standpoint of need and ability. In the meantime, the President of the United States has appointed three separate commissions to make a survey of our own resources and ability to aid the distressed nations of the world to get on their feet, and thereby restore their own political independence, and increase their ability to resist outside pressure.

These commissions will, undoubtedly, report as soon as it is humanly possible to gather all the facts.

In the meantime, the Foreign Ministers of Great Britain, France, and Russia, met in Paris recently for the purpose of discussing the possibility of a European conference to carry out the suggestions of our Secretary of State to take stock of European needs, not for the purpose of presenting us a one-sided bill for collection, but in order, by their mutual conference and mutual efforts, to determine what they can do for themselves, so that we may determine for ourselves how much of the balance we are able to do, as well as what other nations are able to contribute to the general results.

As so often happens, the Russian Foreign Minister made the conference of the three ministers impossible of success. He packed up his bags and returned to Moscow. Whereupon, Mr. Ernest Bevin, Foreign Minister of Great Britain, and Mr. Georges Bidault, Foreign Minister of France, issued invitations for 22 European nations, including Russia and her satellites, to meet in conference in Paris to do what General Marshall suggested in his speech at Harvard University a few weeks before. So far Russia has declined, and 4 of her satellites have declined. One of them, Czechoslovakia, first accepted, but, under pressure from Moscow, withdrew the acceptance. But, if that nation had been free to accept upon their own responsibility, without outside pressure, they would be sitting in the Paris Conference today with the other European nations. I believe the same may be said of the other nations which declined, including Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. But, be that as it may, there are 16 European nations now in session at Paris, seeking to take stock of their conditions, of their own abilities, in order that they and we may present a picture to the world and to our own people, which may be the basis of cooperative action designed to restore human happiness, human prosperity, and preserve the peace of the world by preserving it in every nation.

We do not know what will come out of this conference in Paris. It has begun its deliberations with commendable zeal and speed. It seems to have sensed the responsibility which rests upon the statesmen of Europe to tighten their belts and reduce their necessities to a figure which can be easily understood by those upon whom they call for assistance. It is impossible to speculate as to how much money it will be found these nations need from the outside world. But, we know that in order for the American people to put their hand to the plow with a determination which the situation may require, we must give them the facts. We must tell them the truth. General Marshall has emphasized this necessity in every utterance he has made, and I think the Congress of the United States recognizes the necessity of taking the American people into their confidence, insofar as it can be done. There are, of course, certain facts surrounding the conditions abroad, and certain delicate, diplomatic difficulties, which cannot be publicized, at least until all the facts are known. But, what we are trying to do, and our Secretary of State and President, and all of us, without regard to partisan politics, are trying to do, is organize our efforts upon a sound and stable basis, and organize the recuperative ability of all the nations who need help, so that they may not be led to believe that they may rely solely upon our own largess, in order that they may reap the benefits of a long and prosperous peace in the years to come.

We feel that the recovery of Europe is not a one-way street. We are willing to go the full length of the requirements, so long as we feel that the nations we are trying to help are, in good faith, trying to help themselves. We know that the peace of the world cannot be long maintained, if there is chaos in Europe and Asia. We know that democracy in America cannot be maintained if it is to be surrounded by the antithesis of democracy in every other continent of the world. Realizing this, the American people and American Government are willing to team up with every other nation that is, in good faith, seeking to help itself. We are willing to pull even the major part of the load, if necessary, in order that the vehicle may go forward—the vehicle of peace, of contentment, of happiness and confidence in the future—the vehicle of self-government, and of political and economic integrity in every nation whose independence is essential to the advancement of democratic ideals in all portions of the world and their preservation wherever they exist today.

It is, therefore, my view that this suggestion, or plan, or proposal, of General Marshall's, whatever it may be called, is one of the most constructive approaches to world rehabilitation that has been made, and it is my sincere hope and belief that, if the nations who are the victims of the ravages of war, and victims of internal and external pressures designed to eat into the foundation of their national integrity, rise to the opportunity which now faces them, by cooperating fully with our Government and among themselves, we shall find a solution of the problems that beset Europe and the rest of the world and constitute such a pall upon the horizon of liberty and democracy. We are willing to cooperate with all nations that are willing to cooperate with us. We would prefer to cooperate with every nation, regardless of the form of its government, but, if we cannot enlist all of them in this international effort to restore normal conditions, to restore employment, and production, and the stability of currencies, and all the other things so essential in the production of the essentials of happiness and contentment, we shall do the best we can to cooperate with those nations that are willing to meet us halfway on this highway to peace and progress.

Cashing of Terminal-Leave Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I issued yesterday when I introduced a bill to raise from 2½ to 6 percent the interest accruing on uncashed terminal-leave bonds of veterans, and thereafter a recent editorial entitled "Keep the Bonds" from the Pittsburgh Press of July 21.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I hope the President will sign H. R. 4017 to allow those veterans who really need the money from their terminal leave bonds to cash them at any time after September 1, and not be required to wait for 5 years. At the same time, I recognize the validity of the argument frequently made against cashing the bonds that the money, if paid out in great volume now, might cause inflationary pressures on our already inflated economy.

That is why I am introducing this bill to raise the interest rate on the bonds to 6 percent. If the bonds bear interest at this rate, they will become the best bond value in America, and there will be real incentive for any veteran who does not absolutely need the cash now to hold on to his bonds and receive this substantial interest return.

The present 2½ percent interest return on the bonds puts them in the same interest classification as Government bonds anyone can purchase, whereas I think veterans who fought in this war are entitled to a much better interest break on these very special issues.

Veterans are paying much more than 2½ percent interest on home loans and on other loans they may be making either through Government-sponsored programs or on the outside. I think it is only fair that when the Government owes them money on an obligation arising primarily out of their war service, it pay at least as much to the veteran as he now has to pay in the Government, and preferably 6 percent.

As a matter of fact, the Government now pays 6 percent interest on all refunds to those who overpay their taxes. It certainly has the obligation to pay the same amount to the veteran, to whom the Government owes a far greater debt.

[From the Pittsburgh Press of July 21, 1947]

KEEP THE BONDS

Without one dissenting vote, both branches of Congress have passed the bill to permit GI war veterans to cash their terminal leave bonds at any time after September 1. Despite the Treasury's objection that this bill might have inflationary effect, we hope President Truman signs it into law.

It is a measure of simple justice. Officers were given in cash the terminal leave pay due them when they left the armed services but the GI's had to take theirs in bonds.

We hope, also, that all veterans who possibly can will hold on to their bonds until they mature. The bill permits that. These bonds are a fine, sound, interest-bearing investment. Those whose need for cash is not immediate and urgent will find it highly profitable, we think, to keep the bonds and let them earn more money for future use.

The United States Treasury and Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very interesting article entitled "The United States Treasury and Gold."

I insert this article as a means of calling attention to, and clearing up a very obscure and curious method of handling our governmental operations. It seems to me that our Secretary of the Treasury owes to Congress an explicit explanation of the extraordinary incongruity of our financial operations, as set forth in the article which follows:

THE UNITED STATES TREASURY AND GOLD

(By Bronson Trevor)

According to the Wall Street Journal of July 19, 1947, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have issued a joint statement calling on all American banks, business enterprises, and individuals to refrain from helping speculative buying and selling of gold abroad.

The Wall Street Journal says that the speculation referred to is the buying and

selling of gold abroad at prices above the legal rate. This newspaper further states that the joint announcement was prompted at least in part by complaints from the International Monetary Fund that this speculation undermines the currency exchange stability that the fund is trying hard to achieve.

From the same source comes the following quotation:

"After characterizing most of the gold transactions abroad as taking place in illegal markets, the announcement continued: 'In view of these circumstances, and on general grounds of national policy, the Treasury Department and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System request American individuals, banks, and business enterprises to refrain from encouraging and facilitating this traffic and in particular to refrain from extending the use of their facilities and funds for the carrying out of such transactions.' "

In a dispatch from Manila, published in the Wall Street Journal of the previous day, July 18, 1947, appeared the following:

"A free world market for gold seemed assured in Manila when a Philippine spokesman indicated that the Republic would do nothing to hinder private gold sales to British, Chinese, and other purchasers at prices higher than the United States-controlled rate of $35 an ounce.

"On Wednesday United States Treasury Secretary Snyder hinted the United States Government would make no effort to prevent an American firm from buying Canadian gold ore, refining it in the United States, and then exporting it for shipment abroad at prices higher than the $35-an-ounce level. This was taken here to mean there would be no objection on the part of the United States to similar sales in the Philippines."

As the Philippine market is a legal market, the Treasury's objections on the score of illegality would be invalid as to transactions consummated there. The only other basis in the Treasury's statement, as quoted in the press, appears to be on general grounds of national policy.

What is the national policy? On July 18 the Secretary of the Treasury is reported as countenancing the sale of gold by American business firms at more than $35 an ounce. On July 19 the opposite appears to be the case.

The complaints of the International Monetary Fund apparently have influenced our policy. Let us examine what justification there is for the present attitude of the fund.

The New York World Telegram on June 25, 1947, published an article by Arthur Gorman from which the following is quoted:

"Camille Gutt, managing director of the fund, on Monday called on member nations to prevent transactions in gold at premium prices. His statement had the endorsement of Secretary of the Treasury Snyder as Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International monetary and financial problems.

"Mr. Gutt said sales of gold in the free market at premium prices threatened world exchange stability."

Article V, section 6, of the Articles of Agreement, International Monetary Fund, reads as follows:

"SEC. 6. Purchases of currencies from the fund for gold.—(a) Any member desiring to obtain, directly or indirectly, the currency of another member for gold shall, provided that it can do so with equal advantage, acquire it by the sale of gold to the fund.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to preclude any member from selling in any market gold newly produced from mines located within its territories."

It would seem from these provisions that section 6 (a) in the phrase "provided it can do so with equal advantage" envisions the possibility of a nation having a greater advantage, which could only mean a higher price, in selling gold elsewhere than to the fund, and obviously confers no power to restrict such a transaction.

Section 6 (b) is even more explicit as to the freedom of members in disposing of newly mined gold.

Therefore, whatever the personal opinion of Camille Gutt, managing director of the fund, may be, it would appear that he had exceeded his authority in calling for a restriction on sales of gold at premium prices. Any policy of our Government cannot be justified by reliance on the opinions of an individual, no matter how distinguished, when they contravene the written text of an agreement to which our Nation, perhaps unwisely, is committed.

Is it the policy of the Treasury Department to attempt to hamper the operation of the International Monetary Fund as the agreement intended, under the guise of cooperating with an official of that body who apparently has exceeded his authority?

In connection with the above article, the following from the New York Journal of July 18 and 19 will be interesting:

GOVERNMENT MOVES TO PUT AN END TO REPORTED USE OF FACILITIES IN UNITED STATES BY FOREIGN GOLD SPECULATORS

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Government yesterday took the first step toward blocking the reported use of American business facilities to aid illegal speculation in gold abroad.

In a joint statement the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board called on all American banks, business enterprises, and individuals to refrain from helping speculative buying and selling of gold abroad. Treasury officials indicated later that if this request does not halt United States participation in the speculation, the Government will take stronger action.

The speculation referred to is the buying and selling of gold abroad at prices above the legal rate. Usually the gold is traded against United States dollars. Since the black-market price of gold varies in different countries, shrewd speculators can make large profits by buying gold in one foreign market and selling it in another.

The Treasury-Federal Reserve announcement said it is well known that such active speculation has been going on. The announcement did not specify any American interests participating in the speculation. It simply warned American firms and individuals not to. Privately Treasury officials say they have evidence of participation in the speculation by American interests.

The joint announcement was prompted at least in part by complaints from the International Monetary Fund that this speculation undermines the currency-exchange stability that the fund is trying hard to achieve.

The Treasury declined to say what further action might be taken if the request failed to end the speculative activity.

After characterizing most of the gold transactions abroad as taking place in illegal markets, the announcement continued:

"In view of these circumstances, and on general grounds of national policy, the Treasury Department and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System request American individuals, banks, and business enterprises to refrain from encouraging and facilitating this traffic and in particular to refrain from extending the use of their facilities and funds for the carrying out of such transactions."

OTTAWA.—Finance Minister Abbott reiterated in the Commons the government's stand against allowing Canadian mines to sell gold in the open market at more than $35 an ounce. This is the price paid by the United States Treasury.

The minister did not commit himself definitely on what action if any he would take regarding the recent proposal of the American Smelting & Refining Co. to export gold refined from Canadian concentrates at more than parity prices.

The government has all along permitted certain gold mines in British Columbia, whose ore contains arsenic and requires special treatment not conveniently available in Canada, to ship their concentrates to the American company. All other gold produced in Canada must be sold to the mint.

While the United States insists that all gold produced there must be sold to the United States Treasury at parity prices, it does allow gold from concentrates imported for refining purposes to be reexported.

The combination of Canada permitting these particular concentrates to be exported and United States permitting the gold from them to be reexported places this gold in a unique position of being available for sale in the free, or what is referred to as the grey market.

The refining company has offered to sell this gold in the open market at whatever premium it could obtain and give the Canadian firms 90 percent of the premium obtained.

While the minister did not say he was going to stop this, he did read the statement of the International Monetary Fund, endorsed by the United States, urging that steps be taken in member countries to stop the international traffic in gold, much of which goes into private hoards and is not available for currency stabilization.

"That is the reason," Mr. Abbott said "why we believe it is in conformity with international obligations and in the public interest to prohibit exports of gold to this so-called free market."

FREE WORLD MARKET FOR GOLD NOW SEEMS ASSURED FOR MANILA

MANILA.—A free world market for gold seemed assured in Manila when a Philippine spokesman indicated that the republic would do nothing to hinder private gold sales to British, Chinese, and other purchasers at prices higher than the United States controlled rate of $35 an ounce.

Some sales already have taken place in Manila.

The latest involved the purchase by a Chinese syndicate of bars of refined gold from the big wedge mine operated by the Atok Gold Co. at $45.50 an ounce. The sale involved only about $20,000, but it was understood that Atok had disposed of a considerable amount of its production since April to Chinese buyers through London, at $42.50 an ounce.

On Wednesday United States Treasury Secretary Snyder hinted the United States Government would make no effort to prevent an American firm from buying Canadian gold ore, refining it in the United States and then exporting it for shipment abroad at prices higher than the $35-an-ounce level. This was taken here to mean there would be no objection on the part of the United States to similar sales in the Philippines.

Fair Prices—America's Big Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the

RECORD a statement which I have prepared on America's big problem—the securing of fair prices.

I ask that following my statement there be printed the text of an article in the Christian Science Monitor of July 22, 1947, on the subject of labor monopoly.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR PRICES—AMERICA'S BIG PROBLEM

LET'S BRING DOWN HIGH COST OF LIVING

Almost every mail which comes to me from the State of Wisconsin emphasizes the need for bringing down the high cost of living. Just as after the First World War, when high prices caused great hardship among our people, so the Second World War has left us with this problem. We are on our way toward defeating it; many prices have come down already, but cooperation on the part of all of us is still necessary to lick inflation decisively.

THOSE WHO SUFFER

Who suffers from high prices? Just about everyone—the housewife who cannot buy enough food and other items for her family; the wage earner who sees the pitiful inadequacy of his wage envelope; the old folks living on meager pensions and annuities; the white-collar workers, like teachers and others living on relatively fixed incomes; the storekeeper who cannot sell overpriced goods; the manufacturer who finds that he cannot sell his increasing inventory of items; the farmer who finds prices skyrocketing on the things he has to buy, with still relatively low returns for him on the things he has to sell. High prices hit where it hurts most—the American home.

ANSWER TO PROFITEERS

Yes; we all find ourselves caught in the web of inflation brought about principally by underproduction. Only the profiteer rejoices. The best answer to him—to anyone who would try to gouge the public by asking outrageously high prices—is to turn his goods down flat, to let him know in no uncertain terms that the public believes in fair prices but not outrageous prices, that the American people believe in fair profits but not in profiteering, in sensible buying, not reckless buying.

The profiteer—the price gouger—can be slapped down, too, by full, uninterrupted production—the solution of which I have urged throughout the whole history of OPA. Full, uninterrupted production means increased supply, and increased supply balanced with demand in a free competitive market means fair prices.

MALICIOUS SLANDERS

Profiteers and political opportunists are helped rather than hurt when you and I fail to understand the true reasons for high prices. When we know the "truth which sets men free," we are freed from their control. Certain opportunists are seeking to use the present situation to attempt to smear the Eightieth and preceding Congresses by blaming the Congress for the present situation. Moreover, they are attempting to delude the people into thinking that Congress prematurely removed Government controls, thus causing higher prices. A further slander they are attempting is to vilify America's farmers for alleged profiteering.

What is the answer to these untrue charges, to oversimplified explanations, to sly innuendos? What are the real factors causing high prices?

Here are a few:

LABOR FACTOR

(1) Higher wage levels: The labor costs in American industry have soared to their highest peak, even surpassing wartime levels. This is not to imply that our present wages are unjustified, for they have been worked out in the democratic process of collective bargaining between labor and management.

But it does indicate that all other things being equal, with labor constituting as much as 90 percent—in some industries—of the total cost of a product, when labor costs go up, the price of the item will have to go up.

(2) Work stoppages: This factor caused us last year a direct loss of 116,000,000 man-days of working time. It also cost us a loss of hundreds of millions of man-days more indirectly when, for example, plants had to shut down because of material shortages caused by strikes in so-called feeder plants. With underproduction brought about by labor disputes, we have had decreased supply, which has inevitably caused high prices.

It is the prayer of the American people that the new labor statute, Public Law 101, will make for industrial peace. It is our prayer that this law will be administered fairly, efficiently, and in a manner consistent with Congress' intent so that the public welfare—the paramount welfare—can be protected.

HIGH INCOME

(3) Still another factor is the high-spending level of the American people—over $160,000,000,000. With 60,000,000 Americans working, and many of them having the highest incomes they have ever realized, it is only natural that in their competition for scarce goods, they would serve to force prices up. However, once we can get into full and uninterrupted production, the cost of goods will come down because there will be a sufficient supply for all.

WORLD SHORTAGE

(4) Everyone knows that another factor in the picture is the world shortage of food and other items. With Europe and Asia desperate for goods and eager to pay high prices for them (where they have a dollar supply) our domestic prices have inevitably reacted by rising with the intense overseas demand.

(5) Another factor is adverse conditions of nature. We can see this in the case of present corn prices which have soared because of the reduced crop resulting from Midwestern floods and other factors.

(6) Still another factor relating to high prices is the terrific heights to which prices soared on the black market during OPA days. While OPA was still regimenting the American economy, many items could not be secured at all on the open market, but only on the black market at fantastic prices. In almost no instances have prices these days, no matter how high they have reached, come up to the level of the black-market prices of OPA days.

GOVERNMENT IRRESPONSIBILITY

(7) The Federal Government itself has contributed to many high prices by its arbitrary buying practices. Thus, for example, as has been cited here in the Senate, the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation bought huge supplies of wheat in January 1947 when actual requirements were low and we were experiencing a terrific boxcar shortage. On the other hand, the Government has spurned wheat purchases in more opportune times. The effect of such irresponsible purchases is obvious in upsetting the market.

(8) An eighth factor in causing high prices is the inevitable maladjustment that comes after years of Government control during war. We could not expect to return to normalcy overnight. Reconversion cannot be accomplished by a flick of the legislative wand. It takes time, patience, and experimenting in a free economy.

SUMMARY

These are eight factors. There are more, too. But the keyword—the key factor in high prices is underproduction. Lick underproduction and you lick high prices.

ANSWER TO CHARGES

Let us consider now two of the many unfounded charges which I have mentioned above. The first is the charge that it is the Congress which caused these high prices. That charge is disproved by the above factors. Obviously, by considering all of those factors, we see that no matter what was done in Washington, D. C., these various influences would have served to cause a rising price level. But let us note this historical fact, too. The record shows that it was the President of the United States who effected the mass decontrol of items. Thus, on November 9, 1946, for example, President Truman announced the end of price control on everything except sugar, rice, and rent and the following day all but these controls were removed at his direction. Of course, previous to that date the Congress had sought to decontrol those items which it felt were in abundant supply.

FARMERS' PRICES

A second false charge is that the farmers of America are gouging the consumer by charging high prices. Anyone who is even slightly familiar with the farmers' postwar problems knows that this charge is basely untrue, first, because the prices of items that the farmer buys have risen far higher than the prices of items that he sells, and, second, because the price that the farmer gets for his products—for his milk, for his cheese, his butter, and other items—is still but a small fraction of the price that the consumer ultimately pays.

When one considers the amount that the farmer invests in his product, the amount of labor that he puts into his work, the help that he has to secure from his own family, and his other expenses, we see that his return is still far lower for a given hour of work compared to the return which city laborers get.

As proof of the farmers' disadvantage, let me point out that prices paid by farmers have risen 126 percent above the 1940 level, while city consumers' prices have risen 89 percent above the 1940 level. Both farmers and city consumers are obviously in the same boat, but the farmers are even worse off than their city cousins in feeling the pinch of inflation.

CONCLUSION

These times call for meeting the price problem with adequacy. With the same spirit that we displayed during the war, we can bring the high cost of living down to a reasonable level. We have made tremendous progress toward that end. Many items, such as luxury goods, which were selling at amazingly high levels, have been brought down by the simple law of supply and demand.

We can bring other high prices down in the American way by full production and sensible buying.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 22, 1947]

NEW TRUSTS TO BUST?—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—Monopoly, it appears, is no longer an economic sin indulged in exclusively by businessmen.

The house painter plying a brush 4 inches wide instead of a 6-inch brush and the bricklayer laying 150 bricks a day and no more—both acting on union orders—are in the monopoly business.

They are acting in combination to limit production. They are candidates for a crack-

down by the Department of Justice. Some members of the House Small Business Committee, at any rate, would like to convince Congress there ought to be a law defining the liabilities of labor unions under the antitrust laws.

The closed shop, the slow-down, padding of personnel, and other forms of featherbedding, union opposition to labor-saving machines, industry-wide bargaining, all these have been cited at one time or other as reasons why organized labor should be subjected to the same legal restraints as monopolistic business.

C. E. Wilson, president of the General Motors Corp., expressed a widely held opinion when he remarked during the coal strike last winter that the American people must be protected against the predatory abuse of monopolistic power under the guise of unionism.

A good deal has happened since then to tighten the curbs on labor unions. Curbs on featherbedding are pretty well covered by the Taft-Hartley Act, which makes it an unfair-labor practice for a union to force or require an employer to pay or deliver any money or thing of value in the nature of an exaction for services which are not performed or not to be performed. The closed shop also has been outlawed by the new labor law.

Small business groups are worried these days over still another threat to their economic interests—that is the warning voiced by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, that if the inflationary wage price spiral continued, the AFL's 7,500,000 members might have to form a system of labor-consumer cooperatives to produce and distribute the necessities of life on a gigantic scale.

Such a move in the opinion of Representative WALTER C. PLOESER (Republican), of Missouri, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, would, if carried to its logical outcome, seriously endanger the American small-business profit system, if not labor organizations, also.

The recent coal agreement between John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers and the bituminous-coal industry is cited as another example of the way smaller business interests, and the public as well, are being squeezed between two powerful economic groups.

"Few persons can be found today," observes Gerard D. Reilly, a former member of the National Labor Relations Board, "who view the monopoly possessed by the United Mine Workers in the bituminous-coal industry as anything short of a continuing public menace."

There is a tendency to regard the coal agreement as a victory for free collective bargaining. But anyone appraising the effects of the new wage contract on the price of coal perhaps will conclude that big labor is as economically powerful as big business.

Wholly apart from the merits of the miners' wage gains, it is apparent that very little real collective bargaining figured in the process of agreement. This is confirmed by the report in the current issue of the Mine Workers' Journal of the secret talks the heads of the two biggest steel and coal interests initiated with Mr. Lewis, without the knowledge or approval of the operators' group which the industry had delegated to negotiate with Mr. Lewis.

Charles O. Gregory, former solicitor of the Department of Labor, once observed that the Supreme Court, by so interpreting the antitrust laws as to give extreme latitude to union activity, had done the labor unions a real disservice in vesting them with the worst curse of modern times—too much economic power over others.

The Taft-Hartley law was enacted out of the awareness in Congress that it would be compounding the evils of labor monopoly if it did not provide appropriate controls over that power.

Address by Wilson W. Wyatt Before American Veterans Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address recently delivered by Wilson W. Wyatt, national chairman, Americans for Democratic Action, before the American Veterans Committee dinner at Chicago, July 18, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I salute you as a young, great, and growing liberal organization of veterans of World War II. I salute you as an organization of veterans interested first in American citizens.

Many times have I acknowledged your dynamic and unflagging support of the veterans' emergency housing program last year, both through your leadership and through your membership throughout the country. Early last year I met with your national chairman, Charles Bolte, with the chairman of your housing committee, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., with your national legislative representative and this year's national chairman, Chat Paterson, with Bob Nathan and Bill Batt, and others in your leadership. From each of them I received inspiration and valuable concrete assistance. I cannot pay too high a tribute to F. D. R., Jr., who gave such invaluable support throughout all of last year, not only to the veterans' emergency housing program in general, but to the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill in particular.

As many of you know, I have a certain interest in that non-Communist liberal organization known as Americans for Democratic Action. I therefore feel a further bond in common with you through that ADA national vice chairman, one Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., by name; through your national vice chairman who was the Midwest organizer for ADA—Dick Bolling; and through your national chairman, who is a charter member of ADA.

I have the greater admiration for you in AVC because I realize so well the difficult role of liberals in this atmosphere of Taft inflation, postwar disillusion, and normalcy fatigue. Inflation blinders destroy the perspective of many people today. The premature lifting of price controls by TAFT, WHERRY, and their colleagues has whirled people into an upward spiral so rapid that they do not yet realize just how air sick they are. The American economy is going to have a bad headache from this back-to-normalcy binge. The short-sighted self-proclaimed realists have carried us into a very unreal world, the world of inflation, the world where you make believe high prices are prosperity.

Anyone with even a scintilla of historic sense knows the truth of that adage: "Where there is no vision the people perish."

Despite the seeming evidence of last November's election—and make no mistake about this—America is a liberal country. If anyone doubts it, let him look at Elmo Roper's Fortune survey analyzing the elections of last year. If ever you become discouraged, just pause for a moment to reflect on the great names of American history: Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt. America's years of greatness have been America's years of practicing, performing liberalism.

So I salute you as an organization with the courage and the vision to be an oasis of liberalism in the desert of 1947.

A straight-thinking liberal knows well that the future of this country, just as the past and the present, lies neither in the totalitarianism of the left nor in the totalitarianism of the right. Both fascism and communism and their police states ask people to sell their birthright of freedom and liberty for a mess of false security. But liberal democracy does not offer "bread or liberty—which?"; it offers "bread and liberty—both." In the true American tradition of liberalism, your uncompromising leadership has seen quite clearly that a totalitarian state, even if it is on the left, does not have so much as a cousin relationship with an American liberal. Every person who loves the Declaration of Independence and cherishes the Bill of Rights knows full well that there is but one course—the course of democratic American liberalism. The other day I talked with an Austrian professor who had lost his freedom under Hitler; he fairly inhales and breathes his new freedom as an American. Although some liberals are confused, just as some conservatives are blind, I am thankful that the AVC is an organization which realizes that Communists have no kinship with liberals. The reactionaries are inviting at least a recession by the inflation which they have created. Through their ignorance they are bringing about the very climate in which communism thrives—the climate of recession or depression, call it as you will, of unemployment, of frustration, of hunger.

I happen to know that your leadership is very uncompromising and your membership very principled and discriminating, since I know that your "independent progressive" caucus of non-Communist liberals won at your recent election in Milwaukee, and with this victory, of course, has come responsibility—a grave responsibility for leadership in these trying times.

If for one moment we liberals think that we can relax, all we need do is cast our eyes in the direction of those forces of grab that have been voting to increase the wool tariff, contrary to every consideration of America's foreign policy and commercial position in the world of today. The great danger is that the power lobby and the real-estate lobby and the various other lobbies will grab enough for themselves from this "had-enough" Congress that there will not be enough left to keep America as a Nation in her position of world leadership. Under the false and deceptive cry of economy, this Republican-controlled Congress would either silence the Voice of America or reduce it to a whisper. This same Republican-controlled Congress has just passed a so-called rent control bill, the practical effect of which will be to raise the rent bill some $750,000,000 and score another triumph of inflation. Of course, the rent control and housing bill does not stop there. It also makes it certain that nonhousing construction will have a full and unfettered opportunity to diminish even further the all-too-little home and apartment construction which we now have. Thanks to Taft and his "had-enough" colleagues, houses, and apartments in the range of the average veteran's pocketbook have been priced out of the market, and, with a sickening swing to Harding normalcy, the veteran is now left to the hazards of the trickle theory for the chance of a roof over his head. In such a congressional climate, the importance of a grass-roots, liberal organization becomes incalculably great.

Steadily throughout this year it has been obvious that the majority of Congress had no intention to provide a decent minimum wage. Since the lowest income group is unorganized, it has no representatives to

speak up for it through the processes of collective bargaining; and only by Federal legislation can it be assured a decent increase in income with which to meet present-day inflationary costs. But because of criticism heaped on Congress for restrictive provisions incorporated in its labor bill, it now looks as though the leadership of Congress may be frightened politically into taking action on this bill. Without constant public pressure, however, the authors of this eleventh-hour conversion of expediency may lapse back into their old habits. If the minimum wage bill is to become a law and to be effective to relieve human misery and want, the aggressive support of your organization is essential.

And then what of the Stratton bill, a bill which is descended from that very spirit which prompted peoples of many lands to leave the oppression of Europe to settle on the eastern shores of North America. The phrase "displaced persons" has almost a clinical sound, but it describes people of flesh and blood who so love and treasure their freedom and their liberty that they are unwilling to return to their native countries in Europe where persecution of a police state awaits them. If this bill fails of passage at the present session, we must not be discouraged. On the contrary, we must remember that only with the militant pressure of liberal groups such as yours will there ever be a chance that such a bill can be passed. Can we so forget our heritage, can we grow so smug in our new comforts, that we as Americans can forget the plight of these wretched, weary and homeless people? If we do, we shall at the same time forget the future of America. Since our earliest days, our shores have been the haven for suffering people of Europe seeking new homes, new horizons, and new freedoms; and yet until now the leadership of Congress has preferred to appropriate millions of dollars in relief funds, a dollar dole for people living virtually in prison camps, rather than to permit part of them to come to America. This bill requires the outspoken championship of veterans. You who risked your lives not only that we might achieve victory in combat, but the further victory of a better and more decent world in which to live; you, the veterans of this war, have a special right to speak on this subject, and Congress has a special duty to listen keenly to what you say.

Since you are concerned with veterans first as citizens, you have made it clear from the beginning of your organization that you are interested in homes, decent American homes, and in decent and continuing livelihood. Certainly the minimum that any veteran has a right to expect is a decent job and a decent home. This means that you are interested not in fifty-seven or sixty million jobs for a few months, but in full employment on a regular, continuing basis. It is not enough to have a good hourly wage or a good monthly salary for a season, or a short period of time. It is important to have the security of a continuing job or an annual wage. Here you are faced with a great challenge in economics in a changing world. How can big business and big labor and big agriculture be brought to identify themselves with the interests of the public in such a way that we may have full production, full employment, great efficiency, dignity of labor, and a fair division of profits? The problem is how to make our capitalism responsible. Who, better than you, can be counted upon to bring forth the answer? The problem is not merely what to do when the next depression comes; the greater question is how to prevent that next depression.

And almost before we can get our breath from stating some of the problems on the domestic front, we realize that we have a job of pioneering yet to do if the phrase "one world" is to become a reality. And we know full well that unless it does become a reality, all other things are insignificant. We live in a world where time and space have been telescoped by our inventive and productive genius. The airplane and the radio have made all nations neighbors. We might have been given a more leisurely period for working out our international solutions, but the sands of time have been placed in an hour glass by the splitting of the atom, and those sands are running fast. Atomic energy, if we are permitted to put it to peaceful use, will undoubtedly mean a far higher standard of living and way of life than even we of the twentieth century can envision. And yet against this bright possibility, Dr. Einstein and his Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists tell us simply and coldly that "atomic bombs can now be made cheaply and in large number. They will become more destructive. There is no military defense against atomic bombs, and none is to be expected. Other nations can rediscover our secret processes by themselves. Preparedness against atomic war is futile and, if attempted, will ruin the structure of our social order. If war breaks out, atomic bombs will be used, and they will surely destroy our civilization. There is no solution to this problem except international control of atomic energy and, ultimately, the elimination of war." Faced with these simple yet startling facts, we realize there is no question of shall we, or should we, work together as united nations; that is a must. And the Christian philosophy is the way. Two thousand years after Christ, his teachings of brotherhood are no longer an elective for occasional Sunday sermons. They are the indispensable "must" if our civilization is to continue. The discovery of atomic energy has given this, our generation, a challenge such as no other generation in the history of the world has ever faced. And face it, and meet it, and solve it, we must.

Against this ominous background of the atom, you of the AVC, and all of us as Americans, must get a quick answer to such questions as these—how to make certain nearsighted people in our own country see the importance of having the Voice of America as the voice of freedom and liberty heard behind the iron curtain by the people of a country whose leaders would divide this world, one world, into two worlds; how to lower tariffs, not raise them as was tried in the case of wool; how to bring about a commercial one world through advancing world trade; how to obtain effective, speedy, and thoughtful support for the rehabilitation of foreign countries, not merely as a matter of kindness and charity, but as a matter of hard-headed, realistic self-preservation in one world.

As liberals we want decent housing, adequate provisions for health, expanded social security, Federal aid to education, a decent minimum wage. We want the Marshall plan for European reconstruction. We want a stronger United Nations, able to cope with the problems of the atomic age. As liberals how shall we achieve these objectives? Through a third party? No. By launching a third party we shall lose them. I am not going to duck the $64 question of liberals: What about Henry Wallace and a third party in 1948? I think such a third party would be a catastrophe. Who would gain? The liberals? Not at all. It would be the Communists and the NAM. What a pair of bedfellows. If there were a liberal third party in 1948 it would result inevitably in the election of a reactionary and isolationist administration; the legislative objectives of liberals would be lost; the NAM would be in the saddle; and the isolationists would turn our foreign policy back to the steps of the twenties that led to World War II. The Communists would be rubbing their hands in gleeful celebration of the accomplishment of their dual purpose; reaction and an economic bust at home, and United States isolationism, bringing in its train chaos throughout the world. Some liberals, following Wallace, would probably argue that a liberal administration would then be elected, but I say to you that Paul Hoffman of the CED is right, that our system cannot afford another serious depression and its attendant unemployment and misery. If that should happen—God forbid—pent up hates and emotions would break their bounds and the moderate course of American democratic liberalism might perish. That is why we in the ADA are not, and from the beginning have not been, a third party movement. That is why ADA disagrees with Henry Wallace and believes that when he fronts for a third party with the private cheering of the reactionaries and the beaverish industry of the Communists, he is fronting for a movement which can only injure—perhaps irretrievably—the very liberalism for which Franklin D. Roosevelt fought. I am not unmindful of the fact that there are many sincere non-Communist followers of Wallace who are ready to rally behind his banner of a third party. No step they could take would lead more assuredly to the defeat of the very objectives in which they believe. American liberals should work through the two-party system and should not, quixotic like, tilt with the windmills of a third party. However naively and innocently done, it would merely advance the causes of communism and fascism, and do injury, not to reaction, but to liberal democracy itself.

Because you see the problems of today in the bold strokes in which they are painted on the canvas of history, because you are applying your abilities and your energies to the solution of these problems, you, the members of the AVC, are important to postwar American life. God speed you on your way.

Proposed Curtailment in Natural Gas in Fort Dodge, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter dated July 18, together with two short statements from a radio broadcast from Station KVFD, in Fort Dodge, the letter being signed by Edward Breen, the manager of the broadcasting company, and refers to certain hearings of the Federal Power Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the extracts from the broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHWEST BROADCASTING CO.,
Fort Dodge, Iowa, July 18, 1947.

Hon. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing copies of two news stories which were aired over KVFD yesterday, one at 8:15 a. m. and the other at 12:15 p. m. They describe, first of all, a possible and disastrous gas shortage in Fort Dodge next year. Second, they describe the treatment accorded radio and news reporters by representatives of the Federal Power Commission.

If the schedule described in these stories is approved by the Federal Power Commission, Fort Dodge industries, employing 2,000 people, will be without gas for manufacturing and industrial purposes for a period of 60½ days this coming winter. That figure is based upon the actual record of gas consumed in Fort Dodge last year. If we should have a severe winter, those same industries will be closed for a much longer period.

How much longer is Congress going to put up with the insolence of these Washington carpetbaggers, such as Kaufman and Sarnoff?

Yours very truly,

EDWARD BREEN.

The question uppermost in the minds of civic-minded Fort Dodge residents is, What will develop if the proposed curtailment in natural gas as proposed by the Northern Natural Gas Co. should become effective?

About a week ago natural gas consumers in Fort Dodge learned that a new consumption schedule was being proposed, not only for house heating units but industrial plants as well. The proposal would curtail the city's allotment to about eight and a half million cubic feet a day during the peak period in severe winter weather. It so happens that about twice that amount is required to efficiently heat all home units and still keep the industrial plant users in operation.

Naturally Fort Dodge industrial leaders who use natural gas in their plants became greatly concerned on a possible gas curtailment next winter. They realized only too well that such a schedule would force them to close their plants for as long as several months. Not only would the plants suffer great losses, but the city itself would feel the effect of reduced pay rolls. Some 2,000 employees would be laid off.

So a meeting was arranged for yesterday at Omaha with representatives of the Federal Power Commission, the Northern Natural Gas Co. officials, and officials of the Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co.

This meeting was just another of a series—not only is Fort Dodge vitally concerned about natural gas, but so too is Mason City and Des Moines. These cities also have met with the Federal men and the natural gas officials at Omaha.

Not all details concerning the meeting could be obtained first-hand by KVFD's news editor Ken Peterson. No, sir! He and Bob Kenyon, of the Messenger, were ejected from the hearing. No force was used but Federal employee Kaufman, fronting for the Federal Power Commission, and Vice President Marian of the Northern Natural Gas Co., were most insistent in declaring that a precedent had been established—a precedent barring radio or newspaper men from the hearings. Well, that was enough for Ken, but as he approached the door to leave the sacred precincts of the public utility, he remarked: "Gentlemen, regardless, we have a story whether in or out."

That left 12 Fort Dodge industrialists in the room to voice their objections to the proposed curtailment of natural gas in the city next winter. Those present were Fred Clark, Harold Gilman, and Frank Crabb of the Tobin Packing Co.; O. J. Whittemore, Vicent Clay Products; Henry Wasem of the Wasem Plaster Co.; Harvey Marxhausen of Cargill's; E. L. Flynn, Certainteed; Fred Kratosky, Iowa-Illinois Gas and Electric; William Carroll, of the Warden shops and apartments; Mayor Poole; Homer Marshar, National Gypsum; and William Terrill, secretary of the chamber of commerce.

In addition, there were legal representatives of the gypsum companies from Chicago, and officials of the Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co. from Rock Island.

And sitting at the table with Federal employee Kaufman, and a man in the same classification with Kaufman with a name which sounded like Zainoff or Sarnoff—with those two were the Northern Natural Gas Co. officials—Vice President Marian, Sales Manager Larry Schumaker, and President Bay.

Each one in the hearing room presented his objection to the proposed natural-gas-reduction schedule. At times the natural-gas men were at it hot and heavy with the Iowa-Illinois gas and electric men. But after hours in the hot hearing room, the meeting was ended and the result of the session was in plain words—nothing.

The only step remaining appears to be to request a formal hearing before the Federal Power Commission, the only body which can make a ruling on the natural-gas question.

One thing brought out into the open—behind the closed doors of the meeting room—was the charge that the Northern Natural Gas Co. had oversold its product. The gas company claims that all its new customers have been prewar commitments. This brings to mind that Webster City now is being furnished natural gas from the Northern Natural Gas Co. and we doubt very much if that was a prewar commitment. Voters of Webster City back in 1940 defeated a proposal to let the natural-gas company into the city. Then about a year ago—and it was after the war—the voters again balloted on the same question and this time approved the plan to make natural gas available in their city.

There is no shortage of natural gas in the Texas field. The trouble now is that the present pipe line is not big enough to handle all the accounts along the line.

If you are wondering what happened at the meeting yesterday in Omaha relative to a Fort Dodge protest to curtailment of natural-gas service next winter—the answer is nothing.

When we say nothing we mean no understanding of any kind was reached before the "yes" men who were representing the Federal Power Commission and three top officials of the Northern Natural Gas Co.

Technically we have no right to even mention what went on in the conference room yesterday in Omaha. The 14 businessmen of Fort Dodge who attended the conference had entered the meeting room, and with them were members of the press, including KVFD's news editor, Ken Peterson. Federal Power Commission Representative Kaufman and the Northern Natural Gas Co.'s Vice President Marian quickly voiced objection to having any publicity on what they called an informal conference over the proposed schedule to curtail natural-gas service to Fort Dodge.

So the men who handle the publicity graciously left the room—and if this were Russia, we would say they left the Kremlin. Then the iron curtain fell—that is, Kaufman and Marian hoped it had. After being ejected from the sacred sanctorum at the Northern Natural Gas headquarters, the men had a photographer take a picture of the closed door—the closed door behind which arguments were to be heard on the natural-gas question.

But if Federal Power Commission Kaufman and Natural Gas Marian expected no publicity on the meeting, their expectations have certainly gone into a tailspin.

Fourteen Fort Dodge businessmen stayed in the room, and after hours of presentation of arguments against the proposed curtailment the meeting was adjourned. Kaufman and his colleague, a man by the name which sounded something like Sarnoff and who, by the way, never said a word during the session, could make no ruling on anything. All they can do is make a report to the Federal Power Commissioners. So it looks as though a bona fide hearing will be held some time in the future before the Commissioners—and not some front men.

The Northern Natural Gas Co., which operates the gas line which feeds the product into Fort Dodge, has a new schedule for consumption of gas in the city. This schedule would limit the use of gas to approximately eight and a half million cubic feet daily during the peak next winter. If this were allowed to be done, all industrial users in the city would have to switch over to such stand-by units as they could rig up. Industry in Fort Dodge would be crippled, and any future expansion industrially would be smothered. Fort Dodge would cease expanding.

Fort Dodge men at the meeting and who protested the gas curtailment included heads of the gypsum plants, packing plant, feed companies, large apartment buildings, the mayor, chamber of commerce—all users of natural gas.

It was stressed that the gas needs in Fort Dodge during a peak load in the wintertime would be about 13,000,000 cubic feet.

And behind those closed doors yesterday at Omaha the arguments at times became very pointed and even a bit personal.

Proposed Amendment of United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, recently I received a request from the Renovo Daily Record, of Renovo, Pa., asking for my opinion on certain pending Senate resolutions which urged an immediate revision of the United Nations Charter. I replied, and in my letter I indicated that I feared that these resolutions probably would bring about the final cleavage within the United Nations, and instead of strengthening it, would actually destroy it.

I ask unanimous consent that the two communications be printed in the RECORD, the letter to me, which is dated July 12, and my reply, dated July 18.

I also ask that there be printed at the same place in the RECORD a recent article entitled "Would This Make UN a Reality?" by Sumner Welles, which appeared in the Washington Post of July 22, 1947.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 18, 1947.

Mr. JACK SMYTH,
Publisher, Renovo Daily Record,
Renovo, Pa.

DEAR MR. SMYTH: This is to acknowledge your letter of a few days ago in support of the two resolutions urging the convening of a conference to review the Charter of the United Nations with the purpose of strengthening it. You asked my frank opinion on these resolutions.

First of all, I want to say that I share your concern over the weakness of the Charter and in the United Nations as they have developed. I recognize the feeling behind these resolutions, as expressed by some of the sponsors, that such a conference would provide an opportunity for us to learn exactly which nations are sincerely committed to making the United Nations work, and which are not. As one Senator, I think it was Senator TAYLOR, put it, if Russia refuses to cooperate in revising the United Nations in order to build a more effective organization,

then we will know where we stand, and we will know that we have done everything we can do to prevent a possible rupture of the peace.

This position undoubtedly has merit, or there would not be so many citizens whom I know to be whole-heartedly committed to effective international organization who would be supporting it. On the other hand, I am frankly afraid that what we might do by proceeding with this show-down—and it would be a show-down—at this time would be to strike the final cleavage within the United Nations and instead of strengthening it, actually be destroying it. Can we take that chance?

It is my own belief that the leadership of the Soviet Union at the present time has absolutely no inclination to cooperate with us and with other free nations—perhaps I should use the term "nations of free people," so that you do not confuse my thought with the implication of sovereignty—in really making the United Nations work. She has blocked almost every program in all of the constituent agencies, those that she bothered to join at all. Her action in connection with the Balkan situation and the report of the United Nations Balkan Commission shows that Russia is not now willing to allow the United Nations to work effectively.

On the other hand, the United Nations as it is now set up is probably the most effective organization we could hope to have at the present time and still retain the Soviets and their satellites as members. I think it is important to try to hold them as members in the hopes that this present intransigence may be merely a passing period, a sort of adolescence in international cooperation. For this reason, I think that the proposed conference would be premature, and, in probably breaking up the United Nations, would, in fact, be responsible for losing us what now appears to be our best present hope for stabilizing peace.

I know this is not what you want from me, and perhaps the better part of wisdom on my part might have been to give you ambiguous or noncommittal generalities. Knowing how important it is to you, however, and appreciating the vigor your newspaper is demonstrating on behalf of real and effective international cooperation, I feel I owe it to you to make my views specific.

I am enclosing copies of three speeches I delivered recently which reflect some of my thinking on this urgent problem of enduring peace.

Thank you very much for your letter. Although we apparently do not see eye to eye on all of the mechanics, I know we are in perfect accord that wars must be prevented and that this can be done only by the United States and all of its citizens being willing to expend the time, the energy, and the money to make this a reality.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

RENOVO DAILY RECORD,
Renovo, Pa., July 12, 1947.

Senator FRANCIS MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: It is with surprise and disappointment that I did not find your name among the Senators sponsoring the resolutions introduced July 9 calling on the President to strengthen the United Nations.

The feeling that the present set-up is becoming another impotent League of Nations is becoming more and more prevalent, even in a small town like Renovo, as the enclosed clippings indicate.

This is really the time for courageous, farseeing action in the field of international affairs. Any course chosen is filled with peril but far more dangerous is apathy.

Very truly yours,

RENOVO DAILY RECORD,
JACK SMYTH, *Publisher.*

[From the Washington Post of July 22, 1947]

ABOLISHING THE VETO—WOULD THIS MAKE UN A REALITY?

(By Sumner Welles)

The issues raised by the bipartisan resolutions recently introduced in the Congress which urge an immediate revision of the United Nations Charter and the restriction of the veto require sober thinking and plain speaking.

Three resolutions have been introduced. They range from a demand that the President summon a general conference for the purpose of making the United Nations capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to a recommendation that amendments to the Charter be adopted that will strengthen the United Nations as an instrument to prevent war and maintain world peace.

The sponsors of one of these resolutions assert: "There is no surer way of determining whether the Soviet Union is bent on conquest than by learning whether she would be willing to go along with other nations in creating a United Nations which would guarantee her security."

Article 109 of the Charter provides that a conference of the United Nations may be held to review the Charter, if two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and any seven members of the Security Council so determine, and that any alterations of the Charter recommended by a two-thirds vote of such conference shall take effect when ratified by two-thirds of the members of the United Nations, including all of the permanent members of the Security Council.

It is, therefore, clear that even if the suggested conference recommended the amendments desired by those who support the pending resolutions, the Soviet Union could, under the terms of the Charter, block their adoption.

The measures introduced in the Congress have naturally been acclaimed with loud hosannas by the various groups in this country that are clamoring for the prompt establishment of a world republic or a world government.

One of the least highfalutin of these organizations is the United World Federalists. It is directed by outstanding citizens who are versed in foreign affairs and who believe in the United Nations. This organization commends the Senators and Congressmen who have introduced these resolutions, "for taking the lead toward making peace through the UN a reality rather than a promise." It urges that the resolutions "now receive insistent vigorous support if the UN is to be strengthened in time to end the growing threat of war."

There can be no doubt that the Charter contains defects which should be corrected, and that the exaggerated use of the veto by the Soviet Union has frequently hamstrung the United Nations. The all-important question is whether the steps contemplated by these congressional resolutions are in fact calculated to "strengthen the United Nations," and to make "peace through the UN a reality."

We have entered a most dangerous period. Recent events are already threatening to divide the world into two hostile camps. The Politbureau has pursued an aggressive and expansionist course. The Soviet leaders have shown themselves to be pathologically suspicious as well as increasingly fearful of the military and economic strength of the west. By their most recent maneuvers they are doing irreparable damage to the vital interests of the Russian people as well as to those of the rest of the world.

Yet is it likely that this Government can now change Russian policies by any such show-down as would result from our demand for a revision of the Charter and a limitation of the Soviet's veto rights? The Soviet Union faces an adverse majority on almost every issue coming before the United Nations. From Russia's standpoint her veto right is her only assurance that the United Nations will not endanger Russian security. Under present world conditions the Kremlin will not relinquish that right.

If a United Nations conference were now to recommend Charter amendments to which Russia objects, what would be the practical results? Russia would either veto such amendments, in which case the present split between the east and the west would be still further intensified, or Russia and her satellites would abandon the United Nations.

In the latter event, what hope would we then have of a peaceful world? The United Nations would become merely an alliance directed against Russia and the countries within her sphere of influence. There would no longer be any universal organization. We ourselves have known from the outset that the United Nations, as a universal organization, cannot succeed unless Soviet-American cooperation can be achieved.

An American foreign policy designed to maintain the United Nations intact, while at the same time based upon a long-range program of reconstruction intended to check Soviet expansion wherever it may be attempted, is not a dramatic policy nor can it be a popular policy. For it implies protracted patience, persistent effort, and continued burdens upon the taxpayers. Yet it is the only policy that may prevent war and that may eventually convince the Russian people that cooperation, rather than antagonism, between the west and the east is in their own interest.

A divided world will not solve the problems of atomic control, of disarmament, of economic reconstruction, nor any of the other grave international questions which today confront us. The measures proposed in the Congress would merely force the issue. They would probably obliterate the last glimmer of hope which we possess of avoiding a two-world order.

Investigation of Department of Justice in Connection With Alleged Kansas City Election Frauds

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Times-Herald of July 23, 1947, entitled "Last Chance" by Frank C. Waldrop, and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed an article from the New York Times of today written by Arthur Krock on the subject of the inaction of the Department of Justice in connection with the Kansas City vote frauds.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 23, 1947]

LAST CHANCE

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Today's the day for Attorney General Tom Clark to mow the Republicans down. It's his last chance, and all he has to do is make a public demand that his good name and that of the Department of Justice be cleared by thorough and searching investigation of the record.

At today's session of the Senate, one more attempt will be made to stop the filibuster by the Democrats against a resolution for such an investigation brought by Senator JAMES P. KEM (Republican), of Missouri.

There is very little chance that the filibuster can be broken unless Clark or President Truman, or both, speak up. The old party wheelhorses in the Senate can go plugging right on and holding up the Senate's business.

One thing they can't do by such tactics, however, is clear the good name of the Justice Department. That can be done only by a search of the facts.

And another thing the Democratic filibuster can't do is prevent such a search.

For it is only necessary to switch the resolution of investigation from Senate to House and the full congressional power to act will then be in operation just as effectively.

That is exactly what may happen, too. And if it does, the black cloud over the Department of Justice settles just that much lower. The Democrats will have not only tried to prevent public knowledge of the truth but will have been defeated in their evasive action.

What are they afraid of, anyhow? The truth can't hurt anybody who has been behaving himself. The Department of Justice is the world's biggest staff of lawyers. It knows the law and it knows perfectly well the paths of right and wrong.

If it has been following the path of good behavior, "triumphant vindication," as Senator KEM has accurately put it, is not only inevitable but thoroughly deserved.

In fact, not only the Department of Justice deserves triumphant vindication but the taxpayers of the United States, who finance the Department, are entitled to see that vindication spread on the record.

What's Clark afraid of?

The Kem resolution was introduced because there has been some very strange doings down at Justice.

Last August a Democratic Member of the House of Representatives was defeated for renomination in Kansas City, Mo., by special request of Mr. Truman.

The boys who did the job for him are known notoriously all over the U. S. A. as the Pendergast mob, a handsome garden of roses, indeed, including jailbirds and some who aren't yet but will be.

The Pendergast performance in that deal was so raw that even strong-stomached Kansas City couldn't take it. First, the congressional seat went Republican. Then the Kansas City Star turned up a hair-raising scandal of voting frauds in the Democratic primary aforementioned. Then grand juries began to click.

Things got so hot that the Department of Justice had to make at least an appearance of interest in the possibilities of Federal corrupt practice acts. Then came on a preliminary inquiry in the Senate Judiciary Committee, which disclosed that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has never made a full investigation of the Kansas City thing but only has done a very limited check of items listed for it by Clark.

That, in spite of Clark's statement to the Senate committee to the effect that a full and thorough investigation by the FBI disclosed no evidence of Federal law violation.

And then, just when things were beginning to get all tangled up in legal wildwoods, whereases, henceforths and howsomevers—Blam! Some eager beaver blew open the vault in the courthouse at Kansas City and made off with a lot of ballots and other evidence.

So, though he had already said that a "thorough and full" investigation had been made by the FBI before, Mr. Clark had to turn around after the blast and order another "thorough and full" investigation.

No wonder Senator KEM asks that the Department of Justice be put under the microscope.

It is very bad, by any test.

The Department of Justice, since Government has come to penetrate into every detail of our political and economic affairs, is the most powerful agency of the civil government.

Other branches may take your money away from you or bust you out of your job. But Justice can take your liberty. It can smear your good name. It can fix you so you can never come back.

The good name of the Justice Department, therefore, ought to be guarded fiercely and by nobody more than the Attorney General. The Kansas City vote fraud thing to date is working exactly opposite to that and Mr. Clark has it in his power to do more than any other man to make the matter right.

He needs only be the first today to demand the senatorial investigation. That, alone, would be more than half that's needed to restore public confidence. Why doesn't he do it?

[From the New York Times of July 24, 1947]

IN THE NATION—THE BLOCK AGAINST THE KEM RESOLUTION

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 23.—In somebody's memoirs one day a comprehensible reason may be given for the effort of administration Democrats in the Senate to prevent a vote on the Kem resolution, but it is doubtful that, whatever the reason, it is politically sound. This is the resolution offered by the junior Senator from Missouri, a Republican, to inquire into the record of the Attorney General and the Department of Justice with respect to the primary election frauds in the Fifth Missouri Congressional District, located in Kansas City.

So far as this correspondent was able to discover from the departmental record, Attorney General Clark has nothing serious to hide in his action on the revelation of frauds made by the Kansas City Star. It is true that these were committed by the unsavory Pendergast machine, of which the President is a member and which put and promoted him in public office. It is also true that the purpose of these frauds was to nominate the President's choice for the Democratic congressional nomination in 1946, Enos Axtell, over Representative Slaughter. But before the blocking move on the Kem resolution began in the Senate, a special Federal grand jury and prosecutor were on the move in Kansas City to disclose the full facts and punish more of the guilty. And, if the Senate Democrats were able to block the inquiry into Mr. Clark's activities, it was plain that the probe would ultimately be made.

Delay merely meant that whatever headlines come from the investigation would appear nearer to the dates of the national conventions and elections of 1948. How this timing could help the Democrats, and Mr. Truman as candidate for reelection, and why it was not better political strategy to separate these events as widely as possible, are questions to which the semifilibusterers in the Senate have offered no good answer, publicly or privately. Whatever the influence behind the delaying tactics, the reasoning is mysterious.

COMPETING FOR THE BOOBY PRIZE

Lacking any explanation, the tactics seem just dumb. For, despite the outcome of the semifilibuster, it has given the Republicans a chance to charge that the administration was trying to cover up something directly damaging to the high command in Washington. And many people will probably believe that.

The Republican leadership in this Congress has been accused of unbelievable dumbness in handling various matters. But the record to date of the Democratic leadership in the matter of the Kansas City frauds surpasses in this particular anything the Republicans have done.

The Attorney General's part in the inquiry came to the attention of Congress when J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee, left an implication concerning his chief which he sought later to remove. This implication, however unintentional, was that Mr. Clark's directive to the FBI to look into the frauds tended to protect the guilty by narrowly limiting the FBI inquiry.

But the text of the Attorney General's instructions, under date of October 11, 1946, does not support the doubts of his course which have materialized in the Kem resolution. He told the FBI to investigate the evidences of fraud uncovered by the Kansas City Star; and that possible violations were indicated of the scanty Federal laws that affect primaries, which are under State jurisdiction. He directed a preliminary investigation by the FBI together with all circumstances surrounding the violations.

NOT AN FBI INVESTIGATION

The FBI was further instructed to interview six persons (the four election officials and two Star reporters) and such other of the Star employees as participated in the Star investigation. The FBI obeyed except that, instead of interviewing the 30 or more designated as such others, it examined more than 1,400 affidavits obtained by them from 8,000 persons in the district. Though this was not classified as an FBI investigation, and the agency's director in Kansas City made this distinction in writing to the district United States attorney there, the restrictive statement did not appear in the FBI report made to the Attorney General.

The report advised him that the inquiry he ordered had developed data insufficient to indicate that the result of the primary might have been changed by the frauds; that the Missouri State authorities were actively prosecuting the culprits and that the Federal judges in Kansas City, to whom the evidence had been submitted, found no ground for further Federal action. Accordingly Mr. Clark closed the case for the Department.

After that the ballot boxes that doubtless contained more evidence were stolen by the gang, the Federal judges reversed their conclusion, and the Attorney General appointed a special assistant in Kansas City to bring Federal prosecutions. It is very difficult to see anything in this record to prompt administration Democrats in the Senate to a course which has aroused suspicion that something very rotten is concealed there.

Senator KEM contends that the words, "together with all circumstances," were deliberately placed in the directive in such a way as automatically to restrict their natural meaning and foreclose a real FBI investigation. This syntax will be at issue in the probe of the Department and the Attorney General.

A Summary of Florida Archeology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very scholarly address entitled "A Summary of Florida Archeology," delivered by the Honorable John W. Griffin, archeologist, Florida Park Service, before the Jacksonville Historical Society, February 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SUMMARY OF FLORIDA ARCHEOLOGY
(By John W. Griffin, archeologist, Florida Park Service)

Twenty years is a short time in either history or archeology, but the last 20 years mark a major epoch in the history of archeology. To see just what has been accomplished in American archeology in this time let us look back to 1927.

In 1927 the first wholly acceptable find of early man in America in association with extinct animals, as found at Folsom, N. Mex., was just a year old, and the lid was off the much-discussed problem of early man in America. The two finds of fossil man in Florida, Vero and Melbourne, were still in disrepute among archeologists.

In 1927 another important contribution was just a year old; the arrangement of the prehistoric cultures of the southwestern United States into a time sequence. The science of tree-ring dating which was further to revolutionize southwestern archeology was as yet unborn.

In the eastern United States, vague is the only accurate term to describe the state of archeological knowledge. True, in New York, some ideas of early and late Indian cultures had developed, largely because of the well-known history of the Iroquois. But in the remainder of the East, that essential element of history and archeology, time perspective, was poorly developed.

In Florida specifically, our knowledge rested primarily on the investigations of C. B. Moore, conducted for the most part around the turn of the century; admirable for their day, but woefully inadequate from the point of view of modern archeology—just as our present research will be inadequate 20 years hence, for this is the way in which science and scholarship advances.

The past 20 years, then, have seen tremendous strides in our knowledge, and corresponding shifts and changes in our thinking and interpretation. It is not amiss to point out that a mere 20 years ago professionally trained archeologists were virtually unheard of; practicing archeologists were frequently trained transfers from other fields. The archeologist trained as an archeologist is a relatively modern phenomenon.

Most of these advances in our knowledge have accumulated so rapidly that they have not been digested for the public. They remain buried in technical archeological reports, or even in unprinted manuscripts or unanalyzed field notes. It is difficult, therefore, for the seriously interested layman to find out much of what he would like to know, and it is the purpose of this paper to offer a summary of our present knowledge of Florida archeology—a summary which we sincerely trust will be hopelessly out of date in another year.

If we begin with the problem of early man in Florida we will find that thinking has changed radically in recent years. You may be aware that when Dr. Sellards, then State geologist of Florida, announced the finding of human remains associated with extinct animals at Vero, Fla., in 1915, his account was met with extreme skepticism in the archeological world. In 1925, when Dr. Gidley announced a similar find from Melbourne, Fla., he was greeted with the same reaction.

The finds at Folsom, N. Mex., in 1926, opened the door to research in this field, and in 1946, Dr. T. Dale Stewart of the United States National Museum published a reanalysis of these two important Florida finds. He finds that in the case of the Melbourne skull in particular the early reconstruction was in error—so much in error that his reconstruction shows not an extremely round headed individual, but a long headed one. Stewart points out that this agrees in shape with the Vero skull, and that less than 4 percent of Florida skulls exhibit this character. Purely from this point of view, Stewart asks if it is not strange that two skulls of this minority type have turned up under conditions that have made geologists feel they were associated with fossil animals; and less than 40 miles apart, at that. Indeed, such coincidence is difficult to explain away. Then, too, it is now generally agreed that the extinct animals found with these skulls may have outlasted the Pleistocene period, or ice age, and therefore the skulls do not need to be quite as old as was postulated by their supporters a few years ago.

To summarize, more and more authorities are of the opinion that the Vero and Melbourne skulls were associated with extinct animals, and do date from a time when those animals roamed Florida. This would place men in Florida shortly after the end of the ice age, some 10,000 years ago.

As to the question of Folsom points—the type of arrowhead found with extinct animals in numerous places in the Southwest and high plains. In 1935 Dr. Stirling pointed out that no Folsom points had been found in Florida, but in recent years several points that can be definitely considered as related to this type have turned up. We have here a further suggestion of man's antiquity in Florida which future research must clarify.

Following this incompletely understood early period, we are faced with a gap of some thousands of years in our knowledge. This is true not only in Florida but in America in general. It is now definitely established that man was in America ten to fifteen thousand years ago, but we lose sight of him from that time almost to the turn of the Christian era. From the turn of the Christian era until the present day our record is relatively continuous, although hazy in parts.

Jeffries Wyman, in 1875, was the first to recognize that the bottom layers of some of the deep shell heaps along the St. Johns River were definitely built by man, but contained no pottery. In recent years a series of such cultures have been found in the eastern United States. In every case they underlie the earliest known pottery and are, therefore, termed prepottery cultures. In Florida we know little of these cultures other than that they exist, but from comparative evidence it would seem that they all begin after the turn of the Christian era and continue until approximately 500 A. D. The people were undoubtedly nomadic or semi-nomadic hunters, fishers, and gatherers. We may well imagine that the groups were small and movement over an area rather than permanent village life the rule.

About 500 A. D.—perhaps a little earlier, perhaps later—the first pottery was made in the eastern United States. It is believed that the idea spread from either the Southwest or Mexico. This early pottery was made from clay to which a liberal amount of vegetal fiber had been added. When the pottery was placed in the fire to bake it hard, this fiber burned out, leaving the core of the pottery honeycombed with little holes. The surface is frequently decorated with series of lines cut into it. The archeologist calls this fiber-tempered pottery. In Florida it has been found in several sites along the St. Johns River, and recent excavations by Yale University have shown it to lie below later pottery at a site near the headwaters of the St. Johns. The Florida Park Service has located a site of this period in eastern Volusia County, the only such site known from coastal Florida. Scattered pieces have come from the Florida northwest coast, and probably indicate relationships to and contemporaneity with the next period to be discussed.

The northwest coast of Florida has long been a favorite hunting ground for the archeologist, and many of C. B. Moore's most interesting explorations were carried on here in the 1890's. In 1940 an expedition under the direction of Gordon R. Willey, cosponsored by the National Park Service and Columbia University, covered this coast from Pensacola to St. Marks and established a series of archeolcgical periods which form a framework for future research.

The earliest culture known in this region is called the Deptford period, and it dates from approximately 800 to 1000 A. D. As previously indicated, this period seems in part to be contemporaneous with the fiber-tempered horizon in the St. Johns area. Pottery of the Deptford period is tempered with sand rather than fiber, and is decorated with rather large, crude checked designs imprinted on the damp surface of the pottery with a wooden paddle. It seems doubtful whether the Deptford people knew the art of agriculture, and it is certain that they had not as yet begun to inter their dead in mounds.

About 1000 A. D. this period gives way to one known as Santa Rosa-Swift Creek. The pottery decoration is made up of curved lines in a complicated design impressed, as before, on the surface of the vessel with a wooden paddle. Other types of pottery are also known, but there is not sufficient time to do other than indicate the main types and trends. Another important innovation of this period was the burial mound, and it is probable that this is the first period in which agriculture was practiced.

This horizon gives way in approximately 1200 A. D. to the Weeden Island period, which may perhaps be described as the artistic peak of prehistoric Florida. The pottery becomes more elaborate in both decoration and form. A common and definitive decoration consists of neatly executed curvilinear lines, with the spaces thus defined filled with little punched depressions. In form the vessels take on exotic shapes; double bodies, bowls with bird or animal heads modeled on the rim, vessels with many compartments, and a variety of others. The burial mounds of this period frequently contain numbers of pots with the dead, as well as other ornaments and tools. It would seem that by this period agriculture was firmly established, villages were larger and more permanent, and the population in general had increased in numbers.

The next, and at present final, period of the northwest coast is called the Fort Walton culture. In this period the use of mounds for burial is largely abandoned, their place being taken by what can properly be called cemeteries. In the place of the burial mound an-

other type of mound was built. This is the so-called temple mound, a truncated pyramid of earth on top of which temples or houses were constructed. Some of these temple mounds are tremendous in size. The early Spanish explorers describe mounds of this kind, for the Fort Walton culture runs from approximately 1500 A. D. into full historic times. The pottery has once more undergone a change, being decorated with lines cut into the clay, confined mainly to the upper portions of vessels, and the vessels themselves tend to be shallow bowls.

Moving to south Florida, we find that the development of prehistoric culture followed slightly different lines, and must be considered apart from the previous outline. Most of the work in south Florida has been done by John M. Goggin, at present at Yale University.

From about 900 to 1100 A. D. the Indians of south Florida made a plain pottery, tempered with fine sand so that it has a gritty feel to the fingers. It was not decorated. This period is called Glades I by Goggin, and is not known to southeast Florida.

Succeeding this period is Glades II, a period in which designs are found near the rims of vessels. These designs are scratched into the damp clay, and take various forms which seem to have significance in their distribution in space in the southern peninsula.

At about 1400 A. D. further changes make it necessary to designate the period as Glades III. This period shows a decrease in decoration of pottery, and is the period in which the elaborate earth and shell works of south Florida were built. Temple mounds, similar to those described for northwest Florida, appear in this period, and it is evident that the people have been subjected to the same influence so far as mound building is concerned, but have developed their pottery along different lines. This Glades III period runs well into historic times.

Turning our attention to another part of the State, we will discuss the northeastern portion of Florida. It is well to indicate at the outset that we know this region incompletely; even more incompletely than we know the rest. We have mentioned the early fiber-tempered horizon previously, and we do know that various cultures follow it, but the exact definition of the sequence in northeast Florida is one of the major problems facing us. This sequence will be defined by careful work in the shell heaps and mounds of the area—in the near future, we hope.

We do know that there are materials in northeastern Florida which are somewhat related to the northwest coast. We also know that there are materials related to the known sequence in southern Georgia. With two known sequences to tie to the archeology of northeastern Florida becomes important not only in and of itself but as a means of relating two known areas to each other.

The most common type of pottery design in northeast Florida is a checked design impressed by a wooden paddle, and this design seems to be prevalent over a long period of time. This very fact is one of the confusing features when an attempt is made to arrange the archeology of the region into time periods.

I have delayed a discussion of the historic horizons until this point in the paper so that they may be discussed for the State as a whole rather than regionally.

One of the most interesting archeological phenomena in the entire Southeast occurs near the end of the archeological record. This is the so-called Buzzard cult. Sometime after the first white inroads into North America a religious cult sprang up among the natives. Since the most typical sites of this movement are found in northern Georgia, Alabama, and Oklahoma it is felt that the cult centered there. However, sites which have articles belonging to this cult are widespread; from Illinois through Florida.

The cult is marked by items unknown from any other period. Plumed rattlesnake and spider motifs are used on pottery, shell, and other materials. Elaborately carved shell gorgets with woodpeckers, and masked men in ceremonial costumes are found, axes made of a single piece of stone, handle and all, are part of the paraphernalia. Many other items too numerous to record are also found. Many of the motifs are clearly Mexican in derivation, but this does not mean that the makers were Mexicans. It is assumed that this cult was a reaction to the conquest by the whites, and that it arose, spread rapidly, and soon disappeared as did the later ghost dance among the plains Indians.

That the cult is historic in Florida is proved by cult motifs on metals that must have been procured from the Europeans. The exact dates are as yet unknown, but I tend to date the Buzzard cult as belonging to the middle of the seventeenth century, or perhaps a little earlier.

On the northwest coast the influence of this cult is clearly seen on the Fort Walton horizon, and in south Florida it is equally clear in such Glades III sites as Key Marco. In eastern Florida it is evident in such sites along the St. Johns as Mount Royal, south of Palatka.

The unraveling of the interesting history of this cult in Florida promises to be one of the most interesting problems which we will encounter, and it is a problem that may have some light shed upon it by historical documents.

We have several times mentioned the fact that the Fort Walton period in northwest Florida extends into historic times. We may now state that pottery of this period has been found in connection with European materials at early Spanish mission sites east of Tallahassee. The Florida Park Service has excavated one of these sites and is analyzing the data.

Although many other sites have been found in Florida which give evidence of historic Indians, most of them have not been scientifically excavated or analyzed. I shall, therefore, mention only one more.

In a low sand mound south of Sebring, Fla., the Florida Park Service has discovered Indian burials accompanied by European trade objects. These trade objects consist of thousands of small glass beads of various colors, little copper hawk's bells (such as the ones used on falcons in Europe), fragments of glass mirrors, rusty scissors, and a couple of small pieces of sheet copper perforated for suspension as ornaments. There is also a fragmentary Spanish jar. The Indian pottery which accompanies the burials is not decorated, and has a gritty feel. Surprisingly little is known of the dates of various trade goods; our only good comparative information comes from Michigan. Here the trade period has been divided into two phases, one dating from 1700 to 1760 and the other from 1760 to 1825. The materials found near Sebring, when compared to the Michigan list, would seem to fall before 1760; in other words in the first Spanish occupation of Florida.

We have learned a lot in the past 20 years, but there is still much more to learn. The material which I have given you tonight is, as you can see, just the beginning for Florida. To summarize, we have begun to achieve historical perspective in the archeology of Florida, and the basic framework for some regions has been worked out. The detailed investigations into Florida's past will go on, with the support of the people of Florida.

I hope that I will be able to appear again before this group, and that at some future time some of the gaps of knowledge which made themselves evident tonight will have been filled by continued research.

Our Debt to TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Debt to TVA," from the Denver (Colo.) Post, July 11, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR DEBT TO TVA

For years such authorities as the United States Bureau of Mines and the Encyclopedia Britannica have been saying the Rocky Mountain empire eventually will become the center of a big phosphate fertilizer industry. The West has waited, but not patiently, for the predictions to come true.

In the last few days there have been a couple of encouraging developments, however. The Bureau of Mines has announced that F. H. Gunnell and W. A. Young have completed a report suggesting the use of Reclamation Bureau power for the operation of a phosphoric-acid plant at Casper, Wyo., which would have a capacity of 100 tons a day.

The report suggests the entire installed cost of the project, including a mine near Lander, a crushing plant at Lander and the plant at Casper, would be $5,844,000.

The other development was a proposal by the Tennessee Valley Authority that it be allowed to erect a new phosphate experimental plant at Mobile, Ala., to explore new and cheaper methods of treating western phosphate rock. Department of Agriculture experts immediately suggested the erection of such a plant at some place in the West, like Pocatello, Idaho, instead.

If the plant is built, its location probably will depend in large measure on the adequacy of cheap electric power with which to operate furnaces.

When the Rocky Mountain phosphate industry becomes a booming reality, this region will have the TVA to thank. TVA has sold American farmers on the use of phosphate fertilizers. It has developed processes for producing such fertilizers more cheaply than ever before. It has led the way in research to increase the percentage of phosphoric plant food in such fertilizers, thereby accomplishing important savings in shipping costs.

TVA was created to develop the water and other resources of a single region. In doing so it has rendered an important service to the Rocky Mountain empire also. If proof were needed that the development of any particular part of the country benefits the Nation as a whole, the TVA fertilizer program supplies it.

It is to be hoped that western capital will seize the opportunity to finance the Mountain States phosphate industry. If it does not, eastern capital, operating through existing or new companies, will do so only too gladly. The profits from entirely too many western resources now go elsewhere, never to return.

Medical Care and Treatment of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following report of the deans' committee of Baltimore, on the medical care and treatment of veterans and the residency training program for physician veterans in the Baltimore region, 1946–47:

Subject: Report of the Deans' Committee of Baltimore on the Medical Care and Treatment of Veterans and the Residency Training Program for Physician Veterans in the Baltimore Region, 1946–47.

To: The Director, Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

I. This report summarizes the activities of the deans' committee of Baltimore in respect to the provision of adequate medical care and treatment for veterans and of approved residency training to physician veterans in the Baltimore region during the year 1946–47.

II. The deans' committee of Baltimore, which is one of a number of similar committees set up in cooperation with medical schools in this country by the Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration, at the direction of the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, was organized by the University of Maryland School of Medicine and the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine under the chairmanship of Dean Robert U. Patterson, University of Maryland School of Medicine, on March 6, 1946. It has held nine meetings since its organization. On July 1, 1946, Acting Dean H. Boyd Wylie, University of Maryland, succeeded Dr. Patterson as chairman of the committee. In June 1946, a subcommittee on neuropsychiatry composed of Drs. Ross McC. Chapman, John C. Whitehorn, and Philip S. Wagner was established by the Deans' Committee of Baltimore.

III. The functions of the deans' committee of Baltimore as described in the original and subsequent memoranda from the Director, Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration, were as follows:

A. To organize the professional staffs of the various medical installations of the Veterans' Administration in the Baltimore region in a manner to insure the provision of high standards of medical care and treatment for veteran patients.

B. To organize and maintain a program of adequate postgraduate education for physician veterans within the medical installations of the Veterans' Administration in the Baltimore region.

C. To provide the full-time and part-time medical staff in the medical installations of the Veterans' Administration in the Baltimore region which would be necessary to carry out the design of A and B.

D. To maintain a constant supervision of the professional aspects of medical care and treatment of veterans and of the educational program for physician veterans.

E. To integrate the professional medical services of the medical installations of the Veterans' Administration in the Baltimore region in order to provide high standards of medical care for veterans without a concomitant uneconomical use of the medical talent available for such services.

IV. The activities of the deans' committee of Baltimore. Initially, a survey was made by representatives of the committee of the medical personnel, professional resources, and the physical plant of the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Howard, Md. Following this study, the committee took steps in conjunction with the Veterans' Administration to secure professionally competent, full-time and part-time staff members for the hospital at Fort Howard. As the result of this joint effort, the following full-time chiefs of service were obtained:

A. General medicine. Dr. Paul Padget, assistant professor of medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine; instructor in medicine, University of Maryland School of Medicine; diplomate, American Board of Internal Medicine.

B. General surgery. Dr. Joseph Miller, instructor in surgery, University of Maryland School of Medicine; assistant in surgery, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine; diplomate, American Board of Surgery.

C. Pathology. Dr. William B. Vandergrift, instructor in pathology, University of Maryland School of Medicine.

D. Orthopedic surgery. Dr. John Lyford III, instructor in orthopedic surgery, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine; diplomate, American Board of Orthopedic Surgery.

E. Urology: Dr. Herman J. Meisel, diplomate, American Board of Urology. Highly qualified part-time chiefs of service were also secured for neurosurgery, ophthalmology, and dermatology and syphilology.

The committee next undertook the task of providing a group of competent consultants and attending physicians and surgeons in order to insure that high standards of medical care and treatment for veteran patients would be constantly available at Fort Howard, and that a program of postgraduate education, adequate to meet the specialty boards' requirements, could be developed in that institution. The response to the overtures of the deans' committee by qualified physicians and surgeons in Baltimore was very gratifying, and the part-time staff was filled in a short time. A list of the consulting and attending staff in the hospitals in the Baltimore region is in appendix A of this report.

With the cooperation of the Veterans' Administration, excellent junior full-time personnel was obtained for the various services at Fort Howard, and residency programs were established in 1946. The committee wishes to report that the residencies in general surgery, general medicine, orthopedic surgery, radiology, and dermatology and syphilology have been approved at Fort Howard by the various American specialty boards concerned.

In June 1946 the committee initiated studies through its subcommittee on neuropsychiatry and other representatives of the professional problems of the neuropsychiatric hospital at Perry Point, Perryville, Md. This hospital is forty-odd miles away from Baltimore, and in the past because of its isolation has not received the needed professional support from Baltimore. The surveys made by representatives of the committees showed that due to the depletion of the professional staff at Perry Point resulting from the war, and to the inexperience of many of the then current staff (junior medical officers on loan from the Army and Navy), a large backlog of neuropsychiatric patients had accumulated, whose records were incomplete, and whose psychiatric treatment had been limited. The first task of the committee was to reorganize the neuropsychiatric service at Perry Point. In this effort the committee was aided by the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, which placed an able manager in charge of Perry Point and added a competent clinical director of neuropsychiatry to the staff of that hospital. The subcommittee on neuropsychiatry secured the services of seven competent neuropsychiatrists from the staffs of the University of Maryland and the Johns Hopkins University Schools of Medicine for Perry Point. These individuals act as consultants, both in service and teaching capacities.

Next, the efforts of the deans' committee were turned to a study of the needs for surgical and medical services at Perry Point. A careful consideration of these services led the deans' committee to recommend the initiation of residency training programs in general medicine and in general surgery at Perry Point. These recommendations were accepted and at the time of the writing of this report, the surgical service has been reorganized under the direction of a qualified surgeon, while the medical service, which already had a competent chief, is being prepared for such a program. Already such strides have been made in the psychiatric service that it is now under consideration for approval by the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology. It is hoped that the training programs in surgery and medicine will be approved within the year. In addition to these activities, the deans' committee has provided qualified consultants in ophthalmology, dermatology, and syphilology, obstetrics, gynecology, radiology, and in tuberculosis for the hospital at Perry Point.

The final major activity of the deans' committee of Baltimore during the year 1946–47 was the correlation of the professional services in the various medical installations of the Veterans' Administration in the Baltimore region. It became evident to the committee in the course of its activities, that the provision of a high level of medical care and treatment to veterans and of an adequate post-graduate education to physician veterans could be facilitated by a correlation of the professional activities in the dispensary in Baltimore with those of the two hospitals in the Baltimore region. Discussions were then held with the regional director, representatives from the branch office, the chief medical officer of the dispensary and with the managers and chiefs of service of the two hospitals, with the result that in the year 1947–48, the following plan will be in operation. Resident physicians and surgeons from the two hospitals will participate in the activities of the dispensary in Baltimore under the immediate supervision of the consulting and attending physicians and surgeons from the University of Maryland and Johns Hopkins University Schools of Medicine. In addition to the general medical and surgical clinics in the dispensary, special clinics will be established in diseases of the chest (tuberculosis), dermatology, and eventually, in allergy. This will mean that veterans will not only have made available to them the highest type of diagnostic and therapeutic services, but also their after-care following hospitalization will be made easier for them. Under this plan there will not be a veteran applying for medical service in the medical installations of the Veterans' Administration in the Baltimore region, who will not have the opportunity of receiving adequate medical or surgical care and treatment.

V. The deans' committee feels that at this point in its report, it can enter into a short discussion of what its activities have meant to the sick veteran. The hospital at Fort Howard will be used as an example. In 1944, 1940 patients; in 1945, 3,099 patients; and in 1946, 3,942 patients were admitted to that hospital. The death rates of patients at Fort Howard were 6.4 percent, 6.3 percent, and 4.2 percent, respectively. The appreciable drop (36 percent) in the death rate at that hospital in 1946 occurred despite the fact that many more seriously ill patients were admitted and many more serious operations were performed than in the previous 2 years. In reality, in 1946 many patients were taken care of at Fort Howard who would have had to be sent elsewhere before the deans' committee, working in cooperation with the Veterans' Administration, provided a highly competent staff for that hospital. The death

rate at Fort Howard is not higher than it is in any other good hospital in Baltimore. Another point which is of importance is that now patients do not have to wait for long periods before they can undergo surgical treatment. They are taken care of as promptly as the bed space at Fort Howard permits.

The deans' committee of Baltimore wishes to make clear that this improvement in the medical care of veterans in the Baltimore region is the result of the policies initiated by Gen. Omar Bradley and his director of medicine and surgery, Dr. Paul R. Hawley. As a result of their efforts, the cooperation of the medical schools was obtained through the establishment of deans' committees in the problem of staffing the hospitals of the Veterans' Administration. These committees have secured the specialists who are now giving part-time service to the veterans, and have been instrumental in obtaining many qualified physicians who have entered the medical service of the Veterans' Administration on a full-time basis. The deans' committee of Baltimore heartily endorses and supports the efforts of General Bradley and his staff for providing adequate medical care and treatment for veterans. The committee believes that few of the members of the staffs of the University of Maryland or Johns Hopkins Hospitals would be participating in this program were it not for the policies established by General Bradley. These doctors (who are listed in appendix A) are interested in working under the present plan because:

A. It permits them to maintain a high type of medical care and treatment for veterans.

B. It is relatively free from the stifling effects of red tape and of bureaucracy.

C. It permits the doctors to practice under conditions comparable to those existing in the best civilian hospitals in Baltimore.

D. It is free (or has been so far) from so-called politics.

E. It is satisfying to both doctor and patient alike.

F. The physicians and surgeons who participate in this program are paid in relation to their training and experience and to the time which they give to the medical care and treatment of veterans.

VI. In concluding this report, the deans' committee desires to state that it has had excellent cooperation from the Veterans' Administration in the development of adequate medical services for veterans in medical installations of the Veterans' Administration in the Baltimore region. The committee also wishes to reiterate that, in their opinion, the policies initiated by Gen. Omar Bradley and Dr. Paul R. Hawley for providing adequate medical care and treatment to veterans and postgraduate education for physician veterans in the Baltimore region have been highly successful.

THE DEANS' COMMITTEE OF BALTIMORE,

H. BOYD WYLIE, M. D.,
Acting Dean, University of Maryland School of Medicine; Chairman, Deans' Committee of Baltimore.

ALAN M. CHESNEY, M. D.,
Dean, the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.

LEWIS P. GUNDRY, M. D.,
Assistant Professor of Medicine, University of Maryland School of Medicine.

HARRY C. HULL, M. D.,
Assistant Professor of Surgery, University of Maryland School of Medicine.

ALAN C. WOODS, M. D.,
Professor of Ophthalmology, the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.

PERRIN H. LONG, M. D.,
Professor of Preventive Medicine, the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine; Secretary, Deans' Committee of Baltimore.

APPENDIX A—CONSULTING AND ATTENDING STAFF OF THE HOSPITALS (FORT HOWARD AND PERRY POINT) OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IN THE BALTIMORE REGION, 1946–47

CONSULTANTS AT THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, FORT HOWARD, MD.

I. General surgery:

A. Dr. Harry C. Hull, assistant professor of surgery, University of Maryland.

B. Dr. George A. Stewart, assistant professor of surgery, Johns Hopkins University.

C. Dr. George G. Finney, assistant professor of surgery, Johns Hopkins University.

II. Orthopedic surgery:

A. Dr. Allen F. Voshell, professor of orthopedic surgery, University of Maryland.

B. Dr. Henry F. Ulrich, associate professor of orthopedic surgery, University of Maryland.

C. Dr. H. Alvan Jones, instructor in orthopedic surgery, Johns Hopkins University.

III. Urology: A. Dr. J. A. C. Colston, associate professor of urology, Johns Hopkins University.

IV. Neurosurgery:

A. Dr. Richard G. Coblentz, clinical professor of neurological surgery, University of Maryland.

B. Dr. James G. Arnold, Jr., associate professor of neurological survey, University of Maryland.

V. Thoracic surgery: A. Dr. Thomas B. Aycock, professor of clinical surgery, University of Maryland.

VI. Gynecology: A. Dr. J. Mason Hundley, professor of gynecology, University of Maryland.

VII. Ophthalmology: A. Dr. M. Elliott Randolph, assistant professor of ophthalmology, Johns Hopkins University.

VIII. Otolaryngology: A. Dr. Dudley C. Babb, assistant professor of otolaryngology, Johns Hopkins University.

IX. Proctology: A. Dr. Monte Edwards, professor of clinical surgery, University of Maryland.

X. Roentgenology: A. Dr. H. Webster Brown, assistant professor of roentgenology, Johns Hopkins University.

XI. General medicine:

A. Dr. Louis A. M. Krause, associate professor of medicine, University of Maryland.

B. Dr. Lewis P. Gundry, assistant professor of medicine, University of Maryland.

C. Dr. L. Earle Morre, assistant professor of medicine, Johns Hopkins University.

D. Dr. Perrin H. Long, professor of preventive medicine, Johns Hopkins University.

XII. Cardiology: A. Dr. William S. Love, associate professor of medicine, University of Maryland.

XIII. Gastroenterology: A. Dr. Samuel Morrison, assistant professor of gastroenterology, University of Maryland.

XIV. Alergy: A. Dr. Walter W. Winkenwerder, assistant professor of medicine, Johns Hopkins University.

XV. Tuberculosis: A. Dr. Hugh G. Whitehead, instructor, medicine, Johns Hopkins University and University of Maryland.

XVI. Neuropsychiatry:

A. Dr. Theodore Lidz, assistant professor of psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University.

B. Dr. Stephen W. Ranson, assistant professor of psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University.

XVII. Dermatology and syphilology: A. Dr. Maurice Sullivan, assistant professor of dermatology, Johns Hopkins University.

ATTENDING PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS AT THE VETERANS' HOSPITAL, FORT HOWARD, MD.

I. General surgery:

A. Dr. George H. Yeager, associate professor of surgery, University of Maryland.

B. Dr. Edward S. Stafford, assistant professor of surgery, Johns Hopkins University.

C. Dr. Harry C. Bowie, instructor of surgery, University of Maryland.

D. Dr. Howard W. Jones, assistant in surgery, Johns Hopkins University.

E. Dr. Karl F. Mech, assistant in pathology, University of Maryland.

F. Dr. Edward F. Lewison, assistant in surgery, Johns Hopkins University.

II. Urology:

A. Dr. Howard B. Mays, instructor, genitourinary surgery, University of Maryland.

B. Dr. Hugh J. Jewett, assistant professor of urology, Johns Hopkins University.

III. Gynecology: A. Dr. John C. Dumler, associate in gynecology, University of Maryland.

IV. Otolaryngology: A. Dr. Theodore A. Schwartz, instructor, otolaryngology, University of Maryland.

V. Oncology (cancer): A. Dr. Arthur G. Siwinski, associate in surgery, University of Maryland.

VI. Roentgenology: A. Dr. Harry A. Miller, Mercy Hospital.

VII. General medicine:

A. Dr. Theodore E. Woodward, assistant in medicine, University of Maryland.

B. Dr. Samuel T. R. Revell, assistant in medicine, University of Maryland.

C. Dr. John Z. Bowers, assistant in medicine, University of Maryland.

D. Dr. Joseph E. Muse, assistant in medicine, University of Maryland.

E. Dr. Ralph G. Hills, instructor of medicine, Johns Hopkins University.

F. Dr. Sidney Scherlis, assistant in medicine, Johns Hopkins University.

G. Dr. J. Elliott Levi, assistant physician, Johns Hopkins Hospital.

VIII. Dermatology and syphilology:

A. Dr. Harry M. Robinson, Jr., assistant professor of dermatology, University of Maryland; assistant in medicine, Johns Hopkins University.

B. Dr. Eugene S. Bereston, assistant in dermatology, Johns Hopkins University.

C. Dr. William D. Wolfe, assistant in dermatology, Johns Hopkins University.

D. Dr. Israel Zeligman, assistant in dermatology, Johns Hopkins University.

E. Dr. Albert Shapiro, assistant in dermatology, Johns Hopkins University.

IX. Psychiatry: A. Dr. James Bing.

X. Anesthesia: A. Dr. Fred C. Dye, professor of anesthesiology, University of Maryland.

XI. Plastic surgery: A. Dr. Clarence P. Scarborough, assistant in surgery, University of Maryland.

CONSULTANTS AT THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, PERRY POINT, MD.

I. Psychiatry:

A. Dr. Paul V. Lemkau, assistant professor of mental hygiene, Johns Hopkins University.

B. Dr. O. R. Langworthy, associate professor of psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University.

C. Dr. Wendell S. Muncie, associate professor of psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University.

D. Dr. Jacob H. Conn, assistant professor of psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University.

E. Dr. Philip S. Wagner, instructor, psychiatry, University of Maryland.

F. Dr. Manfred Guttmacher, psychiatrist, supreme bench, Baltimore, Md.

G. Dr. George S. Ingalls.

II. General surgery:

A. Dr. Richard T. Shackelford, assistant professor of surgery, Johns Hopkins University and University of Maryland.

B. Dr. Edward S. Stafford, assistant professor of surgery, Johns Hopkins University.

III. Gynecology:

A. Dr. Bernard C. Brack, assistant professor of gynecology, Johns Hopkins University.

B. Dr. Ernest I. Cornbrooks, instructor in gynecology, University of Maryland.

C. Dr. Edward S. Diggs, assistant professor of gynecology, University of Maryland.

IV. Tuberculosis:

A. Dr. H. Vernon Langeluttig, associate professor of medicine, University of Maryland.

V. Medicine: A. Dr. Theodore E. Woodward, instructor in preventive medicine, Johns Hopkins University.

VI. Ophthalmology: A. Dr. Fred M. Reese, instructor in ophthalmology, Johns Hopkins University.

ATTENDING PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON AT THE VETERANS' HOSPITAL, PERRY POINT, MD.

I. Urology: A. Dr. Benjamin Klotz, assistant professor of surgery, genitourinary staff, Sinai Hospital, Baltimore.

All attending physicians and surgeons are diplomates of their respective American specialty boards.

Mr. Truman Versus President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States in vetoing the tax-reduction bill has placed himself on record as opposed to the constitutional tradition of our Government. It is the province of Congress to determine Federal expenditures and appropriations. It has never been the prerogative of the President to arrogate to himself this authority, and no President in our history prior to Mr. Truman has ever successfully asserted such authority.

If a President may veto every measure dealing with public taxation enacted by Congress and win for himself the sustaining of that veto, the specific provision of the Constitution vesting the taxing authority in our National Legislature becomes meaningless. It would be possible for a political-minded President and a determined one-third minority to prevent the passage of any revenue legislation which he opposed, irrespective of the judgment of the will of the overwhelming majority of the Congress.

It has been asserted by our President that the type of tax reduction passed by Congress is the "wrong kind of reduction at the wrong time." He has cited figures designed to demonstrate that this bill, concurred in by a 3 to 1 majority of the House of Representatives and an almost 2 to 1 majority of the Senate, offers tax reductions to the well-to-do which are disproportionate to those offered to others less fortunate economically. Therefore, says the President, let us offer no tax reduction for the year 1947 to anybody. He is now seeking to exert pressures which are simply calculated to influence the trend of the election in 1948.

If the President himself had not voted in 1945 to exempt corporations from excess-profits taxes, when he was a Member of the Senate, the charge that his conduct now is based upon political considerations rather than fiscal might be difficult to support, but the record of Mr. Truman on this subject is at variance with the record of President Truman, and the political implications are inescapable.

Let us look at the facts and figures which furnish the proof of this pudding. In my own State of Ohio the President's veto of the tax-reduction bill means that hundreds of thousands of taxpayers who are now faced with increased living costs must continue to bear large Federal tax burdens unnecessarily. These men and women are not economic royalists. They are folks who have worked long and hard in the war years and deserve some relief. I say that we could readily dismiss several hundred thousand Federal employees without impairing the efficiency of our essential Government services. We will not dismiss them so long as the President can veto and veto and veto our efforts to cut taxes. For, as sure as the sun rises, the more money there is in the Federal Treasury, the more money Government agencies are going to spend. If we cut those funds, they will not be able to spend them, and I am certain that nobody doing business with the Government will be unduly disturbed.

Here is the monument to President Truman's violation of our Government tradition on the passage of tax bills. The people of Ohio's 88 counties will be paying to the Federal Treasury these millions of dollars they should have and could have saved.

Count them up, people of Ohio—and they total $227,513,000—from our State alone. I furnish this table, supplied by the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation of Congress, to prove the point.

If Mr. Truman has his way, we should change the motto of our country to these well-known words: "Sweat on, Mr. Taxpayer, sweat on."

Address by Burgin Dassett to Tennessee Convention of American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address delivered before the Tennessee Convention of the American Legion at Memphis on Monday night, July 21, 1947, by Hon. Burgin Dassett, commissioner of education of Tennessee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Commander, my comrades of the American Legion, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered tonight in this beautiful ampitheater, having turned aside for the moment from the heat, the dust, and the uproar of the workshops of life to commemorate the valor and sacrifices of the soldiers of Tennessee who helped give birth to this Republic, and through the years have done much to peserve its life. On a memorial shaft standing in one of the parks of this beautiful city, erected to the memory of three young men who gave their lives in the service of their city and State, are inscribed these words: "He who lives on in the hearts of his friends never dies." In the spirit of these words we are here in this twenty-ninth American Legion convention memorial to pay tribute to our comrades, our soldier dead, to acknowledge our gratitude to our Nation's defenders, both living and dead. We reconsecrate curselves to the cause for which they died. Through these 29 years by usage and custom this hour has broadened so as to include the memory of all our soldiers and sailors who have cemented their services and their sacrifices into the superstructure of our American life.

Within the recent past we have seen the peoples of Europe and Asia cowering under the clouds of darkness by night, and watching fearfully for the shadows of wings by day. We have seen our young men and women again go forth to war on foreign fields with the hope of giving aid to oppressed peoples, and making the world safe for democracy. Today we give thought to the principle for which this sacrifice in youth and treasure was made in the empty hope that wars may be ended forever. However, the light of that hope burns low between the spirit of the close of the conflict in 1918 and the spirit of today, 1947, when the blighted expectations of nations and whole generations, and the liberties of millions of men and women still cry out for peace 2 years after the war.

To our eternal regret there are signs of renewal of the tramp of marching armies, argosies of fighting death on wings, and the roar of cannon. In spite of the tremendous sacrifice, in spite of the staggering cost in lives and money, it begins to appear that the two world wars which we fought did not end in the solution of world problems. It again appears that notwithstanding the hope held out to the world in the Atlantic Charter, the sincere efforts made at Casablanca, Chapultepec, Yalta, Teheran, Moscow, Quebec, San Francisco, London, and Paris, to the end of a better world understanding, and the soul-searching effort being made by the United Nations in an attempt to establish a just peace and understanding built upon the principles of the prince of peace that there may arise new totalitarian governments, to again destroy political, religious, and economic rights; that have taken away freedom and made millions of helpless people mere vassals of the state doomed to slavery. Against this imminent threat to the nations of the world, who believe in the perpetuation of the liberties of men, we must marshal our peacetime forces. We must go forth in peace as in war with the same faith in democratic ideals, and with a renewed determination "to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism," "to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States," and to stop forever the propagation of a sinister philosophy seeking to dominate all the free peoples of the world. We must be determined to "make the world safe for democracy." We must catch the torch and take up the quarrel with the foe.

It is said that in 1918, when the news was brought to ex-President Theodore Roosevelt that his son Quentin had been shot down over the German lines and killed, the old soldier and statesman, as was his custom, brought his teeth down and replied firmly, "He who lives like the eagle lives dangerously, but dies gloriously." Through the years the American soldier has bared his breast to the cold steel of the enemy to assure the prosecution of the ideals exemplified by the American eagle. Our goals and purposes as a nation have never been successfully questioned, but even though many of our present goals are remote, and the noblest objectives are beyond our present grasp, and we declare with Henry VI, "O War, thou son of hell," there are few among us who, after the perspective of time, do not hold that "right is more precious than peace" and rejoice that we fought for the thing that we have always carried nearest to our hearts so as to bring peace and safety to all the na-

tions and make the world itself at last free with full appreciation of the tragic cost.

With this restatement of our ideals and purposes, we turn backward in our thoughts and rededicate ourselves today to the ideals for which our men have died in the past, and acknowledge our gratitude to our defenders, both living and dead. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do so, for a nation which forgets its defenders is not fit to live and should not long endure. The great heart of this people is peculiarly warm and tender today as we pause in these exercises. As we gather here the mystic chords of our memory turn once again to that sainted one whom it pleased God for us to call mother. This has come from every battlefield, from the deck of every battleship, and emanates from every patriot's grave throughout the world where sleeps an American soldier or sailor, because—

"Here where these gravestones white,
Like soldiers stretched in line,
Stand guard by day and night,
Here is a nation's shrine."

We are touched by the finer, better sentiments which actuate men and women. The soldiers of our land should occupy the mind and heart of the people today as never before, challenging their admiration, claiming their love and gratitude; and in paying this tribute to our dead, and in acknowledging our debt of gratitude to the living, we renew our faith in American institutions and reconsecrate ourselves to the task of transmitting these institutions, unimpaired, to posterity. "One thousand years scarce serve to found a state; an hour may lay it in the dust."

There is but one guaranty on the life of a nation, and that is written in, and rests upon, intelligent appreciation of our institutions, and a determination that we will serve our country as loyally now as her defenders have served her in the wars when her ideals were pressed upon the crucible. This occasion, therefore, means much to all who are gathered here, but it has a deeper meaning for the veterans under whose auspices these exercies are conducted. In joining the American Legion in commemoration of the Nation's defenders, we renew our faith in American institutions. The spirit and purpose of these organizations when put in the life of the American people are the guaranties that we will continue to exist as a free people.

For the members of the American Legion who are gathered here, this is a day of sacred memories. Their minds turn backward in their flight, and "fond memories bring the light of other days around them." Through the mist of the years they are reminded anew of the noble heritage received from their fathers who never bowed their heads to a foreign foe, nor permitted in their beautiful land the tyrant's tread, but met him with that steel which carves the progress and marks the determination of a true and noble race.

The courage of these soldiers—dead and living—is fully exemplified by that hardy Tennessean, David Crockett, who having served in the counsel chambers of his Nation, hearing the call of the oppressed, set forth for the lone star of the West and gave his life in the Alamo for the sunset republic of his adoption. From the smouldering campfires of Sycamore Shoals the forebears of this noble soldier dead ascended the slopes of Kings Mountain and, amid the withering fire of the British guns, planted the first American flag that ever unfolded its beautiful colors over the victorious fields of an American host. This same type of soldiery from the mountains and plains of Tennessee, men of loyal souls and brave hearts who feared Almighty God, and loved the welfare of their race, took their Bibles, their axes, and their muskets and, through wilderness, savage and difficult, which it seemed no courage and acumen could surmount, planted, cultured and nurtured the greatest civilization that man has ever known.

This panorama rises before you like a dream and you become young again. The years roll away and again in the strength, vigor and loyalty of young manhood, in your solemn imagination, you march away from home and loved ones, erect in form with elastic step, to join in spirit your comrades on the muster-grounds to enlist again under your country's flag to preserve for the world their heritage of freedom and independence.

The world's loftiest examples of friendship, as well as courage and sacrifice, were born upon the battlefield. We read that "the soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David and he loved him as his own soul." Thus in the long ago, between two soldiers was formed a friendship that laid the shepherd's crook beside the scepter, and outweighed a scepter and a crown. In the hot crucible of war the soul of the soldier is expanded and made luminous with the ardor of a righteous cause, and is welded with that of his comrade in an insoluble brotherhood of love.

The comradeship born of a common danger, privation, and suffering from Yorktown to Pearl Harbor, sleepless nights and harrowing days of the sunburned and seared Marne, the soaked forest-fastness of the Argonne and Chateau-Thierry, Iwo Jima, Anzio, and Bataan, and the raising of the flag of victory at San Juan and Manila Bay, endured together, has flowered into acts of individual heroism and challenged the admiration of the world.

Thus it has ever been—

"The bravest are the tenderest;
The loving are the daring."

It is said of an army of Scotland that when reduced to a bagatelle of their former power and greatness, surrounded by their enemy on a little hill of their country, that when their surrender was demanded they knelt and prayed for guidance. Upon arising each one pledged his word that he would not surrender, but that they would all die for their country. They were charged by their foes whose number exceeded theirs many hundred times, and not one was left of that gallant band of Scottish heroes of carnage. As a mark of respect their enemies buried them upon the beautiful hill where they fell. This hill was soon covered with the most beautiful bluebells that ever bloomed in Scotland, and the people hold in sacred belief today that these bluebells bloom in eternal memory of those heroes who died rather than stain their country's soul with the shame of surrender. Like those liberty-loving Scotsmen to whom freedom meant more than life, the soldiers of America have been found in the front of every battle where the tyrant's grip was to be broken from the wrist of a fettered slave. They sealed the destiny of our country when they marked with bleeding feet the snows around Valley Forge. Their devotion to freedom was uttered by Nathan Hale when he said his only regret was that he had only one life to give for his country.

Their steadfast courage was exemplified by Sam Davis—a Tennessee son of the Confederacy whose heroic figure in bronze stands on the slopes of capitol hill at Nashville—who, when told by his captors that if he would reveal the secrets held in his heart that his life would be spared and he could return to his mother, replied, "I would rather die a thousand deaths than to betray a friend or a noble cause."

Of the patriotic devotion of the American soldier to his country, no writer, no speaker, has ever expressed a doubt. When in infinite wisdom the power of righteousness called for help in the two World Wars to aid the struggling millions of Europe and Asia to free themselves from the fetters of bondage, Tennessee, ever ready to aid mankind, furnished the fairest sons of her soil for this awful sacrifice. Who can portray the possibility of a State and Nation whose manhood had followed the Stars and Stripes through the smoke and flame of so many desperate battles and have stepped proudly into history as the greatest fighters the world has ever known, making possible the birth, preservation, and practice of the Declaration of Independence: "That all people are born free and equal, that government derives its power only from the consent of the governed, and that man's inalienable right is freedom to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

A great American has said "he who sacrifices most contributes most." In calling the roll of our heroes we see again that noble character pacing restlessly through the night the deck of the British battleship outside the ramparts of Old Fort McHenry at Baltimore. The Capitol and White House had been desecrated at the hands of a foreign foe and he feared that this bulwark of American freedom would be forced to yield to superior forces. Dawn came and there, proudly floating over the old fort, though tattered and torn at the instance of enemy shell, was the old Stars and Stripes. There came into his mind those immortal words, "Oh, the Star-Spangled Banner, long may it wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

In the darkest hour of our country's history when the mosaic of our noble institutions were about to be torn asunder, there appeared one whose faith could ever see the star of his country's hope, and whose lasting love could ever hear the rustle of her flag with not a stripe erased nor a star polluted. In his clarion call to his countrymen to forever stand by the faith of their fathers and the heritage bequeathed them, he was able to say in that immortal memorial at Gettysburg "That this government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

We stand here today to rededicate ourselves to this principle. This, Tennessee soldiers, living and dead, have guaranteed. Its glory is yours and because of it you do, and ever will occupy a high place in the affection and esteem of the American people.

Soldiers, veterans, your country is your monument. Her greatness, her laws, her liberty shall be your epitaph. A grateful people in deathless bronze, in imperishable granite, in animated bust have cast and covered the story of your exploits. Your valor and your victories shall live and breathe throughout the endless years on the pages of history, while—

"On fame's eternal camping ground
Your silent tents are spread
And glory guards with solemn sound
The bivouac of the dead."

But the deepest tribute to your lasting fame is not written on tablets of cold stone, nor plates of bronze, but is inscribed by the finger of memory upon the imperishable tablets of the human heart. And when you have passed away it will be to have joined—

"The choir invisible
Of these immortal dead who live again
In minds made better by their presence; live
Impulses stirred to generosity
In deeds of daring rectitude, in scorn
Of miserable aims that end with self
In thoughts sublime that pierce the
Night like stars,
And with their wild persistence
Urge men's hands
In vaster issues."

Tennessee takes you to her heart today and joins with you in rejoicing as you hear the verdict of history. When your country called and its principles were at stake, you were true to that country, and by your valor and loyalty you have passed on to posterity the principles for which your fathers died. As we stand at the crossroads of our country's destiny today, we have but one sentiment for the soldier, cheers for the living and

tears for the dead, with the patriots' inflexible resolution never to surrender their vision—

"'Till the war drums throb no longer
And the battle flags are furled
In the parliament of man
The federation of the world."

In this reconsecration of our lives and rededication of our talents to the liberty which is the consummation of all the blood and sacrifice made by mankind since Jesus of Nazareth hung upon the cross of Calvary, it is clear that our imperative obligation is to gird our loins and be actuated by the spirit of the Roman soldiers who said as they saluted, "Hail Caesar, they who greet thee are ready to die for thee." It is in that spirit that democracy is to be preserved, first for America and then for the world, if we would undergird and perpetuate the blessings of free institutions at home and set a standard for the nations of the world who are looking and yearning for government built through the mosaic of the rights and privileges of free men.

From beneath the crosses which mark the resting place of our hero dead throughout the world today, the spirit hand has thrown to us the torch of liberty with the challenge to hold it high and carry on with the same faith and determination with which they marched with the banner of freedom. Their call to us will not be in vain; their sarcophagus will become a monument to all free men; their dust shall rest a sacred memory to the myriads whose thoughts shall journey to their resting place to rekindle their zeal and patriotism and their devotion to their country. They will not have died in vain and "They shall sleep where poppies grow in Flanders Field."

"Rest on, embalmed and sainted dead,
Dear as the blood you gave;
No impious footsteps here shall tread
The herbage of your grave.

"Lord God of hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

The End of Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert two editorials on the President's veto of tax reduction, and desire to call particular attention to the editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press because it raises a point that many members have evidently overlooked. The editorials are as follows:

THE END OF TAX REDUCTION

For the first time in the history of the United States, Congress has permitted a President to take the power of taxation out of its hands.

This power was put by the Constitution in Congress. Only one other President has ever attempted to defeat the intention of the Constitution by vetoing a general tax bill, and in that attempt Franklin Roosevelt encountered perhaps the sharpest rebuke of his Presidency.

President Truman becomes the first Chief Executive to succeed in taking the taxing power into his own hands, but those Senators who yesterday voted to sustain his veto may be sure that it will not be the last. The failure of the Senate to override the veto will mark the beginning of a new phase in the strengthening of the executive at the expense of the legislative branch of the Government.

The veto and the Senate vote also combine to deprive 49,000,000 taxpayers of a measure of relief from wartime peak taxation. President Truman again finds that this is not the right time to reduce taxes, because business is good, because the fiscal outlook is uncertain, because of inflation. Yet Roosevelt raised taxes when business was bad and the country was in a deflation. So far as the fiscal outlook is concerned, there never was a time when it wasn't uncertain and never will be. The suspicion will not down that 49,000,000 taxpayers must wait for tax relief because President Truman wants to wait until the time is better for him.

The President also repeats his criticisms of this kind of tax reduction, with a few statistical embellishments not in his first veto message. By starting with the tax law of 1940 as a base, he invents a so-called special wartime tax burden. This is the tax increase between the 1940 law and the present. By this tricky device he is able to make a sophistical attack on the bill passed by Congress.

The bill would have reduced taxes on small incomes 30 percent, on middle incomes 20 percent and on large incomes 10½ percent. But the President says that this formula reduced the special wartime tax burden of the biggest taxpayers 85 percent, of the middle taxpayer 64 percent and of the little taxpayer only 21 percent.

Of course what he talked about is the added taxation since 1940 and not total taxation. The little taxpayer was paying almost nothing at all in 1940; a married man with $2,500 net paid $22 that year. But the million-dollar income in 1940 already was paying nearly confiscatory rates. The rate on that income was about 75 percent and the tax was $751,000. Wartime taxation could not add much to that rate. In fact it went up to about 85 percent, and the tax at present is about $840,000.

Meanwhile the married man with the $2,500 income was increased to $285. Since the big incomes were already being taxed so heavily, there was no way of increasing revenues greatly except by reaching into the small and middle incomes. So by looking only at the added tax since 1940, 30 percent of the small income tax must necessarily work out as a lesser percentage than 10 percent of the big income tax.

What President Truman is saying is that he is so interested in seeing the many little fellows get an even bigger tax cut than provided in this bill that he is not going to let them have any at all. He could have said this better in fewer words and without the tricky use of a tax base deliberately selected to make Congress look bad.

KNUTSON

One thing is certain and that is the Republicans in Congress refuse to bow to the President's veto of the tax bill. Congressman KNUTSON, GOP chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, announced Friday that the American taxpayers could look forward to the $4,000,000,000 tax slash as a 1947 Christmas present from the Republicans.

KNUTSON, author of the tax-cut bill, and other economy-minded Congressmen, are of the opinion that they now have enough votes to crash through the next Truman veto.

This was about the best news of the day, because the average American taxpayer has his "belly full" of Truman's unnecessary expenditures, which in turn is piling taxes upon taxes until the load has reached the back-breaking point.

If the Republicans can pass this new tax slash legislation before 1948 they'll not only win back the Congress but the White House as well.

Americans are tired of supporting European wars.

Modernize Our Presidential Election—VIII. Population as a Basis of Dividing Electoral Votes Between the Candidates in the State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 124, which I am advocating, does not change the constitutional provision which now assures each State its relative strength as to other States in electing a President, on the basis of its population. However, an understanding of this phase of the Presidential election is of related interest to the general problem.

Since the beginning of the Government there has been a marked difference in the percentage of the population that has voted at Presidential elections as between the States, as well as for the Nation as a whole. The percentage of the popular vote was extremely low for the first 30 years under the Constitution. The tendency toward an increased vote is illustrated as follows:

1824	5.1
1836	12.6
1848	12.8
1860	15.3
1872	16.9
1896	22.4
1908	16.3
1920	25.
1932	32.4
1940	38.02

In 1940 over 53 persons out of each 100 voted in Illinois, while less than 40 out of 100 voted in Michigan. In Michigan 19 electoral votes represented 2,085,925 popular votes, while the same number of electoral votes in Illinois represented 2,859,160 popular votes, or 769,462 more than the same number of electoral votes represented in Michigan.

In 1920 California and Indiana were practically equal in population. In the Presidential election that year 43 people out of 100 in Indiana voted, and 27 out of 100 in California. Here were two States practically of equal population, in which there were 16 more out of 100 voting in one than in the other.

This made no difference in the final count of electoral votes at Washington, because under the Constitution the relative voting strength of each of these States was based on its total population and not on the number of its votes. If the relative strength of these States had been in proportion to the number of their voters and not in proportion to population, Indiana would have had over

50 percent more influence in electing the President than California with an equal population. That is not an exaggerated illustration. Figures to the same import could be provided at every election.

As illustrative of the disparity of voting population in the election of a President, we might accept the election of 1940 as fairly typical of the present percentage of voting population per hundred. The percentage of voters per hundred in the various States is shown by the following table:

Alabama	10.385
Arizona	30.052
Arkansas	10.297
California	47.323
Colorado	48.874
Connecticut	43.722
Delaware	51.171
Florida	25.587
Georgia	10.005
Idaho	44.804
Illinois	53.410
Indiana	52.008
Iowa	47.884
Kansas	47.766
Kentucky	34.089
Louisiana	15.749
Maine	37.869
Maryland	36.244
Massachusetts	46.956
Michigan	39.685
Minnesota	44.808
Mississippi	8.051
Missouri	48.451
Montana	44.306
Nebraska	46.803
Nevada	48.231
New Hampshire	47.895
New Jersey	47.415
New Mexico	34.412
New York	46.750
North Carolina	23.032
North Dakota	43.738
Ohio	48.061
Oklahoma	35.362
Oregon	44.163
Pennsylvania	41.198
Rhode Island	44.809
South Carolina	5.254
South Dakota	47.969
Tennessee	17.930
Texas	16.230
Utah	45.032
Vermont	39.824
Virginia	12.943
Washington	45.722
West Virginia	45.640
Wisconsin	44.796
Wyoming	44.763

This difference of the number of persons who would vote in the various States was anticipated when the Constitution was written. It was recognized that there would be a variety of conditions in different States and of the motives which induce people to vote. It was also recognized that each State would fix the qualifications of its voters, and perhaps there would be no common system of qualification in any two States.

This disparity of voting population between the States and the allotment of two electoral votes to each State regardless of population, make it entirely impractical to provide for equality of treatment between the States on the basis of popular votes. This is illustrated by table V.

The nearest practical approach we can get to a common denominator to measure the relative strength that each State should have in the election, is by giving it electoral votes which are common units as measured by population, plus the two electoral votes assigned to each State regardless of population.

The voters are a limited class of the people of each State authorized to vote by the laws of that State. There is no Nation-wide, universal qualification of voters. Each State maintains its right to fix the qualifications of its own voters, subject only to certain limited provisions of the Constitution.

In the make-up of the Federal Government one State is not entitled to more influence or power in the Federal Government than another State of equal population, simply because one State sends more voters to the polls than the other. Each member of the population of a State is equally the concern of the Federal Government; each citizen has equal rights and is entitled to the same consideration of the Federal Government, regardless of whether or not he votes.

A man who goes to the polls and votes does not vote for himself alone. He belongs to one of the class of citizens of a State who are qualified to vote. There is another larger group of citizens within the State who do not vote. Those who exercise the vote within the State control the elections of the State. There is a common unit of the voters within the State under a common qualification to vote that justifies the State in determining the result of the election according to the number of the votes. The voter, as such, has no other or greater rights beyond the rest of the people. In voting, he represents the people of his State. The real parties in interest are the people he represents, and not the voters alone. His vote is one of the common unit to express the will of the people in that State.

So in a Federal election for President, the credence that should be given to the vote of the State is the number of people in the State represented by its voters, and not merely the number of voters, who are only agents for the expression of the popular will of the whole population. Therefore, the constitutional provision, so far as it fits the relative strength of the States in the Federal Union on the basis of population, does so with the greatest possible fairness under which the authority of the State to participate in the Federal Government could be defined.

The further provision awarding the electoral votes regardless of population was a departure from that fundamental policy in the allotment of electoral votes between the States. It was, however, consistent with the policy of the Constitution in distributing its powers to Congress by making each State the equal of every other State in the Senate. In other words, this allotment of two votes to each State is not more violative to the population basis of representation, than the provision of the Constitution which gives the State equal voting powers with every other State, in the Senate.

The attempt now to eliminate that two-vote assignment would be comparable to a proposal to eliminate the Senate itself.

So the practical situation is that we should accept these two provisions of the Constitution as a permanent and acceptable part of the policy of the Nation.

If we had no constitutional provision defining the right of the State and its limit to participate in the election of a President, we would thereby create for each State the temptation to inflate its voting population to take advantage of its sister States. At the present time, and under the proposed amendment, it would be beyond the power of any State to unduly increase its relative strength over other States.

Under the present policy of the Constitution and under our proposal, the electoral vote would remain as the common unit of determining the relative powers of the States in electing the President. The fundamental evil in the constitutional system is not in granting electoral votes, but rather in the fact that it provides no method for the division of the State electoral votes between the candidates in the State. Neither is there any provision that prevents the whole vote of the State being cast as a unit for a candidate who fails even to secure a majority vote of the State. In other words, in defiance of common sense and fairness, the whole vote of the State, given to it primarily for the purpose of representation according to its population, is accorded to one candidate who failed to secure the support of even one-half of its voters.

Commission on Reorganization of Executive Branch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on July 4, there appeared a syndicated article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop entitled "The 100-to-1 Shot," which discussed the Lodge-Brown bill for a commission to reorganize the executive branch of the Government.

I believe the viewpoint of the article is both original and constructive.

The Alsop column, I may add, has for a long time been a consistent and early advocate of the type of survey which we all hope will result from the Lodge-Brown bill and gave the bill support and encouragement throughout the session. I ask that an excerpt from that article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF FACT—THE 100-TO-1 SHOT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON, July 3.—The optimistic citizens who enjoy backing long shots might get a little money down on the proposition that history will remember the Lodge-Brown bill as one of the most important enactments of the present Congress. The odds are heavily adverse, but the pay-off will be very big indeed if it occurs. And, incidentally, it will

be vitally important to the future of the United States.

As usual with long shots of any real promise, it is necessary to explain what the Lodge-Brown bill is. In brief, it is a bill introduced by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts, and Representative CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio, which permits the President, the Speaker, and the President pro tempore of the Senate to name a Commission to Investigate the Organization of the Federal Government. The Commission is allowed 16 months to complete its inquiries and is instructed to recommend a plan of reorganization in January 1949. The idea is that if the Commission does a decent job a newly elected President with a Congress of his own party may then conceivably be able to effect the thoroughgoing Government house cleaning that has been more and more urgently needed every year for the last 50 years.

AN UNWIELDY BODY

The odds are unhappily against the Lodge-Brown bill paying off for two reasons. First, the Commission is to be composed of 12 members, 4 from Congress, 2 from the executive branch, and 6 from private life. So large a body, tackling so complex a task, is bound to be hampered by its mere unwieldiness. Second, there is no guaranty that men of the highest quality will be named, or can be persuaded to serve on the Commission. It is crucial that none but men of the most eminent abilities, able to command general confidence in their judgment, be charged with the job of replanning the Government. Such men are hard to find.

It will do no good, on the other hand, to name one more commission which will be just like all its predecessors, drawing its per diem, presenting a report recommending strict economy and general virtue, and fading into obscurity again. The responsibility placed on President Truman, Speaker MARTIN, and Senator VANDENBERG is heavy. It will be the more difficult to discharge because the really acute need for thoroughgoing Government reorganization is so little understood.

None the less, a heavy debt of gratitude is owed both to the hard-headed Representative BROWN and to Senator LODGE. * * * Even if their scheme is not successful, LODGE and BROWN have at least called attention to the two most important facts about the United States Government today. They have pointed out that the Government is disorganized, ponderous, and dropsical to the point of acute danger. And they have tacitly recognized that the economy shouters are largely talking nonsense at present. This is because the economy shouters really know nothing whatever about the inner pattern of the Government, and are therefore in the position of doctors trying to operate on a patient with dropsy when the source of the dropsy has not been located.

STATE DEPARTMENT PROGRESS

The remarkable progress made by Secretary of State George C. Marshall and Under Secretary Robert Lovett, following blueprints originally drawn by Dean G. Acheson, is an illustration of what can be achieved in one small area. From immemorial chaos, something like order is emerging at the State Department. It may not result in fiscal economies. But what is immeasurably more important, it will unquestionably result in a clear, coherent foreign policy, in which all parts will be related to each other and the whole, and the whole will be conditioned by the interests of the United States. Clarity and effectiveness of policy are more important, in every branch of the United States Government today, then the petty penny pinching bawled for by the kind of Congressman who would sink the national defense in order to cut 30 percent off the income taxes of his political angel.

If one were to write a memo to the commission to be named under the Lodge-Brown bill it would contain the following headings:

1. The insane complexity, the nightmarish proliferating, of Federal administration is the first fault. No government on earth can operate when there is so little consolidation of responsibility that every major activity involves a score or more of agencies; and that at least 150 officials in theory and about 90 in practice report directly to the President.

2. Besides ruthless consolidation of responsibility, the Government cannot much longer continue to operate without some sort of coordinating executive secretariat working under the President to keep the whole machine oiled and in condition.

3. Most urgently of all, a decent governmental service, with reasonable conditions of servitude, is now required. It is plain, stark, staring madness to let a $37,000,000,000 national enterprise be largely directed by an army of routine-minded clerks.

The commission will do well to concentrate on these fundamental objectives. Achieve these, and we shall get efficient Government. And once we get efficient Government, we shall get economy as a healthy byproduct.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE WINSTEAD ON FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, APRIL 29, 1947

Through the leadership of Thomas Jefferson, the great fundamental ideal of human equity in rights, privileges, and opportunities was conceived and established. Under this ideal we believe that every American has as his birthright the chance to achieve according to his individual capacity and effort. The American public-school system had its origin in this ideal, because it was established as one of the major instruments through which the ultimate ideal of complete equality of opportunity for all might be realized. Perhaps we have never achieved the ideal because we have never given to public education the Nation-wide financial support essential to develop its full force and power. We can no longer afford to leave the great potential power of this resource only partially developed. Perhaps the leadership of America among the great nations that have emerged from this war-torn world depends more than anything else upon the power of enlightenment generated from an adequately supported system of public schools open to all regardless of place of birth.

Yet American education has never in all its history faced conditions as critical, as deeply rooted, and as far reaching as those that threaten the complete breakdown of the Nation's public-school system today. Since 1941 more than 350,000 teachers have left the classroom for other more lucrative employment. This is more than one-third of the Nation's normal teaching force and has been termed by many the greatest vocational migration in our Nation's history. It has resulted in the employment of 110,000 substandard teachers, more than one in eight, as replacements. It has curtailed school programs and created split-shift days, yet 75,000 teaching vacancies now exist. Classes have been crowded to twice normal capacity, yet 75,000 children in school are being deprived of education because of lack of teachers, and another 5,000,000 school-age youth are not attending any school.

These conditions are not likely to be relieved in the near future by replacements from students now enrolled in colleges and universities. Recent surveys indicate that the number of college students planning to enter teaching is so small that it would not provide normal replacement of teachers 25 years ago.

No less alarming is the devoloping pressure on school systems by the enormously increased birth rate during the war years. Where population experts predicted wartime births amounting to from 4 to 8 million they actually aggregated 13,000,000 from 1941 to 1946. Schools have already felt this pressure at the kindergarten and primary level—as the "bulge" moves upward the extraordinary demands upon schools will bring about the unprecedented crisis unless quick and effective measures are taken to replenish the rapidly shrinking teaching force.

While there are other factors that influence the teacher shortage, the disgracefully low salary of teachers as compared with other employed personnel is the major reason for the dearth of teachers. Although this is not a temporary condition brought about by war, the impact of the war and postwar conditions have increased this disparity. Since 1940 the average salary of teachers has increased 31 percent, that of all other employed persons 79 percent, while during the same period living costs have increased 55.5 percent. Business Week recently revealed the startling information that between 1939 and 1946 public school teachers have suffered an actual loss of 20 percent in real wages. This reveals more than any other fact why teachers are continuing to leave the classroom for other employment.

Within recent months a number of States and larger cities have attempted to improve teachers' salaries. A recent survey reveals that 12 States and 15 of the larger cities have provided a substantial increase in teachers' salaries. I am proud to say that my own State of Mississippi has made a magnificent effort to improve teacher salaries. For the school year 1944–45 Mississippi appropriated 46.9 percent of its total tax revenue, or $10,000,000, for schools. The next session of the legislature increased the school appropriation to eleven and one-half million, making the appropriation for session 1947–48 total $16,500,000. This increase takes the whole of the present excess-tax receipts, yet next session the average teacher's salary in Mississippi will be less than one-half the minimum of $2,400 established in several of the wealthier States.

While educational expenditures by States vary widely, the extremes between communities are even greater. Some communities spend 60 times as much on the education of children as other communities and the educational opportunity is so meager in some areas that more than 25 percent of the school-age children do not attend any school.

Various studies have been made of educational inequality among the States. Invariably these studies reveal that in areas where educational opportunity is abundant, the per capita wealth is high, the burden of child care low, and the relative effort to support education small. On the other hand, in areas where educational opportunity is meager, the per capita income is low, the number of children per wage-earning adult extremely high, and the effort to support even inadequate education higher than in wealthier communities.

Since these conditions seem self-perpetuating, and since they seem to be clearly beyond the power of the States to remedy, the only possible solution seems to be financial aid from the Federal Government to estab-

lish a minimum program of adequate education guaranteed to every American boy and girl without interference by the Government in the complete control of education by States and local communities.

To accomplish this purpose I have introduced H. R. 1722, a bill to assist the States in providing more effective programs of public education with every safeguard over State and local control. For two decades legislation to secure Federal aid for public schools has been before the Congress yet never has the need been presented with such Nationwide interest. It is my sincere belief that the need is so clearly and conclusively evident that this Congress must take positive action to prevent the complete collapse of America's system of public education.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject of tax reduction for our people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVE THE AX TO HIGH TAXES
WHY WISCONSIN AND ALL AMERICA NEED TAX RELIEF

The American people insist that the second session of the Eightieth Congress shall vote long-overdue tax relief. I, for one, will do everything within my power toward that objective. Mail to me from the State of Wisconsin overwhelmingly endorses tax relief as indispensable to America's welfare.

I voted for both 30-10.5 percent tax reduction bills which the President unfortunately vetoed. Moreover, I have in the past, sponsored legislation for a complete overhaul of our entire obsolete tax set-up, including excise taxes, social security, income taxes, community-property phase and all other tax features, all of which must be reevaluated in the light of changing needs. We must set our tax structure on a sound, streamlined basis, fair and equitable and calculated to encourage private initiative rather than to penalize it.

"Unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation" has been a true American motto. We must give the ax to outrageously high taxes. The American people, already hard pressed by high prices, have been bled too long by high taxes.

EFFECTS ON WISCONSIN

In our State, the effects of the President's two tax vetoes spelled "bad news" to Wisconsin's 1,183,000 tax-paying citizens and to their dependents. So, too, the two arbitrary tax vetoes which were made in the face of the overwhelming mandate from the American people for tax relief, spelled "bad news" for all 49,000,000 other American taxpayers in every State of the Union.

We might note that in Wisconsin 1,151,000 folks earn under $5,000 and only 32,000 earn more than $5,000 per year.

WHY RELIEF IS NECESSARY

Well, why is tax relief so necessary to Wisconsin and every other State? Here are the answers:

(1) Tax relief is necessary in order to sustain purchasing power. Many so-called Government experts have been predicting a recession or a decline in economic activity. This tax relief would have put four billion needed dollars of purchasing power into the hands of our people, thus assuring a continuing effective demand for goods.

(2) Tax relief would have served to help American small businesses. Some two and one-half million new small businesses have just entered into the picture. They could have been immensely helped in expansion through the tax relief they could have secured.

(3) Tax relief is important to America's people in order to assure a better distribution of their income spending. It is an amazing fact that the American people are now forced to give more of their money to taxes than they actually spend on food. This makes for absurd distribution of income. America's nutrition and its whole standard of living depends on a more sensible distribution of earnings.

(4) Tax relief would have served to encourage American initiative and enterprise. We know that in recent years countless individuals and companies have spurned expansion of their businesses because more income would have only served to put them in the higher tax brackets, thus in effect causing a loss in their net income.

(5) Government itself would have benefited. Reduced taxes would have meant more income for the American people because free enterprise could expand. This in turn would have meant adequate revenue to Government, which always has a high tax revenue in times of prosperity.

PEOPLE'S MANDATE

(6) Tax relief would have served to fulfill the mandate of the American people which was given in the November 1946 election. The people at the same time demanded every reasonable economy in Government—making sure that every taxpayer's dollar was well spent and that useless bureaus and bureaucrats were demobilized. The Congress has done everything it could toward reducing the budget in the face of stiff opposition from the executive branch. Had it been able to enact tax relief, it would have served to pass along the savings which it has made in accordance with its promises to our people.

(7) Tax relief would have shown the American people that their welfare is borne in mind just as is the welfare of stricken foreign peoples. It is absurd to talk of unlimited United States expenditures overseas at the same time that our own people are urgently in need of tax relief. Reducing taxes here is consistent with our foreign relief program because reduced taxes mean increased enterprise, increased production, which will help us fulfill foreign commitments.

JUSTICE OF TAX BILL

The two tax bills which the President vetoed were absolutely just for the principal reason that they were "graduated" according to income level. Thus,

(1) The largest percentage reduction made under the bill was 30 percent. Twenty-six million taxpayers with surtax net incomes of $1,000 or less would have gotten the benefit of this substantial maximum reduction.

(2) The next largest reduction was to go to 7,000,000 taxpayers with surtax net incomes between $1,000 and $1,400. They would have benefited by reduction between 30 and 20 percent.

School teachers, clergymen, shopkeepers, retail store clerks, small farmers, office workers, factory workers—folks in the lower income brackets would thus have gotten the major benefit. These folks have been terrifically hard-hit by inflation, by the housing shortage, and other factors, which have already seriously curtailed their purchasing power and their standard of living.

(3) An additional 16½ million taxpayers with incomes between $1,400 and $136,700 would have gotten the benefit of 20 percent tax reduction.

(4) Our old folks who have been severely hurt by inflation would have benefited by receiving a special exemption of $500. The relief provided by this exemption would have been heavily concentrated in the lower income brackets.

(5) We may note that 63 percent of the total tax reduction provided by H. R. 1 and H. R. 3950 would have been received by taxpayers with net incomes of $5,000 or less. On the other hand, taxpayers with net incomes over $25,000 would have received only 19 percent of the total tax reduction. A married couple over 65 years of age with an income of $2,500 would have received a reduction of $218.50. That amounts to nearly 77 percent of their present tax—which is a very high percentage obviously. Now, as a result of the President's vetoes, such elderly couples, as well as younger couples, will receive no tax reduction at all.

We may note, too, that a single person with no dependents earning $2,500 a year who is now paying $380 would have paid only $304 in taxes under the bills. Now that individual must continue to pay $380 per year.

PARTISAN VETOES

America will neither forget nor forgive the partisan politics which apparently motivated the vetoes of the tax-reduction bills. The American people have memories and they will recall that the Administration which vetoed the present tax bills put through (a) the ending of the excess-profits tax on corporations, and (b) a 5-percent reduction on personal-income taxes at a time when there was a severe Government deficit. Yet, a short time later the same Administration brazenly refuses to pass tax-cut bills when there is a substantial Government surplus rather than a deficit, and when there is sufficient money to make a reasonable reduction in the huge national debt.

CONCLUSION

Wisconsin and all America demand income-tax relief, and by all the laws of justice, they will get it. I will do everything within my power to fulfill the mandate given to me by my constituents.

The New York Herald Tribune on the Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of yesterday, July 22, 1947:

THE POLL TAX VOTE

The House passed yesterday by a vote of 290 to 112 a bill to make poll taxes unlawful. This action gains added significance from its manner and timing. With the driving assistance of Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, who nipped an incipient filibuster by using his power of refusing to entertain dilatory motions, proponents broke up a southern revolt and passed the bill under suspension of the rules, getting the necessary two-thirds vote and 22 to spare.

Much too simple was the minority opposition's cry of "politics." Their point that the gesture was hollow since the Senate obviously will not act by Saturday, when Congress goes home, overlooks one fact: The bill will remain alive when the Senate reconvenes following the recess. A year-long filibuster even in the Senate, where delaying tactics have developed into a fine art, is hard to imagine.

It may be that some voted, as Representative GERALD W. LANDIS threatened to do, in order to "put on the spot" those southerners who "opposed us on taxes." It strikes us as more likely that the decisive elements were the Republican leaders' determined steering and the growth of popular feeling even in the South about the democratic process—which growth, in spite of outbursts of prejudice, has been real. It is indicated, to take but two examples, by the appeal of the Governor of Alabama to his legislature to abolish the poll tax, and the recent decision of the Corpus Christi, Tex., Junior Chamber of Commerce to campaign against the poll tax upon the basis of its own State-wide sentiment of 4 to 1 against the tax.

The House vote is another sound gain for the democratic idea, here and elsewhere.

Good for Yankee Nerves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, several days ago we received a booklet or pamphlet from the Baltimore Sun which I commend highly to my colleagues as a reliable source of information in regard to Russia. It is a reprint of a series of articles by Paul W. Ward, published in the Baltimore Sun, entitled "Life in the Soviet Union."

In view of the saber rattling on the part of our generals and Government officials during the past several months, the document is timely and will enable us to get a better picture of the Russian situation, to analyze and place a true value on the war propaganda now rampant throughout the country.

The last chapter in the booklet is entitled "Visit to Russia Good for Yankee Nerves," and I quote:

WASHINGTON, May 17.—Moscow lacks even a faint resemblance to a health resort, but a visit to the Soviet capital is good for the nerves.

At least it is good for the nerves of Americans who worry about the possibilities of the Kremlin:

1. Acquiring atomic weapons in the foreseeable future.

2. Extending into perpetuity its present domination of some 100,000,000 Poles, Bulgars, Rumanians, Yugoslavs, Finns, Germans, Slovaks, Hungarians, and Ruthenians.

The Soviet system, seen in operation at close range, does not foster either type of fear.

It is hard, for example, to conceive of atom bombs being made in a country that had to rely on American trucks to move its armies toward Germany and that has been unable to manufacture successfully even so relatively crude a machine as the automobile.

It is equally hard to think of its rulers maintaining indefinitely their sway over the so-called states after seeing evidence of their own fears on this score as well as their lack of the wherewithal to manufacture lasting bonds. They enjoy certain advantages such as direct access to these territories and possession of modern technical weapons.

Perhaps more potent than either of these are the energy, discipline, and ruthlessness of the Communist Party regime. It is, of course, at the beck and call of the Kremlin and—no matter how much Stalin may disown it in talk with Stassens, Willkies, and Roosevelts—its official gospel is still Lenin's assertion:

"We cannot live in peace; memorial services will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism. But until this takes place, the principal rule is to dodge and maneuver. We have to use any ruse, dodge, trick, cunning, unlawful methods, veiling of the truth."

These advantages, which the Kremlin enjoys, are, however, likely to be outweighed in the long run by the weaknesses it also has.

These include the necessity of giving at least a feeling of independence to the Poles and others, a difficult thing among people whose training under German occupation has made them expert at spotting quislings.

It is a task made more difficult by the arrogance and chauvinism the war and accompanying propaganda have rekindled in the Kremlin's satraps at home and abroad.

Historically, moreover, the Russians have always failed to hold and control alien peoples. Out of their difficulties in this respect there arose in the nineteenth century the Jewish bundists, Lettish trades-unionists, Polish Socialists, and Caucasian minority groups that in the twentieth century formed the backbone of the Bolshevik organization which undermined the Kerensky regime and took over the Russian revolution.

The subsequent loss of Russia's western states due to that revolution was in some respects a relief to the Bolsheviks, enabling them to concentrate on a home front which, in 1947, again needs intensive looking after.

There are also some other difficulties facing the Kremlin, the visitor to Moscow discovers. These include the fact that the Bolsheviks are poor propagandists.

Despite complete control of all avenues of communication within the Soviet Union, they have not been able to sell their system even to the Russian people. They have found it necessary to extinguish rank-and-file democracy and substitute Stalinism, which is closely akin to czarism.

Virtually all the original generation of Communists, some 75 percent of the governing class and intelligencia and more than half the higher officer corps were liquidated in the 1937 purge. As a result of this and other things, the fire of revolutionary Marxism is largely dead today in the U. S. S. R.

The masses are submissive but no longer inspired; they turn out obediently for Communist Party demonstrations but show none of the fervor exhibited in attendance at churches. Their reopening has evoked no protests from a people subjected to 30 years of the Bolsheviks' aggressively antireligious propaganda.

* * * * *

Russia, at the moment, has nothing to give them (Russian people) except land reform, a Communist affair of splitting large farms into little ones to garner peasant votes. It is a program that both reduces agricultural production—thereby further lowering living standards—and, by increasing the need for mechanization, creates a demand for machinery the U. S. S. R. cannot produce in quantities sufficient for its own needs.

I am quite sure you will find the articles entertaining and informative and, as the author says, "Good for Yankee nerves."

Hon. Benjamin V. Cohen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM RAYBURN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, for something like 14 years, off and on, Benjamin V. Cohen, who has just resigned as counsel for the State Department, has been connected with the Government of the United States in some fashion. The Government was never served by a better or abler individual than Ben Cohen.

I fully concur in the views expressed in today's Washington Post regarding him. The editorial follows:

BRAIN TRUSTER

The last of the brain trusters who gathered around former President Roosevelt has taken his bow off the stage of our public life with the resignation of Mr. Benjamin V. Cohen as Counselor of the State Department. Mr. Cohen put intellectual spine in many of the reforms which we lump together as the New Deal.

A superb lawyer, with a priceless gift of draftsmanship, Mr. Cohen wrote the Truth in Securities Act, the Wages and Hours Act, the Public Utilities Holding Company Act, among other New Deal laws. His particular monument was this last-named measure. Public utility lawyers little realized the skill with which this statute was drawn till they came to test it. Then they found Mr. Cohen as adept in marshaling the defense as in draftsmanship. The law weathered all the challenges at the hands of a mobilized bar, and the history of the litigation was a personal triumph for Mr. Cohen. It is nowadays regarded as a classic in both the preparation of a complicated piece of legislation and the conduct of an equally complicated piece of litigation.

President Wilson once said that those who come to Washington either grow or swell. Many of the New Dealers swelled out of all recognition as they basked in Mr. Roosevelt's favor. Mr. Cohen, fixed in character and endowed with a true humility, never did. Or the stars died out of the eyes of many of Mr. Cohen's coadjutors as they throve on power. Mr. Cohen's remained unchanged, though they never shone offensively. Then there were many New Dealers who in their zest to make over America forgot that America is not an island in the great world. Here is where Mr. Cohen, in particular, furnished an example of perspective. As absorbed as any of his colleagues in reform, yet he saw the international storm clouds on the horizon, and threw his energies and talents into preparedness. He was an invaluable aide, for example, in putting through the destroyer deal and lend-lease.

When war came, he was on familiar ground, for in the First World War he had been a young lawyer in the Shipping Board. In this war he worked inconspicuously but most effectively at the side of successive top-level administrators. One of his great services consisted of what in effect was the briefing of the Nation on what was happening. This he did for Mr. Byrnes when Mr. Byrnes was head of the Office of War Mobilization. Before the war was over, Mr. Cohen's gifts were made use of in preparing for the peace. He sat on the delegation to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and when Mr. Byrnes went to the Department of State was appointed counselor.

This was a public recognition of the services of a man who gave himself unstintingly

and almost anonymously to the prosecution of war. But the counselor role was nothing new, only the spotlight. In public or private, "deliberation sat, and public care" on Mr. Cohen's shoulders for a dozen years, and he seemed destined to become a very pillar of state. Now he has retired. He does not intend to put up a shingle or capitalize his experience for personal profit. We fancy he will still be on hand, in his shy and modest fashion, to keep on helping those who know the true worth and sterling objectivity of his counsel.

Agricultural Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include copy of a letter received from A. S. Goss, master of the National Grange, Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Association, and John W. Davis, secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, on how sections 307 and 308 of H. R. 3756 will undermine agricultural credit.

If agricultural credit is to be sound these two vicious sections should be stricken from the bill.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 22, 1947.*

To Members of the House of Representatives:

GENTLEMEN: Your attention is invited to the effect of sections 307 and 308 of H. R. 3756 on agricultural credit.

Government lending corporations fall into two groups. The first includes those created by Congress under basic legislation which provides ample safeguards in detail for the borrowers, the lenders, the public and the Government. The second includes those either created directly through legislation, or set up by executive order, or otherwise, without adequate safeguards. The operations of such corporations have been adequately safeguarded in the public interest through the Byrd-Butler bill of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Sections 307 and 308 of the House bill undermine a Federal policy of over 30 years standing—a policy designed to build up a farm credit system owned and controlled by farmers in order to provide themselves and their cooperatives an assured source of credit under fair competitive treatment.

It now develops that some members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Government Corporations have been working for 18 months on the provisions embodied in sections 307 and 308. Despite this long study and preparation, the provisions were sprung on the Congress without allowing the farmer borrowers affected by the proposed drastic changes any opportunity whatsoever for public hearing.

Enactment of sections 307 and 308 would be legislation written into an appropriation bill by an appropriation committee, without public hearing in the House on the legislation involved. It is therefore a fundamental issue. It cannot be solved by exempting certain corporations from the effect of the legislation, as has been forcefully pointed out in the report of the Senate Appropriations Committee on the bill. It is an issue that can only be solved by eliminating the two sections in their entirety.

ANALYSIS OF SECTION 307

A. Section 307 provides annual fiscal year limitations and restrictions on:

1. Administrative expenses: The total amount that can be used and for what purpose it may be used.
2. Capital: Total amount that can be used, and the amount that must be returned to the Treasury.
3. Surplus: Total amount to remain for use during the fiscal year and the amount to be declared as dividends to the Treasury.
4. Loans: Total amount of loans that can be made; total amount that could be outstanding at any time; and the kind of loans that can be made.
5. Borrowings: Total sums that can be borrowed on debenture sales and borrowed from commercial banks, and the amount that can be outstanding at any time.

B. In the Farm Credit Administration the wholly owned corporations with adequate basic legislation are:

1. Federal intermediate credit banks.
2. Production credit corporations.
3. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

C. Effect of section 307 on operation of Federal intermediate credit banks.

1. Commitments to borrowers such as production credit associations, agricultural credit corporations, commercial banks, and banks for cooperatives could not be given until all items under A above are authorized in an annual appropriation bill. It would be impossible for the appropriations committee or any other committee to determine annually with accuracy the credit requirements for agriculture 18 months in advance.

2. Purchasers of debentures might well hesitate to buy debentures that matured beyond a fiscal year date, because the capital and surplus of the banks might be withdrawn before the debentures matured. This restriction might cause an increase in the cost of debenture money to the banks; hence, an increase in interest costs to farmers.

3. Production credit associations and the banks for cooperatives obtain their major supply of lending funds by rediscounting farmers' loans with the FICB's. By limiting or restricting the borrowing and lending amounts of the FICB's, the lending resources of the PCA's, and the banks for cooperatives, the needed loanable funds might not be available.

D. Effect of section 307 on operations of Production Credit Corporation.

1. Ownership by farmers of production credit associations could be materially retarded and many PCA's crippled if severe limitations or heavy withdrawals of capital were made during fiscal year periods.

2. Supervision of PCA's by PCC's might be restricted so that PCA's would become unsound in credit policies to a point of jeopardizing the Government's and the farmers' capital in their associations.

E. Effect of section 307 on operations of Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

Although not making loans now, the corporation will need ample administration expense funds for the collection of outstanding farmers' loans, some of which mature each year for the next 20 years. The amount necessary varies widely with crop and price conditions and requires the flexibility provided in the basic law.

ANALYSIS OF SECTION 308

Section 308 would place the central and regional banks for cooperatives which are mixed ownership corporations, under the limitations outlined under A above. True, the present law does not provide an adequate basis whereby the farmers' cooperatives—the borrowers—can acquire eventual ownership. But these cooperatives desire the law to be amended so that they can eventually own these banks and assume the responsibility and authority for their operations under general supervision of the Government.

Present basic laws authorize these banks to make loans only to farmers' cooperative marketing associations, farmers' purchasing associations, and farmers' business service enterprises.

Until fiscal year authorizations were approved, no firm loan commitments could be made to borrower associations for the seasonal marketing of farm commodities, for providing fertilizer, seeds, feeds, and other farm supplies, or for rendering farm business services such as those of mutual irrigation associations, freezer locker plants, etc.

Intermediate or long-term financing of from 1 to 3 years or long-term financing running for a long period of years—for processing, storing, and other facilities—would be hazardous because of the uncertainty of future seasonal operating and commodity and facility loans required.

Farmers, and their cooperative enterprises, would hesitate to invest their money in the capital of the banks if these restrictions were present. The life of the banks and their usefulness would be too uncertain. Plans are being made for submitting amendments to the present laws in order that this ownership may become realistic. Placing the banks under the proposed restrictions would not permit borrowers to assume responsibility and authority in operating the banks which they would demand if they put in the funds to own the banks eventually as is their present long-time objective.

GENERAL

Sections 307 and 308 reverse a 30-year trend of congressional action which has pointed toward ownership and control of these Farm Credit institutions by their users—the farmers and farmers' cooperatives. The proposed limitations, restrictions, and controls of sections 307 and 308 can lead only to the Treasury as the source for all lending funds instead of leading toward the goal of complete capitalization by farmers.

We therefore request your cooperation in having sections 307 and 308 stricken from the Government's corporations appropriation bill, H. R. 3756, now in conference.

Respectfully yours,

A. S. GOSS,
Master, National Grange.
CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.
JOHN H. DAVIS,
Executive Secretary, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

Government Buying of Wheat and Flour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, if Uncle Sam's busy bureaucrats continue buying wheat and flour out of all proportion to the Nation's needs and the simple economics of the situation, you are going to see housewives paying from 3 to 5 cents more per loaf for bread in the near future.

Bakers of the country are today warning that the Federal Government is making price increases in bread inevitable. Here is a quotation from the market pages of newspapers Tuesday:

Grain futures made a strong spurt at the start of trading today. * * * Wheat climbed as much as 4 cents a bushel on buying and short covering influenced by the Government's increases of 15 and 20 cents per hundredweight in its flour buying price for export.

We have heard a lot of talk recently about what causes high prices in America. Much of the talk has been sheer demagoguery, particularly that which attempted to make people believe that the OPA or some other Government agency could hold the line against inflation. Even now there are some who tell us that we can feed and finance Europe and can maintain extraordinary Government expenditures and still have lower prices.

The fact that Uncle Sams's bureaucrats are in the market shopping for wheat and flour, is running the price out of sight, although there is the greatest amount of wheat being harvested in the history of man. It seems incredible that Government should choose this time when wheat prices are the highest in years, to get into the market and bid prices higher, causing further inflation.

President Truman should do something about this. Otherwise he must take full responsibility for high prices. What his bureaucrats do surely cannot be laid to the Republicans.

Too Strong Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Thomas L. Stokes that appeared in the Washington News of July 24, 1947, as follows:

TOO-STRONG GERMANY?

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The campaign going on in behalf of building a strong internal German economy, while employing some surface logic, arouses doubts and suspicion.

This is especially true in the case of anyone who has explored in recent years—before, during and since the war—the devious activities and influences of the German big-business cartelists, their methods of creating the Nazi war machine, and their tie-ups with powerful industrial and financial interests all over the world, including our own country.

Not so many months ago evidence was presented to the House by former Representative Jerry Voorhis, of California, that cartel directors continued during the war their relations with outside interests through channels in neutral countries, that they sequestered and protected their resources, and were in a position to return to power again.

Today, it is indicated, they are in a strong position and again influential, both in Germany and outside, despite the purposes of the Potsdam agreement and despite the round-up of some important cartel leaders for the trial now going on in the United States zone. Missing at the bar of justice, though, are some of the more powerful figures.

France's recent representations to us against a policy that would give Germany a dominant position in Europe again should give us pause. While France naturally is highly sensitive to a strong Germany, this also should provide a clue to a situation that affects us as well as other nations.

The campaign in this country for building up the German economy to a strength plainly not contemplated by the Potsdam agreement seemingly has gathered considerable headway.

The campaign has found fertile ground in the current anti-Russian feeling and the fears aroused over communism. These find an outlet in the idea of building up Germany as a bulwark against Russia, though nobody publicly puts it that bluntly. That idea proved a snare and a delusion to England in the years before World War I, blowing up with an explosion that engulfed the world when Germany turned first on England and France.

The new and changed attitude toward Germany has been a slow and gradual development, but only 2 years after the end of the war it is something rather strange to behold. It easily could lead, especially among powerful economic and financial interests that have international stakes, to the sort of sympathy that was prevalent here among those interests toward the Nazi system not long before World War II.

The reason for this interest, other than a philosophical kinship, was clearly revealed in the numerous investigations in Congress and by the Justice Department that showed the relations of big American interests with German cartels in agreements that divided up markets, pooled patents, and restricted our own production of strategic materials to our disadvantage, as we discovered when war came we had to protect ourselves.

It is dangerous to forget that.

There is somewhere a middle ground between an economically insufficient Germany and a too strong Germany that again would be a threat. It may be hard to find. But it must be found if we are not to make the same mistake that was made after World War I. No selfish interests should be allowed to obscure that vital fact.

The Government's "Snatch" of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 21, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, for obscure and unspecified reasons the President has seen fit to veto the bills (H. R. 2955 and S. 1231) providing for an appraisal and for the reception of bids looking to the sale by the Government of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City. This is the 32-story, narrow-shaft office building purchased only last August. The Government's purchase and retention of this building has aroused angry protests from the people of Kansas City and has actually endangered the businesses of tenants of the property in addition to inflating all other commercial rentals in the downtown area.

The general resentment of the people of Kansas City at the veto of the bill in question is well expressed in the column "It Happened in Kansas City," which appeared in the Kansas City Star on July 20, and in an editorial published in the Kansas City Times on July 19. Under leave heretofore granted, I include at this point in my remarks an excerpt from the column referred to and the entire text of the editorial:

[From It Happened in Kansas City, July 20, 1947, issue of the Kansas City Star]

The President's attempted justification of the Fidelity snatch was kin to the loose thinking that helped muddle our housing. * * * The housing mess was easy to brew. Just a lot of shouting about the sweet little white bungalow for the veteran. And so easy to ignore the really vital, but problem-packed, business of new rental housing. Blame, as we see it, mantles both political camps and just about everybody except the handful who here and elsewhere were trying to get multiple-unit rental projects under way.

Sure the Fidelity buy was a prudent investment on the part of Government, the same as a candy factory cornering a community's supply of sugar, or Mr. Rich trucking the corner butcher's entire stock to his own deep freeze. * * * Already office tenants are paying through the nose for this bit of callous prudence. * * * And with the Government one of the few users of office space in a position to erect new office buildings. * * * A fine time for Uncle to become economy-minded or so belatedly conscious of building costs.

[Editorial from the Kansas City Times of July 19, 1947]

WHY NOT BUILD ITS OWN?

If you assume the Federal Government is obligated to consider the plight of local communities it never should have bought the Fidelity Building in the first place.

Since it was done, the bill sponsored by Representative ALBERT L. REEVES, JR., and Senator JAMES P. KEM offered the best way out of a bad situation.

President Truman gave no specific reason for his veto, so people are left with the impression that it could have been a political shot at REEVES and KEM. The veto doesn't solve the real problem, which deserves some straight thinking both by Congress and the President.

Needed immediately is a Government policy on buildings to fit its program of decentralizing various agencies. The decentralization plan is fine. It should be good for Government and good for the cities that share in it. The Withholding Tax Unit moved to the Pratt & Whitney Building will employ as many persons as a large industrial plant, which is a big thing for Kansas City. The office will be close to the grass roots and away from the influences that were making trouble in the East, so it should be good for Government.

But as long as we have a big Government, it will have to be housed. All can't go to places like Pratt & Whitney. There are only two choices in sight. One is to buy existing property and force out the firms that now occupy it. That is what the Government is doing in the building the Donnelly Garment Co. has occupied for many years. Since the veto the threat comes closer to the tenants of the Fidelity building. And so much office space cannot be squeezed out of Kansas City without squeezing its business future.

The other choice is Government construction to go along with its big operations. From a strictly business standpoint it should be little more expensive for the Government to build than it is to buy. Few Government offices require such an expensive location and structure as the Fidelity building.

Dollars and cents are not the only consideration for the Government. It is obligated to consider the local communities. If it is to protect the cities where its expands it will be forced to build wherever there is no vacant space available. It can't afford to become an unfair competitor in this desperate scramble for office space.

An era of Government office construction is rather frightening. It suggests the old

post office pork barrel on a larger scale. But where is a decent alternative?

The Fidelity building in overcrowded Kansas City should furnish the President and Congress a good illustration of their problem. Until that problem is solved by a definite policy, we would think it would hold back the movement of Federal offices into the building. There is no real reason to hurry with the moving and it wasn't planned as a rush job. Neither does a policy of erecting Government buildings where necessary, require a big rush of construction this year. Just ordinary common sense ought to solve this one.

A Letter on DP's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following letter which I received from an outstanding Georgia citizen who is a former jurist and presently an officer in the Army of the United States:

JULY 15, 1947.

Hon. PRINCE H. PRESTON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Among the many dangers to the American way of life that the postwar adjustment is attempting to impose upon the American people, it is my opinion that the current efforts to secure Congressional action authorizing the admission of 400,000 displaced persons to American refuge and citizenship, is the most serious and far-reaching danger thus far proposed.

I concur fully in the humanitarian aspect involved, and readily agree that some effective measures should be developed, whereby these unfortunate individuals could be given some hope of security and stability for the future, but from my personal experience in dealing with DP's in the occupation of Germany I am thoroughly convinced that mass importation of these people into the already confused, social, and economic life of America would create a danger to the future welfare of America that even the political and economic benefits to this great number of people could not justify.

In the many years that were available for study and planning for the eventual occupation of Germany the serious and important problem of the DP's was not given sufficient consideration to develop a definite program or plan for solution of this problem. It was determined early in the study and planning period that there were approximately 20,000,000 DP's in German-controlled areas, but no definite plan for their care or ultimate repatriation was formulated. Because of this lack of planning many DP's were arbitrarily determined to be citizens of a given country and crowded into trains or trucks and sent there, but in many cases they were not sympathetic with the powers we control, and their ultimate disposition in many cases have been doubtful. The remaining groups of DP's are aware of what has happened in many instances of the bunglesome job of repatriations to which we have been a party and in which either relative or fellow countryman has been a victim.

In addition to this final imprint of unfairness and injustice that has been inflicted upon groups of fellow DP's, there are the impressions and developed characteristics which many years of German enslavement have created in the basic thinking and political purposes of these people. From my observation in dealing with groups of these people, it became positively apparent, that because of their experiences they had lost all concept of the rights of individuals in private ownership of property. They followed a most ruthless and reckless abandon in satisfying their slightest desires by the appropriation of any available article or property regardless of ownership or value. In addition to this loss of a sense of individual right of ownership the life which the average DP's was forced to adapt himself to under German domination has had a decided tendency to destroy his social equilibrium.

There are inherent dangers to the American way of life in the normal concepts of the Europeans and when these difficulties are augmented by indelible concepts and impressions as a result of many years of enslavement and ill treatment, in some instances, but both the country of which he is supposed to be a citizen, and by the country which has been his master. We are inviting reinforced difficulties of assimulative when we voluntarily invite him to become a factor in our already disturbed and confused social and political order. It seems to me to be a completely fallacious and unfounded hope to argue that absorption of DP's by the United States would remove a persistent source of friction with Russia. Since Russia is claiming that all subjects of countries now subject to the Soviet governmental authority are Russian subjects and under obligation to return to such territory, and demanding that we forcibly repatriate the DP's, it seems to me, that for us to evade this demand for repatriation, by offering them refuge as citizens of the United States would aggravate rather than remove a persistent source of friction with Russia.

As has been suggested, it is a dangerous undertaking for America to add 400,000 patent political agitators to the already millions of Americans who have been confused and disturbed, both socially and economically by the consequences of war. There are many problems of readjustment which are still unsolved in America, and unless these problems are solved by distinctly American processes, then their solution presents a definite threat to the American way of life. European political concept has never been able to grasp the fundamental basis of American democracy. Freedom of political expression and submission to the will of a majority is totally foreign to the European understanding of politics. Minorities are always considered menaces, and it is the established political procedure of the European to rid itself of such dangers, and for this reason it has been possible to so easily develop totalitarianism in Europe.

Most of the individuals composing the 400,000 DP's who would seek refuge in the United States are political agitators. That is the reason why they cannot be satisfactorily repatriated. They would create political disturbances wherever they were sent in Europe and would do the same thing if brought to the United States.

Since it is considered of little value to offer criticism without proposing some alternative, constructive solution, I shall try to meet that obligation by proposing what has been my idea of the correct solution of this problem from the time I first began to study it early in 1944. My experiences in dealing with large groups of D. P.'s during 1945, confirmed my conviction in this solution of the problem. After World War I there were large groups of people who were never repatriated, but who were wards of the Geneva Conference and people without a country. These were so few in comparison to the numbers now that there can be no possibility of making these wards of the UN, but these people should and must have the opportunities of citizenship and a chance to work out of this chaos a future for themselves and their children. My idea of the solution for this problem is for the United Nations Organization to establish a separate and independent state under direct supervision of UNO as a permanent national home for all D. P.'s who are unwilling to claim citizenship in their original state, and for those who are unable to establish their citizenship. It will, in my opinion, be a great deal more economical for the United States to bear its share of the cost of this procedure through UNO, than to assume the risk and responsibility of attempting to absorb them into American citizenship.

Very truly yours,

LEROY COWART,
Lieutenant Colonel, AUS.

Keeping Gold Price Officially Low Retards Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the gold miners in this country have long contended that the price of gold should be increased. The gold mining industry is the only industry in this Nation with but one customer for its product, with the customer—the United States Treasury—fixing the price. It is not only justice to the gold miners to raise the price but it will make good sense economically here and abroad. I wish to call the attention of the House to the following article in the July 21, 1947, issue of Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly by John E. Kelly in which he forcefully points out the beneficial effects on international trade of paying for gold what its actually worth in a free market:

UNITED STATES COULD RAISE QUOTATION TO FREE-MARKET VALUE AND THE WORLD TRADE

(By John E. Kelly)

Maintenance of a fictitious gold quotation threatens to precipitate an international monetary crisis, and cripple or halt our export trade. For this reason, this Nation should resolutely defy the tearful plea of M. Camille Gutt that the signatories of the International Monetary Fund veto the law of supply and demand. We should revalue gold in the $52–$60 an ounce range.

Currently, American exports are running at over $16,000,000,000 per annum, while imports total only about half that. To make up the balance, foreign buyers must increase their shipments to this market, pay with their fast dwindling stock of United States dollars or gold, or hope for further American loans.

Since few items of overseas manufacture can compete in our home markets and foreign luxury goods are meeting with increasing buyer resistance, proposals recently emanating from official sources, among such the Secretary of Commerce, suggest that the gap between export and import totals be narrowed by the importation of much greater amounts of alien raw materials, principally minerals. But attempts to dump here vast quantities of ores and metals would endanger the domestic mining industry and meet with the determined opposition of the potent congressional delegations of the Western States.

GOLD HOLDINGS TOO SMALL

When a foreign nation wishes to acquire more American goods than it sells here it

must first secure dollars to buy the excess. Dollars are to be had for gold, the universally accepted medium of international settlement. But the hard fact is that the world beyond our borders has too little gold—at $35 per ounce—to continue to buy American goods at our present rate of overseas shipment. Already the shortage of dollars has forced several foreign governments to restrict the importation of American products. As the gold and dollar scarcity increases abroad, United States exports will be hampered or prohibited to a degree causing repercussions in every American factory. It is this peril, not a slackening in domestic buying power, that will bring about a recession, if one comes.

It is obvious that if gold were revalued at $70 per ounce in terms of paper dollars, foreign buyers could pay for twice as much American goods as they do today. Gold as a commodity is worth what it will bring, no more, and certainly no less. In the free markets of the world which perturb M. Gutt, gold sells at from $39 to $80 per ounce, with prices firming upward. The list is long: Mexico, Peru, Stockholm, Buenos Aires, Brussels, Paris, Toronto, Athens, Bucharest, Bombay, Cairo, Chungking, Tangier, Istanbul, Rome, Lisbon, Beirut, Santiago. Even in New York, despite harsh legal penalties threatening private possessors of gold, it is $39 an ounce.

The new Indian Government maintains the market at $70 per ounce; the Attlee regime has just announced that it may be compelled to permit a free market in London. An eminent Canadian authority estimates that the British market would open at 250 to 270 shillings, or in the range $50 to $55 (United States). President James D. Mooney, of Willys-Overland, with an unexcelled experience as head of General Motors Export Corp., also calls for a free auction of gold to determine the true value of paper currencies, and estimates gold's value in today's dollars at about $60 per ounce. A prominent Canadian gold producer, McIntyre-Porcupine Mines, has stock-piled ingots worth $5,700,000, about 90 percent of its 1946 output, to await the higher prices which its directors consider imminent. Despite her desperate financial status, Britain is hoarding gold, outbidding us for South African metal. Canada also is increasing her reserves.

INFLATION WORLD-WIDE

Gold is not priced upward. As the measure and yardstick of value, it marks the fluctuations of paper money. All the world's currencies today, save only the Swiss franc, which is redeemable in gold on demand, suffer from chronic inflation. The paper dollars, guilders, crowns, pounds, francs (French), lira, etc., are inflated because so many of them were paid for things that no longer exist, the expendables, wastage, and loss of war. The buying power of the American dollar is about 60 cents in terms of productivity and value received.

A major error in the Bretton Woods plan which, unless promptly rectified, will prevent European rehabilitation and render even the Marshall plan unproductive of permanent stability, was the freezing of the world's paper currencies at their inflated wartime levels, or at the nominal values set by the signatory nations. These claimed values were fictitious then; they are even more unrealistic today as inflation increases while world need grows and production stalls. The Bretton Woods plan in inception and execution was largely the work of the late Lord Keynes, but the cheap gold figure of $35 was due to the insistence of the United States.

THE SHOE PINCHES

With our 60-cent dollar, we export a $1,200 motortruck priced at $2,000 and pay $4 for wines or perfumes worth $2.40 or less. If the totals of imports and exports were substantially the same, this mutual overpricing would be comparatively unimportant, but when our customers must pay in gold for half their purchases—and the United States will accept that gold only at $35—the shoe pinches until the sufferer soon cannot walk.

After every great war, currency devaluation has been necessary to write off part of the loss of real values by fire, looting, property destruction, use in munitions, etc. Ancient kings devalued their currency by clipping bits from the silver coins, while maintaining their face value by decree. Nations ignoring this truism have experienced sharp lessons in economic law. In 1946 Sweden and Canada, two of the most solvent powers, raised their currencies in terms of United States dollars. Their motives differed, but the result was the same. Canadians and Swedes could then buy American goods more cheaply, but their products were higher priced to us, further unbalancing international trade. Gold and dollars flowed out of the two countries at such a rate that their governments became, tardily, alarmed and placed restrictions upon imports.

The British pound is pegged, officially, at $4.04, but it brings only $2.90 on the free market, a measure of its acceptability. It is said that among the unwritten clauses of the recent British loan was London's guaranty to maintain the higher quotation. Yet Ernest Bevin has truly said England must export or die and the greatest efforts, coupled with rationing severer than in wartime, have proven unable to lift British export totals above those of the depression year 1937. With the pound at $4, British goods are too expensive for John Bull's traditional markets. Early next year the American and Canadian loans, designed to last until 1951 and set Britain back on her feet, will be exhausted. Then or before London must cut the pound to increase her foreign sales. Signs that despite American opposition the time of devaluation is nearing, include the London free market trial balloon previously mentioned and the action of India and Egypt, with large sterling credit balances, in cutting their currency tie to the pound and adhering to the dollar. If the British devalue, every other European exporting nation must follow suit. We could not remain aloof from a general devaluation, whether it took the form of a scuttling race or orderly multilateral agreement.

LITTLE EFFECT ON US

Despite the fulminations of die-hard New Deal economists, wedded to a managed currency and detesting the gold standards and all its safeguards, devaluation of our paper money would have little if any perceptible effect within our frontiers. No appreciable change in the domestic price index was definitely attributable to the gold price increase from $20.67 to $35 in 1934.

In our export trade, the effect of a dollar with the water squeezed out, would be definitely beneficial. The seller in the U. S. A. would still get $2,000 for his motor truck, but the foreign buyer would need only as much gold as buys $1,200 today. Hence he could buy more and oftener, become a better customer, and contribute importantly to his country's rehabilitation, which is the aim and end of all international planning, official and private.

Price Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Amherst (Va.) New Era-Progress, of July 17, 1947:

WASTE OF TIME

President Truman might as well have saved his breath as to have expended it in a plea against further price increases as a result of the wage boosts granted miners. Despite the President's urging, you can be sure that ere long that wage increase is going to be reflected in the price of everything you buy which contains steel, and unfortunately by the time the cycle of increases gets down to Mr. and Mrs. John Public, the increase is going to be vastly out of line with what the miners received.

This is a situation which just naturally follows as the night the day and talking isn't going to do any good. It will not be many months before John L. Lewis will be leveling a finger at the charts and bellowing that his miners must have another wage increase.

We don't know where it will all end, or when, but we do know this: The American miner will live to curse the name of John L. Lewis as he praises it today. The mine boss is the miners' hero today, but he is driving more and more individuals and industries to seek other means of heat than coal. The day is not far distant when oil, natural gas, and hydroelectric power will have supplanted in a large measure the use of coal. And then where will our miners be?

The coal market is too unstable—too vastly uncertain as to anything except rising costs and threats of work stoppages. If it continues thus there can be only one answer, the answer the American people have given before. They will find a substitute.

Midyear Economic Report—Campaign Document

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, now that the President's Midyear Economic Report has been in the hands of the people long enough to be studied and analyzed, it is regrettable that the administration has seen fit to distort the facts in order to serve their political ends. Many able observers classify the report as a campaign document. Thus, as has been the case for 14 years, tax money is used to promote a political campaign.

David Lawrence, in the Evening Star yesterday, heads his column "United States economic report seen adulterated by political puff," and to quote part of his article:

Some splendid statements of economic reasoning are to be found in the Midyear Economic Report submitted by President Truman to Congress, but unfortunately someone at the White House has interspersed just enough political argument, designed presumably for the 1948 campaign, to adulterate the whole document.

It is unfortunate that Congress has not passed legislation requiring that the report of the nonpolitical economic advisers appointed under the Full Employment Act be transmitted to Congress unedited by the White House politicians. Such a step would be constructive and would add immeasurably to the respect with which these reports would be received in the future.

It is high time we have honesty in government. The Government demands

honesty of the people under penalty of fine or imprisonment; if you falsify your tax return, severe punishment awaits you. The people have equal right to demand and receive honest treatment on the part of governmental officials, but from what we have experienced from these administration reports we know well what to expect from the committee the President has set up to ascertain if we can continue dumping billions of dollars all over the world.

We have every reason to expect that as far as the report will be concerned Uncle Sam may just as well fill his fountain pen and get out his checkbook. The cheating and deception of the American people on the part of Government agents has been the all-American pastime for the past dozen years.

Marshall Plan: What Price for France?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Carlyle Morgan which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, July 23, 1947, as follows:

MARSHALL PLAN: WHAT PRICE FOR FRANCE?

(By Carlyle Morgan)

A while ago it might have seemed less important. But it is important now. France is keenly dissatisfied—it would not be too much to say disquieted—by the way American diplomatists are developing United States policy in Europe.

Any reader of French newspapers over the last week end knows that. And Premier Ramadier did not even bother to insinuate the French discontent between the lines of his speech to the socialist federation the other day. He stated it as frankly as possible.

There was a time when American diplomatists might have dismissed the French attitude with a shrug. That time was passing while Secretary Marshall was making a now-famous speech at the Harvard commencement on June 5. Shortly afterward, France became the key continental ally of the United States for application of the Marshall plan to Europe.

French refusal to cooperate would stymie American efforts to build a wall of European prosperity against the advance of communism. The French do not threaten to refuse cooperation. But there are factors in the French equation which could make France unable to cooperate.

Washington seems to be giving these all too little attention. The most outstanding piece of evidence of this neglect is the new directive issued to American occupation authorities in Germany. Now it may be said for the directive itself that it only brings rules into line with actual practice in the American zone. It may be said that a change of emphasis as between controlling German industry and building it up was needed. Nevertheless, the timing of the directive gave it a sharp side.

It was issued just after the Paris conference of 16 nations under British-French sponsorship had come to a successful conclusion. This conference met to take steps toward putting the Marshall plan into operation. The British and French, having taken a lead in setting up committees to study Europe's needs, are now informed by the American directive that in any plan to rehabilitate Europe, the United States will insist that German rehabilitation be given a leading place.

There is no doubt that Germany will have an important place in European recovery. But the question is one of priority. For the immediate future, American plans seem to the French to envisage a program for German recovery, which will deprive France of German coal so that Germans can use it to make steel. At the same time, the Soviet reaction to the Marshall plan means that Polish coal will stay in eastern Europe. Therefore, France, by cooperating in the Marshall plan, might deprive herself of coal from both sources.

Looked at over the perspective of say 15 or 20 years, American plans seem in French eyes to risk the building up of an expanded steel industry in Germany while France gets along as best she can. This is a matter of French security. On this the French will speak out.

There is one way that maximum French energies may be enlisted in a European recovery plan under American auspices. It is to make the program harmonious with French security needs vis-à-vis Germany. If the Marshall plan can be based on that foremost consideration of French politics, economics—yes, survival—then Communist opposition to it in France will have to be careful, to say the least.

Washington policy at the moment seems to be contributing less than nothing to the solution of this French problem. It is asking France, with a big Communist Party, not only to oppose communism but to do it through methods opposed to the general French sense of national security.

The result, so far, is to produce echoes in France of one of Mr. Molotov's statements at Paris. But not only in France, in Britain, too, and from Mr. Bevin himself. These echoes are to the effect that Germany ought not to be singled out for special attention ahead of the victims of German aggression.

It is doubtful if Mr. Molotov makes this point as seriously as he seems to, in view of Russian reparation demands for German steel which would result in a great expansion of German steel making. It is doubtful that Mr. Bevin would agree exactly with the French as to where to draw the line on rehabilitation of Germany.

But what the French think is clear enough, and matters enough at the moment, to warrant the special attention of American policy makers.

Settled Labor Benefits Factory at James Lees & Sons Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Rockbridge County News, Lexington, Va., of July 17, 1947:

SETTLED LABOR BENEFITS FACTORY AT JAMES LEES & SONS CO.

(By Helen Henley)

GLASGOW, VA.—When big business came to Glasgow, a town of 1,050 people hidden away in the valley of Virginia, where the Alleghenies and the Blue Ridge Mountains meet, it made no effort to industrialize the community.

Instead, industry ruralized itself.

In so doing, it has developed a pattern of democratic living and working which not only has caused the business to prosper but also has enriched the everyday lives of the people who do the work.

James Lees & Sons Co., maker of carpet and hand-knitting yarns for the past 100 years, has written industrial history in its 13 years of operation in Glasgow, but at the same time, an even more engrossing story has been recorded in the lives of the people who inhabited the valley long before the Lees' experts discovered it.

It takes Wert Faulkner, General Manager of the Glasgow plant and a native of the area, to tell this story. The other executives of the company are his friends, the workers in the plant are his lifelong friends and neighbors, and no one knows more intimately than he what goes on behind the scenes in the modern 17-acre factory tucked in among the Virginia mountains. He knows intimately, too, the lives that go on in the workers' homes scattered throughout the valley.

"Every executive in this company," Mr. Faulkner told me, "is imbued with the fact that the people are the most important thing in the mills. You can't make a quality product without quality people. That's why, in seeking a site for the new mill 13 years ago, the company looked not only for the necessary three R's—rivers, roads, and railroads—but looked first for the people who could do the job."

In the course of the search, 99 sites were surveyed, and here in Rockbridge County was found the largest percentage of native-born families in any of the counties investigated.

"We were looking for people who had sunk their roots in the county and loved it—people whose integrity was unquestioned, who sent their children to school, and who went to church," Mr. Faulkner explained.

When Earl B. Morgan, now vice president, but at that time general manager, offered him a position 13 years ago, Mr. Faulkner was assistant football manager at Virginia Military Institute, his own alma mater. He said that he didn't know much about business then, but as a native of the State, he did know the people of the valley. He accepted the job of personnel manager and thus became the first employee.

Workers for the mills were recruited with great care, because the company had no wish to throw off balance the normal agricultural pursuits of the area. If a farmer had four sons, Mr. Faulkner explained, jobs were not offered to all of them. The farmer was asked, "Do you want your boys to work in the plant?" He might reply that he could spare two of the boys, but needed the others to keep the farm going.

Thus, it was worked out with each family which of their members should work in the mills.

"We believe in people living on farms," Mr. Faulkner said. "Then the worker is sure of his eggs, his hog meat, and his butter, and is always taken care of. The money he earns in the plant can go to improve his home."

"These workers are individualists," he went on. "They're accustomed to running their own farms and businesses, and our biggest job was to teach them mill procedure. The average worker, a farmer, was used to getting up very early, feeding his horses, having his breakfast, in getting out into the fields by sun-up. After lunch, he rested awhile, then went back to the fields. If a neighbor came by, he'd stop and chat with him as long as the neighbor would linger.

"In the plant, at first, he reacted much the same way. If a neighbor strolled by, he just naturally stopped his loom and devoted himself to visiting."

Although in these respects, it was necessary for the people to learn new ways of conduct,

the problem was pretty well solved when the piecework plan was adopted. Once the first shiny new automobile bought with the worker's earnings made its appearance, Mr. Faulkner recalls, the problem of work interruptions vanished. On piecework, employees have no trouble assessing for themselves the good results of sticking to the job.

When a young man takes his first job with the company, Mr. Faulkner says, they tell him:

"We are putting you in business. We are putting you on a loom. We pay for the loom, and for insurance for you, and we've set up a cafeteria where you can eat. We are going to buy your carpet. You wouldn't sell us bad potatoes or a bad watermelon. Now don't sell us a bad carpet."

As an incentive to careful workmanship, each loom in the plant displays in large letters the slogan, "Quality first, then yardage."

Manufacturing and Exhibiting in Foreign Trade Zones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Representative ELLSWORTH B. BUCK, of New York and myself on amendment to the Foreign Trade Zones Act:

REPRESENTATIVES BUCK AND CELLER INTRODUCE AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN TRADE ZONES ACT—WOULD PERMIT MANUFACTURING AND EXHIBITING IN FOREIGN TRADE ZONES

Representatives ELLSWORTH B. BUCK, Republican, New York, and EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York, today introduce into the House identical bills to extend the Celler Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934 to permit exhibition and manufacture in foreign trade zones.

This legislation was introduced at this time in order that persons and groups interested in foreign trade may have an opportunity to express their views of these extensions of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act in anticipation of hearings to be held at the next session of Congress.

Under the 1934 act, foreign trade zones were established in New York in 1937 and in New Orleans this year. Applications for permits to establish similar zones in San Francisco, Houston, and San Juan, P. R., have been received by the Federal Foreign Trade Zones Board. Other ports undertaking surveys preliminary to applying for grants are Los Angeles, Seattle, Laredo, and Norfolk. Should the extensions provided for in this amendatory legislation be enacted, it is anticipated that other ports of entry having airports, including those in the interior of the country, will seriously consider the establishment of zones in their area.

ZONES DEFINED

Foreign-trade zones are areas within a port of entry containing warehouse facilities, steamship piers and/or rail connections set apart from the remainder of the port by unscalable walls or fencing, floodlights, and guards. In these segregated zone areas, which by law are divorced from custom territory, merchandise in foreign trade may be stored, manipulated, and transshipped free of the duties, taxes, quotas, licenses, Government inspection, bonds, and similar encumbrances imposed on like articles in customs territory. In the event foreign merchandise in a zone is imported into customs territory, it then becomes subject to the laws and regulations of the United States affecting imported merchandise.

Congress in passing the Celler Foreign Trade Zone Act of 1934 joined the United States in the ranks of other countries that had given consideration to the problems of world commerce and had set apart greater or lesser waterfront areas for its accommodation and exercise of privileges. The American law differs in some respects from those of most other countries in that it is permissive in character and in that it withholds from foreign commerce a number of privileges that logically could have been expected to be within the rights and field of such commerce?

The proposed changes in the act of 1934 which are set forth in the Celler-Buck bill have been designed to extend the rights of foreign commerce consistent with the proper protection of the revenue and the economy of the Nation. They are based on the principle that merchandise in foreign trade has the right to expect every practical freedom from the time it is exported from the country of origin to the moment when it is formally imported into the country of ultimate destination—all intermediate countries at which such goods touch have no real right to do more than protect their own security and revenue

These zones such as have been established in New York and New Orleans attract new commerce to this country, thus generating additional cargo for American ships, new opportunities for labor and industry, and more business for our banks and insurance carriers.

EXHIBITION AUTHORIZED

The Buck-Celler bills would permit exhibition now prohibited in zones. This liberalization of the act would allow the organization and holding of international trade fairs and exhibits at foreign-trade zones. The success of such fairs in European cities in encouraging the commerce and industry of the country is well known. Already New York, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Chicago have taken steps to establish international trade marts. The Department of Commerce and its Secretary, who is also Chairman of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, have advocated the holding of such fairs in this country. Whether through fairs or through modest exhibitions of single consignees, the advantages that foreign-trade zones would offer through such exhibitions would be duty- and tax-free consignments, both of samples and stocks; convenient locations for exhibitors and customers in the American Hemisphere; relatively low cost to exhibitors; inducement to the relocation of world commodity markets from their prewar European centers; an opportunity for domestic as well as foreign products to present their advantages to buyers from many countries; the increased potential of ports of entry in which foreign-trade zones are located to become world trade centers with all the concomitant material and prestige benefits.

MANUFACTURE PERMITTED

The Buck and Celler bills would also authorize manufacturing operations within zones to provide additional advantages to American manufacturers and exporters in foreign markets.

In and of itself, the value of allowing manufacture is attested by the very considerable manufacturing for export markets normally undertaken in this country with imported materials. The long history of the drawback privilege is a partial reflection of this section of foreign commerce. The shorter history of the bonded manufacturing warehouse is still another indication of its importance. All too often, however, American manufacturers and exporters have pointed out that the complexities, restrictions, and delays inherent in the drawback and bonded manufacturing warehouse procedures have so discouraged the manufacturer that he either pays the duty on his imported raw materials and absorbs this amount in his costs or he does not enter the foreign field at all. By extending the Celler Foreign Trade Zones Act to permit manufacturing in foreign trade zones, this important segment of our economy will be enabled to benefit from expanded foreign opportunities and to meet competition from other world areas.

The bills also provide for certain administrative changes of benefit to American foreign traders and inducements to the encouragement and expedition of foreign commerce through American ports.

The text of the bill follows:

"A bill to amend sections 3, 4, 9, and 14 of the act of June 18, 1934, relating to the establishment of foreign-trade zones

"SEC. 3. Foreign and domestic merchandise of every description, except such as is prohibited by law as malum per se, may, without being subject to the laws of the United States affecting imports, except as otherwise provided in this act, be brought into a zone and may be stored, sold, exhibited, broken up, repacked, assembled, distributed, sorted, graded, cleaned, mixed with foreign or domestic merchandise, or otherwise manipulated, or be manufactured, and be exported, or laden on foreign carriers and domestic carriers engaged in the foreign, noncontiguous, and intercoastal trades as supplies and equipment, and foreign merchandise may be sent into customs territory of the United States therefrom, in the original package or otherwise; but when foreign merchandise is so sent from a zone into customs territory of the United States it shall be subject to the laws and regulations of the United States affecting imported merchandise: *Provided*, That whenever the privilege shall be requested the collector of customs shall take under supervision any lot or part of a lot of foreign merchandise in a zone, cause it to be appraised and taxes determined and duties liquidated thereon. Thereafter it may be sorted, manipulated, or manufactured under the supervision and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and whether mixed or manufactured with domestic merchandise or not may be sent into customs territory upon the payment of such liquidated duties and determined taxes thereon in the proportion that such foreign merchandise is contained in the entered article together with the tax on the entered article, if any, or, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, may be exported, destroyed, or returned to the status of nonsupervised merchandise in the zone. Where two or more products result from the manufacture or production of merchandise in a zone the liquidated duties and determined taxes shall be distributed to the several products in accordance with their relative value at the time of separation: *Provided further*, That subject to such regulations respecting identity and the safeguarding of the revenue as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary, articles, the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States, on which all internal revenue taxes have been paid, if subject thereto, and articles previously imported on which duty and/or tax has been paid, or which have been admitted free of duty and tax, may be taken into a zone from the customs territory of the United States, placed under the supervision of the collector, and whether or not they have been combined with or made part while in such zone, of other articles may be brought back thereto free of restrictions, duty, or tax, other than such tax as may be levied on them because of their changed condition; except that articles subject to internal revenue tax may not be returned for

domestic consumption if manufactured or produced entirely with the use of domestic materials taken into a zone under this proviso: *Provided further*, That if in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury their identity has been lost such articles not entitled to free entry by reason of noncompliance with the requirements made hereunder by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be treated when they reenter customs territory of the United States as foreign merchandise under the provisions of the tariff laws and internal revenue laws in force at that time: *Provided further*, That under rules and regulations of controlling agencies, articles may be transferred to a zone with the status of merchandise not supervised and such a transfer shall be considered to be exportation within the meaning of all Federal laws including drawback, refunds, export bonds, general order, excise, the Federal Security Agency, and the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That domestic merchandise subject to excise but which, by reason of transfer to a zone in accordance with the fourth proviso of this section, has not paid such tax shall not be used in the manufacture or production of articles for return to customs territory: *Provided further*, That articles produced or manufactured in a zone and exported therefrom shall on subsequent importation into the customs territory of the United States be subject to the duty and internal revenue tax, if any, applicable to like articles manufactured in a foreign country; except that articles not subject to internal revenue tax, produced or manufactured in a zone exclusively with the use of domestic merchandise, the identity of which has been maintained in accordance with the second proviso of this section, may on such importation be entered as American goods returned: *Provided further*, That rectification, blending, reduction of proof, bottling, and other manipulations or manufactures of distilled spirits, wines, fermented and brewed malt liquors shall be permitted in a zone; except that distillation of spirits, fermentation of wines, or brewing of malt liquors shall not be permitted in a zone. If domestic taxable ingredients are used in rectification, the product, if imported into customs territory from a zone or elsewhere, shall be subject to the domestic rectification tax, if any: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of the income tax laws applicable to now resident aliens, merchandise in a zone for any purpose whatsoever, and the sale thereof in a zone, shall be considered to be outside of the United States.

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury shall assign to the zone the necessary customs officers and guards to protect the revenue and to provide for the admission of foreign merchandise into customs territory. The operator of a zone shall pay all compensation of port patrol officers assigned to work exclusively in the zone, all compensation other than basic salaries for services performed at the request of the operator by other customs employees so assigned, and all customs expenses in the zone other than basic salaries.

"SEC. 9. The Board shall have exclusive jurisdiction over zones and all matters pertaining thereto, except as otherwise provided in this act, and no agency of State or local governments may claim or exercise jurisdiction over articles in a zone for tax, license, or control purposes. However, the Board shall cooperate with the State, subdivision, and municipality in which the zone is located in the exercise of their police, sanitary, and other powers in and in connection with the free zone. It shall also cooperate with the United States Customs Service, the United States Internal Revenue Service, the Post Office Department, the Public Health Service, the Bureau of Immigration, and such other Federal agencies as have jurisdiction in ports of entry described in section 2.

"SEC. 14. Each zone shall be operated as a public utility, and all rates and charges for all services or privileges within the zone shall be fair and reasonable, and the grantee shall afford to all who may apply for the use of the zone and its facilities and appurtenances uniform treatment under like conditions, subject to such treaties or commercial conventions as are now in force or may hereafter be made from time to time by the United States with foreign governments."

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing a letter from the Honorable A. P. Campbell, treasurer of the Shenandoah Valley Electric Cooperative, of Dayton, Va., which is in compliance with my request for information on the rural electrification in his area.

Mr. Campbell has made an outstanding success with the Shenandoah Valley Electric Cooperative, and through his fine service and constant consideration for those in rural areas, many, many hundreds now enjoy light who once were sentenced to darkness.

The letter follows:

SHENANDOAH VALLEY
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
Dayton, Va., July 3, 1947.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RIVERS: It was a real pleasure to have your letter of June 25 on my desk when I returned from a few days of leave of absence from the office. I am always glad to hear from any Member of Congress relative to the rural-electrification program that has been put on for the upbuilding of the lives of the rural citizens and the grand joy and comfort that it brings to those who have the privilege of enjoying it at the place where they are satisfied.

The greatest contribution that could be made to the rural-electrification program, also to other consumers, would be the development of our water power so that Virginia and North Carolina, especially Virginia, could enjoy a better rate than we now have. At the present time there are few hydro developments in Virginia under consideration. We trust some of the projects that have now been started will be developed without delay, especially at least one hydro development that we could compare with the rates we now have. I understand the Gaithrite Dam has an appropriation of $40,000 for engineering on this project. This dam could be put in without destroying a large number of acres of farming land as it is between two mountains.

The Buggs Island Dam, no doubt you are familiar with this, and know the progress that is being made for the development of this project. We would be delighted to know that you are a strong supporter of this kind of development.

No doubt you are aware of the unfair and underhanded methods the power companies are using to deny the citizens of our grand country the low rate of current that could be enjoyed by them.

We are enclosing a clipping from the July issue of Rural Virginia published at Blackstone, Va., by the Virginia REA Association. This will give you some evidence as to how the power companies are using innocent people to promote their interests, if it would be honest to give them the doubt of sincerity.

We wish you the best of success in your endeavors. Any time I can be of some assistance I would be glad to hear from you. If any information comes into this office that would be of some value to you I would be only too glad to send it to you.

Sincerely yours,

A. P. CAMPBELL,
Treasurer.

The Real Reason Why We Have a Shortage of Tin Plate in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the tin-plate shortage in the United States has been a source of economic concern for thousands of small businessmen during the past several years and is growing more acute each day. Yet, despite the seriousness of the situation, there has been no definite steps taken to remedy the situation.

Small manufacturers are still at the mercy of the export program and have been driven to the verge of bankruptcy because of a shortage of tin plate and inability to maintain production.

At this point I should like to read a letter from one of the manufacturers in my congressional district in which he aptly sizes up the current tin-plate situation. For obvious reasons, I have refrained from identifying the firm. The letter is as follows:

JUNE 17, 1947.

The Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Wall Street Journal article attached to this letter is ample evidence of why there is a tin plate shortage in this country.

We, as a small company, have no chance to compete with the large can companies for favors from Congress or the bureaucratic bodies and agencies, the result being that the can companies got a green light on tin plate to make enough tin cans to can everything that could be canned—dog food, beer, tobacco, in addition to foodstuffs. The foodstuffs are now going to spoil because we canned three times what we can use. We, therefore, not only waste food but we have put thousands of men out of work who could have used the same steel that went into cans to make meters, pipes, automobiles, freight cars, ice boxes, and the thousand and one other items that are in short supply.

We brought Mexican laborers into California to help can the surplus. We used gas, electricity, and coal in the canning process, while other industries were being closed down for lack of steel, lack of gas, lack of coal, and last winter people actually froze because of lack of gas and coal to heat their homes.

The steel companies knew when they were furnishing tin plate for cans that more food was being canned than could possibly be used. The can companies knew it and now want a subsidy to ship the cans to Europe so they can keep on expanding their can-making facilities.

The cheapest thing and best thing for all is, if necessary, let the fruit and food rot, paying the farmer if necessary. This would stop

the necessity for bringing Mexicans into the country, stop the waste of gas, electricity, coal, and steel. If we stop using these items in can business, there will be more steel available for the items in short supply for housing, heating homes, supplying freight cars, pipe lines, and electric power lines which we are now told, next winter, will put thousands out of work.

We have been told by our local power company that we must work our people nights because they can't supply us with power. We have been told not to buy any more equipment because they cannot supply the power.

The gas companies tell us they will be short of gas again next winter and not to add any gas load.

Are we still going to allow steel companies and can companies to use gas for making tin plate for can companies to make into tin cans and food processers to use gas and power to can food which we don't need and allow people to freeze, go without homes, or go without heat after they get their homes because there is no steel for furnaces, pipe lines, and meters to supply them with heat?

Things are sure in a mess when big business, the steel companies, the can companies, and the big food processors want a subsidy while our own people are thrown out of work, left homeless, and to freeze this winter.

Very truly yours.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include in my remarks the following article written by William Parker, staff correspondent of the Wall Street Journal, and which appeared in the issue of July 10, 1947.

Following Mr. Parker's article, I am calling attention to the column written on July 12, 1947, by Frederick C. Othman, Staff Correspondent of the United Press, and which has appeared in many newspapers throughout the Nation.

Mr. Parker's article is as follows:

NEW UNITED STATES HAND-OUTS?—CANNERS ASK SUBSIDY TO HELP SELL SURPLUS FOODS TO OVERSEAS MARKETS—MUST OFFER BARGAIN PRICES TO COMPETE WITH GRAINS; STOCKS PILE UP IN UNITED STATES—SOME SUPPORT IN CONGRESS

(By William Parker)

WASHINGTON.—United States consumers may be forking over tax money before the year is out to keep their own grocery bills high.

This paradoxical situation will arise if the administration decides to place an export bounty on canned foods which become so plentiful that prices begin to slip. Sentiment is growing in the Department of Agriculture for such a program to bolster the prices of some foods which are already becoming surplus.

The scheme is getting support on Capitol Hill. Meeting today, at the call of several Congressmen from areas where food canning is important, are representatives of the canning industry and the Agriculture and State Departments.

Among the farm products which might be immediate candidates for this sort of Federal hand-out are a number of canned vegetables like peas, beans, and sweetpotatoes; some canned fruits; and such dried fruits as raisins and prunes.

No specific legislative action would be required to set up an export subsidy program. The Department of Agriculture already has authority to make such payments out of funds set aside for handling farm surpluses. Such a subsidy has been paid on cotton exports for some years past.

TIPPING THE BEAM

And a kindly word from legislators on broadening the program to cover canned foods probably would be enough to tip the beam in favor of the idea.

If the canning industry gives the Congressmen at today's meeting the same story it has been peddling to the Government departments, testimony will go something like this:

Stocks of many varieties of canned goods are piling up in warehouses and on dealers' shelves. Meantime, the new canning season is approaching. Either some steps must be taken to clear out the surplus goods, or the canners will have to reduce the size of their 1947 packs of the already overproduced goods.

Should this happen, farmers who grow these vegetables will find their markets sharply reduced. Prices of these crops can be expected to slump as a result.

Meanwhile, the canning industry argues, there are a host of potential foreign customers for the surplus canned goods—if they can buy this food at a price. These other nations are already buying heavily in United States markets, but are confining their purchases largely to grains. Wheat and other cereals offer a greater amount of food value per scarce dollar than any other type of food.

WHAT THE CANNERS SUGGEST

What the canning industry has suggested to the Agriculture Department is that the Government pay subsidies which will enable sellers to offer their wares to overseas buyers at bargain prices. Presumably these prices would be set low enough to bring the foods into competition with grain on a cost-per-unit-of-food value. Any loss sustained by the seller in these bargain sales would be made up by Government payments.

Canners hope the subsidy, in addition to increasing their sales to foreign buyers, will enable them to do a land office business with the War and State Departments.

The Army is responsible for feeding the people of our occupied zones in Germany, Austria, and Italy and seeing that the Japanese and Koreans are fed. This makes the Army the largest single buyer of food for export. The State Department, meantime will soon take on the job of dishing out a $350,000,000 fund approved by Congress for foreign relief. Most of this is expected to be spent on food.

Both State and War Departments have had somewhat the same attitude toward the export of canned goods as purchasing agents of foreign nations have. They believe that, with a limited amount of money available, they can feed more hungry people by spending it on grain. A subsidy on canned goods—even though paid by another Government agency—would permit the Army and State Department to purchase these foods without making such a large hole in appropriations.

OTHER FOOD INDUSTRIES CHIME IN

Backing up the canners in their campaign for a subsidy are representatives of other food industries beginning to feel the pinch of overproduction. Dried fruit processors are worrying over markets for prunes and raisins. Citrus fruit growers and packers saw high wartime prices collapse last winter. They know another bumper crop next year means the same slump—or worse. Their plight has been bad enough to make the Florida, Texas, and California sections of the industry temporarily forget their rivalry and get together behind a program calling for Government aid in finding additional markets at home and abroad, through Federal payments.

Unless some unexpected and heavy opposition develops to the plan to be discussed today on Capitol Hill, it appears likely the Government will initiate an export subsidy program. It may start on a small scale, but it could cover a wide range of commodities before it's finished.

What are the probable results of subsidizing food exports on a broad scale?

First, if carried out extensively enough, such a subsidy would bring the canning industry back into the market for new produce. This, in turn, would help maintain prices to crop growers.

Second, the program would tend to delay any decline in food prices to domestic consumers. If the surplus foods are not sold abroad at subsidized bargain prices, sellers here probably would be forced to follow the traditional method of disposing of surpluses—selling them on the home market at a loss.

A flood of low-priced foods on the grocery market might well tend to bring down the cost of many other items not already on the surplus list. Housewives finding low-cost canned peas on store shelves, for example, would probably buy these rather than more expensive vegetables. If this process of substitution were carried far enough, the grocer would find the reduced demand for higher-priced foods creating a surplus. He then would be forced to reduce their prices to compete with the low-cost items.

LIST OF FOODS WOULD GROW

Under present proposals, the list of subsidized foods would be relatively short and would not bulk too heavily in the total cost of living. However, the list could be expected to grow. As farmers found markets for other products filing up to the point where prices began to soften, they'd be inclined to turn to the Government for subsidies to move a portion of the oversupply from the market. The Government, having set a precedent in helping out canners, raisin and prune packers, and citrus growers, would find it difficult to turn down other requests for aid.

Machinery for operating an export subsidy program already exists within the Department of Agriculture. Since the 1930's the Department has been paying exporters a subsidy to enable them to sell United States cotton on the world market in competition with less expensive cotton grown in other parts of the world. In the late thirties when wheat was a drug on the market, the Agriculture Department made payments to exporters in an effort to dump part of the surplus abroad.

To finance these operations, the Department has a fat kitty in appropriations for "surplus removal" operations. These funds are known familiarly as "section 32 money" because that section of the old Agricultural Adjustment Act set aside 30 percent of the gross customs receipts each year to be used in whittling down farm surpluses. The Department has wide latitude on how the surplus is to be moved. It can be exported under subsidy, given away for free school lunches, sent to public or charitable institutions, or, if the occasion arises, just dumped.

If canners, Congressmen, and the Agriculture Department agree, the Government will dip into these funds to send more food overseas. The hungry nations which hope to eat this American food may understandably be enthusiastic over the prospects. But the United States housewife, struggling to make ends meet under a rigid food budget, may question the new program.

The article by Mr. Othman is as follows:

OTHMAN IN WASHINGTON

(By Frederick C. Othman)

WASHINGTON, July 12.—You ladies noticed any slash lately in the price of a can of peas? I thought so.

So today's our day to shed a tear for the boys who find themselves with 67,000,000 cases of canned vegetables they can't sell, a new crop coming up, and nobody standing in line to buy.

There seems to be only one solution. Get the Government to do something. So the representatives of the farmers, the canners, and the wholesale groceries came to the Agriculture Committee of the House. The

thing to do, they said, is force the State Department and the War Department to send canned goods to the hungry in Europe.

The relief experts so far have refused. They claim a can of tomatoes, for instance, is mostly water and why spend the money to ship H_2O abroad?

The canned-goods fellows said the Europeans need vitamins from tinned vegetables as much as calories from wheat. They said also that if the Government doesn't take over some of the millions of cases, many a farmer will go bust (and many a cannery, too) and that'll be the start of a depression.

Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, wondered if any of the boys had thought about cutting prices of peas (which seem to be in greatest surplus) here at home.

"Oh, yes," replied William M. D'Miller, secretary of the Cooperative Food Distributors of America, Chicago, a typical witness. "Prices have been reduced. But the people insist on the fancy stuff and they won't buy the standard grades."

This caused Representative WILLIAM S. HILL, of Colorado, to explode. Or perhaps "erupt" is the better word.

"I'd like to see the ads on those reduced prices," he shouted. "So my wife can get 'em. How do you figure the cost of living is going up if the price of these foods is going down?"

D'Miller tried to soothe him. Representative HILL was having none of it. He charged that grocers advertised low prices on canned goods, but always were fresh out when Mrs. Hill tried to buy.

"And it isn't only canned goods," he said. "Why one store advertised lamb at 15 cents a pound and when I went in to get some I had to pay 65 cents a pound for it."

The suave D'Miller, wearing a checked suit, a large diamond ring, and heavy-rimmed eyeglasses, said he was sorry but he didn't know about meat. Only canned goods. And the warehouses in his association have so many cans of peas, string beans, cut beets, sauerkraut, and sweet potatoes on hand they intend to buy no more for the next 8 to 14 months.

Representative ANDRESEN wasn't convinced. He ordered D'Miller to produce a list of current retail prices of canned goods for study by the lawmakers. The witnesses kept coming. A thousand acres of string beans have been plowed under in Louisiana because the canners wouldn't buy. Spinach is rotting in the Norfolk, Va., area, and tomatoes in Maryland.

"Tomatoes are being plowed into the ground right now," said Dr. T. B. Symons, director of the extension service of the University of Maryland.

"But I paid 35 cents a pound for Maryland tomatoes only last week," protested Representative ANDRESEN.

"Ah yes," repied Dr. Symons. "Lovely tomatoes, from our Maryland hothouses. But field tomatoes, no. There is no market for them."

This was hard for Representative ANDRESEN to understand. He could use a few pounds and so, I think, could I. If we could afford 'em, that is.

Joseph Jefferson Mansfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I cannot add to the memorable and beautiful tributes that have been paid my namesake, Judge MANSFIELD. However, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my sadness over the death of the judge. The passing of our colleague did not come as a surprise because we know he had been critically ill for a number of days. However, we are never ready for news of this kind. It leaves us, who knew the judge so well, with very heavy hearts indeed.

During his 30 years here he was faithful to his task. He had but one purpose and that was to represent his congressional district to the very best of his ability. By his passing Texas has lost a most efficient public servant; and the Nation has suffered a heavy loss. All who knew him will miss a true friend.

An inspiring statesman and a splendid American citizen has left this world for the rich reward which will be his in the kingdom of heaven.

Proposed New Maritime Shipping Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a most important undertaking of interest to our merchant marine was inaugurated by the former Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives about 2 years ago under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. This project is to codify all of the Federal laws relating to shipping. It is part of a comprehensive plan to codify all the laws of the United States so that the text of these laws will be accessible and clear without the necessity of examining scores of volumes of the Statutes at Large.

The Legislative Appropriation Act of June 13, 1945, authorized the former Committee on Revision of the Laws to prepare a new edition of the United States Code and the codification of the shipping laws is one of the most important parts of the preparation of such a code. The functions of the Committee on Revision of the Laws have been transferred to the House Committee on the Judiciary under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the work has gone forward under the supervision of the latter committee.

I should like to give you a brief statement of the background of this work and of its present status. The committee engaged the services of the West Publishing Co. and the Edward Thompson Co., two law publishing companies which have assisted the committee in the preparation of the United States Code and in the preparation of bills to codify other titles of the code. These companies, in addition to their regular editorial and manuscript staffs, engaged the services of a reviser who is experienced in the codification of laws and a special consultant, the former general counsel of the War Shipping Administration. They have maintained close contact with the counsel for the Committee on Revision of the Laws and the Judiciary Committee in the various stages of the work. After a preliminary draft had been prepared which contained the Federal laws relating to shipping, most of which are now found in title 46 of the United States Code, a meeting was held to review it. At this meeting, there were present the publishing company staffs and the chairman of the House committee, together with his counsel and the counsel for the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and a group of men familiar with the administration of the various phases of the shipping laws from the point of view of the shipowners, operators, labor, the Department of Justice, and the Maritime Commission. The preliminary draft was reviewed section by section and suggestions and criticisms were noted and work was then commenced on the preparation of a second draft which was later submitted to a comprehensive and painstaking review by the same groups. These preliminary drafts were circulated among the ship industry and the labor organizations throughout the country and suggestions and criticisms were solicited.

The Maritime Law Association appointed a committee to examine the drafts and report thereon.

There has now been printed a committee print of a bill which I understand will be introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION], at the opening of the next regular session of the Congress. Copies of the committee print have been distributed to members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and to the various other groups interested in the project with the request that criticisms and suggestions be submitted to the gentleman from Kentucky before October 15, 1947.

The preparation of a shipping code is a matter of extreme importance. I sincerely hope that the Members of the House will take an active interest in this work with the view that an accurate, modern, and simple code will be enacted. The maxim of the former chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York, "Making the laws understandable is as important as making the laws," is to my mind a most worthy one and is being followed in the preparation of this code.

Although no major or controversial changes in substantive law were intended in this codification, the law is being completely rewritten for the sake of simplicity and clarity. Obsolete and redundant provisions are being eliminated and the language is being modernized without doing violence to the intention of the original statutes. It is my earnest hope that this work may go forward under the Committee on the Judiciary with the active support and cooperation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and that a bill will be enacted during the next regular session codifying these laws.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is desirous to cooperate in this codification of the shipping laws, and I have appointed from the Committee on Merchant Marine and

Fisheries the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM], the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] chairman, as a special committee to study, examine, and review the proposed code with those engaged in maritime operations.

Railroads Fight for Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial written by Mr. Robert W. Boyer, managing editor of the Altoona Tribune, and appearing in the issue of July 19.

The editorial is as follows:

RAILROADS FIGHT FOR LIFE

How about America?

We ask that question again as Mr. Truman again vetoes the tax-reduction bill with the terse comment that such a tax cut "is the wrong kind at the wrong time."

When is the right time, Mr. President?

That, America must know.

For, while this country is spending vast sums abroad, and preparing to spend many more billions in Europe, there is increasing need of a sharp concentration of attention and effort on the home front.

Yesterday, this was emphasized for the railroads, when the interstate commerce examiner recommended that 14 major railroads in the East be authorized to raise their commutation fares and other passenger tickets sold on a multiple basis, by 15 to 25 percent.

The war years saw the railroads meet every demand placed upon them. They set world records for transportation. Without their great capacity, their great hauling power, we should not have been able to provide the munitions of war where they were needed fast enough.

But, the railroad establishment depreciated during those years when every effort was placed upon speed rather than maintenance.

The railroads need relief. They need something more from Government than constant pressure, constant demands. They need some encouragement, some real help. And they have not yet asked for subsidies as such.

The Pennsylvania Railroad, with whose welfare this city is vitally concerned, reported last year that it operated at a loss for the first time in history. It ran into the red for a total of eight and one-half million dollars.

Now, the railroads' coal bill will be raised by the new contract obtained by Mr. Lewis. Already the Nation's railroads are committed to a billion dollars for new and renewed safety appliances.

Last year, the railroads of the Nation spent almost $400,000,000 for soft coal. Now, that cost may rise as must as a fifth. And, in addition, coal, as a basic industry, also is raising the price of steel, principal commodity required by railroads.

And, still further, the railroads are faced by demands for wage increases that will reach over $500,000,000 a year. And, in addition, unions have drafted demands for working-rule changes that will require the railroads to spend almost another billion dollars.

The wage demands alone are almost equal to twice the railroads' 1946 net income.

We are sending steel, locomotives, and cars to Europe. We are busily engaged on figuring out Europe's problems, while other forces in Europe are figuring out ways to undo them.

But, who is figuring out America's problems?

Are we going to let the housing problem stick right where it is?

Are we going to let the railroads stifle under these staggering costs?

Our whole industrial establishment will collapse about our ears if the railroads stick. A major portion of Europe's present difficulties is due to destruction of her railroads.

Railroad transportation is the foundation of all others; wheels cannot turn for long with the goods they produce piling up on docks.

Experts believe our railroads should earn 6 percent; a rate which the Supreme Court has held reasonable for regulated utilities on two occasions.

The Government should see to it that the railroads are permitted to offset these increasing costs, that they are enabled to pay for the freight cars—twice as many on order as manufacturers have been able to produce—and that they are enabled to maintain their establishment so that it can do the job expected of it.

Europe again provides the shining example for us of what not to do. The world's poorest railroad schedules and accommodations are provided by railroads operating under government control.

Mr. Truman has many big problems here in America. His second tax-cut veto and his accompanying comments indicate that his advisers are blind to what is happening in their own country.

The Governor's Stand on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Outlook of Santa Monica, Calif.:

THE GOVERNORS' STAND ON FOREIGN POLICY

If for no other reason than to impress the fact upon the world, the action of the Governors' Conference at Salt Lake City in expressing "faith and confidence" in Secretary of State Marshall, and in calling for a continuation of a nonpartisan American foreign policy, is praiseworthy and valuable. The world needs to realize that the American people stand united today as never before on foreign policy, and that there is no prospect of that policy being reversed by a fatal political division, as happened a generation ago.

The action of the Governors' Conference, representing the chief executives of 44 of our 48 States, should make it clear to the world that Henry Wallace does not speak for the American people, and that his attempts to stir up discord and division on foreign policy have completely failed.

It is to be hoped that the resolution of the Governors' Conference will be widely published and broadcast abroad. It reads: "The Governors' Conference hereby asserts its conviction that the foreign policy of this country transcends in importance all partisan, personal, or political considerations, and should be at all times an American foreign policy, representative of the best in America, and representing the United States to the nations of the world as a country that seeks peace and is united in its determination to protect the inalienable rights and privileges that our citizens now enjoy."

That sentiment will command the full support of every loyal American, which means 99 percent of our population.

Home Mortgage Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings of the Government Corporations Subcommittee of Appropriations one of the highest officials of the Federal Home Loan Agency submitted the following statement to that committee, but requested his identity not be disclosed.

This statement proves conclusively that while home loans guaranteed by the Federal Government have made it possible for many people to save their homes, and of course has also made it possible for many people to build a home, the facts are that the program has brought about greatly increased costs of homes, the effect of which will surely bring about disastrous results unless it can soon be corrected. Possibly the most feasible and effective way to solve the problem would be to reduce the percentage guaranteed by the Government. Prices on homes will continue to spiral to the bursting point so long as cheap, easy loans can be obtained, while at the same time the building of homes is retarded because most people will not pay these inflated prices. Even when material becomes available in plentiful supply the cost of building construction is bound to stay up so long as the Federal Government guarantees 80, 90, and in some cases, 100 percent of the appraised value under the present appraisal custom, and may I say here and now that so long as the Government is in the housing business to the extent it is today the condition I have just stated and the conditions explained in the following statement will be with us and will defeat home building at reasonable prices for our veterans and for everybody who wants to own a home of their very own. It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I have opposed, and will continue to oppose, the so-called WET bill or any other socialized housing bill that can be cooked up by the great planners.

The statement submitted by the Federal Home Loan Agency official follows. I trust it will make a lot of people think through on this problem.

WHY THE HOME-MORTGAGE DEBT OF THE UNITED STATES AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1946, IS $24,561,000,000

The effect on national economy, if difficulties should arise in savings institutions and home mortgages, is indicated by the experiences of 1930 to 1933.

In 1931 and 1932 there were over half a million foreclosures of mortgages on homes—an all-time world record. In the spring of 1933 such foreclosures were running at the rate of a thousand a day. Indignation meetings of home owners were being held in the larger cities and many communities. Farm foreclosures at the same time resulted in riots and threats to hang sheriffs in some sections.

While the situation was bad enough when the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was organized, there was no adequate understanding of how really serious it was. The Home Owners' Loan Act was passed with only four dissenting votes in the House of Representatives and none in the Senate. The House votes were equally divided—two Democrats and two Republicans.

The law gave the Corporation $200,000,000 of capital and provided for the issuance of two billions in 4-percent tax-free bonds to be exchanged for defaulted mortgages. Loans could be made only to home owners whose mortgages were being foreclosed or those threatened with foreclosure and unable to refinance their loans elsewhere. The applications for relief poured in at such a rate that it was soon apparent that two billions of bonds would not be enough, and presently Congress increased the limit to three billions and finally to $4,750,000,000. The Corporation received more than 2,000,000 applications representing mortgages in excess of $6,000,000,000 or almost one-third of all the outstanding home mortgages in the country. When about $1,000,000,000 worth of the money represented by these applications had been paid out to the mortgage-lending institutions and the Federal Housing Administration was organized to insure mortgages, the pressure on the Home Owners' Loan Corporation relaxed somewhat and the total number of mortgages which the Corporation was called upon to accept before it finished lending in June of 1936, was a little over a million.

The balance of its total advances up to three and one-half billions was represented by taxes the Corporation was obliged to pay, amounting to $486,613,716, delinquent insurance of about $18,000,000, and the necessary expenditures of $239,000,000 to repair and rehabilitate the long-neglected houses on which loans were made.

The above figures convey some idea of the results which can develop if as a result of the present high speculative level of prices on homes and excessive mortgages made on such homes things begin to move in the wrong direction.

Many mortgage-lending institutions failed to realize before the conclusion of HOLC refinancing that large numbers of home loans on their books were weak and would develop trouble. For 3 or 4 years after June 30, 1936, the lending institutions had unusual foreclosure records and losses. In Massachusetts alone they took over half a billion dollars worth of homes through foreclosure in the years following 1936. In New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania the figures were very high, and the total in the country as a whole ran into billions.

Such a development can be prevented by the exercise of caution, but it will be very difficult to deal with if it starts again on any considerable scale.

PRICES ON HOMES

The present inflation of sales prices on homes and the corresponding influence on mortgages began to be apparent as far back as the spring of 1943. These prices have been rising rapidly ever since, and in the latter part of 1945 and during 1946 they jumped at a record-breaking rate. This is reflected not only in the total dollar volume of home mortgages made—the highest for any single year in our history—but reliable records of prices on sales for average, everyday homes in all parts of the country during the 18 months ending December 31, 1946, show clearly enough what has happened. On top of the 1942–44 increases, further increases in prices from 1945 to 1946 by 40 to 45 percent for the same types of homes were common. Some States showed jumps from a low average for 1 month in 1945 to a high in 1946 of 59 to 72 percent. In one State an increase of as much as 90 percent from the lowest average price for any one month in 1945 to the highest average for a corresponding period in 1946 is recorded.

In the 10 most populous States, figures on more than 175,000 sales reflected such percentage increases in prices from 1945 to 1946 as those quoted above. These prices were made on houses renting on the average from $31 to $33 a month. The rental averages do not tell the full story because they include rentals in some of the more densely populated areas which range higher, but they indicate the great increase in prices on houses selling for $4,000 and less.

Figures on a limited number of sales in recent months in one western State at $13,000 to $13,500 indicate that the costs of construction and land were less than $7,000.

MORTGAGE DEBT DECEMBER 31, 1946

The all-time high mortgage debt at the beginning of this year was $24,561,000,000. This was three billions above any previous peak. The increase in home mortgages for 1946 over 1945 of $4,570,000,000 was the greatest for any one year for which there are reliable records. This in spite of the fact that because of full employment, higher rates of pay and overtime pay, more mortgages were undoubtedly paid off in full and more were substantially reduced than in any corresponding period.

In 1946 we built but 450,000 new houses but the total mortgages made during the year was $9,453,000,000. This figure indicates the extent to which prices and mortgages on existing homes were raised.

In 1925, the year of greatest home building in this country, we built, ready for occupancy, 937,000 homes. This was over twice the number of new homes produced in 1946. All the mortgages made in 1925 on existing homes and new homes totaled less than half the dollar amount of the mortgages made in 1946. The total figure for 1925 was $4,763,000,000.

At the end of that year (1925), total home mortgage debt in this country was $13,216,000,000—a little more than half of the $24,561,000,000 figure of 1946.

The old houses which sold at such high prices in 1946 were over 20 years old on the average and a large proportion of them more than that. Because of the inability to get material for repairs and rehabilition during the 5 years from 1941 to 1946, these houses sold and mortgaged at higher levels, were mostly in need of important repairs and upkeep.

As a result of neglect from 1929 to 1933, following the 1929 panic, the reports of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation show it was necessary for that Corporation to advance $239,000,000 to place the houses on which it made mortgages in decent repair.

CONSTRUCTION LOANS

Aside from inflationary mortgage loans on individual houses, it is a matter of common knowledge that in the last few years many lending institutions, of all groups, have made construction loans to an extent far in excess of any lending of this sort they had ever before done. Reports are common of inflationary lending to contractors with little or no financial responsibility.

With all types of mortgage lending institutions in possession of greatly increased savings, the competition in the making of home-mortgage loans has been more extreme than at any time in the past. It has been characterized not only by excessive loans to contractors but the payment of black-market prices for materials, higher fees to real-estate brokers for bringing in mortgages than have ever prevailed before, and other competitive practices which have contributed to inflationary lending and, in turn, inflationary prices for homes. If excessive loans had not been made in so many cases, the price level of homes today would not be as high as it is.

HOME APPRAISALS

Anyone who has examined the system under which appraisals are made as a basis of making home mortgages in this country must recognize immediately that it is full of defeats and calls for critical attention without undue delay if we are to avoid needless troubles in the future. It is a somewhat complicated problem and cannot be solved quickly because of the great variety of conditions which exist in different parts of the country.

Most of the appraisers who fix valuations as the basis of mortgage lending are real-estate brokers. They receive commissions based upon the price at which a home is sold. In boom times it is, of course, to their interest that the price shall be the highest price obtainable since their return is thereby increased. Many lenders are quite willing to make a mortgage which is higher than it should be. The higher it is, the better, since at present low rates per thousand, it produces more interest income and when, as today, a large proportion of the home-mortgage loans made are guaranteed by the Federal Government, through the Veterans' Administration or the Federal Housing Administration, there is a strong temptation to many lenders to make inflated loans because of their conviction that they cannot lose as a result of the insurance.

Reckless lending institutions, with plenty of funds to invest, often make or accept appraisals intended to get the loan away from a competitor who is trying conscientiously to protect the home purchaser from incurring an excessive debt.

No experienced financial institution thinks of making a business or industrial loan which is to run for 20 to 25 years without employing engineers and experts to examine every phase of the risk involved and taking every conceivable precaution to protect against loss. It cannot be denied, however, that too many mortgages are placed on American homes without any adequate examination of the risks involved or the unfortunate experiences which a family may suffer through being loaded with too much debt.

The home-mortgage appraisal system of the United States should be investigated thoroughly and carefully reorganized.

FIRE INSURANCE AND MORTGAGE LENDING

One of the activities in connection with the operations of too many of our mortgage lending institutions which demands attention is the placing of fire insurance on homes by officials of these institutions. It is well-known that a large number of them are acting as insurance brokers and personally collecting the commissions on such insurance. The practice can and often does have an influence not only on the approval of the loan but the amount loaned. If a real estate broker receives a commission for bringing the mortgage to a lending institution, the higher the price of the home, the more he receives as a commission. In turn, the higher the loan and the amount of insurance, the greater the commission to the person who approves the loan and places the insurance. The monthly payment on long-term, amortized mortgages, under present-day plans, usually includes insurance and taxes. The official of a lending institution making the loan who places the insurance, therefore, has no risk of loss on unpaid premiums and

little collection cost. He has an unfair competitive advantage over independent insurance brokers.

Those who must have mortgages on their homes should be free to place their fire insurance wherever they please. It should not be a factor in the granting of a mortgage. It is well-known, however, that mortgages and officers of many institutions, a large proportion of them mutual in character, have incomes from the handling of insurance in connection with the placing of mortgages, aside from their salaries, the extent of which the public does not realize.

FUTURE HOME MORTGAGE DEBT

It is generally recognized that most of our veterans who have been able to do so, have acquired homes as a result of the $4,000 guarantee against loss on mortgages by the Veterans' Administration. If only one-half of the former servicemen still eligible apply for such guaranteed mortgages within the 10-year period, it will mean approximately 7,000,000 homes to be financed.

If the average mortgage is but 50 percent of reasonable value, it means an increase of between thirty-five and forty billion dollars over our present home mortgage debt. This mortgage need can apparently be financed readily enough if home prices are not excessive, since the net savings of our people at the beginning of this year were at an all-time high of $133,000,000,000.

The price question is vital, however, for not only veteran but nonveteran families will need homes and many of these will be provided out of the existing supply.

The Federal Reserve Board completed a survey of family incomes for 1945, last year. The report declared that in that year of high wages, full employment and much overtime, 70 percent of our American families had an average income of $3,000. These families earned, according to the Federal Reserve Board, 43 percent of the national income and contributed 24 percent of the national savings for that year. These figures show plainly enough what the average American family car afford to pay for a home and safely discharge the mortgage debt. The figures demonstrate conclusively the importance of getting home prices down.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE ON MORTGAGES

The fact that mortgage insurance has made a substantial contribution to higher prices cannot be ignored. These insured mortgages have been made by all classes of lending institutions. The houses, new or old, would not have been sold except in limited numbers if very liberal mortgages had not been available. It is apparent that there must be real caution in making home mortgages from now on by all these institutions if difficulties are to be avoided in the future. Extreme and unwise competition between lending institutions must inevitably bring foreclosures and demands upon the insurance funds of Government agencies.

Charles O. Andrews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, United States Senator from Florida:

Mr. HOLLAND. Senator Charles O. Andrews was a native Floridian, born in Holmes County in the western part of the State on March 7, 1877. He was educated in the public schools of Florida, and in the South Florida Military Institute, a small but excellent military college then existing at my lifelong home, Bartow, Fla. It was while he was a cadet at that school that I first saw him. He also held diplomas from Florida State Normal and the University of Florida. In military activities he served as captain, Company M, First Regiment, Florida National Guard, and also volunteered for the Spanish-American War and applied for service in the First World War but was not accepted. He acquired invaluable experience as bill secretary of the Florida Senate. He was admitted to practice law, by the supreme court of Florida, in 1907, and by the Federal courts in 1911. His legal attainments and standing were of the highest. He served as judge of the criminal court, Walton County, 1910–11; as assistant attorney general of Florida, 1912–19; as circuit judge, 1919–25; and as a commissioner of the Florida supreme court, 1929–32. He was president of the Florida State Bar Association in 1921–22. In civic and fraternal affiliations he was a Rotarian and a Mason, a member of the Florida University Alumni Association, of Pi Kappa Alpha social fraternity, and of Phi Delta Phi legal fraternity. He was elected to the United States Senate November 3, 1936, and reelected for a 6-year term November 5, 1940. He received the honorary doctor-of-laws degree from Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla., in 1941.

Senator Andrews married Miss Margaret Spears of Tallahassee, Fla.—his beloved Daisy—to whose inspiration and influence he attributed much of his success. No man had a more devoted wife, and no children, of whom there were three, a more devoted mother.

It was as a young attorney that I first became closely acquainted with Senator Andrews. This was while he was a circuit judge in Florida and I had just begun the practice of law. From this acquaintance grew a friendship that increased in strength throughout the years and which was always a source of pleasure and inspiration to me. One of his outstanding contributions to the business life of Florida was his service as an attorney and as a citrus grower and citizen in organizing a State-wide agency for citrus growers and handlers known as the Florida Citrus Growers Clearing House Association, which he served as general counsel. He was entitled to much credit for the large amount of good which was accomplished by that organization.

A stanch defender of States' rights and imbued with a patriotism and love of his country transcending all other considerations, Senator Andrews believed in the literal interpretation of the Constitution. Indeed, with him it was truly the supreme law of the land. He made this known in the Senate upon his arrival in 1936 by joining forces immediately with others of his southern colleagues of like convictions on issues where either encroachment on or impairment of the powers reserved to the States was threatened. Senator Andrews' advice and opinion on constitutional questions was eagerly sought and highly regarded by his fellow Senators.

Although Senator Andrews had not been in robust health for some time, which was of great concern to his myriad friends in Florida as well as in Washington, his passing in the early hours of the morning last September 18 came as a shock to all of us. Of a kindly and sympathetic nature, with the modesty and gentleness that so become a gentleman, Senator Andrews from the very beginning of his service in the Senate formed friendships that endured to the end. He was recognized and loved for his sincerity of purpose and for his unwavering devotion to duty, said by General Lee, whom he idolized, to be the "sublimest word in the English language."

Charles Oscar Andrews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. Charles Oscar Andrews, late a Senator from the State of Florida.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, when the announcement of the death of Senator Charles O. Andrews came it was a shock to those who knew him intimately and a distinct and decided loss to the State of Florida and to the Nation.

We have often heard the phrase "to know him is to love him." In the life of Charles O. Andrews this was true. Those Members in the House of Representatives, his associates in the Senate, the employees with whom he came in contact, litigants in the court when he was circuit judge, legislators of the State, men and women in high official life, workmen in the orange groves of Florida, intuitively loved Charles O. Andrews when they knew him. He was kindly and courteous; he was painstaking and thorough, he was conscientious and had a high regard for the office which he held at the time of death and for the offices which he had held previously.

He brought to the Senate a broad background of experience which included position of captain in the Florida National Guard, bill secretary for the Florida Senate, judge of the criminal court, assistant attorney general for the State of Florida, circuit judge, president of the Florida State Bar Association, and commissioner of the Supreme Court of Florida. It was experience which gave him a knowledge of people and a knowledge of problems. Having been born and raised in the State of Florida, and having lived in different sections of the State, he had an intimate knowledge of the problems of this rapidly growing State. When he came to the Congress he made firm friends. The firmness of this friendship was evidenced on a number of occasions. On one occasion when the Everglades National Park bill passed the House, the desire in the Senate to help Senator Andrews was such that within an hour it had passed the Senate. He came to the Senate from a sickbed and was able to secure the passage through the Senate of a bill to reimburse the fruit growers of Florida for losses in the Mediterranean fruitfly campaign. In his service in the Senate he was thorough and conscientious, holding firm to those principles that he thought were right. His was a distinguished career in that great legislative body, a record of which his friends, our State, and his family can well be proud. Our sympathy goes out to his fine family.

Senator Charles O. Andrews will be missed in the Nation; he will be missed by our State, and, personally, I will miss him. It was my pleasure to have appeared before him when he was on the bench and to have his wholehearted cooperation when he was in the Senate.

There comes to my mind a short poem which I heard a number of years ago on a memorial occasion. It is so typical of Senator Andrews that I quote it here:

Here was a man whose heart was good,
Who walked with men and understood.
His was a voice that spoke to cheer,
And fell like music on the ear.
His was a smile men loved to see
His was a hand that asked no fee
For friendliness or kindness done.
And now that he has journeyed on,
His is a fame that never ends
And leaves behind uncounted friends.

The St. Lawrence Waterway Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent radio discussion on the subject of the St. Lawrence waterway development, participated in by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], Dr. N. R. Danielian, and myself.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. DANIELIAN. Senator WILEY, you are chairman of a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee which held extensive hearings on the St. Lawrence project. Could you give us your impressions of the case made before your committee?

Senator WILEY. Dr. Danielian, the subcommittee had very important witnesses before it, such as former President Hoover, Secretary of State Marshall, Secretary of War Royall, and Secretary of Commerce Harriman. They favor construction of the project for national security and industrial development of our country. Opposition witnesses, mostly from Boston, New York, and New Orelans, expressed fears that they would lose business. The subcommittee reported the measure without a dissenting vote. That tells the story.

Dr. DANIELIAN. Senator AIKEN, you have been a staunch and devoted advocate of this project. How do you size up the chances for congressional approval now?

Senator AIKEN. Dr. Danielian, we have the best chance ever to secure congressional approval of the St. Lawrence project in 1948. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved it by a vote of 9 to 4, and it goes on the Senate Calendar during the first week of January.

NATURE OF PROJECT

Dr. DANIELIAN. Senator WILEY, could you tell our audience briefly what the St. Lawrence project is.

Senator WILEY. It is simply this: there is now ocean navigation from the Atlantic to Montreal, which is 1,000 miles up the St. Lawrence River. There is also deep-water navigation from Duluth to Ogdensburg, N. Y., a distance of 1,250 miles. Between Montreal and Ogdensburg there are three rapids, with a tremendous amount of power. The St. Lawrence project contemplates construction of the necessary dams, canals, and powerhouses in this stretch of the river to bring ocean ships directly into the Great Lakes, and to establish 2,200,000 horsepower of electric capacity. We can't let it go to waste.

Dr. DANIELIAN. How is it, Senator WILEY, that at a time when Congress is so economy minded, this project receives favor?

Senator WILEY. Dr. Danielian, there are two reasons for that. First the evidence is overwhelming that this project has national defense value. It is clear that failure to construct it before World War II was very costly. The second reason is that this project will be self-liquidating. The power phase will be paid for by the consumers of electricity and the cost of the seaway will be carried by tolls on traffic. This means that, as in the case of the Panama Canal, the Nation will secure a great asset for commerce and national security, without cost to the taxpayer.

Dr. DANIELIAN. That sounds like a good bargain for the people.

Senator AIKEN. It is a good bargain, and the people realize it. Every poll of public and business opinion indicates that the country is ready to construct this project.

CANADA'S FULL SUPPORT

Dr. DANIELIAN. How about Canada? This is a joint project and Canada must build part of it. Do they favor it on the present basis?

Senator WILEY. The Canadian Government has accepted the principle of self-liquidation by charging tolls.

Senator AIKEN. When President Truman addressed the Canadian Parliament he got tremendous applause when he expressed his support of the St. Lawrence project.

Dr. DANIELIAN. I can well understand that. The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system is Canada's lifeline. Senator WILEY, how much will it cost to build the seaway?

COST OF SEAWAY

Senator WILEY. On the basis of the high construction costs of May 1947, it is estimated that the whole of the unfinished works would cost about four hundred and twenty-five or four hundred and thirty million dollars. This does not include the power project which will be paid for by New York State and Ontario, but it does include the cost of the seaway to both governments, with interest during construction.

Dr. DANIELIAN. How much will it cost on an annual basis?

Senator WILEY. Dr. Danielian, the subcommittee went thoroughly into that question, and it estimated that on the basis of 2½ percent interest, and a sinking fund which would retire the investment in 53 years, and including adequate operating costs, the annual charge to both governments together would be about $17,000,000.

Dr. DANIELIAN. Will there be enough trade and toll revenues, Senator AIKEN, to support such annual expenses?

Senator AIKEN. The bill provides a maximum tonnage charge of $1.25. Bulk agricultural products would carry a much lower rate. Now, former President Hoover estimated there would be 30,000,000 tons of traffic. Secretary of Commerce Averell Harriman substantiated this estimate. The evidence is clear that after a period of development, there will be more than enough revenue to pay the annual charges. This has been our experience at Panama Canal.

Dr. DANIELIAN. The railroads opposed the Panama Canal, too, didn't they?

Senator AIKEN. Yes, and I guess they are not too proud of that episode now.

Dr. DANIELIAN. If the St. Lawrence can be developed on a self-liquidating basis, why doesn't private industry undertake it?

Senator AIKEN. Dr. Danielian, it is an interesting but little-known fact that private industry was among the first to stake out a claim to this natural resource. Twenty years ago some of the most powerful economic interests in the United States tried to get licenses from the State of New York to develop this project for profit. Governors Al Smith and Franklin Roosevelt of New York and President Hoover in Washington just didn't see it that way.

Dr. DANIELIAN. Some Members of the House Public Works Committee say that they would favor this as a private development. Do you think that is feasible?

Senator AIKEN. I think congressional policy and the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court is quite clear on the point that the development of these large water resources is a governmental function. I don't think we are going back on that established policy. It is not practical to suggest that everybody, the public, the Governments of Canada and the United States, and the governments of New York and Ontario, should change their program in order to create opportunities for private exploitation.

Senator WILEY. Senator AIKEN is right, The Canadians would oppose private development and I am not sure that it would be acceptable either in New York or Washington. Throughout our history, the Army engineers have spent nearly $4,000,000,000 for flood control and rivers and harbors projects, none of which brings a direct revenue to the Treasury. In this instance, we are going to make the project pay for itself. I like it that way.

Dr. DANIELIAN. What position do the opponents take, Senator Wiley?

Senator WILEY. Representatives of the railroads testified that they favor self-liquidation and would not oppose this project if it can be proved to be self-liquidating. Of course they have doubts on that score but the subcommittee is convinced it can and will be made to pay for itself.

MIDWEST ORE SITUATION

Dr. DANIELIAN. Senator WILEY, during the past several months there have been many stories in important magazines to the effect that the iron-ore resources of the United States, in Minnesota, are being exhausted. Was there any evidence presented before your committee on this situation?

Senator WILEY. Yes, Dr. Danielian, everyone seems to be agreed on the facts that the iron-ore resources in the Lake Superior region would be exhausted in a matter of 10 to 20 years. The only difference of opinion seems to arise on how to deal with this condition. Some say we will utilize low-grade ores, but the cost of this would be substantially higher than at the present time, resulting in higher costs of steel and everything that is made from steel. Others say they will just pick up and move their plants to the east coast or the Gulf coast. This will mean tremendous dislocation of industry and community life in the whole Great Lakes area. I say let's build the St. Lawrence seaway and utilize both low-grade ores and import from other sources the remainder of our requirements. In this way, the cost of iron and steel would be low and dislocations of industry and people not too serious.

Dr. DANIELIAN. I understand the Interior Department claims also that the seaway is needed to bring in other minerals, too.

Senator WILEY. Yes; copper, bauxite, chrome, and many other minerals are needed and can be brought in cheaply.

SEAWAY'S POWER ASPECT

Dr. DANIELIAN. Senator AIKEN, the St. Lawrence project calls for the development of a large amount of water power on the St. Lawrence River. We have heard much about atomic energy displacing existing sources of electric power. Would you care to comment on the claim made by some that we will not need to develop hydroelectric resources, in view of the impending abundance of atomic energy?

Senator AIKEN. There is no question that in time atomic energy will, if applied to peacetime uses, change our mode of life very materially. It will become an important source of energy. However, the most optimistic estimates currently available seem to

agree that in the foreseeable future electricity from atomic energy will cost about 4 times as much as from the St. Lawrence. When atomic energy becomes available it will first replace highest cost electricity, the most inefficient steam-generating units. We are going to need to develop water power in large quantities for a long time to come, because it will be cheaper.

ADVANTAGES OF SEAWAY

Dr. DANIELIAN. Senator AIKEN, could you briefly outline the principal advantages of the St. Lawrence project?

Senator AIKEN. 1. Of course, national defense. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Leahy, General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, and General Eaker said in a report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that this would be a substantial help in total industrial mobilization in another emergency.

2. Cheap water transportation to bring out industrial and agricultural resources of the whole midcontinent of North America nearer the markets of the world.

3. Cheap power, in an area including New York and New England where rates are high and power resources are short.

4. Conservation of natural resources of oil, iron ore, copper. There are many raw materials that are running low in this country and we should import as much as we can.

Finally, improved international relations. Canada, our best friend and customer, has spent over $130,000,000 completing a part of this waterway, and we have delayed our part. We can set a good example to the world of international cooperation in great constructive undertakings.

What we do here will have an influence on the Rhine, the Danube, the Uruguay River in South America, the Yangtze in China, and many other places.

Senator WILEY. That's a splendid summary of the case, George.

Senator AIKEN. Thank you, Alex; I got it partly from your subcommittee report.

NAVIGATION AND POWER

Dr. DANIELIAN. Senator WILEY, I have heard it suggested that the St. Lawrence Power project could be built separately without constructing the seaway. Is that feasible?

Senator WILEY. No; definitely not. From a legal standpoint, under the commerce clause of our constitution, navigation is the principal justification for constructing anything on navigable rivers. Power is a by-product. I don't believe either the Federal Government or Canada would sanction the construction of power without navigation on the St. Lawrence River.

Senator AIKEN. All that talk about building one without the other is merely an attempt by the opponents to divide those who are supporting the St. Lawrence project. When you build the dam and powerhouse, you already create a lake for navigation. It only requires a small amount of additional expenditure to build the canals and locks. It is not economical to build this project for one purpose alone.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

Dr. DANIELIAN. I notice, Senator WILEY, that the St. Lawrence legislation is sponsored by a distinguished bipartisan group including yourself and Senator AIKEN, as well as other leaders in both parties, such as Senator BARKLEY and Senator VANDENBERG. There doesn't seem to be any partisanship in the advocacy of this project.

Senator WILEY. In fact, that has been characteristic of this project ever since its inception. From the time of Woodrow Wilson, through the administrations of Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman, the support of this project has been bipartisan. I say it is an all-American project.

Senator AIKEN. I think it will continue to be that way until it is built. The same thing has been true in the State of New York where both Democratic and Republican governors have repeatedly advocated the construction of this project.

Senator WILEY. If New York State really gets behind this project, with 2 important Senators and 44 Congressmen in the House, our job of getting Federal approval would be much facilitated.

Dr. DANIELIAN. How is it possible for the public to impress its views upon Congress? For example, the Rochester Chamber of Commerce has been opposing the St. Lawrence project before congressional committees. However, a recent poll of 3,000 business firms in the city indicated approval of the St. Lawrence seaway by 72 percent of them. Here is a situation where Congress is getting a wrong view of the attitude of the business community in Rochester.

Senator AIKEN. The only way you can get around such misrepresentation is for the people themselves to write and wire and speak to their Congressmen and Senators. Otherwise, minority interests will try to give a wrong impression of public opinion.

CONCLUSION

Dr. DANIELIAN. Thank you, Senator AIKEN and Senator WILEY. You have been very helpful in explaining the situation in Washington on the St. Lawrence legislation. I might add that when this project is built, it will be due in large part to your efforts.

Col. Evan E. Kimble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an interesting article in the Vineland (N. J.) Times-Journal, which refers to a story appearing in the American Flint, the official publication of the American Flint Glass Workers Union, relative to Col. Evan E. Kimble, one of the leading figures in the glass industry today. The article follows in part:

HE NEVER FORGOT

An entire page in the June issue of The American Flint, official publication of the American Flint Glass Workers Union, is devoted to a tribute to Col. Evan E. Kimble, founder of the Kimble Glass Co. The article is illustrated with a photograph of Colonel Kimble, and a picture of the AFGWU withdrawal card issued to him on February 28, 1897, by Local Union No. 33, Gas City, Ind.

The article reads:

"We here reproduce a photostatic copy of the withdrawal card of E. E. Kimble, which furnishes evidence of the trade-union background of Col. Evan E. Kimble, of the Kimble Glass Co., Vineland, N. J.

"Mr. Kimble was an outstanding worker in the lamp-working department and at an early age readily grasped the fundamentals in the art of producing fine glassware, which is evidenced by the fact that from the humble beginning as a worker and a member of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union he applied himself to his given task and by the fair play and honest business methods was responsible for the growth and progress of the Kimble Glass Co., which is one of the outstanding glass companies, producing in their Vineland (N. J.) plant chemical wares, laboratory glassware, and apparatus rod and tubing."

NEVER FORGOT HE WAS A WORKER

"Mr. Kimble, in his relationship with the members of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union throughout the years that he has been the owner of the Kimble Glass Co., has been harmonious and he has never forgotten the day when he himself was a worker in the lamp room and a member of the AFGWU, and understands by experience all the trials and tribulations that confront the working men and women.

"The Kimble Glass Co., which he built to its present powerful position in the glass industry, has employed throughout its entire existence members of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union, Local Union No. 44, Hot Metal, Vineland, N. J.; Local Union No. 132, Lamp Working, Vineland, N. J.; Local Union No. 87, Mold Making, Chicago Heights, Ill.; Local Unions Nos. 514, 521, 550, 559, 523, Miscellaneous, at Vineland, N. J.; Local Union No. 555, Miscellaneous, Pleasantville, N. J.; Local Union No. 588, Miscellaneous, Camden, N. J.; and Local Union No. 582, Indianapolis, Ind."

The First GOP Congress Since the Advent of the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio broadcast made over Station WOL July 25, 1947, by George E. Reedy on "The First GOP Congress Since the Advent of the New Deal":

The first GOP Congress since the advent of the New Deal has demonstrated one all-important fact. Whatever shortcomings the Republicans may have, they are a unified party, and do follow the program laid down by their leaders.

To one who has watched the family feuds in Democratic Congress after Democratic Congress, this is little short of amazing. A party that presses a united program and forgets minor differences in favor of that program will definitely leave its mark.

At the beginning of the New Deal regime, the Democrats looked like a political party solidly behind its leadership. It turned out that the only unifying factor, was the personality of the late President Roosevelt.

Even that wore thin in a few years. The Democratic Party was irreparably split, between the North and the South. No one could heal that breach, on any permanent basis. It was just one of those things that couldn't be done.

This was probably one of the most important factors in the defeat of the Democratic Party last fall. No one could vote for the organization with any assurance that it would push any particular piece of legislation.

As Abraham Lincoln once said, "A house divided against itself must fall." The Democratic House did fall, and unless its tenants learn how to patch up their quarrels, it will take them years to put it up again.

The Republican Party, on the other hand, took over the control of Congress, with a clear idea of what it wanted. It also knew how it would get what it wanted. A program was laid down and followed by every Member.

It is interesting to note that there are never more than a few Republican votes against any Republican bill. Frequently, however, there are more Democratic votes against than for a piece of Democratic legislation.

The same situation is reflected, in the House leadership race in both parties early this year. The Republicans selected JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts, as the Speaker, and CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, as their floor leader.

These selections were based solely on the views of the Members as to the ability of the two men. There was no question about different political factions, because there weren't any. It was one party.

The Democrats, by contrast, found themselves in a hot box, on the leadership question. Southerners refused to take a northerner, and vice versa. Eventually the problem had to be solved by asking SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, who wanted to retire, to take the job.

RAYBURN'S personal prestige was sufficiently great to bring his party into a semblance of unity. But it was not great enough to really close the breach. Looking forward to the 1948 campaign, Democrats must envy Republicans their unity and singleness of purpose.

Utah and Its History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago yesterday, on July 24, 1847, a sturdy band of Mormon pioneers entered the Great Salt Lake Valley. On this memorable day Brigham Young, their leader, surveyed the desolate expanse of sagebrush bounded on the west by a sea of salt, and uttered the historic words, "This is the place." To less hardy individuals this desolate expanse could hardly be termed a paradise. Yet, those who visited the same spot yesterday to view the unveiling of one of the most beautiful monuments in the world were united in their acclaim that "This is the place," for the desert has been made to blossom as a rose. One of our distinguished visitors, Vivian Meik, an outstanding writer, well describes the enthusiasm which strangers have expressed regarding Salt Lake City and the events transpiring there:

UTAH AND ITS HISTORY GREATEST OF HERITAGES

(By Vivian Meik)

A year ago Salt Lake City was only a vague name on a map to me. Today I wonder why the whole world has not acclaimed it as the destined metropolis of humanity's dreams of tomorrow.

To you I am a stranger—perhaps with the ways of strangers inclined to enthuse over a new experience. But to me, whose years can claim as milestones some intimate experience of almost every country across the seven seas, your city and your State are something unique.

I know of no city in any country which can compare with yours in spacious town planning. London, Paris, Berlin (prewar), Moscow, Rome, Calcutta, Shanghai, Tokyo—also prewar—I have known all these and many more. Some equal, perhaps surpass, Salt Lake City in one particular respect or another, but none has your combination of beauty and, shall I say? "quality."

No other city has compelled me, almost against my will sometimes, to watch the dawn wake. Yet I do this almost every morning—and every morning thank heaven for the experience.

BEAUTY ENTHRALLS

There is no question of becoming lyrical about the soft glow across the mountains as the morning—and evening—sun rises or falls over the horizon. My emotion goes far deeper than that.

From the porch of the hospitable home which has given me so typically American a welcome to your country, I look over your valley in amazement—an amazement that seems to be reaching its climax in your centennial.

Paradoxically enough, my amazement is not created by the city itself, but by the epic of the story behind it, the story of the dream that came true * * * the greatest civic dream in hisory.

Perhaps you who were born into this modern saga have allowed your keener perceptions to be dulled somewhat by constant familiarity. I wonder sometimes how many of you appreciate fully that you—yes, you—are a part, a living, integral part, of one of the most dramatic interludes in history.

STORY TO BE RETOLD

In a few days this story—your story—will be reenacted for those to read who will. It may remind you of stories of "your ain folk" which you heard at your mother's knee. It will, I am sure, cause all of you to glow with pride.

For myself, I know I shall live in those few hours every chapter of the greatest human story since God led Moses safely into the land of milk and honey.

I am not concerned here with the purely religious harmonic which spans the centuries between Moses and Brigham Young. I accept that without question as something beyond even the long arm of coincidence.

Today I am concerned with the human story.

From my porch I see a green, tree-laden vista of incredible beauty. It is as if Providence has flung forth largesse and held it static at its moment of bounty—a personal, lovely miracle for you, for me, for thousands yet to come.

FROM DESERT TO GARDEN

Yet prosaic history tells me that only a hundred years ago today there was but one solitary juniper in a deserted barren solitude by a lake whose moribund waters were comparable only to the Dead Sea.

Did the man whose vision made this land "blossom as a rose" see this city today? Did his vision stretch out tomorrow?

If I could only answer these questions.

But behind that vision—can anyone call it merely a dream? There is an almost incredible story of work and faith and of invincible, irresistible courage.

How proud you Utahans must feel today of the story of your fathers—and in that word I include their no less noble womenfolk—who toiled and sweated and honored their God in word and deed that you may have a heritage the like of which there is not in the world today.

HAS NO EQUAL

Yes, I, the stranger who has traveled the years that the locust has eaten, tell you that within your centennial you have the greatest heritage that, in my experience at least, has ever been given to any single community or State—and I think I may claim that my observation of these things is not entirely untrained or inexperienced.

I am proud with you. I feel privileged to watch this story unfold.

Next week I shall watch the Sons of Utah Pioneers come down the canyon of their forefathers—their goal after nearly 1,500 searing, alternately scorched and freezing, footsore, heartbreaking miles.

I shall see the unveiling of the worthy monument to mark that historic day and those immortal words: "This is the place."

But I shall also search the clouds above your mountains.

I shall range the horizon above the mountains for the spirits of those who first won through those cruel miles.

You may tell me that I am fanciful, that I shall be wasting my precious moments in vain imaginings—but I shall still seek, and, in my heart, I know that I shall not have searched in vain.

In my mind's eye, I shall see them and I shall find understanding of these hundred years.

Then I shall look around at you who will be paying homage to their memory—no, homage to the great achievement rather, to their matchless courage, to their faith, and to their dreams—and I shall be glad beyond words that I am with you.

Vicious Campaign Being Made for Purpose of Destroying Cooperatives—Tax-Dodging Charge a Smoke Screen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1947, I delivered an address before the annual State-wide meeting of Rural Electric Cooperatives of Texas at Austin, Tex., on the subject entitled "The Cooperatives' Place in the Field of Free Enterprise."

The address is as follows:

My subject, The Cooperatives' Place in the Field of Free Enterprise, is one in which I am greatly interested.

As chairman of the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives during the Seventy-ninth Congress, I caused to be conducted an investigation of the charges being made generally over the country that cooperatives did not pay their fair share of taxes and were a threat to the free-enterprise system. Our committee and nine members reported, after 1 year's investigation and after conducting public hearings in many parts of the United States, that the charges that cooperatives are a threat to private enterprise and that cooperatives do not pay taxes were absolutely false and unfounded. This report has been widely circulated and has been grossly misrepresented by many of those, who do not agree with our findings.

COOPERATIVES NOT TAKING COUNTRY

Is is my considered opinion that no individual proprietor, partnership or corporation nas anything to fear from the competition of the cooperatives as long as the customers of such concern are treated fairly and are not required to pay exorbitant prices. The cooperatives are not going to take the country and destroy all existing businesses as many alarmists, who are putting out scare information for the purpose of raising money for themselves to fight the cooperatives, would lead you to believe.

REA ONE OF FINEST FORMS OF COOPERATIVES

The Rural Electrification Administration is one of the nest and best examples of the benefits that may be obtained through a cooperative. Out of approximately 700 REA cooperatives in the United States that have been organized during the past 12 years, not one of these cooperatives has been forced into liquidation. It is a great tribute to the

fine men and women of the rural population of our country that these cooperatives have been so efficiently and successfully conducted and operated. It certainly shows that all the financial and business brains of the country are not in the cities.

A cooperative, such as the REA, attracts the attention and efforts of the most public-spirited and unselfish citizens of a community. A cooperative must have as its officers and directors leaders in a community, who are willing to do something for others while they are doing something for themselves. In order to attract people of this caliber, the members of a cooperative must necessarily have something in common. In the REA cooperative, they have much in common. Each member wants to obtain electricity and the very best and most satisfactory service for himself, in order to obtain the fullest use of electric energy. Each member has this interest in common with the other members, who have a similar feeling and who are anxious to electrify the homes and farms in their community. This great blessing of mankind, which relieves the farmers of back-breaking duties on their farms and relieves the wives of the drudgery in the home, should be made available to every farm home in America just as quickly as possible. Congress should, and I believe will, cooperate to that end.

It is said that the three greatest institutions in the world are the home, the church, and the school. It is also said that the four greatest evils in the world are poverty, ignorance, disease, and crime. One of the longest steps that has ever been made in our country to encourage the three greatest institutions and to discourage the four greatest evils was made when rural electrification was sponsored.

The REA cooperatives were brought into being because of the desire to make this benefit available to rural America. The record that had been made by the private power companies in this respect had not been a satisfactory one. I doubt that anyone can blame the private companies for not doing too much in this field, in view of the fact that they have so much fertile territory to serve where the cost of serving would be so much less and their profits so much greater. However, the private companies should not oppose, and I will say that very few of them do oppose, the move that has been made by the United States Government in cooperation with the people for the purpose of supplying the electrical need of the farmers of the United States.

When Thomas Jefferson advocated public free schools, he was charged with being socialistic. It was said that the private schools of the country—and there were many at that time—would be put out of business in the future if public schools were encouraged and supported. The same argument was made in abolishing toll roads, toll ferries, and toll bridges; however, there is a certain field of service that cannot be properly performed by private capital and which must be provided through encouragement of the State or the Government. Our country has not gone very far in that respect and will probably go little, if any, further in that direction. Our country is primarily, essentially, and fundamentally composed of people, who believe in the free enterprise system and who are opposed to socialism, communism, or fascism in any form.

This brings me back to my subject. The cooperatives are a part of the free enterprise system. Business and industry in this country are operated by either individual proprietorships, partnerships, corporations, or cooperatives. The REA cooperative pays the taxes that either one of the other forms of business pays to either city, county, State, or Federal Governments. The charge that cooperatives are tax dodgers and do not pay their fair share of the taxes is a false charge and made principally by those who have a selfish, greedy ax to grind. There is only one minor exception, which I shall discuss later, but which does not represent the average or the general rule.

TAX-DODGING CHARGE A SMOKE SCREEN

The selfish people who are trying to build up sentiment against, and who are trying to destroy cooperatives in this country, are using the tax-dodging charge as a smoke screen. It is unfounded and they know it. What they are after is not to tax cooperatives, but to destroy cooperatives. It is their purpose to destroy cooperatives as a way of doing business. It is my opinion that it is just as honorable, legitimate and right for 100 farmers to organize a cooperative for the purpose of furnishing themselves with electricity as it is for the same 100 farmers to organize themselves into a partnership for the purpose of doing the same thing. The propagandists, who are carrying on the insincere and dishonest fight against cooperatives, would have you to believe that the partnership form of organization is all right, but that the cooperative form is all wrong.

REPEAL CORPORATION TAX

Under the cooperative plan, all savings that are passed on to the members increase the incomes of the members, which increases the amount of Federal income taxes that the members must pay to the Federal Government. At the same time, the partnership does not pay any taxes as such, but the members of a partnership who profit by reason of earnings or savings from the partnership must pay taxes on their individual incomes to the Federal Government. It is exactly the same thing. I will admit that as between individual proprietorships, partnerships, and cooperatives on the one hand and the corporate form of organization on the other, that there appears to be double taxation on the corporation. The corporation must pay the tax as a corporation and the dividends that are distributed to the owners of the stock by the corporation must also pay income tax on the amount so received. People prefer the corporation form of organization because it limits the liability of the stock owners. However, this form of double taxation should be removed by the Federal Government and I advocate its removal. The corporation should be relieved of the obligation of paying taxes except possibly a small, say 5 percent, which could be considered a premium payment for the corporate form of organization, which limits the liability of the stock holders. Then the dividends that are distributed to the stockholders would be subject to income taxes in the hands of those receiving them. Some of the greedy opponents of the cooperative system of doing business have gone so far as to charge that cooperatives represent a form of communism, and that they are sponsored in America by Stalin. No charge is further from the truth. I repeat that the cooperative is just as much a part of our free enterprise system and is just as free from communism as the corporate form of operation.

During the past 12 years the Federal Government has made available to REA cooperatives approximately $1,000,000,000 in the form of loans to the cooperatives. This money is being paid back with interest, much of it long before it is due.

Objection is raised by the opponents of cooperatives that they do not pay a sufficient interest rate. This charge is without substance because the interest rate paid by the cooperatives has been on the average the going rate of interest paid on Federal obligations. This charge is rather ironical coming from those in many instances, who are now and have in the past profited so much from Government subsidies, and financial assistance provided by the Federal Government at a much lower rate of interest. The Federal Government can easily borrow money for much less than 1 percent.

THE RFC

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was organized in 1932 for the purpose of bailing out the banks, railroads, and insurance companies that were in distress. It was not until 1933 and later that the powers of the RFC were enlarged to help other groups and classes. During the past 15 years, the RFC has made loans aggregating more than $6,000,000,000 to banks, railroads, and insurance companies and no one screamed to high heaven that this was communism and should be stopped. Incidentally, the amount loaned to these three groups represents six times as much as the total amount loaned to all the farmers in the the United States for the purpose of assisting them in electrifying their homes, which substantially increases the resources of the entire Nation. In addition, the Federal Reserve Banking System, as good a purpose as it serves, and the commercial banking system of the country, which has performed such wonderful service in time of peace and war, operate substantially upon the credit of the entire Nation, thereby giving to business, banking, and industry a great advantage through the use of our Government's credit at a very low rate of interest. Much of such business is performed on a rate of interest of one-half of 1 percent, or less, because it is secured by the properties and incomes of all the people, including the rural population.

Any benefits received by the REA cooperatives are molehills in amount compared with the huge mountains of benefits and subsidies which have been furnished to big business and industry by the Federal Government.

When Congress investigates the charges made against cooperatives for the purpose of comparing the infinitesimal benefits they receive with the huge subsidies and privileges granted by the Federal Government to others, the results will not be helpful to the latter. I welcome such an investigation and hope it is soon conducted.

MEMBERS OF COOPERATIVES WEALTH PRODUCERS

The greatness of a Nation can be measured by the happiness and prosperity of the people, who create the Nation's wealth. No group in America creates more of the Nation's wealth than the group of people, who are members of the REA cooperatives. They are truly wealth producers. They are daily adding to the wealth of the Nation. They furnished the food that was necessary to win World War II. Food was just as necessary as bullets, as bullets could not be used without food.

Although we should not try to array class against class, and I certainly would be one of the last persons in this country to make such an attempt as it would be contrary to every principle that I have ever stood for, however, it is very unbecoming to the classes and groups, who are not wealth producing, to criticize and attempt to destroy the opportunities and benefits of those, who are among the greatest wealth producers and creators in our land. In their own interest and in the Nation's interest, they should encourage such benefits to our farm population rather than attempt to retard them.

Danger lurks where people go hungry. For many years to come, the farmers of this Nation have a great responsibility in furnishing the food for people in other countries, as well as our own country.

REA VITAL FOR FOOD PRODUCTION

When the oceans represented barriers to would-be aggressors, our Nation was more secure against attack by a foreign foe than now when not only do the oceans represent paved highway to our shores, but air transportation and atomic energy have made our country a quick target for any foe. This

situation makes it more necessary than ever that we try to prevent conditions in other lands arising that will cause people to starve and go hungry. In any country, people will fight before they die of hunger. Little fights cause riots. Riots cause small wars. Small wars cause big wars. Our country cannot escape involvement in any major war. It is in our interest to do what we can to prevent conditions in any country that could likely cause a war.

The farmers of this Nation, most of whom are members of the REA cooperatives, will do more toward assisting in relieving these conditions at home and abroad than any other group in America.

KINDS OF TAXES PAID BY COOPERATIVES

To be specific on taxes, cooperatives pay all kinds of Federal taxes, including capital stock, income, old age insurance, unemployment compensation, and stamp taxes. A cooperative also pays to the State capital stock, income, occupational, licenses, unemployment, property, and retail sales taxes. In addition, a cooperative pays all city and county taxes like any other form of private enterprise.

ONE SMALL GROUP—NOT TYPICAL—EXEMPT

There is only one small group of cooperatives that is exempt from the payment of one tax. A cooperative in this group is not required to pay a Federal income tax if an exemption has been granted after application has been made therefor, although required to pay all other taxes. These cooperatives in this small group are organized under what is known as the Capper-Volstead Act, which was sponsored by two prominent Republicans in 1921, and the bill was signed by President Warren G. Harding, a Republican President. This is mentioned to answer the argument that the New Deal gave the cooperatives a tax exemption.

Under this law, the Federal income tax exemption is granted upon application. However, the benefits are so small that 50 percent of the cooperatives in this group have failed to even make application for the tax exemption. These cooperatives are composed principally of small farmers for the purpose of buying many of their supplies needed in farm operations and to sell the products of their labor. Out of the tens of thousands of cooperatives in the United States, it is only this small group of very small cooperatives that receives any kind of tax exemption whatsoever and it is only this small group that the big propagandists of the Nation, who are spending millions of dollars a year to destroy cooperatives, can claim are vulnerable to any one of their attacks. The propagandists, who are trying to destroy all cooperatives, are spending several times as much money every year in their efforts than the amount of Federal income tax would be if the tax-exempt group was fully taxed. In fact, if the cooperatives in that group were fully taxed, the Government would not collect enough money to pay the interest on the national debt 60 seconds and would not collect enough money to pay the cost of administering the tax returns. The propagandists, who are making the false charges against cooperatives, fail to tell the public that five out of every ten corporations engaged in business in this country pay no tax whatsoever, because they operate without profit or in a loss position. If you use the arguments of these propagandists as a guide to go by, it could be contended that these operators of corporate businesses that pay no Federal income taxes are also a threat to other units of free enterprise.

CREDIT UNIONS

Credit unions have been very helpful to the people of small means in this Nation. They are also cooperatives. The members are composed usually of groups having a great deal in common. For that reason, the officers and directors spend a certain amount of time each month in the interest of their credit unions. There are 3,782 Federal credit unions and 4,858 State credit unions in the United States. They have 3,000,000 members, with assets over $4,000,000. They encourage thrift and savings. If a member is in need of funds, because of illness or a death in the family, or for any other purpose, the funds can be obtained through the credit union at a very low rate of interest and the members saved the expense and embarrassment of having to deal with a loan shark. Like the REA cooperatives, not a single credit union has been forced into liquidation in the United States. They, too, are operated by people of small means and without financial experience.

LOAN SHARKS

A trail of misery that cannot be calculated is caused by the loan shark, who is often referred to as "the most odious of all human vultures." In many States, he is preying upon as many as a fourth of all families. An investigation has recently disclosed that in Dallas, Tex., a record of 2,556 loans by 72 companies show that the borrowers paid $85,000 interest on $55,757. The average interest rate in the first thousand cases was 271 percent and the highest was 1,131 percent. One case was cited in which the loan shark took in $1,053 in 9 years on a loan of $20 obtained by the borrower to purchase medicine for his sick wife.

The Government has been trying to eliminate loan sharks through different cooperative credit unions that can be organized locally and conducted by the people who organize them.

The credit union and the REA cooperatives are my favorites among the group.

COOPERATIVES NO THREAT TO EXISTING BUSINESSES

I do not agree that cooperatives will soon operate all or even a substantial part of the grocery stores, drug stores, filling stations, or other types of retail distribution in this country, as charged. In order for a cooperative to be conducted successfully, it must be composed of people who have something in common; for instance, members of the same church, or a lodge, employees of the same post office, factory, city, county, or State, who are closely associated together, people who are willing to use their time and efforts to help the other members while they are helping themselves. Cooperatives composed of members who do not have something in common will not likely succeed and prosper in the end.

SHOTGUN IN CORNER

Therefore, cooperatives in our national economy represent a shotgun in the corner for oppressed people to use in an emergency in order to protect themselves from monopoly, greed, and extortion; also in order to provide themselves with comforts, conveniences, and essentials, which cannot be satisfactorily or economically obtained in any other way.

1948 IMPORTANT YEAR

Next year in Texas will be an important year to members of cooperatives. A strong effort is being made to destroy cooperatives. The year 1948 is a Presidential year, when party platforms will be written. Unless there is substantial sentiment in favor of cooperatives at the various political conventions there is a likelihood that anticooperative planks will be inserted. Being more specific, next May delegates to the Democratic National Convention will be selected in Texas.

To be more specific, May 1, which is the first Saturday in May, national precinct conventions will meet to elect delegates to national county conventions. The time of meeting has been fixed for 2 p. m. in rural precincts and 7 p. m. in city precincts.

The following Tuesday, May 4, at 10 a. m., the county executive committee will meet and make up the temporary roll of delegates to the county conventions. On the same day, May 4, at 2 p. m., the national county convention will meet at a place to be previously designated by the county executive committee to elect delegates to the national State conventions.

May 25, which is the fourth Tuesday in May, the national State convention will meet at a city previously selected by the State executive committee for the purpose of selecting delegates to the national convention.

These are important dates for every good citizen. I urge you and your friends to attend your precinct convention, May 1, and see that the right kind of delegates are selected to the county convention and then to the State convention and then to the national convention.

It is through politics that the people rule. Anyone who says he is not interested in politics is saying that he is not interested in his Government or his own business. It is only through politics that the people control their Government and remain the sovereign power of our country. Applying this discussion to free enterprise, it is necessary that the political affairs of our Government be successfully conducted in order to save our Government, in order that free enterprise may also be saved. Without politicians there could not be a representative democracy, because it is only through politics that the people have a vehicle to express their wishes and demands so that they can be carried out. The public has a fertile, honest, and intelligent mind. The collective mind, acting through the medium of politics, has provided our country—the United States—with the greatest Government in all the world. It will continue great as long as the people taken an interest in its affairs and do not become indifferent.

You have a great responsibility. Your policies will be reflected in the economy of the Nation. In helping to save your country you will be helping your own business by preserving the free-enterprise system.

It was Demosthenes who said: "He who saves his country saves all things, and all things saved will bless him. He who lets his country die lets all things die, and all things dying will curse him."

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith chart A, which appeared in the report of the Committee on Small Business, concerning the taxation of cooperatives:

CHART A

SUMMARY OF TAX LIABILITY OF VARIOUS TYPES OF BUSINESS ENTERPRISES, INCLUDING COOPERATIVES

As a reference for consideration of facts outlined further in the report it has been deemed advisable to indicate generally the differentiation in the various forms of business enterprise and the tax liability each incurs by virtue of its income.

There follows as chart A a simple chart which indicates this position in relative form. In the text following will be found a more detailed description of the points in issue.

Table A has been carefully checked and verified for accuracy by the following agencies and organizations:

United States Treasury, Tax Research Division;

Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics;

Department of Agriculture, Farm Credit Division, Cooperative Research Section;

Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue and Taxation, United States Congress; and by

Independent attorneys and representatives of business and trade associations in position to pass an unbiased opinion on the reflections indicated by the chart.

TABLE A.—*Comparative tax applicability for selected types of business enterprise*

[Positions are generalized. Detailed explanations appear in text of the report]

	Nonco-operative corpo-rations	Partner-ships	Individ-ual pro-prietor-ships	Nonfarm consumer co-ops	Farmer cooperatives	
					Exempt	Non-exempt
FEDERAL TAXES						
General corporation taxes:						
Capital-stock tax	Yes	[1]	[1]	Yes	No	Yes.
Income taxes, general	Yes	[1]	[1]	Yes	No	Yes.
Individual income taxes (in the hands of the recipient):						
(A) Cash distributed:						
1. Patronage dividends	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	Yes	Yes.
2. Dividends on capital stock	Yes	[1]	[1]	Yes	Yes	Yes.
3. Cash withdrawals	[1]	Yes	Yes	[1]	[1]	[1].
(B) Undistributed earnings:						
1. Patrons dividends in noncash form	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	Yes	Yes.
2. Allocations to reserves or surplus	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No.
Social security taxes:						
Old-age insurance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes [2]	Yes.[2]
Unemployment compensation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Stamp taxes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes.
STATE TAXES [4]						
General corporation taxes:						
Capital stock taxes	Yes	[1]	[1]	Yes	No	Varies.
Income taxes	Yes	[1]	[1]	Yes	No	Yes.
Occupational and other licenses	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Unemployment taxes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Property taxes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Retail sales taxes [5]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
CITY AND COUNTY TAXES [4]						
Occupational licenses	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Property taxes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.

[1] Not applicable.
[2] Usually no.
[3] Agricultural pursuits are exempt from old-age insurance and unemployment compensation if renumeration does not exceed $45 for the calendar quarter.
[4] These items vary with State or local regulation. Applicability shown is the general position.
[5] Certain types of agricultural items are exempt from retail sales taxes in all forms of business enterprise including cooperatives.

The table is as follows:

Passenger fatalities and fatality rates per hundred million passenger-miles

ALL STEAM RAILWAYS

Year	Passenger-miles	Fatalities	Rate per hundred million passenger-miles	Passenger-miles per fatality
1935	18, 509, 497, 000	23	0.12	804, 760, 739
1936	22, 459, 781, 000	23	.10	976, 512, 217
1937	24, 695, 214, 060	22	.09	1, 122, 509, 727
1938	21, 656, 918, 000	79	.36	274, 138, 203
1939	22, 712, 941, 000	32	.14	709, 779, 406
1940	23, 815, 598, 000	80	.34	297, 694, 975
1941	29, 406, 250, 000	41	.14	717, 225, 610
1942	53, 747, 029, 000	98	.18	548, 439, 072
1943	87, 924, 994, 000	271	.31	324, 446, 472
1944	95, 662, 501, 000	259	.27	369, 353, 286
1945	91, 826, 353, 000	145	.16	633, 285, 193
1946	[1] 64, 750, 000, 000	115	.18	563, 000, 000

DOMESTIC SCHEDULED AIR LINES

1935	313, 905, 508	15	4. 78	20, 927, 034
1936	435, 740, 253	44	10. 10	9, 903, 188
1937	476, 603, 165	40	8. 39	11, 915, 079
1938	557, 719, 268	25	4. 48	22, 308, 771
1939	749, 787, 096	9	1. 20	83, 309, 677
1940	1, 147, 444, 948	35	3. 05	32, 784, 141
1941	1, 491, 734, 671	35	2. 35	42, 620, 990
1942	1, 481, 976, 329	55	3. 71	26, 945, 024
1943	1, 642, 596, 640	22	1. 34	74, 663, 484
1944	2, 264, 282, 433	48	2. 12	47, 172, 551
1945	3, 500, 092, 064	76	2. 17	46, 053, 843
1946	5, 982, 566, 040	75	1. 25	79, 767, 547

BUSSES

1941	29, 700, 000, 000	70	0. 24	424, 000, 000
1942	44, 000, 000, 000	100	.23	440, 000, 000
1943	60, 000, 000, 000	130	.22	462, 000, 000
1944	65, 000, 000, 000	140	.22	464, 000, 000
1945	69, 000, 000, 000	120	.17	575, 000, 000
1946	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]

PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES AND TAXIS

1941	518, 000, 000, 000	20, 800	4. 02	24, 900, 000
1942	480, 000, 000, 000	12, 900	2. 69	37, 200, 000
1943	360, 000, 000, 000	9, 800	2. 72	36, 700, 000
1944	370, 000, 000, 000	10, 600	2. 86	34, 900, 000
1945	440, 000, 000, 000	12, 900	2. 93	34, 100, 000
1946	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]

[1] Partially estimated.
[2] Not yet available.

Source: Railways: Interstate Commerce Commission. Passengers as used above relate to passengers on trains in both train and train-service accidents; that is, collisions, derailments, etc., or persons getting on or off passenger-carrying trains under conditions not constituting trespass. They do not include ICC Subclassification "travelers not on trains"—other persons lawfully on railway premises in connection with their journeys by railways. Fatalities cover both injuries which result in death within 24 hours following the accident and deaths occurring more than 24 hours after the time of the accident. Suicides are not included.

Air lines: Civil Aeronautics Administration. Figures cover scheduled air lines operating within the continental limits of the United States. Fatalities and passenger-miles include both revenue and nonrevenue data.

Passenger automobiles and busses: National Safety Council. Drivers of passenger automobiles are classed as passengers. Bus transportation passenger mileage estimated by Bus Transportation magazine. Other mileage estimated from gasoline consumption by the National Safety Council. Data for passenger automobiles and busses combined in years prior to 1941.

A Good State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. MATHEWS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, it is a fine thing for a man to be proud of his own State, even if he does not have too much to be proud of. It is a finer thing when a man is proud of his own State and has good reason for that pride. I am proud of my State of New Jersey. It has just about everything that could be desired in a State, from large industries to small businesses, and from enormous corporate agricultural operations to small farms. It has busy cities, beautiful country, and attractive towns. It can offer the visitor the seashore or the mountains, the ocean, or the lake.

It has good government which is not costly and which does not take very much from what little is left of the taxpayers money after the Federal Government cuts off its big slice.

It is a happy State in which to live, and from statistics compiled by my good and efficient friend, Dr. J. Lynn Mahaffey, director of the Department of Health of New Jersey, it appears to be a normal and healthy State in which to live. There are 21 counties in the State of New Jersey and the following is the record of births, marriages, deaths, and deaths under 1 year of age for the year 1946:

County	Births	Marriages	Deaths	Deaths under 1 year
Atlantic	2,406	1,954	1,722	87
Bergen	9,496	5,466	4,118	227
Burlington	2,326	1,453	1,154	74
Camden	6,142	3,798	2,914	161
Cape May	613	411	474	21
Cumberland	1,785	944	913	71
Essex	18,487	12,595	9,296	518
Gloucester	1,780	982	817	52
Hudson	13,815	10,427	7,034	424
Hunterdon	656	444	416	20
Mercer	4,558	2,939	2,223	178
Middlesex	5,187	3,475	2,141	124
Monmouth	4,153	2,416	2,296	117
Morris	2,974	1,591	1,376	73
Ocean	983	631	578	36
Passaic	6,569	4,754	3,221	166
Salem	1,195	436	463	50
Somerset	1,833	978	768	53
Sussex	808	398	374	20
Union	8,158	4,281	3,355	198
Warren	1,120	647	608	34
State total	95,044	61,020	46,261	2,704

Travel by Railroads Safest Method of Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following table of passenger fatalities, which furnishes a comparison between rail, bus, taxicabs, private passenger automobiles, and air travel, reveals that the railroads provide the safest mode of transportation for the traveling public.

Lobbying at the Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article

entitled "The Little Foxes," written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, in their column in the Washington Post of July 25, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF FACT—THE LITTLE FOXES

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

The country is due for a barrage of pious platitudes about the accomplishments of the departing Congress from partisans who wish to paint a charming picture. There will be a holy silence, however, about one feature which has been as conspicuous as it is uncharming. In the presence of lobbyists the Eightieth Congress of the United States has behaved like a blowzy chorus girl just starting on her second pint of rye.

The fact is vitally important, and not merely to the American progressives who can hope that the triumphs of the lobbyists today will prepare for the triumphs of progressivism tomorrow. Sensible American conservatives must realize that holding a lobbyists' carnival at the Capitol is not a wise way to serve long-range conservative interests. Yet at this session something very like the beginning of a lobbyists' carnival has been plainly discernible.

"You can't take a deep breath around here," remarked one disgusted Republican Senator, "without getting a lungful of utilities lobbyists."

Although the large ranchers, real estate, wool, and one or two other lobbies have been rather more conspicuously successful, the best introduction to what has been going on is the story of the blatant power lobby.

The power lobby is the most active, and most conspicuously well-heeled in Washington. Its grand panjandrum, the high-powered P. L. Smith, representative of the National Association of Electrical Companies, gets a salary in the Hollywood class—$65,000 annually, with an ample expense account. But even the prosperous Smith is less important than the numerous officials of the large utilities companies. These converge on the Capitol at frequent intervals to make the boys on the Hill see the power question in the old, free enterprise way. And behind these larger operators, there is a whole network of lawyers with retainers from the utilities, bankers with deposits from them, and other influential figures. These speak from the voting districts to Washington with voices of authority.

Besides stirring up the sordid attack on David E. Lilienthal, the power people have scored major successes at this session with the Appropriations Committees. These committees are a natural field of operations, because of their views on public power held by the two chairmen, roaring old JOHN TABER, of New York and his more slick opposite number in the Senate, STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire.

Through the Appropriations Committees, in fact, the Federal power program has been put into a slow stall, by snipping here and chopping there at vital projects. The great Bonneville project, for example is so undermaintained and overloaded that the transformers are literally being cooled by having hoses played on them. Yet the Bonneville construction funds were cut almost in half, and the funds for operation and maintenance reduced from $4,700,000 to $2,500,000. Thus the present thoroughly dangerous condition will continue.

Again, extension of power supply from the Shasta Dam to several important California municipalities was neatly prevented by the simple deletion of funds for a transmission line. And the Southwest Power Administration, which has to contend with especially strong political counterinfluences in its Texas-Oklahoma-Arkansas area, also had its funds for transmission lines drastically cut. Thus the benefits of the national investment in the Dennison and Norfork Dams, on the Red and White Rivers, will be denied to many potential power users.

These achievements at the present session are obviously intended, however, to be only the hors d'oeuvres—the little snacks at the beginning of a much larger meal. For the first time in a good number of years, the more unenlightened utilities leaders have been openly trying to put the clock back with legislation. The result has been a crop of strikingly significant bills—the Rizley bill, to free natural gas from regulation; the Dondero bill, to limit sales of public power and to deprive the public power-minded Interior Department of its jurisdiction; the Thomas bill, which would have the effect of forbidding Government construction of any further transmission lines; and the bills of Representative MILLER of Connecticut, which would liberate from regulation large numbers of utilities companies now regulated.

None of these bills has yet passed. But this does not trouble the power people. Their strategy obviously is to put on their real pressure drive later on, when the election is over and, as they hope, an intensively conservative Congress will listen to them even more complacently. In that happy period, the body of Federal power legislation is to be revised.

The public power advocates among Federal officials are to be quietly dropped down the political oubliette. And everything is to be as it was before the hated name of Roosevelt was heard in the land.

Fortunately, such Republican leaders as Senators VANDENBERG and TAFT show none of the responsiveness of the congressional rank and file to these "little foxes that spoil the vines." But as the party of business, the Republicans have got a very big, very difficult decision to make, because of this onslaught of the little foxes upon Washington.

Summary of Agricultural Coordination Act of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the so-called Agricultural Coordination Act of 1947, the summary having been made by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF AGRICULTURAL COORDINATION ACT OF 1947

(H. R. 4150, by Mr. COOLEY, of North Carolina; H. R. 4151, by Mr. HILL, of Colorado; and S. 1621, by Mr. REED, of Kansas, and Mr. STEWART, of Tennessee)

Purposes of this legislation are to avoid duplication, overlapping, and conflicts and to bring about effective coordination in programs and activities of agricultural conservation agencies; to decentralize these programs so that each State and county can adapt them to its own conditions and needs; to reduce the costs of administration; and to achieve the maximum results in agricultural conservation among the maximum number of farmers at the minimum expense.

COORDINATION OF RESEARCH

The research work in conservation would be coordinated through the State agricultural experiment stations in cooperation with the Federal Office of Experiment Stations, on a grant-in-aid basis. The conservation research now carried on by the Soil Conservation Service through its own experiment stations would be assigned to the State experiment stations.

COORDINATION OF EDUCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The proposed act would eliminate duplication, overlapping, and conflicts among various agencies in furnishing, educational, informational, demonstrational, and technical assistance to farmers, in the field of agricultural conservation, land use, and farm planning, by assigning these functions to one agency, the Agricultural Extension Service. This is the basic job for which the Extension Service was established. The Extension Service would also furnish technical advice and assistance to local soil-conservation districts and to State and county PMA committees, in connection with conservation programs carried on in the respective States and counties.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Soil Conservation Service would be transferred to the Extension Service at Federal, State, and local levels and their Federal, State, and local offices would be consolidated. The regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service, now costing several million dollars annually, would be abolished as they would no longer be necessary under this set-up. The activities of the Soil Conservation Service consist almost entirely of educational, informational, demonstrational, and technical assistance to farmers in the field of conservation, all of which are a part of the basic functions of the Extension Service. The identity of the Soil Conservation Service would be retained but it would function as a part of the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the States. This consolidation and coordination will make it possible to reach a larger number of farmers and accomplish much better results at less cost. This part of the program would be decentralized on a grant-in-aid basis. In each State, the Extension Service would be required to maintain the Soil Conservation Service as a division of the State extension service, and such of the personnel of the Soil Conservation Service as are needed would be utilized in the State and county offices of the Extension Service.

The bill will not change or interfere in any way with the set-up and operations of the State soil conservation districts acts or local soil conservation districts, organized under these acts. On the contrary, these districts would have more real autonomy under the program than under the present set-up under which the Federal Soil Conservation Service can dictate to local districts what practices and programs they shall adopt. Under the proposed act, soil conservation districts would continue to receive technical assistance but would be freed from centralized control by the transfer of the responsibility for furnishing this assistance to the Extension Service, which is a State agency operated under cooperative agreements with the United States Department of Agriculture. The State extension services would enter into cooperative agreements with local soil conservation districts within their respective States to provide these services.

The appropriations for this work would be placed on a grant-in-aid basis of which not to exceed 10 percent would be allotted as grants to State experiment stations for conservation research, not to exceed 2 percent would be allotted to the Washington office of the Soil Conservation Service, and the balance would be allotted as grants to the

State extension services to maintain the services of the Soil Conservation Service in the States.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The agricultural conservation program, hitherto carried on under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, would be decentralized and the responsibility for developing and carrying out this program in each State would be vested in a State committee, which would be reorganized to make it more representative in character and more democratically selected. The State committee, after receiving recommendations of the county committees, would develop a State conservation program, subject to approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. The conservation practices to be included in this program would be limited to those recommended by a technical committee, composed of the State extension director, the State experiment station director, the State commissioner of agriculture, and a representative designated by the State authority created by the Soil Conservation Districts Act, all of whom would be ex officio members of the State committee. In addition to these ex officio members, the State committee would consist of five farmer members. The State committee would function as a part-time policymaking committee and would employ an administrator and other needed assistants to carry out its duties under the supervision and direction of the committee.

In like manner, the county committee would be responsible for planning and carrying out the county conservation program. It would also be enlarged to include a representative to be designated by the board of supervisors of the soil-conservation district in any county where such districts exist in whole or in part.

The State and county committees would be confined to planning and administering the action phases of the agricultural conservation programs and would also continue to administer the regulatory, enforcement, and other administrative phases of the marketing-quota provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and also local phases of commodity loans and price-support programs under the Steagall Act.

By including on these State and county committees representatives of the State soil districts authority and local soil-conservation districts, the act will facilitate the coordination of the conservation programs carried out through soil-conservation districts and the over-all agricultural conservation program, which is developed and carried out through State and county committees.

Conservation payments to farmers, administered through State and county committees, would be utilized to implement this coordinated conservation program within the respective States. The appropriations for soil-building and soil-conserving practices hereafter would be apportioned to the States on the basis of need.

The Champion Rainbow Trout Are From Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABE McGREGOR GOFF
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, now that our session is about over, the membership should be interested in the pleasant subject of fishing. Herbert Hoover says what is wrong with the world is that people ought to do more fishing. I hold in my hand the April 1947 issue of Field and Stream magazine, and on page 67, there appears a tabulation of the prize winners for the 1946 Field and Stream fishing contest. Ten prize winners were all taken from Pend Oreille Lake, within my district in northern Idaho. Not only that, but of the 10 given honorable mention, 9 of these were also caught in this same lake, the home of the famous fighting Kamloops Rainbow trout. Last year's champion weighed 31 pounds 8 ounces, and even the twentieth listed weighed over 26 pounds. Already this year a 36-pound new champion has been landed.

There are plenty of other fine fishing lakes and clear trout stream in Idaho's cool, heavily timbered mountains. If you are interested, just drop a line to the Idaho Fish and Game Department, Boise, Idaho.

The list of the prize winners is as follows:

Prize winners—1946 Field and Stream fishing contest—Rainbow trout, open, western division

Winner	Weight	Where caught	When
1. E. A. Kirkpatrick	31 pounds, 8 ounces	Pend Oreille Lake, Idaho	Nov. 26
2. Ivan L. Haruff	20 pounds, 12 ounces	do	Oct. 5
3. C. E. Jones	30 pounds, 4 ounces	do	Nov. 5
4. R. Foster	30 pounds, 2 ounces	do	Sept. 29
5. J. M. Smatian	29 pounds, 12 ounces	do	Nov. 4
6. R. G. Wideman	29 pounds, 8 ounces	do	Nov. 13
7. James A. Eaton	29 pounds, 8 ounces	do	Nov. 9
8. Carl J. Haacke	29 pounds, 1½ ounces	do	July 29
9. Mrs. Laurence Hamilton	28 pounds, 8 ounces	do	Nov. 24
10. Andrew Haas	28 pounds, 4 ounces	Kamloops Anchorage, Idaho	Nov. 10

Honorable mentions: C. V. Osborne, 27 pounds 12 ounces, Pend Oreille Lake, Idaho; Mrs. H. W. Dauterman, 27 pounds, 8 ounces, Cowlitz River, Wash.; Mrs. Charles E. Wilt, 27 pounds 6 ounces, Pend Oreille Lake, Idaho; Leonard H. Licht, 27 pounds 2 ounces, Pend Oreille Lake, Idaho; Robert E. Chaffins, 27 pounds, Pend Oreille Lake, Idaho; R. W. Simmons, 26 pounds 12 ounces, Pend Oreille Lake, Idaho; H. L. Chapin, 26 pounds 8 ounces, Pend Oreille Lake, Idaho; Laurence Hamilton, 26 pounds 8 ounces, Pend Oreille Lake, Idaho; Jack A. Mason, 26 pounds 8 ounces, Pend Oreille Lake, Idaho; Mrs. Chris Kleweno, 26 pounds 8 ounces, Pend Oreille Lake, Idaho.

Board of Foreign Scholarships Appointed by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a release by the White House regarding the appointment of a board of foreign scholarships. I ask that this release be followed by a statement prepared by me and an editorial from the Kansas City Star on the same subject.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF FOREIGN SCHOLARSHIPS APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT

President Truman today announced appointment of a 10-man Board of Foreign Scholarships to select American students for study abroad under the Fulbright Act.

The Board, which will have general supervision of educational exchanges under the act as well as the institutions to participate, is made up of leaders chosen from the fields of cultural, educational, student, and war-veteran activities as required by the law.

The appointees are:

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration.

John W. Studebaker, Commissioner, United States Office of Education.

Francis Spaulding, commissioner of education, State of New York.

Helen C. White, professor of English, University of Wisconsin.

Laurence Duggan, director, Institute of International Education.

Ernest O. Lawrence, professor of physics, University of California.

Sarah Blanding, president, Vassar College.

Walter Johnson, professor of history, University of Chicago.

Charles S. Johnson, president, Fisk University.

Martin P. McGuire, dean of the graduate school, Catholic University of America.

Appointment of the Board is a major step in starting the program under which foreign governments are enabled to pay in part for overseas war surpluses purchased from the United States, with scholarships in their own schools for American students.

Specifically, the law authorizes executive agreements with foreign governments for the use of their currencies and credits acquired by the United States in payment for surplus properties overseas to finance studies and other educational activities of United States citizens in their own educational institutions. The funds could also be used to finance their own nationals in American schools operated in foreign countries and to pay for travel of their own nationals to attend schools here so long as they would not displace Americans.

The law limits the amount to be devoted to educational exchanges in any one country to $20,000,000 to be used at the rate of not more than $1,000,000 annually.

Sale to date of overseas United States surplus property is sufficient to make about $137,550,000 available to 22 countries for the educational exchanges provided by the act over the period of the next 20 years. The annual expenditure under the program is expected to total about $7,000,000.

The State Department, which will administer the law, has received some 12,000 applications from Americans to study abroad under the terms of the act, 5,000 of whom are veterans who are given preference status by the law.

Negotiation of the executive agreements necessary to set the plan in operation has started. It is expected that the actual student exchanges will start at the opening of the academic year in the fall of 1948.

The countries now eligible to participate in the plan, together with the amounts to be proposed for educational exchanges for the 20-year period, follow:

Australia	$5,000,000
Austria	750,000
Belgium	3,000,000
Czechoslovakia	6,000,000
Denmark	3,000,000
Egypt	3,000,000
Finland	5,000,000
France	5,000,000
Greece	8,000,000
Hungary	5,000,000
Iran (rials) (about)	2,000,000
Italy	20,000,000
Netherlands	5,000,000
Netherlands Indies	7,000,000
New Zealand	2,300,000
Poland	8,000,000
Siam	4,000,000
Turkey	500,000
United Kingdom	20,000,000
Burma	3,000,000
Philippines	2,000,000
China	20,000,000
Total	137,550,000

STATEMENT BY HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

It is most encouraging for the future of this program that men and women of such high distinction and ability have agreed to serve on the Board of Foreign Scholarships. The membership of the Board represents America in the broadcast sense and I congratulate President Truman upon the wisdom of his appointments.

The sponsoring of the legislation creating these scholarships has been the most gratifying experience that I have had in public life. I believe that the thousands of young men and young women who, under this program, will live and study among the people of countries other than their own, will, because of their experience and understanding, exert a powerful influence for peace. In the long run education is the greatest hope of mankind for peaceful and friendly relations among the peoples of the world.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of July 20, 1947]

VALUE IN A FOREIGN STUDY PLAN

Within a year the first group of American students will enroll in foreign schools under the terms of the Fulbright Act. This measure, named for its sponsor, Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, permits educational cooperation with any nation buying our surplus war goods. Part of the proceeds from such sales will be left with countries sharing in the program to finance the study of United States citizens overseas and in turn enable foreign students to attend American institutions.

President Truman recently named a board of 10 educators and officials to select students qualified for these scholarships. It will be a large-scale undertaking, with several thousand Americans benefiting from it annually and a fund of $137,550,000 already set aside to pay its expenses over a 20-year period. Twenty-two nations representing most areas of the world are eligible to join us in the plan.

Russia is not among them, having shown no interest in the idea. In fact, American officials got a silent brush-off last year when they sought to discuss a proposal for exchange scholarships with the Soviet Union. This attitude was in line with the Russians' general unwillingness to let their people associate with the citizens of non-Communist countries.

The benefits of the plan no doubt would be increased by Russia's participation in it. Yet this lack will not affect the mutual gains to be made available to all countries where students will be exchanged under the arrangement. The dividends in creating better understanding between these nations and the United States are likely to be large. Our experience in sending Rhodes scholars to England and in bringing Chinese students to America long ago proved the value of such programs.

Marshall Plan and the Demands Upon American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the American people are entitled to know all of the facts in connection with the so-called Marshall plan which has been given wide publicity in the United States and overseas. Actually Secretary Marshall did not suggest the plan but merely indicated that if European nations expected assistance from the United States they would have to work out their own problems to a large degree. As part of my remarks I am including a very informative article by a prominent newspaperman which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday:

DEMANDS OF MARSHALL PLAN WILL TAX ABILITY OF INDUSTRY

(By Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr.)

American industry will find it hard to meet the inevitable European demands for capital goods under the Marshall program, a Washington Post survey showed yesterday.

Big European orders next winter and spring will mean that the American manufacturer, farmer, and consumer will have to wait longer to get many types of equipment of the kind Europe desperately needs.

If Congress appropriates the funds, the United States probably can export greater quantities of steam locomotives, steel rails, horse-drawn farm equipment, coal cutters, machine tools, horses, and mules.

But even if Congress appropriates the money, or if the World Bank helps with reconstruction loans, many kinds of capital goods simply will not be available for increased export under the Marshall program without the use of Government priorities, or, alternatively, a self-rationing by American industry.

Among these products are freight cars, coal cars, motor tractors, mine locomotives, textile machinery, fertilizer and soda ash, the last of which is essential for making glass, soap, paper, and other commodities.

The new act of Congress extending certain war powers gives the President the right to divert capital goods from domestic buyers if:

1. The Secretary of State certifies that their prompt export "is of high public importance and essential to the successful carrying out of the foreign policy of the United States," and if

2. The Secretary of Commerce has satisfied himself that such exports "will not have an adverse effect on the domestic economy of the United States."

CALLS FOR SACRIFICE

These are sweeping powers. The administration hopes they will not have to be used, but it is ready to use them if necessary to get Europe back on its feet.

Certainly there is no disposition in high quarters here to do what Soviet propaganda accuses the United States of doing—of using the Marshall program as a device to dump unwanted American surpluses on Europe.

Whatever specific quantities Europe may need, the administration knows already that the Marshall program will require what some officials here call sacrifice, and what others call "deferment of cravings" by the American people.

The impending problem was explained for the first time yesterday to Secretary Harriman's 19-man committee of business and professional leaders, whose assignment will be to recommend what America can "safely and wisely" do to meet Europe's needs. The first meeting was partly an organizational session, to be followed by another all-day meeting tomorrow.

STEEL IS BIG PROBLEM

In advance of the Harriman committee's studies and recommendations, however, it is possible to see how well or how badly certain capital goods industries are able to meet the impact of European requirements in the coming year. There is no question here that capital goods will be the heart of the Marshall program, and that the United States is Europe's only major source for getting them.

Steel is by far the most serious bottleneck at the moment, the Post survey shows, and is responsible for most of the others. Even with the estimated current output of 69,000,000 tons this year, steel production cannot meet the demands now coming from almost every sector of American industry.

The shortage is especially serious in sheet, strip, pipe, and tube, which account for about 40 percent of all steel products.

If steel capacity were increased in this country, there would be (in time) more trucks and tractors, freight cars and coal cars, textile machinery, and a thousand and one other industrial products to help reconstruct Europe.

But it takes 2½ years to build an entirely new steel plant, which means that an increase in capacity would be too slow to meet the present emergency in Europe. In any case, the steel industry is reluctant to expand because it doubts whether the current high demand will continue.

Some electric-furnace capacity is not being used today for the simple reason that it does not pay. If it were used, experts here estimate that it could produce an additional 2,500,000 to 5,000,000 tons of steel ingots for export.

This would give substantial help to Europe, which can roll its own steel from American ingots. But because of the high cost of using this capacity, it would require some kind of Government price premium or subsidy plan which neither Congress nor the steel industry is likely to approve.

PAINFUL CHOICE FACED

Something might be done to increase output by the new method of using oxygen instead of air in blast furnaces—a method which increases the rate of steel output by 50 percent. It would not take more than 6 months, according to estimates here, to complete a large-scale switch to the use of oxygen, but it would cost money and probably would require Federal financing.

An Unequaled Epic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, a generation passed from that day in 1907 when

President Theodore Roosevelt sent the Great White Fleet of the American Navy into Tokyo harbor, to that day in 1945 when Admiral Nimitz again took the United States Navy into the same harbor. Theodore Roosevelt's purpose was to prevent war; Admiral Nimitz' purpose was to restore peace.

It was an unequaled epic in the glorious history of our Navy as a strong arm of national defense.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial which recently appeared in the San Francisco Examiner entitled "An Unequaled Epic" merits the attention of every Member of the House of Representatives. Under permission extended to me to include it in the RECORD I invite the attention of the Members to it:

AN UNEQUALED EPIC

Two years have passed since the United States Navy, in the most overwhelming demonstration of sea power history records, steamed to the shores of the Japanese homeland, poised to deliver the death stroke to an enemy who had challenged, and grievously miscalculated, the spirit and valor of American men in American ships.

How completely crushing that victory was, can best be understood by reading a statistical analysis published recently by the Joint Army-Navy Assessment Committee under the title "Japanese Naval and Merchant Shipping Losses During World War II by All Causes."

The book contains no battle accounts, no illustrations, or word-pictures, no personal names, no comment of any kind.

It is merely a collection of graphs, summaries, chronologies; it lists the name, class, tonnage, and type of Japanese craft; the "flag of agent," and "type of agent" that caused the final entry of the tabulation, which is invariably "sunk," with here and there a "probably sunk."

But the coldly objective figures achieve a dramatic impact more startling because so tight-lipped, when the totals are reached:

Out of a total of 8,000,000 tons of shipping, Japan had less than 1,000,000 at war's end.

Of the millions sunk, American submarines, carrier-based aircraft, and surface ships accounted for the vast majority, the submarines alone sending more than 5,000,000 tons to the bottom.

So much for mere figures, staggering enough in themselves, awe-inspiring in their connotations.

For the American Navy started the war reeling from a nearly fatal blow, the treacherous attack upon Pearl Harbor.

For 2 years thereafter it fought under odds always heavy, often heart-breaking and more than once seemingly insuperable.

Men, ships, planes, and guns fought incessantly, outnumbered and outweighed until it seemed neither human flesh nor tortured mechanisms could hope to endure another moment.

It was then that the United States Navy took its place in the front rank of heroism.

That was the hour of its most shining glory.

That was the time that American gallantry, courage, and devotion eclipsed the legends and epics of Salamis, Lepanto, and Trafalgar.

It was then, that through the power of spirit and stoutness of heart, the American Navy contained its materially more powerful enemy and guaranteed his ultimate defeat.

Later, the valiant handful of men and ships grew until 2 years ago no power on earth could have withstood the weight of metal flung by its guns, beneath, upon, and above the enormous area of its dominion.

The American Navy is still the mightiest force afloat.

It has gained a new progressive spirit.

It is intelligently in harmony with new developments, technical and strategic.

It is solidly based on a tradition of change and improvement, and profoundly dedicated to democratic principles.

It is an instrument of national policy, a guardian of peace, a guarantor of the Nation's security; a splendid school to patriotic youth, a source of pride and hope to America.

This great service has earned the gratitude and the unequivocal support of Americans.

It must be kept strong.

Its glorious past and its vital function today demand not only the tributes of sentiment and admiration but the invaluable aid of understanding and material facilities needed to preserve it as the principal bulwark of our liberties.

War Powers for a Postwar Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, asks of Congress that we use common sense in our after-war changes in order to arrive at normal peacetime conditions.

I think Congress now realizes, considering the abnormal rise in the cost of living during the last year, that we have been too hasty in abandoning wartime controls, especially price controls on food, clothing, rent, and so forth.

WAR POWERS FOR A POSTWAR JOB

In signing the bill which extended certain of his war powers until next March, President Truman commented on the aversion of our people to controls. Yet a little reflection should convince even the stoutest opponent of such Government regulation that the present extension is wise and necessary.

Broadly, these war powers are now aimed at giving the maximum foreign aid when and where it is most needed, with the minimum disturbance to our domestic economy. Already, in the postwar years, they have probably done more than most of us realize to relieve hardship abroad without imposing it at home, and to act as a curb on inflation.

This extension of authority permits the President, through the Secretary of Commerce, to maintain control over the export of critically short supplies. It also permits him to keep ODT control over the allocation of freight cars and other railroad facilities. There are a few other provisions, but these are the two that affect all of us most directly.

The export controls allow the President to continue the quota system of foreign purchase or foreign allocation. All the commodities affected are in short supply abroad. Several foreign countries have dollars with which to buy them. Removal of controls on meat and grains, for example, would almost certainly touch off inflationary bidding and send prices soaring.

The rail controls make possible an intelligent and efficient use of transportation to get badly needed supplies to the right port at the right time. By avoiding waste, delay, and pile-ups, this also tends to eliminate shortages and thus put a downward pressure on prices.

To extend these war powers does not, of course, give assurance that they will be used wisely. There is no important evidence, however, that they have been abused. Their continuance, correlated with the survey of our domestic economy and foreign aid which Commerce Secretary Harriman and a public committee are making, should help to maintain balance in a situation where the demand always exceeds the supply.

Another important matter, pointed out by Mr. Truman, is that the renewal of the war powers gives notice to the world of "our unanimity on matters affecting our international relations." There may have been times when Mr. Truman and Congress have seen eye to eye on policy matters, but not on the means of putting policy into operation. But this is not one of those times.

The United States is committed to a policy of leadership and assistance in saving human lives and human freedom.

Those just reenacted seem the only alternative to the "haphazard distribution of our produce throughout the world" which, as Mr. Truman said, "could only lead to higher prices at home and suffering for the neediest of our friends abroad."

Editorial Tribute to Senator Ives by the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we all admire a man of courage and convictions. Such a man is the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in commendation of the Senator from New York, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IVES' "CRIME"

From New York comes the news of the establishment of an AFL-CIO unity committee on a State basis aimed at unseating Senator IRVING M. IVES in 1952. Senator IVES' "crime" consists of his vote for the Taft-Hartley Act. Forgotten are Senator IVES' great services in behalf of labor, organized and unorganized, in the State of New York, and his unwearying campaign in the Senate against repressive amendments to the Taft-Hartley bill. A freshman Senator, Mr. IVES has shown public spirit, progressiveness, and zeal. His record so far warrants great expectations of his public career, especially in making changes and corrections in the new legislation, as provided for in the setting up in the statute of a joint congressional committee.

This watchdog committee was an innovation in the statute of great importance. We might not have run into the need for a comprehensive statute if provision had been made in the Wagner Act for change in the light of experience. But organized labor bottled up the Senate Labor Committee; it refused to admit the need for any change; it declined to cooperate with Congress in the effort which resulted in the Taft-Hartley Act; and it now appears it will do nothing to help the new joint congressional committee to revise the handiwork of Congress as time goes on. More's the pity. The stiffnecked and vengeful attitude shown by the so-called unity committee in New York is a reminder

of Representative MONRONEY's observation during the Taft-Hartley debate. "The trouble with organized labor is that it has only one sentence. It gives you the death penalty for everything from overparking to murder."

Marshall Plan—Some Heavy Materials That Will Be Required Under This Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article which appeared in the Washington Post, Thursday, July 24, enumerating some of the heavy industrial equipment that will be necessary to support the Marshall plan. The people are entitled to know all of the facts.

The article follows:

Here is an industry-by-industry survey of what the United States can do to supply capital goods to Europe under the Marshall program:

Steam locomotives: The capacity of American plants is about 2,300 units a year, mostly from three companies. This capacity is not being used because American railroads are ordering Diesel-electric engines in place of steam. Higher production of steam locomotives for export depends largely, however, on bigger supplies of steel.

Freight cars: Twice as many new ones are being built this year as in 1946, but because of wear and tear there are 24,000 fewer freight cars in use in this country than at the start of last year. The shortage, caused largely by lack of steel, probably will be worst when this year's harvest is being moved. The shortage of coal cars is just as acute, and it would take at least a year to start production on European orders unless the Government used its powers to divert cars to Europe from the domestic users. In this case diversion of American cars would be impracticable because Europe uses a smaller and lighter type of coal car.

Steel rails: America's present capacity of 4,000,000 tons a year is twice as much as it uses. Exports to Europe so far have been only a trickle, chiefly to France and Italy. Most European countries have already patched up their war-torn transportation systems, and it is by no means certain that Europe will need large quantities of steel rails under the Marshall program.

Tractors: Demand will exceed the supply until 1949, according to the best available estimates. American farmers are clamoring for tractors to replace old equipment worn out during the war years. In spite of the demand at home, which ate up 315,000 tractors last year, the United States exported about 32,000 wheeled tractors to the rest of the world (excluding Canada) and is sending them now at a rate of about 55,000 a year. Crawler tractors, in addition, are going to the rest of the world (excluding Canada) at a rate of 28,000 a year compared to about 18,000 last year and 10,000 before the war.

Horse-drawn farm equipment: Because of the rise in feed prices here, the United States has plenty of horse-drawn farm machinery that could go to Europe. Although there are a million more tractors on American farms than in 1940, there are 4,000,000 fewer horses. There are also plenty of horses and mules available for export as draft animals if Europe wants and needs them.

Motortrucks: Present production is running at a rate of 1,200,000 vehicles a year, of which about one-quarter are being exported. The industry cannot produce more than this number without getting more steel, and Europe probably cannot import more without making American users wait longer to get their orders filled.

Hand implements for farming: Hoes, rakes, shovels, and simple plows are in fairly short supply; the five main companies making them are operating at capacity now. Here, as in so many other items, greater production is hampered by the difficulty of getting steel.

Coal-mining machinery: Cutters, loaders, conveyors, and mine locomotives are all in tight supply because of the demand from American mines. There is an excess capacity for making cutters of a type that can be used in France, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, although it is doubtful whether this type could be used in the Ruhr or in the shallow British mines. The United States probably could ship 60 coal cutters a month—as much as its whole prewar output—if the available type could be used in Europe.

Machine tools: There is ample room here for greater exports without inconveniencing American users. The prewar American business in machine tools was $300,000,000 a year; it soared to over a billion in the war, and has fallen to $600,000,000, of which $300,000,000 is essential to American needs. Thus $300,000,000 worth of machine tools are available for export, although exports are running at a rate of only $135,000,000. Here Europe's problem has been the need of using its dollars for food and fuel instead of for machine tools to reequip its factories.

Fertilizer: The demand at home is so heavy and so insatiable that the United States probably can do little more to satisfy Europe's needs. Production is double what it was in 1937, but the demand is still greater than the supply. If Europe could mine more coal it probably could supply most of its fertilizer needs without having to come to the United States.

H. R. 2873 Should Be Under the Jurisdiction of the House Committee on Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, this bill—H. R. 2873—deals almost in its entirety with water power. It extends from 50 to 78 years the repayment period on power projects built in connection with reclamation projects, reduces the interest rate from 3 to 2½ percent, and allows allocations to be made to certain purposes which shall be nonreimbursable. It is a drastic and important change in Federal power policy, particularly in extending the 50-year amortization period in the existing law by over 50 percent. The change is not explained in the committee report and the figure of 78 years does not appear anywhere in the hearings. It originated in a report of the Interior Department, without explanation, made after the hearings were closed.

The Committee on Public Works, and not the Committee on Public Lands, is vested by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public, 601, 79th Cong.), with jurisdiction over water power. See section 121 of that act, amending rule XI of the House, paragraph O.

The Committee on Public Works has been holding hearings for several weeks on legislation dealing with general power policies. Its jurisdiction extends to all legislation involving water power, whether such power is generated at dams built by the Reclamation Bureau or at dams built by other Government agencies. It it quite proper for the Committee on Public Lands to consider, if it likes, legislation which involves both reclamation of public lands, which is within its jurisdiction, and water power, which is not; but when it has finished its consideration of such a multiple-purpose bill, it cannot exclude the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works by reporting out the bill; the Committee on Public Works has full jurisdiction over water-power legislation, the Committee on Public Lands has none, and a bill involving water power reported out by the latter should be referred to the Committee on Public Works for its consideration, concurrence, or amendment. Otherwise, the whole plan of jurisdiction so carefully set up by the Reorganization Act of 1946 is set at naught Manifestly if the Public Lands Committee had included in this bill a provision for taxation of power revenues of reclamation projects, it could not, by reporting the bill, have deprived the Committee on Ways and Means of jurisdiction. The bill, after clearing the Public Lands Committee, would have to be referred to the committee having conclusive jurisdiction over revenue measures generally. In like manner, this bill, H. R. 2873, because it deals with water power, should be referred at this point to the Committee on Public Works, which alone has jurisdiction of that subject.

This is a matter of extreme seriousness. The amortization period and the interest rate are the controlling factors in the determination of rates to be charged for power. The whole question of the proper Government power policy is under active consideration of the Public Works Committee. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, in reporting out the Interior bill for 1948, called attention to the need for such a study.

The Federal Power Commission is the administrative agency generally charged with jurisdiction over water power. It reports to the Committee on Public Works.

Power policies should be recommended to Congress by the committee having jurisdiction, after consultation with the administrative agencies having jurisdiction. If this bill drastically altering the amortization period and hence the whole scheme of Federal water-power rates is not enacted, placing in the law a period which has not had a single word of explanation in any hearings or report, obviously the ground is cut from under any real and comprehensive overhauling of the Federal power policy, and it will continue to be a piecemeal and patchwork

affair put together by the agencies who want to construct projects.

For these reasons H. R. 2873 should not be enacted but should be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The United States and the Displaced Persons Presently in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere regret that I have learned that the Stratton bill, providing for the admission into the United States of 400,000 persons now in the displaced persons camps of Europe, is not to be considered in this first session of the Eightieth Congress. The bill does not commend itself to me in every particular by any manner of means; but these matters could have been taken care of by amendment. What I am interested in, what I regret, is that this great country with its almost incalculable wealth, its many square miles of open country is presently estopped from bringing into its wide borders a few hundred thousand people who have suffered indescribably from the impacts of war. It distresses me immeasurably that we speak so many words and make so many gestures and then fail to come forward when there is a practical, human action possible to us which would bring into our citizenship useful people whose long period of suffering would give us a leaven of understanding of what Europe has suffered, in itself a very real contribution to make to world understanding and peace.

There have been many misstatements made relative to these people which I feel have been instrumental in halting the action that might well have been taken. With a view to clarifying the record as this session of the Eightieth Congress draws to an end, let me give you as objective a picture as it is possible for me to do.

According to the best figures available there are now about 1,000,000 refugees or displaced persons in western Europe who are under the care of the United States and Great Britain. More than half are in United States zones. The President of the United States asked Congress, in effect, to let 400,000 into the United States.

Before inquiring into the merits of this proposal, it is essential first to know who these people are in terms of nationality or racial stocks:

A. Nearly 300,000 are Poles. They fear to return to their Russian-dominated homeland.

B. About 170,000 are from the Baltic States now incorporated into Russia. They also fear to return to their former homeland.

C. Another 70,000 are from Russian-dominated Yugoslavia.

D. Two hundred and sixty thousand are from the Russian Ukraine and the Balkans.

E. The remaining 200,000 are Jews, and are considered stateless.

Nearly all these refugees fear political or racial persecution if they should return to their former homelands.

The religion of these displaced persons is largely Christian. About 65 percent are Catholic; 15 percent, Protestant; and 20 percent are Jewish.

The age of the displaced persons is relatively low—about 66 percent are between the ages of 18 and 44. This is considered the best working-age bracket; only 21 percent are under the age of 18, and 13 percent are over 44. It is clearly apparent, therefore, that the majority are able to work.

It is important to note that these displaced workers command a variety of highly usable skills in a world which lacks skilled workers. The division of skills among them is as follows: Doctors and nurses, 3.2 percent; inexperienced and students, 4.4 percent; construction workers, 6.7 percent; mechanics and drivers, 7.6 percent; professional, 7.9 percent; mining and factory workers, 9.1 percent; clerks, 11.3 percent; farmers and lumbermen, 24.5 percent; skilled service workers, 25.3 percent.

Farm workers and lumbermen number 89,500 and are, of course, immensely useful wherever they might be put.

The skilled-service workers number 92,700 and include domestics, barbers, printers, bookbinders, opticians, butchers, linotypists, tailors, seamstresses, and upholsterers. Of this total, 33,600 are domestics such as waiters, kitchen help, gardeners, bakers, and cooks. All of these are in short supply in this country. Tailors and seamstresses number 22,800.

Clerks, bookkeepers, stenographers, office managers, interpreters, and typists make a total of 41,400 workers who could readily be absorbed in the world labor market.

Doctors, nurses, dietitians, and veterinarians represent 11,700 displaced persons. Their skills are in enormous demand everywhere.

Construction workers ranging from bricklayers to electricians number 24,600 skilled artisans who are needed here as elsewhere.

Mechanics, radiomen, seamen, and drivers account for a further 27,800 refugees available for immigration. Professionals, including clergymen, engineers, and teachers, represent 23,500 persons, while artists and writers total another 4,230.

Factory skills are available in 9.1 percent of the displaced persons. Seven thousand seven hundred are trained in metal work, 17,960 in processing and ore refining, 8,300 in factory-laborers jobs. These skills are specially needed here and elsewhere.

Inexperienced workers among the displaced persons come to only 4.4 percent of the total, half of whom are students.

United States taxpayers are now paying out $130,000,000 a year to maintain 550,000 refugees in Europe. Of these, about 400,000 are in camps. The cost of this operation in the year ahead is to be reduced to $73,000,000 but the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons remain and will continue to remain, a burden on the United States, until their fate is resolved.

As a partial solution of this painful question, the Stratton bill was introduced in the House. It proposes to bring into the United States 100,000 of these useful people each year for 4 years.

What are the alternatives if we do not do this?

First. The United States could continue for an indefinite time to support the refugee in camps. This could be done only at a very high cost to the American taxpayer and at the continuing deterioration of the men, women, and children who are in these camps through no fault of their own.

Second. The displaced persons could be turned loose in an already overcrowded and impoverished Germany.

Third. They could be forcibly repatriated to their native countries where they would meet with severe political and racial persecution with the result that they would become slave laborers or be executed.

It is significant of a radically changed attitude toward immigration into the United States that the great organized labor organizations of this country, which hitherto have often been opposed to letting down immigration bars, even a little, are now strongly in favor of permitting the 400,000 displaced persons mentioned in the Stratton bill, to enter this country. These include the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the United Automobile Workers, Oil Workers International, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, National Women's Trade Union League, and many others.

Among the religious groups supporting immigration of displaced persons to the United States, there are the American Friends Service Committee, the American Unitarian Association, Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Church, Evangelical and Reformed Church, Commission on Christian Social Action, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, General Council Northern Baptist Convention, Home Missions Council of North America, International Board of the Y. M. C. A., National Catholic Rural Life Conference, National Catholic Welfare Conference, National Lutheran Council, Presbyterian Church U. S. A., Division of Social Action and Education, Protestant Episcopal Church, General Convention, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America, Southern Baptist Convention, Synagogue Council of America, Unitarian Service Committee, United States Synagogue of America, World Alliance for International Friendship Through Churches.

The admission of 400,000 displaced persons to the United States is also favored by the following women's groups: American Association of University

Women, Catholic Daughters of America, Hadassah, League of Women Voters, National Board of the YWCA, National Council of Catholic Women, National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Women of the United States, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, United Council of Church Women, Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace, Women's American ORT, Women's Auxiliary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Women's Division of the Methodist Church, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (United States section), as well as the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The following social, civic, and welfare groups have also gone on record as favoring the admission of 400,000 displaced persons to this country: American Association of Social Workers, American Association for the United Nations, American Council for Judaism, American Farm Bureau Federation, Americans for Democratic Action, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, American Lithuanian Council, B'nai B'rith, Federation of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent, Lithuanian Alliance of America, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Order of the Sons of Italy, Polish-American Congress, Polish National Alliance, Russian-American Union for Protection and Aid to Russians Outside Russia, Ukrainian Congress Committee, The Self-Help of Emigrés from Central Europe, Inc.

Among veterans' groups the following favor the entry of displaced persons into this country: American Veterans' Committee, Catholic War Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, National Conference of Union Labor Legionnaires, National Council of American Veteran Organizations.

It will be seen from the foregoing list that organized labor, the church bodies of the United States, farm opinion as represented by the American Farm Bureau Federation, women's groups representing all shades of opinion, and dozens of social, civic, and welfare bodies favor the entry of displaced persons into this country under the provisions of the Stratton bill.

The principal organizations opposing the bill are the Daughters of the American Revolution and the American Legion. On behalf of the American Legion, National Commander Paul H. Griffith, in an address on June 12, 1947, made the following statements:

> Countless numbers of illegal immigrants are entering the country daily, that for every legal immigrant there are at least 10 illegal immigrants.

Proof of this charge seems to be entirely lacking.

> Immigrants would build up a fifth column in this country.

In other words, they would be representatives and proponents of communism. It is hard to reconcile such a charge with the fact that one of the sources of friction between the Soviet Government and Britain and the United States is that the Soviet Government is demanding that the displaced persons be repatriated to the countries of their origin; that is, that they should be placed again under the domination either of Russia itself, as in the case of Ukrainian displaced persons, or under the domination of Russian satellite countries, such as Poland or the Balkan States. The fact that displaced persons refuse to return to the countries of their origin would seem strong proof of their desire to resist communism and all its works.

Commander Griffith also made the claim that immigration to this country would mean increased competition with our citizens for jobs. This charge is almost as ancient and as trite as immigration itself. It was made more than a hundred years ago when our population was small and the United States was a rapidly developing country, and we had to import millions of people in order to build it up. But if proof were needed of the fallaciousness of Commander Griffith's charge, it lies in the fact that organized labor is strongly in favor of the proposal to admit these 400,000 displaced persons into the United States. It is true that previous to the First World War, labor groups were the traditional opponents of unrestricted immigration because they believed that immigrants tended to lower wages. Trade-union groups had for decades prior to the enactment of the quota laws urged restriction of immigration. As long ago as 1837, during the depression of that year, labor protested against the so-called dumping of Irish immigrants, and in 1868 the National Labor Union took the strong stand against immigration. It is also true that during certain periods in our history employers would find in unrestricted immigration a weapon against unions and tried to play off one immigrant group against the other, but unionization of the immigrant has tended to destroy this weapon in the hands of the employer, while signal success of the foreign-born in unionization have long since withdrawn them from the disfavor of the worker class.

The attitude of the Congress of Industrial Organizations was clearly set forth by its representative, Mr. Leo Goodman, at hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization; House of Representatives, March 20, 1946. He said:

> Naturally, a labor organization representing 6,000,000 American workers would not be inclined to support measures which would threaten the job security of its own membership. However, the CIO realizes, from past experience, that immigration is automatically checked in periods of unemployment while it rises in periods of prosperity; that in the past immigrants have contributed in innumerable ways to the wealth and well-being of this country; that a large proportion of immigrants are not potential job seekers, being women and children; that new blood in industry, agriculture, business, and the professions enriches our national life; and that the best and most enlightened thought on this subject opposes arbitrary, prejudiced, and superficial legislation to curtail immigration into the United States.

The American Federation of Labor takes a similar stand. Mr. Lewis Hines, representative of this organization at the hearings, said:

> Most of our citizens desire that the United States set an example for other nations by continuing to offer succor and a haven to the oppressed and displaced persons uprooted as a result of the war. Our nation has a large share of the responsibility in the maintenance of a peaceful world. The American Federation of Labor, therefore, feels that we should maintain our present immigration quotas as an indication to the world that we intend to remain an active participant in world affairs, believing that to do otherwise, and especially to reduce our immigration quotas, would indicate that we are not willing to accept the responsibility of leadership. The United States as a leading world power must continue its tradition of humanitarianism toward the displaced people of the world.

It has also been charged by opponents of the Stratton bill that refugees to the United States might become public charges. This cannot possibly happen, for the simple reason that thousands of the displaced persons have relatives who are American citizens and who have announced their eager willingness to post bonds or do whatever is necessary to guarantee that immigrants will not become public charges. Similarly, various interested organizations in the United States are prepared to guarantee that those who have no relatives here will not become public charges.

It is also said that immigrants would increase our housing difficulties, but this charge, too, cannot bear examination, for the simple reason that the number of persons who might enter the United States under the Stratton bill is limited and their relatives or friends are prepared to share their housing with them.

If this bill is enacted into law, it will save the United States hundreds of millions of dollars now being spent for the maintenance of displaced persons. Persons admitted have usable skills, which would make them productive here, add to our production of wealth, and increase the number of consumers. They will bring us, fortunately, an added increment of population. It is a matter of grave concern that the United States is now entering upon a period of declining growth of population, and is faced with a relatively static stage of population increase in the present century. A characteristic of a static population is that old people tend to increase disproportionately to the number of young people. The result is that there are fewer able-bodied men and women in the country, while a greater burden is cast upon the young—or the public—to support the older people who have passed their industrial prime. It is worth noting that students of population estimate that in 1970—less than 25 years from now—Soviet Russia will have 34,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 31, a prime age for industrial as well as military uses. The United States, at the same time, will have between ten to twelve million men of these ages, and we shall be outnumbered in this vital age group by almost three to one. It is not suggested that the admission of 400,000 displaced persons could remedy this disparity, but they would certainly help in some measure to close the gap.

But even if all of these persons should be admitted to the United States, their numbers would fall far short of those who would have come here under our quota laws had not the depression and

the war almost completely shut off immigration. Since the last change in our quota system in 1929, our immigration policy has called for an annual quota immigration of 154,000 people per year. Actually our quota immigration since 1929 has averaged but 40,000 people per year. If 400,000 people should be admitted in 4 years under the Stratton bill, that figure would constitute less than half of the quota numbers that went unused during the war years, and less than 17 percent of the quota numbers that have gone unused since 1929.

It is evident that upon grounds of economy, the usefulness of skilled workers who might come here, and the future of our population, that the admission of displaced persons to this country would benefit the United States. But it is not upon these grounds alone that we must act. There are higher considerations.

The United States has strongly resisted Russian efforts to compel displaced persons to return to the country of their origin; which is another way of saying that they must come under Russian influence. This we have refused to permit. Displaced persons are victims of the Nazi terror, driven from their homes by the march of the German Army. They do not want to go back to Communist-dominated countries, and in this stand the United States has supported them. Are we now to say that while we will not permit Russia to take hold of them, we ourselves will not take them in, but will permit them slowly to rot and degenerate in concentration camps? The Russians offer them slavery. We offer them, as matters now stand, life on the dole. From the point of view of the displaced persons, and the point of view of all the world that is watching us, can it be said that our actions are as noble as our pretensions, or that the choice we offer to the refugees is much more alluring than the grim prospect offered them by the Russians? Is this the utmost that generous America can do by way of generosity? Is this all that democratic America can do for men and women who stoutly resist communism? Is there no place in the vast, compassionate bosom of this continent for a handful of people who stand on the brink of spiritual and physical death?

Shall we continue to hold ourselves up as champions of the democratic ideal, and fail to live up to its requirements? While we are talking about admitting displaced persons, Great Britain is admitting them. They are at present migrating into England at the rate of 4,000 a week. This is in addition to 120,000 Poles settling in Britain as the Polish army is disbanded. It does not include the 100,000 Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians which the Ecumenical Refugee Commission, acting for British churches, is planning to bring in during the year beginning September 1. France and Belgium are taking their share, and a number of displaced persons are going to Latin-America, but the migration to England is on a larger scale. England, let us remember, is living on strict rations, and its housing shortage is much greater than that of the United States, but the English people evidently do not see their present or future menaced by the admission of displaced persons. The British action and the action of other countries in this case ought to be the definitive answer to those who say that the whole burden of settling displaced persons will fall upon us.

In view of these facts it is with infinite regret that I register the fact that consideration will not be given to the use of what can be called deficit or unused quota numbers to bring this group of people to this country whose eyes cannot help but turn to this land at whose eastern harbor stands the Statue of Liberty.

Unnecessary Quorum Calls—A Proposed Amendment to the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I wish to include in the RECORD my statement with respect to the House joint resolution which I have introduced today.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution, as written, makes it imperative and necessary that a majority of the Members be present in the House or Senate in order to transact business, from which it does not necessarily follow that all of us who are busy in our offices, or in committee, should surrender to the whim and caprice of any one Member who raises the point of no quorum to call us to the floor to hear him talk about some matter concerning which we are all ready to vote our convictions. We do not need to hear the Member talk unless we wish so to do or unless there is business to transact.

The arbitrary right of one Member to interrupt the real business of all Members in order to have them present at a quorum call simply to hear him talk, is a nuisance, a waste of time, and of the taxpayers' money. That is not the intent of the Constitution.

The framers of the Constitution drew an instrument which is susceptible of amendment. They intended it so. My proposed amendment may need revision or amendment in order to accomplish its purpose, but something should be and must be done to abolish unnecessary quorum calls which are a fraud on the public such as the framers of the Constitution never contemplated could be perpetrated under the language or the provisions of the Constitution as drawn.

My proposed amendment conserves all fundamental rights, violates no prerogatives, carries out the intention of the founders, and protects the rights of minorities.

As I said in the House on April 5, 1946, I again point out that—

in the Seventy-eighth Congress we wasted time in the amount of 45 days of 5 hours each answering quorum calls, many of which were made under a constitutional right to raise the point of order of no quorum, but the privilege is abused. We could amend our rules and protect constitutional rights.

The people laugh at us when we are seen running over here to quorum calls and running out again to our committees. We should show ourselves some respect if we expect the people we represent to respect us.

So I have today offered the following proposed constitutional amendment:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Except as may be provided in rules adopted after the ratification of this article, the question of the absence of a quorum in either House of the Congress may be determined only at the desire of one-fifth of the Members present. This article shall not apply in the case where the right of choosing the President devolves on the House of Representatives or the right of choosing the Vice President devolves upon the Senate.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."

Mr. Speaker, I propose to keep at this proposition until something is accomplished in the interest of long-suffering Members of Congress who are really busy, and for the benefit of the taxpayers.

Address by Spyros P. Skouras at Hon. Tom Clark Luncheon for the United Jewish Appeal (UJA), July 22, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to offer an appeal, made by my friend, Spyros Skouras, president of Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp., in the interest of displaced refugee Jews and for those Jews in Palestine and elsewhere in need of economic and moral rehabilitation. Mr. Skouras, an enlightened and charitable gentleman, is serving as chairman of the nonsectarian committee of the United Jewish Appeal for the motion-picture division. His address follows:

My friends, I wonder whether we have a deep enough sense of gratitude to Almighty God for the blessings of bountiful, free America that enable us to gather here to engage in the noblest of all human endeavors—that of helping others. There is no greater gift nor higher duty than to be the good and kindly neighbor. To be our brother's keeper is the very essence of all religion.

When my own forefathers were striving toward the ideal of democracy they could hardly have envisioned so wonderful a country as America. We have a glorious heritage and a glorious outlook because we based our society upon the brotherhood and equality

of man, borrowing from the highest in religion. To me, personally, I consider it a great honor to be here among you today, because I want to discuss with you a matter of the utmost urgency to all of us—as individuals and members of our community. I refer to the plight of the 1,500,000 surviving Jews of Europe, and I know it is close to all our hearts.

No one who reads the newspapers, listens to the radio, or shows any concern in what is going on in the world can be blind or deaf to the tragic facts of their situation. Nor can anyone be unmindful of the awful significance of the word "surviving," as applied to them.

A little while ago these Jews of Europe numbered 7,500,000. They were peaceful, useful citizens of Germany, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Poland, and other countries, honored by the world for their great contributions to the spiritual life, the culture, and the well-being of mankind. Then came the black doctrine of hate and intolerance, the lust for power, that singled out this religious minority for extermination, and in doing so shadowed in grief every fireside in the world. Six millions were eliminated by the most savage deeds in the history of civilization.

By their very plight, by their sorrow and suffering, the 1,500,000 surviving Jews symbolize the whole fight for freedom all of us profess to feel with such intensity and determination. They represent us all. Indeed, in one way or another, all of us belong to minorities in the last analysis, and every drop of blood shed in behalf of one minority is in the name of freedom for all.

As tragic as any part of the tragic story is the fact that 2 years ago the day of liberation dawned for these unfortunate people abroad.

When the black evil of Hitlerism was at last struck down, these survivors—representing only one-fifth of the prewar Jewish population—saw the beginning of their salvation. They had a right to hail that day as meaning the end of hunger, hopelessness, and despair—the end of torture and persecution. Men of every creed, nationality, and color, cherishing liberty, had rallied to the cause of preserving the dignity of man, the sovereignty of the individual human being. Millions had died in this cause, always the greatest in the upward struggle of mankind.

But we know now that these oppressed people in Europe were cherishing an empty dream. For most of them, starvation, homelessness, and persecution continued. They were driven from country to country. Their morale was worn down by more tragic wandering, by hopes lifted and then dashed down, by unbelievable bungling and unkept promises.

Today, hundreds of thousands are in many respects in a plight as bad as that at the time of the surrender. Instead of 85,000 there are now 250,000 Jews in camps for displaced persons in Germany and Austria—driven there by fear, famine, and homelessness and by the hope that some day, somehow, they might be able to reach the United States, Palestine, or some other haven.

But, whereas a year ago there was hope for effective official solution to this problem, the situation now is a bleak one. UNRRA has been terminated and its successor, the International Refugee Organization, is obviously inadequate. On both the international and national levels the story is the same. At home, we have failed to follow through with legislation that might have helped. The world at large has turned from its triumph over evil to quarrel over new issues.

And these surviving victims, to say nothing of their dead and the dead of all other creeds, are all but forgotten—but not entirely forgotten because we in free America will not have it so.

I wish it could be possible never to refer to any minority by name. But as long as we must talk of the plight of the Jews, why should we not speak of the great contributions they have made to the progress of man from the beginning of time? All of us Christians owe them a great debt.

Perhaps their greatest gift has been made to the philosophy and depth and sincerity of religion in general. Our spiritual life most certainly has been enriched by them. They also have played a great part in developing the kindred ideal of democracy and our own American history is filled with their fighting deeds and wise counsels. In the annals of the arts, sciences and industries, philanthropy and statesmanship, their work has made an eternal mark. In every experience of our daily lives, we find some boon that grows out of their genius. Names like Disraeli, Einstein, Haym Salomon, Brandeis, are immortal. In our land many illustrious family names symbolize public service and humanitarian endeavor. As far back as the revolution, men of the Jewish faith, like Salomon, were helping to fashion the great system of freedom for the individual which is now the one hope of the world and which lies behind the Marshall plan as our retort to totalitarianism.

As much as any other group, the Jewish people help to shape our thoughts, make our laws and, above all, sing our songs. Through the entertainment world, the inspired creativeness so necessary to lift up our visions comes to us from a galaxy of great Jewish names.

It is only right to mention the entertainment industry at this point. We appreciate the privilege of belonging to an industry that provides relaxation and information, but never for a moment forgets that in ministering to the masses it bears a great humanitarian responsibility as well.

I do not believe that our motion-picture people have ever or ever will fail to respond to a worthy call from those in distress—always with never the slightest question as to race, creed, or color. And I believe as firmly that the motion picture itself is the greatest single medium for showing all men how free men can live.

Now we of our industry turn to the plight of the Jews. In my own travels, I saw for myself the stark, ironic tragedy of the people who were the first to suffer, the first to die, and the last to be remembered.

And, particularly, in my native Greece and in Palestine, I fully appreciated for the first time the tremendous scope of the work of the United Jewish Appeal agencies. When I came home, I told everyone about the tragic things I saw and I urged upon my non-Jewish friends that they must participate in the work of the United Jewish Appeal. In my opinion, this is a problem for all humanity and calls to the conscience of the civilized world for solution.

Men of good will must band together to meet this great human need.

I know many of us here already have made generous personal contributions or will do so. But I believe that the corporation we represent owes the same kind of an obligation we feel as individuals and I believe that every one of us should present to our board of directors the case for the Christian committee, of which Thomas J. Watson is chairman, of the appeal at the very earliest possible moment. I am confident that our directors, representing a wide cross section of the community, will respond with generosity and sympathy. I want to appeal to you as strongly as I know how to use your influence with your corporations, and you do have very great influence, so that we may raise our share of the $170,000,000 sought by UJA for this life-saving work. I know you will do that.

Remember the blessings that we enjoy in this great land of ours. Remember the wonderful good fortune the Almighty has bestowed upon us, the unparalleled freedom and plenty we enjoy. Remember that we have an untold opportunity to share a little of our bounty with those who suffer, to spread a little happiness where there is stark despair. Do not forget that a little effort on our part can be a benediction to the tired masses of our fellow men who have suffered so much and want only their birthright—freedom and security, and the privilege of walking upright as self-respecting citizens of a democratic world. We must not take our freedom and security for granted and we must understand how precious these gifts are to those who do not have them. From the bottom of my heart, I ask that you do not fail them.

At this luncheon at which Mr. Skouras spoke, Attorney General Tom Clark lashed out against the bigoted and selfish groups who would restrain Uncle Sam from offering a haven to DP's seeking entry to these shores. He said "America is a Nation of immigrants, a Nation of minorities" and that immigrant-pioneers were the ones who had created the wealth of America, and through their amalgamated genius established a Nation that led the rest of the world in achievement. He reminded his audience that he has advocated that at least 100,000 Nazi victims be admitted to America each year, for at least 4 years. He declared, "Unless governments do assist in this great crusade, our children and their children will suffer by reason of their neglect."

Barney Balaban, chairman of the industry drive, spoke briefly on the sacrifices that must be made to help those who could no longer expect aid from UNRRA since it no longer functions, or from IRO, its successor, since it has not yet begun to function.

Norman Lourie, Paramount News representative in Palestine, and independent film producer, revealed the bitter dilemma in which the moderate element of his co-religionists find themselves when they see how promises have been broken, and they find themselves without recourse.

Edward M. Warburg, chairman of the Joint Distribution Committee, an affiliated agency of the United Jewish Appeal, described the growing distrust of the DP's toward the unfulfilled promises of the United Nations. Only private agencies like the UJA separate these betrayed people from starvation, Warburg said.

Mr. Harry Brandt, an indefatigable worker for UJA, was also present.

Supervision of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago on the floor of the House there was some discussion as to the necessity, desirability and possible effect of the provisions in the foreign relief bill which provided for supervision by United States authorities. Upon this general subject I include a newspaper article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald for July 18, 1947:

AUSTRIA REJECTS RUSS VIEW ON AID

VIENNA, July 17.—The Austrian Government rebuffed the Soviet high commissioner for Austria today in a note rejecting Russian contentions that the Austro-American relief treaty violates terms of the control agreement on Austria.

Chancelor Leopold Figi sent a note to Russian high commissioner Col. Gen. Kurassov stressing that supervision of relief and supply by the United States is necessary since Austrian authorities are unable to prevent the Soviets from taking foodstuffs and raw materials for their own purposes.

The Road to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, without the missing of a day or night, no doubt, every thoughtful person is giving most intent thought to the subject which we regard of the highest importance to our people—world peace.

We ought not to have another war. The question is how to avoid it.

We cannot expect bickering and strife to contribute to a world or international status that may or can lend itself to a just and lasting peace. It doesn't seem to me that a flexing of the muscles, an effort or program of impressing our physical prowess, with heralding a preparation to fight, can contribute to a peaceful desire, or to the convincing of others of this disposition on our part.

There is no use to dodge or cover up. We are not making for peace by indulging in hard words, ascribing mean motives to every act, observed by those in other lands. The presentation of truth, the educating of others in the ways of peace and good will, a disposition to tolerance, a firm stand for the right, a friendly attitude in this stand, will more likely fruit in friendly relations. Friends do not fight; therefore we should cultivate friendship. We are strong, we will remain strong, but we should remember that our strength should lead us to a consideration for the weak. We hope we can say we are morally and spiritually strong.

We can then, with greater assurance, teach others that this strength is to be desired in every nation and among all people.

The Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," is strength of character and ought to be taught to all people.

It is that ideal that will, above every other thing, tend to abolish ill will, prevent wars, and bring peace.

We have need presently to see to the sufficiency of our military strength for purposes of defense, but let us quit boasting about it; in humility retaining it as no more than a guaranty just till the time when we hope to perfect a sounder and better foundation for lasting peace.

In our present attitudes we seem to be groping. We cannot count in plural the years that have elapsed since the days we fought side by side with Great Britain and Russia in a death struggle to save ourselves and the world from physical, intellectual, and spiritual slavery to the German Nazi forces, saying little just now about Japan and the German satellites that engaged as partners in their dastardly undertaking.

And yet, now, we hear no expressed fear of a Nazi German repetition of these attempts, nor a future alliance as that known recently as the Central Powers. All we hear is Communist, Communist; something to scare, excite, prejudice.

A committee of reliable persons finds and certifies: "That a Nazi network in Germany gets stronger." This international committee for the study of European questions charges that a Nazi network in Germany, "whose strength is increasing more and more each week and each month, is laying the groundwork to recapture power through control of Allied fostered democratic institutions." The committee, which includes many outstanding British, French, Danish, and Dutch leaders, reports that this network is composed of former Nazi leaders, important ones, of the former wehrmacht, a fairly important number of former Nazi collaborationists, who took refuge in Germany after her defeat, officers, and noncommissioned officers of wehrmacht, a fairly important number of those liberated July 3, 1946, in the general amnesty granted by United States Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

According to this report, this Nazi organization has a plan, a campaign of action, contemplating, first, wehrmacht nazification; second, spying on Germans in their political and private life to maintain the nationalistic Nazi spirit; and, third, to cause disorder to increase difficulties of Allied Powers administration, thus to insure, more and more, control in the Germans themselves. Of course, thereby to build the Nazi power and control for another war.

Maybe our complacency toward this situation frightens Russia. Possibly, or probably, they see, not in the distant future, the re-establishing of Germany, not only economically, but militarily as well; and see this as a great threat to their own existence. It is just possible they fear an international cartelization to which they are not an admitted part, controlling coal and iron and steel, and materials of every character, with Germany, Nazi Germany, the beneficiary in a large degree. Maybe they know of this, and remember how Germany marched against Russia, through some of the countries, now called Russian satellites; and that on account of that fear they have not cooperated with us, Britain, and France in a program, which we believe in with honesty, but which they fear on account of an apparent program of Nazi Germany to control, in that area, all minerals and metals, adequate to fortify them for a third war. There is danger of this.

The Nazi influence became very powerful when it was able to develop the most powerful war machine the world had ever seen, and to carry on, with danger to the world, the greatest war of all time.

In 1939 Germany attacked France.

In September 1939 Germany attacked Poland;

In September 1939 Germany was at war with the United Kingdom;

In April 1940 Germany attacked Norway;

In May 1940 Germany attacked Belgium;

In May 1940 Germany attacked Luxemburg;

In May 1940 Germany attacked The Netherlands;

In May 1941 Germany attacked Greece;

In May 1941 Germany attacked Yugoslavia;

In June 1941 Germany attacked Russia;

On December 11, 1941, 3 days after the Pearl Harbor outrage, Germany declared war on the United States of America.

Being forced by Germany, on December 13, 1941, Bulgaria declared war on the United States. On June 26, 1941, Finland, fearing destruction at the hands of Germany, declared war on Russia.

For the same reason the next day, June 27, 1941, Hungary declared war on Russia. On the 22d of June 1941 similarly influenced, Rumania declared war on Russia. The next day after Germany declared war on the United States of America, December 12, 1941, Rumania declared war on us. And on December 11, 1941, Italy, under the control of Germany, declared war on us. Italy, under the control of Germany, had, on the 11th of June 1940, declared war on Great Britain and France. It may not be any wonder that Russia has no faith in Nazi Germany and fears to join her or to allow her easy access to Russian territory, after Nazi reestablishment, with her commercial and industrial cartels, with war potentials. We might look into this and find whether any such fears on the part of Russia are justified.

Russia has no right to encourage the growth of communism in the United States or, for that matter, anywhere except the privilege, perhaps, in her own country, but within her own borders. We think that is unwise but may not perhaps do more than to ask them to sit down and let us reason together.

After all, communism in this country is closely akin to nazism, fascism, and anarchism. It is possible that not all of any of these isms is dependent on Russian activity or encouragement We recognize as an antidote for communism true democracy.

Totalitarianism, undemocratic government, is ground in which communism will most surely grow.

There are, no doubt, fanatics or paranoiacs who regard every man who is not a reactionary, a Tory, or a Fascist, as a Communist.

We must realize, too, that, after all, peace can come and last only through good will and real democracy. That we teach this lesson, emphasizing our sincerity by feeding the hungry and clothing the naked, is not a sign of weakness or appeasement but a demonstration of our strength and faith. And we cannot con-

vince anyone of our belief in this power, while we, by our action, lay greatest stress on preparations to kill. And we can convince no one of our faith in democratic government by supporting totalitarian regimes.

A practical situation requires our maintenance of adequate forces of defense for a time—one cannot say how long—but to depend on this permanently is to trust a broken reed, and to paramount it and pyramid it is likely to do no more than invite disaster. We should not forget, either, the need for economic strength and security and moral strength.

I can see no common sense in trusting to toy guns in an atomic age, where technical methods of defense have supplanted the outmoded means of pitiable inability.

The rule of reason ought to have some place in our thinking. We have the greatest Navy in the world. We may supplement it as research and progress may allow. One of our highest military men has said that so far as the Army is concerned we should maintain an army of reasonable proportions, but devote our energies, too, to the discovery and improvement of methods.

In considering what is adequate and competent, I remember that adequacy does not depend so much on the number of soldiers and sailors we have, but on the character of war mechanism we shall use. Have we not learned anything from Hiroshima or Nagasaki or Bikini?

Do we hope to kill communism by supporting Fascist totalitarian governments, or by rebuilding the military power of Germany? I fear such a course will not reduce communism, but will tend to its growth and spread.

Let us find out what is going on in Germany. Let us see what is being recommended in respect to her military reestablishment; either directly or by indirection in the name of something else.

The love of money is still the root of much evil. Our Government does not want to bow to this, but we should be diligent that those who think more of commercial advantages and considerations do not advise and lead us.

Let us look the situation square in the face and if we are traveling the wrong road, turn around.

Bad Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Bad Medicine":

BAD MEDICINE

The House of Representatives has passed a thoroughly bad bill in the name of a thoroughly good cause. The cause, stated generally, is a wish to make certain that those who hold public office in a democratic government actually believe in the democratic method and do their best to make it work successfully. The present instrument for accomplishing this wholly desirable purpose is a bill bearing the title of the "Federal Employees Loyalty Act of 1947." It has been passed in the House by a vote of 319 to 61, with many of the most respected conservatives in that branch of Congress protesting against it, to their credit.

The bill would create a Loyalty Review Board, which would have power to rove anywhere and everywhere into the business of any and all other departments and agencies in Washington, looking, with the enforced aid of the FBI, for disloyal suspects. On discovering such a suspect it would notify the person under investigation in writing of its preliminary finding, together with a factual statement upon which such finding is based, concealing as far as possible the source or sources of the information. The accused, thus denied his rightful opportunity to confront his accuser, would have 15 days to reply. If he failed to satisfy his inquisitors—in such matters, for example, as whether there were reasonable grounds for believing that he had sympathetic association with any organization on a list to be arbitrarily designated by the Attorney General on his own personal say-so as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive—the accused would be dismissed summarily from Government employment. There is no provision for appeal. There is no right of review from the decision of this roving and omnipotent Board. The accused would be dropped, with the soul-searing finding—worse for many than a prison sentence—that he was disloyal to the Government of the United States.

This bill lacks all of the safeguards and protections embodied in President Truman's own recent proposal in the same field. It lacks all the elements of a decent respect for democratic rights and the standards of fair play. It is a bad bill. It should never have been passed by the House. It should be thrown out of the window by the Senate.

National Traffic Safety Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the speech I made on the occasion of the presentation of the grand awards to the State of Connecticut and to the city of Washington, D. C., for the 1946 National Traffic Safety Contest:

You ladies and gentlemen are here this week to report on the progress made throughout the Nation in carrying out the action program for preventing traffic accidents set up last year at the President's Highway Safety Conference.

It is my great privilege today to offer to the State of Connecticut and the city of Washington formal recognition of the fact that they have done an outstanding job of translating this action program into definite results.

Connecticut and Washington have done more—much more—than win the grand awards in the 1946 national traffic safety contest for States and cities, great as that achievement may be. For they have provided the Nation with definite and convincing proof that this action program, put into effect, can and does bring results. They have proved that by using this program the traffic toll can be cut if a State or a city actually wants it cut.

Now, like most statements of that sort, there is a catch to this one. And the catch is that no State or city can reduce its traffic toll by merely wanting to unless it turns this desire into actuality by plain, old-fashioned hard work and elbow grease.

Now, that's not a very glamorous or magic formula for achieving traffic safety, is it? But the ugly truth is that there just isn't any magic formula for preventing accidents—not even through an action program. And I am sure that the gentlemen to whom I am to present these plaques will be the first to agree,

I once was on the receiving end of one of these national grand awards myself—and I know only too well how we won it. We won it by work, hard work and more hard work. That was in Memphis, Tenn., back in 1939, when I was Commissioner of Public Safety there. At that time we did not have the advantage of the complete and practical technical materials that are now available in the reports of the President's Highway Safety Conference.

We found out then that there was only one way to cut down the traffic toll—the hard way. I mean, to take the best available technical material and use it to the best possible advantage; for the public officials to assume full responsibility for doing all they are supposed to do, and more; to keep the public fully and continuously informed of our problem and our program; to make use of every possible means we could devise to obtain public support and cooperation; most of all, to make every citizen aware of his individual responsibility for preventing a traffic accident by his own behavior on foot or behind the wheel of his car.

I have been talking with many of the people attending this conference. I find some encouraging signs. I find a growing recognition of the fact that prevention of traffic accidents is sound and, in fact, vital from both the social and economic viewpoint. I find a deep and increasing interest in the traffic problem, a sincere desire to go forward with our attack on the problem.

But I also find a few cases of plain old defeatism—a feeling that the obstacles in the way of obtaining adequate budgets, enough trained personnel to do the job, and of obtaining public recognition and cooperation are just too great to be overcome.

Well, here today we have concrete proof that these obstacles can be overcome. For the State of Connecticut and the city of Washington have gone a long way in overcoming them.

Take the case of Connecticut, for example. Today it is receiving an award which signifies that it has done the best job of any State in the Union in making its streets and highways safe for its citizens. And this is not a new experience for Connecticut—not just a flash in the pan. For Connecticut won a similar award in 1940 and again in 1944. Now, I must admit that in 1942, 1943, and 1945 it slipped a little and merely won first place among the Eastern States.

Six top awards in 6 years. Does that sound like luck? You bet it doesn't. It sounds like the public officials and the people of Connecticut have made up their minds that traffic accidents in their State are going to be held down to a minimum—and that they are willing to pitch in and do their share to hold them down. Try to tell the people of Connecticut that the obstacles in the way

of traffic safety are too big to be overcome. They know better.

In 1946 Connecticut did such a magnificent job of preventing traffic accidents that its mileage death rate was only half the national rate for all States. Only half, that is.

Do you know what that means in terms of actual human life? It means that if every State in the Union had done as well as Connecticut 16,000 lives could have been saved in 1946.

Now let's turn to our own city of Washington, which today receives the grand award for cities in the national traffic safety contest. What did it do to win? Well, for one thing, it cut its traffic death toll from 76 in 1945 to 59 in 1946—a saving of 17 lives. Not a startling saving, you may think, when you remember that one spectacular disaster—a fire, an explosion, a tornado—can wipe out that many lives in an instant. But what if every city could have done as well? More than 2,000 lives would have been saved throughout the United States.

This is not the first time Washington has won an award for effectively combatting traffic danger. It took first place in its population group in 1940 and won honorable mentions in 1943 and 1944. Safety is no flash in the pan here, either.

You folks here today are practical safety people. You want to know how you can do a better job of cutting your traffic toll.

Well, I am sure that here is one way of doing it:

Put into effect every recommendation of the action program not already being followed in your State or city that it is humanly possible for you to do. Work like the very dickens, and never let up. Not even for a minute.

Enroll your State or city in the national traffic safety contest. Make up a complete factual report of your traffic safety activities on the blanks provided in connection with the contest. Then ask the National Safety Council for an analysis of your report.

This analysis will show you clearly the strength and weaknesses of your traffic-safety program, and the way to correct those weaknesses. Also, you will have an opportunity to see what officials in other States and cities are doing to solve similar traffic problems.

This traffic contest and the follow-up analysis of your own program provide a grand opportunity for you to inventory your job and find the way to further progress. Furthermore, it provides a chance for you to help your fellow officials in other States and cities to do the same.

As a fellow who was once a public-safety official, I want to say to you that this national traffic-safety contest is your opportunity to achieve a better traffic-safety program in your State or city. The contest is set up along practical lines. The questions you are asked, the reports you submit, and the analysis you receive have as their objective the evaluation of the traffic-safety activities and are based on fundamental principles of the action program. Awards in the contest are made on the same basis—plus the actual results of your efforts as shown by the traffic death toll.

The National Safety Council is the correlating agency which conducts this contest. But the invaluable benefits to be gained are yours for the asking—if you contribute your share.

This is one contest where you can't lose. If your efforts to win result in saving the life of one man or one woman or one child in your city or State, you have won a reward that is priceless.

Yes; ladies and gentlemen, Connecticut and Washington, D. C., have proved to the Nation that traffic accidents can be reduced if if you really want to reduce them. Now let all of us—each and every one of us—prove it over and over again, until this Nation, which holds aloft the torch of human liberty and human welfare to the world, proves that it no longer is willing to see 100,000 of its own citizens struck down brutally and needlessly by accidents every year. Safety, like charity, begins at home. Let's end this national disgrace.

And now, on behalf of a grateful American people, it is my great honor and privilege to present the grand awards in the National Traffic Safety Contest for 1946 to Connecticut and Washington.

Summary of Reported Bills and Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Summary of reported bills and resolutions

[For detailed action see committee calendar]

Bill No.	Title	Summary
H. R. 1 (Mr. KNUTSON)	To reduce individual income-tax payments.	This bill was designed to relieve the individual income-tax payer from a portion of his heavy wartime-tax burden. All but a few of the taxpayers were given a reduction of at least 20 percent in the amount of the tax due. A 30 percent reduction was provided for those who have a surtax net income of $1,000 or less. Persons 65 years old and over would have received an additional exemption of $500. Vetoed June 16, 1947. Veto sustained in the House: 268 to override, 137 to sustain. It was reintroduced June 24 as H. R. 3950, with effective date as Jan. 1, 1948, and again vetoed July 18, 1947. House overrides veto: 299 to override, 108 to sustain. Senate sustains: 57 to override, 36 to sustain.
H. R. 468 (Mr. CURTIS)	To amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to distribution by personal holding companies.	The purpose of the bill was to make the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which determine the extent of distributions by personal holding companies constitute taxable dividends in the hands of shareholders, consistent with provisions which impose a surtax on the "undistributed subchapter A net income" of such a company. Approved June 25. Public Law No. 113.
H. R. 479 (Mr. GAMBLE)	Relating to the income-tax liabilities of members of the armed forces dying in service.	The purpose of this bill was to correct, retroactively, an inequitable situation which arises under the income-tax laws upon the death of a member of the armed forces. Existing law makes no provision for refunding an income tax that was paid prior to the date of death but allows an abatement of tax if unpaid. Passed House July 22, 1947.
H. R. 958 (Mr. LYNCH)	To amend sec. 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code. (Excise tax on aromatic cachous.)	The purpose of this bill was to exempt aromatic cachous from the retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations. Aromatic cachous include sen sen and other breath-sweetening pellets other than chewing gum or candy. They are not cosmetics or toilet preparations. Administrative problems would be eliminated with minor loss of revenue. Passed House July 18, 1947.
H. R. 959 (Mr. LYNCH)	To amend sec. 3179 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. (Relating to the draw-back on distilled spirits for export.)	The purpose of this bill is to facilitate exportation of distilled spirits and wines by permitting the use of casks or packages (barrels or similar containers) other than bottles in packaging tax-paid distilled spirits and wines for export with benefit of draw-back. Approved July 14, 1947. Public Law No. 185.
H. R. 1030 (Mr. GRANT of Indiana.)	To continue in effect certain war excise-tax rates.	The bill continues indefinitely the wartime increases in excise-tax rates made by the Revenue Act of 1943. The provisions of the Revenue Act of 1945 relating to floor-stock refunds on distilled spirits, wines, fermented liquors, and electric-light bulbs are retained in the bill. Action was taken on this bill to relieve the tension in the market because of the threatened termination of these rates on June 30, 1947, and in order to give the committee time to make a thorough study of excise-tax problems. Approved Mar. 11, 1947. Public Law No. 17.
H. R. 1945 (Mr. GEARHART)	To amend Internal Revenue Code with respect to wines.	This bill proposes five technical amendments to certain regulatory provisions of the Internal Revenue Code governing the production of wines. In general the amendments proposed permitted American wine growers to compete more favorably in the American market with foreign-made imported wines, and more flexibility in wine-making production. The bill made no changes in existing tax rates. Approved July 14, 1947. Public Law No. 186.
H. R. 1946 (Mr. GEARHART)	To amend Internal Revenue Code with respect to brandies.	This bill is designed to liberalize existing provisions of the Internal Revenue Code governing the blending of beverage brandies, by permitting them, within certain limits, to be blended and subsequently aged in bonded warehouses prior to payment of production and rectification taxes. Approved July 14, 1947. Public Law No. 187.
H. R. 1947 (Mr. GEARHART)	To amend Internal Revenue Code with respect to taxation of distilleries.	This bill would relieve stockholders and other innocent investors from liability, subject to certain limitations, for taxes on distilled spirits assessed against operators of registered distilleries, including fruit distilleries, in which such persons have invested their funds. It would not impair, however, the liability imposed by existing law upon any person interested in the operation of a bootleg or unregistered distillery, or upon operators of registered distilleries or their sureties.
H. R. 2029 (Mr. HUBER)	Provide for free importation of synthetic rubber scrap.	The bill provides for the free entry of synthetic-rubber scrap along with natural rubber scrap which is now permitted free entry under par. 1697 of the Tariff Act of 1930. In making this provision, the bill removes an inevitable discrimination arising under existing law between these 2 types of scrap rubber. It also removes a serious administrative handicap in the classification of scrap rubber which contains both natural and synthetic rubber.
H. R. 2404 (Mr. PATTERSON)	To suspend certain import taxes on copper until Mar. 31, 1950.	The purpose of this bill is to alleviate the present acute shortage of copper in the United States. It relieves, until Apr. 1, 1950, copper, copper-bearing ores and concentrates, and various articles containing copper, from the import tax imposed under sec. 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code, but does not transfer any article from or to the free list. Approved Apr. 29, 1947. Public Law No. 42.

Summary of reported bills and resolutions—Continued

[For detailed action see committee calendar]

Bill No.	Title	Summary
H. R. 2872 (Mr. KNUTSON)----	To amend sec. 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941 and clarify its application.	This bill eliminated the ambiguity that existed with respect to taxation of Federal securities by other jurisdictions than the Federal Government. Approved June 25, 1947. Public Law 116.
H. R. 3101 (Mr. KNUTSON)----	To extend to June 30, 1949, period during which former United States employees may act as attorneys, agents, and counsel in prosecuting claims against the United States.	The bill extended the period of time during which service may be performed in certain Federal departments and agencies by technical and professional persons without preventing them from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney in prosecuting claims against the United States upon termination of such service. This legislation will aid the final completion of the work of renegotiation and work recently undertaken by such agencies as the Excess Profits Tax Council. S. 1073 passed the House in lieu of H. R. 3101. Approved June 14, 1947. Public Law No. 93.
H. R. 3444 (Mr. REED of New York).	To exempt prisoners of war from income tax in certain cases.	This bill provides that a citizen of the United States, taken prisoner of war while serving within a possession of the United States as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, or interned by the enemy while serving as an employee (governmental or private) within a possession of the United States shall receive the benefits of sec. 251 of the Internal Revenue Code even though his ultimate place of confinement by the enemy was not within a possession of the United States. It removes an inequality of tax treatment as between identically situated taxpayers caused by circumstances over which the taxpayer had no control. Passed House June 20, 1947. Passed Senate July 23, 1947.
H. R. 3602 (Mr. REED of New York).	To exempt from admission tax general admission to agricultural fairs.	The purpose of this bill was to exempt from the admissions tax imposed by sec. 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code amounts paid for general admissions tickets at the outside gates of agricultural fairs operated by nonprofit organizations and whose profits are used exclusively for the improvement, maintenance, and operation of such agricultural fairs. It would not affect taxes payable upon admissions to amusement or other concessions inside the fair grounds. Passed House June 5, 1947.
H. R. 3613 (Mr. KEAN)--------	To amend Internal Revenue Code with respect to document tax on corporate shares.	This bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code relating to the stamp and document taxes on issues of capital stock and bonds, respectively. It was designed to remove certain inequities arising under code secs. 1802 and 3481. At present, in some cases, the tax imposed under sec. 1802 on capital stock issues, once levied, must be reimposed upon part of a new capital stock issue. Inequities also arise in mere loans of stock made to accomodate the requirements of timely delivery in the sale of shares, and also inequities in the transfer of partnership interests, where both stamp and document taxes may both be payable on the entire partnership capital. The bill will permit a pro rata tax measured by the extent of the interest transferred. Passed House June 23, 1947.
H. R. 3810 (Mr. KEAN)--------	To amend sec. 522 of the Tariff Act.	This bill proposes to stabilize procedure in determining the value of foreign currencies in terms of United States dollars for custom purposes. In recent years foreign nations have set up systems of dual or multiple exchange rates which has made it extremely difficult for importers to determine the landed cost of their merchandise. This bill would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to promulgate a fixed, single rate with appropriate safeguards. Passed House June 26, 1947.
H. R. 3818 (Mr. KNUTSON)----	Social-security amendments, 1947.	This bill establishes a new schedule of social-security taxes imposed on employers and employees, freezing the present 1-percent rate (2 percent in the aggregate) for 1948 and 1949 and fixing a 1½-percent rate (3 percent aggregate) through 1957. Thereafter the bill calls for a 2-percent rate (4 percent aggregate). It continues until June 30, 1950, the increased grants to States enacted in 1946 with respect to old-age assistance. The bill also continues on a permanent basis the present temporary authorization for congressional appropriations to a special Federal unemployment account of excess unemployment compensation tax receipts, as a protection to the State funds. The bill passed the House June 18, 1947. Passed the Senate July 16, 1947, with amendments. In conference the rate was frozen at 1 percent for 1948 and 1949; 1½ percent for 1950 and 1951; and 2 percent thereafter. The special Federal unemployment account was extended for 2 years instead of making it permanent. Conference report agreed to in House and Senate July 24, 1947.
H. R. 3861 (Mr. JENKINS of Ohio).	To treat certain predecessor and successor railroad corporations as the same taxpayer for the purpose of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.	This bill removed the discrimination of treating differently railroads coming out of receivership or bankruptcy proceedings, depending upon whether they can be reorganized under the same charter or under a new charter, with respect to carry-overs of net operating losses or unused excess-profits credits of the old corporation. No carry-back allowance would be made under the bill. Approved July 15, 1947. Public Law No. 189.
H. R. 3950 (Mr. KNUTSON)----	To reduce individual income-tax payments.	(See summary on H. R. 1.)
H. R. 3997 (Mr. GEARHART)---	To exclude certain vendors of newspapers from certain provisions of the Social Security Act.	This bill would off-set the findings of the Federal district court in San Francisco so as to exclude certain vendors of newspapers from certain provisions of the Social Security Act. In general it was held that, under certain circumstances, the relationship of employer and employee may exist between a newspaper and the street vendors of its papers, and the vendors thus be covered under the social-security system. Due to the peculiar method of handling retail sale of newspapers, it is not practical that certain news vendors be covered by the Social Security Act. The bill definitely clarified the confusion resulting from the court's decision. Passed the House July 16, 1947, without amendment. Passed the Senate July 23, 1947.
H. R. 4011 (Mr. MACKINNON).	To permit voluntary contributions to be used in the computation of reduced rates in certain cases with respect to Federal Unemployment Tax Act.	This bill would give express statutory sanction to the administrative interpretation which has permitted voluntary contributions by an employer to a State unemployment fund, to be used in the computation of reduced required contribution rates. This bill would remedy existing ambiguities arising in all States, relating to the effectiveness of voluntary contributions under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. Passed House July 3, 1947. Passed Senate July 16, 1947.
H. R. 4259 (Mr. REED of New York).	To exempt from tax, musical instruments sold to religious and educational institutions and certain photographic equipment and film.	This bill would exempt from tax, musical instruments sold to religious and educational institutions. It would also reduce from 15 percent to 10 percent the permanent tax on cameras and unexposed amateur films, and remove the excessive tax of 25 percent on photographic lenses, apparatus, and equipment. The bill relieves two of the most acute excise-tax hardship cases that have come to the committee. A floor amendment offered by Mr. Forand and adopted by the House exempts from the 10-percent jewelry tax, the first $25 of the sale price of such items as costume jewelry, fountain pens, pencils, binoculars, silver tableware, and other articles listed in sec. 2400 of the code. Passed House July 22, 1947.
H. J. Res. 57 (Mr. CURTIS)----	To extend for 15 months the period during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars and sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.	This resolution lifted the prohibition against industrial alcohol plants from producing sugar sirups. This temporary extension would provide a market for surplus potatoes and soft and wet grain as well as relieve, to some extent, the sugar and sirup shortage. Approved Feb. 1, 1947. Public Law No. 2.
H. J. Res. 121 (Mr. KNUTSON).	Income, estate, and gift tax deductions for gifts to the United Nations.	This resolution is intended to facilitate the acquisition of a site in the city of New York for the headquarters of the United Nations. It provides that for the period of 1 year beginning Dec. 2, 1946, and ending Dec. 1, 1947, gifts made to the United Nations exclusively for such purpose shall be treated, for Federal tax purposes, as public and charitable gifts are now treated under the income-, estate-, and gift-tax provision of the Internal Revenue Code. Approved Feb. 26, 1947. Public Law No. 7.
H. J. Res. 210 (Mr. KNUTSON).	To extend time for the release, free of estate and gift taxes, of certain powers of appointment.	This resolution extends to July 1, 1948, the period for tax-free release of powers of appointment created on or before Oct. 21, 1942. The Revenue Act of 1942 made a number of significant changes in the treatment, under the estate and gift taxes, of property which is subject to a power of appointment. In order to enable holders of previously created powers to adjust their affairs in the light of the new legislation, it was simultaneously provided that such persons could release their powers within a stated period of time without incurring any tax liability. The extension granted under the resolution is believed to be ample to permit this whole matter to be considered in connection with the general revenue bill to be taken up during the early part of next year. Approved June 25, 1947. Public Law No. 112.
H. R. 4069 (Mr. KNUTSON)----	To terminate certain miscellaneous temporary revenue provisions.	The purpose of this bill is to provide for the termination of a number of war and emergency statutory provisions related to internal revenue and customs. The 2 most important provisions being (1) the termination on Jan. 1, 1948, of servicemen's exemptions from payment of admissions and transportation taxes and exemption of their active service pay from income taxes on account of active service pay, and (2) continuance on a permanent basis of percentage depletion allowances, applicable in certain mining operations. Other important terminations in the bill relate to tax-free status of gifts sent home from overseas by members of the armed forces, and to various administrative provisions of the code. It also continues the suspension of tariff duties on scrap metals and coconuts. Passed House July 21, 1947. Passed Senate with amendments, July 24, 1947. Conference report agreed to in House July 25, 1947.
H. R. 4257 (Mr. KNUTSON)----	To extend time for filing claims of credit or refund with respect to war losses.	The bill extends the time for filing of claims for credit or refund with respect to losses sustained in 1941 and 1942, to Dec. 31, 1948, on account of enemy action during the war. This extension of time will permit the committee to enact a plan of revision that will be generally satisfactory to all groups concerned with war-loss recoveries. Passed House July 22, 1947.

Summary of reported bills and resolutions—Continued

[For detailed action see committee calendar]

Bill No.	Title	Summary
H. J. Res. 238 (Mr. BROWN of Ohio).	To amend Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to definition of standard newsprint paper.	The purpose of this resolution is to permit free entry under the Tariff Act of 1930 of standard newsprint paper in widths of 15 inches rather than the present 16-inch width now accorded free entry under that act. Due to shortage of paper during war, the width of rolls was reduced temporarily by Congress. This provision expired at the end of hostilities. The paper shortage has continued to be acute. Passed House July 19, 1947. Passed Senate July 24, 1947, with amendment. Amendment agreed to in House July 25, 1947.
S. 1072	To extend period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by States in making old-age assistance payments.	This bill would continue to help relieve the farm labor and civilian nursing service shortage that existed during the war and continues to exist especially with respect to nursing. Approved June 30, 1947. Public Law No. 131.

SUMMARY

Out of a total of 30 bills and resolutions reported by the committee, all have passed the House except 1, H. R. 2029. As of July 25, the day before adjournment, the Senate had passed 22 of the committee's bills. We believe this established an outstanding record.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman.

JULY 25, 1947.

Disaster of Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today for the solemn purpose of announcing an impending disaster that will take the lives of 100,000 Americans, injure 10,000,000 more and cost the Nation $5,000,000,000 in economic loss.

Incredible as it may seem, this catastrophe will be endured by America with scarcely a shudder. No screaming headlines will proclaim it, and no spontaneous or general effort will be made to prevent it.

For the disaster to which I refer is the disaster of accidents. And the terrific and frightening toll accidents will take in 1947 is all the more tragic because it could be prevented with little individual effort and at negligible cost.

But this disaster will not be prevented. Its toll may not even be reduced. Why? Because too many of us are not seriously concerned about it, even though it threatens the one thing dear to all of us—our own life or the life of a loved one.

The toll of accidents is an insidious thing. It creeps up on us without fanfare, so that its horror and enormity are assimilated gradually. An accident here, an accident there, one today, another tomorrow, a steady but unspectacular seeping of human life, catching public attention only when a major catastrophe shocks us momentarily by its size or dramatic impact.

Accidents play no favorites. They live with us in our homes, ride with us in our cars, work with us at our jobs, pursue us even at our play.

The irony and tragedy of it is that most of these accidents can be prevented. Industry has long proved this. Cities and States are proving it now—more and more of them every day. They are proving it in the field of traffic safety, which some of us had begun to fear might be beyond redemption.

The extent to which a State or city can control its traffic toll was brought home to me forcefully, when it was my privilege recently to represent the American people in presenting national grand awards to the State and city which won top honors in the national traffic safety contest conducted by the National Safety Council.

This would have been a pleasant assignment for anyone, but it was especially pleasing to me because I have been tremendously interested in accident prevention for many years. And I can think of no finer reputation of a State or city to enjoy than the distinction of having done most to protect the lives of its citizens on the streets and highways.

These awards were presented during the President's Highway Safety Conference here in Washington, and it seemed to me they could have been bestowed at no more appropriate time. For public officials, business leaders, and safety men had come to the Conference from all parts of the country in a united effort to find the answer to the perennial question—"What can be done to make our streets and highways safer for everyone?"

The winners of these traffic safety awards had found, in part at least, the answer to that question. For example, Connecticut, which won the national grand award for States—went through 1946 with a mileage death rate approximately half the national rate for all States.

Think what this means in terms of actual lives saved. It means that if every State in the Union could have had a death rate as low as Connecticut 16,000 lives would have been saved in 1946.

Sixteen thousand lives. Sixteen thousand men, women, and children—16,000 mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters—sacrificed needlessly in 1 year because the American people were unwilling to put forth the little extra care and effort needed to prevent traffic accidents.

Our own city of Washington, D. C., won the grand award for cities. What did Washington do to win? Well, for one thing, it cut its traffic death toll from 76 in 1945 to 59 in 1946—a saving of 17 lives.

Seventeen lives. Not a startling saving when you remember that one tragic disaster—a fire, an explosion, a tornado—can destroy that many people. But what if every city could have done as well? More than 2,000 lives would have been saved throughout the United States.

And Connecticut and Washington had no monopoly on saving human lives in 1946. Other States and cities also won high honor for doing an outstanding job of preventing traffic accidents.

In fact, the record of winners in this national traffic safety contest bears out a conviction that I have held for many years. It is this: A city or State can make its streets and highways just as safe as it actually wants them to be.

Does this sound preposterous? There is plenty of proof that it is not.

When I was commissioner of public safety in Memphis, Tenn., it was my honor and privilege to come to Washington and accept from the National Safety Council on behalf of my city the national grand award in this same traffic-safety contest. The night I stood here and received the bronze plaque emblematic of victory was one of the proudest and happiest moments of my life. I knew as I received that plaque the terrific amount of work and planning that had brought this honor to Memphis. I remembered the long hours of hard, tedious labor that had been spent in formulating and maintaining a traffic-safety program that would make our city safer for its people. I recalled the discouragements and setbacks we had met along the way, and the hours when it seemed that no matter how much we tried, the traffic toll could not be held down. I thought back to the loyal and willing help given by everyone—the police, the traffic engineer, the schools, the civic organizations, the courts, the safety leaders—and, most of all, the people themselves.

Yes, I remembered all this as I received the plaque that night. And I realized more than ever before that there was no magic formula, no easy recipe for winning traffic safety awards. I realized that there was only one way to conquer traffic accidents, and that was by everlastingly keeping after them by a united, hard-hitting attack in which every citizen must play a part.

When this sort of attack is made on accidents day after day, hour after hour, without any time out for rest, the toll comes down and stays down.

We have found that out in Memphis. True, we have not always continued the attack as we should. And when we have not, the accident toll has gone up. When we have, it has come down. And I am happy to report that in the 1946 contest, Memphis won first place among cities of its population group.

But if only one city had proved that accidents can be controlled almost math-

ematically to the extent the people want them controlled, it would not be proof positive that the same thing could be true generally. But when it happens in city after city, and State after State, even the most skeptical cynic has to admit that there is a way to get traffic safety.

Let us name names. Take the State of Connecticut, to start with. Its victory in 1946 was nothing new for it. For almost a decade it has proved to the Nation that it can and does control its traffic accidents. In 1940 and again in 1944 it led all the States in the Nation in its efforts to hold down its traffic death toll. And in 1942, 1943, and 1945, it won first place among Eastern States in the national traffic-safety contest. How do you explain this record? Luck? No, it goes far beyond that. I believe it is because the public officials and people of Connecticut are sold on the idea that traffic accidents can be prevented, and that it is well worth the trouble it takes to prevent them. It is just that simple.

Take Minnesota; in 1942 it won the national grand award of all States. And it finished first among Midwestern States in 1939, 1940, 1943, and 1946! Does that sound like luck? You know it does not. It sounds like a lot of people in Minnesota made up their minds that they wanted their highways and streets to be safe. And did something about it.

I could not, of course, omit the South in this narration of traffic efficiency. So let us consider the case of Texas. Texas won first place among all Southern States in 1946. It also won first place in 1942 and 1945, took second place in 1938 and 1941 and finished third in 1939.

Does that sound like luck? It sounds to me like hard work and efficiency!

Have you ever driven through New Jersey? Then you will agree, I believe, that the volume of traffic is enough to discourage anyone who is trying to hold down accidents. But it did not discourage New Jersey. The people and public officials worked together for safety on their highways—and New Jersey has won 10 traffic safety awards in 15 years.

Have these States a monopoly on safety? Apparently not. For the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which handles a terrific amount of traffic, has won eight awards in 15 years. Oklahoma also has won eight awards in the last 15 years. Iowa and Washington, they too, have made outstanding records.

Yes; these States have proved that you can have traffic safety if you really want it.

And how about the cities? Well, have you ever heard of what Milwaukee has done about traffic accidents? Of course you have and so has everybody else.

For six consecutive years the city of Milwaukee has had the lowest traffic death rate of any big city in the country. This achievement has just won for it a special award from the National Safety Council for sustained excellence in protecting the lives of its citizens in traffic.

Milwaukee has won special awards in 1941, 1943, 1944, and 1946. It won a grand award in 1934, first place awards in its population group in 1933, 1935, and 1937 and tied for first place in 1938.

Does this sound like luck? Ask Milwaukee. It will tell you hard work did it.

And do not think for a minute that Milwaukee has any monopoly on safety among the cities. Detroit, with its teeming industrial life and streaming traffic, has held down accidents so successfully that it has won 10 high safety awards in the last 15 years. The college city of Evanston, Ill., which feels the full force of Chicago's tremendous flow of traffic, has won seven awards. Providence, R. I., also has won seven. Rochester, N. Y., has won six and my old home town has, I am proud to say, won five, and in South Dakota, Aberdeen has come through as a winner time after time, until its municipal trophy case now holds seven prizes.

Does all this sound like luck? You know it does not. But why do some States and cities manage to make headway against traffic accidents while others do not? Is it because the other States and cities do not want to reduce their accident tolls? Of course it is not. It is, I think, because the States and cities I have mentioned are willing to work a little harder to prevent accidents, and because their citizens have caught the spirit of teamwork and cooperative traffic behavior a little better than the others.

This contest for traffic safety that the National Safety Council has been conducting for 15 years is a magnificent project—one of the finest and most inspiring I have ever known. Think of it—more than a thousand cities and every State in the Union competing with each other for the great honor of best protecting their citizens against death and danger that come through accidents. Can you think of anything better that can happen to a State or city than to win national acclaim for doing the most to make its streets and highways safe? Would you not like to live in such a place?

States and cities throughout the Nation take this National Traffic Safety Contest very seriously, and fight hard to win it. They strive throughout the year to establish a traffic safety record and to carry out a traffic safety program that will enable them to win an award. I remember that when Memphis won the national grand award in 1937, the whole town was as excited in the closing weeks of the year as if we were fighting for a baseball pennant. In fact, some of our rival cities claimed that in the final days of the year, we carried all our pedestrians across our busier intersections and made all traffic detour around the city, just to make sure our record was not jeopardized. Well, we didn't go quite that far, but we really worked to hold down those accidents. And we succeeded. We know it was not luck.

And the benefits of this traffic safety contest does not stop with the efforts to win an award. Public officials in States and cities throughout the country are so sincere in their desire to find ways of improving their traffic safety activities that in the first 6 months of 1947 more than 300 requests have come to the National Safety Council for detailed analyses of the various traffic safety programs—pointing out weaknesses in those programs. This, of course, is a huge job for the staff of the council, but it pays off in greater safety. And the encouraging part of it is that practically all the States and cities which received this analysis service in 1946 have put into effect many or all of the recommendations made in the analyses.

Can you think of a finer thing for America than for a thousand cities and all the States to be competing for the privilege of saving human life and limb? If the National Safety Council did not do anything else but conduct this contest and provide the incentive for cities and States to work harder for safety, it could well be proud of itself.

But the council does much more than that. Day in and day out, year after year, its staff of safety experts and engineers, its writers and editors, its statisticians and researchers work to find out how, why, when, and where accidents are caused—and how they can be prevented. And even more important is the fact that throughout the country—in every State and virtually every city—loyal and willing safety-minded men and women serve without pay and without any thought of reward to help the council do the best possible job of reducing the accident toll. These volunteer safety workers number into the thousands, and without them, the chance of winning the war against accidents would be hopeless indeed.

The National Safety Council serves as a clearing house for the safety experiences and activities of the Nation. It has only one aim in the world—to prevent accidents of all kinds. It makes no profit, has no commercal interests. I am proud to have been permitted for many years to work with it and to help a little, I hope, in the work it is doing.

Perhaps some of you may have the feeling that this is an unusual subject for a Representative in Congress to be discussing, especially in these days when so many vital and important problems must be solved if America is to progress. To me it is a perfectly natural thing to be discussing safety here. For I sincerely believe there are few, if any, problems facing America that are more vital or more important than halting this needless slaughter of 100,000 Americans every year.

Let me again repeat that figure. One hundred thousand lives lost in America every year by accidents that could be prevented. Is this what America wants? Is this what we are willing to endure merely because it takes a little time and effort to prevent it?

I do not believe so. I do not believe—I refuse to believe—that a country known around the world for its humanitarian instincts is willing to see 100,000 of its citizens struck down needlessly every year, and another 10,000,000 injured, and shrug it off as something that cannot be helped.

It can be helped. If 100,000 men, women, and children died in 1 year of some dread disease that medical science knew how to prevent, you can be sure we would soon see to it that steps were taken to prevent it.

Well, we know how to prevent accidents. We know it after more than 30 years of research and experiment by the

National Safety Council and other safety organizations. But we cannot wipe out this national scourge of accidental death and injury until the American people use and apply the remedies we have available. If every American citizen would make up his mind today to be more careful, more courteous, and more sensible in traffic, in his home, at play, at work, everywhere; if every American would redouble his efforts to prevent the accident for which he may be responsible, we could cut the accident toll in half overnight.

It costs nothing but a little effort. It means the saving of life—perhaps your life. Is not it worth the trouble?

I ask every Member of Congress, every public official of whatever level, every citizen, no matter where he lives or what he does, to join in a great united effort to cut this accident toll. Let us make America a land of the safe as well as a land of the free.

The Late Henry Ford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a radio talk by the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill over the ABC network, Sunday, April 20, 1947, which reviewed the life of the late Henry Ford, founder of the Ford Motor Co.

In reviewing Henry Ford's life, it sounds almost like a review of the opportunities open to all people under the American system of freemen.

Mr. Ford benefited humanity by giving them an opportunity to benefit themselves through honest effort, work, and thrift. I wish every young man and woman in America might read this story of What Henry Ford Taught America.

It sometimes seems easier to be the recipient of a gift than it is to earn an equivalent compensation for one's self, but the very earning of the compensation for one's self is the thing that has built character into America and its citizens for more than 150 years under our Constitution.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The death of Henry Ford, 83 years young, calls attention to some big facts.

America's 30,000,000 motor vehicles, in close formation, would go twice around the world. If necessary, every man, woman, and child in America could get into these cars and all ride on rubber at the same instant of time.

A nation on wheels—traveling on vehicles undreamed of when Henry Ford and everybody else in this country, 60 years old or over, was a child. I was a boy in college when I first saw an automobile—a foreign contraption—costing $8,000, which no one would have as a gift today.

Well, here are some more big facts that tie in with the argument as to whether communism, socialism, or the individual enterprise system is best for America—and the world.

RUSSIA FAR BEHIND

Thirty-four States of the Union each has more automobiles than all of Russia. Seven States each has more than Great Britain, or France, or Italy, or Germany. California has more than Great Britain, France, and Italy combined.

Of trucks, the United States has five times as many as Russia, and 50 percent more than the rest of the world combined.

I believe that every system of government and business is going to survive that does most for most. What system in any century, in any country, has done more for more people than the American system?

Henry Ford was born while Lincoln still lived. Abraham Lincoln and Ford mean America throughout the world—log cabin to White House—machine shop to industrial empire. Henry Ford and the other automobile manufacturers who, like him, have developed and applied mass production methods represent the American system at its best. They show what competitive individual enterprise can do—and I stress the word competitive.

For many years, Ford was the pacemaker. He forced those who would stay in the race to adopt his principles. He benefited his competitors. But the day came when his competitors benefited him. Even Ford held on to Model T too long, and would have done so still longer, if new competition had not forced him to change his designs.

AVOIDING FEDERAL CONTROL

And so it has gone in an endless struggle—General Motors, Chrysler, Nash, Willys Overland, Studebaker, Hupp, Hudson, Crosley, Packard—all working to build a better car and sell it for less in order to compete for the favor and patronage of the American consumer—better cars, tires, gasoline, lubrication, and looks.

It is worth noting that the industry that has provided the most jobs at the best pay—5,000,000 jobs, in fact—is the one that was freest of Government control. Compare the automobile industry with the railroad industry that can scarcely turn around without Government consent.

Orville Wright, one of the two brothers who first flew a heavier-than-air plane in 1903, says that Henry Ford did more for mankind than any man of his generation.

Ford had the revolutionary idea of tapping the mass market at the base of the economic pyramid. He saw clearly that the big money was in the pockets of the little people. He said: "The market is like a pyramid, pointed at the top, with a very broad base. If a car cost $1,000,000 there might be a few men foolish enough to buy it. If it could be sold for $10, scores of millions of people would buy and use cars instead of wearing out shoes. The further we can lower the price, the more millions can enjoy the car." He taught America that truth. He wanted to design a car that would go anywhere, whether in the frozen wastes of the Yukon or the scorching heat of Death Valley.

He wanted to make a car that even the latest immigrant could build, could drive, and could own. Also, a car that would get you there and bring you back. He built that car, and it went into every country in the world. The name "Ford" became better known and understood by more of the earth's people, probably, than even the name of Lincoln or Washington.

ONCE SOLD CAR FOR $310

At one time, he sold that car at the factory for as little as $310. But, of course, at that time a profligate Government had not added huge taxes to the sales price of every car. Cheap cars led to our great system of paved highways. Neither county commissioners nor Congress, itself, would have built ribbons of concrete from coast to coast for Fiats or Rolls Royces. America has 1,400,000 miles of improved roads, enough to circle the globe 56 times. These roads, brought down the cost of moving produce from farm to city. They made rural life more attractive. They moved families away from the congested slums of the big cities into the suburbs and countryside. They have added enormously to our capacity for national defense.

Cheap cars, plus highways, furnished markets for our great petroleum industry, now a world giant. They planted rubber trees in Java and Borneo and Brazil. They made new markets for cotton, glass, steel, and hundreds of other industries.

WE BEGAN TO GO PLACES

Millions of Americans who had never been 50 miles from their birthplace turned their flivvers toward Niagara Falls, Pike's Peak, Plymouth Rock, Valley Forge, the Alamo. "Old Liz" taught history and geography and patriotism. She helped to erase the scars of the Civil War. She helped to make Americans friends and neighbors.

The Ford Co. alone has built over 30,000,000 motor vehicles. In all the rest of the world, there are only 6,000,000 of all makes combined. Some achievement! As was said of our pioneer forefathers, Ford built his empire with no capital except courage and no resource except resourcefulness. Only $28,000 was invested by others in what became the vast Ford empire, with factories and branch offices in 33 foreign countries. The rest was plowed back from earnings. Taxes had not then fallen like a blight upon the expansion of business.

Has big Government, and the cost and waste of big Government, made it impossible for America to ever have another Henry Ford? Although rated as the world's first billionaire, his fortune was chiefly in buildings and machines, worthless unless at work.

PRODUCTION FOR USE

"Production for use," as the Socialists urge, was actually the principle to which he devoted his life.

Apart from his plant and equipment, it is doubtful if his personal fortune ever exceeded 1 or 2 percent of the wealth he created. Now, by his will, the bulk of his fortune has gone into charitable foundation for public welfare.

The father of mass production, with his single purpose machine tools turning out parts that would fit one another to a hundred-thousandth of an inch, was the first to pay $5 a day to the men who made the cars. He said: "No wage is too high for the man who earns it."

Contrary to the teaching of Communist professors that "one man's gain is the other man's loss," he demonstrated on a world scale that it is possible to make more money, pay higher wages, and reduce costs all at one and the same time—investor, worker, and consumer all gaining and no one losing by the process.

The secret of this miracle of economics is high production per man-hour, which brings costs down. And, high production per man-hour is possible only because of better tools, more mechanical horsepower helping human backs to do the work, better management and last, but not least, higher skill and know-how in the fingers and brains of the men on the job.

The best manager of a machine is the man who runs it, if he takes pride in his job. This is the miracle of America.

It is hard to see any limit to this progress—any ceiling on American achievement in the years and generations to come—if. We have the world by the tail with a downhill pull—if.

If we don't lose the magic formula in a struggle between class and class; if investor, and manager and worker all play fair with each other, each recognizing the part that the others play in better tools, more efficient work and a better coordination of all the parts in the great machine.

In the 90 years following 1848, when Karl Marx wrote his Communist manifesto, investment in tools for each factory worker here in America increased nine times, and working hours were cut almost in half. Because Ford supplied much more capital and much better machine tools for each worker, he was able to lead the whole world in raising the workingman's pay.

But even the magic formula cannot work except under a government friendly to achievement, a government that protects a man in the fruit of his toil. Great as he was, I firmly believe Henry Ford would be a name scarcely known beyond the county limits of his home, if he had not lived under the protection of the Constitution of the United States.

Socialism, fascism, and communism would not have a Chinaman's chance to outlive this generation if they were not financed and subsidized at home and abroad from the earnings, ideas, and inventions of individual competitive enterprise. Socialism and communism put on a show only because they are able to hide their failures from their own people behind the iron curtain of government.

When the American and Russian Armies met at Berlin, it is reported that a Russian general in great surprise said: "Why, you American have jeeps, too." He didn't know that his jeeps came from Detroit and Toledo.

If we could get a Sears, Roebuck or Montgomery Ward catalog, in the Russian language, into every Russian home, Stalin wouldn't have as much chance as a snowflake on a frying pan.

One of the ironies of history was to see engineers, sent here by a foreign government, studying the automobile factories at Detroit while their government has worked constantly to destroy the very system which made these American factories possible.

MUST WORK TO SURVIVE

But the vast assembly line, which is America's other name, will slow down if we featherbed it, doing less but demanding more; if we make savings unattractive by taxing the earnings of capital too highly; if we make good work unattractive by taxing too highly the workers' pay envelopes; if we permit the vampire of big government to suck the lifeblood out of business, and continue to subsidize socialism and communism—here and abroad.

Mr. Bernard Baruch, our statesman without portolio, said the other day, "We are at the brink of an engulfing inflation. There is only one way out. That is by work. * * * We should adopt wholeheartedly a 44-hour week without strikes or lay-offs." This same thought was urged before a congressional committee over a year ago by President Wilson of General Motors.

It is tragic to witness the present stampede for more pieces of paper called dollars because every workingman's wife pays the bill at the market place for every wage increase that does not represent more production per man.

Henry Ford proved that higher pay comes from increased production, and that only increased production can bring costs down and make higher pay mean anything.

Every American should thrill with pride over the life's work of Henry Ford. It is quite possible that in our lifetime he and his friend, Thomas Edison, exerted the most far-reaching and beneficial influence of any two men in the world.

The capital that he accumulated and invested in better tools, the manufacturing methods that he introduced, lifted wages and raised everybody's scale of living.

He, and the other automobile manufacturers, enriched people's lives everywhere by the low-cost, personal transportation they brought within the reach of every family.

Ford's career was possible only in an America with constitutional government and competitive free enterprise unhampered by confiscatory taxation of able men—as it was when he was born.

The Facts About the Action of Congress on Agricultural Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to debunk the vicious and untruthful propaganda put out by the press agents of the New Deal about the action of the Congress on agricultural appropriations for the next fiscal year. Some of this propaganda is being swallowed by agricultural interests, who would think otherwise if they knew the true facts. The facts are in the record. As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record."

The agricultural appropriation bill for 1948, as passed by the Congress, carries an over-all reduction of about 19 percent, or $228,526,400. This is less than some of the other departments have been reduced, but is agriculture's proportional share of reduction. We are not giving a straight across-the-board reduction to Federal departments, for that would necessarily eliminate some valuable programs. Instead, we have studied each program on its individual merits and have cut in some places, left others alone, and increased still others.

There has been more demagoguery and misrepresentation about this particular appropriation bill than any I can remember. The self-appointed spokesmen for the farmer have proclaimed that everybody should have his appropriations reduced except the farmer. They argue that the farmer will vote against anyone who cuts funds for the Department of Agriculture. They thus say, in effect, that the farmer is not willing to do his part to restore an economically stable America. They infer that he favors unnecessary Government spending and subsidies as long as he gets some of it. This is so much bunk and is an insult to the patriotism and good judgment of the farmers of America. I think that the Democrats who raised this hue and cry in the House realize it for the appropriation bill finally passed with the aid of their votes. The vote on final passage was 315 to 38 and the final conference report was approved unanimously.

The House did not go into this matter half cocked. The bill was debated for 3 days. The Appropriations Committee was careful to get the full facts to justify its recommendations to the House. How careful it was can be seen from the printed record which contains 2,833 pages of hearings, weighs 6 pounds, and contains the testimony of 411 witnesses. The bill carried the staggering sum, as approved by the Congress, of $960,044,908, almost a billion dollars to run this one Government Department in 1948.

The criteria used by the Congress in making reductions in appropriations this year were roughly as follows: (1) We have a public debt of $257,000,000,000 on which interest is annually $5,000,000,000. To reduce it requires reduced spending. It must be reduced if we are to stem inflation and the cheapening of the dollar. (2) The people are demanding reduction of wartime high taxes. This means also that economies must be made in Federal spending. (3) People want Federal pay rolls reduced. They can only be reduced by cutting appropriations, in all departments including the Department of Agriculture which employes over 77,000 people. (4) Agriculture is in a sound condition today with farm income at a record high. (5) There are many desirable things the Government might do but are they necessary under the foregoing conditions or can they be postponed until a later date?

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

One of the most popular programs is rural electrification. I am for it. The question before the House was whether or not the President's budget request of $250,000,000 should be granted in full. The REA lobby, one of the most powerful in the country, put out the word among applicants desiring electricity that they have not been connected with an REA line because Congress has not provided enough money. What are the facts?

Last year Congress provided REA with $325,000,000 more than it was able to spend for construction of lines because it could not get the materials. Yet, REA asked the Congress for $250,000,000 more for the next 12 months. The Secretary of Agriculture and the head of the REA say it will be at least 20 months before sufficient transformers, and so forth, become available to take care of all applicants. Congress reasoned that if this was so there was certainly no point in again appropriating so much more money than REA could possibly spend. So, it cut this request by $25,000,000, which leaves a total of $550,000,000 available on July 1. This is 90 percent of what REA asked for. It asked for more than it expected to get and need, as do all Government agencies, and as proved in the case of REA by the fact that last year it asked for and got $325,000,000 more than it could spend. Yet, one Missouri farm publication says: "Thus REA will be materially slowed down and thousands of farm families are condemned to many more years of darkness and all that implies." How untrue and unfair. Congress is not unfriendly to rural electrification. It will provide all of the funds necessary. But, this money is not paid back as fast as it goes out and there is no point in having too many millions tied up in allocations when sufficient materials to spend it on are not available for construction.

We have provided more than can be spent for actual construction next year and no farmer will be deprived of electricity or have the date of his connection postponed by reason of the House action.

I might point out in passing that REA could stand some economy and the Congress went perhaps too easy with it. With only one-half of the amount the REA requested for administrative expenses, they energized twice as much line in 1940 as they did in 1946. The House reduced funds for administrative purposes, the salaries of the REA bureaucrats, from the requested $5,600,000 to $4,000,000. Even so, that amount exceeds any amount appropriated for this purpose for previous years up to and including 1945. The hearings on the bill are full of startling information about the backgrounds of some top REA officials who, when appointed, actually were chauffeurs and otherwise unqualified by experience for the positions they now occupy. There is no agency of Government so holy it cannot stand a little economy and efficiency. And, when I say that I say it as one who has in the past voted more money for REA than it has been able to spend and will be able to spend to build lines for the farmers in the next 12 months.

THE TRIPLE-A OR PMA

The House voted to reduce conservation and use payments for the AAA and to eliminate it in 1948 but the Senate restored it for 1948 and the House accepted the Senate position. Greatest pressure for continuation of the AAA comes from the limestone producers who have been providing farmers with lime, partly paid for by Government. They maintain a powerful Washington lobby calling itself the National Crushed Stone Association. They have heavy investments in machinery and are out on the limb. Many of these people have borrowed heavily from the banks to finance their operation. These banks have also put pressure on Congress to continue this program so that they can be bailed out. Their argument is that Congress is breaking faith with the farmer by not providing all appropriations for this program previously authorized. Further, they fear that the farmer will not buy lime unless it is subsidized by the Federal Government, although it would be cheaper if not subsidized. At this point it is pertinent to quote the Appropriations Committee report, from page 24:

> In prior years the committee made it plain to departmental officials that the programs were contingent upon appropriations made by the Congress and repeatedly insisted that this fact be made clear to agricultural producers. The Department officials testified that millions of circulars relating to the farm program for 1947 were printed and distributed to all cooperating farmers so that it is abundantly clear to all participants that the program is based upon whatever funds are made available. One Congress cannot bind another.

Page 1249 of the committee hearings also quotes Mr. Dodd, Under Secretary of Agriculture, who advised the committee he had 971,500 handbooks printed for AAA committeemen and every cooperating farmer either got one of the booklets or was advised of its contents by an AAA worker. This literature advised farmers and lime producers as follows:

> The provisions of the 1947 program are necessarily subject to such legislation as the Congress of the United States may hereafter enact; the making of the payments herein provided is contingent upon such appropriations as the Congress may hereafter provide for such purpose.

When the lime producers and the Democratic New Deal editors of various farm papers put out the misleading propaganda saying that Congress was breaking contracts with the farmers they did not disclose the foregoing information. Nor did they quote the President who in his budget message to Congress on January 10, 1947 suggested that we shift our efforts from this kind of subsidy to providing technical guidance to all farmers for soil conservation and management along the lines of the Soil Conservation Service and Extension Service. The President said further:

> More than 60 percent of total payments have been going to only 20 percent of the Nation's farmers.

So, if the average farmer who gets absolutely nothing under this program objects to the reduction he has not taken the trouble to write to Washington about it. The pressure is coming from the lime producers and from the Triple-A committeemen. There are 9,087 AAA county committeemen and 97,663 community committeemen, who get a per diem of about $6 from the United States Treasury. The total granted for this army of AAA workers was $24,500,000 for 1948. For national and State administrative purposes, the cost was estimated at $9,025,868 additional and involves the services of 481 persons in Washington and 2,630 at the State level. Two hundred and sixty-five million six hundred and thirty-five thousand and forty-four dollars was appropriated for 1947 payments to the farmers, which is about all requested.

The average farmer knows it is weaning time for the bureaucrats whose motto has been "Spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect." Those bureaucrats being weaned are crying loudly. Their cries are music to ears of the taxpayers, including the average farmer, who is willing to do his part. However, professional farm leaders in many cases are like the professional labor leaders who do not want labor legislation, or the nontaxpayers who do not want tax reduction, or the brass hats who want our military establishment operated in peacetime with the same extravagance as in war. They have not learned to take the "me" out of economy. They want only the other fellow to have his appropriations cut. But, "We can't have our cake and eat it too." Such a policy would mean no debt or tax reductions or lifting of controls at all. It is a selfish, greedy, and unpatriotic attitude and a disservice to agriculture.

SOIL CONSERVATION

I suppose everybody agrees on the importance of soil conservation. Congress created an agency to assist farmers with soil conserving practices. For their field operations for next year this agency asked for forty-three and a half million dollars. That is twice the amount they had only 10 years ago. The House reduced the operations item by only about $6,000,000. We found that they employ 124 publicity people to send out press releases to farmers and farm organizations and newspapers to promote their agency and put pressure on Congress to give it more money. They also employ 146 persons just to supervise the other people employed in this agency. Still another defect in this agency which justified a reduction was the fact that the cost of its operations is about $300 per farm whereas in some areas, other methods of soil conservation got substantial results at one-third the cost. But, the most challenging thing about it is that other agencies with some 30,000 employees also provide advice on soil conservation and duplicate much of the work of the soil conservation agency. Let us look into that for a moment. Here are some of those other agencies doing soil conservation work:

First. The agriculture experiment stations for soil work. The funds for this work were not reduced at all.

Second. The Extension Service or county agents with their soil specialists who have been doing this work for 30 years. Their funds were not reduced at all.

Third. The AAA program which is entirely a duplication of the work of the Soil Conservation Service, the Extension Services, and other agencies. The AAA is the agency which gained fame by killing little pigs a few years ago to promote scarcity and plowed under crops as late as the first year of the war. Now it is trying to increase production by distribution of lime, fertilizer, and encouraging terracing and the planting of trees.

Fourth. The TVA distribution of fertilizers is also a soil-conservation activity duplicating the others.

Fifth. The Forestry Service has an important place in soil conservation. The tree-planting program of this service was not reduced at all. It can do the work AAA was doing in this field; duplicating its effort.

So, we can see from the foregoing, that other agencies of Government are doing soil-conservation work in addition to that being performed by the so-called Soil Conservation Service itself. There is a lot of duplication of effort which means unnecessary expense to the taxpayers and a lot of jobs which should be abolished. But the Soil Conservation Service got off pretty easy. It got only about 2 percent less than it got in 1947. It got about 74 percent more than it did in 1943. A bill is pending to consolidate soil-conservation agencies and I hope it passes in the next session.

The Eightieth Congress is for soil conservation. It might be pertinent to point out in contrast that any Administration such as the present one that discriminates against the livestock industry like it has these many years in order to oversubsidize soil depleting crops; any Administration that has not lived up to the

law in supporting livestock products at not less than 90 percent of parity at the same time it puts a floor of 150 percent of parity under a soil depleting crop; any Administration that functions in such a manner as to reduce hog numbers from 83,000,000 to 56,000,000 as this administration has during the past 4 years; any administration that functions in such a manner that the sheep numbers of America have been reduced by 35 percent during the past 4 years; any administration that functions in such a manner as to reduce cattle numbers in the United States by over 4,000,000 head in the past 4 years; any administration that lowers the duties and invites imports and secures 30 percent custom receipts to be used as section 32 funds under the guise of disposing of surpluses, and then uses these funds to grind up tobacco for fertilizer, subsidize insecticides made of tobacco and pay export subsidies on tobacco, wheat, corn, and other soil depleting crops, is in a rather poor position when it takes upon itself to point a finger at the Eightieth Congress, and accuse it of being against soil conservation.

SCHOOL LUNCHES

The school lunch program began back in the days of food surpluses and the idea came up and was approved, authorizing disposal of these surpluses for school lunches at expense of the United States Treasury. It is thus essentially a nutrition program and is administered as a cash subsidy to schools which operate such programs. Payments are made in cash through the State Educational Authority and schools are free to operate the program as they see fit and serve what they like. The administration asked $75,000,000 for this program for 1948. But, we do not have a surplus of anything now except potatoes. The Congress allowed $65,000,000. The challenging question this item presents is why the Federal Government, head over heels in debt, should be called upon to provide money for a strictly local program when most of the States today receiving this Federal cash subsidy have comfortable bank balances? Certainly, the program today is no longer an aid to agriculture so even if it is provided for why should it be in an agricultural appropriation bill?

FARM LOANS

Time will permit reference to one more item in the bill, namely, the Farmers Home Administration, successor to the discredited Farm Security Administration which engaged in Communist collective-farm experiments and which now administers loans to tenant farm purchasers, production and subsistence loans, and rehabilitation services to farmers. A great hue and cry has gone up that these funds are necessary to help veterans buy farms. Here again we have a duplicating agency. Any veterans who wants to buy a farm can borrow guaranteed money under the GI bill of rights, administered by the Veterans' Administration.

It seems a queer time to provide the FHA with $30,000,000 to spend on salaries of its 8,120 bureaucrats to do work being done by the five other Government farm lending agencies. The amount was reduced to eighteen million and might well have been less for it is an inappropriate time to provide money for tenant purchase loans when only recently a conference was called by the President to cope with land fever and the skyrocketing land prices which would place every tenant purchaser of a farm in jeopardy if commodity prices should start sliding downward or land prices drop. To furnish lavish funds for such a purpose now is to encourage inflation and farm bankruptcy, so farm tenant loans were reduced to $15,000,000 for 1948.

Funds were eliminated to insure farm mortgages because the testimony disclosed that on the basis of the 2½-percent rate for a long-term mortgage, there was not a single customer for such insurance.

A request for $90,000,000 with which to make production loans was cut one-third, or to sixty million. Every bank in the land is bursting with money to loan for such purposes. If we are believers in private enterprise we should practice what we preach when the opportunity presents itself.

There are other items in the bill, but the ones I have mentioned were the most controversial. Efficiency of the Department of Agriculture has been increased by this pruning of the branches, and all essential services have been preserved. The Congress has even played safe and square with the farmer by providing $4,750,000,000 which can be used by the Commodity Credit Corporation to maintain prices on basic commodities at parity level, although it hardly seems likely in this era of high farm prices that these funds will be much used. Treatment of this bill by Congress, which has ignored the appeals of demagogues seeking to farm the farmer, is a real contribution to sound financial policy for the entire Government and in the interest of national welfare.

Letter to a Young American Pole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter published in the Polish Review of July 10, 1947:

LETTER TO A YOUNG AMERICAN POLE
(by Eugene Lyons)

DEAR MICHAEL: You bear an authentically Polish name. Lovely Polish tunes run through your mind; tunes you heard in the cradle, in childhood, at family gatherings. There are a few exotic reminders of the old country in your home—perhaps pictures, books in strange bindings, maybe a costume—and they do touch a chord in your heart.

Being an intelligent young man, you agree that Poland has gotten a raw deal in this war. Listening to your relatives and their friends discuss the ordeal of their native land, you sometimes share their anger and their sorrow.

At the same time, however, you are a little annoyed by their eternal concern about a place thousands of miles away and problems that seem so remote from everyday American life. That hankering interest in the fate of a foreign nation seems to you almost un-American—almost, as you put it, "like divided loyalty." Your parents came here from Poland and you love them. But it seems to you high time they erased the memory of their origins and settled down to being "real Americans."

In any case, you want to know why you—an American boy, as American as any of your Anglo-Saxon classmates—should bother about a far-off country which you have never seen.

It's a fair question, Michael, and you're entitled to a fair answer. It's a question being asked not only by the sons and daughters of Polish-American homes. Millions of Americans only one or two generations removed from their immigrant forebears, from every country on earth, face the same problem.

Somehow they must reconcile their family heritage, whether it be Polish or French, Irish or Mexican, with the general American heritage. Unlike "old line" Americans, they were born into two cultures: the one at home, the other outside the home. Unless they can succeed in blending the two, in making them harmonious, they are likely to be disturbed and unhappy.

Many of them never do achieve that inner sense of harmony. They go through life with a self-conscious feeling about their origins, their names, the "foreign" touch to their homes. Instead of being proud of those things, as they have every right to be, they act almost as if they carried a guilty secret.

But the wisest and healthiest among the second and third generation Americans, Michael, are those who understand early that the whole problem is artificial. It's not in reality but in their minds. They need only straighten out their thinking on the subject and presto! the problem disappears.

And they do straighten out their thinking just as soon as they become aware that America is not made of one piece but is a wonderful mixture of races and cultures, to which new ingredients are always being added. That mixture, in fact, is the basic reason for the vigor and power of our country.

Eric Johnston, now head of the movie industry, made this point well in the course of a speech sometime ago.

"Any metallurgist," he said, "will tell you that the toughest, most resistant metals are not 'pure' ores but alloys that blend the most valuable qualities of many ores. It is thus with the American, who fuses in his blood and his spirit the virtues and vitalities of many races, creeds, cultures—giving us an amalgamation that is new, unique, and immeasurably strong."

There never was and never will be a point at which our American amalgam will be fixed and finished. Ours is a vital, dynamic nation in a continuous process of growth and change. Every new arrival—whether from Poland or Timbuctu—makes a contribution to that evolution. He brings his labor power, his passion for self-betterment, his brains, the virtue and experience of his particular civilization, and throws them into the great American pool.

Our America has never expected its immigrants to discard and forget their past. On the contrary, it has expected them to distil the best in their personal heritage for the enrichment of their adopted fatherland. What distinguishes America from some older

nations is that it has a diversity of people but an equality of human rights.

Once you have grasped this great truth about America, Michael, you will get over any uneasy feeling about your slightly foreign home and relatives. It will turn instead into a feeling of pride—pride in the special qualities and unique experiences of your forebears and their courage in coming to America for a fresh start. You will know that foreign homes have been typically American since the day when the *Mayflower* unloaded its contingent of immigrants on Plymouth Rock.

Immigrant, after all, is only another word for pioneer. It took guts for your father or grandfather to tear up his roots and strike out for a new country on the other side of the ocean. The same kind of guts the Pilgrim Fathers had, or those who struck out for the unknown West in covered wagons.

What if the sons and daughters of a *Mayflower* immigrant had been self-conscious about their English family? What if the boys of old New Amsterdam, which was to become New York, had been a bit uneasy about their Dutch ancestry? You'd say they were foolish. Well, it is no less foolish for the sons of more recent settlers to behave in that fashion. Except for the difference in dates, you are in exactly the same position. America is a long chain of many and diverse links. Your link is more recent, closer to the end of the chain, but not one bit less important than the rest.

An Irish American, if he has self-respect, loves the Green Isle of his forebears, though he has never seen it and doesn't expect to. He marches proudly in the St. Patrick's Day parade and feels himself, rightly, a better American for it. If his interests run in that direction, he gets a special kick out of Irish literature, Irish music, Irish history. If his tastes run in another direction, he takes a deeper pride in an Irish jockey or Irish prize-ring champion.

The very fact that he does these things proves that he is thoroughly adjusted to America. His American patriotism is not one iota less because it includes a perfectly natural and wholesome affection for the ancient land of his fathers.

Do you know, Michael, that tens of thousands of Irish Americans gave their money and their energies in the long struggle for Irish freedom? They did not thereby reduce the measure of their Americanism. Indeed, intelligent fellow-Americans who were not Irish understood and applauded that loyalty to their race. Because our country is compounded of scores of races, a decent pride in your own race, coupled with a decent respect for the other fellow's, has become a fine American tradition.

Intelligent fellow-Americans understand and applaud today when Americans of Polish extraction—Americans like yourself—fight for the cause of Polish liberation. Would it be natural for Americans, who cherish freedom above all else, to remain indifferent to its suppression in another country? Certainly not. And by the same token it would be a hundredfold more unnatural if they remained indifferent to the enslavement of the land from which they have sprung.

Let me put it bluntly. If your father and his friends, born in Poland, ignored the tragedy of their native country it would mean that they have not learned the lesson of their adopted country. It would mean that they have not learned the value of human freedom. If you, the son of Poles, are untouched by the suppression of Poland's freedom, it does not mean that you are a "real American," but, on the contrary, that your Americanism is superficial, shallow, and incomplete.

The fact is that those who fight for Polish freedom are also fighting for American freedom. It happens that an epochal struggle is under way in the world today—a great duel between freedom and dictatorship. America typifies the nations and peoples on the freedom side of the tussle, just as Soviet Russia typifies the forces on the side of slavery. A victory for dictatorship anywhere is a defeat for our America. A victory for freedom anywhere is an American triumph.

Yes, Michael, in standing up for the rights of Poland you are helping to pull your weight in the great tug-of-war against the ideas and the threats represented by Soviet Russia. Poland was one of the first victims of those threats, but their main and ultimate target is the United States. The liberation of Poland, when it comes, will be a great step in the defense of American liberty and the American conception of human relations.

Think of these things next time you are tempted to annoyance because some Pole grows vehement in denouncing the raw deal meted out to Poland by its wartime allies. Remember that he is right. Remember that the betrayal of Poland was also a betrayal of America. It is not simply a "Polish affair," but an affair affecting the entire world.

When Poland, which fought so valorously and paid such a heavy price in blood and pain for its loyalty to the allied ideals, was sold down the river to appease a totalitarian despot, the hopes for a free world suffered a body-blow. You know by now that the injustice perpetrated against Poland did not end there. It was the prelude to a lengthening series of injustices. The latest victim, as these words are written, is Hungary, and other countries are waiting their turn to be enslaved.

A few years ago, when the war was still under way, there was a great deal of talk about one world. The phrase expressed the old yearning of plain people everywhere for a free world organized under law. Today, alas, that phrase sounds ironic—the globe has so obviously been split into two contending worlds, one headed by the United States of America, the other by the U. S. S. R.

As a physical and political fact the one-world concept has been exploded. But in a deeper sense, in the moral sense, this is one world. It always has been and will remain one. I mean that we cannot close our eyes and hearts to evil elsewhere without being contaminated ourselves. Those who exclaim that they are not their brothers' keepers share the biblical mark of Cain. We cannot smugly enjoy liberty and well-being while suffering, moral degradation and political despotism spread beyond our borders.

There were Americans, before World War II, who insisted that it was none of our business what Hitler was doing to his own people, his Jews and his neighbor nations. By this time we know how terribly mistaken they were. We know that in due time the whole world paid heavily in life and substance for the diabolic crimes of the Nazis.

Even so there are Americans who now pretend that it is none of our business what Stalin does to his own people and to the populations of neighboring countries. Their vision, alas, is as narrow as their human sympathies. Horror of the kind the Soviet dictators are inflicting on an ever larger portion of Europe and Asia cannot be ignored with impunity. It is a source of contagion for the rest of mankind. Unless it is cured in good time it may well plunge the world into yet another orgy of global blood-letting.

So I repeat, Michael, that in fighting for the rights of Poland you will be fighting also for the best interests of America. Kosciusko and Pulaski did not cease to be great Polish patriots when they chose to fight for the independence of 13 far-off American Colonies. Lafayette did not cease to be a great Frenchman when he devoted himself to the cause of American freedom. A great English poet, Lord Byron, took up arms for Greek freedom at the beginning of the last century; he did not thereby cease to be a noble English patriot.

By the same logic you—and your Polish relatives, their Polish friends—do not cease to be good Americans when you champion the cause of Polish freedom and independence. Indeed, you demonstrate your Americanism by doing your share in defense of principles of human liberty and human dignity that have their focal center in these United States.

Another thing: Communism is the No. 1 danger facing the world today. Its depredations in Poland or France, in China or in our own country, are not separate phenomena. They are parts of the same world-wide force. We must stand up to it, all of us, not only here at home but wherever the danger is manifest.

Viewed in this light, Poland is not at all far away. Its fate is not unrelated to the interests of America but, on the contrary, intimately linked with our everyday problems.

It is not only your right as an American, Michael, but your duty as an American of Polish origin, to take a direct and enlightened interest in the vital struggle to liberate Poland from Soviet dominion. You will be a better American for it and, more important, a better human being, a better citizen of the world.

"Streamlined" Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, as the first session of the Eightieth Congress comes to a close, the people take an especial interest in the success or shortcomings of the Congressional Reorganization Act of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Some features of the La Follette-Monroney Act, have proven quite beneficial to the functioning of Congress. Other provisions would have been of substantial benefit if Congress had made a greater effort to carry out intent of the Reorganization Act.

It should be borne in mind that only a small part of the job of modernizing Congress was accomplished under the reorganization. Other suggested improvements are contained in the book, Twentieth Century Congress, written by Jack Levin and me. I hope Members of Congress will study and consider these additional proposals.

Life magazine this week in its editorial carries a fair and accurate analysis of the effectiveness of the reforms that were accomplished in the Reorganization Act and the editorial forcibly presents the need for further modernization. Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial is included herewith:

THAT STREAMLINED CONGRESS—ONE REFORM OF OUR LEGISLATIVE MACHINERY WASN'T ENOUGH—SO LET'S TRY AGAIN

Since Congress will wind up in a rush of long-delayed work, it is too soon to assess the legislative hits and misses of this ses-

sion as a whole. But in one respect the score is already in. The Eightieth Congress was to have been known in the history books as the first streamlined Congress. It was the first to apply to itself the La Follette-Monroney Act, passed by the Seventy-ninth, reforming its own machinery. How have those reforms worked out?

The passage of the La Follette-Monroney Act was considered at the time a great victory for better government. Practically all right-thinking people agreed that reform was needed. Now that we have some clinical data, however, it is our sad duty to report that it cannot be called a success.

REFORMS THAT FAILED

Take three of the major reforms in the La Follette-Monroney bill and look at what has happened to them. First, the number of standing committees in both Houses was reduced from 81 to 34. Cutting down this sprawling jungle of "little ministries" (as Woodrow Wilson called them) was supposed to eliminate a lot of unnecessary work. But instead of 34 committees, or even 81, Congress now has more than a hundred—with more being appointed all the time. They are now called subcommittees, and they are not covered with mossy prestige like the old standing committees, but they aren't any more efficient either. Indeed when a subcommittee has finished work on a bill, the bill has to go through the extra step of passing the parent committee before reaching the floor. The regular committees, being fewer, are even more overloaded with work than before. The Judiciary Committee alone has had upward of 1,500 bills this session and has given birth to eight subcommittees in a futile attempt to keep up with them.

Second, there is that potentially very important reform known as the legislative budget. The Reorganization Act required Congress to take at least one annual look at its total appropriations and estimated revenues, fitting them together and authorizing the appropriate increase or reduction in the public debt at the same time. Only by such elementary housekeeping can the Government ever make any real fiscal sense. Those repeated Republican efforts at tax reduction, for example, would look a lot better if Congress had first agreed on approximately how much it was willing to appropriate and on whether it wanted to retire any debt or not. In an effort to obey its own rules the House accepted a budget of $33,000,000,000 ($6,000,000,000 lower than the President's budget); but the Senate wanted $34,500,000,000, and a conference committee has been sitting on the problem since March 4. By now the legislative budget for 1947 is academic. Appropriations are going through on their so-called individual merits, as of yore, without reference to income, debt, the value of the dollar, or any other aspect of high fiscal policy.

A third reform, also potentially very important, was more money for the committees—also for each Senator—to hire expert help. About $3,000,000 has been spent on these vital new jobs this year. The original idea was to build up staffs of brains and ability so that Congress wouldn't have to rely so heavily on lobbyists or on the executive departments for its information. However there has been no great rush of brains to Washington as a result of this reform. The new jobs became patronage, just like the janitors, pages, and elevator operators before them. George Smith, secretary to the majority policy committee, made a partially successful effort to introduce a rudimentary merit system into the selection of committee staffs, but the seniority system (which the Reorganization Act left untouched) and its attendant gravy stains proved too much for him. By and large, the streamlined Congress is much too much like its predecessors.

This is a source of great satisfaction to lobbyists, to cynics, and to those mossbacks in Congress who were against the reforms to begin with. So what do we do; conclude that reform was a bad idea? That the more you try to change Congress, the more it remains the same? Or try again?

A TWELVE AND A HALF PERCENT GAIN

When the Reorganization Act was passed, the principal reason for all the cheering was that Congress had shown itself capable (much smart money to the contrary) of taking any action on self-reform at all. No expert thought the act went far enough. Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, one of the hardest workers for reform, estimates that the act went about 25 percent as far as it should have and has been 50 percent effective, which gives us a 12½ percent net advance. Salaries were raised to $15,000 (they should be $25,000), lobbyists have had to register, the legislative drafting and reference services have been expanded, etc., etc.

Another 25 percent gain should be comparatively easy. Mr. KEFAUVER has filled a whole book—Twentieth Century Congress—with further ideas for lightening Congress' crushing load of work and tradition. For example Congress should get rid of the anachronistic duty of governing the District of Columbia, a duty which takes 1 day a fortnight and which once enabled Senator Cole Blease to make a speech on the floor because he couldn't get a seat in a streetcar. The Senate could also save a lot of time by getting rid of the filibuster. The La Follette-Monroney committee was barred by its own terms of reference from considering this reform. A similar fate met the excellent Kefauver proposal (Life, February 21, 1944) providing for a weekly question period during which executive department heads would appear before both Houses of Congress.

As KEFAUVER says, Congress as at present organized could not function without lobbyists, who outnumber the Congressmen in Washington by two to one. Registering them is a harmless and even useful step, but lobbyists will continue to influence too much legislation until every committee and Member has more and better experts at his call. One reason the House Judiciary Committee is so overworked is that it hasn't a single lawyer on its staff; the members have to do their own drafting. The House took a small step in the right direction recently when it hired a $12,000 Coordinator of Information. That is one kind of public expense no intelligent taxpayer will begrudge.

But even that will not be enough. Congress has at least two wider rivers to cross before it can consider itself streamlined or even decently efficient.

First, it must find some substitute for the seniority method of choosing committee chairmen. The reduction in the number of standing committees has had the effect of increasing the average age of the chairmen; what used to be called the "senility system" must now be called "supersenility." Seniority was adopted in the House in 1910 as an escape from the tyranny of Speaker Cannon. But feudalism is not the only alternative to tyranny. Why not let the committees choose their own chairmen?

THE LAST RIVER

The second river is wider and is not to be crossed in one leap. It requires the development of a clearer and more formal sense of responsibility for legislative policy. Toward this end the La Follette-Monroney committee recommended a majority and a minority policy committee in each House. Speaker RAYBURN, for reasons best known to himself, killed this proposal; but the Senate adopted it for itself, and its majority policy committee which has worked quite well. As Democrat KEFAUVER points out, the Republicans seem to have a more coherent party sense anyway; even in the House, JOE MARTIN'S tight little machine has shown itself quite capable of making a decision and getting out the votes to back it up. But what is still badly needed is a formal and public method for reaching a joint House-Senate majority (and minority) position on critical issues, so that responsibility for action or inaction can be focused where it belongs.

A joint majority policy committee could have prevented the farcial fate of the 1947 legislative budget. It could be a means of better liaison between Congress and the White House. It could lead to the development of a true legislative cabinet, equal and opposite to the Executive Cabinet. It could reverse the depressing trend of this efficiency-minded century, which has been to exalt executives and to discredit parliaments everywhere.

Even in Britain, Parliament has become little more than a talkative appendage of the ministerial government, and one political scientist (Don K. Price) expects the Commons to become like the Lords, one of the merely "theatrical elements" of British self-rule. Our system, through Congress, gives the people a more direct voice in their own fate. Congress has a chance, but only a chance, to justify that high function by becoming responsible and so remaining free.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PARKE M. BANTA
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively, as did all the Members of this House, to the President's message of July 16 relating to the development of water resources and flood control, since referred to by the Members and in press reports as Truman's flood-control plan.

The President opened his message with this sentence:

> The major opportunity of our generation to increase the wealth of the Nation lies in the development of our great river systems.

A variation of this sentence has been uttered by our politicians, and by some of our statesmen, too, for more than a hundred years, during which time ill-conceived, piecemeal plans have been submitted to the Congress for authorization and appropriations, along with pleasing promises for expenditure of funds in the most fertile political areas, upon the theory that we must control floods and preserve our fertile soil.

In the beginning, it was navigation and flood control, but navigation received the benefits and floods continued. Later it was navigation, irrigation, and flood control, whereupon irrigation and navigation received the benefits and floods continued. More recently it has been navigation, irrigation, high dams, behind which shall be multiple-use reservoirs for such additional benefits as the development of hydroelectric power, municipal and industrial water supplies, recreational areas and opportunities, preservation of fish and wildlife, the abatement of pollution, and flood control.

Many huge dams have been constructed, some are in the process of construction and many others authorized, but the floods continue, and in the region

of the great Central West, correctly referred to as the breadbasket of America, in the Missouri and upper Mississippi Valleys, this year, 1947, those rivers have had crests as high as the record of more than 100 years ago; namely, in the year 1844. There was less water in these rivers this year, but the crest was almost as high. Does this fact demonstrate anything to the President or to the Army Engineers Corps? If nothing else, it must serve to teach them that something is wrong with the plan. First things have surely not been placed first in the execution of plans, or they are being erroneously executed. It is conceivable there has been no proper plan from the beginning. We have not received flood control for flood control expenditures. Some may say, "Give us time", and to that the farmers living along these rivers in Missouri are saying: "We have been at it for more than 50 years". We have expended hundreds of millions of dollars for dredging and for dikes in the streams, and to riprap the shores, all of which has served to slow up the flow and to increase the depth at low water stages, but none of which has served to prevent the terrible damage and alleviate the suffering caused by ever-reoccurring floods. We have even built some superficial levees, and in many cases quite near the water's edge, but they have served only when the floods have been minor ones. Also after each disastrous flood these insufficient and superficial levees have been repaired at what virtually amounts to a waste of public money.

In the past, the expenditure of vast sums in the name of development of our great river systems, and for flood control, have been placed in the hands of the War Department, Corps of Engineers, in the Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, and in the Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation, just where the President, in his most recent message on the subject, proposes to continue the authority and expenditure of funds. To some extent at least, each Department has competed for authorization of funds, and for appropriations. Each has had its own plan, not too clearly defined to the Congress nor to the people. There has been no coordination, and no overall plan or program. More often than not, we have witnessed expenditure in the most fertile political area. With each reoccuring failure, demonstrated as I have pointed out by the ever-increasing damage by flood waters, more money has been asked for, and for supplementary purposes, until now, still without an overall plan, it is suggested that $250,000,000 be quickly appropriated to the three departments named, for expenditure, so far as the President makes known, in the same manner in which these agencies have proceeded throughout the years.

Moreover, the President recommends that the Corps of Army Engineers should have more than 94 percent of the total appropriation; the Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, should have 4 percent of the total; and for soil conservation, which undoubtedly is the principal thing to be accomplished by flood control, if not in fact the principal thing, the Department of Agriculture should have only a little more than 1 percent of the appropriation. In Missouri we are becoming impatient with the expensive and ineffectual flood-control procedures practiced over the years. We want flood control. We know it cannot be had with money alone. If first things are to come first, we must have a carefully and expertly prepared plan. It must be one that goes beyond high dams far downstream designed chiefly for the development of hydroelectric power, and to provide playgrounds and recreational areas. The latter we already have in Missouri in abundance. We want rural electrification, but its importance will be gradually lessened if we fail to get flood control.

I am not an engineer, nor am I an authority on flood control, but our experience has been such that I know, as do the thousands of farmers living in the recently flooded Missouri and Mississippi River Valleys, that for the hundreds of millions of dollars spent in this area in the development of these great river systems, we have failed to accomplish flood control. We do not, any longer, favor the haphazard wasteful expenditure of public money for the purpose. It is time to do some efficient intelligent planning in advance of spending.

Statement by Robert M. Hutchins, Chancelor of the University of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PARKE M. BANTA
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

I oppose universal military training on the ground that as a military measure it is absurd. And if you ask how a layman, whose only military experience was that of a private in the First World War, can contradict the leading military experts on a military matter, I reply that they contradict themselves, for they first show that universal miliary training is a military anachronism which will weaken the Nation, and then demand it in the name of military strength.

The generals and admirals all insist on the rapidity of technical change. Then they insist that men trained with old weapons are going to be effective in using entirely new weapons. They prove that there is no defense against the atomic bomb, and then ask for an enormous Army to defend us against it. They show that this bomb can be sent into other countries by rockets or smuggled in by agents and then ask for a large Army, Navy, and Air Force to carry it into other countries. They convince us that in an atomic war 40,000,000 of us will be killed in one night, and then claim that it will be helpful to us to have wasted two or three billion dollars a year in teaching millions of young men close-order drill. They demonstrate that the strength of the country depends on its industrial power and scienific intelligence, and then advocate a system which will give us less industrial power and less scientific intelligence, for it will interrupt the training of men for science and industry. They propose, in short, an obsolete, wasteful, and ineffectual method of dealing with the military problems of the atomic age, problems which they themselves admit require an entirely new approach and entirely new ideas.

There is no defense against the atomic bomb. This means that there is no way of preventing the destruction of the cities of the United States, for nobody seriously supposes that there is a "secret" of the atomic bomb which the United States can keep. If we cannot beat the atomic bomb we shall have to beat war. There is no other way in which we can save our cities from the fate of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. How are we going to train the survivors of the next war to pick up the pieces, connect the plumbing and telephone wires, and get the water, gas, and electric works going again is a matter of relatively little importance to the majority of us; for the majority of us, or our children, or grandchildren, will be killed.

Professor Einstein thinks that about two-thirds of the population will be killed, and that is certainly a cautious estimate. But of all the kinds of training which the one-third surviving might need, the most useless is military training. They would need scientific, industrial, perhaps plumbers' and electricians' training, but their military training would do them no good against the atomic bomb.

The New York Times on the Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 22, 1947. This is a very good discussion of the poll-tax issue, although I feel that the New York Times is unduly pessimistic about action in the other body of the Congress on my bill to abolish the poll tax in Federal elections.

AT LEAST A MORAL VICTORY

Legislatively the House passage of an anti-poll-tax bill yesterday does not mean a thing. The bill will not reach the floor of the Senate, and if it did it would be killed by filibuster. The House has passed such bills before—in 1942 by a vote of 254 to 84; in 1943 by a vote of 265 to 110; in 1945 by a vote of 251 to 105. Yesterday's vote was 290 to 112—the highest yet, with 216 Republicans reinforced by 73 Democrats and Mr. MARCANTONIO. Representatives RANKIN of Mississippi and PICKETT of Texas led the opposition, both speaking for States in which the poll tax is still a means of preventing citizens from voting. They used the same arguments that had been used before. Among other things, they said that the Federal Government cannot constitutionally abolish the poll-tax requirement for voting. But if spokesmen for poll-tax States had real confidence in this argument, they would not need to make such desperate efforts—amounting in the Senate to a sit-down strike on all legislation—to keep a bill from passing.

The argument against the poll tax is not that the Federal Government has a right to interfere in the domestic concerns of the

States. It is that an artificially limited franchise in elections to Federal offices is an interference by some States in the affairs of the Nation. Laws which concern all of us are acted upon, sometimes decisively, by representatives from the limited-franchise districts. The results might be different if all those morally entitled to vote were actually enabled to vote. The limited franchise in Virginia, Texas, Mississippi, Tennessee, South Carolina, Alabama, and Arkansas is very much the business of citizens of New York, Massachusetts, and other States. Someday this fact will be generally realized and someday the Senate will have to back the House up in anti-poll-tax legislation. Yesterday's action in the House was at least a moral victory.

Veterans Housing—What Has Been Done About It in the Eightieth Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to ask my colleagues what has been done for the housing of our war veterans? The answer is, obviously, nothing. Notwithstanding that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported out H. R. 3565, a bill that would alleviate the greatest domestic problem confronting our country today, the Congress has failed to take any action on it.

This bill was a sound solution to this problem in that it would afford to the veteran an opportunity to rent a decent home at a price within the average veteran's income, which is $37 per week. We all recognize that with the high cost of building today, these veterans are not in a position to buy a home.

If this Nation can send billions of dollars abroad to rehabilitate foreign countries certainly it could lend its credit to the men and women who so willingly gave up their good homes to fight for the preservation of the homes of those that they left behind when they answered the call to the colors.

The plan set forth in H. R. 3565 has received acclaim not only from the veterans but also from private enterprise, as evidenced by an editorial which appeared in the Fitchburg (Mass.) Sentinel on July 19, 1947, which is herewith appended.

BANKERS NOD AT THIS ONE

Bankers, especially those in savings and cooperative banks dealing with large numbers of home mortgages, always view with a critical eye proposals for governmental ventures into housing. Being in the business themselves, they know many of the pitfalls of various plans and have a robust faith in private initiative and enterprise.

When, therefore, any project wins the unsolicited approval of bankers, the advocates of action for veterans' housing sit up and take notice. One such proposal that has received favorable comment and endorsement from bankers in this community and region is the H. R. 3565, a bill introduced in May by Congressman HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Worcester.

Raymond P. Harold, president of the Worcester Federal Savings and Loan Association, in the association's July News-Letter has flattering words to say about H. R. 3565. Inasmuch as they come from a banker in the mortgage business, they seem almost ecstatic in their endorsement of an attempt to meet the desperate plight of veterans' families. After citing the defeat of veterans in their search for rental quarters at a price they can pay, and asking this question, What plan will do the best job for the least expense? Mr. Harold comments and explains:

"Congressman DONOHUE's bill is short, simple, and understandable. Proposed as an amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, it would make funds available to local or State housing authorities, groups of veterans or others, organized as limited dividend corporations, in proportion to housing needs and veteran population. Funds would be advanced at the rate of $1,000 per room, or 50 percent of cost, whichever is less, for the construction of up to 200,000 multiple-housing four- and five-room rental units. Funds so advanced by the Government would constitute secondary liens on the rental projects, with interest and principal payments deferred until first-mortgage obligations were entirely discharged.

"It is estimated that, under this plan, modern living quarters can be provided veterans' families at a monthly shelter rent of $30 to $50, depending on the number of rooms, and allowing for variance in construction costs in different sections of the country.

"The bill contains provisions giving reasonable assurance that the Federal Government will get back in large part the money it advances, plus an average yield of 2 percent. Any qualified public or private agencies may participate in building and financing rental homes for veterans under its provisions. These agencies include any bank, Federal savings and loan or building and loan association, insurance company, real estate or builders corporation, veterans' cooperative, and any group of citizens representing the civic, business, or industrial life of a community. The bill calls for tax exemption of rental projects for a minimum period of 10 years by municipalities, which may also provide land and install utilities as a contribution to veterans.

"A 3-percent minimum yearly amortization of first-mortgage indebtedness and a maximum 4-percent-interest rate are specified. After discharge of the first mortgage, net proceeds of operation or sale of such housing would be paid to the Federal Government as a refund in part or whole of its advances. All provisions of the bill when and if enacted and effective, would be handled by the Veterans' Administration."

Noteworthy and significant in Mr. Harold's endorsement of H. R. 3565, which has drawn favorable comment in Fitchburg banking circles, are these facts:

(1) It recognizes the primary need for rental units at prices the veteran can afford to pay.

(2) The bankers, by their endorsement, concede that "something must be done."

(3) They do endorse a proposal that is virtually a Federal subsidy.

(4) The banks themselves would share in the plan to the extent of placing a 4-percent maximum interest rate on first mortgages on projects under the bill.

H. R. 3565 seems to be a good bill, but any plans to proceed under the State housing program should not be held in abeyance. If the bill does not pass at this session of Congress, it would be of no value in meeting the immediate needs of Fitchburg's veterans' families now without living quarters.

Taft-Hartley Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a fine article on the Taft-Hartley bill appearing in the April-May 1947 issue of the American Watch Worker, the official publication of the American Watch Workers' Union.

The article follows:

TAFT-HARTLEY BILL WILL NOT BRING INDUSTRIAL PEACE

President Truman is to be congratulated by every working man and woman in America for the courage of his convictions in vetoing the Taft-Hartley bill, for it took courage for him to veto this bill which had been overwhelmingly passed by a Congress which knows less about industrial relations than they do about what is happening in Timbuktu.

The Congress of the United States is composed of men who are essentially honest and they are a barometer of what the people back home are thinking. This Congress felt it had a mandate to harness labor into channels of conservatism and to bring about industrial peace.

However, the bill which was passed by Congress to bring us about did not accomplish the objectives which would bring about industrial peace, and the law which was just passed over the President's veto can only play into the hands of those industry lawyers who will have a field day under the Taft-Hartley law.

Industrial peace can only come about by human understanding; no law, no legislation can bring about industrial peace until there is human understanding, and what this Congress failed to do and failed to realize is that there are more persons who belong to unions than those few top union officials who have brought the wrath of public opinion down upon all of the trade union movement. Why should the innocent suffer with the guilty? Why should the good, well-disciplined, responsible, democratic union suffer for the abuses of the corrupt union? Why should responsible labor leaders be classed with irresponsible union leadership? The Taft-Hartley law places every union leader under a cloud and makes every union the same. The Taft-Hartley law is a bad law, an unworkable law that can only bring about industrial discord.

President Truman recognized this evil in the law and condemned it. But the Congress was too anxious to meet the wave of hysteria which has been mounting against the labor movement, instead of really studying the problem and bringing in specialists from both companies and unions who really practice the doctrine of union-management cooperation.

It's odd that when a banking bill is being considered by Congress that a cross section of American bankers are heard on the bill, and their advice is heeded. But when a labor bill is up, only the top names in labor and the top names in industry are listened to and the intermediate groups in both labor and industry, those that work at the community level, are completely ignored.

It is time for Congress to realize that the working men and women of America want industrial peace, but they also want social justice; they want to be treated with the dignity of man; they want union democracy;

they want Government agencies to service them honestly and fairly; they want enlightened management which is willing to furnish them the facts concerning the corporation for which they work. The working men and women of America want the economic facts of life and are entitled to them from industry. What Congress failed to do in this bill was to correct the abuses in labor and still give to the working men and women of America the protection to which they are entitled in collective bargaining. The Taft-Hartley law returns America to a day when company unions flourished and when injunctions were served against unions at management's whim.

The American Watch Workers' Union has no problems which it cannot settle without Government aid or interference. It has a successful record to point to in industrial peace and union democracy, but the American Watch Workers' Union will be harassed under the terms of this law and will be punished as much as will those unions which helped bring down the wrath of public opinion upon the rest of us.

To President Truman we say "thank you" for trying to help the bona fide labor movement which represents the rank and file of American working men and women. To those Members of the United States Senate and Congress who voted to override his veto, we ask them to let the test of time determine whether their conscience was right when they cast their vote.

Life in the Soviet Union Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith insert the address delivered by my friend, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, rector of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., and associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs, before the officers, members, and guests of Rotary International, of Frederick, Md., Commander John F. Fitzpatrick, president, presiding. In this speech Dr. Thorning presents a vivid picture of Red fascism:

"One Russian is a genius. Two Russians present an immediate difference of opinion. Three Russians are a cooperative; and four Russians are a revolution."

This is a humorous observation that the Russians themselves used to be the first to enjoy. The description is still valuable as exemplifying the wealth of talent, good will, and overflowing vitality inherent in the Russian people, irrespective of the type of administration by which they are exploited. In the domain of music, painting, sculpture, ballet dancing, operatic composition, poetry, drama, and other forms of literature the Russians have made substantial contributions to world culture. They are a naturally gay, spontaneous, life-loving people. Few, if any, political entities have richer human resources than the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

No government, however dictatorial, can obliterate the innate qualities of 200,000,000 men, women, and children. The latter comprise the most important element in life in the Soviet Union today.

In this connection, it is interesting to note the birth rate in the chief totalitarian state. Taking the figure 1, or unity, as denoting the net reproduction rate necessary to maintain a population, without increase or decrease, we find that the net reproduction rate among the peoples of the Soviet Union is in excess of 1.6. The comparable figure for people of the United States, both white and colored, is 1.2. The net reproduction rate for whites alone in our country is unity. Relatively speaking, therefore, it is safe to say that the Slavs are an expanding, multiplying, dynamic people.

The tremendous driving force represented by this human Niagara has been harnessed by a clique of Soviet Commissars. These Soviet overlords work their will on the masses by means of the Bolshevik Party.

This party, the only one permitted in the Soviet Union, numbered some 23,000 members in Red October 1917. It was this revolutionary group that overthrew, not the Czars, but the social democratic regime of Alexander Kerensky. Although the Bolshevik Party grew rapidly within the next few months, Nicholas Lenin considered the domination of the majority by a minority perfectly natural. "Russia used to be ruled by 150,000 landlords," he wrote in August 1917. "Why could not 240,000 Bolsheviks do the same job?"

Under Josef Stalin, however, the party has reached its period of greatest expansion. A powerful leverage is exerted upon the masses by a tightly knit organization of some 7,000,000 members.

Of course, this is not a party according to the American idea. In the United States, our party system provides variety and liberty. Leaders emerge from and are chosen by the voters.

In the Soviet Union, however, the Bolshevik, or so-called Communist Party, is an officer corps which organizes an army of slave labor. Party members are local agents of the all-powerful Politbureau of 16 slave masters. Although bosses, demagogues, reporters, and spies in their respective districts, the individual party members know that their privileged position depends upon the will of those in the higher echelons of the party.

Few ideas or choices circulate from the bottom up; orders come from top to the lower layers of officials. Combined with constant surveillance of every phase of life, in factories, fields, and mines, this totalitarian dictatorship utilizes schools, newspapers, science, literature, and art in order to indoctrinate and police the people. Indoctrination and supervision are the keynotes of existence in a police state, whether that state be dominated by a Hitler or a Stalin at the top.

One of the boasts of the high priests in the Soviet hierarchy is that the literacy rate has shown a sharp rise under Soviet rule. This is true. It is to the advantage of the ruling clique to have millions of people able to read the propaganda dished out by the one-party regime.

Every dictatorship of the totalitarian model is eager to provide its own type of so-called education. The task of governing is simplified when slave workers can read everything put out by men at the top. This is particularly effective when a brutal censorship eliminates every trace of an opposite opinion.

Nowhere in the world are facts more carefully sifted, selected, and arranged than in the so-called press of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The propagandists of the Kremlin make Paul Goebbels, master of black magic, blush for shame. Over the radio as well as in magazines, pamphlets, and shop papers, Stalin, head of the police state, plays upon public opinion as an organist operates the keys and stops of a pipe organ. The higher and wider the receptivity for his ukases among the masses, the more simplified is the task of administration. Should there be some tiny dissident view, it is drowned out in the blare of the official chorus.

The impact and influence of the single official party upon life in the Soviet Union is intensified by means of the Communist Youth League, a party auxiliary. Although this organization began modestly, it now numbers more than 20,000,000 members.

Nowhere has party indoctrination been more successful than among Soviet youth. Boys and girls, accustomed from their earliest years to a single view of life and work, dedicate all their idealism and enthusiasm to the promotion of party aims. Knowing no other goals or objectives, they work for the glorification of the Soviet state.

Children, who grow up in a one-party, police state, have no chance to learn the truth either about themselves, their parents, or their fellow human beings in other political systems. Like the Hitler youth, these young Soviets are the first victims of propaganda as they are likewise the most fanatical supporters of Red fascism. As long as the youth of the U. S. S. R. continue to be inoculated with the virus of dialectical materialism, according to Karl Marx, there is little or no hope for a decent administration of the countries now in the Soviet orbit.

At this point, it is important to single out for attention a conclusion expressed in that otherwise excellent booklet, Communism in Action (H. Doc. 754). The passage in question reads as follows (p. 113):

"It appears, however, that in proportion to the national income the Russian people are supporting education several times as generously as the people of the United States. According to George S. Counts, professor at Columbia University, the Russians are supporting education far more generously than any other people in history."

Every Member of the Congress of the United States as well as every citizen of our country ought to ask the editors of this booklet, Communism in Action, what is meant by education. Is indoctrination in dialectical materialism true education? Or is this indoctrination not an intellectual discipline, mixed with as much facts as suit the Red Fascist oligarchs, aimed solely at perpetuation of a reign of terror?

Would the Congress or the American people have been complacent in speaking about the Nazi totalitarian system of indoctrination as "education"? Are the Members of Congress willing to permit Marxist propaganda in a House of Representatives document?

This is a clear illustration of how easily the Leftist professors can betray their trust and use a "slanted" terminology to suggest that "the Russians" are more interested in education than the people of the United States.

In the United States, thanks be to God, the people have a voice in the allotment of funds for education. Furthermore, private citizens occasionally have enough private property to endow universities, colleges, academies, elementary schools, vocational and manual training centers, clinics, hospitals and centers of medical research.

In the U. S. S. R., the people have nothing to say about the so-called educational system. In fact, it is particularly in this field that Soviet totalitarianism is most ruthless and uncompromising. Why? Because a regime of slavery can maintain itself, as did that of Hitler, only as long as it can tyrannize over the human mind.

Based upon a partial statement of truth or fact, red fascism can stand only as long as the half-truths by which it is propagated are doled out in state institutions.

It is an unfair reflection upon the generosity of the people of our country to insinuate that they have been less willing than the Russian people in their contributions, whether voluntary or obligatory, for education worthy of the name.

I call upon the Members of the Congress of the United States to investigate the procedure that could allow an "angled" statement of this vicious character appear in a House document. Incidentally, the Congressmen and their constituents should be on their guard whenever they see conditions attributed to the Russian people. That can be and usually is a tip-off that a Soviet sympathizer is engaged in doubletalk.

The Russian people have about as much to say about what moneys are or are not appropriated in the Soviet Union as the seals in a zoo have to say about the amount of fish provided by the trainers.

It is my impression that the "indoctrinators" responsible for this "slanting" of evidence in a House document are loyal neither to the United States of America nor to the people of this country who gladly contribute to education.

Not long ago a United States clergyman, the Reverend Harry F. Ward, praised the concentration camps of the Soviet Union as "rehabilitation" centers. In the Real Soviet Russia, by David J. Dallin (published by the Yale University Press), it is possible to read a rather detailed description of life for the millions forced to labor in these camps. The following is one of the eyewitness accounts given in this book (p. 198):

"More than 200,000 prisoners were employed on the project. * * * More than 50,000 died during a period of a year and a half. The workday was 11 hours. There were no Sundays or any days of rest. Interruptions occurred only during transfers of workers from one camp to another. The work tasks were set very high, and food rations very low. Those who carried out their prescribed task received 800 grams of bread daily; those whose performance was only half of the prescribed norm received 300 grams. Besides bread a watery soup and salt fish were the only foods. Most of the work was done by hand without manual appliances. Despite the terrible Karelian cold, prisoners were forbidden to build camp fires. 'You can warm up by working,' they were told. This camp was named by the prisoners 'Hell of Ice.' I myself saw dead people who had been frozen with axes or saws in their hands. From 25 to 30 men died daily in winter."

This was the price of success in constructing the White Sea-Baltic Canal.

"The number of inmates in the concentration camps," it was reported in September 1938, "has assumed astronomical proportions. Gigantic works are under construction, for example, the Verkhne-Kolymsk Road, extending from the Sea of Okhotsk, is being built with bare hands, without any mechanical appliances. The center of this project is at Nogayev, where there is a huge labor camp to which thousands upon thousands have been exiled. People are dying there like flies, perishing in various ways, without anyone knowing about it, for the sentences dooming victims to prison and labor camps carry with them the notation: 'Without right of correspondence.' This is how they live under horrible conditions of boredom, bad food, in complete isolation from the outside world, slowly dying from weakness and exhaustion, hunger, and constant thrashing of the nerves. They are buried alive."

People in the satellite States of the Soviet Union are exposed to the same brutal treatment. According to a dispatch, published in the New York Times, March 24, 1947, from correspondent Sidney Shalett, "Bulgaria and Yugoslavia are teeming with concentration camps and prisons for political prisoners, offenders against the military and some minority groups. * * * As of fairly recent date, 630,000 persons, according to a conservative estimate, were in concentration camps and prisons in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria for 'political offenses' against the régime or the ruling Communist party. * * * Most of the inmates are described as intellectuals: teachers, university professors, priests, lawyers, physicians, businessmen and leaders and outstanding workers of suppressed political parties. The report said many of them had been imprisoned without court trial."

Mr. Sidney Shalett adds:

"The source of this report says many were 'kidnapped by the Communist militia in Bulgaria or by the UDB, formerly the OZNA, in Yugoslavia. Vermin, filth, humiliation, even torture were allegedly conditions of imprisonment."

About 2 years ago, Matthew Rakosi, the Soviet dictator in Hungary, when reproached with the shameful conduct of Soviet soldiers in Budapest, replied:

"We are taking very energetic measures and hope that in a few weeks we shall have order."

What were the complaints 2 years ago, before the Soviets had taken over the country, lock, stock and barrel? I quote from reliable reports in The New York Times, August 13, 1945, by correspondent John MacCormac. He wrote as follows:

"In broad daylight a Russian soldier is reported to have torn a wristwatch from a woman's arm. When her husband interfered the Russian shot him.

"Another complaint to the Budapest police was that a Russian had entered a house at night, tied up the husband and a boarder and raped the wife before the husband's eyes."

Now that Soviet-trained Matthew Rakosi is in full command in Hungary, he is able to suppress most unfavorable reports about the Red Fascist terror.

In the Soviet Union itself conditions for the ordinary people, with respect to food, clothing, and housing, are appalling. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix for June 6, 1947, contained an illuminating description by Cecil B. Dickson. This newspaperman reported as follows:

"In Moscow I visited one old prerevolutionary mansion where eight families were living in four basement rooms and a hallway, all using the same kitchen, the toilet separated from the stove by a thin partition. One of their so-called modern apartment buildings, built in 1938 before Russia began to prepare for war, was equally jammed with families. Dirty, badly in need of repair, it looked like an East Side tenement, with wiring tacked onto the ceiling and the top-floor rooms flooded by leaks in the snow-covered roof.

" 'Tis said in Moscow that only the roof on the Kremlin does not leak. The attitude of the people is, 'Why take care of property that belongs to the Government?' As a result Moscow is shabby, buildings other than those occupied by high military and Government and party officials need repair."

This touches upon a point that needs elucidation and emphasis. There is a privileged class in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. The words of Mr. Dickson are revealing. His report reads as follows:

"What the Russians have now is not democracy but despotism. A small hierarchy of some 600,000 rule nearly 200,000,000. These people in the Politburo, Government positions, top military and naval officers, and those high in science, medicine, the arts, are the privileged groups. They have automobiles, summer homes, good apartments, ample food. But the common people live under conditions in cities and on collective farms much as did the pioneers in America. But they do not have the freedom our pioneers had."

This report coincides pretty well with a study released on Sunday, July 13, 1947, by the United States Department of Labor. According to this analysis the standard of living of the average American is 1,000 percent above that of the average worker in the Soviet Union today. The study added that the "trend of the Russian standard of living, rather than going upward, has been going sharply downward since the war."

It is fair to note, of course, that a large part of the decrease in the Soviet standard of living may be due to the damage inflicted by the war as well as the strenuous demands of the job of reconstruction. With proper allowance for these factors, it can be concluded that inflation in the Soviet Union and in the Soviet satellite States is fantastic compared to the rise of prices in the United States.

This development would indicate that, so far as living conditions for the working people are concerned, the Soviet system, which is really ultracapitalism, is a socioeconomic failure. As several correspondents put the case, after the recent Moscow conference, "the Soviet performance, checked by professions and promises, makes P. T. Barnum look like a piker." Or as the Hon. Alexander C. Kirk, one-time United States Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow, expressed himself to me, "the Soviet experiment is the most colossal hoax that has ever been perpetrated upon mankind."

Nevertheless, publicists like Mrs. Vera M. Dean, research director of the Foreign Policy Association, and Mr. Maurice Hindus, author of "Red Bread," write and talk as if we were not confronted with something much more formidable than the old Imperial Russia. Neither of these Russia-born propagandists realize that the democratic, freedom-loving people of the United States are face to face with a world conspiracy, directed by Josef Stalin in the Kremlin. They do not recognize that the Nazi-minded followers of Karl Marx, quislings and traitors, are willing to exploit the Orthodox Russian church for the purposes of window dressing and to promote pan-Slavic sentiment in eastern Europe for the aggrandizement of the Soviet Union.

To be sure, some tendencies and attitudes of the ancient Russian Empire persist in the Marxist high command. But both Mrs. Dean and Mr. Hindus should be able to see that some tremendously new elements have been added to the traditional Slavic imperialism.

The Soviet ideal is a police state for all the peoples of the world. Stalinism equates with Hitlerism, with its bigoted emphasis upon religious hatred.

It is time for Mrs. Dean and Mr. Hindus to stop talking and writing about Russia and the Russians. Why don't these leftist sympathizers ask themselves a few simple questions? Is Jacques Duclos a Russian? Is Palmiro Togliatti a Russian? Can Gerhart Eisler, recently convicted in a United States court, be described as a Russian? Since when are William Z. Foster, Eugene Dennis, Maurice Thorez, and Marcel Cachin Russians?

Turning to the Western Hemisphere, can we call Lazaro Peña in Cuba, Vicente Lombardo Toledano in Mexico, and Luis Carlos Prestes in Brazil Russians?

The plot against decency is world-wide. The aims of Stalin were the aims of Hitler: world domination. The totalitarian tactics of the Marxists were the methods of the Hitlerites: intimidation, torture, coercion, arson, rape, and murder. The Red Fascists are an international ring of gangsters. These world racketeers are far more brutal, ruthless, and cunning than the late Al Capone or "Legs" Diamond. They got their cut in every dominated country in the shape of political power, prestige, food, travel privileges and living conditions.

Materialistic to the core, the international clique, with an army of hatchet men in every part of the globe, wait for the word from Moscow for the final onslaught on civilized men, women, and children.

It is idle to talk about understanding Russia or the Russians. It is a clear case of comprehending the nature of a closed corporation of gangsters. If you can grasp the significance of "murder incorporated" on a world scale, you have understood the essence of world Marxism. Whether we live or die, survive or perish, depends upon our getting a full view of the danger of Red fascism and defending ourselves before it is too late.

Twenty-Year Housing Record Broken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, during this session many of us have been concerned about the need for housing. This is not a new need, but has been with us for many years. While it is, of course, true that Congress cannot construct houses, we can encourage home construction. To acomplish this end this Congress has:

First. Removed numerous restrictive governmental controls that were preventing the production of necessary materials.

Second. Provided for aid for the construction of prefabricated homes.

Third. Passed legislation to stop featherbedding practices that have added to the cost of construction.

Fourth. Passed laws to solve jurisdictional strikes between unions that have stopped housing construction all over the country and added materially to the cost of home building.

It is gratifying to note that these measures are beginning to take hold and are having the intended effect. As evidence of the success of this program, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, an article from the Washington Post of July 20, 1947, which quotes the Federal Housing Expediter as saying that "more new homes were started and more completed in June 1947 than in any month in 20 years."

That is encouraging news and shows that we are on the right track.

TWENTY-YEAR BUILDING RECORD IS BROKEN—JUNE HOMES FIGURE, AND YEAR'S ARE UP, CREEDON REPORTS

(By John W. Ball)

More new homes were started and more competed in June than in any month in 20 years, Housing Expediter Frank R. Creedon reported yesterday.

Creedon said 75,000 new permanent homes were started last month, compared with 72,500 in May and 64,100 in June last year.

The total for the first 6 months of this year, he said, also set a new 20-year record, with 358,000 new homes started, compared with 340,100 last year.

In June, he said, 62,800 new permanent units were completed, a new postwar high, more than double last year's 30,600.

In the first half of this year 362,000 new homes were completed, he said, against 128,600 for last year.

Creedon predicted that the present high rate of building would continue through July and August in spite of the lifting of controls on nonresidential construction June 30.

Blue Hen's Chickens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Joint Resolution 246, introduced by my good friend and distinguished colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable ANTONI N. SADLAK, provides for the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

May I, at this time, commend my distinguished colleague, Mr. SADLAK, for his thoughtfulness and foresight in presenting this resolution because it directs attention to one of our most important and most colorful industries here in the United States. The poultry industry especially flourishes in the State of Delaware, and I believe that Sussex County, Del., is the greatest poultry-producing county in the world.

It is my hope that this resolution will receive the favorable attention of the Members of this House and that an appropriate commemorative stamp may be issued.

In this connection, it is my understanding that a decision has not been reached as to an appropriate design for the stamp. I would, therefore, like to suggest to the authorities who may have this decision to make that they consider the design of the State bird of the State of Delaware. Such a design would bring to this commemorative stamp the full color and vigor of our American life from the colonial days to the present. The cut for this design may be procured through the office of the State archivist in Dover, Del., as well as all of the historical tradition and background of the "blue hen's chickens" which have been so much a part of the history of our country and the State of Delaware.

Briefly, let me give you a little of this rich background.

A tradition that has been recorded by the historians of Delaware in their writings relates to the "blue hen's chickens." It is told that during the early days of the Revolutionary War the men of Capt. Jonathan Caldwell's company, recruited in Kent County, took with them game chickens noted for their fighting ability. These chickens were said to be of the brood of a famous blue hen.

Captain Caldwell's company was attached to Col. John Haslet's regiment which fought at Long Island, White Plains, Trenton, and Princeton. When not fighting the enemy, the officers and men amused themselves by pitting these blue-hen chickens. The fame of these cock fights spread throughout the Army and when in battle the Delaware men fought so valorously that they were compared to these fighting cocks, with the result that they received the sobriquet "Blue Hen's Chickens."

Although a law was not enacted and approved until April 14, 1939, by which the blue-hen chicken was adopted as the official bird of the State of Delaware, it is interesting that it received unofficial recognition through the years. Francis Vincent published a newspaper at Wilmington in 1845 which he called the Blue Hen's Chickens. A model of a blue-hen chicken surmounted the flagpole of the Delaware State Building at the centennial exposition, held at Philadelphia in 1876. The blue-hen chicken was used as the motif in numerous political campaigns and in many publications. During the Civil War a company of militia organized in Kent County on May 4, 1861, adopted for themselves the name "Blue Hen's Chickens." During the ceremonies of presenting a silver service and flags to the newly commissioned U. S. S. *Delaware* in 1910, a pair of blue-hen chickens were given to the vessel. In 1913, when the State flag was adopted it was stipulated that—

The Governor's flag should be similar to the State flag, except that a fringe of gold is to surround the edge of the flag and on the pole carrying the same is to be mounted a model of a blue-hen's fighting cock.

Safety for Miners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. HOWES MEADE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I again want to bring to the attention of this House the crying need for adequate safety provisions to protect the miners in this country from the peril of having to work in unsafe mines.

I appealed to the membership for adequate protection laws immediately after the Centralia mine disaster which took the lives of 111 miners on March 25 of this year. Although an investigation was made, and valiant efforts have been made on the part of a few Members of Congress for adequate safety laws and rigid enforcement, the job still remains undone.

Yesterday afternoon at the Old Ben Coal Co.'s No. 8 mine at West Frankfort, Ill., only 55 miles south of Centralia, 26 miners, and perhaps by now even more, lost their lives as a result of a mine explosion. We must take steps to prevent this wholesale slaughter of the miners in this country.

I plead with the membership on both sides of this aisle to give this horrible situation their utmost attention.

The Electrical Industry and Multiple Purpose River Valley Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Electrical Industry and Multiple Purpose River Valley Development," by Morris Llewellyn Cooke, a consulting engineer of Philadelphia, read at the Valley Development Conference in Washington, D. C., July 18, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The commercial electrical operating industry is, and will continue to be, the spearhead of opposition to multiple-purpose and socially minded river valley development. Progress to the goal advocated by this conference will involve the recognition of the character of this opposition and constantly increasing efforts to thwart it. The history of the industry during the last 50 years should leave us in no doubt as to what we are up against.

The electrical industry since early days has been liberal to profligate in the matter of advertising in its various forms. With an all but untrammeled opportunity to spend other people's money, obtained through what have in the great majority of cases been excessive rates, elaborate ventures in publicity were irresistible. Unwisely conducted and put on far from a factual basis, nothing else has so injured the prestige of the industry with the general public—not even its gross overcapitalization and the door-to-door sale of securities at inflated values. The man on the street has been quick to recognize the fallacious character of many of these ideas as elaborately set forth in edited school books, in lectures by highly compensated college professors, and in advertisements in publications of both large and small circulation. Then we must not forget the industry's own subsidized publications, Public Service, Public Utilities Fortnightly, and Edison Electric Institute Bulletin, about as prejudiced and irresponsible a group of trade papers as one can find. Certainly we should and do welcome valid criticism of either legislative action, but such carefree and undependable comment as has been heaped on TVA and other public agencies in this field is wholly regrettable.

In the early days a tender solicitude for widows and orphans pictured as solely dependent upon the income from electric and other utility securities was the underlying thought in most industry pronouncements. Mr. Dooley, the Will Rogers of his day, twitted the industry about this so unmercifully that he had the whole country rocking with laughter, just as Johann Strauss had all Europe dancing after the Napoleonic wars with his Blue Danube and other waltzes.

Of course this widows-orphans theme song had to be changed when at the end of the gay twenties the Electric Bond & Share upped its capitalization five hundred millions with so little reason that a few years later it was forced to drop a like amount. Other electric companies followed suit. Thus financial dark days were brought to thousands of widows, orphans, school teachers, and others operating on limited incomes.

The bright new thought is that any raising of eyebrows at the practices of commercial electric utilities or any advocacy of public ownership necessarily involves lack of loyalty to our free enterprise system. Apropos of this new melody, the New Yorker (issue June 7) says:

"A current ad sponsored by a group of 'business-managed, tax-paying' electric light and power companies in defense of the American way shows a freckle-faced boy—you know him well—selling 'leminade' at 3 cents a large glass.

" 'Butch wants a bicycle' (reads the ad)! 'Lots of lawn and lemonade and baby-sitting lie between Butch and that bike, but we're betting on the boy. He has energy, vision, and our national habit of working hard for what he wants. He's American business—in miniature.

" 'There are many names for Butch's philosophy. You can call it free enterprise, opportunity, democracy, or capitalism, if you want.' (End ad and resume New Yorker.)

"If the sponsoring utilities will pardon us, we should like to discuss the economics of Butch's enterprise for a moment. A large glass of lemonade requires the juice of two lemons, at 40 cents a dozen, and about an ounce of sugar, at 15 cents a pound. Each glass thus stands Butch around 8 cents, not counting ice and overhead, and on every sale he loses 5 cents plus. He is able to operate only because he gets his lemons from his mother's ice box and his sugar from her pantry, figures his gross as his net profit, and offers his lemonade as a public service. What kind of business management is that? What kind of free enterprise? What kind of capitalism? We're afraid that what Butch symbolizes is socialism, and his mother the kindly, protective figure of the State."

As a matter of fact the use of the term "free enterprise" as it pertains to the electric utility industry should call for a "cease and desist" order from the Federal Trade Commission. The privately owned and operated electric utility industry stands in a very different relationship to its customers—the public—than do other privately owned organizations. Many of these companies have the words "Public Service" as a part of their corporate name, indicating the emphasis placed on service rather than profits. These companies are by nature monopolies, and should be. No one disputes this fact. They do not engage in business as a matter of right but rather as a matter of public trust. They are given power to run a business in the public interest, free of direct competition, under public control, and are permitted to earn for their stockholders a fair return on a fair value, both of which are determined by public bodies. To do business, commercial utility companies must obtain a franchise or certificate of public convenience and necessity from the respective sovereign body, Nation, State or city.

An insistent item in the industry's propaganda campaign is to the effect that hydro power and flood control are so opposed as to make impossible or uneconomic multiple-purpose dams which are of course essential to sound river valley development. In the face of TVA's highly successful practice of combining power and flood control back of practically all its dams I ask you to note these weasel words in large type as carried in a recent full-page industry "ad" in large circulation weeklies: "You don't use a full pan to catch a leak. Would you use a full dam to catch a flood?" Certainly not. But——

In most pools back of dams the lower levels account for a relatively small percentage of the total potential storage space. On the contrary, the top levels extending back greater distances from the dam and usually of greater width than those nearer the bottom provide the bulk of the possible storage. This means that by a slight increase in height, additional storage for flood control can generally be obtained economically from a dam which would otherwise be built primarily for power. Even during a flood the effectiveness of the reservoir for minimizing the effects of floods is not materially lessened by releasing the comparatively small amount of water required for driving the power-generating turbines.

Floods on many streams—one is tempted to say on most streams—occur at certain well-defined seasons and under improving modern scientific procedures the operators have increasing advance notice as to when floods are to be expected. This permits the utilization of the same space in the reservoir for flood control and power storage and is the method of multiple-purpose operation generally employed in the Tennessee Valley. Flash floods occasioned by cloudbursts may occur at odd times and, of course, rarely give advance notice. Their effects are local and limited, and can usually be easily handled and their peak flow decapitated by a limited amount of storage. In many situations then, the installation of power equipment in a dam need not stand in the way of flood control. On an integrated system including a number of dams this statement takes on added meaning.

Going further into the seasonal character of floods, experience has shown that with a multiple-purpose reservoir having flood control and power in combination, it is possible to draw a portion of the power storage in the season of greatest flood hazard. Storage capacity can then be provided to reduce flood flow which will be greater than would be available with a single-purpose flood-control reservoir. Further, the greatest incidence of flood flow is in the spring, not at the time of peak power demand, and the draft of power storage to provide for greater flood-control space can be made with no decrease of power values and a material increase in flood-control values.

The opposition of the commercial electrical operating industry to hydroelectric development is based primarily on the fact that the great majority of undeveloped sites are owned by the public, and that if and when developed, low rates based on costs will be charged as is the case with TVA and certain municipally owned plants such as Tacoma, Seattle, and Los Angeles. This will tend to question even more emphatically the existing and usually excessive rate schedules of the commercial companies.

Reduced costs always mean increased use Thus in Seattle in 1946 an average residential rate of 1.39 cents per kilowatt-hour as compared with a national average of 3.23 cents per kilowatt-hour led to an average annual use of 4,099 kilowatt-hours compared with the national average use of 1,327 kilowatt-hours. Fortunately, there are no issues such as navigation, flood control, or irrigation to complicate this showing. Seattle's annual report covering over 40 years' experience makes it as clear as a bell.

A review of typical bills for all classes of electric service in the States constituting parts of the Missouri Basin reveals the extent to which the people of that region can look forward to cheaper power under a Missouri Valley Authority. Speaking in broad terms they should ultimately see their bills cut in half, thereby opening the way to much larger average use with resulting benefits to homes, farms and the attractiveness of the area to industry.

Thus, according to recent Federal Power Commission figures, a majority of the homes in the Missouri Valley are today paying $3.64 or more for 100 kilowatt-hours of electric service a month. Similarly, they are paying more than $6.95 a month for 250 kilowatt-hours use. If these same homes were located in the Tennessee Valley, where a valley authority supplies wholesale power from a fully developed river, they would pay only $2.50 and $5, respectively, for these amounts of service. Their savings would run at the rate of $13.68 and $23.40 annually.

The Commission's figures show even more striking contrasts for commercial and industrial service. Thus, a majority of commercial lighting customers in the Missouri Valley, with a monthly demand of 6 kilowatts and a monthly use of 750 kilowatt-hours, must pay $27.21 or more a month, as compared with a typical bill of $14 for the same service under TVA basic rates. Similarly, a majority of commercial power customers, with 30 kilowatt demand and 6,000 kilowatt-hours of monthly use, must pay $146.30 or more a month, as compared with a typical bill of $78 for such service under TVA basic rates.

In the field of larger industrial service, a majority of industries with a demand of 300 kilowatts and a monthly use of 60,000 kilowatt-hours, would have to pay $940 or more

in the Missouri Valley under present conditions, as compared with a typical bill of $650 under TVA basic rates.

A few examples of possible savings to specific industrial plants under a valley authority set-up will illustrate my point. The annual savings for a representative brick and tile plant, if billed at TVA rates, would range from $720, as compared with rates for off-peak service in Omaha to $2,616 if billed at industrial service rates for unlimited service in Sioux City, Iowa. Such annual savings for representative plants in other industries would be:

A hosiery mill would save from $1,548 for unlimited service in Topeka, Kans., to $3,996 for the same service in Sioux City.

A furniture factory would save from $840 for off-peak service in Omaha to $5,160 for unlimited service in Sioux City.

A foundry would save from $3,312 for off-peak service in Omaha to $8,628 for unlimited service in Sioux City.

A meat packer would save from $5,844 for off-peak service in Omaha to $15,216 for unlimited service in Sioux City.

A machinery manufacturer would save from $1,080 for off-peak service in Omaha to $18,516 for unlimited service in Sioux City.

What such savings might mean to all the people of typical Missouri basin cities is shown by the following figures for estimated savings for all consumers of electricity in 12 such cities on the assumption that they were billed at TVA basic rates:

Community	Population	Annual savings
Sioux City, Iowa	82,364	$903,562
Omaha, Nebr	223,844	2,367,205
St. Joseph, Mo	75,711	663,773
Kansas City, Mo	399,178	4,131,220
St. Louis, Mo	816,048	6,779,026
Topeka, Kans	67,833	489,271
Kansas City, Kans	121,458	939,554
Bismarck, N. Dak	15,496	165,208
Minot, N. Dak	16,577	211,676
Sioux Falls, S. Dak	40,832	393,294
Huron, S. Dak	10,843	154,020
Billings, Mont	23,261	202,058

Another illustration of the way in which the electrical industry operates is afforded by the spectacular development of rural electrification during the last 20 years against the concerted, continuous and at times vicious opposition of the industry, illustrating both its ineptitude as to public relations and the power of public opinion. When in 1923 Gifford Pinchot began his campaign for rural electrification there were about 250,000 electrified farms in the whole United States. Today, almost wholly due to the REA, there are 3,335,000.

Yet only 12 years ago, about the time REA began operations, at a meeting held in the old Interior Building, 18 of the industry's highest officials united in saying emphaticaly and quite solemnly that it could not be done. The real reason why it could not be done was that since early days commercial rural rates had been fixed at "city rates plus" while because the farmer is a power as well as light user rural rates should have been less than city rates. Then REA promptly learned how to cut the cost of building rural lines in half and more.

Notwithstanding such a record note this equivocal claim in the opening address at the recent Edison Institute Convention: "Our industry pioneered in rural electrification. It built the first farm electric lines and has always been a leader in that activity."

The new task of the industry's high command is to assume that the job of electrifying our farms is all but done thus warranting the early liquidation of REA and a smothering attack on REA appropriations led by the industry's $65,000 a year lobbyist, Purcell Smith. As a matter of fact, the most difficult part of this job, that is, operating in increasingly thin territory remains to be done. If REA is not permitted to do it, the commercial industry certainly will not.

So it must regretfully be admitted that the operating electric industry opposes public control and its service responsibilities whenever it can get away with it. During the last 35 years as a private citizen and while occupying a wide variety of official posts I have had exceptional opportunities to observe at close range this utility industry in action. Based on this experience I have no hesitation in saying that the industry is operated essentially for ends all but without social purpose and under conditions which, if understood and properly appraised, would rate it as a closely-knit conspiracy against the public welfare. It reaches practically every county in the United States and, until the disruption caused by World War II, it had baneful international understandings. Its organization includes the Edison Electric Institute, certain State public service commissions, and some individual commissioners, certain city officials, city legislatures, Washington lobbies, and most important, certain inside quasi-social organizations where over-all policies are determined as far as they can be outside top banking circles.

Difficult as it may be to believe in the face of a welter of claims to the contrary, the operating industry has made very few contributions to the art and science of electric service. Practically everything in the way of progress has resulted from research and invention carried on by General Electric, Westinghouse and other electric manufacturing concerns. I am told by those who should know that the large company operating in my home city, Philadelphia, has not one important development affecting electric service to its credit. Research even of the so-called applied variety is all but unknown among service companies. Its secured monopoly position has made of the industry actually a reactionary social agency.

Practically every step in the direction of clarifying the issues involved in the orderly regulation of the industry and providing for more comprehensive electric service has been opposed by the industry. In spite of this opposition we, representing the public interest, have accomplished much:

(a) In many States we have a reasonably satisfactory system of public utility regulation providing rates based on cost plus a fair profit.

(b) Valuation is now based on actual cost or prudent investment, both depreciated, and the reproduction cost new method is now out the window. This system formerly having the support of the United States Supreme Court was so skillfully built up as to place no limits on the intangibles that could be included in valuations. The system led hundreds of engineers and lawyers to leave the straight and narrow path.

(c) Communities wanting publicly owned plants can have them—sometimes after a few years of quite futile litigation. The rights of incorporated communities in this matter have been fully established.

(d) We have the ably administered Water Power Act. It is under fire at the moment but good horse sense will keep us from going back to the days when such things as red neckties were included in water power inventories. There are eleven Ripper bills now before Congress intended to weaken the public control of river development. None of them should be passed. The rivers belong to the people and should be utilized for multiple purposes and for the benefit of the people.

(e) And finally we have in TVA, a going and all but unchallenged concern, the admiration of a world intrigued by the possibilities of river valley development.

These wholly worth while ends have as a matter of fact been accomplished by a relatively small group of men imbued with the importance of energy and electrical service in our whole economy, and courageous enough to give uncompromising battle to what at times seemed an unbeatable interest. For today's more fortunate position of the public, as contrasted with the commercial interests, we have to thank such gerat citizens—only to mention a few of those for whom the struggle is at an end—as the two Roosevelts, George W. Norris, Gifford Pinchot, J. D. Ross of Seattle, Tom Johnson of Cleveland, George Woodruff, Philip Wells, and Jack Eshleman of California—one of my idols. He had great character and he actually gave his life for the cause.

The following headline was in last Sunday's New York Times:

"United States victory seen in power industry. Lack of concerted campaign by private utilities cited as main factor."

This reminds me of an incident in my youth. A very attractive girl lived in our block. A youth of the neighborhood took her what was called in those days "buggy riding." After a 2-hours drive the young man brought the young lady back to her home door. In saying a pert good-by, but with a beguiling smile on her pretty face, she observed: "You didn't have the sand." This "Lack of a concerted campaign" on the part of the electrical industry, as referred to by the Times, really means that the electrical industry hasn't got the sand. Those at the helm—business, large security owners, and operators—have neither the vision nor the nerve to provide such public-spirited service as in the long run a democratic people will demand.

It was a nicely balanced judgment which led General Eisenhower to create a new wartime classification within the United States Army known as combat leaders, which included only those who actually directed combat, ranging from the commander in chief himself, through the various heads commanding and leading armies, divisions, regiments, and even corporals leading platoons of possibly 15. The designation "combat leader" was as simple as the insignia, i. e., a piece of green cloth tied to the shoulder strap. The designation suggested no impeachment of those not wearing the green band—staff officers, commissaries, and agencies of supply—all indispensable adjuncts of an army. But it did afford an inconspicuous distinction to those who led in combat.

While in this widely ramifying fight of ours on behalf of a fundamental public interest we need all kinds of assistants—engineers, accountants, and technicians of many kinds—we need more than all else combat leaders such as those who have won the battles of the past. Choose your own niche but be a combat leader. You don't have to wear the green band on your shoulder if you have laid it on your heart.

Tribute to Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Hamilton Dalton before the Sunbury Rotary Club, at Sunbury, Pa., June 5, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Sunbury Rotary Club: "And what is so rare as

a day in June." We probably never thought James Russell Lowell lazy until today. With the pride understandable in loyal Pennsylvanians, we now think he should have written: "And what is so rare as a day in June—along the Susquehanna, at Sunbury? He could have gotten his beauty from the ripening verdure of these ancient surrounding hills, and his strength from the majestic river that flows mightily to the sea.

Of course Mr. Lowell never had the privilege of knowing Mr. Charles Duffy for 15 years, and of being invited to address the Sunbury Rotary Club, on a June day. Concerning your Northumberland County, Mr. William S. Livengood, Jr., able secretary of internal affairs of the Commonwealth, writes: "Perhaps no county in the State has more beautiful and picturesque scenery, both land and water, or greater diversification of agricultural, manufacturing and mining interests." That sort of makes it official, adding weight to our regret about Mr. Lowell.

For several years, this dealer-in-words has enjoyed sitting back, aloof from the maelstrom of public affairs—and from the microphone, thinking, and saying little. It seemed too much was being said by too many who knew too little. Deep thought, profound silence, are habits especially recommended to the headline, spiel-line and byline boys. Many of us will agree with Lowell when he writes: "There are few brains that would not be better for living on their own fat a little while." We agree the more readily when we understand that many important things are being left unsaid by our professional "thinkers." America needs accurate, complete information—and plenty of action!

A story isn't important because its publisher happens to know a President or a lesser official. Friendships can—and do—hide the real story. In time of war, it isn't human nature for a correspondent to attack a general who has the power to kick him out. That's like sticking one's hand in a buzz saw. In time of peace, a newshound will hesitate before bearing down on a high official who opens friendly doors. It takes no expert of the who, what, when, where and why profession to know that skullduggery lurks and multiplies behind friendly doors and radiant smiles. The charm of men in public life is attested through the ages. It is not an American invention, much as we might like to claim it, but considering everything, we are well served. However, if eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty, we better look behind the sights of our news shooters unless we would gaze, later, into the muzzles of our enemies. Truth and the public will be better served when molders of public opinion again knock down a few doors.

We are fools to accept boudoir Peeping Toms and night club tattle-tale Bettys as a substitute for two-fisted reporting. We worship headlines, by-lines and spiel-lines! Gentlemen of Rotary, they are false gods! They are tinsel! They stand revealed as the glitter of, and not the gold of, truth! Still, we often act as though we believed every sensationally presented story to be important! To this vacationing professional observer such idolatry is a stark example of ballyhoo catnip proving that 140,000,000 people can look—and can act silly. We forget that milk and liver feed the cat! We forget that truth alone is a healthy diet for the reasoning processes of people. The only persons to whom most sensationally presented stories are important are the editors who have papers to sell, and the trick-larynx commentators who have an audience to startle.

Let us recall a tiny few of those headlines! The Japs wouldn't fight! The Japs couldn't fight! Marshall Tito was our friend! We certainly swallowed that catnip. We've been as badly fooled as the hillbilly gentleman was in the following story. His wife was heard laughing uproariously in the corridors of a mountain courthouse. When someone asked why, she replied: "Ah'm th' happies' woman in this here lan'. Ah jes' gotta deevohs from mah ol' man. Ah nelly dahd alaffin at th' cot's decision 'cause it gave him the chillun—and they ain't even hisn."

It is our necessity to find out how seriously we've been cuckolded by this truth-obscuring fiddle-faddle of the palsy-walsy scribes and screechers. Their barrage of chatter and printer's ink is becoming tiresome—people are getting bored. That is serious. All of us know there is no answer to boredom—except flight or change. People are beginning to believe they may safely ignore "world shattering" stories and emotion-drenched radios, without danger of missing anything important.

A story concealing truth, or that diverts the minds of people from truth, is evidence of a kept press or a kept radio, and there isn't a tiny speck in my entire body in which the germ of communism can grow! Moreover, I like editors. A pioneer in it, I also respect my profession, but in the public interest it is essential to protest abuses. And this, incidentally, is the only obligation a commentator owes to a radio station or a sponsor. Our baffled—but always vocal—molders of public opinion seemingly cannot shake off old slogans, old habits.

It comes as quite a shock to the molder boys to learn that it is no longer news when a man bites a dog! To keep from starving, our gallant captured American servicemen had to eat dogs in Japanese prison camps. There's something ghoulish about the descendants of Greeley, Dana, and Watterson being minions of shibboleth and tradition. They are as necrophiles, worshiping the dead bodies and not the immortal inspiration of those nation-building careers. There's something downright dangerous to America in allowing—under cover of press and radio silence—military, naval, or State Department officials to control or direct news releases, or to withhold news. This cover is mendacious when the releases would be embarrassing to such officials. The people should have recourse!

Lowell couldn't have foreseen the difficulties stemming from such reporting when, in a poem called "The Present Crisis," he wrote:

"Once to every man and Nation
Comes the moment to decide
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood
For the good or evil side."

The great poet lived in an American era when moulders of public opinion were hair shirts to America's leaders, and not two-way stretch silken girdles smoothly hiding the bulges of skulduggery. He lived in an age when it was a distinction to be a newspaper man!

It may be pleasant to view the passing drama of life from the Big Wig's box but unless the trained observer constantly comes up with panaceas for human woes, or discloses weaknesses—or worse—in public leadership, he is brazenly flaunting the arrogant power, and not the cleansing duty of a reporter. America desperately needs a few back row editors and commentators who will know how to gripe—and who will have the right to gripe—when the people cannot see, hear and understand all that is done or said on the stages of life. After all, gentlemen of Rotary, the seats of the mighty are with the people—and not on the platform!

To return to Lowell. How are we to know when a headline or a spiel-line is true; when it is propaganda; or when it is falsehood—deliberate or otherwise? How can we make decisions—bold decisions—war-pregnant decisions if we learn less than the whole truth? Does any American think he is smart enough to make decisions for every other American? For even a majority of Americans? Do such people think we should abolish Congress?

Are these decisions to be made for us, in secrecy, by appointed officials? Are even the elected Senate and the House to be in the dark about them? Decisions affecting the lives, liberties and welfare of every living American, and the countless unborn? To a similarly momentous, and self-asked question, the immortal Patrick Henry replied: "Forbid it, Almighty God!" In our time, we prayerfully add a simple but thundering "No!" It has been said, and with ever-recurring truth, that a judge is but a lawyer who knew a governor. It may well be observed that many of our leaders are prominent only because they know pliant men who control publicity outlets!

A great deal of emphasis is placed on America helping the world—and no man of good purpose objects to a donation of assistance to starving, homeless people of whatever race, creed or color. But who pulls these strings? Who enjoys the corollary benefits? Are these benefits financial? Political? Is a bureaucracy again perpetuating itself? Are these people not telling us that food won't grow and cattle won't multiply in foreign lands? Isn't it ridiculous? If there are men in high position in the Army, the Navy, the State department, the Government—or men who own newspapers and radio stations, who believe the American people cannot be trusted to know the whole truth about any subject affecting their vital welfare, those men should be exposed. Moreover, they should be driven from their positions of power or ownership of news channels. Ownership is not overlordship and it endows no living human being with the right to censor relevant news.

In the overpowering emphasis upon helping the unfortunate, Americans are losing sight of the fact that our Nation is entirely innocent of blame for starting the war that devastated people. We did not prepare for war and we did not want war! But we read and hear very little of that! First things come first, ye molders of public opinion—even in politics or propaganda! We must protect America's ability to give! The molding boys should remember that! We must also give emphasis to this Nation's ability to earn! The molding boys should stick that on their mastheads! Finally, we must see that the world respects us for what we are, and for what we do to help ourselves and the world!

As a people we fear nothing—externally or internally—but the gravest menace to our tranquility comes from the public officials who have little or no faith in the common sense of our people to meet any emergency, and the newspaper and radio boys who shield such spineless officials from exposure and dismissal.

We may be a very wealthy Nation at the present time! Some do not unreservedly accept that definition since they happen to think that wealth consists in having more than food, money, and material possessions. An automobile cannot reproduce an automobile! A farm cannot divide itself into two farms of equal size. Thus, it is not valid, in their judgment, to call America wealthy until our people again activate that secret ingredient of mutual trust that inspires Americans to work together to make and keep this Nation strong. Too many groups—of every identifiable description—aided and abetted by the typewriter potentates and the microphone jaw-jaw boys, are trying to blackjack Uncle Sam into making each group hog-fat, power-ridden, and obligation-free. Special privileges of any kind is abominable, especially the privilege of the press and radio to censor news. The people are being outrageously deceived when a free press throttles itself!

Where is the time-tested, common-sense duty of the individual to the whole? Dumb animals herd together in a blizzard to keep a minimum of them from freezing! There is no special privilege in the herd, because constant milling about forces those in the

center to take their turn on the perimeter of cold. That, my good friends, is merely another way of stating the basic principle of democracy—the greatest good for the greatest number. The molding boys might recall that!

One who encourages strife among us, or division among us, is our enemy, whether he be statesman, journalist, or commentator—and whatever his race or creed. Those who tell us to lend or give until we're weak, are our foes, notwithstanding these things be urged in the name of charity! Our Communist "friends" know that a bankrupt America is a softer touch for them than a prosperous, a productive, a united America!

Just as Sunbury's Fort Augusta was an outpost for liberty in the French and Indian Wars and in the Revolutionary War, so is the Sunbury Rotary Club an outpost for the substantial growth of America's strength, in this era of egotistical exploitation of national welfare by our would-be king makers, the bureaucracy-line columnists and commentators.

You have been most kind to allow me this opportunity to emerge from the study and to again take part in the battle for a vigorous and well-informed citizenry. As Rotarians, and as Americans, you see the future as a challenge you want to face. You are better informed than the Biblical Adam. He had to face everything—and of all he beheld none could explain. He didn't know the difference between a toadstool and a mushroom, nor the difference between an insect-eating blacksnake and a deadly cobra.

Adam demonstrated more raw courage than the mariner who first sailed the uncharted Atlantic. Adam showed more fearlessness than the aviator who first flew that vast and stormy ocean. Adam revealed more intrepidity than did those great scientists who made the atomic bomb, because previous experience had taught them safeguards. Adam displayed more daring fortitude than will the hardy adventurer who first flies to the moon—if such be an event of the future, because he will be helped on that flight by a mass of knowledge discovered and proved by other men. Americans are thus emboldened to welcome the future, but they demand the whole truth, so that they may apply safeguards. They are particularly allergic to kilocycleitis which word is defined as "hot air rushing through propaganda-diseased tonsils."

In an era notable for bigotry, Rotarians cherish a belief in the Brotherhood of Man and the Fatherhood of God. Here in Sunbury they remember, for instance, that 90 years before the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, the Pennsylvania Society for the Abolition of Slavery was organized, with Benjamin Franklin as its first president. Thus, it is to be expected that love of their fellowman is warp and woof of their glory-studded history and their restless present.

The very letters of the word Rotary provide, in anagram form, a slogan for the future! R-otary O-penly T-rusts A-merica's R-edoubtable Y-outh! That youth has the wisdom of the ages at its command—as well as America's superior use thereof! Adam did not! That youth will know what to accept and what to reject. That youth wants to meet the world on a basis of mutual respect. It wants to live in peace and happiness with all men. We have every reason to hope that it too will destroy the shackles that hobble truth; that it too will humble leaders of our Government, press or radio who forget that the seats of the mighty are with the people!

Those young people may well take inspiration from the great American poet we have quoted so often tonight, when he wrote: "When I was a beggarly boy and lived in a cellar damp, I had not a friend nor a toy but I had Aladdin's lamp!" Fueled by knowledge, and burning the wick of courage, that lamp must be the light of the world. From these surrounding mountain slopes, let the word reverberate that the power of God alone is infinite, the courage of youth in unfailing, and the future of America is safe in the stewardship of those well-sired and well-trained young men! And now I see by the stop watch that it is time for the motto: "Whoever you are, wherever you live, if you're for progress, you'll like Pennsylvania."

The Pick-Sloan Plan: A Wasteful Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "The Pick-Sloan Plan—A Wasteful Failure," by Benton J. Stong, delivered at the Valley Development Conference in Washington, D. C., July 17, 1947.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PICK-SLOAN PLAN—A WASTEFUL FAILURE

It is extremely fortunate that advocates of valley development through over-all authorities of the TVA type have gathered here at this particular time.

Decisions are being made in connection with the biggest valley in our Nation which may give it either a great and dynamic development, or may lay a blighting, deadening hand across the whole Missouri Valley. A valley authority may be adopted, insuring that the enormous agricultural, mineral and human resources of the area shall be developed. Or a so-called flood control plan may be adopted which would foreclose for generations the full development of the Missouri Valley's irrigation, electric power, minerals, and industrial resources.

We are choosing between a plan with the dynamics to set off a great expansion in the Missouri Valley, as has happened in the Tennessee Valley, and a plan which will chain it to the dead past until billions of dollars of its assets are buried in silt and another, braver, and more enlightened generation comes along to repair damages which cannot be estimated.

Assigning the United States Army engineers to the job of controlling floods in a river is precisely like sending Typhoid Mary to stop a typhoid epidemic.

The Ohio valley has been fully developed by the Army engineers. It is now the scene by some of the Nation's worst floods. The Missouri Valley is only partially developed by the Army engineers. Thus far, with a little under $400,000,000 spent on the lower Missouri River, the Army has pushed flood crests up by 5, 6, and 7 feet. But, given time and a few more hundred million dollars, the Army doubtless can still all opposition to their stream-clogging boondoggles by the the simple process of applying a corset—simple process of drowning out the population.

They have increased flood crests from Omaha, Nebr., to the mouth of the river by restricting the channel for navigation purposes and reducing its carrying capacity to carry water below the flood state. The Army has contended that the river would scour out its bottom and reacquire its former carrying capacity. Instead it has scoured out buildings, farms, urgently needed crops, roads, railways, the Army's own works—hundreds of millions of dollars worth of property. It has scoured out lives and human welfare—but not its own bed. Gen. Lewis A. Pick may still have some faint hope that the convenient theory of scouring will eventually work, but I am certain that Fred Heinkel will tell this conference that his people along the Missouri River have "had enough." The 130,000 members of the Missouri Farmers Association want the Missouri River problem approached in the intelligent way, starting at the headwaters and developing the assets of the valley rather than starting at the mouth and gradually destroying values all the way back to the headwaters, until there is nothing left for the floods to bother, nor people to protest.

The fight for a Missouri Valley Authority dates back to January 1941, shortly after the Army engineers announced Gen. Lewis A. Pick's plan for lower river development. It proposed a navigation channel 300 feet wide and 9 feet deep, of running water, up to Sioux City, Iowa. Such a flowing channel was estimated to require within 2,000,000 acre-feet of the average annual flow of the river over a 30-year period. Some in the West quickly recognized that this plan meant the end of new irrigation, or even a supplemental water supply. In even a moderately dry year, there would not be enough water for such a navigation channel alone. It meant that the river's enormous water power potential would be left undeveloped. And it meant that, although we sacrificed every other beneficial use of the river to attain navigation, even the navigation would be so unreliable that no shipper could rely upon it year-in and year-out as his transportation lifeline.

Whenever rainfall in the valley dropped just 10 percent below average, there would be a scarcity of water even for navigation, and any great industry relying upon it would be forced to look elsewhere for a means of moving goods. One does not build wharves and dock facilities for occasional barge services. Nor does one gamble large investments to establish industries, dependent on low-cost water transportation, when that transportation cannot be depended upon. Even if provided the flowing channel would not assure the reliable navigation which has been assured in the Tennessee Valley by slack water pools, which can be maintained with only enough moving water to operate the locks.

The vested interests which concern themselves so greatly over every river development quickly recognized the implications and meaning of the Pick plan. They saw that it would drown out all the enormous hydroelectric potential of the lower valley, 10 to 12 billion kilowatt-hours a year. They saw that it would provide only spasmodic, unreliable navigation. So they started supporting it with all their might, and drew power companies and water organizations from all over the Nation—even the Pittsburgh Yacht Club—into the flight. They saw that the Pick plan would deaden the river against interference with their monopolies, and they are 100 percent for it.

The contractors recognized the Pick plan, and its meaning. To them, it meant the establishment of the first full-scale, perpetual-motion machine in history—an endless job of dredging the river to get sand and gravel to build dikes and levees which would have to be heightened or replaced by dredging the river to get more sand and gravel, to heighten and replace dikes and levees, ad infinitum. They are for the Pick plan. It would be a contractors' bonanza.

The Bureau of Reclamation also recognized the true meaning of the Army's plan, and it quickly put together and released a plan of its own for the upper valley, known as the Sloan plan, which provides a large group of reservoirs on the tributary streams, and in the Missouri itself, to impound water for irrigation projects, and to develop some

hydroelectric power. It was a hurried throw-together, a "quickie" to prevent the Army staking out and perfecting a claim to all the waters of the river for intermittent navigation.

The advocates of over-all western development also recognized the implications of the Pick plan. My own organization, the National Farmers Union, proposed, as did the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, that it was time to apply the principles of the Tennessee Valley Authority to the Missouri Valley. We suggested that the principles which were first proposed by one of the greatest citizens who ever lived in the Missouri Valley, or the Nation, be adopted in the home river basin of the late George W. Norris.

The valley authority idea is a powerful idea.

The mere proposal, and the publicity given it by the Post-Dispatch and Star-Times in St. Louis, stirred vested interests all over the Nation. The vested bureaucracies, the Army and Bureau of Reclamation, which had hardly been on speaking terms for years, arranged to a hurried alliance.

W. Glenn Sloan had previously testified for the Bureau of Reclamation that two of the Army's principal proposed dams were wasteful, excessively costly, and should be eliminated from a river plan.

The Reclamation Bureau could see no good whatever in either Garrison Dam nor Gavins Point Dam, which were estimated to cost nearly $200,000,000.

The Army, in its turn, opposed the great Souris irrigation project of the Reclamation Bureau as impractical dream stuff.

The two agencies did not like either of the other's children, and said so publicly.

But when a Missouri Valley Authority was proposed, they hastened to Omaha, had what has been aptly described as a shotgun wedding, adopted each other's children, and proclaimed to the public that a great over-all plan for the Missouri Valley had come of their union.

The whole thing is a hoax, pure and simple. The Pick and Sloan plans, no matter how forcibly jammed together, are not one. They remain conflicting, special purpose plans for the Missouri Basin. Neither is complete. Neither is adequate. And the two cannot be operated in harmony.

The Army engineers, apparently with President Truman's support, are out to take the West's water for their own flowing channel. The Bureau of Reclamation, betrayed by the special interests in the National Reclamation Association, and now cut in for only a minute 4 percent of the President's proposed huge emergency flood control budget, has been trying to keep a trickle of water for its irrigation work, by going along with the anti-MVA conspiracy. Certainly it must know today that it has lost virtually everything and that Gen. Lewis A. Pick has, within the official family, been given the go sign to carry out his recent boast in Time magazine: "I am going to control all the waters of the Missouri." Certainly the Bureau people know that after the Army spends another billion dollars on its flowing channel, the waters of the West will have been committed to a use hundreds of times more extravagant than slack water pools, which have never even been investigated as a substitute for the Army's proposal.

The Missouri Basin Interagency Committee, which has been a farce since its establishment, was presented to the public as something better than a valley authority board, an integration of the old and reliable agencies which would require no new machinery. Within a year of its establishment, it had so completely demonstrated its futility as a coordinating body that the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation picked up his brief case and started to walk out, inquiring as he left if he should tell the reporters that the arrangement had blown up.

He was hastily called back into the room, an agreement was reached that the committee would not attempt to settle any controversial issues, but act only as a little interagency reporting bureau, and the public appearance of a happy little family was maintained until July 16, 1947.

It is true that there have been minor flare-ups; flare-ups which have truly exposed the tragic wastes of the so-called Pick-Sloan plan.

The wastes of public moneys on the construction of inadvisable projects will be trivial compared to the enormous wastes of the river's potentials which are inherent in the plan.

The valley authority principle which we advocate is based upon the use of the river, its water and its power as the great natural engine which will set in motion soil programs, resources development, industrial growth and an expanding economy. It contemplates that the river will be the dynamo for better human life, for higher incomes, for development of recreational facilities, abundant power and low cost transportation.

If the river is committed to the Pick plan strait-jacket, then the mighty resources which could have been used to spark an expanding economy will have been wasted. True valley development will have been made enormously expensive, if possible at all until the Army's works have destroyed themselves.

I use that last phrase advisedly—until the Army's works have destroyed themselves. There is little doubt that in time they will do so. Anyone who has seen levees crumble and wash away knows that they will. Only the extremely gullible are even temporarily misled by such fancy theories as the one which General Lewis A. Pick apparently sold to Life magazine recently, namely, that the accumulation of alluvial flow into the basin of a dam "strengthens" it. Amazing as that statement may be, it appeared in a recent edition of Life magazine in a double-page spread titled "The Greatest Dream of Them All," telling of General Pick's ambition to control the Missouri river. Under a picture of Fort Randall dam site, the magazine explained that the dam would be an earth structure, and that the alluvial flow deposited by the river would serve to strengthen it.

Life would apparently also be for filling the interior of skyscrapers with beams and girders because that would make it stronger. It would also settle the problem of tenancy, almost exactly as General Pick's silt-filling dams will settle the problem of flood control.

The nation could far better suffer the monetary loss of the cost of Fort Randall, and the other Army structures, than it can suffer the consequences of such a program.

The Federal Power Commission's regional engineer at Chicago has publicly stated that a minimum adequate power program in the Missouri Basin would develop 25,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of economic electricity annually. The Pick-Sloan plan would waste more than two-thirds of that potential, throwing away the trigger for industrial development, and the trigger for a great phosphate industry which would, in its turn, be the trigger for an enormous soil conservation program.

The Army has not provided for any power installation whatever in the Missouri River between Omaha and the mouth, where 10 to 12 billion kilowatt-hours might be developed.

The Forestry Service, in the Department of Agriculture, has pointed out the total omission of planning for what are called water crop lands, high in the mountains and at the heads of the creeks so named because they store water and release it gradually. Without this storage of water in the land itself, main stem river works cannot be intelligently planned in the first place. If our forest lands in the upper Missouri are permitted to be destroyed, then planning for the present flood crests will again be tragically inadequate for, as the lands are denuded, the flood crests will be increased. If we are going to do a real conservation job in the water crop areas, then the enormous storage proposed in the main stem is a profligate waste of money, for the land will store the water as it falls and release it gradually.

If we are going to extend soil conservation down into the central valley, and store more water, then the waste of oversize main stem works will be increased in direct proportion. If we are not, then we are going to go in for an even more tragic waste, the waste of our basic land resources which will be lost not only to our generation, but to all generations to come.

The Pick-Sloan plan does nothing whatever about the Dust Bowl. It proposes no shelter belts, no land practices which will help to solve a Missouri Valley scourge as great and devastating as the floods.

President Truman said in his recent message to Congress that floods in the Mississippi Valley had done a billion dollars destruction in the last 10 years.

So has drought. Indeed, drought has done more. There was paid out of the United States Treasury, never to return, $1,246,000,000 in relief, rehabilitation, and uncollectible emergency loans as a result of the drought of the thirties in the Missouri Valley alone. That total is 20 percent more than the President's flood figure for the whole Mississippi River Valley.

Yet today we are being urged to adopt an emergency, single-purpose program in the Missouri Valley which would delay action on this even greater destructive force until "ultimately." Recent figures indicate that more than two and a half million more acres have been put under cultivation in the Dust Bowl than ever before in history. Dust storms are again in the making. Only unusually heavy rainfall prevented them this year. This situation, and the need for control measures, is just as urgent and just as great as the floods have ever been.

A successful attack upon the problems of the Missouri Valley, and of all our valleys, must be made on all fronts. It is foolhardy to build dams that are going to be so completely reinforced with silt that they will become valueless. It is foolhardy to believe that any piece-meal, single-purpose approach will succeed.

The Missouri River—Joseph Kinsey Howard's "Golden River"—can be a golden river. It can produce 25,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy to serve as the dynamo for an expanding, instead of a declining, economy. It can supply water for four to six million additional acres of irrigation, and supplemental water for now inadequately irrigated lands. It can provide a great navigation channel to carry the grains, the ores, the fertilizers and the finished products produced in this great valley. It can supply the stimulus for a great soil conservation program. It can provide unlimited recreation. It can be the basis for a new and richer human life in the valley, and in our whole nation. It can stimulate enormous new markets for the nation to supply.

The Missouri Valley awaits only the application of the principles which have been tested and proved successful in the Tennessee Valley.

Until we apply them—and so long as we flirt with interim plans, compromise plans, piecemeal plans and bogus plans—we are wasting not just dollars, not just a few hundreds of millions on false starts—we will be wasting our heritage. Some of it, like the 250,000,000 to 300,000,000 tons of life-sustaining top soil annually passing down the Missouri, will be gone for all time.

The time to start doing the job right in the Missouri Valley is now—not ultimately. It is folly and waste to keep on trying to control floods by methods which, it has been proved, are certain to make them worse, in

the meantime depriving farmers, businessmen and workers of the wealth that is theirs for the planning.

I earnestly solicit those who are attending this conference to hear the four other men from the Missouri Valley who will speak from this platform, and to give us every possible assistance in hastening the achievement of an MVA, that our valley may be through with wastes of every sort and be set on the road to progress.

The Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] at the convention of the National Editorial Association, at Fort Worth, Tex., April 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The decisions reached at the little-publicized Geneva Reciprocal Trade Conference beginning this month could well be more important and far reaching in their effects upon the economic structure of this Nation than anything the present Congress can do, including labor, wartime controls, or tax legislation.

The people of this country can no longer ignore or dodge a definite decision on their long-time foreign policy.

The objective is the same—to maintain our standard of living and to arrive at a free and unobstructed trade flow between nations—the roads proposed to reach that objective are radically different.

The reciprocal trade road as now administered with a free trade trend, without due regard to the difference in the wage standards of living between the countries of the world, means a sharp reduction in our own high wage standards to meet the low wage living standards of the Asiatic and European countries.

The flexible tariff road, adjustable at the will of the President and administered by the Tariff Commission, continually meeting the variable differential of cost of production between this Nation and in competitive countries on specific products, protects and maintains our higher wage living standard while raising those of foreign countries.

As each one of the 54 member nations of the United Nations reach our standard of living, free and unimpeded trade is the immediate and automatic result.

Under the 1930 flexible tariff law, the President may at any time request the Tariff Commission to compute the differential of cost of production of any specific product in this Nation and in any specific foreign country, considering the difference in wages, efficiency, transportation, etc., and then such differential of cost becomes the tariff without further action by Congress or any other body.

Congress searched for the answer to this problem over a long period of years. They tried the Underwood Tariff Act which approached the free trade trend—its effect on American trade caused a special session of Congress to be called almost immediately following World War I to halt market raids and dumping by foreign countries.

They then tried the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, but it became evident that any rigid tariff structure, changeable only through congressional action after full debate, would not meet the continual shifting economic conditions and costs of production.

The 1930 Flexible Tariff Act was then designed to meet the ever changing economic picture so that any disturbance in the balance can immediately be met with a corresponding change in the tariff.

Two all-important things are accomplished through the flexible tariff method: First, it protects our economic structure while we are assisting our less fortunate neighbors to reach our standard of living; and second, it will discourage the long-established practice of the empire-minded nations, notably England, France, and the Netherlands, of holding the wages down in the countries under their control and of manipulating their money system, in order to wriggle under our tariff structure.

We must make up our minds; high wages in this country and free trade with the low wage foreign countries is impossible; the two things are not compatible.

The flexible tariff leaves the door open with a definite procedure laid down by law of giving immediate credit through a lowering of the tariff to meet a corresponding rise in the living standards of any country.

Our people must stop and consider this new picture of world living standards suddenly presented to them through faster transportation and communications. Americans have been building up our standard of living through a kind of fierce ambition and restless energy since the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, while the Europeans and Asiatics have lived according to the standards imposed upon them by their rulers since recorded history.

They were old when we were born and they have not perceptibly changed their standards of living since that time—some of them have little desire to change. All of these factors must be considered when we would, out of the goodness of our hearts open to them the only market of any magnitude in the world today where you can sell anything and get paid for it, unless we have previously loaned the necessary funds to that nation.

All agree that to help other nations we must remain strong. It should be agreed that we cannot remain strong and substantially lower our wage-standard of living. Then it would naturally follow that our economic structure must be protected while we are trying to improve the wage living standards of the 54 other members of the United Nations.

It should also be clear that we cannot continue forever making huge loans to foreign nations to build up their dollar balance through adding to our national debt and without hope of repayment as we have done continually since World War I. The effect on this country would be the same if we simply paid our people for the goods out of the United States Treasury and dumped them in the ocean.

It could well be that the time is here when we have to tell our foreign neighbors the truth, that our money and resources are not inexhaustible and that we cannot continue to support them in the style to which they would like to become accustomed.

We can, however, furnish them the "know-how"—our engineers, technicians, and industrial experts are available. They can be retained by such countries and can show them how to set up tax districts to pay their wages and construction costs for dams, power plants, factories, water supply and necessary city works all in the interests of improving their living and working conditions.

This is the slower, surer method that will be appreciated by the foreign peoples and that will fit into the flexible tariff method of coordinating the economic structures of 54 nations while the normal adjustment to 54 separate and different wage-living standards is taking place.

There is a common sense way for us to approach foreign trade discussion with any nation—or for that matter for any two nations to discuss it.

First, we would make a list of the products produced by us and not produced by that nation. Second, make a list of such products produced by that nation and not by us, and third, make a list of the materials produced by both.

The products on the first two lists will enter the trade channels naturally. The third list is the embarrassing one between friendly nations and the one to which close attention must be paid.

Obviously, there is no more reason for us to purchase cow meat from the Argentine than there is for that nation to purchase it from us—except in such form and at such times as it might be needed. It is not even a friendly gesture to buy something from another country when you do not need it. It is a silly thing to do, or to expect, and over the long swing simply invites contempt.

Further, when the State Department, dealing as it does exclusively with foreign affairs, starts trading segments of the American market to foreign countries to bring about agreements or treaties entirely unrelated to our domestic economy, a permanent disturbance could well be initiated that might be far reaching and dangerous to our intricate economic structure.

For example, our annual economic cycle is one of producing raw materials, taking them to the factory and, after processing them, distributing them to the consumer.

A recent study demonstrates that every dollar of income received by agricultural and other raw material producers, results in approximately $5 of national income. In 1940, for example, we had a raw material income in the United States of approximately $15,000,000,000, while the national income was $77,000,000,000, a little over five times the raw material income. At the present time we have a raw material income of approximately $34,000,000,000 per year, while the national income is running at approximately $170,000,000,000 or five times the raw materials income.

This 5 to 1 ratio has held true for the past 25 years. It is perfectly obvious, therefore, that to have a high level of national income and national prosperity, it is absolutely imperative that we have a high level of income from the production of raw materials and purchasing power for the farmer, miner, and other raw material producers. The importance of maintaining a high level of income for the farmer can be shown by taking a simple example.

Since each dollar of raw materials income generates $5 of national income, if the raw material income level of $34,000,000,000, which now prevails, should be reduced by $10,000,000,000, the net result according to the record would be a substantial reduction in national income, probably near $50,000,000,000, or five times that amount.

With a national Federal budget running above $30,000,000,000 a year, we cannot afford to support any policies, or take any steps, which may lead to a reduction of $50,000,000,000 a year in national income level.

The above analysis points to only one conclusion—that, at this time, it could be disastrous to start a wave of wholesale drastic cuts in import fees and tariffs such as proposed and currently being negotiated by the State Department.

If any changes in tariffs are made to meet the differential in standards of living between this country and foreign nations, let them be made slowly and only after a careful and comprehensive investigation of each product on the flexible tariff basis which includes a comparison of the cost of producing each product in the United States and in such

foreign countries by the Tariff Commission. The Commission is equipped and experienced to do the job.

Floods in the Mississippi Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Pathfinder of July 30, 1947, in an editorial titled "Mad Waters," said that the full fury of the floods which ravaged the Midwest these past weeks will strike the rest of the nation—and a hungry world—this fall and winter.

The St. Louis Star-Times of June 27 last carries an editorial "Breadbasket to Desert." Consider the implication of these statements in the light of the proposal to add new millions of dollars to the vast sums already spent by the Army Engineers:

"The Army Engineers and various other Federal agencies, the Star-Times editorial reads, "have now been at work on the Missouri and the Mississippi for more than a century. Yet today there swirls around us the muddy evidence that each succeeding flood is more costly than its predecessor. Further, major floods are becoming more and more frequent. They have become more and more frequent. They have become all but an annual occurrence. Is it not high time, then, to adopt a new strategy in the war against the Big Muddy?"

At the Valley Authorities Conference held in Washington last week, Morris L. Cooke, consulting engineer from Philadelphia, formerly first Administrator of the REA, chairman of the Mississippi Valley Committee appointed by President Roosevelt, and long-time director of public works of Philadelphia, presented a most provocative paper on the subject of "The Electrical Industry and Multiple Purpose River Valley Development." There he said:

> The commercial electrical operating industry is and will continue to be the spearhead of opposition to multiple purpose river valley development.

Mr. Cooke's study presents authentic facts based on careful engineering investigations of relative costs of electricity. Such information will prove of interest to all those who are concerned over the high cost of electric energy to farmers, industries, and home users in the Missouri region.

A second paper presented at the Valley Authorities Conference was by Benton J. Stong, the chairman of the Regional Committee for an MVA, describing the Pick-Sloan Plan, "A Wasteful Failure."

I have had these two papers published in the RECORD, and I ask permission to have the St. Louis Star-Times editorial of June 27 printed in RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREADBASKET TO DESERT?

With levee after levee giving away along the Mississippi, the Missouri and their tributaries, and with the irreplaceable topsoil of a fair-sized farm being swept under Eads Bridge every few minutes, this great valley once again is undergoing a tragic depletion of its resources.

Remembering that the deserts of the Middle East once were a land of milk and honey, there is no escaping the question whether the breadbasket of America faces a similar fate. Nor can an answer be evaded because it is of interest only to those who will live in the valley hundreds or thousands of years from now. Nature works much faster than that. A rich farming section can be destroyed in 25 or 30 years—sometimes even quicker. Sections of Missouri already offer proof of this.

The Army engineers and various other Federal agencies have now been at work on the Missouri and the Mississippi for more than a century. Yet today there swirls around us the muddy evidence that each succeeding flood is more costly than its predecessor. Further, major floods are becoming more and more frequent. They have become all but an annual occurrence. Is it not high time, then, to adopt a new strategy in the war against the Big Muddy?

The basic battle plans for such a new attack are already at hand. They are to be found in the successful operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. There all that man knows about curbing turbulent rivers has been applied in a coordinated and effective way. The TVA program has not been merely a matter of building levees which, paradoxically, sometimes increase flood damage. Nor has it been merely a matter of building modern dams. The damaging waters were checked at their real sources. As Paul S. Mathes, Tennessee State Commissioner of Conservation, has pointed out, the attack included the application of better farming practices in an area embracing 40,000,000 acres. It meant the planting of more than 200,000,000 trees, the damming of millions of gullies and the terracing and reclamation of thousands of eroded fields. Crops were diversified. Wood lots were developed and the grazing of cattle and sheep was substituted in areas where the plow was the predecessor of the flood.

TVA, however, is much more than a flood-control project. It has made the Tennessee a busy highway of commerce, and it is generating enough electricity to encourage industry and to raise substantially the valley's standard of living. It is not merely a self-liquidating public works project, but over the years will become a major contributor to the Federal Treasury. It is one of the most imaginative works of man, and it is being imitated all over the world. Why not then in the valley of the Missouri?

The governors and the legislators and the people of the Missouri Valley States ought to visit the valley of the Tennessee. They ought to talk not only to TVA's engineers but also to the people of the valley. To see and to hear could hardly fail to convince. There is the great working lesson for this valley. How long before we learn it?

Disloyalty in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cure Worse Than Disease," from the Hartford Daily Courant of Wednesday, July 23, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURE WORSE THAN DISEASE

If the Senate fails to act on the House's version of a bill against disloyalty in Government it will be fortunate. No one likes Communists in Government positions, but casting into the rubbish barrel traditional American principles of jurisprudence and fair dealing is hardly the way to get them out. It could almost be said of the House bill that the cure it prescribes is worse than the disease.

The proposed independent loyalty board would act as judge, jury and prosecutor. No appeal could be taken from its findings. The bill presumes persons guilty until proved innocent. The accused would not have the right to face or to cross-examine his accuser. In these and other provisions the bill proposes to adopt totalitarian means to get rid of totalitarian advocates.

Although Congress crippled President Truman's executive order for a purge of Government rolls by withholding an appropriation, departments are doing their own investigating and dismissing. Nearly 250 employees have been discharged, and numerous applicants for jobs turned down, because of their Red tinge. If the departments will do this work effectively, they can save the country the cost of another bureau. In fact, they should do it, not only as a matter of executing a public trust, but to forestall congressional action that would be both costly and a reflection on department heads. At any rate, no matter how deeply we may be concerned about Communists in government, we do not want the kind of bill the House passed.

American Federation of Physically Handicapped—Proceedings of Public Forum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, about a year ago Congress passed a resolution authorizing the observance of the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

On June 19, 1947, under auspices of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, a public forum was held in the National Press Club Auditorium, Washington, D. C., at which representatives of large national organizations discussed the subject, How To Stimulate Employment of Our Physically Handicapped.

Speakers representing industry, labor, veterans, women, scientific and professional groups, along with the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, the Director of the United States Employment Service, the Director of Information of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and others, presented facts and figures, and outlined their plans for employment of handicapped.

This forum is a part of the program preliminary to observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, established, as will be recalled, by the Seventy-ninth Congress, which I am sure all of us are proud to have supported, as it has been the means of 42,878 handicapped being placed in employment, through the United States Employment Service, of whom 27,341 were disabled veterans.

I believe the proceedings of this important gathering should be broadcast to the general public, so that all may know what has been done, what is being done, and what is planned, in the direction of continuing effort for employment of our disabled citizens, both military and civilian.

The length of the proceedings is such as to require an estimate from the Public Printer. I have obtained such an estimate. It is $710. This is a great deal of money but last year the Government spent some $10,000 in promoting National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. This year I understand there will be no Federal expenditure. I feel that the cost of having this material printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a small contribution to help the physically handicapped. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this material printed in the Appendix of the RECORD notwithstanding the cost.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A mass meeting, under auspices of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, was held in the National Press Club auditorium, Washington, D. C., Thursday, June 19, 1947, to discuss "How to stimulate employment of our physically handicapped." The meeting was called to order by Mr. Anthony J. Oliver, at 8:15 p. m.

Chairman OLIVER. The meeting will be kind enough to be in order. I will ask the audience to rise, while Rabbi Samuel Penner delivers the invocation.

Rabbi SAMUEL FENNER. Almighty God, Father of all men, to Thee we pray for vision and courage—vision to see our brother's need and courage to strive for its realization.

Grant, O God, that out of these sessions there may emerge an ever-growing movement which shall capture the hearts and spirits of all our countrymen, so that our Nation may rise to a conscience befitting its greatness and find a useful and self-respecting place for the handicapped in our midst.

We invoke Thy blessing, O Lord, upon the leaders and membership of this movement, and pray that Thou mayest strengthen them in the pursuit of this great cause to its successful end. Amen.

Chairman OLIVER. The audience will be seated. Honored guests and friends, you are invited here tonight in order to lend your enthusiasm to the spreading of the spirit of an act of Congress known as Public Resolution 176, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the purpose of which was to set aside the first week in October of each year to be reserved and carefully thought out as a week to employ the physically handicapped people of our Nation.

The thought that originated the selection of this particular week in our busy calendar year came from the mind of the president and founder of this organization, who sits beside me tonight and who is, among other disabilities, totally deaf. We watched the results of our work last year in spreading "Employ the Handicapped" throughout the Nation, and we found it quite successful; but this year we are asking all of the industries, we ask the States, we ask the cities, and the counties to redouble their efforts in order to make our goal 50,000 placements by the end of the year. We feel that can be done, because we believe that the employers have somewhat changed their attitude. They begin to realize the value of our people and the prejudice that once held them tight has now modified and almost passed away, wherein they wouldn't hire anybody, anywhere, with any kind of a physical handicap.

In this progressive Nation we cannot bypass 28,000,000 physically handicapped citizens and forget them when they appeal to the Nation as a whole and ask simply for an opportunity to be self-supporting and then self-respecting citizens.

Sensing this humanitarian and economic atmosphere in the country, the President of the United States signed the act that dedicated this week, that set it aside, and then he called on all of the States and the cities and the counties and the industrial managers to help bring it to a head and carry out its ideas. So, tonight, we feel that we are going ahead fast and we will be able to accomplish far more than we did last year, because the thought of giving all the physically handicapped of our Nation an opportunity and a chance to work has seeped into the people gradually, and among our guests tonight there are many who have specialized knowledge of the needs of the handicapped, and many more who have specialized knowledge of the economic value the handicapped employed would be to the economic condition of our country. These same people have in their hearts the tenet that they are their brother's keeper.

I shall now turn the chair over to the president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Mr. Paul A. Strachan. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. Thank you, Anthony. Father Kenney, Rabbi Penner, distinguished guests, members of the federation, and friends of the handicapped, tonight we are here to devise, if possible, ways and means to improve the conditions of our handicapped citizens and to insure them opportunity for decent employment in the face of a looming crisis.

During the war years millions of disabled proved, beyond shadow of doubt, that, given a fair opportunity, they could hold up their end. In action on the home front they showed themselves (1) loyal to the job; (2) had less absenteeism than nonhandicapped; (3) production on par with, and in some instances exceeding, nonhandicapped; and (4) being already disabled, they were careful, and therefore had less injuries than their nonhandicapped brethren.

Despite that brilliant record of achievement, what is the picture today? From all across the country we learn that the handicapped, once more, are being shunted into the oblivion from whence they came. Part of this is due to deplacement of workers by returning veterans—disabled and nondisabled. Part of it is due, we believe, to the fact that industry feels insufficient obligation to the handicapped and takes the attitude, "Why continue to employ disabled, when there is, or soon will be, a plethora of nonhandicapped?"

Whatever the reasons may be, the picture today is dark. On one hand, we have approximately 150,000 disabled veterans whose applications are on file in the various State employment offices. We have, in addition, approximately 2,500,000 civilian handicapped presently unemployed.

Of the estimated 28,000,000 handicapped in the United States, likely some 5,000,000 to 7,000,000 could be employed, although some of these would require preliminary treatment and training.

We cite also the increasing relief loads in all States as a further indication of the downward trend of employment. In the June report of the American Public Welfare Association, it is stated that "General relief case loads are going up fast," the most recent figures showing an approximate increase of 100,000 cases over that of a similar period in 1946.

When this federation was formed in 1942, in the light of experience following World War I, we foresaw, in part at least, the present situation. We hammered away upon the necessity of all public agencies instituting long-range programs designed primarily to take up the slack at the war's end.

We called upon Congress to plan and execute programs for the handicapped that would provide a barrier against future disasters. Although much sympathy has been shown to this idea, as yet nothing has developed. It may be said in passing, that we have at all times insisted upon a full employment program, because we know, from bitter experience, that the place of the handicapped in the economic scheme today is as follows:

1. The disabled veteran, as is just and proper, has first call upon jobs.
2. The nondisabled veteran, reintegrating himself into civilian life, is next.
3. The nondisabled civilian is next.
4. The handicapped are last!

The only out for them, then, is a cycle of full employment of all workers.

We have consistently demanded that the handicapped have a seat at the table when the steak and potatoes are being passed around, and emphasis has been laid repeatedly upon the necessity of all agencies, public and private, devising programs to bring about that happy consummation.

In my opinion, there are still too many people in high positions who are thinking in terms of the conditions which obtained during the War years, when everybody rushed to the Government and said, "Gimme help, Uncle, gimme help!" Today that situation is radically changed. Instead of people coming to Government, they are going away from Government. The transition must be marked and provision made to change our ways. Instead of sitting and waiting for people to come to us, we, instead, must go to them; and above all, we must sell a "handicapped program" to the general public. Without public support we cannot succeed, no matter how good our plan.

Among the speakers here tonight are representatives of public and private agencies and organizations, and I am sure that many of them have performed well on behalf of the handicapped. Yet, as I stand here and reflect, while I realize that they are, in many respects, prohibited from initiating action voluntarily, still I do not see why they cannot recommend programs which they believe essential to meet these changed conditions.

What, for example, are we going to do with the handicapped who came into Government service during the War, made excellent records, and today have little or no chance of continuing a Government career? Are we going to banish these people from the face of the earth entirely? Cannot the Civil Service Commission develop programs beneficial to them, where their services justify it?

What of the skilled and unskilled workers in industry—and there are millions of them—who are now forced to retire involuntarily? Are we going through the same dreary cycle of defeat and misery that we experienced from 1929 to 1933, or are we going to plan, and execute boldly and fairly, to see that our own citizens get a break?

What of the disabled veteran? Is it not true that, even now, we begin to note the same situation which developed following World War I when, after the paraders stopped marching and the bands stopped playing, the public soon forgot their plight and they were "pushed around" and in all too many instances, in the days not long after, became apple sellers?

These things, my friends, are major problems. We cannot shrug them off. We cannot take the smug attitude, "I am not my brother's keeper." I say to you if we do not find a way to provide a decent means of living for the handicapped, let us do what Hitler did: Start a Euthanasia League and wipe them all out at one time! By so doing, undoubtedly we would please those "economy-minded" who object to spending money to aid their fellow citizens in necessary ways.

The way, in my judgment, to stop "wasting" money, is to provide a real program for all disabled. Let us recognize facts for what they are. If we are to shove the handicapped out of jobs, we shall have to maintain them on relief, and that, we know, is expensive and unsatisfactory, from every angle.

There is but one answer: Establish a program wherein the handicapped are treated, trained, given vocational guidance and placement in suitable employment. That is the program of this federation, and we shall keep shooting for it.

Now, however, we address ourselves to the specific question of how best to promote immediate employment for handicapped. As is generally known, this federation authored and sponsored "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week," which has proven a great success. In 1945, the first year of its observance, 13,439 handicapped were placed through USES offices, of whom 8,141 were disabled veterans. In 1946, 29,439 handicapped were placed through USES offices, of whom 19,200 were disabled veterans.

This year we hope to increase the number of placements materially, both military and civilian, and the speakers who follow me will outline briefly the plans of their agencies and organizations to effectuate that.

I am sure that you will be greatly interested in their presentations and I am glad to present to you Mr. Oliver Kincannon, director of information, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, who will explain the plans of that agency, which has done effective work in this field, and has greatly expanded its activities during the past 4 years. Mr. Kincannon. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER KINCANNON. Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I always get a great kick out of sitting down to a table with Paul Strachan. I get a great kick out of attending a meeting which he sponsors. I draw great inspiration from his enthusiasm, and it is a genuine pleasure for me to be here at his invitation tonight.

Paul is one of the outstanding advocates of universal employment of the handicapped that we have. He certainly needles us to do a good job, and I am quite certain that when we do an adequate job—and no one has yet done that—he will give us his applause and hearty approval.

The subject that we are assigned tonight is: How to get jobs for the handicapped. I wish I could answer it succinctly, finally. I cannot do that. I can tell you what we in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation are doing and I am sure that there are many abler speakers here tonight who will give you the plans of other agencies to promote the effectiveness of "employ the physically handicapped week" this year—and I hope we drop the "physically." I hope it is national employ the handicapped week.

We in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation feel that one of the greatest deterrents to full employment of the handicapped is a lack of appreciation on the part of the public of the extent of the problem, a lack of knowledge on the part of the handicapped of the services available to them, and a failure to realize, I assume, a lack of knowledge, on the part of employers as to the effectiveness of handicapped workers.

I cannot understand why there is such a lack of knowledge, because all of us know that our employers are pretty smart people, or they couldn't be employers. We know that the handicapped have established records which offer unassailable proof of their value, as Mr. Strachan has said, they are safer, they are more efficient, they reduce labor turnover—a great expense item to industry—and beyond that, they have a lower rate of absenteeism. These are four elements that are desirable in any employee, and our effort shall be, and should be, to impress upon the employer that it is not disability that counts; it is ability!

In that connection we have made efforts to inform employers, to impress them. We now have in circulation, and only recently in full circulation, a motion picture to which contributions of footage and actual employment scenes of a wide variety of handicapped persons were made—substantial contributions, I may say—by four of the greater industrial companies of this country who are among the most successful employers of the handicapped. Those contributors and those participants are the Ford Motor Co., with something over 11,000 handicapped employees; the Caterpillar Tractor Co., which has originated a community plan in Peoria that I think should be adopted everywhere (there is virtually no unemployed handicapped person in Peoria); the Western Electric Co., which utilizes innumerable handicapped persons in all of its plants throughout the country, and utilizes them intelligently; and lastly, the Bulova Watch Co., which has set up a splendid training plan, which I believe is primarily for returned veterans, and those, of course, who are rather limited in movement, but who have the dexterity to do the fine precision work that goes into watchmaking. We had great pleasure in viewing some of the operations of all of these companies.

We feel, also, that the public and the handicapped person should know about the services available and the need for the services which will render the handicapped person not only employable, but will put him on the job and not just a job, but the right job. In that connection we have issued a considerable number of publications which are receiving wide distribution throughout the country at present, but we are not content to stop there; we are going into every post office in the United States with posters explaining these services. We are finishing right now a series of 13 dramatized radio stories. They are success stories of the handicapped, and these transcriptions will be broadcast throughout the Nation over some 300 to 600 stations. We cannot guarantee in advance what the booking will be, but we know it will be at least 300 stations. We feel that we will help to break down the barrier which consists largely of a lack of information. We do not feel that the people of this country have any animus toward those who are not perfect. We know that none of us are perfect.

In addition to that we are trying steadily to rally the support and the participation in the program of vocational rehabilitation of all agencies and groups and professions which can render material assistance in repairing the disabilities and in fitting the handicapped for employment. As one example of that, last week at the American Medical Association's Centennial Convention in Atlantic City, our consultant on orthopedics conducted a most widely attended demonstration of amputation prothesis and development. At the same time we introduced a booklet, which is addressed to doctors only, and through the cooperation of the American Medical Association that booklet is being mailed this week to every member of the American Medical Association. We feel that doctors, above all, should understand what services are available.

We have worked and are working closely with the American Federation of Labor to the point where we are distributing their material and they are distributing ours, and we hope soon to effect a similar working arrangement with the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

In addition, we are producing special little booklets that are addressed to particular groups. Some of you may possibly be familiar with "Opportunities for the Deaf and the Hard of Hearing." Some of you will become familiar with our forthcoming tuberculosis booklet, and the amputation booklets that we have put out. We feel that while none of these things in itself will cure any ill that exists, all will contribute to the effort that is being made by all of us—by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, by Paul Strachan, by the United States Employment Service, by the Veterans' Administration, by B'nai B'rith, by all of the many organizations that are now attacking this problem. We feel that we will eventually remove the lack of information which constitutes such a barrier to success.

Our feeling, in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, is this: that the best way to get jobs for the handicapped is to make every handicapped man or woman who is placed in a position, a salesman for every other handicapped man or woman. We do not think it is good business to place a man without a medical examination on a job that apparently he can handle, only to have him die of heart failure. We do not feel that it is good business to put an amputee on a job, only to have him break down with tuberculosis. We feel that he should be prepared and fitted, physically, mentally, and by training, for a specific job within his capacities—the right job for him, the job that will make his employer say, "Come on boys, send me more like this fellow." That is one of the best ways. It is a slow process. However, we are making progress.

At the moment there are in process of vocational rehabilitation throughout the country, in the State agencies which operate the Federal-State system, more than 100,000 persons. They are receiving the vocational rehabilitation services which will equip them for and place them on the right job. I had occasion today to write a little item that included this statement: If we can wipe out the backlog of 1,500,000 persons known to be physically or mentally handicapped and in need of vocational rehabilitation services, and if they are as successful as those whom we have rehabilitated, we will add $2,000,000,000 a year to this Nation's productive wealth.

The cost of rehabilitating a disabled man or woman, on an average over the years, has been around $300. It costs more, much more than that, generally twice, to keep that person in dependency. That cost in dependency goes on year after year. The cost of rehabilitation is a one-time cost, and in many cases the rehabilitated person pays back to his Government in income taxes within the first year of his rehabilitation more money than was spent upon his rehabilitation.

We maintain that it is good business, sound business, to rehabilitate the handicapped, and we maintain that it is not good business, as well as not good citizenship, not good humanitarianism, not to rehabilitate the handicapped.

I would just like to run over the services that are provided under the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation. These consist of a medical diagnosis, in every case; of any necessary medical, surgical, psychiatric or hospital care; counsel and guidance so that the man or woman may select the right job; of training so that he may learn to do the right job well; of placement on the right job; and then of follow-up, to make sure that he is making the necessary adjustment, to make sure that the rehabilitated person is making good.

I would like to give you one or two very brief statistics on how the program is operating. I know that it is not as widespread as it should be, with only 100,000 persons now in process of rehabilitation. However, it is growing; the services are increasing.

We have more than eight States this year which, in the first three quarters of the year surpassed the total year's record of the 1946 fiscal year. We have 17 other States which came very close to equaling that record within the first three quarters of the year.

I would like to point out also the progress being made in giving services—I mean real rehabilitation services, services that will put these people on their feet permanently—and I would like to cite these figures. Hospitalization and similar care last year increased 103 percent over the preceding year. This year, at the end of three quarters of the year, it is at 118.7 percent of last year's index. Medical and surgical care and treatment—92.3 percent increase last year. Already in the first three quarters we are at the rate of 135 percent. In prosthetic appliances there has been an increase within the first three quarters over the full last year, of 9.28 percent. Auxiliary services, such as training, supplies, etc., have increased also.

Training has continued on an even keel; and diagnostic examinations, which increased last year by 40 percent, have increased within the first three quarters of this year, over all of last year, by more than 8 percent.

I think you will see from that that you do have a system of State organizations, affiliated under the congressional enactment known as Public Law 113, into a system that is producing results; that is growing, and we hope to put better than 40,000 people in jobs during this year; jobs on which they will remain, and jobs on which they will succeed, and jobs on which they will act as salesmen for all the other handicapped.

I thank you. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. Thank you very much, Oliver. I am glad to have that information. I want especially to emphasize this: That it costs more to maintain the handicapped in a status of dependency than it does to rehabilitate and put them to work.

Now we have a visitor from across the sea. This lady has been visiting the United States for the past few weeks, studying conditions relating to the handicapped. I am very pleased to introduce to you Miss Birgit Busck, Social Curator for Disabled Persons, Provincial Government Employment Service, Halmstad, Sweden. Miss Busck! [Applause.]

Miss BIRGIT BUSCK. Please excuse me, as I am not proficient with your language.

I am very glad to have this opportunity to bring you many, many kind regards from the World Association for the Handicapped in Sweden.

During the war the state employment service in Sweden had many special tasks which we do not have in peacetime. Even at an early stage of the war it was recognized in Sweden that it was our duty to help the distressed in Europe as much as possible. Mention may be made of the relief work of a more special character which has been and is still being carried on since the war ceased, to alleviate want and disease, and of the help to refugees afforded in the country itself.

For a long period during the war Sweden gave shelter to more than 200,000 refugees, and still we have about 100,000. For these displaced and disabled persons, the employment service arranged for homes and engaged social curators to help them with their special problems, to help them find their relatives, and so forth. We arranged training for them and tried to give them good jobs.

We are also very thankful to them that they were a good help to us in the labor market. Each person has received through the employment services the kinds of clothing they needed. We have still in the main offices several employees who are working only for the disabled and displaced persons. So much for the wartime.

It is my task to organize in one of the 24 provinces in Sweden the security and the placement for all kinds of handicapped persons; also, sometimes, for the old people, according to the need.

Here I want to say a few words about our plan for old people. We would never refer to an old person as being indigent. Help to our people is not given in the form of relief. That kind of giving would hurt their pride. In our country everyone has a pension, regardless of how rich or poor. If Mr. Rockefeller were in Sweden, he would get $300 a year, after reaching 67 years of age. All people of that age feel entitled to a pension because it comes from public taxes.

From the time we are 18, we begin paying 1 percent of our income to this fund. That $300 does a lot more in Sweden than it would do here. It is only a part of what the aged without private income may get. We give what we call a supplement, and even that is not regarded as relief. Sweden does not want her old people to feel dependent. We want that they should have an agreeable life in their last years.

They may earn money if they wish. If they can be on duty only a few hours a day, we try to give them good jobs. We need all the labor we can get. In spite of that, we now have a high market condition.

We have many, many problems with our handicapped, and therefore I suddenly decided to come over to America to see what you do with your problems, and I am very impressed. I find your plan for rehabilitation marvelous. I wish we had one like it in Sweden. I hope we may get it soon. There are several things I have paid special attention to, namely, the blind home teacher. The "talking books" we know well, but we haven't it yet. I have seen the films about the handicapped and have bought one about tuberculosis and one about the blind. Also, I have noticed that you have so many propaganda pamphlets, and I find the Handicapped Week and the radio programs a very good idea.

I have received so much kindness here and I have had so much valuable help from Mr. Banta, Mr. Strachan, and many, many others, that I cannot explain to you how thankful I am. Now I only hope that you will come over to Sweden and that I may take care of you with the same kindness that I have received here. I bid you welcome to Sweden. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. I feel old age stealing swiftly upon me and I would like to know the schedule of the next boat to Sweden! If there is anything on earth for working people, everything we know of the Scandinavian countries certainly points to the fact that they know their stuff, and we should do all we can to follow in their footsteps. I thank you very much, Miss Busck. I am sure we all enjoyed it.

All of you have heard from time to time of miracle men. All of you have been told about Superman, who does tremendous jobs, who performs miracles, as it were, but, outside of the funny papers I daresay few of us have seen such an individual in real life. I have often tried to conjecture in my mind what a man would look like, who had engineered the deal that brought about the consummation of 13,000,000 jobs. I want to repeat that; that is an awful lot of jobs—13,000,000 jobs! I had sort of pictured an individual 11 feet tall, 7 feet wide, and wherever he walked, the sidewalk cracked, and I confess that, in a way, I was somewhat disappointed when I met the gentleman in person. It is true he is a pretty big guy; he could lick me with one hand tied behind him; but, in all seriousness, he has done, and his agency has done, during the war years, and what is left of it now, a superlative job. They have been kicked from pillar to post; they have been caught between two fires—the wildcats on one side who say, "You are not going far enough" (and I am one of them) and the conservatives on the other side, who damn them for spending public moneys to get people jobs. They say, "Why, anybody can find a job. There are lots of jobs."

However, I am not going to attempt tonight to steal his thunder or tell his story. He must tell it in his own way. But, before I introduce him, I want to say that up to the end of May 1947, the United States Employment Service had been responsible for the placement of 1,339,636 handicapped; and, ladies and gentlemen, in these past five and a half years, I submit that is one hell of a job! I ask all of you to stand up in recognition of that superlative effort. Let's rise and give Robert Goodwin and the United States Employment Service a hand. [The audience arose and applauded.]

Mr. ROBERT C. GOODWIN. Thank you very much, Paul. I have had many introductions in my life, but I think this one is not only one of the very best but it is the only one where I didn't know I was coming on until he got to the last sentence.

Paul Strachan said in his opening remarks that during the war the handicapped proved they were worth their hire. It seems to me that is one of the most important things for us to keep in mind. Certainly, in the part that we have been privileged to play in the last few years in this handicapped program, and particularly the National Employ the Handicapped Week each October, keeping that phrase in mind has been, in my estimation, a godsend to the program and has given it the impetus which has put it over in a way that has really paid some dividends.

Charity certainly is one of the greatest Christian virtues on which we have made tremendous progress in our civilization, but, unfortunately, it is not a basic principle on which business enterprises are operated, and we have suffered in the past from attempts to sell the services of the handicapped too much on the basis of a charity appeal.

I like particularly the motto that we adopted last year for National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week: "It Pays To Hire the Handicapped!" We in the Employment Service feel that we have made real progress going forward with that motto. It is, of course, based upon a knowledge that if you get the right kind of a job that the handicapped person can do, without any interference, where his handicap is not in effect a handicap, that that person can do as good, and frequently a better, job.

I just want to say a few things about steps we have taken in the United States Employment Service in our attempt to do our part of the job. We went along for a good many years in the Employment Service on the theory that it weakened the system if you went very far in specialization. Then we got into some of our emergency situations, one of them back in the depression years when the pressure on the local office was unemployment compensation, and we saw what happened there. We saw that, under pressure, with large groups of people waiting at the office, all the people in the office tend to be thrown into whatever the pressure job is. First, it was unemployment-compensation-claims taking; next, it came on the placement of people in war work.

So, after we studied this problem, we concluded that it would be necessary, if we were going to get results in this handicapped program, to have specialization, and most important, to protect those specialized people from being dragged off into other work. So, we set up, organizationally, protection for that group. Unfortunately, we have far too few people who are trained to do this job as yet. We have made great progress, I think, but we have a great way to go, so that we are looking forward to working with Paul Strachan and his group, and working, as a matter of fact, with any group that is interested enough to contribute to this program, because we regard it as one of the greatest challenges we have in this country.

Some of the countries, as you know, have found it necessary to pass mandatory legislation to handle this problem. Unfortunately, from an official point of view, it is

only within recent years that we have even given it special emphasis, and I do not know of any problem that needs special emphasis, not only from Government groups but from private groups interested in it—I do not know of any problem that needs more specialization and more attention, because it is a tough job. The educational job that needs to be done with employers and the public, if for no other reason than to get over this one point I started with, that the physically handicapped person is worth his hire, is tremendous. If we can get that over widely enough, we can go much, much further to lick this job.

So it is with the anticipation of getting more help from you and the other people interested in that problem that we are looking forward to playing our part this year in the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, so that we can carry the efforts and the results of the United States Employment Service to greater heights than we have ever before done. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. As I say, I am willing to take a vote of trust from Bob. He has made a lot of pledges here tonight, and we will hold him to every one of them. We want more jobs for the handicapped.

It is a pleasure to introduce old friends, and I have known this man since 1933, when I had the pleasure of meeting a gentleman who has been, paradoxically enough, one of the ones in Washington in high position, with whom I have been continually rowing. But, he took it as a Christian gentleman should. He realized that it was all part of the game, and certainly I regard him today as one of the real friends of the handicapped, and one who, up to the limits of his authority, would see to it that they had every possible break. I prefer to look upon this gentleman not as the administrator of a great Federal agency, but as a good American, who is our friend—the Honorable Harry B. Mitchell, President of the United States Civil Service Commission. Harry! [Applause.]

The Honorable HARRY B. MITCHELL. Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: When Paul Strachan called the other day and said he wanted me to come down and talk to this meeting about what the Civil Service Commission is doing for handicapped persons I tried to tell him that there was another man in the Commission who was much more familiar with the work than I was, who could give the details much better than I could, but he insisted that I come, and as I have known Paul Strachan ever since I have been in Washington, and am a great admirer of the work he has been doing for handicapped persons, I said, of course if that was what he wanted, I would come.

I am glad I am here tonight. I am glad I can get into personal contact with the work he is doing, and that his organization is doing, and with the persons who are interested or who are being benefited by that work.

To present the work of the Civil Service Commission in this field and to describe what it has done, it is necessary to give you a good many details and figures, which I have written out with the assistance of the man who knows more about it than any other, the head of our medical division, who is heart and soul in favor of this work. I asked him to give me some of the data, which I am going to read to you, as to what the Civil Service Commission has been doing.

Allow me to congratulate your organization on the good work that it is doing for the physically handicapped persons who are in need of employment, and to commend that work to others who are interested in these persons, as all good citizens should be.

Therefore, I am glad of the opportunity to tell you how much the Civil Service Commission is interested, with you, in the work you are doing, and to give you an idea of our efforts to stimulate the employment of those persons with physical impairments. Since we are the central personnel agency in the Federal Government, it is only fitting that we give serious thought to the judicious placement of these individuals.

Some of us in the Commission have urged for a considerable time that greater consideration be given to physically handicapped persons, as we felt that we were too stringent in the past. Shortly before our entrance into World War II, we were fortunate, in connection with this problem, in obtaining the services of Dr. Harvey as the head of our Medical Division. He not only was willing but anxious to consider the possibilities of giving greater opportunities for persons who were not in a perfect physical condition, but he has given a great deal of time and thought to the problem. The opportunity for the employment of handicapped persons was increased after we entered the war because of the heavy demand on personnel for the armed services and for the industrial production necessary because of the war. That gave a stronger opportunity to urge that there were thousands of persons with adequate training and with experience who could well qualify for Federal employment, if we could but lower the physical requirements of many types of positions.

What the Commission did to bring thousands of physically impaired workers into its employment is now history, but I am of the opinion that you would like to have some of the facts of our accomplishments, as well as some thought of future plans in this direction. From October 1943, when we began to maintain records of placements of the physically impaired, to April 30, 1947, there were 87,679 persons having permanent disabilities who were selectively placed in field establishments of the Government. Figures on placements made of such persons in the departmental service were not recorded, but these would add thousands more to the total. In these figures we do not include the placement of individuals with disabilities which were correctible through medical treatment or surgery.

It is admitted there was a time when a physically impaired person had little opportunity of obtaining employment in the Federal service. That time has passed. In order that we would have first-hand information regarding the physical fitness necessary properly to perform the duties of Government positions, the Commission instructed its medical officers to conduct job surveys on a continuing basis. To date, over 6,000 such job surveys, representing many thousands of jobs, have been completed. The results of this undertaking are published in a booklet entitled "A Guide for the Placement of the Physically Impaired." It may be of interest to you to know some of the findings of this job study. For example, we learned that, of the six thousand-and-some jobs, 875 were suitable for persons with the amputation of one hand; 2,576 were suitable for persons with the loss of one leg; and at least 81 jobs could be filled by persons having double leg amputations. The study further revealed that persons blind in one eye could perform the duties of 1,889 positions, and that 3,867 jobs held opportunity for the hard of hearing; and so on, for other physical impairments such as heart conditions, tuberculosis, and various orthopedic defects.

It is not enough to look at a job, analyze the functional capacities required, and decide that a person with this or that impairment could handle the duties efficiently. In order to see how well we had used the information secured by the job surveys, our medical officers were instructed to go back to the establishments previously surveyed and study the actual performance of physically impaired workers who had been placed as a result of the first survey. I will not go into the technical considerations that entered into this second type survey, but it will suffice to say that it was a scientifically conducted study, utilizing groups of unimpaired workers as controls. We found that the productivity of the disabled compared favorably with that of the able-bodied, both in quantity and quality. A much lower rate of turn-over was found among the physically impaired. The percentage of the physically impaired receiving special consideration with regard to transportation, lunch and rest periods, hours of work, special equipment, or in time of reporting, has been low. We also learned that the physically impaired experienced fewer severe accidents than the able-bodied worker.

As a result of these surveys, the Commission has positive proof that there are very few jobs which require a worker to use all of his abilities and faculties. We also know that most disabled persons have more ability than disability. Let me remind you that the Commission's information on job performance of the physically impaired is not based on the performance of clerical help alone. On the contrary, thousands have found suitable employment as drill press operators, mechanics, carpenters, laboratory technicians, draftsmen, electricians, truck drivers, and many other classifications which are found in the Government shipyards, gun factories, air fields, hospitals, and other installations. The fact that these handicapped individuals found gainful and suitable Federal employment attests to the success of the Commission's program of selective placement. And by selective placement I mean the deliberate and thoughtful employment of disabled persons in jobs in which the work demands do not exceed the individual's physical capacity.

It has occurred to me that many of you wonder why we at the Commission are so concerned in the physical requirements of various jobs. Many people in Government, and perhaps a majority of those on the outside, are under the impression that the primary concern of the Commission is the giving of examinations to applicants for Federal employment, ranking the names of those who passed the examination on a register, and furnishing those names to appointing officers to fill vacancies in the service. It is true that this is one of the Commission's biggest responsibilities, but in addition, the Commission is also charged with the responsibility of establishing the physical standards for all positions in the competitive service. In order that the standards established by the Commission may be realistic and that no person otherwise qualified is denied employment because he is lacking in some particular physical capacity which may not be necessary in the performance of the duties in that particular position, the Commission is determined to secure sufficient information concerning these jobs to enable it to establish standards which will reflect the minimum physical capacity required of the employee in performing the duties of the position.

Announcements of examinations held by the Civil Service Commission contain a section in which the physical abilities required for the job are outlined. During the war, when special emphasis was placed on the utilization of handicapped persons to help meet critical employment needs, the physical requirements were modified somewhat in those instances in which such modifications did not lead to the creation of an employment hazard.

It is now the Commission's policy to make the physical requirements as flexible as possible in all positions. The physical-ability paragraphs which appear in each examination announcement are individually tailored by the Commission's medical staff to fit the position. The paragraphs explain the physical abilities or faculties which are necessary to perform efficiently and safely the duties of the position without hazard to the employee or to others. The requirements which appear in these paragraphs are based

on the results of the job surveys which were conducted by the medical officers.

When an individual files an application for an examination, he is asked to state briefly any physical defect or disability he may have. The Commission communicates with those applicants who report defects or disabilities, to get full information about a physical impairment likely to limit efficient and safe performance on the job; the Commission's medical officer then passes upon the fitness of the candidate on the basis of a physical examination given by a Federal medical officer or by a private physician specifically designated to give such examinations. By comparing the resulting report of examination and the examiner's recommendations with the analysis of the job involved, the Commission is able to decide whether the person with the impairment can properly perform the duties of the position he desires. The appointing officer to whom the eligible's name is sent for consideration in filling a vacancy then knows that the individual referred to him by the Commission is qualified for the job. He is to be thought of as an efficient worker—not as a "problem," nor as a "special."

The Civil Service Commission looks upon the employment of handicapped persons as a continuing obligation, and not a temporary program designed solely to meet an emergency situation. Although the shortage of able-bodied workers is over, we are determined not to relent in our efforts to make as certain as possible that physically impaired applicants are not prevented from participating in the Government's work. We will not disregard the valuable experience gained in our program for the placement of these people. On the other hand, we will continue our policy of promoting the judicious and effective utilization of the physically handicapped in the Federal service in positions where they may function efficiently and without hazard to themselves, their fellow workers, or others; we will continue the study of physical requirements of jobs, and emphasis will be placed on close working relationships with rehabilitation agencies to insure adequate preemployment considerations and reassignment procedures.

Paul spoke a few minutes ago about the unemployment of handicapped persons owing to the reduction in force. So far as the disabled veterans are concerned, that is not very much of a problem. Under the law, they have a very decided advantage over others, and the chances are that nearly all of those will find positions, and those who are now in the Federal service will be continued in the Federal service. I admit that in the case of others, without a civil service status, there is a possibility of their being liquidated; there will be more difficulty in continuing them in the present jobs or finding jobs for them. However, I can assure you that the Commission is determined to do everything possible to continue the program that has been started and to extend that program so that every possible handicapped person who takes a job in the Federal Government shall be employed. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. I am very glad to have Mr. Mitchell present that progressive attitude on the part of the Commission, which is bound to result in more jobs for the handicapped. We know that with five to seven millions to be thrown upon the labor market, it will be disastrous if public apathy is allowed to grow, in relation to this problem. I hope that the survey will determine that lowering physical standards will not, by any means, lower mental or capacity standards. I thank you very much, Harry.

I am going to call upon Dr. Gilbert MacVaugh, who is representing Mr. Millard Rice, of the Disabled American Veterans.

Dr. GILBERT T. MACVAUGH. Paul and friends, I came in late, intentionally, so that possibly I might avoid this very fine opportunity of speaking.

The DAV has been with this program for a number of years—with it, because of its definition of its immediate interest, inasmuch as it is concerned specifically with disabled veterans.

I suppose no two other individuals have been more responsible for the formation of the general concept behind National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week than have Millard Rice and Paul Strachan, so I think those two people, in addition to all the many other fine minds that have gone into the development of this "Week," should be accorded the highest possible honor and respect, because National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week is the time when all of the concentrated thought of people interested in this problem comes to the surface in a highly crystallized manner. It is at that time that the employers of the country, more than any other time, are called into a thoughtful attitude to consider the plight of the unemployed persons.

No other single individual outside of an employer can supply jobs. Sometimes we lose sight of that very important axiom. If an employer is the only man who can supply a job, obviously programs must be focused on the employer; his attitude, on him, as a personality. If we find that it is necessary to focus our attention on the employer, obviously we want to know something about employers as a group, and the employer as an individual. One of the things which we have found about employers, and about the attitudes of people in regard to employers, is this: namely, a lot of people feel that employers resist the employment of the physically handicapped. Few people will gainsay that statement. That is true; psychologically, sociologically, economically, it is true. There is a basic resistance to the hiring of handicapped people, and we must face that fact.

What do we do about it? We begin to think of a number of programs. In order to launch the programs, we want to have good reasons for launching these programs. One of the reasons why we launch programs is composed of five main points which you have heard many, many times, and I shall not reiterate for you. But one of the basic reasons behind the necessity for our gathering here is the fundamental psychology of this resistance of employers to hiring disabled veterans.

What do we find in our thinking and in our research which contributes to a better understanding of this resistance? If I may digress for just a minute, let me take you back in our thinking to the period of the cave man society. In that period we find that in the combat of one tribe or clan with another, in many cases an individual was injured. Upon his being injured, he is no longer a protector of the tribe or clan, neither is he a producer of food, and so any individual of the tribe or clan who is no longer a protector of the group, nor a producer of food, is, in that society, actually useless, and so it was the custom to do away with disabled persons. They were done away with. It became a ceremony to do away with handicapped individuals. It was an honor to have been done away with. Nevertheless, individuals who were handicapped were disposed of.

And so we see here in the dawn of man's history the beginning of this subtle subconscious resistance to the handicapped individual.

Bringing our thinking a little closer to our own time, we come up to the periods of Grecian and Roman slavery, in which society 1 out of every 10 individuals was a freeman and the other 9 were slaves. As a result, we find a tendency to isolate individuals who were handicapped economically, to isolate individuals who were handicapped socially. They were put in a group by themselves.

This is not unusual today. We find the same thing. Psychologically, our hospitals are a manifestation of this broad social piece of behavior. We isolate sick people in hospitals. Why don't we keep them in our homes? We used to. But today we are becoming sufficiently aware of the modern contributions of science to take advantage of this tendency on the part of mankind to isolate its handicapped individuals and put them in a place where they can get a special kind of treatment. Nevertheless, this is the social movement of mankind to put handicapped individuals in a group by themselves.

Coming up through the period of the guild system, there we find that an individual who could not do a whole job was not permitted to enter the guild system, or a particular guild. A man had to be a whole man in order to do a whole job. The Shoemakers' Guild required a perfect man to do the job. Handicapped individuals were not permitted in the guilds. The Housebuilding Guild had only whole men in it, total workers; only nonhandicapped workers were allowed in the guild. And so always from the dawn of time up through the periods of slavery, the guild system, we find there is a very definite and obvious resistance to handicapped or disabled people.

Bringing it up closer to us, to the dawn of our own mass-production era, which began about the dawn of the twentieth century, we find that individuals who were not whole individuals were just not taken into the mass system of production. Finally, we learned that specialization of labor was the key to success of the mass-production method, and it dawned on people then, that even though an individual was handicapped in part the remaining part of his body was useful; and thus we developed the concept of specialization of labor. And so gradually we began to match the remaining abilities of a man with the requirements of the job.

You say these concepts are not too important? Probably they are not, but they are basic in our thinking and they lead us to this one point, that even from the dawn of man's thinking, we have had a resistance which is ingrained in all of us, toward the handicapped individual. All of you who have walked down a public street have noticed a charming young lady with one limb beautifully shaped and the other withered by infantile paralysis, or what not. There is not a single one of you here who, upon looking at that individual, hasn't had chills run up and down your spine. You just felt differently toward that individual. Why? Because of this cultural heritage in all of us; the tendency in all of us to separate ourselves from those people who are handicapped or disabled in some way. It isn't something which we learn; it isn't a learned behavior pattern. We don't get these little shivers because of something we were taught in the cradle or early childhood by our parents. This is something which is just as natural to us as it is for the mother to develop milk for her suckling baby. She didn't learn to do that; it just developed within her.

So we come to this very important point, namely, that society today, and all of us interested in this major problem, must not condemn employers because of their unconscious resistance to the hiring of disabled people, because this is a subconscious act on their part. They ought to be indicted after they have once heard the story of the worthwhileness of disabled people, but our initial contacts cannot justifiably allow us to regard the employer as one who is consciously resisting the hiring of individuals. He is not. Employers are subconsciously resisting the hiring of disabled people.

I have a note here that there are many other better speakers than I am, so I am

going to abbreviate it by stating this one point: For a long time, probably a year and a half or two years, the DAV has been specifically interested in the problem of getting jobs for disabled veterans. We found, in asking ourselves why there are so many unemployed disabled veterans, that we must learn the reasons why they are unemployed, and so today, with the cooperation of the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Employment Service, and the Veterans' Administration, there is now an effort fairly well organized on a local level which sometime in the near future we hope will spread to a national scale, which will give us the reasons why there are so many unemployed disabled veterans. When we arrive at a crystallization of these reasons, we will then be able to attack the problems which we have discovered, which are the real reasons why so many unemployed disabled veterans are being frustrated in seeking jobs. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. It becomes necessary for Representative MADDEN to leave early, so I am going to make my introduction very short. Here we have a real fighter for the underdog; the type of leadership so essential in Congress, to advance and protect our interests. In having him here tonight, I feel we have a very high type of Representative, and I say that advisedly, on the strength of his record. Here is a friend of the underprivileged, and of working people generally, RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana. [Applause.]

Representative RAY J. MADDEN. Paul, distinguished guests, and friends: I am certainly thankful, Paul, for this invitation here this evening. I have learned a great deal. I was very much interested in the talk that Mr. Mitchell made, and some of the statistics he quoted. About a week ago I talked to Paul in regard to this great work that he is interested in; that you are interested in. In fact, back over 15 years ago I happened to be county treasurer out in my county in Indiana, and we had, I think, during the tax season, between 40 and 50, 55, and 60 employees, and we made it a point to have a certain percentage of those employees from the ranks of the physically handicapped.

I wish to make this statement: Members of Congress do not realize the importance of having a concrete program formulated on the part of the Government, in order to aid and assist in bringing employment to the physically handicapped, and it is only through organizations similar to this, and through the veterans' and labor organizations, that the attention not only of the employer but of the rank and file of the American people, can be called to the necessity of making a special effort to provide aid and employment to the physically handicapped.

I am optimistic, and I believe that the Congress will provide the proper set-up—and I would advocate a department in the Government in order to devote complete attention to the aid of the twenty-odd million physically handicapped throughout this country. I do not know of any better investment our Government could make.

A couple of weeks ago a friend of mine from Gary, Ind.—Maynard Montgomery—who is a World War I veteran and had been connected with the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co. in Pittsburgh in the last 3 years, told me a separate department that Carnegie-Illinois—a part of United States Steel—has created in order to provide employment for the physically handicapped, and especially the veteran returning from World War II. I forget the exact figures, but I think he told me that there were around 2,000 physically handicapped that he has placed in positions with the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co. in the short time that he has been at the head of that department.

Every employer, both large and small, should have his attention called to what a magnificent and a worth-while job can be done, if their minds can only be concentrated along those lines.

I want to say this. I am sorry that I had a previous appointment for 10 o'clock this evening. I would like to stay until the meeting is completed, but I have had this appointment for several days. I want to say this: That if at any time, Paul, any of your organization would request me to be of any service, as far as the Congress is concerned, in order to crystallize this much-needed program to the attention of the Congress, I wish you would call on me and I will be glad to cooperate in every way.

Before closing—I want to have the young lady continue with what I am going to say—I want to pay a tribute to the magnificent job she—Mrs. Claire Gibson—is doing this evening, in interpreting and transmitting these words to this gathering, because that is a distinguished art in itself, and she is certainly doing a great job. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. Thank you, Ray. Just one minute. Before he leaves, I am going to exercise my privilege as national president of this organization, to make him an honorary life member of AFPH. I want everybody to stand up on that. [The audience rose and applauded.]

Representative MADDEN. I want to thank you, and I certainly accept the nomination. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. Frankly, that is the kind of language that I like to hear. We are getting down to brass tacks now. We are getting down to bed-rock. The only solution to the handicapped problem is special services, and the only way there can be special service is under a special agency of the Government.

Frankly, I think we have heard from enough men for a while, and the next speaker is a very delightful lady who has shown her devotion to our cause; who is president of the District of Columbia Tuberculosis Association, and corresponding secretary of the Crippled Children's Society. She has shown a very great interest in what has been done, and what is being done, for old and young people. She took a very active part in last year's observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. I am very happy to introduce to you Mrs. C. D. Lowe. [Applause.]

Mrs. C. D. LOWE. I appreciate the invitation to appear on this program tonight, but at the same time I feel at a great disadvantage in appearing on the same program with people who are doing things and have specific examples of what they have done and what they can do in this Employ the Physically Handicapped movement.

I am just a lay worker. I have been called a "joiner" here in the District of Columbia, I belong to so many organizations, and I have been laughed at many times because I am always preaching an informed membership. I have always felt that unless we knew what we wanted, and knew how to go after it, we wouldn't accomplish anything; so that is where I feel I do fit into this picture, in belonging to many groups, that I can take back to them and try to make them understand the need.

It has been several years since I became interested in the physically handicapped. I have been working in the District Society for Crippled Children for several years, and when I saw what could be accomplished, I was amazed, and I found that those crippled children were just the same as any other people; they were not different. I used to be a little bit afraid of them, but now they are all friends, and it is the same in the Tuberculosis Association.

So I am really very glad to be a part of this, and I hope that I can spread the gospel among some of the women's organizations to which I belong. Too often we pass resolutions and that is about as far as it goes. I know from my own experience that many of us don't know, really, the needs, and if we were asked what is being done, we would say, "Well, everything is being taken care of," but I know, since I have been active in it, that it is not, and that we all have a big job, and I hope I can contribute something to it. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. Mrs. Lowe says she has been called a joiner. I only wish there were more joiners with the spirit and determination to serve the handicapped.

One of the great organizations which has always given attention to the disabled is the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and I am very glad to introduce to you their representative, Mr. Henry N. Hensley, who is the national employment director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Mr. Hensley. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY N. HENSLEY. Mr. President, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen: I just returned late last night from a trip out in Idaho and Wyoming, and while on this trip I was told that a good speech was one with a good beginning, a good ending, and very little in between; so for the 5 minutes that are allotted to me here this evening I have prepared today the "in-between," which I am now going to give to you.

The invitation to appear at this meeting sponsored by the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped and its able president, Mr. Paul Strachan, is gratifying to one who has seen the difficulties encountered and many times surmounted, by the physically handicapped of two world wars. We of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are, of course, primarily concerned with the problems of disabled veterans, but we note with interest and are in complete sympathy with the parallel efforts of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped in behalf of all disabled persons.

Anyone who examines our separate programs will inevitably be drawn to the one conclusion, that the terminal aims of our organizations are identical. Both are seeking to improve the economic and social security of physically handicapped persons. It is natural, therefore, that the approach to our common goal and our methods of procedure should be similar. Reliable figures recently published indicate that the disabled veteran is not obtaining his proportionate share of employment. Although I have no figures to back up my opinion, I feel sure that the same is true of all your physically handicapped. The reason behind this failure to place the physically handicapped is the tendency of the average employer, consciously or unconsciously, to picture a physically handicapped person as incapable of performing the duties of his average position. I am making no attempt to indict the employer who, through lack of knowledge, avoids hiring those persons he feels will be a liability to his business.

The average employer can hardly be expected to hire handicapped persons if he feels that such a hiring policy will result in financial loss, but if we are to succeed in our desire to place our handicapped in gainful employment, this misconception must be erased. The employer must be made to feel that he is not performing an act of charity in hiring the handicapped. We must stress that he is actually availing himself of a source of manpower usually equal to and often better than the average in selected positions.

We can compare our problem to that of the merchant selling goods which are overpriced. By that we do not mean to infer that the services of the physically handicapped are overpriced, but that both the merchants and our organizations are meeting buyer resistance. While the merchant can solve his problem by reducing prices, we must approach ours from a different angle. We must educate the employer and establish in his mind the quality and possible superiority of

the physically handicapped person in performing a job suited to his ability.

The VFW has already inaugurated such a program designed to seek, at the community level, the active cooperation of local employers and civic organizations. The two over-all objectives are to conduct a public education program at the community level, drawing the attention of industry and the public to the handicapped labor pool, and to mesh the functions of our post employment officers with the present existing facilities of Federal and State Employment Services. Until recently the Veterans Employment Service had a corps of field assistants whose chief duty it was to visit employers for the purpose of securing job orders for veterans. We were very sorry that the Congress saw fit to eliminate this program through the reduced appropriations, because we have felt all along that this was one means that we had to approach the employer with people who are qualified to sell the disabled veterans' employment program.

We expect to augment that service through some 9,000 employment officers. We are now developing the program and the program will now soon be in the hands of our employment officers in over some 9,000 posts, and we hope to supplant that service which has been eliminated by Congress.

Mr. Strachan, and members of the federation, I want at this time, in closing, to assure you of the full cooperation of our organization in the furtherance of your program, which is the employment of disabled persons. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. I am not at all worried about the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I know they will be in there pitching for the handicapped. They always have been.

I am now going to introduce to you the representative of a great organization which is deeply concerned, likewise, with rehabilitation and placement of the disabled. Here we have Mr. Ralph H. Lavers, director of the national employment committee of the American Legion, and I am sure you will be interested in what he has to say. Ralph! [Applause.]

Mr. RALPH H. LAVERS. Thank you, Paul. Mr. President, members of the AFPH, distinguished guests, and friends of the AFPH: I am indeed happy to be here tonight and to participate in this program, and to say to you that we of the American Legion are deeply concerned regarding the employment of the physically handicapped, whether or not they be veterans.

I think we expressed our opinion on that when, 2 years ago, we brought to you the pamphlet called The American Legion Program for Maximum Employment, wherein we tried to show to the public at large that it would be folly, in the economy of our Nation, or any other nation, to have one segment of our people employed while the other falters around to find some way to make a livelihood. We feel there is room enough and positions enough and job opportunities enough for everyone, whether they be physically handicapped or not.

Last year during Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, we brought out the picture, No Help Wanted. That film has been shown up to this time to over 7,500,000 people in the public theaters of our country, and is still being shown in playhouses throughout the Nation. Besides the 35 mm. version of that film, we have in circulation approximately 250 copies of the 16 mm. size. If you have not seen that film I urge you to do so.

I have one criticism of it, although I was one of the instigators in the writing of the script for it—and that is that it did not go deeply enough in showing the full line of disabilities that people suffer from.

This year the American Legion, in cooperation with your organization and others, hopes to initiate the presentation of a citation to one or two outstanding employers in every State who cooperate to the fullest extent and with sincerity in the employment of the physically handicapped throughout the year. We are not limiting that to the employment of veterans; we are limiting that to the employment of physically handicapped, regardless of what group they belong to. That project is not my dream; in no way is it the dream of the American Legion. I give full credit for that project to Mr. Vernon Banta of the United States Employment Service, who is the man who gave me that idea.

Tonight, when I came here, I did not come with the idea of making a speech, as I was advised I was to come to a meeting of a group to organize a plan for the Employ the Physically Handicapped Week of this year; and if I am in order, Mr. President, I should like to offer a resolution to this group, which is as follows:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, by enactment of Public Resolution 176 (1st sess., 79th Cong.), has established the first full week in October of each year to be observed as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; and

"Whereas, in accordance with custom, it is understood that the President of the United States will issue an appropriate proclamation, calling upon all citizens to properly observe said week; and

"Whereas a great many Federal and State agencies have an interest in, and responsibility for, serving the handicapped; and

"Whereas this meeting has been called for the purposes of stimulating public interest in employment of handicapped and planning for observance of said week: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this gathering of representatives of interested public and private agencies and individuals, recognizing the need for immediate action, go on record as favoring appointment by the President of the United States of an appropriate committee to coordinate the activities of the various Federal agencies dealing with this problem, so that their efforts shall result in the most effective observance possible of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week: And be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President, the press, and all other media of public information."

Mr. President, if I am in order, I move the adoption of this resolution.

(The motion was seconded by Mr. Anthony J. Oliver.)

President STRACHAN. You have all heard the resolution. It has been seconded. Is there any discussion? Any objection? I am going to ask for a rising vote, and I hope we will get up—everybody.

(The audience arose and the resolution was unanimously carried.) [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. That was a fine seventh-inning stretch, and I certainly appreciate Ralph's resolution. It is one of the best things that could happen, especially since today we have no coordinating agency among the 41 agencies of Government which are concerned with that work.

Mr. LAVERS. Thank you. In closing, I want to say I have indeed been interested in this meeting, and I trust I will be invited back again. I am deeply interested in the remarks of Bob Goodwin of the United States Employment Service, and of Mr. Mitchell, the President of the Civil Service Commission. I think it is only fair for me to say to you here now that our problem with the governmental agencies, in having the physically handicapped employed, does not lie in the laps of the Civil Service Commission, but lies in the appointing officers of the various governmental agencies. Thank you. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. In line with Brother Laver's suggestion, I want to announce that hereafter we shall hold a forum of this sort once every 3 months. We realize there must be continual fuel added to the flame, and we must keep the issue alive. We must not talk about it just once a year, but continually. We must hammer this thing home upon the consciousness of the Congress, the administration, and the public, and we must not take it for granted because what we say here tonight may form our point of view; be true, and be important, that anybody is going to pay any attention to us unless we keep on talking.

We are fortunate to have with us tonight one of the ablest executives of this area. His interest lies in the field of private industry, and he speaks for the employer group. After all, what he has to say will be of special interest to our people, and I am glad to present to you Mr. Dallas H. Smith, of the employment and security committee, Washington Board of Trade. Mr. Smith! [Applause.]

Mr. DALLAS H. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Strachan. Members of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, guests, ladies, and gentlemen: Any consideration of the topic which we have before us tonight is one which I think we must approach, at least in the few words that I have to say, from the point of view of the employer. That calls for a little reviewing of some past history which I hope will bring us up to date, at least insofar as a good many employers are concerned.

Employers as a group are pretty ignorant of the broad fundamentals of the utilization of the physically handicapped. It is true that during the war they were forced, as it were, to sacrifice the peacetime standards applying to the physical condition of employees, and hire most everyone. More often than not, there are no specific or well-defined employment conditions, but rather these conditions revolve around a desire for able-bodied workers who, by common opinion, are supposed to be the best workers.

The demands of war for able-bodied workers in our armed services left less perfect workers in our industry. These were utilized and were even enthusiastically welcomed by industry during this period; but with the coming of peace those prewar standards began to reassert themselves, despite the exhortations about the legal and moral obligations of employers and communities and the hue and cry about rehabilitation.

There has been a long-standing prejudice against the employment of the physically handicapped, and those opinions are returning, to the detriment of the employee, the employer, and society, particularly when the employer had difficulty with handicapped workers during the war period, through imperfect or improper placement. Actually, the knowledge gained during the war can prevent the military, civilian, and industrial cripple from ever becoming a problem, but only if all of us—all of us who at least begin to understand the problem—see that he is used properly.

Many employers during the war found that workers previously classified as unfit could work efficiently and effectively. From the war experience of many employers and the long-time experience of others, basic principles of selective placement that contribute so largely to the successful employment of the handicapped have been evolved. They must be made available to all employers, and the employer must be educated in their use.

Employment of disabled workers is neither ridiculously simple nor beyond the ability of the capable employment interviewer or employing executive. It should be accompanied, however, by a systematic plan rather than by rule-of-thumb or snap judgment. Physical handicaps vary from plant to plant and industry to industry. Those that are accepted in some organizations are quite different from those that are employed in others. What I mean to say is that the definition of a physically handicapped worker in one plant is quite different from that in another, due to the differences of opinion, the

differences of prejudice and the differences of experience of the individuals responsible for selection and placement.

Physical examinations disclose hidden disabilities and are used frequently by some firms. The use of the information developed in the physical examination, however, varies considerably from firm to firm. Only obvious impairments, where there are no physical examinations, rule in other firms.

The definition of a physical handicap that appears to me to be the most important from the employer's point of view is as follows: "A physical handicap is a difference possessed by some persons which, though limiting physically, need not limit vocationally." That is from the Peoria plan, which has been mentioned here earlier this evening, or, in other words, from the personnel man's point of view: One who requires selective job placement because of physical or mental requirements. This definition places the shoe on the other foot. Instead of emphasizing the disability, it emphasizes the job and the need for filling the job with individuals possessing certain worker characteristics.

There are only a relatively small percentage of the total employables in our population who are in a state of physical perfection. Actually, it is a matter of degree and not perfection. The line between normal and defective is quite elastic. It varies according to the judgment, the experience, the aptitude of the placement interviewer or the executive responsible for the selection of employees, and also, according to the job to be performed and the industry in which it is found.

In studies in the use of handicapped by over 2,000 industrial firms, 28 percent showed rejection for physical disabilities of less than 1 percent. Fifteen percent of these 2,000 employers rejected from 6 to 10 percent for this reason. Seven percent rejected from 11 to 50 percent because of physical impairments.

You can see how rejection of the physically handicapped is "all over the map." Of course, there are different standards for different industries, and there needs to be, but there should be a closer proximity to the over-all figures for a greater number of firms. Similar surveys have shown that hernia and hypertension, defective vision, and orthopedics are responsible for three-fourths of the rejections, and in these studies the total rejections ranged anywhere from 0.7 of 1 percent to as high as 16 percent.

It is estimated that there are around 800,000 persons who become permanently disabled from congenital defects, disease, and accident in this country, each year. Of these, 100,000 are caused by industrial accidents, despite educational programs and safety campaigns; 170,000 of these are incapacitated through accidents in the home. Seventy-five percent of these 800,000 disabled persons are able to return to some form of employment; one-fourth of the remainder are so seriously injured that they remain unemployable and another one-fourth are either over or under employable ages. The remainder, or approximately 110,000 individuals, are actually employable by rehabilitation.

The opportunity of the handicapped worker to demonstrate his ability is his biggest hurdle. Industry in the past, as has been so ably explained by a former speaker this evening, has been reluctant, as a whole, to accept the handicapped worker because, first of all, many have excessively high standards for employment; and secondly, because a number of employers labor under an erroneous impression that the handicapped is not as good a producer as the able-bodied worker, or that he has excessive accident proneness, or chronic absenteeism, or there is the fear that he will require constant and special treatment and sympathy. And last of all—and sometimes these may be excuses—there is the fear that there will be a repugnance on the part of fellow workers for handicapped workers in their midst. Some studies have indicated, however, that, when properly selected, trained, and placed, the handicapped worker is likely to equal or excel his able-bodied fellow worker.

I would like to make it clear that in endeavoring to present these few facts I am thinking primarily of what I believe should be the employer's approach and I am not "pulling punches" or attempting to "gild the lily," so to speak, because the employer deals in practical terms that he feels will bring certain results and it is in this manner that I think most of them can be reached. But when this worker is improperly placed, his production and safety suffer; so that our real problem is to make sure that we place the handicapped worker properly and not just select him indifferently for most any job, and if he fails, attribute that failure to his disability.

Other studies made among employers of handicapped workers who have done a good placement job indicate actually that there is less absenteeism, lower turnover, a smaller accident rate, and higher productivity. That is true of the majority of these employers. There is another relatively large group of employers in this study that indicate little or no difference between the handicapped worker and the able-bodied worker. There was a relatively very small percentage of employers in which this study was made, that indicated the reverse—that the handicapped worker was less desirable.

One of the things that has bothered industry considerably—one of the concepts that it constantly brought forward, is that it costs more to insure under workmen's compensation when an employer employs handicapped workers. That is not true unless it is a case of improperly placed workers, and in that instance accidents will result to the able-bodied as well as the handicapped, although naturally to a lesser extent. The rate for workmen's compensation is based upon the experience of the individual plant and of that industry; so what we must do is to convince all employers of the desirability of properly selecting, training and placing handicapped workers, and utilizing them to the best of their ability and we will find that it will tend to improve our experience rating rather than cost us more. This can only be done through constant education and information dissemination, not only to the employer group but to related groups and to the general public as well.

Because many employers are unable to supply themselves, we must provide them with the tools and the techniques to do this job; to properly utilize handicapped workers, and we must convince them that physical disability as such, need not be an industrial handicap. We must show him how to effect the greatest utilization of this source of manpower and what it will mean to him in dollars and cents in his plant. Efficiency and economy of operation has long been the motivating force behind most employers, and needs be, although more and more of them are beginning to temper this objective with a recognition that social responsibility comes in for some consideration also.

Any plan, to be successful, must be accomplished by appraising the abilities and limitations of the workers, by appraising the requirements of jobs and matching them for the greatest possible efficiency. There are four factors that should be taken into consideration. They are:

1. The worker should have the ability to accomplish the task efficiently—i. e., he should be able to meet its physical demands.

2. He should not be a hazard to himself.

3. He must not jeopardize the safety of others.

4. The job should not aggravate his disability.

Much training and increased ability is needed for those who will handle this problem. There is need for a practical manual or handbook for all personnel men and women, to promote understanding of common disabilities of workers; their effect upon production ability, and the precautions necessary to insure suitable placement. There should be a layman's guide to the fundamentals of anatomy and physiology and the disabilities that affect worker ability. And last of all, top management must hear this story and see that the personnel policy of the firm carries it out.

It is up to groups such as this, as well as to the personnel association, the industrial relations or personnel direction, and other interested individuals to see that this story is told and retold over and over again; and it is up to the handicapped worker himself, and his professional organization, and those Government agencies charged with this responsibility, to see that the employer gets this assistance and the education that is necessary if we are going to completely convince him to utilize the handicapped worker to the greatest possible extent for the welfare of this worker, for his advantage as an employer, and for the good of the Nation.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. Well, we led with our chins and we got it. But I am very glad to have such a fair presentation of the employer's point of view. The only thing I can say is, unfortunately, not all employers are disposed to be as fair-minded as those whom you represent.

I should like, if it is not confidential, to have a copy of that study that you speak of. That is very interesting and is in line with what we are trying to do.

With regard to a practical manual or handbook, these poor, maligned Government agencies, which are damned from hell to breakfast for spending public money, have turned out some very excellent work, and very practical indeed. There is today, in the fourth edition, out a few weeks ago, a booklet, Survey of the Handicapped, which shows the efforts made, initiated originally by the Civil Service Commission, War Manpower Commission, and Public Health Service, to aid in placement, to fit the man to the job, and I believe our good friend Harry Mitchell would be glad to present a copy of the latest edition of that manual to the Board of Trade, for study.

There is also a manual put out by Navy Rehabilitation along much the same lines, and still another, put out by the Veterans Employment Service, which is largely the work of Mr. Vernon Banta.

These are the very practical things that you speak of. We know that these efforts are yet in the embryonic stage. First of all, it has been a matter of only approximately four years since we had an intelligent effort to survey jobs and ascertain what kind of people can fit those jobs. I believe that before the War there were approximately 6,800 different jobs listed in the Civil Service, and at that time there was a precedent—let us say, to be kind about it—for Civil Service examiners to give examinations to handicapped in about 370 of those jobs. In the "Survey of the Handicapped," as I recall, the first edition shows that there are 1,800 jobs that handicapped can efficiently fill, and the next edition doubled that, and the next edition went to some 6,000; and, as I remember, the latest book shows in excess of 8,000 out of a potential 27,000 jobs.

That does not mean that these surveys can be regarded as the law of the Medes and Persians. We are still—all of us—groping in the dark, but the hope we have is that we can get together. We can assure you that we do not want any special favors. We merely ask for an opportunity for employment for

the individual who can fill the job satisfactorily. Certainly, we would not ask an aviation company to place an epileptic at the controls of a great airliner—no—but there is no reason why an epileptic cannot run your adding machines or your typewriters or do other work that does not endanger those around him, or himself. And of course we can go through the cardiacs on the other end, and protecting them from accident and death, in particular.

I am very happy to have this assurance from a representative of the Board of Trade because this, to me, sounds fair; and I again say we do not want special favors, and we do not ask you to endanger your profits—not at all—but just go along and where we have proven ground, let's take advantage of it. That is all we ask, and I thank you very much, Mr. Smith. You did a swell job. [Applause.]

Our next speaker has been abroad and has studied conditions comparatively recently in several foreign countries. He is a distinguished educator, and he has given much study to the problem of disabled people. I am glad to present Mr. Kermit Eby, Director of Education and Research of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Mr. Eby. [Applause.]

Mr. KERMIT EBY. All I am going to do is (1) tell you a story; (2) express a direction; (3) sit down.

The story: This evening takes me back to northern Indiana to a little country church, a German Baptist, or Church of the Brethren. As a youngster I used to sit in that church and watch all the ministers. These ministers did not prepare a sermon as they do now. They were supposed to speak when the Holy Spirit moved them. Sometimes they had a difficult job, and that was to tell when the Holy Spirit stopped them. As a youngster, I would watch it, and the first time I prayed was for the ability to survive six sermons.

By coincidence, the Full Employment Committee of the CIO is going to meet tomorrow. It is going to meet for the purpose of formulating a full employment program based on the hypothesis that we are historically at a point where we need to develop such a program, even though tonight we have 58,000,000 people gainfully employed.

The philosophy back of this Committee and of this program is very simple. It rests on the assumption that the only way there can be employment for any minority group is to create an economic situation in which there is employment for all.

We are interested in the physically handicapped primarily because we are convinced that we need the productive capacity of every person, and that the great assets that this Nation has are two: (1) its soil; (2) its people. And so I conclude by saying that we wish to develop those resources for all the people.

My assistant is a man who is physically handicapped. He had infantile paralysis at two-and-a-half. I have worked with him for 10 years. All that I have ever discovered he wants is to be a man in a man's world. Thank you. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. The only thing I am sorry for is that Kermit keeps harping on "full employment" instead of a "full dinner pail." I want to go back to those good old days, you know. This "full employment" is too technical for me, but I can understand hamburgers and onions, and steak and potatoes. Are we getting that?

I do know that they have done very effective work in that field, and I know also that "full employment" must be, if our people are to get any chance at all. Therefore, I am very much in favor of what they are doing today, and hope they will succeed in it. Thank you, Kermit. [Applause.]

Now it has been said that no party is complete unless there is an Irishman in it, and, of course, with deference to the good Father present, we have at least two Irishmen here tonight, to pep things up, and this one bears the distinction of not only being Irish, but looking Irish. Here is Pat Ryan, representative of the American Federation of Labor, which organization—and I am in a position to know—was responsible for the first Federal Vocational Training Act. It was Arthur Holder, of that organization, N. P. Alifas, of the Machinists' Union, and myself who were responsible for putting that act upon the books.

I have never been quite happy because the workings of the act have never lived up to what we who put it on the books hoped for, but the American Federation of Labor has carried on many activities in behalf of the handicapped, and I know you will be glad to hear from its representative. Pat, take the floor. [Applause.]

Mr. PATRICK RYAN. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, I am here tonight "subbing" for Director Fenton, who was called out of town and asked me, at 6 o'clock, to attend this meeting in his place, to give you people the word that the American Federation of Labor is 100 percent behind you in your program and will do everything that they can in any program that you people enact.

I would like to say this, from my own personal observation. I got around the country pretty much during this wartime book period that we just came through. I was sent into a good many places to adjust grievances in different plants for the American Federation of Labor. During all that time, I never had to take up a grievance that was caused by any of the handicapped people whom the employers do not, at the present time, seem to want to hire. I just wanted you people to know that.

I wanted you to know one other thing. I am a longshoreman, by trade. We have workmen's compensation, but it is a Federal law. The employer places his insurance through private companies. When I was the business agent of my own local, I had the insurance companies instruct me that certain men who were crippled in a small way, some men who had reached 60 years of age, had to be let go. We had to take the insurance that was carried on us, away from the employer, and the union carried, it, itself, and paid the premiums, and we did not lay any of these people off.

You have had representatives of different Government agencies, the Civil Service Commission and others, speak to you tonight. They are doing everything in their power to assist your people and our people, but, you people have got to get out, and get after the politicians. Two-thirds of the political jobs in your county, state, and Federal governments could be held by handicapped people, and it is up to you people to get out and do something, and get your friends interested. The Lord only helps those who help themselves.

I am surely glad I had a chance to come tonight. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. I told you that the Irish pep things up—and didn't he do it?

I am not going to dispute great organizations that have been here tonight and have pledged their devotion and support to the handicapped. The only thing that I ask them to do is, to continue that support and keep the pressure rolling.

Last, but not least, I want to thank this audience, and I want to thank especially our speakers and our guests who have come and participated with us tonight in this forum. I hope that this discussion will mark the beginning of increased interest, and will result in positive action for all disabled people.

Before closing, I want to read a letter I received this morning, which shows you a part of a tragedy which is laid before us nearly every day. It says:

"I am writing you to inquire whether it is possible for a person who has lost their health and is no longer able to earn their way or support, to receive compensation.

"To try to make you understand my position, I will give you in as few words as I can, my condition. I lost my right leg six inches below my hip, in 1926—tuberculosis of the bone; left leg and left arm, and in 1945, my gall bladder. . . .

"Since that operation I have never been well. Now I have a bleeding in the stomach which is an ulcer or tumor, causing anemia, and I have low pressure. I am not strong enough to use an artificial leg any longer.

"At the present time I am staying in a convalescent home provided by the county, for a period of 6 weeks only. I do not have anyone I could secure help from. I have had to earn my living since I was old enough to work; went through high school, worked and attended technical university at night, and was working at a Government warehouse during World War I, and worked for the manufacturers of the Norden bombsight during World War II.

"You can see that I have always worked when it was possible, and I only wish I could continue on. In a short time I will have to leave the convalescent home. That is the reason I appeal to you. Just after going into the rehabilitation office, I was suddenly seized and taken to a county hospital, with all my strength gone. Had I been able to work, they in the rehabilitation office could have helped me."

[President Strachan, interpolating: There is the vicious circle: They say, "Get a job and we will rehabilitate you." How can you get a job when you are too sick?]

"Surely there must be some way I can secure a pension or help. I am 50 years of age, American-born. I assure you it is embarrassing for me to write this letter. However, I have no other alternative."

[President Strachan, interpolating: There is your border-line case. What does social security amount to? An average of $6.85 a week. Oh, my. Is that what we have to look forward to? If that is social security, I am the Queen of Sheba! If we are to protect ourselves, we will have to change the whole face of rehabilitation and social-welfare plans in this country. If we don't do it, nobody will.]

"I shall appreciate any assistance or advice that you can render."

There are millions of these people. In this Nation there are 3,600,000 people who are permanently and totally disabled. Think of that. Of course, as medical science progresses and the horizons lift, perhaps some of those may be restored, wholly, or in part; but this federation has devoted itself to a practical consideration of doing what can be done now to aid these people, and primarily to lay the emphasis upon the job and of the problem, because if the individual cannot work, then everything is thrown into sharp focus; if he needs treatment or training or guidance, and we shall continue to lay emphasis upon employment for handicapped people.

I thank you all again, and I especially thank our interpreter, my dear friend, Claire Gibson. And now Father Philip Kenney, of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, will pronounce the benediction, and I ask you all to stand.

The Reverend PHILIP KENNEY. Almighty and Eternal God, extend over us the hand of Thy majesty, that the thoughts that have been expressed and the resolutions that have been taken here tonight may take root in our minds and bear fruit in our practice.

Help us to lead the way in behalf of the handicapped, that the social conscience of ourselves and of our fellow Americans may be kept informed and alert. Help us to recognize and eliminate our thoughtlessness and selfishness. Help us to be fair and just

to the handicapped in our midst, who, in common with all men, only ask the right to earn a living.

Bless this Federation, O Lord, especially its zealous and selfless officers. Bless their policy of racial probity. Enable them to make even greater progress throughout the year in eliminating every semblance of prejudice and discrimination against our brothers in Christ, the members of the Negro race.

We ask Thee also, O Lord, to bless our Nation and our people. Give us the intelligence and the courage to put aside all selfishness and to plan together in organized partnership for full employment, at decent wages, and under decent conditions, all of us, labor, management, agriculture, and the professions, with the assistance and encouragement of government. Enlighten our chosen representatives to be guided always by the general welfare and to enact without unnecessary delay whatever legislation is necessary to provide decent homes and decent jobs for all of our citizens regardless of their race, color, creed, or national origin.

Finally, O Lord, we ask for lasting international peace, peace founded on justice and charity. We ask Thee to bless our efforts at international organization and to give to our Nation and to all of the nations of the world the grace to live together in harmony, as members of one common family, that family of which Thou, O Lord, art the Creator and the loving Father.

All this we ask in the name of Thy divine Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

President STRACHAN. Thank you, Father. And now, good night. The meeting is adjourned. I thank you all.

(The meeting adjourned at 11 p. m.)

Floods and Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Valley Authorities Conference which completed its first annual session last week here in Washington, saw a gathering of eminent and serious-minded citizens intent upon finding a solution of our great flood problem in the Missouri-Mississippi region. Among those who spoke was Mr. Jerome Locke of Montana, a civil engineer whose knowledge of the Missouri Basin and its problems, and whose solid reputation in his profession should compel the most serious consideration of his statement. Mr. Locke is a colonel in reserve of the United States Army Engineers, and a former engineer for the Bureau of Reclamation. He has performed the engineering on some of our important projects, and thus has an understanding of these problems at first hand.

I ask permission to have Mr. Locke's statement before the Valley Authorities Conference printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members, I am grateful for this opportunity and proud to have the privilege of presenting some of the viewpoints of we common folk who live in the great inland empire, the Missouri River Valley. We have hope and confidence that this important gathering will sharply focus national attention on an overdue and rapidly growing need for more valley authorities—not one but several such projects.

Beyond question the pressing and immediate need in lower Missouri Valley, where since 1940 devastating floods have wrought a half billion dollars damage and snuffed out more than 50 lives, is for flood control. In any attempt at solution of this, the currently pressing problem, we need be mindful of several things—all equally important though less in the limelight at the moment.

More than a century of costly and largely futile expenditure, in a staggering sum I have never seen totaled up, should have taught us that floods cannot be controlled by dikes, levees and channel changing devices along the lower and middle reaches of rivers. The fallacy of such works is well illustrated by a set of rating curves gotten out by Missouri State Department of Resources and Development in September 1945. These show volume of flow, corresponding gage heights and the flood stage levels for Missouri River at St. Joseph, Kansas City, Waverly, Bonneville and Herman, all within Missouri State. For a typical illustration I have taken the graph for Herman, Mo., and brought its curve up to date to cover the 1947 flood as well as previous ones.

The river goes out over its banks and floods begin to occur at Herman when the gage height reaches 21 feet. Between 1928 and 1931 one or more floods occurred there. Little or no flood control work in that area had yet been done by Army Engineers. The natural channel of the stream carried 316,000 cubic feet per second at gage height of 21 feet. Then the Army installed some flood control works—bank revetments to stabilize said banks and pile dikes to narrow the channel, increase its velocity, and theoretically cause a scouring action and consequent deepening of the channel. Thereafter the 1942 flood came along. At a gage height of 21 feet the river again went out of its banks, but it was carrying only 193,000 cubic feet per second, or 39 percent less water. When the volume of flow reached 316,000 cubic feet per second the river level was 5.6 feet above its flood stage of 21 feet by gage.

The scouring action theory must have worked a little bit between the springs of 1942 and 1943. In the 1943 flood the river went over its banks at gage height of 21 feet, but the channel was transporting 210,000 second-feet, or 34 percent less than in 1928 and 5 percent more than in 1942. In 1947, the scouring action had again worked in reverse. At 21 feet gage height, volume of flow was 193,000 second-feet. When the volume reached 316,000 second-feet, gage height was 27 feet, or 6 feet above flood level.

In simple understandable language, about 15 years of flood-control construction at five points along the Missouri River has resulted in narrowed and constricted channels with from 9 to 39 percent less water-carrying capacity and a corresponding increase in flood damage.

It is hardly necessary to consult these engineers' graphs. A couple of decades of plain observation or perusal of news accounts should have convinced us that attempts to work flood control back upstream from river mouths is a failure. The task has to be tackled from the other end of the drainage channel. In the case of Missouri River, from the crest of the Rocky Mountains downward—the way that nature and topography causes the stream to flow, to increase in volume and to gather force and effectiveness for more and ever more destructive ravages as it piles up on the flatter lands below.

From an engineering standpoint dams and reservoirs—even such gigantic projects as Fort Peck and the proposed Garrison Reservoirs—when located a half or two-thirds of the way up the stream will be helpful but not fully effective toward relief from floods. Rainfall and its run-off are erratic and unpredictable things. Nobody knows just when, how, or where excess water will develop into the next flood. There have to be many reservoirs scattered over the whole valley area, particularly on tributary streams; these are the flood feeders.

In the arid upper half of the valley even many dams and reservoirs are not enough for full protection. There has to be more irrigated land, more forestation, more replacement of all kinds of vegetation, coupled with other large-scale soil-erosion programs to retard a too-rapid run-off. Denuding of forests, overgrazing, and "soil mining" farm practices are all conspiring toward an increase in both percentage and rapidity of run-off. This must be taken into account seriously. I venture that flood damage will be fully alleviated when we have a full measure of cure for the basic cause of floods—not before and not otherwise.

The whole thing is one big problem extending from the tops of 10,000 feet high mountains in Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado, via confluence of Missouri and Mississippi rivers, out onto the great delta in the Gulf of Mexico. It is thus that Missouri River waters run and destructively transport between two hundred and fifty and three hundred million tons of topsoil annually. Most of this comes down from the semiarid States of the Great Plain Region to furnish a never-ending process of channel clogging in the lower river reaches. What MVA proposes is not a flood-control plan but a coordinated plan for flood prevention.

Nearly 50 years of a national reclamation program has been of great value to the West and the Nation. In too many cases, however, it has taken a second or even a third wave of land settlers to pay out under it. Naturally, the easier and cheaper projects are the ones that have been constructed. With increasing size and costliness future maintenance of a large scale reclamation program is increasingly dependent on a coordinated multipurpose development and a fair apportionment of construction costs to the several benefits thus made possible. The reservoir that conserves water for irrigation is also helpful in flood prevention. It often furnishes a site for a power plant, helps equalize the stream flow for increased power production in other plants below, and invariably creates a habitat for wild fowl and a rearing area for increased supplies of fish and other aquatic life. On the sun-scorched plains of eastern Montana, the Dakotas, Nebraska and Kansas, such reservoirs will furnish the only opportunity for playgrounds and shaded recreation areas. Moreover, every acre-foot of water stored and consumptively used for irrigation is one more acre-foot that does not come down on the crest of some destructive flood.

Power is the heart beat of our industrial civilization. The demand and market for it doubles about every 12 years. In the short time since VJ-day an acute power shortage has begun to develop in the West. This need not be. The Missouri Valley can furnish somewhere between 15 and 25 billion kilowatt hours more power per year if developed under the engineering principle of stream stabilization or equalization of flow, by sufficient reservoirs properly placed.

At its mouth, Missouri River volume of flow is from 55 or 60 times larger at maximum flood stage than at minimum low water. That is, the river may carry only 8,000 second-feet in December or January and 480,000 second-feet in May or June. A similar proportion is true for all points above, including live tributaries. Average volume of flow, or what would result from a completely stabilized stream, will run anywhere from 3 to 10 times the low water flow at the same point.

Any plant without storage facilities above will develop in firm or salable power only the quantity of electric current the low water flow will generate. But each reservoir installed above the plant holds back at least part of the high water and then releases it to augment the low water supply. When there is enough of properly placed storage capacity the stream is stabilized and the production capacity of the power plant is increased anywhere from 3 to 10 times. What is true relative to one power plant is true relative to every other power plant. In the upper end of the valley practically all of Missouri's tributaries streams fall down slopes that run from 5 to 50, even 500, feet fall per mile. That is why we can have cheap and abundant power under a proper development.

Moreover, the principle and process of getting maximum power production by stream stabilization is precisely the process that will eliminate floods coming down from the high areas above. It is likewise the identical process that will always tend and generally succeed in furnishing an even year-around volume of flow for navigation purposes. There is neither mystery nor magic in the idea. Every engineer and hydroelectric technician knows it. The only requirement to accomplishment is horse sense, planning, and a coordination of project units.

Pending in Congress is a bill proposing to increase and improve the Nation's supply of farm fertilizer. Phosphate rock makes the best fertilizer there is, but generally the supply of such rock is limited. Lying about half in each of the headwater drainage areas of Missouri and Snake Rivers is a vast and relatively recently discovered supply of this rock. I saw an estimate that fixed the quantity at 6 to 8 billion tons. Undeveloped hydroelectric power is running to waste down between these vast phosphate beds. Here is a potential and cheap farm fertilizer supply for half or all of the United States for hundreds of years to come.

I will not consume more of your time with details. There in the sparsely settled Missouri Valley in items already mentioned are national opportunities for six, possibly seven million acres of additional irrigated land, fifteen to twenty-five billion kilowatt-hours per year of power, and apparently inexhaustible supply of farm fertilizer, a chance for a navigation channel from the heart of America's granary out to the seven seas and the surest opportunity for complete flood prevention that can be devised. A full and coordinated development should also embrace future timber supplies, increased fish and small game, more easily accessible recreational areas, vast deposits of oil and coal, and some 35 other valuable mine, mineral, and quarry products; all of these will make up sufficient industrialization on which to base a self supporting balanced and growing economy. We need only the tools with which to work and a go ahead signal from Congress. We ask no charity. This project will pay out as TVA is now doing.

The job cannot be done piecemeal or by uncoordinated separate government agencies. Let me cite you a half dozen samples of results under such a policy. Let us look at Fort Peck Dam and its reservoir. Nobody up in my section knows the engineering purpose behind this gigantic and costly structure. Some say flood control, yet a flood control reservoir should be filled during the flood season and emptied thereafter, in order to catch the next year's flood. Then, there is no point simply for flood control purposes in providing storage capacity for four times the average annual run-off of the stream at that point or for twice the volume of greatest yearly flow that has occurred since 1882 there.

If the purpose of the structure is to aid in irrigation it seems strange that the Bureau of Reclamation is now obliged to make surveys for and apparently contemplates another dam across the Missouri only 12 miles below Fort Peck. This second dam was to be installed for the purpose of diverting Missouri River water to serve a great project of 1,250,000 acres in northeastern Montana and North Dakota.

Clearly, power development was not the purpose at Fort Peck. The little old Madison River that falls down about 2,500 feet in its 100-mile journey from Yellowstone Park to Three Forks and carries only about one-tenth the water that passes Fort Peck will generate one-half as much power at about one-fourth or one-fifth the cost of Fort Peck.

In a coordinated multipurpose development there is need for some storage at Fort Peck. I think careful planning will show this should be about seven, rather than twenty million, acre-feet of capacity.

About the same thing is true of Garrison Dam, where 23,000,000 acre-feet of storage is proposed.

The truth is that 80 percent of all Missouri River waters passing Yankton on the South Dakota-Nebraska line originate in Montana and Wyoming. Yet, under the Peck end of the so-called Pick-Sloan plan 80 percent of total storage capacity is being located down in the lowest holes through the two Dakotas. All the engineers this side of the Pearly Gate cannot make water run uphill. The result must be a great denial of irrigation, power, phosphate, and all the type of development in Montana, Wyoming, and the two Dakotas. This denial will cut the upper end of the Valley down by 40 or possibly 50 percent in the development to which it is entitled. Of equal consequence is the certainty that the type of development now proposed will do much less toward eliminating floods than would a larger number of smaller reservoirs properly placed.

In brief outline I have tried to paint for you the dream of we common folk in the Missouri River Valley. Yes, our dream. And some of the basic engineering principles that must lie behind its accomplishment. The task will not be concluded overnight. Some of the work that will stop soil erosion, cure dust bowls, and finally eliminate the last of destructive floods may be in active progress 50 or 75 years hence.

That the job will finally be done we have no doubt. Missouri River water is the lifeblood of our civilization in a semiarid region. Except by the conservation of every drop of this valuable water, there appears no other way to set one-sixth of our country back on the road to self-sufficiency and enduring prosperity—to make it an asset and helpmate rather than a beggar from the whole of our country. We want no more of 1932–40 conditions when Uncle Sam was obliged to dole out more than a billion dollars in relief funds to keep thousands of our worthy people from starvation. We just want a chance to help ourselves and to be able to always hold up our heads as part of a progressive, aggressive, and prosperous nation.

Yes, this magnificent challenging and indispensable project will become a reality. Its construction cannot be accomplished by an uncoordinated piecemeal process or by 15 or 20 governmental agencies, each jealous of its own prerogatives, bound down by outmoded grants of power and authority, and naturally trained to regard its own line of activities of paramount importance. These existing agencies can all participate, and each can render an invaluable service, but this must all be coordinated and dovetailed together into one general master plan developed under the authority of one central agency—not a flood-control program that will forever foreclose half of all other progressive development, but a full-scale, multipurpose, coordinated project that will return maximum benefits including complete flood prevention—a Missouri Valley Authority.

Making the United Nations Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, recently a bipartison group of Members of the Senate and of the House joined in filing a resolution asking the President to call a meeting of representatives of the nations comprising the United Nations for the purpose of strengthening the United Nations Charter so as to make it more effective. This idea has for many months had the backing and support of people in all countries. The interest of John W. Apperson, a well-known and capable attorney of Memphis, Tenn., is typical. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter dated July 19 from Mr. Apperson to me:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *July 19, 1947.*

Mr. ESTES KEFAUVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEFAUVER: Recently I read in the paper where you are sponsoring the resolution introduced in the House which, according to the papers, reads:

"For the purpose of making the United Nations capable of enacting, interrupting, and enforcing world law to prevent war."

Having long been a student of and ardent advocate for a federated world government, I am deeply interested and delighted to learn that our Representatives in the Congress are beginning to get the ground beats from the grass roots, for I am thoroughly convinced that the great mapority of our thinking people have come to realize that the only way we shall achieve world peace is to have world order, and that we shall never have world order without world law, and that that law must be made by the majority of the people, through their representatives, in some sort of world parliament. Again, that law must be applicable to individual citizens of the world and not solely to nation states.

For a long time I was a strong advocate of a full world government, with every nation in the world belonging to it in the beginning either by amending the UN or by forming a new constitution. I have now come to the conclusion that the realistic and practical way to work this out is through the UN, which is already an organization with a good start, and that if Russia or any other nation does not desire to come in at first, then leave the door open for such nations to come in when ready.

Enclosed with this letter is the copy of a letter which I wrote to President Truman on March 20, 1947, a reply which I received to that letter through the State Department under date of April 16, 1947, and a letter which I received from Judge Hugh Anderson, presiding judge of the Court of Appeals of Tennessee, when he had received a copy of my letter to President Truman.

The matter seems so simple to me in principle that it is difficult to understand why all statesmen of the world cannot appreciate the value of the idea.

Wishing you the greatest possible success in the passage of the resolution, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

JOHN W. APPERSON.

Also, I include a part of the remarks Mr. Apperson made over Station WHHM, July 20, 1947:

The question is: To what extent must national sovereignty be surrendered and still maintain national security?

At the outset I would state that we can no longer maintain national security unless we do surrender some of our national sovereignty. In fact, since 1917 we have had no national sovereignty or security. We have thought we had it. But Germany in 1917 and Japan on December 7, 1941, proved to us that they could make us go to war when we, with our so-called sovereignty, did not want to.

Sovereignty in the sense of absolute power to do as we please without any other nation having any say so is an ideal—a dream.

The only possible way for this or any other nation to have security is for the whole world to have order based on law.

When every man was a law unto himself, when there was untrammeled freedom, there was in reality no freedom at all. In the early days of our West there was no law and hence no order. Every man was sovereign and carried a six-shooter and when things didn't go to suit him, he pulled it out and fired at will. Thus everyone was insecure, including the man who carried the six-shooter; for some man who was quicker on the draw might kill him.

Today between the nations there is no law. Each nation reserves the right to carry its six shooter and to fire it at will. We, of course, have the biggest six-shooter, but Russia or some other nation with its dictatorship may be quicker on the draw and blast us into impotency before we could get our six-shooter into firing position.

How was the lawlessness of anarchy remedied between man and man in our West? It was remedied by all men surrendering some of their sovereignty to a government with power to enact laws which would give security to all.

In order to maintain our national security and still control our own domestic affairs a world government based on the Federal system as initiated by our forefathers is the only known and proven way. Under that system we would surrender to an international government limited authority in a few fields in order to gain security and reserve all other authority to ourselves.

The UN should be converted by amendments into a federal government for world affairs with authority to control a few things which transcend our national boundaries. This government should be given power to enact laws in its field which shall apply to individuals of all nations of the world and not just to nations alone. Some of the things which such an international government should control are: Arms and armaments, trade between nations, money, transportation and communication between nations and citizenship. At first only one or two of these subjects might be given into the control of such a government. More may be added as time goes on.

It would be ideal if Russia would join such a government, but if she doesn't in the beginning then leave the door open for her to come in when ready.

This great country of ours should lead the way.

Just recently resolutions have been introduced in the Congress to strengthen the UN. The one in the House reads:

"For the purpose of making the United Nations capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world laws to prevent war."

These resolutions reflect the fact that our political representatives are at last awaking to the fact that the large majority of our people want some form of world government adequate to give us world order based on law and thus prevent war.

Until we do surrender enough of our so-called national sovereignty to get world order based on law, we shall continue to have world anarchy and insecurity.

As stated by J. Z. Howard, managing editor of the Press Scimitar in an article in that paper on July 4, 1947, the freedom-loving nations of the world should prepare and promulgate a declaration of interdependence.

Therefore, I submit that we should surrender our national sovereignty to a federated world government to the extent necessary to enable that government to control arms and armaments, trade between nations, money, transportation and communication between nations, and perhaps citizenship, and that in doing so we will then for the first time maintain national security.

I also include a letter written by Mr. Apperson to President Truman:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *March 20, 1947.*

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Now that the Republican majority controls Congress you can well afford to assume the true role of a great statesman and devote yourself entirely to your personal convictions free from partisan politics and for the good of the entire country and the world at large. This is true, too, because you really owe allegiance to no one politically. You are, in a sense, a free lance.

Lately I have sensed that you realize this great role made possible for you. You seem to be breaking away from what you thought were your obligations to the New Deal and seem to be asserting your own ideas.

The following quotations from two of your speeches lead me to believe that you fully realize that our only hope of salvation is to have a government for world affairs which shall be given authority to control a few things which transcend our national boundaries as was so well stated by Judge Robert N. Wilkin at the Atlantic City meeting of the American Bar Association in August 1946. This government should be given power to enact laws of its field which shall apply to the individuals of all the nations of the world and not just to nations. To enforce laws against nations means war.

In the Senate on November 2, 1943, you stated:

"A small group of willful men kept us from assuming our world obligations in 1919–20, and the same thing can happen again.

"I am just as sure as I can be that this World War is the result of the 1919–20 isolationist attitude, and I am equally sure that another and worse war will follow this one, unless the United Nations and their allies, and all the other sovereign nations, decide to work together for peace as they are working together for victory."

This was quoted as a frontispiece by Alan Cranston in his "Killing of the Peace," the Viking Press, 1945. If you have not read it, I recommend it to you. I particularly recommend what Mr. Lodge said, as quoted at page 2 of this book, as follows:

"This league certainly has the highest of all aims for the benefit of humanity, and because the pathway is sown with difficulties is no reason that we should turn from it. It is the vision of a perhaps impossible perfection that has led humanity across the centuries. If our aspirations are for that which is great and beautiful and good and beneficent to humanity, even when we do not achieve our end, even if the results are little, we can at least remember Arnold's lines:

" 'Charge once more, then, and be dumb!
Let the victors, when they come,
When the forts of folly fall,
Find your body by the wall!' "

That same philosophy applies to an effort to implement the UN. Mr. Lodge said this in 1916 in a speech to the League to Enforce Peace before he turned against Mr. Wilson.

In your speech at Kansas City in June 1945 you stated:

"I am anxious to bring it home to you that the world is no longer country size, no longer State size, no longer Nation size—it is one world, as Willkie said. It is a world in which we must all get along. And it is my opinion that this great Republic ought to lead the way. It is my opinion that this great Republic ought to do and carry out those ideals of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"It was my privilege to be present at the signing of the Charter in San Francisco, which is the first step toward the accomplishment of world peace.

"Back in 1787 and 1788 our forefathers wrote a Constitution for 13 independent States. They considered that Constitution imperfect. They had to go out on a selling program to get enough States to ratify that Constitution to put it into effect. One of those 13 States didn't ratify that Constitution until after it was put into effect. We are going to ratify this constitution at San Francisco, and I want to see the United States do it first.

"I am standing here receiving a degree, a doctor of laws. That means that we live in this country at least in an age of law, and an age of reason, an age in which we can get along with our neighbors. Now, we must do that nationally. It will be just as easy for nations to get along in a republic of the world as it is for you to get along with the Republic of the United States.

"Now when Kansas and Colorado have a quarrel over the water in that Arkansas River they don't call out the national guard in each State and go to war over it, they bring a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States and abide by the decision.

"There isn't a reason in the world why we cannot do that internationally."

For the good of all mankind I recommend that you sponsor amendments to the UN which will evolve it into a government for world affairs with limited power over a few things that transcend national boundaries such as trade, money, transportation, and communication between nations and arms and armaments. Citizenship and some other matters may be later added. The laws enacted by this Government should apply to individuals in the nations and not alone to the nations.

The atomic energy control proposed in the Baruch plan I submit does not go far enough and does not strike at the roots of the evil. It has been turned down by Russia—perhaps to our good fortune.

Should Russia refuse to accept the necessary amendments to UN then those nations which do accept should put them into effect and leave the way open for other nations to come in later as was done when our Constitution was offered for acceptance or rejection.

Respectfully and hopefully yours,
JOHN W. APPERSON.

Also a letter to Mr. Apperson from Judge Hugh C. Anderson of the Court of Appeals of Tennessee:

COURT OF APPEALS,
STATE OF TENNESSEE,
Jackson, April 16, 1947.

Hon. JOHN W. APPERSON,
Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn.

DEAR JOHN: I have just now had an opportunity to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 3d instant with enclosures. I thank you very much for sending me a copy of your letter to President Truman. I think it is splendid. As you say, the President of the United States has an opportunity such as comes to few mortals to grasp the reins of leadership for the benefit of humanity. If he would do so it would give an impetus to a movement which, in his or

her heart, the average man or woman really believes in, and would almost certainly insure its success. This would come about by choice of the free peoples, and as a result of the governments of the others being forced, whether or no, to join in sooner or later.

Those who seem to think that there are insuperable difficulties in the expectation that the United Nations can be converted into a world government of limited powers, it seems to me make the mistake of presupposing that the only way the evolution can take place is by getting agreement of all of the member nations, including the totalitarian powers. The argument is that however likely the free peoples would enter into such an agreement, that is too much to expect of the dictatorships. They overlook the fact that a unanimous agreement is not the only way, indeed, is not the most likely way, whereby the desired results will be brought about. The germ of the evolutionary process is being laid and developed right now by the actual demonstration being given of the inability of the United Nations to function effectively. This demonstration is absolutely essential as a prerequisite to any drastic change, and this is especially true of our own people. In other words, I believe that most of the people of this Nation would still prefer to have nothing to do with the affairs of other nations and revert to what, for want of a better short term, we call "isolationism." They abandoned isolationism pro tanto and accepted the idea of the United Nations only after a very practical and terrible demonstration that that doctrine would not work in actual practice. I think we must go through the same process before they will be willing to take the next step, that is, that they must be convinced by actual demonstration that the United Nations cannot accomplish the desired end. As said, this demonstration, it seems to me, is going on now. A demonstration that will convince a minority will not suffice. There must be one that will convert the average man and woman.

When this stage is reached I believe it will be possible to form, by agreement, a government of limited powers on an international scale among the free peoples, and when such a government is formed, the totalitarian nations can and will be forced to change their systems so as to be eligible and will be forced to join, whether willingly or not. And in this manner the evolutionary process will be complete. It is the possibility of the later phase of the process which I think Fyke and those who believe like him overlook.

* * * * *

With personal regards and best wishes,
Yours very truly,

HU C. ANDERSON.

Col. Patrick J. Ryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding Army chaplains of World War II was Col. Patrick J. Ryan, now Deputy Chief of Chaplains. The newspaper report that he has just been elevated to the rank of Domestic Prelate with the title of Right Reverend Monsignor by Pope Pius XII.

Monsignor Ryan is a native of St. Paul, Minn. He received his education and seminary training in St. Paul. He then served 1 year in a parish assignment and entered the Regular Army in April 1928. Chaplain Ryan has devoted almost 20 years of his life to the Army chaplaincy, during which time he has held many important posts around the world.

The work of Monsignor Ryan was especially outstanding during some of the toughest campaigns fought in the European theater of operations during the last war. He landed with the Third Infantry Division in north Africa and served as its division chaplain throughout the north African campaign. He shared the sorrows and victories of his men through those arduous months of fighting. In the Italian campaign Monsignor Ryan served as the chaplain of the Fifth Army.

His valor has been recognized by his own and other governments. He has been awarded the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, and the Army Commendation Ribbon. He also wears the Medal of War (Brazil), the Order of the Brown (Italy), the Bronze Medal of Valor with Star (Italy), and the Order of the British Empire.

Monsignor Ryan's many friends in his home community, in the armed forces, in official life in Washington, and throughout the world join with him in the happiness he must feel upon this well deserved recognition tendered by his superiors in the church.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the Marshall plan, by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], broadcast over the radio Sunday, July 20, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Press reports from several sections of the country indicate that many people have little interest in international affairs. The difficult task of meeting the present-day high cost of living and other domestic problems have overshadowed interest in world affairs. Many people say, "I know nothing about foreign affairs. That is the job of Government officials." Others cannot understand why they should be worried about the affairs of people who live in foreign lands. Why should I help a man who lives several thousand miles away? is a question asked by many.

That sounds plausible to many people until they sit down and thoroughly analyze conditions confronting all nations in this postwar era. The United States is by far the most powerful Nation today. Production is high. Even though we have a serious housing shortage and the cost of living is high, the average American lives much better than the average citizen in any foreign land.

However, there is a serious doubt as to how long we can continue to enjoy prosperity in a world that is slowly dying economically, socially, and politically. The nations of Europe, battered and torn by several years of bitter warfare, must have help, and if we truthfully analyze the world situation today, we must admit that the majority of that help can come from only one country, the United States.

Since the end of hostilities in Europe, the United States has shipped thousands of tons of food to hungry people. The United States has sent millions of dollars to foreign lands to prevent them from going bankrupt. This program has been very helpful, but it has not solved the many reconstruction problems. It has been a piecemeal plan rather than a long range program.

In an effort to further the reconstruction of Europe, Secretary of State, George Marshall, has proposed a comprehensive program now generally referred to as the Marshall plan. Secretary Marshall set forth this plan at a speech at Harvard University on June 5. He pointed to Europe's plight and said:

"The truth of the matter is that Europe's requirements for the next three or four years of foreign food and other essential products—principally from America—are so much greater than her present ability to pay that she must have substantial additional help or face economic, social and political deterioration of a very grave character."

He said that the remedy for Europe's troubles lies in restoring the confidence of the European people in the economic future of their own countries and of Europe as a whole. Secretary Marshall, also, declared, and I quote:

"Aside from the demoralizing effect on the world at large and the possibilities of disturbances arising as a result of the desperation of the people concerned, the consequences to the economy of the United States should be apparent to all. It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist. Such assistance, I am convinced, must not be on a piecemeal basis as various crises develop. Any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative. Any government that is willing to assist in the task of recovery will find full cooperation, I am sure, on the part of the United States Government. Any government which maneuvers to block the recovery of other countries cannot expect help from us. Furthermore, governments, political parties or groups which seek to perpetuate human misery in order to profit therefrom politically or otherwise will encounter the opposition of the United States."

After Secretary Marshall outlined the need for large-scale aid to Europe the heads of several European nations took definite steps to frame a plan looking toward the recovery of Europe. You may recall that Foreign Ministers Ernest Bevin of Britain and Georges Bidault of France met in Paris to discuss the recovery program. Later in June, Foreign Minister Molotov of Russia joined with Bevin and Bidault to further consider the plan. Eearly this month Mr. Molotov rejected the Marshall plan and returned to Russia. It

is regrettable that Russia has turned down this important program looking to the recovery of Europe; a program, I wish to emphasize, directed against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos.

Russia, or any other country, has the right to refuse to participate in the Marshall plan, but any country taking such action must accept the grave responsibilities that go with such a position, and the possibility of being regarded as an obstructionist to the plan of European reconstruction and peace.

While the foreign ministers were conferring in Paris, here at home President Truman named special committees, including both Government specialists and private citizens, to make a thorough analysis of our natural resources, to the end that we may know what things we can most safely spare. The President's Council of Economic Affairs also launched a survey of the impact of overseas aid on our economy.

This month the nations of Europe are meeting again to create committees to list the needs of each area—food, coal, steel, transport, fertilizer, lumber, etc.—and to establish priorities. By that I mean what will do the most good and where. Next month the European planners will decide how much their countries can contribute to the common stock pile for recovery. They will endeavor to determine how much additional help will be needed from America and other countries able to assist them.

After the European planners have completed their task, sometime late in August or early in September, President Truman will meet with his cabinet to discuss the European plan. They will weigh the various recommendations to determine what can be done to get Europe back on its feet. Then it will be up to Congress to act.

Briefly, I have outlined the Marshall plan timetable. It is an important timetable, one that undoubtedly will affect the future of the world. The Marshall plan is a sound, constructive approach to a tremendous task. It means helping those nations willing and able to help themselves—once given initial assistance.

The European nations will have to show that they are willing to mobilize their resources of manpower and materials for the maximum economic efficiency and future recovery of the Continent as a whole. The success of the Marshall plan should prove a sound investment rather than an endless drain of American dollars into Europe. That is the logical conclusion of many leading Americans of both political parties.

Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin of Britain has characterized the Marshall plan as a step toward a great unity of peoples throughout the world. In a few terse words he outlined the problem, and I quote, "Europe is bleeding to death; it must be stopped."

It is indeed essential to world peace that we do everything possible to help the friendly European nations. However, the Marshall plan cannot succeed unless the people of America clearly understand the character of the problem and the remedies to be applied. Secretary Marshall ably pointed out in his Harvard speech that "political passion and prejudice should have no part" and he added these words: "With foresight and a willingness on the part of our people to face up to the vast responsibility which history has clearly placed upon our country the difficulties I have outlined can and will be overcome."

These difficulties can and will be overcome if the peoples both of America and Europe support the Marshall plan. Although it is still in the formula stage, I regret to say that it is being attacked on many sides. In addition, many competent Washington observers say that the lack of an informed public opinion in the United States may cause the Marshall plan to falter. I sincerely hope that events of the future prove that these observers are wrong.

We face a great challenge. The future of world civilization depends on how well we carry out our responsibilities. We must not permit the lack of understanding, cheap political demagoguery, or isolation boobytraps to defeat the Marshall plan.

This is one time when we must rise above petty grievances and prove to the world that the United States stands ready to assist the devastated nations of Europe.

The United States can win the admiration of the world by supporting the Marshall plan. If the United States adopts an indifferent attitude toward the ill, hungry nations, we may awaken one day in the not too distant future to find the whole world against us.

The Marshall plan offers the opportunity for our Nation to prove to the world that we measure up to our responsibilities. We must not fail in this great task.

Mr. Truman Versus President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States in vetoing the tax-reduction bill has placed himself on record as opposed to the constitutional tradition of our Government. It is the province of Congress to determine Federal expenditures and appropriations. It has never been the prerogative of the President to arrogate to himself this authority, and no President in our history prior to Mr. Truman has ever successfully asserted such authority.

If a President may veto every measure dealing with public taxation enacted by Congress and win for himself the sustaining of that veto, the specific provision of the Consitution vesting the taxing authority in our National Legislature becomes meaningless. It would be possible for a political-minded President and a determined one-third minority to prevent the passage of any revenue legislation which he opposed, irrespective of the judgment of the will of the overwhelming majority of the Congress.

It has been asserted by our President that the type of tax reduction passed by Congress is the "wrong kind of reduction at the wrong time." He has cited figures designed to demonstrate that this bill, concurred in by a 3 to 1 majority of the House of Representatives and an almost 2 to 1 majority of the Senate, offers tax reductions to the well-to-do which are disproportionate to those offered to others less fortunate economically. "Therefore," says the President, "let us offer no tax reduction for the year 1947 to anybody." He is now seeking to exert pressures which are simply calculated to influence the trend of the election in 1948.

If the President himself had not voted in 1945 to exempt corporations from excess-profits taxes, when he was a Member of the Senate, the charge that his conduct now is based upon political considerations rather than fiscal might be difficult to support, but the record of Mr. Truman on this subject is at variance with the record of President Truman, and the political implications are inescapable.

Let us look at the facts and figures which furnish the proof of this pudding. In my own State of Ohio the President's veto of the tax-reduction bill means that hundreds of thousands of taxpayers who are now faced with increased living costs must continue to bear large Federal tax burdens unnecessarily. These men and women are not economic royalists. They are folks who have worked long and hard in the war years and deserve some relief. I say that we could readily dismiss several hundred thousand Federal employees without impairing the efficiency of our essential Government services. We will not dismiss them so long as the President can veto and veto and veto our efforts to cut taxes. For, as sure as the sun rises, the more money there is in the Federal Treasury, the more money Government agencies are going to spend. If we cut those funds, they will not be able to spend them, and I am certain that nobody doing business with the Government will be unduly disturbed.

Here is the monument to President Truman's violation of our Government tradition on the passage of tax bills. The people of Ohio's 88 counties will be paying to the Federal Treasury these millions of dollars they should have and could have saved.

Count them up, people of Ohio—and they total $227,513,000—from our State alone. I furnish this table, supplied by the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation of Congress, to prove the point.

If Mr. Truman has his way, we should change the motto of our country to these well-known words: "Sweat on, Mr. Taxpayer, sweat on."

Estimated distribution by counties in the State of Ohio of the tax reduction provided for in H. R. 3950

[In thousands of dollars]

Counties:	*Tax reduction*
Adams	275
Allen	2,337
Ashland	868
Ashtabula	2,108
Athens	986
Auglaize	667
Belmont	1,793
Brown	320
Butler	3,921
Carroll	258
Champaign	634
Clark	3,043
Clermont	587
Clinton	628
Columbiana	2,559
Coshocton	734
Crawford	1,089
Cuyahoga	52,198
Darke	861
Defiance	628
Delaware	591
Erie	1,485
Fairfield	1,084
Fayette	578
Franklin	13,854
Fulton	603
Gallia	391
Geauga	381

Counties—Continued	Tax reduction
Greene	795
Guernsey	756
Hamilton	26,874
Hancock	1,006
Hardin	553
Harrison	344
Henry	492
Highland	614
Hocking	345
Holmes	320
Huron	817
Jackson	546
Jefferson	2,474
Knox	789
Lake	1,497
Lawrence	727
Licking	1,651
Logan	718
Lorain	3,370
Lucas	12,672
Madison	510
Mahoning	7,590
Marion	1,212
Medina	948
Meigs	470
Mercer	544
Miami	1,448
Monroe	200
Montgomery	11,541
Morgan	200
Morrow	248
Muskingum	1,850
Noble	186
Ottawa	621
Paulding	300
Perry	575
Pickaway	474
Pike	185
Portage	1,032
Preble	545
Putnam	560
Richland	2,252
Ross	1,096
Sandusky	1,066
Scioto	1,956
Seneca	1,301
Shelby	578
Stark	8,418
Summit	14,797
Trumbull	3,634
Tuscarawas	1,697
Union	492
Van Wert	638
Vinton	114
Warren	626
Washington	984
Wayne	1,388
Williams	709
Wood	1,221
Wyandot	481
Total	227,513

Had Enough?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Veterans' Report:

HAD ENOUGH?

It seems to us that the Republicans will have to figure out a new campaign slogan if they expect to get anywhere at the polls in 1948.

Last fall their slogan—"Had Enough?"—worked fine, for the country was suffering from war nerves and the voters were ready to try most any kind of medicine to cure them.

At this writing, and as a direct result of the kind of bromides prescribed by the Republicans, Uncle Sam not only is more nervous than ever before, but also his blood pressure is dangerously high. Coupled with the constantly rising prices of food, the medicine they've been giving him costs so much that Uncle Sam's family is reported to be looking around for other doctors.

No, the Republicans can't very well ask the voters whether they've "had enough" next year, for if they do the answer is apt to be a resounding "Yes," and if that's so old "Doc" Truman, who was muscled aside at the polls last fall is likely to be given another term in the White House, this time backed by a competent staff of "consulting physicians" in the United States Congress.

This country is not so ill but what it can be cured. However, it strikes us that if the medicine prescribed by the New Dealers was often hard to swallow, the petty behavior of the Republicans in the Eightieth Congress has had an even worse effect on the patient. Those who took over majority control of Congress from the New Dealers have been arguing so much about who is to take the place of "Doc" Truman in the White House that they haven't yet written out a satisfactory prescription for what ails us all.

At any other time, we could forgive and forget, considering that America is on the eve of a Presidential election. But in these days when everybody is depending so much on the recovery and leadership of Uncle Sam, there is no excuse for such horseplay as has taken place on Capitol Hill during the Eightieth Congress.

In our opinion, the behavior of the Seventy-ninth Congress—which marked the exit of the New Deal was bad enough to give anybody a headache. But the lobby-dominated, labor-baiting Eightieth Congress which promised so much and did so little for the little guy—especially the homeless veteran—takes the all-time prize for political skulduggery and boondoggling during a highly critical period in the history of America and the world.

Yes; recent Nation-wide opinion polls indicate that the people of America have "had enough." The majority—and this certainly includes millions of veterans—seem to lean toward Harry Truman at the moment. Unless the Republicans really go progressive and nominate a man of the caliber of Eisenhower or Bradley, this newspaper will have to go along with the Democrats.

Are Lower Tariffs Always Good?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the following article describes in general what difficulties face us when we attempt to conduct business with countries of the world whose products are placed in the markets not by individuals or private firms but products fully under the control of the Government itself.

[From Pathfinder for July 2, 1947]

ARE LOWER TARIFFS ALWAYS GOOD?

More heat than light was produced recently when Congress, the press, and radio debated about wool. The tariff angle of the Robertson wool bill was the match that set off the sputtering.

Again next year Congress will decide whether to extend the right of the President to reduce tariff duties by reciprocal agreement. His present authority expires July 1, 1948. The wool debate offered a foretaste of the arguments that will be heard before that date.

Belief appears to prevail that the United States is still a high-tariff country. Little attention has been paid to the fact that, on the contrary, the United States places fewer and lower restrictions on imports than do most other nations. United States barriers are lower than those of Britain, France, and of more than half of the world's trading nations.

Roughly two-thirds of our imports are duty-free. The largest items normally bought from overseas are rubber, coffee, sugar, tin, and silk. Of these only sugar pays any tariff.

How strongly should the United States insist that other countries lower their barriers? Many nations depend upon receipts from import duties for a large share of their national revenue. Sweden and China get nearly half of their revenue from duties. Is it our business to try to trade their revenue away from them?

Many countries need to protect new industries from competition by the United States and older industrial nations. Are we helping them help themselves if we try to bargain them out of such commendable efforts?

Any economy that depends on selling a raw material in the world market can depend on attaining one result: The people who do the work of production will remain in poverty. That has been true for the sugar hands of Cuba, for the rubber plantation workers in Malaya, for the tin miners of Bolivia—and for the cotton farmers of the American South.

Even now an agricultural minority in the Philippines protests against free trade with the United States in sugar and copra. They say that this means plantations up to the cabin doors.

Australia is one of many countries that desire American manufactures and therefore wants to sell goods here. Australia needs dollars and offers wool. We have wool. Wool in an Arctic war may well be a material as strategic as rubber was in 1942.

Economic strength—the strength that flows from a constantly growing, expanding nation—produces more than preparedness. The country has such strength when thousands of kinds of enterprises are healthy, active, and contributing their parts to the whole of employment and prosperity.

A policy that impairs an industry here, another there, can weaken the whole national economy.

Rather than to throw wool and a few other protected products to the internationl dogs, the United States might first do a better job of hunting out a greater variety of imports.

Obviously prudence calls for large stockpiles of whatever strategic minerals may not be here in ample supplies. Around the world there must be many kinds of handicrafts for which Americans would gladly pay dollars.

Much might be done to encourage foreign travel. That, along with purchase of other foreign services, affords means to scatter United States dollars abroad and get something for them in return.

To import what Americans need and do not have, and to spend dollars abroad for services Americans want, is to raise the American standard of living. No case has been made, however, that proves the necessity of driving some American producers out of business in order that others may export.

After all, what the people in most of the world need worst is not merely more trade. It is to produce for themselves more things they need.

Impressions of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Melvin P. McGovern, former Chief of Distribution of the UNRRA Mission to Poland:

The last gunshot in Europe was fired early in 1945. Peace was officially restored to the ravaged and destroyed countries of the Continent. The cessation of hostilities did not signify the end of toil, sacrifice, or struggle for the war-weary peoples of Europe. There still remained the gigantic task of reconstruction. It took the remainder of 1945 for these countries to fully calculate their losses and lay down workable plans for rehabilitation. Therefore, the actual physical reconstruction of Europe didn't begin until January of 1946.

Poland experienced more misery and devastation in human lives and material wealth than any other European nation. She lived through a literal inferno of Nazi occupation. To indicate the immensity of the problem facing the Polish people at the time of liberation, here are some figures on Poland's wartime losses: 6,104,990 Polish citizens killed; 10,000 factories and industrial plants destroyed; 300,000 buildings and 400,000 farms totally or partly left in ruins; 100 percent of the machine-tool industry wiped out; 6,399 damaged schools; 15,900,000 books destroyed; approximately 6,500,000 children in need of medical care, homes, and food.

But, in the face of these seemingly unsurmountable problems, the Polish people willingly turned to the enormous task of rebuilding their destroyed cities, renovating their factories, resowing their farmlands, reestablishing their transportation and communication lines, and countless other tasks. The accomplishments of the Polish people during the past year and a half is nothing short of remarkable. Emerging from the dark chaos of war, the Polish people, through their undying love for their motherland, have instilled new life in their war-ravaged country.

The reconstruction of their ruined capital, Warsaw, is symbolic of the Polish people's achievements during the past year and a half. The Germans had wantonly destroyed this once glorious city, burning its buildings and killing off the populace. Rising from the burning embers the few remaining Poles proceeded with the work of resurrecting Warsaw. A Supreme Council of Reconstruction, comprised of representatives of social, artistic, technical, and professional groups, was formed. Its task was to mobilize all the spiritual and material resources of the nation for the work of rebuilding the city. Not only was the new capital to be based on the old cultural traditions, but its physical environment would coincide with the new social, economic, and political life of the nation.

During the past year and a half great strides have been made in rebuilding Warsaw: Electric plants have been rebuilt; the water system has been repaired; radio station reconstructed; surface transportation has been restored; and many other improvements have been instituted.

One has to be in Warsaw only a short time before one realizes that this city is unlike other ruined cities of Europe. There is a spirit that transcends the sorrow and destruction. On the top of a heap of rubble, where a beautiful edifice once stood, there is now a flower shop. Further down the street, on tops of similar heaps of crumbled stone, one will find a clothing store, a book mart, or other "temporary" shops. All over the city people are rebuilding and renovating. One gets the feeling that the Polish people do not believe in waiting for machinery, equipment, etc.—they are rebuilding with their hearts and hands. Warsaw will live again because the people believe in the inherent value of reconstruction; because the people love her dearly; and because the people are enthusiastic about the future of Poland and are willing to sacrifice to achieve a better life.

But, the spirit in Warsaw is not unlike the feeling of all Poland. Wherever one goes people are working, learning, creating. They have faith and courage in what they are doing. They will succeed.

One of Poland's greatest achievements to date has been the reconstruction of its transportation and communication system. Before the war Poland had a well-organized railroad system. The Germans did their best during the occupation to change that. They confiscated railroad cars, locomotives, and engines. They destroyed about 30 percent of Poland's railway tracks (10,000 miles); 42 percent of her engines; 92 percent of her passenger cars; and 92 percent of her freight cars. At the end of the war Poland was left with 30 locomotives, 100 passenger cars, and 2,000 freight cars. These, without exception, were antiquated German cars, minus windows and doors, and locomotives which couldn't travel 100 miles without stopping for repairs.

At the beginning of the reconstruction period it was not an uncommon sight to see people traveling on the steps and tops of trains or inside passenger cars without doors, windows, or seats. Such was the legacy of German destruction which the Poles took over in the spring of 1945.

Today the picture is still far from perfect, but scenes like the above are no longer common. Poland now has 3,000 locomotives, 5,000 passenger cars, and 122,000 freight cars. In addition, on some few lines, the prewar luxury of sleeping-car accommodations has been reinstituted.

All in all, the Polish people are once again "riding the rails." (The number of passengers on all lines is approaching prewar figures, i. e., 202,000,000 in 1946 as compared with 226,000,000 in 1938.)

At the end of the war Polish bridges were in a state of complete destruction. (Seventy percent of her large bridges were demolished.) The Poniatowski Bridge, the largest in Warsaw, is a good example of what is being done today. It took 7 years prior to World War I to build this bridge. It was destroyed during that war and was reconstructed in 3 years during the early twenties. Totally destroyed by the Germans in World War II, it was rebuilt this time in only 1 year, despite the worse condition existing after this war than after the First World War.

Taking everything into account, the speed in which Poland has rebuilt her transportation and communication system marks one of the great achievements in the economic recovery of Europe.

Perhaps the most striking example of the rapidity with which Poland is rebuilding her industries is her coal production. The losses sustained by the Polish coal mines during the war are estimated to be as high as $700,000,000. Despite this, the Polish people at the beginning of 1946 undertook the gigantic job of rebuilding their coal-producing industry.

So successful have they been that today Poland stands out as the No. 1 supplier of coal in Europe. Her total production for 1947 is expected to be 57,500,000 tons, of which 18,300,000 tons will be exported, as against 45,000,000 tons produced last year, of which 13,487,934 tons were exported. These figures have tremendous significance for the economic recovery of the continent. Europe's most urgent need today is coal. Production in the Ruhr has been decreasing, and Great Britain, once a great exporter of coal, is forced to import coal from the United States and other countries. Consequently, Poland, with its mounting coal production, is becoming the one shining light in an otherwise bleak coal picture in Europe.

One reason offered by many people for the increased coal production in Poland as compared to other countries is the high productivity and enthusiasm of the Polish miner—this, despite the fact that the Polish worker receives fewer calories than the German worker.

Poland's coal production would increase many more times if she could receive more modern mining equipment.

Another area in which Poland has recovered rapidly since the end of the war is her ports and harbors. Destruction in the ports at the time they were liberated was practically 100 percent. Most of the harbors were mined and blocked by sunken ships.

Today, after months of steady work, all of the ports are back in operation. Gdansk can now handle 40 ships daily. The port of Szczecin is now prepared to receive large ocean vessels. Its warehouses and wharves have been rebuilt. An important addition to this port's commercial potentialities is the rehabilitation of its grain elevator with a capacity of 42,000 tons, the largest in Poland.

In 1946 the two principal ports, Gydnia and Gdansk, handled 2,800,691 tons of imports and 4,945,495 tons of exports. With the addition of 19 former German freighters to the Polish merchant marine and with the increased port facilities, these two ports are expected to handle 12,400,000 tons in the course of this year under the provisions of existing trade agreements.

The results of Poland's reconstruction endeavors during the past 18 months were "on display" recently at her first post-war international fair held at Poznan during the latter part of April 1947. At this fair, participated in by 1,500 foreign exhibitors and attended by 363,000 persons, Poland displayed products of 17 branches of her industry.

In traveling throughout Poland, one becomes more and more aware of one important fact: Poland has made great advances in reconstruction, but she needs assistance, especially food and machinery. During the past few years UNRRA provided this aid, but now, with the activities of UNRRA completed, the food situation is extremely grave. During the past few months Poland has been forced to purchase grain on the world market and use her few remaining dollars. She still has a grain deficit of 200,000 tons but no dollars with which to purchase the much needed grain.

Poland is in a position to contribute to the rehabilitation of Europe in a very high degree and she is anxious to do so. She has enough coal to fulfill a great part of Europe's need, but to do so she must have food for her miners and modern machinery to work the mines. Assistance given to Poland would result in her rapid reconstruction and that in turn would mean more assistance to the rest of Europe.

One cannot write about reconstruction in Poland without considering the enormous progress that has been made in the western territories, Poland's recovered territories. A visitor to these areas in the summer of 1945 would have seen only desolation, destruction, idleness, and despair. Today the picture has completely changed. As Charles Drury, one of the former chiefs of the UNRRA mission to Poland, said upon returning from a visit to these areas in 1946: I was greatly impressed * * * by the determination with which the Polish people are undertaking the task. We were in areas where the Poles had been operating as slave laborers for the Germans during the war. Now they are converting these same plants in which they were

slaves to the production of coal cars and other reconstruction items."

When the Big Three at Potsdam agreed to the reversion of the western territories to Poland's possession, the Polish Nation embarked on one of the greatest tasks in European history—the resettlement and reconstruction of a war-devastated area and the repatriation of Germans back to Germany. This involved the movement of millions of people. Today over 4,000,000 Poles have been resettled and about 2,000,000 Germans repatriated.

The resettlement of Poles in these areas has been compared to the early American pioneer days. These hardy people, with no other place to go, have decided to settle in these territories and rebuild a new life. Despite the greatest hardships and difficulties, these people are on the road to building a new civilization out of a wasteland.

To illustrate the extent of Polish colonization in these areas here are a few facts and figures:

Before the last shots were fired in the streets of Wroclaw (Breslau), a group of Polish officials (17) entered the city and established a city administration. They proceeded to extinguish fires, clean up the streets and restore sanitation and other facilities. Since then the 17 pioneers have been joined by 180,000 settlers and the once ghost town has been restored to life. Two of the three bridges have been rebuilt. Thirty new school buildings and 18 hospitals have been constructed. Art and book collections have been brought to the city from Lwow by permission of the Ukrainian Government.

Walking through the streets of Wroclaw—and it should be pointed out that what is going on there is typical of all the cities in Poland—one cannot but help admire the intense determination, willingness to sacrifice, and unrelenting spirit of these new Polish settlers.

The greatest activity in these territories—and that which is most essential to Poland's economic recovery—is occurring in the Silesian coal fields. Here, in mines that had been ruthlessly exploited and later destroyed by the Germans, Polish miners are putting every ounce of their strength into mining coal. Despite poor equipment, the shortage of electric power, the lack of skilled workmen, Poland has succeeded in increasing coal production steadily.

Because of the importance of coal, both to the reconstruction of Poland and to the economy of Europe, it becomes clear how important the recovered territories, and particularly the Silesian coal fields, are to Poland. Already people are describing the Silesian region as the Ruhr of Poland or the Polish Pittsburgh.

In other branches of industry reconstruction in the recovered territories is proceeding at a rapid pace.

Transportation facilities in these areas were badly wrecked by the Germans. The settlers have rehabilitated bridges and railroads with amazing speed. More than 70 percent of the large bridges and 77 percent of the small bridges have been rebuilt.

Like all other branches of the economy, agriculture in the regained territories was in a miserable state at the time of liberation. Through the efforts of the Polish Government much progress has been made in restoring some semblance of a going farm economy. More than 80 percent of the horses, cows, and other farm animals supplied by UNRRA and other agencies were sent to these areas to speed up the agricultural revival. Four hundred thousand acres of land belonging to former German landowners have been divided among the new Polish farmers. Since food is so essential to the maintenance of a healthy Polish economy, the agricultural achievements in these areas take on greater significance as the days go by.

When discussing rehabilitation in the recovered territories one cannot pass by without mentioning the cultural progress that has been made. As of June 30, 1946, there were 4,000 schools of all types, 1 university, 1 academy of medicine, 1 engineering school, 1,000 kindergartens, 130 homes for children, and 80 industrial or trade schools. The destruction of Polish culture during the war was not merely a result of normal hostilities; it was the result of a well-calculated and methodically executed campaign developed by the Nazis. But just as the Polish people are rebuilding their homes, farms, and factories, so too they are resurrecting their culture. The Germans were able to break Polish bodies, destroy Polish cities, and devastate Polish farm lands, but they were not able to still the Polish faith and spirit, the Polish will to learn and create.

From this brief and far from complete review of the accomplishments in the recovered territories one can understand why these areas have been called the cornerstone of Poland's economic reconstruction.

In all Europe the writer has seen nothing comparable to the advances made by the Polish people during the past year and a half. Where once there was confusion and uncertainty, today there is hope, order, and assurance. The Polish people are forever looking ahead. Out of the ruins of the old order a new Poland is rising.

Minnesota Wilderness Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Minneapolis Star of July 4, 1947:

UNSPOILED WILDERNESS RETREAT NOW UP TO CONGRESS

(By George L. Peterson)

ELY, MINN.—Proper way to get acquainted with the international boundary territory north of Ely is by canoe. It's just about the finest canoe country left in the United States, because it still is a virgin, roadless, wilderness in large part.

But I wanted to get a bird's-eye view of the whole area. So with Federal Ranger Jack Valentine as guide and C. M. Nelson as pilot we took off in a forest service seaplane from Shagawa Lake here. A brisk wind was blowing and the silver ship bobbed around in the air as we flew northeast to Lac la Croix. Then we headed west along the border, flew almost to Saganaga Lake, turned south and east and came down at Basswood lodge on Basswood Lake.

It was a perfect day for sightseeing from the air. And what a sight.

The country is rocky and hilly, covered with forests of pine and spruce. Generous rains this spring have made the landscape greener than usual. Not a single forest fire marred the view. A dozen lakes were always to be seen below us—deep blue lakes reflecting the sky, with a tinge of brown from iron. Shorelines were rugged and picturesque, seldom a marshy spot along them.

We flew low over rapids which were discharging the highest water levels in years. A priest and guide were swept over Basswood Falls last week when fishing. Their boat and motor were smashed, but they got out of the battering 30-foot drop with only bruises.

In a couple of hours we covered territory where canoe parties, traveling 15 or 20 miles a day, may spend entrancing weeks. Fishing is grand—pike, northerns, lake trout. Even better is the smell of the pine, the clean air, the solitude.

That roadless area—a million acres on the Minnesota side, another million in Ontario—is one of the few remaining easily accessible wilderness expanses. Ray Hoefler of Ely estimates that more than 8,000 American canoeists explore the region each summer. It is so attractive a vacation spot that more lodges are being built and planned to exploit the northern charms. More and more seaplanes fly in.

Now, vacation lodges are fine in their place. But Minnesota has 11,000 lakes outside the wilderness area where they can be built. One sizable spot should be left for a gateway and a place where future generations may see what America looked like before the white man civilized it.

Designated roadless areas in the Superior National Forest total 1,077,000 acres. A bill before Congress defines a truly wilderness area of 460,000 acres from which the Forest Service would like to exclude resorts and other improvements. The Government owns some of the land already. It is estimated that another 110,000 acres must be purchased to protect the lakes and streams.

The bill lists 56 tracts to be acquired from private owners, 19 of them improved, 8 with resorts. Some of the land can be acquired by exchanging Government acreage elsewhere. Cash outlay would be about $500,000.

Izaak Walton League members have been active in getting together a fund of about $100,000 and have bought up some of the tracts. These members will turn the property over to the Federal Forest Service at cost if public funds are made available. In one deal at Kekekabic Lake, Izaak Walton Leaguers paid for improvements at a half-built lodge, the Government traded property on the west end of Lac la Croix for the land, and the owners moved out.

The bill would not disturb the old established resorts on Basswood, Saganaga, Seagull of the west end of Lac la Croix. It would reclaim and maintain the rest of the beautiful border area in its primeval beauty.

There is strong indication that Canada will do the same thing on its side of the boundary if America makes this fine move.

One of the chief obstacles to congressional approval of the bill is a provision that the Government pay the affected counties—Cook, Lake, and St. Louis—12 cents an acre annually in lieu of taxes.

Present law gives counties 25 percent of the net income from national-forest land located inside their borders. Sale of timber is the biggest item, although there is some revenue from rental of cabin sites.

But income from the wilderness area would be almost nil under that arrangement. Little timber cutting is contemplated there. The idea is to zone it for canoeing and camping, not for commercial exploitation.

Last year the three counties received $39,838 as their share of revenue from all Federal holdings. Those holdings include the vast Superior Forest. And last year's cut for the counties was the largest in history, brought about by abnormal demand for timber and not likely to be repeated.

The three counties, all sparsely settled, have little opportunity for tax revenue except for the iron mines. Yet they must provide roads and other services. The State has had to bail out these northern counties on occasion. It seems only just that the Nation, which takes over custody of the wilderness area, share in a small way the cost of local government in the region.

Chester Wilson, State conservation commissioner, and Federal forestry officials have given long study to this per-acre payment and approve it.

Though Ely may be penalized in a business way if fewer resorts dot the border

country, the chamber of commerce here is strongly behind the bill. A party of Congressmen is due in August to look over the region. Ely conservationists are sure that a trip into the wilderness is all the lawmakers need to convince them of the necessity for acquiring now this area where wilderness beauty is making a last stand.

The Growth of the Automotive Industry From 1904 to 1946—One of the Nation's Greatest Sources of Employment and Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the automotive industry has become one of the Nation's greatest assets in the relatively short span of 42 years, both as a source of tax revenue and as a means of employment for one out of every seven persons in the United States. One out of every six business concerns is directly connected with the manufacture, sale, service, or operation of automobiles and trucks.

The growth of this industry has been phenomenal. In 1904 only 22,000 passenger cars and 1,000 trucks were produced. By 1929 the total number of passenger cars and trucks produced reached 5,358,000, with a total wholesale value of $3,413,000,000. In spite of the decrease in production caused by the war, in 1946 production climbed back to 3,090,000 trucks and passenger cars, with a total wholesale value of $3,216,000,000.

The automotive industry today provides one of the largest sources of tax revenue for the Government. In 1921 special motor user taxes amounted to only $275,000,000. In 1946 taxes paid by the motoring public rose to $2,507,000,000. Federal collections from motorists in 1947 are expected to reach a point where the mortists will contribute about 3 percent of President Truman's proposed national budget for the 1948 fiscal year.

State registration fees in 1946 amounted to $551,318,000. State gasoline taxes alone collected $1,064,681,000. Municipal and county governments accounted for an additional $15,000,000, and highway and bridge tolls added another $80,000,000.

In 1946 the American motorist contributed $5,000 a minute in special Federal, State, and local taxes. Three-fourths of the Federal excise levies were paid by the population group which in 1941 was making $3,000 or less in income. In contrast, this group pays only one-eighth of income taxes.

Today automobiles are a necessity in the daily lives of millions of Americans. Fifty-five percent of automobile mileage is used for business. Forty-five percent of the total mileage represents social and recreational driving. The automotive industry contributes to every phase of living in our Nation. The industry in the short span of its existence has grown in size and services rendered until today it represents one of the greatest assets in the United States. The men who built this industry and who work in it today are to be commended for the contribution they have made to the Nation as a whole.

Finland's Debt to Russia Should Be Canceled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution which would authorize the President to reduce the Russian indebtedness to the United States by an amount equal to the sum that Finland owes the Russians in reparations under the peace treaty between Finland and Russia of February 10, 1947.

The resolution is short and simple and so I quote it here in its entirety:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should make appropriate agreements and arrangements for the purpose of cancelling the amount which Finland owes in reparations to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics under the treaty of peace with Finland, signed February 10, 1947, by reducing, in an equal amount, the amount which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics owes to the United States under the Lend-Lease Act.

The effect of this resolution would be to exonerate the Finns from paying the Russians a debt which they do not owe on any basis of fairness or justice by simply reducing to that extent the amount of money which the Russians rightfully owe the United States—and which they will never pay.

Because we were never at war with Finland, we were not permitted to have any voice in her treaty with Russia. This treaty which the Russians forced upon the Finns in 1944 by unilateral action was one of the most brutal, ruthless and oppressive ever recorded in world history. None of the great powers for the world, including this country came to her assistance. We stood by silently while the Russians emasculated her government and the freedom of her people.

Finland was the first victim of the Soviet program of aggression which has now spread half way around the world. It started back in 1939 when the mighty Soviet horde attacked little Finland without any cause or provocation. When Finland fought back to defend her freedom and the integrity of her borders, the whole world marveled at the demonstration of national heroism—against overwhelming odds. The leaders of all the great countries spoke out against this wanton aggression by the Russians. Russia was righteously condemned and properly expelled from the League of Nations. Fighting alone so bravely against this ruthless and brutal adversary Finland had the sympathy of the entire civilized world. But times changed. A few years later when the Finns fought to regain what the Russians had taken from them, they were branded as aggressors by the same people who denounced the Russians in 1939.

Then came 1944. The war was still on when the Russians forced upon the Finns one of the most brutal reparation agreements ever recorded. We made no effort to invoke the terms of the Atlantic Charter in Finland's behalf at the very time when the Charter was fresh in everyone's mind and when most people thought it would be adhered to.

Many of us could see then that if Stalin and his program of aggression was not stopped at Finland's borders it would probably be too late to stop him anywhere in Europe. On March 21, 1944, I made a statement in this House on this very subject which I am taking the liberty of quoting in part:

> We have groups in this country urging Finland and Poland to accept the unilateral peace terms of the Soviet as the best means out of a desperate situation. How can we in the spirit of fairness and common decency urge a settlement which will mean virtual extermination of the free and independent governments of these sturdy little countries? Why, Mr. Speaker, that is the very sort of thing that killed the treaty of Versailles. It amounts to a sacrifice of principle for expediency; it means the abandoning of human rights and liberties at a moment when we can least afford to make that sacrifice. No, Mr. Speaker, in making such assertions these people are doing irreparable damage to the cause of freedom of governments and freedom of peoples everywhere when this war is finally won. I will tell you what I think we should do, and I say this as an average American, because I am neither statesman nor diplomat. We should insist that the Soviet Union live up to her agreements; we should insist that the Atlantic Charter be followed and adhered to now; and last, but not least, we should insist that the Soviet Union treat us as an equal ally equally concerned with the outcome of this conflict and equally concerned with the peace and future welfare of the world. Mr. Stalin will listen to our side of the story if he knows that we mean what we say; but I think it is clear that he will continue to do exactly as he pleases in his dealings with other nations unless we convey to him in plain, simple, and straightforward language of unmistakable meaning, that we expect his government to deal with its allies with all cards on the table, in the spirit of harmony and friendliness so vital to winning both war and peace.

Mr. Speaker, events have proven that we waited too long to get tough with Stalin. We could have stopped him easily in 1944 but because of our stupid foreign policy, we must now pay the penalty of stopping him the hard way.

Mr. Speaker, there was never any reason for the United States to change its attitude toward Finland. The only reason for it was our desire to appease Mr. Stalin and the Russian Communists—a policy which I assert we shall always regret. Finland fought the Russians in 1939 and again in 1942 for exactly the same purposes. She fought to preserve the freedom of her people and their democratic government. Finland wanted nothing from the Russians except the right to live in unmolested peace.

Nevertheless, we went to great lengths in helping the Russians conquer Finland. In 1944, in this little nation's darkest hour, our State Department added insult to injury by expelling from our borders the Minister to Finland, Hjalmer Procope. Mr. Procope's only offense was that he hated Communist Russia and justifiably maintained the right of his own country to defend itself against Stalin's aggression.

After Procope's departure we stood by while Stalin forced his communist regime upon the people of Finland and compelled them to agree to pay the Russians $300,000,000 in alleged reparations within the short space of 8 years.

Moreover, in addition to this unconscionable reparations agreement, Finland was forced to surrender one-twelfth of the entire area of her country. This included the warm water Arctic seaports, together with the most northern parts of Finland rich in copper and nickel as well as vital agricultural areas in Karelia, in the eastern part of Finland. Approximately one-twelfth of the population of Finland lost their homes in these areas and had to be absorbed elsewhere. Mr. Speaker, this $300,000,000 which the Finns must pay the Russians is sapping their very lifeblood. It is payable in commodities such as timber products, paper, cellulose, seagoing and river craft and sundry machinery. This means that the major part of her natural resources must go to the Russians over an 8-year period.

If there is any justice in this world, Mr. Speaker, these reparations ought to be canceled. If Finland is to survive as a free and democratic nation, they must be canceled. Stalin's current program of aggression got its start in Finland. We ought to start there to stop it.

National Security Training Act of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. HEDRICK
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the House Armed Services Committee, July 24, 1947, on the subject of national security and the bill—H. R. 4278—to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am in favor of some form of universal military training. However, I cannot support fully H. R. 4278, called the National Security Training Act of 1947. There are some features of this bill which I cannot agree with, and I further believe that this bill should not have come up at the present time, near the end of the session, having been rushed through the subcommittee without the proper hearings and consideration by the committee.

This subject is controversial, and both the proponents and the opponents of this measure should have had the privilege of appearing and presenting their views before the subcommittee. This was apparently denied them.

I cannot agree that the National Security Training Commission, whose duty it is to set up the policy and standards of the training of the program, should have at least one member from the armed forces. I believe that this training should be kept entirely in the hands of a civilian Commission. I believe that the Commission should have full authority over the specifications and manner in which this training should be administered, and that the Secretaries of the War and Navy Departments should act only as consultants to the Commission—without authority to prescribe the method of training.

I am also opposed to the selective-training system as proposed in this measure, which is similar, if not identical, to the selective-service system used during the war. I feel that many fathers and mothers of this country will oppose such a system which simulates the methods used during the war to induct their sons in the armed services.

I further believe that H. R. 4278 goes into minor details too extensively, and the bill of 82 pages has been hastily drawn. It is confusing. Almost one-third of this bill is devoted to the punishment for minor offenses of the law, which, in my opinion, should be handled entirely by the commanding officer in charge.

Therefore, I do not favor the passage of this bill at this time.

Get Ready for Greatness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I desire to include an address recently delivered before the Chautauqua Summer Assembly, Chautauqua, N. Y., by Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson, an eminent lecturer and author of Lebanon, Wilson County, Tenn. Dr. Taylor's address entitled "Get Ready for Greatness," appears as follows:

GET READY FOR GREATNESS

I am profoundly grateful for the delightful privilege of speaking to you today. It is a great hour to be alive. Tennyson told us a day in Sicily was better than a cycle in Cathay. Well may we feel that a month of life today is better than all the many centuries of Methusaleh, whose biography is complete in these few words, "Methusaleh lived for 969 years and died."

Many of you are in life's springtime, the poetry period of life. We cannot wholly agree with the poet that "Blessed of the gods are they who die ere youth has fled," but May is more to be desired than November. Shakespeare called the world a stage and all men and women merely players upon that stage. Many of you are now coming upon the stage of active life. For you the curtain is now rising upon scene 1 of act 1.

We hear much about the gloom which hangs like a cloud everywhere. You will remember that Dante began his great classic with a reference to a dark and gloomy wood and closed that classic, after much wandering with Virgil in hell, with a reference to the stars. Today we are in one of the tunnel periods of history. Tunnels everywhere are dark and gloomy, but the light at all their exits is blinding in its brilliancy.

Winston Churchill, at a dark hour in English history, encouraged a brave people with these optimistic words:

"In front the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward, look, the land is bright!"

"Am I asking too much that we sing!
Now at last tho oft mistaken, oft despairing
At last methinks I see the dawn:
Soon shall the awakened nations
Proclaim the passing of the night forlorn;
Soon shall the long conceived child of time
be born of progress;
Soon the morn sublime shall burst effulgent
thru the clouds of earth,
And light time's greatest page, O right! thy
glorious birth!"

I am sure many of you are now dreaming of greatness. "For too low they build who build beneath the stars." My message is for you. My subject is "Get ready for greatness." We shall discuss the word "greatness" in a twofold sense. First, let us consider it in terms of our new era. Toynbee, the great English historian, tells us we have had 19 separate civilizations during our 6,000 years of recorded history; of that number, 14 now lie in ruins.

You have read of the different ages that have prevailed in our world history, of the Stone Age, the Bronze Age, and finally of the Golden Age. May I suggest Uranean as the name for our present age. Uranium, as we all know, was one of the basic elements used in the making of earth's most terrible and destructive weapon of war. Uranus, you will recall, was in Greek mythology the personification of heaven. The god Uranus was, also, the father of the Titans. The planet Uranus is one of the most distant in the sky. Let us hope and pray that in the future uranium will be used to restore the lost Eden of man instead of for the hastening of a Dantean Hades.

Let us think of the word "greatness" primarily in terms of personal growth and gain. We are inclined to associate it only with high place and power. We forget that many mute but glorious Milton's live and die unknown. The true greatness of the individual is of the mind and heart. It is a quality which belongs to the great servants of mankind and not to its masters. It is the God-given attribute of those who live and move in tune with the philosophy that the only truly great are those who serve unselfishly their day and generation.

Let us now consider ways in which to get ready for greatness. First, get ready for greatness physically. Samuel Johnson said a sick man was a scoundrel, an observation which many wives would confirm. Our recent long list of rejections for Army service disclosed the low physical and mental state of our Nation. Our many health campaigns make more vivid that sober fact. We are told that 200,000,000,000 human beings have been born into the world during the past 2,000 years. The vast majority of that number lived lives as brief as they were empty. They were—

"Like a snowflake on the river
A moment white, then gone forever."

We boast here in America of our decade by decade extension of life expectancy. We are told that it increased from 20 to 40 years between 1650 and 1850, and that now it is three times what it was 300 years ago. But let us not forget that a great deal of this increase has not been an increase in the length of adult lives but in the reduction of infant mortality.

Recent college graduates will find comfort in the forecast that the future life expectancy of the 200,000 1947 college graduates will be 51½ years for the female graduate and 45 years for the male graduate. The female of the species may not be more deadly

than the male, but she is at least more successful in defying the demon called death.

Too many of our great leaders fall at life's noontide. Theodore Roosevelt, the most athletic of all our President, died at 60, though he entered that high office as its youngest occupant. Wendell Willkie, a recent contender for the Presidency, died in his early fifties. Poe the poet died at 40 years of age.

Our new age calls for the firmest of muscles, the steadiest of nerves, and the soundest of hearts. So I beg of you to touch not, taste not, handle not anything which would prevent the maximum strength and beauty. If you travel too fast on life's highway, do not blame fate or Providence if you reach its end ahead of schedule.

It is a singular fact that our two greatest Presidents, Washington and Lincoln, were physical giants. So was Phillips Brooks, America's best-known preacher. So was Brigham Young, the Mormon leader, the one hundredth anniversary of whose westward trek to Utah was recently celebrated.

Many noble souls have bravely fought on despite their physical handicaps. The sanguine Robert Louis Stevenson sang:

"The world is so full of a number of things,
I am sure we should all be as happy as kings."

A sad but defiant Henley cried:

"It matters not how straight the gate,
How charged with punishment the scroll,
I am the master of my fate.
I am the captain of my soul."

But their optimism and bravery did not drown out the pathos of their pain-racked lives.

So strive to become like Hercules in strength and Helen in beauty. Remember that the choicest cosmetic is character, sweet modest gentle Christian character. Its mark is indelible. It alone survives unchanged the storm of life. It, too, will shine brightest in the light of the eternal morning.

Get ready for greatness—mentally.

The future will belong to the brightest in mind. The day of the thinker has come. The leaders of the future will be those who can out-think and out-act their rivals. Psychologists tell us the difference in normal human minds is largely a matter of cultivation, that not over one-tenth of the average man's brainpower is ever used. Sad would be the fate of any business or bank where only one-tenth of their resources were in use.

It was refreshing to read that more than one-half of Columbia University's 1947 graduating class were of Phi Beta Kappa rank. We often confuse the words "knowledge" and "wisdom." We have many men of knowledge but few of wisdom. "Knowledge is earthly and of the mind: wisdom is heavenly and of the soul." Our great need is for more mental poise and serenity of soul. We have all but forgotten that contemplation is as necessary as action. We are an all but neurotic nation. The crowded condition of our mental institutions bear witness to that fact. We need to choose more carefully our mental menu if our caps and bells shall mean to us what they should. We need a more wholesome and calm approach to all our problems. We have not learned to meet with triumph and disaster and treat both imposters just the same, as Kipling advised us to do.

Next, we have largely lost the lessons of nature and solitude—"To see the world in a grain of sand and heaven in a wild flower." There are still "sermons in stones, tongues in trees and books in running brooks." We need to be still. It has been said that the notes of the nightingale would be no sweeter than those of the wren if heard at noonday when all the geese are cackling. It was in calm Concord that Emerson said of Thoreau, his pupil and fellow lover of nature, "he was at home wherever there was knowledge, wherever there was virtue and wherever there was beauty." Such riches may be yours.

Get ready for greatness—socially. We are using the word social in a personal and, also a general way. The art of human understanding is one mastered by a minority of us. However, unless we learn early in life to move along peacefully and successfully with others, the odds for success are against us. President Conant of Harvard recently declared that 90 percent of those who lose their positions, both high and low, do so primarily because they are unable to get along with their fellow workers. The wise person adjusts himself to his state whatever it may be. The inability to do that was named as one of the reasons why the dinosaur disappeared from the earth 60,000,000 years ago.

A vital factor in every successful life is the ability to make and hold friends. Kingsley who answered "I had a friend" when asked the secret of his success was not the only one who could give such a reply. That has been the secret behind many great lives. No one will ever have a surplus of friends. It would be well to make new ones every day, for sooner or later like autumn leaves they fall and die.

"He who has a thousand friends
Hath not a friend to spare,
For he who hath an enemy
Will find him everywhere."

Then we must think of the word social in a larger way. We are a part of the great human family whether we enjoy it or not, our human boundaries have been broadened. Socrates, long ago, said: "I am no longer an Athenian or Greek, but a citizen of the world." His world was a puny one in comparison with ours. Patrick Henry rose in our first Continental Congress in Philadelphia and eloquently declared, "I am no longer a Virginian, I am an American." New occasions have brought to us new duties. When Washington was President, 70 percent of our population was of English origin. It is quite different now. We were then a provincial people. We, like Socrates of old, are now world citizens. What a demand for tolerance and human understanding!

We have become one world in business relationships, but we are far from it in human brotherhood. We have learned how to die together successfully, but we have yet to learn how to live together in peace and harmony. We sometimes forget that our roll of the great is a cosmopolitan one. The answers come to us from various climes and countries. From Greece we have the voices of Homer and Demosthenes; from Italy those of Dante and Virgil; from Poland, the Catholic Copernicus; from Russia, the troubled Tolstoy; and from Germany we hear the voices of the cultured Kant and Goethe.

A deep sense of justice, an abiding mercy, and a God-given humility alone will prepare us socially for greatness.

Get ready for greatness—spiritually. Every student of our times is aware of the spiritual depression which has long prevailed, not only in America but everywhere. It is a world-wide tragedy. We have advanced a thousandfold faster in a material way than we have in a spiritual way. Things have long been in the saddle. We forget that the Golden Age was not an age of golden things but of golden minds and hearts. We need to learn afresh that goodness is preferable to gadgets, and that royal manhood, not moving machinery, makes a nation great. We forget that spiritual values are as real as material ones; that faith is as real as the fragrance of flowers, hope is as eternal as the everlasting hills, and love is as luminous as the light from sun and moon and stars.

History has proven that only men and women of a strong religious faith survive long the stings and arrows of misfortune. In a brilliantly written magazine article some months ago, the story is told of the saintly men and women who came unscarred in souls, though broken in body, out of the death house at Dachau.

The study of astronomy has always been a valued adjunct to the students of religion. It is our oldest science. Kant named the starry heavens, along with the moral order in man, as his reasons for believing in God. He was not alone in thinking that the heavens declare the glory of God. Your speaker saw with supreme interest out in California a few weeks ago the final work upon the lens of the world's largest telescope. Millions await with infinite interest the new wonders of the sky it may reveal.

You will remember that Pluto was the name given to our newest planet, discovered at Lowell Observatory in Flagstaff, Ariz., a few years ago. Suppose we let the five letters—P-l-u-t-o—suggest to us certain great absolutes in all spiritual growth.

P is for purity. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." So spoke time's greatest teacher. The light of purity cannot enter the stained soul. Milton never failed to pay homage to purity. It was he who wrote:

"Love virtue! She alone is free!
She can teach you how to climb
Higher than the sphery chime,
Or, if virtue feeble were
Heaven itself would stoop to her."

L—for love. Love never faileth. It is the divine alchemy which transforms foe into friend, darkness into light, and hell into a heaven. The supreme contribution to Jesus of Nazareth was the revelation of God as love. That was a far cry from the vindictive gods of the pagan world. Whatever our faiths may be, we can all sing together with John Greenleaf Whittier, the Quaker poet:

"I know not where his islands
Lift their fronded palms in air;
I only know I cannot drift
Beyond his love and care."

U—for unselfishness. The sublimest of the paradoxes is that we only find ourselves when we lose ourselves in some great cause. Emerson reminded us that we forget ourselves into immortality. Tennyson wrote:

"Love took up the harp, smote upon its chords with all its might, smote upon the chord of self that trembling passed in music out of sight."

T—for truth. The perplexed Pilate of old asked what is truth? When Truth Incarnate stood before him. "Ye shall know the truth and it shall make you free." That is the great glory of the true scientist. William Cullen Bryant warned us that truth crushed to earth will rise again. Lowell sang:

"Truth forever on the scaffold,
Wrong forever on the throne;
Yet that scafford sways the future
And behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow,
Keeping watch above His own."

O—for order. In our disturbed and depressed age we could well pray with the psalmist, "Let me never be put to confusion." Clear and calm minds were never needed more. Pope called order heaven's first law. Victor Hugo reminded us that God is awake while we are sleeping, and that a divine justice will always prevail. The laws of God, in man as in nature, are inexorable; we cannot successfully defy them.

The great goal of every fine person is to grow into a beautiful soul. It was for that Plato prayed to Pan his pagan god. It is for that men and women make their holy pilgrimages. Oliver Wendell Holmes prayed that his soul might leave its low vaulted past as it built for itself more stately mansions. The ancient writer in his historic prayer cried exultingly, "He restoreth my soul."

A final word—one of our classic stories is Hawthorne's story of The Great Stone Face, which tells of the lad who gazing day after day upon that face dreamed that some day

a native son who had wandered afar, in fame, would return home bearing upon his countenance the image of the great stone face. One by one came those who had won riches, military renown, fame in a statesman's life, and finally, poetic fame. But none of them could be likened to the rocky face upon the mountain side.

At last, with spiritual insight, the poet reminded his former friends and neighbors that the one time lad who had kept the vision of the great stone face before him as he served in his humble way was the real one who had grown into its likeness.

May you, strong in body, cultured in mind and selfless in soul, fix your minds and hearts forever upon our Rock of Ages and so serve His creatures high and low, and so grow into His image and then you will be ready for greatness.

Excess-Lands Limitation on Federal Irrigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Carleton R. Ball, representing the legislative committee, Council of Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches, made an excellent statement in opposition to the bill that proposed the repeal of the land-limitation clause of the reclamation law—the so-called 160-acre clause.

This statement was made before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Lands. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his statement:

EXCESS LANDS LIMITATION ON FEDERAL IRRIGATION

(Statement of Dr. Carleton R. Ball, representing the legislative committee, Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches, submitted to the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation Projects, Senate Committee on Public Lands, May 1947)

The long-accepted principle of limiting the acreage of a single owner which may receive public irrigation water does not stand by itself alone. It is inseparably tied to the still older principle of devoting arable public lands to the service of the people and the Nation, as family-sized, owner-operated farms. Material is presented here under several subheadings, in order to make the story clearer and more complete.

A. THE STAND OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN CHURCHES

Presented first is a policy statement on the proposed legislation to remove the long-maintained 160-acre limitation on public water for irrigable lands of a single owner on the lands of a single owner in the Central Valley project of California, and elsewhere. This was adopted by the Council for Social Action on April 5, 1947.

"The General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches in its biennial meeting of June 1946 urged the denomination to support the family-sized, owner-operated farm and called upon the Council for Social Action to concern itself with legislation which would strengthen the position of the family-sized farm unit.

"We believe in the soundness of the land policy which guided the framers of the Reclamation Act of 1902 and of all subsequent amending and supplementing acts to provide that delivery of water from Federal irrigation projects shall be limited to family-sized farm units not larger than 160 acres (or in case of joint ownership by husband and wife, not more than 320 acres).

"We believe that the present acreage limitations on water deliveries in the Central Valley project of California, the San Luis Valley project of Colorado, and the valley gravity canal project of Texas are sound legal provisions and necessary safeguards to the family-sized farms in these areas.

"We believe that the repeal of the aceage limitation provision of the Reclamation Act would expose the family-sized farms of these Federal irrigation projects to pressures which would seriously jeopardize their survival. Such action would vastly reduce any hope that as a result of the Federal reclamation works the number of family-sized farms in the Nation might be increased. There is a real possibility that such a policy, if adopted in respect to these three irrigation projects, would be an entering wedge for those who would then advocate the elimination of acreage limitation on all Federal irrigation projects.

"Therefore, we oppose S. 66, S. 912, H. R. 655, H. R. 656, and H. R. 2052 and all other bills designed to remove the acreage-limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws as applied to Federal reclamation projects.

"We further oppose Senate Resolution 21 calling for a senatorial investigation of the practices of the Department of the Interior in disposition of water in the Central Valley project of California, unless it be amended to provide specifically that the investigation shall include hearings conducted in the Central Valley at which spokesmen for the family-sized farm operators of the valley may be heard.

"We authorize the legislative committee of the Council for Social Action to prepare testimony on these bills and the resolution in accordance with this statement, and to present such testimony to the appropriate committees of Congress and to other public officials."

This policy statement represents principles long sponsored by our Congregational Christian Churches, as a body. In 1925 our national council declared in favor of family-sized, owner-operated farms, for the welfare of the farm population and the protection of society. Nor is this policy statement their only recent declaration. In March 1945 our legislative committee published its beliefs regarding a national land policy, as follows:

"We are concerned that all Federal activities with respect to land shall be such as to encourage and promote the operation of family-type (adequately sized, family owned and operated) farms, and to discourage other types.

"We urge the formulation of a national land policy by Congress. Such a policy should expressly reaffirm and declare the historic policy of encouraging and assisting families in the ownership of the lands they till. Such a policy should also discourage the development of large holdings, often absentee-owned, which force an ever large number of independent farmers to become tenants, sharecroppers, or migratory laborers.

"The increasing displacement of owner-operators from the farms, increase in the percentages of tenants and migratory agricultural families, wasteful exploitation of natural soil resources, and the development of the 'factory in the field' type of farming, are matters of grave public concern. The family type farms have long been stabilizers of social, civic, and moral attitudes in our culture. To conserve and increase such farms is to conserve and strengthen the forces of democratic citizenship.

"Specially, we believe that a workable national land policy should direct that in Federal legislation and operations with use of the land:

"1. Appropriations should be authorized and expended only when the interests of national conservation or of family-type farm ownership are promoted and protected.

"2. Agricultural lands now held in Federal ownership should be disposed of to private citizens only in tracts large enough for the adequate maintenance of the farm family, and should not be disposed of to private citizens who already possess an acreage sufficient for family needs.

"3. Provision should be made for the orderly retirement of submarginal farm lands, for the use of such lands for forestry, recreation, agriculture, or industrial use, and for the uniting of small holdings suitable for agriculture to form family-type farms.

"4. On all lands which depend upon Federally financed irrigation or flood-control projects, irrigation water in the future should be made available to landowners only for an acreage sufficient for a family-type farm and not for acreage in excess of that area.

"5. All practicable Federal assistance should be given to continued and increased operator ownership of family-type farms, through proper financial and informational help and guidance."

Our general council of Congregational Christian Churches, at its biennial meeting in Grinnell, Iowa, in June 1946, devoted one of its six sections to our rural situation. It adopted the section resolutions and urged the component churches (5,800) "to support the family-sized, owner-operated farm." Specifically, the churches were urged to create advisory committees to help their young people to settle on family-sized farms and to obtain tenure arrangements which would make ultimate ownership possible.

Our council for social action was asked to prepare a manual of suggestions and instructions for such committees. One of our boards was asked to consider the possibility of establishing a loan fund to aid in the purchase of such farms, and to cooperate with national agencies in sponsoring sound legislation and education for strengthening the family-sized farm unit. I cite these facts to show that our people are in dead earnest about these matters.

Our Congregational people always have been pioneers, following the frontier westward, obtaining land, and establishing their homes, their schools, and their churches. For them, this belief in, and support for, the family-sized, owner-operated farm is a product of 10 or 12 generations of experience.

We strongly oppose the pending bills to remove present restrictions on the single-owner acreage which may receive public irrigation water in the Central Valley project of California, or anywhere else. The public policy of America, from the founding fathers until now, has been to use the land and water resources of our country for the benefit of the greatest number of our people and not for the enrichment of a greedy and selfish few.

B. GOD SPEAKS AGAINST THE GREED FOR HUGE LAND HOLDINGS

Our Federal land policy of allotting public lands in family-sized units, for the benefit of the many, dates from the beginning of our Nation. The principle goes back to the beginning of history and bears the divine command and sanction of the Creator.

The tenth commandment includes: "Neither shalt thou covet thy neighbor's house, or his field * * * or anything that is thy neighbor's" (Deuteronomy 5: 21).

Taking away from 9 neighbors, or 90, or 900 neighbors, the opportunity to get a watered family-sized farm for each of themselves has exactly the same purpose and effect as coveting the farm the neighbor already has.

God has said: "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein" (Psalm 24: 1). He certainly did not mean that the few shall have much of the land and the water and that His many shall have little or none of either. He still demands that His children shall have fair dealing. We hold that this proposed legislation is not fair dealing.

In those days, as now, His commands were not always heeded, and so we hear the Prophet Isaiah give dire warning to the greedy: "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no room, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the land"; when in that far-off day God was showing his people the evils of increasingly large land holdings, with the selfish owner living in lordly solitude, and the many poor living in serfdom and squalor, with no opportunity to obtain a family-sized land unit and a sense of security. These nations have perished long since.

God's church today is not silent on the rights of humble citizens to share in the national land and water resources, or on the wrongs done by selfish groups in attempting to take away those rights. Many other religious bodies, both Catholic and Protestant, have spoken forcefully against the evils of land and water monopoly. Among these has been the Reformed Church, one of the bodies now forming the Evangelical and Reformed Church, with which the Congregational Christian Churches are in process of merging. Interdenominational national church bodies also have spoken.

C. ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF OUR NATIONAL LAND POLICY

From the English settlement of America until today, there has been a continuing struggle to obtain rights and opportunities for the common citizen. This has required continual effort to control the selfish demands of small but often powerful groups which seek to get much more than their share. These facts are as true in the fields of land ownership and water use as in other lines of human activity.

Our Congregational Pilgrims and Puritans came to Massachusetts not only for religious freedom but also to obtain economic freedom and opportunity. The Colony of Georgia was created as a haven for homeless and hopeless debtors. To all of the colonies lying in between, the spirit of hope brought immigrants. Many came as debt slaves, worked as indentured servants until their debt was paid, and then sought freedom, land, and security on the frontier. Orders of the Crown at times forbade migration and frontier settlement. Championing the rights of the individual against the selfishness of the powerful is nothing new to the Congregational or other religious bodies in America.

In colonial days, grants from the reigning monarch provided enormous land holdings for the nobles and other privileged persons (proprietors), and the law of entail kept these holdings intact. Some were as large as whole colonies. With the founding of the American Republic, the struggle for the right to own land took on new direction and impetus. Immediately after signing the Declaration of Independence in 1776, Jefferson introduced a Virginia bill abolishing entail and permitting estates to be sold. It was passed quickly and followed soon by others, including the abolishing of the law of primogeniture and thus permitting all heirs to share in an estate. Most of the other colonies took similar action.

Enormous areas of Crown lands soon became vested in the States. The Federal Government acquired a large body of public land by cession of such lands from several of the original 13 States. This land was situated in 30 of the present 48 States, or in all except the original 13 plus Maine, Vermont, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Texas. Land ordinances sponsored by Jefferson in 1784 and 1785 outlined the general principles of land policy in America for all time. The first provided for organizing States from this public domain and the second for surveying and selling the land. The Louisiana purchase, in 1803, insured a continuing land opportunity for American citizens.

The developing land policy of the United States was based, in general, on four convictions, namely: (1) That a new and struggling democracy must have the right sort of citizens; (2) that a freeholder makes a better supporter of democracy than a tenant or a serf; (3) that the opportunity to obtain public land would save many insolvent debtors from becoming a public burden; and (4) that land ownership promotes the stability of the family, the basis of democracy.

The young republic was poor and needed revenue. Some short-sighted leaders urged the immediate sale of public domain to speculators as well as homemakers. Others, more farsighted, urged that these lands be made cheaply available to settlers, in the faith that this was the best financail policy in the long run. Both plans were followed for many years, but gradually it became evident that pyramiding speculation and monopoly were preventing ownership of family-sized farms. By 1820, public clamor for farms for settlers on the public domain became strong and increased with the years.

The first large-scale result of the public indignation was the passage of the Predemptio nAct of 1841, which gave a settler the right to stake his claim on 160 acres of public land and make his legal settlement with the Government at a later date. Difficulties with settlement and title focused public sentiment on a more orderly homestead law. The idea was sponsored by national leaders in many walks of life and finally the Homestead Act was passed in 1862, the year in which the United States Department of Agriculture was created by Congress.

The Homestead Act finally and firmly established the principle of using the public domain to provide family-sized and owner-operated farms. This has become the economic and social ideal of America. From that time until now, this principle has never been a partisan issue. The national platforms of both major, and several minor, political parties have favored the conservation of land and water and have sponsored the fullest practicable development of the family-sized and owner-operated farm, both without and with irrigation.

D. DEVELOPMENTS AND ABUSES IN THE USE OF PUBLIC LANDS AND WATERS

The Homestead Act of 1862 insured that an adult citizen should have one opportunity to acquire, from the public domain, a family-sized farm, chiefly by his own labor. Several later amendments have held to this principle. Some have increased the acreage obtainable in the drier and less productive portions of the country, in order that the farm still might maintain a family. Irrigation legislation has provided for public irrigation water to limited acreages, varying from 10 to the present maximum of 160 acres for a single owner, under varying conditions. All this has represented a continuing recognition of the economic and social value of the family-sized farm and of the right of the people to the use and benefit of their natural resources.

These resources originally had an almost incalculable value. Economists have estimated that, if our forest and mineral resources had remained in public ownership no Federal taxes would have been necessary through all the decades of our history. That was before World War II, of course. Throughout our national history, unfortunately, there have been repeated attempts, some very successful, to defraud the people of America of their heritage in land and other resources.

The immense grants of public domain, between 1851 and 1871, to finance railroad companies in building lines into sparsely settled territory, were accompanied by congressional restrictions on the resale prices of such grant lands. Some of the larger railway companies receiving these valuable grants immediately engaged in the most scandalous and dishonest frauds to avoid these legal restrictions on sales and to obtain priceless forest and mineral lands in lieu of the granted lands of average quality paralleling their rights-of-way. These frauds constitute one of the most disgraceful chapters in American history. Within recent years, our Government has recovered some of the lands fraudulently obtained in Oregon but most of them were long since hopelessly lost to the American people.

Other speculator organizations bought up, often at little cost, the land scrip representing the Federal grants of land to aid the founding of a college of agriculture and mechanic arts in each State. By this means, and often through established dishonesty, they became the monopolistic owners of enormous land holdings, totaling many millions of acres and rivaling the fabulous Crown grants of colonial days.

E. THE LAND AND WATER POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The land-use policies of the Department are well known and have been expressed for many years by the several agencies charged with action programs to help the people on the land. Among these agencies are the Federal-State Agricultural Extension Service, the Farm Credit Administration, the Farmers' Home Administration (formerly the Farm Security Administration), and, more recently, the Rural Electrification Administration. Much of the work of these organizations is intended, by congressional enactment, to insure that those farmers least able to help themselves shall have a fair chance at farm ownership and at better living conditions.

The water-use policies of the Department are much less widely known, because that Department has comparatively little direct responsibility in the field of irrigation. Two years ago (February 9, 1945), the then Secretary of Agriculture, Claude R. Wickard, now Director of the Rural Electrification Administration, discussed current agricultural problems before the District of Columbia Chapter of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers. Speaking specifically to the problem of the use of public water for irrigation, he said:

"Two fundamental principles underlie the Department's water policy for the West. One is the conviction that the ultimate goal of every irrigation project must be the welfare of the families who make their homes on the land. The other is a conviction that a water policy, to be fully effective, must be part of a comprehensive policy for wise use of all the Nation's natural resources."

"Irrigation projects must be so plotted and organized as to make new land available in adequate family-sized units, and to give settlers reasonable prospects of success.

"Speculation in raw land, due to the prospective increased value because of a project, should be prevented so that the increased cost of land may not offset the benefit from irrigation.

"There will be an even greater stimulus to the demand for productive farms of family

size when many of the farm boys who have gone to war return with the hope of entering agriculture. From all indications, the supply of suitable farms will run far behind the demand." (From Agricultural Engineering, 26 (4): 141–144, April 1945.)

F. THE WORK OF THE UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The United States Bureau of Reclamation has been charged, for 45 years, with the development of Federal reclamation projects and the enforcement of the regulations established by the Congress for their protection and control. These measures have been established primarily to insure family-sized, owner-operated farms and to protect against speculation, monopoly, exploitation, and fraud.

The Bureau obviously has been diligent in its performance of these duties. Recently it has issued a 100-page report on Land Ownership on Federal Reclamation Projects. This shows, among other things, that the intent of the many acts of Congress has been achieved, and that the vast majority of the holdings on these projects are family-sized, owner-operated farms, mostly 80 acres or less. It shows further that the excess holdings still existent constitute a very small fraction of the total.

One of the plausible arguments advanced by the proponents of these bills is that the present acreage limitations are unenforceable. The Central Valley project is by no means the first on which this problem of large land holdings has been met. The survey mentioned shows that it has been solved on these other projects. It can be solved on the Central Valley project. All laws are reasonably enforceable if the legislating and enforcing officers are honest and efficient and the public is vigilant.

The present national policy of land and water use for the benefit of the many is right and therefore sound. To legislate for the advantage and enrichment of a selfish few at the expense of the humble many is wrong and no amount of argument can make it right or sound.

The specious claim is made that, under present acreage limitations, the large land holders will get a free ride by pumping overflow, seepage, and percolating project waters from wells and thus irrigating their excess lands. This question doubtless will be handled by the experts on ground water. Past history in California and elsewhere does not bear out this claim.

G. THE PROBLEM IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY OF CALIFORNIA

The present rules applying in the Central Valley project forbid the delivery of water to a single farm owner for use on more than 160 acres of land (or 320 acres in case of joint ownership by man and wife). If an owner holds more than this acreage of land, he has two options. He may retain the larger acreage but receive water for only 160 acres, using the remainder for dry-land purposes. Or he may enter into a contract with the Reclamation Bureau to sell the excess acreage within 10 years and at a price which does not reflect the increased value added by the presence of water for irrigation purposes. Similar precautions were established in the large dry-land areas which may ultimately receive water from the Grand Coulee project in Washington. Undoubtedly this has prevented tremendous exploitation of the uninformed landseekers.

Numerous attempts have been made by special interests to evade this limitation in California or to obtain its repeal. We now face another such attempt to change the law. Typical of the farmers opposing the acreage limitations of the water law are the Kern County Land Co., which owns about 1,000,000 acres of farm land in the United States, and of which about 200,000 acres are irrigable acres in the Central Valley of California. In earlier years the Miller & Lux Co. owned practically a continuous block of land from the Mexican border to the Canadian boundary. Another example is the Anderson Clayton Co., reputedly the world's largest cotton grower, which recently bought a 54,000-acre farm in the Central Valley.

The basic issue at stake here is whether the Central Valley project of California is to be farmed in many family-sized units or exploited by a few large land corporations. If these bills pass, the family-sized farm is virtually doomed in the Central Valley. No one questions the fact that 160 acres is much more than ample for a family-sized farm unit under those conditions. That limit has already been breached in the 320-acre man-and-wife authorization. The pending bills represent the next step and must be stopped.

Worse still, the entire national land and water policy in favor of the family-sized, owner-operated farm is jeopardized. If the limitation is broken in the Central Valley, a flood of proposed legislation to break other limitations elsewhere is absolutely certain. Now is the time to settle this problem decisively and permanently.

Earl Bunting, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, in a radio address from Winchester, Va., on March 29, 1947, is quoted in the press as saying:

"There is no room in our future for selfish interest. What is good for the public is good for every group; any group that grabs more than its share destroys its own future, just as it destroys the greatest opportunity all of us ever had to achieve prosperity for all."

Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 100, entitled "Small Farm and Big Farm," presents a most striking contrast of conditions in two comparable farming communities in California. They are quite comparable in size, population, and their irrigated farming industry. Arvin is an area of large farms, averaging 497 acres. Dinuba is an area of small farms, averaging 57 acres. The table below shows the many striking contrasts in the two communities:

Items contrasted in the two communities	Arvin	Dinuba
1. Average size of farms	497 acres	57 acres.
2. Total population	6,300	7,800.
3. Tributary trade area	70,000 acres	77,000 acres.
4. Ratio of independent farmers to wage hands	1 to 4	1 to 1.
5. Total retail trade (October 1942 to September 1943)	$2,534,000	$4,317,000.
6. All business establishments	60	156.
7. Banks	0	2.
8. Newspapers	1	2.
9. Schools, grade	1	4.
10. Schools, high	0	1.
11. Service and commercial clubs	2	5.
12. Fraternal and women's clubs	0	7.
13. Veterans organizations	0	2.
14. Churches	6	14.
15. Streets, condition as to paving	None paved	Almost all paved.
16. Sidewalks	None	General rule.
17. Housing conditions	Very poor; lots small	Generally adequate.
18. Expenses for household goods and liquor	$103 to $100	$232 to $100.
19. Delinquency, youth and juvenile	Fairly serious	Almost nonexistent.
20. General character of community	More like a camp	A real community.

There is a startling contrast between the two communities in the relative prevalence of those things which make for a satisfying home, family, and community life. Large farms: Low ownership, insecurity of the many, poor homes, and lack of community development. Small farms: High ownership, economic ability and security, and a high development of those things which make for satisfying home and community life. The family-sized, owner-operated farm is basic to the American way of life. Large land holdings, with high ratio of tenants and wage hands, living under comparatively poor conditions, undermines and destroys the American way of life.

Congress Should Scrutinize Railroad Reorganizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, during this session of Congress many Members of the House have received a large amount of correspondence about railroad reorganizations from stockholders and bondholders alike who have waited patiently through many years of bankruptcy reorganizations to find out what, if anything, their holdings are worth. Necessarily the evaluation of equities and the satisfaction and adjustment of various classes of mortgage obligations and other indebtedness of impaired railroads, often in derogation of the interests of common stockholders, is a complex and tedious process. But it ought not to require half a generation to accomplish.

In justice to those who hold railroad securities, whether stock or bonds or debentures, and in the public interest, the reorganization of a railroad company ought to be conducted and completed expeditiously, as Congress plainly intended in enacting legislation for the purpose. Nothing should be sacrificed by haste; but neither should the rights of interested parties be prejudiced, and the soundness of the national transportation system jeopardized, by unnecessary delay. It is regrettable that the prolonged delays in such proceedings have created doubt as to their effectiveness and questions as to their administration.

As long ago as 1935 the Supreme Court recognized this situation in an opinion which said, in part:

The delay and expense incident to railroad receiverships and foreclosure sales constitute probably the chief reasons which induced the passage of section 77; and to promote the perpetuation of these evils under this new legislation would be subversive of the spirit in which it was conceived and adopted.

Notwithstanding this declaration of judicial policy, it required 9 years to bring the Northwestern Railroad reorganization to a conclusion on June 1, 1944, and 10½ years to conclude the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific proceedings in December 1945. The marathon pro-

ceeding is that of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific reorganization, begun in June 1935, and now in its fifteenth year. In the last case the reorganization plan has been approved and will terminate the proceedings in the course of several months.

Some of these proceedings and the formulation of reorganization plans are bitterly and expensively contested. In the Rock Island case particularly bad feeling developed. A review of the record suggests that that proceeding might have been brought to an end much earlier.

In June 1943 the district court approved the Rock Island plan—50 Federal Supplement 835—with the exception of two relatively minor matters, one involving a disputed allotment of a block of shares of the new common stock as between contending classes of bondholders, and the other making the appointment of the reorganization managers by the creditors subject to ratification by the court. The decision on these two matters required action by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the court returned the plan to the Commission for that purpose.

On May 1, 1944, the Commission returned the plan to the court with these two matters adjusted in accordance with the opinion of the district court. Final approval of the plan was at that point presumably a matter of course and should have followed without delay. Nevertheless, 13 months elapsed before the court took action. On June 15, 1945, the court approved, without change, the plan which had been before it for more than 13 months. I am unable to find any explanation for this long delay. But this was still not the end of the road.

The district judge's order of approval of the plan was affirmed by the circuit court of appeals on May 23, 1946. Confirmation in the district court should have followed immediately and as a matter of routine upon receipt of the mandate of the appellate court. Instead, in disregard of his former decision and the decision of the circuit court of appeals—and, incidentally, of the opinion of the Supreme Court in Denver & Rio Grande Western case, handed down June 10, 1946—the district judge refused to confirm the plan and on June 28, 1946, sent it back to the Interstate Commerce Commission which had long since completed its work on it. His opinion cited as reasons for his action matters which the Supreme Court had just held were immaterial and other matters which had occurred before his first approval was given in June 1945.

An appeal was again taken, and the circuit court of appeals rejected the reasons given by the district court and directed the district judge to confirm the plan of reorganization. This mandate should have settled the matter forthwith. But it did not.

Instead of obeying the plain language of the mandate, the district judge entered a "conditional order of confirmation," stipulating that he, the district judge, and not the creditors, should have the right to select a majority of the reorganization managers. This condition was attached by the district judge notwithstanding a decision by the circuit court of appeals that a district judge had no power to alter the provisions of a plan of reorganization which gave the creditors the right to select reorganization managers.

The bondholders in the Rock Island case again applied to the circuit court of appeals. That court promptly ordered the district judge to confirm the reorganization plan as it stood and to expunge his conditions. Only then did the district judge comply.

The almost endless controversy which attended the proceedings throughout was bad enough, but much of the delay in bringing the proceedings to a close at the proper time appears to be attributable to both the action and the inaction of the district judge. Not only did the prolonging of the proceedings work an injustice on all classes of stockholders and bondholders, and a hardship on the railroad itself, but public charges against the district judge and one of his trustees of delaying tactics, whether or not well founded, cast reflection upon the whole administration of the reorganization and upon the effectiveness of the Reorganization Act. In this connection the court of appeals spoke with considerable asperity of the delay permitted by the district judge, and was sharply critical of the attitude and conduct of the trustee appointed by the district judge in delaying the reorganization and attempting to organize opposition to the plan. In this connection, I include at this point in my remarks an article which appeared in the Chicago Sun on June 21, 1947, one of numerous articles which appeared in newspapers in Chicago and elsewhere:

ROCK ISLAND GROUP FAILS TO OUST IGOE

Senior bondholders of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway yesterday lost their fight in the United States circuit court of appeals to have District Judge Michael L. Igoe removed as administrator of the bankrupt road's reorganization.

While refusing to displace Judge Igoe with a circuit court judge, Evan A. Evans, the senior jurist of the circuit, sharply criticized two aspects of the lower court's handling of the case.

HE FINDS UNDUE DELAY

He found there has been undue delay in the reorganization. And he censured in detail actions taken by Aaron Colnon, appointed by Judge Igoe as one of the two Rock Island trustees.

"This long stay of the railroad (on the court dockets) is not complimentary to the courts," Judge Evans said. "Fourteen years is, in the writer's opinion, too long for any receivership or bankruptcy proceedings, longer than necessary to reorganize any debtor."

COLNON'S ROLE ASSAILED

Colnon, the court found, "has said and done things which would possibly justify a conclusion that he has been bent upon delaying the execution of the reorganization plan, changing it to the interest of the junior creditors to prolong the period of reorganization.

"Statements made by Mr. Colnon indicate he has misconceived his duties and entertains magnified ideas about the part he is to play in this reorganization."

NEW YORK TRIP QUESTIONED

"His duty (as trustee) was to represent all creditors, not one group. I fail to understand his motive in going to New York and arranging a meeting of stockbrokers in an effort to stir up opposition to the plan, a closed matter so far as he was concerned."

The reference to Colnon's New York trip related to a visit the trustee made there while the case was before Judge Igoe. Colnon also appeared in Washington before congressional committees considering changes in the application of bankruptcy laws to railroads.

UNITED STATES STATUTE PERMITS MOVE

In their plea for Judge Igoe's removal the bondholders acted under a Federal law making such a move possible where the public interest is at stake.

Edward W. Bourne, their attorney, charged that Igoe had caused a needless delay of 2 years in the already prolonged and involved litigation.

In rejecting the petition the court pointed out that any action of Igoe's is subject to established appeals procedure. Evans' own ruling of yesterday also may be appealed to the Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Congress ought to review in detail the administration of all railroad reorganizations under section 77 in an effort to determine whether legislative action can be taken to expedite and improve them. Certainly special and thorough scrutiny should be given to the Rock Island reorganization in the light of Judge Evans' opinion and the particularly aggravated circumstances of that case. The interests of the public and all other parties concerned should not be prejudiced either by a deficiency in applicable legislation or by purposeful delay.

German Reparations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted by the House, I submit herewith a manuscript on the subject of German reparations.

It is one of the most thought-provoking documents that has come to my attention during these troubled times.

It was prepared by a German-born American citizen, an engineer, who, for obvious reasons, prefers to remain anonymous. He did very important work for the armed forces of the United States during World War II. His mother was killed by the Nazis.

His document follows:

HOW TO GET REPARATIONS OUT OF GERMANY—A SUGGESTION FOR THE PARTIAL SOLUTION OF A BIG PROBLEM

The war with Germany has been over for almost 2 years and, as the present Moscow Conference shows (April 1947), the problem of reparations to be paid by Germany is by no means solved.

The vicious circle seems to be that in order to pay reparations the German industry has to be revived and thereby its war potential will have to be reestablished. Besides the economic chaos of Germany, its lack of communication facilities, transportation, raw materials, and food will for some time to come

absorb all possible production to take care of Germany's own minimum need.

As in similar problems, the magnitude of the problem and the apparent impossibility of solving it with one big formula tends to paralyze the minds of those who are faced with having to arrive at a solution.

But perhaps if one restates the problem and, being less ambitious, limits oneself to a partial solution, it is possible to arrive at an attack to the over-all problem.

The purpose of these notes is to make this attempt.

In engineering practice it is customary to establish first a list of desirable features to be incorporated into the design of a new device and during the process of the development to modify these specifications in the light of necessary limitations. We shall make an attempt to follow similar procedures and afterward see whether our proposed solution fulfills the requirements of our established goal.

We start with the premise that Germany, having started this world war, is morally and economically responsible for its consequences and that it owes to its victims a sincere effort to relieve their suffering and losses.

The goods or products to be turned over by Germany should be such that—

(a) Their production does not call for facilities which re-create the German war potential.

(b) Their export does not deprive Germany of her minimum living standard.

(c) If possible, the exported goods should be of such a nature that Germany has a surplus of them and can replenish them.

(d) The exports of Germany should not compete with the economical efforts of its recipients.

(e) There should be an incentive for the Germans to live up to their commitments rather than an incentive, as after the First World War, to avoid the fulfillment of their obligations.

(f) Its moral justification is to be so evident that all classes of Germans will not only participate but also endorse the effort as one possibility to compensate a conscious or subconscious feeling of responsibility for what has happened.

(g) It should be a constructive scheme which will combine the efforts of Germany with those of the world and thereby give her a chance to reestablish her position in the family of nations.

(h) It should attract those intellectual leaders who in generations to come will influence the thinking and then the destiny of their fellow citizens.

(i) Last, but not least, the products should be of such general nature that they are needed equally by all of the former allies.

A glance at this formidable list may produce a sense of defeatism, as it appears almost impossible even to hope for a solution which will fulfill all or even part of the above requirements.

The proposed attack to the problem, however, seems to satisfy so many of them to such a high degree that it will be worth while at least to check its possibilities and consider its potentials.

THE PROPOSED SCHEME

The proposed scheme is extremely simple and could be tried out immediately on any scale involving a few hundred people or a few thousand. It could—which is also of importance—be stopped at any given moment if the results obtained are not satisfactory.

In its simplest form it proposes to ask Germany to pay part of her debt to the world by research in fields which will decrease the suffering of the world.

We shall now take up each specification individually to see whether or not our simple scheme fulfills these requirements.

(a) Their production does not call for facilities which recreate the German war potential.

It may be agreed that research in general offers to a nation the means for fighting a war. As an example, the rockets V–1 and V–2 and the atom bomb—just to mention the most dramatic examples—will be cited. But basic research will go on independently of whether the Germans are permitted to participate in it, and basic research means a world-wide exchange of knowledge between those engaged in it.

Even if, as in the present moment, military applications of the results of such research are kept a secret in some instances, there seems to be a general agreement on the point that this secrecy is a temporary expedient and cannot be preserved for any length of time.

It is for that reason that all universities have, since the Middle Ages, attracted an international body of research students and teachers and have objected most vigorously to any attempt of censoring this work.

It is true that in the last analysis everything has a potential war application—every child born, every plant that grows, education in general—but unless one is willing to accept the alternative of complete extermination of a people (the one chosen by Hitler with regard to Jews) one has to limit oneself to the obvious.

This means that it would not at this time be advisable to give to the German research workers an applied military research project like the atom bomb, guided missiles, or rockets (as it is being done now in White Sands where imported scientists are at work for us), but to let them work on basic problems which are fundamental in nature and whose results perhaps are not immediately lucrative.

Just to give a few examples:

(a) Cancer research is one which would, if enough talent with unlimited funds were applied to it, finally save more lives than those destroyed by this war.

(b) In general, medical research—heart, lung diseases, tuberculosis, and so forth—is a field in which the Germans have already shown considerable success.

(c) Basic mathematical research, astronomy, physics, chemistry. These are unlimited fundamental problems, never seriously attacked for want of money, time, and manpower.

Without going into more details at this point it seems that such research guided into the proper channels would fulfill the above specification not to contribute to a rearmament of Germany.

(b) Their export does not deprive Germany of her minimum living standard.

The proof that this condition is fulfilled by the above scheme is obvious.

Let us assume such a research project would occupy a few thousand people eventually. Even if they would have to be completely supported by the rest of the German community their percentage consumption would be almost negligible.

Unlike an export of coal, grain, steel, clothing or consumers' goods, the goods exported in the form of test reports neither calls for any strain on shipping facilities nor does a single person suffer hardship from the export of such a commodity.

(c) If possible, the exported goods should be of such a nature that Germany has a surplus of them and can replenish them.

This evidently is also the case if the product is research. German scientists have had and still have a reputation of being outstanding in their fields.

It appears to be part of the national character which was once defined as a tendency to be systematic without a sense of reality. This attribute, most dangerous in politics, is a great asset in science, which is a structure with an artificial reality of its own.

In research we have one of the few cases where the amount of returns is inexhaustible. Any amount of work already done just strengthens the foundations upon which future work can be built.

On the other hand, if Germany were to export food, coal, or other consumers' goods, she would deprive herself of her minimum needs; consequently something else would have to be given her in exchange to keep her population alive. (At present Great Britain is paying $500,000,000 a year in reversed reparations just to avoid chaos.)

(d) The exports of Germany should not compete with the economical efforts of its recipients.

If, for instance, Germany were made to modernize our domestic railroad system (a very desirable improvement, no doubt), the result would be a serious dislocation of our own industries which supply this service to the railroads.

Experience of the prewar years showed that the objections raised against import of scientists (refugees) to this country were justified to a certain degree as by necessity their employment competed with that of United States citizens.

There are only a limited number of top-rank research jobs available in our country (owing to limitations in funds). By filling these with imported scientists (who may be very gratified to do the job), this opportunity is taken away from these American scientists. The case is identical to the competition of reparation locomotives with the products of our own plants.

The export of basic research data, however, is of an entirely different character. The more data are made available the better can our own scientists build up their own applied and basic research and development as the foundation is strengthened.

Thus the payment of reparations by research in the form of test reports, which would be made available in translations (furnished by the Germans) to all members of the Allied Nations, would only benefit but not compete with our own research endeavors.

In this connection it may be pointed out that our country could greatly benefit by reprinting some of the scientific literature published by the Germans before the war. The translation into English as part of this reparation program would be of immeasurable value. (During the war the Alien Property Custodian reprinted a number of German publications, but as they were in German, their value was limited to those who were familiar with the German language.)

(e) There should be an incentive for the Germans to live up to their commitments rather than an incentive to avoid the fulfillment of their obligations.

After the last war, enforced reparations in the form of consumers' goods were most demoralizing for German industry, as industry was working on a cost-plus basis and as, owing to lack of supervision, wherever possible either inferior quality was furnished or charges thrown into the reparations account which did not belong there.

In the case of a research organization as proposed, all charges would go to reparations and the product would be carefully inspected by the most expert type of inspectors—the international fellow scientists.

As the scientific reputation of those who publish the reports is at stake, there is an incentive of the strongest kind to do a good job.

But beyond this, the incentive to have practically unlimited research facilities available to do a job of research that very few scientists have ever been privileged to handle will attract the best minds.

In particular, as this is no slave labor but a service which not only will benefit the scientist but all of humanity and last but not least also their own people (medical science

is the most obvious example), there is not only a strong incentive to give the best but a very strong incentive to succeed over all obstacles.

Such research work calls not only for brains but also for laboratory equipment—test setups which are usually outdated as soon as completed. This is one of the reasons for the high cost of research.

Therefore, such a laboratory will employ a considerable staff of craftsmen, who would build individual research apparatus in lots of one (or in a small number, if a laboratory of the Allies would want to obtain such equipment). The development of such special equipment is usually most uneconomical, so that it is in general avoided; or if it has to be obtained, its effect on the research budget is catastrophic, thus limiting its application.

The employment of such talent for peaceful purposes with the greatest ease of supervision is considered as one of the major advantages of the proposed scheme.

(f) Its moral justification is so evident that all classes of Germans will not only participate but also endorse the effort as one possibility to compensate a conscious or subconscious feeling of responsibility for what has happened.

The plan has not only economical possibilities.

A great number of the German scientists who were forced by the Nazis to fall in line felt deeply the responsibility of Germany for the suffering which resulted from her foreign and domestic acts of aggression.

If, by participating in this research project, they can contribute to a relief of these sufferings (again the cancer problem, or the development of new sources of food), they will feel that they are doing something constructive and thereby atone for their feelings of responsibility—if not guilt.

To cooperate—or rather to be permitted again to cooperate—in that international nonpolitical catholic group of scientists will restore their personal self-respect and make them less willing to lend their services to any underground movements which are likely to develop in one form or another.

It should not be forgotten that many research projects can be carried on in many fields with relatively small means and that such work can easily be carried on in secrecy. By giving these opportunities of rehabilitation it can be expected that the country's foremost talent will be attracted and will work in the open where their activities are easily checked.

The importance of this cannot be overemphasized. By giving liberal scholarships to Allied and American students to participate in such work two additional advantages are gained:

1. First, a unique training of our own scientist students—a training which includes a knowledge of Europe and the European mind.

2. Second, the German top scientists and technicians will learn from personal experience the habits and the democratic ways of the western nations. This experience in itself will be most beneficial as it will mean a participation in a practical experiment of democracy free from political prejudices.

(g) It should be a constructive scheme which will combine the efforts of Germany with those of the world and thereby give her a chance to reestablish her position in the family of nations.

This point has already been stressed. By giving the Germans a chance to show what they can do, applying their talents for the benefit of mankind rather than for its destruction, it will contribute eventually to their return to the family of nations and establish new international links on the highest possible level.

The leaders of tomorrow—coming out of an experimental laboratory, whose fair play and ability will be the only key to success—will be expected to bring to their tremendous task of rebuilding Europe a new, healthier approach than their predecessors.

The experience of working together with an international group of students cannot help but broaden their horizons.

Thus it can be hoped that out of this group will be recruited some of the men whose influence could change the attitude of a misguided country.

(h) It should attract those intellectual leaders who in generations to come will influence the thinking and then the destiny of their fellow citizens.

This point has also been discussed in connection with other specifications.

To make the idea workable, it is suggested that the research foundation provide additional laboratories for the scientists of the United Nations who will rotate in presiding over the project until it is decided to invite in turn one of the German professors.

This would not only give an opportunity to those Allied professors who want to study particular phases of science for which funds are rarely available but also establish a personal exchange of ideas on the top level, while giving a living example of democracy at work to those German students who will be admitted to participate in the experiment.

As all expenses will be carried on reparations by the Germans, no cost to the American taxpayer will result, and at the same time the selection of those Germans who are to participate can be made only on the basis of scientific ability and capability of working constructively in a group.

It will be easy to weed out those who in any way sabotage or delay the success of the experiment.

(i) Last, but not least, the products should be of such general nature that they are needed equally by all of the former Allies.

In most of the political discussions about reparations there was a natural competition among the Allies regarding the products to be obtained from the Germans.

For instance, food going to Russia has forced the British to ship their own food to western Germany—a strain which England can hardly stand much longer.

The results of basic and applied research are, as previously stated, noncompetitive. The people of Russia are just as much interested in combating cancer, venereal diseases, or tuberculosis as any other nation in the world.

Experiments in river and flood control, soil conservation, agricultural developments, mining, basic research in physics and chemistry, biology, history, even in the arts—all these things are of common mutual value and any success in these fields will benefit the whole world.

If one only watches the difficulty with which money is being raised in the battle for cancer control, where a few million dollars are already a terrific program only a few institutes can afford, one wonders what could be done with the reparations fund of a few billion dollars, which Germany could easily pay in this field without exhausting her resources and without costing a cent to the Allies.

CONCLUSIONS

The trouble with this approach seems to be that it appears to be too perfect. Somewhere there must be a flaw in this picture.

But, even if the experiment fails—and it is to be believed that Germany has the greatest possible interest in making it a success—then it would be very easy to dissolve the laboratory.

Again, no dislocation of an important industry or a part of the population would result. The equipment could easily be transferred to other universities or laboratories of the Allied Nations.

As a practical suggestion it may be desirable to attach such a research center to one of the old universities like Göttingen or Heidelberg, whose records, background, and traditions will give the venture not only weight but at the same time link the past with a better tomorrow.

Democratic Headquarters Plans Small Purge—Only 126 Members of Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Republican News for July 1947:

DEMOCRATIC HEADQUARTERS PLANS SMALL PURGE—ONLY 126 MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Once again headquarters of the Democratic National Committee announces a purge of Congressmen not following the New Deal-PAC line. In this purge, 20 Democratic Senators and 106 Democratic Representatives are read out of the party, and doorbell ringers are told to visit their constituents.

The sentence was passed on the Congressmen by Gael Sullivan, Chicago Kelly protégé who now is stand-in for Democratic Chairman Hannegan in the role of executive director of the Democratic National Committee. Sullivan writes in the current Capitol Comment, official newsletter of the party, in best PAC copybook style that the Taft-Hartley labor law was passed by the reactionary axis in Congress.

Sullivan advises Democrats to ring doorbells and get out the vote in behalf of the axis (Wallace-Hannegan) which opposed passage of the law. He says the vote on the labor law sharpened the cleavage between the two parties.

In such a cleavage, the 20 Democratic Senators and 106 Representatives could no longer be considered Democrats because they voted for the law and to override the President's veto.

Furthermore, Sullivan is quoted by the top-flight Capitol correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, Bert Andrews, as saying that every word in the article had been read and approved by Mr. Truman.

The projected Democratic purge is reminiscent of and thoroughly consistent with earlier New Deal purges over the court-packing plan of 1938 and the Case labor bill of 1946. A successful purge by the Democratic National Committee would eliminate the whole congressional delegation from Arkansas, and nearly all of those of Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Texas, and Virginia.

These presumably unhappy wretches in Sullivan's Domesday Book for the 1948 primary are:

Alabama: Representatives BOYKIN, GRANT, ANDREWS, HOBBS, RAINS, JARMAN, MANASCO, JONES, and BATTLE.

Arkansas: Senators FULBRIGHT and MCCLELLAN; Representatives GATHINGS, MILLS, TRIMBLE, CRAVENS, HAYS, NORRELL, and HARRIS.

California: Representatives LEA, ENGLE, and ELLIOTT.

Florida: Senator HOLLAND; Representatives PETERSON, PRICE, SIKES, SMATHERS, HENDRICKS, and ROGERS.

Georgia: Senators GEORGE and RUSSELL; Representatives PRESTON, COX, PACE, CAMP, DAVIS, VINSON, WHEELER, WOOD, and BROWN.

Kentucky: Representatives GREGORY, CHELF, and CHAPMAN.

Louisiana: Representatives HÉBERT, BOGGS, DOMENGEAUX, BROOKS, PASSMAN, LARCADE, and ALLEN; Senators ELLENDER and OVERTON.

Maryland: Senators TYDINGS and O'CONOR; Representatives MEADE, FALLON, and SASSCER.

Mississippi: Representatives RANKIN, WHITTEN, WHITTINGTON, ABERNETHY, COLMER, and WILLIAMS.

Missouri: Representatives BELL and ZIMMERMAN.

New Mexico: Senator HATCH; Representative FERNANDEZ.

North Carolina: Senators HOEY and UMSTEAD; Representatives BONNER, KERR, BARDEN, COOLEY, DURHAM, CLARK, DEANE, DOUGHTON, JONES, BULWINKLE, and REDDEN.

Oklahoma: Representatives STIGLER, ALBERT, MONRONEY, and PEDEN.

South Carolina: Senator MAYBANK; Representatives RIVERS, RILEY, DORN, BRYSON, and RICHARDS.

Tennessee: Senators MCKELLAR and STEWART; Representatives GORE, EVINS, PRIEST, COURTNEY, MURRAY, COOPER, and DAVIS.

Texas: Senators CONNALLY and O'DANIEL; Representatives BECKWORTH, WILSON, TEAGUE, PICKETT, JOHNSON, POAGE, LUCAS, GOSSETT, LYLE, WEST, BURLESON, WORLEY, MAHON, KILDAY, and FISHER.

Virginia: Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON; Representatives BLAND, HARDY, GARY, DREWRY, STANLEY, ALMOND, HARRISON, and SMITH.

Committee O. K. for Rayfiel is Simple Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of this House, regardless of party affiliation, is happy as the result of the other body's confirmation of the nomination of our distinguished colleague, Hon. LEO F. RAYFIEL, to be United States district court judge for the eastern district of New York. I feel that I express the sentiment of every Member of this body when I say that we wish him a long and happy judicial career. He is the great son of a great father who served as a justice of the court of special sessions of the city of New York for many years and with eminent distinction. I am happy to say that Congressman RAYFIEL'S father is alive today at the age of 86 years to experience the thrill of his son's ascendancy to the Federal bench.

Under the leave granted me, I include an editorial published in the Brooklyn Eagle of July 22, 1947, the day before Congressman RAYFIEL'S confirmation on the floor of the other body. It accurately describes what the people of Brooklyn think of him. We all wish him Godspeed in his new career.

The editorial follows:

COMMITTEE O. K. FOR RAYFIEL IS SIMPLE JUSTICE

The action of the Senate Judiciary Committee in approving the nomination of Representative LEO F. RAYFIEL to succeed the late Judge Grover M. Moscowitz on the Federal bench in this district is good news to Mr. RAYFIEL'S many friends and supporters.

To the Eagle and all those who really know the ability and character of the nominee, the decision of the committee which virtually assures favorable action on the floor of the Senate is simple justice too long delayed.

Some of the statements by opponents of the nomination, which was made by President Truman at the recommendation of the local Democratic leader, Borough President Cashmore, were extremely unfair. Without advancing any evidence there were broad intimations of incompetence.

Representative RAYFIEL'S record was the answer to all this, and it was noteworthy that opposition by the State bar association was offset by warm support by the Brooklyn and Federal bar groups. Also the high praise by such leading jurists as Court of Appeals Judge Conway, Appellate Division Justice Carswell, and Supreme Court Justice Walsh obviously made a deep impression.

In addition to the high character and knowledge of the law, Mr. RAYFIEL has, in our opinion, just the judicial type of mind to make him a fine, sympathetic, and impartial judge.

Modernize Our Presidential Election—IX. Election of the President in the House; Electors Useless; a Separate Vote for the Vice President; a Plurality Elects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, a very objectionable feature of our present method of electing the President is that which sometimes leads to the election of the President in the House of Representatives. In case no candidate for President secures a majority of votes in the electoral college, the election is thrown into the House. This is done even though one of the candidates might have a majority of the total popular votes of the Nation.

Election in the House is confined to a vote among the three highest candidates as voted for in the electoral college.

Under the twentieth amendment, Congress may provide for the case of a death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President, when the choice devolves upon the House. The same is true as to the election in the case of a candidate where the Senate must choose a Vice President.

At an election in the House, each State has 1 vote only, regardless of its population. That 1 vote is controlled by the majority of the Representatives of each State voting. If there be a tie, the State has no vote.

In voting, every State is the equal of every other State. One State with 300,000 people has an equal voice with a State with 10,000,000 population. This method of electing the President is about as improvident as any that could now be conceived of for such purpose.

In order to elect it is necessary that the candidate receive a majority of the votes of all the States participating.

Congress has 86 Members as a total representation in the House of 25 States, a majority of all the States. It is possible, but not probable, that the majority necessary to elect the President could be made up of 25 of the small States, which have only 20 percent of its membership. So if we had the election of the President in the House it would be within the power of those 25 States to elect a President, over the will of the people of the United States and over the will of 80 percent of the Members of the House.

When this question was up in the Constitutional Convention, after a provision had been adopted to elect the President by States, a motion to require that it should also be necessary to get a majority of the whole vote of the House was rejected. The small States were riding with a strong hand and they refused to concede that much to the large States.

So we had the situation of 1800, when the election between Jefferson and Burr was thrown in the House. The Federalists had a majority in the House. Many proposals were made to Jefferson to try to get him to yield certain things to the Federalists, if they would elect him President. One proposal made to Jefferson was that if he would retain in office all of the Federalist employees, they would elect him. Jefferson replied, in substance, that he did not want to become President in that way, and refused the offer. Finally, it was through the action of patriotic men who were willing to forego what they regarded as a political advantage, for the sake of the country, and who refused to vote and thereby permitted the election of Jefferson.

In 1824 the election was thrown in the House again and accompanied by much turmoil and a degree of scandal. The country was bitterly aroused and finally the House elected Adams instead of Jackson, who appeared to be the choice of the people. There was much resentment. The result was, in the following election, some Members who voted to seat Adams were defeated for that reason. Part of the people thought those Members of the House had betrayed their trust; that the House should have carried out what they regarded as the will of the people of the Nation instead of their party or personal motives. It was an unfortunate instance in the history of our country. Henry Clay, long an enemy of Jackson, was made a Cabinet member after joining in the election of Adams. The charge of a bargain remained a cloud on Clay's career even to his dying day, although his opposition to Jackson was, no doubt, an expression of his true feeling rather than a mere means of keeping a bargain to help himself.

There have been instances in which one party had a majority in the House and another party a majority of the States. The minority party thus would be able to elect over the majority represented in the House and over a majority vote of the people of the Nation.

The fundamental evil running through this whole plan of electing in the electoral college and in the House is the absence of any accurate or assured way of reflecting the public will.

Our country had experiences in settling these deadlocks as to the President in 1800, 1824, 1876, and as to the Vice President in 1836.

In each of these controversies as to the selection of a President, public turmoil and great bitterness developed. Even Jefferson is quoted as having said in 1800 that the people would arm, if necessary, to assure themselves that the President they had intended to elect should be installed.

The conflict of 1824 was one of the notable ones of our history in peacetime.

The contest of 1876 was likewise a bitter one that greatly disturbed the country.

One primary weakness of the situation is placing in the hands of a few men the responsibility of deciding who shall be President of this Nation.

We had a long experience in selecting Senators by the State legislatures, where the power of making such selection was left to the members of the legislature.

In some instances, even one man or a small number of men had the power to elect or defeat. That developed trades and scandalous reports.

A history more current with the time of the election of Senators by the legislatures stated reasons for the change of the system, which provided for their election by popular vote as follows:

> There were several objections to it which grew stronger as time went on. (1) Deadlocks were frequent, and sometimes were not broken, so that a State went unrepresented, or partially represented. (2) It was much easier to corrupt a legislature than a whole body of electors, and elections were frequently purchased. (3) A type of men could command a majority in the legislature who could not under any circumstances have been elected by the votes of the electors.

ELECTORS USELESS

A casual understanding of our electoral college system will make it plain that the Presidential elector is a useless encumbrance in our system of electing the President. The electors were designed to select a President at their own discretion for the Nation. Through the practice of electing electors pledged to particular candidates, the electors were deprived of the exercise of their discretion.

Since that time the elector has had no function to perform so far as exercising his discretion is concerned; he has served merely as a mechanical device for registering votes cast for candidates selected by others.

A little over 100 years ago and for many years, Thomas Benton was the outstanding advocate of the modification of our system of electing the President. Thomas Benton said:

> From the beginning these electors have been useless and an inconvenient intervention between the people and the object of their choice; and, in time, may become dangerous; and, being useless, inconvenient, and subject to abuse and danger; having wholly failed to answer the purpose for which they were instituted (and for which purpose no one would now contend), it becomes a just conclusion that the institution should be abolished and the election committed to the direct vote of the people.

If we had no higher or more important purposes than simply to improve the mechanics of electing the President, we would do well to abolish the Presidential elector, let the people vote directly for President, and give the whole State electoral vote to the plurality candidate according to the present practice. However, if we put such a scheme in operation, the absurdity of giving the total electoral vote of the State to one candidate without crediting his opponents with their share of the votes would be so absurd that it would meet forthright rejection by a public that would not approve or tolerate such unfairness. Our present method is just as absurd, but its indirect methods seem to have the effect of concealing its absurdities from general recognition.

The Presidential elector performs not only a useless function in the election, but under some circumstances he is a hazard to the success of the election. The man chosen as an elector may die at an inopportune time; he may be disqualified; he may become insane; he may be slain; he may betray his trust; he may be unable to attend on the day assigned by the Constitution for his vote, or for other reasons fail to vote. And so, in a close contest, where the election of a President may be determined possibly by the vote of one man in order to get the necessary majority, if something defeats that one man's vote, the election by the electoral college is defeated. That uncertainty, that element of human frailty, is an inevitable part of the present constitutional requirement.

A SEPARATE VOTE FOR VICE PRESIDENT

The Constitution provides for the election of the Vice President by a separate vote of the electors. That practice is followed now.

Under the present practice the right to vote separately for Vice President cannot be effectively exercised by the voter, because in so many States he does not have that chance.

Normally, the Vice President will be elected together with the Presidential candidate on the same ticket. However, there may well be instances in which discriminating voters may see fit to vote for the President from one party and the Vice President from another. That is a problem for the voter. No constitutional provision would be warranted which would deny the voters the privilege of discriminating between candidates for Vice President, as well as candidates for President.

The fact that the people would have a more effective means of expressing their judgment would probably contribute to more care in the selection of Vice Presidential candidates. In any event, it is not for the Constitution to deny the voters of the country a separate vote.

A PLURALITY ELECTS

The general system of election in our country is, of course, by plurality vote. That means that in the final count the candidate receiving the highest vote is elected.

Under the Constitution, Presidents are elected only by a majority vote in the electoral college, even though the candidate did not receive a plurality of the popular vote of the Nation.

While the majority vote of the Presidential electors is required to elect, the electors themselves are elected by pluralities. The result has been that while a majority vote in the electoral college is necessary to elect, a large percentage of our Presidents failed to receive a majority of the popular vote of the country. So, in effect the President is now elected by a plurality. Of the 31 elections for President from 1824 to 1944, inclusive, 13 of the elected men were minority candidates as measured by the total vote of the Nation.

The election of Lincoln in 1860, Cleveland in 1892, and Wilson in 1912, were notable cases of the election of minority candidates.

As amply demonstrated in our history, the electoral votes do not closely run parallel with the popular vote of the country. It has been fortunate that, while a majority of the Presidential electors was required to elect, there is no requirement that the elected candidate be supported by a majority vote of the people of the country. In the three cases mentioned above, there were three or more candidates in the field with whom the electoral votes were divided. Under which circumstances, the fact that a plurality candidate won was to the advantage of the Nation. In fact, it is hard to develop any practical plan of electing the President other than on a plurality basis.

In 14 elections, electoral votes have been shared by 3 or more candidates. The popular votes are usually shared by three or more candidates. A requirement that the President be actually elected by a majority vote of the people of the Nation would be a difficult hindrance to the election under any plan. Such a scheme would require run-off elections and the compulsory elimination of some of the candidates, with all the confusion, delay and expense that a run-off election would involve.

This proposal meets that situation squarely by providing that the candidate having the greatest number of electoral votes shall be elected.

Hon. Leo F. Rayfiel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join with the other Members of Congress in expressing their sentiments on the appointment of our colleague the Honorable LEO F. RAYFIEL, Democrat, of Brooklyn, representing the Fourteenth District of New York, to the Federal bench of the eastern district of New York.

When men come to Congress they either grow or swell. In this particular instance Congressman LEO RAYFIEL has grown to the stature of a Federal Judge.

His experience as a legislator in the New York State Assembly and as a Member of the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, as well as his legal experience before the bar of the State of New York of which he has been a member since 1918, befits him well for his present appointment. In the little over 1 year that I have been a Member

of Congress I have learned to know LEO RAYFIEL well.

He is solid in character, sound in judgment and possesses judicial temperament. He is shy and modest and possess a deep sense of humility. He is humble. These fine attributes will make an excellent judge. Avoiding the glare of the spotlight he has an innate reserve and a deliberate sense of patience. He is one who puts social aims ahead of personal profit. Nothing could better qualify a man for life tenure than these endearing and superlative qualities. To you, Leo and your family, my sincere congratulations and to President Truman who made your appointment possible. Your record on the bench will more than justify what I say about you.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 2953, the Federal aid for education bill without Federal control, in the House April 3, 1947. In order that all Members of the House may have the opportunity to become familiar with the main provisions of the bill, I am inserting the following statement under leave to extend my remarks:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE EDWARD O. McCOWEN, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, CONCERNING THE PROVISIONS OF H. R. 2953

The purpose of H. R. 2953, a public welfare measure, is to authorize the appropriation of Federal funds to help the States and Territories finance a minimum program of education in the public schools of the Nation. It calls for $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1949, and thereafter $300,000,000 per annum. Beginning with the lower figure and stepping up over a three year period to the maximum amount allows the States time in which to adjust their programs of education so as to make the most effective use of the Federal funds.

STATE CONTROL GUARANTEED

The bill safeguards the controls over educational policy now exercised by the States. This it does in a number of ways.

First, there is no transfer of existing State authority to the Federal Government. Second, the act in section 2 provides that "No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or prescribe any requirements with respect to any school, or any State educational institution or agency with respect to * * * the administration, the personnel, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instruction." Third, the bill prohibits any Federal agency or officer from entering into any agreement or imposing any term or condition in relation to grants made to any State. Fourth, the bill specifically provides that no State shall be required to alter any provision in its State constitution "prerequisite to * * * sharing the benefits of this act." There can be no Federal interference with segregation policies and practices in any State where separate school systems are maintained for separate racial groups under constitutional, or for that matter statutory, authority.

Thus the enactment of H. R. 2953 will not disturb existing educational controls now lodged in the States and by the States in the localities. In these respects the bill conforms to the best features of the more than 150 Federal-aid-to-education bills which the Congress has enacted since 1802.

APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS TO THE STATES

The funds apportioned under the act to the States are determined by an objective formula which is not subject to manipulation or the exercise of discretionary authority by any Federal agency or officer.

The formula allots funds in direct proportion to the need of the State (as measured by the number of children to be educated), in indirect proportion to the relative ability of the State to finance its schools (as measured by average State-income payments for a specified 5-year period), and in direct proportion to State effort to finance public schools (as measured by the percentage of State-income payments devoted to that purpose). If States make less than average national effort their Federal funds are proportionately reduced. Thus the States determine for themselves whether they are to receive the highest amount, or less than the highest amount, of Federal aid for which they are eligible to qualify under the act.

MINIMUM SCHOOL PROGRAM FOR THE NATION

The funds are so distributed as to guarantee, in conjunction with State and local school revenues, a minimum-school program average not less than $40 per pupil in average daily attendance each year in every school district in the Nation. Reduced to its simplest terms, the computation of Federal aid for each State under the act is made in the following manner:

1. The cost of the foundation program is computed by multiplying $40 by the number of children, 5 to 17 years old, inclusive, in the State.

2. State income payments, averaged for a 5-year period, are then multiplied by 1.1 percent (1.1 percent is used because for a recent year approximatly 1.1 percent of national income payments would have been required to finance the $40 program on a Nation-wide basis. For that reason the percentage ratio of 1.1 was accepted as the "standard effort" which every State would be expected to make in helping to finance the minimum education program.)

3. If (2) is greater than (1) the State is then eligible to receive not more than $3 per child of school age. If (1) is greater than (2), the State is then eligible to receive the difference in Federal aid, provided, however, that in no event would the State receive less than $3 multiplied by the number of children, 5 to 17 years old, inclusive, in the State.

The formula employs child population and State income payments data established by the Department of Commerce.

Census population figures are used instead of average daily attendance because (1) methods of computing average daily attendance vary greatly among the States, (2) the use of Federally derived data places all States on the same uniform basis, (3) such data are established by a disinterested agency, and (4) the use of census data in allotting funds offers a larger assurance that the States will be in position to provide the instruction necessary to educate all children of school age.

Table 1 shows the amounts of Federal aid the States and Territories would have received for a recent year under the provisions of H. R. 2953.

For the particular year for which the computation was made, 19 States would have received aid in excess of the minimum grant of $3 per child of school age. The remaining States—29—would have received Federal funds equal to the number of children of school age multiplied by $3. Of this group of 31 States, 6 would have participated in the so-called equalization program but each in an amount less than $3 times the number of children of school age, 5 to 17 years old, inclusive. Under the minimum apportionment of $3 per school child the amounts of Federal aid allotted to States in this category would be increased to the $3-per-school-child level.

In no event would any State receive a grant of Federal aid in an amount less than $3 multiplied by the number of children, 5 to 17 years old, inclusive, in the State.

Approximately one-sixth, or $50,000,000, of the maximum authorization under the act would be required to finance the $3-per-school-child distribution to those States which are not entitled to Federal funds greater than that amount under the equalization provisions of the formula. Supporting the minimum $3-per-school-child distribution to these States are the following considerations: (1) There are no States in which education in some school districts is not financed on a near-poverty level; (2) inasmuch as all States contribute through taxes to the proposed Federal-aid program, all States are entitled to at least a minimum return for the support of their own schools; and (3) the Federal-aid program offered in H. R. 2953 conforms closely to the best features of outstanding State-aid programs in the Nation.

STATE ACCEPTANCE PROVISIONS

States are not required to qualify for the benefits of the act. Those that do qualify must, however, designate the State treasurer, or other appropriate State official, who is to receive the funds; authorize the State educational agency to represent the State in administering the funds; provide for a State audit of such funds; submit reports to Congress on money received and how expended as is done in the administration of Federal land-grant college funds; transmit notice of acceptance and certified copies of legislative enactments and the official regulations issued by the State educational authority, in connection with Federal funds, to the Federal Government, and show that the Federal funds are not applied for the purpose of reducing State and local effort to finance their public elementary and public secondary schools. The Federal funds are to be used to supplement, not to displace, State and local school revenues.

MINORITY RACIAL GROUPS

H. R. 2953 establishes safeguards in the use of the funds by the States for the education of members of minority racial groups. This it does in several ways.

First, the bill provides in section 7 (a) (1) (F) that in States where separate public schools are maintained and operated for minority races, the apportionment of such funds for such schools shall be just and equitable. A just and equitable apportionment is defined in section 9 (d) as "a proportion of said funds not less than the proportion that each minority racial group in such State bears to the total population of that State."

Second, it is provided in section 7 (a) (2) that the minimum $40 school program shall be provided "in local school jurisdictions where separate schools are maintained for separate races" in the same way such program is provided in other public schools.

Third, in section 7 (a) (1) (F) it is provided that the "just and equitable" distribution, cited above, shall be guaranteed "without the reduction of State and local moneys expended for educational purposes during the fiscal year ended in 1947 for public schools for minority races."

SCHOOLS TO BENEFIT UNDER THE ACT

H. R. 2953 is a public elementary and a public secondary school bill. Section 6 (a) provides that the funds authorized under the act shall be disbursed by the State to local school districts or other public education agencies, for all types of current expenditures (excluding interest, debt service, and capital outlay).

Section 6 (b) states that the definition of a public school is a State function and shall remain a State responsibility. In some States public funds are expended by public agencies under public control for the transportation of nonpublic school children. Some States spend their own money for textbooks for the same children. Section 6 (b) authorizes the States to use Federal funds available under H. R. 2953 in the same way they use their own State and local school revenues, provided, however, that the ratio of Federal funds used for nonpublic school pupils shall not exceed the ratio of State and local funds so expended. The support of this provision is based upon the principle of adhering as closely as possible to State control of educational policy.

RIGHT OF APPEAL

In the event a question arises at any time in the administration of the provisions of the act, the State educational agency has the right of appeal to the United States Commissioner of Education, and from him to a United States district court, which "court shall have jurisdiction as to both fact and law."

SEPARABILITY

In the event any part of the act should be held invalid, other parts of the act will not be affected thereby.

TABLE I.—*Estimates of Federal aid under McCowen bill (H. R. 2953), April 1947*

States	Estimated payments to States under McCowen bill after applications of 2.5 percent effort to the equalization funds (calculations based on 1944 data)		
	Equalization ($40 and 1.1 percent)	Nonequalization ($3 payments)	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Continental U. S.	[1] $141,646,000	$55,446,000	$197,092,000
Alabama	13,330,000		13,330,000
Arizona	1,232,000		1,232,000
Arkansas	8,215,000		8,215,000
California		4,356,000	4,356,000
Colorado		735,000	735,000
Connecticut		1,023,000	1,023,000
Delaware		171,000	171,000
District of Columbia		432,000	432,000
Florida	(614,000)	1,356,000	1,356,000
Georgia	10,664,000		10,664,000
Idaho	564,000		564,000
Illinois		4,512,000	4,512,000
Indiana		2,187,000	2,187,000
Iowa		1,503,000	1,503,000
Kansas		1,116,000	1,116,000
Kentucky	12,095,000		12,095,000
Louisiana	7,959,000		7,959,000
Maine	(174,000)	564,000	564,000
Maryland		1,281,000	1,281,000
Massachusetts		2,496,000	2,496,000
Michigan		3,588,000	3,588,000
Minnesota	(548,000)	1,668,000	1,668,000
Mississippi	12,735,000		12,735,000
Missouri		2,253,000	2,253,000
Montana		327,000	327,000
Nebraska	(467,000)	810,000	810,000
Nevada		81,000	81,000
New Hampshire	(126,000)	294,000	294,000
New Jersey		2,145,000	2,145,000
New Mexico	2,824,000		2,824,000
New York		7,206,000	7,206,000
North Carolina	18,766,000		18,766,000
North Dakota	1,213,000		1,213,000
Ohio		4,254,000	4,254,000
Oklahoma	7,210,000		7,210,000
Oregon		675,000	675,000
Pennsylvania		6,246,000	6,246,000
Rhode Island		432,000	432,000
South Carolina	$10,686,000		$10,686,000
South Dakota	1,080,000		1,080,000
Tennessee	9,556,000		9,556,000
Texas	10,547,000		10,547,000
Utah	1,022,000		1,022,000
Vermont	(211,000)	$225,000	225,000
Virginia	3,714,000		3,714,000
Washington		1,092,000	1,092,000
West Virginia	8,234,000		8,234,000
Wisconsin		1,980,000	1,980,000
Wyoming		168,000	168,000

[1] The total of column 2 does not include the amounts in parentheses. These parenthetical amounts are equalization sums which are less than $3 per child guaranteed payments shown in column 3.

TABLE I.—*Estimates of Federal aid under McCowen bill (H. R. 2953), April 1947*—Continued

Source: National Education Association, Research Division.

How To Recognize the Un-American Individual and His Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which I have prepared on request of the magazine the Republican, and which appears in their current issue:

HOW TO RECOGNIZE THE UN-AMERICAN INDIVIDUAL AND HIS UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

(By J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman, House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities)

If every American citizen were congenitally equipped with the ability to recognize subversive activities, the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities probably would never have been born. This article would never need to be written.

For I am convinced that the vast majority of our population is fundamentally loyal to the American democratic way of life. Their scorn of any subversive minority would normally cause such elements to wither away or at least to render them ineffective.

Unfortunately, however, some American citizens are not born with the power to see through subversive efforts. The peaceful history of our country's development and the geography of our country have offered them little background in international political intrigue—such a common denominator in the history of foreign countries. Furthermore, the un-American has bent every effort to keep the wool over their eyes.

Recognizing the natural American antipathy to schemes which aim to supplant the American system of free enterprise and democracy with a Communist or Fascist collectivism that can spell only slavery for its participants, subversive elements cloak their aims and activities in devious disguises with the hope of achieving a policy of noninterference if not actual support from loyal citizens.

The success of this Trojan horse strategy is shocking.

For example, the Communists have succeeded in worming their way into the control of many labor unions and liberal groups in America. In this way they are able to exert a far more powerful influence than their true numbers merit.

Another field into which the Communists are attempting to infiltrate is the movie industry. The House Committee on Un-American Activities is now in the midst of an investigation of subversive work in that industry.

One of the major aims of the House committee is the tearing away of all disguises now protecting individuals and organizations working against the true interests of the United States. By means of investigation, public hearings, and printed reports, it tries to show the American public and Congress just where its traitorous elements lie.

The individual citizen can also learn to recognize these elements. I will suggest two formulas, one for revealing the Communists on the extreme left and another for revealing Fascists on the extreme right.

Both, in spite of their vociferous opposition to each other, champion totalitarian systems which void the basic American democratic concept of individual rights. Their use of the "hate" formula, centered around classes in the case of the Communist and around race and religion in the case of the Fascist, is utterly incompatible with the democratic ideal of tolerance. Basic kinship of these two enemies of democracy is strikingly revealed by the ease with which Communists and Fascists have changed sides in Germany and Italy.

The first formula is designed to fit either the un-American individual who holds actual membership in the Communist Party or the fellow-traveler who, while not a party member, unwaveringly supports Communist policies. The latter is often more dangerous because he can more easily masquerade as a loyal American.

COMMUNIST FORMULA

1. Membership in the Communist Party.

This committee's voluminous files contain proof of party affiliations of many individuals. Many hide their affiliation, however, as in the case of Carl Aldo Marzani, whose deceit enabled him to work in the highly secret Office of Strategic Services during the last war. In cases where membership is not admitted, one can infer the same if the individual pays dues to the party, solicits membership, holds office in the party or on one of its official publications, runs for political office on the party ticket or attends closed party meetings.

2. Services rendered to Communist Party.

An individual who is un-American will also frequently reveal himself by making financial contributions to the Communist Party or its publications. Other services which may indicate a party liner include signing election petitions for party political candidates, registering as a Communist voter, speaking or entertaining at Communist functions, and writing for Communist publications.

3. Attendance at Communist Party meetings, rallies, and other functions.

4. Defense of the party or individual Communists.

Signing petitions defending the ballot rights of the Communist Party may be an indication of un-American sympathies, as may the signing of petitions or support of special committees defending individual Communists. Party members organized committees to fight for the freedom of Earl Browder, former general secretary of the party who was imprisoned for passport fraud, and to oppose the threatened deportation of Communist Harry Bridges. A committee is already organized in behalf of Gerhart Eisler, Communist International agent who was recently convicted of contempt of Congress. Such activity is significant, especially when it is found in conjunction with other types of Communist support.

5. Support of Communist front or Communist-infiltrated organizations.

The Communists have organized hundreds of groups, usually under high-sounding titles, to promote their purposes in the United States. The American Youth for Democracy, for example, dishes out Communist propaganda to college students, while the National Negro Congress exploits racial issues for Communist purposes. As a result of exposure by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the American Youth for Democracy in many areas is now hastily trying to hide behind the disguise of a new title.

In addition, Communists have stolen control or partial control of a number of legitimate organizations, particularly unions. Outstanding examples are the American Youth Congress and the American Jewish Congress and, among unions, the hotel and restaurant locals of the AFL in New York. Communists got in on the ground floor of the CIO unions that they control; outstanding among them are the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, American Communications Association, Transport Workers Union of America, and National Maritime Union of America—all fields in which vital interests of the Nation are involved.

6. Denunciation of the American system of government and praise of the Soviet's.

Communists and their fellow-travelers castigate the American system of free enterprise as imperialistic and warmongering and refer to the Russian way of life, in spite of its dictatorship and slave labor, as the true democracy.

7. Consistent opposition to American foreign policy that conflicts with Russian interests.

The Communist pays blind allegiance to the Soviet Union which, in his eyes, can do no wrong. Before 1935, he noisily preached revolution and condemned all governments outside of Russia. After 1935, however, he saw a great need for American-Soviet friendship and began cultivating liberals in a "united front" movement. He backed Franklin Delano Roosevelt, urged national defense efforts, and spoke in glowing terms of "democracy". All this was the result of Russia's sudden fear of Germany and her desire for other foreign allies.

Stalin's startling coalition with Hitler in August 1939 found American Communists again doing an about face. Without apology the American Communist became isolationist, attacked Roosevelt, and protested national defense efforts. When Russia became an American ally in war against Hitler in 1941, the Communist once more turned into a flag-waving patriot, demanding all-out efforts to win the war.

Today the American Communist has reverted pretty much to his stand during the Stalin-Hitler pact. The Greek-Turkish aid program and other foreign policy moves conflicting with Russian interests are bitterly assailed. Soviet expansionism on the other hand is never subject to criticism which brings up another point in the Communist pattern:

8. Unwavering defense of the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

9. Ridicule of claims that communism is a menace.

The Communist tries to silence his opponents by ridiculing them as Red-baiters and Fascists. He insists his party stands only for peace, democracy, unions, and other popular catch-words and he denounces any attempt to expose his subsersive work as an attack on civil liberties or trade unions.

The cunning of the Communist is well illustrated by the case of Carl Aldo Marzani, who worked as a party educational director in New York in the early 1940's under the pseudonym of Tony Whales. He obtained employment in 1942 with the Office of Coordinator of Information in Washington, D. C., after an unblushing denial to Federal authorities of any affiliation with the Communists. During the war, he worked in the Office of Strategic Services where he had access to top military secrets, and a little later, he was in the State Department from which he was finally discharged in December 1946. He was convicted of misrepresentation on May 22, 1947, after a court trial at which police undercover agents described his Communist party work.

Marzani had provided a clue to his sympathies in other ways, however. He had circulated petitions which would place Earl Browder, former general secretary of the American Communist party, on New York's 1940 election ballot, and he had attended rallies for Browder. Marzani was a member of the Communist-controlled American Labor Party of New York and of the Communist-dominated International Workers Order. His wife was listed as a Communist party member.

Fascism can never be disregarded, in spite of the recent costly military defeat of two of its most notorious purveyors—Hitler, in Germany, and Mussolini, in Italy.

A type of slander being directed at the House Committee on Un-American Activities is characterized by recent press statements that we see no Fascist menace in America. This is as fantastic as the claim that the Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited Shirley Temple as a Communist. Actually, on June 12, this committee, upon recommendation of its subcommittee on fascism, voted to embark on an all-inclusive program of investigations and hearings on this subversive field.

Undoubtedly the most highly organized, foreign-inspired Fascist movement seen in this country was the German-American Bund, which worked hand in glove with Hitler to prepare for Der Tag—the day when American democracy would be overthrown in favor of a Fascist dictatorship.

Testimony before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities showed that the organization could muster 5,000 uniformed storm troopers from within its ranks and that it was funneling into America great quantities of propaganda direct from the German Ministry of Propaganda and Enlightenment.

The House committee has called before it such pro-Fascists as Fritz Kuhn, leader of the Bund, William Dudley Pelley, George Deatherage, and Gerald L. K. Smith, while studies were made of many individual native American Fascists. Committee files, by the way, were consulted at great length by the Department of Justice when that agency prepared its mass sedition case. The committee plans to hold hearings on other pro-Fascist individuals and organizations as soon as investigations now under way are completed.

Thus far, there are no indications that local Fascist efforts since the defeat of Hitler and Mussolini are part of any single, highly organized movement directed from an international center as in the case of communism. But while communism for this reason remains the greater menace, we cannot belittle the dangers of American fascism.

Fascism or nazism is characterized by a belief that dictatorship, with complete control over every phase of an individual's activity, is the ideal and natural form of government. Its chief instrument is a single "rubber stamp" political party completely subservient to a head of a state who is not chosen by the will of the people. Racial supremacy is also a keynote.

Insofar as they tend to overglorify a leader and set him up beyond criticism and insofar as they tend toward the concentration of power over all phases of human life in the hands of a power-hungry bureaucracy, the New Dealers are borrowing lock, stock, and barrel from the totalitarian arsenal of both communism and fascism.

In the time of Hitler, American Fascists, much like the Communists, paid blind allegiance to a totalitarian leader overseas, preached of revolutionary overthrow of the American government and dreamed of world domination. They used the same "fifth column" strategy of the Communists.

Some of the same subversive ideas are still being propagated in this country. Some of the organizations instrumental in furthering this Fascist line in America during Hitler's career have not even bothered to change their names.

The term Fascist is often too loosely applied. There are two different types: the militant, revolutionary and foreign controlled pro-Fascist like Fritz Kuhn who wanted to see a Hitlerite government replace American democracy, or the Fascist-minded individual who will borrow such un-American attitudes as anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism without necessarily subscribing to the complete Fascist philosophy.

The following pattern of behavior should reveal the Fascist-minded American:

FASCIST FORMULA

1. Defense of Fascist governments or Fascist individuals.

The extreme American pro-Fascist defends such "leaders" as Hitler and Mussolini and supports leading American pro-Fascists like William Dudley Pelley, Silver Shirt leader now serving a jail sentence for criminal sedition.

2. Racism.

The exploitation of racial issues was one of Hitler's most successful techniques, and it has been borrowed by our native Fascists.

3. Anti-Semitism or anti-Catholicism.

Anti-Semitism is a favorite weapon of the Fascist-minded individual, who counts on promoting his theories by promoting hate and dissention. It is a direct steal from Adolph Hitler, who did not recognize Jews as German citizens under the master race principle and used them as a convenient whipping boy and cover for his own ineptitude. In some predominantly Protestant areas, the pro-Fascist uses anti-Catholicism as a hate breeder.

4. Advocacy of a strong centralized government.

A government where the individual would be subject to the complete control by the state.

5. Derision of democracy.

The American pro-Fascist thinks of democracy as decadent, often dubbing it a "mobocracy."

6. Red-baiting.

The American pro-Fascist tries to throw the smoke screen of communism over anything or on anybody he opposes, just as the American Communist indiscriminately applies the word fascism.

7. Membership in pro-Fascist organizations or support of pro-Fascist publications.

Fascist-minded persons set up organizations and publications to promote their propaganda. These organizations and publications will reveal themselves by following the same pattern listed above for the pro-Fascist individual.

Conclusive proof of pro-Fascist or pro-Communist sympathy should never depend upon one point alone, with the exception of proof of actual Communist party membership. Liberals have been known to join pro-Fascist or pro-Communist front organizations only to resign in disgust after learning the true character of their leaders.

However, any individual who shows a consistent pattern of affiliation and/or support of un-American organizations and causes must be considered un-American.

Exposing Communist and Fascist elements in the Federal Government was one of the first tasks which the House Committee on Un-American Activities outlined for itself this year. The committee also promises to air Communist influence in Hollywood; spot-

light Communists in American labor unions; investigate groups or movements trying to steal atom bomb secrets for the benefit of a foreign power; and unearth any hidden Communist or Fascist elements in our educational system.

An aggressive effort by any private citizen or organization in ferreting out subversive individuals and their activities is always heartily welcomed by the House committee. But I would like to insert a word of caution. Blind and indiscriminate attack on any individual as a Fascist may render one a dupe of the Communists, who have lumped all their enemies into the Fascist category. Conversely, the same kind of unthinking labeling of an individual as a Communist may serve the Fascists, who use the Communist charge as their favorite smoke screen.

One should note that one of the major "fronts" for the dissemination of Communist propaganda in the 1930s was beguilingly entitled the "American League Against War and Fascism," while a present-day Communist front, Mobilization for Democracy, was allegedly formed to fight fascism. On the other hand, the notorious Silver Shirt Legion, headed by pro-Fascist William Dudley Pelley, had insisted its purpose was to combat a Communist revolution.

It is, therefore, only the thoughtful, unhysterical approach to the problem that promises all loss and no profit for the twin enemies of democracy.

Modernize Our Presidential Election—X. A Contribution to Clean, Efficient, and Progressive Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the Constitution by which we propose to modernize our Presidential election is simple in its terms and clear in its purposes.

We would eliminate the useless Presidential electors; the State would retain electoral votes as at present; the people would vote directly for President; the electoral votes of the States would be divided between the candidates according to their popular vote in each State; the "solid" State vote would no longer appear in election returns; there would be no "solid" States; no candidate would be given credit for votes cast for another, as is done under the present system; there would be no disfranchisement of votes after they are cast.

Every citizen in every section of the country could vote with the consciousness that his ballot will be counted as cast and have its proper part in deciding who should be President. It would make unnecessary and abolish the present system of breaking deadlocks by elections in the House of Representatives; it would discourage sectionalism in politics; and it would tend to encourage a greater interest in public affairs everywhere.

In an average Presidential election the votes of more than 35 of each 100 persons who vote are not counted as cast, in the ultimate count. They are credited to other candidates.

In the Presidential election of 1944 the votes of 44 persons out of each 100 who voted were, in the electoral count, credited to candidates other than the ones for whom cast.

It is hard to recognize this system of counting votes for the Presidency as having any legitimate place in any practical plan for a popular government. Its appalling injustice is repulsive. A citizen of this Republic who must cast his vote with an uncertainty as to whether or not it will be counted as cast, is denied an incentive that should be the privilege of every citizen. We penalize a virtue that should be fostered.

Electoral votes are awarded to States primarily in proportion to their population. Instead of awarding the vote of the State in proportion to the way its people vote, all of its votes are cast in a solid block—this solid block goes to the one candidate who receives the largest number of the State's popular votes. In other words, all votes cast for the minority candidates and electoral votes representing even those who do not vote, are computed as if voted for the plurality candidate.

The total electoral vote of the Nation ordinarily varies from its popular vote from 10 to 30 percent. This shows how inaccurately the electoral vote reflects the popular will.

The legitimate object of an election is to accomplish the will of the people. There is no justification for the maintenance of a voting system which does not and cannot accurately reflect the will of the American people.

We live in an age of pressure groups—groups that frequently exercise a power far out of proportion to their numbers. It is rather a paradox that the electoral college system deprives all minor groups of a legitimate recognition in the election, but greatly enlarges the nuisance value of pressure groups. Let us assume a case. Assume that a given State has 35 electoral votes. Let us assume, for illustration, that it has 100,000 voters for each electoral vote. Let us assume there is a one-purpose pressure group in that State, 400,000 of whom are determined to support that candidate who by promises or otherwise convinces its members that he will serve their purposes. The candidate is intent on his election, in doubt as to results, under persuasion of political friends who have an overweaning desire to win the election. The demands upon the candidate may be unfair to national welfare. He visualizes the probability of the gain or loss of 35 electoral votes of one of our greatest States. His decision may well mean the difference between election and defeat. In office, he can never be as good a President as he would have been without that promise. If that candidate was in striking distance of the Presidency he must have had something like 25,000,000 ready to vote for him. With that number behind him he would be on the border line for election in 1948, for instance. By yielding he may have 35 votes, or 13 percent of the 265 electoral votes, he needs to be President. Under the system of counting, those 400,000 votes may mean 35 electoral votes. They are the final weight that may be necessary to tip the scales to the victory side.

Under the proposed plan those 400,000 votes would mean only 4 electoral votes at most. They would not control 35 electoral votes. There would be 125 times 400,000 in the total vote of the Nation.

What was a serious threat under the present system would become of minor consequence under the proposed plan. The difference is the difference between a fair and an unfair method for recognizing the will of the people of the country.

Under our system, by which States participate in electing the President under diverse plans of State elections, we can, if this amendment is adopted, by the allotment of electoral votes to the States and the division of those in proportion to the popular votes in each State, transmute the election returns into a fair and accurate common unit of expressing the will of the Nation as the votes are finally counted. We can give the Nation a just system of electing the President and on a plan that will operate definitely uniformly and accurately under all circumstances. By adopting this plan we will make an important contribution to clean, efficient, and progressive government.

Brief Summary of First Session, Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we bring to a close the first session of the Eightieth Congress, I believe that it will be well to sum up briefly some of the accomplishments. In doing this, I believe we should point out the fact that its first task was to put into operation the Reorganization Act adopted by the Seventy-ninth Congress. This was more of a chore than most people realize. It meant that 47 committees had to be reorganized into 19 major standing committees. The Leadership is to be congratulated for the thoughtfulness in assigning the new Members. It is well to call attention to the fact that 74 Republican Members and 30 Democrat Members were newly elected in November 1946. Naturally, the qualifications and abilities of these new Members were not too well known in all cases, and a great deal of judgment had to be exercised. This reorganization took about 6 weeks to accomplish. A very short time, considering the amount of work involved.

This Eightieth Congress was charged with the responsibility of bringing about the transition from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy. The results prove that this has been done in a very thoughtful, cautious manner. Those who remember the periods following previous wars will remember the chaotic conditions which prevailed. Compared with the transition period for which this

Eightieth Congress assumes responsibility, there is a noticeably great difference. Unlike previous situations, employment has set a high record, national revenues are at their peak, and we have brought about orderly reductions in expenditures with sensible cuts in appropriations. We are returning the Nation to a proper peacetime economy in a remarkably orderly manner.

LABOR LEGISLATION

The legislation which has attracted the greatest national interest is the enactment of the Labor-Management Law of 1947. I was one of those who did not favor the original proposal and voted against it. I was very happy to vote for the proposal that came out of the conference, and was glad to vote to override the President's veto. I feel that the President made a mistake in taking the action that he did. This is not the type of legislation that can be appraised without study and without observation and practice, and yet there are some who condemned it before even learning its provisions. Naturally, a few people, solidly entrenched in their secure positions in the labor movement, opposed this bill and are trying to mislead the rank and file. And yet, the positions of good labor leaders are in no jeopardy as the result of the passage of this law. Men and women who work should be sure that they understand the provisions of this law, and know what new rights they gain after August 22 when labor law changes take effect.

The right to work is spelled out by the law. A man looking for a job cannot, hereafter, be denied a job simply because he does not belong to a particular labor union. A man, once hired, may find that he must join a union, but he can get in on the same terms as anyone else. He has a right to appeal to the National Labor Relations Board if he is treated any differently. A worker cannot be fired on union orders unless he fails to pay his union dues. He can express his views with reference to the leaders of his union. He can urge other members to get out of the union. He can try to set up a rival union. In other words, his Government will protect him and give him freedom of action. Every worker will enjoy the right to vote in an election to determine whether or not union membership is to be required of all workers. Furthermore, a worker may decide whether or not he prefers the check-off system as a system of union dues payments.

For twelve years, individual workers have been deprived of certain rights which are restored under the Labor-Management Act of 1947. There is nothing in this law that takes away the right to strike, but a worker has a right to express himself in this connection. Furthermore, he has a right to sue the union in case of an illegal strike, if he can prove that he has lost money as the result of this strike. No longer does a worker suffer the insecurity that results from illegal strikes.

One of the most important features of the law is the report that must be made by the union of its financial affairs and methods of doing business. In order that a union may be eligible for the protections of the National Labor Relations Board, it must file with the Government copies of its constitution and bylaws. Such reports must contain complete information on salaries of union officers, methods of electing officers and detailed descriptions of union operating practices. This is information that many workers have never had available to them before. Another thing, a worker can take a position with reference to his union's policy and oppose such policy if he desires. He may be expelled by the union, but the union cannot force his employer to fire him even in a union shop. The result will be more freedom for workers to express themselves on union matters. In the past, many workers were assessed for political activities with which they did not agree. Under this law, such assessments can no longer be made and a worker cannot be fired for failure to participate. The law provides for reasonable initiation fees. The system of excessive fees which has kept many men out of unions is now barred. Under this law, Communist activity in a union is brought out into the open. No union can take a case to the National Labor Relations Board until its officers have filed sworn statements that they are not affiliated with the Communist Party. A worker can demand that the union officers file such statements to protect his union's right to use the Labor Board. A worker can report a union officer to the Justice Department if he believes that a false statement has been made concerning the officer's Communist affiliation. Many workers would prefer to take matters up directly with their employer without having to go through the union. Under this law this is now possible. This law provides that professional workers such as lawyers and engineers may also form separate bargaining units. Skilled workers can form their own unions or join craft unions, instead of remaining members of plant-wide unions.

The National Labor Relations Board will support them in their efforts to obtain separate contracts with employers. These are a few features with which men and women who work should familiarize themselves. They go even further and include protection against discrimination for race, color, or creed. This is a good law but not a panacea. There may be faults in it which will reveal themselves. In which case, corrections may have to be made. One thing is certain, it is not such a law as is described by many prejudiced persons. It will not destroy labor unions or retard a proper labor movement.

Strikes have their economic effect on the pocketbooks of individuals as well as on the national economy. The lessening of strikes since the 1st of January 1947 is quite noticeable. The predicted big strikes in steel, coal, and other heavy industries have not taken place. There has been an almost total absence of unauthorized strikes. One large union has issued a very significant official order instructing its membership that, regardless of circumstances, no strikes or stoppages of work must occur in advance of receiving sanction by the executive council. The new law, far from being against the interests of a responsible labor union, fits in with its program of discipline and makes sure that minorities will not pull off strikes without consulting the proper authorities. Wives and families of working men will appreciate the security they gain by this provision.

Furthermore, there is nothing in this new law which will destroy labor unions. The rank and file are going to ask questions later of those who have charged that this law will destroy their labor organizations.

TAX BILL

This Eightieth Congress has tried continuously to have enacted a new tax law which would reduce personal income taxes. Twice the House of Representatives and the Senate have passed such laws, only to have them vetoed. The House overrode the veto on the second tax law, but the bill failed to get the necessary two-thirds vote of the Senate in order to override the veto in that body. It is next to impossible to thoroughly satisfy everyone when making a tax cut. It is easy enough to criticise any program or plan, but it is not so easy to substitute a system which would be any more acceptable. The plan submitted was reasonable and could have been carried out. It would have meant savings in taxes to people in all walks of life, and would have eliminated taxes for a large number. There is no question but what the tax cut was feasible as, through the reductions in appropriations, the estimated revenue for 1948 will be 41 billion 200 million dollars. Expenditures are estimated at 34 billion 600 million dollars. This being the case, it is estimated that the budget surplus will be 6 billion 600 million dollars. A tax cut of 4 billion dollars for the 1948 calendar year would reduce revenues by only 2 billion dollars in the fiscal year that ends June 30, 1948. That would leave 4 billion dollars for debt retirement or further tax cut. Such being the case, no one can question the ability of the Government to make such a tax cut.

CONTROLS

One of the outstanding factors that contributed to the predicament in which France found itself after World War I was due to the retention of wartime controls and the maintenance of a large bureaucracy. Recognizing what would happen to this country if such a policy were carried out here, this Eightieth Congress has seen fit to sensibly and progressively discontinue certain controls. Some have had immediate beneficial results, and some are such that the beneficial results may take a little time. For example, this Congress pointed out that many controls were no longer necessary, notably sugar. We now find sugar in abundant supply. In taking action on rent controls the Congress was confronted with a compromise which was hardly satisfactory to either owners or renters. Members of Congress living in areas in which the majority of the people live in rented property did their very best in seeking a compromise which would be the least disruptive. The immediate results were confusion and misunderstanding. It is hoped that this will not be long-lived. The redeeming feature lies in the fact that certain controls of building materials have been eliminated which should stimulate and encourage additional building of residential property.

After all, the solution of the housing problem lies in more building. It is almost 2 years since VJ-day. Since then 16,000,000 servicemen and women have returned home. During that time the retention of controls on building materials and the shipment of such material abroad has prevented the type of construction program which took place immediately after the termination of hostilities in World War I. Many impractical ideas were tried and discarded before it was realized that people want apartments of small or medium size. The building of a sufficient number of these quickly will solve the housing problem as it exists today in large cities. Private enterprise should be given an opportunity to solve the housi g situation. At the same time, this Congress has taken a wise precaution in appointing a committee to investigate the whole housing situation. If, upon the reconvening of Congress, it is indicated that private enterprise alone cannot cope with this problem, Congress will be ready to act without further delay.

VETERANS

Action has been taken to insure proper operation of the veterans' preference provisions. Weaknesses in the Veterans' Preference Act have been corrected. An act was passed providing for the voluntary cashing of terminal leave bonds. Attempts to do this in previous Congresses failed. This Congress accomplished this, and it means that these bonds outstanding in the amount of 1 billion 792 million dollars may now be redeemed after September 1. The cashing of these bonds serves two purposes. It enables the men who need the money now to get it. It also saves the Government approximately 62 million 500 thousand dollars in annual interest. This Congress also acted on legislation recommending that the Veterans' Administration make use of Army and Navy hospitals in order to provide for veterans needing hospital care.

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL

The House of Representatives passed by a vote of 290 to 112 a bill which would outlaw the provision which still exists in a few remaining States, which makes payment of a poll tax a qualification for voting in Federal elections. This bill will be high on the list for consideration by the Senate when Congress reconvenes.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Disclosures made in this Congress have resulted in positive action in the way of legislation which will eliminate disloyal persons from the Government service. Due to the turning of the spotlight on this situation several Government employees occupying positions of trust have been brought to justice and convicted. Only a short time ago, over 1,000 civilians were released from positions of confidence in the Army, the Navy, and the State Department. This is but a start, and it is hoped that as the result of the action of this Congress that we shall seek out all of those of questionable loyalty and prevent them from occupying positions in which they can be of harm to the security of the United States.

GENERAL

This Eighteth Congress has worked hard to carry out the wishes of the American people as they were expressed in the election of 1946. Appropriation requests have been scrutinized with care and savings effected without jeopardizing national security. All requests for research have been treated with liberality. We have been exceedingly generous in contributing to the welfare of less fortunate countries. It is gratifying to know that a committee of Congress is going abroad this summer and fall to investigate at first hand conditions in countries that we have tried to help, in order to determine whether that help was justified and whether additional assistance may be warranted. Other committees will explore the fields of labor-management, executive expenditures, the Post Office and Civil Service Departments, to determine policies which should be followed in the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

First-hand information is vital in order to know what plans are necessary and what programs should be followed. For example, the Post Office Department is confronted with a $300,000,000 deficit. The solution suggested by the Post Office Department is to increase postal rates. If economies can be effected which will make this unnecessary there is no need for increasing the cost of postal services. No such examination has been made in many years. There can be no question but what such an investigation should be made at this time.

Great hopes are held for modernization of the Federal Government as the result of the appointment of a 12-member Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. It is hoped that former President Hoover will head this Commission. This Commission was authorized by the Eightieth Congress to make recommendations on the outright abolition of any services and functions it finds unnecessary and defining and limiting of executive functions, services, and activities.

The Congress is adjourning under a special agreement which permits the Republican leadership, as well as the President, to call the Congress back. In the event that any serious emergencies arise, the Congress will be reconvened before the regular session which meets in January.

Petrillo Labor Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following broadcast by George E. Reedy:

One of the sorest spots in American labor-management relations seems well on the way to a rapid settlement. It is the long-standing dispute between James C. Petrillo, head of the American Federation of Musicians, and school and military bands.

Possibly the method of the settlement may point the way to the adjustment of many other conflicts that have plagued our country. For the whole thing was settled, on a peaceable basis, at a conference attended by everyone involved.

There were actually two issues that had to be ironed out. One was whether the military and school bands would be allowed to make records. The other was whether the school bands would be allowed to broadcast over the radio.

These questions have been the subject of heated argument for many a year. The amateur and military bands have claimed that the people are entitled to hear their music. No reasonable grounds can be found for disputing this claim.

The union, on the other hand, has claimed that amateur competition takes work away from professionals, who earn their living out of music. No one has contended that this should be permitted to happen.

In Petrillo, the union had a strong man—one who could enforce the demands of his organization. As a result, it has been able to hold its own in a running battle with employers. As usual, the chief victim of the economic warfare has been the public.

Petrillo and the educators and military officials were brought together by Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, a Pennsylvania Republican. KEARNS is chairman of a House labor subcommittee that is investigating the activities of the union.

The settlement was quite simple. The union leader agreed to permit military bands to make recordings for schools and colleges only. At the same time, a committee of educators was set up to write a code of ethics to govern musical education.

The most significant part of the whole deal is that, once the parties were brought together, they found they could get along pretty well. KEARNS later commented that a warm friendship seems to have sprung up between Petrillo and the educators.

For years they have been making faces and tossing brickbats at each other. To say that their differences were heated would be to understate the case. They were positively sizzling and neither side made any secret of it.

Members have been expelled from the Musicians Union for aiding the amateurs—notably, Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, of Interlochen, Mich. His misdeed was to sponsor amateur performances at which no one moved to hire professionals to stand by without playing.

Today, the educators and the union chief seem to be the greatest of friends. In fact, Petrillo has accepted an invitation to speak at an educational Congress next year. The educators are in for some real education.

The agreement, however, is not the end of the congressional investigation which started earlier this month. KEARNS says it will continue, even though another hearing is not to be held until the middle of September.

The Pennsylvanian says that Petrillo has more interests than a centipede has legs, and he wants to look into some of them. They include radio, television, frequency modulation and the movie industry.

So far, KEARNS has done pretty well. In fact, the agreement between Petrillo and the nonprofessional musicians may emerge as the outstanding feat of the House Labor Committee—in many respects, even more important than the Taft-Hartley bill.

Unification of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN C. SNYDER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the House today approved the Conference Report

of the Managers of the House on the legislation providing for the unification of the armed services.

The need for greater coordination and unification of the various components of our armed services has been obvious since World War I.

During the years of peace, the responsible heads of our armed forces accepted with too much complacency the demands of modern warfare and the necessity for coordinated action between all elements of the combat team. Each service not only retained its separate entity, but its independent action in the matter of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, and research.

The legislation as passed is disappointing in some respects, in that it does not go as far as it should in the unification process. However, as a matter of fact, no legislation actually would be necessary to obtain unification if our various branches of the service would take steps which are all too obvious.

The process of unifying the services will be slow and, in the first instance, there will not be a great deal of money saved. The responsibility of now molding into one team all of our armed services, to give the Nation the security it has a right to expect, rests squarely upon the shoulders of our military people. Congress itself cannot legislate responsibility. The Congress has appropriated approximately $12,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for defense purposes. If the taxpayer gets a dollar's worth of defense for his tax dollar, there is no question in my mind but that we will have national security to a degree that will fully protect the American people.

The waste, extravagance and duplication which exists today and of which the military must be fully cognizant, can be more expeditiously eliminated under the legislation just passed. No one desires to see the identify of any of our services destroyed. The Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marine Corps, through their courageous performance, have definitely made a place for themselves in the hearts of the people. All take pride in their great achievements. The time of individual glory for any particular service is past. All must be willing to submerge individual entity and become a part of a great team. The aims, ambitions, and desires of any one service must be forgotten, except as they become a part of the team and contribute to its success. If that objective is accomplished, there will be sufficient credit for all.

Judge Evan Howell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Illinois State Journal of July 22, 1947:

JUDGE EVAN HOWELL

Thousands of Illinois State Journal readers know EVAN HOWELL personally, while practically all have followed his record in Congress with sufficient enthusiasm to elect him four times to represent the Twenty-first Illinois District. Now we have another cause to take great pride in a favorite son—EVAN HOWELL has been appointed for life as a judge of the United States Court of Claims in Washington, D. C.

Judge HOWELL, as we may now call him, was never too busy in Washington or on his visits to the home district to hear the problems or opinions of his constituents, and to perform with personal interest the hundreds of minor tasks which fall to the lot of a Congressman. It can be said without equivocation that he has worked without stint to serve well the Illinois capital district.

Judge HOWELL'S record as a Congressman on the floor of the House is one of loyalty to American principles and devotion to those causes judged to be in the final interest of the American people. On issues from taxes to flood control he has always kept in mind the welfare of the 250,000 residents of Christian, Montgomery, Macoupin, and Sangamon counties he represents.

Judge HOWELL is just over 40 years of age, but he has packed into his active career the elements of personal character and professional experience needed to fit him for his new office. Although he will be under much less pressure in his new job and will find more spare time to indulge personal tastes, we cannot help but feel that Judge HOWELL will frequently recall with nostalgia his years as Congressman from the Twenty-first District of Illinois.

We would all like to feel that Judge Howell will continue to call Springfield his real home town. We know that he will return to us often to cast a good, solid Republican vote in his old district, and to keep alive the friendships and associations of his Young Republican years.

The Twenty-first District has lost an able representative, but the United States Court of Claims has gained a capable judge. Our congratulations may be accompanied by expressions of regret over our loss, but they are nonetheless sincere.

Plenty of Money Appropriated by Congress To Fight Communism but Efforts To Disseminate Information About an Equally Dangerous Enemy, Fascism, Meet With Failure—Both Communism and Fascism Should Be Exposed at Every Opportunity, and Every Time One Is Denounced, Both Should Be Denounced, Since One, Communism, Is Approaching Us From the Left and the Other, Fascism, Is Approaching Us From the Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the booklet on Fascism in Action is being printed by the Government Printing Office as a House document. The House of Representatives approved the printing of this document but, under existing laws, each Member of Congress will only get one copy and no other copies will be printed for distribution except a supply will be printed by the Government Printing Office to be sold to the public. The price will be 40 cents per copy.

When the booklet "Communism in Action" was printed, several hundred thousand copies were printed at Government expense and furnished to Members of the House and Senate for free distribution. This should have been done and the booklet is very helpful in advising people of the dangers of communism. We have recently gone through a horrible war with Fascists. The war cost us between 300 and 400 billion dollars. Fascism can creep up on our country and get charge of it, the same as it happened in Italy, while we are fighting communism here like they were fighting it in Italy, if we do not, at the same time, warn people of the dangers of fascism.

The Fascist movement in this country is in very strong hands. It is supported by great wealth and unlimited funds are available by Fascist-minded people for the purpose of distracting the people's attention from fascism by exposing and denouncing communism only.

DISAPPOINTED IN ACTION OF COMMITTEE

I cannot understand why a Member of Congress, or any other person in an official position, should not be just as anxious to expose fascism as communism. For that reason, I am disappointed because the Committee on House Administration has failed to favorably report the resolution which provides for the printing of 100,000 additional copies for distribution. In other words, it places the House of Representatives in the position that it is perfectly willing to expose communism but is unwilling to do just as much toward exposing fascism. Between $30,000 and $50,000 has been spent by the Government to print and distribute free books on communism. I have no complaint about this; in fact, it should have been done, but I do insist that we should at least spend as much on trying to expose properly an equally vicious enemy, fascism.

I am inserting herewith a copy of the last letter that was addressed to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration concerning this matter. A copy of this letter was forwarded to the Hon. HOBERT J. CORBETT, chairman of the Subcommittee on Printing.

A copy of Mr. LECOMPTE'S reply is also inserted.

They are as follows:

JULY 24, 1947.

Hon. KARL M. LCCOMPTE,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, United States Capitol.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: After the House approved the resolution to print the document, Fascism in Action, as a House document, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 69, asking for 100,000 additional copies to be printed for free distribution. This resolution was introduced July 10, 1947, and I have diligently tried to get consideration of it since that time. To date I have heard nothing concerning the resolution or the possibility of its consideration by your committee.

The House Administration Committee reported the resolution to print the document, Fascism in Action, with the understanding and knowledge that at least 100,000 copies would be asked for for free distribution and more if the demand justified. The House of Representatives adopted the resolution authorizing the printing of this document with the knowledge and understanding that I would ask for the printing of 100,000 additional copies for free distribution.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that this Resolution No. 69 should be considered by your committee at once, if it has not already been considered, and should be adopted and presented to the House before adjournment. Otherwise, during the recess of Congress, Members of Congress will be requested to send constituents copies of this booklet and they will not be available except through purchase at the Government Printing Office. I cannot understand why any Member should want to stop the publication of this book. It is just as important as the book on communism. Both communism and fascism are our enemies and each should be exposed at every opportunity.

Please advise me if and when I may expect consideration of this Resolution No. 69.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 24, 1947.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR WRIGHT: I have your letter of July 24 with reference to House Concurrent Resolution No. 69, which you introduced on July 10, asking for 100,000 additional copies of Fascism in Action to be printed for free distribution.

I am informed that at the time the Subcommittee on Printing held its last meeting the estimated cost of printing these additional copies was not yet available.

At the meeting of our full committee on Wednesday of this week I called for reports from the subcommittee chairman, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Printing made no report on your resolution. It appears, therefore, that no action can be taken by the committee during this session of Congress.

Always with kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

K. M. LECOMPTE.

Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, last spring the Committee on Ways and Means held extended hearings to determine how the reciprocal trade law was operating, and to what extent the interests of the American farmer, laborer, and manufacturer were considered in negotiating trade agreements.

As was to be expected, those segments of business which have a large export business lauded the operation of the reciprocal trade law to the skies, but on the other hand, those whose protection had been lowered to the fierce onslaughts of imported competitive products, expressed dissatisfaction, also apprehension over what will happen to them once the competing countries get back on a full exporting basis.

Mr. Speaker, the present reciprocal trade law will expire on June 30th next. Before that date the Ways and Means Committee will have to give consideration to either extending the law in its present form or making such changes in its operation as will more fully protect the interests of American agriculture, labor, and industry.

To do that intelligently it will be necessary that we have certain definite information, which has not heretofore been available. In order to make the necessary information available the Ways and Means Committee on yesterday afternoon, by a substantial majority vote, adopted the following resolution which speaks for itself:

Whereas the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will expire June 12, 1948, and the Committee on Ways and Means will consider a new Trade Agreements Act, or an extension of the present act and will require adequate information for that information; and

Whereas representatives of domestic agriculture, labor, and industry have indicated before various committees through briefs and oral testimony that they are fearful of a loss of domestic markets; and

Whereas the items listed for possible tariff concessions in the trade agreement negotiations which opened in Geneva on April 10, 1947, constitute the great bulk of the agricultural and other items classified in the Tariff Act of 1930; and

Whereas it is the aim and purpose of this committee to promote a system of true reciprocity in our foreign trade and a firm regard for the protection of the interests of American agriculture, labor, and industry: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, That the United States Tariff Commission is hereby requested to keep currently informed and to report immediately to the Committee on Ways and Means any rate or rates of duty or prospective rates of duty proposed in trade concessions, which appear to be so low as to give imports a substantial competitive advantage over domestically produced items, or so high as to exclude from the domestic market reasonable competition from imports; and be it further

Resolved, That the Tariff Commission is requested to establish as soon as practicable, but not later than November 1, the substantive and procedural criteria, measurements, or other standards by which it will determine whether imports of any particular commodity are entering in such quantities as to injure or threaten injury to any domestic unit of agriculture, labor, industry, or segment thereof, and to inform the Committee on Ways and Means as to how that Commission intends to comply with the provisions of Executive Order 9832 issued February 25, 1947; and be it further

Resolved, That the Tariff Commission is requested to revise, rewrite, or otherwise bring up to date the Dictionary of Tariff Information and the commodity Summaries of Tariff Information, by February 1, 1948.

Duel in the Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on June 19 I introduced a resolution to protect the children of Washington, D. C., from the showing of a picture show called Duel in the Sun, one of the most loathsome, repulsive, and degrading picture shows the sadistic elements in Hollywood have ever been able to dish out to a helpless public.

I understand now that it is being brought back and shown in Washington in spite of the protest of the decent Christian elements of the Nation's Capital.

This immoral production was condemned by the board of censorship of Memphis, Tenn., and has been banned by Christian leaders of the Nation as morally offensive, spiritually depressing, and degrading in every respect.

As pointed out by Hon. Lloyd T. Binford, chairman of the board of censorship of Memphis, Tenn.:

This foul production known as Duel in the Sun begins with a double murder which takes place in a bedroom of a saloon and dive theater, and which is spawned and instigated by infidelity. This picture ends with a double murder brought to pass by a series of seductions and the destruction of a young woman's virtue. It is a tale of two lust-driven delinquents who rush through reams of sadistic love-making toward a final catastrophe of minds filled with murderous mania to the exclusion of even the tiniest spark of human decency. It is a story of jungle savagery, which might have amused the people of Sodom and Gomorrah in the final moments of the destruction of those ancient, evil cities.

The scenes of rape of the half-breed Indian girl should not even be shown to the inmates of a red-light district, much less to decent adults. To permit innocent, unsuspecting children to see this lecherous depiction of sexual abnormality and brutality would be contributing to the delinquency of minors. For, in the finale of the picture, the two victims of the lowest form of depraved, animal passion slaughter each other, and, with blood streaming from their wounds and sweat pouring from their bodies, press their mouths together in a last spasm of sadism and die in each other's arms.

To add flavor to this film of filth, an unordained minister of the Gospel, known as the Sin Killer, offers prayers to God that are worse than blasphemous, irreverent, impious, and profane. Christians unfortunate enough to enter a theater where Duel in the Sun might be shown will cringe and shudder as they witness the scenes in which Walter Huston appears, and hear his sacrilegious outbursts.

Hollywood commentators and critics refer to Duel in the Sun as stark realism. It is stark murder. It is stark horror. It is stark depravity. It is stark filth. If Duel in the Sun in a sample of the manner in which a prominent and influential director is going to help preserve American ideals of honor and fidelity and decency—God help America.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 19, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a short address recently

made by myself over the network of the Columbia Broadcasting Co. on the subject of Federal aid to education:

I AM OPPOSED TO FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

SCHOOL FINANCE A LOCAL FUNCTION

It is the business of the Federal Government to pay the cost of national defense but not to finance our public schools. That is the duty and responsibility of local government. We face many problems in our schools, but it is a mistake to think we can solve them simply by turning on the spigot of Federal funds. The problems of education cannot be solved by Federal subsidy.

CRISIS CAUSED BY GOVERNMENT SPENDING

So-called Federal-aid-to-education schemes would help only temporarily. Moreover, they would fail to restore the teaching profession to its rightful place of honor on a permanent basis. The real trouble that has caused the crisis in the teaching profession is excessive spending in Washington. Teachers' dollars are worth less because of the policy of creating scarcity of goods at home by shipping so many life-sustaining necessities abroad. The National Government has been seizing a much larger share of the earnings of the people than ever before. Twenty years ago the Federal Government took 27 percent of the tax dollar. Local governments, the largest item of which is schools, got 56 percent of all taxes levied. But in 1946, the local governments received only 14 percent of all tax collections. The National Government had increased its grab on the tax dollar from 27 percent in 1927 to 74 percent of all taxes paid in 1946.

STATES BETTER OFF FINANCIALLY

Yet there is no State in the Union but what is better able to finance its schools today than is the Federal Government. The Government at Washington has been deficit financed for 16 years. The proposed legislation calls for the Federal Government to help the States to carry the burdens of public education. But the States have been balancing their budgets. They have their taxing systems in order, and have been reducing, not increasing, their debt burdens. They have been putting money away by the hundreds of millions against stormy times. Where would the Federal Government get the money to pay this huge subsidy? Impose additional or new Federal taxes, or borrow the money, thus pyramiding debt upon debt and further diluting the value of the dollar? Remember, most States have surpluses while the National Government is in the red.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT MORE EFFICIENT

Taxpayers are getting wise to the way dollars sent to Washington shrink 20 to 50 percent by the time they get back to the home community. Local government always collects and distributes funds more directly and more efficiently. Why send our school funds off to Washington to be distributed back home by some bureaucrat? Our local officials are more familiar with the problems and best suited to deal with them. The Federal method will in the long run result in actually less being spent for education.

Last year while attending a meeting of educators in my home town of Columbia, Mo., I explained to the teachers that Missouri would have to pay their part of the appropriation for Federal aid. Many teachers were bewildered, somehow having the idea that we were to get our share of the appropriation with no burden on our own people. As a matter of fact, that particular Federal aid bill called for each of 31 States to put in more money than they would take out. One reason that so many people come rushing to Washington for relief on local problems is because they have the notion that if they get hand-outs from Washington this costs nothing to anybody. This false impression must be corrected before it wrecks our economic order. It is unadulterated humbug to tell the teachers that by Federal interference they would get permanently higher compensation for their services.

DANGERS THAT MAKE FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION UNDESIRABLE

To say that we can have Federal aid without Federal control of education is wishful thinking. No legislator is able to offer such a guaranty. Of course, the bills say that there must be no interference with the States' own control of education. And yet the same bills provide that no State can get money until the State officially adopts a plan acceptable to the United States Office of Education. In the past we have repeatedly turned down such proposals and have adhered strictly for 150 years to a policy of local financing and supervision of public schools. Why? Because every student of government knows that so-called Federal aid means Federal control of education. He who pays the fiddler calls the tune.

These bills are not aid to education or equalization of opportunity; they are totalitarian, pure and simple. They would eventually place the Federal Government in full control of all schools. That is what every totalitarian nation has done, and automatically came the end of freedom in those lands. I suppose educational opportunities are uniform in totalitarian states but the price is too high and the product too inferior for America. From the earliest day to the present day public education in America has been primarily a local responsibility and largely supported by local taxation. Therein is a paramount reason for the greatness of America.

FEDERAL CONTROL WOULD DESTROY INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE

Federal control and nationalization of education takes away probably the most important of local community rights—the right of parents and taxpayers to determine the kind of education their children shall have. There is a growing trend toward regimentation in textbooks, in general courses of study, length of school days and months per year. The worst disaster of all would be a standardized ideology. For example, there are those who believe in a world government. Others whose convictions are nationalistic in scope. The fact that we can arrive at our beliefs in our own way—therein lies our greatest strength. Uniformity of ideas is a first necessity to the dictator. In Germany, Italy, and other politically backward countries, control of education and of avenues of information to youth was about the first step on the road to despotism. It would probably ultimately mean the downfall of our Republic.

Federal meddling in local public school affairs would most surely have the most cancerous effects. It would destroy local initiative and control. We have had too much centralization and bureaucratic control over the local affairs of our citizens. We should not make the situation worse by a new excursion into the field of education. Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. If America is to remain strong and free, our public schools must maintain their independence from Federal domination.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE. L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as this session of the Congress draws to a close it is apparent that the legislative docket is unfinished and that much essential legislation remains for enactment into law. Should the Congress have moved as swiftly at the beginning as it has during the closing days of the session—when too much speed and too little consideration has been given to bills brought up for passage—much legislation that is needed and essential could have been passed prior to adjournment.

It is to be regretted that this session of the Congress has failed to bring to the floor of the House for consideration legislation providing Federal aid to education. The enactment of such a measure is one of great importance and concerning which there is great public interest. There exists a need for providing adequate pay for our school teachers, improving our school systems, and raising the educational standards of our country. The Congress should provide legislation to aid in wiping out and removing illiteracy that exists in various sections of America. During the recent war some 17,000,000 young men were examined under Selective Service and of this number approximately 5,000,000 were rejected for physical, mental, and educational deficiencies. As long as a situation such as this exists there will remain the pressing need for the enactment of enabling legislation to aid our States in the carrying forward of a better educational program. Federal aid to education without Federal control must be considered during the next session of the Congress.

When the Congress passed an act recreating and renewing the life of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the bill as passed failed to provide authority for the RFC to purchase and acquire home loans of veterans as existed in the original act. Legislation to provide a secondary market for home loan mortgages of veterans by amending the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act has been introduced in both the House and the Senate. However, the Congress has failed to give favorable consideration to this vital and needed legislation. The failure to include this authority in the new RFC Act or to pass any one of a number of measures introduced for this purpose constitutes perhaps the severest jolt the veterans of our country have taken to date in their fight to obtain adequate housing. Under the GI bill of rights the Veterans' Administration is empowered to guarantee one-half or 50 percent of a veteran's real-estate loan or up to a maximum of $4,000 on an $8,000 loan.

Under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act prior to the recent legislative change, this agency was empowered to purchase GI housing loans from the original mortgagees—banks and other lending institutions—thereby providing a market for loans of veterans investing in a home. Inasmuch as a serious housing shortage exists and no veterans housing legislation has been enacted into law, it seems to me that the least which this Congress could do in the way of aiding veterans in this connection would be to provide a method of financing loans for those veterans who desire to purchase a home. I regret ex-

ceedingly that this authority was deleted from the RFC Act and that the Congress has failed to give consideration to bills introduced to correct this situation. Representatives of the Veterans' Administration, and veterans' service organizations have urged the passage of this legislation. There exists no justification for the failure of its passage inasmuch as the Veterans' Administration has reported that an exceedingly small number of a total of 750,000 veterans' home loans have proven bad or on which the veterans have defaulted. The failure to pass legislation providing adequate housing for veterans and the cutting off of means for financing loans for those veterans who desire to become home owners remains a most important part of the unfinished business of this Congress.

The recent action in providing increased funds for soil conservation purposes should be commended. However, the Congress has not provided all the necessary and recommended funds for rural electrification and various other agricultural benefit programs. Adequate funds should be provided for these purposes if we are to have a sound and prosperous agriculture in America.

The providing of legislation for strengthening our national defense has only been partially completed. The passage of the armed forces unification measure to bring about centralized command for the Army, Navy, and Air Forces is a forward step in the right direction. However, other recommended legislation to insure the strengthening of our country is needed Through the enactment of this legislation we not only "put our own house in order" but declare to the other nations of the world that America intends to remain strong and to assume her responsibilities in endeavoring to bring about a permanent and lasting peace. The completion of this and other unfinished legislation remains as objectives which must be pursued and accomplished when the next session of Congress convenes.

Income Sharing Still Lags Behind Soaring United States Output

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, so timely and well written is the article in the Detroit News of July 22 by Blair Moody, able and brilliant journalist and syndicate writer, that I could not refrain from furthering this valuable and factual data and making it available in its concentrated form to more people that I have asked unanimous consent to print it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Of course, it is gleaned from the more extensive economic report of President Truman, but I take for granted most of you do not always have the time to read all such reports in full; even if you do, however, it would be well to suggest you read again and digest these forceful facts and call them to the attention of your people.

Now, in closing let me add a thought which, if followed, I believe, may tend not only to maintain our present prosperity but will assure indefinite extension and expansion of our economic well-being.

If the present scale of high wages is maintained and the lower-paid workers are brought up into a higher plane and the minimum-wage scale is raised to 65 cents per hour, while at the same time production is increased by increased efficiency and elimination of waste so that unit prices of goods produced can be held in line or even reduced, our prosperity will last far into the future or until a gross mistake is committed by our economic forces.

INCOME SHARING STILL LAGS BEHIND SOARING UNITED STATES OUTPUT—GAIN SHOWN SINCE 1937, TRUMAN SAYS, URGING CUTS IN HIGH-PROFIT ITEMS

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, July 22.—President Truman's midyear economic report shows that more families than ever before have achieved what can decently be described as an American standard of living.

Not only are we producing goods and services at a rate of $225,000,000,000 a year—compared with $103,000,000,000 in 1929—but are as the President says, "enjoying the benefits more equitably."

Yet the President's facts indicate that we still have a long way to go before achieving the economic balance which will assure sustained prosperity for everyone without successive shots in the arm.

Then years ago, when the Nation was still struggling back from the 1929–32 collapse, more than two-thirds of its families had to get along on incomes of $1,500 a year or less. One-third—that was 40,000,000—lived in families with incomes below $790.

In those days the number of families receiving more than $3,000 a year was only 7 percent of the total. Today the President reports that 35 percent receive over $3,000 a year, including 10 percent over $5,000. He reveals that last month 60,055,000 were employed—more than the "impractical" 60,000,000 "goal" of liberal economists.

YOU CAN'T EAT FIGURES

But the President also reports that the great bulk of American families, nearly two-thirds, are still getting under $60 a week ($3,000) in this day of inflated prices, and that 17 percent still draw incomes under $1,000, less than $20 a week.

Since 1939 the average weekly wage, in a cross section of the economy so broad as to assure approximate accuracy, has jumped, according to the President's figures, from $23.86 to $48.91.

A pay check under $50 does not provide a luxury standard of living at present price levels, even though the price advance (thanks to the hold-the-line policy before June 1946) was only about half the wage advance on a percentage basis.

White-collar and other families not sharing in these gains of industrial labor have not found percentages edible, nor have the unorganized workers, down around the Federal minimum wage level, whom Congress is callously deserting this week-end when it pigeonholes the bill boosting that minimum from 40 to 65 cents an hour.

PHONY SCARCITY STORIES

Yet the gains already made have created an illuminating set of statistics in the consumption column.

In a period when many food commodities were supposed to be scarce as a nation we actually were eating better than ever before.

Howls over the meat shortage to the contrary, in 1946 we actually consumed 15 percent more meat per person than in 1939, the President reports. This was despite a much larger population, which means the supply of meat was considerably more than 15 percent above prewar.

Our 1946 consumption of canned vegetables was 52 percent above prewar; of fresh vegetables 14 percent; of canned fruits, 36 percent; and of eggs, 22 percent. Domestic consumption of wheat, dairy products and a few other items, declined only slightly despite huge shipments abroad.

"These improvements," the President said, "are in vivid contrast to the greatly deteriorated nutrition of unfortunate peoples in many other countries."

TWO MAJOR SUGGESTIONS

But the President warns that "adjustment" must be made if a "tragic depression" is to be averted. What adjustments? First, he says, "prices must be revised downward where profits are excessive or where reductions are needed to forestall a collapse of markets."

Second, wages in the lowest brackets must be raised.

The present 40 cents an hour minimum—$16 a week—must be raised, the President says, not alone as a matter of fairness but as a national economic necessity.

For when the unusual and temporary postwar markets, especially the export market, begin to fade, the country cannot afford to have an important sector of domestic demand bottled by lack of buying power. As the President put it:

"Our concern today is not whether consumers can buy as much as they could before the war. It is, rather, whether they can buy enough to sustain our postwar economy at maximum production."

Philipsburg, Pa., Celebrates Sesquicentennial, 1797-1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that a community celebrates its founding by attracting national and international attention but such an exception attended the Sesquicentennial of Philipsburg, Pa., one of the thriving and enterprising towns in Centre County, Pa., in my congressional district.

The week of July 21–25, inclusive, was selected for the sesquicentennial observance by the following proclamation by Chief Burgess Ernest E. Demi:

SESQUICENTENNIAL PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY BURGESS DEMI

To the People Assembled Here in the American Legion Stadium at Philipsburg, Pa., and to the Community, State, and Government:

I, Ernest E. Demi, chief burgess of the Borough of Philipsburg, Centre County, Pa., do proclaim this devotional service to be the opening session of the one-hundred and fiftieth anniversary to celebrate the memory and founding of Philipsburg.

And I further proclaim that the following days, July 21 to 25, 1947, inclusive, be set aside to further celebrate the same occasion.

It is our hope and desire that we have a large attendance of the former residents of Philipsburg, as well as many thousands of visitors.

We wish for them all a friendly and pleasant visit, and that our home people will so receive and entertain them, that they will say, "Philipsburg has again proven its reputation as a friendly town."

Affixed with the borough seal this 20th day of July 1947 and signed by

ERNEST E. DEMI,
Chief Burgess, Philipsburg.

In keeping with the spiritual development that has marked the life of the community of Philipsburg, outdoor union church services were conducted Sunday, July 20, at the American Legion Memorial Field as a fitting prelude to the official opening of the week's celebration. Dr. Ross H. Stover, prominent pastor of the Messiah Lutheran Church of Philadelphia, Pa., addressed the union religious service, choosing as his topic Pillars of Philipsburg. Dr. Stover listed as the four pillars: Divine ideals, devotional life, productive fellowship, and the passion to propagate. The union church services were attended by a huge throng, with local pastors assisting in conducting the religious program.

The Old Union Church, erected in 1820, is regarded as an historic shrine in Philipsburg and stands among ancient oaks in the center of Philipsburg's residential district on Presqueisle Street. It was erected as a church where all denominations could worship. While it has not been in use in recent years for regular church services, it is regarded as a memorial to Philipsburg's settlers and during sesquicentennial week was opened for the purpose of holding union services.

The following churches serve the spiritual needs of Philipsburg—Evangelical United Brethren Church, First Lutheran Church, Trinity Methodist Church, SS. Peter and Paul Roman Catholic Church, Philipsburg Jewish Synagogue, First Presbyterian Church, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Philipsburg Gospel Tabernacle, First Baptist Church, Free Methodist Church, First Church of Christ, Church of the Nazarene and the Gospel Tabernacle.

The sesquicentennial program for the week provided for changes daily with Monday, July 21, being designated as veterans' day, which was climaxed by a mammoth military parade that attracted the finest bands and drum corps in the State of Pennsylvania. A gala display of fireworks featured the veterans' day program. The parade was voted to be one of the finest ever staged in Central Pennsylvania and was witnessed by a huge throng that crowded the streets of Philipsburg and wildly cheered the colorful spectacle.

Industrial transportation day on July 22 resulted in a splendid parade comprised of various divisions depicting the industrial growth and development of Philipsburg.

The remainder of the week found each day presenting a varied and novel program, which reflected careful planning on the part of the sesquicentennial committee, headed by Roy H. Schreffler, president of the celebration, and Samuel Z. Miller, celebration program chairman.

During the entire week civic groups, service clubs, and the schools of Philipsburg cooperated in presenting varied features portraying the development and achievements of the community over the period of 150 years of its existence.

The Philipsburg schools sponsored an historical pageant on three successive evenings at the Memorial Stadium, with pageant players garbed as frontiersmen, carrying ancient muzzle-loaders, depicting scenes in early American life when Philipsburg was in swaddling clothes.

The Philips family of Manchester, England, settled Philipsburg in 1797 and in recognition of this fact the lord mayor of Manchester, England, sent the following congratulatory message to Chief Burgess Ernest E. Demi, of Philipsburg:

LORD MAYOR OF MANCHESTER SALUTES PHILIPSBURG'S ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

TOWN HALL, MANCHESTER,
June 3, 1947.

DEAR MR. MAYOR: On the occasion of the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Philipsburg, I am happy to send to the citizens hearty greetings and congratulations.

I am interested to learn that the foundations of your city were laid in 1797, by the Philips family, who are reputed to have connections with Manchester. From enquiries I have made, it would seem that the founders of Philipsburg and the present Manchester firm of J. and N. Philips have a common ancestry in one Nathaniel Philips (1659–1737) of Team in Staffordshire. The Manchester firm was founded in 1747 and part of the firm's original mill is still in being.

The city of Manchester is important as a centre of industry, commerce, art, culture, and progressive self-government, and lies at the heart of a vast industrial and manufacturing region having a great density of population.

During the war Manchester was subjected to heavy enemy air attacks and suffered considerable loss of life and damage to property. Many of the bombed-out citizens found comfort and consolation in the warm clothing, blankets, and other precious gifts that were sent to them by the kind-hearted people of the United States. Doubtless some of these gifts originated in your city, and I am glad to take this opportunity, even at so late a date, of expressing my warm thanks for these gifts.

It is a sad commentary on world affairs that a Second World War was necessary to bring the peoples of the United States and the peoples of Britain closer together in mutual understanding and good will. Strange it may seem, but nevertheless it is true to say that millions of United States fighting men were ambassadors of friendship and good will from your country to Britain, where they found those sentiments warmly and sincerely reciprocated. We had in Manchester many thousands of your fine fellows, many of whom lived in our homes, becoming accustomed to our wartime mode of life.

We were glad to welcome them and they were kind and considerate to us. The growing realization that our Nations were partners in an enterprise to preserve the freedom we both cherish brought your soldiers, your sailors, and your airmen close to the British people in friendship and mutual understanding, and in coordinated effort, equal suffering and sacrifice.

Out of these things, with the help of God, came victory. Let us pray that the sacrifices and efforts of the fighting men and civilians of both our countries will not have been in vain, but that they will bind our two peoples together in the unshakable conviction that for all times our countries shall stand foursquare to help maintain peace and justice throughout the world. The present time is a testing time, when the statesmen of all countries need conjointly the honest endeavor and good will of all peoples to dispel suspicion among nations and to establish lasting peace throughout the world.

Mr. Mayor, I am particularly pleased to send to you and to the citizens of Philipsburg sincere good wishes and expressions of friendship from the citizens of Manchester. This opportunity also enables me to express sentiments of good will which I hope will reach out beyond your city boundaries to our good American friends everywhere.

May your city prosper, and with it your citizens.

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS H. ADAMS,
Lord Mayor.

In addition to greetings from the lord mayor of Manchester, England, Fred Waring, nationally renowned band leader, dedicated a portion of the Fred Waring Show to the Philipsburg sesquicentennial on the NBC Network, Monday morning, July 21. The NBC salute to Philipsburg opened with Happy Birthday to You, which was followed by the Waring players reenacting a scene depicting the auction sale at 2 cents an acre to the Philips brothers of the land on which Philipsburg now stands. Fred Waring stated that while the Philips family, by their purchase, probably deprived many panthers and bears of their homes, acquiring this tract of land provided new homes for a lot of settlers. The famed band leader reminded the radio audience that it was in Philipsburg, Pa., in 1878 that Dr. J. C. Richards and Dr. John D. McGirk made medical history by performing the first appendicitis operation; and that it was in Philipsburg, Pa., where the first street arc lights were installed and placed in operation.

One of the features of the Fred Waring Show tribute to Philipsburg was the rendition of Deep in the Heart of the Alleghenies—a song written especially for the sesquicentennial celebration by Jack Fulton, former Philipsburg boy, who is now a nationally famed radio artist. The song was sung publicly for the first time on Sunday evening preceding the Fred Waring Show at the outdoor union church services by a male chorus of 23 voices under the direction of Dr. Frank Gette of Philipsburg.

The words of the song are as follows:

DEEP IN THE HEART OF THE ALLEGHENIES

One hundred and fifty years ago today,
Some pioneers and settlers on their way,
Picked this spot to settle down
And build a friendly town.
Philipsburg, Pa., is its moniker today,

Deep in the heart of the Alleghenies
Is my home town.
Rich in tradition and pleasant memories
Is my home town.
The friends you greet
And the folks you meet
Always wear a smile up
And down Front Street.
Deep in the heart of the Alleghenies
Is my home town.

The Fred Waring show over NBC was preceded by another tribute from the NBC network when a native son of Philipsburg, William J. Thomas, broadcast his weekly program A Main Street

Editor Looks at the News, from the editorial rooms of the Philipsburg Daily Journal, where over 25 years ago he secured his first job on a daily newspaper. Bill Thomas is now editor of the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress and he is also a member of the Westinghouse KDKA news staff, with a weekly broadcast that is well presented and, because of its informative value, has resulted in a large and highly appreciative radio audience over Station KDKA, Pittsburgh. His radio tribute in commemoration of Philipsburg's sesquicentennial is as follows:

I am speaking to you this evening from Philipsburg, up here in Centre County—very close to the geographical center of the Keystone State.

This Main Street community is filled with excitement and anticipation—Philipsburg is just one hundred and fifty years old. Beginning tomorrow, Philipsburgers have set aside six whole days to celebrate—but, we'll come back to that in a moment.

This evening we want to look at three things—some of the highlights of the past 168 hours, the day's outstanding developments, and this Philipsburg celebration, for it is the kind of thing that helps us keep our perspective—maybe it even has a lesson worth learning.

As I said earlier, I am speaking from Philipsburg in Centre County and Philipsburg tomorrow begins a six-day celebration—its sesqui-centennial celebration. Philipsburg—150 years old and its nearly 4,000 residents will be hosts to many more thousands from near and far.

I am very happy to be invited to take part in this important event in Philipsburg's life, for this broadcast is a kind of unofficial opening of what everybody here calls "The Sesqui."

I am not only happy, but proud to be here, for I was born and raised in this typical, friendly and enthusiastic Main Street town.

As I drove up Front and Presqueisle Streets this afternoon—colorfully decorated streets, they are too—I thought how far this town has traveled since 1797. You couldn't buy the town today for several million dollars. Yet 150 years ago you could have bought the land on which it stands for 2 cents an acre.

Things have changed a lot in a century and a half. As a matter of fact the streets were sticky mud bogs after every rain, with street after street of board sidewalks. Today, practically every street, alley, and sidewalk is paved—I remember as a boy—the passenger trains. There aren't any passenger trains at all coming into town now. But when I was a boy—it seems almost unbelievable now—there were 3 railroads with 24 passenger trains a day. Although there aren't any passenger trains, nobody seems to mind it. There is good bus service and I suppose there are as many automobiles to the block as anywhere in the United States.

Like most progressive Main Street towns, Philipsburg has interesting history. It has also had its dark days as well as its bright ones.

The town was founded by the Philips family of Manchester, England. Three brothers helped to found it, but one of the brothers, Hardman Philips, dominated the Philipsburg scene for about 35 years. He had great hopes for this town in the wilderness. He built an iron forge and the first screw factory in the United States. Then, the Pennsylvania Canal was built. It missed Philipsburg by 28 miles. Philips tried to have a railroad built into the town, but was unsuccessful. His iron forge burned. A man by the name of Harvey invented a new kind of screw—one with gimlet point—the Philips' screw had blunt ends. His business declined and he returned to England.

But other men carried on. The town eventually got its railroad. Coal was discovered and a new industry sprang up. The town became identified with the early development of electrical power. It is the first town in the world to have street arc lights. The Episcopal Church was the first church in the world to be lighted by electricity. And here is another "first" that I copied out of the July bulletin of the Pennsylvania Department of Internal Affairs.

"In 1878, medical history was made (in Philipsburg) when Dr. J. C. Richards and Dr. John D. McGirk, performed what was probably the first appendicitis operation. The two doctors made an incision in a child to discover a pin piercing the middle of the appendix and protruding through the opening. They cut off the appendix with a pair of scissors and the child recovered. It was not until 8 years later—in 1886—that appendicitis was recognized."

The men who founded the town and others who have helped keep it wholesome and progressive will be honored during the next 6 days. There will be a church day, an all-veterans' day, a miners' and industrial day, a founders' day, a firemen's and sports day, and an education day.

Some of the members have just been telling me what they have planned for the week. It sounds like a pretty full week. Next Wednesday, for instance, is founders' day. There will be a memorial service at the Old Union Church, built by Hardman Philips; a muzzle-loading contest—whatever that is—trap shooting, a State police dog show, a parade depicting the town's history, a pageant at Memorial Field, and two dances, one of them the sesquicentennial ball.

Celebrations like this have a place in the life of every community. They are valuable. They help give us a sense of perspective. They impress upon us that change is not only a characteristic of today—it was a predominating characteristic of the 1800's and the 1700's, too.

These celebrations and the reunions they foster are satisfying, not alone because of what we see and hear, but because of what we remember. They become sentimental journeys into the past.

The very spot from which I am speaking holds many memories for me. I am in the office of the Daily Journal, where I was once city editor. More than a quarter of a century ago, the man who was then editor and publisher of the paper, the late W. T. Bair, gave me my first daily newspaper job.

Among those who are here in the Daily Journal Office for this broadcast is the chairman of the sesquicentennial committee, Roy H. Schreffler. Roy, would you mind saying a word to our Main Street Editor audience?

Mr. SCHREFFLER. First of all, Bill, we want to welcome you back to Philipsburg. I should also like to say that anyone is welcome to attend any of the events during any of the days of our celebration. We assume, then, that any of the activities will be most interesting and entertaining. While you have mentioned next Wednesday, there will be no one big day. Every day will be a big day. However, we do wish to emphasize our Sunday evening union service at the Legion Memorial Field—that's tomorrow night.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Roy Schreffler.

The six fun-filled days that commemorated the founding of Philipsburg presented daily programs to fit every possible mood of the thousands who lined the streets and avenues of this hospitable Pennsylvania town.

Historical pageants, block-dancing, centennial balls, daily parades of beauty and magnitude, night baseball, a dazzling collection of antiques descriptive of the 150-year period of Philipsburg's existence are only a few of the stellar attractions that delighted the vast crowds that daily gathered to enjoy the carnival atmosphere that provided clean fun and keen enjoyment to young and old.

Philipsburg is located on the boundary line of Clearfield County and according to the 1940 census, had a population of 3,963. However, Chester Hill Borough in Clearfield County, with a population of 900, and South Philipsburg Borough, with approximately 600 inhabitants, are regarded as a part of Philipsburg when considering the town's population, which would approach approximately 5,500. There are numerous towns in Clearfield County within a radius of a few miles of Philipsburg and because of their size, use Philipsburg as a trading center, with the result that it enjoys a drawing population conservatively estimated to be in excess of 35,000.

Centre County is the second largest county in area among the counties of Pennsylvania and is located in the geographic center of the State. Organized in 1800, Centre County is made up of parts from old Northumberland, Mifflin, Huntingdon and Lycoming Counties. The original area has since been diminished to form other counties.

The whole surface of Centre County is elevated and is also broken by several distinct ranges of mountains, which have a southwesterly course. These mountains outline splendid valleys which, in most cases, bear the same names as adjacent ridges: Brush, Nittany, Penns, and Bald Eagle. The valley lands are largely limestone and highly fertile, contributing an important element to the economic wealth of the country. Settlement of this section of Pennsylvania was undertaken as early as 1768 when small beginnings were made at Milesburg and Potter's Fort, attracted by the opportunity to engage in iron making. In that early period there was iron ore and limestone in abundance, together with timber for charcoal, but the production of bituminous coal was developed much later. At the present time, in addition to coal, the county's principal mineral products are crushed limestone, lime and fire clay.

After the county was created the county seat was located on an unusually fine site and took its name from a nearby spring of great volume. The name Bellefonte (beautiful fountain) was suggested by Charles Maurice, Duc de Talleyrand, who visited the place in 1794–95 while an exile from France. Bellefonte was the home of Andrew Gregg Curtin, famous Civil War Governor, who died there October 7, 1894. Governors Beaver and Hastings also lived at Bellefonte.

State College, the largest borough in Centre County, is the site of the Pennsylvania State College, which was founded in 1854 as a farm school but has developed into a general college of wide scope, with an enrollment in excess of 10,000 students.

The principal classes of industry in Centre County are clay, glass and stone

products, metals and metal products, textiles and textile products, food and kindred products. The chief products are brass, bronze and copper products, lime, terra cotta and fire clay products, bituminous coal and bakery products. Agriculture and dairy products play an important part in the economic life of Centre County.

Philipsburg is the third largest borough in Centre County and its industries are diversified. They consist principally of coal mining, planing mills, ice cream, candy and meat packing plants; wearing apparel and other fabricated textile products; bakery products and food processing plants; men's and boys' clothing, men's trousers and sportswear. During World War II MacLaren Sportswear Co. in Philipsburg, with an annual pay roll of over three-quarters of a million dollars, was engaged in the manufacture of clothing for our armed forces and handled Government contracts totaling millions of dollars.

Philipsburg residents are kept well informed by a modern daily newspaper, The Philipsburg Daily Journal, established in 1888 by the late W. T. Bair, and now published by members of the Bair family. The Daily Journal is the oldest daily newspaper in Centre County and is ably edited by a competent staff of news analysts. In addition, up-to-the- minute news of world-wide events is afforded readers since the Daily Journal has wire service from nationally known news outlets.

The sesquicentennial celebration provided an occasion for appraising the steady development of Philipsburg during the past 150 years. As you view the modern streets and fine homes in this thriving community, it is easily recognized that such progress results from the industry and zeal of civic-minded residents who have taken pride in advancing the best interests of Philipsburg at every opportunity.

The Pennsylvania State Hospital, with an experienced and skilled medical and surgical staff, has ministered to the needs of Philipsburg and vicinity to such an extent that it is widely recognized as one of the finest hospitals in the Keystone State.

As the curtain falls on the celebration of the sesquicentennial of Philipsburg the six fun-packed days have served to focus national and international attention on one of the finest towns in my congressional district. The high spirit of patriotism that the citizens of Philipsburg have exhibited during every war in which this nation has been involved reflects the highest American ideals. With such a priceless tradition as a heritage and conscious of the zeal and determination of the people of Philipsburg, I am confident that the future of this thriving and enterprising community is secure. Therefore, on this memorable occasion I join with all the people of Pennsylvania in saluting the citizens of Philipsburg and wishing them continued progress, good health, long life, and a full measure of happiness in what I regard as one of the finest communities in the Keystone State. Forward! Philipsburg!

The Faith and Credit of Foreign Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development had floated its first offering of $250 million consisting of two issues—a 10-year and a 25-year obligation. As was expected by reason of these issues carrying rates of interest far in excess of those which govern on Federal issues, the offering was oversubscribed. Thus the bonds and debentures of the International Credit Bank are now moving on their way into the portfolios of our people, their banks and their savings institutions.

During the past 7 years the United States Government has committed itself to expenditures in behalf of foreign aid totalling some $73,000,000,000. During these war years private capital did not enter into these operations on a large scale. But now with the bank selling its debentures to our people private investment again moves into the picture.

Will these foreign governments pay their obligations? This is a question which will take on more and more importance as the years come and go.

If there is one subject on which, more than another, a keen and well-informed public opinion is needed, it is precisely this question of our giving and lending to foreign people and governments. In order to give a bit of light on the attitude of one government with respect to its international obligation, let me present copy of a letter addressed to the Iranian Ambassador to the United States. Here is a case upon which both the State Department and the Iranian Government has too long delayed. If this is a sample of how our people are to be treated, it will be well for the citizens of this country to become better informed on many of these transactions.

ULEN REALIZATION CORP.,
New York, July 24, 1947.

HUSSEIN ALA,
Iranian Ambassador to the United States,
Washington, D. C.

EXCELLENCY: At the request of Messrs. Nemazee and Aram, of your Government's Embassy in Washington, this letter has been prepared for purposes of restating the substance of the Ulen company's claim against the Government of Iran. Informal conversations were held with Messrs. Nemazee and Aram on Monday, July 21, and it was the position of these two gentlemen that neither they, nor anyone in official position in Teheran, was sufficiently well informed on this matter to discuss it. Their statement that insufficient information and documentation of this matter was available to the Government of Iran struck the writer as being somewhat strange, inasmuch as the Government is known to have a complete set of records incident to the matter in question, plus the records and documents which it confiscated, by military force, from my company. Nor is it particularly reassuring that the spokesmen for Iran would assume this attitude in discussing this matter with me, whereas they discuss it freely and in detail with others.

Ulen company's claim against the Government of Iran, as stated repeatedly in previous correspondence, arises from the Government's unilateral cancellation of contracts by the Iranian Government in connection with the construction of the southern portion of the Trans-Iranian Railway. The following sums represent Ulen's documented claim for unpaid balances:

1. Ulen's own funds, disbursed in payment of purchases and expenses for the account of the Iranian Government	$267,388.72
2. Interest on the above amount, from 1930 to 1946	349,216.70
3. Balance of fee, unpaid	432,000.00
Total	1,048,585.42

The contract in question was illegally and unilaterally cancelled by the Government of Iran on May 13, 1930. As of that date, Ulen & Company had spent $267,388.72 of its own funds for materials, equipment, and expenses incident to the construction project, for which it has not yet been reimbursed. As noted, the second item, $349,216.70, is interest on that sum, for the period from May 1940 to 1946. This interest has been charged at the rate of 6% per annum, which as you know is much less than the prevailing interest rate in your country. The third item is self-explanatory.

As you know from previous correspondence, and as the records will show, this was a "cost-plus" construction contract, although your Government confiscated Ulen & Company's records in Iran—fortunately the Company is in possession of a completely documented record of all agreements, purchases, waivers, etc., incident thereto which were forwarded weekly by the company's works manager. This documentation shows conclusively that the Government of Iran failed to comply with many terms of the contracts entered into; it will show that the Government of Iran defaulted in furnishing funds for the prosecution of the work as it had agreed to do; it will show that innumerable changes in plans beyond those provided for in the contracts were forced; it will show failure to approve plans promptly, harrassment by Government inspectors who were neither experienced nor qualified for their duties; it will show failure on the part of the Government to reimburse Ulen for current expenditures as provided in the contracts, and many other deviations.

Notwithstanding these facts, within two days of the receipt by Ulen's representatives in charge, of the sudden, unexpected and illegal unilateral cancellation of the contracts, the Iranian Government placed its military in Ulen's offices and on the project, and by military force took possession of Ulen's books, records, equipment, material, etc., and ordered Ulen's American representatives and employees from the project.

It is further a matter of record that Ulen kept its accredited representative in Teheran from the date of the cancellation of the contract, May 13, 1930, until October 16, 1932, a period of over 2 years, in an effort to settle the outstanding accounts; but to no avail.

Since that time, the Government of Iran persistently has pursued a policy of evasion in this matter, seeking first to build up a fictitious counterclaim, and now professing ignorance of the affair to the degree that no official in the whole government is qualified to discuss it, or possessed of sufficient authority to even recommend payment of the claim.

Ulen & Company, and its engineering associates, The J. G. White Engineering Co., of

New York, the Societe de Construction de Batignolles of France, and Stewart & MacDonald of London, undertook and prosecuted the project in good faith. Since the cancellation of the contract, Ulen for itself and their associates has at every available opportunity, sought to secure payment of the funds due to them. The claim has been presented to the Iranian Government on numerous occasions. To date, the Iranian Government has ignored this claim completely and has refused even to designate any representative with authority to discuss and settle the matter.

Mr. Nemazee, the Commercial Attaché, and Mr. Aram, the First Secretary of your Embassy, stated at the outset of last Monday's conference that they possessed no authority to negotiate and settle the matter. While stating that they had little information on the subject, they did not hesitate to criticize Ulen's claim and the company's attempts to secure payment. In asking for a restatement of the claim it was obvious that they were interested only in continuing Iran's 17-year policy of evasion in this matter.

In the course of the conference my legal counsel and I were told by Messrs. Nemazee and Aram: (1) that they did not understand Ulen's claim; (2) that Ulen's actions to collect its just debt were resented; (3) that there was little hope of any serious consideration of the claim by the present Iranian Government since there was no authority vested in any member of the present Government to make a settlement of the matter; (4) that, this matter involving acts by a former Iranian administration, none of the present ministers of Iran's present Government would dare take the responsibility of making a recommendation that the matter be settled; (5) that no early action could be expected—"it might take 16 months or 16 years—and further—what difference did it make inasmuch as Ulen had already waited 17 years"; (6) that in any event it would take years to secure passage of legislation which would permit payment of the claim; (7) that neither the State Department, which has recently authorized $30,000,000 in credits to the Government of Iran, nor the International Bank, which will consider Iran's application for a loan of $250,000,000, would take the slightest cognizance of Ulen's claim.

In the light of these statements by official spokesmen of your Government, it will be understood if Ulen & Company and its associates make appropriate representations to the Department of State, and to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and protest the giving of further financial assistance to the Government of Iran until that Government has demonstrated proper respect for its financial obligations, and some orderly process under which American citizens can secure fair and equitable treatment in dealing with the Government of Iran.

With assurances of all appropriate esteem and regard.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANK H. REDIKER,
Agent and Attorney-in-fact,
Ulen Realization Corporation.

New Zealand Social Security Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and statement:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, July 11, 1947.

Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARNESS: As you know from the conversation we had with you on June 17, Mr. Mitchell, the Acting Commissioner for Social Security, and I were greatly disturbed by your criticism, in a speech on the floor of the House on the 16th, of our proposed study of social security in New Zealand. I regret that I was not afforded an opportunity to provide you with the facts which follow before your speech was made.

You had been correctly informed that we had planned to send a member of our staff, Mr. Jacob Fisher, to New Zealand. However, he was not being sent merely or even primarily "to study compulsory health insurance in that country" as was stated in your speech but to study the whole social security system. Mr. Fisher's inquiries on health benefits were to be only a fraction of a broad social security study which was planned to include cash benefit provisions for old age, invalidity, unemployment, sickness, widows, orphans, minors, etc.

The New Zealand Social Security System is recognized among experts as being of great significance on account of its unified nature, comprehensive scope, and other special characteristics. It is different in many important respects from our own and from the systems of most other countries. It combines social insurance and public assistant concepts in unusual ways, its coverage is national, the protections are very broad, and the financing rests on earmarked national income taxes. It has attracted world-wide attention, and is widely regarded as something in the nature of a laboratory experiment for testing many important and controversial proposals in the field of social security. It has been criticised by some insurance and medical writers as a bad and overambitious program that cannot succeed; and at the same time it has been held out, in a report from the Brookings Institution of Washington, as something of a model for a new type of social security program for the United States. Obviously, it cannot be all that is claimed or charged. We have learned all that we could about it through published documents, correspondence and personal inquiries here. Though we have had every courtesy and assistance from the New Zealand representatives in Washington and by correspondence from officials in New Zealand, many questions about administration, effectiveness of the system, costs, etc. have remained unanswered; and some conflicting reports have been left unresolved. Study and inquiry on the ground were, in our opinion, clearly indicated.

Mr. Fisher had already made careful studies of all the available information on the New Zealand system, with the assistance of other technical experts on our staff. As far as we know, his two publications on this subject[1] have been received—both here and abroad—as accurate, objective, and authoritative documents. He was therefore selected for this new investigation. In your speech to the House you said that his "report on socialized medicine * * * has been described by several reputable authorities as extremely biased and dishonest." In this connection may I say, first, that Mr. Fisher's article did not deal with socialized medicine. It described the New Zealand system of cash and health benefits. Secondly, no comments such as those you referred to have come to our attention. I trust that the sources of this criticism may be made known to us in order that we may learn the basis for the charges.

Your speech referred to this trip to New Zealand as a type of activity "never authorized by Congress" and "never * * * authorized directly or indirectly in the appropriation bills." While you reiterated this view during our discussion in your office, I presume that any confusion which may have existed on that subject has now been cleared up by your committee counsel who has assured us that he has no question as to our authority to engage in this activity or to incur financial obligations in connection with it. His opinion in this respect conforms to that of the legal staff of this agency.

The Social Security Act (sec. 702) imposes a positive "duty" upon this agency for engaging in activities such as the one regarding which you have raised question. This duty to make studies and recommendations has always included studies of foreign as well as domestic practices and experiences. Indeed, you will find that foreign systems, and the lessons to be learned from them, were carefully and extensively considered by the House and Senate Committees when social security legislation was first enacted, just as they have been on various occasions since then when committees of Congress have considered changes in the social security laws. All countries have a great deal to learn from each other about social security, from both successes and failures, and this has always been the attitude of Congress. I have not the slightest doubt that congressional committees would regard us as having done less than our duty under the law if they found, at hearings or on other occasions that we had not taken all reasonable steps to be informed on foreign experience.

Since you have raised questions and expressed disapproval of our selection of Mr. Fisher for the New Zealand study, and since I have high regard for the wishes of Members of Congress and its committees, and acknowledge our responsibility to them, I have directed that the study be postponed until after our investigation of the charges against him is completed.

While I expect to go into the matter thoroughly the data obtained thus far from your committee counsel, from the House Committee on Un-American Activities and from Mr. Fisher himself impress me as not justifying so serious a reflection upon the reputation of a person whose conduct and service, so far as we have been able to observe, have been beyond reproach.

In view of the fact that your criticism of this Agency and certain of its programs and officers has been made a public record, I trust that you will similarly make this letter a public record.

Sincerely yours,

WATSON B. MILLER,
Administrator.

JULY 24, 1947.

Hon. WATSON MILLER,
Administrator,
Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. MILLER: I desire to acknowledge your letter of July 11, 1947, regarding the remarks I made on the floor of the House on June 16. In the speech to which you refer, and at a conference held with you and Mr. Mitchell in my office on June 17, I definitely expressed my disapproval of international junkets by Federal employees. I refer to trips designed to make studies of foreign concepts of government to further the plans and ideologies of groups in this country to influence legislation being considered by the Congress of the United States; and I reiterate I am today strongly of the same opinion.

[1] Cash Benefits Under the New Zealand Social Security Program, Bureau of Research and Statistics Report No. 13, June 1945; 42 pp.; the New Zealand Social Security Program, Social Security Bulletin, September 1945, vol. 8, No. 9, pp. 3–11.

I have made careful study of the memorandum submitted by Isadore Falk, Director of the Bureau of Research and Statistics, entitled, "New Zealand Social Security Plan: Principal Features, Aspects Warranting Field Study." Under "Principal Features," it is stated:

"New Zealand Social Security Plan is of interest to the rest of the world because it ties up in one package protection against all of the major risks to income, 'free' medical care, complete population coverage, pay-as-you-go financing."

The list of subjects given in the memorandum to be studied, most of which relate to Compulsory Health Insurance, are of such nature that I feel they could be secured without great expense to the Government; and that travel to the far corners of the globe is unwarranted, as well as unauthorized.

The Subcommittee to investigate publicity and propaganda (of which I am Chairman) does not concern itself with the merits of pending legislation but is interested in the subject of improper and unlawful activities of Federal employees attempting to influence the Congress for or against pending legislation.

In view of your reference, I should like to direct your attention to Relief and Social Security, written by Lewis Meriam, and published by the Brookings Institution, in 1946, in which there is some criticism of the New Zealand plan; and I refer, particularly, to language contained on page 548, which reads as follows:

"The New York Times of October 7, 1945, reported that the Minister of Health of New Zealand had stated in the house of representatives that because of abuses the government is seriously considering whether free physician services will be continued. It admits widespread racketeering which followed the institution of a system under which a New Zealander may consult a physician as frequently as he likes, and the doctor can collect a fee for each visit. The costs are running far higher than the government had anticipated when it instituted the system, and they constitute a serious drain on the social security fund. Placing physicians on salary is one of the possibilities under consideration."

Certainly, the language above-quoted, taken from the report of the Brookings Institution, would not justify the New Zealand plan as being a model which might be adopted by the United States Government.

In my speech on the floor, reference was made to articles written by Jacob Fisher. In your letter of July 11, 1947, you stated that "Mr. Fisher's article did not deal with socialized medicine. It described the New Zealand system of cash and health benefits."

The coverage given medical care in Mr. Fisher's article, The New Zealand Social Security Program, most certainly presents a picture of socialized medicine.

Four of the five paragraphs in the introduction deal with New Zealand's health benefits program.

The second section of the article is headed "Health Benefits" and devotes nine columns to the subject with subsections on "Medical benefits," "Hospital benefits," "Maternity benefits," and "Other benefits." "Other benefits" are divided into "Pharmaceutical," "X-ray," "Massage," and "District nursing." The next section in the article is titled and deals with "Relationships with the medical profession."

The following subtitle "Relative success in attaining goals" begins with this paragraph—"To what extent has the health program achieved its objective—elimination of ability to pay as a factor in the distribution of medical care?"

It is a well-known fact that elimination of ability to pay as a factor in the distribution of medical care has been a favorite argument by proponents of socialized medicine.

Two days prior to writing this letter to me, you testified before the United States Senate Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The record of the hearing of July 9, on page 1723, reveals that Senator Donnell made inquiry as to the books and pamphlets you had read on the subject of social security programs of other countries. I quote briefly from the record:

"Senator DONNELL. You have not read any books, as distinguished from pamphlets, on the subject of compulsory health insurance, either in England or in Germany?

"Mr. MILLER. No extensive documents.

"Senator DONNELL. How about New Zealand? Have you read the experience of New Zealand with compulsory health insurance?

"Mr. MILLER. I have not."

It is apparent, therefore, from your sworn testimony that, although you have outlined at length the New Zealand Plan and referred to Mr. Fisher's article, you are, in fact, without knowledge of the New Zealand Plan or the content of Mr. Fisher's article. Therefore, in view of your testimony, I feel further reference to the New Zealand Plan or the Fisher article is unnecessary.

You have stated that Counsel for my Committee has assured the FSA that he has no question as to its authority to engage in this activity or to incur financial obligations in connection with it. Mr. Bow, who is Counsel for the Committee, has advised me that no such advice has been given by him to the Federal Security Agency, or any other department or agency of Government. Mr. Bow recalls that, at the time of the Hearings on the Health Workshop, inquiry was made of him regarding any prohibition by statute, relating to foreign travel. Mr. Bow's reply was that, at that time, he could cite no prohibiting statutes nor statutes authorizing the travel; and he suggested that, as counsel for the committee, further study would be made of the subject. The subcommittee counsel study does not conform with that of the legal staff of your agency.

Section 702 of the Social Security Act, reads as follows:

"DUTIES OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 702. The Administrator shall perform the duties imposed upon him by this act and shall also have the duty of studying and making recommendations as to the most effective methods of providing economic security through social insurance, and as to legislation and matters of administrative policy concerning old-age pensions, unemployment compensation, accident compensation, and related subjects."

The history of the enactment of this law is interesting, and I shall refer to it only briefly. The Social Security Act was recommended by the President to the Congress on January 17, 1935. On the same day, there was introduced in the Senate, Senate Bill 1130; and, in the House, H. R. 4120.

Each of the proposed bills contained a section, "Duties of the Social Insurance Board," which stated that the Board should, among its other duties, have the "duty of studying health insurance." However, the bill was rewritten and reintroduced as H. R. 7260, on April 4, 1935; and the provision, "duty of studying health insurance," had been eliminated; and the bill, as amended, became law on August 14, 1935.

It is apparent, therefore, that the Congress of the United States, by the elimination of the authority to study health insurance, intended that the agency, under the Social Security Act, should not engage in such studies. Such an interpretation is elementary in the field of statutory construction, and I shall not burden this letter with further comment upon the question of proper construction. However, may I say that there is serious question as to the authority of the Federal Security Agency to conduct the study of health insurance.

In view of the foregoing, I repeat my statement made on the floor of the House, to which you have made reference:

"These international junkets are an item of considerable expense. Such activities have never been authorized directly or indirectly in the appropriation bills."

That the attitude of Congress on foreign studies was known to the Federal Security Agency is obvious from an interoffice communication dated April 1, 1947, from Maurine Mulliner to Mr. Falk and others, which reads as follows:

"Subject: Project to Study Social Security in Other Countries:

"Several questions have been raised during the last 10 days, in considering congressional attitudes with respect to the budget for this administration, about the wisdom of proceeding with the project to study social security in other countries. It is the consensus of those who have commented that nothing further should be done at this time on this project. Consequently, this project is being dropped unless you bureau directors believe that further consideration should be given to it."

You further state in your letter that the information which you have thus far received does not justify so serious a reflection upon the reputation of Mr. Fisher. This is a charge I cannot permit to remain unanswered, for it is again obvious that those upon whom you rely have withheld facts from you, or have distorted facts to which you were entitled. I have seen Jacob Fisher's report to Mr. Isadore Falk, dated June 17, 1947, relative to his investigation of the published volumes of the Un-American Activities Committee. If the accuracy of his investigation in this matter is any criterion upon which his ability might be tested, I am sure that further study or investigation by the individual should not be considered or contemplated.

Mr. Fisher failed to mention the magazine, "Social Work Today" (of which he was managing editor and a member of the board of editors). In the reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, the following comment relating to Mr. Fisher's magazine will be found:

"A study of the contents and policies of the magazine (Social Work Today) indicate, however, that it is primarily a vehicle whereby the line of the Communist Party is promulgated among social workers in a form calculated to be most palatable and effective to this particular group.

"Social Work Today has been the vehicle for considerable publicity in behalf of numerous front organizations supporting the line of the Communist Party.

"Social Work Today has been quick to respond when individual Communists are under fire.

"In 1935, the magazine was sponsored by the National Coordinating Committee of Rank and File Groups in Social Work, an organization of left-wing social workers."

Jacob Fisher was the chairman of the National Coordinating Committee of Rank and File Groups in Social Work, from its inception.

I am attaching to this letter a report submitted to me by the staff of my subcommittee. It is too lengthy to be the subject of this letter; but I am sure that, after you have given consideration to the evidence in the report, you will understand my anxiety in this matter and why I called it to the attention of the House of Representatives. It would seem your duty in the matter is, also, well defined.

You have asked that your letter be made a public record; and I am pleased to comply with your request, by asking that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with this, my reply.

Sincerely yours,

FOREST A. HARNESS,
Chairman.

Attachment: Staff report.

To: Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS, chairman, Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.
From: Committee Staff.
Subject: Jacob Fisher.

REFERENCES

We are in receipt of the following applications filed by Jacob Fisher for positions with the Social Security Board of the Federal Security Agency:

Social Security Board, dated June 30, 1936.

United States Civil Service, dated September 1, 1938.

Federal Security Agency, dated June 19, 1940.

Without exception the individuals given as references, by Jacob Fisher, in these applications, are found in the published reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Dies Committee).

The references given by Jacob Fisher are:

June 30, 1936: Mary van Kleeck, Herbert D. David, Simon Breines, Albion W. Hartwell, George Wolfe.

September 1, 1938: Mary van Kleeck, Harry Greenstein, George Wolfe, Maurice Bernstein, Morris Lewis.

June 19, 1940: Philip L. Klein, Mary van Kleeck, Harry Greenstein, Louis Sobel, Morris Lewis.

The mention given in the published reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Dies committee) range from a single mention for Herbert D. David, who is listed as the signer of a statement defending the Communist Party, to Mary van Kleeck, who "has a long list of connections with front organizations and movements dominated by the Communist Party" (Report on the National Citizens Political Action Committee, p. 918).

ACTIVITIES OF JACOB FISHER

He was a member of the executive committee of the New York chapter of the Interprofessional Association which was also the Provisional National Executive Committee of the Interprofessional Association.

(Jacob Fisher was elected to this membership at the meeting of the organizing group on March 24, 1934.) He later appears as a member of the national executive committee.

The Interprofessional Association was later known as the Interprofessional Association for Social Insurance.

The Interprofessional Association and the Interprofessional Association for Social Insurance cooperated closely with various Communist-controlled front organizations; received favorable publicity in the Daily Worker (official publication of the Communist Party); and carried on their activities in close cooperation with leaders of the Communist Party.

He was secretary of the Interprofessional Association for Social Insurance. His name appears on the letterhead of a letter sent by Mary van Kleeck, chairman of the association and chairman of the provisional committee for National Congress for Social Security, which accompanied a "Call to a National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance."

"Herbert Benjamin, member of the National Committee of the Communist Party in the United States, general secretary-treasurer of the Workers Alliance, and later executive secretary of the International Workers Order, was executive secretary of the national sponsoring committee for the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance. Among the other avowed members of the Communist Party who served on this committee were the following: Max Bedacht, William Z. Foster, Granville Hicks, Lem Harris, Israel Amter, Earl Browder, Ben Gold, Roy Hudson, Elmer Johnson, Fred Biedenkapp, Benjamin Davis, Jr., Harold Hickerson, George Primoff, Grace Hutchins. The foregoing names tell an accurate story of the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance. Its completely Communist character was not even thinly veiled" (p. 1183, Report on the National Citizens Political Action Committee).

He was a member of the executive committee of the Social Workers Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. "This committee was one of the numerous Communist fronts which were set up for agitation around the issues of the Spanish civil war" (p. 1577, Report on the National Citizens Political Action Committee).

He was one of the endorsers of the Campaign to Aid International Volunteers. The campaign was a project of the Communist-controlled North American Spanish Aid Committee. Almost all of the other endorsers were persons whose names will be found on the lists of numerous Communist-front organizations.

He was one of the endorsers of an emergency Conference for the Release of International Volunteers in Spanish and French Prison Camps, held April 13, 1940, Hotel Capitol, New York City. Some of the other endorsers were the Honorable Vito Marcantonio, Dr. Edward Barsky, Herman Shumlin, Marcel Sherer, Rockwell Kent, and Sam Wiseman, of the Workers Alliance. (Appeared in Daily Worker, March 25, 1940.)

He was a sponsor of a conference called by the Consumers' National Federation. In 1939, Earl Browder identified the Consumers' National Federation as a "transmission belt." A "transmission belt" is described by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as being "In Communist nomenclature, an organization through which the Communist Party extends its influence and ideology to groups which are broader than the party (Communist Party) itself." Among the other sponsors are found such well-known Communists as Israel Amter, Grace Hutchins, Rose Nelson and Bella V. Dodd.

He was one of the individual sponsors of a campaign to raise funds for the Disabled Veterans' Fund launched by the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, which was completely controlled by the Communist Party as indicated by the report of Earl Browder, General Secretary to the National Committee of the Communist Party on May 6–8, 1939.

He was active in the Rank and File Movement of social work groups. The Rank and File Movement was originally composed of other than professional social workers. The Rank and File Movement began with discussion clubs of which the New York Discussion Club was among the most active. The program followed by the discussion clubs paralleled the program of the Communist Party. There was an interlocking between the discussion clubs and the Inter-Professional Association (later the Inter-Professional Association for Social Insurance). Communist Party leaders were active in many of the undertakings of the aforementioned groups. At the first national convention of Rank and File Groups in Social Work, Jacob Fisher was elected chairman of the National Coordinating Committee of Rank and File Groups in Social Work. In April of 1936 the name was changed to the National Coordinating Committee of Social Service Employee Groups and Jacob Fisher continued as chairman. A month after the first national convention and the formation of the National Coordinating Committee of Rank and File Groups in Social Work with Jacob Fisher as chairman, rank and file social work employees began work stoppage, mass demonstrations, picketing, and general demonstration activities. "It was in New York that the mass meetings, petitions, publicity, delegations, demand for collective bargaining by social workers was first engaged in.

The rank and file groups lent support to other groups and affiliated themselves with a series of Communist Party cause celebre, such as the Angelo Herndon case, the Scottsboro boys, the department store strikes, the Newspaper Guild strikes, defense of David Poindexter, and similar activities. The 1936 convention of the National Coordinating Committee was opened with greetings from the National Unemployment Council, a completely Communist-controlled group, and the Workers' Alliance of America, which was also dominated by the Communist Party.

The official publication of the Discussion Clubs and the NCC was "Social Work Today." Jacob Fisher was the first editor. As in the case of his references, mentioned at the beginning of this report, every one of the contributing editors in the first few issues are found in the published reports of the Dies Committee. Harry L. Lurie, Jacob Fisher's last supervisor before he was employed by the Federal Security Agency, was active with the above-mentioned group and is given considerable mention in the published reports of the Dies Committee. The report on "Social Work Today" follows.

Jacob Fisher given as editor and/or one of a group of editors in the following issues of Social Work Today:

Jacob Fisher, sole editor, volume 1, Nos. 1, 2, and 3, 1934.

Jacob Fisher and three others listed as editors, October 1934 through July 1935, seven issues.

Jacob Fisher and two others listed as editors, volumes 4 and 5, October 1936 through June 1937.

ACTIVITIES

Social Work Today, Publication of the Social Workers Discussion Club of New York.

March–April 1934, volume 1, No. 1: Editor, Jacob Fisher (p. 9).

Page 19: Advertisement. There is only one advertisement in this issue. It reads as follows:

"INFLATION DOES NOT AFFECT YOUR TRIP TO THE U. S. S. R.

" 'Full value of your dollar.'

"Special group sailings to the Soviet Union for the May Day celebration. Arrangements are now being made for 'special worker,' student, and teacher groups to the Soviet Union during the spring and summer. Our long and thorough experience warrants you the best service.

"Torgsin orders sent through us are executed by mail or cable 'at the lowest rates.'

"World Tourists, Inc., 175 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Telephone ALgonquin 4–6656–7–8.

" 'Excursion boats and buses chartered for organizations at lowest prices.' "

(NOTE.—The single-quoted portions above are in italics in the advertisement.)

Pages 3, 4, 5, and 6: Article describing the convention of the American Association of Social Workers which was held at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., early in 1934. The following are excerpts from the article:

Page 4: "Social workers must realize that it is terribly important to get behind the whole economic program of the President. As for him, he has appointed his last right winger! [Applause.] From now on he will

appoint only people sympathetic with that program."

Page 5: "Fisher of New York suggests there are other measures before Congress. But first he would like to propose three principles. One, that insecurity can be corrected only by redistributing income. Two, that goodwill and intelligence won't put through any program that runs counter to the interests of any control group. The most effective pressure for social change comes from the group that will benefit—in the case of unemployment insurance, labor itself. The best social workers can do is to get behind the pressure group. Three, wealth is distributed unevenly geographically and a Federal program alone can do the job."

May–June 1934, volume 1, No. 2: Editor: Jacob Fisher (p. 2).

Page 9: Article by Jacob Fisher, Social Work and Liberalism. Opening sentence: "American social work is an integral part of the liberal's answer to life under capitalism."

July–August 1934, volume 1, No. 3: Editor: Jacob Fisher (p. 2).

October 1934, volume 2, No. 1: Editors: Flora Davidson, Jacob Fisher, Clara Miller, Elizabeth Ruth Sherman (p. 2).

November 1934, volume 2, No. 2: Editors: Same as above (p. 2), Jacob Fisher and three others.

Page 12: Article by Jacob Fisher Do Strikers Get Relief? with picture of southern textile strikers picketing (p. 13); two pictures of police brutality (p. 14).

January 1935, volume 2, No. 3: Editors: Same as above (p. 2), Jacob Fisher and three others.

February 1945, volume 2, No. 4: Editors: Same as above (p. 2), Jacob Fisher and three others.

Page 8: Article by Jacob Fisher, Meet the Relief Administration. This article is an account of the Unemployed Council delegation led by Israel Amter, on a visit to Aubrey Williams, Assistant Administrator of F. E. R. A. This two-page article is typical of the agitation technique which was carried on in the year 1935 by the communist, communist-front and fellow-travel groups. The phraseology of the article eliminates any doubt as to the author's pro-communist leanings.

Back cover: An apt description of the publication Social Work Today is given on the back cover of this issue:

"Social Work Today is the voice of social workers who . . . realize that they must become the allies of labor in the struggle for a new social order" (Pen and Hammer Bulletin, organ of revolutionary writers' group, quoted on back cover, Feb. 1935 issue).

"The well edited Social Work Today . . . has effectively represented the radical wing of the social workers . . ." (From The Nation. This item appears on the back cover of of the Feb. 1935 issue.)

April 1935, volume 2, No. 5: Editors: Jacob Fisher and three others (p. 2).

Pages 5, 6, 7, and 8: Article by Jacob Fisher, Rank and File Challenge—First National Convention of Rank and File Groups in Social Work.

Page 8: Jacob Fisher was chairman of the arrangements committee for the convention, and was elected Chairman of the National Coordinating Committee of Rank and File Groups in Social Work, which was set up at the convention.

October 1935, volume 3, No. 1: Article by Jacob Fisher, Threat to the Relief Workers. This article deals with the program of action engaged in by the various groups affiliated with the National Coordinating Committee, of which Jacob Fisher was Chairman, and their program for bringing pressure to bear on Aubrey Williams and the F. E. R. A. administration.

February 1936, volume 3, No. 5: Article by Jacob Fisher, The Rank and File Movement 1930–1936.

Page 5 and 6: Precedent for protective organization already existed in private social work. The New York Association of Federation Workers, organized in 1931 to promote the economic interests of employes of agencies deriving their support from the Jewish Federation of that city, had done considerable spade-work in the theory and practice of protective organization. It was this New York group which first defined the employer-employee relationship in social work, first developed the techniques of mass meetings, petitions, publicity, the support of other groups, delegations, and first raised the demand for collective bargaining. It was this group which later engaged in the first stoppage in social work history.

Page 18: Social Work Today addressed letters to a group of representative individuals requesting a brief statement of their views on the use of demonstrations, picketing and stoppage in social work.

One of the replies was by Ewan Clague. Excerpts from that reply are:

Page 18: "Under such circumstances it seems to me essential that social workers should organize themselves into efficient, coordinated groups. I think this will be the best, if not the only, effective way to protect themselves and their work."

"In dealing with the Government it is impossible to use the more aggressive tactics that are used on a private employer. Perhaps it is unfortunate that this is so, but the fact remains that such action against the Government is always interpreted as being directed against the public as a whole. Any politician can cry 'subversive,' 'revolutionary,' 'communistic,' and easily persuade the public that concerted action by a group of Government employees is a threat to the general welfare. Even the most militant trade unions have refrained from aggressive, open warfare against a Government agency.

"Social workers will never enjoy the full confidence of the community until they have demonstrated that they are doing a skilled job requiring special training and experience. So long as a considerable section of the public, along with many of the cheap politicians, believe that the only necessary requirement of a social worker is 'common sense' and that unpaid, volunteer service is better than professional service, just so long will social workers be ineffective, no matter what tactics they attempt. Therefore, I would counsel centering attention upon this one point, perhaps to the exclusion of most others, and hammer upon it by the most effective means at our disposal. This, to my mind, would constitute the best tactics at the present time."

(NOTE.—The first contact made by Jacob Fisher for a position with the Federal Security Agency was a letter to Ewan Clague (See SSA Jacob Fisher personnel file). Ewan Clague, formely with SSB, is now Director of Labor Statistics of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.)

April 1936, volume 3, No. 7, paragraph 11: At a convention of the National Coordinating Committee in Cleveland, Ohio, February 22 and 23, 1936, the name was changed to the National Coordinating Committee of Social Service Employe groups. Jacob Fisher continues as chairman.

Page 11: Article by Jacob Fisher, The AASW Takes Its Stand, "Good, But Not Good Enough." This is a report on the 1936 Delegate Conference of the AASW held in Washington, D. C., Feb. 14–16, 1936.

November 1936, volume 4, No. 2, page 27: Under "Books in Review" is a review by Esther Lucille Brown of a book by Jacob Fisher entitled "The Rank And File Movement In Social Work," a 49-page pamphlet published by the New York School of Social Work. In the review Esther Lucille Brown states "this is the story that Mr. Fisher tells of the period from 1931–1933 when a group of courageous young persons became so dissatisfied with the social order or their own economic status or both that they proposed to 'do something about it.'"

April 1937, volume 4, No. 7, page 3: Editorial entitled "We Support the President." Some excerpts from this are as follows:

"Social Work Today calls upon all social workers to lend unqualified support to the President's plan to enlarge the Supreme Court because:

"1. It will remove the threat of judicial veto hanging over the activities of the Social Security Board, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Public Works Administration, and the Labor Relations Board.

"2. It will do so immediately avoiding the lengthy process of reform thru constitutional amendment.

"3. It is clearly constitutional.

"4. It will bring the federal judiciary in line with the overwhelmingly progressive sentiment of the country.

"We may well remind the first group (the manufacturers asscociation) that there always has been politics in the Court. The question is not politics or no politics, but what kind of politics? Whose political aspirations shall be honored, those of the sweat-shop manufacturer, or those of the working population?"

May 1937, volume 4, No. 8, page 3: Article by Jacob Fisher "It Just Doesn't Belong!" supporting the viewpoint that trade-unionism belongs in the professional field of social work.

October 1937, volume 5, No. 1, page 8: Article by Jacob Fisher, Forward With the C. I. O.

This is a report on the birth of the United Office & Professional Workers of America, a C. I. O. international union. It was formed chiefly from local unions previously members of the A. F. of L. The United Office & Professional Workers of America issued charters to four social service locals, one of which was the Social Service Employes Union of New York which became Local 19, UOPWA.

Page 30: Under a column headed "Shop Talk" appears the following item:

"Jacob Fisher and Daniel Allen (Forward With the C. I. O. and C. I. O. for Public Agencies) are leaders in the converging lines of public and private agency employees into the C. I. O. Mr. Fisher is President of the Social Service Employes Union of New York, Local 19, United Office & Professional Workers of America. Mr. Allen is New York District Organizer for the State, County and Municipal Workers of America."

November 1937, volume 5, No. 2, page 30: In a column headed "Shop Talk" under a subheading "At the New York State Conference" appears the following:

"Delegates and visitors to the New York State Conference of Social Work are to be offered two interesting sessions sponsored by the Joint Trade Unions in Social Service in New York City. On October 20th, Jacob Fisher, New York SSEU President, will preside at the first session entitled 'Unionism and Professionalism'."

Page 31: In an advertisement of the Social Workers Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy—For Child Welfare—soliciting funds for children in Republican Spain, Jacob Fisher's name appears as a member of the executive committee of this organization.

December 1947, volume 5, No. 3, page 18: Article by Jacob Fisher, Private Agency Annuity Plans. The New York Social Service Employes Union, of which he is president, evaluates 11 existing annuity plans and recommends inclusion under the Social Security Act.

Page 30: Under a column headed "Shop Talk" appears the following: "Jacob Fisher (Private Agency Annuity Plans) is one of our first, best, and most faithful contributors."

January 1938, volume 5, No. 4, page 15: Jacob Fisher is listed under the 1936–37

Social Work Today Cooperators as having contributed $20 in the preceding 12 months to the support of the magazine.

March 1938, volume 5, No. 6, page 29: In the section, Books In Review, Jacob Fisher does a review of the book, When Clients Organize, by Helen Seymour. Among his comments are:

"Judging from the growing concern of the C. I. O. and Labor's Non-Partisan League with unemployment, with relief and social insurance, that future (of the organized client movement) may lie perhaps with the economic and political organization of labor rather than with client organization as we have known it in the past."

June 1938, volume 5, No. 9, page 21: Article by Jacob Fisher One Year of the CIO in Social Work.

In this he reviews the activities of the past year of the State, county, and municipal workers of America and the United Office and Professional Workers of America and their respective locals in the field of social service.

He reports that the New York Local, Local No. 19, the Social Service Employes Union, sent delegates to the American Youth Congress in Milwaukee. Jacob Fisher was President of Local 19 at that time.

Page 46: Under "Shop Talk" is the following item: "Jacob Fisher is president of Social Service Employes Union, Local No. 19 of UOPWA, CIO, New York City."

December 1938, volume 6, No. 3, page 25: The following item appears in a box headed "The Profession Is Proud."

"On September 16th Jacob Fisher, President of the New York City Social Service Employes Union, was elected a vice-president of New York State's new CIO Industrial Council. Thus, one of the early leaders of the trade union movement in social work has been given the responsibility of representing the white collar and professional workers who constitute an important section of the 800,000 CIO members in the State."

January 1939, volume 6, No. 4, page 17: Under the heading "Social Work Today Cooperators—1938" and the sub-heading "New York City" Jacob Fisher is listed as having contributed $10 to the magazine Social Work Today during the year 1938.

April 1939, volume 6, No. 7, page 9: Article by Jacob Fisher, President, Local 19, Social Service Employes Union, UOPWA, entitled "The Future of the Private Field."

May 1939, volume 6, No. 8, page 27: Under the column heading "Trade Union Notes" and the sub-heading "Joint Trade Unions at Buffalo" is the program of the Joint Committee of Trade Unions in Social Work at the Buffalo National Conference June 18–24. Among the various items is the following:

"Jacob Fisher, President, SSEU Local 19, is to speak on 'Social Work and the Democratic Tradition'." (This was on the program for Thursday, June 22.)

January 1940, volume 7, No. 4, page 17: Under the heading "Social Work Today Cooperators—1939" and sub-heading "New York City" Jacob Fisher is listed as having contributed $15 to the magazine Social Work Today during the year 1939.

Pages 5 and 6: Jacob Fisher is one of the 75 national and local leaders in social work who signed a statement of principles that was prepared by the editorial board of Social Work Today. This appeared under the heading, "Meeting social need: A peace program." The statement of principles was against America being geared into a military program; was against military preparation; advocated taxing all the profits out of those industries supplying war materials; advocated peace and was against involvement in the European war. This statement of principles was released to the press and mailed to every Member of the United States Congress.

April 1940, volume 7, No. 7, page 9: An article by Jacob Fisher, "Relief: Old Problem, New Setting." He is listed as president, New York City Joint Council UOPWA. "With business on the downgrade and legislatures bending to reactionary pressure, the outlook of the unemployed is little short of desperate."

January 1941, volume 8, No. 4, page 5: A reprint of the January 1940 article A Statement of Principles which has Jacob Fisher as one of the 75 signatories.

Page 16: Under the heading "Social Work Today cooperators—1940" and the subheading "Illinois," Jacob Fisher is listed as having contributed $15 to the magazine, Social Work Today, during the year 1940.

Pages 28–29: Under Books in Review, Jacob Fisher does a review of the book "Foundations of American Population Policy," by Frank Lorimer, Ellen Winston, and Louise K. Kiser. It was published by Harper & Bros.

Mr. Jacob Fisher's review is an adverse one which he heads up "Control for what?" and in it refers to the "Fascist" mentality from which the authors obtained their ideas of eugenics.

June–July 1941, volume 8, No. 9, page 17: Article by Jacob Fisher, Social Security Board, Regional Office, Chicago, entitled "Running Out on the Needy." [A note at the bottom of the page stated: Mr. Fisher writes in his personal capacity. The Social Security Board is not responsible for the views expressed.—Eds.]

This article defended the large relief rolls despite the marked upturn in business activity and prosperity and fought any cuts in relief funds.

February 1942, volume 9, No. 4, page 51: Under the heading "Social work today cooperators—1941" and the subheading "Illinois," Jacob Fisher is listed as having contributed financially to the support of the magazine, Social Work Today, during the year 1940.

Georgia Warm Springs Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on June 25 last, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, generally known as the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation, presented to the State of Georgia its properties at Warm Springs, Ga. In connection with the presentation, an inspiring and historical ceremony was held. The Army band from Fort Benning, Ga., furnished music for the occasion, and Graham Jackson, a gifted Negro musician, played and sang a most appropriate number. I would like to have the speeches delivered on that occasion printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I have consulted the Government Printing Office, and I find that the printing of the speeches will exceed the two pages allowed to be printed without an estimate, and that the cost will be $266.25. I ask that, in spite of that, the speeches may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE BY JOSEPHUS DANIELS AT THE DEDICATION OF THE LITTLE WHITE HOUSE AT WARM SPRINGS, GA., JUNE 25, 2947

Many of us come here today out of affection for a man, but those of us who loved him most, I believe, come also in devotion to the things to which Franklin Roosevelt gave his life. It was his genius that he could speak clearly in warm-hearted leadership for us in an American period of difficulty never equalled in the history of our Nation.

What we say here will be soon forgotten. On this day we are only a little group of the millions who will come not merely for aid in the ills of the body but for help in the deeper sicknesses of the spirit.

We come to these springs to which a young man came. How young and debonair, striding and strong he had been. I am glad I can remember not only that he was great but that he was beautiful as well. He came here a cripple to recruit his strength.

It is fitting that we come here in an hour today when there seems to be more hate and confusion than love and purpose in the world. In New World and Old World alike recent allies of courage and sacrifice are made in their victory to seem implacable enemies across an impermanent peace. There are men among us who would defend democracy by infringing its liberties. There are some who think that the democratic faith depends for defense upon military force rather than the steady fulfillment of its promise for plenty and freedom together and everywhere.

We need not be the captives of our fears.

Only the already lost can think of our future as besieged.

We have more to give than to guard.

Our powers are not weapons but tools with which to build the promise of democracy into the purposes of mankind.

Sometimes that faith is hard to hold. Even to one who has seen many years, these times seem dark. But this place is lit with courage. Indeed, it is illumined with faith. At Warm Springs today our task is not to dedicate a shrine, but here and now to rededicate ourselves.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 18, 1947.

HON. BASIL O'CONNOR,
President, Georgia Warm Springs Foundation, New York 5, N. Y.

DEAR MR. O'CONNOR: I regret exceedingly that the unremitting pressure of the public business makes it impossible for me to be present and to deliver an address at the Warm Springs Foundation on June 25.

It is fitting, indeed, that at ceremonies marking the twelfth anniversary of the establishment of the foundation—the Little White House—where my predecessor's life came to an untimely close, should be presented to the State of Georgia to be maintained as a national shrine.

The Warm Springs Foundation, which Franklin D. Roosevelt created body and soul, stands as a living memorial to his overflowing love for his fellow men and to his tender sympathy for all who suffer from the afflictions to which mankind is heir. He had conquered the insidious foe which struck him down without warning. He wanted all—particularly those less privileged in wordly goods than he—to have the benefit of the skills which brought him back to continue and complete a career of public service without a parallel in American annals.

Franklin Roosevelt's victory made him the inspiration of those who came to the foundation for similar relief, and for all of them he had a true affection and understanding. This sympathetic understanding was reflected in the principle upon which he insisted—that the foundation should always be a home—never an institution. God grant

that the work of the foundation be always carried on in the noble tradition which he inspired.

The little white cottage in which died the man who led his country to victory in the greatest war in history will become one of the sacred places of the Nation. This cottage happily stands adjoining the grounds of the great humanitarian center which he established and which will enshrine his memory through the generations in the hearts of a grateful pepole.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

RADIO ADDRESS BY BASIL O'CONNOR AT THE DEDICATION OF THE LITTLE WHITE HOUSE, GEORGIA WARM SPRINGS, JUNE 25, 1947

We stand here today before the Little White House in Warm Springs, Ga., as visitors who have come to call upon our good friend, Franklin D. Roosevelt. We find him not at home.

But this was indeed his home. As we look at these hills he loved, these red clay roads he delighted in driving over, these rooms in which he lived, we feel his presence.

Franklin D. Roosevelt is alive today, in the hearts and minds of many men. His service to his country and to the world needs no monument for remembering. Yet it is here, at the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation, scene of his struggles against physical disability, that he is most alive. Everything reminds us of the man who brought this place into being.

He came here for the first time in 1924, seeking to overcome the handicap of a crippling disease. Here he found new strength, new courage to resume public life, when it was commonly assumed his political career was at an end. Here, as President of the United States of America, he found relaxation from the burdens of war. And here he brought courage to hundreds of others who, like him, had had infantile paralysis.

Whatever other accomplishments may keep the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt great throughout history, here at Warm Springs the memory of the man is bright. Here he showed others how to conquer fear. The spirit he infused into this place, transforming it from a neglected summer resort to the first and largest center for the care of those suffering from the after effects of infantile paralysis, is as strong and fine today as in the beginning, 20 years ago.

Georgia Warm Springs Foundation this year is celebrating its silver anniversary. It is natural for those of us who have known this place since 1927 to remember the familiar wave of the hand at the Warm Springs railroad station, when the founder arrived. We have seen his smiling face so often in front of Georgia Hall, or gathered round his fireplace for familiar chat and banter. Yet those who are visiting for the first time today sense the presence of the founder, too. The spirit he created is in the faces of the patients here now, just as it used to be.

To the struggling and confused on every tortured continent, the name Franklin D. Roosevelt symbolizes the American Nation—an enlightened people, a courageous people, a people who took positive action to propagate the gospel of human understanding. His leadership awakened the world to the meaning of true democracy. Men of every nation responded enthusiastically to his exhortation to faith in God and the goodness of humanity.

"We have nothing to fear but fear itself," he said—and the world responded with courage.

We think of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the man, today—as we dedicate his Georgia home, the Little White House, as a national and international shrine. Twenty years ago that man practiced the philosophy of overcoming fear. He refused to be overcome by his handicap. And by his example and his determination to help others, thousands have been able to conquer their infirmities.

Franklin D. Roosevelt set in motion the machinery through which other victims of infantile paralysis now can make the same effort to overcome their handicaps—here at the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation and in all parts of the country. Through the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which he founded 9½ years ago, the great fight against this disease is going forward today, bringing help and hope to thousands of boys and girls, men and women, throughout the United States. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the man, symbolizes that living fight.

In the tranquillity of this Little White House, Franklin D. Roosevelt found renewed strength and courage when the tide of battle was turned against him. And here, with victory in sight, he found eternal peace.

By his will, the Little White House became the property of the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation. But it can never belong to any one group or individual. It belongs, rather, to the citizens of the world—to the millions of the hungry, the sick, and the oppressed, whose heavy hearts burn with hope that the ideals of Franklin D. Roosevelt may not be forgotten. That is why it is being given to the State of Georgia—why, in the future, countless thousands will come to visit here, as we come today.

As president of the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation, I invite you, Governor Thompson, to accept for the State of Georgia, and for all humanity, this deed to the Little White House. May this cottage become an international public shrine, eternally dedicated to the principles for which Franklin D. Roosevelt so gallantly fought.

God grant that the memory of this man may sustain our courage and inspire us to renewed confidence in our quest for permanent peace.

Governor Thompson, I present you with the deed to the Little White House.

ADDRESS BY MICHAEL FRANCIS DOYLE, CHAIRMAN, PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS, ON UNVEILING MEMORIAL TABLET, "LITTLE WHITE HOUSE," WARM SPRINGS, GA., JUNE 25, 1947

Mr. Chairman, we are met here to dedicate this national shrine today. This marks the last earthly spot in which Franklin Delano Roosevelt lived. This is the place where his great heart was centered. If the choice had been his, it would be here he would have closed his book of life. Here he founded a solace for suffering humanity. He was one who bore his full share of suffering. Human suffering makes humanity one—this suffering which any of us may at some time endure. The great and the small—the rich and the poor—the powerful and the helpless, are all creatures of the laws of human nature and all subject to them. Human suffering is the tie which binds us to a common interest. Humanity thus finds nature's democracy. If mankind fails to find equality under man-made laws, it will find it at the end when death makes all equal.

Our Nation was founded on the principle of equality before the law and the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The voice of democracy is the voice of the people. It is in the administration of the law that we find the real test of democracy. Franklin Delano Roosevelt administered the law in the spirit of democracy.

The Presidential electors most rightfully participate in these ceremonies. They, under our Federal Constitution, which was founded on the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence, represent the citizens in the election of the President and Vice President of our country. They accept the guidance of the voice of those who elected them in making the selection to these great offices. This trust has never been sullied and the electors have cast their votes for those whom the majority of the citizens of their State designated as their choice. They have thus become a model of faithful adherence to democracy. For 160 years they have chosen the Presidents of these United States. Their judgment in the fulfillment of their duties has never been challenged. They followed the people"s voice. This is democracy.

At the fortieth Presidential election in 1944 the electors, following the directions of the voters, chose Franklin Delano Roosevelt as President of the United States, and Harry S. Truman, as Vice President. They were inaugurated in Washington in the presence of these electors. President Roosevelt thereupon assumed the fourth term of his office in the midst of the greatest war whichever engulfed mankind. He organized our country for defense against its enemies. He formed the greatest Army and Navy and Air Force the world has ever known. He expressed again and again to the people of the world the great principles of human freedom. He promised our country that we would win the war and that, having won it, we would build a peace in which the spirit of Christ could rule the hearts of men and of nations. As our country was on its way to the conclusion of this war and to glorious victory, he was suddenly summoned on April 12, 1945, from this spot to eternity. He was not permitted to establish the peace in which he hoped to find a happier world.

The 531 Presidential electors comprising the last electoral college are represented here today and express anew their devotion to the ideals which he so nobly represented. Those ideals for which our country must forever strive and which, when adopted, and faithfully administered, will insure the peace and happiness of mankind. They take advantage of this opportunity to express their devotion and loyalty to Harry S. Truman, who has succeeded to the great office of President. They pledge their service and their loyalty to him and confidently pray that the people of our country will sustain him as they did President Roosevelt.

This tablet marks the expression of their loving devotion to Franklin Delano Roosevelt—

"No soldier gave more on any battlefield than he who here gave his life for his country.

"No greater martyr ever served the cause of freedom."

We honor the dead—we salute the living. May God ever protect and bless the United States of America.

RESPONSE BY GOVERNOR THOMPSON ON RECEIVING LITTLE WHITE HOUSE DEED FROM BASIL O'CONNOR AT CEREMONIES DEDICATING THE HOUSE TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AT WARM SPRINGS, JUNE 25

One of the pleasant features of being Governor is to serve at functions like this, when I am permitted to act in behalf of the State of Georgia in accepting a gift of great worth.

From the hands of Mr. Basil O'Connor, president of the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation, I have just received deeds of gift—deeds that convey to the State of Georgia: (1) The hallowed grounds on which we stand; (2) the Little White House and other buildings which served as a haven for the great man we honor today; and (3) to more than 3,000 additional acres of land nearby.

By this act of dedication, this site becomes a monument, one that begets a world of memories; one that recalls a long list of valiant deeds—deeds that led to glory and to undying fame.

Mother Nature was good to Georgia in many ways, but fortune was never kinder to our State than when Franklin D. Roosevelt, man of destiny, found reason to adopt Georgia as his second home, his other State.

In order to accept this historic gift, Georgia has undertaken and has pledged the develop-

ment and maintenance of this property as a memorial shrine forever, to the memory of one who was not only a friend and benefactor of Georgia and all its people, but who was one of the greatest men the Nation has yet produced.

His stature will grow as the years pass. The memory of what he did—what he stood for, lived for, and fought for—will endure for all time enshrined in the hearts of a grateful people whose lives were brightened by his efforts and influence.

Georgia is honored in having this distinguished group of visitors present here today, in one of the best known spots on the globe. Warm Springs are familiar words wherever the English language is understood. It is my pleasure to assure all those present, and those listening in over the radio, that we regard the task of creating this monument to one of the really great men of this century in all the world, as a sacred trust, to the execution of which, we pledge our best efforts and cheerful service.

ADDRESS BY IVAN ALLEN, CHAIRMAN, FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT WARM SPRINGS MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Welcome. The great Roosevelt. Before he was Governor of the State of New York—before he was President of the United States, 4 terms, he came here to these simple, rural, rustic surroundings in pursuit of health, and here also, found happiness and friends. In solitude and tranquillity, here he had humanitarian dreams and planned a government with a soul. Afterward these dreams and plans were enacted into laws. Through the years these laws have not been materially changed.

There is being dedicated here today a national, yes, an international, shrine, a sanctuary of glory, an altar of liberty. It shall light the pathways of the generations to come.

On this 3,000-acre reservation is a mountain called Dowdell's Knob. Mr. Roosevelt bought this mountain and built a private road to the top. It was his favorite picnic grounds, and here he entertained his visitors and neighbors. Here he could look over the countryside for 50 miles in all directions. Shall we, his followers, build there on this eminence, the Franklin D. Roosevelt Peace Tower, higher than the Washington Monument, more elaborate and more beautiful in design, modernized, with radio, television, chimes, elevators, equipped to broadcast messages of inspiration to the world? Shall it be built with funds from all the 48 States? Yes, and from all the other nations of liberty-loving people. In the very words of the great Roosevelt, "This generation has a rendezvous with destiny."

God give us heart and will to take this mission forward to a new, more daring future, a new world of peace.

ADDRESS BY BASIL O'CONNOR ON WARM SPRINGS ANNIVERSARY, GEORGIA WARM SPRINGS, JUNE 25, 1947

The history of Georgia Warm Springs as we know it today—a great medical center for the care and treatment of sufferers from infantile paralysis—properly begins a little more than two decades ago, when the most famous of all victims of that dread disease first discovered the site and, in a very real sense, claimed it for his own.

The beginnings of the actual history of Warm Springs as a place of peace and beauty—where men might come to rest and recuperate from the ills of the mind and of the flesh—are unknown; lost in legend and the mists of antiquity.

Long before Franklin D. Roosevelt's time; long, indeed, before overland explorers first reached the mountain cradle of Warm Springs, Indians of the Creek Confederacy, in Georgia, Alabama, and northern Florida knew the beauty and practical worth of the site. According to legend, warriors wounded in battle were brought to the springs and bathed here after all other efforts to heal their injuries had failed. A stricken Indian brave was granted safe conduct through territories of hostile tribes if his destination was Warm Springs. And thus the springs became an influence for peace, a sort of intertribal sanctuary in the wilderness. As all who spend a little time here today never fail to note, that atmosphere of peace still pervades this clearing in the Georgia pine woods.

It was an Indians' spa, a dot on a crudely drawn map carried by restless white men, a post tavern on a military highway leading to Columbus, Ga.

And then it was discovered by men seeking relief from sultry cities and air contaminated by smoke from the multiplying chimneys of the new industrial age. It became a summer resort—with an inn famous for open-handed hospitality. But the magnet that drew men here, then as always, was the Warm Springs, whose waters were guaranteed—somewhat optimistically by the jovial landlord—to counteract hospitality's immediate effects, and, indeed, to cure virtually all the shocks that flesh is heir to.

Summer cottages began to spring up about it, built by merchants from Columbus and other nearby cities, who joined their families here for longer or shorter periods as the exigencies of business permitted.

Nearly a hundred years ago that hostelry was destroyed by fire. The property, including the springs and some 1,800 acres of these wooded hills and valleys that surround them, was acquired by Col. John Lloyd Mustian, stagecoach-line operator and pioneer Georgia railwayman, whose heirs still owned it when it was acquired, in turn, by George Foster Peabody, New York banker from whom it was bought by the group, headed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, that created the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation of today.

Under Colonel Mustian's ownership, a second hotel was built on the same site—and, in 1888, met the same fate. Miss Georgia Wilkins, great granddaughter of Colonel Mustian and donor of the beautiful little chapel fronting Georgia Hall, who, happily, is still with us today, well remembers the destruction of the second hotel, though she was a very small child at the time. For she was living in it, with her aged great grandmother, Colonel Mustian's widow, and the two barely escaped with their lives in the conflagration.

Miss Wilkins remembers, too, the building of the third, and last, the most famous of the Warm Springs summer hotels—Meriwether Inn—for this was in 1893, year of the Chicago World's Fair.

Meriwether Inn had gingerbread on its roof lines, gables and turrets galore, curlicues of wood along its numerous verandas that would shame an old-fashioned Spencerian penman—and contours unclassifiable in architecture. But it was a happy house. Two generations played here, sunning themselves, splashing in the Warm Springs pools, riding horseback, playing golf on the new nine-hole course.

Then came the automobile, and the discovery by city-dwelling Georgians that other, more up-to-date resorts, once too distant to be conveniently reached by stagecoach or horse and buggy, offered livelier attractions. Warm Springs went into a slow decline, only the loyal cottagers returning year after year to enjoy its peace and bathe in its waters. Meriwether Inn still stood, a gallant, but seedy and somewhat unkept reminder of earlier glories. It seemed just about ready to fall apart when Franklin D. Roosevelt first saw it. This was in the autumn of 1924.

It was 3 years earlier—in the prime of his life and at the height of his great physical powers—that he had been stricken with poliomyelitis—a paralyzing disease for which there still is no known cure. Meanwhile, with what soul-searing disillusionment none but him knew—for it is not on record that at that time—or at any other—he was ever heard to complain of his handicap, he tried unsuccessfully by every means then known to medical science to regain some use of his legs.

Many stories—some of them quite fantastic—have been told of how he first happened to come here. Most of them have to do with rumors that had reached his ears of the magical curative powers of the waters of Warm Springs—and the legends of how the Creeks and the Cherokees had only to visit the springs and bathe in their waters to be promptly cured of their ills and wounds.

Mr. Roosevelt loved those legends and delighted in retelling them—but the true story of his coming here, as he himself recounted it years after to his Warm Springs family, is quite simple.

In the spring of 1924, while he was in Boston, having his braces adjusted and learning some new leg exercises, his personal physician, Dr. Robert Lovett, famous orthopedic surgeon and pioneer in the modern treatment of infantile paralysis, told him of an interesting experiment he was making in the children's hospital with some of his little polio patients. He had discovered that those of his patients who went bathing in the warm waters of Buzzards Bay were showing vastly greater improvement in the use of their leg muscles than those that bathed in the chilly waters of the Maine coast. So Dr. Lovett had just installed a shallow tank in the hospital, to determine if he could not do more for his patients by having them exercise in the medium of warm water than was possibe by simply using tables—as was then the common practice.

"I thought he was pursuing an interesting course in developing his theory," Mr. Roosevelt said, "but I was too busy with the Democratic National Convention, and the subsequent political campaign, to give it much thought."

In September he had a letter from George Peabody, then owner of Warm Springs, telling him about young Louis Joseph, who, following an attack of infantile paralysis resulting in involvement very similar to his own, had gradually taught himself to use his legs in the Warm Springs pool—first getting his feet to the bottom, then walking a few steps in deep water, and then, gradually, in shallower water, until, at long last, he found he could walk on dry land.

"This," said Mr. Roosevelt to himself, "seems to confirm Dr. Lovett's theory"—and he straightway arranged to visit the Springs himself.

What that visit did for him he reported in a letter to Mr. Peabody 6 weeks later:

"Every morning," he wrote, "I spend 2 hours in the most wonderful pool in the world. It is no exaggeration to say that the muscles in my legs have improved to an extent noticeable in every way."

What the visit was to mean thereafter to his thousands of fellow-sufferers from infantile paralysis, about whom, typically, he was already thinking, is indicated in another paragraph of that same letter: "There is no question," he wrote, "that to the average case of infantile paralysis this Warm Springs pool is a great find * * * nothing finer, nor more useful to humanity, could be done than to establish a 'cure' where the best treatment could be given."

At that time, and on his return to the Springs the following year, it was as private citizen Roosevelt that he visited Georgia, but his "discovery" of the Springs had already been spread abroad. A reporter from the local press came over to interview him—in the pool—and then wrote a flamboyant Sunday supplement story called "Swimming his way back to health," which featured not only Mr. Roosevelt, but two famous and shapely

professional women swimmers who had recovered from youthful attacks of infantile paralysis. The story was widely reprinted—with the result that before the summer of 1925 was well advanced, and long before any preparations could be made to receive them—a dozen hopeful and unheralded polios, on stretchers, or crutches, or in wheelchairs, descended on him.

It was in that same spring—of 1925—that I first heard of Warm Springs—from the enthusiastic lips of my new law partner. He insisted on my going down with him to see the place. I must admit I did not share his enthusiasm for it. Looking at these beautiful grounds and buildings today, it would be difficult for anyone to believe what a sad, rundown, ramshackle establishment it was then. Buildings were falling down, roofs leaked, and there was an air of complete hopelessness about the place that left me very cold, indeed.

My partner saw it in a different light, because one of his finest assets was vision. He could dream practically. He didn't have to see all four parts of a square closed. If he could see only a little distance ahead, he didn't worry—though he never grew careless about the rest of the journey, either.

Well, he took on those first Warm Springs visitors himself. I will not say singlehanded, for he had an able and enthusiastic assistant in Dr. J. A. Johnson, on of his lifelong admirers, who blithely neglected his own practice in nearby Manchester to aid his hero. Dr. Johnson, who later was to become chief of medicine here and who, also, happily, is still with us, says that his first assignment, which took many a long evening after office hours, was to prepare an anatomical chart showing every muscle in the human body, against which the physical involvement of each patient was carefully checked and his course of muscular treatment plotted.

Those treatments were not given under ideal conditions. The summer residents of Warm Springs, who later were to lead all the generous citizens of the State of Georgia in their wholehearted and substantial support of the Foundation, at first—and very understandably—resented the influx of helpless men and women and children, suffering from a crippling disease of which little was then popularly known. The dining room of the Meriwether Inn, where business quickly fell off, was at first barred to the newcomers. They were not welcomed at the public pool. Most of them were without funds. Housing, in the cottages or in rooms in the nearby village, presented difficult problems. "Doctor" Roosevelt and Doctor Johnson had to do a lot of jumping about to visit their patients, chart affected muscles, exercised wasted limbs, bring some strength and more cheer to the afflicted, and in lieu of modern equipment, make use of dining tables, ironing boards, stationary washtubs, and anything else that could be contrived for examinations and treatments.

Nevertheless, promptly at 11 o'clock every day, when the "cottagers" had deserted it, they caused the patients to foregather at the pool, where for 2 hours the team of Roosevelt and Johnson put them through their paces. And it was always Dr. Johnson who was first ready to cry "quits." "F. D. R. was tireless," he recalls. 'In the pool where he was on equal terms with other swimmers," says Dr. Johnson, 'President Roosevelt was the physical match of any man living."

Besides the expenditure of time and energy, all these labors meant the expenditure of money. Soon a sympathetic public was aware of what their beloved President was undertaking. The famous birthday balls had been organized and so generous was the popular response that in time sufficient funds were available not only to take care of all the immediate needs of the Warm Springs project, but also to launch the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

But all this came later. Back in 1925, when I first saw it, Warm Springs was not a very prepossessing place. A tumbledown hotel; a few scattered cottages, many of them long unfamiliar with the protective touch of a paint brush; the melancholy pines; and the pool, which to my practical eyes seemed just another pool, and not a very attractive one at that; although, as I have said, to my law partner it was already "the most wonderful pool in the world."

It was to such a shabby place that Franklin D. Roosevelt came to meet a desperate personal crisis. And it was in his wonderful pool that there first dawned in his consciousness the hope that a cure—and possibly a preventive—might be found that should rid the world forever of the terrible threat of infantile paralysis.

Perhaps, too, it was in this selfsame pool, or in the lonely solitude of Pine Mountain—on the famous knob, where he was wont to go to rest and meditate—that there first came to him his blessed dream of a world at peace, a world in which courage and helpfulness and understanding would guide the relationship of man to man, and of nation to nation.

For a Warm Springs Mr. Roosevelt found—and gave—something more than mere physical strength and muscular coordination. As the news of this neglected resort and its beneficial waters and what Franklin Roosevelt was attempting with a few fellow polio-sufferers spread about the land, other people, similarly handicapped, trekked to Georgia. Soon the tiny hamlet was crowded beyond capacity. Facilities for care and treatment were nonexistent. There was not even sufficient accommodation properly to house the many who came with the burning hope that here they might find relief from the bodily ills that had so restricted their lives.

Mr. Roosevelt clearly was under no obligation to assist any of these people, some of whom had neither the means nor the physical capacity to support themselves. Actually, it seemed to many that their coming might seriously impede his own progress. But far from resenting the intrusion, he found in this influx of the stricken an opportunity to utilize his own limited strength in lending assistance to others.

Under his guidance the problems of each lonely, brooding individual were dissipated in the common effort to assist all along the road to recovery. The terrible agony of helplessness that had beset so many of the afflicted suddenly became a rallying point as one by one they shed their hopelessness in the realization that now, more than ever before, were their best efforts of consequence, not only to themselves, but to the recovery of all with whom they associated.

They found strength in the energy of this tireless friend who took upon himself so much of the responsibility for housing and feeding the many who arrived at Warm Springs with nothing more than a flickering spark of faith in their ability to conquer infirmity with the help of this "wonderful pool." They listened with rapt attention to his explanation of stretching exercises that he had devised and found beneficial in his own case. They followed his direction as he personally led them in water exercises that stimulated the use of long-dormant muscles.

The clinical value of these early exercises might well be a subject for medical discussion. But we cannot possibly doubt that here these stricken people found the means to a positive philosophy that transcended the severe handicaps imposed upon their bodies by an unkind fate. Here, pursuing a common cause, and with the guidance of the indomitable spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt, they experienced a resurgence of hope and faith.

Some of them were restored to health in an almost incredible manner. Others made partial recovery in a greater or lesser degree. And there were those for whom the waters were not so obviously beneficial.

But the importance of physical gains was paled by the miraculous rebirth in the hearts of these visitors of a common will to carry on cheerfully and constructively despite bodily limitations.

Georgia Warm Springs has changed considerably since those early days. Its accomplishments in the field of polio treatment have become part of medical history. Neat, modern structures have replaced the ramshackle buildings of a score of years ago. The hit-or-miss water exercises with which visitors experimented in the mid-twenties have given way to supervised individual treatment of the highest order, under the direction of an efficient staff of polio experts. Visitors to the Springs now approach with something more than hope in their hearts. They approach with confidence—confidence that whatever can possibly be done for their well-being will be done.

The changes that have taken place are obvious. But there is one thing that has not changed through the years. The spirit that dominated Warm Springs 20 years ago—the spirit that inspired Mr. Roosevelt to purchase, renovate, and rebuild this neglected resort and dedicate it to the treatment of polio patients from every part of the country—that spirit continues to burn brightly in the hearts of all these good people who abide here today.

It is as if every small flame of hope that has been placed upon this great altar of courage had taken on added strength, added luster, firing the atmosphere with a happy warmth of spirit, driving from men's souls the coldness of fear and despair.

Franklin Roosevelt's dream of establishing at Warm Springs a citadel of hope for polio patients has become a reality through no mere chance. It is the result of intelligent planning and maximum effort by its founders. And, most important, it is the direct result of concerted action by millions of Americans who decided, after long and bitter experience with polio epidemics, that they would no longer stand idly by while thousands of children fell victim to this crippling malady.

When the first President's birthday ball was inaugurated in 1934 to raise funds for indigent polio patients, America responded enthusiastically. The Nation, awakened to a sense of its responsibility in the fight against a specific disease, signified its willingness to participate in the development of Warm Springs. Today, that willing spirit not only contributes to the continuous support of Georgia Warm Springs Foundation—it is the motivating force that makes possible the world's second largest people's philanthropy, supporting an intensive Nation-wide program of polio research, education, medical care, and epidemic aid. The American people have decided to conquer this disease. And, through the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis—an outgrowth of Warm Springs—every man, woman, and child in the Nation has a share in the project.

So when you see these smiling patients looking forward to the future with optimism, you know what has made such an attitude possible—the cooperation of a people inspired by a great and compassionate leader, who have looked beyond the tiny sphere of their own existence and turned to help a neighbor in need.

I have spoken of President Roosevelt's fondness for the Indian legends associated with Warm Springs. More than once in his informal, unrehearsed talks to his Warm Springs family, he referred to these legends, ascribing what he called "The Spirit of Warm Springs"—which barred all talk and all thought of war and strife from these peaceful premises—to the heritage of the warring Indians that here, at least, could dwell together in trust and amity. That spirit, he once said, "has been here at least as long as I have been here, and I am quite sure it will always rest upon these buildings."

These were the words of a true prophet—but the spirit of Warm Springs is not just the tenuous influence of the long-dead redmen, seeking surcease from war and healing for the wounds of war. It is the spirit of what the Indians themselves have poetically called "the Great White Father in Washington"—the living spirit of Franklin Roosevelt, which dwells here today as through the last two decades—a warm and vital presence that breathes in every living flower and shrub and tree and blade of grass that grows in Warm Springs, and that is reflected in the hearts and faces of all Warm Springs' dwellers—the polios, who fight patiently to regain health and strength, and the doctors, nurses, physical therapists and all the other good people of this foundation who minister to them.

Yes; the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt—and I am thinking now not of the great statesman, President, and war leader, but of the great humanitarian—is indeed a living spirit, and though it is surely here present with us today, it is not in Warm Springs alone that it dwells. Increasingly now as midsummer approaches, and the still terrible scourge this foundation was created to combat once more spreads over the land, the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt is on the march.

It will be found wherever new victims of poliomyelitis are found—in the gleaming wards of city hospitals, where iron lungs are being wheeled in; in the modest kitchens of remote ranches and farms in the wastelands of Colorado and the Badlands of Dakota, whither doctors and nurses and polio emergency volunteers are hurrying with crude hot packs to relieve the distress of the suffering.

You can fancy his towering figure at the head of each of 10,000 beds, as he looks down, with understanding and compassion, on twisted bodies, tortured limbs, arching backs, stiffening necks—bringing hope and courage to the stricken children of America and, where need is, comfort to their bereaved parents.

Yes; the living spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt is abroad—is here with us today as surely as any of us who loved and revered him is here in the flesh. And to that great spirit we renew our loyal pledge—to carry on the good work he here began—to lead, direct and unify the fight against the great crippler until, in God's good time, the final victory is won.

Everybody's for It, But

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Everybody's for It, But," appearing in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune for July 21, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERYBODY'S FOR IT, BUT

If everybody is for tax reduction—and everybody is for it—why did President Truman dare to veto the income tax reduction bill? Why do the Democrats say they welcome it as a 1948 campaign issue?

The answer may be available when the campaign of 1948 rolls around. And then, again, it may not be.

For the prospect is that we'll have a tax reduction early in the session of 1948 and the issue of 1947 will be forgotten. There is a theory that the American people have no memory on public affairs beyond 6 months and, while it may be wrong in some cases, there is plenty of evidence to sustain it.

Meanwhile, there is some reason to believe that the people as a whole were less enthusiastic for this particular tax reduction bill than would be indicated by the strong support for it in Congress. A good many individuals agree with the President that it constituted the wrong kind of tax reduction even though they may disagree with him that it came at the wrong time.

The average individual with a family—and dad and mother have two votes between them—feels that it didn't take their needs into consideration. The cost of caring for a child has risen sharply in the last 18 months and they are feeling the pinch. In the view of many parents the income tax exemption for a child never was high enough and now it's lower than ever if prices are considered.

Thus many individuals will feel that Congress did not do the best possible job in devising this tax bill and to the extent that this feeling prevails resentment at Truman will be diminished in intensity.

It is sincerely to be hoped that a better tax-reducing bill can be enacted at the next session of Congress and approved by the President. But it should not be on the same basis as this last one. This tax bill is reminiscent of the man who made horse-and-rabbit sausage on a 50–50 basis. The proportions were one horse to one rabbit.

The Zionist Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Zionist Club at Manhattan Center, New York City, July 6, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Silver, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to join you here tonight on this great occasion. For many years I have enjoyed visits from your distinguished leader, Dr. Silver, in Washington, and have been impressed and influenced by his eloquent appeals in the cause of the Zionist movement. [Applause.] I wish to assure you that you have strong friends in Washington. [Applause.] Only a short while ago I had the honor of organizing a luncheon in Washington for the purpose of bringing your friends in the Senate together for the purpose of considering this problem we are considering which is foremost in your hearts here tonight. [Applause.]

As a result of that luncheon in Washington, which was attended by distinguished leaders of your cause, among others Freda Kirchwey, of The Nation, who has been in correspondence with me for some time on this matter, we arranged a conference of Senators with the Secretary of State, General Marshall. As a result of that meeting, at which we were accorded a generous and cordial reception, I have great confidence that you will not be disappointed by the final action of our Government in this matter. [Applause.]

After 50 years of organized Zionist endeavor, after almost a century of growing pro-Zionist sentiment in the world, after 2,000 years of suffering and longing, after two great world wars, and after the catastrophe that has struck the Jewish people in the past decade, it would seem this meeting tonight should have been called together for another purpose—for the purpose of celebrating the establishment of a Jewish state. [Applause.]

I can understand how tedious it must be for you, who devote to Zionism so much of your lives, to gather over and over again only to hear the same friendly speeches from people who want to help but cannot, and to hear the same excuses from people who could help but would not. I know how discouraged even I become at times, in this and in other issues, at the never-ending opposition of those determined to stop progress in the world.

And yet, getting discouraged is the worst disservice one could perform for your movement, for any movement. This is what the enemies of Zionism, this is what the enemies of any worth-while cause are waiting for—that its friends should lose heart and patience and give up.

You are right, therefore, in gathering here to celebrate the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of your movement. During these 50 years, you have withstood many enemies, overcome many obstacles, and brought about—despite them—many encouraging results.

Today you are no longer a small band of men and women endowed with courage and vision. Today yours is an effective voice uniting the overwhelming majority of the Jewish people everywhere. [Applause.] Your objectives, through formal treaties executed by our Government and congressional resolutions duly enacted, have become part of the law of the land, which must be recognized, as well as part of the international law of the world. [Applause.] Today a foundation has already been laid in Palestine for the Jewish state—a prosperous, freedom-loving, progressive Jewish community of 650,000 men and women who are happy to live for their freedom—do not underestimate the importance of this fact in our hard and cruel world—ready to die for it. [Applause.]

Today you stand on firm ground, supported by the law and the facts, and your enemies have to battle against both law and facts.

I think that despite disappointments and tragedies of your people you have a right to celebrate the progress achieved, and to look forward to greater achievements to follow. And because I am convinced that your cause is a just and necessary cause, and because I have been with you adding my voice in your struggle, I am glad to be with you sharing the fiftieth anniversary of your movement.

Still, the fight has to go on. And perhaps the most important thing we can do at this point is to ask just why the fight has not yet been won.

There is a lot of loose talk that the Palestine question is so utterly complicated, so dangerous, and so explosive, and so whatnot, that its solution must be postponed again and again. To my mind, the Palestine question is very simple. To summarize briefly what I think of this argument—nonsense! Humanity in the past has solved questions that were infinitely more complicated, dangerous, and explosive. Upon

close scrutiny, the "dangers" of a just solution of the Palestine problem resolve themselves as figments of the imagination; often as figments of an uninformed imagination, but just as often as figments of a malicious, hostile imagination.

In characterizing these hostile influences, I do not propose to search for new words to describe an old situation. I would rather, with your permission, quote from an address I made on the floor of the United States Senate on October 2, 1945, and which, unfortunately, still applies in this struggle:

"The chapter of British rule in Palestine contributes nothing to the honor of the British Government. It is a blank chapter in English history. It is a chapter full of evasion and duplicity. After having received the trusteeship over Palestine mainly in order to help the Jews establish their national home, British administrators did their best to prevent the Jews from doing so. For the present, and, as it has been ever since 1939, Palestine is ruled under the notorious British document known as the Chamberlain white paper of 1939, under which no more Jews may enter Palestine, and under which, in this so-called national homeland of the Jews, Jews are not even permitted to live or to own property anywhere except a tiny part of the territory of Palestine.

"This document is reviled and repudiated even in England. Winston Churchill, the man who pulled Great Britain through the war, called the white paper a unilateral breach of promises and a violation of international obligations.

"But on the part of Mr. Churchill, too, just as on the part of many others, these were only words. For four long years Churchill was Prime Minister of England, and he had it within his power to right the wrong that was done. He did not do so. For most of those 4 years there was an explanation—the critical war situation. But for the last year and a half this explanation no longer held true.

"During the past year and a half it would have been easily possibly to abrogate the white paper, to open Palestine to the Jewish refugees of the Old World, and to lay the foundation of the Jewish state. [Applause.]

"It was not done by Mr. Churchill's government, and now we hear that Mr. Attlee's government does not intend to do so, either. It is said to wish to maintain the white paper intact, with but slight and insignificant concessions. It is said to intend to 'pass the buck' for the future of Palestine to a United Nations organization which has not yet started operating and which, God knows when, will be able to start operating effectively.

"An overwhelming majority of the members of both Houses of Congress, both political parties, the Administration, are publicly pledged to support the policy of a Jewish commonwealth, and yet in practice we are failing to carry this policy into execution. It is reported that the President of the United States has asked that 100,000 Jewish refugees be admitted to Palestine at once. This is, indeed, an elementary requirement of the mandate. The victims of our enemy's brutality who by some miracle survived in his concentration camps and who desire to go to the country that was promised to them should be enabled to go without the least delay.

"But this is only the first step. Without shirking responsibility, our Government and the Government of Great Britain, who have made so many far-reaching decisions in the international field in the interest of peace and humanity, must not shirk this responsibility, either—the long overdue responsibility of redeeming and carrying out a sacred obligation." [Applause.]

This, my friends, is what I had to say to my colleagues in the Senate in 1945, more than a year and a half ago. Since then, the British Government has not improved its record. Indeed, it has blackened that record beyond anything that has happened heretofore. Since then, to my deep regret, the desire to shirk responsibility or, indirectly, to make more difficult a just solution in Palestine has been manifest in certain circles in Washington as well, thus causing American policy to deviate from its logical and officially prescribed path, or, at best, causing this policy to be pursued in so hesitant and round-about a manner as to rob it of all efficacy.

I would not like to indulge on this occasion in criticism of British policy across 3,000 miles of ocean. What we think of British policy in the matter of Palestine has been said quite often, quite audibly, and quite clearly, and I could hardly add anything to it.

There is a task much nearer home that has to be tackled and I should like to tackle it tonight. This has to do with the problem, already touched upon, of American policy on Palestine. [Applause.] I have early in my address referred to the call which a group of United States Senators, including myself, paid the Secretary of State. The matter was published in the papers of the country. The visit was due to our growing apprehension that the singular lack of firmness and of enthusiasm displayed by representatives of the Department of State for the official American policy on Palestine will cause irreparable harm. That Secretary Marshall gave us a very earnest hearing was quite encouraging. Some things which the Secretary told us were still more encouraging. Nevertheless, I think it useful to make clear in public what has been pointed out by my colleagues and by myself in private.

The law- and policy-making body under our Constitution is the body that represents the people of the United States—the Congress. On the matter of Palestine Congress has spoken—spoken with a unanimity hardly ever achieved in our deliberations. The resolution of Congress on Palestine, adopted by the Senate on December 17, 1945, and by the House of Representatives 2 days later, reads as follows:

"Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved 'That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected'; and

"Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution; and

"Whereas these urgent necessities are evidenced by the President's request for the immediate right of entry into Palestine of 100,000 additional Jewish refugees; and

"Whereas the influx of Jewish immigration into Palestine is resulting in its improvement in agricultural, financial, hygienic, and general economic conditions; and

"Whereas the President and the British Prime Minister have agreed upon the appointment of a 'Joint Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry' to examine conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and the Jewish situation in Europe and have requested a report within 120 days: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish National Home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights."

This, and nothing else, is the official policy of the United States with regard to Palestine.

All the talk that pretends to assume that American policy on Palestine must yet be defined, or developed, or crystallized, misses the point. The actual point is that American policy has been defined, developed, and crystallized. All that is needed is that it be applied and executed. And this must be the task of the officials of the executive branch of our Government. [Applause.]

I am personally convinced that President Truman is fully in accord with this policy and desires to see it applied. His message to the King of Saudi Arabia, of October 28, 1946, shows this to be the case. I am also convinced that our Secretary of State has no other thought than to have this policy carried out just as forcefully and effectively as other policies to which our Government is committed. [Applause.]

And yet, I am constrained to state that in the matter of Palestine, there has developed in the State Department the tendency to postpone taking a clear position in defense of our official program, and, when a stand had to be taken, to do it half-heartedly, with qualifications and mental reservations that were only too obvious.

This was the case before the matter came up in the United Nations, and this was also the case since then. Our Government which, in all other questions tries to lead the nations of the world, in this one question displays a tongue-tiedness and a faint-heartedness which are quite out of character and which neither befit our role in the world, nor correspond to our responsibilities in the question of Palestine, nor are likely to result in the attainment of the goal which Congress has set by its resolution. It is not for me to say what can be the justification for this attitude, but the time has come to make it clear that in this country of ours, all executive officials are duty-bound to execute policies laid down by Congress; that those who, for lack of sympathy with these policies, do not do so should have no controlling voice in these matters. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I am aware that you represent a great many of our fellow citizens of Jewish ancestry. I could never understand why a cause is rendered less just because many fellow citizens believe in it. On the contrary, in a democracy, the very fact that a large section of the citizenry favors a certain cause, entitles this cause to additional respect. [Applause.] I recall, not so many years back, when Ireland was fighting for its freedom. [Applause.] I recall the response that the American people gave in that cause. I recall very vividly the support we received from our Jewish fellow citizens. [Applause.] I attended many meetings in those days, not only in my own State, but in distant parts of the country. In every section I visited, I found that our Jewish fellow citizens were in full sympathy with the struggle of the Irish people for their freedom. [Applause.] They were fighting the same sort of a battle the Jews today are fighting. You deserve and are entitled to the sympathy of every fair-minded American regardless of race who realizes what the struggle means. I am sure you will have it. [Applause.]

It seems to me that even if America did not have a single citizen of Jewish ancestry among its population, the world-wide problem caused by the homelessness of the Jewish people, by the need to provide for the Jewish people that which is granted as a matter of course to all other peoples—an independent national homeland, would still justify our ardent support of this cause. [Applause.]

The brazen disregard of the international arrangements made 30 years ago to remedy this situation is sufficiently challenging to America's role as a major world power, to impel our Government to exert itself on behalf of this cause.

If you, and we, all of us who believe in the righteousness and the wisdom of Zionism, continue our efforts unabated, your next convention, let us hope, will find us all, Jew and Gentile alike, celebrating the attainment of your ancient and historic objective—the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. [The assembly arose and applauded.]

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. James G. MacDonald, former Higher Commissioner of the League of Nations for German Jews, the Chairman of President Roosevelt's Committee on Refugees, a member of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine, on the occasion of the Jubilee Convention of the Zionist Organization of America, at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, July 4, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the convention, for a few minutes during the last of the JNF appeal, I felt that this was really becoming a Jewish meeting. [Applause and laughter] For, after all, I feel that it is a loss of time to get a lot of good Jewish people together and not make them poorer and better Jews at the same time. [Laughter and applause.]

It is a great honor to speak at this convention—a convention which would bring great pleasure to the two great figures whose pictures are on the wall here at my back—Dr. Herzl, a man who had an extraordinary vision, all the more extraordinary because he was, in a certain sense, rather remote from his Jewish background. Despite that, he more nearly than any man of his generation, perhaps, foresaw the future. This convention would be to him a large measure of fulfillment of his dreams.

I am glad to be on the same platform with the President of the JNF, though, of course, I suspect that he is only a facade for the irrepressible activities of Mr. Fisher. [Laughter.] Speaking of Mr. Fisher, if I may, on a personal note for a moment, I think you will all be happy to know that his son who underwent a very serious operation 3 or 4 days ago is definitely better today. [Applause.]

I think the JNF would do well to teach Zionists the story of Ussishkin. Of the many Zionists interested in the JNF, to my mind he is one of the greatest. He was a general Zionist, but a general Zionist in the fullest and most comprehensive sense. He believed in political activity. He believed in cultural activity. But he also knew that without the land, all the rest would be in vain.

I want, finally, to say just a word about my friend, Aaron Wright, who has spoken to you. He was very kind to me in England when I was there during their delightful winter last February and March. [Laughter.] What a winter that was! The meeting of welcome to me in Kingsway Hall had what the British call 10 degrees of frost. That is, it was exactly 10 degrees below freezing. But the orators went on and the audience remained—perhaps frozen to their seats. [Laughter.]

I want to pay my personal respects to the efforts he has been leading in England under very difficult circumstances. I want also to say that I share his view that next to land itself in Palestine, the most critical problem is the problem of housing. It must be met. I do not mean to say delay in meeting it should in any way limit immigration, because the immigrants who come will be taken care of, houses or no houses. [Applause.] Yet, from the point of view of sound economic building and the welfare of the community, those 100,000 rooms are sorely needed.

My mission this spring and winter was threefold. First to England to help there in the opening of the joint Palestine appeal. Then to Palestine for a special mission on behalf of the new medical school of the Hebrew University and Hadassah. In Palestine I was the guest of the JNF and had the fine privilege of being shown Palestine by Dr. Granovsky.

I have one bit of advice to you. I know that you delegates have been getting advice from all the orators. I dare say either now or later, you would all like to have your turn in giving advice to the orators. Well, I hope you get it. But this advice applies also to orators. It applies to Judge Rothenberg here, and I have given it to him before and I am going to continue to give it to him until he takes it. [Laughter.] That advice is to go to Palestine and see for yourself. [Applause.] I do not imply the judge has never been there, but he has not been there recently enough.

Indeed, if I had my way, if I were a dictator—of course, I know the role of dictators among Jews is a very sorry one. [Laughter.] Indeed, I could disprove the old libel about the Elders of Zion and the Protocols. I know if the Elders of Zion has existed they would not have agreed, and had they agreed and drawn up the protocols, they would not have been followed. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, with complete seriousness, there is no substitute for going to Palestine and seeing and feeling what is taking place there on the ground itself. Not even the unmatchable eloquence of Dr. Silver can give you that feeling. Not even the analytical summations of a Dr. Neumann can do the easy job. Nothing can do the job except to go and see. It is very easy now. From New York it is a matter of 20, 24, 36 hours—no time at all.

My report to you is twofold. First, very briefly, about the political situation which I found in Palestine in April and in May of this year. On the surface, conditions have sorely worsened in Palestine since we members of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry were there a year ago. Oh, I know it is true that the British Government, the high commissioner in his wisdom, has carried out one fractional, infinitesimal, parenthetical, insignificant portion of our report. [Laughter.] Perhaps you all know what it is. Some of the members of our committee last year were shocked when they went to Tiberias and there learned that a night club on the Sea of Galilee played jazz music and the young people occasionally danced to that music. So somebody dragged it into our report.

Well, Sir Alan in his wisdom has now decreed the sacred waters of that lake are not to be contaminated by jazz music. We did not know then that night club was owned by a Christian Arab. [Laughter.] Even if we had known it, we ought not to have put anything in. Of course, the British and we, at least most of our committee, had forgotten, if we ever knew, that in the days of Jesus the Sea of Galilee was the center of many Roman villas, a great winter resort of the Roman aristocracy. I imagine the things that went on in those villas in Jesus' day would make jazz music seem fitting for the most strict evangelical Sunday school. [Laughter and applause.]

We had our initial experience in Jerusalem which gave the key to the present situation there. We arrived at the Eden Hotel about teatime. I was planning to take my wife out to see the old city immediately thereafter, but the hotel said "No, not tonight. You see, the curfew is on. You are not allowed outside the door on the street. You may not sit or appear on your balcony overlooking the street." As you know, several Jewish children have been wounded and some killed who had escaped from their mothers and had appeared on the balconies overlooking the streets during the curfew time.

The next morning we were awakened by a raucous voice saying something in Hebrew which we could not understand. At breakfast we were told we would not go out that day because the previous night there had been the four executions and the curfew was extended. Again that night. So our first 36 hours in Jerusalem was a period of confinement in our hotel. That told us more of the police state which Palestine today is than any amount of reading could have done. Everywhere in Jerusalem one is running straight up against the so-called controlled areas into which the city is divided. Everywhere barbed wire, tanks, machine guns, heavier guns, armored vehicles racing through the streets at top speed—everyone held up and searched and checked, even Americans, non-Jews. You can imagine, therefore, what happens to Palestinian Jews.

One must be off the roads in the country at 6 o'clock. One must be back in the city at 6:30. One never knows when he starts out whether he will arrive at his destination or at what time he will return. Sometimes he may be held up for 10 minutes, sometimes for an hour, sometimes for 4 hours, by road checks or road searches. Everywhere one sees the evidence of overwhelming military might. Last year, when we were there officially, there were perhaps 60,000 British troops and police in Palestine. Today there are 125,000 British police and soldiers in Palestine. Everywhere there is the dominance of force. Yet the more force the British pile up in Palestine the weaker becomes their moral position in Palestine. [Applause.]

One day I had two important political interviews which I report to you briefly. The first was with the chief secretary of the British administration, Sir Henry Gurney, in the King David Hotel, now no longer a beautiful hotel, but, instead, a fortress. Sir Henry was in a bad mood. Nothing about the Jews pleased him. He complained about everything, even about my dear friend whom I regard as perhaps the ablest woman in the world, Goldie Meyerson. [Applause.] Even she no longer satisfied him. You know the heart of his complaint? It was that the Jews show no confidence in the British administration. [Laughter.] He complained that they did not tell him in advance of "Operation Negev," and give the British Government an opportunity to cooperate [laughter] in all these settlements in the south.

He even complained a little bit about me, though sort of indirectly. He said, "You see how uncooperative they are. They did not serve notice on me and did not invite me to the party which the university and Hadassah had yesterday on the breaking of the ground for the new biological building of the new medical school on Mount Scopus." Well, of course, there were no social relations then between the agency and the Government. Besides, had Sir Harry been invited, and had he come, he would have felt called upon to bring with him a squadron of troops, machine guns, tanks, and the rest.

And even he should have known that they did not fit into a quiet academic groundbreaking of a biological building. [Applause.]

As we talked, I got a new sense of the difficulties under which Jewish leaders have to work in Palestine, and a new sense of the necessity of Jewish self-rule in Palestine.

My second political interview was with Sir Alan Cunningham, the high commissioner, a man with whom I feel I was quite friendly last year. This can be described in a moment. The lunch was good, the food was excellent, the talk was casual and friendly. Afterwards, I expected that the high commissioner would invite me into his office for serious talk. Instead, he invited my wife out into the gardens and kept her there until it was time for us to go home. [Laughter.] I do not know whether my wife thought it was because of her beauty or charm. If she did, I quickly corrected her in the best husbandly fashion. [Laughter.] Don't we have a right? The wives are always putting us in our place. Surely we should occasionally have a right to reciprocate. [Laughter.]

I explained to her that the reason Sir Alan had kept her so long was because he did not want to talk to me.

Politically then, militarily, conditions in Palestine are bad, deteriorating. But beneath the surface, there is the best evidence of growth—many indications which give reason for high hope and optimism.

Just two stories about the land in the north and in the south. On one of our trips we went up to the Huli, to what were the swampy areas, from which now the mosquitoes have been so completely eliminated that when one of the Jewish professors at the university or at the hospital wants mosquitoes for experimental purposes, he has to send a special expedition up to Syria to get them. [Laughter.] The Huli is cleared of mosquitoes. New settlements are being established. But the full carrying out of that program waits upon the British Government.

Above the Huli, in the mountains of Galilee, is the settlement of Menorah which I like to tell about. It was on the rocky fields covered with stones and huge granite pieces that some 4 years ago 40 Jewish boys and girls went to work. They cleared half the land. They built their buildings of stone. They built their stables. They built their reservoirs. They get their only water from the rain. They built their fortifications. They are now building a rest house to be shared by them and the members from the colonies in the lower reaches of the Jordan. This rest house is on the bluff overlooking the great Jordan Valley, from which one gets a view up to Mount Hermon with its perpetual snow and on down to the Sea of Galilee.

The leader of that group, as is so often the case of the leaders in colonies, was a girl. Only in Palestine, of all the places in the world, do women have an equality of opportunity—only in Palestine. [Applause.] In this settlement the colonists showed good judgment in choosing this young girl. She was 22. She had been 18 when she went there. As she showed me about, I could feel her sense of pride, the pride which a mother would have in her own children. I looked at her hands and at her face. As I did, I thought of our own daughter, the same age, and the daughters of most of my rich and well-to-do Jewish friends. I thought how creative has been the life of this young girl. How she has demonstrated the capacity of young Jews to rebuild. It is that feeling you can get only in the colonies in Palestine. I cannot give it to you. No one can give it to you. You must go and get it for yourselves. [Applause.]

Then we passed through the Emek. As we did, I remembered the experience of Ussishkin back in 1920–21, just after he bought a large section of the Emek on behalf of the Jewish national fund. Do you know that if the Zionist organization of that day had an inquisition, Ussishkin would have been punished. He was bitterly criticized for wasting money. Yet today, that valley which was then cursed with malaria, largely uninhabitable, is one of the richest valleys in the world, comparable to the Sacramento Valley in California. Ussishkin represented the spirit of the JNF. It was that sort of a pioneering, individualistic spirit which has helped so much to make what has happened in Palestine possible.

In some respects, the south is the most challenging and the most encouraging of all the parts of Palestine. I do not have time to describe the settlement in the far south which has been engaged in water experimentation, the control of floods. I cannot take the time to tell you how the first year the dam was swept away by unprecedented floods. The second year there were no floods, and the third year the water was diverted. When we were there, young Jews were beginning to mix the salt water from their wells with the water they had saved.

I want to tell you just a word about two or three of the young people in that settlement. One of them, a young meteorologist, a boy who in this country would be a professor, there he is serving with no thought of professional advancement in a highly technical job. Others are agronomists. There is a third to whom I want to make special reference because she represents the spirit to which I referred earlier. The buildings, as I say, are very primitive. Conditions are extremely primitive. No babies can be raised there. It is tough and hard. We went into the bakery where a young girl of about 18 was preparing to put some 20 loaves of brown bread in an improvised oven. It was heated by a blow-torch, fed by a gas tank sent down from Jerusalem. The room was hot and unpleasant. This young girl of 18, do you know who she was? She was the daughter of Goldie Meyerson. The daughter of the most important woman in Palestine chose as her place of national service such a spot in Palestine. [Applause.]

I saw the pipe line, partly completed. I later heard Sir Harry's devious excuses for the British opposition. But I want to say this to you: Already the Jews have done enough in the Negev to prove it can be made to bloom as the rest of Jewish Palestine. [Applause.]

I spent the night at Rehovoth with my old friend, Dr. Weizmann. [Applause.] We talked about many things. I do not say he was cheerful on every subject. What Zionist leader ever is cheerful on every subject? Indeed, what leader of any great militant movement has ever been cheerful on every subject? But Weizmann was cheered because he said to me, "We have now proved in the Negev that there are facilities and resources to care for from 300,000 to 500,000 Jewish settlers. That has been proved." [Applause.]

Well, I am about through. I wish I could go on and give you more details, because it seems to me nothing really matters except the detailization of the achievements in Palestine. But there is no time. The substance of what is being done is extraordinary. The spirit in which it is being done is incomparable. The confidence of those who are doing it is the sort to make ashamed timid souls elsewhere. One indication of the confidence of the Jews of Palestine in the future is their resolute effort to go about the building of the new medical school, in connection with the hospital school of Hadassah and the Hebrew University.

And now I am going to give you a special assignment, as all the other orators have done. You will have nothing at all to do when you get home except carry out the various suggestions made to you during this convention. But this is an easy one. If you have anywhere in your home, in your district, a Jewish millionaire who unlike most millionaires has not lost most of his imagination and most of his intelligence in getting rich—I do not mean to say he hasn't intelligence to continue to get money, that is another matter [laughter]—but intelligence and imagination enough to see far in a nonbusiness area, then please tell him that on Mount Scopus, in the proposed medical school, he has an opportunity to build for himself and for his people and for the good of all the Jews and the Arabs, too, in that part of the world, a lasting and an incomparable monument. See if you can strike his imagination.

Finally, I used to be accused, and rightly, I think, of speaking of Palestine almost always and perhaps almost exclusively in terms of a place of refuge. There are even times when my good friend, Dr. Silver, felt that though I was useful in a certain way, I too narrowly restricted my conception of Palestine. I want here and now to confess that he was right and I was wrong. [Applause.]

Palestine is a great place of refuge. But Palestine is more than a great place of refuge. Believe it or not, since I was League of Nations High Commissioner, since I was on the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, I have been reading. The more I read of Jewish history, the more I read of new books on Palestine—and there are some excellent ones now—the more I can understand that Palestine has a meaning far transcending its role as a place of refuge. As I read the history, I see how the men of vision, fighting against the obscurantists and those without vision, have stuck stanchly to the central point—that Palestine is to be a home for Jews in which Jews can create distinctively and unique Jewish values which can be created nowhere else. So now, I have taken onto myself a special assignment. You see, I not merely give you jobs, but I take one myself. This job is to show my wealthy Jewish non-Zionist friends, those of them who have that imagination and intelligence to which I refer, to show them that the young people in the colonies, whether in the Huli, in Galilee, in the Emek, or the Negev—that those young Jewish boys and girls building nobly as they are in Palestine, for themselves and the people of Palestine, are, in the long run, doing more for the sons and grandsons of these rich American Jews than all the antidefamation societies and all the defense societies in the world. [Prolonged applause.]

This is no criticism of my good friend, Judge Proskauer, who, by the way, is becoming a better and better Zionist. [Applause.] It is no criticism of my good friends in the B'nai B'rith. It is merely to reaffirm a principle which Jews should long ago have understood—that the creative, the affirmative, the positive approach is the only answer. [The assembly arose and applauded.]

Visit of President Truman to the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock from this morning's New York Times. In the article reference is made to a man beloved on both side of this Chamber, Mr. Leslie Biffle.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOLASSES INSTEAD OF VINEGAR FOR A CHANGE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 24.—The President's visit yesterday to the Senate, where he spent "what I think were the best 10 years of my life," and his brief reoccupancy of his old seat in the Chamber, will not bring enduring political peace between him and the Republicans. But the deft and brilliant personal touch of the episode somewhat soothed the ill feeling which vetoes and other Presidential actions have aroused.

The homely, pleasant scene, the friendly words uttered by Senator VANDENBERG to Mr. Truman and the equally friendly words of the President in response, are bound to send many Members home from the adjournment of Congress with the consciousness that they and he, after all, are laboring to serve the state according to their lights. This soothes the keen edge of partisan controversy, even though the effect be only temporary.

There was, of course, a master showman behind the scenes. No Senator, daring the President to resume his old seat, was the impresario. The man to whom the agreeable idea occurred was Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, secretary to the Senate minority, and a friend of rare devotion to the President—devotion which dates from Mr. Truman's first appearance in the Senate from Missouri.

For some years Mr. Biffle has employed the luncheon hour at the Capitol to bring together political notables of both parties and others, but mostly Senators, with the faith that men who come to know each other work more constructively on common problems. It was he who first suggested to the President, after Mr. Truman left the Capitol for the White House, that there was no good reason why he should not return occasionally to "visit," as country folk say, with his former colleagues. The President agreed and acted on the suggestion once or twice, out of which grew yesterday's great idea.

STAGING THE IMPROMPTU

Mr. Biffle had asked the other guests, after getting the President's acceptance to the luncheon yesterday, and was gazing out of the window when the thought came to him. He proposed it to the actor designed to be principal in the kindly drama and got Mr. Truman's consent. Then Mr. Biffle carefully arranged matters so that nothing of the impromptu color of the surprise visit would be lost.

It was necessary to a good show that a certain number of people be prepared for the breaking of every Senate precedent and the writing of a new chapter in executive-legislative history. But it was also necessary that the show give off no odor of grease paint. Mr. Biffle, therefore, kept his secret from the press and public. One result was that two groups of tourists, after briefly inspecting the droning Senate from the galleries, left a few minutes before the President appeared. Doubtless they are today the most chagrined citizens of the United States.

Mr. Biffle, a slender man of great sagacity and firmness, and yet as friendly as every gesture he makes, came to Washington in 1913 as "patronage." The late Senator Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas, gave him one of the Capitol jobs assigned to that member, a humble clerkship in the folding room. But the youth's talents, projected by unceasing industry and instinctive loyalty, soon brought him to the attention of the entire Senate. He became indispensable to the minority in the 1920's, and when the Democrats became the majority in 1933 Mr. Biffle was elected Secretary to the majority of the Senate. He served in that capacity until he succeeded the late Col. Edwin A. Halsey as Secretary of the Senate in February 1945. On the change in the political complexion of the Senate caused by the 1946 elections, it was decided he should have an office called Executive Director of the Democratic Policy Committee, with ample quarters and facilities. The Republicans, with whom he is as popular as the Democrats, were glad to agree.

MR. BIFFLE'S DUTIES

In this niche Mr. Biffle is even more important in some respects than when he was Secretary of the Senate. His work as professional whip of the Democrats—a Senator always holds the amateur title—has become more consequential, because, with the narrow margin of the Republican majority, an alert Democratic whip may upset it at any time, as Mr. Biffle has demonstrated. His intimate relations with the President, who relies on his counsel in many matters, bring to his office Republicans as well as Democrats with questions and requests that involve the White House.

To all who come on legitimate errands Mr. Biffle is helpful, his only reservations being two: He will attempt nothing that even possibly might conflict with the interests of his party in Congress, especially in the Senate; and he will not listen to a proposal or a request for White House assistance which he thinks would have an adverse effect on the President, though unintended. Despite this, and also despite the schism between administration and antiadministration Democrats in the Senate, Mr. Biffle has the goodwill and strong liking of every member of that branch as well as of hundreds of others in Washington.

Shrewdness, tact, and the good taste of which tact is a part are strong constituents in Mr. Biffle's make-up. This was shown again yesterday when the Republican leadership of the Senate was represented at the luncheon by Senator WHITE, the titular leader, Senator VANDENBERG, and Senator WHERRY. The distinguished co-leader, Senator TAFT, was not there because of the feeling that has grown up between him and the President. Mr. Biffle, though he is on the best of terms with Mr. TAFT, made sure that nothing would mar the day of good feeling.

Compensation of Letter Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Letter Carriers' Due" from the New York Herald Tribune of July 20, 1947, and an editorial entitled "A Matter of Justice" from the Daily Mirror of New York of July 22, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 20, 1947]

THE LETTER CARRIERS' DUE

Postmaster Generals come and go according to the exigencies of politics, and so still does a sizable proportion of postmasters, but the great mass of the Department's employees came under the status of civil servants and make a career of their jobs. Thus it is that for promptitude and accuracy of delivery our mails have no serious rival the world over.

Nevertheless, in their case Uncle Sam has never been too generous an employer. He demands of his mail carriers and postal clerks a high degree of literacy, also hard work and for wages and security privileges which are hardly commensurate with his demands. And they may not strike for better treatment; their only recourse is to public sympathy and to its reflection in Congress.

This newspaper has consistently supported their modest requests over the years and does so now in the form of the Langer-Chavez bill which has been on the calendar of the Senate since mid-May and the companion Stevenson measure in the House. These bills would liberalize the retirement pay of letter carriers after 30 or more years of service by adding $6 to their present weekly pension of $23, providing for the first time for widows' and survivors' benefits, and for an annuity increase for active carriers who will retire. The present maximum annuity, set in 1930, is $1,200, which, one can agree with a recent correspondent, forces retired employees "to seek light employment to augment their earnings during their twilight years." To finance the cost of a pension increase of 20 percent the proposed legislation would step up pay-roll deductions into the retirement fund from 5 to 6 percent. The Government, according to careful computation, would lose nothing.

Decency and fairness, it seems to us, require that this legislation be passed before Congress adjourns on July 26.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of July 22, 1947]

A MATTER OF JUSTICE

We've always tried to give help to the mailmen because we believe they are about the highest type of public servant developed in this country, the hardest working, and the closest in their contacts with the people.

They are the men and women who have made the United States postal service the best the world.

They are not highly paid. Only a year ago, they won the first pay increase that had been granted them in 20 years. We are happy to have had a part in winning the approval of that increase.

The mailmen cannot strike. They cannot engage in political activity. They can only request measures to improve their condition.

One such request won the approval of the House yesterday. It is a modest request for the liberalization of retirement. It would add $6 to the present $23 weekly pension. It would provide for widows' and survivors' benefits. It would be financed by increasing retirement deductions from 5 to 6 percent. It would represent little or no additional expense to the Government.

In addition, it would open up new jobs for veterans and others in the service by permitting the retirement of men who now simply cannot afford to quit.

The legislation represents only elementary justice to our best public servants. It should be accorded full congressional approval and sent to the White House as finished business.

The People Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an

editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch commenting on the great decision of the United States Supreme Court in the tidelands oil case. It is entitled "The People Win." The Court's decision is truly a victory for the people. But it is also a victory for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch itself, a great crusading newspaper, which has done so much to prevent the despoliation of the public domain.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE WIN

The Supreme Court's decision upholding the right of the United States Government to tidelands oil is a victory for national defense. Justice Black's majority opinion is a stinging rebuke to would-be despoilers of the public domain.

This last great reserve of national fighting oil would have been turned over to private exploiters by the State governments of California, Texas, and Louisiana, to be drained as fast and wastefully as they chose, if the supporters of legislation quitclaiming the Federal right to it had had their way.

The quitclaim legislation was intended to head off judicial decision of a suit which the Department of Justice filed in the Supreme Court in October of 1945 in behalf of the Interior Department, asserting Federal ownership of the mineral rights in the lands from low tide 3 miles seaward. It was pressed upon Congress with an array of extravagant arguments.

The quitclaimers contended that State ownership of the tidelands had already been upheld by at least 52 court decisions, including the Supreme Court. They asserted that if the Federal Government could take over tidelands oil in the Interior suit it could also take over, among other things, New York Harbor, much of lower Manhattan, the built-up Chicago lake front, the more than one-half of downtown Boston that consists of reclaimed land, the coal beds under the Ohio River in West Virginia, and the San Francisco waterfront up to the Russ Building.

The Supreme Court's decision shows the falseness of the claim that the issue had already been decided by the court, and the falsity of the claim that Federal ownership will extend to all those other items will be demonstrated by the simple fact that it won't.

The proper people should be ashamed of this attempt to mislead the officials of 48 States into sponsoring a greedy grab of a vital national resource in the mistaken notion that they were protecting their rights. And there are plenty of people who have every right to be embarrassed by their roles in this affair.

There are the attorneys general of 41 States who let themselves be duped by the three States really involved. Only the attorneys general of Missouri, Washington, Arizona, and Georgia refused to be gulled into going along with selfish legislation which in no way concerned them.

There are the National Association of Attorneys General, the policy committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the board of managers of the Council of State Governments, which passed resolutions in favor of the grab.

There were Governors Green, of Illinois, Hildreth, of Maine, and the late Walter S. Goodland, of Wisconsin, and former Goveronor Kerr, of Oklahoma, who let themselves be made cat's-paws.

There are Senators MCCARRAN, KNOWLAND, and MOORE, and Representatives HINSHAW and HÉBERT, who spearheaded the quitclaim bill. There are the 108 Representatives and the 88 Senators who voted the quitclaim bill and were saved by President Truman's veto from giving away the Government's right to a resource which its security requires.

"It is difficult," said the State government of California at the time, "to conceive that all of these responsible public officials have been duped * * * into defending an issue which concerns only California—and oil." It is not only difficult to believe, it is necessary to believe, in the light of the Supreme Court decision.

We trust also that the lesson of tidelands oil will not be lost upon Edwin W. Pauley, the California oil man who benefits from State exploitation of tidelands oil and who used his influence as a crony of President Truman to try to shenanigan the quitclaim bill through Congress.

We trust that it will be clear to all others who seek to thwart the prerogatives of the Supreme Court by legislative lobby, including the advocates of legislation to exempt railroads and insurance companies from the operation of the antitrust laws. In its widest implication, the tidelands oil case is a victory for the principle of judicial, not legislative decisions of lawsuits.

Alabama Electric Cooperative, Gantt, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Maury A. McWilliams, president of the Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc., to Hon. Claude E. Wickard, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, under date of June 7, 1947, in behalf of the REA loan to the Alabama Electric Cooperative for the construction of a steam generating plant at Gantt, Ala., together with a copy of a telegram sent to me by Hon. Gordon Persons, president of the Alabama Public Service Commission, under date of June 9, 1947, containing information with reference to the same matters.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALABAMA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Andalusia, Ala., June 7, 1947.

Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKARD: At the request of the Senators from Alabama and Florida and Congressmen GRANT, SIKES, and HOBB: I am submitting to you this additional information and justification for the construction of a steam generating plant by the Alabama Electric Cooperative at Gantt, Ala.

Our cooperative and the other cooperatives receiving service from the Alabama Power Co. have known for some time that the power-supply situation has been very insecure. We have known that the Alabama Power Co. did not have sufficient assured generating capacity to carry its own peak loads without relying on outside help. We also knew from bitter personal experience that when it was a low-water year, as it was in 1941, the Alabama Power Co. had to call upon our cooperative to curtail the use of its power.

You will certainly appreciate that no one is as dependent upon a stable and reliable source of power as the farmer whose farm is electrified. A farmer is not merely inconvenienced when he is denied the power he needs but he may actually be ruined financially. I am sure that I do not have to detail for you the various ways in which a shortage of power can be disastrous to the farmer. You will, therefore, appreciate our great concern that this cooperative be made secure in the knowledge that it will at all times have sufficient power to meet the needs of its consumers and not have to fear that a certain power company may, as it has in the past, find itself short of power and decide to favor other consumers as against the cooperative, or may have to curtail everyone's use of electricity.

As I have stated, we, in this area, have been aware of the inadequacy of the Alabama Power Co.'s generating capacity for some time and I fear that we have taken for granted that others were aware of the situation, so that we have not brought it sharply to your attention, as perhaps we should have. We have, therefore, gone to the records of the Alabama Public Service Commission to study the testimony given by the officials of the Alabama Power Co. in support of that company's application for permission to build a new 120,000-kilowatt steam generating plant at Gadsden, Ala. We shall later in this letter detail some of our findings, but they can be summarized as follows:

The Alabama Power Co. is short of reliable generating capacity. Under any but the most favorable conditions, it will require outside help to meet the power demands upon its system. The new company plant will not materially change this situation, since the company expects a load growth that will exceed the capacity of the new plant by the time that plant is placed in operation. The company testified, and we agree with that testimony, that to be secure it must have sufficient generating capacity of its own, since it can call upon others for help only when the others have surplus power available and, therefore, may not be able to get the help when it is needed. There is, then, an existing shortage of power in our area. The new plant of the Alabama Power Co. will not cure that shortage and the only way in which our cooperative can be made secure as to its power needs is for it to construct the proposed plant at Gantt, Ala.

In detailing the testimony and statistics which establish the above findings, I should first like to quote Mr. Robinson, vice president in charge of operations of the Alabama Power Co., on the question of the necessity of a supplier having adequate capacity in its own system:

"But as I say we must look out, we must take care of ourselves. Each of these companies in the group start out on the same basis. * * * Well, each one of them is taking care of its own situation."

"We will then have this tight spot in 1949, unless we and the other companies provide for it and each one of them takes its own share of the burden and nobody leans on anybody, except as you can use the surpluses at a saving."

We have no quarrel with this statement. We think it represents sound policy. On the other hand, let us examine the adequacy of the generating system of the Alabama Power Co. to meet the demands upon it. Item 2 of the supplemental data furnished by the Alabama Power Co. to the Alabama Public Service Commission at the latter's request in connection with the company's application for permission to build the Gadsden plant shows that the net total generating capacity of the Alabama Power Co. is 683,360 kilowatts. This includes units more than 30 years old and which can be operated only for short periods. It also includes all of the hydro installations, which depend, of course, upon water conditions for their actual output. Item 2 also

shows that the Alabama Power Co.'s own estimate of its actual operating capacity is only 409,260 kilowatts. This, Mr. Wickard, is from the statistics furnished by the Alabama Power Co. In exhibit II of the Alabama Power Co. filed with the Alabama Public Service Commission we find that the peak demand, as estimated by the company itself, for 1946 through 1949 is as follows:

	Kilowatts
1946	577,000
1947	651,000
1948	695,000
1949	730,000

You will, therefore, see that from their own statistics and estimates the Alabama Power Co. has established the fact that it was, in 1946, and will be thereafter, short of actual operating generating capacity to meet the demand upon its system. The new installation of 120,000 kilowatts will not correct that situation, since, as shown above, the power company anticipates an increase of 153,000 kilowatts in its load by 1949.

What would happen to our cooperative in a low-water year, or when one of the 60,000-kilowatt units of the company was down, or some of its old units were down?

I have discussed the question of power supply with Mr. Gordon Persons, president of the Alabama Public Service Commission, and he has assured me that in his mind there is no doubt but that the Alabama Power Co. is short of the necessary generating capacity to carry its load by itself and that the commission had approved the company's application for permission to build the new plant at Gadsden on the basis of the company's clear showing of need for that plant. He further informed me that he had discussed the problem with Mr. Gordon Clapp, Director of TVA, and that Mr. Clapp had confirmed the fact that there was real need for the plant. This plant will not, however, solve the problem of adequate power supply insofar as the Alabama Electric Cooperative is concerned. The company completely disregarded the needs of the cooperatives to be served by the Alabama Electric Cooperative in making its showing of its need for the new plant. In fact, Mr. Robinson minimized the entire plan for the cooperative's plant and the power it would release to the company, by saying, "Well, I am not too familiar with the plant, but I guess they would serve five or six more co-ops in addition to the Alabama Water Service Territory * * * we will say six or seven thousand kilowatts, something like that."

We thus have the situation where the Alabama Electric Co. already has an overloaded generating system and is installing less additional capacity than is needed to take care of only the expected load growth between the present time and the time the new plant is operating.

Furthermore, Mr. Wickard, many of the generating units of the Alabama Power Co. are very old units. For example, there are two 2,500-kilowatt units in the company's Montgomery plant which were installed in 1911. There are two 5,000 kilowatt-units in the company's Gadsden plant which were installed in 1913. There are two units of 20,000 kilowatts and 30,000 kilowatts in the company's Gorgas No. 1 plant which were installed in 1917 and 1918, respectively. Many of the hydro units are also very old. Add to these facts that in a low-water year only a fraction of the hydro capacity is available and you will see how insecure any customer of the Alabama Power Co. must feel with respect to the reliability of his power supply—and how much more insecure we would feel, with our firm commitments to others to furnish them with power. We do not want, we cannot afford to have, that type of insecurity.

Also, Mr. Wickard, any insecurity which we feel will be reflected in similar feelings by our consumers. It is quite possible that, when they consider the over-all inadequacy of the Alabama Power Co.'s generating system and the antagonistic and shabby manner in which that company has treated our cooperative in the past, some of our most important consumers will try to make other arrangements for their power—unless we are assured our power needs by having our own source. Should they do so, repayment of the Government's loan to us would be seriously jeopardized. This must not be permitted to happen.

Although it has already been brought to your attention, because reliability of service is so important to us, I should like to remind you of the fact that in 1941 the Alabama Power Co. called upon the cooperatives to curtail their use of power; and only this past May 8 the company asked this cooperative to reduce its demand at the Samson substation to 1,000 kilowatts, despite the fact that the company has delivered to the cooperative as much as 5,000 kilowatts over this connection.

Mr. Wickard, we believe that the record is clear beyond any reasonable doubt. There is a power shortage on the Alabama Power Co.'s system. New generating capacity is needed over and above the company's proposed plant at Gadsden. To insure reliable service to our cooperative, an additional source of power must be obtained. We are already generating much of the power that we use. We are convinced, therefore, that from every engineering, business, and policy consideration, the only way for us to handle this power shortage situation is to install our proposed steam plant in Gantt, Ala.

In further connection with this, may we again quote the Alabama Power Co. in its sworn testimony before the Alabama Public Service Commission to demonstrate the advisability of having the cooperative served from a plant located at Gantt, Ala.:

"President PERSONS. But the plant in your load center is more desirable from an operating standpoint?

"Mr. ROBINSON. Of course. We have the peak load in the Anniston and Gadsden area and, over and above any cost consideration, it is worth a great deal to have the better service assurance that you have with the plant right there rather than at Gorgas or in some other distant point where you are subject to transmission line interruptions."

Not even the Alabama Power Co., I presume, would contend seriously that different engineering rules apply to power company systems than to cooperative systems. If it is advantageous to a power company to locate its plant in its load center, certainly it is just as advantageous to a cooperative to locate its plant in its load center. That is what we are proposing to do.

Mr. Wickard, we have already in previous presentations to you, discussed the many other compelling reasons why the cooperative should build this plant and we do not wish to belabor those points. We do, however, want to take this opportunity to remind you that the Alabama Power Co. sat back for more than 2 years after the Alabama Electric Cooperative purchased the system of the Alabama Water Service Co. without making any serious move to help us solve our power problems. Not until after a costly and extensive engineering survey was made by the cooperative and an allocation was made by the REA for the construction of the steam plant at Gantt did the Alabama Power Co. make any new proposal. Yet its proposal, even if sincere, would not result in lower power costs for the cooperative. In fact, whatever advantage in cost would exist would favor the cooperative's steam plant. In addition, the Alabama Power Co. has merely talked about its new rate to distribution cooperatives. Months have passed since the original proposal, but the company has taken no step to have the rate approved by the Alabama Public Service Commission nor has it even worked out the terms of the contract which would cover this rate. We seriously question the sincerity of the company with respect to that proposed rate. There are cooperatives in Alabama which are ready to sign contracts with the Alabama Power Co. covering that new rate and which have asked the company for contracts to execute, but the company has not offered them such contracts. This is merely part of the entire pattern of delay, delay, delay which the Alabama Power Co. has followed from the beginning. Always they are "too late with too little." They are interested only in preventing the construction of the cooperative's plant in order to maintain their monopolistic position in the generation of power and they care not at all about the fact that the best interests of the cooperative and its consumers would be served only through its own plant.

Don't you, therefore, think, Mr. Wickard, that we have waited long enough? The power situation in our area becomes more critical daily. The correction of that situation cannot be an overnight task. The longer we delay, the more serious will be the consequences. We earnestly submit that there has already been too much of this delay and that in all fairness to the Alabama Electric Cooperative, and to the distribution cooperatives and other consumers that it serves, we should immediately be granted the right to move ahead.

In our previous letter to you, we set forth in some detail the various other considerations for the construction of the steam plant at Gantt and we shall not burden the record further by repeating those considerations. We want you to know, however, that we are fully appreciative of the rules and restrictions under which you must operate. You have made it completely clear as to when you can and when you cannot approve a loan for generating facilities. It is our firm conviction that our case meets every requirement of established REA policy and that every consideration dictates the construction of the plant.

Summarizing some of these considerations, we find that:

1. There is a power shortage on the Alabama Power Co.'s system insofar as actual operating and reliable capacity is concerned.

2. The company's proposed new plant at Gadsden will not relieve that shortage, since the new plant will have a capacity of only 120,000 kilowatts, whereas the company anticipates an increase of 153,000 kilowatts in its load by 1949.

3. The cooperative's plant would not only solve the cooperative's own power problems, but it would also help relieve the power shortage in that entire area of Alabama.

4. The company has failed, for months, to take any affirmative steps to place in operation the new rate that it is publicizing.

5. The proposed new rate, even if finally made operative—which we question—will not result in lower costs to the distribution cooperatives than would the cooperative's proposed plant at Gantt.

6. The proposed cooperative plant would be at the load center of the cooperative, and not many miles away, as are the company's plants—a distinct and definite advantage in insuring reliability of service.

7. The proposed cooperative plant would result in our having a complete and integrated system giving the greatest possible assurance of adequate and reliable service.

8. At the end of the amortization period, the cooperative would own, free from debt, a valuable generating system. This, added to the lower cost of generated, as against purchased, power, makes the cooperative's plan much more attractive, businesswise, than the company's plan.

9. The Alabama Power Co. has been one of the leaders in the fight against REA-financed cooperatives. Its treatment of us has been particularly shabby. If we had to rely upon them for our power needs we would constantly fear for both our costs and

reliability of service. We cannot live and prosper under the constant threat of this Damocles sword.

10. All of our plans have been made—and those plans received REA approval. REA is committed to this loan.

11. When the studies were made and REA approval was given, the advantage was clearly with the cooperative's plan—and it still is. Even if the company is sincere about its proposed new rate, this would merely reduce the savings of generated power.

12. Our situation has been made critical by the delays which have been forced upon us. Immediate action is imperative. The cooperative's generating plant must be constructed without further delay.

We urge you, therefore, to permit us to proceed immediately so that we may know once and for all that the only satisfactory solution of our power difficulties is at hand.

Respectfully yours,

MAURY A. MCWILLIAMS,
President.

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *June 9, 1947.*

Senator LISTER HILL:

I have your wire with reference to Alabama Power Co. At formal hearing on December 23, 1946, President Thomas W. Martin, of the Alabama Power Co., testified that company's load was increasing far more than anticipated and that construction of 120,000 kilowatt steam plant at Gadsden was vitally necessary. In 1946, according to annual return, Alabama Power Co. purchased 376,261,630 kilowatt-hours from Tennessee Valley Authority. As president of Alabama Public Service Commission I refused to sign order approving construction of Alabama Power Co.'s Gadsden steam plant until Mr. Martin was able to furnish me with full facts showing absolute need for this particular plant to partially satisfy their own requirements. Also was assured by Mr. Gordon Clapp, General Manager of TVA, that TVA would probably have to curtail sale of power to Alabama Power Co. due to their own heavy requirements, and this would, of course, further aggravate Alabama Power Co.'s anticipated shortage. I recommend construction of cooperative's Gantt steam plant, as I am positive that it and all other power sources in State are urgently needed for present and future requirements. Territory of Alabama Power Co. and Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc., are clearly defined and there is no overlapping therefore, construction of cooperative's steam plant will not in any way be a duplication of generating facilities. This commission has no knowledge of any 7-mill wholesale rate to cooperative and we have not received petition for approval of such rate. If further information is needed please do not hesitate to call on me.

GORDON PERSONS,
President, Alabama Public Service Commission.

Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the subject of the concentration of monopoly power in America, by A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, published in the Railroad Trainmen for July 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONOPOLY—CONCENTRATION OF MONOPOLY POWER IN AMERICA NOW AT ITS PEAK

In answer to a recent editorial published in the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, which stated that "the only business monopolies in the United States today are the public utilities," President A. F. Whitney of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen wrote the following to the editor of the Plain Dealer:

Editor Plain Dealer, SIR: An editorial published in the May 13 issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer asserts "the only business monopolies in the United States today are the public utilities."

Just whom, Mr. Editor, are you trying to kid?

On May 21, Mr. Wendell Berge, who resigned on May 1 as head of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, said "The concentration of monopoly power in American industry now stands at the greatest peak in history."

On the same day, Berge described the N. A. M.-sponsored campaign to hound labor unions as a red herring to divert public attention from the real menace—the growing concentration of business monopoly.

"Insufficient funds and insufficient personnel," the former trust buster charged, are making enforcement of the antitrust laws "woefully inadequate."

The Federal Trade Commission recently said the growing concentration of economic power in the United States constitutes today's greatest domestic challenge to the American theory of competitive enterprise.

In April 1947, the United States Government opening its attack on illegal monopoly in the railroad field, said that the conspiracy here has created the most far-reaching concentration of monopoly power thus far known to the law.

The Government action was brought against the Association of American Railroads, the Western Association of Railway Executives, 47 railroads, operating practically all the railroad mileage west of the Mississippi River, the New York banking firm of J. P. Morgan Co., Inc., and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and 89 individuals, who participated in the unlawful combination and conspiracy as directors or officers of railroads or as officials or agents of organizations formed by the railroads.

The Department of Justice stated that this conspiracy served the purpose of nonrailroad interests as well as some of the railroads, emphasizing that alliances between the defendants' private government and dominant groups in the oil, steel, cement, and other industries have perpetuated the economic status quo by imposing restraints upon trade and commerce in both transportation and basic industry.

Attorney General Clark said in Boston last fall that the monopoly tax paid by housewives, storekeepers, and even small manufacturers runs into billions of dollars a year. This, he said, is money which could have bought more radios and clothing, automobiles and housing. Many times it is money which could have bought food.

American monopolists, through their tie-ups with German cartels, helped to precipitate the last war. Cartels created a set of world-encircling economic governments, each based on a commodity or field of science.

No business monopolies? The N. A. M., whom the Plain Dealer customarily lauds, has said so through advertisements which it paid the Plain Dealer money to publish. Yet, the N. A. M. itself elected as its president in 1945 Mr. Ira Mosher, who had been indicted for violating the laws "guaranteeing free competitive enterprise." Mosher came to the N. A. M. from the American Optical Co., which he had served as general manager and through which a system of business monopoly price control was created designed to hold the price of spectacle frames at an exorbitantly high level.

Did the Plain Dealer say there is no monopoly in aluminum? It was just a year ago that the aluminum cartel was cracked by the Reynolds Metals Co.

What about the stranglehold which Standard Oil maintained on the development of buna synthetic rubber even after Pearl Harbor?

Standard had concluded a cartel deal with I. G. Farben of Nazi Germany to control the development and use of buna. Mr. Frank Howard, president of Standard Oil Development Co., made this statement about its tie-up with Hitler's industrialists:

"War does not abrogate contracts of this kind; it only suspends them."

In a consent decree, Standard Oil finally agreed to break its contract with I. G. Farben, but it did so only under heavy Government pressure.

No business monopolies today? The writer of your editorial would do well to read Darel McConkey's "Out of Your Pocket" and get the facts. Or read the report of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee (79th Con.).

No business monopolies? Whom are you trying to kid?

A. F. WHITNEY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Call to Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD what I call "A Call to Action," a speech that was delivered by me at the Roosevelt Hotel a few nights ago.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CALL TO ACTION

Mr. President, because I was twice attorney general and twice Governor of North Dakota before I was elected Senator over the unscrupulous opposition of the old gang predatory political machines I feel it my bounden duty, in these most perilous hours, to call the people to action.

If you millions of plain, everyday folks were in one vast auditorium, ready to embark on a fight to protect your own and your children's interests, I would speak to you thus:

PEOPLE OF AMERICA

People of America, we are facing a national election. On the one side are your political enemies, those who believe in vast aggregations of wealth and monopoly, in a continuation of the old system where the farmer and laboring man get just enough to exist, and the small businessman is almost no more; on the other side are you, the miner, the factory worker, the farmer, and the laborer, whom these autocratic, powerful monopolists wish to keep on robbing. These predatory, sinister interests are again already engaged in trying to array the farmers against the laborers, the laborers against the farmers, and dividing both the farmers and

the laborers into organizations where they even fight each other; in arousing the passions of one class against the other, in the continuation of prejudice against American citizens because of race, color, or creed.

These monopolists and cartelists who divided the business of the world before the war and were responsible for the low wages, the starvation farm prices, and farm foreclosures, are once again conniving to dominate the economic world, now that the war is over The international banker, the members of infamous cartels, the new war-made millionaires, all these disciples of greed and avarice are determined by electing the next President of the United States to gain a deadly strangle hold upon the lives of the people.

Through a pliant tool in the White House whom they hope to elect while your minds are occupied by the struggle to stretch your income to meet the present high cost of living, they plan to make certain that they continue to rule your lives. Abolition of the electoral college and direct nomination through the primary system and election by popular vote of the President of the United States must be our first fight.

Unless you wake up you will find yourselves helpless. As of today millions of soldier boys and possibly any girl in World War II who trusted you to preserve democracy at home, while hundreds upon thousands lost their lives or came back blind, insane, or maimed, now find no hope for a return to the way of life they left to fight for the preservation of America and its freedom. There are no homes, no decent jobs for the majority of returned veterans. Grand promises of assistance and preferential consideration have been almost completely forgotten by those who made the promises—but the veteran has not forgotten. Shall we look to the new crop of millionaires created by World War II to rehabilitate them or shall we do this job ourselves?

My friends, our enemies are organized. They know neither race, color, nor creed. They are interested in money and profits and in ruling you. To them the word "democracy" is a joke. To them a Republican or a Democrat or a Socialist is all right if he plays their game. They know neither East, West, North, nor South, except to array one against the other.

They have proven that party affiliations mean nothing to them. You, by voting for non-partisan candidates for school boards, township officers, mayors, and governors, have proven that you have the power now to go one step further and vote men into the offices of President and Vice President on a nonpartisan basis, through the primary system and popular vote.

ORGANIZE YOUR VOTING PRECINCT

It is to rally you to that kind of fight that I address you. Alone, one of you suffering from injustices can do little. United, you can rule America as the Constitution intended the people should rule. The way to do that is by the organization of yourselves. Adopt the slogan "Every man a politician," and organize your voting precinct.

THIS IS HOW

On a day chosen we will ask you leaders in every precinct in America to call a meeting of the people at your home. People of all political faiths, Republicans Democrats, and all others. Let no party lines divide you. There, delegates will be chosen who will meet a week later that the county or parish courthouse. There, delegates will be selected to meet at a State convention, and there delegates will be chosen to meet at a national convention. In no other way can the people, whom our political enemies are attempting to divide and array one against the other, better work out their problems, adopt their own platform, select their own candidates, and emerge unitedly pledged to fight for that platform and for those candidates.

If you Americans pledged yourselves to enter this fight, we would start with a strong nucleus of votes. By secret vote at the national convention of your elected delegates they may select some great labor or farm leader or businessman who today has not even been mentioned, but when they choose one man for President and another for Vice President, you can definitely depend upon the fact that it is your convention, made up of your friends, who are selecting these candidates whom you are pledged to support, and not the parasites who have grown fat and wealthy and powerful through the selection of their candidates to office.

ENLIST, ENLIST

This fight can be successful only if enough of the people enlist in it. This fight will not even get started unless enough of you show that you are determined to take control and organize. If enough of you respond by signing the pledge herein contained, we will go on to a glorious victory. You are not organizing a new party.

You are simply calling a convention in an endeavor to have the people take control of one of the parties now existing. But if you find that the politicians are controlling the present political parties, and that you cannot nominate a liberal friend of the people in one of these party conventions, then the national convention, made up, as I have before said, of your own delegates, representing you, will decide the course to take and which of the parties to support and you can dominate that party which you choose for you have the power because you have the votes.

EXPLOITATION OF THE MANY

If you will take up this battle, America at last will have one political group fighting for America first. You who gave your sons and daughters in the last World War, and not the politicians, will say whether this world is going to continue to be a place of exploitation for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, you and not the politicans will say where there is to be a continuation of discrimination because of race, color, or creed.

ILL-CLAD, ILL-HOUSED, ILL-NOURISHED

Already, although the peace treaties are not yet signed formally ending the last war, we see an attempt to tie this country into commitments which can conceivably send your boys into another shooting war in the very near future. We are witnesses to the fact that America today is the bread basket for a great part of the world. We are attempting to feed and clothe and arm Europe, the Asiatic countries, as well as the nations comprising the South American hemisphere. We see this despite the fact that your taxes remain the same as during the costly days of the recent war, although we all know that wartime taxes on big business were reduced months ago. We see this although one-third of our own people are still undernourished and ill-clad, and ill-housed. We have seen our Government for decades making a ghastly failure at ruling little Puerto Rico, and yet some wish to have us help rule the world. I say that you and not groups of internationally minded should decide.

YOU WILL DECIDE

You, and not the politicians, will decide whether patriotic lovers of America shall run this country, or whether it shall be governed by a horde of bureaucrats, none of whom you elected, and most of whom are seemingly more interested in how much of the taxpayers money and property they can give away to other countries rather than in America. You will never sell America short. To you America will always be first. You and not the politicians will be the political force that will unite the farmer, the laborer, the returned soldier, the small businessman, the miner, the factory worker, and all other patriots into a relentless battle against monopoly, greed, cunning, wicked, cruel avarice, and un-Christian prejudice. Never forget. You have the votes if you will but use them collectively.

YOUR PLEDGE

The pledge we ask you to sign is as follows:

"PLEDGE

"I do hereby promise at a date to be selected by the national committee to call together at my home on the day specified, patriotic men and women who, regardless of race, color, and creed, will pledge themselves to fight the battle of the people.

"Name _____
(Print name)

"Address _____
(Print address)

_____
(Signature)

"Mail to Senator LANGER today."

Sign this pledge and mail it to me, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Washington, D. C., as temporary chairman, together with the names of five of your friends, and if enough of you will do this you will begin one of the most effective battles for the common man ever begun in any nation on this earth. You, if you believe in America's future, sign this pledge that you will organize your precinct immediately, and mail it to me today.

An Un-American Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, last night I delivered an address over the broadcasting facilities of the National Broadcasting Co. on the subject of the business now pending before the Senate, which is the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 150, which is a resolution to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of Senate Resolution 116. As the President pro tempore will recall, this has been the pending business in the Senate since July 17, but it has been impossible to secure action on the motion.

The subject of my address was An Un-American Iron Curtain, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN UN-AMERICAN IRON CURTAIN

At the outset, let us go back for some local political history.

For years Kansas City, Mo., has been disgraced by one of the most ruthless and corrupt political machines that has ever besmirched an American city. In an election in the year 1936, the returns were amazingly lopsided in favor of the candidates sponsored by the Pendergast machine. Maurice Milligan, a courageous and incorruptible United States District Attorney, instituted an investigation with the unrestricted assistance of the FBI. Of course, no help could be expected, and none was forthcoming, from the Pendergast-controlled local law-enforcement agencies. Let it be said to the credit of

the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt that in spite of the support he received from the Pendergast machine all attempts by interested politicians to secure his intervention in their behalf were of no avail. As a result of the crusade of Mr. Milligan and his assistants, 259 persons were indicted and convicted of illegal conduct.

Now let us come to the year 1946, 10 years later. Tom Pendergast was dead. Jim Pendergast, his nephew and protege, had picked up the fallen reins of power, and quietly bided his time to drive the machine back into full control of governmental affairs in Kansas City. The 259 persons who were sentenced to the penitentiary after the 1936 election had served their terms and many had received Presidential pardon. Thanks to the efforts of Mr. Truman, Maurice Milligan had been replaced as District Attorney by Sam Wear, long recognized as an ally of the Pendergast machine.

AND THEN CAME THE PURGE

Roger C. Slaughter, the member of Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri, incurred the displeasure of President Truman because, as a Member of Congress he had opposed some of the measures favored by the President. He had committed the unpardonable sin of thinking for himself. In July, 1946, President Truman called Jim Pendergast to Washington and you may recall he was an overnight guest at the White House. While there, Pendergast received his instructions from the President to oppose the nomination of Roger Slaughter and to support Enos Axtel. President Truman is a dues-paying member of the Pendergast organization, and after he became President he sent his dues by check and wrote Jim Pendergast, "I hope the outfit is still going good." I do not hesitate to call attention to his membership, because the President himself has on several occasions referred to it with pride and satisfaction. Even though Pendergast had previously announced his support of Slaughter, he returned to Kansas City and prepared to carry out the order of the President.

In recent years there have been other attempts by a President to purge Members of Congress. But never has a President resorted solely to a political machine to carry out his purge. Other Presidents have had the courage to go directly to the people, but Mr. Truman called for the help of a corrupt political machine, notorious for its ability to produce results.

The President, from personal experience, knew the effectiveness of the Pendergast machine. In 1934, Mr. Truman, then a candidate for the Democratic nomination to the Senate, received a plurality of less than 41,000 votes in the entire State of Missouri. Yet in only four Pendergast wards in Kansas City he was given a reported plurality in excess of 50,000 votes. In those same four Pendergast wards, Mr. Truman's opponent, the late Representative Jack Cochran, one of the most popular men ever to run for public office in Missouri, was credited by the Pendergast vote-counters with receiving only 160 votes.

In 1946, the Pendergast machine again delivered according to plan. Enos Axtell was shown on the reported returns to have been nominated for Democratic candidate for Congress. Shocking anti-Slaughter majorities were returned from the Pendergast precincts, such as 80 votes for Axtell and none for Slaughter, and 145 votes for Axtell and 1 for Slaughter. This was too much even for the people of Kansas City. In the November election, Enos Axtell was defeated by his Republican opponent in a district long regarded as safe for the Democrat candidate.

CLARK RECEIVED REQUESTS FOR INVESTIGATION

What I have related is shocking enough, but what has happened since is even worse. The chief law-enforcing agent of the United States for many months attempted to protect the Pendergast mob from criminal prosecution. Following the primary election, Attorney General Tom Clark received requests from the Kansas City board of election commissioners and the city council of Kansas City that an investigation be made. The Kansas City Star, an independent and crusading newspaper, conducted a thorough and vigorous investigation at its own expense, and uncovered astounding evidence of fraud, corruption, and ghost-voting. All this revealing material was made available to Attorney General Clark. The House of Representatives Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures also made an investigation and turned its evidence over to the Attorney General.

THE HANDS OF THE FBI WERE TIED

On October 11, 1946, the Attorney General directed the FBI to make a preliminary investigation, but in doing so he specifically limited and restricted the FBI so that it could interrogate only the following two classes of persons:

First. Members of the Kansas City election board.

Second. Employees of the Kansas City Star.

These persons were known not to be witnesses of illegal acts and could in the nature of things have only hearsay information. The FBI operates under the direction and supervision of the Attorney General and in complying with the Attorney General's instructions only six witnesses were interviewed. On January 6, 1947, the Attorney General closed his files and instructed the FBI to make no further investigation, for the reason, as he stated, that he had no evidence of Federal crime.

In January of this year I wrote Attorney General Clark and requested a detailed report of what he had done and expected to do to bring to justice those guilty of Federal crime in connection with the election. The Attorney General replied in one letter that the FBI had conducted a lengthy and detailed investigation and in another letter that the FBI had made a full investigation. The replies of the Attorney General were a misrepresentation of known facts, because the investigation by the FBI, in accordance with the instructions received, was limited and restricted to the interview of witnesses who could have only hearsay information.

STATE GRAND JURY

After the Attorney General closed his files a State grand jury was impaneled. This State grand jury returned 81 indictments against 71 individuals. In its investigation it found wrongful, illegal, and wholesale marking of ballots, vote buying, and bribery, and that ballots were cast in large numbers by impersonators. A recount by the State grand jury of some of the ballots revealed miscounts of shocking proportions, and in every case where there was a sizable miscount it was in favor of the candidates backed by the Pendergast machine On May 27, the grand jury made its final report, in which it stated that it believed that Roger Slaughter had been deprived of the nomination for Congress by a fraudulent miscount of votes and by other types of fraud, and strongly urged the United States Department of Justice and the FBI to enter the investigation.

THE BALLOTS ARE STOLEN

Less than 24 hours after the grand jury report was made public, and less than 12 hours before Attorney General Clark was to appear before a Senate subcommittee to explain why he tied the hands of the FBI, the vaults of the election board were blown open with dynamite and the ballots from 32 of the worst precincts were stolen. Those ballots have not been recovered, and there have been no arrests.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL IS GUILTY OF DERELICTION OF DUTY

Attorney General Clark testified that no evidence of a Federal crime could be found in the material furnished him. This is a shocking statement because since then a Federal grand jury has returned indictments against five persons. I have previously stated it and now repeat, that until Tom Clark was forced into reluctant action by the Senate investigation, he was doing everything possible to whitewash this sordid affair.

The President recently asked for, and Congress authorized, the expenditure of $400,000,000 of the taxpayer's money to guarantee free elections in Greece and Turkey. Is it now out of order to ask Mr. Truman what he intends to do to guarantee free elections in his own community?

For over a week, the able and determined Republican leadership in the Senate has tried to have the resolution calling for a full investigation of the inaction of the Attorney General brought to a vote in the Senate. The Democrats immediately came to the Administration's rescue with a filibuster. The Republicans fought desperately all last night, but the rules of the Senate made it impossible to prevent a small clique from thwarting the people's will as shown by a majority in the Senate.

The vital issues are clean elections and fair and impartial enforcement of the criminal laws without regard to political advantage. If the Attorney General is innocent of the charges made against him and has nothing to hide, he is entitled to, and no fair-minded man will deny him, a triumphant vindication as the result of a complete investigation. I challenge the Truman administration to raise this un-American iron curtain and let the people know the facts.

Immigration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent, able, and thought-provoking article on why we must modernize our immigration policy by Mr. Stanley High.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WE MUST MODERNIZE OUR IMMIGRATION POLICY

(By Stanley High)

In justice to ourselves, in fairness to our increasing immigrants, the United States urgently needs a new immigration policy to be based on three common-sense principles:

First. The number of immigrants should be determined by, and periodically adjusted to, our economic needs.

Second. Immigrants should be selected individually for skills and capacities that match our requirements.

Third. We should require that immigrants be distributed geographically and occupationally in conformity with our needs.

Until that is our policy, the growing antagonism toward all immigrants is not likely to abate; efforts to furnish haven for more of Europe's refugees will probably continue to be blocked; many of the advantages which

should accrue to America from its rising immigration stream will continue to be dissipated.

The number of legal immigrants entering the United States for permanent residence is now running at the rate of about 130,000 a year and growing. We are receiving seven times the number of the early 1930's. Many more are entering illegally, by forged documents, border jumping, as ship deserters. Last year the immigration authorities actually apprehended more than 150,000 such illegal entrants—twice as many as in the previous year.

Back of the increasing thousands who are finding refuge and opportunity in the United States are millions more—14,000,000 from Italy alone, says an Associated Press dispatch to the New York Times—who would come here if they could In most European countries the waiting lists for a place among the annual quotas are full from 2 to 10 years ahead. Of the 850,000 homeless victims of the war in displaced-persons camps in Europe, a vast majority want to come to the United States. More than 200,000 Poles from our occupation zone have already applied. Enough people in Greece want to come to fill the quota until 1997.

For determining which among these millions we will admit, our present immigration laws—in striking contrast to those of every other important immigration-receiving country—permit scarcely any selectivity at all. The law enacted in 1924 fixes the annual total of quota immigration at 154,000. It fixes the total which annually can come from each country. But it is selective only in such elementary matters as illiteracy, criminal records, confessed leanings toward violent revolution, and outright pauperism. Aside from contagious disease, there is at present no examination adequate to determine an immigrant's physical fitness as a prospective American. Such insurance should be a minimum requirement.

In regard to the immigrant's ability to support himself, he has merely to satisfy the consul, sometimes with faked affidavits, that he will not become a public charge. He is not required to have a job in prospect or a place of residence. The immigrant's skills and adaptability—or his lack of them—in no wise affect his eligibility. As to whether or not the immigrant believes in the violent overthrow of our institutions, the American consul is generally obliged to take his word for it. It is largely a matter of first come, first served.

This lack of selectivity in large measure accounts for the antagonisms which have arisen against refugees in the United States and against proposals to admit more. Up to this year, from both the Nazi and the Communist terrors, we admitted 300,000 refugees—many times the number admitted by any other nation. About 1,600 more are still coming in each month. The cost of their transportation is sometimes borne by themselves, but more often by individuals and organizations in the United States.

To find a permanent solution for the tragic and worsening problem of displaced persons is an inescapable international responsibility—the most pressing moral problem left by the war. Last January, President Truman addressed an earnest plea to Congress to authorize the United States to do its full part, within the framework of our existing immigration laws. Many Members of Congress, who earnestly want to succor war victims, hesitate to do so because our immigration laws permit so little selectivity. In the best interest of both the United States and the refugees, say these Members of Congress, we should take not only our numerical proportion of the 850,000 but also our share of those whose skills and adaptabilities make them likely Americans. There is a great shortage here, for example, of farm hands and domestics. Under our present laws no such selection can be made. Out of 108,721 immigrants admitted last year, the total of farmers and farm laborers was only 1,136. There were only 2,464 domestics—a 2-percent result.

Nor is there any way whereby those who do come can be directed into areas where their talents can be most usefully employed. Certain sections of the United States are in dire need of doctors. In some States there is only one doctor for every 1,500 people, in some counties only one for every 10,000. Between 1933 and 1944 we admitted more than 5,000 refugee doctors. Most of these settled where they were least needed. Fifty-five percent of them remained in New York State, which in 1940 had one doctor to every 597 persons—more than any other State in the Union.

According to the report made in Germany last year by George Meader, chief counsel for the Senate Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, there are, among the remaining displaced persons, a substantial number of undesirables. "These persons," Mr. Meader reported, "do not desire to work, but expect to be cared for, and complain when things are not as well done as they think they should be. It is doubtful that any country would desire these people as immigrants." Mr. Meader's conclusions have been supported by other investigators. Under the present law our numerical share of the remaining refugees is almost certain to include a disproportionately large number of these undesirables.

That prospect, unfortunate both for America and for the immigrants who will suffer from consequent antagonisms, is made more probable by the fact that other immigration-receiving nations propose to accept none but the more desirable.

Despite Great Britain's acute shortage of manpower, the basic British immigration policy, stated in March 1946, is that "an alien may be given leave to land only if he proposes to enter the employment of a particular employer and produces a permit in writing for his engagement issued to that employer by the Minister of Labor."

Since 1931 Canada—admittedly in need of increased population—has had its doors virtually barred against all save British and American immigration. Exception was made at the close of the war to admit 3,000 Polish war veterans, hand-picked by special examiners sent to Europe for that purpose. In addition to the usual requirements, it was specified that each applicant be unmarried and willing to work as a farm hand for 2 years at $45 a month. On reaching Canada he is directed to a farm job. For 2 years he remains on probation. If at the end of that time he can against pass muster, he has the right to remain permanently.

The Canadian Government recently announced its intention to accept an unspecified number of refugees. The number will be determined by a survey now under way to find out how many refugee openings are in prospect in various Canadian industries and occupations. When that study is complete selection officers will go to Europe to choose specific refugees for specific occupations in specific places.

Australia and New Zealand are proceeding with equal caution. Argentina plans to admit at least 50,000 immigrants each year for the next 5 years. But they will be selected to meet Argentina's need for farmers, fishermen, and industrial technicians. They will be sent, on arrival, to specific jobs which they will be required to keep for 2 years.

Brazil's planned immigration, which calls for the admission of 35,000 immigrants this year, is specifically aimed "to promote the opening up of the country." Eighty percent of the immigrants must be farmers and farm workers. The government will direct them to designated farming areas. Each immigrant must remain in the business of farming for at least 4 years.

Because of the emotions involved and the pressures invariably unloosed, Members of Congress regard immigration legislation as an explosive issue to be avoided whenever possible. Last year, however, the House of Representatives developed sufficient concern to authorize its Immigration Committee to make a study of the problem—the first study of its kind in more than 20 years.

After holding hearings in eight cities and collecting 1,500 pages of printed testimony, the committee concluded that our laws are in general need of overhauling. But it prudently recommended that specific measures to overhaul them be postponed until a committee of experts makes a further study. That committee, to date, has not been authorized.

Members of Congress in the present session have dropped some 35 immigration bills into the legislative hopper. One would admit close to a million refugees. Another would admit no one so long as the number of unemployed persons in the United States is 100 or more. No bill in Congress goes to the root of the problem and offers an immigration policy in which immigrants will be selected on the basis of our requirements and absorptive capacities.

Early in May, in outlining Canada's post-war immigration policy, Prime Minister King declared: "I wish to make it quite clear that Canada is perfectly within her rights in selecting persons whom we regard as desirable future citizens. It is not a fundamental human right of any alien to enter Canada. It is a privilege."

We are in need of legislators who, for our own and our immigrants' good, can declare such a principle for America and undertake to write it into law.

Democratic Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Democratic Folly," from this morning's New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC FOLLY

The record of the Republican Party in Congress has its weak spots as well as its solid achievements in execution of its election pledges. None of its mistakes, however, can compare with the fantastic folly of the Democrats in blocking, by one subterfuge after another, an investigation of the Department of Justice's relation to the Kansas City voting frauds of 1946.

The charges which have been on the floor of the Senate are not pleasant ones. Senator KEM, one of the two Republicans representing the State of Missouri in the upper Chamber, asserted that the Attorney General "tied the hands of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and whitewashed the whole incident." The prima facie evidences of fraud in the election are strong. When a grand jury, called for a recount, thugs broke into a steel vault in the Jackson County Courthouse and carried away incriminating ballots, records, poll books, and toll sheets of the August 1946

Democratic primary. President Truman was at the time staying at the Hotel Muehlebach, a few blocks away. The best comment he could find to make was that the case should be "carried through to its logical conclusion."

If the Democrats wanted to plead guilty in advance of trial, they could hardly do better than use the tactics of suppression which they have done. All they have accomplished in a parliamentary sense is to postpone action until 1948. For the country and Congress will insist that such a gross scandal, affecting the integrity of the Congress itself, cannot be brushed into a corner. It must and it will be investigated to the limit, let the guilt fall where it may.

The New Day and a New Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, while we were in Switzerland, Mrs. Thomas and I were guests of Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, at Caux. On the 17th of July, Dr. Buchman delivered an address to the representatives of many countries who were at Caux. Because of its universal interest, I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Caux is the answer to crisis. All the world wants an answer. We have reached the moment when, unless we find an answer and bring it quickly to the world, not just one nation but all nations will be overwhelmed. Too long we have breathed an atmosphere of problems. We move from conference to conference but give up hope of a fundamental solution. We are cynical of success yet we have become slaves of our defeats personally and nationally.

Nations desire the fruits of an answer without having the answer. We want production, prosperity, world organization, a united Europe, and a new national life but we do not go to the root of the matter. You cannot continue to cry crisis without providing an adequate answer. The habit of crisis breeds the habit of apathy. We must lift people to a new level, out of the fogs of fear and the bogs of bitterness where today humanity founders.

Nations fail because they try desperately to combat moral apathy with economic plans. Economic break-down walks as a black specter through the heart of every statesman and citizen. Yet material crisis may obscure the real crisis from us, for people do not recognize material break-down as the moral breakdown that underlies it and so they do not know how to cure it. Until we deal with human nature thoroughly and drastically on a national scale, nations must still follow their historic road to violence and destruction. The problem is not just an iron curtain which separates nation from nation, but steely selfishness which separates man from man, and all men from the government of God. When men listen to God and obey, steel and iron melt away.

A generation ago a group of men gripped by a materialist ideology decided to capture the world with it. They gave their lives to that task. For 25 years they have worked every hour, sleeping, waking, ceaselessly, skillfully, ruthlessly, on a world front. Suddenly statesmen of democratic nations have awakened and they rub their eyes as they see what is happening, a world force of materialism has penetrated every nation, infiltrated their schools and industries, invaded their offices and government departments, influenced their families and colleagues, even themselves. At last they realize the imminence of crisis. They perceive the colossal progress of organized materialism in its march toward world chaos and control.

"Why," they ask, "are we in this situation? How did it come about?" The reason is simple, while many slept and others busied themselves with their own affairs, materialists have been working out their revolution with philosophy, passion and plan. What is the answer? A generation ago the force of moral rearmament began fighting too on a world front. It has been answering a plan with a plan, an idea with an idea, militant godless materialism with a militant inspired ideology for democracy. The idea caught hold. It remade men and infiltrated nation after nation. Now it girdles the globe.

Today at this MRA assembly at Caux we see this force in action with an answer available for service. At a time when statesmen realize the lateness of the hour it freely offers the fruit of 25 years of toil. It is a force in the war of ideas with training and experience which under God can equip statesmen and ordinary men with an ideology adequate to remake nations now. This new message goes out from Caux to a stricken world. An answer has been found. It has been given legs and is on the march. Here at Caux we are reaching the end of an age of crisis and pioneering an era of cure.

Take a great world problem today: The production of coal. Test this answer. Britain must produce more coal or, as Cabinet Ministers say, the midnight hour will strike for her. This week the coal industry announces that the output of coal nationally is considerably short of the target set by the Government. But where miners have been trained at Caux and in coal fields where the MRA drama, The Forgotten Factor, has been shown there is a different picture. In one mine the 6-day target was reached in 4½ days. In another the target was passed so often that miners asked for the target to be raised. Absenteeism, too, was affected. Reports from one area say that absenteeism has dropped in 12 months from 20 percent to 3 percent. Paper plans will never raise production. Only new men working together in a new spirit with the fire of an ideology will raise production, build teamwork springing from happy homes, and set nations on the path to recovery.

Test the answer again. A great Indian labor leader was with me at Caux last week end. He told of two problems that dogged India, racial bitterness and class bitterness. We saw no solution. After one day he told me he had seen the answer. He says, "Moral rearmament is the answer, because moral apathy is the problem. I have seen here a way of life without tragedy. As I make this way my own life I can be effective, I can make others effective. This is our chance. One of us can make many. Thousands can make millions. The world can be saved from tragedy." His words are a key to the statesmanship that can save the world. He shows us where to begin because MRA is for everyone everywhere. Human nature can be changed. That is the fruit of the answer. World history can be changed. That is the destiny of our age.

Let's be honest and face facts. A new conference is no answer to a false philosophy. A new theory is no answer to a militant ideology. Plans fail for lack of inspired people to work them. Yet we multiply plans. Caux produces inspired people who will make plans work.

A statesman came to Caux, the president of the board of trade of his nation. For years his life has been governed by a hatred of the British so powerful he had sworn never to speak English again. He was involved in incidents which brought his country to a crisis that in his words could very easily have led to civil war. He spoke English as he told us, "I have experienced myself how that hatred which at times used to flash to white heat can be removed in an instant through my willingness, though I did not know or believe in God, to learn his miracle-working power." He learned the secret that honest apology leads to honest peace. Civil war was averted. Change in this statesman and the guidance of God turned him from being a divisive element in the nation to a pioneer of teamwork and taught him to live effectively for other races as well as his own.

Change of heart. Inspired statesmanship. The answer to hate and division. Is that the answer we are all seeking? MRA offers the world and the statesmen of the world a force trained and on the march that has the answer to individual and national selfishness. It is a chance for everyone everywhere to step today into the fresh dimension of a new age. It is not theory but a way of life tested and tried in every circumstance. It is a force that has the power to save and re-create a society on the brink of collapse. On his return from the Antarctic, Admiral Byrd summed up his own conviction about MRA, "I want to say with all the emphasis at my command that it gives you the chance you have been looking for to go into action to save civilization." Men born again are bringing renaissance to nations. Industry with this force of MRA at its heart will produce enough for the needs of all. Homes with this force in everyday life will secure the next generation from chaos. Armies with this force will give new standards of moral training to their nations. Cabinets and diplomats with this force will be totally effective for they will have the power to turn their enemies into friends. Europe will arise from sleep and the defeat of apathy and disillusionment. This is the only possible hope for world reconstruction. "Men must be governed by God or they will be ruled by tyrants," said that great American, Willian Penn.

This is the new day and a new way.

Railroad Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the pressure on me, urging my support of S. 249, as amended by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] has been terrific, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, statements sent out by Henry W. Harrison, chairman, special stockholders committee, National Conference of Railroad Investors, together with a form by which contributions may be made for the purpose of carrying on the efforts of this group of lobbyists.

I do not question the right of these people to urge action by Members of

Congress, and included in these statements is one by Mr. Harrison, giving the names of those who should be contacted. While this may be perfectly proper, it illustrates the pressure exerted by the lobby operating in behalf of those who have secured the stock at almost nothing to get the comparatively few who have held their stock through the years to join in the effort to undo the work of reorganization under the bankruptcy law over the past 12 or 14 years in the courts.

In my opinion, the sponsors of this move desire to control railroads under their new plan of reorganization. To illustrate, I had a letter from a very small stockholder in which she stated:

I have been requested to write you this letter but I do not understand what it is all about.

Her letter to me was the result of these communications.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL STOCKHOLDERS COMMITTEE,
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF R. R. INVESTORS,
New York, N. Y., July 9, 1947.

FELLOW ROCK ISLAND STOCKHOLDER: You will be glad to know that there is an excellent chance of passing a reorganization bill at this session of Congress, which will not only protect our stocks from being wiped out but will, in addition, increase the value of their equity.

We invite your careful consideration to the enclosed progress report. We wish to emphasize the following points:

1. The general provisions of the present bill are more favorable to stockholders than the bill passed a year ago but vetoed by the President.

2. The provision for reducing interest on the old outstanding bonds during the 12 or more years these roads have been in bankruptcy will greatly increase the stockholders' equity in these properties.

3. We are confident the President will sign the bill if it is passed by Congress.

4. We feel sure Congress will pass the bill if every stockholder does his full part in the way of using his personal influence with his Senators and Representatives, and if he contributes his pro rata share toward expenses so that we can continue our work during the critical weeks ahead.

Accordingly, if you have not sold your stock, we are counting on your support, and trust that we may hear from you by return mail.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY W. HARRISON,
Chairman, Special Stockholders Committee.

HARRY W. HARRISON,
Chairman,
New York, N. Y.:

I enclose check for ------ as my subscription toward defraying expenses connected with legislation which will protect my railroad stock in reorganization. It is understood that the funds shall be used exclusively for this purpose and any unused portion shall be returned.

I hold ------ shares of stock in railroads now in reorganization and my subscription is computed as follows:

------ shares at 5 cents per share, $------
Plus flat service fee, $1.
Check enclosed for total of $------.
Name----------
Address----------

Checks should be made payable to Harry W. Harrison, chairman, and mailed to suite 1110, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, chairman of the Senate committee which decides on what bills may be considered at this session of Congress, has stated that he doubts whether the Reed railroad reorganization bill can be brought up for vote on the floor of the Senate before Congress adjourns. This would be a calamity because the New Haven, Missouri Pacific, and Rock Island reorganizations probably will be completed, and their stockholders wiped out, before Congress reconvenes in January 1948. Therefore, if the Reed bill is not passed at this session of Congress it will, in all probability, be too late for Congress to enact legislation which will protect our stocks.

However, Senator TAFT stated that the door is not closed, but implied that the members of his committee believe there is not sufficient public interest in this bill to entitle it to the priority necessary for passage at this time.

The members of the committee are Senators ROBERT A. TAFT, chairman, of Ohio; C. WAYLAND BROOKS, of Illinois; GUY CORDON, of Oregon; HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan; ALBERT W. HAWKES, of New Jersey; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado; KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska; and WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., of Maine.

Please immediately telegraph or write to each of these Senators and explain to them that only through passage of the Reed railroad reorganization bill at this session of Congress can your stock investment be protected. Tell them what the loss of your stock investment would mean to you and your family. Tell them that the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has reported the bill favorably, and it is now ready for vote on the floor of the Senate. Urge them to have the bill brought up for action on the floor of the Senate at the earliest possible date—and, in any case, before this session of Congress adjourns.

Also urge your own Senators and Representatives to see the members of Senator TAFT's committee and urge their prompt and favorable action.

HARRY W. HARRISON,
Chairman, Special Stockholders Committee.

Mr. Truman's Homesickness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am sure we were all impressed by the visit of the President of the United States to this Chamber the other day. The Philadelphia Bulletin yesterday published an editorial which I really think should be read by every Member of the Senate. In the closing words of the editorial, the Bulletin had this to say:

That his visit was a spur-of-the-moment affair, without showmanship, is the best testimony to the spirit that motivates the President. Here is evidence of a human touch and an understanding which are still all too rare.

Despite his high place, the man from Missouri is still one with those of us who occasionally long to sit again for a little while at an old and carved school desk.

I ask that the entire editorial be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TRUMAN'S HOMESICKNESS

Of the 11 Senators who have become Presidents of the United States, Harry S. Truman is the first to go back, even for a brief visit, and occupy his old seat.

His return was without formality, but not without nostalgia. The President confessed he was a bit homesick for his old associations: that 10 of the happiest years of his life had been spent in the Senate.

Such a feeling will be understood by millions who enjoy going back to the scenes of happy experiences. Perhaps the reason the other 10 Senator-Presidents didn't return is that they lacked the depth of feeling enjoyed by Mr. Truman.

That his visit was a spur-of-the-moment affair, without showmanship, is the best testimonial to the spirit that motivates the President. Here is evidence of a human touch and an understanding which are all too rare.

Despite his high place, the man from Missouri is still one with those of us who occasionally long to sit again for a little while at an old and carved school desk.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Forty-ninth State" from the Dayton, Ohio, News of July 6, 1947; an editorial entitled "Hawaii's Good Americans," from the Pasadena (Calif.) Star-News of July 1, 1947; an editorial entitled "A New Star for Old Glory?" from the New York Herald Tribune of July 4, 1947; an editorial entitled "Case for Hawaii," from the Dallas (Tex.) News of July 3, 1947; and an editorial entitled "Hawaiian Statehood Bill," from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 3, 1947.

I wish also at this time to express the hope to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands that very early in the next session hearings will be held on the statehood-for-Hawaii bill.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dayton (Ohio) News of July 6, 1947]

FORTY-NINTH STATE

Admission of Hawaii to the Union as the forty-ninth State is forecast by the House approval of a bill to that end by a substantial and bipartisan majority. Though the measure may not come to a vote in the Senate before next year, it is supported by Democratic and Republican leaders, as well as by President Truman, and now appears to be on the way to enactment.

The Hawaiian Islands, "the cross roads of the Pacific," were annexed to our Republic 49 years ago, their people heartily assenting,

and in 1900 were given a Territorial government, with a promise of statehood as soon as they should be qualified for it. In the judgment of a congressional committee which has studied the question at first-hand on the islands themselves, that time has come. The survey shows that Hawaii's present population of 519,000 exceeds that of either New Mexico or Arizona when they were admitted as the forty-seventh and forty-eighth States, respectively, in 1912; that it pays the Federal Treasury more taxes than do 14 of the States; and that its expenditures for public education are proportionately much larger than those of many of the States.

One of the opposition arguments in the House debate dwelt on the fact that nearly a third of Hawaii's inhabitants are of Japanese ancestry. The reply was that the vast majority of these Japanese proved loyal to America throughout the war, that they "were given a clean bill of health" by the military authorities and the FBI, and that 7,000 of them entered the armed services. Another opposition argument, that Hawaii is 2,100 miles across the ocean from our nearest mainland, has little weight as against air transport schedules and modern communication facilities. The fact is, Honolulu is nearer to San Francisco than San Francisco is to Washington, D. C. In view of our vital interests and increased responsibilities in the Pacific, Hawaii has an importance greater than ever before.

[From the Pasadena (Calif.) Star-News of July 1, 1947]

HAWAII'S GOOD AMERICANS

Only a few years ago there was strong opposition to every proposal that Hawaii be admitted to the Union. Probably a big majority of the people in the United States were opposed to it, and certainly a majority of Californians were.

It is different today when the news comes that the House of Representatives has voted to make Hawaii a State. Pearl Harbor and what came afterward have changed the attitude of a great many Americans toward the islanders. In spite of the fact that they are a racial mixture with Orental stock predominating, Hawaiians, in the test of war proved themselves as American as the inhabitants of continental United States.

If there had been disloyalty among any racial group in Hawaii the chance to show it was after Pearl Harbor when the United States Navy was crippled, the Japanese probably could have taken Hawaii and the way laid open for the enemy to attack the Pacific coast of the United States.

The FBI found no evidence of disloyalty by any Hawaiian of Japanese blood who was born under the United States flag. As soon as their services would be accepted the young men of the islands, including those of Japanese stock, flocked to the colors and fought gallantly for America.

Americans of Hawaii paid war taxes, bought war bonds and did war work. They were 100 percent in the war for their country the same as the rest of the American people. They are Americans and belong in the Union.

The movement for Hawaiian statehood dates back almost a century. The islands were annexed to the United States in 1898. Hawaii was made a Territory in 1900. Fifteen editions for statehood have been presented to Congress. Twenty-eight bills granting statehood have been introduced in Congress. The President has recommended statehood. The people of Hawaii voted for it in a plebiscite. Hawaii has the population and the resources to justify statehood. Action by the Senate will assure it. And the approach of July 4, Independence Day, is a fitting occasion to grant these Americans self-government.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 4, 1947]

A NEW STAR FOR OLD GLORY

The House of Representatives has approved by 196 votes to 133 the bill giving statehood to the Territory of Hawaii. Now the issue is up to the Senate, but a crowded calendar will delay a vote until next year, and it would take a year or so after that for statehood to become a reality. Anyone can understand the aspirations of Hawaiians to be brought integrally into our great Union after 47 years of probationary status. The long wait seems no better characterized than by the islanders' own word for their spirit of leisure—"mahope," which means "tomorrow, let it go until later, there's no sense rushing."

Can the legitimate claims of Hawaii to statehood be much longer denied? Here is a problem to which Americans as a whole have given little thought; 101 Members of the House did not vote the other day, and they might easily have upset the majority of 63 by which the bill got through.

Shall the United States in its great tradition of encouraging self-government among dependent peoples neglect this opportunity to set an example of democracy in the Pacific that might give new strength to democratic elements in Japan, Korea, and China? Mindful on this Fourth of July of its own birth cry, "No taxation without representation," shall this Nation perpetuate that condition in Hawaii, whose people pay Federal taxes but cannot vote for a President, and must accept a federally appointed Governor?

Would not Hawaii, a crucible of racial tolerance, be a fitting addition to a Nation founded on that very principle but still striving to perfect it? Has not the Territory proved its loyalty, demonstrated its economic and social stability? Not one act of sabotage was committeed against the United States by a resident of Hawaii during the war. Its 160,000 persons of Japanese ancestry—all but 35,000 of whom are American citizens—maintained allegiance to our flag; 18,000 of Hawaii's Japanese-American sons fought in the war with distinction.

Or will we set a bad precedent by extending the United States beyond its continental limits? Will the statehood clamor now increase from Puerto Rico and Alaska? Have we something to fear from Japanese-American Senators and Representatives coming to Washington, if they are so elected? Is Hawaii's polyglot populations really unassimilable into the Union? Or have we forgotten so soon our own roots in other lands? These are grave questions, honest doubts. The Nation must soon decide.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News of July 3, 1947]

CASE FOR HAWAII

Hawaii's long-cherished ambition of statehood got a big boost from the lower House in its approval Monday. If the Senate of the Eightieth Congress acts favorably, the flag makers can try to solve the difficult problem of placing with geometrical precision 49 stars on the blue field of the corner of Old Glory.

With us, Hawaii should be a case of put up or shut up. Denying all claims to imperial status, we still have retained on Territorial basis a country that merged its independent kingdom voluntarily in the Union 49 years ago. It has suffered for us and fought with us. Simple justice and a sound theory of fair play urge admission now.

The American babyhood of the 20 islands was passed in an era when Americans, flush with the easy victory over Spain's decadent naval power in 1898, spoke of manifest destiny without catching the vision that might have gone along with it. Hawaii furnished a ready example for Pacific hegemony that might have been developed with profit both to ourselves and the thousands of land dots that make up Oceania. Had we viewed Hawaii as a stepping stone to governmental relations with these isolated insular areas, long before this the Pacific might have been developed under the American flag. Japan's hideous dream of expansion by force majeur might never have developed into its costly reality.

Size and population and economic limitations make impractical the maintenance of many thousands of separate political units. On the other hand small islands lend themselves admirably to the development of localized governments resembling municipalities or counties, larger ones like Hawaii to statehood. A benign imperialism might have cultivated the Pacific toward ideal government, guaranteeing the civil rights of its populations and furnishing trade advantageous to all concerned. It is far too late to realize now on that dream. Hawaii, State or Territory, is not a gateway but an outpost.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 3, 1947]

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD BILL

The Territory of Hawaii has long worked for statehood. Back in the nineties it repeatedly sought annexation, finally becoming a part of the United States in 1900. Since then it has made consistent progress in agriculture, its educational system, its territorial government and institutions. It has merited the right to be included among the sovereign States of the Union.

Often considered only as the land of the lei, aloha, and grass skirts, Hawaii is actually a thriving country. Its somewhat conglomerate population, largely of Japanese descent, proved itself during the war a most loyal part of the American family. It has a major sugar industry and is a strategic outpost in the Pacific.

Not only in recognition of Hawaii's development and United States fealty does it seem entitled to statehood. It would be hard-headed statesmanship to link Hawaii even more intimately with Washington. Granting it full rights not only will bind it closer but afford practical evidence that the United States practices the creed of self-determination and equal government for all members of its family.

The measure before Congress is not the first petition for Hawaiian statehood. But it is the first ever to have come to a vote in either Chamber. The House has approved the bill. It now goes to the Senate, where it will probably not get to ballot before 1948. We believe the Senate should make Hawaii the forty-ninth star in the American flag.

Peacetime Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at the next session of Congress we shall very likely be studying the question of universal military training. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the last Gallup poll on the subject.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—SAMPLE SURVEY FINDS NATION 4 TO 1 FOR PEACETIME TRAINING

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., July 24.—As Congress prepares to adjourn, two major pieces of

business that have wide public support remain unfinished.

One is legislation to raise minimum wages. The other is the peacetime military training bill.

If the country were to vote today in an official referendum on peacetime military training, the results would be as follows on the basis of the estimated 61,000,000 eligible voters at the time of the last Presidential election: 45,700,000 voters in favor; 11,000,000 voters opposed; 4,300,000 not voting.

That reflects the results of the latest institute survey on military training—an unofficial sampling referendum among the voters in all 48 States. A cross section, scientifically selected to represent all walks of life, was interviewed on the following:

In the future, do you think every physically fit young man (who has not already been in the armed forces) should be required to take military or naval training for 1 year?

The vote:	Percent
Yes	75
No	18
No opinion	7

Experience has shown that sampling referendums such as this are subject to error that rarely exceeds 3 to 4 percentage points.

If a national referendum had been held on the military training issue at any period in the last 4½ years, it would have resulted in a vote something like 2 to 1 in favor. Twelve surveys by the institute since December 1942 have found that only twice has the percentage in favor been as low as 63 percent, with the average around 70 percent.

These poll results form a substantial body of evidence to illustrate the general unreliability of letters to Congressmen as an index of public opinion.

Congressmen and Senators have received many letters opposing military training just as they did in 1940 when the selective service bill was pending. In the summer of 1940, 14 Senators alone received 30,000 letters on the selective service bill. An analysis published in the Public Opinion Quarterly showed that 90 percent of those letters were against the bill, 10 percent in favor—or a ratio of 9 to 1 against selective service.

But when polls were conducted among a scientific cross section of the population by the institute, it was found that 68 percent were in favor of the bill, while 27 percent were opposed and 5 percent had no opinion.

In short, Congress in 1940 was hearing almost entirely from the 27 percent who opposed the bill, and today it is hearing from the 18 percent who oppose peacetime military training.

(The Washington Post poll found, in June of this year, that 76 percent of Washingtonians favored universal military training during peacetime. Only 20 percent of local residents expressed opposition and the remaining 4 percent were undecided.

(In an earlier survey, in November 1945, the Washington Post poll recorded an overwhelming majority of 82 percent of local residents—more than 4 out of every 5—in favor of universal military training. At that time, just after the war's end, 7 percent more Washingtonians approved the plan than did the country as a whole.)

It was also said in 1940 that President Roosevelt would suffer a great loss in the Presidential election of that year because the selective service bill was adopted. Irate mothers were supposed to take it out of the hide of the Democratic Party. But analysis of political trends, as shown in impartial polls, fails to show that adoption of selective service had any material effect on the outcome of the 1940 election.

In today's survey a special question was added in order to be able to single out the men and women in the population who have a son or a brother between the ages of 15 and 20.

It was found that such people are as likely to be in favor of peacetime military training as anybody else, in spite of having a blood relative of draft age or soon to be of draft age. The vote for this group was 77 percent in favor, 19 percent opposed, and 4 percent without opinion.

Preparedness and protection for the future are the chief reasons given by people in favor of the peacetime draft. Next is a belief that a year's military training is "good discipline" for a young man. Third: People say that in the current difficulties with Russia we should take steps to assure ourselves of sufficient military manpower.

REASONS FOR OPPOSITION

Those opposed to peacetime training say that it is not necessary, that we should be able to accumulate a force of sufficient size by enlistment. The second objection raised, the poll finds, is that military training makes for war-mongering and war-mindedness. The third is that because of the atom bomb we no longer need big armies, and the fourth objection is that peacetime training disrupts a young man's educational plans.

One thing the survey brings out is that endorsement of peacetime training is uniformly high in all major population groups. There are no striking differences by age, amount of education, geographical section, sex, or party.

Certain labor-union leaders have opposed the peacetime training bill. But today's survey finds an overwhelming approval of such training among the rank and file of union members questioned in the sample.

The vote by groups follows:

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	Percent	Percent
By age:			
21 to 29	75	19	6
30 to 49	75	18	7
50 and over	74	18	8
By sex:			
Men	74	20	6
Women	76	16	8
By education:			
College	72	23	5
High school	78	17	5
Grade or no school	71	17	12
By party:			
Democrats	76	16	8
Republicans	75	20	5
By section:			
New England and Middle Atlantic	74	18	8
East Central	73	20	7
West Central	72	20	8
South	80	14	6
Far west	73	20	7

Among labor-union members polled, the vote is 75 percent in favor, 19 percent opposed, and 6 percent undecided.

National School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an outline of the work of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, consisting of excerpts from reports of State school-lunch chairmen of State congresses, and other data pointing to the need for the program and increased Federal grants.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OUTLINE OF THE WORK OF THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS AND A BREAK-DOWN OF BENEFITS TO THE SEPARATE STATES

NATIONAL SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM—EXCERPTS FROM REPORTS OF STATE SCHOOL-LUNCH CHAIRMEN OF STATE CONGRESSES AND OTHER DATA POINTING UP NEED FOR THE PROGRAM AND INCREASED FEDERAL GRANTS

1. Schools in many States were compelled to discontinue their lunch programs because of insufficient Federal funds to assist in carrying their programs to the end of the school year.

Minnesota reports: "When the April 15 deadline was reached, the State Department of Education was not in a position to know whether additional Federal moneys were to be made available, so 27 percent of the school-lunch programs were discontinued. Unfortunately, the program closed down in most instances were those we particularly wanted to continue because of the nutritional needs of the children. The shutting down of these programs affected approximately 35,000 children, mostly in rural areas."

South Carolina reports: "We were obliged, in March, to close the lunch programs in 150 rural schools due to lack of Federal funds. Because the deficiency funds came too late and because school-lunch workers had already taken other jobs for the summer, they could not open up again for the short period before the close of school. Therefore, South Carolina has had to turn back some of the Federal funds for lunches, even though these funds were desperately needed."

2. In school districts where the program was continued and where it become necessary to increase the prices of the lunches, the number of children who could afford to pay for them was greatly reduced.

North Carolina reports: "Our State school-lunch program was considerably curtailed due to inadequate Federal grant. The majority of the school-lunch projects continued to serve lunches with an increase in cost to pupils. This price increase meant a large reduction in the number of lunches served. The pupils unable to pay at the increased rate were the children most in need of a well-balanced noon meal."

3. As an alternative to increasing the price, some school districts decreased the quality and the quantity of the lunch.

Idaho reports: "The original allocation to the Idaho school-lunch program was exhausted as of March 1. Many schools that continued serving lunches were obliged to decrease the quantity and the quality of the meal to such an extent that children weren't satisfied and spent their money for candy and soft drinks at neighborhood stores."

Oregon reports: "Some few schools ceased to operate lunch programs but, in the main, they continued by increasing the charge made to the child for the lunch and by using other and more devious means of raising funds to meet the deficit. Unquestionably, the quality of meals suffered and many programs closed their operations in the red."

4. A majority of the States during the past year had to deny the benefits of the program to many new communities that wished to enter it because the Federal appropriation was insufficient not only to allow new schools to enter but to carry the program through the school year in communities already participating.

Michigan reports: "Last December an announcement went to all school administrators stating that no more school-lunch programs could be accepted because the Federal grant was insufficient. Many schools have indicated a desire to join the program and a long list of schools is waiting to join up next fall."

Maryland reports: "More than 200 schools made application to join the program last fall, which had to be denied because Federal funds were not adequate to carry the existing program through the entire school year."

5. If the matching feature is changed, State legislatures, municipalities, and school districts whose budgets are predetermined will be unable to meet the new Federal requirements.

New Mexico reports: "If the Federal Government does not allow the receipts for the sales of lunches as matching money, New Mexico will be without a school-lunch program for the next 2 years because the State legislature does not meet again until 1949."

Idaho reports: "It is essential that the ruling that the money received as payment for the meal cannot be used as part of the matching money be eliminated from the appropriation bill, as Idaho matching from other funds would not be adequate until the State can enact legislation to meet the new requirement."

6. Every report that we received from throughout the Nation shows that the program has been of great benefit to the children in the communities where it operates and has been one of the most popular of the federally assisted programs.

Missouri reports: "I wish that you might take up the reports of the lunchrooms and show them to the ones responsible for setting aside this money for the school-lunch program. Not only is there an increase in attendance at school, better scholastic standing, and improvement in social relations, but it is almost uncanny to read the reports on improved health."

New Jersey reports: "We have made tests in certain schools with undernourished children. At the end of 3 months both weight, mental ability, and general health showed great improvement. This proves to us that it is money well spent."

Wyoming reports: "In a recent survey regarding whether or not school-lunch programs can operate another year if Federal funds were cut, results showed that 64 percent would have to close and 36 percent would try to carry on by raising the prices of lunches and allowing no free meals. Naturally, this would cut down on school lunch participation and eliminate many of those children most in need of a balanced meal. Wyoming transports 13,661 children to school by busses. This represents over 25 percent of all school children in the State. Good noon lunches are important to this group of pupils, many of whom travel distances of 25 miles or more."

All the reports received indicate the need for continuing the school-lunch program and for increasing rather than decreasing the Federal grants. During the past year no State has failed to meet the requirements of the National School Lunch Act and the regulations of the Department of Agriculture. Every State had matched more than the dollar for dollar requirement. The State matching the least spent $1.28 against each Federal dollar received; one State spent $10.68 against each Federal dollar.

Information from the Department of Agriculture shows that $3,000,000 of the $6,000,000 deficiency appropriations will not be spent this year because before the money was made available to the States which had exhausted their funds, the school-lunch programs had been forced to close and were not reopened. Therefore, it is imperative that the appropriation of Federal funds for the coming year be large enough to cover the entire school year.

On the basis of figures submitted by the States and tabulated by the Department of Agriculture with the average national matching of $2.18 for each Federal dollar, an appropriation of $133,500,000 is required to carry the program next year. The appropriation of $75,000,000 granted for this past year proved to be inadequate by $23,000,000 for the program existing as of last fall. If this is not increased, the 3,000,000 additional children which the States report are ready to be included in their programs next year will get nothing.

Compiled by Edna P. Cook (Mrs. Stanley G. Cook), chairman, committee on legislation.

TABLE VI.—*Analysis of funds, national school-lunch program, January 1947, as submitted by State educational agencies*

State	Amount of USDA payments for first 2 quarters [1]	This year's allotment for food assistance [2]	Could have spent during year to satisfy total demands	To satisfy total demands, allotment is—		Total Federal cash expenditure for food assistance, 1946 fiscal year	Peak participation, 1946 fiscal year [3]		Estimated 1947 peak participation with sufficient funds	
				Excessive by	Deficient by		Schools	Children	Schools	Children
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Alabama	$880,388	$2,239,552	$2,367,500		$127,948	$1,900,792	1,004	147,843	1,220	242,000
Arizona	162,682	319,922	609,457		289,535	307,630	144	28,083	180	39,950
Arkansas	797,848	1,507,722	1,412,977	$94,745		1,215,018	752	98,398	1,006	182,227
California*	1,343,794	1,821,718	3,805,830		1,984,112	2,001,916	1,029	163,627	2,069	422,870
Colorado	286,021	473,881	610,141		136,260	334,359	253	28,594	381	41,000
Connecticut	181,410	419,609	600,000		180,391	298,335	232	36,775	375	65,000
Delaware	42,771	75,331	207,500		132,169	190,268	80	13,719	89	16,500
District of Columbia	43,361	200,587	98,561	102,026		54,011	84	12,917	85	16,000
Florida	402,218	903,438	1,537,000		633,562	1,099,052	675	87,894	751	123,200
Georgia*	1,304,164	2,145,520	2,818,434		672,914	2,612,228	1,298	202,228	1,435	243,000
Idaho*	147,219	225,755	355,000		129,245	249,301	185	21,590	261	32,100
Illinois	922,361	2,133,451	3,647,002		1,513,551	2,545,483	1,703	259,283	2,344	358,632
Indiana	595,780	1,183,254	1,750,000		566,746	1,104,676	725	100,240	1,050	177,450
Iowa*	549,901	934,019	1,245,875		311,856	849,651	660	81,156	873	118,584
Kansas	295,342	656,607	612,000	44,607		461,841	458	35,078	620	53,400
Kentucky	826,835	1,916,745	2,420,000		503,255	1,329,697	549	78,619	1,150	165,700
Louisiana	638,667	1,477,261	1,910,000		432,739	1,789,424	1,215	142,570	1,378	210,358
Maine*	161,838	329,637	519,471		189,834	236,155	323	29,771	677	78,676
Maryland*	440,571	644,088	720,000		75,912	337,574	233	37,087	479	91,904
Massachusetts	805,323	1,189,294	1,400,000		210,706	987,904	1,406	182,634	1,770	234,706
Michigan	868,906	1,699,152	2,428,000		728,848	1,633,372	1,119	190,406	1,250	270,000
Minnesota*	718,122	1,079,106	2,138,500		1,059,394	1,122,114	950	114,680	1,657	260,440
Mississippi	903,123	2,088,954	2,000,000	88,954		1,174,055	740	87,472	1,250	175,000
Missouri	665,000	1,407,153	1,650,000		242,847	1,438,037	1,005	115,157	1,400	169,400
Montana*	111,914	183,164	315,000		131,836	170,287	126	13,790	200	45,000
Nebraska	238,391	503,866	491,200	12,666		242,437	347	30,682	593	68,797
Nevada	34,513	39,917	82,018		42,101	47,639	35	3,458	50	5,700
New Hampshire	63,027	206,319	131,969	74,350		110,428	223	17,896	265	21,300
New Jersey	698,325	1,066,165	1,455,000		388,835	908,838	812	107,146	1,021	147,240
New Mexico	174,207	380,888	288,188	92,700		217,067	191	19,673	235	30,100
New York*	2,000,000	2,937,450	5,700,000		2,762,550	3,865,585	2,288	426,586	2,419	480,057
North Carolina*	1,293,700	2,633,003	4,117,687		1,484,684	2,805,066	973	215,017	1,250	320,000
North Dakota	76,197	283,712	183,500	100,212		149,170	400	18,382	628	29,400
Ohio*	1,250,765	2,028,502	2,496,690		468,188	2,149,744	1,079	186,800	1,368	285,801
Oklahoma*	853,226	1,174,247	1,781,895		607,648	1,267,324	1,270	96,640	1,683	143,172
Oregon*	175,028	322,617	909,603		586,986	459,103	360	41,613	479	67,535
Pennsylvania	1,126,069	3,303,016	4,000,000		696,984	1,090,234	1,105	127,872	2,200	500,000
Rhode Island	90,382	209,058	208,550	508		168,685	193	24,283	200	22,966
South Carolina	791,269	1,587,400	1,913,914		326,514	1,920,217	1,609	169,620	1,804	175,870
South Dakota	137,721	299,279	301,188		1,909	184,286	180	12,908	220	18,900
Tennessee*	1,204,736	1,796,084	3,552,000		1,755,916	2,146,693	1,311	152,974	2,525	329,192
Texas*	2,098,920	3,308,282	4,468,716		1,160,434	3,391,298	2,297	251,423	2,650	283,728
Utah*	160,730	292,107	1,284,582		992,475	304,021	242	40,282	510	105,293
Vermont	60,000	141,959	185,000		43,041	91,473	138	11,654	354	28,000
Virginia	842,541	1,493,920	1,744,406		250,486	1,179,070	721	101,906	851	152,848
Washington*	394,078	455,760	1,377,700		921,940	779,256	607	79,927	751	133,000
West Virginia	618,023	1,172,867	1,519,000		346,133	1,022,184	1,117	83,399	1,520	105,520
Wisconsin	589,774	1,128,836	1,383,589		254,753	904,712	1,081	115,891	1,501	175,536
Wyoming*	75,318	104,824	175,000		70,176	147,114	111	11,002	140	14,000
Total	29,142,499	54,124,998	76,929,643	610,768	23,415,413	50,994,824	35,638	4,656,645	49,167	7,477,142

*These States have requested the balance of their allotment for their third quarter grant of funds.

[1] Includes full year's allotment to private schools where handled by PMA State Office.

[2] Includes the direct distribution money in process of transfer ($7,325,000).

[3] Data are for April 1946, the month when total participation was at its peak. (These data include child-care centers.)

National Congress of Parents and Teachers, an organization dedicated to the welfare of children and youth which in the 50 years of its existence has grown to a membership of four and one half million with State congresses in every State in the union. In each State is a school lunch chairman to promote the establishment of school-lunch program—this organization being one of the pioneers in this field.

Background and Work of Senator Malone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the Engineering News-Record dated January 2, 1947, on the background and work of GEORGE W. MALONE, the junior Senator from Nevada, who is the chairman of the Special National Resources Economic Committee studying the effect of the factors affecting production in this country.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RANDOM LINES FROM AN EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK, IN WHICH ARE GIVEN SOME HIGH LIGHTS IN THE CAREER OF GEORGE WILSON MALONE WHO, AS THE ONLY CIVIL ENGINEER IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE, OUGHT TO BECOME A NATIONAL ASSET

One of the victors in the several spirited contests for seats in the United States Senate that enlivened the November election was GEORGE WILSON MALONE, Republican, of Nevada.

Of special interest to the engineering profession is the fact that Senator MALONE is a successful civil and hydraulic engineer of long experience. When he takes his seat upon the opening of the Eightieth Congress this week, he will be the only representative of the profession in the upper House. One civil engineer—Representative CARL HINSHAW, of Pasadena, Calif.—now represents the profession as a Member of the House of Representatives.

It seems particularly appropriate that at a time when plans are under way for an almost unprecedented amount of construction for water power, water supply, irrigation, and flood control there should enter the Senate a man with Mr. MALONE'S experience and qualifications, one who has long been active in the development of important engineering projects in the West.

He entered the University of Nevada in 1914 and proved himself to be not only a good student but a good athlete. He became captain of both the baseball and the football teams, and at that time was also the winner of the amateur middleweight boxing championship of the Pacific coast.

When the United States got into the First World War, MALONE promptly enlisted in the Army and in 1918-19 he served as lieutenant in the Field Artillery in the AEF. Later he was in the regimental intelligence office of the Fortieth Division. After the war he was a major in the One Hundred and Fifteenth Engineers, Nevada National Guard.

STATE ENGINEER OF NEVADA

In 1927 he became State engineer of Nevada, and afterward served on many public bodies, including the State public service commission, the Colorado River Commission, State planning board, and the National Committee on Conservation and Administration of the Public Domain. While carrying on his own engineering and consulting practice, he published a report on resources and industrial uses of power in the Boulder Dam area. He was also adviser to the Secretary of the Interior for construction and sale of power, and he was consulting engineer on the Central Valley water project, now under construction in California.

Since 1937 Mr. MALONE has been managing director of the Industrial West Foundation; and he has recently compiled and published an industrial encyclopedia on the Western Economic Empire, including the 11 Western States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands.

TAKES POSITIVE STAND

During his campaign for election Mr. MALONE, basing his views on his professional background, demanded a positive program of improvements on the fundamental (for the West) issues of water power development and storage, improvement of rangelands, and other matters.

URGES RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

As to power and industry, he thinks:

"We should immediately install our 82,500-kilowatt generator at Boulder Dam, demand a withdrawal privilege for the same percentage of power to be generated at Davis Dam as we secured from Boulder, and make a thorough investigation of ways and means to deliver low-cost power for mining, agricultural, and domestic users to the northern and central areas of our State.

"Possibilities in this line are tremendous, but plans must be made by men of vision and initiative, and pursued with vigor, if Nevada is to realize any benefits.

"It is time that we directed our best thoughts along the lines of utilizing our vast resources for the benefit of our people and raising our living standards through the creation of additional employment, business opportunities, and taxable wealth to help carry out the necessary tax load."

As a Senator from Nevada, Mr. MALONE will be in a position to aid the implementation of some of these ideas for the benefit of his local constituents. And he will also have the broader responsibility of serving the needs of the whole country. In both cases, his engineering training will stand him in good stead, and in both he can measurably add to the stature and influence of the civil engineering profession.—T. D. M.

Importance of Independent Testing, Research, and Inspection Laboratories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, July 16), 1947

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, because of the importance of independent testing, research, and inspection laboratories to the national economy, particularly as applied to small business, I ask unanimous consent, at the request of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories, to have printed in the Appendix a statement issued by that organization, April 15, 1947.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Large corporations have been consistently spending large sums of money for research activities such as these over many years because experience has proved it is profitable to do so. But a majority of the smaller firms have been going on without research plans or programs. Of 100,000 industrial and manufacturing companies in the United States, it is estimated only 2,000 have any research facilities of their own. And yet, in the light of modern competition, research can no longer be regarded as a luxury which the small business cannot afford. Indeed, research is an investment—and a mighty profitable one which the small business cannot afford to disregard.

The war has in itself created demands for improved material, and the stimulation of higher wages has created an increased market for the products of all types of business. Competition for these markets will call for greater efficiency on the part of both personnel and product. Research, testing, and rigid inspection will increasingly be demanded of all types of business establishments. And these developments must be tailored to the particular needs of each one.

Nine out of ten employment-producing ideas in this country over a period of many years have originated in small establishments The open path of new ideas and new leadership from bottom to top and back again must be maintained. Without a steady growth of new business and new employers, together with improved efficiency of existing organizations we shall lack adequate job opportunities.

With limited floor space, estimated to be 1,500,000 square feet, independent laboratories offer a special service to small business enterprises. Without these laboratories small business would be deprived of its major research, testing, and inspection assistance. Collectively these laboratories lead directly toward the objectives of independent research, protection for the independent inventor, and encouragement of new processes and materials which make for a more productive small business economy.

The United States leads the world in technological development in large part because the American way of life and our system of government have allowed room for the individual and his unique contributions.

The maintenance of balance within the framework of our social and economic structure is of primary importance to the commercial laboratories which are taxpaying organizations rendering over $10,000,000 in taxes to the Federal Government over the last 10 years. This balance has been upset by the war. Now that we are emerging from a war economy, thorough consideration must be given to definite ways and means whereby independent research may continue to thrive in terms of facilities, equipment, personnel, orders, and free enterprise.

Until a proper adjustment is made, a proportionate share of governmental aid which has been made available for every other segment of our national economy should be available to the commercial laboratories. This, however, is not viewed as an ultimate objective, which might be nothing better than state socialism, but rather as a step toward the maintenance of conditions of private enterprise where men and ideas that are worth while can survive because of their own individual worth.

This situation involves an improved relation of independent laboratories to large business enterprise and to the Government itself, so that neither will be unfairly competitive with independent research. Particular attention must be given to the so-called nonprofit organizations offering research to

individual business firms on a fee basis without regard to the effect of such business arrangements on the taxpaying independent laboratories.

The research findings of tax-free institutions, every field and at every level, no matter how financed, are in the public domain and should not be handed over privately to an individual firm or organization. This point of view is implicit in the now famous Saratoga Springs water case.

Basic research which aims to project the frontiers of knowledge of fundamental character, irrespective of any specific application, is the fountain head of all technological developments. The American Council of Commercial Laboratories is heartily in favor of increased basic research by industrial laboratories, educational institutions, and the Government. Applied research which draws upon basic research for its sense of direction is the workable form of these fundamental principles as developed by industry.

Funds spent for basic research by the Government and educational institutions feed the technological resources of the Nation and make possible an increase of applied research on a commercial basis. Independent scientific laboratories find their greatest field of activities in industrial or applied research testing and inspection.

It is difficult to believe that until a few weeks ago the Government of the United States had never given any direct recognition of the importance of commercial laboratories. The National Resources Committee in its volume, Research—A National Resource, December 1938, devoted a full section, section 6, to research in American universities and colleges but made no study of independent scientific laboratories which paid enough in taxes to finance several such studies.

We, therefore, recommend to the President's Scientific Research Board that:

1. Additional efforts be made to survey and to publicize the scope and importance of this issue.

2. Encouragement be given to independent scientific laboratories to associate together; to survey their needs in terms of equipment, personnel, contract work from all sources; relation to other scientific associations; and to create for themselves a more clearly defined place in our national economy.

3. Practical measures be taken to continue the political, social, and economic conditions which make for private enterprise without which research cannot continue to be independent.

Who Is Walter S. Steele?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, who is this man Walter S. Steele who was given an open forum by the Committee on Un-American Activities for his savage attacks on decent progressive Americans, and his fantastic Hitlerian charges of "5,000,000 Communists" in the United States?

What is this American Coalition of Patriotic, Civic and Fraternal Societies?

Walter Steele is a prosperous businessman, owner of a big printing plant here, and of a magazine he publishes.

Although America has been very kind to him, somewhere along the way his emotions jumped the track.

He became enamored of the Nazi ideals. He swallowed the Goebbels line, hook and sinker. For more years than I can remember he has been engaged in Red baiting, with all that that implies. Many of you receive his magazine. You can recognize his obsession with racism, with religious prejudices, with hatred of labor unions—though his own shop is organized.

FRIENDS OF DEMOCRACY CALLS HIS NUMBER

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert a brief sketch of Walter S. Steele prepared and issued by Friends of Democracy only yesterday. It seems to me Steele should be the one investigated.

[Friends of Democracy, Inc. For release Friday, July 25, 1947]

Communism in the United States is strengthened, rather than retarded, when the House Committee on Un-American Activities invites a questionable witness like Walter S. Steele of Washington, D. C., to testify on communism, it was charged today (Friday) in a statement by L. M. Birkhead, founder and national director of Friends of Democracy, Inc., which has been combatting the propaganda of American subversives on both the right and the left for more than 10 years.

According to Birkhead, regarded as America's outstanding authority on political extremists of all shades, Steele, who appeared before the committee on Tuesday, and entered 300 pages of testimony, has a long record of close cooperation with Nazi and pro-Fascist elements here and abroad.

Steele, publisher of a magazine called National Republic, made his appearance before the congressional inquiry group as chairman of the National Security Committee of the American Coalition of Patriotic, Civic, and Fraternal Societies

CALLED "FASCIST" BY ARMY

Birkhead said that the National Republic in 1942 was characterized by United States Army Intelligence as a Fascist organization. The Coalition of Societies, according to Birkhead, has approximately 100 member outfits, ranging from genuinely respectable organizations to out-and-out Fascist fronts. Closely linked to native Fascist groups are member organizations such as Harry Jung's American Vigilance Intelligence Federation, the American Indian Federation, and the American Women Against Communism, he charged. Birkhead said that coalition literature has been distributed widely by many pro-Fascists including George Deatherage, indicted for sedition, and Francis Moran, of the Boston, Mass., Christian Front. John Roy Carlson said in Under Cover, "This literature was frequently, if not always, found in the company of outright German propaganda from World Service (Nazi Propaganda Bureau) as well as the propaganda efforts of the indicted seditionists, such as (Robert) Edmonson, (James) True, (William Dudley) Pelley, (Eugene) Sanctuary, etc."

Birkhead said: "Communist activities in the United States must be watched closely and carefully. However, under no circumstances, must we play into the hands of the Communists by viewing communism and Communists through the distorted, irresponsible eyes of a person like Walter S. Steele, who has a long record of close collaboration with Nazi and pro-Fascist elements here and abroad.

ENDORSED NAZI BOOK

"The House Committee on Un-American Activities should realize that communism is strengthened rather than retarded when a person like Steele, who indiscriminately lumps genuine liberals and progressives in the Communist camp, is permitted to give testimony that has only the effect of confusing the American people."

Birkhead revealed that Steele, together with 15 other Americans, including former Congressman Hamilton Fish, endorsed a Nazi-inspired book, printed in Germany and titled, "Communism in Germany." The foreword, signed by Steele, Fish, and the others, said: "Here is a challenging book. It should be read by every citizen, because it presents the history of the life and death struggle Germany has been waging." It was this book which said: "The total contrast to Jewish-Marxist bolshevism is exclusively represented by German national socialism."

Birkhead asserted that Steele is highly regarded in native pro-Fascist circles and has been lauded often by many of the individuals indicted for sedition by the Federal Government in World War II. Steele, in turn, has defended the indicted individuals, a list which included George Sylvester Viereck, convicted Nazi agent; Ralph Townsend, convicted agent of the Japanese Government; and William Dudley Pelley, serving 15 years for sedition.

"Individuals like Steele are dangerous realities," Birkhead said. "Their outward, seeming respectability actually cloaks sinister purposes."

TOO KIND TO STEELE

But actually, Mr. Speaker, Friends of Democracy is almost too kind with the ubiquitous Mr. Steele.

Dr. Birkhead omitted all mention in his release of the difficulties which Steele and his magazine had with the Better Business Bureau in Kansas City. You have to realize that very few of these Red baiters are motivated solely by their inverted patriotism or by their venom. They are out for a profit. They use their Fascist propaganda as a means of putting over their deals.

A fundamentalist "preacher" named Gilbert solicited subscriptions for the National Republic, which Steele calls a magazine of fundamental Americanism. Steele has recommended Reverend Curran as an expert on communism, and defended Father Coughlin and his Christian Front. He regards most progressive, non-Communist Americans as Reds and has collaborated closely with Mrs. Dilling in the publication of patriotic books.

Steele testified before the Dies committee on communism. One of his fund solicitors exploited that testimony, according to the Kansas City, Mo., Better Business Bureau. Its bulletin of October 26, 1942, charged that Steele's representative, V. W. Carrington, in selling subscriptions to National Republic and other patriotic Steele literature to businessmen, also stated that the literature had the approval of Dr. Harold C. Hunt, superintendent of schools. Businessmen could subscribe in the following amounts: $7.50, $22.50, $45, and $75. Subscription to the magazine is $2 a year.

STRIPLING DISOWNED STEELE

According to the Better Business Bureau release, Carrington solicited funds in units of $7.50, each unit to pay for the mailing of Steele's literature to a public-school teacher in the Kansas City system. Dr. Hunt strongly denied authorizing Carrington to use his name, stating that he had only had an interview with the solicitor. Following complaints about Carrington's methods, the Kansas City Police Department investigated. The Bureau report stated:

In a special meeting of the * * * welfare board, October 21, a resolution was passed commending the police department for stopping the unlicensed and unauthorized solicitation.

Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator of the Dies committee, wired the Better Business Bureau on October 14:

There is no connection between this committee and the National Republic of Washington, D. C. No individual or agency is authorized to solicit funds under the pretext that they are aiding the Dies committee.

WHY DID STRIPLING CHANGE?

If Robert Stripling knew of this racket in 1942, why did he bring Walter S. Steele to the public forum of the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947?

In his 1937 testimony before the Dies committee Steele's statements filled 402 pages but less than 7 pages were devoted to the perils of nazism and fascism, though the Nazi panzers rolled into Vienna that very year.

Steele claimed the credit or discredit for bringing about the WPA investigation in 1939. I am informed that he is a close friend of Hiram Ralph Burton, who was counsel for admitted Nazi propagandists in 1934, a former lobbyist for Father Coughlin, counsel for the coalition, and part of the old Ford labor spy network; that Steele and Joe Kamp told Burton who to investigate and what to find during the WPA investigation, and that Steele and Burton were in frequent telephone communication. Steele and Burton, like the Dies committee, accepted Edwin P. Banta, the psychotic, as authentic and reliable. Both Steele and Burton defend and cooperate with Father Coughlin, though Steele seems to be tinged with anti-Catholicism.

PRIVATE GESTAPO SYSTEM

Steele operates his own private Gestapo system. He is reputed to have the largest card file system on what he calls subversives—meaning chiefly progressives and liberals—in America, and sells a phony patriotic service which seems to bear a close resemblance to the industrial blacklist system.

ESCAPED SEDITION INDICTMENT

Though as a sop to the public Steele occasionally has an article in his magazine touching the Nazi war machine, there can be little doubt of his prewar sympathy with Nazi Germany. His office manager, Mrs. Flora Walker, openly expressed her own enthusiasm for the march of the Nazi war machine to several investigators. Some of Steele's close friends and collaborators were even more outspoken in their allegiance to Hitler Germany. Washington police files reveal interesting information linking Burton with surveillance in connection with both German and Japanese espionage activities before Pearl Harbor.

John B. Trevor is president of the "Coalition," which was required by the Senate Committee on Campaign Expenditures in 1944 to file a questionnaire for organizations engaged in political activities within the scope of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. The American Coalition was mentioned as a "factor" in the indictment of 28 persons on charges of seditious conspiracy, although Trevor and Steele and Burton escaped indictment. Nevertheless, the National Republic and Walter Steele are regarded as important cogs in George Sylvester Viereck's plot to keep America out of the war by spreading "the truth as Germans saw it."

This, then, is the Walter S. Steele paraded before the American people as an expert on "un-American" activities. Good God, Mr. Speaker, he should be an expert; he seems to me to have been engaged in them most of his life. Why, Mr. Speaker, why, why is this man not himself under investigation?

Hon. Leo F. Rayfiel to the Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was most happy to learn that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAYFIEL] received the appointment of Federal district judge in Brooklyn. He was a most valued member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and his great background of experience and law contributed much to the deliberations of the committee.

While we are sorry to lose him, he goes to the judiciary with the best wishes of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Real Estate Lobbies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 26, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the President on June 30, 1947, asked that the real-estate lobbies be investigated. He said:

One of the most stubborn obstacles in the way of any constructive housing program has been the opposition of the real-estate lobby. Its members have exerted pressure at every point against every proposal for making the housing program more effective. They have constantly sought to weaken rent control and to do away with necessary aids to housing. They are openly proud of their success in blocking a comprehensive housing program.

This group has sought to achieve financial gains without regard to the damage done to others. It has displayed a ruthless disregard to the public welfare.

It is intolerable that this lobby should be permitted by its brazen operations to block programs so essential to the needs of our citizens. Nothing could be more clearly subversive of representative government. I urge the Congress to make a full investigation of the activities of this selfish and short-sighted group. When the truth is known, I am confident that this obstacle to constructive housing legislation will be removed.

Six weeks before the session began, Boyd Bernard, then president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, told members to "wait for the new Congress on the Capitol steps with a proposal for a cushioned decontrol of rents."

On May 12, after the House had passed the bill opening the way for rent increases and repealing most of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, the association notified members:

We won the first round of rents through the passage of the Wolcott bill. This embodies substantially the program we wanted.

I have introduced a resolution intended to carry out the President's request that the real-estate lobby be investigated.

I had hoped that even at this late hour the Republican leadership of the Eightieth Congress would support this resolution. I intend to reintroduce it the day that Congress reconvenes. I trust that the experience of the Members while they are home will cause them to support the President's request.

The housing problem which the Republican leadership of the Eightieth Congress has seen fit to ignore has become a housing crisis.

Families are living doubled up in one room from one end of the country to the other.

Veterans and their families are living under the most indescribable conditions—in one-room dwellings, basements, trailers, tents, and even chicken coops, and automobiles.

The housing shortage is a catastrophe for millions of American families.

In the face of this tragedy, the Republican leadership of the Eightieth Congress has not only rejected the administration plan for a central housing agency but has scrapped most of the remaining controls on home building and other construction. It has pigeonholed all measures for public housing and even sought to completely strangle the public-housing program by inadequate appropriations for FPHA and impossible regulations which seek to make the FPHA an agency of clerks.

And as a final blow to the American people, the Republican leadership in Congress passed the Wolcott so-called "rent-control" bill which already has brought privation and misery.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution to have the real-estate lobby investigated. I hope it will have the backing and support of the Republican leadership of the Eightieth Congress.

Families are looking for homes. Families are being evicted. And yet Congress prepares to go home. This is deeply regrettable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of the Members, I include my resolution:

Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the real-estate lobby and other pressure groups

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the activities of the real-estate lobby and any other pressure group during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses in weakening rent control, doing away with necessary aids to housing, and otherwise blocking a comprehensive housing program, and such further investigation and study as in its judgment will contribute to removing the obstacles presented by such lobby or pressure group to constructive housing legislation.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) on or before January 3, 1948, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 341

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 341, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of such investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as may be necessary for the purposes of such investigation and study, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Effect of Report by Conference Committee on Government Corporations on the Federal Public Housing Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 26, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, having been unable to strangle the public housing program by legislation, the report of the conferees on Government corporation appropriations, does the job effectively by appropriations.

The Senate, having restored a workable program after the House had scuttled FPHA is faced with the fact that its conferees had capitulated straight across the board.

Administrative appropriations are reduced from the Senate approved $13,000,000 to $11,500,000. The Bureau of the Budget had approved $17,000,000. This means more than a 50-percent reduction in personnel.

The report restores the House provision that not more than 20 percent of the total number of paid employees from the administrative funds can receive $4,500 annually or more.

For example, if the reduction is made according to salary grades, the Commissioner of FPHA would be required to reduce his top staff—P–8 classifications—assistant commissioners, comptroller, and regional directors from 16 to 3.

If reductions are made by divisions, by regions or by lumping the entire organization, the result is the same. There will be an agency of clerks to carry out one of the most technical assignments in Government.

The report also provides a reduction in the payments of annual contributions to local housing authorities in order to maintain low rents from the Senate-approved $5,200,000 to $4,000,000. The agency, on the basis of need, had requested $7,500,000. Therefore, the Congress is legislating to jeopardize local and Federal public housing bonds. Firm contracts may well be abrogated.

Any one of these actions might well mean death to public housing, but combined it is nothing short of murder at the time, when the housing crisis is the most critical in our history.

It must be remembered that FPHA is a supervisory and lending agency. It establishes public housing policy within the provisions of the law, makes loans to local public agencies for the construction of low-rent housing, and makes annual contributions to such agencies to permit families of lowest incomes to move from slums into decent shelter.

The agency, through highly trained personnel, audits the management, construction, and financing operations of local housing authorities in order to protect the Federal Government's interest.

This action today is not economy; it is a deliberate attempt to scuttle public housing. It will result in extravagance, due to the lack of competent audits of operations by trained people. It jeopardizes the faith and credit of the United States. It is gross irresponsibility.